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1. Introduction. Let $\Sigma$ denote the set of functions that are, analytic and univalent in $\{z: 0<|z|<1\}$ and are normalized by
$f(z)=\frac{1}{z}+\sum_{n=0} a_{n} z^{n},(0<|z|<1)$.
In [6] K. Löwner showed that if $f \in \Sigma$ then
$\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|<\frac{1}{|z|^{2}\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)},(0<|z|<1)$.
Except for an additive constant there is a unique function in $\Sigma$ for whichisquality in (2) holds at a point $z_{0}$. If $z_{0}=r(0<r<1)$ the extremal functions are
$f(z)=\frac{1}{z}+a_{0}-\frac{\left(1-r^{2}\right) z}{1-r z}$
Throughout this paper we let
$M(r)=\max _{|z|=r}\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|$
whenever $f$ is analytic on $\{z:|z|=r\}$. Inequality (2) implies that $(1-r) M(r)$ is und-
formly bounded over $\Sigma$ as $r^{\prime} \rightarrow 1$. Since the extremal functions for (2) vary with $z_{0}$ it is not clear whether is a function in $\Sigma$ for which $\prod_{r \rightarrow 1}(1-r) M(r)>0$.

Our first theorem shows that this is not possible since
$\varlimsup_{r \rightarrow 1}(1-r) M(r)=0$.
for each function in $\Sigma$. The proof is a consequence of the area theorem which asserts that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=1} n\left|a_{n}\right|^{2}<1 \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

whenever $f \in \Sigma[7, \mathrm{p} .210]$. We also show that (5) is sharp in that there is no prescribed rate at which $(1-r) M(r)$ tends to zero for all functions in $\Sigma$. This is proved by an application of Ahlfor's distortion theorem to a suitable conformal mapping.

Similar results are obtained for the growth of the integral means. We shall let
$I(f ; r, p)=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d \theta$
whero $z=r e^{10}$ and $p>0$, whenever $f$ is analytic on $\{z:|z|=r\}$. We show that $(1-r)^{p-1} I\left(f_{i} r, p\right)$ is uniformly bounded over $\Sigma$ as $r \rightarrow 1$ whenever $p>2$. Also, if $p>2$ and $f \in \Sigma$ then $(1-r)^{p-1} I(f ; r, p) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 1$.

Let $S$ denote the set of functions that are analytic and univalent in $\Delta=\{z:|z|<1\}$ and are normalized by

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(z)=z+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n},(|z|<1) . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

We show that the results quoted above have equivalent formulations for $S$ which involve $g^{\prime}(z) / g^{2}(z)$. We also use the arguments developed for $\Sigma$ to obtain analogous results for the derivatives of bounded functions in $S$.

In the last section we obtain estimates on $M(r)$ and $I(f ; r, p)$ for functions that are analytic and bounded in $\Delta$. Examples are given which depend on infinite Blaschke products and gap series.
2. Meromorphic, univalent functions.

