

Division of Numerical Mathematics  
The Norwegian Institute of Technology  
The University of Trondheim

F. RØNNING

**Duality Applied to Meromorphic Functions  
with a Simple Pole at the Origin**

Zasada dualności dla funkcji meromorficznych z biegunem  
pierwszego rzędu w początku układu

Принцип дуальности для мероморфных функций  
из простым полюсом в точке 0

1. Introduction, Let  $f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k$  and  $g(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k z^k$

be analytic in the unit disk  $D = \{z : |z| < 1\}$  and normalized by  $f(0) = g(0) = 1$ . We denote the class of functions with this property by  $A_0$ . The convolution (Hadamard product) of  $f$  and  $g$  is defined by

$$(f * g)(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k b_k z^k$$

For  $U \subset A_0$  the dual set  $U^*$  is defined in the following way

$$U^* = \left\{ g \in A_0 : \text{for each } f \in U, (f * g)(z) \neq 0, z \in D \right\}$$

We denote  $(U^*)^*$  by  $U^{**}$  and call it the second dual of  $U$ .

This concept was introduced by Ruscheweyh [5] in connection with the work leading to the proof of the Følys-Schoenberg conjecture [6]. The central reference on convolutions and properties of duality in  $A_0$  is the book of Ruscheweyh: *Convolutions in Geometric Function Theory* [4].

We introduce the class  $B$  of functions analytic in  $0 < |z| < 1$  with a simple pole at the origin and the subclass  $B_0$  consisting of functions with the series expansion

$$(1.1) \quad f(z) = \frac{1}{z} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k.$$

i.e.  $f \in B_0$  if and only if  $zf \in A_0$ .

The purpose of the present paper is to show some results from the transfer of the theory of convolutions and duality from  $A_0$  to  $B_0$ .

For  $f, g \in B_0$  the convolution is defined in the obvious way

$$(1.2) \quad (f * g)(z) = \frac{1}{z} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k b_k z^k.$$

The concept of duality can also be transformed in a natural way, because for  $f$  and  $g \in B_0$  we have

$$f * g \neq 0, \quad 0 < |z| < 1$$

if and only if

$$zf * zg \neq 0, \quad z \in D.$$

The basic theorem for the duality theory in  $A_0$  is the Duality Principle which is stated and proved in [4]. Before stating the Duality Principle in  $B_0$  we shall give two definitions which will be needed later.

Definition.

1.  $U \subset B_0$  is called complete if for all  $f \in U$ ,  $0 < |x| \leq 1$  we have  $f_x \in U$ , where  $f_x(z) = xf(xz)$ .
2. Let  $U \subset B_0$ .  $T \subset B_0$  is called a test set for  $U$  if

$$T \subset U \subset T^{**}$$

and write  $T \rightsquigarrow U$ .

The definition of a test set in  $B_0$  is exactly the same as in  $A_0$ . In the definition of completeness the function  $f_x(z)$  is defined slightly different in  $B_0$  because we want to keep the normalization on  $f_x$ .

(The corresponding definitions in  $A_0$  are in [4].)

2. The duality principle in  $B_0$ . In the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets of the punctured disk  $0 < |z| < 1$ ,  $B$  is a locally convex topological vector space. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the space of continuous linear functionals on  $B$ .

Theorem 1. (Duality Principle). Let  $U \subset B_0$  be compact and complete. Then

(i) for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda : \lambda(U) = \lambda(U^{**}) ;$

(ii)  $\overline{\text{co}}(U) = \overline{\text{co}}(U^{**}) .$

The Duality Principle in  $A_0$  is stated in exactly the same way [4], and the proof runs the same way for both  $A_0$  and  $B_0$ . We will therefore not go into details of the proof, but only point out that the proof rests on the representation theorem for continuous linear functionals by Caccioppoli [1] which in our case is a slight modification of the theorem of Toeplitz [7]. This theorem will be formulated in the following way for the class  $B$ .

Theorem.  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  if and only if there is a function  $g \in B$  such that for  $f \in B$

$$\lambda(f) = (f * g)(1) .$$

3. Applications to univalent functions. We now turn to the class of univalent functions in  $B_0$ , here denoted by  $\Sigma$ . By  $\Sigma_0$  we denote the subclass of  $\Sigma$  which consists of the functions with constant term zero. The following theorem shows how  $\Sigma$  can be described as the dual set of a two parameter family of functions.

Theorem 2. Let

$$(3.1) \quad V = \left\{ f \in B_0 : f(z) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{xyz}{(1-xz)(1-yz)} ; x, y \in \bar{D}, x \neq y \right\} .$$

Then  $V^* = \sum$  and  $\sum_0 \subset V^{**}$ .

