

## 49. On the Boundary Behavior of Taylor Series of Regular Functions of Some Classes in the Unit Circle

By Chuji TANAKA

Mathematical Institute, Waseda University

(Communicated by Kôzaku YOSIDA, M. J. A., June 12, 1979)

**1. Introduction.** In his previous papers ([3], [4]), the author introduced  $(C, k, \alpha)$ -summation, by means of which Taylor series of the regular function of bounded type in  $|z| < 1$  can be summable on  $|z| = 1$ . In this note, for the class wider than bounded type, he studies the convergence, the almost everywhere convergence and the mean convergence of this summation.

**2. Statement of results.** For the sake of completeness, we recall the definition of  $(C, k, \alpha)$ -summation. Let  $f(z)$  be a regular function in  $|z| < 1$ :

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n.$$

For two constants  $k, \alpha (k > -1, \alpha > 0)$ , we put

$$\frac{1}{(1-z)^{k+1}} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\alpha}{1-z}\right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n(k, \alpha) z^n,$$

where

$$(1) \ b_n(k, \alpha) > 0, \quad (2) \ b_n(k, \alpha) \sim \frac{\exp(\alpha/2 + 2\sqrt{\alpha n})}{2\sqrt{\pi} \alpha^{1/4 + k/2} n^{1/4 - k/2}} \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

and let

$$\frac{1}{(1-z)^{k+1}} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\alpha}{1-z}\right) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n e^{in\theta} z^n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} S_n(k, \alpha, e^{i\theta}) \cdot z^n.$$

If  $C_n(k, \alpha, e^{i\theta}) = S_n(k, \alpha, e^{i\theta}) / b_n(k, \alpha) \rightarrow s$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we say that the series  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n e^{in\theta}$  is summable  $(C, k, \alpha)$  to  $s$ .

Our Theorem 1 reads as follows.

**Theorem 1.** Let  $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$  be a regular function in  $|z| < 1$  such that

$$(2.1) \quad \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 1} (1-r) \cdot \log^+ M(r) = \delta < +\infty,$$

where  $M(r) = \max_{|z|=r} |f(z)|$ . Then the following propositions hold:

(A) If  $f(z)$  has the finite angular limit  $f(e^{i\theta})$  at  $z = e^{i\theta}$ , then for any  $\alpha > \delta$ ,  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n e^{in\theta}$  is summable  $(C, k, \alpha)$  to  $f(e^{i\theta})$ .

$$(B) \quad \rho^n \cdot \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |C_n(k, \alpha, e^{i\theta}) - f(\rho e^{i\theta})| d\theta = o(1) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $\rho = 1 - \sqrt{\alpha/n}$ ,  $\alpha > \delta$ .

We denote by  $N$  the class of functions  $f(z)$  regular and bounded type in the unit circle. Then we have

$$A(f) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} 1/2\pi \cdot \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ |f(re^{i\theta})| d\theta < +\infty.$$

$N^+$  is the subclass of  $N$  of functions  $f(z)$  satisfying

$$A(f) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} 1/2\pi \cdot \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ |f(re^{i\theta})| d\theta = 1/2\pi \cdot \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ |f(e^{i\theta})| d\theta < +\infty.$$

As its applications to the class of bounded type, we get two corollaries.

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n \in N$  in  $|z| < 1$ . Put*

$$\beta = 2A(f) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} 1/\pi \cdot \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ |f(re^{i\theta})| d\theta.$$

If  $\beta < \alpha$ , then the following propositions hold:

(A)  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n e^{in\theta}$  is summable  $(C, k, \alpha)$  to  $f(e^{i\theta})$  a.e. on  $|z|=1$ .

(B)  $\rho^n \cdot \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |C_n(k, \alpha, e^{i\theta}) - f(\rho e^{i\theta})| d\theta = o(1)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

where  $\rho = 1 - \sqrt{\alpha/n}$ .

**Corollary 2.** *Let  $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n \in N^+$  in  $|z| < 1$ . Then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have*

(A)  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n e^{in\theta}$  is summable  $(C, k, \varepsilon)$  to  $f(e^{i\theta})$  a.e. on  $|z|=1$ .

