

On a direct transcendental singularity of an inverse function of a meromorphic function.

By Masatsugu TSUJI

(Received Nov. 21, 1952)

Let Δ be an infinite domain on the z -plane, which may be infinitely multiply connected and I' be its boundary, which consists of at most a countable number of analytic curves. We assume that I' contains at least one curve extending to infinity. Let $w=w(z)$ be regular in Δ and on I' , except at $z=\infty$, such that $|w(z)| < R$ in Δ and $|w(z)|=R$ on I' and $w(z) \neq 0$ in Δ . Let Δ_r be the part of Δ , which lies in $|z| < r$. We put

$$S(r; \Delta) = \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\Delta_r} \frac{|w'|^2}{(1+|w|^2)^2} dx dy, \quad (w=w(z), z=x+iy), \quad (1)$$

$$T(r; \Delta) = \int_1^r \frac{S(r; \Delta)}{r} dr. \quad (2)$$

Now Δ_r consists of a finite number of connected domains. Let Δ_r^0 ($r \geq r_0$) be the one, which contains a fixed point z_0 of Δ and θ_r be the part of $|z|=r$, which belongs to the boundary of Δ_r^0 . θ_r consists of a finite number of arcs θ_r^i ($i=1, 2, \dots, \nu(r)$) and $r\theta_i(r)$ be its arc length and put $\theta(r) = \sum \theta_i(r)$. $\theta(r)$ is continuous except at most a countable number of isolated points $0 < r_1 < r_2 < \dots < r_\nu \rightarrow \infty$, where $\theta(r_\nu-0) = \theta(r_\nu) < \theta(r_\nu+0)$.

In the former paper,¹⁾ I have proved the following theorem.

THEOREM. For any $0 < \alpha < 1$,

$$T(r; \Delta) \geq \text{const.} \cdot e^{\pi \int_{r_0}^{\alpha r} \frac{dr}{r\theta(r)}} \quad (r \geq r_0).$$

1) M. Tsuji: On a regular function which is of constant absolute value on the boundary of an infinite domain. Tohoku Math. Journ. 3 (1951).

In the proof of the theorem on the number of direct transcendental singularities of an inverse function of a meromorphic function of finite order, Ahlfors²⁾ proved a similar relation :

$$T(r) \geq \text{const.} \int_{r_0}^{\alpha r} \frac{dr}{r^{\theta(r)}}, \quad (3)$$

where $w(z)$ is meromorphic for $|z| < \infty$ and $T(r)$ is its characteristic function and $\theta(r)$ is defined for a simply connected domain, which is bounded by the outermost boundary curve of Δ . Our theorem is an extension of (3). In this paper, I shall give a somewhat simpler proof than the former one.

Proof. Let

$$u(z) = \log \frac{R^2 + |w|^2}{2R|w|} \geq 0, \quad w = w(z), \quad (4)$$

then

$$\Delta u = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2} = \frac{4R^2 |w'|^2}{(R^2 + |w|^2)^2} \geq 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \log r^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \theta^2} = r^2 \Delta u \geq 0, \quad (5)$$

($z = x + iy = re^{i\theta}$)

so that $u(z)$ is subharmonic in Δ .

Since $\frac{R^2 + |w|^2}{2R|w|} = 1 + \frac{(R - |w|)^2}{2R|w|}$, we see that

$$u = 0, \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 \quad \text{on } I', \quad (6)$$

where ν is the outer normal of I' .

Let λ_r be the part of $|z| = r$, which lies in Δ , so that $\theta_r \subset \lambda_r$. We put

$$\mu(r) = \int_{\lambda_r} u(re^{i\theta}) d\theta. \quad (7)$$

We denote I'_r the part of I' , which belongs to the boundary of Δ_r , so that $I'_r + \lambda_r$ is the whole boundary of Δ_r .

2) L. Ahlfors: Über die asymptotischen Werte der meromorphen Funktionen endlicher Ordnung. Acta Acad. Aboensis. Math. et Phys. 6, Nr. 9 (1932).