Proof. Let  $g \in B_0$  and  $f \in V$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (f \circ g)(z) &= \left( \frac{1}{z} - \frac{xyz}{(1-xz)(1-yz)} \right) * g(z) = \\ &= \frac{xy}{x-y} \left( \frac{1}{yz} + \frac{1}{1-yz} - \frac{1}{xz} - \frac{1}{1-xz} \right) * g(z) = \\ &= xy \frac{g(yz) - g(xz)}{x-y} \end{aligned}$$

From this computation we see that  $f \circ g \neq 0$  if and only if  $g$  is univalent. Thus we have proved that  $V^* = \sum$ .

To prove that  $\sum_0 \subset V^{**}$  we use the following well known fact:

If  $f(z) = \frac{1}{z} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k \in \sum$  and  $g(z) = \frac{1}{z} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k z^k \in \sum_0$ ,

then  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k |a_k b_k| \leq 1$ , and this implies that  $f \circ g$  is starlike.

(For reference, see e.g. Goodman [2], p. 134-135.)

This means in particular that  $(f \circ g)(z) \neq 0$ ,  $0 < |z| < 1$ , so  $\sum_0 \subset \sum^* = V^{**}$ .

A relevant type of problem in this context is to find a suitable test set for a given set. It would in particular be an interesting problem to try to find a test set for  $\sum$ . Because of the Duality Principle we then could get information about  $\sum$  by investigating the functions in the test set. Theorem 2 is a small step in this direction because of the inclusion  $\sum_0 \subset V^{**}$ .

But we obviously do not have  $V \subset \Sigma_0$  since by appropriate choices of  $x$  and  $y$  the coefficients of the functions in  $V$  will be so large that the area theorem is violated.

Our next idea is to introduce a set of functions related to  $V$ , but with smaller coefficients. A function  $f \in V$  can be written  $f(z) = \frac{1}{z} - xyz - xy(x+y)z^2 - xy(x^2 + xy + y^2)z^3 - \dots$ . Let  $l(z) = \frac{1}{z} + \log(1-z) = \frac{1}{z} - z - \frac{1}{2}z^2 - \frac{1}{3}z^3 - \dots$ . Define a function  $h(z) = (f(z) * l(z)) * l(z)$ ,  $f \in V$ , and let  $W$  be the set consisting of functions of this form. That is

$$(3.2) \quad W = \left\{ h \in B_0; h(z) = \frac{1}{z} - \frac{xy}{x-y} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{x^k - y^k}{k^2} z^k; x, y \in \bar{D}, x \neq y \right\}.$$

For functions in  $W$  it is clear that the  $k^{\text{th}}$  coefficient is bounded by  $\frac{1}{k}$  in absolute value, so these functions are "closer" to the univalent functions as far as the size of the coefficients is concerned.

For  $h \in W$ ,  $f \in B_0$  we get

$$(3.3) \quad z(z(f * h))'(z) = xy \frac{f(yz) - f(xz)}{x-y}$$

which means that for  $f \in \Sigma$ ,  $h \in W$

$$(3.4) \quad z(z(f * h))'(z) \neq 0, \quad 0 < |z| < 1.$$

A natural question is to ask whether for arbitrary  $f$  and  $h$  in  $\Sigma$ , (3.4) will be true. As previously mentioned the convolution of two functions  $f$  and  $g$  in  $\Sigma_0$  is starlike. In particular we will then have  $(f * g)'(z) \neq 0$ ,  $0 < |z| < 1$ . If  $f$  and  $g$  are in  $\Sigma_0$  (or in  $\Sigma$ ), it is therefore clear that

$$(3.5) \quad z(z(f * g)')'(z) \neq 0, \quad 0 < |z| < 1$$

is equivalent to

$$(3.6) \quad 1 + \frac{z(f * g)''(z)}{(f * g)'(z)} \neq 0, \quad 0 < |z| < 1.$$

We notice the similarity between (3.6) and the condition for convexity of  $f * g$  which is

$$(3.7) \quad \operatorname{Re} \left\{ 1 + \frac{z(f * g)''(z)}{(f * g)'(z)} \right\} < 0, \quad 0 < |z| < 1.$$

This is a stronger condition than (3.6), and it is tempting to ask whether the convolution of two meromorphic univalent functions (in  $\Sigma$ ) is a convex function. If this were true, it would indeed be a surprising result, but we will soon give an example showing that neither (3.7) nor (3.5) is true in general.

Still we feel that it would be of interest to characterize the subset of the univalent functions for which (3.5) holds.

