V. Uniqueness theorems for analytic functions.

- 0. Introduction.
- A. A sharp version of the Phragmén-Lindelöf theorem
- B. Asymptotic series.
- C. A uniqueness theorem for aymptotic series

Introduction.

A sharp version of the Phragmén-Lindelöf theorem is proved in Theorem A.2. It is preceded by a differential inequality where Carelman's result in Theorem A.1 was inspired by earlier constructions due to Lindelöf. Asymptotic series are studied in section B where earlier work by Borel led Carleman to the general construction in Theorem B.1. The question of uniqueness is expressed via Theorem B.6 and is settled via solutions to a variational problem in Section C.

A. The Phragmén-Lindelöf theorem.

Let f(z) be an entire function. To each $0 \le \phi \le 2\pi$ we set

(*)
$$\rho_f(\phi) = \max_r |f(re^{i\phi})|$$

The text-book Le calcus des residues by Ernst Lindelöf contains examples of entire functions f where $\rho_f(\phi)$ is finite for all ϕ with the exception $\phi = 0$, i.e. only along the positive real axis the ρ -number fails to be bounded. An example is the entire function

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{z^2} \cdot \sum_{\nu=2}^{\infty} \frac{z^{\nu}}{\left(\log \nu\right)^{\nu}}$$

Here one verifies that that there exists a constant k such that:

$$|f(re^{i\phi})| \le \exp(e^{\frac{k}{|\phi| \cdot |2\pi - \phi|}})$$

It turns out that the example above is essentially sharp. Namely, assume that the ρ -number in (*) is finite for almost every ϕ . Then the ρ_f -function cannot be too small, unless f is reduced to a constant. Before Theorem A.1 is announced we introduce the non-negative function

(***)
$$\omega(\phi) = \log[\log^+ \rho_f(\phi)]$$

Thus, we have taken a two-fold logarithm which means that $\omega(\phi)$ is considerably smaller compared to the ρ -function.

A.1.Theorem. For every non-constant entire function f(z) one has

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \omega(\phi) \cdot d\phi = +\infty$$

Proof. Assume that f is not a constant. Consider the maximum modulus function

$$M(r) = \max_{|z|=r} |f(z)|$$

By the ordinary Liouville theorem the M-function increases to infinity. So we may assume that $M(r) \ge 1$ when $r \ge r_*$ for some r_* . Put

(i)
$$v(r) = \operatorname{Log} M(r) : U(z) = \operatorname{Log} |f(z)|$$

Given r we consider the domain

(ii)
$$\Omega_r = \{U > \frac{v(r)}{2}\} \cap \{|z| < r\}$$

Next, let ζ_r be some point on the circle |z| = r where $|f(\zeta_r)| = M(r)$ where ζ_r always can be chosen so that there exist arbitrary small δ where $|f(\zeta_{r-\delta})| = M(r-\delta)$ and $\lim_{\delta \to 0} \zeta_{r-\delta} = \zeta_r$. Next, in Ω we get the connected component Ω_* whose boundary contains ζ_r . Put

(iii)
$$\gamma = \partial \Omega_* \cap \{|z| = r\}$$

Notice that

(iv)
$$U(z) \le \frac{v(r)}{2} : z \in \partial \Omega_* \cap \{|z| < r\}$$

So if W is the harmonic function in the disc D_r with boundary values 1 on γ and 0 on $\{|z|=1\}\setminus \gamma$ we have:

(v)
$$U(z) - \frac{v(r)}{2} - \frac{v(r)}{2} \cdot W(z) \le 0 \quad : \quad z \in \partial \Omega_*$$

The maximum principle entails that (v) also holds in Ω_* . Hence there exist arbitrary small $\delta > 0$ such that

(vi)
$$v(r-\delta) - \frac{v(r)}{2} - \frac{v(r)}{2} \cdot W(\zeta_{r-\delta}) \le 0$$

Let $2r \cdot \ell$ be the total length of the intervals which belong to γ . By the general inequality from XX we have

