## Analysis Qualifying Review, solutions Morning session

1. Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{1}$. Show that the characteristic function $\chi_{E}(x)$ is the limit of a sequence of continuous functions if and only if $E$ is both $F_{\sigma}$ and $G_{\delta}$.

Proof. $(\Rightarrow)$ First, suppose $\chi_{E}(x)$ is the (pointwise) limit of a sequence $\left\{f_{n}\right\}$ of continuous functions. Let $U_{n}$ be the open set $\left\{x: f_{n}(x)>1 / 2\right\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, and let $V_{n}$ be the closed set $\left\{x: f_{n}(x) \geq 1 / 2\right\}$. Then define

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\tilde{U}_{n}=\bigcup_{i \geq n} U_{i}=\left\{x: f_{i}(x)>1 / 2 \text { for some } i \geq n\right\}, \\
\tilde{V}_{n}=\bigcap_{i \geq n} V_{i}=\left\{x: f_{i}(x) \geq 1 / 2 \text { for all } i \geq n\right\} .
\end{array}
$$

Note that each $\tilde{U}_{n}$ (resp. $\tilde{V}_{n}$ ) is open (closed) because it is a union of open sets (intersection of closed sets). We claim that $E=\cap_{n} \tilde{U}_{n}$, which shows that $E$ is $G_{\delta}$. Indeed,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bigcap_{n \geq 1} \tilde{U}_{n} & =\bigcap_{n \geq 1}\left\{x: f_{i}(x)>1 / 2 \text { for some } i \geq n\right\} \\
& =\left\{x: \limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{n}(x)>1 / 2\right\} \\
& =\left\{x: \chi_{E}(x)>1 / 2\right\}=E
\end{aligned}
$$

by our assumption that $f_{n} \rightarrow \chi_{E}$ pointwise. We claim also that $E=\cup_{n} \tilde{V}_{n}$, which shows $E$ is $F_{\sigma}$. Indeed,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bigcup_{n \geq 1} \tilde{V}_{n} & =\bigcup_{n \geq 1}\left\{x: f_{i}(x) \geq 1 / 2 \text { for all } i \geq n\right\} \\
& =\left\{x: \liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{n}(x) \geq 1 / 2\right\} \\
& =\left\{x: \chi_{E}(x) \geq 1 / 2\right\}=E
\end{aligned}
$$

$(\Leftarrow)$ Now suppose that $E$ is both $F_{\sigma}$ and $G_{\delta}$. Let $V_{n}$ be a sequence of closed sets such that $E=\cup_{n} V_{n}$ and let $U_{n}$ be a sequence of open sets such that $E=\cap_{n} U_{n}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the $V_{n}$ are increasing, i.e. $V_{n} \subset V_{n+1}$, by replacing the sequence with $\tilde{V}_{n}=\cup_{i=1}^{n} V_{i}$. Similarly, we may assume that $U_{n} \supset U_{n+1}$. For each $n$, we have

$$
V_{n} \subset E \subset U_{n}
$$

We claim that there exists a continuous function $f_{n}$, for each $n$, such that

$$
f_{n}(x)= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } x \in V_{n} \\ 0 & \text { if } x \notin U_{n}\end{cases}
$$

This follows from Urysohn's lemma, since $V_{n}$ and $U_{n}^{c}$ are disjoint closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}$, and $\mathbb{R}$ is a metric space and thus normal (i.e. disjoint closed sets are separated by disjoint open neighborhoods). The sequence $\left\{f_{n}\right\}$ converges pointwise to $\chi_{E}$, as desired.
2. Let $\left\{g_{n}\right\}$ be a sequence of measurable functions on $[a, b]$, satisfying
(a) $\left|g_{n}(x)\right| \leq M$, a.e. $x \in[a, b]$;
(b) for every $c \in[a, b], \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{a}^{c} g_{n}(x) d x=0$.

