УДК 519.213.2+517.53

## L. V. KULYAVEC', M. M. SHEREMETA

## ON THE *l*-INDEX BOUNDEDNESS OF ENTIRE RIDGE FUNCTIONS

L. V. Kulyavec', M. M. Sheremeta. On the l-index boundedness of entire ridge functions, Mat. Stud. 40 (2013), 144–148.

The *l*-index boundedness of entire ridge functions of finite order with real zeros, entire characteristic functions of probability laws and finite Fourier-Stieltjes transforms was investigated.

Л. В. Кулявец, М. М. Шеремета. Об ограниченности l-индекса целых хребтовых функций // Мат. Студії. – 2013. – Т.40, №2. – С.144–148.

Исследована ограниченность *l*-индекса целых хребтовых функций конечного порядка с действительными нулями, целых характеристических функций вероятностных законов и финитных преобразований Фурье-Стилтьеса.

1. An entire function  $\varphi \not\equiv \text{const}$  is called ridge provided  $|\varphi(z)| \leq |\varphi(i \text{Im } z)|$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ . The concept of ridge function generalizes the concept of the characteristic functions of probability laws. In particular, entire characteristic functions form a proper subclass of ridge functions ([1, p. 42–51]). It is well known ([1, p. 45]) that zeros of an entire ridge function are symmetric with respect to the imaginary axis.

Let  $\Lambda$  be a class of positive continuous functions on  $[0, +\infty)$ . For  $l \in \Lambda$  an entire function f is called ([2, p. 5]) a function of bounded *l*-index provided there exists  $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that

$$\frac{|f^{(n)}(z)|}{n!l^n(|z|)} \le \max\left\{\frac{|f^{(k)}(z)|}{k!l^k(|z|)}: \ 0 \le k \le N\right\}$$
(1)

for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ . If (1) holds for  $l(r) \equiv 1$ , then f is called a function of bounded index. We need the following criterion of *l*-index boundedness.

**Lemma 1.** Let  $l \in \Lambda$  and  $l(r + O(\frac{1}{l(r)})) = O(l(r))$  as  $r \to +\infty$ . Let  $a_k \in \mathbb{C}$  be zeros of an entire function f,  $n(r, z_0, \frac{1}{f}) = \sum_{|a_k - z_0| \le r} 1$  and  $G_q(f) = \bigcup_k \{z : |z - a_k| \le \frac{q}{l(|a_k|)}\}$ . Then f is of bounded l-index if and only if

1) for every q > 0 there exists P = P(q) > 0 such that  $\frac{|f'(z)|}{|f(z)|} \leq P(q)l(|z)|$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus G_q(f)$ ;

2) for every 
$$q > 0$$
 there exists  $n^*(q) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that  $n\left(\frac{q}{l(|z_0|)}, z_0, \frac{1}{f}\right) \leq n^*(q)$  for all  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ .

**2.** The aim of our note is to establish the *l*-index boundedness of some classes of ridge functions. We will begin with entire ridge functions of finite order. The following theorem is correct.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 30D15, 30D99, 60E10.

Keywords: entire function; ridge function; l-index boundedness; probability law; Fourier-Stieltjes transform.

**Theorem 1.** If an entire ridge function  $\varphi$  of finite order has only real zeros and its positive zeros  $a_k$  satisfy the condition  $a_k^2 - a_{k-1}^2 \nearrow +\infty$  as  $k \to \infty$ , then  $\varphi$  is a function of bounded *l*-index with l(r) = r for  $r \ge r_0 > 0$ . The condition  $a_k^2 - a_{k-1}^2 \nearrow +\infty$  as  $k \to \infty$  can not be replaced by the condition  $a_k^2 - a_{k-1}^2 \to +\infty$  as  $k \to \infty$ .

*Proof.* By a result of Gol'dberg and Ostrovskii ([3]) every entire ridge function  $\varphi$  of finite order with only real zeros has a form

$$\varphi(z) = c e^{-\gamma z^2 + i\beta z} \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{z^2}{a_k^2} \right), \qquad (2)$$

where  $c, \gamma, \beta$  and  $a_k$  are constant,  $\gamma \ge 0$ ,  $\text{Im}\beta = 0$ ,  $a_k > 0$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a_k^2} < +\infty$ .

