# **MATH 427**

Problem Set #6

Solutions written by Alex Menendez

#### Problems from text:

- §3.1: 15, 16

- §3.2: 1, 6, 8, 13, 15

- §3.3: 4, 5, 8, 16

- Additionally, prove Theorem 3.3.10

### Solutions to §3.1 exercises:

15. Solution. Let  $f_n(w) = \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k w^k$ , and observe that

$$\int_0^z f_n(w) \ dw = \int_0^z \left( \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k w^k \right) \ dw$$
$$= \sum_{k=0}^n \left( \int_0^z (-1)^k w^k \ dw \right)$$
$$= \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{(-1)^k w^{k+1}}{k+1},$$

where the integral-summation swap performed between the first and second line is done since the sum is finite. Now, apply the limit to both sides to get:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_0^z f_n(w) \ dw = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{(-1)^k w^{k+1}}{k+1}$$
$$= \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{(-1)^k w^{k+1}}{k+1}.$$

However,  $f_n(w)$  converges uniformly to f(w) = 1/(1+w) on  $D_1(0)$ , so we can bring the limit inside the integral so that  $\lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_0^z f_n(w) \ dw = \int_0^z \lim_{n\to+\infty} f_n(w) \ dw$ , whence

$$\int_0^z \left( \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} (-1)^k w^k \right) dw = \int_0^z \frac{1}{1+w} dw$$
$$= \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{(-1)^k w^{k+1}}{k+1} \right].$$

The above derivation justifies an integral-summation swap for the sum now being infinite. Via Theorem 3.1.11, the above equality holds for all  $w \in D_R(0)$ , where R is the radius of convergence of the original series for f(w). Since the series for f(w) converges for any  $w \in D_1(0)$ , we have that our new series also converges on  $D_1(0)$ , because of equality.

16. Solution. Given  $E(z) = \int_0^z e^{-w^2} dw$ , we differentiate to obtain

$$E'(z) = e^{-z^2},$$

which follows by the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus. We've done this since  $e^{-w^2}$  can't be anti-differentiated in elementary terms, so we'll differentiate and work backward. Thus,

$$E'(z) = e^{-z^2} = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{(-1)^k z^{2k}}{k!}.$$

1

Page 1 of 5

Anti-differentiating, we have

$$E(z) = \int E'(z) dz$$

$$= \int \left(\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{(-1)^k z^{2k}}{k!}\right) dz$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{(-1)^k z^{2k+1}}{(2k+1)k!} + C.$$

Since E(0) = 0, we have that C = 0, and so the desired series is

$$E(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{(-1)^k z^{2k+1}}{(2k+1)k!},$$

which converges over all of  $\mathbb{C}$ .

## Solutions to §3.2 exercises:

1. Solution. We know that  $\frac{1}{1-z} = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} z^k$  for |z| < 1. Now, note that  $\frac{1}{(1-z)^2} = \left(\frac{1}{1-z}\right) \left(\frac{1}{1-z}\right)$ . Since we know the power series expansion for each factor, we have that

$$\frac{1}{(1-z)^2} = \left(\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} z^k\right) \left(\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} z^k\right).$$

We want to consolidate this sum so that it's written with only one  $\sum$  symbol, so note that, for a product of power series, we have that

$$\left(\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \alpha_k z^k\right) \left(\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \beta_k z^k\right) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \gamma_k z^k,$$

where  $\gamma_k = \sum_{j=0}^k \alpha_k \beta_{k-j}$ . The coefficients for each factor are all 1, so

$$\gamma_k = \underbrace{1 + 1 + \ldots + 1}_{k+1 \text{ terms}} = k+1,$$

so

$$\frac{1}{(1-z)^2} = \left(\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} z^k\right) \left(\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} z^k\right) = \left[\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} (k+1)z^k\right].$$

6. Solution. Let  $f(z) = 1/\cos(z) = \sec(z)$ . In a general sense, the power series for  $\sec(z)$  assumes the form

$$\sec(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{\sec^k(0)z^k}{k!},$$

where  $\sec^k(0)$  denotes the  $k^{\text{th}}$  derivative of  $\sec(z)$  at  $z_0 = 0$ . However, the poles of the function  $\sec(z)$  and its subsequent derivatives occur precisely where the function  $\cos(z)$  has its zeroes, which are at odd integer multiples of  $\pi/2$ . Let's formalize this argument. Suppose that the radius of convergence of the series is  $\pi/2 + \epsilon$ , for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . Certainly, then,

$$D_{\frac{\pi}{2}}(0) \subset D_{\frac{\pi}{2} + \epsilon}(0).$$

By convergence, for any  $\epsilon' > 0$ , there exists an M such that, if n > M, then

$$\left| \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{\sec^{k}(0)z^{k}}{k!} - \sec(z) \right| < \epsilon'.$$

By assumption, this is true for any  $z \in D_{\frac{\pi}{2}+\epsilon}(0)$ , but in particular, we can choose  $z = \pi/2$ , but that's precisely where  $\sec(z)$  has a pole and diverges to  $\pm \infty$ . So the above bound doesn't hold when  $|z| \geq \pi/2$ , and so we require that  $|z| < \pi/2$ , so the radius of convergence is  $\pi/2$ , as required.

