

Zeitschrift: Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici
Herausgeber: Schweizerische Mathematische Gesellschaft
Band: 40 (1965-1966)

Artikel: The spherical derivative of integral and meromorphic functions.
Autor: Clunie, J. / Hayman, W.K.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-30631>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 06.07.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

The spherical derivative of integral and meromorphic functions

by J. CLUNIE and W. K. HAYMAN

1. Introduction

In a recent paper LEHTO and VIRTANEN [2] introduced the spherical derivative

$$\varrho(f(z)) = \frac{|f'(z)|}{1 + |f(z)|^2}$$

as a measure of the growth of $f(z)$ near an isolated singularity. This point of view was further pursued by LEHTO [1]. If the singularity is taken to be at $z = \infty$ then LEHTO obtained the following results.

Theorem A. *Suppose that $f(z)$ is meromorphic for $R < |z| < \infty$, and has an essential singularity at $z = \infty$. Then*

$$\limsup_{z \rightarrow \infty} |z| \varrho(f(z)) \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (1.2)$$

Equality holds for functions of the form

$$f(z) = \prod_1^{\infty} \frac{a_v - z}{a_v + z}, \quad (1.3)$$

where a_v is a sequence of complex numbers such that

$$\left| \frac{a_{v+1}}{a_v} \right| \rightarrow \infty \quad (v \rightarrow \infty). \quad (1.4)$$

Theorem B. *If $f(z)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem A and in addition $f(z)$ is regular near $z = \infty$, then (1.2) can be replaced by*

$$\limsup_{z \rightarrow \infty} |z| \varrho(f(z)) = \infty. \quad (1.5)$$

Following LEHTO, we denote by $h(r)$ a positive function such that $h(r) = o(r)$ ($r \rightarrow \infty$). The connection between $\varrho(f(z))$ and PICARD's Theorem is strikingly brought out by the following result of LEHTO [1].

Theorem C. Let $f(z)$ be meromorphic for $R < |z| < \infty$. If for a sequence $\{z_\nu\}$, $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} z_\nu = \infty$ and

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} h(|z_\nu|) \varrho(f(z_\nu)) = \infty \quad (1.6)$$

then PICARD's Theorem holds for $f(z)$ in the union of any infinite subsequence of the discs

$$C_\nu = \{z : |z - z_\nu| < \epsilon h(|z_\nu|)\} \quad (1.7)$$

for each $\epsilon > 0$.

Conversely if there exist discs (1.7) such that PICARD's Theorem is true in every union $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} C_{\nu_k}$ for every $\epsilon > 0$ then (1.6) is satisfied. (V. GAVRILOV has pointed out to us that the converse must be modified here. (1.6) is satisfied for a sequence z'_ν instead of z_ν , where $|z'_\nu - z_\nu| = o\{h(|z_\nu|)\}$. This condition is also sufficient for the existence of the disks (1.7)).

In particular it follows that if $f(z)$ has an essential singularity at $z = \infty$ then $f(z)$ possesses a JULIA direction provided that

$$\limsup_{z \rightarrow \infty} |z| \varrho(f(z)) = \infty. \quad (1.8)$$

From Theorem B we see that every transcendental integral function possesses a JULIA direction. If (1.8) is not satisfied there is not, in general, a JULIA direction as the examples (1.3) show if $a_\nu > 0$.

2. Some further results for meromorphic functions

Our aim in this paper is to obtain some extensions of Theorems A and B. We may suppose without loss of generality that $f(z)$ is meromorphic in the whole plane. First we consider whether or not a restriction on the growth of $f(z)$ as defined by its order imposes any restriction on $\varrho(f(z))$, or conversely. For meromorphic functions no restriction on $\varrho(f(z))$ is implied by a restriction on the growth of the characteristic $T(r, f)$. Consider, for instance,

$$f(z) = \frac{\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - z/a_n)}{\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - z/b_n)}$$

where $\sum |a_n|^{-1}$, $\sum |b_n|^{-1}$ converge. Since $f(a_n) = 0$, $f(b_n) = \infty$ it follows that

$$\int \varrho(f(z)) |dz| \geq \pi,$$

where the integral is taken along the segment Γ_n joining a_n to b_n . In particular

$$\varrho(f(z_n)) \geq \frac{\pi}{|b_n - a_n|}$$

for some point z_n on Γ_n . By choosing a_n, b_n close enough together we can make the right hand side bigger than any preassigned function of $|z_n|$.

On the other hand a result in the opposite direction is possible. It is convenient to set

$$\mu(r, f) = \sup_{|z|=r} \varrho(f(z)).$$

Suppose that for $r > r_0$ we have

$$\mu(r, f) < K r^\sigma. \quad (2.1)$$

By Theorem A this is only possible when $\sigma > -1$ or when $\sigma = -1$ and $K \geq \frac{1}{2}$. In the usual notation of NEVANLINNA Theory,

$$T_0(r, f) = \int_0^r \frac{S(t, f)}{t} dt$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S(r, f) &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^r \int_0^{2\pi} \varrho^2(f(te^{i\varphi})) t d\varphi dt \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^r \mu^2(t, f) t dt. \end{aligned}$$

Thus if $\sigma = -1$ in (2.1),

$$S(r, f) = O(\log r), \quad T_0(r, f) = O(\log^2 r). \quad (2.2)$$

The examples (1.3) with $a_\nu = A^\nu$ ($A > 1$) show that the order of magnitude in (2.2) cannot be sharpened.

If (2.1) is satisfied with $\sigma > -1$ we obtain

$$S(r, f) = O(r^{2\sigma+2}), \quad T_0(r, f) = O(r^{2\sigma+2}). \quad (2.3)$$

Hence a meromorphic function of proper order $k > 0$ cannot satisfy (2.1) for any $\sigma < \frac{k}{2} - 1$. The implication from (2.1) to (2.3) is sharp as our first theorem shows.

Theorem 1. Suppose that $0 < \lambda < \infty$ and that

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n z^n}{n^{\lambda n} - z^n}. \quad (2.4)$$

Then $f(z)$ has perfectly regular growth of order $2/\lambda$ and satisfies (2.1) with $\sigma = \frac{1}{\lambda} - 1$.

The function $f(z)$ has poles at the points $z = n^\lambda e^{\frac{2\nu\pi i}{n}}$ ($\nu = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$; $n \geq 1$). The number of poles in $|z| \leq r$ is $\frac{1}{2}p(p+1)$ where p is the largest integer such that $p^\lambda \leq r$, i.e. $p = [r^{1/\lambda}]$. Thus $n(r, f)$, the number of poles of $f(z)$ in $z \leq r$, satisfies

$$n(r, f) \sim \frac{1}{2}p^2 \sim \frac{1}{2}r^{2/\lambda} (r \rightarrow \infty),$$

and so

$$N(r, f) = \int_0^r \frac{n(t, f)}{t} dt \sim \frac{\lambda}{4} r^{2/\lambda} (r \rightarrow \infty). \quad (2.5)$$

We now estimate $|f(z)|$. Assume that

$$(p - \frac{3}{4})^\lambda \leq |z| \leq (p + \frac{3}{4})^\lambda, \quad (2.6)$$

where p is a positive integer. $A(\lambda)$ denotes a positive constant depending only on λ and is not necessarily the same at each occurrence. Let n be an integer satisfying $n > p$ and put $n = p + \nu$ so that $\nu \geq 1$. We have, in the range (2.6),

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{z}{n^\lambda} \right|^n &\leq \left(\frac{n - \nu + \frac{3}{4}}{n} \right)^{\lambda n} = \left\{ 1 - \frac{(\nu - \frac{3}{4})}{n} \right\}^{\lambda n} \\ &\leq e^{-(\nu - \frac{3}{4})\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, when z lies in the range (2.6),

$$\left| \sum_{n=p+1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n z^n}{n^{\lambda n} - z^n} \right| \leq \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-(\nu - \frac{3}{4})\lambda}}{1 - e^{-(\nu - \frac{3}{4})\lambda}} = A(\lambda). \quad (2.7)$$

When $1 \leq n < p$ and z lies in the range (2.6) then, if $n = p - \nu$ with $\nu \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{z}{n^\lambda} \right|^n &\geq \left(\frac{n + \nu - \frac{3}{4}}{n} \right)^{\lambda n} \geq \left(1 + \frac{\nu - \frac{3}{4}}{n} \right)^{\lambda n} \\ &\geq \left(1 + \frac{\nu - \frac{3}{4}}{k} \right)^{\lambda k} \quad (n \geq k). \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

Now

$$\frac{(-1)^n z^n}{n^{\lambda n} - z^n} = (-1)^{n+1} + \frac{(-1)^n n^{\lambda n}}{n^{\lambda n} - z^n}$$

and so if we choose k in (2.8) to be $\left[\frac{2}{\lambda} \right] + 1$ so that $\lambda k > 2$, assuming that $p > \left[\frac{2}{\lambda} \right] + 1$, we find that in the range (2.6)

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \sum_{n=1}^{p-1} \frac{(-1)^n z^n}{n^{\lambda n} - z^n} \right| &\leq 1 + \left| \sum_{n=1}^{p-1} \frac{(-1)^n n^{\lambda n}}{n^{\lambda n} - z^n} \right| \\
&\leq 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{|z|}{n}\right)^{\lambda n} - 1} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{p - \frac{3}{4}}{k}\right)^2 - 1} = A(\lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

From this and (2.7) we obtain

$$\left| f(z) - \frac{(-1)^p z^p}{p^{\lambda p} - z^p} \right| \leq A(\lambda) \quad (2.9)$$

in the range (2.6) for $p > \left\lceil \frac{2}{\lambda} \right\rceil + 1$. It is easy to see that consequently (2.9) holds in the range (2.6) for $p \geq 1$.