We put

$$\varphi_1(z) = ce^{-\gamma z^2 + i\beta z}, \quad \varphi_2(z) = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{z^2}{a_k^2}\right)$$

and we will show that each of these functions is of bounded *l*-index with l(r) = r for  $r \ge r_0 > 0$ .

Since the function  $\varphi_1$  does not have zeros and

$$\frac{|\varphi_1'(z)|}{|\varphi_1(z)|} = |-2\gamma z + i\beta| \le 2\gamma r + |\beta| \le \left(2\gamma + \frac{|\beta|}{r_0}\right)r,$$

this function is of bounded *l*-index with l(r) = r for  $r \ge r_0 > 0$  by Lemma 1.

Now we consider

$$\pi(z) = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{z}{b_k} \right), \quad b_k = a_k^2.$$

It is clear that  $b_k - b_{k-1} \nearrow +\infty$  as  $k \to \infty$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b_k} < +\infty$ . G. Fricke ([4]) proved that the function  $\pi$  is of bounded index under such conditions, and  $b_k - b_{k-1} \nearrow +\infty$  as  $k \to \infty$  can not be replaced by the condition  $b_k - b_{k-1} \to +\infty$  as  $k \to \infty$ .

In [5] it is proved that if the function  $l \in \Lambda$  satisfies  $l(r) = (1 + o(1))r^{n-1}$  as  $r \to +\infty$  for some  $n \geq 2$ , f is an entire function and  $Q(z) = c_n z^n + \cdots + c_1 z + c_0$ ,  $c_n \neq 0$ , then the function g(z) = f(Q(z)) is of bounded *l*-index if and only if f is of bounded index. Therefore, since  $\varphi_2(z) = \pi(z^2)$  and  $\pi$  are functions of bounded index,  $\varphi_2$  is of bounded *l*-index with l(r) = r $(r \geq r_0)$ .

Finally, since  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  are of bounded *l*-index with l(r) = r  $(r \ge r_0)$ , by Theorem 2.3 from [2, p. 84] their product  $\varphi$  is also of bounded *l*-index with l(r) = r for  $r \ge r_0$ .

**3.** Now we consider an entire function given by finite Fourier-Stieltjes transform

$$\varphi(z) = \int_{-a}^{a} e^{izt} dF(t), \qquad (3)$$

where  $0 < a < +\infty$  and F is a function of bounded variation. If F is non-decreasing (or non-increasing) on [-a, a], then the function (3) is ridge. If F is non-decreasing on [-a, a], F(x) = 0 for x < -a and F(x) = 1 for  $x \ge a$ , then F is a probability law and (3) is its characteristic function.

We suppose that  $F(-a) \neq F(-a+0)$  and  $F(a) \neq F(a-0)$ . Then ([6, p. 41–42]) all zeros of  $\varphi$  are contained in some strip  $\{z : |\text{Im } z| \leq h\}$  and have the form

$$z_n = \frac{\pi n}{a} + O(1), \quad n \to \pm \infty.$$
(4)

Using this result it is easy to prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.** If a function F is of bounded variation on [-a, a],  $F(-a) \neq F(-a+0)$  and  $F(a) \neq F(a-0)$ , then finite Fourier-Stieltjes transform (3) is a function of bounded index.

*Proof.* Since the functions w = z and  $w = \sin z$  are of bounded *l*-index, by Theorem 2.3 from [2, p. 34] the function

$$\pi_1(z) = \frac{\sin z}{z} = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{z^2}{n^2 \pi^2} \right),$$

and thus ([7]) the function  $\pi_2(z) = \pi_1(az)$  are also of bounded index.

In the paper [8] it is proved that if zeros  $z_n$  of an entire function f of bounded index lie on the finite system of rays and  $\psi_n = O(1)$  as  $n \to \infty$ , then the function  $f_{\psi}$  with zeros  $z_n + \psi_n$  is also of bounded index. Since the entire function  $\pi_2$  is of bounded index and has zeros  $z_n = \frac{\pi n}{a}$ , the function with zeros (4), that is the function (3), is of bounded index.  $\Box$ 

We remark that in the case of characteristic functions Theorem 2 complements the following result of S. Shah ([9]): if a function  $p(t) \ge 0$  is absolutely continuous on [-a, a],  $p(-a) \ne 0$ ,  $p(a) \ne 0$  and  $\int_{-a}^{a} p(t)dt = 1$ , then the function  $\varphi(z) = \int_{-a}^{a} e^{izt}p(t)dt$  is of bounded index.