(B)  $\rho^n \cdot \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |C_n(k, \varepsilon, e^{i\theta}) - f(\rho e^{i\theta})| d\theta = o(1)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

where  $\rho = 1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon/n}$ .

**Remark 1.** N. Yanagihara ([7, p. 332], [8]) has independently introduced the same summation as  $(C, k, \alpha)$ -summation, and he proved Corollary 2(A) by the entirely different method. He also proved Corollary 1(A) for sufficiently large  $\alpha$  ([8]), but it holds for any  $\alpha$  greater than  $\beta$ .

In Theorem 1(A), under some additional conditions on the growth of  $f(z)$ , we can prove  $(C, k, \delta)$  summability at  $z = e^{i\theta}$  instead of  $(C, k, \alpha)$  ( $\alpha > \delta$ ) summability. Here we remark that next inclusions hold; for  $\delta < \alpha$ ,

$$(C, k, \delta)\text{-summation} \subset (C, k, \alpha)\text{-summation} \subset \text{Abel summation}.$$

Now we introduce

**Definition.** Let  $f(z)$  be a regular function in  $|z| < 1$  such that

$$\overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 1} (1-r) \log^+ M(r) = \delta < +\infty,$$

where  $M(r) = \max_{|z|=r} |f(z)|$ . If there exists a constant  $r_1 (0 < r_1 < 1)$  such that

$$M(r) < \exp\left(\frac{\delta}{1-r}\right) \quad \text{for } r_1 \leq r < 1,$$

we say that  $f(z)$  has the exact type  $\delta$ .

Using Definition, we can prove

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$  be a regular function of the exact type  $\delta (0 < \delta < +\infty)$  in  $|z| < 1$ . Then the following propositions hold:*

(A) Let  $f(z)$  have the finite angular limit  $f(e^{i\theta})$  at  $z=e^{i\theta}$ . Then  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n e^{in\theta}$  is summable  $(C, k, \delta)$  ( $k>1/2$ ) to  $f(e^{i\theta})$ , provided that

$$\overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 1} (1-r) \log^+ M(r, \Delta, \theta) < \delta$$

for sufficiently small  $\Delta > 0$ , where

$$M(r, \Delta, \theta) = \max_{|h| \leq \Delta} \left| 1/h \cdot \int_{\theta}^{\theta+h} |f(re^{i\phi})| d\phi \right|.$$

(B)  $\rho^n \cdot \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |C_n(k, \delta, e^{i\theta}) - f(\rho e^{i\theta})| d\theta = O(1)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

where  $\rho = 1 - \sqrt{\delta/n}$ .

From Theorem 2, we get the followings

**Corollary 3.** Let  $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n \in N$  in  $|z| < 1$ , and let  $\alpha = 2A(f) > 0$ .

(A) If  $f(z)$  has the finite angular limit  $f(e^{i\theta})$  at  $z=e^{i\theta}$ , then  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n e^{in\theta}$  is summable  $(C, k, \alpha)$  ( $k>1/2$ ) to  $f(e^{i\theta})$ , provided that

$$\overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 1} (1-r) \cdot \log^+ M(r, \Delta, \theta) < \alpha$$

for sufficiently small  $\Delta > 0$ .

(B)  $\rho^n \cdot \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |C_n(k, \alpha, e^{i\theta}) - f(\rho e^{i\theta})| d\theta = O(1)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

where  $\rho = 1 - \sqrt{\alpha/n}$ .

**Corollary 4.** Let  $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n \in N$  in  $|z| < 1$ , and let  $\alpha = 2A(f) > 0$ . If

$$\overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 1} (1-r) \cdot \log^+ M(r, \varphi, \varphi') < \alpha,$$

where  $M(r, \varphi, \varphi') = \max_{\varphi \leq \theta \leq \varphi'} |f(re^{i\theta})|$ , then  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n e^{in\theta}$  is summable  $(C, k, \alpha)$  ( $k>1/2$ ) to  $f(e^{i\theta})$  a.e. on the arc  $C = \{e^{i\theta} : \varphi \leq \theta \leq \varphi'\}$ .

