

ON THE PROXIMATE TYPE OF AN ENTIRE FUNCTION

S. K. Vaish, H. S. Kasana

Abstract. The proximate type T and lower proximate type t of an entire function $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$ with respect to the proximate order $\rho(r)$ are defined as:

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup \log M(r)/r^{\rho(r)} = T \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \leq \infty, \quad M(r) = \max_{|z|=r} |f(z)|.$$

We have obtained some of the growth properties of the entire function $f(z)$ with the help of the proximate order $\rho(r)$ and proximate type T . Our main aim in this paper is to prove the following theorem: the proximate type of the derivative of $f(z)$ is the same as that of $f(z)$ with respect to the proximate order $\rho(r)$.

1. Introduction. Let $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$ be an entire function of order ρ , lower order λ and type P . Denoting with $M(r)$ the $\max_{|z|=r} |f(z)|$, the type of $f(z)$ is defined by

$$(1.1) \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log M(r)/r^{\rho} = P, \quad 0 \leq P \leq \infty.$$

Further, let

$$\mu(r) = \sup \{ |a_n| r^n : n \geq 0 \}, \quad \nu(r) = \max \{ n : |a_n| r^n = \mu(r) \}.$$

Then $\mu(r) = |a_{\nu(r)}| r^{\nu(r)}$. Similarly, if $\mu_s(r)$ and $\nu_s(r)$, ($s = 1, 2, 3, \dots$) denote the maximum term and its rank for the function $f^{(s)}(z)$ the s th derivative of $f(z)$, respectively, then $\mu(r)$, $\mu_s(r)$, $\nu(r)$ and $\nu_s(r)$ are all positive and non-decreasing functions of r . We write $\mu_0(r) \equiv \mu(r)$ and $\nu_0(r) \equiv \nu(r)$.

It is to be noted that $\log \mu(r)$ is an increasing convex function of $\log r$. In fact [6, p. 31]

$$(1.2) \quad \log \mu(r) = \log \mu(r_0) + \int_{r_0}^r \frac{\nu(x)}{x} dx, \quad r > r_0.$$

A function $\rho(r)$ satisfies the conditions

$$(1.3) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \rho(r) = \rho \quad \text{and}$$

$$(1.4) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r \rho'(r) \log r = 0$$

is called a proximate order [1, p. 54].

The proximate type T and lower proximate type t of $f(z)$ with respect to the proximate order $\rho(r)$ are defined as:

$$(1.5) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup \log M(r)/r^\rho = \frac{T}{t}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \leq \infty.$$

An entire function $f(z)$ is said to be of irregular growth, if $\rho \neq \lambda$ and it has been shown by Srivastava [4, p. 345] that lower type of an entire function of irregular growth of finite order is zero, that is

$$(1.6) \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log M(r)/r^\rho = 0, \quad 0 \leq \lambda < \rho < \infty.$$

In such a case if the quantity

$$(1.7) \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log M(r)/r^{\lambda(r)} = t_\lambda$$

is different from zero and infinity, then t_λ is defined to be the λ -type of $f(z)$ with respect to the comparison function $\lambda(r)$, which possesses the following properties:

$$(1.8) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(r) = \lambda \quad \text{and}$$

$$(1.9) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r \lambda'(r) \log r = 0.$$

Our aim in this paper is to study a few growth properties of the entire function $f(z)$ with the help of proximate order $\rho(r)$ and proximate type T . Throughout this paper we shall assume $0 < \rho < \infty$. We prove the following theorems:

2. Theorems. Theorem 1. We find

$$(2.1) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \{L(r+b)/L(r)\}^{r/b} = 1, \quad b > 0,$$

where $L(r) = r^{\rho(r)-\rho}$.

