

## REFERENCES

1. N. Aronszajn, *Rayleigh-Ritz and A. Weinstein methods for approximation of eigenvalues*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. vol. 34 (1948) pp. 474-480 and 594-601.
2. A. Weinstein, *New methods for the approximation of eigenvalues*, Lectures at the University of Maryland, 1950-1951 (in preparation).

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AND  
UNIVERSITY OF ISTANBUL

---

## ON SOME FUNCTIONS HOLOMORPHIC IN AN INFINITE REGION

YU CHIA-YUNG<sup>1</sup>

S. Mandelbrojt indicated the following proposition: If a function is holomorphic and bounded in a half-strip of the  $z$ -plane containing the half-axis  $ox$  as a part of its central line and if this function and a certain infinite sequence of its derivatives vanish at the origin, then it is identically zero. The proof of this proposition is based upon a result of Mandelbrojt [1, p. 372].<sup>2</sup> In the present paper, we consider a function  $F(z)$  holomorphic in a region  $\Delta$  of the  $z$ -plane defined by  $x \geq d$ ,  $|y| \leq g(x)$ , where  $-\infty < d < 0$  and where  $g(x)$  is a certain positive continuous function tending to zero with  $1/x$ . In this case if, in  $\Delta$ ,  $F(z)$  tends to zero rapidly enough and uniformly with respect to  $y$  as  $x$  tends to infinity, and if  $F(z)$  and a certain infinite sequence of its derivatives vanish at the origin, then  $F(z)$  is identically zero. In order to establish our proposition, we prove at first a lemma by means of the following theorem of G. Valiron [3, p. 62, §32]:

**THEOREM V.** *Let  $Y(X)$  be a real function having a first derivative for  $X \geq X_0$  such that*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{XY'(X)}{\psi(X)} = 1; \quad \psi(X) \geq 1, \quad X \geq X_0; \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{X\psi'(X)}{[\psi(X)]^2} = 0.$$

*Let  $\Phi(X)$  be an entire function and let  $M(r) = \max_{|z|=r} |\Phi(z)|$ . Then a necessary and sufficient condition that*

---

Presented to the Society, September 7, 1951; received by the editors May 1, 1951.

<sup>1</sup> The author wishes to express to Professors S. Mandelbrojt and G. Valiron his respectful gratitude for their kind and precious suggestions and criticisms.

<sup>2</sup> Numbers in brackets refer to the bibliography at the end of this paper.

$$\log M(r) \sim e^{Y(X)}, \quad X = \log r,$$

is that

$$\nu(r) \sim Y'(X)e^{Y(X)} \sim \frac{d}{dX} \log M(r),$$

where  $\nu(r)$  is the rank of the maximum term of the highest rank of the Taylor expansion of  $\Phi(z)$  corresponding to the value  $|z| = r$ .

LEMMA. Let  $\Phi(z) = \sum_0^\infty \phi(n)z^n$  and let  $\mu(r)$  be the value of the maximum terms of  $|\phi(n)|r^n$  ( $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ). If<sup>3</sup>

$$\mu(r) \sim K[(\log_2 r)(\log_3 r) \cdots (\log_{p+1} r)]^{\log r} \quad (K = \text{const.} > 0),$$

then for any given  $\epsilon > 0$  ( $\epsilon < 1$ ), we have, for  $n$  sufficiently large,

$$|\phi(n)| < \exp \left\{ -\exp [\omega_p(e^{(1-\epsilon)n})] \right\}$$

and, for a sequence  $\{n_k\}$  such that  $n_{k+1}/n_k$  tends to 1 as  $k$  tends to infinity,

$$|\phi(n_k)| > \exp \left\{ -n_k \exp [\omega_p(e^{(1+\epsilon)n_k})] \right\}$$

where  $p$  is a positive integer and where  $\xi = \omega_p(\eta)$  is the inverse function of  $\eta = \xi(\log \xi)(\log_2 \xi) \cdots (\log_{p-1} \xi)$ .

