

HEYMAN' S REGULARITY THEOREM FOR THE COEFFICIENTS OF UNIVALENT FUNCTIONS

1970

SovietRxiv

View the original and related papers at <https://sovietrxiv.org/items/ru-197001.32831>

Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.

Abstract

Full Text

UDC 517.54

MATHEMATICS

I. M. MILIN

HEYMAN' S REGULARITY THEOREM FOR THE COEFFICIENTS OF UNIVALENT FUNCTIONS

(Presented by Academician M. A. Lavrent'ev on 2 X 1969)

Let S be the class of functions $f(z) = z + c_2z^2 + \dots$, regular and univalent in the unit disk, and let Σ be the class of functions $F(z) = z + a_0 + a_1z^{-1} + \dots$, meromorphic and univalent in the domain $|z| > 1$. Denote the expansions:

$$\ln \frac{f(z)}{z} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2\gamma_k z^k, \quad f(z) \in S; \tag{1}$$

$$\ln \frac{z-t}{F(z)-F(t)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k(t)z^{-k}, \quad F(z) \in \Sigma; \tag{2}$$

$$(1-z)^{-h} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} d_k(h)z^k, \quad h > 0. \tag{3}$$

In addition, by the symbol $\{\psi(z)\}_n$ we shall denote the coefficient of z^n in the expansion of the function $\psi(z)$ about $z = 0$, and by $M(r, f)$ the maximum of $|f(z)|$ on the circle $|z| = r$, $0 < r < 1$.

It is known ⁽¹⁾ that for every function $f(z) \in S$ there exists

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} (1-r)^2 M(r, f) = \alpha, \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1,$$

and, for $\alpha > 0$, a radius of greatest growth of the function, i.e. such a $\varphi_0 \in [0, 2\pi]$ that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} (1-r)^2 |f(re^{i\varphi_0})| = \alpha, \quad 0 < \alpha \leq 1. \tag{4}$$

Using (4) and the "area inequality" ⁽²⁾:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n|A_n(z)|^2 \leq \ln \frac{1}{1-r^2}, \quad |z| = \frac{1}{r} > 1,$$

I. E. Bazilevich ⁽³⁾ proved for $f(z) \in S$ the inequality

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \left| \gamma_k - \frac{1}{k} e^{ik\varphi_0} \right|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1}{\alpha}. \quad (5)$$

It is proved below that conditions (4) and (5) are already sufficient for the regular growth of the Taylor coefficients even of non-univalent functions, i.e. the following holds.

Theorem. For a function $f(z) = z + c_2 z^2 + \dots$ satisfying conditions (4) and (5), for any $\lambda > 1/4$ the asymptotic equality

$$\frac{\{(f(z)/z)^\lambda\}_n}{d_n(2\lambda)} \sim \alpha^\lambda \exp\{i[\lambda \arg f(re^{i\varphi_0}) - (n+\lambda)\varphi_0]\} \quad (n \rightarrow \infty), \quad (6)$$

holds, where r is connected with n by the relation

$$1 - r = \theta/n, \quad m < \theta < M \quad (7)$$

(m and M are positive constants).

The proof of the theorem is based on two lemmas.

Lemma 1. If the coefficients of the power series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k z^k$ satisfy—

satisfy the conditions:

$$\text{a) } \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k|A_k|^2 < \infty;$$

$$\text{b) } \operatorname{Re} \sum_{k=1}^n A_k = O(1) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty) \quad (8)$$

and if the power series is formed

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} D_k z^k = \exp \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k z^k \right), \quad (9)$$

then for every $h > 1/2$ the following asymptotic equality holds:

$$\sum_{k=0}^n D_k - \frac{1}{d_n(h)} \sum_{k=0}^n d_{n-k}(h) \bar{D}_k = o(1) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty). \tag{10}$$

