

ITERATES OF MEROMORPHIC FUNCTIONS ON ESCAPING FATOU COMPONENTS

ZHENG JIAN-HUA AND WU CHENG-FA

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we prove that the ratio of the modulus of the iterates of two points in an escaping Fatou component may be bounded even if the orbit of the component contains an infinite modulus annulus sequence and this case cannot happen when the maximal modulus of the meromorphic function is large enough. Therefore, we extend the related results for entire functions to ones for meromorphic functions with infinitely many poles. And we investigate the fast escaping Fatou components of meromorphic functions defined in [44] in terms of the Nevanlinna characteristic instead of the maximal modulus in [12] and show that the multiply-connected wandering domain is a part of the fast escaping set under a growth condition of the maximal modulus. Finally we give examples of wandering domains escaping at arbitrary fast rate and slow rate.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

Let f be a meromorphic function which is not a *Möbius* transformation and let f^n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, denote the n th iterate of f . The Fatou set $F(f)$ of f is defined as set of points, $z \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}$, such that $\{f^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is well-defined and forms a normal family in some neighborhood of z . Therefore, $F(f)$ is an open set. Since $F(f)$ is completely invariant under f , i.e., $f(z) \in F(f)$ if and only if $z \in F(f)$, for a component U of $F(f)$, $f(U)$ is contained in a component of $F(f)$. We write U_n for the component of $F(f)$ such that $f^n(U) \subseteq U_n$. The complement $J(f) = \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus F(f)$ of $F(f)$ is called Julia set of f . Then $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f^{-n}(\infty) \subset J(f)$ and if $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \overline{f^{-n}(\infty)}$ contains three distinct points in the extended complex plane $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$, then $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \overline{f^{-n}(\infty)} = J(f)$. Thus every f^n is analytic in $F(f)$ for $n \geq 1$.

In this paper, we investigate the Fatou component U of f with $f^n|_U \rightarrow \infty (n \rightarrow \infty)$. For convenience of statements, we call such an U an escaping Fatou component of f . Let us first determine what kinds of Fatou components will be escaping to ∞ under iterates.

A periodic Fatou component W of f with period $p \geq 1$, i.e., $f^p(W) \subseteq W = W_p$ and p is the minimal positive integer such that the inclusion holds, is known as a Baker domain if $f^{np}|_W \rightarrow a (n \rightarrow \infty)$, but f^p is not defined at a . Then ∞ must be the limit value of f^{np+j} in W for some $0 \leq j \leq p-1$ and so W_j is unbounded. If an escaping Fatou component U of f is periodic, i.e., for some positive integer p , $f^p(U) \subseteq U = U_p$, then U is a Baker domain of f . The periodic Fatou components are classified into five possible types: Attracting domains, Parabolic domains, Siegel disks, Herman rings and Baker domains; see [10], Theorem 6.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37F10 (primary), 30D05 (secondary).

Key words and phrases. Escaping Sets, Meromorphic Functions, Fatou set, Julia set.

Supported by the grant (No. 12071239) of NSF of China.

A Fatou component U is called a wandering domain of f , if for any pair of positive integers $m \neq n$, $U_m \neq U_n$ and actually $U_m \cap U_n = \emptyset$. We know that the escaping Fatou component U is either a wandering domain, a Baker domain or a preimage of Baker domain. Many examples of such Baker domains and wandering domains have been revealed; see [26] for a survey about Baker domains and [2, 3, 8, 21, 18, 22, 30, 11, 36, 15, 14, 19, 23], here we mention some of many papers, for wandering domains; the existence of wandering domains with some special behavior of geometry, analysis or dynamics and/or for some special class of meromorphic functions continues to be an important topic and keeps to attract many interests.

Let U be an escaping Fatou component of a meromorphic function f . Generally for any two distinct points a and b in U there exist $M > 1$ and a positive integer N such that for $\forall n \geq N$,

$$(1.1) \quad |f^n(b)|^{1/M} \leq |f^n(a)| \leq |f^n(b)|^M$$

and if $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus U$ contains an unbounded component, we have a more precise inequality

$$(1.2) \quad M^{-1}|f^n(a)| \leq |f^n(b)| \leq M|f^n(a)|, \quad \forall n \geq N.$$

(see [1], Lemma 5 or [10], Lemma 7). Therefore, if U is an unbounded or simply-connected wandering domain, then (1.2) holds. As we know, the escaping Baker domain is unbounded and may be either simply-connected or multiply-connected. However, it was shown in [43] and [25] that a Baker domain is always such that (1.2) holds. Therefore, an escaping Fatou component U not satisfying (1.2) must be bounded, multiply-connected and wandering.

The first entire function with multiply connected Fatou component was constructed by I. N. Baker [2, 3, 4] and every multiply-connected Fatou component U of a transcendental entire function was shown in Töpfer [40] and Baker [5] to be a bounded escaping wandering domain and in [42] and [13] that for all sufficiently large n , $f^n(U)$ contains a round annulus centered at the origin with the large modulus tending to ∞ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. But it is not this case for a meromorphic function with poles. A meromorphic function may have the Herman rings, multiply connected attracting domains, parabolic domains and Baker domains; see [16] for examples of meromorphic functions with only one pole that have invariant multiply connected Fatou component. A meromorphic function was constructed by Baker, Kotus and Lü [8] to have a multiply connected wandering domain U of preassigned connectivity such that the limit set of $\{f^n|_U\}$ is an infinite set including ∞ . A planar region E is said to have connectivity m if $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$ has m components. Such a wandering domain of a transcendental entire function must be simply connected and such an example of entire function was constructed by Eremenko and Lyubich [18]. Some examples of meromorphic functions with finitely or infinitely many poles which have simply, doubly or infinitely connected wandering domains and which change connectivity of wandering domains under iterates can be found in [30].

There exists a meromorphic function with bounded, multiply-connected, escaping and wandering domains separating the origin and ∞ where (1.2) holds; see Example 5.2 of [45]. As we know, there exist the escaping wandering domains such that (1.1) holds but (1.2) does not hold. In fact, an entire function does not satisfy (1.2) in its multiply connected Fatou component and, however, (1.1) is best possible; see Theorem 1.1 in [13]. Furthermore, if (1.2) does not hold, then the U

contains two points a and b such that

$$(1.3) \quad |f^{n_k}(a)|/|f^{n_k}(b)| \rightarrow \infty (k \rightarrow \infty).$$

We have shown in [45] that in this case, $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f^n(U)$ contains a sequence of annuli $A(r_m, R_m)$ with $R_m/r_m \rightarrow \infty (m \rightarrow \infty)$ and $r_m \rightarrow \infty (m \rightarrow \infty)$; we call such a sequence of annuli an infinite modulus annulus sequence; Here and henceforth, for $R > r > 0$ we denote round annulus $\{z : r < |z| < R\}$ by $A(r, R)$. And for all sufficiently large n_k , $U_{n_k} = f^{n_k}(U)$ separates the origin and ∞ . A condition was given in [45] to ensure the establishment of that for all sufficiently large n , $U_n = f^n(U)$ surrounds the origin and contains a large round annulus centered at the origin which form an infinite modulus annulus sequence. We can construct meromorphic functions which have wandering domain U such that $f^{2n}(U)$ surrounds the origin and contains a large round annulus centered at the origin with (1.3), but $f^{2n-1}(U)$ does not surround the origin by suitably modifying the construction of Example 5.4 in [45]. Here we omit the constructing details which are routine but lengthy.

This leads us to beg the following

Question A: For an escaping Fatou component U of f , if $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f^n(U)$ contains an infinite modulus annulus sequence, are there some pair of points a and b in U such that (1.2) does not hold ?

An equivalent statement of Question A is that if (1.2) is satisfied in an escaping Fatou component U of f , then whether may $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f^n(U)$ contain an infinite modulus annulus sequence? It turns out that it is this case. There exist wandering domains whose orbit contains an infinite modulus annulus sequence and (1.2) holds. This is the first result of this paper.

Theorem 1. *There exists a transcendental meromorphic function f which has an escaping wandering domain U such that for all sufficiently large n , $f^n(U) \supset A(r_n, R_n)$ with $R_n/r_n \rightarrow \infty (n \rightarrow \infty)$ and $r_n \rightarrow \infty (n \rightarrow \infty)$, but for any two points $a, b \in U$, there exists an $M > 1$ such that for all sufficiently large n ,*

$$M^{-1}|f^n(a)| \leq |f^n(b)| \leq M|f^n(a)|.$$

In another preparing paper studying the Baker domains, we construct a meromorphic function which has a Baker domain containing an infinite modulus annulus sequence and not essentially conjugating to a Möbius transformation.