4. For a probability law F we put  $W_F(x) = F(-x) + 1 - F(x)$ ,  $x \ge 0$ . Since the function F is non-decreasing on  $(-\infty, +\infty)$  and continuous from the right,  $F(-x) \to 0$  and  $F(x) \to 1$  as  $x \to +\infty$ , we have  $W_F(x) \searrow 0$  as  $x \to +\infty$ . The equality  $W_F(x) = 0$  for  $x \ge x_0$  is a necessary condition for  $\varphi$  to be of bounded index, because if  $W_F(x) \neq 0$  for all  $x \ge 0$ , then the characteristic function  $\varphi(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{izt} dF(t)$  is of bounded index. Indeed, if  $\varphi$  is of bounded index, then by theorem of Hayman and Shah [10-11; 2, p. 59]  $\varphi$  is a function of exponential type  $\sigma$ . Hence it follows by Theorem 2.4.2 from [1, p. 53] that  $W_F(x) > 0$  for  $0 \le x < \sigma$  and  $W_F(x) = 0$  for  $x > \sigma$ , which is impossible.

We generalize now the above statement on the unboundedness of index to the statement on the unboundedness of *l*-index. For this purpose we denote by  $\Omega$  a class of positive unbounded on  $(-\infty, +\infty)$  functions  $\Phi$  such that the derivative  $\Phi'$  is positive continuously differentiable and increasing to  $+\infty$  on  $(-\infty, +\infty)$ . For  $\Phi \in \Omega$  let  $\phi$  be the function inverse to  $\Phi'$ , and let  $\Psi(\sigma) = \sigma - \Phi(\sigma)/\Phi'(\sigma)$  be the function associated with  $\Phi$  in the sense of Newton. Let P be an arbitrary function on  $(0, +\infty)$  different from  $+\infty$  (it can take a value  $-\infty$ , but  $P \not\equiv -\infty$ ), and let  $Q(r) = \sup\{P(t) + rt \colon t > 0\}$   $(-\infty < r < +\infty)$  be the function, conjugated with P in the sense of Young.

In [12] it is proved that if  $\Phi \in \Omega$ , then  $Q(r) \leq \Phi(r)$  for all  $r \geq r_0$  if and only if  $P(x) \leq -x\Psi(\phi(x))$  for all  $x \geq x_0$ . Therefore, if we put  $\mu(r,\varphi) = \sup\{W_F(x)e^{rx} \colon x \geq 0\}$  for  $r \geq 0$  and  $P(x) = W_F(x)$ , then  $Q(r) = \mu(r,\varphi)$  for  $r \geq 0$  and the following lemma is correct.

**Lemma 2.** Let  $\Phi \in \Omega$ . In order that  $\ln \mu(r, \varphi) \leq \Phi(r)$  for all  $r \geq r_0$ , it is necessary and sufficient that  $\ln W_F(x) \leq -x\Psi(\phi(x))$  for all  $x \geq x_0$ .

Using Lemma 2 we prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.** If  $\Phi \in \Omega$  and

$$\lim_{x \to +\infty} \frac{1}{x} \Phi' \left( \Psi^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{x} \ln \frac{1}{W_F(x)} \right) \right) = 0$$

then the function  $\varphi$  is of unbounded *l*-index with  $l(r) = \Phi'(r)$  for all r > 0 large enough.

*Proof.* We suppose that  $\varphi$  is of bounded *l*-index. Then  $\varphi$  is of bounded *l*-*M*-index, that is ([2, p. 74]) there exists  $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $r \ge 0$ 

$$\frac{M(r,\varphi^{(n)})}{n!l^n(r)} \le \max\left\{\frac{M(r,\varphi^{(k)})}{k!l^k(r)} \colon 0 \le k \le N\right\},\,$$

where  $M(r, \varphi) = \max\{|\varphi(z)| \colon |z| = r\}.$ 

Theorem 4.4 from [2, p. 83] implies that if the function l is positive and continuously differentiable on  $[0, +\infty)$ ,

$$\lim_{r \to +\infty} \frac{(-l'(r))^+}{l^2(r)} < +\infty \text{ and } \int_0^{+\infty} l(t)dt = +\infty,$$

