

ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF ZEROS OF PARTIAL SUMS OF LAPLACE-TRANSFORMS

By Chuji TANAKA

(Communicated by Y. Komatu)

(1) INTRODUCTION. Concerning the distribution of zeros of partial sums of Taylor series, the following theorems are known:

JENTZSCH'S THEOREM ([1] p.p.92-95). Let $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$ be convergent for $|z| < 1$. Then, every point on $|z| = 1$ is an accumulation point of zeros of partial sums

$$S_n(z) = \sum_{v=0}^n a_v z^v \quad (n=1, 2, \dots).$$

SZEGŐ'S THEOREM. Let $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$ be convergent for $|z| < 1$. Then, every point on $|z| = 1$ is an accumulation point of zeros of partial sums

$$S_{n_k}(z) = \sum_{v=0}^{n_k} a_v z^v \quad (k=1, 2, \dots)$$

with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} n_{k+1}/n_k = 1$

In this Note, we shall establish analogous theorems in Laplace-transforms.

(2) THEOREM I. Let us put

$$(2.1) \quad F(s) = \int_0^{\infty} \exp(-sx) d\alpha(x)$$

$$(s = \sigma + it, \quad \alpha(0) = 0),$$

where $\alpha(x)$ is of bounded variation in any finite interval $0 \leq x \leq X$, X being an arbitrary positive number. As an extension of Jentzsch's theorem, we can prove

THEOREM I. Let (2.1) be simply convergent for $\sigma > 0$. Then, every point on $\sigma = 0$ is an accumulation point of zeros of partial sums

$$S_y(s) = \int_0^y \exp(-sx) d\alpha(x)$$

$$|\alpha_\nu| \leq y \leq \alpha_\nu \quad (\nu = 1, 2, \dots)$$

where

$$(2.2) \quad 0 = \sigma_s = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \left| \int_{|\alpha|}^{\lambda} d\alpha(x) \right| \\ = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_\nu} \log \left| \int_{|\alpha|}^{\alpha_\nu} d\alpha(x) \right|$$

REMARK. By T. Ugaheri's theorem ([2]), the simple convergence-abscissa σ_s of (2.1) is determined by

$$\sigma_s = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \left| \int_{|\alpha|}^{\lambda} d\alpha(x) \right|$$

Hence, the sequence $\{\alpha_\nu\}$ satisfying (2.2) certainly exists.

Next corollary 1 immediately follows.

COROLLARY I. Let (2.1) be simply convergent for $\sigma > 0$. Then, every point on $\sigma = 0$ is an accumulation point of zeros of partial sums

$$S_y(s) = \int_0^y \exp(-sx) d\alpha(x) \\ (0 < y < +\infty)$$

Putting $\alpha(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n (0 \leq \lambda_1 < \dots < \lambda_n \rightarrow +\infty)$, we have easily

COROLLARY II. Let Dirichlet series $F(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \exp(-\lambda_n s)$ be simply convergent for $\sigma > 0$. Then, every point on $\sigma = 0$ is an accumulation point of zeros of partial sums

$$S_n(s) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \exp(-\lambda_i s) \quad (n=1, 2, \dots).$$

Putting $\lambda(x) = \int_0^x f(y) dy$, where $f(y)$ is R-integrable in any finite interval $0 \leq y \leq Y$, Y being an arbitrary positive number, we get

COROLLARY III. Let Laplace-transform $F(s) = \int_0^{\infty} \exp(-sx) f(x) dx$ be simply convergent for $\sigma > 0$. Then, every point on $\sigma = 0$ is an accumulation point of zeros of partial sums

$$\int_0^y \exp(-sx) f(x) dx \quad (0 < y < +\infty)$$

(3) LEMMAS. For the proof of Theorem 1, we need next Lemma.

LEMMA 1. Let (2.1) be simply convergent for $\sigma > 0$. Then, we have

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{1}{y} \log |S_y(s)| \\ \leq \sigma, \quad \sigma \leq y < \sigma_0 \quad (y > 0)$$

$$< -\sigma' + \sigma_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma} C(\sigma_0, \gamma, \mathcal{D})$$

where (i) $S_{\gamma}(d) = \int_0^{\gamma} \exp(-\lambda x) d\alpha(x)$
(ii) $\mathcal{D}$ is a bounded domain, (iii) $C(\sigma_0, \gamma, \mathcal{D})$ is a constant depending upon only $\sigma_0, \gamma, \mathcal{D}$.