If $|z| = t$ and (2.6) is satisfied then using (2.9) we see, in the notation of NEVANLINNA Theory, that

$$\begin{aligned}
m(t, f) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ |f(te^{i\theta})| d\theta \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ \left| \frac{t^p}{p^{\lambda p} - t^p e^{i p \theta}} \right| d\theta + A(\lambda) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ \left| \frac{1}{\sin p\theta} \right| d\theta + A(\lambda) \\
&= A(\lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

From this and (2.5) we deduce that

$$T(r, f) = m(r, f) + N(r, f) \sim \frac{\lambda}{4} r^{2/\lambda}, \quad (r \rightarrow \infty)$$

so that $f(z)$ is of perfectly regular growth, order $\frac{2}{\lambda}$ and type $\frac{\lambda}{4}$.

It remains to be proved that $f(z)$ satisfies (2.1) with $\sigma = \frac{1}{\lambda} - 1$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
f'(z) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n \frac{n^{\lambda n+1} z^{n-1}}{(n^{\lambda n} - z^n)^2} \\
&= (-1)^p \frac{p^{\lambda p+1} z^{p-1}}{(p^{\lambda p} - z^p)^2} + f'_p(z), \quad \text{say,}
\end{aligned}$$

where $f_p(z)$ is defined by the series for $f(z)$ with the p th term omitted. Now, by the above, $f_p(z)$ is regular and bounded by $A(\lambda)$ in $(p - 3/4)^\lambda \leq |z| \leq (p + 3/4)^\lambda$

and each point in $(p - 1/2)^\lambda \leq |z| \leq (p + 1/2)^\lambda$ is the centre of a disc which lies in the larger annulus with radius $\frac{p^{\lambda-1}}{A(\lambda)}$. Hence, from CAUCHY's integral,

$$|f'_p(z)| \leq A(\lambda) p^{1-\lambda} < A(\lambda) |z|^{1/\lambda-1},$$

for

$$(p - 1/2)^\lambda \leq |z| \leq (p + 1/2)^\lambda \quad (p \geq 1). \quad (2.10)$$

Therefore in the range (2.10),

$$\begin{aligned} |f'(z)| &\leq \left| \frac{p^{\lambda p+1} z^{p-1}}{(p^{\lambda p} - z^p)^2} \right| + A(\lambda) |z|^{\frac{1}{\lambda}-1} \\ &= \frac{p^{\lambda p+1}}{|z|^{p+1}} \left| \left(\frac{z^p}{p^{\lambda p} - z^p} \right)^2 \right| + A(\lambda) |z|^{\frac{1}{\lambda}-1} \\ &\leq A(\lambda) \frac{p^{\lambda p+1}}{|z|^{p+1}} (1 + |f(z)|^2) + A(\lambda) |z|^{\frac{1}{\lambda}-1} \end{aligned}$$

by (2.9). Consequently, in the range (2.10),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|f'(z)|}{1 + |f(z)|^2} &\leq A(\lambda) \frac{p}{|z|} + A(\lambda) |z|^{1/\lambda-1} \\ &< A(\lambda) |z|^{1/\lambda-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the ranges (2.10) cover all the plane apart from a disc, the proof of the theorem is complete.

3. Positive theorems for integral functions

The remainder of the paper will be devoted to obtaining improvements of Theorem *B* and to showing that these are best possible. We assume without loss of generality that $f(z)$ is an integral function. It will also be assumed that $f(z)$ is always transcendental. In this section we state our positive theorems.

Theorem 2. *If $f(z)$ is an integral function of proper order σ ($0 \leq \sigma \leq \infty$), then*

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r \mu(r, f)}{\log M(r, f)} \geq A_0(\sigma + 1), \quad (3.1)$$

where A_0 is an absolute constant. In particular

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r \mu(r, f)}{\log r} = \infty. \quad (3.2)$$

Inequality (3.2) sharpens (1.5) which is equivalent to

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} r \mu(r, f) = \infty.$$

Theorem 3. *If $f(z)$ is an integral function satisfying (2.1) for all large r with $-1 < \sigma < \infty$, then for large r*

$$\log M(r, f) < \frac{A_1 K}{\sigma + 1} r^{\sigma+1}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $A_1 = 25e \log 2$.

It follows from (1.5) that the restriction $\sigma > -1$ is necessary in Theorem 3. The theorem shows that for integral functions (2.1) implies that

$$T(r, f) = O(r^{\sigma+1}).$$

This is significantly stronger than (2.3) which is the best possible result for meromorphic functions by Theorem 1. Note that if $f(z)$ is of perfectly regular growth then Theorem 3 is a consequence of Theorem 2.

As we shall see later, if $f(z)$ is an integral function such that the growth of $\log M(r, f)$ is properly of the order of $\log^2 r$ in the sense that

$$0 < \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r, f)}{\log^2 r} < \infty,$$

then no improvement of (3.2) is possible. On the other hand our next theorems show that if $\log M(r, f) \neq O(\log^2 r)$ or $\log M(r, f) = o(\log^2 r)$ then we can improve (3.2), the improvement depending on how large or how small $\frac{\log M(r, f)}{\log^2 r}$ becomes respectively. However, there is no sharp difference in the behaviour of $\mu(r, f)$ as we pass from one of the above classes of functions to another. By this we mean that if $\varphi(r) \rightarrow \infty (r \rightarrow \infty)$, then there is an $f(z)$ from each of the above classes such that

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r \mu(r, f)}{\varphi(r) \log r} < \infty.$$

Before stating our next theorem we give an indication of how one arrives at an improvement of (3.2) if $\log M(r, f) \neq O(\log^K r)$ for K suitably large. If

$\mu(r, f) < K \frac{\log^2 r}{r}$ for large r then, from the inequality involving $T_0(r, f)$ and $\mu(r, f)$ in § 2, it follows that

$$T_0(r, f) = O(\log^6 r).$$

Hence if $\log M(r, f) \neq O(\log^6 r)$ we see that (3.2) can be improved to

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r \mu(r, f)}{\log^2 r} = \infty.$$

Our next result gives the improvement of (3.2) for functions $f(z)$ such that $\log M(r, f) \neq O(\log^2 r)$, but $\log M(r, f) = O(\log^6 r)$.

Theorem 4. *If $f(z)$ is an integral function and $\varphi(r) \nearrow \infty$ ($r \nearrow \infty$) and*

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r, f)}{\varphi(r) \log^\alpha r} > 0, \quad \log M(r, f) = O(\log^{\alpha+1} r), \quad (3.4)$$

where $2 \leq \alpha < \infty$, then

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r \mu(r, f)}{\varphi(r) \log^{\alpha-1} r} > 0. \quad (3.5)$$

When $\alpha = 2$ in (3.4) then (3.5) is the improved form of (3.2). For functions such that $\log M(r, f) \neq O(\log^3 r)$, $\log M(r, f) = O(\log^6 r)$ take $\varphi(r) = \{\log(r+1)\}^{1/2}$ and choose α so that both conditions (3.4) are satisfied and $\alpha \geq 2.5$. The improved form of (3.2) is then

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r \mu(r, f)}{(\log r)^2} > 0.$$

To deal with functions such that $\log M(r, f) = o(\log^2 r)$ we have the following result.

Theorem 5. *If $\varphi(r)$ is increasing and $f(z)$ is an integral function such that*

$$\log M(r, f) = O\left\{\frac{\log^2 r}{\varphi(r)}\right\} \quad (r \rightarrow \infty) \quad (3.6)$$

then

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r \mu(r, f)}{\varphi(r) \log r} = \infty. \quad (3.7)$$

4. Proofs of the positive theorems

4.1. We require a number of preliminary lemmas.

Lemma 1. *Let $f(z) = a_0 + a_1(z - z_0) + \dots$ be regular in $|z - z_0| \leq \delta$ and satisfy $|f(z)| \geq 1$ there. Then*

$$|a_1| \leq \frac{2|a_0| \log |a_0|}{\delta}, \quad (4.1)$$

and for $|z - z_0| \leq r < \delta$

$$|a_0|^{\frac{\delta-r}{\delta+r}} \leq |f(z)| \leq a_0^{\frac{\delta+r}{\delta-r}}. \quad (4.2)$$

If further $|f(z_1)| = 1$ for some z_1 with $|z_1 - z_0| = \delta$ then for some z on the segment joining z_0 to z_1

$$\varrho(f(z)) \geq \frac{\log |a_0|}{10\delta \log 2} \geq \frac{|a_1|}{20|a_0| \log 2}. \quad (4.3)$$

(4.1) and (4.2) are classical.