Theorem 2. Let $F(r)$ be any function bounded on each finite interval and increasing monotonically to infinity for $r > r_0$, and

$$(2.2) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup \inf F(r)/r^{\rho(r)} = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}, \quad 0 \leq \beta \leq \alpha \leq \infty,$$

then

$$(2.3) \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{r^{\rho(r)}} \int_{r_0}^r \frac{F(x)}{x} dx \right\} \leq \frac{\alpha}{\rho},$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{r^{\rho(r)}} \int_{r_0}^r \frac{F(x)}{x} dx \right\} \geq \frac{\beta}{\rho}.$$

Theorem 3. Let $f(z)$ be an entire function of order ρ . Then with respect to the proximate order $\rho(r)$, $f(z)$ is of (i) minimal proximate type when $H=0$, (ii) maximal proximate type when $h=\infty$, (iii) normal proximate type when $H \neq \infty$ and $h \neq 0$, where

$$(2.5) \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{v(r)/r^{\rho(r)}}{\inf_{r \rightarrow \infty} v(r)/r^{\rho(r)}} = \frac{H}{h}, \quad 0 \leq h \leq H \leq \infty,$$

Theorem 4. Let T and t be the proximate type and lower proximate type, respectively, of $f(z)$ with respect to the proximate function $\rho(r)$. If ρ be the order of $f(z)$ and

$$(2.6) \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M'(r)/M(r)r^{\rho(r)}}{\inf_{r \rightarrow \infty} M'(r)/M(r)r^{\rho(r)}} = \frac{\gamma}{\delta}, \quad 0 \leq \delta \leq \gamma \leq \infty,$$

where $M'(r)$ is the derivative of $M(r)$ which exists for almost all values of r , then

$$(2.7) \quad \delta \leq \rho t \leq \rho T \leq \gamma.$$

Theorem 5. The proximate type of the derivative of $f(z)$ is the same as that of $f(z)$ with respect to the proximate order $\rho(r)$.

Theorem 6. If ρ be the order and T be the proximate type with respect to the proximate order $\rho(r)$ of an entire function $f(z)$ and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} v(r)/r^{\rho(r)}$ exists, then

$$(2.8) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \{r [\mu_m(r)/\mu(r)]^{1/m} r^{-\rho(r)}\} = \rho T.$$

Theorem 7. The λ -type of the derivative of $f(z)$ is same as that of $f(z)$ with respect to $\lambda(r)$, provided $|a_n/a_{n+1}|$ forms a non-decreasing function of n for $n > n_0$.

3. Proofs of theorems. Proof of Theorem 1. Let us set $\varphi(r) = \rho(r) \log r$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \log \{L(r+b)/L(r)\} &= (\rho(r+b) - \rho) \log(r+b) - (\rho(r) - \rho) \log r \\ &= (\varphi(r+b) - \varphi(r)) - \rho \log(1+b/r) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= b \varphi'(k) - b \rho(1 - o(1))/r \\
 &= b\{\rho(r)/r + \rho'(r) \log r\} - b \rho(1 - o(1))/r, \\
 &\quad r_0 < r < k < r + b
 \end{aligned}$$

or, $r(\log \{L(r+b)/L(r)\})/b = \rho(r) + r \rho'(r) \log r - \rho(1 - o(1))$.

From (1.3) and (1.4), we have

$$\rho(x) - \rho < \varepsilon/2 \quad \text{and} \quad |x \rho'(x) \log x| < \varepsilon/2,$$

where ε is an arbitrarily taken small positive number. Using this, we get

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r b^{-1} \log \{L(r+b)/L(r)\} = 0.$$

Hence, $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \{L(r+b)/L(r)\}^{r/b} = 1$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

Corollary 1. For $r > r_0$, we have

$$1 - \varepsilon < \{(r+b)^{\rho(r+b)-\rho} r^{\rho-\rho(r)}\}^{r/b} < 1 + \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon > 0.$$

To prove Theorem 2 we need the following lemma.

