

ON THE MEANS OF AN ENTIRE FUNCTION OF SEVERAL COMPLEX VARIABLES

By

PAWAN K. JAIN*

(Received July 26, 1971)

1. Introduction

Let**

$$f(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{m, n=0}^{\infty} a_{m, n} z_1^m z_2^n,$$

be an entire function of two complex variables. Following Dzrbasyan [1], the orders ρ_1 and ρ_2 of $f(z_1, z_2)$ with respect to the variables z_1 and z_2 , respectively, are defined as:

$$(1.1) \quad \overline{\lim}_{r_2 \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{r_1 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log M(r_1, r_2)}{\log r_1} = \rho_1, \quad 0 \leq \rho_1 \leq \infty,$$

and

$$(1.2) \quad \overline{\lim}_{r_1 \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{r_2 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log M(r_1, r_2)}{\log r_2} = \rho_2, \quad 0 \leq \rho_2 \leq \infty,$$

where

$$M(r_1, r_2) = \sup \{|f(z_1, z_2)| : |z_1| \leq r_1, |z_2| \leq r_2\}.$$

Define:

$$(1.3) \quad I_\delta(r_1, r_2) \equiv I_\delta(r_1, r_2; f) = \left\{ \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(r_1 e^{i\theta_1}, r_2 e^{i\theta_2})|^\delta d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \right\}^{1/\delta},$$

and

$$I_\delta^{(i)}(r_1, r_2) = I_\delta\left(r_1, r_2; \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_i}\right), \quad (i=1, 2), \quad \text{where } 1 \leq \delta \leq \infty.$$

In this note I prove the theorem:

Theorem: *If $f(z_1, z_2)$ is an entire function of orders ρ_1 and ρ_2 , $0 \leq \rho_1, \rho_2 \leq \infty$, with respect to the variables z_1 and z_2 , respectively, then*

* The work of the author has been supported partially by U.G.C. (India).

** For simplicity we consider only two variables, though the results can easily be extended to several variables.

$$(1.3) \quad \overline{\lim}_{r_2 \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{r_1 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \left\{ r_1 \frac{I_\delta^{(1)}(r_1, r_2)}{I_\delta(r_1, r_2)} \right\}}{\log r_1} = \rho_1,$$

$$(1.4) \quad \overline{\lim}_{r_1 \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{r_2 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \left\{ r_2 \frac{I_\delta^{(2)}(r_1, r_2)}{I_\delta(r_1, r_2)} \right\}}{\log r_2} = \rho_2.$$

2. Lemmas:

It is sufficient to prove (1.3), and the proof of (1.4) will follow similarly. The proof of the same is based on the following lemmas:

Lemma 1: For any fixed $r_2 \geq 0$, and $|z_1| \leq r_1 < R_1$,

$$I_\delta^{(1)}(r_1, r_2) \leq (R_1 - r_1)^{-1} I_\delta(R_1, r_2).$$

Proof: For a fixed z_2 in the open disk $|z_2| < r_2$, the function $f(z_1, z_2)$ is analytic in the disk $|z_1| < R_1$. Thus applying Cauchy's integral formula to it for the derivative with respect to z_1 , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \{I_\delta^{(1)}(r_1, r_2)\}^\delta &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} f(r_1 e^{i\theta_1}, r_2 e^{i\theta_2}) \right|^\delta d\theta_1 d\theta_2, \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C \frac{f(\omega_1, z_2)}{(\omega_1 - r_1 e^{i\theta_1})^2} d\omega_1 \Big|^\delta d\theta_1 d\theta_2, \end{aligned}$$

where C is the disk: $\{\omega_1: |\omega_1 - r_1 e^{i\theta_1}| = R_1 - r_1\}$. Putting

$$\omega_1 = r_1 e^{i\theta_1} + (R_1 - r_1) e^{i(\theta_1 + \phi_1)}, \quad |f(\omega_1, z_2)| = F(r_1, \theta_1, \phi_1; r_2, \theta_2) \equiv F,$$

in this we get

$$\begin{aligned} \{I_\delta^{(1)}(r_1, r_2)\}^\delta &\leq \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{R_1 - r_1} \int_0^{2\pi} F(r_1, \theta_1, \phi_1; r_2, \theta_2) d\phi_1 \right\}^\delta d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(R_1 - r_1)^\delta} \cdot \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} F^\delta d\phi_1, \end{aligned}$$