Suppose that

$$|f(z_0 + \delta e^{i\varphi})| = 1 \quad (z_1 = z_0 + \delta e^{i\varphi}).$$

If

$$|f(z_0 + \varrho e^{i\varphi})| \leq 2 \quad (0 \leq \varrho \leq \delta) \quad (4.4)$$

then $|a_0| \leq 2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |a_0| - 1 &\leq |f(z_0 + \delta e^{i\varphi}) - f(z_0)| \leq \int_0^\delta |f'(z_0 + te^{i\varphi})| dt \\ &\leq \delta \max_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} |f'(z_0 + te^{i\varphi})|. \end{aligned}$$

If $\zeta = z_0 + t_0 e^{i\varphi}$ is a point where the maximum on the right is attained then,

$$|f'(\zeta)| \geq \frac{|a_0| - 1}{\delta} \geq \frac{\log |a_0|}{\delta}$$

and so

$$\varrho(f(\zeta)) = \frac{|f'(\zeta)|}{1 + |f(\zeta)|^2} \geq \frac{|f'(\zeta)|}{5} \geq \frac{\log |a_0|}{5\delta}.$$

Hence the first inequality of (4.3) is true in this case.

If (4.4) is false let ϱ be the largest number with $0 \leq \varrho < \delta$ such that $|f(z_0 + \varrho e^{i\varphi})| = 2$. Take $\zeta = z_0 + t_1 e^{i\varphi}$ to be a point for which $|f'(z)|$ is greatest when $z = z_0 + te^{i\varphi}$ ($\varrho \leq t \leq \delta$). Then $|f(\zeta)| \leq 2$ and so

$$\frac{|f'(\zeta)|}{1 + |f(\zeta)|^2} \geq \frac{|f'(\zeta)|}{5}.$$

Also

$$1 \leq |f(z_0 + \delta e^{i\varphi}) - f(z_0 + \varrho e^{i\varphi})| \leq \int_{\varrho}^{\delta} |f'(z_0 + te^{i\varphi})| dt \\ \leq (\delta - \varrho) |f'(\zeta)|.$$

Further, by (4.2) and the fact that $|f(z_0 + \varrho e^{i\varphi})| = 2$, we have

$$|a_0|^{\frac{\delta-\varrho}{\delta+\varrho}} \leq 2,$$

and hence

$$\delta - \varrho \leq \frac{(\delta + \varrho) \log 2}{\log |a_0|} \leq \frac{2\delta \log 2}{\log |a_0|}.$$

From the above it follows that

$$\varrho(f(\zeta)) = \frac{|f'(\zeta)|}{1 + |f(\zeta)|^2} \geq \frac{|f'(\zeta)|}{5} \geq \frac{1}{5(\delta - \varrho)} \geq \frac{\log |a_0|}{10\delta \log 2}.$$

This completes the proof of the first inequality of (4.3). The second follows immediately from (4.1).

Lemma 2. *Suppose that $f(z)$ is an integral function such that for some $r_1 > 0$*

$$\min_{|z|=r_1} |f(z)| = 1, \quad (4.5)$$

and that

$$|f(z)| > 1 \quad (r_1 < |z| < 3r_1). \quad (4.6)$$

Then for some r satisfying $r_1 < r < 2r_1$ we have

$$\mu(r, f) > \frac{e^{-4\pi} \log M(r, f)}{10r \log 2}. \quad (4.7)$$

In particular if the conditions are satisfied for arbitrarily large r_1 then,

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r \mu(r, f)}{\log M(r, f)} \geq \frac{e^{-4\pi}}{10 \log 2}. \quad (4.8)$$

Let $r_0 = 2r_1$ and let $z_0 = r_0 e^{i\vartheta_0}$ be such that

$$|f(z_0)| = M(r_0, f).$$

There is a ϑ_1 with $|\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_0| \leq \pi$ such that

$$|f(r_1 e^{i\vartheta_1})| = 1.$$

For each ζ , with $|\zeta| = r_0$, $|f(z)| > 1$ for $|z - \zeta| < r_1 = \frac{r_0}{2}$ and so (4.1) gives

$$\frac{|f'(\zeta)|}{|f(\zeta)| \log |f(\zeta)|} \leq \frac{4}{r_0}.$$

Thus

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \vartheta} \log \log |f(r_0 e^{i\vartheta})| \right| \leq 4$$

and so

$$\left| \log \frac{\log |f(r_0 e^{i\vartheta_1})|}{\log |f(r_0 e^{i\vartheta_0})|} \right| \leq 4\pi,$$

from which it follows that

$$\log |f(r_0 e^{i\vartheta_1})| \geq e^{-4\pi} \log |f(r_0 e^{i\vartheta_0})| = e^{-4\pi} \log M(r_0, f).$$

In the closed disc $|z - r_0 e^{i\vartheta_0}| \leq \frac{r_0}{2}$ we have $|f(z)| \geq 1$ and, at the point $z_1 = r_1 e^{i\vartheta_1}$ on the boundary, $|f(z_1)| = 1$. Consequently, by (4.3) with $\delta = \frac{r_0}{2}$, there is a point ξ on the segment joining $r_0 e^{i\vartheta_1}$ to z_1 for which

$$\varrho(f(\xi)) \geq \frac{\log |f(r_0 e^{i\vartheta_1})|}{5r_0 \log 2} \geq \frac{e^{-4\pi} \log M(r_0, f)}{5r_0 \log 2}.$$

If $|\xi| = r$, then $\frac{r_0}{2} \leq r \leq r_0$ and hence we deduce that

$$\mu(r, f) \geq \frac{e^{-4\pi} \log M(r, f)}{10r \log 2}.$$

This proves Lemma 2.

The next lemma is required to cope with possible irregularities in the growth of $\log M(r, f)$.

Lemma 3. *Suppose that $\varphi(r)$ ($r_0 \leq r < \infty$) is continuous, positive and strictly increasing with a sectionally continuous locally bounded derivative $\varphi'(r)$. [At points of discontinuity we define $\varphi'(r)$ as the limit from the left.] Suppose that for positive α, β*

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(r)}{r^\alpha} > \beta. \quad (4.9)$$

Then given α' ($0 < \alpha' < \alpha$) there exist arbitrarily large r for which the following are satisfied:

$$\frac{\varphi(r)}{r^\alpha} \geq \beta e^{-\delta}; \quad (4.10)$$

$$\frac{\varphi'(r)}{\varphi(r)} \geq \frac{\alpha'}{r}; \quad (4.11)$$

$$\varphi \left\{ r + 2 \frac{\varphi(r)}{\varphi'(r)} \right\} < e^4 \varphi(r). \quad (4.12)$$

We assume that $\varphi'(r)$ is never zero. This really involves no loss of generality. First of all we show that there are arbitrarily large values of r such that (4.11) and

$$\frac{\varphi(r)}{r^\alpha} \geq \beta \quad (4.10)'$$

are satisfied. Now $\frac{\varphi(r)}{r^{\alpha'}}$ is unbounded as $r \rightarrow \infty$ and so for arbitrarily large r it must be locally nondecreasing. For such r ,

$$\frac{d}{dr} \left\{ \frac{\varphi(r)}{r^{\alpha'}} \right\} = \frac{\varphi(r)}{r^{\alpha'}} \left\{ \frac{\varphi'(r)}{\varphi(r)} - \frac{\alpha'}{r} \right\} \geq 0$$

and so (4.11) is satisfied. If for all large r , $\varphi(r) \geq \beta r^\alpha$ then we obtain the desired result. Otherwise there are arbitrarily large values of r such that $\varphi(r) < \beta r^\alpha$. From (4.9) there is a smallest $R > r$ such that $\varphi(R) = \beta R^\alpha$. But then $\frac{\varphi(r)}{r^\alpha}$ is nondecreasing at R and so $\frac{\varphi'(R)}{\varphi(R)} \geq \frac{\alpha}{R}$, as in the previous argument, and $\frac{\varphi(R)}{R^\alpha} = \beta$. Hence the result.