However, the answer to Question A is positive for a transcendental entire function; Indeed, (1.2) does not hold for an entire function in its multiply-connected Fatou component, as we mentioned earlier; see Theorem 1.1 in [13]. In this paper, we establish a more general result allowed to deal with infinitely many poles.

In order to clearly state our second result of this paper, we describe the notations appearing often below. Here and below $M(r, f)$ ($\hat{m}(r, f)$, respectively) denotes the maximal (minimal, respectively) modulus of f on the circle $\{|z| = r\}$, i.e.,

$$M(r, f) = \max\{|f(z)| : |z| = r\}, \quad \hat{m}(r, f) = \min\{|f(z)| : |z| = r\}.$$

If f has a pole in $\{|z| = r\}$, then $M(r, f) = +\infty$. $T(r, f)$ is the characteristic of Nevanlinna of f ; $m(r, f)$ is the proximity function of f ; $N(r, f)$ is the integrated counting function of f in Nevanlinna theory (see [20] and [41]). Please see Section 2 for their exact definitions.

For an escaping Fatou component U and $c \in U$, define

$$h_n(z) := \frac{\log |f^n(z)|}{\log |f^n(c)|}, \quad \forall z \in U,$$

$$\bar{h}(z) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(z), \quad \underline{h}(z) := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(z), \quad \forall z \in U.$$

In view of (1.1) we easily see that $\bar{h}(z)$ and $\underline{h}(z)$ exist on U . In [13], Bergweiler, Rippon and Stallard first introduced and proved that $h(z) := \bar{h}(z) = \underline{h}(z)$ on a multiply connected Fatou component U of an entire function f and applied h successfully to describe the geometric structure of U ; This work leads to h becoming a significant function.

Theorem 2. *Assume that for some $C \geq 1$, $c > 0$ and $r_0 > 0$, we have*

$$(1.4) \quad \log M(Cr, f) \geq \left(1 - \frac{c}{\log r}\right) T(r, f), \quad \forall r > r_0.$$

Then there exist constants $D > 1$, $d > 1$ and $R_0 > 0$ such that for a Fatou component U of f , if for some $m > 0$ and some $r \geq R_0$, we have

$$(1.5) \quad A(D^{-d}r, D^d r) \subseteq f^m(U),$$

then U is an escaping wandering domain, $h(z) := \bar{h}(z) = \underline{h}(z)$ exists on U and $h(z)$ is a non-constant positive harmonic function on U . Therefore for any point $z_0 \in U$ and any neighborhood V of z_0 in U , we have for some constant $0 < \alpha < 1$ and all sufficiently large n

$$f^n(V) \supset A(|f^n(z_0)|^{1-\alpha}, |f^n(z_0)|^{1+\alpha});$$

moreover, there exist two points a and b in V and $\tau > 1$ such that

$$|f^n(a)|^\tau \leq |f^n(b)|$$

and

$$A_n = A(r_n, R_n) \subseteq f^n(V)$$

with $R_n \geq r_n^\tau \rightarrow \infty (n \rightarrow \infty)$ and $A_{n+1} \subseteq f(A_n)$.

We can give effective conditions to determine D , d and R_0 in Theorem 2. We note that the condition which D , d and R_0 satisfy is actually for the result of Lemma 6 to hold. Therefore from the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [45], a rough calculation shows that D , d and R_0 satisfying the following inequalities are available for Theorem 2:

$$(1.6) \quad D > 2Ce^{c+1}, \quad \frac{\pi}{d \cos \frac{\pi}{2d}} \left(1 + \frac{\pi}{2 \log D}\right) < \frac{1}{6}, \quad R_0 \geq D^d r_0$$

and

$$(1.7) \quad \frac{T(r, f)}{\log r} > d \log D, \quad \forall r \geq R_0.$$

It is easy to see that that if $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f^n(U)$ contains an infinite modulus annulus sequence for an escaping Fatou component U of f , then we have (1.5) with D , d and R_0 such that (1.6) and (1.7) hold.

Let us make remarks on (1.4). Theorem 1 tells us that (1.4) cannot be removed in Theorem 2. In Example 5.3 in [45], we constructed a meromorphic function which has an escaping wandering domain U in which there exist two points a and b such that $|f^n(b)|/|f^n(a)| \rightarrow \infty (n \rightarrow \infty)$ but $h_U(z) \equiv 1$ on U .

If f only has at most finitely many poles, then (1.4) immediately holds. So Theorem 2 extends the related results in [13] to a meromorphic function with infinitely many poles. If

$$(1.8) \quad T(r, f) \geq N(r, f) \log r, \quad \forall r \geq r_0,$$

then we have

$$m(r, f) = T(r, f) - N(r, f) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\log r}\right) T(r, f), \quad \forall r \geq r_0.$$

Hence, (1.8) implies (1.4) and that the Nevanlinna deficiency $\delta(\infty, f)$ of f of poles is 1. It is easy to find a meromorphic function f satisfying (1.4) and $\delta(\infty, f) < 1$.

Consider the function $f(z) = \frac{e^z - 1}{e^{-z} + 1}$. Then

$$m(r, f) \sim \frac{r}{\pi}, \quad N(r, f) \sim \frac{r}{\pi} \quad (r \rightarrow \infty)$$

and $\delta(\infty, f) = \frac{1}{2}$. And

$$\log M(r, f) \geq \log \frac{e^r - 1}{e^{-r} + 1} \sim r \sim \pi T(r, f) \quad (r \rightarrow \infty).$$

Then we obtain (1.4) for $C = 1$.

Finally, we mention that Theorem 2 is still true even if (1.4) is satisfied for all possibly except a set of r with finite logarithmic measure.

The existence of large annuli in the orbit of an escaping Fatou component guarantees the stability of the annuli in the sense that the suitable large annuli still exist under relatively small changes to the function in question.

Theorem 3. *Let f be a meromorphic function satisfying the conditions in Theorem 2. If f has an escaping Fatou component U such that $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f^n(U)$ contains an infinite modulus annulus sequence, then for any meromorphic function g which is analytic on $\bigcup_{n=N}^{\infty} f^n(U)$ and such that for some N and for $0 < \delta < 1$*

$$(1.9) \quad M(r, f - g) \leq M(r, f)^\delta, \text{ for } \{|z| = r\} \subset \bigcup_{n=N}^{\infty} f^n(U),$$

g has an escaping Fatou component V on which the results in Theorem 2 also hold for g .

Theorem 3 was proved in [13] for the case when f and g are entire. Theorem 3 gives us a strong argument to be able to find a meromorphic function f with $\delta(\infty, f) = 0$ which has an escaping wandering domain U with properties stated in Theorem 2 under f . This is stated as follows.

Theorem 4. *There exists a meromorphic function f with $\delta(\infty, f) = 0$ which has a wandering domain W such that the results in Theorem 2 hold for f and W .*

Furthermore, we can find a meromorphic function that has the results in Theorem 2, but that does not satisfy (1.4) in a set of r with the infinite logarithmic measure.

Next we investigate escaping speed of points in an escaping Fatou component under iterates. A fast escaping set of a transcendental entire function f , denoted by $A(f)$, was introduced by Bergweiler and Hinkkanen [12] and can be defined [29] by

$$A(f) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{there exists } L \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } |f^{n+L}(z)| \geq M_n(R, f), \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

where $R > \min_{z \in J(f)} |z|$ and $M_n(r, f)$ is the n th iterate of $M(r, f)$ with respect to r . $A(f)$ is independent of the choice of R . It turns out that the fast escaping set $A(f)$ possesses many interesting dynamical behaviors and attracts a lot of attentions; see [29] for the detail; for example, every component of $A(f)$ is unbounded, which is related to a conjecture of Eremenko ([17]). This has led to a lot of recent researches, here we mention some of them: [24, 37, 38, 34, 33].

The maximal modulus $M(r, f)$ of an entire function has proved to be powerful in the study of iterate theory, but it is inferior for a meromorphic function with infinitely many poles. Although we can define the maximal modulus of a meromorphic function, basically f^n with $n > 1$ may not be a meromorphic function. Hence we cannot consider the fast escaping set of a meromorphic function with the help of maximal modulus. Rippon and Stallard in [27] mentioned how to define the fast escaping set for a meromorphic function. In [41] we used the Nevanlinna characteristic in the place of the maximal modulus to define it.