Show that for any $f \in L^{1}[a, b]$,

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{a}^{b} f(x) g_{n}(x) d x=0
$$

Proof. We first observe that condition (b) implies that for any interval $\left[c_{1}, c_{2}\right] \subset[a, b]$, we have $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{c_{1}}^{c_{2}} g_{n}(x) d x=0$ since

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int_{c_{1}}^{c_{2}} g_{n}(x) d x\right| & =\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int_{a}^{c_{2}} g_{n}(x) d x-\int_{a}^{c_{1}} g_{n}(x) d x\right| \\
& \leq \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int_{a}^{c_{2}} g_{n}(x) d x\right|+\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int_{a}^{c_{1}} g_{n}(x) d x\right|=0
\end{aligned}
$$

We next claim that for any measurable set $E \subset[a, b], \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{E} g_{n}(x) d x=0$. Indeed, the previous observation implies this is true for any finite union of intervals. For any $\epsilon>0$, there is some finite union of intervals $\tilde{E} \supset E$ such that $\mu(\tilde{E}-E)<\epsilon$, so

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int_{E} g_{n}(x) d x\right| & =\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int_{\tilde{E}} g_{n}(x) d x-\int_{\tilde{E}-E} g_{n}(x) d x\right| \\
& \leq \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int_{\tilde{E}} g_{n}(x) d x\right|+\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\tilde{E}-E}\left|g_{n}(x)\right| d x \leq M \epsilon
\end{aligned}
$$

so as we let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ we see that the limit must be 0 .
$\underset{\tilde{f}}{\text { Now we she }}$ show that the desired equality holds for any simple function $\tilde{f} \in L^{1}[a, b]$. Indeed, if $\tilde{f}=\sum_{k=1}^{m} a_{k} \chi_{E_{k}}$ for some measureable sets $E_{k} \subset[a, b]$ and $a_{k} \in \mathbb{R}$ then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int_{a}^{b} \tilde{f}(x) g_{n}(x) d x\right| & =\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int_{a}^{b}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} a_{k} \chi_{E_{k}}(x)\right) g_{n}(x) d x\right|=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\sum_{k=1}^{m} a_{k} \int_{E_{k}} g_{n}(x) d x\right| \\
& \leq \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{m}\left|a_{k} \int_{E_{k}} g_{n}(x) d x\right|=\sum_{k=1}^{m}\left|a_{k}\right| \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int_{E_{k}} g_{n}(x) d x\right|=0
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally, since simple functions are dense in $L^{1}[a, b]$, for any $\delta>0$ there is a simple function $\tilde{f}$ such that $\|f-\tilde{f}\|_{1}<\delta$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int_{a}^{b} f(x) g_{n}(x) d x\right| & =\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int_{a}^{b} \tilde{f}(x) g_{n}(x) d x+\int_{a}^{b}(f-\tilde{f})(x) g_{n}(x) d x\right| \\
& \leq \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int_{a}^{b} \tilde{f}(x) g_{n}(x) d x\right|+\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{a}^{b}|(f-\tilde{f})(x)| \cdot\left|g_{n}(x)\right| d x \\
& \leq 0+M \int_{a}^{b}|(f-\tilde{f})(x)| d x<M \delta,
\end{aligned}
$$

so the claim follows from letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$.
3. Let $f_{k}(x), k=1,2, \ldots$ be increasing functions on $[a, b]$. Assume

$$
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_{k}(x)
$$

is convergent on $[a, b]$. Show that

$$
\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_{k}(x)\right)^{\prime}=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_{k}^{\prime}(x), \quad \text { a.e. } x \in[a, b]
$$

Proof. Let $F(x)=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_{k}(x)$, and let $T_{n}(x)=\sum_{k=n}^{\infty} f_{k}(x)$ denote the tail of this summation, so that

$$
F(x)=\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} f_{k}(x)+T_{n}(x)
$$

for any $n \geq 1$. Taking derivatives, we have

$$
F^{\prime}(x)=\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} f_{k}^{\prime}(x)+T_{n}^{\prime}(x)
$$

so it suffices to show that as $n \rightarrow \infty, T_{n}^{\prime}(x) \rightarrow 0$ for a.e. $x$.
Note that since each $f_{k}$ is increasing all the derivatives $f_{k}^{\prime}, F^{\prime}, T_{n}^{\prime}$ are non-negative. Thus for fixed $x$, the sequence $\left\{T_{n}^{\prime}(x)\right\}_{n}$ is monotonically decreasing and bounded below by 0 , so for each $x, \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{n}^{\prime}(x)=\liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{n}^{\prime}(x)$ exists. (We include the possibility that this limit is $+\infty$.) By Fatou's lemma,

