

# Asymptotic Behavior of Fractional Derivatives of Bounded Analytic Functions

I. Chyzhykov and Yu. Kosaniak

*Lviv Ivan Franko National University  
Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics  
1 Universytetska Str., Lviv 79000, Ukraine*

E-mail: chyzhykov@yahoo.com  
yulia\_kosaniak@ukr.net

Received December 20, 2015, revised October 29, 2016

We find sharp sufficient conditions for the boundedness of fractional derivatives of a bounded analytic function in a Stolz angle. If  $F \neq 0$  in the unit disc, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the boundedness of fractional derivatives of its argument in a Stolz angle are established.

*Key words:* bounded analytic function, Stolz angle, Blaschke product, fractional derivative.

*Mathematics Subject Classification 2010:* 30D50.

## 1. Introduction and Main Results

Let  $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ ,  $D(\zeta, \rho) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - \zeta| < \rho\}$ . The symbol  $C(\cdot)$  stands for some positive constant depending on the values in the parentheses not necessarily the same in each occurrence. Let  $H^\infty$  be the Hardy class of bounded analytic functions in  $\mathbb{D}$ . Let  $B$  be a Blaschke product

$$B(z) = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\bar{a}_n(a_n - z)}{|a_n|(1 - \bar{a}_nz)}, \quad 0 < |a_n| < 1, n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1)$$

For a fixed  $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  the following theorem of O. Frostman ([7, 12]) gives the necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of the radial limits of  $B$  and its derivative.

**Theorem A.** (i) *Necessary and sufficient that*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1-0} f(re^{i\theta_0}) = L,$$

exist and  $|L| = 1$  for  $f = B$ , and every subproduct of  $B$ , is that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - |a_n|}{|e^{i\theta_0} - a_n|} < \infty. \tag{2}$$

(ii) Necessary and sufficient that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1-0} B(re^{i\theta_0}) = L, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 1-0} B'(re^{i\theta_0}) = M$$

exist and  $|L| = 1$  is that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - |a_n|}{|e^{i\theta_0} - a_n|^2} < \infty. \tag{3}$$

Note that condition (2) is often called Frostman's condition.

Theorem A was generalized and complemented by many authors (e.g., G. Cargo ([5]), P. Ahern, D. Clark ([1, 2]), K.-K. Leung, C.N. Linden ([13]) and others). Since the proof of the necessity of Theorem A is based on the estimates of the argument, one may expect to describe the local behavior of  $\arg B(z)$  in terms of Frostman's type conditions. In [6], one can find necessary and sufficient conditions for the local growth  $\arg F$ ,  $F \in H^\infty$ , in terms of the generalized Frostman's condition. The relations between conditions on the zeros of the Blaschke product  $B$  and the membership of  $\arg B(e^{i\theta})$  in  $L^p$ ,  $0 < p \leq \infty$  were studied in [14].

It is known that every function  $F \in H^\infty$ ,  $F(0) \neq 0$ ,  $|F(z)| < 1$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ , can be represented in the form ([7, 9])

$$F(z) = B(z) \exp \left( - \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{e^{it} + z}{e^{it} - z} d\mu(t) \right), \tag{4}$$

where  $\mu$  is a non-decreasing function on  $[-\pi, \pi]$ . We use the same letters to denote the non-decreasing functions on  $[-\pi, \pi]$  and the Stieltjes measures on  $\partial\mathbb{D}$  associated with them.

Let  $\mu, \mu_*$  be finite Borel measures on  $\partial\mathbb{D}$ . We write that  $\mu_* \prec \mu$  if  $\mu_*(M) \leq \mu(M)$  for an arbitrary Borel set  $M \subset \partial\mathbb{D}$ . We say that  $F_*$  is a divisor of  $F \in H^\infty$  if  $F_* \in H^\infty$  and if there exists a function  $G \in H^\infty$  such that  $F = GF_*$ . Note that  $F_*$  is a divisor of  $F$  if and only if  $\mu_* \prec \mu$  and the zero set of  $F_*$  is a subset of that for  $F$ .