Now set $h = h(r) = 2 \frac{\varphi(r)}{\varphi'(r)}$ and note that

$$\log \varphi(r + h) - \log \varphi(r) = \int_r^{r+h} \frac{\varphi'(t)}{\varphi(t)} dt \leq h \max_{r \leq t \leq r+h} \frac{\varphi'(t)}{\varphi(t)}.$$

Consequently if (4.12) is false for $r = r_0$ there is an r_1 such that $r_0 < r_1 \leq r_0 + h(r_0)$ and

$$\frac{\varphi'(r_1)}{\varphi(r_1)} \geq \frac{4}{h(r_0)} = 2 \frac{\varphi'(r_0)}{\varphi(r_0)}.$$

Suppose that r_0, r_1, \dots, r_n have been defined in this way so that (4.12) is false for $r = r_\nu$ ($0 \leq \nu \leq n$) and

$$r_\nu < r_{\nu+1} \leq r_\nu + 2 \frac{\varphi(r_\nu)}{\varphi'(r_\nu)} \quad (0 \leq \nu \leq n-1),$$

$$\frac{\varphi'(r_{\nu+1})}{\varphi(r_{\nu+1})} \geq 2 \frac{\varphi'(r_\nu)}{\varphi(r_\nu)} \quad (0 \leq \nu \leq n-1).$$

Then we can define r_{n+1} so that

$$\frac{\varphi'(r_{n+1})}{\varphi(r_{n+1})} \geq 2 \frac{\varphi'(r_n)}{\varphi(r_n)}, \quad r_n < r_{n+1} \leq r_n + 2 \frac{\varphi(r_n)}{\varphi'(r_n)}.$$

If this process continued indefinitely then we should have

$$\frac{\varphi'(r_n)}{\varphi(r_n)} \rightarrow \infty \quad (r \rightarrow \infty)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (r_{n+1} - r_n) &\leq 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi(r_n)}{\varphi'(r_n)} \\ &\leq 2 \frac{\varphi(r_0)}{\varphi'(r_0)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \\ &= 4 \frac{\varphi(r_0)}{\varphi'(r_0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus r_n would tend to a finite limit and so $\frac{\varphi'(r_n)}{\varphi(r_n)} \rightarrow \infty$. This contradiction shows that the construction of the r_n must terminate after a finite number of steps.

Take now as r_0 a value such that (4.10)' and (4.11) are satisfied for $r = r_0$. If (4.12) is not satisfied for $r = r_0$ then there is a sequence r_0, r_1, \dots, r_N as above such that it is not satisfied for $r = r_n$ ($0 \leq n \leq N-1$) but it is satisfied for $r = r_N$. Then for $0 \leq n < N$,

$$\frac{\varphi'(r_{n+1})}{\varphi(r_{n+1})} \geq 2 \frac{\varphi'(r_n)}{\varphi(r_n)} \geq 2^{n+1} \frac{\varphi'(r_0)}{\varphi(r_0)}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} r_N - r_0 &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (r_{n+1} - r_n) \leq 2 \frac{\varphi(r_0)}{\varphi'(r_0)} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2^n} \\ &< 4 \frac{\varphi(r_0)}{\varphi'(r_0)} \\ &< 4 \frac{r_0}{\alpha'} \end{aligned}$$

by (4.11). Hence if α' is near enough to α ,

$$r_N < r_0 \left(1 + \frac{4}{\alpha'} \right) \leq r_0 (1 + 5/\alpha).$$

Since (4.10)' holds for $r = r_0$,

$$\varphi(r_N) \geq \varphi(r_0) \geq \beta r_0^\alpha \geq \beta r_N^\alpha (1 + 5/\alpha)^{-\alpha} > \beta e^{-5} r_N^\alpha.$$

Also

$$\frac{\varphi'(r_N)}{\varphi(r_N)} \geq \frac{\varphi'(r_0)}{\varphi(r_0)} \geq \frac{\alpha'}{r_0} \geq \frac{\alpha'}{r_N}.$$

Hence the proof of Lemma 3 is complete.

4.2. Proofs of Theorems 2 and 3 for $\sigma \geq 6$.

Suppose now that $f(z)$ is an integral function of order $\sigma \geq 6$. We apply Lemma 3 with $\sigma > \alpha' > 5$ to $\varphi(r) = \log M(r, f)$ so that for some arbitrarily large r , (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12) hold simultaneously. For such an r there is a point $z_0 = re^{i\theta}$ so that [see e.g. 3, Lemma 2, p. 136.]

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z_0)| &= M(r, f), \\ \left| \frac{f'(z_0)}{f(z_0)} \right| &= \varphi'(r). \end{aligned}$$

It now follows from Lemma 1 that if $\delta = \delta(r)$ is the radius of the largest disc with centre z_0 in which $|f(z)| > 1$ then, by (4.1),

$$\delta(r) \leq 2 \frac{|f(z_0)| \log |f(z_0)|}{|f'(z_0)|} = 2 \frac{\varphi(r)}{\varphi'(r)} \leq \frac{2r}{\alpha'} < \frac{2}{5} r.$$

By (4.3) there is a point z with $|z - z_0| < \delta(r)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho(f(z)) &\geq \frac{\log |f(z_0)|}{10 \delta(r) \log 2} \\ &= \frac{\varphi(r)}{10 \delta(r) \log 2} \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha' \varphi(r)}{20 r \log 2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

If $|z| = R$, then $R < r + \delta(r)$ and so, by (4.12),

$$\varphi(R) \leq \varphi(r + \delta(r)) \leq \varphi \left(r + 2 \frac{\varphi(r)}{\varphi'(r)} \right) \leq e^4 \varphi(r).$$

Hence, since also $R > r - \delta(r) > 3/5 r$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(R, f) &\geq \varrho(f(z)) \geq \frac{\alpha' e^{-4} \varphi(R)}{20(2R) \log 2} \\ &= \frac{\alpha' e^{-4} \log M(R, f)}{40R \log 2}.\end{aligned}$$

From $R > \frac{3}{5} r$ it follows that as $r \rightarrow \infty$ then $R \rightarrow \infty$ and so we arrive at

$$\limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R \mu(R, f)}{\log M(R, f)} \geq \frac{\sigma e^{-4}}{40 \log 2},$$

since α' can be taken as near to σ as we please. This proves (3.1) and so Theorem 2.

We next prove Theorem 3 for $\sigma \geq 5$. Suppose in fact that (3.3) is false for some arbitrarily large r where A_1 is some positive constant. We may apply Lemma 3 as before with $\alpha = \sigma + 1$, $\alpha' = \sigma$ and any quantity β such that

$$0 < \beta < \frac{A_1 K}{\sigma + 1}. \quad (4.14)$$

Then (4.13) yields for some z with $|z| = R$

$$\varrho(f(z)) \geq \frac{\sigma \varphi(r)}{20r \log 2} \geq \frac{\sigma \beta e^{-5} r^\sigma}{20 \log 2}. \quad (4.15)$$

Also

$$|z| = R < r + \delta(r) \leq r + 2 \frac{\varphi(r)}{\varphi'(r)} \leq r \left(1 + \frac{2}{\sigma}\right)$$

by (4.11). Therefore

$$R^\sigma \leq r^\sigma \left(1 + \frac{2}{\sigma}\right)^\sigma \leq e^2 r^\sigma.$$

Then (4.15) shows that

$$\mu(R, f) \geq \frac{\sigma \beta e^{-7}}{20 \log 2} R^\sigma$$

for arbitrarily large values of R . From (4.14) we see that

$$\frac{\sigma A_1 K}{\sigma + 1} \frac{e^{-7}}{20 \log 2} \leq K,$$

and so

$$A_1 \leq \frac{\sigma + 1}{\sigma} 20 e^7 \log 2 < 25 e^7 \log 2.$$

Consequently it is only for such A_1 that the result of the theorem is false. Hence it must be true with $A_1 = 25 e^7 \log 2$. This proves (3.3) for $\sigma \geq 5$.

4.3. Completion of proof of Theorem 3

Suppose that the hypotheses of Theorem 3 hold with $-1 < \sigma < 5$. Let n be a positive integer such that

$$n(\sigma + 1) \geq 6 \quad (4.16)$$

and consider $F(z) = f(z^n)$. Then for all large r we have

$$\varrho(F(z)) = \frac{|F'(z)|}{1 + |F(z)|^2} = \frac{n r^{n-1} |f'(z^n)|}{1 + |f(z^n)|^2} < K n r^{n-1} r^{n\sigma} \quad (|z| = r)$$

by (2.1). Hence $F(z)$ satisfies (2.1) with Kn in place of K and $n(\sigma + 1) - 1$ in place of σ . In view of (4.16) we can apply the previous result to $F(z)$ and obtain

$$\log M(r, F) \leq \frac{A_1 K n r^{n(\sigma+1)}}{n(\sigma + 1)} = \frac{A_1 K}{\sigma + 1} r^{n(\sigma+1)}.$$

As $M(r, F) = M(r^n, f)$ this completes the proof of Theorem 3.