$$
\int_{a}^{b}\left(\liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{n}^{\prime}(x)\right) d x \leq \liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{a}^{b} T_{n}^{\prime}(x) d x
$$

and by the fundamental theorem of calculus, since $T_{n}$ is increasing we have

$$
\int_{a}^{b} T_{n}^{\prime}(x) d x \leq T_{n}(b)-T_{n}(a)
$$

We are given that the infinite summation defining $F(x)$ converges, so for all $x \in[a, b]$ we have $T_{n}(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus

$$
\int_{a}^{b}\left(\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{n}^{\prime}(x)\right) d x \leq \liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{a}^{b} T_{n}^{\prime}(x) d x \leq \liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(T_{n}(b)-T_{n}(a)\right)=0
$$

and since the first function is non-negative this implies $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{n}^{\prime}(x) \equiv 0$ a.e., as desired.
4. (a) Assume that $f \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$, and $f$ is continuous at 0 . Show that

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \frac{n}{\pi\left(1+(n x)^{2}\right)} f(x) d x=f(0)
$$

(b) Assume that $f \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$. Show that

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \frac{n}{\pi\left(1+n^{2}(x-y)^{2}\right)} f(y) d y=f(x) \quad \text { a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}
$$

(Hint: $\int \frac{1}{\pi\left(1+y^{2}\right)} d y=1$.)
Proof. (a) By the change of variables $u=n x$,

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \frac{n}{\pi\left(1+(n x)^{2}\right)} f(x) d x=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \frac{f(u / n)}{\pi\left(1+u^{2}\right)} d u
$$

so it suffices to show that the right-hand limit is equal to $f(0)$. Since $f \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$, there is some $M<\infty$ such that $|f(x)|<M$ a.e., and since $f$ is continuous at 0 , for any $\epsilon>0$ there is some $\delta$ such that $|f(x)-f(0)|<\epsilon$ for any $-\delta<x<\delta$. (In particular, this implies $|f(0)|<M$.) Following the hint, we have $\int \frac{f(0)}{\pi\left(1+y^{2}\right)} d y=f(0)$ so

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|f(0)-\int \frac{f(u / n)}{\pi\left(1+u^{2}\right)} d u\right| & =\left|\int \frac{f(0)-f(u / n)}{\pi\left(1+u^{2}\right)} d u\right| \\
& \leq \int_{|u|<n \delta} \frac{|f(0)-f(u / n)|}{\pi\left(1+u^{2}\right)} d u+\int_{|u| \geq n \delta} \frac{|f(0)-f(u / n)|}{\pi\left(1+u^{2}\right)} d u \\
& \leq \int_{|u|<n \delta} \frac{\epsilon}{\pi\left(1+u^{2}\right)} d u+\int_{|u| \geq n \delta} \frac{2 M}{\pi\left(1+u^{2}\right)} d u \\
& \leq \epsilon+2 M \int_{|u| \geq n \delta} \frac{1}{\pi\left(1+u^{2}\right)} d u
\end{aligned}
$$

which holds for arbitrary $n$. As $n \rightarrow \infty$, it is clear that the last integral approaches 0 , so we have

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|f(0)-\int \frac{f(u / n)}{\pi\left(1+u^{2}\right)} d u\right|=\left|f(0)-\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \frac{f(u / n)}{\pi\left(1+u^{2}\right)} d u\right| \leq \epsilon
$$

Since this holds for arbitrary $\epsilon$, this shows $f(0)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \frac{f(u / n)}{\pi\left(1+u^{2}\right)} d u$ as desired.
(b) Since $f$ is measurable, by Luzin's theorem for any $\epsilon>0$ there is a continuous function $\tilde{f}$ and a closed set $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(x)=\tilde{f}(x)$ for all $x \in E$ and $\mu\left(E^{c}\right)<\epsilon$. Since $|f(x)|<M$ a.e. we may also choose $\tilde{f}$ to have this same bound. Then for any $x$