(vii)
$$W(\zeta_{r-\delta}) \le \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\ell}^{\ell} \frac{r^2 - (r-\delta)^2}{r^2 - 2r(r-\delta)\cos\theta + (r-\delta)^2} d\theta$$

Let $h(r-\delta)$ denote the right hand side in (vii) which by (vi) gives us arbitrary small $\delta > 0$ such that

(viii)
$$v(r-\delta) - \frac{v(r)}{2} - \frac{v(r)}{2} \cdot h(r-\delta) \le 0$$

Rewriting this inequality we obtain

$$\frac{v(r) - v(r - \delta)}{\delta} \ge \frac{v(r)}{2} \cdot \frac{1 - h(r - \delta)}{\delta}$$

Next, from the definition of the h-function one has the limit formula

(ix)
$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{1 - h(r - \delta)}{\delta} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{\cos \ell}{\sin \ell}$$

Passing to the limit as $\delta \to 0$ in (vii) we get the differential inequality:

$$(**) v'(r) \ge \frac{v(r)}{2\pi r} \cdot \frac{\cos \ell}{\sin \ell}$$

Next, put

$$\log r = s$$
 and $\log \frac{v(r)}{2} = g(s)$

By derivation rules we see that (**) gives

$$\frac{dg}{ds} \ge \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{\cos \ell}{\sin \ell}$$

Next, identifying γ with a subset of the periodic interval $0 \le \phi \le 2\pi$ it is clear that the definition of the ω -function gives the inclusion

$$(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \qquad \gamma \subset \{\omega(\phi) \ge g(s)\}$$

So if $\lambda(s)$ is the Lebesgue measure of the set $\{\omega(\phi) \geq g(s)\}$ then $\ell \leq \lambda(s)$ and (***) gives

$$\frac{dg}{ds} \ge \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{\cos \lambda(s)}{\sin \lambda(s)}$$

Next, the inequality $\sin(t) \ge \frac{2}{\pi} \cdot t$ gives a positive constant k which is independent of s such that the following hold for sufficiently large s, i.e. to ensure that the corresponding r-value satisfies $M(r) \ge 1$:

(xi)
$$\frac{dg}{ds} \ge \frac{k}{\lambda(s)}$$

Hence, starting from some sufficiently large s_0 one has

(xii)
$$\int_{s_0}^{s} \lambda(s) \cdot dg(s) \ge k(s - s_0)$$

This inequality implies in particular that one has a divergent integral:

(xiii)
$$\int_{s_0}^{\infty} \lambda(s) \cdot dg(s) = +\infty$$

Finally, the general equality for distribution functions from XXX gives:

(xiiii)
$$\int_0^{2\pi} \omega(\phi) \cdot d\phi = \int_0^{\infty} \lambda(s) \cdot dg(s)$$

The last integral is $+\infty$ by (xiii) and the requested divergence for the intergal of the ω -function follows.

Remark. At the end of the article [XXX] Carleman points out that the proof above gives a sharp version of the Phragmén- Lindelöf theorem. More precisely one has the following: Let f(z) be analytic in a sector

$$S_{\alpha} = \{ z = re^{i\phi} : -\alpha < \phi < \alpha \}$$

Define $\omega(\phi)$ as above when when $-\alpha < \phi < \phi$. With these notations one has:

A.2. Theorem. Let f be bounded on the half-lines $arg(z) = \alpha$ and $arg(z) = -\alpha$ and assume also that

$$\int_{-\alpha}^{\alpha} \omega(\phi) \cdot d\phi < \infty$$

Then f(z) is bounded in the whole sector

A.3. Exercise. Deduce Theorem A.2 from the preceding results.

B. Asymptotic series.

Introduction. The notion of asymptotic series was expressed as follows by Poincaré:

Let f(z) be complex-valued function defined in some subset E of \mathbb{C} and z_0 is a boundary point. We say that f has an asymptotic series expansion at z_0 if there exists a sequence of complex numbers c_0, c_1, \ldots such that $\lim_{z \to z_0} f(z) = c_0$ and for each $n \ge 0$ one has:

(*)
$$\lim_{z \to z_0} (z - z_0)^{-n-1} \left[f(z) - (c_0 + c_1 + \dots + c_n z^n) \right] = c_{n+1}$$

where the limit is taken as z stay in E.