Lemma 1. $\int_{r_0}^r x^{\rho(x)-1} dx = \frac{1}{r} r^{\rho(r)} + o(r^{\rho(r)}), \quad r > r_0.$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{r_0}^r x^{\rho(x)-1} dx &= \int_{r_0}^r x^{\rho(x)-\rho} x^{\rho-1} dx \\
 &= \left[\frac{x^{\rho(x)-\rho}}{\rho} \right]_{r_0}^r - \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{r_0}^r x^{\rho(x)-1} \{\rho(x) - \rho + x \rho'(x) \log x\} dx \\
 &= \frac{1}{\rho} r^{\rho(r)} + O(1) - o(1) \int_{r_0}^r x^{\rho(x)-1} dx
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{or, } (1 + o(1)) \int_{r_0}^r x^{\rho(x)-1} dx = \frac{1}{\rho} r^{\rho(r)} + O(1).$$

Thus, finally, we obtain

$$\int_{r_0}^r x^{\rho(x)-1} dx = \frac{1}{\rho} r^{\rho(r)} + o(r^{\rho(r)}).$$

Proof of Theorem 2. From (2.2), we have, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $r > r_0$, $F(r) < (\alpha + \varepsilon) r^{\rho(r)}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{r_0}^r \frac{f(x)}{x} dx &= \int_{r_0}^{r'} \frac{F(x)}{x} dx + \int_{r'}^r \frac{F(x)}{x} dx, \leq O(1) + (\alpha + \varepsilon) \int_{r'}^r x^{\rho(x)-1} dx \\ &= O(1) + (\alpha + \varepsilon) \left\{ \frac{1}{\rho} r^{\rho(r)} + o(r^{\rho(r)}) \right\}, \quad r_0 < r' < r \end{aligned}$$

or,

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{r^{\rho(r)}} \int_{r_0}^r \frac{F(x)}{x} dx \right\} \leq \frac{\alpha}{\rho}.$$

Similarly, considering the inequality

$$F(r) > (\beta - \varepsilon) r^{\rho(r)}, \quad r > r_0, \quad \varepsilon > 0,$$

we can prove (2.4).

Corollary 2. *If $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} F(r)/r^{\rho(r)} = B$, then*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{r^{\rho(r)}} \int_{r_0}^r \frac{F(x)}{x} dx \right\} = \frac{B}{\rho}, \quad r > r_0.$$

Proof of Theorem 3. It is well known that the function $v(r)$ is bounded in finite intervals, has an enumerable set of discontinuities and changes values at these discontinuities only. Also, for functions of finite order $\log M(r) \sim \log \mu(r)$. Hence, from (1.2) and (2.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log M(r)/r^{\rho(r)} = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log \mu(r)/r^{\rho(r)} \\ &= \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{1}{r^{\rho(r)}} \left\{ \log \mu(r_0) + \int_{r_0}^r \frac{v(x)}{x} dx \right\} \right] \\ &= \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{r^{\rho(r)}} \int_{r_0}^r \frac{v(x)}{x} dx \right\} \leq \frac{H}{\rho}, \end{aligned}$$

or,

$$(3.1) \quad \rho T \leq H.$$

Similarly, proceeding for lower proximate type t and applying (2.4), we obtain

$$(3.2) \quad \rho t \geq h.$$

Combining (3.1) and (3.2), we find

$$(3.3) \quad h \leq \rho t \leq \rho T \leq H.$$

All the three results (i), (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 3 now follow from (3.3).

Corollary 3. *If $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \nu(r)/r^{\rho(r)}$ exists and is equal to D , then $H = h = D$.*

It follows from (3.3) that $\rho t = \rho T = D$, that is

$$(3.4) \quad \rho T = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \nu(r)/r^{\rho(r)}$$

and in this case

$$(3.5) \quad t = T = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log M(r)/r^{\rho(r)}.$$

Thus existence of $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \nu(r)/r^{\rho(r)}$ implies the existence of $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log M(r)/r^{\rho(r)}$.

Proof of Theorem 4. It is known [6, p. 27] that

$$(3.6) \quad \log M(r) = \log M(r_0) + \int_{r_0}^r \frac{W(x)}{x} dx, \quad r > r_0$$

where $W(r)$ is a positive, indefinitely increasing function. Hence differentiating we get $M'(r)/M(r) = W(r)/r$. But $M'(r)/M(r)$ is bounded on each finite interval. Hence (2.6) follows from (2.3) and (2.4).