For a meromorphic function f , set $\hat{T}(r, f) = \exp T(r, f)$ and $\hat{T}_n(r, f)$ is the n th iterate of $\hat{T}(r, f)$ with respect to r . Define

$$M(f) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{there exists } L \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } |f^{n+L}(z)| \geq \hat{T}_n(R, f), \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Other equivalent definitions of $A(f)$ (cf.[12] and [29]) can be defined with the Nevanlinna characteristic for an entire function f , but not for a meromorphic function with poles. In [41], we showed that

- (1) $M(f)$ is non-empty and completely invariant;
- (2) $J(f) = \partial M(f)$;
- (3) if U is a Fatou component of f and $U \cap M(f) \neq \emptyset$, then $\overline{U} \subset M(f)$ and U is an escaping wandering domain of f .

Let us compare $M(f)$ to $A(f)$ for an entire function and establish the following

Theorem 5. *Let f be a transcendental entire function. Then $M(f) = A(f)$.*

Closure of a multiply connected Fatou component of an entire function must be in the fast escaping set $A(f)$, proved in [32]. But basically, this conclusion does not hold for a meromorphic function. In following, we give a sufficient condition.

Theorem 6. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function with (1.4). Then for $D > e^{3c}$ and $R_0 \geq r_0$ with property that for $r \geq R_0$,*

$$(1.10) \quad \frac{T(r, f)}{\log r} > \frac{22.56(\kappa + \log D)}{\log D - 3c},$$

if a Fatou component U of f satisfies that for some $m > 0$ and some $r > CR_0$,

$$(1.11) \quad A(r, Dr) \subset f^m(U),$$

we have $\overline{U} \subset M(f)$.

As we know, a simply connected wandering domain of an entire function may not be in $A(f)$. Are there any simply connected wandering domain in $A(f)$, which is asked in [28]. The existence of such simply connected wandering domains has been shown by Bergweiler [11] and Sixsmith [36].

A point z_0 in an escaping Baker domain has escaping rate

$$\log |f^n(z_0)| = O(n) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty);$$

see [6, 10, 43, 25]. In another paper we find a Baker domain where $|f^n(z)| = o(n)(n \rightarrow \infty)$ and $f^n(z)$ goes forward to ∞ in a slow spiral. For the case of escaping wandering domains, we can construct escaping wandering domains with any escaping rate under iterates, that is to say, given a sequence $\{a_n\}$ of positive numbers tending to ∞ , we can find a wandering domain U such that for any point $z_0 \in U$, we have

$$(1.12) \quad |f^n(z_0)| \sim a_n(n \rightarrow \infty).$$

Theorem 7. *Let $\{a_n\}$ be arbitrary sequence of positive numbers with $1 < a_n < a_{n+1} \rightarrow \infty(n \rightarrow \infty)$. For $0 < \rho \leq \infty$, there exists an entire function f with order at least ρ which has an escaping wandering domain U such that for some point z_0 , $|f^n(z_0)| \sim a_n(n \rightarrow \infty)$. In terms of (1.2), for any point $a \in U$, there exists $L > 1$ such that $\frac{a_n}{L} \leq |f^n(a)| \leq La_n$.*

If it is allowed that f is meromorphic in Theorem 7, then we can obtain (1.12) for any point $z_0 \in U$. Theorem 7 would not be new, but we could not find any references about it. It was shown in [31] that every Fatou component of $z + \sin z + 2\pi$ is a bounded wandering domain where $f^n(z) \sim 2\pi n(n \rightarrow \infty)$; every Fatou component of $z + e^{-z} + 2\pi i$ is an unbounded wandering domain where $f^n(z) \sim 2\pi n(n \rightarrow \infty)$.

If f is entire, then $a_n \leq M(2|z_0|, f^n) \leq M_n(2|z_0|, f)$, where $M_n(r, f)$ stands for the n th iterate of $M(r, f)$ with respect to r . However from Theorem ?? we cannot estimate a_n in terms of f and z_0 when f is meromorphic with infinitely many poles.

The organization of this paper is the following. We will collect the preliminary results in Section 2 applied often to the proofs of theorems. We will prove Theorems 1-4 in Section 3 and Theorems 5-7 in Section 4. We will make further discussions or remarks after the proofs of theorems.

2. PRELIMINARY LEMMAS

Firstly we need a covering lemma which comes from the hyperbolic metric. Let Ω be a hyperbolic domain in the extended complex plane $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$, that is, $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Omega$ contains at least three points. Then there exists on Ω the hyperbolic metric $\lambda_\Omega(z)|dz|$ with Gaussian curvature -1 and $\lambda_\Omega(z)$ is the hyperbolic density of Ω at $z \in \Omega$. Then

$$\lambda_D(z) = \frac{1}{|z| \log |z|}, \quad D = \{z : |z| > 1\}$$

and

$$(2.1) \quad \lambda_A(z) = \frac{\pi}{|z| \operatorname{mod}(A) \sin(\pi \log(R/|z|)/\operatorname{mod}(A))}, \quad \forall z \in A = A(r, R),$$

where $A(r, R) = \{z : r < |z| < R\}$ and $\operatorname{mod}(A) = \log R/r$ is the modulus of A . The hyperbolic distance $d_\Omega(u, v)$ of two points $u, v \in \Omega$ is defined by

$$d_\Omega(u, v) = \inf_\alpha \int_\alpha \lambda_\Omega(z) |dz|,$$

where the infimum is taken over all piecewise smooth paths α in Ω joining u and v .

Lemma 1. ([45]) *Let f be analytic on a hyperbolic domain U with $0 \notin f(U)$. If there exist two distinct points z_1 and z_2 in U such that $|f(z_1)| > e^{\kappa\delta} |f(z_2)|$, where*

$\delta = d_U(z_1, z_2)$ and $\kappa = \Gamma(1/4)^4/(4\pi^2)$, then there exists a point $\hat{z} \in U$ such that $|f(z_2)| \leq |f(\hat{z})| \leq |f(z_1)|$ and

$$(2.2) \quad f(U) \supset A \left(e^\kappa \left(\frac{|f(z_2)|}{|f(z_1)|} \right)^{1/\delta} |f(\hat{z})|, e^{-\kappa} \left(\frac{|f(z_1)|}{|f(z_2)|} \right)^{1/\delta} |f(\hat{z})| \right).$$

If $|f(z_1)| \geq \exp\left(\frac{\kappa\delta}{1-\delta}\right) |f(z_2)|$ and $0 < \delta < 1$, then

$$(2.3) \quad f(U) \supset A(|f(z_2)|, |f(z_1)|).$$

In particular, for $\delta \leq \frac{1}{6}$ and $|f(z_1)| \geq e|f(z_2)|$, we have (2.3).

In order to be able to cover an effective annulus, we are forced to calculate carefully the hyperbolic distance in an annulus.

Lemma 2. *Set $A = A(r, R)$ with $0 < r < R$. Then for any two points $z_1, z_2 \in A$ with $|z_2| \leq |z_1|$ we have*

$$\max \left\{ \frac{\pi}{\text{mod}(A)} \log \frac{|z_1|}{|z_2|}, \log \frac{\log \frac{R}{|z_2|}}{\log \frac{R}{|z_1|}} \right\} \leq d_A(z_1, z_2) \leq \frac{\pi^2}{\text{mod}(A)\hat{K}_0} + \frac{\pi}{\text{mod}(A)\hat{K}_1} \log \frac{|z_1|}{|z_2|},$$

where $\hat{K}_0 = \max_{j=1,2} \sin(\pi \log(R/|z_j|)/\text{mod}(A))$ and $\hat{K}_1 = \min_{j=1,2} \sin(\pi \log(R/|z_j|)/\text{mod}(A))$.

In particular, for z_1, z_2 with $\frac{R}{|z_1|} = \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^\sigma$, $\frac{R}{|z_2|} = \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^\tau$ and $0 < \sigma \leq \tau < 1$, we have

$$(2.4) \quad \max \left\{ (\tau - \sigma)\pi, \log \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \right\} \leq d_A(z_1, z_2) \leq \frac{\pi^2}{\hat{K}_0 \text{mod}(A)} + \frac{(\tau - \sigma)\pi}{\hat{K}_1},$$

with $\hat{K}_0 = \max\{\sin(\sigma\pi), \sin(\tau\pi)\}$ and $\hat{K}_1 = \min\{\sin(\sigma\pi), \sin(\tau\pi)\}$.