Proof. Since $F(\sigma_0)$ ($\sigma_0 > 0$) is convergent, there exists a constant $K(\sigma_0)$ such that

$$(3.2) \quad |S_{\gamma}(\sigma_0)| < K(\sigma_0) \quad (0 \leq \gamma < +\infty)$$

By integration by parts.

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\gamma}(d) &= \int_0^{\gamma} \exp(-\lambda x) d\alpha(x) \\ &= \int_0^{\gamma} \exp(-(d-\sigma_0)x) \exp(-\sigma_0 x) d\alpha(x) \\ &= [S_{\lambda}(\sigma_0) \exp(-(d-\sigma_0)\gamma)]_0^{\gamma} \\ &\quad + (d-\sigma_0) \int_0^{\gamma} S_{\lambda}(\sigma_0) \exp(-(d-\sigma_0)x) dx \\ &= S_{\gamma}(\sigma_0) \exp(-(d-\sigma_0)\gamma) \\ &\quad + (d-\sigma_0) \int_0^{\gamma} S_{\lambda}(\sigma_0) \exp(-(d-\sigma_0)x) dx \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (3.2), we get, for $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\sigma' \leq \gamma < \sigma_0$ ($\gamma > 0$),

$$\begin{aligned} &|S_{\gamma}(d)| \\ &\leq K(\sigma_0) \exp(-(\sigma'-\sigma_0)\gamma) + |d-\sigma_0| K(\sigma_0) \int_0^{\gamma} \exp(-(\sigma'-\sigma_0)x) dx \\ &< K(\sigma_0) \exp(-(\sigma'-\sigma_0)\gamma) \left\{ 1 + \frac{|d-\sigma_0|}{\sigma_0-\sigma'} \right\} \quad (\sigma'-\sigma_0 < 0) \\ (3.3) \quad &< K(\sigma_0) \exp(-(\sigma'-\sigma_0)\gamma) \left\{ 1 + \frac{\alpha(\sigma_0, \mathcal{D})}{\sigma_0-\gamma} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha(\sigma_0, \mathcal{D}) = \max_{d \in \mathcal{D}} |d-\sigma_0|$,
so that, for $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\sigma' \leq \gamma < \sigma_0$ ($\gamma > 0$),

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\gamma} \log |S_{\gamma}(d)| \\ &< -\sigma' + \sigma_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma} C_1(\sigma_0, \gamma, \mathcal{D}), \end{aligned}$$

where $C_1(\sigma_0, \gamma, \mathcal{D}) = \log \left\{ K(\sigma_0) \left(1 + \frac{\alpha(\sigma_0, \mathcal{D})}{\sigma_0-\gamma} \right) \right\}$,
 $\gamma \in \mathcal{D}$.

(4) **PROOF OF THEOREM I.** If $\sigma_0 = ib_0$ were not an accumulation point of zeros of $S_{\gamma}(d)$, $[x_{\nu}] \leq \gamma \leq x_{\nu}$ ($\nu = 1, 2, \dots$), there would exist a sufficiently small circle $|d - \sigma_0| \leq \delta'$ in which

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\gamma} \log |S_{\gamma}(d)| \\ &(\{x_{\nu}\} \leq \gamma \leq x_{\nu}, \quad \nu = 1, 2, \dots) \end{aligned}$$

would be regular. By Lemma 1, $\frac{1}{\gamma} \log |S_{\gamma}(d)|$ is bounded and since $S_{\gamma}(d)$ converges uniformly in any finite domain contained in $\sigma' > 0$ ([3] p.54), we have uniformly

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\gamma} \log |S_{\gamma}(d)| = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D},$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ is contained in $|d - \sigma_0| < \delta'$,

