ANNALES DE L'INSTITUT FOURIER

LAWRENCE GRUMAN

The growth of entire solutions of differential equations of finite and infinite order

Annales de l'institut Fourier, tome 22, nº 1 (1972), p. 211-238

<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIF_1972__22_1_211_0>

Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble
22,1 (1972), 211-238

THE GROWTH OF ENTIRE SOLUTIONS OF DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS OF FINITE AND INFINITE ORDER

by Lawrence GRUMAN

Let $f(z)$ be an entire function (of one or several variables) of finite order ρ. A proximate order $\rho(r)$ is a function which satisfies the conditions

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} \rho(r) = \rho \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r\to\infty} r\,\rho'(r)\ln r = 0\ . \tag{1}$$

The function $L(r) = r^{\rho(r)-\rho}$ satisfies

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} \frac{L(kr)}{L(r)} = 1 \quad \text{uniformly for} \quad 0 < a \leqslant k \leqslant b < \infty\ . \tag{2}$$

We assume in addition that $\lim\limits_{r\to\infty} L(r)$ exists (perhaps infinite). For every entire function of order ρ, there exists a proximate order $\rho(r)$ with respect to which $f(z)$ has normal type [5].

For a given proximate order $\rho(r)$, we define the functions

$$h_r^*(z) = \overline{\lim_{z'\to z}} \left[\overline{\lim_{r\to\infty}} \frac{\ln|f(rz')|}{r^{\rho(r)}} \right],\ r > 0$$

$$\left(\text{resp. } h_c^*(z) = \overline{\lim_{z'\to z}} \left[\overline{\lim_{|u|\to\infty}} \frac{\ln|f(uz')|}{|u|^{\rho(r)}} \right],\ u \in \mathbf{C}\right).$$

If $f(z)$ is of normal type with respect to the proximate order $\rho(r)$, it follows from (2) that these functions are pluri-subharmonic and real positive homogeneous (resp. complex homogeneous) of order ρ [4]. The function $h_r^*(z)$ (resp. $h_c^*(z)$) is called the radial (resp. circular) indicator of growth function of $f(z)$.

A convex homogeneous function $g(z)$ is one which satisfies $g(z_1 + z_2) \leqslant g(z_1) + g(z_2)$ and $g(tz) = tg(z)$, $t \geqslant 0$. To every convex homogeneous function $g(z)$, we associate the compact convex set $K_g = \{w : \mathrm{Re} < w, z > \leqslant g(z) \ \forall \ z \in C^n\}$, and to every compact convex set K, we associate the convex homogeneous function

$$g_K(z) = \sup_{w \in K} \mathrm{Re} < w, z > ,$$

which is called the support function of K. If $\rho \equiv 1$, we define $h_K(z)$, the *convex indicator of growth function* of $f(z)$, to be the least convex homogeneous majorant of $h^*(z)$. It is evidently the support function of the closed convex hull of the set

$$\{w : \mathrm{Re} < w, z > \leqslant h^*(z) \ \forall \ z \in C^n\} .$$

If the dimension $n = 1$, these two functions are the same [5].

In § 1, we investigate for the case $n = 1$ the relationship between the growth of the function $f(z)$ and that of solutions $u(z)$ of the differential equation $P(D)\,u = f$ (where $D = \dfrac{\partial}{\partial z}$ and P(D) is a differential polynomial).

Let $p(z)$ be a complex norm (i.e. $p(\lambda z) = |\lambda| \, p(z)$, $\lambda \in C$), B_A^ρ the space of functions which satisfy a majoration

$$|f(z)| \leqslant C_A \exp\{(A\, p(z))^\rho\}$$

and $E_R^\rho = \bigcap_{A > R} B_A^\rho$. In [8], A. Martineau introduced the notion of a constant coefficient differential operator as a convolution operator on the dual space $(E_R^\rho)'$ of continuous linear functionals defined on E_R^ρ. We will take as our definition of such an operator the *transpose*, which is a linear operator on the space E_R^ρ into itself. This category includes the usual constant coefficient differential operator as a special case. For $\rho \geqslant 1$, Martineau showed that for every such operator $\hat{\mu}$ on E_R^ρ and every $f \in E_R^\rho$, there exists a solution $g \in E_R^\rho$ of the equation $\hat{\mu}(g) = f$.

In § 2, we extend this notion and this result to the case of $p(z)$ a pseudo-norm and $\rho(r)$ a proximate order ($\rho \neq 1$), including the important case of $\rho < 1$. In § 3, we extend this notion and result to the case $\rho = 1$ and $p(z)$ an arbitrary convex homogeneous function. In § 4, we extend this notion and result to those functions which satisfy a majoration of the type $\exp\{k(\ln r)^\rho\}$ for $\rho > 1$.

Remark. – The case of proximate orders for $\rho = 1$ is rendered much more difficult by the special role played by the exponentials. We do not treat this case.

1. Ordinary differential equations.

Let $f(z)$ be an entire function of a single variable and $h_r^*(z)$ its indicator function with respect to a proximate order $\rho(r)$. We will henceforth in this section use the notation $k_f(\theta) = h_r^*(e^{i\theta})$, which is the standard notation for $n = 1$. If $u(z)$ is a solution of the constant coefficient differential equation $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{D})\, u = f$, then it is an easy consequence of Cauchy's theorem that $k_f(\theta) \leqslant k_u(\theta)$. We are interested in seeing if we can choose a solution such that equality holds (at least locally). We will need

LEMMA 1. – *The number of disjoint open intervals on which $k_f(\theta)$ can be negative is at most* $\sup_{a<1} [2a\rho]$ *(where [ ] means "greatest integer in").*

Proof. – For $\theta_1 < \theta_2 < \theta_3$ and $\theta_3 - \theta_1 < \pi/\rho$, we have [5, p. 70]

$$k_f(\theta_1) \sin \rho(\theta_2 - \theta_3) + k_f(\theta_2) \sin \rho(\theta_3 - \theta_1) + \\ + k_f(\theta_3) \sin \rho(\theta_1 - \theta_2) \leqslant 0 \; .$$

Thus, any two disjoint intervals on which $k_f(\theta)$ is negative are separated by an interval of length at least π/ρ on which $k_f(\theta)$ is non-negative. Q.E.D.

THEOREM 1. – *Let $f(z)$ be an entire function with indicator $k_f(\theta)$ with respect to the proximate order $\rho(r)$. Then there exists a solution $u(z)$ of the differential equation* $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{D})\, u = f$ *such that*

i) $k_u(\theta) = k_f(\theta)$ *for* $\rho \leqslant 1$.

ii) $k_f(\theta) \leqslant k_u(\theta) \leqslant k_f^+(\theta) = \max(k_f(\theta), 0)$ *for* $\rho > 1$ *and for any specific interval* (θ_1, θ_2) *on which $k_f(\theta)$ is negative, there exists a unique solution u with this property such that* $k_u(\theta) = k_f(\theta)$ *for* $\theta_1 \leqslant \theta \leqslant \theta_2$.

Proof. – It is enough to consider solutions of the equation $(D - a)u = f$ and then iterate the result. All such solutions are given by

$$u(z) = e^{az} \int_0^z f(\zeta)\, e^{-a\zeta}\, d\zeta + Ce^{az} . \tag{3}$$

If for some open interval of θ, the function $f(z)\, e^{-az}$ has negative indicator (with respect to *any* proximate order), then

$$C = \int_0^\infty f(t\xi)\, e^{-at\xi}\, \xi dt \ , \ \xi = e^{i\theta} \ ,$$

defines a constant for all θ in this interval. If there is no such region, we choose $C = 0$. By Lemma 1, for $\rho \leqslant 1$, there is at most one such interval, but for $\rho > 1$ there may be more than one such interval and we may only be able to choose C to satisfy this relation in one of the intervals. (This explains the difference between i) and ii) above).