We denote this subset by  $C$  and define it in the following way.

$$(3.8) \quad C = \left\{ g \in \Sigma_0 : \text{for each } f \in \Sigma, z(z(f * g))'(z) \neq 0, \right. \\ \left. 0 < |z| < 1 \right\}.$$

From (3.3) it is immediately clear that  $C \supset W \cap \Sigma$ . We notice that it is no restriction to define  $C$  as a subset of  $\Sigma_0$  because if  $g$  is a function that satisfies (3.5), then any function  $g + c_0$ ,  $c_0$  a complex constant, will also satisfy (3.5).

It is well known that the convolution of a convex univalent function with an arbitrary univalent function (both in  $B_0$ ) is convex [3], so we know that  $C$  contains all functions in  $B_0$  that are convex.

We will return to the class  $C$  later. First we give the example showing that  $C$  does not contain all of  $\Sigma$ .

#### 4. The counterexample. Let

$$F(z) = \frac{1}{z}(1+z^4)^{1/2} = \frac{1}{z} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{4k-1} z^{4k-1}$$

and

$$k_r(z) = \frac{1}{z(1-(rz)^4)} = \frac{1}{z} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} r^{4k} z^{4k-1}$$

Then



$$F(z) * k_r(z) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + (rz)^4)^{1/2}$$

$F$  is univalent, so if we can find some  $r$  for which  $k_r$  is univalent and the same time  $z(z(F * k_r)')'(z) = 0$  for some  $z$ ,  $0 < |z| < 1$ , then we have constructed a counterexample to (3.5).

In order to decide when  $k_r$  is univalent we choose  $z_1 \neq z_2$  and compute

$$\begin{aligned} (4.1) \quad k_r(z_1) - k_r(z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1(1 - (rz_1)^4)} - \frac{1}{z_2(1 - (rz_2)^4)} = \\ &= \frac{z_2 - z_1 - (r^4 z_2^5 - r^4 z_1^5)}{z_1 z_2 (1 - (rz_1)^4)(1 - (rz_2)^4)} = \\ &= \frac{(z_2 - z_1) [1 - r^4 (z_2^4 + z_1 z_2^3 + z_1^2 z_2^2 + z_1^3 z_2 + z_1^4)]}{z_1 z_2 (1 - (rz_1)^4)(1 - (rz_2)^4)} \end{aligned}$$

If  $r^4 \leq \frac{1}{5}$ , (4.1) will never be zero for  $0 < |z_1|, |z_2| < 1$ , and if  $r^4 > \frac{1}{5}$ , it will be possible to find  $z_1, z_2$  such that  $k_r(z_1) - k_r(z_2) = 0$ . Thus we have found that  $k_r(z)$  is univalent if and only if  $r < 5^{-1/4} \approx 0.6687$ .

In order to decide when  $z(z(F * k_r)')'(z) = 0$  we get the equation

$$\begin{aligned} (4.2) \quad \frac{1}{2} (1 + (rz)^4)^{1/2} + 4r^4 z^3 (1 + (rz)^4)^{-1/2} - \\ - 4r^8 z^7 (1 + (rz)^4)^{-3/2} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

This equation has a solution in  $0 < |z| < 1$  if and only if  $r > (3 - 2\sqrt{2})^{1/4} \approx 0.6436$ .

By geometric considerations one can see that this  $r$  value also will be the radius of convexity for the functions  $\frac{1}{z}(1 + (rz)^4)^{1/2}$ . So in this case condition (3.5) and condition (3.7) will be equivalent.

The conclusion is that if we choose  $r$  in the interval  $0.6436 < r < 0.6667$ , then  $F(z) * k_r(z)$  will be the convolution of two functions from  $\Sigma$ , and there is a  $z$ ,  $0 < |z| < 1$ , such that  $z(z(F * k_r))'(z) = 0$ .

5. More about the class  $C$ . From the preceding example we have seen that  $C$ , as defined in (3.8), does not contain all univalent functions. But we notice that the interval of permissible  $r$  values was rather small, and that could be a hint towards guessing that  $C$  is a fairly big subset of  $\Sigma_0$ . It would therefore be interesting to find a good characterization of  $C$ .

The following result, although not very informative, is an immediate consequence of the definitions we have made.

Theorem 3. As before let

$$W = \left\{ h \in B_0 : h(z) = \frac{1}{z} - \frac{xy}{x-y} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{x^k - y^k}{k^2} z^k ; x, y \in \bar{D}, x \neq y \right\}$$

and

$$C = \left\{ g \in \Sigma_0 : \text{for each } f \in \Sigma, z(z(f * g))'(z) \neq 0, 0 < |z| < 1 \right\}$$

Then  $C = \sum_0 \cap W^{**}$  .

