

On independence of characteristics of asymptotic behavior of entire functions

V.S. Azarin

Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, 52900, Israel

E-mail: azarin@macs.biu.ac.il

Received December 11, 2001

Communicated by I.V. Ostrovskii

It is known [6, Ch. 3, Theorem 18] that using any *total* family of asymptotic characteristics, we have a possibility to learn whether an entire function of finite order is a function of completely regular growth. However, the main result of this paper shows that all these characteristics do not give a possibility to know whether a function has an H -multiplier [4].

Dedicated to the 100th anniversary of the birth of Naum Il'ich Akhiezer

1. Multiplier problem

Let Φ be an entire function of order ρ and normal type; we write $\Phi \in A(\rho)$. Its *Phragmén–Lindelöf indicator* is defined by the equality

$$h(\Phi, \phi) := \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{-\rho} \log |\Phi(re^{i\phi})|.$$

The function $h(\Phi, \phi)$ is 2π -periodic and ρ -trigonometrically convex. This means that on the unit circle \mathbb{T} it satisfies a differential inequality in the sense of distributions:

$$h'' + \rho^2 h := \nu \geq 0. \tag{1.1}$$

Let $H(\phi)$ be a fixed ρ -trigonometrically convex function. The function $g \in A(\rho)$ is called an H -multiplier of Φ if the Phragmén–Lindelöf indicator $h_{g\Phi}$ of the product $g\Phi$ satisfies the condition

$$h(g\Phi, \phi) \leq H(\phi).$$

Mathematics Subject Classification 2000: 30D20, 31A05.

The property of having an H -multiplier depends only on the asymptotic behavior of Φ . It is important for some problems in analysis to know whether the function Φ has an H -multiplier (for details, see [4]).

2. Completely regular growth

A function $f \in A(\rho)$ is called a *function of completely regular growth* in sense of Levin–Pfluger (*CRG-function*) if

$$|\lambda|^{-\rho} \log |f(\lambda)| - h(f, \arg \lambda) \rightarrow 0$$

when $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ outside some small set (a C_0 -set) (for details, see [7, Ch. 2, 3]). To be a CRG-function is an asymptotic property of an entire function. This class of entire functions has been studied completely and plays an important role in applications [6, Ch. 2].

3. Total families

There exist numerous asymptotic characteristics of growth of entire functions. Now we recall some of them and their connection to the CRG-functions.

The *lower indicator* in sense of A. Gol'dberg is defined by the equality

$$\underline{h}(f, \phi) := \sup_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \left\{ \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty, r \notin E} \frac{\log |f(re^{i\phi})|}{r^\rho} \right\} \quad (3.1)$$

where \mathcal{E} is a class of “small” sets $E \subset [0, \infty)$ satisfying the condition

$$\text{mes}\{E \cap [0, R)\} = o(R)$$

as $R \rightarrow \infty$.

The sets E serve for excluding the influence of zeros of the function f . If the function has no zeros in some open angle containing the ray $\{\arg \lambda = \phi\}$, then the right side of (3.1) can be replaced by a standard *lower limit*.

The family $\mathcal{H} := \{h(f, \phi), \underline{h}(f, \phi) : \phi \in [0, 2\pi)\}$ is *total*, i.e., it gives a possibility to learn whether a function $f \in A(\rho)$ is a CRG-function.

Theorem A (A. Gol'dberg). (See [5]). *A function $f \in A(\rho)$ is a CRG-function iff*

$$h(f, \phi) = \underline{h}(f, \phi), \quad \forall \phi \in [0, 2\pi). \quad (3.2)$$

The family \mathcal{H} is also “minimal” in some sense. Namely, if we claim that the equalities (3.2) hold for $\phi \in [0, 2\pi) \setminus U$ where U is an open set, then the function f

need not be CRG-function. Moreover, for any U there exists a function $f \in A(\rho)$ such that the equalities (3.2) are broken exactly for $\phi \in U$ ([2, 3]).

Consider another family of asymptotic characteristics. Set

$$c_k(f, r) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log |f(re^{i\phi})| \cos k\phi d\phi, & \text{for } k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \\ -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log |f(re^{i\phi})| \sin k\phi d\phi, & \text{for } k = -1, -2, \dots, \end{cases}$$

the Fourier coefficients of $\log |f|$.

The corresponding asymptotic characteristics are defined by

$$\bar{c}_k(f) := \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_k(f, r)}{r^\rho}; \underline{c}_k(f) := \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_k(f, r)}{r^\rho}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

The family $\mathcal{F} := \{\underline{c}_k(\cdot), \bar{c}_k(\cdot) : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is also total:

Theorem B (V. Azarin, A. Gol'dberg). (See [1], [6, Ch. 3, Theorem 11]). *A function $f \in A(\rho)$ is a CRG-function iff*

$$\bar{c}_k(f) = \underline{c}_k(f) \tag{3.3}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The family \mathcal{F} is also “minimal”. If we claim the equalities (3.3) not for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ the function f need not be a CRG-function. Moreover, for any decomposition \mathbb{Z} into two subsets A and $\mathbb{Z} \setminus A$, there exists $f \in A(\rho)$ such that the equalities (3.3) hold for $k \in A$ and do not hold for $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus A$ (see [1]).

4. The main result

The author was going to study a connection between the property of a function Φ of having a multiplier and the described above asymptotic characteristics but it turned out, that the result is negative as the following theorem shows

Theorem 4.1. *For any smooth, strictly* ρ -trigonometrically convex function $H(\phi)$ there exist two functions $\Phi_1, \Phi_2 \in A(\rho)$, $\rho > 1/2$ such that*

$$h(\Phi_1, \phi) = h(\Phi_2, \phi), \quad \underline{h}(\Phi_1, \phi) = \underline{h}(\Phi_2, \phi), \quad \forall \phi \in [0, 2\pi) \tag{4.1}$$

$$\bar{c}_k(\Phi_1) = \bar{c}_k(\Phi_2), \quad \underline{c}_k(\Phi_1) = \underline{c}_k(\Phi_2), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{4.2}$$

but Φ_1 has an H -multiplier and Φ_2 does not have anyone.

* It means that ν from (1.1) is summable and strictly positive.

References

- [1] *V. Azarin*, On the regularity of the growth of the Fourier coefficients of the logarithm of the modulus of an entire function. — *Sel. Math. Sov.* (1982), v. 2, p. 51–63.
- [2] *V. Azarin*, On rays of completely regular growth of an entire function. — *Math. USSR Sb.* (1969), v. 8, p. 437–450.
- [3] *V. Azarin*, An example of an entire function with a given indicator and lower indicator. — *Math. USSR Sb.* (1969), v. 18, p. 541–558.
- [4] *V. Azarin and V. Giner*, Limit sets and multipliers of entire functions. — *Adv. Sov. Math.* (1992), v. 11, p. 251–275.
- [5] *V.S. Azarin and L.R. Podoshev*, Limit sets and indicators of entire functions. — *Sib. Math. J.* (1984), v. 25, p. 833–844.
- [6] *A.A. Gol'dberg, B.Ya. Levin, and I.V. Ostrovskii*, Entire and meromorphic functions. — *Encycl. Math. Sci.* (1997), v. 85, p. 4–172.
- [7] *B.Ya. Levin*, Distribution of zeros of entire functions. AMS, Providence, RI (1980).