

sphere, then we have found a Galois extension of the field of rational functions, such that the Galois group is isomorphic to the preassigned group  $G$ .

## REFERENCES

1. L. Ahlfors, *The complex analytic structure of the space of closed Riemann surfaces*, Analytic functions, pp. 45–66. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N. J., 1960.
2. ———, *Teichmüller spaces*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, 1962 (to appear).
3. L. Bers, *Quasiconformal mappings and Teichmüller's theorem*, Analytic functions, pp. 89–119, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N. J., 1960.
4. ———, *Spaces of Riemann surfaces*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, 1958, pp. 349–361, Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 1960.
5. ———, *Correction to "Spaces of Riemann surfaces as bounded domains,"* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **67** (1961), 465–466.
6. W. Fenchel and J. Nielsen, *Discontinuous groups of non-Euclidean motions* (to appear).

BROWN UNIVERSITY

## A NOTE ON ENTIRE FUNCTIONS AND A CONJECTURE OF ERDÖS

BY ALFRED GRAY AND S. M. SHAH<sup>1</sup>

Communicated by R. C. Buck, March 14, 1963

1. **Introduction.** Let  $f(z) = \sum_0^\infty a_n z^n$  be an entire (transcendental) function and let

$$M(r) = M(r, f) = \max_{|z|=r} |f(z)|, \quad \mu(r) = \mu(r, f) = \max_n (|a_n| r^n).$$

Erdős conjectured that [1] for every entire function, either

$$(1.1) \quad U = U(f) \equiv \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mu(r)/M(r) > u = u(f) \equiv \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mu(r)/M(r),$$

or

$$(1.2) \quad U(f) = 0.$$

We prove this conjecture, except in one case, when broadly speaking the Taylor series for  $f(z)$  has "wide latent" gaps. For  $r > 0$ , let  $\nu(r) = \max (n | \mu(r) = | a_n | r^n)$ , and denote by  $\{\rho_n\}$  the sequence of jump-

<sup>1</sup> The work of this author was supported by U. S. National Science Foundation grant N.S.F. GP-209.

points of  $\nu(r)$ , so that  $0 \leq \rho_1 \leq \rho_2 \leq \dots$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n = \infty$ , and  $\nu(r) = n$  when  $\rho_n \leq r < \rho_{n+1}$  [2, p. 4]. Let  $\{n_k\}$  be the range of  $\nu(r)$  for  $0 < r < \infty$  and  $R = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{n_{k+1} - n_k\}$ ,  $L = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{n+1}/\rho_n$ .

**THEOREM 1.**

- (1.3) *If  $L > 1$ , then  $U > u$ .*
- (1.4) *If  $L = 1$ ,  $R < \infty$ , then  $U = 0$ .*
- (1.5) *Suppose that  $L = 1$ ,  $R = \infty$  and*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{ \rho_{n_k} / \rho_{n_{k+p}} \}^{n_{k+p} - n_k + p - 1} = 1,$$

for  $p = 1, 2, \dots$ , then  $U = 0$ .

**COROLLARY.** *If*

$$(1.6) \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log \mu(r) / (\log r)^2 < \infty$$

then  $U > u$ .

It is not possible to improve on the hypothesis (1.6), for we have

**THEOREM 2.** *Given any function  $\psi(x)$  tending to infinity (however slowly) with  $x$ , there exists an entire function  $f(z)$ , for which  $U = 0$ , and as  $r$  tends to infinity,  $\log M(r, f) = o((\log r)^2 \psi(r))$ .*

**2. Lemma 1.<sup>2</sup>  $u(f) \leq 2/\pi$ .**

**PROOF.** Suppose  $|z| = r$  is a value such that at least two terms  $a_k z^k$  have moduli equal to  $\mu(r)$ . If these terms are  $a_n z^n$  and  $a_m z^m$ , then

$$a_n z^n + a_m z^m = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|\xi|=r} \frac{f(\xi)}{\xi} \left\{ \left( \frac{z}{\xi} \right)^n + \left( \frac{z}{\xi} \right)^m \right\} d\xi.$$

