

This is a collection of old complex analysis qualifier exam solutions, as well as some notes on useful results and proofs.

## Useful Results and Proofs

### Analytic Functions

**Definition:** Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  be an open set. A function  $f: U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is called *analytic* if, for any  $z_0 \in U$ , there is  $r > 0$  and  $(a_k)_k \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k (z - z_0)^k$$

for all  $z \in U(z_0, r)$ .

Analytic functions form a  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra.

**Theorem (Identity Theorem):** Let  $f, g: U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be analytic functions defined on a connected open set (also known as a region). If

$$A = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid f(z) = g(z)\}$$

admits an accumulation point in  $U$ , then  $f = g$  on  $U$ .

*Proof.* To begin, we show that if  $f: U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is an analytic function that is not uniformly zero, then for any  $z_0 \in U$ , there is  $\rho > 0$  such that  $f$  is nonzero on  $\dot{U}(z_0, \rho) \subseteq U$ . Towards this end, we may write

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k (z - z_0)^k,$$

for all  $z \in U(z_0, r)$ , some  $r > 0$ , and since  $f$  is not uniformly zero, there is some minimal  $\ell$  such that  $a_\ell \neq 0$ . This yields

$$f(z) = (z - z_0)^\ell \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_{k+\ell} (z - z_0)^k;$$

the function  $h: U(z_0, r) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  given by

$$h(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_{k+\ell} (z - z_0)^k$$

then has the same radius of convergence as  $f$  and is not zero at  $z_0$ , so that  $g$  is not zero on some  $U(z_0, \rho)$  as  $g$  is continuous.

Now, we let  $V_1$  be the set of accumulation points of  $A$  in  $U$ , and let  $V_2 = U \setminus V_1$ .

If  $z \in V_2$ , then there is some  $r_1 > 0$  such that  $\dot{U}(z_0, r_1) \cap A = \emptyset$ , or that  $\dot{U}(z_0, r_1) \subseteq A^c$ . Meanwhile, since  $U$  is open, there is some  $r_2 > 0$  such that  $U(z_0, r_2) \subseteq U$ , meaning that if  $r = \min\{r_1, r_2\}$ , then  $U(z_0, r) \subseteq U \setminus A$ . Thus,  $V_2$  is open.

Meanwhile, if  $z \in V_1$ , then since  $V_1 \subseteq U$ , it follows that there is  $r > 0$  such that  $U(z, r)$  and  $(a_k)_k$  such that

$$f(w) - g(w) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k (w - z)^k$$

for all  $w \in U(z, r)$ . We claim that  $f(w) - g(w)$  is uniformly zero on  $U(z, r)$ . Else, if there were  $w_0 \in U(z, r)$  such that  $f(w_0) \neq g(w_0)$ , then it would follow that there is  $0 < s \leq r$  such that  $f(w) \neq g(w)$  for all  $w \in U(w_0, s)$ . Yet, this would contradict the assumption that  $z$  is an accumulation point, meaning that  $V_1$  is open.

Since  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are disjoint open sets whose union is equal to  $U$ , it follows that either  $V_1 = U$  or  $V_2 = U$ . If  $A \neq \emptyset$ , then the identity theorem follows.  $\square$

## Differentiability

**Definition:** If  $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  is an open set, then we say  $f$  is differentiable at  $z_0 \in U$  if

$$\lim_{w \rightarrow z_0} \frac{f(w) - f(z_0)}{w - z_0}$$

exists. We call this value the *derivative* of  $f$  at  $z_0$ , and usually write  $f'(z_0)$ .

If  $f$  is differentiable at every  $z_0 \in U$ , we say  $f$  is differentiable on  $U$ .

If  $f$  is continuous and admits a continuous derivative, then we say  $f$  is *holomorphic*.

Note that the limit must be independent of direction. That is, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\left| \frac{f(w) - f(z_0)}{z - z_0} - f'(z_0) \right| < \varepsilon$$

whenever  $0 < |z - z_0| < \delta$ .