P. Ahern and D. Clark proved the following theorem ([1]).

**Theorem B.** *Let  $f \in H^\infty$  be of the form (4), and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

(i) Suppose that  $N$  is even, and  $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$ . Necessary and sufficient that  $F_*^{(N)}(re^{ix})$  be bounded as  $r \rightarrow 1 - 0$  for every divisor  $F_*$  of  $F$  is that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - |a_n|}{|e^{ix} - a_n|^{N+1}} + \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\mu(t)}{|e^{it} - e^{ix}|^{N+1}} < \infty \tag{5}$$

hold.

(ii) Suppose that  $N$  is odd. Necessary and sufficient that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1-0} F^{(j)}(re^{ix}) = L_j$$

exist for  $j = 0, \dots, N - 1$ , that  $F^{(N)}(re^{ix})$  be bounded as  $r \rightarrow 1 - 0$  and that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow 1+0} F^{(j)}(Re^{ix}) = L_j$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq N - 1$  is that (5) hold.

Note that the set of points  $e^{ix}$  such that (5) is satisfied with  $N = 1$  is often called the Ahern-Clark set. This notion has many applications, see, e.g., [3], [8, Chap. IX]. In particular, a function  $F$  of the form (4) is said to have an angular derivative  $F'(\xi)$  at  $\xi \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  ([4]) if there exist  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1-0} F(r\xi) \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  and  $F'(\xi) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 1-0} F'(r\xi) \in \mathbb{C}$ . By [2, Theorem 2],

$$|F'(\xi)| = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - |a_n|^2}{|\xi - a_n|^2} + 2 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\mu(t)}{|e^{it} - \xi|^2},$$

so (5) with  $N = 1$  and Carathéodory's theorem ([4, Sec. 298–299]) (cf. (3)) provide the existence of the angular derivative.

In order to formulate the next results, we need some information on fractional derivatives. For  $f \in L(0, a)$ , the Riemann–Liouville fractional integral of order  $\alpha > 0$  is defined by ([15, Chap. I, p. 33])

$$D^{-\alpha} f(r) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^r (r - x)^{\alpha-1} f(x) dx, \quad r \in (0, a)$$

$$D^0 f(r) \equiv f(r), \quad D^\alpha f(r) = \frac{d^p}{dr^p} \{D^{-(p-\alpha)} f(r)\}, \quad \alpha \in (p - 1, p], p \in \mathbb{N},$$

where  $\Gamma(\alpha)$  is the Gamma function.

The Stolz angle with the vertex  $\zeta$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{S}_\sigma(\zeta) = \{z \in \mathbb{D} : |1 - z\bar{\zeta}| \leq \sigma(1 - |z|)\}, \quad \sigma \geq 1.$$

We denote  $\mathcal{S}_\sigma^*(\xi) = \mathcal{S}_\sigma(\xi) \cap D(\xi, \frac{1}{2})$ .

**Theorem C [6].** *Let  $0 \leq \gamma < 1, \theta \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $F \in H^\infty$ . Necessary and sufficient that for every divisor  $F_*$  of  $F$  and every  $\sigma > 1$  there exist a constant  $K = K(\gamma, \sigma, F) > 0$  such that*

$$\sup_{z \in S_\sigma^*(e^{i\theta})} |D^{-\gamma} \arg F_*(z)| < K, \tag{6}$$

and that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - |a_n|}{|e^{i\theta} - a_n|^{1-\gamma}} + \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d\mu(t)}{|e^{it} - e^{i\theta}|^{1-\gamma}} < \infty \tag{7}$$

hold.

In view of Theorems B and C the following questions arise:

- (i) Does a counterpart of Theorem B for fractional derivatives hold?
- (ii) What are the necessary and sufficient conditions for the boundedness of  $D^\alpha \arg F(z)$  for  $F \in H^\infty$ ?

In this paper we give partial answers to these questions.