Proof of Theorem 5. We have [3, p. 42]

$$(3.7) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(n) |a_n|^{1/n} = (e \rho T)^{1/\rho},$$

where $\varphi(t)$ is the unique (for $t > t_0$) solution of the equation $t = r^{\rho(r)}$.

Let T_m be the proximate type of the m th derivative $f^{(m)}(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+m)(n+m-1) \cdots (n+1)a_{n+m}z^n$ with respect to proximate order $\rho(r)$. It is well known that the order of $f^{(m)}(z)$ is equal to that of $f(z)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (e \rho T_m)^{1/\rho} &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(n) \{(n+m)(n+m-1) \cdots (n+1) | a_{n+m} | \}^{1/n} \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(n) | a_n |^{1/n} \{(n+m)(n+m-1) \cdots (n+1)\}^{1/n} | a_{n+m} / a_n |^{1/n} \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(n) | a_n |^{1/n} = (e \rho T)^{1/\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives,

$$(3.8) \quad T_m = T.$$

Before we start the actual proof of the next theorem, we consider the following lemma which will be needed in this proof.

Lemma 2. For $m = 1, 2, 3, \dots$

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \nu(r)/r^{\rho(r)} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \nu_m(r)/r^{\rho(r)}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\log \mu(r) = \log \mu(r_0) + \int_{r_0}^r \frac{\nu(x)}{x} dx$$

$$\text{and } \log \mu_m(r) = \log \mu_m(r_0) + \int_{r_0}^r \frac{\nu_m(x)}{x} dx, \quad r > r_0.$$

Also, $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \nu_m(r)/r^{\rho(r)}$ exists for all non-negative integers m . Hence from (3.4), we obtain

$$(3.9) \quad \rho T = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \nu(r)/r^{\rho(r)} \quad \text{and}$$

$$(3.10) \quad \rho T_m = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \nu_m(r)/r^{\rho(r)}.$$

Lemma 2 now follows from (3.9) and (3.10).

Proof of Theorem 6. The proof of this theorem can be obtained by using Lemma 2 and the following result [5. p. 276]:

$$\nu(r)/r \leq \{ \mu_m(r) / \mu(r) \}^{1/m} \leq \nu_m(r)/r.$$

Proof of Theorem 7. If $F(x)$ is the unique solution of the equation $x = r^{\lambda(r)}$, for $x > x_0$, then the λ -type t_λ of the entire function $f(z)$ is given by [2, p. 76]

$$(3.11) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{F(n) | a_n |^{1/n}\} = (t_\lambda \lambda e)^{1/\lambda},$$

provided $|a_n/a_{n+1}|$ is a non-decreasing function of n for $n > n_0$.

Now, proceeding as for Theorem 4, we can prove the required result by using (3.11) instead of (3.7). The details are omitted.

REFERENCES

- [1] M.L. Cartwright, *Integral functions*, Cambridge Tract, C.U.P. 1956.
- [2] Kuldip Kumar, *A note on entire functions of irregular growth*, *Ganita*, **28**(1977), 75—78.
- [3] B.Ja. Levin, *Distribution of zeros of entire functions*, *Trans. AMS* **5**(1964),
- [4] R.S.L. Srivastava, Prem Singh, *On the λ -type of an entire function of irregular growth*, *Arch. Math.* **27**(1966), 342—346.
- [5] S.K. Vaish, G.S. Srivastava, *On the maximum term any its rank of an entire function of slow growth. I*, *Rev. Roum. Math. Pur. Appl.* **25**(1980), 277—282.
- [6] G. Valiron, *Lectures on the general theory of integral functions*, Chelsea Publ. Co., New York, 1949.

Department of Mathematics,
University of Roorkee,
Roorkee — 247672 (U.P.),
INDIA.

(Received 07 01 1982)