and if  $\varphi$  is an entire function of bounded *l*-*M*-index, then  $\ln M(r,\varphi) = O(L(r))$  as  $r \to +\infty$ , where  $L(r) = \int_0^r l(t)dt$ . Since  $\Phi \in \Omega$  is positive and continuously differentiable on  $[0, +\infty)$ , the function  $l(r) = \Phi'(r)$  for *r* large enough satisfies the condition of Theorem 4.4 from [2, p. 83] and, thus,  $\ln M(r,\varphi) = O(\Phi(r))$  as  $r \to +\infty$ . Taking into account [1, p.54]  $\mu(r,\varphi) \leq 2M(r,\varphi)$  we have  $\ln \mu(r,\varphi) \leq K\Phi(r)$  with K = const > 0 for all  $r \geq r_0$ . Using Lemma 2 with  $K\Phi(r)$  instead of  $\Phi(r)$ , we obtain the inequality  $\ln W_F(x) \leq -x\Psi(\varphi(x/K))$  for  $x \geq x_0$ , i.e.

$$\frac{1}{x}\Phi'\left(\Psi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{x}\ln\frac{1}{W_F(x)}\right)\right) \ge \frac{1}{K} > 0,$$

which is impossible.

Theorem 3 an for entire characteristic function of finite order implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.** If  $\rho \in (1, +\infty)$  and

$$\lim_{x \to +\infty} \frac{1}{x^{\varrho/(\varrho-1)}} \ln \frac{1}{W_F(x)} = 0,$$
(5)

then  $\varphi$  is a function of unbounded *l*-index with  $l(r) = r^{\varrho-1} (r \ge r_0)$ .

Indeed, if we choose  $\Phi(r) = r^{\varrho}$  for  $r \ge r_0$ , then we have  $\Phi'(r) = \varrho r^{\varrho-1}$   $(r \ge r_0)$  and  $\Psi^{-1}(x) = \frac{\varrho x}{\varrho-1}$   $(x \ge x_0)$ . Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{x}\Phi'\left(\Psi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{x}\ln\frac{1}{W_F(x)}\right)\right) = \left(\frac{\varrho r}{\varrho-1}\right)^{\varrho-1}\frac{1}{x^{\varrho}}\ln^{\varrho-1}\frac{1}{W_F(x)}$$

and the condition of Theorem 3 holds provided (5). Since  $\ell(r) = \Phi'(r) = \rho r^{\rho-1}$   $(r \ge r_0)$ , the proof of the corollary is complete.

## REFERENCES

- Linnik Yu.V., Ostrovskii I.V., Decomposition of random variables and vectors. Moscow: Nauka, 1972. – 479 p. (in Russian)
- 2. Sheremeta M.M. Analytic functions of bounded index. Lviv: VNTL Publishers, 1999. 141 p.
- 3. Gol'dberg A.A., Ostrovskii I.V. On the growth of entire ridge functions with real zeros// Matem. fizika and funk. analysis. 1974. №5. P. 3–10. (in Russian)
- Fricke G.H. Entire functions having positive zeros// Indian Journ. Pure and Appl. Math. 1974. V.5, №2. – P. 478–485.
- Sheremeta M.M. On entire functions and Dirichlet series of bounded l-index// Izv. vuzov, Matem. 1992. – №2. – P. 81–87. (in Russian)
- 6. Sedletskii A.M., Classes of analytic Fourier transforms and exponential approximations. M.: Fizmatlit, 2005. 503 p. (in Russian)
- Fricke G.H. A characterisation of functions of bounded index// Indian Journ. of Math. 1972. V.14, №3. – P. 207–212.
- Sheremeta M.M. Problems in the theory of entire functions of bounded index and functions of sine type// Mat. Stud. - 2001. - V.15, №2. - P. 217-224.
- Shah S.M. Entire functions whose Fourier transforms vanish outside a finite interval// J. Math. Anal. and Appl. - 1976. - V.53, №1. - P. 174-185.
- 10. Hayman W.K. Differential inequalities and local valency// Pacific J. Math. 1973. V.44. P. 117-137.
- 11. Shah S.M. Entire functions of bounded index// Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 1968. V.19. P. 1017-1022.
- Sheremeta M.M., Sumyk O.M. Relation between the growth of functions conjugated in the sense of Young// Mat. Stud. - 1999. - V.11, №1. - P. 41-47. (in Ukrainian)

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv ljubasik26@gmail.com m\_m\_sheremeta@list.ru

> Received 3.09.2013 Revised 20.11.2013