Now, given  $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ , write  $z = x + iy$  and

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= f(x + iy) \\ &= u(x, y) + iv(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

where  $u = \operatorname{Re}(f)$  and  $v = \operatorname{Im}(f)$ . Observe then that if  $f$  is differentiable at  $x_0 + iy_0 \in U$ , then since the limit is independent of path, by taking the limit over real numbers, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f'(z_0) &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{(u(x+h, y) + iv(x+h, y)) - (u(x, y) + iv(x, y))}{h} \\ &= \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + i \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}, \end{aligned}$$

and by taking over the imaginary numbers,

$$\begin{aligned} f'(z_0) &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{(u(x, y+h) + iv(x, y+h)) - (u(x, y) + iv(x, y))}{ih} \\ &= -i \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain the following.

**Definition:** The system of partial differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} &= \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} &= -\frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \end{aligned}$$

is known as the *Cauchy–Riemann Equations*.

Observe that if  $f$  is differentiable, then the  $u$  and  $v$  in the definition of  $f$  satisfy the Cauchy–Riemann equations. Yet, we desire to understand a bit more about when exactly  $f$  is differentiable or holomorphic.

**Proposition:** If  $f = u + iv$  is a holomorphic function such that  $u, v$  are in  $C^2(U)$ , then  $u$  and  $v$  are harmonic. That is,  $u$  and  $v$  satisfy Laplace’s equation:

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2} = 0.$$

We call  $u$  and  $v$  *harmonic conjugates* for each other. That is, if  $u: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a harmonic function, then  $v \in C^1(U)$  is called a harmonic conjugate if the Cauchy–Riemann equations hold for  $u$  and  $v$ .

**Theorem:** Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  be a ball or all of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Then, every harmonic function on  $U$  has a harmonic conjugate. If  $u \in C^3(U)$ , then this conjugate is itself harmonic.

**Lemma:** Let  $g: U((x_0, y_0), R) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be such that  $g$  and  $\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}$  are continuous. Then,  $G: U((x_0, y_0), R) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , given by

$$G(x, y) = \int_{y_0}^y g(x, t) dt$$

satisfies

$$\frac{\partial G}{\partial x} = \int_{y_0}^y \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x, t) dt.$$

*Proof of Lemma.* Write

$$\frac{G(x+h, y) - G(x, y)}{h} - \int_{y_0}^y \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x, t) dt = \int_{y_0}^y \left( \frac{g(x+h, t) - g(x, t)}{h} - \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x, t) \right) dt.$$

By mean value theorem, the first term is equal to  $\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x_1, t)$  for some  $x_1$  between  $x$  and  $x+h$ . As  $h \rightarrow 0$ ,  $x_1 \rightarrow x$ , as  $\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}$  is uniformly continuous on a compact subset that contains  $x$  and  $x+h$ . We may exchange limit and integral to obtain the desired result.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem.* We prove for the case of  $U = U((x_0, y_0), R)$ . Define

$$v(x, y) = \int_{y_0}^y \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}(x, t) dt + \phi(x),$$

with  $\phi(x)$  to be determined later. By the fundamental theorem of calculus, we have

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x},$$

while by differentiating under the integral sign, and using the fact that  $u$  is harmonic, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} &= \int_{y_0}^y \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(x, t) dt + \frac{d\phi}{dx} \\ &= - \int_{y_0}^y \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2}(x, t) dt + \frac{d\phi}{dx} \\ &= - \frac{\partial u}{\partial y}(x, y) + \frac{\partial u}{\partial y}(x, y_0) + \frac{d\phi}{dx}. \end{aligned}$$

Defining  $\phi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\phi(x) = - \int_{x_0}^x \frac{\partial u}{\partial y}(s, y_0) ds,$$

we see that  $v$  thus satisfies all the necessary requirements to be a harmonic conjugate.

Now, if  $u$  is  $C^3$ , then we defined  $v$  via the derivative of  $u$ , so that  $v$  is  $C^2$ , and thus  $v$  is harmonic.  $\square$

## Cauchy's Integral Formula

**Proposition:** Fix  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $R > 0$ , and  $f: U(z_0, R) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  holomorphic. For all  $z \in U(z_0, R)$ , we have

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S(z_0, R)} \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta.$$

*Proof.* It suffices to show that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S(z_0, R)} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(z)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta = 0.$$

By using the chain rule and fundamental theorem of calculus, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S(z_0, R)} \frac{f(\zeta) - f(z)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S(z_0, R)} \frac{\int_0^1 f'((1-t)z + t\zeta)(\zeta - z) dt}{\zeta - z} d\zeta \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S(z_0, R)} \int_0^1 f'((1-t)z + t\zeta) dt d\zeta \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S(z_0, R)} \frac{d}{d\zeta} \left( \frac{1}{t} f((1-t)z + t\zeta) \right) d\zeta \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Proposition:** Let  $f: U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a holomorphic function. The following all hold:

- (i)  $f$  is analytic;
- (ii)  $f$  is smooth with  $f^{(n)}$  holomorphic;
- (iii) for all  $z_0 \in U$ , if we let  $R = \sup\{r > 0 \mid U(z_0, r) \subseteq U\}$ , then there is  $(a_n)_n \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n (z - z_0)^n,$$

where the power series has radius of convergence  $R$ .

*Proof.*

- (i) There exists  $r < s$  with  $U(z_0, s) \subseteq U$  and  $r < r_1 < s$  such that  $S(z_0, r_1) \subseteq U$ . By Cauchy's Integral Formula, and a power series expansion of  $\frac{1}{\xi - z}$  about  $z_0$ , this gives

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{S(z_0, r_1)} \frac{f(\xi)}{\xi - z} d\xi \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (z - z_0)^n \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{S(z_0, r_1)} \frac{f(\xi)}{(\xi - z_0)^{n+1}} d\xi \right)}_{=: a_n} \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n (z - z_0)^n. \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) Analytic functions are automatically smooth, hence complex-differentiable with continuous

derivative.

(iii) If  $r < r_1 < R$ , then

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (z - z_0)^n \left( \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S(z_0, r_1)} \frac{f(\xi)}{(\xi - z)^{n+1}} d\xi \right),$$

and since the series converges uniformly, we have

$$\frac{f^{(n)}(z)}{n!} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{S(z_0, r_1)} \frac{f(\xi)}{(\xi - z)^{n+1}} d\xi.$$

Since  $r$  was arbitrary, this holds for any  $0 < r_1 < R$ , whence

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n (z - z_0)^n$$

holds for all  $z \in U(z_0, R)$ .

□

**Corollary:** Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  be open, let  $z_0 \in U$ , and  $r > 0$  with  $B(z_0, r) \subseteq U$ . The following hold:

(i) for all  $z \in U(z_0, r)$ ,

$$\frac{f^{(n)}(z)}{n!} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S(z_0, r)} \frac{f(\xi)}{(\xi - z)^{n+1}} d\xi;$$

(ii) for all  $n > 0$ ,

$$|f^{(n)}(z_0)| \leq \frac{n!}{r^n} \sup_{\zeta \in S(z_0, r)} |f(\zeta)|.$$

This particular result is known as *Cauchy's Estimate*.

**Theorem** (Liouville's Theorem): If  $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is holomorphic and bounded in modulus, then  $f$  is constant.

Liouville's Theorem follows from applying Cauchy's estimate to  $f$  and using the fact that  $f$  is bounded to find that all higher derivatives of  $f$  vanish.

**Theorem** (Fundamental Theorem of Algebra): If  $p(z) = a_n z^n + \cdots + a_1 z + a_0$  has  $n \geq 1$  and  $a_n \neq 0$ , then there is at least one  $z_0$  such that  $p(z_0) = 0$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $p(z)$  were never zero. It would follow then that  $\frac{1}{p(z)}$  is also an entire function.

Since  $\lim_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} |p(z)| = \infty$ , it follows that  $\lim_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|p(z)|} = 0$ , whence  $\left| \frac{1}{p(z)} \right|$  is an entire function that is bounded (as all functions that vanish at infinity are bounded). This means that  $\frac{1}{p(z)}$  is constant, so  $p(z)$  is constant. □

**Corollary:** Let  $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a nonconstant entire function. Then,  $f(\mathbb{C})$  is dense in  $\mathbb{C}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose there were  $w \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $r > 0$  such that  $U(w, r) \cap f(\mathbb{C}) = \emptyset$ . Then,  $|f(z) - w| \geq r$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , meaning that

$$g(z) = \frac{1}{f(z) - w}$$

is bounded and entire (the entirety following from the fact that  $f(z) - w$  is nonvanishing). □

## Cycles, Winding Numbers, and Homology

Now, we may generalize some of these results related to Cauchy's Integral Formula.