Let us denote

$$G(z) = \exp \left( - \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{e^{it} + z}{e^{it} - z} d\mu(t) \right), \tag{8}$$

The following theorem yields the necessary and sufficient conditions for the local growth of  $\arg G$  in terms of local properties of the boundary measure.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\sigma > 1$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ . Given  $G$  (8), the value  $|D^\alpha \arg G_*(re^{i\varphi})|$  is bounded in the Stolz angle  $S_\sigma(e^{i\theta})$  for each divisor  $G_*$  of  $G$  if and only if*

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d\mu(t)}{|e^{i\theta} - e^{it}|^{1+\alpha}} < \infty. \tag{9}$$

**Corollary 2.** *Let  $\alpha > 0$ . Given  $G$  (8),  $\sup_{|z|<1} |D^\alpha \arg G_*(z)| < \infty$  for each divisor  $G_*$  of  $G$  if and only if*

$$\sup_{\theta} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d\mu(t)}{|e^{it} - e^{i\theta}|^{1+\alpha}} < \infty.$$

For an analytic function  $f$  in  $\mathbb{D}$ , we set

$$f^{[\alpha]}(re^{i\varphi}) = D^\alpha(r^\alpha f(re^{i\varphi})), \quad \alpha > 0, r > 0.$$

This definition provides that  $f^{[\alpha]}(z)$  is analytic in  $\mathbb{D}$  ([8, Chapter IX]).

**Theorem 3.** Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $F \in H^\infty$  be defined by (4). If

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - |a_n|}{|e^{i\theta} - a_n|^{1+\alpha}} + \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d\mu(t)}{|e^{i\theta} - e^{it}|^{1+\alpha}} < \infty, \quad (10)$$

then for every divisor  $F_*$  of  $F$ ,  $|F_*^{[\alpha]}(z)|$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(e^{i\theta})$ .

**Corollary 4.** Let  $F \in H^\infty$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ . If

$$\sup_{\theta} \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - |a_n|}{|e^{i\theta} - a_n|^{1+\alpha}} + \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d\mu(t)}{|e^{it} - e^{i\theta}|^{1+\alpha}} \right\} < \infty, \quad (11)$$

then for every divisor  $F_*$  of  $F$ ,  $\sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} |F_*^{[\alpha]}(z)| < \infty$ .

Note that in the limit case  $\alpha = 0$ , the assertion of Theorem 3 would be a bit weaker than a generalization of the sufficiency part of Theorem A ([1, Lemma 3]), we have the boundedness in the Stolz angles instead of the existence of the radial limit. On the other hand, similarly to Theorem B, in the case  $\alpha = 1$ , we would have boundedness of  $F'(z)$  but in the Stolz angles as well. It seems plausible that the converse statement to Theorem 3 is true, but we were not able to prove it. Nevertheless, we show that the statement of Theorem 3 is sharp in Example 1.

## 2. Proof of the Theorems

**P r o o f** of Theorem 1. *Sufficiency.* Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\theta = 0$ . Let us denote

$$S(re^{i\varphi}) = \frac{e^{it} + re^{i\varphi}}{e^{it} - re^{i\varphi}}.$$

Then

$$S_r^{(n)}(re^{i\varphi}) = \frac{2n!e^{i(t-\varphi)}}{(e^{i(t-\varphi)} - r)^{n+1}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

According to the definition of  $G_*$ , we have

$$\arg G_*(z) = -\operatorname{Im} \left( \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{e^{it} + z}{e^{it} - z} d\mu_*(t) \right), \quad (12)$$

where  $\mu_* \prec \mu$ .