4.4. Completion of proof of Theorem 2

We assume that $f(z)$ is of order $\sigma < 6$ and consider $F(z) = f(z^{12})$. Since, as above,

$$\varrho(F(z)) = 12 |z|^{11} \varrho(f(z^{11}))$$

and $F(z)$ is of order 12σ it follows that if (3.1) holds for $F(z)$ then

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r \mu(r, f)}{\log M(r, f)} \geq \frac{1}{12} A_0(12\sigma + 1)$$

and this is the result for $f(z)$ if A_0 is adjusted. Consequently it is sufficient for $\sigma < 6$ to prove the theorem for $F(z)$.

Now for some constant A_2 we have

$$\log M(4r, F) \leq A_2 \log M(r, F) \quad (4.17)$$

for arbitrarily large values of r . Otherwise for some r_0 we find that

$$\log M(4^n r_0, F) \geq A_2^n \log M(r_0, F) \quad (n \geq 1)$$

so that the order of $F(z)$ is at least $\frac{\log A_2}{\log 4}$. This is impossible if $A_2 \geq 4^{72}$ as $F(z)$ is of order less than 72.

We consider arbitrarily large r for which (4.17) is true. If for an infinite sequence of such r , $|f(z)| \geq 1$ ($r \leq |z| \leq 3r$) then the result follows from Lemma 2. Hence we assume always that for some R in $r \leq R \leq 3r$ there is a z on $|z| = R$ where $|f(z)| < 1$. From the periodic nature of $F(z)$ we see that there is a disc $S(R)$ centred on ζ where $|\zeta| = R$, $|F(\zeta)| = M(R, F)$ such that $|F(z)| \geq 1$ in $S(R)$, $|F(z)| = 1$ at some boundary point and the radius of $S(R)$ does not exceed $\frac{\pi R}{12}$. By Lemma 1 it follows that

$$\mu(t, F) \geq \frac{12 \log M(R, F)}{10\pi R \log 2},$$

for some t satisfying $R - \frac{\pi R}{12} < t < R + \frac{\pi R}{12}$, so that $\frac{2}{3}R < t < \frac{4}{3}R$. If $t \leq R$ then we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(t, R) &\geq \frac{12 \log M(t, F)}{10\pi \cdot \frac{2}{3}t \log 2} \\ &= \frac{4 \log M(t, F)}{5\pi t \log 2}. \end{aligned}$$

If $t > R$ then, since $R \leq 3r$, $t < 4r$ and so, using (4.17) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(t, F) &\geq \frac{12 \log M(t, F)}{A_2 10\pi t \log 2} \\ &= \frac{6 \log M(t, F)}{5A_2 \pi t \log 2}. \end{aligned}$$

As $t > \frac{2}{3}R \geq \frac{2}{3}r$ it follows that one of the above inequalities must hold for arbitrarily large t . Hence the proof of Theorem 2 is complete.

4.5. Proof of Theorem 4

For any function $f(z)$ of order less than 1 with $f(0) \neq 0$ we have the well known inequalities [see e.g. 4, p. 28]

$$\int_0^r \frac{n(t)}{t} dt \leq \log \left(\frac{M(r, f)}{|f(0)|} \right) \leq \int_0^r \frac{n(t)}{t} dt + r \int_r^\infty \frac{n(t)}{t^2} dt, \quad (4.18)$$

where $n(t)$ is the number of zeros of $f(z)$ in $|z| \leq t$. The restriction $f(0) \neq 0$

clearly involves no loss of generality. From the second condition of (3.4) and the left hand inequality of (4.18) it follows that

$$n(r) = O(\log^\alpha r). \quad (4.19)$$

From (4.19) we find that

$$r \int_r^\infty \frac{n(t)}{t^2} dt = O(\log^\alpha r). \quad (4.20)$$

Hence for r such that $\log M(r, f) > \eta \varphi(r) \log^\alpha r$, where η is some positive constant implied in the first condition of (3.4), we obtain, from (4.18) and (4.20),

$$\log M(r, f) = \{1 + o(1)\} \int_0^r \frac{n(t)}{t} dt. \quad (4.21)$$

Assume now that we are dealing with values r of the above kind. By a known result we have for some R in $\left(\frac{r}{4}, \frac{r}{2}\right)$, $\log |f(z)| > H \log M(R, f)$ ($|z| = R$) where, here and elsewhere, H depends only on $f(z)$ [5, pp. 64–65]. For sufficiently large r let R' be the smallest number such that $|f(z)| > 1$ ($R' < |z| < R$). We deal with two cases: a) $R' > \frac{r}{12}$; b) $R' \leq \frac{r}{12}$ for arbitrarily large values of R' . It is clear that in fact R' does take arbitrarily large values.

Case a). If $|f(\zeta)| = 1$ ($\zeta = R' e^{i\varphi}$) we consider the largest disc D centred on $R e^{i\varphi}$ in which $|f(z)| > 1$. The radius of D is at most $\frac{r}{2} - \frac{r}{12} = \frac{5}{12} r$ and so D lies in $|z| < \frac{r}{2} + \frac{5}{12} r < r$. By Lemma 1, (4.3), for some t in $\frac{r}{12} < t < r$ we have

$$\mu(t, f) > \frac{H \log M(R, f)}{r}.$$

From (4.18), (4.19) and (4.21) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \log M\left(\frac{r}{12}, f\right) &> H \log M(r, f) - \int_{r/12}^r \frac{n(t)}{t} dr + O(\log^\alpha r) \\ &> H \log M(r, f) + O(\log^\alpha r) \\ &= H(1 + o(1)) \log M(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(t, f) &> H \frac{\varphi(r) \log^\alpha r}{r} \\ &> H \frac{\varphi(t) \log^\alpha t}{t},\end{aligned}$$

for arbitrarily large values of t . This proves the theorem in this case.

Case b). In this case $|f(z)| > 1$ ($R' < |z| < 3R'$) and $|f(\zeta)| = 1$ ($\zeta = R' e^{i\varphi}$). We see from the proof of Lemma 2 that

$$\mu(t, f) > H \frac{\log M(2R', f)}{R'} \quad (4.22)$$

for some t satisfying $R' < t < 2R'$. Now from (4.19) and (4.21)

$$\begin{aligned}n\left(\frac{r}{4}\right) \log r &> H \int_0^{r/4} \frac{n(t)}{t} dt = H \left(\int_0^r \frac{n(t)}{t} dt - \int_{r/4}^r \frac{n(t)}{t} dt \right) \\ &> H \varphi(r) \log^\alpha r - H \log^\alpha r\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$n\left(\frac{r}{4}\right) > H \varphi(r) \log^{\alpha-1} r.$$

But $\left(R', \frac{r}{4}\right)$ is free from zeros and so

$$n(R') > H \varphi(r) \log^{\alpha-1} r.$$

Hence, by (4.18),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\log M(2R', f)}{|f(0)|} &\geq \int_{R'}^{2R'} \frac{n(t)}{t} dt = n(R') \log 2 \\ &> H \varphi(r) \log^{\alpha-1} r.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we find that in (4.22),

$$\mu(t, f) > \frac{H \varphi(t) \log^{\alpha-1} t}{t}.$$

Since this holds for arbitrarily large values of t the theorem is proved in this case.

4.6. Proof of Theorem 5

From the left hand inequality of (4.18) we get

$$\begin{aligned}n(r) \log r &\leq \int_r^{r^2} \frac{n(t)}{t} dt \leq \log M(r^2, f) \\ &= O\left\{\frac{\log^2 r}{\varphi(r^2)}\right\}\end{aligned}$$

and so, since $\varphi(r)$ is increasing,

$$n(r) = O \left\{ \frac{\log r}{\varphi(r)} \right\}. \quad (4.23)$$

Using (4.23) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} r \int_r^\infty \frac{n(t)}{t^2} dt &= O \left\{ \frac{1}{\varphi(r)} \cdot r \int_r^\infty \frac{\log t}{t^2} dt \right\} \\ &= O \left\{ \frac{\log r}{\varphi(r)} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Hence if we put $\beta(r) = \eta \sqrt{\frac{\log r}{\varphi(r) \log M(r)}}$, where $\eta > 0$ and depends on $f(z)$, then, by a known result [5, pp. 64–65], in $r(1 - \beta(r)) < |z| < r(1 + \beta(r))$

$$\log |f(z)| > H \log M(|z|, f)$$

outside a set of circles the sum of whose radii is at most $Hr\beta^2(r)$.