**Proposition:** Let  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a piecewise  $C^1$  loop. For all  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{im}(\gamma)$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma} \frac{1}{\xi - z} d\xi \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\phi: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be defined by

$$\phi(t) = \int_a^t \frac{\gamma'(s)}{\gamma(s) - z} ds.$$

Then, we observe

$$\phi(b) = \oint_{\gamma} \frac{1}{\xi - z} d\xi.$$

Then, define  $\psi: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by

$$\psi(t) = \frac{e^{\phi(t)}}{\gamma(t) - z}.$$

By the fundamental theorem of calculus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(t) &= \frac{\gamma'(t)}{\gamma(t) - z} \\ \psi'(t) &= \frac{\phi'(t)e^{\phi(t)}}{\gamma(t) - z} - \frac{e^{\phi(t)}\gamma'(t)}{(\gamma(t) - z)^2} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

whence  $\psi(t)$  is constant, and  $\psi(t) = \psi(a)$ , so

$$\psi(a) = \frac{1}{\gamma(a) - z}.$$

In particular,  $\psi(b) = \psi(a)$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\phi(b)} &= \psi(b)(\gamma(b) - z) \\ &= \psi(a)(\gamma(a) - z) \\ &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

so  $\phi(b) = 2\pi i k$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . □

**Definition:** Let  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a piecewise  $C^1$  loop. For all  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{im}(\gamma)$ , define

$$n(\gamma; z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma} \frac{1}{\xi - z} d\xi$$

to be the *winding number* of  $\gamma$  about  $z$ .

**Definition:** A piecewise  $C^1$  *cycle* is a formal sum

$$\Gamma = \gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_n,$$

where the  $\gamma_j: [a_j, b_j] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  are piecewise  $C^1$  loops. The *length* of  $\Gamma$  is the sum of the lengths of the respective  $\gamma_j$ .

Given a piecewise  $C^1$  cycle  $\Gamma$ , define

$$\oint_{\Gamma} f(z) dz = \sum_{j=1}^n \oint_{\gamma_j} f(z) dz,$$

and

$$n(\Gamma; z) = \sum_{j=1}^n n(\gamma_j; z).$$

**Proposition:** The following hold for the winding number  $n(\gamma; z)$ :

- (i) the function  $n(\Gamma; \cdot): \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{im}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is continuous;
- (ii)  $n(\Gamma; z)$  is constant on each connected component of  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \text{im}(\Gamma)$ ;
- (iii) there exists a unique unbounded connected component with  $n(\Gamma; z) = 0$  for all  $z$  in this unbounded connected component.

*Proof.*

- (i) Since  $\text{im}(\Gamma)$  is compact, any  $z \notin \text{im}(\Gamma)$  admits a strictly positive

$$\text{dist}_{\text{im}(\Gamma)}(z) = \inf_{w \in \text{im}(\Gamma)} |w - z|.$$

Let  $w \in \mathbb{C}$  be such that

$$|w - z| < \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}_{\text{im}(\Gamma)}(z),$$

so that  $w \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{im}(\Gamma)$ . Observe then that

$$\begin{aligned} |n(\Gamma; z) - n(\Gamma; w)| &= \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} \frac{1}{\xi - z} - \frac{1}{\xi - w} d\xi \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=1}^n \oint_{\gamma_j} \left| \frac{1}{\xi - z} - \frac{1}{\xi - w} \right| |d\xi| \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=1}^n \oint_{\gamma_j} \left| \frac{z - w}{(\xi - z)(\xi - w)} \right| |d\xi| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \left( \frac{2}{\text{dist}_{\text{im}(\Gamma)}(z)} \right)^2 \ell(\Gamma) |z - w|, \end{aligned}$$

whence  $|n(\Gamma; z) - n(\Gamma; w)|$  is sufficiently small whenever  $|z - w|$  is sufficiently small.

- (ii) If  $C$  is a connected component of  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \text{im}(\Gamma)$ , and  $n(\Gamma; \cdot): C \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is continuous, then since  $\mathbb{Z}$  is discrete,  $n(\Gamma; \cdot)$  is constant on  $C$ .
- (iii) For uniqueness, if there are unbounded connected components  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  of  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \text{im}(\Gamma)$ , then there exists  $M > \sup_{z \in \text{im}(\Gamma)} |z|$  and  $w_1 \in C_1, w_2 \in C_2$  such that  $|w_1| > 2M$  and  $|w_2| > 2M$ . Since  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{U(0, 2M)}$  is path connected, there exists  $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  with  $|\gamma(t)| \geq 2M$  and  $\gamma(0) = w_1, \gamma(1) = w_2$ . Therefore,  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are in the same connected component.

