

# A NOTE ON THE GROWTH OF ENTIRE FUNCTIONS

CHUNG-CHUN YANG<sup>1</sup>

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND RESULTS

Let  $f(z)$  be a nonconstant entire function in the finite plane  $|z| < \infty$ , then the growth of  $f$  can be measured in terms of  $M(r, f)$  ( $= \max_{|z|=r} |f(z)|$ ) or  $T(r, f)$  ( $= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ |f(re^{i\theta})| d\theta$ , where  $\log^+ x = \max\{\log x, 0\}$ ), the Nevanlinna characteristic function. We note that the order  $\rho_f$  of  $f$  is defined to be  $\rho_f = \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log \log M(r, f) / \log r$ , ( $= \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log T(r, f) / \log r$ ), and that both  $T(r, f)$  and  $\log M(r, f)$  are monotone increasing functions of  $r$ . There are many results done on comparing the growth of  $T(r, f)$  with that of  $M(r, f)$ . Among them the following one is fundamental:

**THEOREM 1** ([3, p. 8]). If  $f(z)$  is regular for  $|z| \leq R$ , then

$$(1) \quad T(r, f) \leq \log^+ M(r, f) \leq \frac{R+r}{R-r} T(R, f) \quad (0 \leq r < R).$$

It is shown by examples that  $T(r, f) \sim \log M(r, f)$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  need not be necessarily true (see e. g., [3, p. 19]). However, in [4, p. 48] Kamthan proved the following result.

**THEOREM 2.** Let  $f(z)$  be an entire function of finite order. Then there exists a sequence  $\{r_n\}$ ,  $r_n \rightarrow \infty$  with  $n$ , such that

$$(2) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log \log M(r, f) / \log T(r, f) = 1.$$

We remark here that the above result can be extended to entire functions of all orders by an application of a result of T. SHIMIZU (see [3, p. 20]).

<sup>1</sup> Mathematics Research Center, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D. C., 20390



In the conclusion of the paper [4] Kamthan remarked that it was still an open question if

$$(3) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log \log M(r, f) / \log T(r, f) = 1$$

for entire functions of all orders.

In this note, although we do not give any positive answer to this question we have succeeded to prove that given any  $\epsilon > 0$  the quotient  $\log \log M(r, f) / \log T(r, f)$  is always less than  $1 + \epsilon$  outside a set  $E$  of  $r$  values of finite measure which depends on  $\epsilon$ . We shall also show that for certain entire functions of infinite order one can replace  $\epsilon$  by 0 in the above assertion. More precisely we have.

**THEOREM 3.** Let  $f(z)$  be a transcendental entire function and let  $\epsilon$  be any given positive number. Then possibly outside a set  $E(\epsilon)$  of  $r$  values of finite measure, we have for  $r \notin E(\epsilon)$

$$(4) \quad \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log \log M(r, f) / \log T(r, f) \leq 1 + \epsilon.$$

**THEOREM 4.** Let  $f(z)$  be an entire function. Suppose that

$$(5) \quad \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log T(r, f) / r^{12} \geq c < 0.$$

Then

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log \log M(r, f) / \log T(r, f) = 1$$

outside a set of  $r$  values of finite measure.

## 2. LEMMAS NEEDED FOR THE PROOFS.

In the proofs of Theorems 3 and 4 we shall need the following two lemmas of Borel's type argument on monotone functions.

**Lemma 1** ([3, p. 38]). Suppose that  $T(r)$  is continuous, increasing and  $T(r) \geq 1$  for  $r_0 \leq r < \infty$ . Then we have

$$(6) \quad T\{r + 1/T(r)\} < 2T(r)$$

outside a set  $E$  of  $r$  which has linear measure at most 2.

Remark. In view of the proof of Lemma 1, one can see easily that there is no sacredness about the constant multiple 2 in the right hand side of inequality (6). It can be replaced by any other fixed constant  $\epsilon$  with  $\epsilon > 1$ , and, of course, the measure of the exceptional set will no longer be bounded by 2 but  $\epsilon/(\epsilon - 1)$ .