Proof. We prove the first inequality. In view of (2.1), for all $z \in A$ we have

$$\lambda_A(z) = \frac{\pi}{|z| \text{mod}(A) \sin(\pi \log(R/|z|)/\text{mod}(A))} \geq \frac{1}{|z| \log \frac{R}{|z|}}$$

and

$$\lambda_A(z) \geq \frac{\pi}{|z| \text{mod}(A)}.$$

Therefore

$$d_A(z_1, z_2) \geq \int_\gamma \frac{|dz|}{|z| \log \frac{R}{|z|}} \geq \log \frac{\log \frac{R}{|z_2|}}{\log \frac{R}{|z_1|}}$$

and

$$d_A(z_1, z_2) \geq \frac{\pi}{\text{mod}(A)} \log \frac{|z_1|}{|z_2|},$$

where γ is the geodesic curve in A connecting z_1 and z_2 .

Next we prove the second inequality. For all z with $|z_2| \leq |z| \leq |z_1|$ we have

$$\sin(\pi \log(R/|z|)/\text{mod}(A)) \geq \min_{j=1,2} \sin(\pi \log(R/|z_j|)/\text{mod}(A)) = \hat{K}_1.$$

Without loss of generality assume that \hat{K}_0 attains the maximal value at z_2 . Then

$$\begin{aligned} d_A(z_1, z_2) &\leq \frac{\pi}{\text{mod}(A)\hat{K}_0} \int_{\gamma_0} \frac{|dz|}{|z|} + \frac{\pi}{\text{mod}(A)\hat{K}_1} \int_{\gamma_1} \frac{|dz|}{|z|} \\ &\leq \frac{\pi^2}{\text{mod}(A)\hat{K}_0} + \frac{\pi}{\text{mod}(A)\hat{K}_1} \log \frac{|z_1|}{|z_2|}, \end{aligned}$$

where γ_0 is the shortest arc from $|z_2|e^{i \arg z_1}$ to z_2 and $\gamma_1 = \{z = te^{i \arg z_1} : |z_1| \leq t \leq |z_2|\}$. \square

Please pay attention! The bounds of $d_A(z_1, z_2)$ only depend on $\text{mod}(A)$, but independent of the size of R and r .

Lemma 3. ([45]) *Let $h(z)$ be analytic on the annulus $B = A(r, R)$ with $0 < r < R < +\infty$ such that $|h(z)| > 1$ on B . Then*

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \log \hat{m}(\rho, h) &\geq \exp\left(-\frac{\pi^2}{2} \max\left\{\frac{1}{\log \frac{R}{\rho}}, \frac{1}{\log \frac{\rho}{r}}\right\}\right) \log M(\rho, h) \\ &\geq \min\left\{\frac{\log \frac{\rho}{r} - \pi}{\log \frac{\rho}{r} + \pi}, \frac{\log \frac{R}{\rho} - \pi}{\log \frac{R}{\rho} + \pi}\right\} \log M(\rho, h), \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho \in (r, R)$ and $\hat{m}(\rho, h) = \min\{|h(z)| : |z| = \rho\}$.

Secondly we need the basic notations and results in Nevanlinna theory of meromorphic functions ([20] or [41]). Set $\log^+ x = \log \max\{1, x\}$. Let f be a meromorphic function. Define

$$\begin{aligned} m(r, f) &:= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ |f(re^{i\theta})| d\theta, \\ N(r, f) &:= \int_0^r \frac{n(t, f) - n(0, f)}{t} dt + n(0, f) \log r, \end{aligned}$$

where $n(t, f)$ denotes the number of poles of f counted according to their multiplicities in $\{z : |z| < t\}$, sometimes we write $n(t, \infty)$ for $n(t, f)$ and $n(t, 0)$ for $n\left(t, \frac{1}{f}\right)$ when f is clear in the context, and the Nevanlinna characteristic of f by

$$T(r, f) := m(r, f) + N(r, f).$$

Then the deficiency of Nevanlinna of f of poles is

$$\delta(\infty, f) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m(r, f)}{T(r, f)} = 1 - \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, f)}{T(r, f)}.$$

We write the conclusions about the Nevanlinna characteristic we shall use below as a lemma, which also holds for $\log M(r, f)$ of a transcendental entire function f ; see Theorem 2.2 of [13].

Lemma 4. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function. Then*

- (1) $\frac{T(r, f)}{\log r} \rightarrow \infty (r \rightarrow \infty)$;
- (2) *There exists $r_0 > 0$ such that for $r_0 \leq r < R$,*

$$(2.6) \quad T(R, f) \geq \frac{\log R}{\log r} T(r, f);$$

- (3) *There exists $r_0 > 0$ such that for $r_0 \leq r < R$ and any positive integer n , we have*

$$(2.7) \quad \hat{T}_n(R, f) \geq \hat{T}_n(r, f)^{\frac{\log R}{\log r}},$$

where $\hat{T}(r, f) = e^{T(r, f)}$ and $\hat{T}_n(r, f) = \hat{T}(\hat{T}_{n-1}(r, f), f)$, $\hat{T}_0(r, f) = r$.

Since $T(r, f)$ is a logarithmic convex function, the result (2) in Lemma 4 follows from the result (1) in Lemma 4 and further (3) in Lemma 4 follows (see [45]).

3. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 1-4

We need Runge Theorem to complete the proofs of Theorems 1.

Runge Theorem(cf. [35]). *Let W be a compact set on the complex plane and let $f(z)$ be analytic on W . Assume that E is a set which intersects every component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus W$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a rational function $R(z)$ such that all poles of $R(z)$ lie in E and*

$$|f(z) - R(z)| < \varepsilon, \quad \forall z \in W.$$

Now let us go to the proof of Theorem 1.

Take four sequences $\{r_n\}$, $\{R_n\}$, $\{r'_n\}$ and $\{R'_n\}$ such that $10 < r_n < r'_n < R'_n < R_n$, $2 \leq r'_n/r_n \leq 3$, $2 \leq R_n/R'_n \leq 3$, $9R_n < r_{n+1}$ and $R_n/r_n = R'_{n+1}/r'_{n+1}$. Thus $\frac{R_n}{r_n} = \frac{R'_{n+1}}{r'_{n+1}} \leq \frac{1}{4} \frac{R_{n+1}}{r_{n+1}}$, and $\frac{R_n}{r_n} \geq 4^{n-1} \frac{R_1}{r_1} \rightarrow \infty (n \rightarrow \infty)$.

Define

$$T_n(z) = \frac{r'_{n+1}}{r_n} z : A(r_n, R_n) \rightarrow A(r'_{n+1}, R'_{n+1}).$$

Take a_n and b_n such that $b_n > R_n + n$, $\frac{b_n}{R_n} \rightarrow 1 (n \rightarrow \infty)$ and $a_n < r_n - n$, $\frac{a_n}{r_n} \rightarrow 1 (n \rightarrow \infty)$. Set $A_n = A(r_n, R_n)$, $C_n = \{z : |z| = b_n \text{ or } a_n\}$ and $B_n = B(0, r_n/4)$ with $r_1 > 4$.

Take a sequence of positive numbers $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ such that $\varepsilon_{n+1} < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_n$ and $\varepsilon_1 < \frac{1}{2}$. In view of the Runge's Theorem, we have a rational function $f_1(z)$ such that

$$|f_1(z) - T_1(z)| < \varepsilon_1, \quad \forall z \in A_1; \quad |f_1(z)| < \varepsilon_1, \quad \forall z \in B_1$$

$$|f_1(z)| < \varepsilon_1, \quad \forall z \in C_1$$

and inductively, we have rational function $f_{n+1}(z)$ such that

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} f_k(z) - T_{n+1}(z) \right| < \varepsilon_{n+1}, \quad \forall z \in A_{n+1}; \quad |f_{n+1}(z)| < \varepsilon_{n+1}, \quad \forall z \in B_{n+1}$$

and

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} f_k(z) \right| < \varepsilon_{n+1}, \quad \forall z \in C_{n+1}.$$

Write $f(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n(z)$. Since the series is uniformly convergent on any compact subset of \mathbb{C} , $f(z)$ is a meromorphic function on \mathbb{C} .