For  $f^{(p)} \in L(0, l)$ , the following equality holds ([8, Chapter IX, p. 572], [15, Chapter I, p. 39]):

$$D^\alpha f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} \frac{f^{(k)}(0)}{\Gamma(1+k-\alpha)} x^{k-\alpha} + \frac{1}{\Gamma(p-\alpha)} \int_0^x (x-t)^{p-\alpha-1} f^{(p)}(t) dt, \quad (13)$$

$p-1 < \alpha \leq p, p \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Applying (13) to  $\arg G_*$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D^\alpha \arg G_*(re^{i\varphi}) &= - \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} \frac{2k! \sin k(\varphi-t)}{\Gamma(1+k-\alpha)} r^{k-\alpha} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\Gamma(p-\alpha)} \int_0^r (r-x)^{p-\alpha-1} \int_{-\pi}^\pi \operatorname{Im} \left( \frac{2p! e^{i(t-\varphi)}}{(e^{i(t-\varphi)}-x)^{p+1}} \right) d\mu_*(t) dx, \\ \left| D^\alpha \arg G_*(re^{i\varphi}) \right| &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} \frac{2k! r^{k-\alpha}}{\Gamma(1+k-\alpha)} \\ &\quad + \frac{2p!}{\Gamma(p-\alpha)} \int_0^r \int_{-\pi}^\pi \frac{(r-x)^{p-\alpha-1}}{|e^{i(t-\varphi)}-x|^{p+1}} d\mu_*(t) dx. \end{aligned}$$

In order to finish the proof, we need the following lemma.

**Lemma A [10].** *Let  $0 \leq \gamma < \alpha < \infty$ . Then there exists a constant  $C(\gamma, \alpha)$  such that*

$$D^{-\gamma} \frac{1}{|1-r\xi|^\alpha} \leq \frac{C(\alpha, \gamma)}{|1-r\xi|^{\alpha-\gamma}}, \quad \xi \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}, 0 < r < 1.$$

Using Lemma A and the fact that  $z \in \mathcal{S}_\sigma(e^{i\theta})$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| D^\alpha \arg G_*(re^{i\varphi}) \right| &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} \frac{2k! r^{k-\alpha}}{\Gamma(1+k-\alpha)} + C(\alpha) \int_{-\pi}^\pi \frac{d\mu_*(t)}{|e^{i(t-\varphi)}-r|^{\alpha+1}} \\ &\leq C(\alpha) + C(\alpha) \int_{-\pi}^\pi \frac{d\mu_*(t)}{|e^{i\theta}-e^{it}|^{\alpha+1}} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

*Necessity.* Since  $\frac{1}{|1-e^{it}|}$  is bounded outside  $[-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$ , we consider the integral (9) only on the interval  $[0, \varepsilon]$ , where  $\varepsilon > 0$  will be specified later. Convergence of the integral on  $[-\varepsilon, 0]$  can be shown in a similar way. Let us estimate

$$\arg S_r^{(n)}(re^{i\varphi}) = \arg \left( \frac{2n! e^{i(t-\varphi)}}{(e^{i(t-\varphi)}-r)^{n+1}} \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We consider  $z = re^{i\varphi} \in \mathbb{D}$  such that  $\arg(1 - z) = \sigma_0 \in \left(\frac{(4n+1)\pi}{4(2n+1)}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right)$ . We choose  $\varepsilon > 0$  satisfying  $\varepsilon < \frac{\pi}{4(2n+1)}$  and  $|e^{i\varepsilon} - 1| < \frac{1}{8}$ . Let  $0 < t < \varepsilon$ . By the construction, we have

$$\sigma_0 < \arg(e^{it} - re^{i\varphi}) < \frac{\pi}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

thus

$$\sigma_0 - \varphi < \arg(e^{i(t-\varphi)} - r) < \frac{\pi}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - \varphi.$$

Since  $z \in \mathcal{S}_\sigma(e^{i\theta})$  for some  $\sigma > 0$ , we have

$$\varphi = \arg z = O(1 - |z|) \Rightarrow \varphi \sim (r - 1) \tan \sigma_0, \quad z \rightarrow 1, \arg(1 - z) = \sigma_0.$$

So we can assume that  $\frac{-\varepsilon}{n+1} < \varphi < 0$  as  $r \rightarrow 1 - 0$ . Then, denoting

$$\gamma(t) = \gamma_{n,r}(t) := \arg(e^{i(t-\varphi)}) - (n+1) \arg(e^{i(t-\varphi)} - r), \quad (14)$$

we obtain

$$2\varepsilon - \sigma_0(n+1) > \gamma(t) > -(n+1)\left(\frac{\pi}{2} + \varepsilon\right). \quad (15)$$