Theorem 1. If $f \in \Sigma$ then $\lim _{r \rightarrow 1}(1-r) M(r)=0$.
Proof. Suppose that $f \in \Sigma$ and $f$ has the Laurent expansion (1). If $N$ is any positive . integer then
$r^{2} M(r)<1+\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} n\left|a_{n}\right|+\sum_{n=N}^{\infty} n\left|a_{n}\right| r^{n *-1}$.
Cauchy's inequality implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=N} n\left|a_{n}\right| r^{n+1} & <\left\{\sum_{n=N}^{\infty} n\left|a_{n}\right|^{2}\right\}^{1 / 2} \cdot\left\{\sum_{n=N} n r^{2(n+1)}\right\}^{1 / 2} \leqslant \\
& <\left\{\sum_{n=N}^{\infty} n\left|a_{n}\right|^{2}\right\}^{1 / 2}\left\{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n r^{2(n-1)}\right\}^{1 / 2}= \\
& =\frac{1}{1-r^{2}} \cdot\left\{\sum_{n=N}^{\infty} n\left|a_{n}\right|^{2}\right\}^{1 / 2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Using this inequality in (9) we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
r^{2}\left(1-r^{2}\right) M(r)<\left(1-r^{2}\right)\left[\left(1+\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} n\left|a_{n}\right|\right]+\left\{\sum_{n=N} n\left|a_{n}\right|^{2}\right\}^{1 / 2} .\right. \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $\epsilon>0$ then the convergence of the series in (6) implies that
$\left\{\sum_{n=N} n\left|a_{n}\right|^{2}\right\}^{2 / 2}<\epsilon / 2$
for some integer $N$. With $N$ so chosen, there is a number $\delta>0$ so that
$\left(1-r^{2}\right)\left[1+\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} n\left|a_{n}\right|\right]<c / 2$
whenever $1-\delta<r<1$. Because of $(10)$ this shows that $(1-r) M(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 1$.
Theorem 2. Suppose that $e$ is a positive function defined on $(0,1)$ so that $e(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 1$. There is a function $f$ in $\Sigma$ for which
$\lim _{r \rightarrow 1} \frac{(1-r) M(r)}{e(r)}=\infty$.
Proof. Since $\epsilon(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 1$ there is an increasing sequence $\left\{\rho_{n}\right\}$ so that $\rho_{1} \geqslant 0$, $\rho_{n} \rightarrow 1$ and $\epsilon(r)<1 / r$ whenever $\rho_{n} \leqslant r \leqslant \rho_{n+1}$. By approximating the step function defined by $\alpha(r)=2 / n$, if $\rho_{n} \leqslant r \leqslant \rho_{n}+1$, we obtain a function $\beta$ which is differentiable on $\left[\rho_{1}, 1\right)$ and satisfies $\beta^{\prime}(r)<0, \beta(r)>\epsilon(r)$ and $\beta(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 1$. If $\gamma(r)=\beta(r)+$ $+\sqrt{1-r}$, then the function $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ has the additional property that its graph has a vertical tangent at $(0,0)$.

Let $\phi$ be an increasing differentiable function defined for $t \geqslant 0$ so that $\phi(t) \rightarrow+\infty$ as $t \rightarrow+\infty$. If $\omega(t)=\phi(t)+t^{2}+t$ then $\omega$ has the additional properties that $\omega^{\prime}(t) \geqslant 1>0$ and $\omega^{\prime}(t) \rightarrow+\infty$ as $t \rightarrow+\infty$. Let $D=\{s:|\operatorname{Ims}|<\pi / 2\}$. A simply connected domain $E$ shall be defined in terms of $\omega$. We require that $E \subset D$, and $E$ contains and is symmetric
with respect to the realaxis. Also, if the boundary of $E$ is given by the curves $y=\lambda(x)$ and $y=-\lambda(x)$ then we require that for $x \geqslant t_{0}$,
$\lambda(x)=\frac{\pi}{4 \omega^{\prime}(x)}$.
Let $\psi$ denote the analytic function that maps $E$ one-to-one onto $D$ so that $\psi(-\infty)=$ $=-\infty, \psi(0)=0$ and $\psi(+\infty)=+\infty$. If $t$ is real and $t>t_{0}$ then
$\psi(t)>\psi\left(t_{0}\right)+\pi \int_{t_{0}}^{t} \frac{1}{2 \lambda(x)} d x-4 \pi$
whenever $\int_{f_{0}}^{t} 1 /(2 \lambda(x)) d x>2$ [3, p. 136]. Equation (12) thereby implies that if $t$ is sufficiently large, then $\psi(t)>\psi\left(t_{0}\right)+2 \omega(t)-4{ }^{\prime}>\omega(t)$. Therefore,
$\psi(t)>\phi(t)$
for sufficiently large $t$. This asserts that $E$ may be obtained so that on the positive real axis the mapping function $\psi$ tends to $\infty$ as fast as we like. This is equivalent to having the inverse of $\psi$ tend to $\infty$ as slowly as possible, in terms of a given monotone differentiable function.