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \frac{n}{\pi\left(1+n^{2}(x-y)^{2}\right)} \tilde{f}(y) d y=\tilde{f}(x)
$$

by continuity of $\tilde{f}$ (using the same argument as in part (a)), so for any $x \in E$,

$$
\left|f(x)-\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \frac{n}{\pi\left(1+n^{2}(x-y)^{2}\right)} f(y) d y\right| \leq \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \frac{n}{\pi\left(1+n^{2}(x-y)^{2}\right)}|\tilde{f}(y)-f(y)| d y
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(\int_{E} \frac{n|\tilde{f}(y)-f(y)|}{\pi\left(1+n^{2}(x-y)^{2}\right)} d y+\int_{E^{c}} \frac{n|\tilde{f}(y)-f(y)|}{\pi\left(1+n^{2}(x-y)^{2}\right)} d y\right) \\
& \leq \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(0+2 M \int_{E^{c}} \frac{n}{\pi\left(1+n^{2}(x-y)^{2}\right)} d y\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

If we choose $x \in \operatorname{int}(E)$, the interior of $E$, so $E$ contains the open interval $(x-\delta, x+\delta)$ for some $\delta>0$, then

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{E^{c}} \frac{n}{\pi\left(1+n^{2}(x-y)^{2}\right)} d y \leq \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|x-y|>\delta} \frac{n}{\pi\left(1+n^{2}(x-y)^{2}\right)} d y=0
$$

so $f(x)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \frac{n}{\pi\left(1+n^{2}(x-y)^{2}\right)} f(y) d y$ for any $x \in \operatorname{int}(E)$. Then the measure of the points in $\mathbb{R}$ where this equality does not hold is bounded above by $\mu\left(\overline{E^{c}}\right)=\mu\left(E^{c}\right)<\epsilon$, and since $\epsilon$ was arbitrary this equality is true almost everywhere.
5. Let $\left\{f_{n}\right\}$ be a sequence of functions in $L^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right), 1<p<\infty$, which converge almost everywhere to a function $f \in L^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, and suppose that there is a constant $M$ such that $\left\|f_{n}\right\|_{p} \leq M$ for all $n$. Show that for every $g \in L^{q}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right), q$ the conjugate of $p$,

$$
\int f g=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_{n} g
$$

Is the statement true for $p=1$ ?
(Hint: you may want to use Egorov's theorem.)
Proof. We first show the statement is false for $p=1$. Indeed, consider the functions $f_{n}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$
f_{n}(x)= \begin{cases}1 / n & \text { if } 0<x<n \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Then $\left\|f_{n}\right\|_{1}=1$ for all $n$, and the sequence $\left\{f_{n}\right\}$ converges pointwise to the zero function $f=0$. Taking the constant function $g=1 \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$
0=\int f g \neq \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_{n} g=1
$$

Now we prove the claim for $1<p<\infty$. The proof relies on the fact that for any $h \in L^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$,

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} h=\lim _{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_{R}} h \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \lim _{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}-B_{R}} h=0
$$

where $B_{R} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ denotes the ball of radius $R$ around the origin in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$, and

$$
\lim _{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{E_{\epsilon}} h=0
$$

where $E_{\epsilon}$ is a measureable set whose measure is bounded by $\epsilon$.

By Egorov's theorem, for any $\epsilon>0$ (and $R>0$ fixed) there is a subset $E_{\epsilon} \subset B_{R}$ such that $\mu\left(E_{\epsilon}\right) \leq \epsilon$ and the convergence $f_{n} \rightarrow f$ is uniform on $B_{R}-E_{\epsilon}$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\int f g-\int f_{n} g\right| & \leq \int\left|f-f_{n}\right||g| \\
& =\int_{B_{R}-E_{\epsilon}}\left|f-f_{n}\right||g|+\int_{E_{\epsilon}}\left|f-f_{n}\right||g|+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}-B_{R}}\left|f-f_{n}\right||g|
\end{aligned}
$$

We may use Holder's inequality to replace the second and third integrals above with expressions independent of $n$, namely

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{A}\left|f-f_{n} \| g\right| & \leq\left\|f-f_{n}\right\|_{p}\|g\|_{q}=\left(\int_{A}\left|f-f_{n}\right|^{p}\right)^{1 / p}\left(\int_{A}|g|^{q}\right)^{1 / q} \\
& \leq\left(\|f\|_{p}+\left\|f_{n}\right\|_{p}\right)\|g\|_{q} \leq\left(\|f\|_{p}+M\right)\left(\int_{A}|g|^{q}\right)^{1 / q}
\end{aligned}
$$

and as $n \rightarrow \infty$ the first integral (on $B_{R}-E_{\epsilon}$ ) goes to zero by uniform convergence on a finite measure space. Thus