Existence then follows from  $\text{im}(\Gamma)$  being compact.

Finally, let  $(z_n)_n \subseteq C$ , where  $C$  is the unbounded connected component, be such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |z_n| = \infty$ . For  $M > \sup_{z \in \text{im}(\gamma)} |z|$ , there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $|z_m| > M$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |n(\Gamma; z_m)| &= \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} \frac{1}{\xi - z} d\xi \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=1}^k \oint_{\gamma_j} \frac{1}{|\xi - z|} |d\xi| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=1}^k \oint_{\gamma_j} \frac{1}{|z_m| - M} |d\xi| \\ &= \frac{\ell(\Gamma)}{2\pi(|z_m| - M)}, \end{aligned}$$

whence  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} n(\Gamma; z_m) = 0$ , meaning that there exists  $N$  such that  $|n(\Gamma; z_m)| < 1$  for all  $m \geq N$ , meaning  $n(\Gamma; z_m) = 0$  for all sufficiently large  $m$ . Since  $C$  is connected, it thus follows that  $n(\Gamma; z) = 0$  for all  $z \in C$ .

□

## Maximum Modulus Principle

**Theorem (Mean Value Property):** Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  be open,  $f: U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  holomorphic, with  $z_0 \in U$  and  $r > 0$  such that  $B(z_0, r) \subseteq U$ . Then,

$$f(z_0) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(z_0 + re^{i\theta}) d\theta.$$

*Proof.* By the Cauchy Integral Formula, we have

$$f(z_0) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S(z_0, r)} \frac{f(\xi)}{\xi - z} d\xi.$$

Parametrizing  $\gamma(\theta) = z_0 + re^{i\theta}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} f(z_0) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{f(z_0 + re^{i\theta})}{re^{i\theta}} ire^{i\theta} d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(z_0 + re^{i\theta}) d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Corollary:** If  $u: \mathbb{R}^2 \supseteq U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is harmonic,  $(x_0, y_0) \in U$ , and  $r > 0$  is such that  $B((x_0, y_0), r) \subseteq U$ , then

$$u(x_0, y_0) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u(x_0 + r \cos(\theta), y_0 + r \sin(\theta)) d\theta.$$

*Proof.* Take real parts of the mean value property for holomorphic  $f = u + iv$ .

□

Observe then that the triangle inequality implies that

$$|u(x_0, y_0)| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |u(x_0 + r \cos(\theta), y_0 + r \sin(\theta))| d\theta.$$

Functions that satisfy this weaker criterion are known as *subharmonic*. It is subharmonic functions for which the most general case of the *maximum modulus principle* hold.



**Theorem (Maximum Modulus Principle):** Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  be open and connected, and let  $u: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be subharmonic. Suppose there exists  $(x_0, y_0) \in U$  such that  $u(x_0, y_0) \geq u(x, y)$  for all  $x, y \in U$ . Then,  $u$  is constant.

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda = u(x_0, y_0)$ , and let  $E = \{(x, y) \mid u(x, y) = \lambda\} = u^{-1}(\{\lambda\})$ . We see immediately that  $E$  is closed; we claim that  $E$  is also open.

Fix  $(x_1, y_1) \in E$ . Then,  $u(x_1, y_1) = \lambda$ . Take  $r > 0$  such that  $U((x_1, y_1), r) \subseteq U$ . Then, for all  $0 < s < r$ , we have  $S((x_1, y_1), s) \subseteq U$ , meaning that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= u(x_1, y_1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u(x_1 + s \cos(\theta), y_1 + s \sin(\theta)) \, d\theta \\ &\leq \lambda, \end{aligned}$$

with the latter inequality following from the fact that  $\lambda$  is a local maximum. Therefore,  $u(x_1 + s \cos(\theta), y_1 + s \sin(\theta)) = \lambda$  for all  $0 < s < r$ , whence  $U((x_1, y_1), r) \subseteq E$ . Thus,  $E$  is open, so since  $U$  is connected, it follows that  $E$  is all of  $U$ , meaning  $u$  is constant.  $\square$

**Corollary:** If  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  is bounded and  $u: \overline{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous with  $u|_U$  subharmonic, then there exists  $(x_0, y_0) \in \partial U$  such that  $u(x_0, y_0) = \sup_{(x,y) \in U} u(x, y)$ .

