

## 72. The Order of the Derivative of a Meromorphic Function.

By Yûsaku KOMATU.

(Comm. by K. KUNUGI, M.J.A., July 12, 1951.)

The following result is due to Whittaker<sup>1)</sup>:

**Theorem.** *Any meromorphic function is of the same order as its derivative.*

Whittaker's own proof of the theorem was based upon a result concerning the expansion of a meromorphic function into a series of Mittag-Leffler's type which had also been established by himself<sup>2)</sup>. He further remarked in the addenda<sup>3)</sup> at the end of the Journal containing his paper that Valiron drew his attention to a memoir<sup>4)</sup> in which Valiron had previously proved the theorem. But, in the Valiron's paper we can find no detail; in fact, only the following statement is found there:

Signalons encore proposition: *l'ordre  $\rho$  d'une fonction méromorphe  $f(z)$  et l'ordre de sa dérivée sont égaux.* C'est évident lorsque  $f$  est le quotient d'une fonction entière  $f_1$  d'ordre au plus égal à  $\rho$  par un produit canonique  $P$  d'ordre  $\rho$  et dans le cas contraire, la propriété résulte de ce que la fonction  $f_1 P' - f_1' P$  est d'ordre  $\rho$  si  $f_1$  est d'ordre  $\rho$  et  $P$  d'ordre inférieur à  $\rho$ .

Recently, Tsuji has succeeded to give a simple proof of the theorem essentially based upon Valiron's idea which will be in a paper<sup>5)</sup> before long published. The last part of the above cited Valiron's statement will really be found in this paper as a lemma accompanied by a proof.

The purpose of the present paper is to give a more brief proof of this interesting theorem. The last part of the Valiron's statement will also be established, as a corollary of the theorem, at the end of the present paper.

Let  $f(z)$  be a meromorphic function of order  $\rho$ , and let the order of its derivative  $f'(z)$  be denoted by  $\rho'$ . If  $f(z)$  is an integral

1) J. M. Whittaker, The order of the derivative of a meromorphic function. Journ. London Math. Soc. **11** (1936), 82-87.

2) J. M. Whittaker, A theorem on meromorphic function. Proc. London Math. Soc. (2) **40** (1935), 255-272.

3) J. M. Whittaker, Addendum to the previous paper. Journ. London Math. Soc. **11** (1936), 320.

4) G. Valiron, Sur la distribution des valeurs des fonctions méromorphes. Acta Math. **47** (1926), 117-142.

5) M. Tsuji, On the order of the derivative of a meromorphic function. Tôhoku Math. Journ. (2) **3** (1951).

function, the identity  $\rho' = \rho$  is almost evident. In fact, either, as noticed in Whittaker's paper, the inequalities

$$\frac{1}{r}(M(r, f) - |f(0)|) \leq M(r, f') \leq \frac{1}{r}M(2r, f)$$

can easily be established, where  $M(r, F)$  denotes, as usual, the maximum modulus of  $F(z)$  on  $|z| = r$ , whence it follows  $\rho' = \rho$  immediately. Or the result may also be deduced from a well-known fact that the order of an integral function  $F(z)$  can be expressed in the form

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n \log n}{\log |c_n|^{-1}},$$

$\{c_n\}$  denoting the Taylor coefficients:  $F(z) = \sum c_n z^n$ .

Now, in case of general meromorphic function, the function  $f(z)$  is expressible as a quotient of two integral functions of order not exceeding  $\rho$ . From this it is easily seen that the inequality

$$\rho' \leq \rho$$

holds good, which is also really a well-known fact. It remains therefore to deduce the opposite inequality

$$\rho' \geq \rho,$$

which will be proved in the following lines.

The case  $\rho' = \infty$  being trivial, it may and so will be supposed that  $\rho' < \infty$ . The derivative  $f'(z)$  can be expressed in the form

$$f'(z) = \frac{\varphi(z)}{\psi(z)},$$

where  $\varphi(z)$  and  $\psi(z)$  are both integral functions of order not exceeding  $\rho'$ . Moreover, one may take as  $\psi(z)$  the canonical product composed of the poles  $\{z_\nu\}$  of  $f'(z)$ . Then, a theorem due to Borel<sup>6)</sup> asserts that, for arbitrary positive number  $\varepsilon$ , if about each point  $z_\nu$  of modulus greater than unity as centre a circle of radius  $|z_\nu|^{-\eta}$  with  $\eta > \rho'$  is described, so at any point  $z$  outside all these circles the inequality

$$\log |\psi(z)| > -r^{\rho' + \varepsilon}$$

---

6) É. Borel, Sur les zéros des fonctions entières. *Acta Math.* **20** (1896), 357-396. Cf. also, for instance, G. Valiron, *Lectures on the general theory of integral functions*. Toulouse (1923), Theorem 19, p. 57; or E. T. Copson, *An introduction to the theory of functions of a complex variable*. Oxford (1935), p. 173.