$\sigma' > 0$. Hence, by a well-known Vitali's theorem, we have

$$(4.1) \quad \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\gamma} \log |S_{\gamma}(d)| = 0 \quad d_1 = -\frac{\sigma'}{2}, \quad t$$

$$(\{x_{\nu}\} \leq \gamma \leq x_{\nu}, \quad \nu = 1, 2, \dots)$$

Putting $R_{\gamma, \gamma'}(d) = S_{\gamma'}(d) - S_{\gamma}(d)$ and by integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{x_{\nu}}^{x_{\nu'}} \alpha d\alpha(x) \\ &= R_{\alpha_{\nu}, x_{\nu}}(d_1) \exp(d_1, x_{\nu}) - d_1 \int_{x_{\nu}}^{x_{\nu'}} \xi_{\alpha_{\nu}, x_{\nu}}(d_1) \exp(d_1, x) dx \\ &= \{S_{x_{\nu}}(d_1) - S_{x_{\nu'}}(d_1)\} \exp(d_1, x_{\nu}) \\ &\quad - d_1 \int_{x_{\nu}}^{x_{\nu'}} \{S_{\lambda}(d_1) - S_{x_{\nu'}}(d_1)\} \exp(d_1, x) dx \end{aligned}$$

Setting

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\{x_{\nu}\} \leq \gamma \leq x_{\nu}} |S_{\gamma}(d_1)| &= |S_{\gamma_{\nu}}(d_1)|, \quad (\{x_{\nu}\} \leq \gamma_{\nu} \leq x_{\nu}), \\ &|\int_{x_{\nu}}^{x_{\nu'}} \alpha d\alpha(x)| \\ &\leq 2 |S_{\gamma_{\nu}}(d_1)| + \frac{|d_1|}{|R(d_1)|} 2 |S_{\gamma_{\nu}}(d_1)| [\exp(R(d_1, 2))]_{x_{\nu}}^{x_{\nu'}} \\ &< 2 |S_{\gamma_{\nu}}(d_1)| \frac{|d_1|}{|R(d_1)|} \exp(R(d_1, 2x_{\nu})) \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{x_{\nu}} \log \left| \int_{x_{\nu}}^{x_{\nu'}} \alpha d\alpha(x) \right| \\ &< \frac{1}{x_{\nu}} \log K(d_1) + R(d_1) \frac{x_{\nu}}{x_{\nu}} + \frac{\gamma_{\nu}}{x_{\nu}} \frac{1}{\gamma_{\nu}} \log |S_{\gamma_{\nu}}(d_1)| \end{aligned}$$

where $K(d_1) = 2 \frac{|d_1|}{|R(d_1)|}$. By (4.1)

$$0 = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{x_{\nu}} \log \left| \int_{x_{\nu}}^{x_{\nu'}} \alpha d\alpha(x) \right| \leq -\frac{\sigma'}{2} < 0$$

which is impossible. Thus, every point on $\sigma = 0$ is an accumulation point of zeros of $S_{\gamma}(d)$,
 $\{x_{\nu}\} \leq \gamma \leq x_{\nu} \quad (\nu = 1, 2, \dots)$, q.e.d.

(5) **THEOREM II.** In this section, we shall prove an extension of Szegő's theorem.

THEOREM II. Let (2.1) be simply convergent for $\sigma' > 0$. If, furthermore, the regularity-abscissa σ_r is 0, then every point on $\sigma = 0$ is the accumulation point of zeros of $S_{\gamma}(d) = \int_0^{\gamma} \exp(-\lambda x) d\alpha(x)$ ($\nu = 1, 2, \dots$) with $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \log \nu / \gamma_{\nu} = 0$, and $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\nu+1} / \gamma_{\nu} = 1$.

If $\alpha(x) \neq 0 \quad x \neq X$, by H. Hamburger's theorem ([3] p.59), $\lambda = 0$ is a singular point of (2.1). Hence, we have

COROLLARY I. Let (2.1), with $\alpha(x) \neq 0$ for $x \neq X$, be simply convergent for $\sigma' > 0$. Then, every point on $\sigma = 0$ is the accumulation point of zeros of $S_{\gamma}(d)$ with $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \log \nu / \gamma_{\nu} = 0$ and $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\nu+1} / \gamma_{\nu} = 1$.

