

## The first, the second and the fourth Painlevé transcendents are of finite order

By Shun SHIMOMURA

Department of Mathematics, Keio University, 3-14-1, Hiyoshi, Yokohama, Kanagawa 223-8522

(Communicated by Shigefumi MORI, M. J. A., March 12, 2001)

**Abstract:** We show that every solution of the first Painlevé equation has the finite growth order. The second and the fourth Painlevé equations have the same property.

**Key words:** Painlevé equations; growth order.

**1. Introduction.** Consider the first Painlevé equation

$$(I) \quad w'' = 6w^2 + z$$

( $' = d/dz$ ). Every solution of (I) is meromorphic in  $\mathbf{C}$  ([2], [3], for [3] see [6]). In this paper, we prove the following:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $w(z)$  be an arbitrary meromorphic solution of (I). Then,  $T(r, w) = O(r^C)$ , where  $C$  is some positive number independent of  $w(z)$ .*

For the notation in the value distribution theory such as  $m(r, f)$ ,  $N(r, f)$ ,  $T(r, f)$ ,  $S(r, f)$ , the reader may consult [4]. In the proof, Lemma 2.1 and the auxiliary function given by (2.5) play essential roles. The second and the fourth Painlevé transcendents have the same property (Theorem 4.1). We remark that the constant  $C$  in Theorem 1.1 can be replaced by  $5/2$ , which is proved by another method ([5]).

**2. Lemmas.** In what follows,  $w(z)$  denotes an arbitrary meromorphic solution of (I), and

$$\theta = 2^{-4}, \quad D_0 = \{z \mid |z| \geq 5\}.$$

We begin with the following lemma, whose proof is a modification of M. Hukuhara's argument ([3], [6]).

**Lemma 2.1.** *Suppose that, for  $a \in D_0$ ,  $|w(a)| \leq \theta^2 |a|^{1/2}/6$ . Then,*

- (i)  $w(z)$  is analytic and bounded for  $|z - a| < \delta_a$ ,
  - (ii)  $|w(z)| \geq \theta^2 |a|^{1/2}/5$  for  $(5/6)\delta_a \leq |z - a| \leq \delta_a$ ,
- where  $\delta_a$  is a positive number such that

$$(2.1) \quad \theta |a|^{-1/4} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\theta |a|^{3/4}}{|w'(a)|} \right\} < \delta_a \leq 3\theta |a|^{-1/4}.$$

*Proof.* In (I), put  $z - a = \rho t$ ,  $\rho = a^{-1/4}$ ,  $w(z) =$

$w(a + \rho t) = \theta a^{1/2} W(t)$ . Then,

$$\dot{W}(t) = 6\theta W(t)^2 + \theta^{-1}(1 + \rho^5 t) \quad \left( \dot{\phantom{x}} = \frac{d}{dt} \right).$$

Integrating both sides twice, we have

$$(2.2) \quad W(t) = W(0) + \dot{W}(0)t + \frac{\theta^{-1}t^2}{2} + g(t),$$

where

$$W(0) = \theta^{-1} a^{-1/2} w(a), \quad \dot{W}(0) = \theta^{-1} a^{-3/4} w'(a),$$

$$g(t) = \frac{\theta^{-1} \rho^5 t^3}{6} + 6\theta \int_0^t \int_0^\tau W(s)^2 ds d\tau.$$

(1) *Case  $|\dot{W}(0)| \leq 1$ .* We put

$$\eta_0 = \sup \{ \eta \mid M(\eta) \leq 8\theta \},$$

where  $M(\eta) = \max \{ |W(t)| \mid |t| \leq \eta \}$ . Then,  $\eta_0 > 0$ , because  $|W(0)| = \theta^{-1} |a|^{-1/2} |w(a)| \leq \theta/6$ . Suppose that  $\eta_0 < 3\theta$ . Observing that, for  $|t| \leq \eta_0$  and for  $|a| \geq 5$ ,

$$(2.3) \quad |g(t)|$$

$$\leq \frac{\theta^{-1} |\rho|^5 |t|^3}{6} + 6\theta \int_0^t \int_0^\tau |W(s)|^2 |ds| |d\tau|$$

$$\leq \frac{\theta^{-1} |\rho|^5 (3\theta)^3}{6} + \frac{6\theta (8\theta)^2 (3\theta)^2}{2} < \frac{\theta}{4},$$

we obtain from (2.2) that

$$(2.4) \quad |W(t)| \leq |W(0)| + |t| + \frac{\theta^{-1}|t|^2}{2} + \frac{\theta}{4} < 7.92\theta$$

for  $|t| \leq \eta_0$ , which contradicts the supposition. Hence  $\eta_0 \geq 3\theta$ , and (2.3) is valid for  $|t| \leq 3\theta$ . Furthermore, for  $2.5\theta \leq |t| \leq 3\theta$ ,

$$|W(t)| \geq \frac{\theta^{-1}|t|^2}{2} - |W(0)| - |t| - |g(t)|$$

$$\geq \left( \frac{2.5^2}{2} - \frac{1}{6} - 2.5 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \theta > \frac{\theta}{5}.$$