For $z \in B_1$, we have

$$|f(z)| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |f_n(z)| < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_n < 1,$$

that is to say, $f(B_1) \subset B(0, 1)$ and so B_1 is contained in an invariant Fatou component of f . For $z \in C_n$, we have, by noting that $C_n \subset B_m$ for $m > n$,

$$|f(z)| \leq \left| \sum_{k=1}^n f_k(z) \right| + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} |f_k(z)| < \varepsilon_n + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} |f_k(z)| < \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \varepsilon_k < 1$$

and so $f(C_n) \subset B(0, 1)$ and C_n is contained in a preperiodic Fatou component of f . Since for $z \in A_n = A(r_n, R_n) \subset B_{n+1}$,

$$(3.1) \quad |f(z) - T_n(z)| \leq \left| \sum_{k=1}^n f_k(z) - T_n(z) \right| + \left| \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} f_k(z) \right| < \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \varepsilon_k = \varepsilon'_n \text{ (say)},$$

we have

$$(3.2) \quad f(A(r_n, R_n)) \subset A(r'_{n+1} - \varepsilon'_n, R'_{n+1} + \varepsilon'_n) \subset A(r_{n+1}, R_{n+1}).$$

Therefore, A_n is contained in a wandering domain U_n of f and $f : U_n \rightarrow U_{n+1}$ is proper. Since f is univalent in A_n by the Rouché Theorem, U_n is not doubly connected. Each of U_n has no isolated boundary points. If U_n is finitely connected, then in view of the Riemann-Hurwitz Theorem, f is univalent in U_n , but the modulus of annulus A_m tends to infinity as m does, which contracts to the conformal invariant property of annulus modulus. Therefore, U_n must be infinitely connected.

For a point $a \in A_n$, it follows from (3.1) that

$$\frac{r'_{n+1}}{r_n} |a| - \varepsilon'_n \leq |f(a)| \leq \frac{r'_{n+1}}{r_n} |a| + \varepsilon'_n$$

and

$$\frac{r'_{n+1} - \varepsilon'_n}{r_n} \leq \frac{|f(a)|}{|a|} \leq \frac{r'_{n+1} + \varepsilon'_n}{r_n}.$$

Inductively, from (3.2) we have

$$\prod_{k=1}^m \frac{r'_{n+k} - \varepsilon'_{n+k-1}}{r_{n+k-1}} \leq \frac{|f^m(a)|}{|a|} \leq \prod_{k=1}^m \frac{r'_{n+k} + \varepsilon'_{n+k-1}}{r_{n+k-1}}.$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{r'_{n+k} + \varepsilon'_{n+k-1}}{r'_{n+k} - \varepsilon'_{n+k-1}} &= \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{2\varepsilon'_{n+k-1}}{r'_{n+k} - \varepsilon'_{n+k-1}} \right) \\ &< \exp \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2\varepsilon'_{n+k-1}}{r'_{n+k} - \varepsilon'_{n+k-1}} < e^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for two points a and b in A_n , we have

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{|f^m(a)|}{|f^m(b)|} \leq \frac{|a|}{|b|} \prod_{k=1}^m \frac{r'_{n+k} + \varepsilon'_{n+k-1}}{r'_{n+k} - \varepsilon'_{n+k-1}} < \frac{|a|}{|b|} e^2, \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Now we need to treat two cases:

Case (I): $|f^m(b)| \leq R'_m < R_m \leq |f^m(a)|$;

Case (II): $|f^m(b)| \leq r'_m < r'_m \leq |f^m(a)|$.

Below we only prove that Case (I) would be impossible. The same method yields the same assertion to Case (II). Set $E_m = A(a_m, b_m)$. In view of the Principle of

Hyperbolic Metric (Shwarz-Pick Lemma), we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
d_U(a, b) &\geq d_{U_m}(f^m(a), f^m(b)) \\
&\geq d_{E_m}(f^m(b), f^m(a)) \\
&\geq d_{E_m}(R'_m, R_m) \\
&= \int_{R'_m}^{R_m} \lambda_{E_m}(z) |dz| \\
&= \int_{R'_m}^{R_m} \frac{\pi}{t \operatorname{mod}(E_m) \sin(\pi \log \frac{b_m}{t} / \operatorname{mod}(E_m))} dt \\
&\geq \int_{R'_m}^{R_m} \frac{dt}{t \log \frac{b_m}{t}} \\
&= \log \frac{\log \frac{b_m}{R'_m}}{\log \frac{b_m}{R_m}} \\
&= \log \left(1 + \frac{\log \frac{R_m}{R'_m}}{\log \frac{b_m}{R_m}} \right) \\
&\geq \log \left(1 + \frac{\log 2}{\log \frac{b_m}{R_m}} \right) \rightarrow \infty (m \rightarrow \infty).
\end{aligned}$$

A contradiction is derived. Then for all sufficiently large $m > 0$, $f^m(a)$ and $f^m(b)$ lie in A_m or $A(a_m, r'_m)$ or $A(R'_m, b_m)$ at the same time.

By noting that $2 \leq r'_n/a_n \leq 4$ and $2 \leq b_n/R'_n \leq 4$ together with (3.3), we deduce that for any pair of points $a, b \in U$ and all sufficiently large n

$$\frac{|f^n(a)|}{|f^n(b)|} \leq \max \left\{ 4, \frac{|a|}{|b|} e^2 \right\}.$$

□

For the proof of Theorem 2, we first establish two lemmas.

Lemma 5. *Let f be a meromorphic function on $\{z : |z| \leq R\}$ and f be analytic on $\overline{A}(r, R)$ with $0 < r < R/4$. Then for $r + 1 < r' < R' \leq R$, on $\{|z| = r'\}$, we have*

$$(3.4) \quad \log^+ |f(z)| \leq \left(\frac{R' + r'}{R' - r'} + \left(\log \frac{R}{r} \right)^{-1} \log \frac{R'}{r' - r} \right) T(R, f).$$

Proof. In view of the Poisson formula, for $z \in D = \{z : |z| < R'\}$ with $f(z) \neq 0, \infty$, we have

$$(3.5) \quad \log |f(z)| \leq m(D, z, f) + N(D, z, f),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
m(D, z, f) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial D} \log^+ |f(\zeta)| \frac{\partial G_D(\zeta, z)}{\partial \bar{\zeta}} ds, \\
N(D, z, f) &= \sum_{b_n \in D} G_D(b_n, z),
\end{aligned}$$

G_D is the Green function for D and all b_n are poles of f in D appearing often according to their multiplicities. Then for z with $|z| = r'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m(D, z, f) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ |f(R'e^{i\theta})| \frac{R'^2 - |z|^2}{|R'^2 - z|^2} d\theta \\ &\leq \frac{R' + |z|}{R' - |z|} m(R', f) \leq \frac{R' + |z|}{R' - |z|} T(R', f) \end{aligned}$$

and, by denoting the number of poles of f in D by $n(D, f)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} N(D, z, f) &\leq \sum_{b_n \in D} \log \frac{R'}{|b_n - z|} \\ &\leq n(D, f) \log \frac{R'}{r' - r} \\ &= n(r, f) \log \frac{R'}{r' - r} \\ &= \left(\log \frac{R}{r} \right)^{-1} \int_r^R \frac{n(t, f)}{t} dt \log \frac{R'}{r' - r} \\ &\leq \left(\log \frac{R}{r} \right)^{-1} \left(\log \frac{R'}{r' - r} \right) T(R, f). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we immediately have (3.10). \square

The following is extracted from the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [45], but the condition (1.4) in that paper is replaced by the more general condition (1.4) in this paper.

Lemma 6. *Let f be a meromorphic function with (1.4). Let U be a Fatou component of f . Then there exist constants $D > 1$, $d > 1$ and $R_0 > 0$ such that if for some $m > 0$ and $r \geq R_0$,*

$$(3.6) \quad A(D^{-d}r, D^d r) \subseteq f^m(U),$$

then for all sufficiently large n , $f^n(U) \supset A_n$ and $A_{n+1} \subset f(A_n)$ with $A_n = A(r_n, R_n)$, $R_n \geq r_n^\sigma$, $r_{n+1} > R_n$, $r_n \rightarrow \infty$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$) and $\sigma > 1$.