From (1), we have that

$$(r^{\rho(r)})' = \rho(r)\, r^{\rho(r)-1} + r^{\rho(r)}\, \rho'(r) \ln r \rightarrow \rho(r)\, r^{\rho(r)-1} \ . \tag{4}$$

Let us consider the case $\rho < 1$. For a given $\xi = e^{i\theta}$, let $b = k_f(\theta)$ and $s = \operatorname{Re} a\xi$. Then given $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $|f(t\xi)| \leqslant K \exp(b + \varepsilon)\, t^{\rho(t)}$.

i) If $s < 0$ and $b < 0$ and if $\varepsilon < -\dfrac{b}{2}$, then

$$|u(r\xi)| \leqslant K\, e^{sr} \int_0^r e^{(b+\varepsilon)\, t^{\rho(t)} - st}\, dt + |C|\, e^{sr}$$

$$\leqslant K_1'\, e^{sr} \int_{q_0}^r \left[(b+\varepsilon) \frac{d}{dt} (t^{\rho(t)}) - s \right] e^{(b+\varepsilon)\, t^{\rho(t)} - st}\, dt + |C|\, e^{sr} \ ,$$

where q_0 is chosen so large that $\left[(b+\varepsilon) \dfrac{d}{dt} (t^{\rho(t)}) - s \right]$ is bounded below and K_1' depends on q_0.

$$|u(r\xi)| \leqslant K_1' \left[e^{(b+\varepsilon)\, r^{\rho(r)}} - e^{sr} \cdot K_{q_0} \right] + |C|\, e^{sr}$$

$$\leqslant K_1''\, e^{(b+\varepsilon)\, r^{\rho(r)}} \ .$$

ii) If $s \geqslant 0$ and $b < 0$, then by the choice of C, we have

$$|u(r\xi)| \leqslant K\, e^{sr} \int_r^\infty e^{(b+\varepsilon)\, t^{\rho(t)}} \cdot e^{-st}\, dt$$

$$\leqslant K \int_r^\infty e^{(b+\varepsilon)\, t^{\rho(t)}}\, dt \leqslant K\, e^{(b+2\varepsilon) r^{\rho(t)}} \int_r^\infty e^{-\varepsilon\, t^{\rho(t)}}\, dt$$

$$\leqslant K_2'\, e^{(b+2\varepsilon)\, r^{\rho(r)}} ,$$

since by (4), $r^{\rho(r)}$ is increasing for sufficiently large r.

iii) If $s > 0$ and $b \geqslant 0$, then

$$|u(r\xi)| \leqslant K\, e^{sr} \int_r^\infty e^{(b+\varepsilon)\, t^{\rho(t)} - st}\, dt$$

$$\leqslant K_3'\, e^{sr} \int_r^\infty \left[(b+\varepsilon) \frac{d}{dt} (t^{\rho(t)}) - s \right] e^{(b+\varepsilon)\, t^{\rho(t)} - st}\, dt$$

$$\leqslant K_3''\, e^{(b+\varepsilon)\, r^{\rho(r)}} .$$

iv) If $s \leqslant 0$ and $b \geqslant 0$, then

$$|u(r\xi)| \leqslant K\, e^{sr} \int_0^r e^{(b+\varepsilon)\, t^{\rho(t)} - st}\, dt + |C|\, e^{sr}$$

$$\leqslant K_4'\, r\, e^{(b+\varepsilon)\, r^{\rho(r)}} .$$

The case $\rho \geqslant 1$ is treated similarly (for $\rho = 1$, we must make use of the assumption that $\lim_{r \to \infty} r^{\rho(r) - \rho}$ exists). For $\rho > 1$, if for some θ, $k_f(\theta) \neq k_u(\theta)$, then $u(z) = w(z) + Ce^{az}$, where $k_f(\theta) = k_w(\theta) < 0$, so $k_u(\theta) = 0$. Q.E.D.

Remark. – It follows from Theorem 6 below that if P(D) has a non-zero constant term, then for $\rho < 1$, the solution $u(z)$ in i) is unique.

The following example shows that it is not always possible to find a solution u of $P(D)\, u = f$ with the same indicator as f. Let $f(z) = e^{z^2}$ and let u be a solution of $Du = f$. The function $f(z)$ has two intervals on which its indicator is negative. If we integrate $f(z)$ along the positive imaginary axis, we obtain a constant different from that which we obtain by integrating along the negative imaginary axis.

There is even a more intimate connection between the growth of the function $f(z)$ and the solution $u(z)$ of $P(D)\, u = f$. If $f(z)$ grows regularly in a given direction, then so will $u(z)$. We introduce our criterion for regularity of growth.

Let E be a measurable set of positive real numbers and let $E^r = E \cap [0, r]$. A set is said to have upper relative measure U if $\overline{\lim_{r \to \infty}} \frac{\text{meas}(E^r)}{r} = U$. If $U = 0$, E is an E^0-set.

DEFINITION [5]. — *Let $f(z)$ be an entire function with indicator $k_f(\theta)$ with respect to a given proximate order $\rho(r)$; $f(z)$ is said to be of completely regular growth along the ray $re^{i\theta}$ if*

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\ln |f(re^{i\theta})|}{r^{\rho(r)}} = k_f(\theta) ,$$

where r takes on all values except perhaps for some E^0*-set.*

Remark. — The property of being of completely regular growth is not invariant with respect to a change in proximate orders.

THEOREM 2. — *If $u(z)$ is a solution of $P(D)u = f$ for an entire function $f(z)$ and if $\rho(r)$ is a proximate order with respect to which both $k_f(\theta)$ and $k_u(\theta)$ are bounded, then if $f(z)$ is of completely regular growth along the ray $re^{i\theta}$, so is $u(z)$.*

Proof. — We consider a solution of $(D - a)u = f$. By Theorem 1, for given θ, there is an interval (θ_1, θ_2) containing θ such that $u = w + C e^{az}$ and w has the same indicator as f in the interval (θ_1, θ_2). Thus, if $k_u(\theta) \neq k_f(\theta)$, we have that $\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\ln |u(re^{i\theta})|}{r^{\rho(r)}}$ exists with no exceptional set. Hence, in the following, we assume that $k_u(\theta) = k_f(\theta)$. We assume without loss of generality that $\theta = 0$.

Let ε and η be given positive numbers. Then there exists a set E_1 of upper relative measure less than $\eta/4$ such that if $r \notin E_1$, the family of functions $k_{u,r}(\phi) = \frac{\ln |u(re^{i\phi})|}{r^{\rho(r)}}$ is equicontinuous [5, p. 96]. Thus, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for $|\phi| < \delta$,

$$|k_{u,r}(\phi) - k_{u,r}(0)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \text{ and } |k_u(\phi) - k_u(0)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \text{ for } r \notin E_1 .$$

Since f is of completely regular growth along the positive real axis, given $\gamma > 0$ (depending eventually on η and ε), for r not in some E^0-set E_2,

$$-\frac{\gamma}{4} + k_f(0) \leqslant \frac{\ln |f(r)|}{r^{\rho(r)}} \leqslant k_f(0) + \frac{\gamma}{4} = k_u(0) + \frac{\gamma}{4} \cdot \tag{5}$$

We choose r so large that meas $(E_2^r) < \frac{\eta}{4} r$ and $\frac{\ln |u(re^{i\phi})|}{r^{\rho(r)}} \leqslant k_u(\phi) + \frac{\gamma}{4}$ [5, p. 71]. By Cauchy's formula,

$$f(r)\, e^{-ar} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|\xi|=1} \frac{u(\xi + r)}{\xi^2}\, e^{-a(\xi+r)}\, d\xi \,.$$

So by (5) for $r \notin E_2$ and r sufficiently large, there exists w with $|w - r| = 1$ such that, noting $\phi_w = \arg w$,

$$|a| + \ln |u(w)| > \left\{ k_f(0) - \frac{\gamma}{4} \right\} r^{\rho(r)} \geqslant \left\{ k_f(\phi_w) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \right\} |w|^{\rho(|w|)}$$

Let $R_m = \left(\frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}\right)^m$. Then, as in the proof of Theorem 31 [5, p. 73], we can choose γ so small (depending on ε and η but independent of w since $k_u(\theta)$ is bounded) such that

$$\frac{\ln |u(r\,\phi_w)|}{r^{\rho(r)}} > k_u(\phi_w) - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$$

except perhaps on a set of measure at most $\frac{\eta^2}{4} R_m$ for

$$(1 - 2\eta)\, R_m \leqslant r \leqslant (1 + 2\eta)\, R_m$$

(for $m \geqslant m_0$ so large that the above inequalities hold). Let

$$E_3 = [0\,, R_{m_0}] \cup \left(\bigcup_{m \geqslant m_0} E_m \right) .$$

Then

$$\frac{\text{meas}\,(E_3^r)}{r} \leqslant \frac{R_{m_0} + \sum_{i=m_0}^{m} \frac{\eta^2}{4} \frac{(R_{m_0} - R_m)}{1 - \frac{(1+\eta)}{(1-\eta)}}}{R_m(1-\eta)}$$

$$\leqslant 0(1) + \frac{\eta}{2}\left(1 - \frac{R_{m_0}}{R_m}\right) < \frac{\eta}{4}$$

for m sufficiently large. Let $E_\eta = E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3$. Then

$$\overline{\lim_{r\to\infty}} \frac{\operatorname{meas}(E_\eta^r)}{r} < \eta ,$$

and gathering together our inequalities, we have $|k_{u,r}(0) - k_u(0)| < \varepsilon$ for $r \notin E$. To see that this implies the theorem, we refer the reader to Theorem 1, part 3 [5, p. 141]. Q.E.D.

Remark. – The fact that a function is of completely regular growth in an interval has important consequences for the distribution of its zeros. This is fully discussed in [5].