**Corollary:** If  $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  is open and connected, with  $f: U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  holomorphic, then if  $|f|: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  has a local maximum at  $z_0 \in U$ , then  $f$  is constant.

*Proof.* Let  $r > 0$  be such that  $U(z_0, r) \subseteq U$ . Then, restricting  $|f|$  to  $U(z_0, r)$ , we see that  $|f|$  restricted to  $U(z_0, r)$  is subharmonic viewed as a function on  $U(z_0, r)$ , hence  $|f|$  is constant on  $U(z_0, r)$ .

Now, by the mean value property and triangle inequality, it follows that for all  $0 < s < r$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z_0)| &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(z_0 + se^{i\theta})| \, d\theta \\ &= |f(z_0)|, \end{aligned}$$

meaning that these are equalities. In particular, there exists some  $\theta_s$  such that  $e^{i\theta_s} f(z_0 + se^{i\theta}) \geq 0$ , meaning that for this value of  $s$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z_0)| &= e^{i\theta_s} \int_0^{2\pi} f(z_0 + se^{i\theta}) \, d\theta \\ &= e^{i\theta_s} f(z_0), \end{aligned}$$

with the latter equality following from the mean value property. Since this holds for any  $s$ , it follows that  $\theta_s$  is independent of  $s$ , meaning that  $f(z)e^{i\theta_s} \geq 0$  for all  $z \in U(z_0, r)$ , meaning that  $\text{Im}(e^{i\theta_s} f(z)) = 0$  on  $U(z_0, r)$ , whence  $f(z)e^{i\theta_s}$  is constant, meaning  $f$  is constant on  $U(z_0, r)$ .

Finally, by the identity theorem, it follows that  $f$  is constant on  $U$ .  $\square$

## Classification of Singularities

The classification of singularities seeks to answer two fundamental questions: if  $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  is open,  $z_0 \in U$ , and  $f: U \setminus \{z_0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is holomorphic,

- does  $f$  have a holomorphic extension to  $U$  including  $z_0$ ;
- and what else can we say about the behavior of  $f$  at  $z_0$ ?

**Definition:** Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  be open,  $z_0 \in U$ ,  $f: U \setminus \{z_0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  holomorphic.

- If there exists a holomorphic  $g: U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  with  $g = f$  on  $U \setminus \{z_0\}$ , then we say  $z_0$  is a *removable singularity*.
- If  $\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} |f(z)| = \infty$ , then we say  $f$  has a *pole* at  $z_0$ .
- Else, we say  $f$  has an *essential singularity* at  $z_0$ .

**Theorem** (Riemann's Theorem on Removable Singularities): Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  be open,  $z_0 \in U$ , and  $f: U \setminus \{z_0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  holomorphic. Then,  $z_0$  is a removable singularity if and only if  $\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} f(z) = 0$ .

*Proof.* If  $z_0$  is removable, then  $g(z)$  is a holomorphic function with  $g(z) = f(z)$  on  $U \setminus \{z_0\}$ , and since  $g$  is continuous, it follows that  $\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} g(z) = g(z_0)$ , whence  $\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} (z - z_0)g(z) = \lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} (z - z_0)f(z) = 0$ .

Now, if  $\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} (z - z_0)f(z) = 0$ , then there is  $r$  such that  $B(z_0, r) \subseteq U$ , and since  $f$  is locally bounded around  $z_0$ , it follows that

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S(z_0, r)} \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta$$

holds for all  $z \in \dot{U}(z_0, r)$ . Yet, the formula extends to  $z_0$  as it is bounded, whence we may define the holomorphic extension for  $f$  by

$$g(z) = \begin{cases} f(z) & z \neq z_0 \\ \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S(z_0, r)} \frac{g(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta & z = z_0 \end{cases}.$$

□

## Old Exams

### Notation

- $U(z_0, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z - z_0| < r\}$
- $B(z_0, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z - z_0| \leq r\}$
- $S(z_0, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z - z_0| = r\}$
- $\dot{U}(z_0, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid 0 < |z - z_0| < r\}$
- $A(z_0, r_1, r_2) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid r_1 < |z - z_0| < r_2\}$