We remark that if the conclusion of Lemma 6 holds, that is to say, for large n , $f^n(U)$ contains large annulus stated in Lemma 6, then the condition (1.4) can be replaced by the following inequality

$$(3.7) \quad \log M(Cr, f) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\log \log r}{\log r} \right) T(r, f), \quad \forall r > r_0.$$

We will complete the proof of Theorem 2 under the condition (3.7) instead of (1.4) after we obtain large annulus sequence stated in Lemma 6. Now we are in the position to prove Theorem 2.

Under the conditions of Theorem 2, in view of Lemma 6, for all sufficiently large n , we have

$$(3.8) \quad A(r_n, R_n) \subset f^n(U)$$

with $R_n \geq r_n^\sigma$, $r_{n+1} > R_n$, $r_n \rightarrow \infty$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$) and $\sigma > 1$. Therefore, for a sufficiently large m and $n \geq m$ we have $r_{n+1} > R_n \geq R_m^{\sigma^{n-m}}$. Without loss of

generality for a sufficiently large m , we rewrite r_m , R_m and $\sigma > 1$ such that

$$f^m(U) \supset A(r_m^\alpha, R_m^\beta) \supset A(r_m, R_m)$$

with $R_m = r_m^\sigma$, $(\sigma - 1) \log r_m > 2m^2$, $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\beta > 1$ (For example in (3.8) for $n = m$ we replace r_m by $r_m^{1/\alpha}$ and R_m by $R_m^{1/\beta}$ with $\beta = \alpha\sigma$). Take $R'_m = e^{-m^2} R_m$ and $r'_m = er_m$. Applying Lemma 3 to f on $A(r_m, R_m)$, we have

$$(3.9) \quad \hat{m}(R'_m, f) \geq M(R'_m, f)^{s_m}, \quad s_m = \exp\left(-\frac{\pi^2}{2} \max\left\{\frac{1}{\log \frac{R_m}{R'_m}}, \frac{1}{\log \frac{R'_m}{r_m}}\right\}\right).$$

Let us estimate s_m . Since

$$\log \frac{R_m}{R'_m} = m^2 \text{ and } \log \frac{R'_m}{r_m} = (\sigma - 1) \log r_m - m^2 > m^2,$$

we have

$$s_m = \exp\left(-\frac{\pi^2}{2m^2}\right).$$

Take τ with $1 < \tau < \sigma$ such that $s_m \sigma > \tau$ and take two points a and b with $|a| = r'_m$ and $|b| = R'_m$. Set $\hat{R}_m = r'_m e^{m^3}$. Finding σ_m such that $R'_m/C = \hat{R}_m^{\sigma_m}$, we have

$$\sigma_m = \frac{\log R'_m/C}{\log \hat{R}_m} = \sigma - \frac{\sigma m^3 + m^2 + \sigma + \log C}{\log r_m + m^3 + 1}.$$

Therefore, we have $|f(a)| \leq M(r'_m, f)$ and in view of (3.7) and (3.9), we have

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} |f(b)| &\geq M(R'_m, f)^{s_m} \geq \exp(s_m \tau_m T(R'_m/C, f)) \\ &= \exp(s_m \tau_m T(\hat{R}_m^{\sigma_m}, f)) \geq \exp(s_m \sigma_m \tau_m T(\hat{R}_m, f)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_m = 1 - \frac{\log \log(R'_m/C)}{\log(R'_m/C)}$. Since $r'_m > r_m > r_0^{\sigma_m}$ with $r_0 > e$, we have

$$\sigma_m > \sigma - \frac{(C + \sigma)m^3}{\log r_m} > \sigma - \frac{(C + \sigma)m^3}{\sigma^m \log r_0}$$

and $s_m \sigma_m \tau_m \rightarrow \sigma > 1 (m \rightarrow \infty)$.

In view of Lemma 5 with $R' = r'_m(m^2 + 1)$, $r' = r'_m$, $r = r_m$ and $R = \hat{R}_m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log M(r'_m, f) &\leq \left(\frac{m^2 + 2}{m^2} + \frac{\log \frac{r'_m(m^2+1)}{r'_m - r_m}}{\log \frac{\hat{R}_m}{r_m}}\right) T(\hat{R}_m, f) \\ &= \left(\frac{m^2 + 2}{m^2} + \frac{\log \frac{e}{e-1}(m^2 + 1)}{m^3 + 1}\right) T(\hat{R}_m, f) \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{t}{m^2}\right) T(\hat{R}_m, f), \end{aligned}$$

where t is an absolute constant. Set $t_m = (1 + \frac{t}{m^2})^{-1}$. Thus combining (3.10) together with the above inequality yields

$$(3.11) \quad |f(b)| \geq \exp(s_m \sigma_m \tau_m T(\hat{R}_m, f)) \geq M(r'_m, f)^{t_m s_m \sigma_m \tau_m} \geq |f(a)|^{t_m s_m \sigma_m \tau_m}.$$

Set $r'_{m+1} = |f(a)|$ and $R'_{m+1} = |f(b)|$. Then we have $R'_{m+1} \geq (r'_{m+1})^{t_m s_m \sigma_m \tau_m}$. Set $R_{m+1} = e^{(m+1)^2} R'_{m+1}$ and $r_{m+1} = r'_{m+1}/e$.

Now let us estimate $d_{U_m}(a, b)$ with $U_m = f^m(U)$. Set $A'_m = A(r_m^\alpha, R_m^\beta)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \sin\left(\pi \frac{\log \frac{R_m^\beta}{r_m'}}{\text{mod}(A'_m)}\right) &= \sin\left(\pi \frac{(\beta - 1/\sigma) \log R_m - 1}{(\beta - \alpha/\sigma) \log R_m}\right) \\ &\rightarrow \sin\left(\pi \frac{\sigma\beta - 1}{\sigma\beta - \alpha}\right) (m \rightarrow \infty) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sin\left(\pi \frac{\log \frac{R_m^\beta}{R'_m}}{\text{mod}(A'_m)}\right) &= \sin\left(\pi \frac{(\beta - 1) \log R_m + m^2}{(\beta - \alpha/\sigma) \log R_m}\right) \\ &\rightarrow \sin\left(\pi \frac{\sigma(\beta - 1)}{\sigma\beta - \alpha}\right) (m \rightarrow \infty), \end{aligned}$$

in view of (2.1) we have

$$\lambda_{A'_m}(z) \leq \frac{K\pi}{\text{mod}(A'_m)} \frac{1}{|z|}, \quad r'_m \leq |z| \leq R'_m,$$

where K is a constant with $1/K < \min\left\{\sin\left(\pi \frac{\sigma\beta - 1}{\sigma\beta - \alpha}\right), \sin\left(\pi \frac{\sigma(\beta - 1)}{\sigma\beta - \alpha}\right)\right\}$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{r'_m}^{R'_m} \lambda_{A'_m}(z) |dz| &\leq \frac{K\pi}{\text{mod}(A'_m)} \int_{r'_m}^{R'_m} \frac{dt}{t} \\ &= \frac{K\pi}{\text{mod}(A'_m)} \log \frac{R'_m}{r'_m} \\ &= \frac{K\pi}{(\beta - \alpha/\sigma) \log R_m} ((1 - 1/\sigma) \log R_m - m^2 - 1) \\ &\rightarrow \frac{K\pi(\sigma - 1)}{\sigma\beta - \alpha} (m \rightarrow \infty) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_0^\pi \lambda_{A'_m}(R'_m e^{i\theta}) R'_m d\theta \leq \frac{K\pi^2}{\text{mod}(A'_m)} \rightarrow 0 (m \rightarrow \infty).$$

Therefore, for sufficiently large m and $\sigma > 1$ close to 1, we have

$$\delta = d_{U_m}(a, b) \leq d_{A'_m}(a, b) < \frac{1}{6}.$$

In view of the above inequality, (3.11) and (3.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\kappa} \left(\frac{|f(b)|}{|f(a)|}\right)^{1/\delta - 1} &\geq e^{-\kappa} \left(|f(b)|^{1 - 1/(t_m s_m \sigma_m \tau_m)}\right)^5 \\ &\geq \exp\left[5 \left(1 - \frac{1}{t_m s_m \sigma_m \tau_m}\right) s_m \sigma_m \tau_m T(\hat{R}_m, f) - \kappa\right] \\ &> \exp[3(\sigma - 1)T(\hat{R}_m, f)] > e^{(m+1)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $|f(a)| \leq |f(\hat{z})| \leq |f(b)|$ with $\hat{z} \in U_m$ we have

$$e^\kappa \left(\frac{|f(a)|}{|f(b)|}\right)^{1/\delta} |f(\hat{z})| \leq e^\kappa \left(\frac{|f(a)|}{|f(b)|}\right)^{1/\delta - 1} r'_{m+1} < r'_{m+1}/e = r_{m+1};$$

and

$$e^{-\kappa} \left(\frac{|f(b)|}{|f(a)|} \right)^{1/\delta} |f(\hat{z})| \geq e^{-\kappa} \left(\frac{|f(b)|}{|f(a)|} \right)^{1/\delta-1} R'_{m+1} > e^{(m+1)^2} R'_{m+1} = R_{m+1}.$$