8. Solution. Let

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} \sin(z)/z & \text{if } z \neq 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } z = 0. \end{cases}$$

Obviously, f is analytic at z = 0 since 1 is analytic. What concerns us is the analyticity of f on  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ , wherein we'll write  $\sin(z)/z$  using power series methods. Let's begin by decomposing  $\sin(z)/z$  in the following way:

$$\frac{\sin(z)}{z} = \sin(z) \left(\frac{1}{z}\right)$$
$$= \sin(z) \left(\frac{1}{1 - (1 - z)}\right).$$

Writing each factor as its power series, we have that

$$\sin(z) \left( \frac{1}{1 - (1 - z)} \right) = \left( \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{(-1)^k z^{2k+1}}{(2k+1)!} \right) \left( \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} (1 - z)^k \right)$$
$$= \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{(-1)^k z^{2k}}{(2k+1)!}.$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{d}{dz} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{(-1)^k z^{2k}}{(2k+1)!} \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{2k(-1)^k z^{2k-1}}{(2k+1)!},$$

so  $\sin(z)/z$  is analytic, provided  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ .

- 13. Proof. Since f is analytic on  $D_r(z_0)$ , we have that the power series for f converges uniformly to f everywhere inside the disc. Now, the radius of convergence must be at least r. Supposing that the radius of convergence is  $R = r \epsilon$ , then f is bounded, a contradiction.
- 15. Proof. Suppose that  $f_n \rightrightarrows f$  on every compact  $K \subset U$ . We'll use the derivative approximation formula given by:

$$f^k(z_0) = \frac{k!}{2\pi i} \int_{|w-z_0|=\epsilon} \frac{f(w)}{(w-z_0)^{k+1}} dw.$$

However, this integral is taken over a disc, so we need to square away some logistical issues first – we can't take any  $z_0$  on the "corners" of K, otherwise the disc containing  $z_0$  will have to include points outside of K. So, let  $\tilde{K}$  be the "thickened" version of K. We can enlarge K to account for this because  $\tilde{K}$  will still have the same cover as K and thus still be compact. So, using the approximation formula to write the derivatives  $f_n^k(z_0)$  and  $f^k(z_0)$ , we have that:

$$|f_n^k(z_0) - f^k(z_0)| = \left| \frac{k!}{2\pi i} \int_{|w-z_0| = \epsilon} \frac{f_n(w)}{(w - z_0)^{k+1}} dw - \frac{k!}{2\pi i} \int_{|w-z_0| = \epsilon} \frac{f(w)}{(w - z_0)^{k+1}} dw \right|$$

$$\leq \frac{k!}{2\pi} \int_{|w-z_0| = \epsilon} \left| \frac{f_n(w) - f(w)}{(w - z_0)^{k+1}} \right| dw$$

$$= \frac{k!}{2\pi} \int_{|w-z_0| = \epsilon} \frac{|f_n(w) - f(w)|}{|w - z_0|^{k+1}} dw.$$

We know that  $f_n \rightrightarrows f$  on all  $\tilde{K}$ , so certainly  $f_n$  converges uniformly to f on any disc inside  $\tilde{K}$ . So, for any  $\epsilon' > 0$ , there exists an N > 0 such that, if n > N, then  $|f_n - f| < \epsilon'$ . So in particular, we have an upper bound for the integrand along the path that the integral is taken over:

$$\frac{|f_n(w) - f(w)|}{(w - z_0)^{k+1}} < \frac{\epsilon'}{|w - z_0|^{k+1}}.$$

However,  $|w-z_0|=\epsilon$ , so by Cauchy's estimate we have that

$$\frac{|f_n(w) - f(w)|}{(w - z_0)^{k+1}} < \frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon^{k+1}}.$$

3

Page 3 of 5

Lastly, we know that any path integral is bounded above by the supremum of the integrand multiplied by the arc length of the path, so in particular,

$$\frac{k!}{2\pi} \int_{|w-z_0|=\epsilon} \frac{|f_n(w) - f(w)|}{|w - z_0|^{k+1}} dw \le (2\pi\epsilon) \frac{k!}{2\pi} \frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon^{k+1}}$$
$$= \frac{k!\epsilon'}{\epsilon^k},$$

and so we have that he difference  $|f_n^k - f^k|$  is bounded uniformly on each compact  $\tilde{K} \subset U$  and hence each compact  $K \subset U$ , so  $f_n^k \rightrightarrows f^k$ , as required.

### Solutions to §3.3 exercises:

**Theorem** (Theorem 3.3.10 from Taylor). An entire function f is a polynomial of degree at most n if and only if there are positive constants A and B such that

$$|f(z)| \le A + B|z|^n$$

for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ .

Proof. The stipulation that f being a polynomial implies the given bound on f has been proven in the text, so we'll prove the converse. Suppose that f is an entire function and that there exist real, positive constants A and B so that  $|f(z)| \leq A + B|z|^n$  for all z. We need to show that this inequality can only be satisfied if f is a polynomial of degree  $\leq n$ . We know that f is entire, so it's analytic on all of  $\mathbb{C}$ . Certainly, this means that f is analytic on any open  $U \subset \mathbb{C}$  containing a disc  $\overline{D_R(z_0)}$ . For any z on the boundary of this disc, called  $z_b$ , we have that

$$|f(z_b)| \le A + B|z_b|^n,$$

which gives us a bound on f along the boundary. Then, using Cauchy's estimate, we then have that the  $n^{\text{th}}$  derivative of f evaluated at  $z_0$  is bounded in the following way:

$$|f^n(z_0)| \le \frac{n!M}{R^n},$$

where M is the maximum of f on the boundary. However, we know what this maximum is, so more explicitly we have that

$$|f^n(z_0)| \le \frac{n! (A+B|z_b|^n)}{R^n}.$$

Of course,  $R = |z_0 - z_b|$ , so by substitution, we obtain

$$|f^n(z_0)| \le \frac{n! (A+B|z_b|^n)}{|z_0-z_b|^n}.$$

Estimating the  $(n+1)^{th}$  derivative, we have that

$$|f^{n+1}(z_0)| \le \frac{(n+1)! (A+B|z_b|^{n+1})}{|z_0-z_b|^{n+1}}.$$

However, this is true for the entire plane, so letting  $|z_0 - z_b|$  tend to  $\infty$  gives that  $|f^{n+1}(z_0)|$  is bounded above by zero, so  $f^{n+1}(z_0) = 0$ . This, of course, implies that f must be a polynomial of degree at most n, which is what we wanted to show.

4. Proof. Suppose that f is entire and that  $|f(z)| \ge 1$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ . Now, consider the function 1/|f(z)|. Since f is entire, it's analytic over all of  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $|f| \ge 1$  everywhere in the plane (so in particular |f| is not zero), so 1/|f(z)| is entire, as well. Since  $|f(z)| \ge 1$ , it follows by inequality that

$$\frac{1}{|f(z)|} \le 1$$

for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ . So, we have an entire, bounded function, so invoking Liouville's Theorem, we have that 1/f(z) must be constant everywhere. This implies that f(z) must be constant, and so we are done.

4

Page 4 of 5

5. Proof. f is entire, by assumption, so if we can show that f is bounded, then by Liouville's Theorem, f has to be constant, and we'll be done. So, we can express f in the following way:

$$f(z) = \Re(f(z)) + i\Im(f(z)).$$

However,  $\Re(f(z)) \leq a$  for some finite a, so

$$f(z) = \Re(f(z)) + i\Im(f(z)) \le a + i\Im(f(z)).$$

Taking the modulus on both sides, we get:

$$|f(z)| \le |a+i\Im(f(z))|$$
$$= \sqrt{a^2 + \Im(f(z))^2},$$

which is a real number. So, we've found a real bound for |f(z)| and so f is bounded. Together with the fact that f is entire, Liouville's Theorem tells us that f is constant, as required.

8. Proof. Suppose that  $|f(z)| \le K|e^z|$  for every  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  and that K > 0 is a real number. Dividing both sides, we have that

$$\frac{|f(z)|}{|e^z|} = \left| \frac{f(z)}{e^z} \right| < K.$$

Since f is entire and  $e^z$  is entire, letting  $g(z) = f(z)/e^z$ , we see that g is entire, as well. In the inequality above, however, we've found that  $|g(z)| \le K$ , so by Liouville's Theorem, g(z) must be constant, so

$$\frac{f(z)}{e^z} = C,$$

for some real constant C, whence re-arranging gives  $f(z) = Ce^z$ , as required.

16. Solution. Suppose that such functions f do exist. For such f, we have – by assumption – that  $|f| \le A + B \log |z|$ . However, for  $|z| \gg 1$ , the  $\log |z|$  term grows much slower than the polynomial term |z|, so certainly  $|f| \le A + B|z|$  for  $|z| \gg 1$ . To be more explicit, this holds for  $|z| \ge R$ , for some sufficiently large R. For |z| < R, we have that  $|f| \le C + D|z|$ , for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  (provided different constants C and D). So, for all z, we have that f behaves polynomially, so  $f(z) = a_1z + a_0$ . However, if f is a polynomial, then  $|f| \le A + B \log |z|$  for  $|z| \ge 1$  if and only if  $a_1 = 0$ , in which case f has to be constant. This gives a contradiction, since f must be non-constant. So, the answer is no and we are done.

5

Page 5 of 5