2. Differential operators with constant coefficients.

Let $p_n(z)$ be a decreasing sequence of real valued functions and B_n the space of entire functions such that $|f(z)\exp\{-p_n(z)\}|$ goes to zero at infinity. This is a Banach space with norm

$$\|f\|_n = \sup_z |f(z)\exp\{-p_n(z)\}| .$$

We then set

$$E = \bigcap_n B_n , \tag{6}$$

which is a Fréchet space when we equip it with the projective limit topology. If B'_n is the dual space of B_n, E' that of E, then $E' = \bigcup_n B'_n$.

Let $p(z)$ be a complex pseudo-norm and $\rho(r)$ a proximate order. The space $E_p^{\rho(r)}$ will designate the space we get in (6) by setting $p_n(z) = \left\{ p(z) + \frac{1}{n}\|z\| \right\}^{\rho(r)}$ (where $r = \|z\|$, and we use the Euclidean norm). The space E^0 will be the space we get in (6) by setting $p_n(z) = \|z\|^{1/n}$ (the space of entire functions of zero order).

For a given proximate order $\rho(r)$, we have by (4) that $r^{\rho(r)}$ is increasing for sufficiently large r. For a given integer q, we define $\phi(q) = r_q$ to be the largest solution of $q = r^{\rho(r)}$. Then the type with respect to $\rho(r)$ of an entire function of one variable with coefficients c_q (in its Taylor series expansion at the origin) is given by the formula

$$(\sigma\rho e)^{1/\rho} = \overline{\lim_{q\to\infty}} (\phi(q) \mid c_q \mid^{1/q}) \quad [5, \text{ p. } 42] . \tag{7}$$

If $f \in E_p^{\rho(r)}$, we expand f at the origin in homogeneous polynomials $f(z) = \sum_q P_q(z)$. Let $A_q = \left(\frac{\phi(q)^\rho}{e\rho}\right)^{q/\rho}$. If we set

$$f_t(z) = \sum_q A_q P_q(z) ,$$

then $f_t(z)$ is a holomorphic function in the open set $D = \{z : p(z) < 1\}$, and when we equip the space $\mathcal{H}(D)$ of holomorphic functions defined on D with the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets, the mapping $f \to f_t$ becomes an isomorphism of $E_p^{\rho(r)}$ onto $\mathcal{H}(D)$ (cf. [8], Prop. 4, p. 116 and [4]).

For $\mu \in (E_p^{\rho(r)})$, we define the linear functional μ_t on $\mathcal{H}(D)$ by $(f_t, \mu_t) = (f, \mu)$. This is an isomorphism of $(E_p^{\rho(r)})'$ onto $\mathcal{H}'(D)$, the space of continuous linear functionals on $\mathcal{H}(D)$. We say that a linear functional μ_t is carried by the compact convex set K if for every open neighborhood Ω of K, there exists a constant C_Ω such that $|\mu_t(f_t)| \leqslant C_\Omega \sup_\Omega |f_t|$. Every $\mu_t \in \mathcal{H}'(D)$ is carried by one of the sets $K_n = \left\{ z : p(z) + \frac{1}{n} \| z \| \leqslant 1 \right\}$.

We define the Fourier-Borel transform of the functional μ_t to be the entire function $\widetilde{\mu}_t(u) = \mu_t(\exp \langle z, u \rangle)$. Then we have [3], [7].

Proposition 1. – *The functional* μ_t *is carried by the compact convex set* K *if and only if*

$$\widetilde{\mu}_t(u) \leqslant C_\delta \exp(H_K(u) + \delta \| u \|) \quad \textit{for all} \quad \delta > 0 ,$$

where $H_K(u)$ *is the support function of* K.

Let $p_n'(u) = \sup_{z \in K_n} \operatorname{Re} \langle z, u \rangle$. Then $p_n'(u)$ is a family of increasing complex norms, and since each $\mu_t \in \mathcal{H}'(D)$ is carried by some K_n, we have

$$\widetilde{\mu}_t(u) \leqslant C_n \exp H_{K_n}(u) \quad \text{for } n \text{ sufficiently large.}$$

Let α be a multi-index of positive numbers, $|\alpha| = \Sigma\, \alpha_i$ and

$z^\alpha = z^{\alpha_1} \dots z^{\alpha_n}$. Since the polynomials converge to $\exp < z, u >$ in $\mathcal{H}(D)$, we have

$$\mu_t(\exp < z, u >) = \mu_t \sum_q \sum_{|\alpha|=q} z^\alpha \frac{u^\alpha}{\alpha!} = \sum_q \sum_{|\alpha|=q} \mu_t(z^\alpha) \frac{u^\alpha}{\alpha!}$$

$$= \sum_q P_q^{\mu_t}(u)$$

and from (7) and Proposition 1, we have

$$\overline{\lim_{q \to \infty}} \left\{ \frac{q}{e} \, | P^{\mu_t}(u) |^{1/q} \right\} \leqslant p'_n(u)$$

for n sufficiently large. From the relation $\mu_t(z^\alpha) = \dfrac{1}{A_{|\alpha|}} \mu(z^\alpha)$, we see that $\mu \in (E_p^{\rho(r)})'$ (resp. $(E^0)'$) if and only if

$$\overline{\lim_{q \to \infty}} \left\{ \frac{q}{e} \left| \frac{1}{A_q} \sum_{|\alpha|=q} \mu(z^\alpha) \frac{u^\alpha}{\alpha!} \right|^{1/q} \right\} \leqslant p'_n(u) \tag{8}$$

for n sufficiently large (resp. for ρ sufficiently small).

For $\mu \in (E_p^{\rho(r)})'$ (resp. $(E^0)'$), we define its Fourier-Borel transform to be the *formal* power series

$$\tilde{\mu}(u) = \mu(\exp < z, u >) = \sum_q \sum_{|\alpha|=q} \mu(z^\alpha) \frac{u^\alpha}{\alpha!} = \sum_q P_q^\mu(u).$$

If $\rho > 1$, we assume that the proximate order $\rho(r)$ satisfies :

i) $\rho(r) > 1$ for all r

ii) $\dfrac{d}{dr} (r^{\rho(r)-1}) > 0$ for all r.

By (1), these properties hold eventually, so this is an inessential assumption. Then the equation $r = t^{\rho(t)-1}$ has a unique solution for all r. We define

$$\rho^*(r) = \frac{\rho(t)}{\rho(t) - 1}, \text{ where } t \text{ is this unique solution.}$$

It is an easy calculation to show that $\rho^*(r)$ satisfies the conditions (1) and so is a proximate order. For $\rho > 1$, we designate

$$F_{Ap'}^{\rho^*(r)} = \bigcup_n E_{Ap'_n}^{\rho^*(r)},$$

where $A = \dfrac{(\rho-1)^{\frac{\rho-1}{\rho}}}{\rho}$

THEOREM 3. – *The mapping* $\mu \mapsto \tilde{\mu}(u)$ *is a one-to-one linear mapping of* $(E_p^{\rho(r)})'$ *(resp.* $(E^0)'$*) onto*

i) $F_{Ap'}^{\rho^*(r)}$ *for* $\rho > 1$

ii) *the set* $Q_{p'}^{\rho(r)}$ *of formal power series at the origin which satisfy (8) for some n for* $\rho < 1$

iii) *the set* Q_0 *of formal power series at the origin which satisfy (8) for some* $\rho > 0$ *for* $(E^0)'$.

Proof. – We have that (8) holds for some n_0. Since

$$A_q^{1/q} = \frac{\phi(q)}{(e\rho)^{1/\rho}}, \quad \frac{q}{e}\,\frac{1}{A_q^{1/q}} = \frac{A\,r_q^{\rho(r_q)-1}}{(e\rho^*)^{1/\rho^*}}$$

(where $r_q = \phi(q)$). Let $r'_q = r_q^{\rho(r_q)-1}$. Then

$$(r'_q)^{\rho^*(r'_q)} = (r_q^{\rho(r_q)-1})^{\rho^*(r_q^{\rho(r_q)-1})}$$

$$= (r_q^{\rho(r_q)-1})^{\frac{\rho(r_q)}{\rho(r_q)-1}} = r_q^{\rho(r_q)} = q$$

so if $\phi'(q)$ is the unique solution of $(r'_q)^{\rho^*(r)} = q$, we have that $\dfrac{q}{e}\,\dfrac{1}{A^{1/q}} = A\,\dfrac{\phi'(q)}{(e\rho^*)^{1/\rho^*}}$ so the mapping is into. Since the calculations are all reversible, the mapping is also onto. This proves case i). Cases ii) and iii) follow directly from (8). Q.E.D.