Since $d_{U_m}(a, b) < \frac{1}{6}$, in view of Lemma 1 we have

$$U_{m+1} = f(U_m) \supset A(r_{m+1}, R_{m+1}) \supset \bar{A}(r'_{m+1}, R'_{m+1}).$$

Thus by noting that $d_{U_{m+1}}(f(a), f(b)) \leq d_{U_m}(a, b) < \frac{1}{6}$ (β and α are just used to imply the inequality), $|f(a)| = r'_{m+1}$ and $|f(b)| = R'_{m+1}$, we can repeat the above step and obtain that

$$(3.12) \quad |f^n(b)| \geq |f^n(a)| \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} s_{k+m} t_{k+m} \sigma_{k+m} \tau_{k+m}.$$

For sufficiently large m , we can require, for $n \geq 1$,

$$\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} s_{k+m} t_{k+m} \sigma_{k+m} \tau_{k+m} > \frac{\sigma+1}{2} > 1.$$

Take a point $c \in U$. Define

$$h_n(z) = \frac{\log |f^n(z)|}{\log |f^n(c)|}, \quad \forall z \in U.$$

Since U is wandering and escaping, we can assume that $|f^n(z)| > 1$ on U and with (1.1) we have that $h_n(z)$ is harmonic and positive on U . In view of (1.1) or by Harnack's inequality, the family $\{h_n\}$ of harmonic functions is locally normal on U and hence

$$\bar{h}(z) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(z), \quad \forall z \in U$$

exists and \bar{h} is harmonic and positive on U . In view of (3.12), we have

$$h_n(b) \geq \frac{\sigma+1}{2} h_n(a), \quad \bar{h}(b) \geq \frac{\sigma+1}{2} \bar{h}(a) > \bar{h}(a).$$

Therefore, $\bar{h}(z)$ is not a constant on U . The same argument implies that

$$\underline{h}(z) := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(z), \quad \forall z \in U$$

exists and \underline{h} is a non-constant, harmonic and positive function on U .

Suppose that $\bar{h}(z_0) > \underline{h}(z_0)$ for some $z_0 \in U$. Without any loss of generalities suppose that $\bar{h}(z_0) > \bar{h}(c) = 1$. Take a real number η with $\max\{1, \underline{h}(z_0)\} < \eta < \bar{h}(z_0)$. Since $\bar{h}(z)$ is not a constant, we can find z_1 and z_2 such that $\bar{h}(z_1) < 1 = \bar{h}(c) < \bar{h}(z_0) < \bar{h}(z_2)$. In view of Lemma 1, for some sufficiently large m , we have

$$f^m(U) \supset A(|f^m(c)|^\alpha, |f^m(c)|^\beta),$$

where $\bar{h}(z_1) < \alpha < 1$ and $1 < \bar{h}(z_0) < \beta < \bar{h}(z_2)$.

From the argument of above paragraph we can take $a = f^m(c)$ and $b = f^m(z_0)$ such that

$$|f^{n+m}(z_0)| > |f^{n+m}(c)|^\eta, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This implies that $\underline{h}(z_0) \geq \eta$. A contradiction is derived. We have proved that $\bar{h}(z) = \underline{h}(z)$ on U , that is to say,

$$h(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |f^n(z)|}{\log |f^n(c)|}$$

exists on U .

Set

$$H(z) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |f^n(z)|}{\log |f^n(z_0)|} = \frac{h(z)}{h(z_0)}.$$

H is a non-constant, harmonic and positive function on U . Thus we can find two points z_1 and z_2 in V and $0 < \alpha < 1$ such that $H(z_1) < 1 - \alpha < 1 < 1 + \alpha < H(z_2)$. For a sufficiently large m we have $d_{f^m(V)}(f^m(z_1), f^m(z_2)) < \frac{1}{6}$ and hence, in view of Lemma 1, for $n \geq m$

$$f^n(V) \supset A(|f^n(z_1)|, |f^n(z_2)|) \supset A(|f^n(z_0)|^{1-\alpha}, |f^n(z_0)|^{1+\alpha}).$$

Thus we have (3.6) for sufficiently large m and $f^m(V)$ instead. In view of Lemma 6, for all sufficiently large n and some $\tau > 1$, we obtain $A_n = A(r_n, R_n) \subseteq f^n(V)$ with $R_n \geq r_n^\tau \rightarrow \infty (n \rightarrow \infty)$ such that $A_{n+1} \subset f(A_n)$.

We complete the proof of Theorem 2. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. In view of Theorem 2, there exist a sufficiently large m and a sufficiently large r_m such that for $n \geq m$ and $r_{n+1} > R_n \geq r_n^\sigma$ with $\sigma > 1$ we have

$$f^n(U) \supset A(r_n^\alpha, R_n^\beta), \quad 0 < \alpha < 1, \quad 1 < \beta.$$

From (1.9) and (1.4), in view of Lemma 3, Lemma 4 and Lemma 5 in turn, we can show

$$M(R_m, g) \geq \hat{m}(R_m, g) > M(r_m, g) \geq \hat{m}(r_m, g)$$

and in view of the maximal principle, we have

$$(3.13) \quad g(A(r_m, R_m)) \subseteq A(\hat{m}(r_m, g), M(R_m, g)).$$

Set $u(z) = f(z) - g(z)$ and $s_m = \exp\left(-\frac{\pi^2}{2m^2}\right)$. For sufficiently large m , we have $s_m > \max\{1/2, \delta\}$. In view of Lemma 3 for $r = e^{-m^2} r_m$, $\rho = r_m$ and $R = R_m$ and by noting that $\log(1-x) > -2x$ for $0 < x < \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{m}(r_m, g) &\geq \hat{m}(r_m, f) - M(r_m, u) \geq M(r_m, f)^{s_m} - M(r_m, u) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{M(r_m, u)}{M(r_m, f)^{s_m}}\right) M(r_m, f)^{s_m} \geq M(r_m, f)^{s_m \gamma_m}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_m = 1 - \frac{4M(r_m, f)^{\delta - s_m}}{\log M(r_m, f)} > 1 - \frac{1}{m^2}$ and by noting that $\log(1+x) < x$ for $x > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M(R_m, g) &\leq M(R_m, f) + M(R_m, u) \\ &= M(R_m, f) \left(1 + \frac{M(R_m, u)}{M(R_m, f)}\right) \leq M(R_m, f)^{\tau_m}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_m = 1 + \frac{1}{M(R_m, f)^{1-\delta} \log M(R_m, f)} < 1 + \frac{1}{m^2}$ for sufficiently large m . Thus it follows from (3.13) that

$$(3.14) \quad g(A(r_m, R_m)) \subseteq A(M(r_m, f)^{s_m \gamma_m}, M(R_m, f)^{\tau_m}).$$

On the other hand, we have

$$(3.15) \quad f^{m+1}(U) \supset f(A(r_m^\alpha, R_m^\beta)) \supset A(M(r_m^\alpha, f), \hat{m}(R_m^\beta e^{-m^2}, f)).$$

In view of Lemma 3 and (1.4), we have

$$\hat{m}(R_m^\beta e^{-m^2}, f) \geq M(R_m^\beta e^{-m^2}, f)^{s_m} \geq \exp(\sigma_m t_m T(R_m^\beta e^{-m^2}/C, f)),$$

for $t_m = 1 - \frac{\log \log(R_m^\beta e^{-m^2}/C)}{\log(R_m^\beta e^{-m^2}/C)} > 1 - \frac{1}{m^2}$ for sufficiently large m , and in view of Lemma 5, we can show that

$$\tau_m \log M(R_m, f) < s_m t_m T(R_m^\beta e^{-m^2}/C, f)$$

and in view of (1.4) and Lemma 4, we have

$$s_m \gamma_m \log M(r_m, f) > \log M(r_m^\alpha, f).$$

Thus $M(R_m^\beta e^{-m^2}, f)^{s_m} > M(r_m^\alpha, f)$ and from (3.15) we can deduce

$$(3.16) \quad f^{m+1}(U) \supset A(M(r_m^\alpha, f), M(R_m^\beta e^{-m^2}, f)^{s_m}).$$

