

## M2PM3 HANDOUT: THE MAXIMUM MODULUS THEOREM

For information only – not examinable.

**Theorem (Maximum Modulus Theorem: Local form).** If  $f$  is holomorphic in  $N(a, R)$ , and

$$|f(z)| \leq |f(a)| \quad \forall z \in N(a, R)$$

– then  $f$  is constant.

*Proof.* Fix  $r$ ,  $0 < r < R$ . By CIF,

$$\begin{aligned} f(a) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma(a,r)} \frac{f(z) dz}{z - a} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{f(a + re^{i\theta}) \cdot ire^{i\theta} d\theta}{re^{i\theta}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_0^{2\pi} f(a + re^{i\theta}) d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

So

$$|f(a)| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \left| \int \dots \right| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(a + re^{i\theta})| d\theta \leq \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(a)| d\theta = |f(a)|,$$

by hypothesis. So both inequalities are equalities:

$$\int_0^{2\pi} (|f(a)| - |f(a + re^{i\theta})|) d\theta = 0.$$

The integrand is continuous (as  $f$  is holomorphic), and  $\geq 0$  (by hypothesis). So it is  $\equiv 0$ . So

$$|f(a)| - |f(a + re^{i\theta})| \quad \forall \theta \in [0, 2\pi], \quad r \in (0, R).$$

So  $|f|$  is constant.

If  $f = u + iv$ ,  $|f|^2 = u^2 + v^2$  is constant,  $c^2$  say. So (applying  $\partial/\partial x$  and  $\partial/\partial y$ ):

$$2uu_x + 2vv_x = 0, \quad 2uu_y + 2vv_y = 0.$$

Using the Cauchy-Riemann equations,

$$uu_x - vv_y = 0, \quad uu_y + vv_x = 0.$$

Multiply the first by  $u$ , the second by  $v$  and add:

$$(u^2 + v^2)u_x = 0, \quad c^2 u_x = 0.$$

If  $c = 0$ ,  $f = 0$ , constant. If  $c \neq 0$ ,  $u_x = 0$ . Similarly,  $u_y = 0$ . So  $u$  is constant. Similarly,  $v$  is constant. So  $f = u + iv$  is constant. //

**Theorem (Maximum Modulus Theorem).** If  $D$  is a bounded domain and  $f$  is holomorphic on  $D$  and continuous on its closure  $\overline{D}$  – then  $|f|$  attains its maximum on the boundary  $\partial D := \overline{D} \setminus D$ .

*Proof.*  $D$  is bounded, so  $\overline{D}$  is closed and bounded, so is compact (Heine-Borel Thm.). As  $|f|$  is continuous on the compact set  $\overline{D}$ , it attains its supremum  $M$  on  $\overline{D}$ , at  $a$  say.

Assume  $a \notin \partial D$  (which will give a contradiction). Then  $a \in D$ , open, so  $N(a, R) \subset D$  for some  $R > 0$ . So  $|f|$  attains its maximum on  $N(a, R)$  at  $a$ . By the above Local Form,  $f$  is constant on  $N(a, R)$ . So by the Identity Theorem,  $f \equiv \text{constant}$ .

If  $f$  is non-constant, this gives the required contradiction, showing  $|f|$  attains its maximum on the boundary  $\partial D$ . If  $f$  is constant, all points are maxima, a trivial case. //

**Theorem (Minimum Modulus Theorem).** If  $f$  is holomorphic and non-constant on a bounded domain  $D$ , then  $|f|$  attains its minimum either at a zero of  $f$  or on the boundary.

*Proof.* If  $f$  has a zero in  $D$ ,  $|f|$  attains its minimum there. If not, apply the Maximum Modulus Theorem to  $1/f$ .

**Theorem (Maximum Modulus Theorem for Harmonic Functions).** If  $D$  is a bounded domain,  $u$  is harmonic in  $D$  and continuous on  $\overline{D}$ , and  $u \leq M$  on  $\partial D$ : then  $u \leq M$  on  $\overline{D}$ . That is,  $u$  attains its maximum on the boundary  $\partial D$ .

*Proof:* similar to the above – omitted.

*Applications.*

Applications include asymptotics, in particular the *Saddlepoint method* (Riemann, posthumous, 1892) and *Method of steepest descents* (P. DEBYE, 1909). Suppose we have to estimate a line integral, of a holomorphic function  $f$  along a curve  $\gamma$  in a bounded region of holomorphy  $D$ . We look for a stationary point  $z_0$  of the integrand  $f = u + iv$  on  $\gamma$ . As points on  $\gamma$  (closed) are interior points of  $D$  (open),  $u$  attains its maximum on the boundary. So  $z_0 \in \gamma$  is not a maximum. Arguing similarly for  $-f$ , it is not a minimum, so must be a saddle-point (see Calculus of Several Variables in Real Analysis). The level curves (contours)  $u$  constant near  $z_0$  cut the level curves  $v$  constant orthogonally, and these are paths of steepest descent (as with contours on an OS map). As in the Deformation Lemma, we may deform  $\gamma$  to such a path of steepest descent. We must refer for further detail to a book or course on Asymptotics. Suffice it to point out here that applications include Stirling's formula for the factorial, or the Gamma function:

$$n! \sim \sqrt{2\pi} e^{-n} n^{n+\frac{1}{2}} \quad (n \rightarrow \infty), \quad \Gamma(x) \sim \sqrt{2\pi} e^{-x} x^{x-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty)$$

(James STIRLING (1692-1770) in 1730).