Let $\mu \in (E_p^{\rho(r)})'$. Then for any other element ν, we define the convolution of ν with μ, $\mu * \nu = \tau$ by $(f(z), \mu * \nu) = (\mu_w\, f(z+w), \nu)$. This is defined at least on the polynomials, which are dense in $E_p^{\rho(r)}$. For $\rho > 1$, it is also defined on the exponentials [8]. We then have the relationship (for $\rho \neq 1$) $\tilde{\tau}(u) = \tilde{\mu}(u) \cdot \tilde{\nu}(u)$, which, for the case $\rho < 1$, follows from

LEMMA 2. — *For* $\widetilde{\mu}(u)$, $\widetilde{\nu}(u) \in Q_{p'}^{\rho(r)}$ *(resp.* Q_0*), we have* $\widetilde{\tau}(u) = \widetilde{\mu}(u)\,\widetilde{\nu}(u) \in Q_{p'}^{\rho(r)}$ *(resp.* Q_0*) for* $\rho < 1$ *(i.e. these spaces are algebras).*

Proof. — We choose n_0 so large so that for $n \geqslant n_0$, (8) holds for both μ and ν. Consider such an n and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then there exist constants C_ε^μ and C_ε^ν such that

$$|P_q^\mu(u)| \leqslant C_\varepsilon^\mu [p_n'(u) + \varepsilon \,\|u\|]^q \left(\frac{\Phi(q)^\rho}{e\rho}\right)^{q/\rho} \left(\frac{e}{q}\right)^q$$

and

$$|P_q^\nu(u)| \leqslant C_\varepsilon^\nu [p_n'(u) + \varepsilon \,\|u\|]^q \left(\frac{\Phi(q)^\rho}{e\rho}\right)^{q/\rho} \left(\frac{e}{q}\right)^q .$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |P_q^\tau(u)| &= \Big|\sum_{m+n=q} P_m^\nu(u)\, P_n^\mu(u)\Big| \\ &\leqslant C_\varepsilon^\mu C_\varepsilon^\nu [p'(u) + \varepsilon \,\|u\|]^q \left(\frac{\Phi(q)^\rho}{e\rho}\right)\left(\frac{e}{q}\right)^q \\ &\qquad \sum_{m+n=q} \left[\frac{\Phi(m)^m\,\Phi(n)^n}{\Phi(m+n)^{m+n}}\right] \frac{(m+n)^{m+n}}{m^m n^n} . \end{aligned}$$

Let $r_q = \Phi(q)$. Then $\dfrac{q}{\Phi(q)} = r_q^{\rho(r_q)-1}$, and hence, since by (1), $r^{\rho(r)-1}$ is decreasing for r sufficiently large

$$\sum_{m+n=q} \frac{[r_{m+n}^{\rho(r_{m+n})-1}]^{m+n}}{[r_m^{\rho(r_m)-1}]^m\,[r_n^{\rho(r_n)-1}]^n} \leqslant K\,q \text{ for some constant } K .$$

Thus $|P_q^\tau(u)|$ satisfies (8). For Q_0, we choose ρ_0 so small that (8) holds for both μ and ν for $\rho < \rho_0$. The result then follows from the above calculations. Q.E.D.

Thus, by Theorem 3, for $\rho < 1$, the mapping $\nu \to \mu * \nu$ is a map of $(E_p^{\rho(r)})'$ (resp. $(E^0)'$) into $(E_p^{\rho(r)})'$ (resp. $(E_0)'$). If $\rho > 1$, this is only the case if $\widetilde{\mu}(u)$ is of minimal type with respect to the proximate order $\rho^*(r)$. Assuming μ to satisfy these conditions, we define $\check{\mu}$ to be the transpose of μ, $(\check{\mu}(f), \nu) = (f, \mu * \nu)$. We are interested in proving that the mapping $\check{\mu}(E_p^{\rho(r)})$ (resp. E^0) is onto (i.e. that there always exists a solution g such that $\check{\mu}(g) = f$). We will make use of [cf. 9, p. 85].

PROPOSITION 2. – *Let* E, F *be two Fréchet spaces,* α *a continuous linear map of* E *into* F. *The two following are equivalent*

i) α *is onto*

ii) ${}^t\alpha : \mathrm{F}' \to \mathrm{E}'$ *(the transpose map) is one-to-one and its image* ${}^t\alpha(\mathrm{F}')$ *is weakly closed in* E'.

We shall prove the closure of $\mu * \nu$ in the equivalent spaces as determined by Theorem 3, but first we must equip these spaces with topologies. For $\rho > 1$, we equip the space $\mathrm{F}^{\rho^*(r)}_{\mathrm{A}p'}$ with the topology of pointwise convergence. For $\rho < 1$, we equip $\mathrm{Q}^{\rho(r)}_{p'}$ (resp. Q_0) with the topology of convergence of Taylor's series coefficients. Each of these topologies is at least as weak as the weak topology.

We define a *differential operator with constant coefficients* (with respect to a given proximate order $\rho(r)$) to be

i) $\check{\mu}$ for $\mu \in (\mathrm{E}^{\rho(r)}_p)'$ for $\rho < 1$

ii) $\check{\mu}$ for $\mu \in (\mathrm{E}^0)'$

iii) $\check{\mu}$ for $\mu \in (\mathrm{E}^{\rho(r)}_p)'$ such that $\widetilde{\mu}(u)$ is of minimal type with respect to $\rho^*(r)$ for $\rho > 1$.

For $\rho > 1$, the mapping $\widetilde{\nu}(u) \to \widetilde{\mu}(u)\,\widetilde{\nu}(u)$ is closed in the topology we have chosen (the proof is carried out in [8] ; the modifications necessary to treat the case of proximate orders are obvious). Thus, we limit ourselves to the case $\rho < 1$ and E^0.

LEMMA 3. – *Let* $\mathrm{A}_n(u) = \dfrac{\mathrm{B}_{n+m}(u)}{\mathrm{C}_m(u)}$ *be a homogeneous polynomial which is the ratio of two homogeneous polynomials. Furthermore, assume that for some complex norm* $p_0(u)$ *that*

$$|\mathrm{B}_{n+m}(u)| \leqslant \mathrm{C}[p_0(u)]^{n+m}\ .$$

Then given $\delta > 0$, *there is a constant* K_δ *(depending only on* $\mathrm{C}_m(u)$ *and* δ*) such that* $|\mathrm{A}_n(u)| \leqslant \mathrm{C}\,\mathrm{K}_\delta\,[p_0(u)]^n\,(1+\delta)^{n+m}$.

Proof. – Let $\Omega = \{u : 1-\delta \leqslant p_0(u) \leqslant 1+\delta\}$. For every point u in Ω we find a polydisc (by making a non-singular linear change of variable if necessary) $\Delta(u\,;r^u)$ centered at u and lying in Ω such that $\mathrm{C}_m(u'_1, \ldots, u'_{n-1}, \xi_n) \neq 0$ for $|\xi_n - u_n| = r^u_n$ and

$$|u'_i - u_i| \leqslant r_i^u , i = 1 , \ldots , n-1 \ [2] .$$

Let $\Omega' = \{u : p_0(u) = 1\}$. We now consider the polydisc $\Delta'_u = \Delta\left(u ; \frac{r^u}{2}\right)$. Since Ω' is compact, it can be covered by a finite number of Δ'_{u^j}, $j = 1 , \ldots , \mathrm{N}$. The function $\frac{1}{\mathrm{C}_m(u)}$ is bounded, say by $\frac{\mathrm{K}_\delta}{2}$, on the compact set

$$\mathrm{K} = \bigcup_j \{u' : u' \in \Delta_{u^j} , |u'_i - u_i| \leqslant r^{u^j_i} , i = 1 , \ldots , n-1 , |u'_n - u_n| = r^{u^j_n}\} .$$

Let the function A_n take its maximum on Ω' at the point u^0. Then $u^0 \in \Delta'_{u^j}$ for some j. By Cauchy's formula

$$|\mathrm{A}_n(u^0) = \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|\xi_n - u^j_n| = r^j_n} \frac{\mathrm{B}_{n+m}(u^0_1 , \ldots , u^0_{n-1} , \xi_n)\, d\xi_n}{\mathrm{C}_m(u^0_1 , \ldots , u^0_{n-1} , \xi_n)(\xi_n - u^0_n)} \right|$$
$$= \mathrm{K}_\delta \, \mathrm{C}\, p_0(u)(1 + \delta)^{n+m} . \qquad \text{Q.E.D.}$$

THEOREM 4 (Division Theorem). – *Let* $\mathrm{H}(u)$, $\mathrm{F}(u) \in \mathrm{Q}_p^{\rho(r)}$ *for* $\rho < 1$ (*resp.* Q_0) *with* $\mathrm{H}(u) = \mathrm{F}(u)\,\mathrm{G}(u)$, *where* $\mathrm{G}(u)$ *is a formal power series at the origin. Then* $\mathrm{G}(u) \in \mathrm{Q}_p^{\rho(r)}$ (*resp.* Q_0).