PROOF. Since [3, p. 111 and 4, p. 32, chap. II]

$$\log M(r) \sim \log \mu(r) \sim (\log r)(\log_3 r + \log_4 r + \cdots + \log_{p+2} r),$$

we have, by Theorem V,

$$\nu(r) \sim \log [(\log_2 r)(\log_3 r) \cdots (\log_{p+1} r)].$$

Considering with Valiron a polygon of Newton and using his notations, we see that

$$n \sim \log [(\log_2 R_n)(\log_3 R_n) \cdots (\log_{p+1} R_n)].$$

$\omega_p(\eta)$  being an increasing function, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \exp \left\{ \exp [\omega_p(e^{(1-\epsilon)n})] \right\} &< e^{G_n} = e^{G_0} R_1 R_2 \cdots R_n \\ &< \exp \left\{ n \exp [\omega_p(e^{(1+\epsilon)n})] \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for  $n$  sufficiently large. The lemma will then be completely established by Valiron's reasonings.

The following result is an immediate corollary of our lemma:

<sup>3</sup> We write  $\log_0 x = x$  and  $\log_k(x) = \log(\log_{k-1} x)$ ,  $k$  being a positive integer and  $x$  being sufficiently large.

COROLLARY. If for a given  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\phi(n) = \exp \left\{ -n \exp \left[ \omega_p(e^{(1+\epsilon)n}) \right] \right\}$$

for  $n$  sufficiently large, then we have

$$\mu(r) \leq [(\log_2 r)(\log_3 r) \cdots (\log_{p+1} r)]^{\log r}$$

for  $r$  sufficiently large.

Now we can prove our main theorem:

THEOREM. Let  $g(x)$  be a positive continuous function defined for  $x \geq d$  ( $-\infty < d < 0$ ) decreasing to zero with  $1/x$  for  $x$  sufficiently large and satisfying

$$(1) \quad g(x) = O[g(x + \eta)] \quad (x \rightarrow \infty)$$

for  $|\eta|$  sufficiently small. Denote by  $\Delta$  the region of the  $z$ -plane defined by  $x \geq d$ ,  $|y| \leq g(x)$ .

Let  $\{v_n\}$  and  $\{q_n\}$  be two complementary sequences of non-negative integers [1] such that the upper density function [1]  $D^*(q)$  of  $\{q_n\}$  satisfies, for  $q$  sufficiently large,

$$(2) \quad D^*(q) < \frac{b}{(\log q)(\log_2 q) \cdots (\log_{p+1} q)} \quad \left( 0 < b = \text{const.} < \frac{1}{2} \right).$$

Suppose that  $F(z)$  is a function holomorphic in  $\Delta$  and satisfying

$$(3) \quad F^{(v_n)}(0) = 0$$

and, for a given  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$(4) \quad F(z) = O \left\{ [g(x)]^{\exp \omega_p [g(x)]^{-1-\epsilon}} \right\} \quad (z \text{ in } \Delta, x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Then we conclude  $F(z) \equiv 0$ .

PROOF. We can evaluate the moduli of all the derivatives of  $F(z)$  on the half-axis  $ox$ :  $x \geq 0$ ,  $y = 0$ . Let us put

$$h(x) = \min [x - d, g(x)] \quad [x \geq 0, |x - \xi| \leq g(x)]$$

and construct in the  $z$ -plane circles  $C(x)$ :  $|z - x| \leq h(x)$  which are evidently situated in  $\Delta$ . We have

$$F^{(n)}(x) = \frac{n!}{2\pi i} \int_{C(x)} \frac{F(z)}{(z - x)^{n+1}} dz \quad (x \geq 0).$$

By hypotheses there exist positive constants  $A$ ,  $B$ ,  $E$  and  $x_0 > d$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned} |F(z)| &\leq A \quad \text{for } z \in \Delta \cap \{\Re(z) \leq x_0 + g(x_0)\}; \\ |F(z)| &\leq B[g(x)]^{\exp \omega_p[\sigma(x)]^{-1-\epsilon}} \quad \text{for } z \in \Delta \cap \{\Re(z) \geq x_0 - g(x_0)\}; \\ g(x) &\text{ decreases for } x \geq x_0 - g(x_0); \\ h(x) &\geq E \quad \text{for } x \leq x_0 + g(x_0). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |F^{(n)}(x)| &\leq A \cdot \frac{n!}{E^n} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq x_0; \\ |F^{(n)}(x)| &\leq Bn! \frac{[g(x - g(x))]^{\exp \omega_p[\sigma(x-g(x))]^{-1-\epsilon}}}{[h(x)]^n} \\ &\leq Bn! \frac{[g(x - g(x))]^{\exp \omega_p[\sigma(x-g(x))]^{-1-\epsilon}}}{[g(x + g(x))]^n} \\ &= Bn! \Omega_n(x, g(x)), \text{ say, for } x \geq x_0. \end{aligned}$$