Due to the choice of  $\sigma_0$  and  $\varepsilon$  for  $n = 2k, k \in \mathbb{N}, n - 1 < \alpha \leq n$ , we get

$$\left(- (n+1)\left(\frac{\pi}{2} + \varepsilon\right), 2\varepsilon - (n+1)\sigma_0\right) \Subset (-\pi(k+1), -\pi k).$$

For  $n = 2k - 1, k \in \mathbb{N}, n - 1 < \alpha \leq n$ , we consider

$$\arg S_r^{(n+1)}(re^{i\varphi}) = \arg \left( \frac{2(n+1)!e^{i(t-\varphi)}}{(e^{i(t-\varphi)} - r)^{n+2}} \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Using the similar estimates, we obtain

$$\gamma_{n+1,r}(t) \in \left(- (n+2)\left(\frac{\pi}{2} + \varepsilon\right), 2\varepsilon - (n+2)\sigma_0\right) \Subset (-\pi(k+1), -\pi k).$$

It follows from the previous inclusion that  $\sin \gamma(t)$  keeps the sign for  $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$ . Let  $\chi_E$  be the characteristic function of a set  $E$ . Let us denote  $\mu_* = \mu\chi_{[0, \varepsilon]}$ . We deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |\arg G_*^{(n)}(re^{i\varphi})| &= \left| \operatorname{Im} \left( \int_0^\varepsilon \frac{2n!e^{i(t-\varphi)}}{(e^{i(t-\varphi)} - r)^{n+1}} d\mu(t) \right) \right| \\ &\geq \int_0^\varepsilon \frac{2n!}{|e^{i(t-\varphi)} - r|^{n+1}} |\sin \gamma(t)| d\mu(t). \end{aligned}$$

We consider the function

$$G_n(z) = e^{P_n(z)}, \quad P_n(z) = a_0 + a_1z + \dots + a_{n-1}z^{n-1}, \quad a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (16)$$

Since  $D^\alpha \arg G_n(z)$  is uniformly continuous on  $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$  and, consequently, bounded, without loss of generality, we can consider

$$D^\alpha \arg \frac{G_*(z)}{G_n(z)} = D^\alpha \arg G_*(z) - D^\alpha \arg G_n(z) \tag{17}$$

instead of  $D^\alpha \arg G_*(z)$ . Applying (13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| D^\alpha \arg \frac{G_*(re^{i\varphi})}{G_n(re^{i\varphi})} \right| &= \left| - \sum_{p=0}^{n-1} \int_0^\varepsilon \frac{2p!r^{p-\alpha} \sin p(t-\varphi) d\mu(t)}{\Gamma(1+p-\alpha)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_0^r \frac{(r-x)^{n-\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(n-\alpha)} \int_0^\varepsilon \operatorname{Im} \left( \frac{2n!e^{i(t-\varphi)}}{(e^{i(t-\varphi)}-x)^{n+1}} \right) d\mu(t) dx - D^\alpha \operatorname{Im} P_n(re^{i\varphi}) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We choose the coefficients  $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}$  such that

$$D^\alpha \operatorname{Im} P_n(re^{i\varphi}) = - \sum_{p=0}^{n-1} \int_0^\varepsilon \frac{2p!r^{p-\alpha} \sin p(t-\varphi) d\mu(t)}{\Gamma(1+p-\alpha)}. \tag{18}$$