Proof. – Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given and let

$$\mathrm{G}(u) = \sum_q \mathrm{R}_q(u) , \quad \mathrm{H}(u) = \sum_q \mathrm{P}_q(u) , \quad \text{and } \mathrm{F}(u) = \sum_q \mathrm{T}_q(u) ,$$

with s the smallest integer such that $\mathrm{T}_s(u) \neq 0$. We choose n_0 so large that (8) holds for both $\mathrm{H}(u)$ and $\mathrm{F}(u)$ for $n \geqslant n_0$. Thus, there exist constants C_1 and C_2 such that

$$|\mathrm{P}_q(u)| \leqslant \mathrm{C}_1 [p'_n(u) + \varepsilon \|u\|]^q \left(\frac{\phi(q)^\rho}{e\rho}\right)^{q/\rho} \left(\frac{e}{q}\right)^q$$

and

$$|\mathrm{T}_q(u)| \leqslant \mathrm{C}_2 [p'_n(u) + \varepsilon \|u\|]^q \left(\frac{\phi(q)^\rho}{e\rho}\right)^{q/\rho} \left(\frac{e}{q}\right)^q .$$

We have

$$P_{q+s}(u) = \sum_{m+k=q} R_m(u)\, T_{k+s}(u)$$

or

$$R_q(u) = \frac{P_{q+s}(u) - \sum\limits_{\substack{m+k=q \\ m \neq q}} R_m(u)\, T_{k+s}(u)}{T_s(u)}.$$

We now show by induction that there exist constants K_q (with $K_{q-1} \leqslant K_q$) such that

$$|R_q(u)| \leqslant K_q [p'_n(u) + \varepsilon \, \|u\|]^q (1+\delta)^q \, q \left(\frac{\phi(q+s)^\rho}{e\rho}\right)^{\frac{\rho+s}{\rho}} \left(\frac{e}{q+s}\right)^{q+s},$$

where $K_q = K_{q-1}$ for q sufficiently large.

For $q = 0$, it follows from Lemma 3. We assume it true for $q \leqslant q_0 - 1$.

$$|R_{q_0}(u)| \leqslant \frac{|P_{q_0+s}(u)| + \sum\limits_{\substack{m+k=q_0 \\ m \neq q_0}} |R_m(u)\, T_{k+s}(u)|}{|T_s(u)|}$$

$$\leqslant K_\delta (1+\delta)^s [p'_n(u) + \varepsilon \, \|u\|]^{q_0} (1+\delta)^{q_0} \left(\frac{\phi(q_0+s)^\rho}{e\rho}\right)^{\frac{q_0+s}{\rho}} \left(\frac{e}{q+s}\right)^{q_0+s} \times$$

$$\times \left\{ C_1 + \sum_{\substack{m+k=q_0 \\ m \neq q_0}} K_{q-1} C_2 m \left[\frac{\phi(m)^m \, \phi(k+s)^{k+s}}{\phi(k+m+s)^{k+m+s}}\right] \frac{(m+k+s)^{m+k+s}}{m^m (k+s)^{k+s}} \right.$$

$$\leqslant \max[K_0(1+\delta)^s C_1, K_{q-1} C_2] [p'_n(u) + \varepsilon \, \|u\|]^{q_0} (1+\delta)^{q_0} \left(\frac{\phi(q+s)^\rho}{e\rho}\right)^{\frac{q_0+s}{\rho}} \left(\frac{e}{q+s}\right)^{q_0+s} \times$$

$$\times \left\{ 1 + \sum_{\substack{m+k=q_0 \\ m \neq q_0}} K_\delta (1+\delta)^s m \left[\frac{\phi(m)^m \, \phi(k+s)^{k+s}}{\phi(m+k+s)^{m+k+s}}\right] \frac{(m+k+s)^{m+k+s}}{(k+s)^{k+s} m^m} \right\}.$$

We assume that the function $r^{1-\rho(r)}$ is increasing. By (1), this holds eventually, so this is an inessential assumption

$$\left[\frac{\phi(m)^m\,\phi(k+s)^{k+s}}{\phi(q_0+s)^{q_0+s}}\right]\frac{(q_0+s)^{q_0+s}}{m^m(k+s)^{k+s}}=\frac{1}{\left[\dfrac{r_{q_0+s}^{1-\rho(r_{q_0+s})}}{r_m^{1-\rho(r_m)}}\right]^m\left[\dfrac{r_{q_0+s}^{1-\rho(r_{q_0+s})}}{r_{k+s}^{1-\rho(r_{k+s})}}\right]^{k+s}}.$$

Let us assume for the moment that $k+s\leqslant\frac{3}{4}(q_0+s)$. Then

$$\left[\frac{r_{q_0+s}^{1-\rho(r_{q_0+s})}}{r^{1-\rho(r_{k+s})}}\right]^{k+s}=\left[\frac{r_{q_0+s}^{\frac{1-\rho(r_{q_0+s})}{1-\rho}\cdot\frac{\rho}{2}}}{r_{k+s}^{\frac{1-\rho(r_{k+s})}{1-\rho}\cdot\frac{\rho}{2}}}\right]^{(k+s)\frac{2}{\rho}(1-\rho)}$$

Let $\psi(r)=r^{\frac{1-\rho(r)}{1-\rho}\cdot\frac{\rho}{2}}$. Then

$$\psi(r_{q_0+s})-\psi(r_{k+s})=\int_{r_{k+s}}^{r_{q_0+s}}\frac{d}{dr}\psi(r)\,dr\geqslant\int_{\frac{3}{4}(r_{q_0+s})}^{r_{q_0+s}}\frac{d}{dr}\psi(r)\,dr\geqslant$$

$$\geqslant\int_{\frac{3}{4}(r_{q_0+s})}^{r_{q_0+s}}\frac{d}{dr}r^{\frac{\rho(r_{q_0+s})}{4}}\,dr$$

for q_0+s sufficiently large, by (1). Thus

$$\psi(r_{q_0+s})-\psi(r_{k+s})\geqslant r_{q_0+s}^{\frac{\rho(r_{q_0+s})}{4}}\left[1-\left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{1/4}\right]=\mathrm{T}(q_0+s)^{1/4}.$$

For $(k+s)\geqslant 12\,\frac{\rho}{2}\,\frac{1}{1-\rho}=\alpha$, we have

$$\left[\frac{r_{q_0+s}^{\frac{1-\rho(r_{q_0+s})}{1-\rho}\cdot\frac{\rho}{2}}}{r_{k+s}^{\frac{1-\rho(r_{k+s})}{1-\rho}\cdot\frac{\rho}{2}}}\right]^{(k+s)\frac{2}{\rho}(1-\rho)}\geqslant\left[1+\frac{\mathrm{T}(q_0+s)^{1/4}}{r_{k+s}^{\frac{1-\rho(r_{k+s})}{1-\rho}\cdot\frac{\rho}{2}}}\right]^{(k+s)\frac{2}{\rho}(1-\rho)}$$

$$\geqslant\left[1+\frac{(k+s)\,\mathrm{T}(q_0+s)^{1/4}}{r_{k+s}^{\frac{1-\rho(r_{k+s})}{1-\rho}\cdot\frac{\rho}{2}}}+\cdots+\mathrm{K}\,\mathrm{T}^{\gamma}(q_0+s)^{\gamma}+\cdots\right]^{\frac{2}{\rho}(1-\rho)},$$

where $\gamma \geqslant 3\,\dfrac{\rho}{2}\,\dfrac{1}{1-\rho}$, $\left(\text{since } r_{k+s}^{\frac{1-\rho(r_{k+s})}{1-\rho}\cdot\frac{\rho}{2}} = 0(k+s)^{1/2}\right)$

$$\geqslant T'(q_0+s)^3 .$$

For $(k+s) \leqslant \alpha + 1$

$$\left[\frac{r_{q_0+s}^{1-\rho(r_{q_0+s})}}{r_{k+s}^{1-\rho(r_{k+s})}}\right]^{k+s} \geqslant \left[\frac{r_{q_0+s}^{1-\rho(r_{q_0+s})}}{\beta}\right]^{k+s} \geqslant (\alpha+1)^2\, K_\delta\,(1+\delta)^s\, 3 ,$$

$\left(\text{where } \beta = \max_{(k+s)\leqslant\alpha} r_{k+s}^{1-\rho(r_{k+s})}\right)$ for q_0 sufficiently large. By symmetry, similar inequalities exist if we replace $(k+s)$ by m. We choose q_0 so large that $\dfrac{K_\delta(1+\delta)^s}{T'(q_0+s)^2} \leqslant \dfrac{1}{q_0}$. Thus

$$\left\{1 + \sum_{\substack{m+k=q_0\\ m\neq q_0}} K_\delta(1+\delta)^s\, m \left[\frac{\phi(m)^m\,\phi(k+s)^{k+s}}{\phi(m+k+s)^{m+k+s}}\right] \frac{(m+k+s)^{m+k+s}}{m^m(k+s)^{k+s}}\right\}$$

$$\leqslant 1 + \frac{(q_0-1)}{3} + 2 \leqslant q_0$$

for q_0 sufficiently large, which establishes the induction.