Choose  $z$  such that  $\arg(a_n z^n) = \arg(a_m z^m)$ . Then

$$2\mu(r) \leq \frac{M(r)}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |1 + e^{(m-n)i\theta}| d\theta = \frac{4M(r)}{\pi}.$$

**LEMMA 2.** *Let*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\rho_{n+1}}{\rho_n} = l; \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup \frac{\log \mu(r)}{\inf (\log r)^2} = \begin{cases} Q, \\ q. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$1/2 \log L \leq q \leq Q \leq 1/2 \log l.$$

---

<sup>2</sup> This lemma is due to Dr. J. Clunie. We are thankful to him for communicating this result to one of us.

We omit the proof which is straightforward.

3. **Proof of Theorem 1.** If  $P(z)$  is any polynomial, then

$$\mu(r, f + P)/M(r, f + P) \sim \mu(r, f)/M(r, f)$$

and so we may suppose  $a_0 = 1$ . We have then  $0 < \rho_1 \leq \rho_2 \cdots$ . Let

$$(3.1) \quad F(z) = 1 + \sum_1^{\infty} z^n/\rho_1 \cdots \rho_n.$$

Then  $F(z)$  is an entire function and  $M(r, f) \leq F(r)$ ,  $\mu(r, f) = \mu(r, F)$  for all  $r$ . Let  $1 < L_1 < L$ . There exists a sequence  $\{n_p\}$  such that, setting  $\rho_n = \rho(n)$ ,

$$(3.2) \quad \rho(n_p + 1)/\rho(n_p) > L_1, \quad p = 1, 2, \dots$$

Let  $z = W\rho(n_p)$ . If  $1 < |W| < L_1$ , then for all  $p$ ,

$$(3.3) \quad 1 < |W| < \rho(n_p + 1)/\rho(n_p); \rho(n_p) < |z| < \rho(n_p + 1).$$

Define for these values of  $z$ ,

$$\mu(z, F) = \mu(z, f) = \mu(W\rho(n_p), f) = (W\rho(n_p))^{n_p}/\rho(1) \cdots \rho(n_p).$$

Then  $|\mu(z, f)| = \mu(|z|, f)$ , and from (3.1)–(3.3)

$$\frac{F(|z|)}{\mu(|z|, F)} = \frac{F(|W| \rho(n_p))}{\mu(|W| \rho(n_p), F)} \leq C(W)$$

where

$$C(W) = 1 + \sum_1^{\infty} |W|^{-j} + \sum_1^{\infty} (|W| L_1^{-1})^j.$$

Define

$$\phi_p(W) = f(W\rho(n_p))/\mu(W\rho(n_p)),$$

and let  $\Omega = \{W | 1 < |W| < L_1\}$ . For  $W \in \Omega$ , we have

$$|\phi_p(W)| \leq M(|W| \rho(n_p), f)/\mu(|W| \rho(n_p), f) \leq C(W)$$

for all  $p$ . Hence  $\phi_p(W)$  is analytic in  $\Omega$  for all  $p$  and the family  $\{\phi_p(W)\}$  is uniformly bounded on every compact subset of  $\Omega$ . Hence  $\{\phi_p(W)\}$  is a normal family and so there exists a sequence  $\{p_k\}$  such that  $\{\phi_{p_k}(W)\}$  converges uniformly to a function  $G(W)$  on every compact subset of  $\Omega$ , and  $G(W)$  is finite in  $\Omega$ . Let  $1 < R < L_1$ . Then  $\{\phi_{p_k}(W)\}$  converges uniformly to  $G(W)$  on  $|W| = R$ . Now

$$| M(R, \phi_{p_k}) - M(R, G) | \leq \max_{|W|=R} | \phi_{p_k}(W) - G(W) |,$$

and since by uniform convergence

$$\lim_{p_k \rightarrow \infty} \max_{|W|=R} | \phi_{p_k}(W) - G(W) | = 0,$$

we have

$$\lim_{p_k \rightarrow \infty} M(R, \phi_{p_k}) = M(R, G).$$

Now

$$M(R, \phi_{p_k}) = \max_{|z|=R\rho(n_{p_k})} \left| \frac{f(z)}{\mu(z)} \right| = \frac{M(R\rho(n_{p_k}), f)}{\mu(R\rho(n_{p_k}), f)}.$$