Consider now values of r such that $f(z)$ has a zero on $|z| = r$. Let $z_0 = re^{i\theta_0}$ be such a zero. Then from the above, if r is large enough, for some R satisfying $r - Hr\beta^2(r) < R < r$ we have

$$\log |f(Re^{i\theta_0})| > H \log M(R, f).$$

Let D be the disc with centre $Re^{i\theta_0}$ in which $|f(z)| > 1$, assuming r is sufficiently large, with $|f(z)| = 1$ somewhere on the boundary. Then, by Lemma 1 and the above for some z in this disc

$$\varrho(f(z)) > \frac{H \log M(R, f)}{r\beta^2(r)}. \quad (4.25)$$

Now as $\beta(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ it follows that for large r , $\frac{r}{2} < R < r$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} \log M(R, f) &= \{1 + o(1)\} \int_0^R \frac{n(t)}{t} dt \\ &> \{1 + o(1)\} \left\{ \log M(r, f) - \int_R^r \frac{n(t)}{t} dt \right\} \\ &= \{1 + o(1)\} \{ \log M(r, f) + O(\log r) \} \\ &= \{1 + o(1)\} \log M(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (4.23), (4.24), (4.18) and the obvious result that $\log r = o(\log M(r, f))$. Hence, from (4.25),

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho(f(z)) &> \frac{H \log M(r, f)}{r \beta^2(r)} \\ &= \frac{H \varphi(r) \log r}{\eta^2 r} \left\{ \frac{\log M(r, f)}{\log r} \right\}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now in (4.25), $\frac{r}{2} < |z| < r$ for large r and so if $|z| = t$ then for large r we find that

$$\mu(t, f) > H \frac{\varphi(t) \log t}{\eta^2 t} \left(\frac{\log M(r, f)}{\log r} \right)^2$$

since $\varphi(t)$ is increasing. As the final factor above tends to ∞ with r and the inequality holds for some arbitrarily large t this proves Theorem 5.

5. Counter examples

The first theorem shows that (3.2) is best possible and that the properties of $f(z)$ referred to in §3 preceding Theorem 4 do in fact hold.

Theorem 6. *Given $\varphi(r) \nearrow \infty$ ($r \nearrow \infty$) there is a sequence of increasing integers k_n such that if*

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= \prod_1^\infty \left(1 - \frac{z}{2^{k_n}} \right)^{k_n}, \quad f_1(z) = \prod_1^\infty \left(1 - \frac{z}{2^{nk_n}} \right)^{k_n}, \\ f_2(z) &= \prod_1^\infty \left(1 - \frac{z}{2^{k_n/n}} \right)^{k_n} \end{aligned}$$

then for $g(z) = f(z)$, $f_1(z)$ or $f_2(z)$

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r \mu(r, g)}{\varphi(r) \log r} < \infty.$$

The sequence $\{k_n\}$ will be seen later to satisfy $\frac{k_{n+1}}{k_n} \geq 4$ and in this case it is easy to verify that

$$0 < \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r, f)}{\log^2 r} < \infty, \quad \log M(r, f_1) = o(\log^2 r), \quad \log M(r, f_2) \neq O(\log^2 r).$$

The next theorem shows that Theorem 2 is best possible

Theorem 7. *Given σ ($0 \leq \sigma < \infty$) there is an integral function of proper order σ and very regular growth when $\sigma > 0$ such that*

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r \mu(r, f)}{\log M(r, f)} < C(\sigma + 1)$$

for some absolute constant C .

5.1. Proof of Theorem 6

The proof of the theorem requires a number of lemmas. We assume that besides any other conditions that the integers k_n will be required to satisfy, that they will always satisfy

$$\frac{k_{n+1}}{k_n} \geq 4 \quad (n > 1), \quad k_1 \geq 2. \quad (5.1)$$

We confine our attention to $f(z)$. The proofs for $f_1(z)$ and $f_2(z)$ are similar.

Lemma 4. *On $|z| = 2^{k_{n+1}}$ and on $|z| = 2^{k_{n-1}}$,*

$$|f(z)| > H|z|.$$

On $|z| = 2^{k_{n+1}}$ we have

$$|f(z)| \geq \prod_{m=1}^n \left(\frac{2^{k_{n+1}}}{2^{k_m}} - 1 \right)^{k_m} \cdot \prod_{m=n+1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{2^{k_{n+1}}}{2^{k_m}} \right)^{k_m}.$$

From (5.1) each factor in the first product is at least 1 and so

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{m=1}^n \left(\frac{2^{k_{n+1}}}{2^{k_m}} - 1 \right)^{k_m} &\geq \left(\frac{2^{k_{n+1}}}{2^{k_1}} - 1 \right)^{k_1} \\ &> H \cdot 2^{k_{n+1}} = H|z|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Also, from (5.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{m=n+1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{2^{k_{n+1}}}{2^{k_m}} \right)^{k_m} &> \prod_{m=n+1}^{\infty} \left(1 - 2^{-\frac{k_m}{2}} \right)^{k_m} \\ &> H. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

From (5.2) and (5.3) the lemma follows for $|z| = 2^{k_{n+1}}$.

In dealing with $|z| = 2^{k_{n-1}}$ we assume for convenience that $n > 1$. This clearly involves no loss of generality. On $|z| = 2^{k_{n-1}}$ we have

$$|f(z)| \geq \prod_{m=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{2^{k_n}}{2^{k_{m+1}}} - 1 \right)^{k_m} \cdot 2^{-k_n} \prod_{m=n+1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{2^{k_n}}{2^{k_{m+1}}} \right)^{k_m}.$$

By (5.1) each factor in the first product is at least 1 and so

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{m=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{2^{k_n}}{2^{k_{m+1}}} - 1 \right)^{k_m} &> \left(\frac{2^{k_n}}{2^{k_1+1}} - 1 \right)^{k_1} \\ &> H \cdot 2^{2k_n-1} \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

since $k_1 \geq 2$. As before

$$\prod_{n=m+1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{2^{k_n}}{2^{k_{m+1}}} \right)^{k_m} > H. \quad (5.5)$$

Hence on $|z| = 2^{k_n-1}$, by (5.4) and (5.5),

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z)| &> H \cdot 2^{2k_n-1} \cdot 2^{-k_n} \\ &= H 2^{k_n-1} = H |z|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the lemma follows for $|z| = 2^{k_n-1}$.

We see from Lemma 4 that when z is large the regions in which $|f(z)| < 1$ are disjoint, with one in each annulus $2^{k_n-1} < |z| < 2^{k_n+1}$. Denote these by D_n . Clearly D_n contains the zero at $z = 2^{k_n}$.

Lemma 5. *If the k_n increase sufficiently rapidly then on the boundary of D_n when n is large*

$$H 2^{k_n-k_1-k_2-\dots-k_{n-1}} < |z - 2^{k_n}| < H 2^{k_n-k_1-\dots-k_{n-1}}.$$

We have

$$|f(z)| = \prod_{m=1}^{n-1} \left| 1 - \frac{z}{2^{k_m}} \right|^{k_m} \left(\frac{|z - 2^{k_n}|}{2^{k_n}} \right)^{k_n} \cdot \prod_{m=n+1}^{\infty} \left| 1 - \frac{z}{2^{k_m}} \right|^{k_m}.$$

Now on the boundary of D_n

$$\prod_{m=1}^{n-1} \left| 1 - \frac{z}{2^{k_m}} \right|^{k_m} = \frac{|z|^{k_1+\dots+k_{n-1}}}{2^{k_1^2+k_2^2+\dots+k_{n-1}^2}} \prod_{m=1}^{n-1} \left| 1 - \frac{2^{k_m}}{z} \right|^{k_m}. \quad (5.6)$$

When n is large then $2^{k_n-1} < |z| < 2^{k_n+1}$ by Lemma 4 and so, if the k_n increase sufficiently rapidly to ensure that the final product in (5.6) lies between $\frac{1}{H}$ and H , we obtain on the boundary of D_n ,

$$H \cdot \frac{2^{(k_n-1)(k_1+\dots+k_{n-1})}}{2^{k_1^2+\dots+k_{n-1}^2}} < \prod_{m=1}^{n-1} \left| 1 - \frac{z}{2^{k_m}} \right|^{k_m} < H \cdot \frac{2^{(k_n+1)(k_1+\dots+k_{n-1})}}{2^{k_1^2+\dots+k_{n-1}^2}}. \quad (5.7)$$

Again, from Lemma 4, it follows that on boundary of D_n when n is large,

$$H < \prod_{n=m+1}^{\infty} \left| 1 - \frac{z}{2^{k_m}} \right|^{k_m} < H. \quad (5.8)$$

From (5.6), (5.7) and (5.8) we find that on the boundary of D_n when n is large

$$H \cdot 2^{k_n} \left\{ \frac{2^{\frac{1}{k_n}(k_1^2 + \dots + k_{n-1}^2)}}{2^{\left(1 + \frac{1}{k_n}\right)(k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1})}} \right\} < |z - 2^{k_n}| < H 2^{k_n} \left\{ \frac{2^{\frac{1}{k_n}(k_1^2 + \dots + k_{n-1}^2)}}{2^{\left(1 - \frac{1}{k_n}\right)(k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1})}} \right\}.$$