Applying theorem 2 to Dirichlet series, we get

COROLLARY II. Let $F(\lambda) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \exp(-\lambda_n \lambda)$ ($\lambda = \sigma + i\tau$) with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n) > 0$ be simply convergent for $\sigma > 0$. Then, every point on $\sigma = 0$ is an accumulation point of zeros of

$$S_{n_k}(\lambda) = \sum_{n=1}^{n_k} a_n \exp(-\lambda_n \lambda) \quad (k=1, 2, \dots)$$

with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n_k} / \lambda_{n_k} = 1$

In fact, putting $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n) = \delta > 0$, by G. Pólya's theorem ([4] p.140), every closed segment on $\sigma = 0$ with length greater than $2\pi/\delta$ contains at least one singular point, and we have easily $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \log n = 0$ (a fortiori, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_{n_k}} \log k = 0$). Hence, corollary 2 follows immediately from Theorem 2.

Applying Theorem 2 to Laplace-transform, we get

COROLLARY III. Let $f(z)$ ($z = re^{i\theta}$) be an integral function of exponential type. If $F(\lambda) = \int_0^{\infty} \exp(-\lambda x) f(x) dx$ is simply convergent for $\sigma > 0$, then every point on $\sigma = 0$ is an accumulation point of zeros of $S_{\nu}(\lambda) = \int_0^{\nu} \exp(-\lambda x) f(x) dx$ ($\nu = 1, 2, \dots$) with $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \log \nu / \gamma_{\nu} = 0$, and $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\nu+1} / \gamma_{\nu} = 1$.

In fact, by the theorem ([4] p.298, [5] p.75, [6]), there exists at least one singular point on $\sigma = 0$, so that corollary follows from Theorem 2.

(6) LEMMA. For the proof of Theorem 2, we need next Lemma.

LEMMA 2. Let (2.1) be simply convergent for $\sigma > 0$. Then we have

$$(6.1) \quad \frac{1}{\gamma_{\nu}} \log |R_{\nu}(\lambda)| < -\sigma' + E_{\nu}(\lambda),$$

where (i) $R_{\nu}(\lambda) = S_{\gamma_{\nu+1}}(\lambda) - S_{\gamma_{\nu}}(\lambda)$, $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\nu+1} / \gamma_{\nu} = 1$,

(ii) $\mathcal{P}$ is a bounded domain, (iii) $E_{\nu}(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$ as $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in $\mathcal{P}$.

Proof. Let us put $\eta = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_0 + \sigma_0^2)$, $\sigma_0, \sigma_0^2 \in \mathcal{I}$. Since $F(\sigma_0^2)$ is convergent, there exists $\chi_1(\sigma_0)$ such that

$$(6.2) \quad |R_{\gamma_{\nu}}(\sigma_0^2)| = \left| \int_{\gamma}^{\gamma'} \exp(-\sigma_0^2 x) d\alpha(x) \right| < \chi_1(\sigma_0)$$

for $\gamma' > \gamma \geq 0$

By integration by parts,

$$R_{\gamma_{\nu}}(\lambda) = \int_{\gamma}^{\gamma'} \exp(-\lambda x) d\alpha(x)$$

$$= \int_{\gamma}^{\gamma'} \exp(-(\lambda - \sigma_0^2)x) \exp(-\sigma_0^2 x) d\alpha(x) = R_{\gamma_{\nu}}(\sigma_0^2) \exp(-(\lambda - \sigma_0^2)\gamma) + (\lambda - \sigma_0^2) \int_{\gamma}^{\gamma'} R_{\gamma_{\nu}}(\sigma_0^2) \exp(-(\lambda - \sigma_0^2)x) dx$$

Hence, by (6.2)

$$|R_{\gamma_{\nu}}(\lambda)| \leq \chi_1(\sigma_0) \exp(-(\lambda - \sigma_0^2)\gamma) + (\lambda - \sigma_0^2) \chi_1(\sigma_0) \int_{\gamma}^{\gamma'} \exp(-(\lambda - \sigma_0^2)x) dx$$