Since

$$D^\alpha \left( \frac{x^\gamma}{\Gamma(1+\gamma)} \right) = \frac{x^{\gamma-\alpha}}{\Gamma(1+\gamma-\alpha)}, \quad \gamma > -1, \tag{19}$$

it is easy to check that

$$a_p = 2 \int_0^\varepsilon e^{-ipt} d\mu(t) \tag{20}$$

is a solution of (18). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| D^\alpha \arg \frac{G_*(re^{i\varphi})}{G_n(re^{i\varphi})} \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{\Gamma(n-\alpha)} \int_0^r (r-x)^{n-\alpha-1} \int_0^\varepsilon \operatorname{Im} \left( \frac{2n!e^{i(t-\varphi)}}{(e^{i(t-\varphi)}-x)^{n+1}} \right) d\mu(t) dx \right| \\ &\geq \left| \frac{1}{\Gamma(n-\alpha)} \int_0^r (r-x)^{n-\alpha-1} \int_0^\varepsilon \frac{2n! \sin \gamma(t)}{|e^{i(t-\varphi)}-x|^{n+1}} d\mu(t) dx \right|. \end{aligned}$$

In order to estimate the inner integral, we may assume that  $|1-z| < \frac{1}{8}$ . Since  $|e^{i\varepsilon} - 1| < \frac{1}{8}$ , we have  $r > 2|z - e^{it}|, t \in [0, \varepsilon]$ . For  $r - x \leq 2|re^{i\varphi} - e^{it}|$ , we deduce

$$|xe^{i\varphi} - e^{it}| \leq |re^{i\varphi} - xe^{i\varphi}| + |re^{i\varphi} - e^{it}| \leq |r-x| + |re^{i\varphi} - e^{it}| \leq 3|re^{i\varphi} - e^{it}|. \tag{21}$$



Using (21), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| D^\alpha \arg \frac{G_*(re^{i\varphi})}{G_n(re^{i\varphi})} \right| \\ & \geq \left| C(\alpha) \int_0^\varepsilon \int_{r-2|e^{i(t-\varphi)}-r|}^{r-|e^{i(t-\varphi)}-r|} \frac{(r-x)^{n-\alpha-1} dx d\mu(t)}{|e^{i(t-\varphi)}-r|^{n+1}} \right| \\ & \geq C(\alpha) \int_0^\varepsilon \frac{d\mu(t)}{|e^{i(t-\varphi)}-r|^{\alpha+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Tending  $z$  to 1, using Fatou's lemma and the boundedness of  $D^\alpha \arg G_*(z)$ , we conclude that

$$C \geq C(\alpha) \int_0^\varepsilon \frac{d\mu(t)}{|e^{it}-1|^{\alpha+1}}.$$

For  $n = 2k - 1, k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we set

$$G_n(z) = e^{P_n(z)}, \quad P_n(z) = \sum_{p=0}^n a_p z^p, \tag{22}$$

where  $a_p$  are defined by (20). Integrating (13) by parts, we get

$$D^\alpha f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^p \frac{f^{(k)}(0)}{\Gamma(1+k-\alpha)} x^{k-\alpha} + \frac{1}{\Gamma(p-\alpha+1)} \int_0^x (x-t)^{p-\alpha} f^{(p+1)}(t) dt.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| D^\alpha \arg \frac{G_*(re^{i\varphi})}{G_n(re^{i\varphi})} \right| \\ & = \left| \int_0^r \frac{(r-x)^{n-\alpha}}{\Gamma(n-\alpha)} \int_0^\varepsilon \operatorname{Im} \left( \frac{2(n+1)! \sin \gamma_{n+1,r}(t)}{|e^{i(t-\varphi)}-x|^{n+2}} \right) d\mu(t) dx \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof repeats that for the case  $n = 2k$ . ■

**P r o o f** of Theorem 3. Let  $(a_n^*)$  be the zero sequence of  $F_*$ . Let us calculate the derivative of  $r^\alpha F_*(re^{i\varphi})$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r^\alpha F_*(re^{i\varphi})) = \alpha r^{\alpha-1} F_*(re^{i\varphi}) - r^\alpha F_*(re^{i\varphi}) \int_{-\pi}^\pi \frac{2e^{i\varphi} e^{it}}{(e^{it} - re^{i\varphi})^2} dm_*(t)$$

$$+r^\alpha F_*(re^{i\varphi}) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - |a_n^*|^2}{(re^{i\varphi} - a_n^*)(1 - \bar{a}_n^* re^{i\varphi})}.$$