Going back to the original variables, we obtain (i) and (ii) with  $\delta_a = 3\theta|a|^{-1/4}$ .

(2) *Case*  $|\dot{W}(0)| = \kappa > 1$ . Putting

$$\eta_1 = \sup\{\eta \mid M(\eta) \leq 5\theta\}$$

and supposing  $\eta_1 < (2/\kappa)\theta$ , we obtain  $|g(t)| < \theta/24$  and  $|W(t)| \leq |W(0)| + \kappa|t| + \theta^{-1}|t|^2/2 + \theta/24 < 4.3\theta$  for  $|t| \leq \eta_1$ , instead of (2.3) and (2.4). This implies  $\eta_1 \geq (2/\kappa)\theta$ , and hence  $|g(t)| < \theta/24$  for  $|t| \leq (2/\kappa)\theta$ . Furthermore, for  $(0.8/\kappa)\theta \leq |t| \leq (1.2/\kappa)\theta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |W(t)| &\geq \kappa|t| - \frac{\theta^{-1}|t|^2}{2} - |W(0)| - |g(t)| \\ &\geq \left(0.8 - \frac{0.8^2}{2} - \frac{1}{6} - \frac{1}{24}\right)\theta > \frac{\theta}{5}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain (i) and (ii) with

$$\delta_a = \frac{1.2\theta|a|^{-1/4}}{\kappa} = \frac{1.2\theta|a|^{-1/4} \cdot \theta|a|^{3/4}}{|w'(a)|},$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark.** In Lemma 2.1, since  $|a| \geq 5$ , the property (ii) can be replaced by

(ii')  $|w(z)| \geq \theta^2|z|^{1/2}/5.5$  for  $(5/6)\delta_a \leq |z - a| \leq \delta_a$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *There exists a curve  $\Gamma_0 : z = \phi(x)$ ,  $0 \leq x < +\infty$  such that*

- (1)  $x$  is the length of  $\Gamma_0$  from  $\phi(0)$  to  $\phi(x)$ ;
- (2)  $|\phi(x)|$  is monotone increasing and  $|\phi(x)| \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $x \rightarrow +\infty$ ;
- (3)  $|dz| \leq (6/\sqrt{11})d|z|$  along  $\Gamma_0$ ;
- (4)  $|w(z)| \geq 2^{-11}|z|^{1/2}$  along  $\Gamma_0$ .

*Proof.* Consider the ray  $R_0 (\subset \mathbf{R}) : z \geq 5$ . Start from  $z = 5$ , and proceed along  $R_0$ . Suppose that a point  $a \in R_0$ ,  $a \geq 5$  satisfies  $|w(a)| \leq \theta^2|a|^{1/2}/6$  and  $|w(z)| > \theta^2|z|^{1/2}/6$  for  $5 \leq z < a$ . Draw the semi-circle  $C_a : |z - a| = \delta_a$ ,  $\text{Re } z \geq 0$  (cf. Lemma 2.1) which crosses  $\mathbf{R}$  at  $a_-$  and  $a_+$  ( $a_- < a_+$ ). Take points  $a_-^*$ ,  $a_+^*$  ( $\text{Re } a_-^* < \text{Re } a_+^*$ ) on the semi-circle  $C_a^* : |z - a| = (5/6)\delta_a$ ,  $\text{Re } z \geq 0$  in such a way that the segments  $[a_-, a_-^*]$  and  $[a_+^*, a_+]$  come in contact with  $C_a^*$ . Let  $\gamma(a)$  be a curve which consists of the segments  $[a_-, a_-^*]$ ,  $[a_+^*, a_+]$  and the arc  $(a_-^* a_+^*) \sim \subset C_a^*$ . Replacing the segment  $[a_-, a_+]$  by  $\gamma(a)$ , we get the curve  $\Gamma_1 = (R_0 \setminus [a_-, a_+]) \cup \gamma(a)$ . By Lemma 2.1 and Remark, and by a geometric consideration, we have, on  $\Gamma_1$ ,  $|w(z)| \geq \theta^2|z|^{1/2}/6 > 2^{-11}|z|^{1/2}$  and  $|dz| \leq (6/\sqrt{11})d|z|$  if  $\text{Re } z \leq a_+$ . Start again from  $z = a_+$ . Suppose that we first meet a point  $b \in \Gamma_1$ ,  $b > a_+$  such that  $|w(b)| = \theta^2|b|^{1/2}/6$ . By the same argument as above, we obtain the curve  $\gamma(b)$ . Then it crosses  $\Gamma_1$  at  $b'_-$ ,  $b_+$  ( $\text{Im } b'_- \geq 0$ ,