on applying Holder's inequality. As the integrand is continuous in θ_1 , θ_2 and ϕ_1 the order of integration can be changed. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \{I_\delta^{(1)}(r_1, r_2)\}^\delta &\leq \frac{1}{(R_1 - r_1)^\delta} \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi_1 \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} F^\delta d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \\ (2.1) \quad &= \frac{1}{(R_1 - r_1)^\delta} \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} I_\delta^\delta(|r_1 + (R_1 - r_1)e^{i\phi_1}|, r_2) d\phi_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(R_1 - r_1)^\delta} \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} I_\delta^\delta(R_1, r_2) d\phi_1, \end{aligned}$$

since $I_\delta(x_1, r_2)$ is an increasing function of x_1 for any $r_2 \geq 0$ and $R_1 > r_1$. The

inequality (2.1) may be written as

$$\{I_\delta^{(1)}(r_1, r_2)\}^\delta \leq (R_1 - r_1)^{-\delta} I_\delta^\delta(R_1, r_2).$$

This proves the lemma.

Lemma 2: For $r_1 \geq r_1^0 \geq 1$, any $r_2 \geq 0$ and $\delta \geq 1$,

$$I_\delta^{(1)}(r_1, r_2) \geq \frac{I_\delta(r_1, r_2)}{r_1} \cdot \frac{\log I_\delta(r_1, r_2) - \log I_\delta(r_1^0, r_2)}{\log r_1}.$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned} I_\delta^{(1)}(r_1, r_2) &= \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^2 \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_1}(r_1 e^{i\theta_1}, r_2 e^{i\theta_2}) \right|^\delta d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \right\}^{1/\delta} \\ &= \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^2 \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(r_1 e^{i\theta_1}, r_2 e^{i\theta_2}) - f(r_1 - r_1 \varepsilon e^{i\theta_1}, r_2 e^{i\theta_2})}{r_1 \varepsilon e^{i\theta_1}} \right|^\delta d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \right\}^{1/\delta} \\ &\geq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^2 \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \left(\frac{|f(r_1 e^{i\theta_1}, r_2 e^{i\theta_2})| - |f(r_1 - r_1 \varepsilon e^{i\theta_1}, r_2 e^{i\theta_2})|}{r_1 \varepsilon} \right)^\delta d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \right\}^{1/\delta} \\ &\geq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{r_1 \varepsilon} \left[\left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^2 \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(r_1 e^{i\theta_1}, r_2 e^{i\theta_2})|^\delta d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \right\}^{1/\delta} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^2 \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(r_1 - r_1 \varepsilon e^{i\theta_1}, r_2 e^{i\theta_2})|^\delta d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \right\}^{1/\delta} \right], \end{aligned}$$

by using Minkowski's inequality ([3], p. 384). Hence

$$\begin{aligned} I_\delta^{(1)}(r_1, r_2) &\geq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{I_\delta(r_1, r_2) - I_\delta(r_1 - r_1 \varepsilon, r_2)}{r_1 \varepsilon} \\ (2.2) \quad &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{I_\delta(r_1 - r_1 \varepsilon, r_2)}{r_1 \varepsilon} \left\{ \frac{I_\delta(r_1, r_2)}{I_\delta(r_1 - r_1 \varepsilon, r_2)} - 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Further, since $\log I_\delta(r_1, r_2)$ is a convex function of $\log r_1$, for any $r_2 \geq 0$,

$$(2.3) \quad \log I_\delta(r_1, r_2) = \log I_\delta(r_1^0, r_2) + \int_{r_1^0}^{r_1} \frac{\omega(x_1, r_2)}{x_1} dx_1, \quad (r_1 \geq r_1^0)$$

where $\omega(x_1, r_2)$ increases with x_1 for any $r_2 \geq 0$. From (2.3), we get

$$I_\delta(r_1, r_2) \geq I_\delta(r_1 - r_1 \varepsilon, r_2) (1 - \varepsilon)^{-\omega(r_1 - r_1 \varepsilon, r_2)} = I_\delta(r_1 - r_1 \varepsilon, r_2) \{1 + \varepsilon \omega(r_1 - r_1 \varepsilon, r_2) + O(\varepsilon^2)\},$$

which, when used in (2.2), gives

$$(2.4) \quad I_\delta^{(1)}(r_1, r_2) \geq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{I_\delta(r_1 - r_1 \varepsilon, r_2)}{r_1 \varepsilon} \{ \varepsilon \omega(r_1 - r_1 \varepsilon, r_2) + O(\varepsilon^2) \} = \frac{I_\delta(r_1, r_2) \omega(r_1, r_2)}{r_1}.$$

Also, from (2.3), one has

$$(2.5) \quad \omega(r_1, r_2) \geq \frac{\log I_\delta(r_1, r_2) - \log I_\delta(r_1^0, r_2)}{\log r_1 - \log r_1^0} \geq \frac{\log I_\delta(r_1, r_2) - \log I_\delta(r_1^0, r_2)}{\log r_1},$$

for $r_1 \geq r_1^0$ and $r_2 \geq 0$, since $r_1^0 \geq 1$.