Using (13) with  $p = 1$ , we obtain

$$D^\alpha(r^\alpha F_*(re^{i\varphi})) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^r (r-x)^{-\alpha} F_*(xe^{i\varphi}) \left( \alpha x^{\alpha-1} - x^\alpha \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{2e^{i\varphi} e^{it}}{(e^{it} - xe^{i\varphi})^2} dm_*(t) + x^\alpha \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - |a_n^*|^2}{(xe^{i\varphi} - a_n^*)(1 - \bar{a}_n^* xe^{i\varphi})} \right).$$

Since  $F_* \in H^\infty$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |F_*^{[\alpha]}(re^{i\varphi})| &\leq \frac{C}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \left( \int_0^r (r-x)^{-\alpha} \alpha x^{\alpha-1} dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^r (r-x)^{-\alpha} x^\alpha \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{2}{|e^{it} - xe^{i\varphi}|^2} dm_*(t) dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^r (r-x)^{-\alpha} x^\alpha \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - |a_n^*|^2}{|1 - \bar{a}_n^* xe^{i\varphi}|^2} dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the proof of Theorem 1 and (19) that it is sufficient to estimate

$$\frac{r^\alpha}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^r (r-x)^{-\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - |a_n^*|^2}{|1 - \bar{a}_n^* xe^{i\varphi}|^2} dx.$$

We have

$$|1 - \bar{a}_n r e^{i\varphi}| = r \left| \frac{1}{r} - \bar{a}_n e^{i\varphi} \right| > r |1 - \bar{a}_n e^{i\varphi}| \geq r |a_n - e^{i\varphi}|, 0 < r < 1. \quad (23)$$

Using the fact that  $z \in \mathcal{S}_\sigma(e^{i\theta})$ , (23) and applying Lemma 1, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |F_*^{[\alpha]}(re^{i\varphi})| &\leq C + C(\alpha) r^\alpha \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - |a_n^*|^2}{|1 - \bar{a}_n^* xe^{i\varphi}|^{1+\alpha}} \\ &\leq C + \frac{C(\alpha)}{r} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - |a_n^*|}{|e^{i\theta} - a_n^*|^{1+\alpha}} < \infty, \frac{1}{2} \leq r < 1. \end{aligned}$$

For  $r < \frac{1}{2}$  the boundedness is obvious. ■

**E x a m p l e 1.** Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1), \gamma > 1$ . We show that the statement of Theorem 3 is sharp. Let  $\mu$  be an absolutely continuous measure with the density

$$p(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma|t|^{\gamma-1}, & |t| \leq \frac{\pi}{4}, \\ 0, & |t| \in (\frac{\pi}{4}, \pi]. \end{cases}$$

We prove that if

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d\mu(t)}{|e^{i\theta} - e^{it}|^{1+\alpha}} \tag{24}$$

is divergent, then  $|G^{[\alpha]}(z)|$  is unbounded, where  $G$  is of the form (8). Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\theta = 0, \varphi = 0$ . Since  $|e^{it} - 1| \sim t$  as  $t \downarrow 0$ , the integral (24) is divergent for  $\gamma \leq 1 + \alpha$ . Let us calculate the derivative of  $r^\alpha G(r)$ ,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(r^\alpha G(r)) = \alpha r^{\alpha-1} G(r) - r^\alpha G(r) \gamma \int_{-\frac{\pi}{4}}^{\frac{\pi}{4}} \frac{2e^{it}}{(e^{it} - r)^2} |t|^{\gamma-1} dt.$$

Using (13) with  $p = 1$ , we obtain

$$D^\alpha(r^\alpha G(r)) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^r (r-x)^{-\alpha} G(x) \left( \alpha x^{\alpha-1} - x^\alpha \gamma \int_{-\frac{\pi}{4}}^{\frac{\pi}{4}} \frac{(2(1+x^2)\cos t - 4x - 2i(1-x^2)\sin t)|t|^{\gamma-1} dt}{|e^{it} - x|^4} \right) dx.$$