Furthermore,

$$\left[\frac{\phi(q+s)}{q+s}\right]^{q+s} = \left[r_{q+s}^{1-\rho(r_{q+s})}\right]^{q+s} = \left[\frac{\phi(q)}{q}\right]^{q+s} \left[\frac{r_{q+s}^{1-\rho(r_{q+s})}}{r_q^{1-\rho(r_q)}}\right]^{q+s}$$

$$\leqslant (1+\delta)^{q+s}\left[\frac{\phi(q)}{q}\right]^{q+s+1}$$

for arbitrary $\delta > 0$ when q is sufficiently large. Thus

$$\overline{\lim_{q\to\infty}}\left\{\frac{q}{e}\left|\frac{1}{A_q}R_q(u)\right|^{1/q}\right\} \leqslant p_n'(u) ,$$

which proves the theorem. Q.E.D.

COROLLARY. – *Let* $F(u) = \sum_q T_q(u)$, $H(u) = \sum_q P_q(u)$ *be in* $Q_p^{\rho(r)}$ (*resp.* Q_0) *and assume* $T_0 \neq 0$. *Then there exists a unique* $G(u) \in Q_p^{\rho(r)}$ (*resp.* Q_0) *such that* $F(u)\,G(u) = H(u)$.

Proof. – It is well known that the set of formal power series with non-zero constant term forms a group under multiplication. By Theorem 4, $G(u) \in Q_p^{\rho(r)}$ (resp. Q_0). Q.E.D.

Combining Theorem 4 with Proposition 2, we obtain the following

THEOREM 5. – *Let* $\check{\mu}$ *be a differential operator with constant coefficients for some space* $E_p^{\rho(r)}$ *for a complex pseudo-norm* $p(z)$ *and a proximate order* $\rho(r)$ $(\rho \neq 1)$ (*resp.* E^0). *Then for* $f \in E_p^{\rho(r)}$ (*resp.* E^0), *there always exists* $g \in E_p^{\rho(r)}$ (*resp.* E^0) *such that* $\check{\mu}(g) = f$. *For* $\rho < 1$ (*resp.* E^0), *if* $\check{\mu}(1) \neq 0$, *the solution* g *is unique.*

Proof. – As a result of Theorem 4, the mapping $\nu \to \mu * \nu$ is one-to-one and closed. If $\widetilde{\mu}(u)$ has a non-zero constant term, then by the corollary to Theorem 4, this mapping is also onto, so its transpose $\check{\mu}$ is one-to-one. Q.E.D.

We now show that for $\rho < 1$, the uniqueness of the solution has important consequences for the circular indicator function. Instead of a complex pseudo-norm, we let $p_0(z)$ be any positive upper semi-continuous complex homogeneous function (i.e. $p_0(\lambda z) = |\lambda|\, p_0(z)$). We construct the space $E_{p_0}^{\rho(r)}$ as in (6).

LEMMA 4. – *Let* $p_0(z)$ *be a positive upper semi-continuous complex homogeneous function,* $\mathfrak{F} = \{p(z) : p(z)$ *a complex norm,* $p(z) \geqslant p_0(z)\}$. *Then* $p_0(z) = \inf_{p(z) \in \mathfrak{F}} \{p(z)\}$.

Proof. – Let $D = \{z : p_0(z) < 1\}$, $D_\varepsilon = \{z : p_0(z) + \varepsilon \,\|z\| < 1\}$, which are open. Consider a complex line (λz_0), $\lambda \in C$ (which we assume to be $(\lambda(z_1, 0, \ldots, 0))$), and let

$$D^{z_0} = D \cap (\lambda z_0)\ ,\ D_\varepsilon^{z_0} = D_\varepsilon \cap (\lambda z_0)\ .$$

This determines two concentric circles in the (λz_0) line. We choose a radius $r_{z_0} < \infty$ between the radii of these two concentric circles and ε_{z_0} so small that the convex set

$$K_{z_0} = \{ z : \|z_1\| < r_{z_0} , \sqrt{\sum_{i=2}^{n} |z_i|^2} < \varepsilon_{z_0} \} \subset D .$$

We define $p_{z_0}(z) = \inf_{\frac{1}{t} z \in K_{z_0}} t$, which is a complex norm. Since D_ε is a compact set, it can be covered by a finite number of the open sets K_{z_j}, $j = 1, \ldots, N$. Then $p_0(z) \leqslant \inf_j p_{z_j}(z) \leqslant p_0(t) + \varepsilon \|t\|$.

Q.E.D.

THEOREM 6. – *Let $\rho < 1$ and let f have circular indicator $h_c^*(z)$ with respect to $\rho(r)$. Let $\mu \in \bigcap_{A > 0} (E_{A\|z\|}^{\rho(r)})'$ such that $\mu(1) \neq 0$. Then there is a unique solution g of the equation $\check{\mu}(x) = f$ such that, if $k_c^*(z)$ is the circular indicator of g with respect to $\rho(r)$, $k_c^*(z) \leqslant h_c^*(z)$.*

Proof. – Let $p_\alpha(z)$ be a family of norms such that

$$h_c^*(z)^{1/\rho} = \inf_\alpha p_\alpha(z) .$$

Then $\mu \in (E_{p_\alpha(z)}^{\rho(r)})'$ for every α, and by Theorem 5, there exists a unique solution g to the equation $\check{\mu}(g) = f$. We clearly have

$$k_c^*(z) \leqslant h_c^*(z) . \qquad \text{Q.E.D.}$$

In particular, if $P(D)$ is a differential polynomial with constant coefficients and non-zero constant term, then for $\rho < 1$, there is a unique solution g of the differential equation $P(D)\,g = f$ where g has the same circular indicator as f.

3. The case of $\rho = 1$ and convex functions.

Let h_k be a convex function, K the associated convex compact set. We make the space E_{h_k} of entire functions $F(u)$ whose convex indicator functions are less than or equal to h_k into a Frechet space as in (6) by choosing $p_n(z) = h_k(z) + \frac{1}{n} \|z\|$; $(E_{h_k})'$ is its dual space. We have the following characterization of $(E_{h_k})'$ [8].

PROPOSITION 3. – *The space* $(E_{h_k})'$ *is just the set of measures* m *for which there exists an* $\varepsilon > 0$ *such that* $m \cdot e^{h_k(z)+\varepsilon \|z\|}$ *is a bounded measure.*

We recall some of the basic notions that A. Martineau [8] used in defining the projective Laplace transformation of a function $f(z)$ of exponential type. Let V be an n-dimensional linear vector space, V′ its dual. Let P(V) be the projective space obtained from V by adding the points at infinity, P(V′) that obtained from V′ by adding the points at infinity. We write the coordinates of P(V) as (ζ_0, z), those of P(V′) as (ξ_0, ξ), and we let $\bar{\xi}$ be the hyperplane

$$\zeta_0 \cdot \xi_0 + \langle z, \xi \rangle = 0 .$$

We introduce the differential forms $\pi(z) = dz_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge dz_n$,

$$\theta(\xi) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^j \xi_j \, d\xi_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \widehat{d\xi_j} \wedge \ldots \wedge d\xi_n$$

($d\xi_j$ omitted) and $\bar{\omega}(\xi, z) = \theta(\xi) \wedge \pi(z)$, which is defined in V × P(V′).

Let Γ be the boundary of a strictly convex open set Ω and assume Γ regular and oriented by Stokes' formula $\int_{\partial\Omega} \pi = \int_{\Omega} d\pi$. To each point $z \in \Gamma$, we have the associated hyperplane $\bar{\xi}(z)$ through z tangent to Γ. This defines a manifold $\Sigma(\Gamma)$ in V × P(V′).

For a compact convex set K, we designate by $\overset{*}{\complement}K$ the open subset of P(V′) formed of hyperplanes $\bar{\xi}$ such that $\bar{\xi} \cap K = \{\phi\}$.

PROPOSITION 4 [8]. – *Suppose* K *convex and compact. Let* ψ *be a function defined in* $\overset{*}{\complement}K$, *holomorphic there, and zero at the points at infinity* ($\xi_0 = 0$). *Let* $\bar{f} \in \mathcal{H}(K)$ (*functions holomorphic in a neighborhood of* K) *and* f *a representative of* $\bar{f}$ *in an open neighborhood* Ω *of* K. *Let* ω *be a strictly convex neighborhood of* K *with regular boundary included in* Ω. *Posing*

$$T_\psi(\bar{f}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n} \int_{\Sigma(\omega)} f(z) \frac{\partial^{n-1}}{\partial \xi_0^{n-1}} \left(\frac{1}{\xi_0} \psi(\xi)\right) \bar{\omega}(z, \xi) \qquad (9)$$

we define a continuous linear functional on $\mathcal{H}(K)$ *which is independant of the choice of the representative* f *and of* ω.