(6.3)

$$< \frac{|\lambda - \sigma_0^2|}{\eta - \sigma_0^2} \chi_1(\sigma_0) \exp(-(\lambda - \sigma_0^2)\gamma) \quad (\sigma - \sigma_0^2 > 0)$$

In particular,

$$|R_{\nu}(\lambda)| = \left| \int_{\gamma_{\nu}}^{\gamma_{\nu+1}} \exp(-\lambda x) d\alpha(x) \right| < \frac{|\lambda - \sigma_0^2|}{\eta - \sigma_0^2} \chi_1(\sigma_0) \exp(-(\lambda - \sigma_0^2)\gamma_{\nu}),$$

so that

$$(6.4) \quad \frac{1}{\gamma_{\nu}} \log |R_{\nu}(\lambda)| \leq \frac{1}{\gamma_{\nu}} \log \chi_1(\sigma_0) < -\sigma' + \sigma_0^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma_{\nu}} C_1(\sigma_0, \mathcal{P}),$$

where $C_1(\sigma_0, \mathcal{P}) = \log \left\{ \chi_1(\sigma_0) \frac{\alpha(\sigma_0^2, \mathcal{P})}{\eta - \sigma_0^2} \right\}$, $\alpha(\sigma_0^2, \mathcal{P}) = \max_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}} |\lambda - \sigma_0^2|$

By (3.3),

$$|R_{\nu}(\lambda)| \leq |S_{\gamma_{\nu+1}}(\lambda)| + |S_{\gamma_{\nu}}(\lambda)| < 2\chi_1(\sigma_0) \exp(-(\lambda - \sigma_0^2)\gamma_{\nu}) \left\{ 1 + \frac{\alpha(\sigma_0^2, \mathcal{P})}{\sigma_0 - \eta} \right\}$$

Hence,

$$(6.5) \quad \frac{1}{\gamma_{\nu}} \log |R_{\nu}(\lambda)| \leq \frac{1}{\gamma_{\nu}} \log \chi_1(\sigma_0) < (\sigma_0 - \sigma') \frac{\gamma_{\nu+1}}{\gamma_{\nu}} + \frac{1}{\gamma_{\nu}} C_2(\sigma_0, \mathcal{P}) = -\sigma' + \sigma_0 + o(1) + \frac{1}{\gamma_{\nu}} C_2(\sigma_0, \mathcal{P}) \quad \left(\log \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma_{\nu+1}}{\gamma_{\nu}} = 1 \right),$$

where $C_2(\sigma_0, \mathcal{P}) = \log \left\{ 2\chi_1(\sigma_0) \left(1 + \frac{\alpha(\sigma_0^2, \mathcal{P})}{\sigma_0 - \eta} \right) \right\}$

By (6.4) and (6.5), we finally get

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_{\nu}} \log |R_{\nu}(\lambda)| < -\sigma' + \sigma_0 + \sigma_0^2 + o(1) + \frac{1}{\gamma_{\nu}} \max \{ C_1, C_2 \}.$$

Since σ_0 is arbitrarily small, we can put

$$E_{\nu}(\lambda) = \sigma_0 + \sigma_0^2 + o(1) + \frac{1}{\gamma_{\nu}} \max \{ C_1, C_2 \} \quad \eta \in \mathcal{I}$$

(7) PROOF OF THEOREM II. If $\lambda_0 = i\tau_0$ were not an accumulation point of zeros of $S_{\gamma_{\nu}}(\lambda)$ ($\nu = 1, 2, \dots$), by the entirely similar argument as in the proof of Theorem 1, we should have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} |S_{\gamma_{\nu}}(\lambda)|^{\frac{1}{\gamma_{\nu}}} = 1$$

uniformly in $|\lambda - \lambda_0| \leq \delta$,

whence, for any given $\varepsilon (> 0)$,

$$(7.1) \quad |S_{\gamma_{\nu}}(\lambda)| < (1 + \varepsilon)^{\gamma_{\nu}} \quad \text{for } |\lambda - \lambda_0| \leq \delta, \quad \nu > N(\varepsilon)$$