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int f g-\int f_{n} g\right| \leq\left(\|f\|_{p}+M\right)\left(\int_{E_{\epsilon}}|g|^{q}\right)^{1 / q}+\left(\|f\|_{p}+M\right)\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}-B_{R}}|g|^{q}\right)^{1 / q}
$$

This holds for arbitrary $R, \epsilon$ so taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $R \rightarrow \infty$, we have (since $h=|g|^{q} \in L^{1}$ )

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|\int f g-\int f_{n} g\right|=0
$$

so $\int f g=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_{n} g$ as desired.

## Analysis Qualifying Review, solutions

 Afternoon session1. Construct an explicit analytic bijection from

$$
\{z \in \mathbb{C}:|z|>1, z \text { not real and positive }\}
$$

to

$$
\{z \in \mathbb{C}: \operatorname{Re} z>0\}
$$

(You may write your mapping as a composition of simpler explicit mappings.)
Proof. Take $f(z)=(-i z) \circ \frac{1}{2}(z+1 / z) \circ(\sqrt{z})=\frac{1}{2 i}\left(z^{1 / 2}+z^{-1 / 2}\right)$, where we choose the branch of the square root that is positive on positive real numbers.
2. Let $A=\{z \in \mathbb{C}: 5 \leq|z| \leq 10\}$.
(a) Prove or disprove: there is a function $f$ analytic on a neighborhood of $A$ and satisfying $|f(z)|<1$ for $|z|=10,|f(x)|>1000$ for $|z|=5$.
(b) Prove or disprove: there is a function $f$ analytic on a neighborhood of $A$ and satisfying $\operatorname{Re} f(z)<1$ for $|z|=10$, $\operatorname{Re} f(z)>1000$ for $|z|=5$.

Proof. (a) We show such an $f$ exists: consider $f(z)=(9 / z)^{n}$ for some positive integer $n$. On $|z|=10,|f(z)|=(9 / 10)^{n}<1$, and on $|z|=5,|f(z)|=(9 / 5)^{n}$ will be larger than 1000 for sufficiently large $n$ (e.g. $n \geq 18$ ).
(b) We claim no such $f$ exists. Indeed, since $A$ is connected its image $f(A)$ will be a connected subset of $\mathbb{C}$. Let $L \subset \mathbb{C}$ denote the complex numbers with real part $=500$. Since $A$ is compact, its image $f(A)$ is also compact and thus closed. This implies the intersection $L \cap f(A)$ is closed. By the open mapping theorem, the interior int $(A)$ must be sent by $f$ to an open set $f(\operatorname{int}(A)) \subset \operatorname{int}(f(A))$. Thus $L \cap f(\operatorname{int}(A))$ is open in the induced subspace topology of $L$. We identify two possible cases: either $L \cap f(\operatorname{int}(A)) \subsetneq L \cap f(A)$, or $L \cap f(\operatorname{int}(A))=L \cap f(A)$.
In the first case,

$$
L \cap f(\partial A)=L \cap f(A-\operatorname{int}(A)) \supset(L \cap f(A))-(L \cap f(\operatorname{int}(A)))
$$

is non-empty so some point $z$ in the boundary of $A$ (so $|z|=5$ or 10 ) must be sent to $f(z)$ with real part $=500$, contradicting the given hypotheses for $f$.
In the second case, the intersection $L \cap f(\operatorname{int}(A))=L \cap f(A)$ is both open and closed so it is either empty or the entire line $L$. It cannot be the entire line because $f(A)$ is compact so it must be empty. Then since $f(A)$ is connected, it must lie entirely on one side of $L$ (e.g. Re $f(z)<500$ ) or on the other ( $\operatorname{Re} f(z)>500$ ), which also contradicts the hypotheses.
3. For $f$ analytic on $\mathbb{D}$ let

$$
\sigma(f)=\sup \left\{\# f^{-1}(w): w \in \mathbb{C}\right\}
$$

(a) Prove or disprove: there exists a sequence $f_{n}$ of functions analytic on $\mathbb{D}$ converging uniformly on compact sets of $\mathbb{D}$ to a limit function $f$ with all $\sigma\left(f_{n}\right)=3$ but $\sigma(f)=4$.
(b) Prove or disprove: there exists a sequence $f_{n}$ of functions analytic on $\mathbb{D}$ converging uniformly on compact sets of $\mathbb{D}$ to a limit function $f$ with all $\sigma\left(f_{n}\right)=4$ but $\sigma(f)=3$.