It is obvious that if f has an asymptotic expansion at z_0 then the sequence $\{c_n\}$ is unique. Constructions of functions which admit asymptotic expansions appear in Emile Borel's thesis Sur quelques points de la théorie des fonctions from 1895 and he proved for example that for every sequence of real numbers $\{c_n\}$ there exists a C^{∞} -function f(x) on the real line whose Taylor expansion at x=0 is given by the sequence, i.e.

$$\frac{f^{(n)}(0)}{n!} = c_n$$
 : $n = 0, 1, \dots$

Following [Car: xx, page 29-31] we prove a complex version of Borel's result where D_+ denotes the open half-disc $\{\Re \mathfrak{e}(z) > 0 \cap \{|z| < 1\}$.

B.1. Theorem. To each sequence $\{c_n\}$ of complex numbers there exists a bounded analytic function F(z) in D_+ which has an asymptotic series expansion at z=0 given by $\{c_n\}$.

Proof. It suffices to prove this when $c_0 = 0$. Let a_1, a_2, \ldots be a sequence of positive real numbers such that $\sum a_{\nu} < \infty$. Given $\{c_n\}$ we construct a sequence of functions $P_1(z), P_2(z), \ldots$ which are analytic in the half plane $\Re \mathfrak{c}(z) > 0$ as follows: First

(i)
$$P_1(z) = c_1 z \left(1 - \frac{z}{z + \epsilon_1}\right) : \epsilon_1 = \frac{\alpha_1}{|c_1|} \Longrightarrow$$

(ii)
$$|P_1(z)| = |c_1| \cdot \epsilon_1 \cdot \frac{|z|}{|z + \epsilon_1|} \le \alpha_1 \quad : \quad \Re \mathfrak{e}(z) \ge 0$$

Now $P_1(z)$ has a series expansion at z=0:

(ii)
$$P_1(z) = \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} c_{\nu}^{(1)} \cdot z^{\nu}$$

Notice that the series converges in the disc $|z| < \epsilon_1$. Set

(iii)
$$P_2(z) = \left[c_2 - c_2^{(1)}\right] \cdot z^2 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{z}{z + \epsilon_2}\right) : |c_2 - c_2^{(1)}| \cdot \epsilon_2 \le a_2$$

With such a careful choice of a small positive ϵ_2 we see that

(iii)
$$|P_2(z)| \le a_2 \cdot |z| \quad : \quad \mathfrak{Re}(z) \ge 0$$

Again we obtain a convergent series at z = 0:

(iv)
$$P_2(z) = P_1(z) = \sum_{\nu=2}^{\infty} c_{\nu}^{(2)} \cdot z^{\nu}$$

The inductive construction. Let $n \geq 3$ and suppose that P_1, \ldots, P_{n-1} have been constructed where we for each $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ have a series expansion

$$(v) P_k(z) = \sum_{\nu=k}^{\infty} c_{\nu}^{(k)} \cdot z^{\nu}$$

Then we define

$$P_n(z) = \left[c_n - (c_n^{(1)} + \dots + c_n^{(n-1)}) \cdot z^n \cdot \left(1 - \frac{z}{z + \epsilon_n} \right) : \left| c_n - (c_n^{(1)} + \dots + c_n^{(n-1)}) \right| \cdot \epsilon_n \le \alpha_n$$

So we obtain a new series at z = 0:

(vi)
$$P_n(z) = \sum_{\nu=n}^{\infty} c_{\nu}^{(n)} \cdot z^{\nu}$$

Staying in the half-disc D_+ , the inductive construction gives

$$\max_{z \in D_+} |P_n(z)| \le \alpha_n \quad : \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Hence there exists a bounded analytic function in D_+ defined by

$$F(z) = P_1(z) + P_2(z) + \dots$$

At this stage we leave as an exercise to the reader to verify that

$$\lim_{z \to 0} z^{-n-1} \cdot \left[F(z) - (c_1 z + \ldots + c_n z^n) \right] = c_{n+1}$$

B.2. Uniqueness of asymptotic expansions.