Let $F(u)$ be an arbitrary element of E_{h_k}. We define the function

$$\mathcal{L}_F(\overline{\xi}) = \xi_0 \int_0^\infty F(-\xi t)\, e^{-\xi_0 t}\, dt .$$

This defines a function in $\overset{*}{C} K$ which is zero at the points at infinity $\xi_0 = 0$. The function $\mathcal{L}_F$ is called the projective Fourier-Borel transform of F. We then have

PROPOSITION 5 [8]. – *Let* $F(u) \in E_{h_k}$. *Then*

$$F(u) = \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n} \int_{\Sigma(\omega)} \exp < z , u > \frac{\partial^{n-1}}{\partial \xi_0^{n-1}} \left(\frac{\mathcal{L}_F(\xi)}{\xi_0}\right) \overline{\omega}(z , \xi), \quad (10)$$

where ω *is any strictly convex neighborhood of* K *with regular boundary.*

Let $\mu \in (E_{h_k})'$. We define the Fourier-Borel transform of μ to be $f_\mu(z) = \mu(\exp < z , u >)$, which, by Proposition 3, defines a function holomorphic in a neighborhood of K. For $\nu \in (E_{h_k})'$, we define the convolution of μ with ν as $(\nu * \mu)(F(u)) = \mu_u(\nu_v\, F(u + v))$. We refer the reader again to [8] to see that the convolution is well defined. We then have the relationship that $f_{\nu * \mu}(z) = f_\nu(z) \cdot f_\mu(z)$ where these functions are defined.

On the other hand, let $g(z)$ be a function holomorphic in a neighborhood of K. Then g defines a continuous linear operator S_g from E_{h_k} into E_{h_k} by

$$S_g(F(u)) = \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n} \int_{\Sigma(\omega)} g(z) \exp < z , u > \frac{\partial^{n-1}}{\partial \xi^{n-1}} \left(\frac{\mathcal{L}_F(\xi)}{\xi_0}\right) \overline{\omega}(z , \xi),$$

where ω is a suitably small strictly convex regular neighborhood of K.

LEMMA 5. – *Let* $\psi_{z_0} = \mathcal{L}_{\exp < z_0 , u >}$ *for* $z_0 \in K$. *Then the linear functional on* $\mathcal{H}(K)$ *determined by* ψ_{z_0}, $T_{\psi_{z_0}} = \delta(z_0)$, *the Dirac measure.*

Proof. – Let f be a representative of $\overline{f} \in \mathcal{H}(K)$ defined in some convex neighborhood ω of K. Since ω is a Runge domain, f can be uniformly approximated by polynomials in an open neighborhood of K, and since $z_i = \lim_{|\lambda| \to 0} \dfrac{e^{z_i \lambda} - 1}{\lambda}$, $\lambda \in \mathbf{C}$, f can be uniformly approximated by exponentials. But by (10), we have that $T_{\psi_{z_0}}$ is just $f(z_0)$ for the exponentials. It now follows from the uniform convergence in a neighborhood of K that $T_{\psi_{z_0}}(f) = f(z_0)$. Q.E.D.

LEMMA 6. – *Let $\nu \in (E_{h_k})'$. If f_ν is its Fourier-Borel transform, then the linear operator $Q_{f_\nu} : E_{h_k} \to E_{h_k}$ is just the transpose of the convolution $\nu * \mu$* (i.e. $(Q_{f_\nu}(F), \mu) = (F, \nu * \mu)$).

Proof. – By Proposition 3, we can represent μ by a measure m_μ such that $m_\mu e^{h_k(u) + \varepsilon \|u\|}$ is a bounded measure for ε sufficiently small. Then

$$\mu(F(u)) = \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n} \int_{\Sigma(\omega)} \mu(\exp < z, u >) \frac{\partial^{n-1}}{\partial \xi^{n-1}} \left(\frac{\mathcal{L}_F(\xi)}{\xi_0}\right) \bar{\omega}(z, \xi)$$

follows from Fubuni's theorem for ω a sufficiently small, strictly convex neighborhood of K. Thus, μ is completely determined by its values on a set of exponentials $\exp < z, u >$ defined for z in a neighborhood of K. We choose ω so small that f_ν is defined and bounded in ω. Then for $z_0 \in \omega$,

$$(Q_h(\exp < z_0, u >), \mu) =$$

$$= \mu\left(\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n} \int_{\Sigma(\omega)} \exp < z, u > f_\nu(z) \frac{\partial^{n-1}}{\partial \xi^{n-1}} \left(\frac{\psi_{z_0}(\xi)}{\xi_0}\right) \bar{\omega}(z, \xi)\right) =$$

$$= f_\nu(z_0)\, \mu(\exp < z_0, u >) = f_\nu(z_0) f_\mu(z_0) ,$$

from which the lemma follows. Q.E.D.

For $\nu \in (E_{h_k})'$, we define the differential operator with constant coefficients $\check{\nu}$ on E_{h_k} to be the transpose of the convolution operation $\mu \to \nu * \mu$ on $(E_{h_k})'$.

THEOREM 7. – *Let* $\check{\nu}$ *be a differential operator with constant coefficients on* E_{h_k}. *Then*

(a) *for* $F \in E_{h_k}$, *there always exists* $G \in E_{h_k}$ *such that* $\check{\nu}(G) = F$,

(b) *if* f_ν *has no zeros in* K, *then* G *is unique*

(c) *the polynomial exponential solutions of* $\check{\nu}(x) = 0$ *are dense in the space of all solutions of this equation.*

Proof. – (a) The mapping $\mu \to f_\mu$ is a one-to-one linear mapping of $(E_{h_k})'$ onto $\mathcal{H}(K)$. We topologize $\mathcal{H}(K)$ with the topology of convergence of the Taylor series coefficients at each point of K. This is at least as weak as the equivalente on $\mathcal{H}(K)$ of the weak topology on $(E_{h_k})'$, since, for a multi-index α,

$$\mu(u^a \exp < z_0 , u >) = \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} f_\mu(z_0)}{\partial z^\alpha}.$$

If $f_\nu \cdot f_{\mu_\gamma}$ is a filter converging to $g \in \mathcal{H}(K)$, then we must have $g = f_\gamma \cdot f_g$, since the Taylor series of g is divisible by that of f_ν at each point of K. Thus the mapping $f_\mu \to f_\nu \cdot f_\mu$ is one-to-one and closed, so $\mu \to \nu * \mu$ is also one-to-one and closed. By Proposition 2, its transpose is onto.

(b) If f_ν has no zeros in K, then $f_\mu \to f_\nu \cdot f_\mu$ is onto so $\mu \to \nu * \mu$ is onto and hence its transpose is one-to-one.

(c) See [8] and [6]. Q.E.D.

The following example, due to C.O. Kiselman, shows that in some sense the results of § 2 and § 3 are sharp. Let $P(D) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}$ and let $f(z) = \cos \sqrt{z_1 z_2}$, which is of exponential type. Let u be a solution of exponential type of $P(D)\, u = f$. Then

$$u(0,r) - u(-r,0) = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} u(-r(1-t), tr)\, dt =$$

$$= r \int_0^1 \cos r \sqrt{-t(1-t)}\, dt = \frac{r}{2} \int_0^1 (e^{r\sqrt{t(1-t)}} + e^{-r\sqrt{t(1-t)}})\, dt \geqslant$$

$$\geqslant \frac{r}{2} \int_0^1 e^{r\sqrt{t(1-t)}}\, dt \geqslant \frac{r}{2\sqrt{2}}\, e^{\frac{r}{2\sqrt{2}}} .$$

But $h_c^*(z)$ the circular indicator of $f(z)$, is zero in both the complex line $(\lambda(0, z_2))$ and $(\lambda(z_1, 0))$, so that the circular indicator (and hence the radial indicator) of u is strictly greater than that of f.

4. Functions of slow growth.

In this section, we extend the notion of a differential operator with constant coefficients to entire functions which satisfy a majoration of the form

$$|f(z)| \leqslant C_k \exp(\ln[p(z)])^k \tag{11}$$

asymptotically for some $k > 1$ and some norm $p(z)$. These functions are known to have very even growth [1].

We define the *logarithmic order* ρ of such a function to be the infemum of all k for which (11) holds. We define the *logarithmic type* σ of f (with respect to a logarithmic order ρ) to be the infemum of all b such that

$$|f(z)| \leqslant C_b \exp b(\ln p(z))^\rho .$$

These values are clearly independent of the norm used to define them.