Lemma 2 ([2, p. 118]). Let  $T(r)$  be a nonnegative, nondecreasing unbounded function defined in  $r > r_0$ . Then there is a set  $E$  with

$$(7) \quad m\{E \cap [\varrho, 2\varrho]\} \leq \frac{8\varrho}{[\log T(\varrho)]^4} \quad (\varrho > \varrho_0)$$

such that outside  $E$ , we have

$$(8) \quad T\{r + r/\log^2 T(r)\} < e T(r).$$

Remark. This is a special case of a Lemma 10.2 [1] ( $\alpha = 0, \epsilon = 1$ ).

### 3. Proof of Theorem 3.

From (1) by setting  $R = r + \frac{1}{\log T(r, f)}$  and taking logarithm, we have

$$(9) \quad \log \log M(r, f) \leq \log \left| \frac{2r + 1/\log T(r, f)}{1/\log T(r, f)} \right| + \\ + \log \{T(r + 1/\log T(r, f), f)\}$$

By applying the Borel's lemma to the monotone function  $T(r) = \log T(r, f)$  and noting the remark mentioned earlier, we obtain

$$(10) \quad \log T(r + 1/\log T(r, f), f) < (1 + \epsilon) \log T(r, f),$$

provided  $r \notin E(\epsilon)$ . From this and (9), we have for  $r \notin E(\epsilon)$

$$(11) \quad \log \log^+ M(r, f) \leq \log \{2r \log T(r, f) + 1\} + (1 + \epsilon) \log T(r, f) \\ \leq (1 + \epsilon + o(1)) \log T(r, f) + \log 2r.$$

Since for any transcendental entire  $f, \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log r / \log T(r, f) = 0$ , we have from (11) that

$$(12) \quad \log \log^+ M(r, f) \leq (1 + \epsilon + o(1)) \log T(r, f),$$

and Theorem 3 is thus proved.

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 4.

Put  $T(r) = T(r, f)$ , and without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\rho_0 = r_0 = 1$ . Let  $E$  be the set of  $r$  values greater than 1 where inequality (8) fails to hold.

By Lemma 2 and the assumption (5)

$$(13) \quad m\{E\} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m\{E \cap [n, n+1]\} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{8n}{\{\log T(n)\}^4} \\ \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{8(c-\epsilon)^{-4}}{n^2} < +\infty$$

where  $\epsilon$  is a positive number less than  $c$ .

Then, for  $r \notin E$  with  $r > 1$ ,

$$(14) \quad T\left(r + \frac{r}{\log^2 T(r, f)}, f\right) = T\left(r + \frac{r}{\log^2 T(r)}\right) < e T(r).$$

Now applying Theorem 1 by setting  $R = r + \frac{r}{\log^2 T(r)}$  with  $r \notin E$  and taking logarithm, we deduce

$$(15) \quad \log \log^+ M(r, f) \leq \log \frac{2r + r/\log^2 T(r)}{r/\log^2 T(r)} + \log T\left(r + \frac{r}{\log^2 T(r)}\right) \\ \leq \log \{2 \log^2 T(r) + 1\} + \log T\left(r + \frac{r}{\log^2 T(r)}\right).$$

Hence, by (14), for  $r \notin E$

$$(16) \quad \log \log^+ M(r, f) \leq (1 + o(1)) \log T(r, f).$$

Our assertion follows from this and the fact that  $\log \log^+ M(r, f) \geq \log T(r, f)$  for  $r > r_0$ .

#### REFERENCES

- 1 A EDREI & W H J FUCHS: *Bounds for the number of certain classes of functions*, Proc Lond Math Soc 3, Ser 12 (1962), 315-344
- 2 A EDREI & W H J FUCHS: *On meromorphic functions with regions free of poles and zeros*, Acta Math Vol 108, 1962
- 3 W K HAYMAN: *Meromorphic Functions*, Oxford (1964)
- 4 P K KAMTHAN: *Growth of a meromorphic function*, Collectana Mathematica, Vol XIX - Fases 1 ° y 2 ° - Año 1968