Let $u=\phi(z)$ be the:composite function given by $z \rightarrow s \rightarrow t \rightarrow u$ where $z \in \Delta, s=$ $=\log (1+2) /(1-2), t=\log (1+u) /(1-u)$ and $s=\bar{\psi}(t)$. Then $\phi$ maps $\Delta$ one-to-- one onto a subset of $\Delta$ and $\phi(z) \rightarrow 1$ as $z \rightarrow 1$. Since $z \rightarrow s$ and $t \rightarrow u$ are inverse mappings the previous argument implies that with $\gamma$ given there is a domain $E$ so that
$\phi(r)<1-\gamma(r)$
whenever $0<r<1$ and $r$ is sufficiently close to 1 .
We claim that there is an increasing sequence $\left\{r_{n}\right\}$ of positive numbers so that $r_{n} \rightarrow 1$ and
$1-\phi\left(r_{n}\right)<\left(1-r_{n}\right) \phi^{\prime}\left(r_{n}\right)$
for $n=1,2, \ldots$ If no such sequence exists then there is number $r_{0}\left(0<r_{0}<1\right)$ so that $1-\phi(r) \geqslant(1-r) \phi^{\prime}(r)$ whenever $r_{0}<r<1$. Integrating this inequality from $r_{0}$ to $r$ we find that $\frac{1-\phi(r)}{1-r}>\frac{1-\phi\left(r_{0}\right)}{1-r_{0}}$ for $r_{0}<r<1$. This inequality is inconsistent with (15) and the fact that $\gamma$ has a vertical tangent at $(1,1)$.

Using equations (16) and (15) and $\gamma(r)>e(r)$ we conclude that
$\left(1-r_{n}\right) \phi^{\prime}\left(r_{n}\right)>\epsilon\left(r_{n}\right)$

If $A=\phi^{\prime}(0)$ then $A \neq 0$ and $f=(A / \phi) \in \Sigma$. Since $\phi\left(r_{n}\right) \rightarrow 1$ this implies that ( $1-$ $\left.-r_{n}\right)\left|f^{\prime}\left(r_{n}\right)\right|>(|.4| / 2) \in\left(r_{n}\right)$ for sufficiently large $n$ If, in the initial argument, we replace $\varepsilon$ by $\sqrt{e}$ this shows that there is a function $f$ in $\Sigma$ and a sequence $\left\{r_{n}\right\}$ so that $r_{n} \rightarrow 1$ and $\frac{\left(1-r_{n}\right)\left|f^{\prime}\left(r_{n}\right)\right|}{c\left(r_{n}\right)} \rightarrow+\infty$. This proves (11).

The argument given in Theorem 2 depends only on a local property of $f$. Our example at $z=1$ locally maps onto the exterior of a region with a suitable cusp. The next theorem indicates to what extent $\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|$ may tend to $\infty$ on an average. One assertion is uniform over $\Sigma$ and the other holds for individual functions in $\Sigma$.

Theorem 3. There is a positive constant $C$ such that if $p>2$ and $f \in \Sigma$ then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d \theta<\frac{C}{(1-r)^{p-1}} \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $p>2$ and $f \in \Sigma$ then
$\lim _{r \rightarrow 1}\left\{(1-r)^{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2 \pi} \quad \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d \theta\right\}=0$.
Proof. Suppose that $f \in \Sigma$ and $f$ has the expansion (1). Parseval's formula implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)\right|^{2} d 0=1+\sum_{n=1}^{\mathbb{Z}} n^{2}\left|a_{n}\right|^{2} r^{2(n+1)} . \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $r^{n+1}(1-r) \leqslant \max _{0<r<1} r^{n+1}(1-r)=\left(\frac{n+1}{n+2}\right)^{n+1} \frac{1}{n+2}$ it follows f that $n n^{2(n+1)}<\frac{n}{n+1} \quad\left(\frac{n+1}{n+2}\right)^{n+1} \quad \frac{1}{1-r^{2}}<\frac{1}{2\left(1-r^{2}\right)}$, for $0<r<1$ and
$n=1,2, \ldots$ This inequality and (6) imply that $\sum_{n=1}^{m} n^{2}\left|a_{n}\right|^{2} r^{2(n+1)}<\frac{1}{2\left(1-r^{2}\right)}$.
Because of (20) this proves (18) in the case $p=2$ and with $C=3 / 2$.
Now suppuse that $p>2$. We apply (2) and (18) in the case $p=2$ to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d \theta<\frac{1}{\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{p-2}} \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)\right|^{2} d \theta< \\
& <\frac{1}{\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{p-2}} \frac{3}{2\left(1-r^{2}\right)}=\frac{3}{2\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{p-1}}<\frac{3}{2(1-r)^{p-1}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We next prove (19) in the case $p=2$. If $N$ is any positive integer then from (20) we find that
$\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2}-f^{\prime}(z)\right|^{2} d \theta<1+\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} n^{2}\left|a_{n}\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{2\left(1-r^{2}\right)} \bar{\sum}_{n=N} n\left|a_{n}\right|^{2}$.
Suppose that $\epsilon>0$. Since the series in (6) converges there is an integer $N$ so that $\sum_{n=N}^{\infty} n\left|a_{n}\right|^{2}<e$. Next $\delta$ is choosen so that $\delta>0$ and $(1-r)\left[1+\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} n^{2}\left|a_{n}\right|^{2}\right]<\epsilon / 2$ whenever $1-\delta<r<1$. Because of $(21)$ this proves that $(1-r) \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)\right|^{2} d 0 \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 1$.