Since  $p(t)$  is continuous at 0, we get ([11, Chapter IX, p. 369])

$$|G(r)| \rightarrow \exp\{-2\pi p(0)\} = 1, \quad r \rightarrow 1 - 0.$$

Using (19), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |D^\alpha(r^\alpha G(r))| &\geq \frac{2\gamma}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^r (r-x)^{-\alpha} x^\alpha \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{4}} \frac{2 \sin t (1-x^2) t^{\gamma-1} dt}{|e^{it} - x|^4} dx \\ -C(\alpha) &\geq C(\alpha, \gamma) \int_0^r (r-x)^{-\alpha} (1-x) \int_0^{1-x} \frac{t^\gamma dt}{(1-x)^4} dx - C(\alpha) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq C(\alpha, \gamma) \int_0^r \frac{(r-x)^{-\alpha} dx}{(1-x)^{2-\gamma}} - C(\alpha) \geq C(\alpha, \gamma) \int_0^r \frac{dx}{(1-x)^{2-\gamma+\alpha}} - C(\alpha) \\ &\geq \begin{cases} \frac{C}{(1-r)^{1-\gamma+\alpha}} - C, & \gamma < 1 + \alpha, \\ C \ln \frac{1}{1-r} - C, & \gamma = 1 + \alpha. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $|G^{[\alpha]}(z)|$  is unbounded for  $\gamma \leq 1 + \alpha$ .

### References

- [1] *P.R. Ahern and D.N. Clark*, Radial Nth derivatives of Blaschke products. — *Math. Scan.* **72** (1971), 189–201.
- [2] *P.R. Ahern and D.N. Clark*, On Inner Functions with  $H^p$ -derivatives. — *Michigan Math. J.* **21** (1974), 115–127.
- [3] *A. Baranov, A. Hartmann, and K. Kellay*, Geometry of Reproducing Kernels in Model Spaces Near the Boundary. arXiv: 1509.09077v1, 30Sep2015, 19 pp.
- [4] *C. Carathéodory*, Theory of Functions of a Complex Variable, V. 2. Chelsea Publ. Co., New York, 1954.
- [5] *G.T. Cargo*, Angular and Tangential Limits of Blaschke Products and their Successive Derivatives. — *Canad. J. Math* **14** (1962), 334–348.
- [6] *I. Chyzhykov*, Argument of Bounded Analytic Functions and Frostman’s Type Conditions. — *Ill. J. Math.* **53** (2009), No. 2, 515–531.
- [7] *E.F. Collingwood and A. J. Lohwater*, The Theory of Cluster Sets. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1966.
- [8] *M.M. Djrbashain*, Integral Transforms and Representations of Functions in a Complex Domain. Nauka, Moscow, 1966. (Russian)
- [9] *P. Duren*, Theory of  $H^p$  Spaces. Academic Press, New York, 1970.
- [10] *D. Gilera, J.A. Peláez, and D. Vukotić*, Itergrability of the Derivative of a Blaschke Product. — *Proc. Edinburg Math. Soc.* **50** (2007), 673–688. MR 2360523
- [11] *G.M. Golusin*, Geometric Theory of Functions of a Complex Variable. Nauka, Moscow, 1966. (Russian)
- [12] *O. Frostman*, Sur le Produits de Blaschke. — *K. Fysiogr. Sallsk. Lund Forh.* **12** (1939), 1–14.
- [13] *K.-K. Leung and C.N. Linden*, Asymptotic Values of Modulus 1 of Blaschke Products. — *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **203** (1975), 107–118.
- [14] *A.V. Rybkin*, Convergence of Arguments of Blaschke Products in  $L_p$ -metrics. — *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **111** (1991), 701–708.
- [15] *S.G. Samko, A.A. Kilbas, and O.I. Marichev*, Fractional Integrals and Derivatives: Theory and Applications. Gordon and Breach, Yverdon, 1993.