holds provided  $r \equiv |z| \geq r_\varepsilon$ . By choosing  $r_\varepsilon$  sufficiently large, one may suppose that the inequality

$$\log |\varphi(z)| < r^{\rho'+\varepsilon}$$

also holds simultaneously. Hence, it follows that the inequality

$$\log |f'(z)| < 2r^{\rho'+\varepsilon}$$

holds good outside all the above mentioned circles, provided  $r \geq r_\varepsilon$ . On the other hand, the convergence exponent of  $\{z_\nu\}$  coinciding with the order of  $\psi(z)$ , the series

$$\sum_\nu |z_\nu|^{-\eta}$$

converges, since  $\eta > \rho'$ . Hence, replacing  $r_\varepsilon$ , if necessary, by a suitably large number, there exists a half-line

$$\arg z = \alpha, \quad |z| \geq r_\varepsilon$$

lying outside all the above circles in question. Let further the sum of the circular projections of all these circles on the positive real axis be denoted by

$$\{p_\nu \leq x \leq q_\nu\}.$$

It is immediately seen that

$$l \equiv \sum_\nu (q_\nu - p_\nu) \leq 2 \sum_\nu |z_\nu|^{-\eta} < \infty.$$

Let  $r (\geq r_\varepsilon)$  be any point on the real axis which does not belong to the set of projections. Then, for a point  $z = re^{i\theta}$  it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z)| &= \left| f(r_\varepsilon e^{i\alpha}) + \left( \int_{r_\varepsilon e^{i\alpha}}^{re^{i\theta}} + \int_{re^{i\theta}}^{re^{i\alpha}} \right) f'(z) dz \right| \\ &= O\left(1 + \int_{r_\varepsilon}^r \exp(2t^{\rho'+\varepsilon}) dt + \int_0^{2\pi} \exp(2r^{\rho'+\varepsilon}) r d\phi\right) \\ &= O(\exp(2r^{\rho'+2\varepsilon})), \end{aligned}$$

$O$ -notations depending on  $r \rightarrow \infty$ ; whence it follows that

$$m(r, f) = O(r^{\rho'+2\varepsilon}).$$

Since the poles of  $f(z)$  consist of the corresponding ones of  $f'(z)$ , multiplicity being diminished by one, it is evident that

$$N(r, f) \leq N(r, f') = O(r^{\rho'+\varepsilon}).$$

Hence, one concludes that

$$T(r, f) = O(r^{\rho' + 2\varepsilon})$$

provided  $r (\geq r_\varepsilon)$  does not belong to a set on the real axis whose total length is equal to  $l$ .

For any remaining value  $r (\geq r_\varepsilon)$  there exists a value  $r'$  with  $r < r' < r + l + 1$  which does not belong to the set. The monotone increasing character of the characteristic function  $T(r, f)$  — moreover,  $T(r, f)$  is really a convex function of  $\log r$  — implies

$$T(r, f) \leq T(r', f) = O((r + l + 1)^{\rho' + 2\varepsilon}) = O(r^{\rho' + 2\varepsilon}).$$

Consequently, since  $\varepsilon$  is an arbitrary positive number, it follows the relation

$$\rho \equiv \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T(r, f)}{\log r} \leq \rho',$$

yielding the desired result.

In conclusion, it will immediately be deduced from the just proved theorem that, if  $F(z)$  and  $G(z)$  are integral functions of order equal to and less than  $\rho$  respectively, then  $F'(z)G(z) - F(z)G'(z)$  is of order  $\rho$ ; the fact which has also be noticed by Whittaker. In fact, otherwise, it follows that the order of the derivative of  $F(z)/G(z)$  would become less than  $\rho$  what is evidently absurd.

Tokyo Institute of Technology.