Since $u=0$ at the end points of λ_r , we have by (6) and Green's formula,

$$r\mu'(r) = \int_{\lambda_r} \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} r d\theta = \int_{\Gamma_r + \lambda_r} \frac{\partial u}{\partial v} ds = \iint_{\mathcal{A}_r} \Delta u \, dx dy = 4R^2 \iint_{\mathcal{A}_r} \frac{|w'|^2}{(R^2 + |w|^2)^2} \, dx dy > 0,$$

so that

$$\int_{\lambda_r} u(rc^{i\theta}) d\theta = \mu(r) = 4R^2 \int_{r_0}^r \frac{dr}{r} \iint_{\mathcal{A}_r} \frac{|w'|^2}{(R^2 + |w|^2)^2} \, dx dy + \text{const.} \leq \text{const.} \int_{r_0}^r \frac{dr}{r} \iint_{\mathcal{A}_r} \frac{|w'|^2}{(1 + |w|^2)^2} \, dx dy + \text{const.} = \text{const.} T(r; \mathcal{A}) + \text{const.} \quad (9)$$

Following Carleman³⁾, we put

$$m(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} [u(rc^{i\theta})]' d\theta. \quad (10)$$

We denote I_r^0 the part of I' , which belongs to the boundary of \mathcal{A}_r^0 , so that $I_r^0 + \theta_r$ is the whole boundary of \mathcal{A}_r^0 . Since $u=0$ at the end points of θ_r , by (6) and Green's formula, we have for $r_\nu < r < r_{\nu+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dm(r)}{d \log r} &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\theta_r} u \frac{\partial u}{\partial \log r} d\theta = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\theta_r} u \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} r d\theta = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{I_r^0 + \theta_r} u \frac{\partial u}{\partial v} ds = \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\mathcal{A}_r^0} \left(\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right)^2 \right) dx dy + \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{\mathcal{A}_r^0} u \Delta u \, dx dy > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

so that $m(r)$ increases at r ($\neq r_\nu$). At r_ν , we see that $m(r_\nu - 0) = m(r_\nu) < m(r_\nu + 0)$. Hence $m(r)$ is an increasing function of r .

By (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 m(r)}{d \log r^2} &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\theta_r} \left(\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \log r} \right)^2 + u \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \log r^2} \right) d\theta = \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\theta_r} \left(\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \log r} \right)^2 + ur^2 \Delta u - u \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \theta^2} \right) d\theta \geq \end{aligned}$$

3) T. Carleman: Sur une inegalité différentielle dans la théorie des fonctions analytiques. C. R. 196 (1936).

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\theta_r} \left(\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \log r} \right)^2 - u \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \theta^2} \right) d\theta = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\theta_r} \left(\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \log r} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \theta} \right)^2 \right) d\theta, \quad (12)$$

by the integration by parts.

Now

$$\left(\frac{dm(r)}{d \log r} \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_{\theta_r} u^2 d\theta \int_{\theta_r} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \log r} \right)^2 d\theta = \frac{2m(r)}{\pi} \int_{\theta_r} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \log r} \right)^2 d\theta,$$

so that

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\theta_r} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \log r} \right)^2 d\theta \geq \frac{1}{2m(r)} \left(\frac{dm(r)}{d \log r} \right)^2. \quad (13)$$

Since $u=0$ at the end pints of θ_r^i , we have by Wirtinger's inequality,

$$\int_{\theta_r^i} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \theta} \right)^2 d\theta \geq \frac{\pi^2}{(\theta_i(r))^2} \int_{\theta_r^i} u^2 d\theta \geq \frac{\pi^2}{(\theta(r))^2} \int_{\theta_r^i} u^2 d\theta.$$

Summing up for i ,

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\theta_r} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \theta} \right)^2 d\theta \geq \frac{\pi}{(\theta(r))^2} \int_{\theta_r} u^2 d\theta = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2\pi}{\theta(r)} \right)^2 m(r). \quad (14)$$

Hence by (12), (13), (14),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 m(r)}{d \log r^2} &\geq \frac{1}{2m(r)} \left(\frac{dm(r)}{d \log r} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2\pi}{\theta(r)} \right)^2 m(r) \\ &\geq \frac{dm(r)}{d \log r} \cdot \frac{2\pi}{\theta(r)} \quad (r_\nu < r < r_{\nu+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

since $\frac{dm(r)}{d \log r} > 0$ by (11).