Since $|R_\nu(d)| \equiv |S_{y_\nu(d)}| + |S_{y_{\nu+1}(d)}|$,
by (7.1), $\frac{1}{y_\nu} \log |R_\nu(d)|$
 $< \frac{1}{y_\nu} \log 2 + \frac{y_{\nu+1}}{y_\nu} \log(1+\varepsilon)$

for $|d-d_0| \leq \delta$, $\nu > N(\varepsilon)$. By $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} y_{\nu+1}/y_\nu$
 $= 1$, we can put

$$(7.2) \quad \frac{1}{y_\nu} \log |R_\nu(d)| < \varepsilon_\nu(d)$$

for $|d-d_0| \leq \delta$,

where $\varepsilon_\nu(d) \rightarrow 0$ as $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly
in $|d-d_0| \leq \delta$.

Let us define a closed analytic
curve C such that C contains
a singular point d_1 on $\sigma=0$,
and the arc $\widehat{Qd'}$ contained in
 $|d-d_0| \leq \delta$ lies strictly to
the left of the imaginary axis.
Now we define a harmonic function
 $h(d)$ such that

- (i) on $\widehat{Qd'}$, $h(d)$ continuous,
and $0 < h(d) < -\delta$ ($\delta > 0$),
- (ii) on the complementary of
 $\widehat{Qd'}$, $h(d) = -\sigma$.

Then, we have evidently $h(d) < -\sigma'$
in C . In particular,

$$(7.3) \quad h(d_1) < -\Re(d_1) = 0$$

By the definition of $h(d)$,
Lemma 1 and (7.2), we obtain, in
 C ,

$$\frac{1}{y_\nu} \log |R_\nu(d)| < h(d) + \varepsilon_\nu(d)$$

Therefore, by (7.3),

$$\frac{1}{y_\nu} \log |R_\nu(d_1)|$$

$$< h(d_1) + \varepsilon_\nu(d_1) < 0 + \varepsilon_\nu(d_1),$$

so that, in a neighbourhood of
 d_1 , we can put

$$\frac{1}{y_\nu} \log |R_\nu(d)| < \log f \quad (0 < f < 1), \quad i.e.$$

$$(7.4) \quad |R_\nu(d)| < \exp(-y_\nu \log(\frac{1}{f}))$$

Since, by $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \log \nu / y_\nu = 0$ and
G.Valiron's theorem ([4] p.4 [7]),
 $\sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \exp(-y_\nu d)$ is convergent for
 $\Re(d) > 0$, in a neighbourhood of
 d_1 , by (7.4),

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} |R_\nu(d)|$$

$$= \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} |S_{y_{\nu+1}}(d) - S_{y_\nu}(d)|$$

$$< \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \exp(-y_\nu \log(\frac{1}{f})) < +\infty$$

Hence, $d = d_1$, is a regular point,
which is impossible.

If there exists no singular
point on $\sigma=0$, and the sequence
of singular points $\{d_n\} = \{\sigma_n + it_n\}$
($n=1, 2, \dots$) approach $\sigma=0$ asymptotically,
then taking it n for sufficiently large n as d_1 in the
above proof, we can establish our
theorem in this case. This completes our proof.

(*) Received July 28, 1951.

- [1] E.Landau: Darstellung und Begründung einiger neuerer Ergebnisse der Funktionentheorie. Berlin, 1929.
- [2] T.Ugaheri: On the abscissa of convergence of Laplace-Stieltjes integral. Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics. Vol.II. No.1. 1950;
- C.Tanaka: Note on Laplace-transforms. (I) On the determination of three convergence-abscissas.
- [3] D.V.Widder: The Laplace-transform. Princeton. 1946.
- [4] V.Bernstein: Leçons sur les progrès récents de la théorie des séries de Dirichlet. Paris. 1933.
- [5] G.Doetsch: Theorie und Anwendung der Laplace-Transformation. 1937.
- [6] C.Tanaka: Note on Laplace-transforms. (III) On some class of Laplace-transform. (II)
- [7] G.Valiron: Sur l'abscisse de convergence des séries de Dirichlet. Bull.Soc.Math.de France, t.52. 1924.

Mathematical Institute,
Waseda University, Tokyo.