Denoting by $S_n^{(h)}$ the numerator of the Cesàro mean in (10), i.e.,

$$S_n^{(h)} = \sum_{k=0}^n d_{n-k}(h) D_k = \left\{ \frac{1}{(1-z)^h} \exp \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k z^k \right) \right\}_n \quad (n = 0, 1, \dots), \tag{11}$$

we write for the Cesàro means the obvious identity

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{S_n^{(h)}}{d_n(h)} - \frac{S_{n+1}^{(h)}}{d_{n+1}(h)} &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left[\frac{d_k(h)}{d_n(h)} - \frac{d_k(h+1)}{d_{n+1}(h+1)} \right] D_{n-k} = \sum_{k=1}^n d_{n-k}(h) \cdot k D_k / (n+h) \times \\ &\times d_n(h) = \sum_{k=1}^n d_{n-k}(h) \sum_{\nu=1}^k D_{k-\nu} \nu A_\nu / (n+h) d_n(h) = \sum_{k=1}^n S_{n-k}^{(h)} k A_k / (n+h) d_n(h). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Cauchy's inequality, applied to the right-hand side of (12), gives the estimate

$$\left| \frac{S_n^{(h)}}{d_n(h)} - \frac{S_{n+1}^{(h)}}{d_{n+1}(h)} \right| \leq \frac{1}{(n+h)d_n(h)} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} |S_k^{(h)}|^2 \sum_{k=1}^n k^2 |A_k|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \tag{13}$$

In order to estimate $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} |S_k^{(h)}|^2$, we note that, by the conditions of the lemma, the relation

$$\sum_{k=1}^n k \left| \frac{h}{k} + A_k \right|^2 = h^2 \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k} + 2h \operatorname{Re} \sum_{k=1}^n A_k + \sum_{k=1}^n k |A_k|^2 \leq h^2 \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k} + O(1)$$

holds, and, consequently, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\delta_n(h) = \max_{1 \leq \nu \leq n} \left\{ \frac{1}{h^2} \sum_{k=1}^{\nu} k \left| \frac{h}{k} + A_k \right|^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{\nu} \frac{1}{k} \right\} = O(1). \tag{14}$$

But earlier, for the coefficients of a compound function of exponential form, inequality (4) was established:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left| \left\{ \exp \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{h}{k} + A_k \right) z^k \right) \right\}_k \right|^2 \leq \exp(h\delta_{n-1}(h)) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} d_k^2(h),$$

using which, and taking into account (11) and (14), we shall have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} |S_k^{(h)}|^2 = O(1) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} d_k^2(h) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty), \quad h > 0. \quad (15)$$

Simple calculations give, for the sum of squares of binomial coefficients when $h > 1/2$, the estimate

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} d_k^2(h) = O(1)n^{2h-1} \quad (n \rightarrow \infty),$$

which, together with (15), (13), and condition (8a), leads to the result

$$S_n^{(h)}/d_n(h) - S_n^{(h+1)}/d_n(h+1) = o(1) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty), \quad h > \frac{1}{2}. \quad (16)$$

In particular, for $h = 1$, it follows from (16) that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n kD_k = o(1) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty). \quad (17)$$

Now consider the difference

$$\sum_{k=0}^n D_k - \frac{S_n^{(h)}}{d_n(h)} = \frac{1}{d_n(h)} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k} [d_n(h) - d_{n-k}(h)] kD_k. \quad (18)$$

Since for $h \geq 2$ the sequence of numbers

$$\frac{1}{k} [d_n(h) - d_{n-k}(h)]$$

($k = 1, 2, \dots, n$) is nondecreasing, by Abel's inequality, from (18) and (17) we obtain

$$\sum_{k=0}^n D_k - \frac{S_n^{(h)}}{d_n(h)} = o(1) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty), \quad h \geq 2. \quad (19)$$

Equalities (16) and (19), considered together, prove the lemma completely.

Lemma 2. Under the conditions of Lemma 1, the following asymptotic equalities hold for $h \geq \frac{1}{2}$:

$$\frac{1}{d_n(h)} \sum_{k=0}^n d_{n-k}(h) D_k \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} D_k r^k \sim \exp \left(\sum_{k=1}^n A_k \right) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty), \quad (20)$$

where r is connected with n by formula (7).