Now, suppose that $p>2$ and $f \in \Sigma$. Inequality (2) and (19) in the case $p=2$ imply that
$(1-r)^{p-1} \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d 0<(1-r)^{p-1} \frac{1}{\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{p-2}}$.
$\cdot \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)\right|^{2} d \theta \leqslant(1-r) \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)\right|^{2} d \theta \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 1$.
Inequality (18) cannot be improved in the sense that if
$A(p)=\sup _{0<r<1} \max _{f \in \Sigma}\left\{(1-r)^{p-1} \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)\right| p d 0\right\}$
then $A(p)>0$ for $p>2$. We need the following inequalitics:
$(a+b)^{p}<a^{p}+b^{p} \quad(a \geqslant 0, b>0,0<p<1)$.
$(a+b)^{p}<2^{p-1} \quad\left(a^{p}+b^{p}\right)(a>0, b>0, p>1)$.
These are proved in [2, p. 57] and combined assert that $(a+b)^{p}<C_{p}\left(a^{p}+b^{p}\right)$ where $C_{p}>0$. If $f$ is defined by equation (3), then to emphasize that $f$ depends on $r$ we write $f(z)=f_{r}(z)$. Since $z^{2} f_{r}^{\prime}(z)=-1-\left[\left(1-r^{2}\right) z^{2} /(1-r z)^{2}\right]$ we conclude that $\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} f_{r}^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d \theta>C_{p}\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{p} r^{2 p} \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \frac{1}{|1-r|^{2 p}} d \theta-2 \pi$.

Where, as usual, $z=r e^{10}$. There are positive constants $D_{\varphi}$ so that if $q>1$ and $z=R e^{1 \theta}$ then
$\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \frac{1}{11-2:\left.\right|^{q}} d \theta>\frac{D_{q}}{(1-R)^{q-1}}$
[ $8, \mathrm{p} .262$ ]. If (26) is used in (25) we see that
$\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} f_{p}^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d \theta>\frac{C_{p} D_{2 p} r^{2 p}}{\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{p-2}}-1$
whenever $p>12$. This implies that $A(p) \geqslant\left(C_{p} D_{2 p}\right) /\left(2^{p-8}\right)$ whenever $p>1 / 2$. In particulas, $A(p)>0$ for $p>2$.

The problem of the determining the best estimate on
$\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d \theta$
where $f \in \Sigma$ and $p<2$ seems to be difficult. The best known result in the case $p=1$ is the assertion that
$\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)\right| d \theta<\frac{A}{(1-r)^{1 / 2-1 / 300}}$
for a positive constant $A$.
3. Aralytic, univalent functions. If $f \in \Sigma$ then there is a complex nuber $c$ so that $f(z) \neq c$ for $0<|z|<1$. Thus the function $g=1 /(f-c) \in S$ and $-\left[\left(g^{\prime}(z)\right) /\left(g^{2}(z)\right)\right]=$ $=f^{\prime}(z)$. Conversely, if $g \in S$ then $f=(1 / g) \in \Sigma$ and $f^{\prime}(z)=-\left[\left(g^{\prime}(z)\right) /\left(g^{2}(z)\right)\right]$. This implies that
$\left\{-\frac{g^{\prime}(z)}{g^{2}(z)}: g \in S\right\}=\left\{f^{\prime}(z): f \in \Sigma\right\}$
whenever $0<|z|<1$.
Because of (27) the results about $\sum$ described in section 2 have equivalent formulations for $S$. For exanuple, inequality (2) implies the sharp inequality
$\left|\frac{z^{2} g^{\prime}(z)}{g^{2}(z)}\right|<\frac{1}{1-|z|^{2}}$,
where $g \in S$ and $|z|<1$, and inequality (18) implies that if $p>2$ and $g \in S$ then
$\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|\frac{z^{2} g^{\prime}(z)}{g^{2}(z)}\right| p d 0<\frac{C}{(1-r)^{p-1}}$.
The arguments used to prove Theorems 1,2 and 3 may be adapted to resolve similar problems for the derivatives of bounded functions in $S$. We shall outline how the arguments proceed and point out that the results do not depend on the normalizations given for $S$.