$b_+ \in \mathbf{R}$ ,  $\text{Re } b'_- < b_+$ ). Replacing the part of  $\Gamma_1$  from  $b'_-$  to  $b_+$  by that of  $\gamma(b)$  from  $b'_-$  to  $b_+$ , we get the path  $\Gamma_2$ . On it, the inequalities in (3) and (4) are valid, if  $\text{Re } z \leq b_+$ . Repeat this procedure. For every  $l \geq 5$ , the modification of the part such that  $l \leq \text{Re } z \leq l + 1$  can be done by repeating this procedure finitely many times. The reason is stated as follows. If not so, there exists a sequence  $\{a(\nu)\}_{\nu=0}^\infty \subset [l, l + 1] \subset \mathbf{R}$  satisfying  $\sum_{\nu=0}^\infty \delta_{a(\nu)} \leq 1$  and  $|w(a(\nu))| \leq \theta^2(l + 1)^{1/2}/6$ . Hence, by (2.1), we may choose a subsequence  $\{a(\nu_j)\}_{j=0}^\infty$  satisfying  $a(\nu_j) \rightarrow a_* \in [l, l + 1]$ ,  $w(a(\nu_j)) \rightarrow w_* \neq \infty$ ,  $w'(a(\nu_j)) \rightarrow \infty$ , as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . Then  $w(a_*) = w_* \neq \infty$ ,  $w'(a_*) = \infty$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore we get the curve  $\Gamma_0$  with the desired properties.  $\square$

Modifying a circle in a similar way, we obtain

**Lemma 2.3.** *For an arbitrary pole  $z = \sigma$  of  $w(z)$  such that  $|\sigma| > 10$ , there exists a closed Jordan curve  $J_\sigma$  with the properties:*

- (1)  $\sigma \in J_\sigma$ ;
- (2)  $J_\sigma \subset \{z \mid |\sigma| \leq |z| \leq |\sigma| + 1\}$ ;
- (3)  $|dz| \leq (6/\sqrt{11})d(|\sigma| \arg z)$  along  $J_\sigma$ ;
- (4)  $|w(z)| \geq 2^{-11}|z|^{1/2}$  along  $J_\sigma$ .

Consider the auxiliary function

$$(2.5) \quad \Phi(z) = w'(z)^2 + \frac{w'(z)}{w(z)} - 4w(z)^3 - 2zw(z).$$

A straight-forward computation yields

$$\Phi'(z) + \frac{\Phi(z)}{w(z)^2} = -\frac{z}{w(z)} + \frac{w'(z)}{w(z)^3}.$$

Solving this we have

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\gamma(z_0, z)$  be a path starting from  $z_0$  and ending at  $z$ , and  $\gamma(z_0, t)$  the part of  $\gamma(z_0, z)$  from  $z_0$  to  $t$  ( $\in \gamma(z_0, z)$ ). If  $w(t) \neq 0$  on  $\gamma(z_0, z)$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(z) &= E(z_0, z)^{-1} \left[ \Phi(z_0) - \frac{E(z_0, z)}{2w(z)^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2w(z_0)^2} - \int_{\gamma(z_0, z)} \frac{E(z_0, t)}{2w(t)^4} (2tw(t)^3 - 1) dt \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $E(z_0, t) = \exp(\int_{\gamma(z_0, t)} w(\tau)^{-2} d\tau)$ .

