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As a corollary of the Cauchy Residue Theorem, we proved the following as a homework assignment.

## Theorem (HW EP-2)

Suppose that $f$ is analytic on and inside a positively oriented simple closed contour $\Gamma$ and that $f$ does not vanish on $\Gamma$. Then $f$ has at most finitely many zeros inside of $\Gamma$ and

$$
\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} d z=N_{f}
$$

where $N_{f}$ is the number of zeros of $f$ inside $\Gamma$ counted up to multiplicity.

## Finitely Many Zeros

You proved the result on the previous slide using the assumption that $f$ had finitely many zeros inside of $\Gamma$. To see that this must be the case, suppose $f$ had infinitely many zeros in the interior, $D$, of $\Gamma$. Because $D \cup \Gamma$ is closed and bounded, there would be a sequence $\left(z_{k}\right)$ of zeros of $f$ converging to some $z_{0} \in D \cup \Gamma$. Since $f$ does not vanish on $\Gamma$, we must have $z_{0} \in D$. By continuity, $f\left(z_{0}\right)=\lim _{k} f\left(z_{k}\right)=0$. But then $z_{0}$ is not an isolated zero of $f$ and $f$ must be constantly equal to zero. But then $f$ is zero on $\Gamma$ as well. So the assumption that $f$ has only finitely many zeros inside of $\Gamma$ is automatically satisfied.

## But You Made Me Learn About the Index?!?

Let $f$ and $\Gamma$ be in the homework result. If $z:[0,1] \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ is an admissible parameterization of $\Gamma$, then $w:[0,1] \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ given by $w(t)=f(z(t))$ is an admissible parameterization of $f(\Gamma)$. In fact, $w^{\prime}(t)=f^{\prime}(z(t)) z^{\prime}(t)$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
N_{f}=\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} d z & =\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \int_{0}^{1} \frac{f^{\prime}(z(t)) z^{\prime}(t)}{f(z(t))} d t \\
& =\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \int_{0}^{1} \frac{w^{\prime}(t)}{w(t)} d t \\
& =\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \int_{f(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{w} d w \\
& =\operatorname{lnd}_{f(\Gamma)}(0)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Homework Upgrade

## Theorem

Suppose that $f$ is analytic on and inside a positively oriented simple closed contour $\Gamma$ and that $f$ does not vanish on $\Gamma$. Then

$$
\operatorname{Ind}_{f(\Gamma)}(0)=N_{f}
$$

where $N_{f}$ is the number of zeros of $f$ inside of $\Gamma$ counted up to multiplicity.

## An Example

The function $f(z)=z^{2}+z+1$ has exactly two simple zeros inside the positively oriented circle $\Gamma$ equal to $|z|=2$ and is nonzero on $\Gamma$. We can verify the previous result as follows.

(a) The circle $\Gamma$ of radius 2
centered at the origin and the zeros of $f(z)=z^{2}+z+1$

(b) The composite path $f(\Gamma)$ with $\operatorname{lnd}_{f(\Gamma)}(0)=2$

Figure: Counting the zeros of $f(z)=z^{2}+z+1$

## Rouche's Theorem

## Theorem (Rouche's Theorem)

Suppose that $f$ and $g$ are analytic on and inside a simple closed contour $\Gamma$ and that

$$
|f(z)-g(z)|<|f(z)| \quad \text { for all } z \in \Gamma
$$

Then $f$ and $g$ have the same number of zeros inside of $\Gamma$ up to multiplicity.

## Proof.

Note that $(\ddagger)$ implies that Neither $f$ nor $g$ vanishes on $\Gamma$. Let $z:[0,1] \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ be an admissible parameterization of $\Gamma$.

## Willy Time

## Proof.

Note that

$$
|f(z(t))-g(z(t))|<|f(z(t))-0| \quad \text { for all } t \in[0,1] .
$$

Now we can apply the Walking the Dog Lemma to $f(\Gamma)$ and $g(\Gamma)$ so that $\operatorname{Ind}_{f(\Gamma)}(0)=\operatorname{Ind}_{g(\Gamma)}(0)$. Then

$$
N_{f}=\operatorname{lnd}_{f(\Gamma)}(0)=\operatorname{lnd} g_{(\Gamma)}(0)=N_{g} .
$$

## An Example

## Example

Show that $p(z)=z^{5}+3 z^{3}+7$ has five distinct zeros in the disk $B_{2}(0)$.

## Solution.

Let $f(z)=z^{5}$. Then if $|z|=2$, then

$$
|f(z)-p(z)|=\left|3 z^{3}+7\right| \leq 24+7=31<32=|f(z)|
$$

Since, up to multiplicity, $f(z)=z^{5}$ has 5 zeros inside $|z|=2$, by Rouche's Theorem, so does $p(z)$. The only remaining question is whether these zeros are distinct. But $p^{\prime}(z)=5 z^{4}+9 z^{2}=z^{2}\left(5 z^{2}+9\right)$. It is easy to check, by plugging in, that none of the zeros of $p^{\prime}(z)$ are also zeros of $p(z)$. Thus all the zeros of $p(z)$ are simple and must be distinct.

## Break Time

## Remark

Alright, time to rest a bit. We have about a half a lecture to go. We'll save that for Wednesday.

Enough