We are going to find an upper bound of  $\Omega_n(x, g(x))$  for  $x \geq x_0 - g(x_0)$ . By (1),

$$\Omega_n(x, g(x)) \leq K_1^n \frac{[g(x)]^{\exp \omega_p[\sigma(x)]^{-1-\epsilon}}}{[g(x)]^n} \quad (K_1 = \text{const.} > 0).$$

For the sake of simplicity, consider the case  $g(x) = e^{-x}$ . We have

$$\Omega_n(x, g(x)) \leq K_1^n (e^{-x \exp \omega_p(e^{(1+\epsilon)x})}) e^{nx}$$

for  $x \geq x_0 - e^{-x_0}$ . The preceding corollary shows that

$$\Omega_n(x, g(x)) \leq [K_1(\log n)(\log_2 n) \cdots (\log_p n)]^n$$

for integral  $x \geq x_0 - e^{-x_0}$ . But, for  $0 < \delta < 1$ ,

$$\frac{\exp \{-(x + \delta)[\exp \omega_p(e^{(1+\epsilon)(x+\delta)})]\} e^{n(x+\delta)}}{\exp \{-x[\exp \omega_p(e^{(1+\epsilon)x})]\} e^{nx}} \leq e^n \quad (x \geq 0).$$

Hence we obtain

$$\Omega_n(x, g(x)) \leq [K_2(\log n)(\log_2 n) \cdots (\log_p n)]^n \quad (K_2 = \text{const.} > 0)$$

for  $x \geq x_0 - e^{-x_0}$  and for  $n$  sufficiently large. (We pass from the case  $g(x) = e^{-x}$  to the general case simply by replacing  $e^{-x}$  in what precedes by  $g(x)$ .) Consequently we have

$$|F^{(n)}(x)| \leq [K_3(\log n)(\log_2 n) \cdots (\log_p n)]^n \quad (K_3 = \text{const.} > 0)$$

for  $x \geq 0$  and for  $n$  sufficiently large.  $F(x)$  and its derivatives of lower

orders are evidently also bounded for  $x \geq 0$ . An application of a Mandelbrojt's result on generalized quasi-analyticity [2, chap. III]<sup>4</sup> will complete immediately the proof of our theorem.

From this theorem it follows that if  $F_1(z)$  and  $F_2(z)$  are functions holomorphic in  $\Delta$  and verifying conditions similar to (4) and if  $F_1^{(\nu_n)}(0) = F_2^{(\nu_n)}(0)$  for a sequence  $\{\nu_n\}$  defined in the above theorem, then we have  $F_1(z) \equiv F_2(z)$ .

We remark that in the case  $p=1$ , (4) reduces to

$$(4) \quad F(z) = O\{[g(x)]^{\exp\{|\sigma(x)|^{-1-\epsilon}\}}\} \quad (z \text{ in } \Delta; x \rightarrow \infty).$$

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. S. Mandelbrojt, *Sur une inégalité fondamentale*, Ann. École Norm. (3) vol. 63 (1946) pp. 351-378.
2. ———, *Séries adhérentes, régularisations des suites, applications*, Paris, Gauthier-Villars, 1952.
3. G. Valiron, *Sur les fonctions entières d'ordre fini et d'ordre nul*, Thèse, Paris, 1914, and Annales de la Faculté des Sciences de l'Université de Toulouse vol. 27 (1913) pp. 117-257.
4. ———, *Lectures on the general theory of integral functions*, Toulouse, Édouard Prival, 1923; new ed., New York, Chelsea, 1949.

INSTITUT HENRI POINCARÉ

<sup>4</sup> For the case  $p=1$  of the mentioned result, see [1, p. 372].