There exist functions whose asymptotic series is identically zero. Here is an example:

$$F(z) = e^{-\frac{1}{z^2}}$$

If $z = re^{i\theta}$ with $-\pi/8 \le \theta \le \pi/8$ we see that

$$|F(re^{i\theta})| = \exp{(-\frac{\cos{2\theta}}{r^2})} \le \exp(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2} \cdot r^2})$$

It follows that the asymptotic series at z = 0 is identically zero. Via a conformal map from the half-disc D_+ above to the unit circle we are led to the following problem: Let F(z) be analytic in the open unit disc D. Suppose that

(*)
$$\lim_{z \to 1} \frac{F(z)}{(1-z)^n} = 0 : n = 1, 2, \dots$$

We seek growth conditions on F in order that (*) implies that F is identically zero. A complete answer to this uniqueness problem was proved by Carleman in [Car]. First we exhibit a class of functions whose asymptotic series vanish identically. Namely, consider a sequence of real positive numbers A_1, A_2, \ldots To each $n \ge 1$ we put

(**)
$$I_n = \exp\left(\frac{1}{\pi} \int_1^\infty \operatorname{Log}\left[\sum_{\nu=1}^{\nu=n} \frac{r^{2\nu}}{A_{\nu}^2}\right] \cdot dr\right)$$

B.3. Definition. Denote by \mathfrak{B} the set of all sequences $\{A_n\}$ such that the associated sequence $\{I_n\}$ is bounded, i.e. there exists some K such that

$$I_n \leq K$$
 : $n = 1, 2 \dots$

In [Car: page 7-52] the following existence result is proved:

B.4. Theorem. To each sequence $\{A_n\} \in \mathfrak{B}$ there exists an analytic function f(z) in D which is not identically zero and satisfies:

(***)
$$\frac{|f(z)|}{|(1-z)^n|} \le A_n \quad : \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

- **B.5.** A converse result. In [loc.cit] appears also proof of the converse to the result above.
- **B.6. Theorem.** Let $\{A_n\}$ be a sequence of positive numbers such that there exists an analytic function f(z) in D which is not reduced to a constant and satisfies (***) in Theorem 4. Then $\{A_n\} \in \mathfrak{B}$.

The proof of the two results above rely upon a varational problem which is presented below while the deduction after of the two cited results above are left to the reader who may find details in [Carleman].

C. A variational problem.

Let $n \ge 1$ and a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n some *n*-tuple of non-negative real numbers where $a_0 > 0$ is assumed. Let $\mathcal{O}(*)$ denote the family of analytic functions f(z) in the unit disc satisfying f(0) = 1. Put

$$I(f) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot \sum_{\nu=0}^{\nu=n} a_{\nu}^{2} \cdot \int_{0}^{2\pi} \frac{|f(e^{i\theta})|^{2}}{|e^{i\theta} - 1|^{2\nu}} \cdot d\theta \quad : \quad I_{*} = \min_{f \in \mathcal{O}(*)} I(f)$$

Remark. Above we have a variational problem. It turns out that there exists a unique function $f_*(z)$ which yields a minimum. To find f_* we shall use the rational function:

$$\Omega(z) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{\nu=n} a_{\nu}^{2} \left[(1-z)(1-\frac{1}{z}) \right]^{n-\nu}$$

Notice that

(i)
$$\Omega(e^{i\theta}) = a_0^2 + \sum_{\nu=1}^{\nu=n} a_{\nu}^2 \cdot |e^{i\theta} - 1|^{2n-2\nu}$$

In particular Ω is real and positive on the unit circle and by symmetry it has n zeros ρ_1, \ldots, ρ_n in the unit disc and $\frac{1}{\rho_1}, \ldots, \frac{1}{\rho_n}$ are the zeros in the exterior disc. Thus