Proof. Let  $f(z) = \frac{1}{z} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k$  and define

$$F(z) = (f(z) * l(z)) * l(z) \quad , \quad \text{where} \quad l(z) = \frac{1}{z} + \log(1-z) .$$

Keeping in mind that a function from  $W$  can be expressed as a function from the set  $V$  , as defined in (3.1), convolved twice with  $l(z)$  , it is clear that with  $h \in W$

$$(5.1) \quad f(z) * h(z) = \frac{xy}{y-x} [F(xz) - F(yz)] .$$

From (5.1) we deduce that  $f \in W^*$  if and only if  $F$  is univalent ( $\in \sum_0$ ) . With  $F$  as above we can write

$$(5.2) \quad (f * g)(z) = z(z(F * g))'(z)$$

for arbitrary  $g \in B_0$  with constant term zero.

Now assume that  $F$  is univalent ( $f \in W^*$ ) and  $g \in C$  . Then  $z(z(F * g))'(z) \neq 0$  ,  $0 < |z| < 1$  , and from (5.2) we get  $(f * g)(z) \neq 0$  ,  $0 < |z| < 1$  . Thus we have proved that  $C \subset W^{**}$  . In fact we have  $z(z(F * g))'(z) \neq 0$  if and only if  $g \in W^{**}$  , so  $W^{**}$  consists exactly of those functions  $g$  having the property that  $z(z(F * g))'(z) \neq 0$  for any  $F \in \sum_0$  . Since we have defined  $C$  to be a subset of  $\sum_0$  , we get that  $C = \sum_0 \cap W^{**}$  .

Remark. The ultimate goal of the investigations of the present type is to find a suitable test set for  $\Sigma$ . From what we now have seen, it is clear that  $W^{**}$  will not contain all of  $\Sigma_0$ , so  $W$  is not a suitable candidate for a test set. Nevertheless the class  $C$  seems to be an interesting and fairly large subset of  $\Sigma_0$ , and hence it would be interesting to make further investigations of  $W^{**}$  in order to get a better characterisation of the class  $C$ .

Acknowledgements. I want to thank professor Stephan Ruscheweyh, who has initiated my work by suggesting some of the ideas presented in this paper.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Cacciopoli, R., Sui funzionali lineari nel campo delle funzioni analitiche, Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur. 13(1931), 263-266.
- [2] Goodman, A.W., Univalent Functions, vol. II, Mariner Publ. Co. Inc. 1983.
- [3] Pommerenke, Ch., Über einige Klassen meromorpher schlichter Funktionen, Math. Zeitschrift 78(1962), 263-284.
- [4] Ruscheweyh, St., Convolutions in Geometric Function Theory, Les Presses de l'Université de Montreal 1982.
- [5] Ruscheweyh, St., Duality for Hadamard products with applications to extremal problems for functions regular in the unit disk, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 210(1975), 63-74.

- [6] Ruscheweyh, St., Sheil-Small, T., Hadamard Products of Schlicht Functions and the Pólya-Schoenberg Conjecture, Comment. Math. Helv. 48(1973), 119-135.
- [7] Toeplitz, O., Die linearen vollkommenen Räume der Funktionentheorie, Comment. Math. Helv. 23(1949), 222-242.

### STRESZCZENIE

W pracy tej wprowadzone przez Ruscheweyh'a pojęcie zbiorów dualnych (ze względu na splot Hadamarda) funkcji holomorficznych  $f$  w kole jednostkowym,  $f(0) = 1$ , przeniesiono na klasę  $B_0$  funkcji holomorficznych w obszarze  $\{z : 0 < |z| < 1\}$ , mających w zerze biegun pierwszego rzędu z residuum 1. Sformułowana została zasada dualności dla  $B_0$ . Badana była podklasa  $\Sigma \subset B_0$  składająca się z funkcji jednoliatnych. Wyznaczono zbiór dualny do  $\Sigma$ .

### РЕЗЮМЕ

В этой работе введено Русевайом понятие дуальных множеств /по отношению к свертке Адамара/ аналитических функций  $f$  в единичном круге  $f(0)=1$ , переносится на класс  $B_0$  функций аналитических в области  $\{z: 0 < |z| < 1\}$  имеющих в  $z=0$  простой полюс с вычетом 1. Сформулирован принцип дуальности для  $B_0$ . Исследован подкласс  $\Sigma \subset B_0$  однолистных функций и определено его дуальное множество.