**Remark 2.** In his previous papers ([3, p. 59], [4, p. 287]), the author proved Corollary 3(A) under the superfluous condition that  $f(z) = f(e^{i\theta}) + o(\sqrt{|z - e^{i\theta}|})$  as  $z \rightarrow e^{i\theta}$  in Stolz domain with its vertex at  $z = e^{i\theta}$ .

**3. Outline of the proof.** Throughout this note, we use the following notations:

$$\eta = \pi/n, \quad \rho = \rho(\alpha) = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{n}} \quad (\alpha > 0, n = 1, 2, \dots)$$

$$g(z) = g(z, \alpha) = \frac{1}{(1-z)^{k+1}} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\alpha}{1-z}\right) (k > -1).$$

To establish our theorems, we need

**Lemma 1.** The following equality holds:

$$\begin{aligned} C_n(k, \alpha, e^{i\theta}) - f(\rho e^{i\theta}) &= O(e^{\sqrt{n\alpha}}) / b_n(k, \alpha) \cdot I(n, \theta) \\ &= O(e^{\sqrt{n\alpha}}) / b_n(k, \alpha) \cdot \{I_1(n, \theta) + I_2(n, \theta)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I(n, \theta) &= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} [f(\rho e^{i(\theta+\phi)}) - f(\rho e^{i\theta})] \cdot g(\rho e^{i\phi}) \cdot e^{-in\phi} d\phi, \\ I_1(n, \theta) &= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} [f(\rho e^{i(\theta+\phi)}) - f(\rho e^{i\theta})] \cdot [g(\rho e^{i\phi}) - g(\rho e^{i(\phi+\eta)})] \cdot e^{-in\phi} d\phi, \end{aligned}$$

$$I_2(n, \theta) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} [f(\rho e^{i(\theta+\phi)}) - f(\rho e^{i(\theta+\phi+\eta)})] \cdot g(\rho e^{i(\phi+\eta)}) \cdot e^{-in\phi} d\phi.$$

This lemma is proved by next equalities:

$$f(z e^{i\theta}) \cdot g(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} S_n(k, \alpha, e^{i\theta}) \cdot z^n, \quad e^{-in\phi} = 1/2 \cdot (e^{-in\phi} - e^{-in(\phi-\eta)}).$$

**Lemma 2.** Let  $f(z)$  be a function regular in  $|z| < 1$  and satisfying

$$M(r) < \exp\left(\frac{\beta}{1-r}\right) \quad \text{for } 0 < r_0 \leq r < 1,$$

where  $M(r) = \max_{|z|=r} |f(z)|$ ,  $\beta$ : a positive constant. Then for any  $\alpha (> 0)$  and sufficiently large  $n$ , we have

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \max_{0 \leq \psi \leq \eta} |f'(\rho e^{i(\theta+\psi)})| d\theta = O\left(n \cdot \exp\left(\sqrt{n\alpha} \cdot \frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)\right),$$

where  $\rho = \rho(\alpha) = 1 - \sqrt{\alpha/n}$ .

This lemma is established by E. Goursat's theorem, Poisson's integral and G. H. Hardy's "Max" ([1, p. 114], [5, p. 186]).

**Lemma 3.** We have the following estimate:

$$e^{\sqrt{n\alpha}} \cdot \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |g(\rho e^{i\phi})| d\phi = O(b_n(k, \alpha)) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

where  $\rho = \rho(\alpha) = 1 - \sqrt{\alpha/n}$ .

This lemma is proved by elementary but very delicate calculations.