Making use of (2.5) in (2.4), the lemma follows.

Lemma 3: *If $f(z_1, z_2)$ is an entire function of order ρ_1 ($0 \leq \rho_1 \leq \infty$) with respect to the variable z_1 , then*

$$\overline{\lim}_{r_2 \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{r_1 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log I_\delta(r_1, r_2)}{\log r_1} = \rho_1, \quad 0 < \delta < \infty.$$

Proof: The lemma easily follows, by putting $R_1 = 2r_1$ and taking the limits, from (1.1) and the following inequalities: For $0 \leq r_1 \leq R_1$, $r_2 \geq 0$,

$$I_\delta(r_1, r_2) \leq M(r_1, r_2) \leq \left(\frac{R_1 + r_1}{R_1 - r_1} \right)^{1/\delta} I_\delta(R_1, r_2).$$

The left hand inequality is obtained from (1.3) whereas the right hand inequality is obtained by applying lemma 1 in [2], for a fixed z_2 , to the function $f(r_1 e^{i\theta_1}, r_2 e^{i\theta_2})$.

3. Proof of the main theorem:

From lemma 1 together with (2.3), we get

$$(3.1) \quad \log I_\delta^{(1)}(r_1, r_2) < \log I_\delta(r_1, r_2) + \log \frac{1}{R_1 - r_1} + \int_{r_1}^{R_1} \frac{\omega(x_1, r_2)}{x_1} dx_1.$$

Choose R_1 such that

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{\omega(R_1, r_2)}{R_1} = \frac{1}{R_1 - r_1},$$

i.e.

$$(3.3) \quad R_1 = \frac{r_1}{1 - (\omega(R_1, r_2))^{-1}} \leq \frac{r_1}{1 - (\omega(r_1, r_2))^{-1}} = r_1(1 + o(1)),$$

where $o(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $r_1 \rightarrow \infty$.

From (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \log I_\delta^{(1)}(r, r_2) &< \log I_\delta(r_1, r_2) + \log \frac{\omega(R_1, r_2)}{R_1} + \omega(R_1, r_2) \log \frac{R_1}{r_1} \\ &= \log I_\delta(r_1, r_2) + \log \frac{\omega(R_1, r_2)}{R_1} - \omega(R_1, r_2) \log \left(1 - \frac{R_1 - r_1}{R_1} \right) \\ &= \log I_\delta(r_1, r_2) + \log \frac{\omega(R_1, r_2)}{R_1} - \omega(R_1, r_2) \log \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{\omega(R_1, r_2)} \right\} \\ &= \log I_\delta(r_1, r_2) + \log \frac{\omega(R_1, r_2)}{R_1} + 1 + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$(3.4) \quad \log \left\{ r_1 \frac{I_\delta^{(1)}(r_1, r_2)}{I_\delta(r_1, r_2)} \right\} < \log \omega(R_1, r_2) + \log \frac{r_1}{R_1} + 1 + o(1) < \log \omega(R_1, r_2) + 1 + o(1) .$$

But, with the help of lemma 3 and (2.3), we can easily prove that

$$\log \omega(R_1, r_2) < (\rho_1 + \varepsilon) \log R_1 + O(1) < (\rho_1 + \varepsilon) \log r_1 + O(1) + o(1) \quad (\text{by (3.3)}) ,$$

for all $r_1 \geq r_1^0 = r_1^0(\varepsilon, r_2)$ and $r_2 \geq 0$, where $O(1)$ is independent of r_1 . So using (3.5) in (3.4), we find that

$$\lim_{r_2 \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r_1 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \left\{ r_1 \frac{I_\delta^{(1)}(r_1, r_2)}{I_\delta(r_1, r_2)} \right\}}{\log r_1} \leq \rho_1 .$$

The reverse inequality can easily be obtained from lemma 2.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. M. Dzrbasyan, *On the theory of some class of integral function*, Izv. Akademi Nauk. Armyanskoi. S.S.R. VIII, no. 4, 1955.
- [2] Q. I. Rahman, *On the means of entire functions*, Quart. J. Maths., 7, (1956), 192-195.
- [3] E. C. Titchmarsh, *The Theory of Functions*, Oxford, 1952.

Department of Mathematics,
Hans Raj College,
Delhi University,
Delhi-7, INDIA.