For an arbitrary pole  $z = \sigma$ ,  $|\sigma| > 10$ , consider the disk  $U(\sigma) = \{z \mid |z - \sigma| < \eta(\sigma)\}$  with  $\eta(\sigma) = \sup\{\eta \mid |w(z)| > 2|z|^{1/2} \text{ in } |z - \sigma| < \eta (\leq 1)\}$ . Then

**Lemma 2.5.** *In  $U(\sigma)$ ,  $|\Phi(z)| \leq K_0|z|^\Delta$ . Here  $K_0$  is independent of  $\sigma$ , and  $\Delta (\geq 3/2)$  is independent of  $w(z)$  and  $\sigma$ .*

*Proof.* For  $z \in \Gamma_0$ , denote by  $\Gamma_0(z)$  the part of  $\Gamma_0$  from the starting point  $c_0$  to  $z$ . By Lemma 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned} |E(c_0, z)^{\pm 1}| &\leq \exp\left(\int_{\Gamma_0(z)} \frac{|dt|}{|w(t)|^2}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{6 \cdot 2^{22}}{\sqrt{11}} \int_{|c_0|}^{|z|} \frac{d|t|}{|t|}\right) = O(z^{\Delta'}), \end{aligned}$$

$\Delta' = 3 \cdot 2^{23}/\sqrt{11}$ . Hence, by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.4, for  $z_\sigma \in \Gamma_0 \cap J_\sigma$ , we have  $\Phi(z_\sigma) = O(z_\sigma^{2\Delta'+3/2})$ . Since  $|\sigma| \leq |z_\sigma| \leq |\sigma| + 1$ , by Lemma 2.3,  $E(z_\sigma, z) = O(1)$  along the curve  $J_\sigma$  ( $\ni z_\sigma, z$ ). Observing that  $\Phi(z_\sigma) = O(z_\sigma^{2\Delta'+3/2})$  and using Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4, we have  $\Phi(\sigma) = O(\sigma^{2\Delta'+3/2})$ . Applying Lemma 2.4 with  $\gamma(z_0, z) = [\sigma, z]$ ,  $z \in U(\sigma)$ , we derive the conclusion.  $\square$

**3. Proof of Theorem 1.1.** For an arbitrary pole  $z = \sigma$  of  $w(z)$ , by Lemma 2.5, we have  $|\Phi(z)| \leq K_0|z|^\Delta$  for  $z \in U(\sigma)$ . Put  $w(z) = u(z)^{-2}$ ,  $z = \sigma + \sigma^{-\Delta/6}s$  in (2.5). Then  $v(s) = u(\sigma + \sigma^{-\Delta/6}s)$  satisfies

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{dv}{ds}(s) &= \sigma^{-\Delta/6}(1 + h(s, v(s))), \\ |h(s, v(s))| &< \frac{1}{2}, \quad v(0) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

as long as

$$(3.2) \quad |(\sigma + \sigma^{-\Delta/6}s)^{\Delta/6}| |v(s)| < \varepsilon_0,$$

where the branch of  $u(z)$  is taken so that  $u'(\sigma) = \sigma^{\Delta/6}(dv/ds)(0) = 1$ , and  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(K_0)$  is a sufficiently small positive constant independent of  $\sigma$ . Note that (3.2) implies  $z = \sigma + \sigma^{-\Delta/6}s \in U(\sigma)$ . Put  $\eta_* = \sup\{\eta \mid (3.2) \text{ is valid for } |s| < \eta\}$ , and suppose that  $\eta_* < \varepsilon_0/4$ . Then, integrating (3.1), we derive

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{|s|}{2} \leq |\sigma^{\Delta/6}| |v(s)| \leq \frac{3|s|}{2} \leq \frac{3\varepsilon_0}{8}$$

for  $|s| \leq \eta_*$  ( $< \varepsilon_0/4$ ), which implies

$$\begin{aligned} |(\sigma + \sigma^{-\Delta/6}s)^{\Delta/6}| |v(s)| \\ \leq |\sigma^{\Delta/6}| |v(s)| \left(1 + \frac{1}{M_0}\right)^{\Delta/6} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \end{aligned}$$

for  $|s| \leq \eta_*$  and for  $|\sigma| \geq M_0$ , where  $M_0$  is sufficiently large. In case  $|\sigma| \geq M_0$ , this contradicts the definition of  $\eta_*$ , and hence  $\eta_* \geq \varepsilon_0/4$ . Therefore, if  $|\sigma| \geq M_0$ , then (3.3) is valid for  $|s| < \varepsilon_0/4$ , and  $w(z)$  is analytic for  $0 < |z - \sigma| < (\varepsilon_0/4)|\sigma|^{-\Delta/6}$ . By a well-known argument [1, §4.6], the number of the poles of  $w(z)$  in the disk  $|z| < r$  does not exceed  $O(r^{2+\Delta/3})$ . Combining this fact with  $m(r, w) = S(r, w)$  (cf. [4, Lemma 2.4.2] and [4, Lemma 1.1.1]), we get  $T(r, w) = m(r, w) + N(r, w) = O(r^{2+\Delta/3})$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**4. The second and the fourth Painlevé equations.** The method above is also applicable to the second and the fourth Painlevé equations

$$(II) \quad w'' = 2w^3 + zw + \alpha,$$

$$(IV) \quad \begin{aligned} ww'' &= \frac{(w')^2}{2} + \frac{3w^4}{2} \\ &\quad + 4zw^3 + 2(z^2 - \alpha)w^2 + \beta, \end{aligned}$$