**Outline of the proof of Theorem 1.** Without any loss of generality, we can assume that  $\theta = 0$ . For the proof of Part (A), it suffices to prove that  $C_n(k, \alpha, 1) - f(\rho) = o(1)$  as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ . By (2.1), for any  $\varepsilon$  ( $0 < \varepsilon < \alpha - \delta$ ), there exists  $r_0(\varepsilon)$  such that

$$(3.1) \quad M(r) < \exp\left(\frac{\beta}{1-r}\right) \quad \text{for } r_0(\varepsilon) \leq r < 1, \quad \beta = \delta + \varepsilon < \alpha.$$

By Lemma 1,

$$(3.2) \quad C_n(k, \alpha, 1) - f(\rho) = O(e^{\sqrt{n\alpha}}) / b_n(k, \alpha) \cdot I(n, 0).$$

We divide  $I(n, 0)$  into two parts:

$$(3.3) \quad I(n, 0) = \int_0^{\pi} + \int_{-\pi}^0 = I_1 + I_2.$$

We further divide  $I_1$  into two parts:

$$I_1 = \int_A^B + \int_B^D = I_{1,1} + I_{1,2},$$

where  $A: z = \rho$ ,  $D: z = -\rho$ ,  $B$ : the first intersection point of the circle  $|z| = \rho$  and the half straight line:  $z = 1 - te^{-i\theta}$  ( $0 \leq t < +\infty$ ,  $0 < \theta < \pi/2$ ).

Since  $f(z)$  has the finite angular limit  $f(1)$  at  $z = 1$ , on the arc  $\widehat{AB}$  we have uniformly with respect to  $\phi$

$$f(\rho e^{i\phi}) - f(\rho) = o(1) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty,$$

so that, by Lemma 3

$$|I_{1,1}| \leq o(1) \cdot \int_A^B |g(\rho e^{i\phi})| d\phi < o(1) \cdot \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |g(\rho e^{i\phi})| d\phi = o(e^{-\sqrt{n\alpha}} \cdot b_n(k, \alpha)).$$

On the  $\widehat{BD}$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{|1 - \rho e^{i\phi}|} \leq \frac{1}{BE} = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\alpha}} \cdot \cos \theta \cdot (1 + o(1))$$

for sufficiently large  $n$ , where  $E: z=1$ , so that by (3.1)

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{1,2}| &< 2\pi \cdot e^{\beta/(1-\rho)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)^{k+1} \cdot \exp(\sqrt{n\alpha} \cdot \cos \theta \cdot (1 + o(1))) \\ &= O(e^{-\sqrt{n\alpha}b_n(k, \alpha)} \cdot n^{3/4} \cdot \exp\left(\sqrt{n\alpha} \cdot \left(-1 + \frac{\beta}{\alpha} + \cos \theta \cdot (1 + o(1))\right)\right)). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\theta$  is sufficiently near  $\pi/2$ , we have

$$-1 + \frac{\beta}{\alpha} + \cos \theta \cdot (1 + o(1)) < 0.$$

Hence

$$|I_{1,2}| = o(e^{-\sqrt{n\alpha} \cdot b_n(k, \alpha)}),$$

so that  $|I_1| = o(e^{-\sqrt{n\alpha} \cdot b_n(k, \alpha)})$ . Similarly  $|I_2| = o(e^{-\sqrt{n\alpha} \cdot b_n(k, \alpha)})$ . Therefore, by (3.2) and (3.3)

$$C_n(k, \alpha, 1) - f(\rho) = o(1) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty,$$

which proves Part (A).

By Lemma 1, we have

$$(3.4) \quad |C_n(k, \alpha, e^{i\theta}) - f(\rho e^{i\theta})| \leq O(e^{\sqrt{n\alpha}}/b_n(k, \alpha) \cdot \{I_n^{(1)}(\theta) + I_n^{(2)}(\theta)\}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_n^{(1)}(\theta) &= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(\rho e^{i(\theta+\phi)}) - f(\rho e^{i\theta})| \cdot |g(\rho e^{i\phi}) - g(\rho e^{i(\phi+\eta)})| d\phi, \\ I_n^{(2)}(\theta) &= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(\rho e^{i(\theta+\phi)}) - f(\rho e^{i(\theta+\phi+\eta)})| \cdot |g(\rho e^{i(\phi+\eta)})| d\phi. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.1)

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} I_n^{(1)}(\theta) d\theta < 8\pi \cdot \exp\left(\sqrt{n\alpha} \cdot \frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right) \cdot \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |g(\rho e^{i\phi})| d\phi.$$