Taking into account Lemma 1 and condition (8b), it suffices to prove the relations

$$\sum_{k=0}^n D_k \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} D_k r^k \sim \exp \left(\sum_{k=1}^n A_k \right) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty). \quad (21)$$

We first derive the second part of (21). To this end consider the difference

$$\sum_{k=1}^n A_k - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k r^k = \sum_{k=1}^n A_k (1 - r^k) - \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} A_k r^k.$$

Applying Cauchy's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{k=1}^n A_k - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k r^k \right| &\leq \left[\sum_{k=1}^n k |A_k|^2 (1 - r^k) \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k} (1 - r^k) \right]^{1/2} + \\ &+ \frac{1}{n} \left[\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} k |A_k|^2 \cdot \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} k r^{2k} \right]^{1/2} \leq \left[\sum_{k=1}^n k |A_k|^2 (1 - r^k) \right]^{1/2} [n(1 - r)]^{1/2} + \\ &+ \left[\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} k |A_k|^2 \right]^{1/2} \frac{1}{n(1 - r)}, \end{aligned}$$

whence, taking (7) and (8a) into account, we conclude that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n A_k - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k r^k = o(1) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty), \quad (22)$$

which, after exponentiation, gives the second part of (21).

Next, consider the other difference for $0 < r < 1$:

$$\sum_{k=0}^n D_k - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} D_k r^k = \sum_{k=0}^n D_k (1 - r^k) - \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} D_k r^k. \quad (23)$$

The first sum on the right-hand side of (23) is estimated with the aid of Abel's inequality, namely

$$\left| \sum_{k=0}^n D_k (1 - r^k) \right| = \left| \sum_{k=1}^n k D_k \frac{1}{k} (1 - r^k) \right| \leq (1 - r) \max_{1 \leq \nu \leq n} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\nu} k D_k \right|. \quad (24)$$

From (24), (7), and (17) we obtain

$$\sum_{k=0}^n D_k (1 - r^k) = o(1) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty). \quad (25)$$

The second sum can be estimated, also using Abel's transformation:

$$\left| \sum_{k=n+1}^N D_k r^k \right| \leq \left(\sum_{k=n+1}^N \frac{1}{k} r^k + \frac{2n+1}{n+1} r^{n+1} \right) \max_{n+1 \leq k \leq N} \frac{1}{k} \left| \sum_{\nu=n+1}^k \nu D_\nu \right|. \quad (26)$$

If r is chosen according to (7), then the first factor in (26) is uniformly bounded with respect to n and N , while the second factor, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, tends to zero uniformly with respect to N by (17), and, consequently,

$$\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} D_k r^k = o(1),$$

which, together with (25) and (86), gives the first part of (21). The lemma is proved.

Proof of the theorem. Without loss of generality one may assume that $\varphi_0 = 0$, since otherwise, instead of $f(z)$, it suffices to consider $e^{-i\varphi_0} f(e^{i\varphi_0} z)$.

Starting from the identity

$$\left(\frac{f(z)}{z} \right)^\lambda = \frac{1}{(1-z)^{2\lambda}} \left[\frac{f(z)}{z} (1-z)^2 \right]^\lambda \quad (27)$$

and denoting

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \left[\frac{f(z)}{z} (1-z)^2 \right]^\lambda &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k z^k, \quad A_k = 2\lambda \left(\gamma_k - \frac{1}{k} \right), \\ \left[\frac{f(z)}{z} (1-z)^2 \right]^\lambda &= \exp \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k z^k \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} D_k z^k, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

we write the equality of the Taylor coefficients for the functions in (27):

$$\left\{ \left(\frac{f(z)}{z} \right)^\lambda \right\}_n = \sum_{k=0}^n d_{n-k}(h) D_k \quad (n = 0, 1, \dots), \quad h = 2\lambda. \quad (29)$$

It is not difficult to verify that the coefficients of the power series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k z^k$ satisfy conditions (8). Therefore, for $h > 1/2$ and for r chosen according to (7), by Lemma 2 we shall have:

$$\frac{1}{d_n(h)} \sum_{k=0}^n d_{n-k}(h) D_k \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} D_k r^k = \left[|f(r)| \frac{(1-r)^2}{r} \right]^\lambda \exp(i\lambda \arg f(r)),$$

which, together with (29) and (4), proves the theorem.

From the theorem just obtained there follows directly Hayman's regularity theorem¹ for the coefficients of univalent functions in the case $\alpha > 0$ (proved by him for p -valent functions). If $\alpha = 0$, then the regularity theorem is proved more elementarily.

Received
26 IX 1969

REFERENCES

- ¹ W. K. Hayman, *Multivalent Functions*, II, 1960.
- ² I. M. Milin, DAN, 154, No. 2 (1964).
- ³ I. E. Bazilevich, *Matem. sbornik*, 74 (116), 1 (1967).
- ⁴ I. M. Milin, DAN, 176, No. 5 (1967).

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.