Proof. (a) We claim such a sequence does not exist. Indeed, suppose the sequence $f_{n}$ converges to $f$ as specified, such that $\sigma(f)=4$. We may assume without loss of generality that $f$ has four zeros, by adding the appropriate constant to all $f, f_{n}$. Let $z_{1}, \ldots, z_{4} \in \mathbb{D}$ denote the four (distinct) zeros of $f$, each with some positive multiplicity. For each $i=1, \ldots, 4$ choose some closed contour $\gamma_{i} \subset \mathbb{D}$ that encloses $z_{i}$ and no other zeros, and let $K_{i}$ denote the compact region enclosed by this contour. Let $\epsilon_{i}=\min \left\{|f(z)|: z \in \gamma_{i}\right\}>0 \quad$ (since $f$ has no zeros on $\gamma_{i}$ ). Note that $f-f_{n} \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on the compact sets $K_{i}$, so for sufficiently large $n,\left|f(z)-f_{n}(z)\right|<\epsilon_{i}$ for all $z \in \gamma_{i}$. This implies $f$ and $f_{n}$ have the same number of zeros (with multiplicty) in each $K_{i}$ by Rouche's theorem. Thus $\sigma\left(f_{n}\right) \geq 4$ for sufficiently large $n$, contradicting the hypothesis.
(b) We show that such a sequence exists as follows. Let $\phi(z)=\frac{z+i}{i z+1}$ be a Möbius transformation sending the unit disk to the upper half-plane; then set $f_{n}(z)=\phi(z)^{6+1 / n}$ (choosing the principal branch of the logarithm), so the sequence $f_{n}$ converges uniformly on compacts sets to the limit function $f(z)=\phi(z)^{6}$. It is straightforward to verify that for any $\alpha>0$,

$$
\#\left(\phi^{\alpha}\right)^{-1}(w)= \begin{cases}\lceil\alpha / 2\rceil & \text { if } 0<\operatorname{Arg} w<\{\pi \alpha\} \\ \lceil\alpha / 2\rceil-1 & \text { if }\{\pi \alpha\} \leq \operatorname{Arg} w \leq 2 \pi\end{cases}
$$

where $\phi^{\alpha}(z):=\phi(z)^{\alpha}$ and we define $\{\pi \alpha\}$ to be the unique angle equivalent to $\pi \alpha$ in the range $(0,2 \pi]$, so $\sigma\left(\phi^{\alpha}\right)=\lceil\alpha / 2\rceil$. Thus $\sigma\left(f_{n}\right)=\left\lceil 3+\frac{1}{2 n}\right\rceil=4$, while $\sigma(f)=3$ as desired.
4. Let $f: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ be an analytic function defined on a neighborhood of $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and satisfying

- $f(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \subset \mathbb{D} ;$
- $f(0)=0$.

Let $f^{\circ n}=f \circ \cdots \circ f, n$ times. Show that $f^{\circ n}(z) \rightarrow 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$.
Proof. Consider the function $g(z)=f(z) / z$. Since $f(0)=0, g$ is analytic on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, and on the boundary $\partial \overline{\mathbb{D}}=\{z:|z|=1\}$, the magnitudes of $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ coincide. Thus

$$
\max _{|z|=1}\{|g(z)|\}=\max _{|z|=1}\{|f(z) / z|\}=\max _{|z|=1}\{|f(z)|\} .
$$

Call this maximum $\lambda$ (which exists by compactness of $\partial \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ ); since $f(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \subset \mathbb{D}$ we have $0 \leq \lambda<1$. By the maximum modulus principle,

$$
|g(z)|=|f(z) / z| \leq \lambda \quad \text { for all } z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}
$$

But this is equivalent to $|f(z)| \leq \lambda|z|$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, and by induction this implies

$$
\left|f^{\circ n}(z)\right| \leq \lambda^{n}|z| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad(z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}} \text { fixed })
$$

so $f^{\circ n}(z) \rightarrow 0$ as desired.
5. Suppose $\left\{f_{n}\right\}$ is a uniformly bounded sequence of analytic functions on a domain $\Omega$ such that $\left\{f_{n}(z)\right\}$ converges for every $z \in \Omega$.
(a) Show that the convergence is uniform on every compact subset of $\Omega$.
(b) Must $\left\{f_{n}^{\prime}\right\}$ converge uniformly on every compact subset of $\Omega$ ? Prove or disprove.