From (11), we see that at r_ν ,

$$\left(\frac{dm(r)}{d \log r} \right)_{r_\nu-0} = \left(\frac{dm(r)}{d \log r} \right)_{r_\nu} < \left(\frac{dm(r)}{d \log r} \right)_{r_\nu+0},$$

so that integrating (15), we have

$$\log \frac{dm(r)}{d \log r} - \log \frac{dm(r_0)}{d \log r_0} \geq 2\pi \int_{r_0}^r \frac{dr}{r\theta(r)},$$

or

$$r m'(r) = \frac{dm(r)}{d \log r} \geq \text{const. } e^{2\pi \int_{r_0}^r \frac{dr}{r \theta(r)}}. \tag{16}$$

Since $m(r)$ is an increasing function of r , we have for any $0 < \beta < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} m(r) > m(r) - m(r_0) &\geq \int_{r_0}^r m'(r) dr \geq \text{const.} \int_{r_0}^r \frac{dr}{r} e^{2\pi \int_{r_0}^r \frac{dt}{t \theta(t)}} \geq \\ &\text{const.} \int_{\beta r}^r \frac{dr}{r} e^{2\pi \int_{r_0}^r \frac{dt}{t \theta(t)}} \geq \text{const.} \int_{\beta r}^r \frac{dr}{r} e^{2\pi \int_{r_0}^{\beta r} \frac{dt}{t \theta(t)}} = \\ &\text{const. } e^{2\pi \int_{r_0}^{\beta r} \frac{dr}{r \theta(r)}} \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Let $u(z)$ attain its maximum at $z = r e^{i\theta_0}$ on θ_r , then

$$(u(r e^{i\theta_0}))^2 \geq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\theta_r} [u(r e^{i\theta})]^2 d\theta = m(r) \geq \text{const. } e^{2\pi \int_{r_0}^{\beta r} \frac{dr}{r \theta(r)}},$$

so that

$$u(r e^{i\theta_0}) \geq \text{const. } e^{\pi \int_{r_0}^{\beta r} \frac{dr}{r \theta(r)}}. \tag{18}$$

Let

$$U(z) = U(r e^{i\theta}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\lambda_\rho} u(\rho e^{i\varphi}) \frac{\rho^2 - r^2}{\rho^2 - 2\rho r \cos(\varphi - \theta) + r^2} d\varphi, \tag{19}$$

$(r < \rho)$

then $U(z) = u(z)$ on λ_ρ and $U(z) > 0 = u(z)$ on I'_ρ and since $u(z)$ is subharmonic in Δ_ρ , we have $u(z) < U(z)$ in Δ_ρ . Hence if we put $\rho = kr (k > 1)$, then by (19) and (9),

$$\begin{aligned} u(r e^{i\theta_0}) < U(r e^{i\theta_0}) &\leq \frac{\rho + r}{\rho - r} \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\lambda_\rho} u(\rho e^{i\varphi}) d\varphi = \frac{k+1}{k-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\lambda_{kr}} u(kr e^{i\varphi}) d\varphi \\ &\leq \text{const. } T(kr; \Delta) + \text{const.}, \end{aligned}$$

so that by (18),

$$T(kr; \Delta) \geq \text{const. } e^{\pi \int_{r_0}^{\beta r} \frac{dr}{r^{\theta(r)}}} - \text{const.}$$

Hence if we put r instead of kr and $\alpha = \frac{\beta}{k}$, then

$$T(r; \Delta) \geq \text{const. } e^{\pi \int_{r_0}^{\alpha r} \frac{dr}{r^{\theta(r)}}} - \text{const.}$$

From this we have easily,

$$T(r; \Delta) \geq \text{const. } e^{\pi \int_{r_0}^{\alpha r} \frac{dr}{r^{\theta(r)}}} \quad (r \geq r_0).$$

Since α is any number, such that $0 < \alpha < 1$, our theorem is proved.

Mathematical Institute,
Tokyo University.