Suppose that $g$ is analytic in $\Delta$ and
$g(z)=\sum_{n=0} b_{n} z^{n},(|z|<1)$.
If $g$ also satisfies $|g(z)|<M,(|z|<1)$, then
$\left|z^{\prime}(z)\right| \leqslant \frac{M}{1-|z|^{2}}$
[ 5, p. 330]. If, in addition, $g$ is univalent in $\Delta$ then as $g$ maps $\Delta$ onto a set having area at most $\pi M^{2}$ we conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=0} n\left|b_{n}\right|^{2}<M^{2} \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following theorem is a consequence of the convergence of the series in (30) and the proof is sinilar to the proof of Theorem 1.

Theorem 4. If $g$ is analytic, univalent and bounded in $\Delta$ then $(1-r) M(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 1$.
Theorem 4 is sharp in the sense described in Theorem 2. This actually is shown in the proof of Theorein 2 where an extremal function $g$ for this assertion is $g=\phi$, and say $M=1$. The assertions of Theorem 3 also hold where $f$ is replaced by $g$ (and $g$ is analytic, univalent and bounded). The argument depends on the inequalities (29) and (30). Inequality (18) is replaced by
$\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|z^{2} g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d \theta<\frac{C M^{2}}{(1-r)^{p-1}}$
where $C$ is an absolute constant and $p>2$.
4. Bounded, analytic functions. We now examine problems about the growth of $\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|$ where $g$ is analytic and bounded in $\Delta$ (and not necessarily univalent) and for simplicity take the bound to be 1. Let $B$ denote the set of functions $g$ that are analytic in $\Delta$ and satisfy $|g(z)|<1$ for $|z|<1$.

Inequality (29) asserts that if $g \in B$ then
$\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|<\frac{1}{1-|z|^{2}},(|z|<1)$.
Equality in (32) at $z=z_{0}\left(\left|z_{0}\right|<1\right)$ occurs only for the functions
$g(z)=x \frac{z-z_{0}}{1-\bar{z}_{0} z}$
where $|x|=1$.
Since $g$ in (33) depends on $z_{0}$ it isn't clear whether there is a function $g$ in $B$ for which
$\overline{\lim }_{r \rightarrow 1}(1-r) M(r)>0$.

We now provide an example where (34) holds. Suppose that
$g(z)=\prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{z-z_{k}}{1-\bar{z}_{k} z}$
where $\left|z_{k}\right|<1$ and
$\sum_{k=1}^{艹}\left(1-\left|z_{k}\right|\right)<+\infty$.

Condition (36) ensures that (35) converges in $\Delta$ uniformly on compact subsets [2, p. 19]. Since

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|g^{\prime}\left(z_{n}\right)\right|=\frac{1}{1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}} \prod_{k \rightarrow n}\left|\frac{z_{n}-z_{k}}{1-\bar{z}_{k} z_{n}}\right| \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

inequality (34) holds if there is a positive constant $\delta$ so that
$\prod_{k=n}\left|\frac{z_{n}-z_{n}}{1-z_{k} z_{n}}\right| \geqslant \delta$ for $n=1,2, \ldots$
Inequalits (38) is the definition that $\{z\}\}$ is uniformly separated and a sufficient condition for this is
$1-\left|z_{k}+1\right|<C\left(1-\left|z_{k}\right|\right)$ for $k=1,2, \ldots$
where $0<C<1$ [2, p. 155]. Thus, by letting $\left|z_{k}\right| \rightarrow 1$ geometrically we obtain our example. The example becomes even more interesting if $\left\{z_{k}\right\}$ is also choosen so that each point on $\partial \Delta$ is a point of accumulation of $\left\{z_{k}\right\}$.