Proof. (a) Fix a compact subset $K \subset \Omega$. Suppose for a contradiction that the convergence $f_{n} \rightarrow f$ is not uniform on $K$. Then for some $\epsilon>0$, there are infinitely many $f_{n}$ such that

$$
\sup _{z \in K}\left|f_{n}(z)-f(z)\right|>\epsilon
$$

Let $\left\{f_{n_{k}}\right\}$ consist of all such functions. Then $\left\{f_{n_{k}}\right\}$ is also uniformly bounded, so by Montel's theorem there is a subsequence $f_{n_{k_{j}}}$ that converges uniformly to some function $g$ analytic on $K$, i.e.

$$
\lim _{j \rightarrow \infty}\left(\sup _{z \in K}\left|f_{n_{k_{j}}}(z)-g(z)\right|\right)=0
$$

Then $f_{n_{k_{j}}} \rightarrow g$ pointwise, and since $f_{n_{k_{j}}}$ is also a subsequence of $\left\{f_{n}\right\}$, which converges pointwise to $f$, we must have $g=f$. But this contradicts our assumption that

$$
\sup _{z \in K}\left|f_{n_{k_{j}}}(z)-g(z)\right|=\sup _{z \in K}\left|f_{n_{k_{j}}}(z)-f(z)\right|>\epsilon
$$

for all $j$, so we must have uniform convergence on $K$ as desired.
(b) Yes; $\left\{f_{n}^{\prime}\right\}$ must converge uniformly on compact subsets as well. Indeed, for a fixed compact subset $K \subset \Omega$ we may choose an open neighborhood $K \subset \Omega_{1} \subset \Omega$ such that $\Omega_{1}$ has compact closure; let $K_{1}$ denote this closure. Then take another open neighborhood $K_{1} \subset \Omega_{2} \subset \Omega$ with compact closure $K_{2}$. (We may assume $\Omega_{1}$ and $\Omega_{2}$ are connected.) Then the distance $|z-w|$ for $z \in \Omega_{1}, w \in \partial K_{2}$ is bounded below by some constant $\epsilon>0$. Moreover, the hypotheses on $f_{n}$ gives a uniform bound $\left|f_{n}(z)\right|<M$ for all $z \in K_{2}$ and all $n$ (where $M$ may depend on $K_{2}$ ). By Cauchy's integral formula,

$$
f_{n}^{\prime}(z)=\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \oint_{\partial K_{2}} \frac{f_{n}(\xi)}{(\xi-z)^{2}} d \xi
$$

for any $z \in \Omega_{1}$, so taking magnitudes

$$
\left|f_{n}^{\prime}(z)\right| \leq \frac{1}{2 \pi} \oint_{\partial K_{2}} \frac{\left|f_{n}(\xi)\right|}{|\xi-z|^{2}} d \xi \leq \frac{1}{2 \pi}\left|\partial K_{2}\right| \frac{M}{\epsilon^{2}}=: M^{\prime}
$$

which shows that $\left\{f_{n}^{\prime}\right\}$ is uniformly bounded on $\Omega_{1}$. Also by Cauchy's formula,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|f_{n}^{\prime}(z)-f^{\prime}(z)\right| & =\left|\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \oint_{\partial K_{2}} \frac{f_{n}(\xi)-f(\xi)}{(\xi-z)^{2}} d \xi\right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2 \pi}\left|\partial K_{2}\right| \frac{\sup _{K_{2}}\left|f_{n}(\xi)-f(\xi)\right|}{\epsilon^{2}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}
$$

by uniform convergence of $f_{n} \rightarrow f$, so $f_{n}^{\prime} \rightarrow f^{\prime}$ pointwise on $\Omega_{1}$. Thus we have uniform convergence of $f_{n}^{\prime}$ on $K$ by the argument in (a).