From these inequalities the lemma follows provided the k_n increase sufficiently rapidly to ensure that

$$k_1^2 + \dots + k_{n-1}^2 = O(k_n) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty). \quad (5.9)$$

Lemma 6. *For large n we have in $2^{k_{n-1}} \leq |z| \leq 2^{k_{n+1}}$, but outside D_n , provided that k_n increases quickly enough,*

$$\left| \frac{f'(z)}{f(z)} \right| < H \frac{k_n 2^{k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1}}}{|z|}.$$

We have

$$\frac{f'(z)}{f(z)} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{k_m}{z - 2^{k_m}}.$$

If the k_n increase sufficiently rapidly then, for $2^{k_{n-1}} \leq |z| \leq 2^{k_{n+1}}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{k_m}{z - 2^{k_m}} &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{k_m}{2^{k_{n-1}} - 2^{k_m}} \\ &< \frac{2}{2^{k_{n-1}}} \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} k_m \\ &< H \frac{k_n}{2^{k_n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{k_m}{|z - 2^{k_m}|} &\leq \sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{k_m}{2^{k_m} - 2^{k_{n+1}}} \\ &< H \sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{k_m}{2^{k_m}} \\ &< \frac{H}{2^{k_n}} \sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{k_m}{2^{\frac{k_m}{2}}} \\ &< \frac{H}{2^{k_n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

From Lemma 5 it follows that if the k_n increase rapidly enough then

$$\frac{k_n}{|z - 2^{k_n}|} < H \frac{k_n 2^{k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1}}}{2^{k_n}}. \quad (5.12)$$

From (5.10), (5.11) and (5.12) the lemma follows.

Lemma 7. *If the k_n increase sufficiently rapidly then for $2^{k_n+1} \leq |z| \leq 2^{k_{n+1}-1}$ we have*

$$\varrho(f(z)) = O\left(\frac{1}{|z|}\right).$$

If the k_n increase quickly enough then on $|z| = 2^{k_n+1}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|f'|}{|f|^2} &< H \frac{k_n 2^{k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1}}}{|z|^2} \\ &< \frac{H}{|z|} \end{aligned}$$

by Lemmas 4 and 6. The same inequality is also true for $|z| = 2^{k_{n+1}-1}$. Now $\left|\frac{zf'(z)}{f^2(z)}\right|$ is subharmonic in $2^{k_n+1} \leq |z| \leq 2^{k_{n+1}-1}$ and since it is bounded by H on the boundary it is bounded by H inside the annulus. Therefore in $2^{k_n+1} \leq |z| \leq 2^{k_{n+1}-1}$,

$$\varrho(f(z)) < \frac{|f'(z)|}{|f^2(z)|} = O\left(\frac{1}{|z|}\right).$$

Lemma 8. *In $2^{k_n-1} \leq |z| \leq 2^{k_{n+1}}$ we have*

$$\varrho(f(z)) \leq H \frac{k_n 2^{k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1}}}{|z|}$$

provided the k_n increase quickly enough.

In $2^{k_n-1} \leq |z| \leq 2^{k_{n+1}}$ but outside D_n it follows, if the k_n increase quickly enough, that

$$\left|\frac{zf'(z)}{f^2(z)}\right| < H k_n 2^{k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1}} \quad (5.13)$$

by Lemmas 4 and 6 and the use of subharmonicity as before. Hence the lemma is true in this region.

On the boundary of D_n we get

$$|zf'(z)| < H k_n 2^{k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1}} \quad (5.14)$$

and so, by the maximum modulus principle, this also holds inside D_n . From (5.13) and (5.14) the lemma follows.

Given $\varphi(r)$ as in the theorem choose an increasing sequence of integers k_n so that the above results hold and also

$$2^{k_1} + \dots + 2^{k_{n-1}} < \varphi(2^{k_n}).$$

Then from Lemmas 7 and 8 we see that

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r \mu(r, f)}{\varphi(r) \log r} < \infty,$$

since $\varphi(r)$ is increasing.

This completes the proof of the theorem. It should perhaps be pointed out that given $\varphi(r)$ where $\varphi(r) \rightarrow \infty (r \rightarrow \infty)$ it is not difficult to find a $\psi(r)$ such that $\psi(r) \rightarrow \infty (r \rightarrow \infty)$, $\varphi(r) \geq \psi(r)$ and $\psi(r)$ is increasing. Consequently $\varphi(r)$ was assumed to be increasing in the theorem only for convenience.

5.2. Proof of Theorem 7

A number of lemmas are required.

Lemma 9. *If $A > 1$ and $f(z) = \prod_1^\infty \left(1 + \frac{z}{e^{nA}}\right)^{[A^n]}$ then $f(z)$ is a function of very regular growth and order $\frac{\log A}{A}$.*

For $e^{nA} \leq |z| \leq e^{(n+1)A}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log M(r, f) &\geq \log |f(e^{nA})| \\ &\geq (A^n - 1) \log 2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

Also, in this range,

$$\begin{aligned} \log M(r, f) &\leq \log M(e^{(n+1)A}, f) \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{n+1} A^m \log \{1 + e^{(n+1-m)A}\} + \sum_{m=n+2}^\infty A^m \log \{1 + e^{(n+1-m)A}\} \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{n+1} A^m \{\log 2 + (n+1-m)A\} + \sum_{m=n+2}^\infty A^m e^{-(m-n-1)A} \\ &\leq \frac{A^{n+2} \log 2}{A-1} + A^{n+1} \sum_{\nu=1}^n \frac{\nu}{A^\nu} + A^{n+1} \sum_{\nu=1}^\infty A^\nu e^{-\nu A} \\ &< K(A) A^n. \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

From (5.15) and (5.16) it follows that for $e^{nA} \leq |z| \leq e^{(n+1)A}$

$$\frac{(A^n - 1) \log 2}{A^{n+1}} < \frac{\log M(r, f)}{r^{(\log A)/A}} < \frac{K(A) \cdot A^n}{A^n},$$

and so the result follows.

Lemma 10. *If $\varphi_n(z) = \left(\sum_1^{n-2} + \sum_{n+1}^{\infty} \right) [A^m] \log \left| 1 + \frac{z}{e^{mA}} \right|$ then for*

$$\frac{e^{nA}}{2} \leq |z| \leq 2e^{nA},$$

$$-\eta A^n \leq \varphi_n(z) \leq \eta A^n$$

where $\eta = \eta(A) > 0$ and $\eta \rightarrow 0 (A \rightarrow \infty)$; η is not necessarily the same at each occurrence.

We have, in the range of the lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_1^{n-2} [A^m] \log \left| 1 + \frac{z}{e^{mA}} \right| &\leq \sum_1^{n-2} A^m \log \left(1 + \frac{2e^{nA}}{e^{mA}} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_1^{n-2} A^m \{ \log 4 + (n-m)A \} \\ &\leq \frac{A^{n-1} \log 4}{A-1} + A^{n-1} \sum_{\nu=0}^{n-3} \frac{\nu+2}{A^\nu} \\ &\leq \eta(A) \cdot A^n. \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

Also, in the above range,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n+1}^{\infty} [A^m] \log \left| 1 + \frac{z}{e^{mA}} \right| &\leq \sum_{n+1}^{\infty} A^m \log \left(1 + \frac{2e^{nA}}{e^{mA}} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{n+1}^{\infty} A^m e^{(n-m)A} \\ &= 2A^n \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} (A e^{-A})^\nu \\ &\leq \eta(A) A^n. \end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

From (5.17) and (5.18) the right hand inequality of the lemma follows.

In the range of the lemma we also have, if $e^{2A} \geq 4$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_1^{n-2} [A^m] \log \left| 1 + \frac{z}{e^{mA}} \right| &\geq \sum_1^{n-2} [A^m] \log \left(\frac{e^{nA}}{2e^{mA}} - 1 \right) \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

and, if $e^A > 4$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n+1}^{\infty} [A^m] \log \left| 1 + \frac{z}{e^{mA}} \right| &\geq \sum_{n+1}^{\infty} A^m \log \left(1 - \frac{2e^{nA}}{e^{mA}} \right) \\
&> -4 \sum_{n+1}^{\infty} A^m e^{(n-m)A} \\
&= -4A^n \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} (Ae^{-A})^{\nu} \\
&\geq -\eta(A)A^n,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

From (5.19) and (5.20) the left hand inequality of the lemma follows.