The argument given to prove that (39) inylies (38) shows that
$\prod_{k \neq n}\left|\frac{z_{n}-z_{k}}{1-\bar{z}_{k} z_{n}}\right|>\left[\prod_{n=1} \frac{1-C^{n}}{1+C^{n}}\right]^{2}$.
Since the right-hand side of (40) tends 1 as $C \rightarrow 0$ we see that to each number $A$ so that $0<A<1$, there is a function in $B$ for which

$$
\begin{equation*}
\overline{\lim }_{r \rightarrow 1}\left(1-r^{2}\right) M(r) \geqslant A \tag{41}
\end{equation*}
$$

We raise the problem of whether there is a function in $B$ for which
$\varlimsup_{r \rightarrow 1}\left(1-r^{2}\right) M(r)=1$.
$r \rightarrow 1$

We next examine the growth of the integral means of the derivatives of functions in $B$. The first theorem determines the exact upper bounds for these means when $0<p<2$. The following inequality is needed for that argument.

Lemma. If $m$ is a non-negative integer and
$\frac{m}{m+1}<r<\frac{m+1}{m+2}$
then
$n r^{n-1}<(m+1) r^{m}$ for $n=1,2, \ldots$
Proof. We may assume that $r>0$, and we let $n_{0}=-1 / \log r$. Since the functions $y=x-\log (1+x)$ and $y=\log (1+x)-[x /(1+x)]$ are increasing for $x>0$,
$k<\frac{1}{\left(\log \left(1+\frac{1}{k}\right)\right)}<k+1$ for $k=1,2, \ldots$

Applying this inequality and (42) we conclude that
$m<n_{0}<m+2$.
The function $\mu(n)=n r^{n-1}(n>0)$ is increasing for $0<n<n_{0}$ and decreasing for $n>n_{0}$. If $n$ varies over the posture integers then (44) implies that the maxinuin of $\mu$ occurs at $m, m+1$ or $m+2$. Now, $\mu(m)<\mu(m+1)$ as this is equivalent to $r>$ $>m \mid m+1$. Also, $\mu(m+2)<\mu(m+1)$ since this is equivalent to $r^{2}<(m+1) /(m+2)$, which follows from $r<(m+1) /(m+2)$. This proves (43).

We also note that equality in (43) occurs only for $n=m+1$ when $m / m+1<r<$ $<(m+1) /(m+2)$ and only for $n=m$ and $n=m+1$ when $r=m / m+2$.

Theorem 5. If $g \in B$ and $0<p<2$ then
$\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(2)\right|^{p} d \theta \leqslant(m+1)^{p} r^{m p}$
where $m$ is the greatest integer in $r /(1-r)$.
Proof. $m$ is the integer for which $m<r /(1-r)<m+1$ and this inequality is the . same as (42).

If $g \in B$ and $g$ lias the representation (28) then
$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left|b_{n}\right|^{2}<1$
[2, p. 8]. The Lemma assert that if $A(r)=\sup \left\{n r^{n-1}: n=1,2, \ldots\right\}$ then $A(r)=$ $=(m+1) r^{m}$. Thus,
$\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(2)\right|^{2} d \theta=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2}\left|b_{n}\right|^{2} r^{2(n-1)}<A^{2}(r) \sum_{n=1}\left|b_{n}\right|^{2} \leqslant A^{2}(r)$.
This proves (45) in the case $p=2$.
Now, suppose that $0<p<2$. Hölder's inequality completes the proof, as follows $\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d \theta \leqslant\left\{\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{2} d \theta\right\}^{p / 2} \leqslant\left\{(m+1)^{2} r^{2 m}\right\}^{p / 2}=(m+1)^{p, p m}$

The argument also shows that if $m / m+1<r<(m+1) /(m+2)$ then equality in (45) holds only for the functions $g(z)=x z^{m+1}$ where $|x|=1$. When $r=m / m$ it 1 equality occurs only for the functions $g(z)=x z^{m+1}$ and $g(z)=x z^{m}$ where $\mid x i=1$.

The precise upper bounds given by (45) grow with the same order as the "trivial' estimates given by (32). Namely, (32) implies that
$\frac{1}{2 \pi} \cdot \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(2)\right|^{p} d \theta<\frac{1}{\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{p}}$,
which is asymptotic to $1 /\left[2^{p}(1-r)^{p}\right]$ as $r \rightarrow 1$. On the other hand, when $r=m / m+1$ the right hand side of $(45)$ becomes $\left[1 /(1-r)^{p}\right] r^{p(r /(1-r))}$, which is asymptotic to $1 /\left[e^{p}(1-r)^{p}\right]$ as $r \rightarrow 1$.