(*)
$$\Omega(z) = z^{-n} \cdot \frac{(-1)^n}{a_0^2} \cdot p_n(z) \cdot \prod (z - \frac{1}{\rho_\nu}) : p_n(z) = (z - \rho_1) \cdots (z - \rho_n)$$

Next, let us put

(ii)
$$\phi(z) = \frac{f(z)}{(1-z)^n}$$

From (i) we see that

(iii)
$$I(f) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot \int_0^{2\pi} \Omega(e^{i\theta}) \cdot |\phi(e^{i\theta})|^2 \cdot d\theta$$

We will use the last expression to prove

C.1 Theorem. The variational problem has a unique solution where the minimum I_* is achieved by the function

$$f_*(x) = (1-z)^n \cdot \frac{1}{\prod 1 - \rho_{\nu} \cdot z}$$

Moreover,

$$I_* = \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot \int_0^{2\pi} \text{Log} \left[\sum_{\nu=0}^{\nu=n} a_{\nu}^2 \cdot \frac{1}{(2 \cdot \sin \frac{\theta}{2})^{2\nu}} \right] \cdot d\theta$$

Proof By (iii) the variational problem is equivalent to seek the minimum of

(1)
$$I(\phi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot \int_0^{2\pi} \Omega(e^{i\theta}) \cdot |\phi(e^{i\theta})|^2 \cdot d\theta \quad : \phi(0) = 1$$

With f_* as in the theorem we get the ϕ -function

$$\phi_*(z) = \frac{1}{\prod 1 - \rho_{\nu} \cdot z}$$

Now f_* is a unique minimizing function if we have proved the strict inequality

$$(3) I(\phi_* + h) < I(\phi_*)$$

for every analytic function h(z) in D with h(0) = 0. To show this we notice that (1) can be replaced by a complex line integral over |z| = 1 which gives

$$I(\phi_* + h) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \cdot \int_{|z|=1} \Omega(z) \cdot |\phi(z)| + h(z)|^2 \cdot \frac{dz}{z} =$$

(4)
$$I(\phi_* + I(h) + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \cdot \int_{|z|=1} \Omega(z) \cdot [\bar{\phi}_*(z) \cdot h(z) + \phi_*(z) \cdot \bar{h}(z)] \cdot \frac{dz}{z}$$

Since $\Omega = \bar{\Omega}$ holds on |z| = 1 where we also have $\bar{z} = z^{-1}$, it follows from (*) that |z| = 1 entails

$$\Omega(z) = z^n \cdot \frac{(-1)^n}{a_0^2} \cdot \prod \left(\frac{1}{z} - \frac{1}{\rho_\nu}\right) \cdot \prod \left(\frac{1}{z} - \rho_\nu\right) =$$

(ii)
$$\frac{(-1)^n}{a_0^2} \cdot \prod (1 - z\rho_{\nu}) \cdot \prod (\frac{\rho_{\nu}}{z} - 1) \cdot \frac{1}{\rho_1 \cdots \rho_n}$$

At the same time (2) gives

(ii)
$$\bar{\phi}_*(z) = \left(\prod \left(1 - \frac{\rho_{\nu}}{z}\right)\right)^{-1}$$

Hence

$$\Omega(z) \cdot \bar{\phi}_*(z) = \frac{1}{\rho_1 \cdot \rho_n \cdot a_0^2} \cdot \prod \left(1 - \rho_\nu \cdot z \right)$$

Since h(0) = 0 it follows that

$$\int_{|z|=1} \Omega(z) \cdot \bar{\phi}_*(z) \cdot h(z) \cdot \frac{dz}{z} = 0$$

In the same way we get

$$\int_{|z|=1}\,\Omega(z)\cdot\phi_*(z)\cdot\bar{h}(z)\cdot\frac{dz}{z}=0$$

Hence the last integral in (4) is zero which shows that

$$I(\phi_* + h) = I(\phi_* + I(h))$$

and since I(h) > 0 we get the strict inequality in (3).