THEOREM 8. – *Let m be a multi-index of positive numbers $m = (m_1, \ldots, m_n)$, $|m| = \Sigma m_i$. Then the logarithmic order and logarithmic type of a function f are given by*

$$\frac{\rho}{\rho - 1} = \overline{\lim_{|m|\to\infty}} \frac{\ln \ln^+ \frac{1}{|c_m|}}{\ln n} \; \textit{and} \quad \left(\frac{\rho - 1}{\rho}\right)\left[\frac{1}{\sigma\rho}\right]^{\frac{1}{\rho-1}} = \overline{\lim_{|m|\to\infty}} \frac{\ln \frac{1}{|c_m|}}{n^{\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}}$$

where $f(z) = \sum_m c_m z^m$ *and* $\ln^+ a = \sup(0, \ln a)$.

Remark. – We interpret this to mean $\rho = 1$ if the limit in (12) is infinite. In this case, if we have $\sigma < +\infty$, we have a polynomial. We do not consider this case but rather assume that if $\rho = 1$ that $\sigma = +\infty$.

Proof. – Let $b > 0$ and $k > 1$ be numbers such that

$$|f(z)| \leqslant C \exp b(\ln r)^k .$$

We assume without loss of generality that $r = \|z\|_1$, where $\|z\|_1 = \max_i |z_i|$. By applying Cauchy's formula to the distinguished boundary of the polydisc of radius r, we get

$$|c_n| \leqslant C \exp\{b(\ln r)^k - |m| \ln r\} .$$

This function takes on its maximum (for $k > 1$) when $\ln r = \dfrac{|m|^{\frac{1}{k-1}}}{kb}$ and equals $\exp\left\{\left(\frac{1}{kb}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \left(\frac{1}{k} - 1\right) |m|^{\frac{k}{k-1}}\right\}$, which establishes the theorem in one direction.

On the other hand, if $|c_m| \leqslant K \exp\left\{\left(\frac{1}{kb}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \left(\frac{1}{k} - 1\right) |m|^{\frac{k}{k-1}}\right\}$,

$$|f(z)| \leqslant \sum_m K |m|^n \exp\left\{\left(\frac{1}{kb}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \left(\frac{1}{k} - 1\right) |m|^{\frac{k}{k-1}} + |m| \ln r\right\}$$

on the distinguished boundary of the polydisc of radius r. The function $\left(\frac{1}{kb}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \left(\frac{1}{k} - 1\right) x^{\frac{k}{k-1}} + x \ln r$ takes on its maximum for

$$x = \{(kb)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \ln r\}^{k-1}$$

and equals $\exp b(\ln r)^k$.

Let $M_0 = [\{(kb)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \ln r\}^{k-1}]$ and

$$M_0' = \left[\left\{\frac{1}{2} \frac{k}{(k-1)} (kb)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \ln r\right\}^{k-1}\right]$$

("greatest integer in"). Then

$$|f(z)| \leqslant K'(\ln r)^{2n(k-1)} \exp b(\ln r)^k +$$
$$+ \sum_{|m| = M_0'+1}^{\infty} r^{|m|} \exp\left\{\left(\frac{1}{kb}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \left(\frac{1}{k} - 1\right) |m|^{\frac{k}{k-1}}\right\} .$$

But

$$\sum_{|m|=M_0'+1}^{\infty} r^{|m|} \exp\left\{\left(\frac{1}{kb}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \left(\frac{1}{k}-1\right) |m|^{\frac{k}{k-1}}\right\} \leqslant$$

$$\leqslant \sum_{|m|=M_0'+1}^{\infty} \exp\left\{\left(\frac{1}{kb}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \left(\left(\frac{1}{k}-1\right) |m|^{\frac{k}{k-1}} + |m|\,(M_0+1)^{\frac{1}{k-1}}\right)\right\}$$

and this last series is bounded independently of M_0' since

$$\left(\frac{1}{k}-1\right) |m|^{\frac{k}{k-1}} + |m|\,(M_0+1)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} =$$

$$= |m| \left(\frac{1}{k}-1\right) \left(|m|^{\frac{1}{k-1}} - \frac{(k-1)}{k} (M_0+1)^{\frac{1}{k-1}}\right) < |m| \left(\frac{1}{k}-1\right) T$$

for some $T > 0$. Q.E.D.

We let $E_{\sigma,\rho}$ be the Fréchet space that we get by taking

$$p_n = \left(\sigma + \frac{1}{n}\right) (\ln r)^{\rho}$$

in (6), E_1 that which we get by taking $p_n = (\ln r)^{\left(1+\frac{1}{n}\right)}$, and we designate their duals by $(E_{\sigma,\rho})'$ and $(E_1)'$.

Lemma 7. – *A linear functional μ on $E_{\sigma,\rho}$ (resp. E_1) is in $(E_{\sigma,\rho})'$ (resp. $(E_1)'$) if and only if*

$$|\mu(z^m)| \leqslant K_\varepsilon \exp \left[\frac{1}{(\sigma+\varepsilon)\,\rho}\right]^{\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}} \left[1-\frac{1}{\rho}\right] |m|^{\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}} \tag{13}$$

(resp.

$$|\mu(z^m)| \leqslant K_\varepsilon \exp\left[\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}\right]^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}} \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\right] |m|^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}}\Big) \tag{14}$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. – It follows from the proof of Theorem 8 that the Taylor series of an element in $E_{\sigma,\rho}$ (resp. E_1) converges to the function in this space (cf. [8]). Thus, if μ is a continuous linear functional, it follows that (13) (resp. (14)) holds.

On the other hand, if (13) (resp. (14)) holds, it follows from the estimates of Theorem 8 that μ is a continuous linear functional on $E_{\sigma,\rho}$ (resp. E_1). Q.E.D.

For $\mu \in (E_{\sigma,\rho})'$ (resp. $(E_1)'$), we define its Fourier-Borel transform $\widetilde{\mu}(u) = \mu(\exp < z , u >) = \Sigma\, \mu(z^m) \dfrac{u^m}{m\,!}$, in the sense of a formal power series at the origin. We topologize this space with the topology of convergence of coefficients. Let $Q_{\sigma,\rho}$ (resp. Q_1) be the space of formal power series whose coefficients satisfy (13) (resp. (14)) above.

For $\nu , \mu \in (E_{r,\rho})'$ (resp. $(E_1)'$), we define the convolution of μ with ν, $\nu * \mu$ to be

$$\nu * \mu(f(u)) = \mu(\nu_v(f(u + v))) \ .$$

A differential operator with constant coefficients on $E_{\sigma,\rho}$ (resp. E_1) is defined as the transpose of this convolution operation. We then have the following

THEOREM 9. – *Let $\check{\nu}$ be a differential operator with constant coefficients on the space $E_{\sigma,\rho}$ (resp. E_1). Then for $f \in E_{\sigma,\rho}$ (resp. E_1) there is always a solution $g \in E_{\sigma,\rho}$ (resp. E_1) of the equation $\check{\nu}(g) = f$. If $\check{\nu}(1) = 0$, then g is unique.*

The proof is the same as that of Theorem 6, with some alterations in the calculations of Theorem 5 to prove that the operation of convolution is closed. The details are left to the interested reader.

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to C.O. Kiselman for the many useful conversations that we had during the course of this research, for his patience, and for his encouragement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] P.D. BARRY, The minimum modulus of small integral and subharmonic functions, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) 12 (1962), 445-495.

[2] R.C. GUNNING and H. ROSSI, Analytic Functions of Several Complex Variables, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, (1965).

[3] L. HORMANDER, An Introduction to complex analysis in several variables, Princeton, N.J., Van Nostrand, 1966.

[4] P. LELONG, Non-continuous indicators for entire functions of $n \geqslant 2$ variables and finite order, *Proc. Sym. Pure Math.* 11 (1968), p. 285-297.

[5] B.Ja. LEVIN, Distribution of zeros of entire functions, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 5, A.M.S., Providence, R.I. 1964.

[6] B. MALGRANGE, Existence et approximations des solutions des équations aux dérivées partielles et des équations de convolution, *Ann. Inst. Fourier,* Grenoble, t. 6, 1955-1956, 271-355 (Thèse Sc. math., Paris, 1955).

[7] A. MARTINEAU, Sur les fonctionnelles analytiques et la transformation de Fourier-Borel, *J. Anal. math. Jérusalem,* t. 11, (1963), 1-164 (Thèse Sc. math., Paris, 1963).

[8] A. MARTINEAU, Equations différentielles d'ordre infini, *Bull. Soc. math. France,* 95, (1967), 109-154.

[9] F. TREVES, Linear Partial Differential Equations with Constant Coefficients, New York, Gordon and Breach (1966).

Manuscrit reçu le 8 mai 1971

Lawrence GRUMAN
Department of Mathematics
Sysslomansgatan 8
S – 752 23 UPPSALA,
Sweden