Biblioteca de Ciències

fundació FERRAN SUNYER I BALAGUER

Prof. R. P. Boas Evanston

Dear Professor Boas,

I received your kind letter of the 13 december 1959 together with a letter from Srivestava which to the 13 december 1959 together with a letter from Srivestava which to the 13 december 1959 together with a letter from Srivestava which to the 13 december 1959 together with a letter from Srivestava which to the 13 december 1959 together with a letter from Srivestava which to the 13 december 1959 together with a letter from Srivestava which to the 13 december 1959 together with a letter from Srivestava which to the 13 december 1959 together with a letter from Srivestava which to the 13 december 1959 together with a letter from Srivestava which to the 13 december 1959 together with a letter from Srivestava which to the 13 december 1959 together with a letter from Srivestava which to the 13 december 1959 together with a letter from Srivestava which to the 13 december 1959 together with the 14 december 1959 together with the 15 december 1959 together with 15 december 1959 together wi

We can see that the proof of Srivastava is incorrect as follows:

According to Hardy and Riesz (The general theory of Dirichlet's series, Cambridge Tract no 18 p.8) if the abscissa of absolute conver-

gence of the series  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n e^{-\lambda_n t}$  is positive, it is given by:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup\frac{\log\sum_{k=0}^{n}|a_{k}|}{\lambda_{n}}$$

Therefore only if the abscissa of absolute convergence o' of the series  $f_{a}(s) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{in} e^{t\lambda_{i,n}}$  is negative, we can after that that

$$\sigma' = -\lim_{n \to \infty} \sup \frac{\log A_{r}(n)}{\lambda_{r,n}}$$

(never  $O'=\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup \frac{-\log A_1(n)}{\lambda_{1,n}}$ ). Hence from  $O'=+\infty$  it doks not necessarily follows that

(1) 
$$-\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup\frac{\log A_{j}(n)}{\lambda_{j,n}}=+\infty)$$

and in general we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup\frac{\log A_1(n)}{\lambda_{1,n}}=0,$$

and only when  $a_{i,n}=0$  for every  $n_i$  we shall have (1). And equally for  $f_{i,n}(s)$  and

$$-\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup\frac{\log A_{\lambda}(n)}{\lambda_{\lambda,n}}$$

On the other hand, beside the proof that I have suggested in my letter 23 october there exists the following: If

Zanle Oly, n

and



are convergent for everyo, since  $\lambda_n \sim \lambda_{1,n} \sim \lambda_{1,n}$  we shall have

$$(2) \qquad \qquad \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} |a_{j,n}| e^{\sigma \lambda_n} = \infty$$

$$(3) \qquad \qquad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_{i,n}| e^{\sigma \lambda_n} < \infty$$

for every  $\sigma$ . It follows from (2) that  $\lim_{n\to\infty} |a_{1/n}| = 0$ , and therefore from (3) it follows

and, since  $|a_n| \sim |a_{t,n}| |a_{t,n}|$ , we have

for every U.

I wish you a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

sincerely yours