By Lemma 2,

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} I_n^{(2)}(\theta) d\theta = O\left(\exp\left(\sqrt{n\alpha} \cdot \frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)\right) \cdot \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |g(\rho e^{i\phi})| d\phi.$$

Hence, by (3.4)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |C_n(k, \alpha, e^{i\theta}) - f(\rho e^{i\theta})| d\theta &\leq O(e^{\sqrt{n\alpha}}/b_n(k, \alpha) \cdot \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |g(\rho e^{i\phi})| d\phi \\ &\quad \times \exp\left(\sqrt{n\alpha} \cdot \frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)), \end{aligned}$$

so that by Lemma 3,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |C_n(k, \alpha, e^{i\theta}) - f(\rho e^{i\theta})| d\theta &= O\left(\exp\left(\sqrt{n\alpha} \cdot \frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\sqrt{n\alpha}\right) O\left(\exp\left(\sqrt{n\alpha}\left(-1 + \frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $-1 + \beta/\alpha < 0$ ,

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |C_n(k, \alpha, e^{i\theta}) - f(\rho e^{i\theta})| d\theta = o(\exp(\sqrt{n\alpha})) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty,$$

which proves Part (B), taking account of  $\rho^{-n} = \exp(\sqrt{n\alpha} + \alpha/2 + o(1))$ .

**Proof of Corollary 1.** since  $f(z) \in N$ , the following properties hold:

- (1)  $f(z)$  has the finite angular limit a.e. on  $|z|=1$ ,
- (2)  $M(r) < \exp(\beta/(1-r))$  for  $0 < r < 1$  ([2, p. 57]), so that
 
$$\overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 1} (1-r) \cdot \log^+ M(r) = \delta \leq \beta < \alpha.$$

Hence, Corollary 1 follows immediately from Theorem 1.

**Proof of Corollary 2.** By  $f(z) \in N^+$ , we have

- (1)  $f(z)$  has the finite angular limit a.e. on  $|z|=1$ ,
- (2)  $\overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 1} (1-r) \cdot \log^+ M(r) = 0$  ([6, p. 39]), so that Corollary 2 is an

immediate consequence of Theorem 1.

Theorem 2 is also proved by the arguments which are similar to Theorem 1, but more delicate.

**Proof of Corollary 3.** Since  $f(z) \in N$ , we have

$$(3.5) \quad M(r) < \exp\left(\frac{\alpha}{1-r}\right) \quad \text{for } 0 < r < 1 \text{ ([2, p. 57])},$$

so that

$$\overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow 1} (1-r) \cdot \log^+ M(r) = \delta \leq \alpha.$$

In the case  $\delta < \alpha$ , by Theorem 1, Corollary 3 holds evidently. In the case  $\delta = \alpha$ , by (3.5)  $f(z)$  has the exact type  $\delta$ . Hence, by Theorem 2, Corollary 3 is proved.

Corollary 4 is an immediate consequence of Corollary 3. More detailed proof will be published elsewhere in near future.

## References

- [1] G. H. Hardy: A maximal theorem with function-theoretic applications. *Acta. Math.*, **54**, 81–116 (1930).
- [2] I. I. Priwalow: *Randeigenschaften Analytischer Funktionen*. Berlin (1956).
- [3] C. Tanaka: On the summability of Taylor series of the regular function of bounded type in the unit circle. *Memoirs of the School of Science & Engineering, Waseda Univ.*, no. 39, 51–66 (1975).
- [4] —: Ditto. *Proc. Japan Acad.*, **52**(6), 286–288 (1976).
- [5] M. Tsuji: *Potential Theory in Modern Function Theory*. Maruzen, Tokyo (1959).
- [6] N. Yanagihara: Mean growth and Taylor coefficients of some classes of functions. *Ann. Polon. Math.*, **30**, 37–48 (1974).
- [7] —: On the functional analysis of Nevanlinna class. *Sûgaku*, **28**(4), 323–334 (1976) (in Japanese).
- [8] —: Summability for power series of some classes of functions (to appear).