$\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{C}$ . For (II), instead of (2.5), we consider the auxiliary function

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{II}(z) &= w'(z)^2 + \frac{w'(z)}{w(z) - \theta_1 z^{1/2}} \\ &\quad - w(z)^4 - zw(z)^2 - 2\alpha w(z). \end{aligned}$$

Putting  $z - a = a^{-1/2}t$ ,  $w(z) = \theta_1 a^{1/2}W(t)$ , we show a lemma corresponding to Lemma 2.1, and we choose paths analogous to  $\Gamma_0$  and  $J_\sigma$  on which  $|w(z) - \theta_1 z^{1/2}| \geq c_1|z|^{1/2}$ . For (IV), we take

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{IV}(z) &= \frac{w'(z)^2}{w(z)} + \frac{4w'(z)}{w(z) - \theta_2 z} - w(z)^3 \\ &\quad - 4zw(z)^2 - 4(z^2 - \alpha)w(z) + \frac{2\beta}{w(z)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the change of variables  $z - a = a^{-1}t$ ,  $w(z) = \theta_2 aW(t)$ , we also choose paths corresponding to  $\Gamma_0$  and  $J_\sigma$  on which  $|w(z) - \theta_2 z| \geq c_2|z|$ . Here  $\theta_j$  and  $c_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) are suitably chosen small positive numbers. These auxiliary functions satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} &\Phi'_{II}(z) + \frac{\Phi_{II}(z)}{(w(z) - \theta_1 z^{1/2})^2} \\ &= \frac{w'(z)}{(w(z) - \theta_1 z^{1/2})^3} \left(1 - \frac{\theta_1^2}{2} + \frac{\theta_1}{2} z^{-1/2} w(z)\right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{(w(z) - \theta_1 z^{1/2})^2} \left(\theta_1^2 z w(z)^2 + \theta_1 z^{3/2} w(z) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \alpha w(z) + \theta_1 \alpha z^{1/2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\Phi'_{IV}(z) + \frac{2(w(z) + \theta_2 z)}{(w(z) - \theta_2 z)^2} \Phi_{IV}(z) \\ &= \frac{4w'(z)}{(w(z) - \theta_2 z)^3} \left((2 + \theta_2)w(z) + (2 - \theta_2)\theta_2 z\right) \\ &\quad - \frac{4}{(w(z) - \theta_2 z)^2} \left(\theta_2^2 z^2 w(z)^2 + 2\theta_2 z^2 w(z) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times (w(z) + \theta_2 z) + 4\theta_2(z^2 - \alpha)zw(z) - 2\beta\right), \end{aligned}$$

respectively. By an argument analogous to that in Section 3, we have

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $w(z)$  be an arbitrary meromorphic solution of (II) (resp. (IV)). Then  $T(r, w) = O(r^{C'})$  (resp.  $O(r^{C''})$ ), where  $C'$  (resp.  $C''$ ) is some positive number independent of  $w(z)$ .*

### References

- [ 1 ] Hille, E.: Ordinary Differential Equations in the Complex Domain. John Wiley, New York (1976).
- [ 2 ] Hinkkanen, A., and Laine, I.: Solutions of the first and second Painlevé equations are meromorphic. *J. Anal. Math.*, **79**, 345–377 (1999).
- [ 3 ] Hukuhara, M.: Meromorfecio de la solvo de (F)  $y'' = 6y^2 + x$  (unpublished lecture notes).
- [ 4 ] Laine, I.: Nevanlinna Theory and Complex Differential Equations. de Gruyter, Berlin-New York (1992).
- [ 5 ] Shimomura, S.: Growth of the first, the second and the fourth Painlevé transcendents (2000) (preprint).
- [ 6 ] Takano, K.: Defining manifolds for Painlevé equations. *Toward the Exact WKB Analysis of Differential Equations, Linear or Non-Linear* (eds. Howls, C. J., Kawai, T., and Takei, Y.). Kyoto Univ. Press, Kyoto, pp. 261–269 (2000).