Inequality (45) cannot hold for large values of $p$. This is a consequence of the fact that if $g$ is analytic in $\Delta$ and $0<r<1$ then
$\lim _{p \rightarrow-}\left(\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d 0\right)^{v / p}=\max _{|z|=r}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|$.
If we let $g(z)=(z-r) /(1-r z)$ then the right hand side of $(47)$ is $1 /\left(1-r^{2}\right)$ and if $g(z)=x z^{n}(|x|=1)$ then

$$
\left(\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d \theta\right)^{1 / p}=n r^{n-1}
$$

Our assertion follows from the inequality sup $\left\{n r^{n-1}: n=1,2, \ldots\right\}<1 /\left(1-r^{2}\right)$, which is not difficult to show.

Theorem 6. If $g \in B$ and $p>0$ then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{r \rightarrow 1}\left\{(1-r)^{p} \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d \theta\right\}=0 \tag{48}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Using the notation in the proof of Theorem 5, we see that if $N$ is a positive integer then
$\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{2} d \theta \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \sum^{2}\left|b_{n}\right|^{2}+\sum_{n=N} n^{2}\left|b_{n}\right|^{2} r^{2(n-1)}$.
If $n \geqslant 2$ then
$\max _{0<r<1}(1-r) r^{n-1}=\frac{1}{n}\left(\frac{n-1}{n}\right)^{n-1}$
and thus
$n r^{n-1} \leqslant \frac{1}{1-r}\left(\frac{n-1}{n}\right)^{n-1} \leqslant \frac{1}{2(1-r)}$ for $n=2,3, \ldots$
Applying this inequality in (49) we conclude that
$(1-r)^{2} \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{2} d \theta<(1-r)^{2}{\underset{\sum}{n=1}}_{N-1} n^{2}\left|b_{n}\right|^{2}+y / 4 \sum_{n=N}\left|b_{n}\right|^{2}$.
Because the series (46) converges, by first choosing $N$ large and then letting $r \rightarrow 1$ we conclude from (50) that (48) holds in the case $p=2$.

If $0<p<2$ then Hölder's inequality implies that
$(1-r)^{p} \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d \theta<(1-r)^{p}\left\{\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{2} d \theta\right\}^{p / 2}=$
$=\left\{(1-r)^{2} \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{2} d \theta\right\}^{p / 2}$.
Since (48) holds in the case $p=2$ this proves (48) when $0<p<2$.
If $p>2$ then inequality (32) implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (1-r)^{p} \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d \theta<(1-r)^{p} \frac{1}{\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{p-2}} \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{2} d \theta= \\
& =\frac{1}{\left(1+r^{2}\right)^{p-2}}\left\{(1-r)^{2} \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{2} d \theta\right\} \rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}
$$

as $r \rightarrow 1$.
Theorem 6 is precise in the following sense. If $\epsilon$ is a positive function on $(0,1)$ so that $e(r) \rightarrow 1$ as $r \rightarrow 1$ then there is a function $g$ in $B$ for which
$\varlimsup_{r \rightarrow 1} \frac{(1-r)^{p} \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p} d \theta}{e(r)}=\infty$

The proof of this fact is implicitly contained in an argument in [4, p. 219-222]. The appropriate function $g$, which is constructed in terms of $\epsilon$, has the form
$g(z)=\sum_{n=1}^{m} a_{n} z^{\nu n}, \quad(|z|<1)$
where $\left\{a_{n}\right\}$ is a spectic sequence of positive numbers for which $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{n} \leqslant 1$. The sequence $\left\{\nu_{n}\right\}$ of positive integers is increasing and selected to tend to $\infty$ sufficiently fast. The actual argument assumed that $0<p \leqslant 1$ since it relied on (23). When $p>1$ by appealing to (24) the same argument is possible. Thus, (51) holds for each $p>0$.
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## STRESZCZENIE

Badane s problemy wurostu pochodnej I njektórych Grednich całkowycb w klasach funkcji jednolistnych.
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