Hence

$$M(R, G) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} M(R\rho(n_{p_k}), f) / \mu(R\rho(n_{p_k}), f).$$

Consider first the case when  $G(W)$  is a constant on  $\Omega$ . Then for  $1 < R < L_1$ ,

$$G(W) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|W|=R} \frac{G(W)}{W} dW = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|W|=R} \left( \lim_{p_k \rightarrow \infty} \phi_{p_k}(W) / W \right) dW.$$

By considering the Laurent expansion of  $\phi_{p_k}(W)$  about the origin, we obtain

$$1 = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|W|=R} \{ \phi_{p_k}(W) / W \} dW,$$

and so

$$G(W) = 1 = M(R, G) = \lim_{p_k \rightarrow \infty} M(R\rho(n_{p_k}), f) / \mu(R\rho(n_{p_k}), f).$$

Now by Lemma 1,  $\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} M(r, f) / \mu(r, f) \geq \pi/2$  and so  $U(f) > u(f)$ . If  $G(W)$  is not a constant, then let  $1 < R_1 < R_2 < R_3 < L_1$ . Since  $G(W)$  is analytic for  $R_1 \leq |W| \leq R_3$ ,  $|G(W)|$  assumes its maximum, for this closed region on either  $|W| = R_1$  or  $|W| = R_3$  or both. Hence

$$M(R_2, G) < \max \{ M(R_1, G), M(R_3, G) \} = M(R_i, G)$$

say. Then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M(R_i\rho(n_{p_k}), f)}{\mu(R_i\rho(n_{p_k}), f)} \neq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M(R_2\rho(n_{p_k}), f)}{\mu(R_2\rho(n_{p_k}), f)}$$

and so  $U(f) > u(f)$  and (1.3) is proved.

To prove (1.4), (1.5) we may assume  $a_0 = 1$ . Then

$$\rho(1) > 0, \rho(n_k) < \rho(n_k + 1) = \dots = \rho(n_{k+1}) < \dots, k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Further

$$\{M(r, f)\}^2 \geq \sum_0^\infty |a_n|^{2r^{2n}} \geq 1 + \sum_1^\infty \{r^{n_k}/\rho(1) \dots \rho(n_k)\}^2.$$

Hence for  $\rho(n_k) \leq r < \rho(n_k + 1)$ ,

$$(3.4) \quad \left\{ \frac{M(r)}{\mu(r)} \right\}^2 \geq 1 + \left( \frac{r}{\rho(n_k + 1)} \right)^{2(n_{k+1} - n_k)} + \left( \frac{r}{\rho(n_k + 1)} \right)^{2(n_{k+1} - n_k)} \left( \frac{r}{\rho(n_{k+1} + 1)} \right)^{2(n_{k+2} - n_{k+1})} + \dots$$

and (1.4) follows. To prove (1.5) we note that the second term, third term,  $\dots$   $p$ th term in the right side of (3.4) tend to 1, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , and so  $U(f) = 0$ .

PROOF OF COROLLARY. By Lemma 2 we must have  $L > 1$ , and so by (1.3),  $U > u$ .

The proof of Theorem 2 and the bounds for  $U$  and  $u$  will be published elsewhere.<sup>3</sup>

#### REFERENCES

1. P. Erdős, *Some unsolved problems*, Michigan Math. J. **4** (1957), 291-300.
2. G. Pólya and G. Szegő, *Aufgaben und Lehrsätze aus der Analysis*. II, Springer, Berlin, 1925.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

<sup>3</sup> Some of these results are indicated in Abstract 587-15, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. **8** (1961), 572; Abstract 597-74, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. **10** (1963), 77.