Lemma 11. For $|z| = \frac{e^{nA}}{2}$ and $|z| = 2e^{nA}$,

$$\left(\frac{1}{4} - \eta\right)A^n \leq \log |f(z)| \leq (3 + \eta)A^n.$$

If $|z| = \frac{e^{nA}}{2}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
[A^{n-1}] \log \left| 1 + \frac{z}{e^{(n-1)A}} \right| &\leq A^{n-1} \log \left(1 + \frac{e^A}{2} \right) \\
&\leq A^{n-1} (\log 2 + A) \\
&\leq (1 + \eta)A^n.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

Also for $|z| = \frac{e^{nA}}{2}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
[A^n] \log \left| 1 + \frac{z}{e^{nA}} \right| &\leq A^n \log 3/2 \\
&\leq A^n.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.22}$$

From (5.21) and (5.22) and Lemma 10, the right hand inequality of Lemma 11 follows for $|z| = \frac{e^{nA}}{2}$.

We have for $|z| = \frac{e^{nA}}{2}$, if $e^A > 4$,

$$\begin{aligned}
[A^{n-1}] \log \left| 1 + \frac{z}{e^{(n-1)A}} \right| &\geq [A^{n-1}] \log \left(\frac{e^A}{2} - 1 \right) \\
&\geq (A^{n-1} - 1) (A - \log 4) \\
&\geq (1 - \eta)A^n;
\end{aligned} \tag{5.23}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
[A^n] \log \left| 1 + \frac{z}{e^{nA}} \right| &> -A^n \log 2 \\
&> -\frac{3}{4} A^n.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

From (5.23) and (5.24) and Lemma 10, the left hand inequality of the Lemma 11 follows for $|z| = \frac{e^{nA}}{2}$.

The result for $|z| = 2e^{nA}$ follows in a similar manner to the above.

Lemma 12. *If z satisfies $|z + e^{nA}| \geq \frac{e^{nA}}{4}$ and $\frac{e^{nA}}{2} \leq |z| \leq 2e^{nA}$ then*

$$\left| \frac{f'(z)}{f(z)} \right| \leq (4 + \eta) \frac{A^n}{e^{nA}}.$$

We have

$$\frac{f'(z)}{f(z)} = \sum_1^{\infty} \frac{[A^m]}{z + e^{mA}}.$$

For $|z| \geq \frac{e^{nA}}{2}$, if $e^A \geq 4$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \sum_1^{n-1} \frac{[A^m]}{z + e^{mA}} \right| &\leq \sum_1^{n-1} \frac{A^m}{\frac{e^{nA}}{2} - e^{mA}} \\
&\leq \frac{4}{e^{nA}} \sum_1^{n-1} A^m \\
&< \frac{4A^n}{(A-1)e^{nA}} \\
&\leq \eta \frac{A^n}{e^{nA}};
\end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

and for $|z| \leq 2e^{nA}$, if $e^A \geq 4$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \sum_{n+1}^{\infty} \frac{[A^m]}{z + e^{mA}} \right| &\leq \sum_{n+1}^{\infty} \frac{A^m}{e^{mA} - 2e^{nA}} \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{n+1}^{\infty} \frac{A^m}{e^{mA}} \\
&= 2 \frac{A^n}{e^{nA}} \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} (Ae^{-A})^v \\
&\leq \eta \frac{A^n}{e^{nA}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

Finally, if $|z + e^{nA}| \geq \frac{e^{nA}}{4}$, then

$$\frac{[A^n]}{|z + e^{nA}|} \leq \frac{4A^n}{e^{nA}}. \quad (5.27)$$

From (5.25), (5.26) and (5.27) the lemma follows.

Lemma 13. For $\frac{e^{nA}}{2} \leq |z| \leq 2e^{nA}$,

$$\mu(r, f) \leq K(A) \frac{A^n}{r},$$

provided A is sufficiently large.

When A is large enough we see from Lemma 11 that the set $|f(z)| < 1$ splits into a number of components. Each zero e^{nA} is contained in a component D_n , say, and D_n lies in $\frac{e^{nA}}{2} \leq |z| \leq 2e^{nA}$.

First of all we show that when A is large the disc $|z + e^{nA}| \leq \frac{e^{nA}}{4}$ is contained in D_n . From Lemma 10 it follows that in this disc,

$$\begin{aligned} \log |f(z)| &\leq [A^{n-1}] \log \left| 1 + \frac{z}{e^{(n-1)A}} \right| + [A^n] \log \left| 1 + \frac{z}{e^{nA}} \right| + \eta A^n \\ &\leq A^{n-1} \log \left(1 + \frac{5}{4} e^A \right) - (A^n - 1) \log 4 + \eta A^n \\ &\leq A^{n-1} \left(\log \frac{5}{2} + A \right) - (A^n - 1) \log 4 + \eta A^n \\ &< 0, \end{aligned}$$

provided A is large enough, independently of n . Hence we arrive at the desired conclusion.

From Lemma 12 and the above it follows that when A is large then on the boundary of D_n ,

$$|f'(z)| = \left| \frac{f'(z)}{f(z)} \right| \leq (4 + \eta) \frac{A^n}{e^{nA}}.$$

Therefore in D_n and on its boundary,

$$\varrho(f(z)) \leq |f'(z)| \leq (4 + \eta) \frac{A^n}{e^{nA}}. \quad (5.28)$$

In the annulus $\frac{e^{nA}}{2} \leq |z| \leq 2e^{nA}$ outside D_n it follows that when A is large

$$\varrho(f(z)) \leq \left| \frac{f'(z)}{f(z)} \right| \leq (4 + \eta) \frac{A^n}{e^{nA}}, \quad (5.29)$$

by Lemma 12.

Since $\frac{1}{e^{nA}} \leq \frac{2}{r}$ for $\frac{e^{nA}}{2} \leq r \leq 2e^{nA}$ the lemma follows from (5.28) and (5.29).

Lemma 14. *For large A , if $2e^{nA} \leq r \leq \frac{e^{(n+1)A}}{2}$ then*

$$\mu(r, f) < \frac{K(A)}{r}.$$

From Lemmas 11 and 12 it follows that

$$\left| \frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)^2} \right| < K(A)$$

on the boundary of $2e^{nA} \leq |z| \leq \frac{e^{(n+1)A}}{2}$. Since the function on the left above is subharmonic in the annulus it follows that the inequality holds throughout the annulus. Hence the lemma follows because $\varrho(f(z)) \leq \frac{|f'(z)|}{|f(z)|^2}$.

5.3. Before completing the proof of Theorem 7, we observe that the constants $K(A)$ appearing in Lemmas 13 and 14 remain bounded as $A \rightarrow \infty$. From Lemmas 11, 13 and 14 it follows that

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r\mu(r, f)}{\log M(r, f)} < B,$$

where B is an absolute constant for all $f(z)$ for which $A \geq A_0$, A_0 being some fixed value.

We proceed to prove Theorem 7.

If $0 < \sigma < \frac{\log A_0}{A_0}$ in Theorem 7 we take $f(z)$ as above with A given by $\sigma = \frac{\log A}{A}$. If $\sigma > \frac{\log A_0}{A_0}$ we proceed as follows. Let $A_1 > A_0$ be defined by $2 \frac{\log A_1}{A_1} = \frac{\log A_0}{A_0}$. Let n be the smallest positive integer such that $\frac{\sigma}{n} \leq \frac{\log A_0}{A_0}$. Then, since $n \geq 2$, $\frac{\sigma}{n-1} \geq \frac{\log A_0}{A_0}$ and so $\frac{\sigma}{n} \geq \frac{n-1}{n} \frac{\log A_0}{A_0} \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\log A_0}{A_0}$. Therefore $\frac{\sigma}{n} = \frac{\log A}{A}$ where $A_1 \leq A \leq A_0$.

We now take, as a function for Theorem 7, $F(z) = f(z^n)$ where $f(z)$ is constructed as in Lemma 9 with this value of A . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r \mu(r, F)}{\log M(r, F)} &= \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n r^n \mu(r^n, f)}{\log M(r^n, f)} \\ &\leq n B \\ &= \frac{\log A}{A} \cdot n \cdot \frac{B \cdot A}{\log A} \\ &\leq \frac{2 A_0 B}{\log A_0} \cdot \sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the theorem is proved for $0 < \sigma < \infty$.

It can be shown by the same methods as above that if K is large enough then

$$F(z) = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 + z e^{-K n^2})^{n^n}$$

is a function of order 0 satisfying the conclusion of the theorem.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] LEHTO O.: *The spherical derivative of a meromorphic function in the neighbourhood of an isolated singularity*. Comment. Math. Helv. 33, 196–205 (1959).
- [2] LEHTO O. and VIRTANEN K.: *On the behaviour of meromorphic functions in the neighbourhood of an isolated singularity*. Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. A. I. No. 240 (1947).
- [3] HAYMAN W. K.: *A characterisation of the maximum modulus of functions regular at the origin*. J. Analyse Math. 1, 135–154 (1951).
- [4] HAYMAN W. K.: *Meromorphic Functions*. (Oxford, 1964).
- [5] VALIRON G.: *Fonctions entières d'ordre fini et fonctions méromorphes*. (Geneva, 1960).

(Received April 28, 1965)