Now we set $\hat{r}_1 = M(r_m^\alpha, f)^{s_m \gamma_m / \alpha}$ and $\hat{R}_1 = M(R_m, f)^{\tau_m}$ so that we have $M(r_m, f)^{s_m \gamma_m} \geq \hat{r}_1$. Combining (3.14) and (3.16) yields

$$f^{m+1}(U) \supset A(\hat{r}_1^{\alpha \eta_m}, \hat{R}_1^{\beta_m}) \supset A(\hat{r}_1, \hat{R}_1) \supset g(A(r_m, R_m))$$

with $\eta_m = \frac{1}{s_m \gamma_m} > 1$ and $\beta_m = \frac{s_m \log M(R_m^\beta e^{-m^2}, f)}{\tau_m \log M(R_m, f)} \rightarrow \beta$ ($m \rightarrow \infty$). For sufficiently large m , we can require that $0 < \alpha \eta_m < \frac{\alpha+1}{2} < 1$ and $1 < \frac{\beta+1}{2} < \beta_m$.

By the same step as above, we have

$$f^{m+2}(U) \supset A(\hat{r}_2^{\alpha \eta_m \eta_{m+1}}, \hat{R}_2^{\beta_{m+1}}) \supset A(\hat{r}_2, \hat{R}_2) \supset g^2(A(r_m, R_m))$$

with $\hat{r}_2 = M(\hat{r}_1^{\alpha \eta_m}, f)^{1/(\eta_{m+1} \eta_m \alpha)}$, $\hat{R}_2 = M(\hat{R}_1, f)^{\tau_{m+1}}$, $0 < \alpha \eta_m \eta_{m+1} < \frac{\alpha+1}{2} < 1$ and $1 < \frac{\beta+1}{2} < \beta_{m+1}$.

Inductively, we have

$$f^{m+n}(U) \supset g^n(A(r_m, R_m)).$$

Thus $A(r_m, R_m)$ is in an escaping Fatou component W of g .

Let us notice that in $A(r_m, R_m)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log M(Cr, g) &\geq \log(M(Cr, f) - M(Cr, u)) \\ &= \log M(Cr, f) + \log \left(1 - \frac{M(Cr, u)}{M(Cr, f)} \right) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{2 \log \log r}{\log r} \right) T(r, f) \end{aligned}$$

and for $r_m < r + 1 < r' < R' < R \leq R_m$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log M(r', g) &\leq \log M(r', f) + \log \left(1 + \frac{M(r' u)}{M(r', f)} \right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{R' + r'}{R' - r'} + \left(\log \frac{R}{r} \right)^{-1} \log \frac{R'}{r' - r} \right) T(R, f) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can repeat the steps in the proof of Theorem 2 and show the results of Theorem 2 hold for g in W . \square

We make a remark on (1.9). From the proof of Theorem 3 we see that in order that Theorem 3 holds for g , in fact, we only need to require (1.9) holds in a sequence of annuli $A(r_n, r_n^{\sigma_n})$ instead of $f^n(U)$ as long as $A(r_n, r_n^{\sigma_n}) \subset f^n(U)$ for $\forall n \geq m$ with m being large enough and $f(A(r_n, r_n^{\sigma_n})) \subset A(r_{n+1}, r_{n+1}^{\sigma_{n+1}})$ with $1 < \sigma \leq \sigma_n$.

Proof of Theorem 4. With the help of Theorem 3 we are going to find a meromorphic function f with $\delta(\infty, f) = 0$ which has an escaping Fatou wandering domain U such that the results of Theorem 2 hold for f in U .

In [13], Bergweiler, Rippon and Stallard proved the results of Theorem 2 for entire functions in their multiply connected Fatou components. The first entire function with multiply connected Fatou component is due to I. N. Baker [2]. The multiply connected wandering domains which have uniformly perfect boundary or non-uniformly perfect boundary were found in [14]. For example, in Theorem 1.3 of [14], an entire function of zero order is constructed such that

$$f(A((1 + \varepsilon_k)r_k, (1 - \varepsilon_k)r_{k+1})) \subset A((1 + \varepsilon_{k+1})r_{k+1}, (1 - \varepsilon_{k+1})r_{k+2})$$

for a sequence $\{r_k\}$ of positive numbers with $r_{k+1} > 2r_k^2$ and a sequence $\{\varepsilon_k\}$ of positive numbers tending to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$. And the Fatou component U containing $A((1 + \varepsilon_k)r_k, (1 - \varepsilon_k)r_{k+1})$ may have uniformly perfect boundaries by suitably choosing $\{r_k\}$.

Now we put

$$g(z) = f(z) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n m_n} \sum_{k=1}^{m_n} \frac{\varepsilon_n}{z - z_{k,n}},$$

where $m_n = [r_{n+1}] + 1$ and $[r_{n+1}]$ is the maximal integer not exceeding r_{n+1} , $z_{k,n} = r_n e^{i \frac{2k\pi}{m_n}}$. It is clear that g is a meromorphic function. For $|z| = r$ with $(1 + \varepsilon_k)r_k < r < (1 - \varepsilon_k)r_{k+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z) - g(z)| &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n m_n} \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} \frac{\varepsilon_n}{|z - z_{j,n}|} \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq k, k+1}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{\varepsilon_n}{|r - r_n|} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2^k} \frac{\varepsilon_k}{r - r_k} + \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \frac{\varepsilon_{k+1}}{r_{k+1} - r} \\ &< \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} = 1, \end{aligned}$$

and this implies (1.9) for $|z| = r$ with $(1 + \varepsilon_k)r_k < r < (1 - \varepsilon_k)r_{k+1}$. In view of Theorem 3 and from the remark after the proof of Theorem 3, there exists an escaping wandering domain W of g such that the results of Theorem 2 hold for g and W .

Next we calculate the deficiency $\delta(\infty, g)$ of Nevanlinna of g . For $er_k < r < (1 - \varepsilon_k)r_{k+1}$, we have $m(r, g) \leq m(r, f) + \log 2$ and

$$N(r, g) = \int_0^r \frac{n(t, g)}{t} dt \geq \int_{r_k}^r \frac{m_k}{t} dt \geq r_{k+1} \geq r.$$

Then as $r \in \cup_{k=m}^{\infty} A(er_k, (1 - \varepsilon_k)r_{k+1}) \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\frac{m(r, g)}{T(r, g)} \leq \frac{m(r, g)}{N(r, g)} \leq \frac{m(r, f) + \log 2}{r} \rightarrow 0,$$

by noting that f is of zero order. This implies that

$$\delta(\infty, g) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m(r, g)}{T(r, g)} = 0.$$

Then g is the desired meromorphic function of Theorem 4. \square

But we do not know if W has uniformly perfect boundary. Therefore, we beg the following

Question B: *Are there any meromorphic function with zero Nevanlinna deficiency at poles which has a multiply connected escaping wandering domain with uniformly perfect boundary?*

Perhaps the following approach would be possible to solve Question B. We try to control the changes of critical values as an entire function that has a multiply connected escaping wandering domain with uniformly perfect boundary is small changed to a meromorphic function with zero Nevanlinna deficiency at poles and then in view of Theorem 3 we show the meromorphic function also has a multiply connected escaping wandering domain with uniformly perfect boundary.

4. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 5-7

Proof of Theorem 5. Put

$$K = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{4}{(k+1)^2}\right)^2, \quad K_n = \frac{K}{\prod_{k=1}^n \left(1 + \frac{4}{(k+1)^2}\right)} > \sqrt{K} > 1, \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

Since f is transcendental, we have

$$\frac{T(r, f)}{\log r} \rightarrow \infty (r \rightarrow \infty)$$

and so we can take a positive number R such that $\forall r \geq R > \max\{1, r_0\}$, where r_0 is the one appeared in Lemma 4, $\hat{T}(r, f) = \exp T(r, f) \geq 9r^2$ and

$$(4.1) \quad \log M_n(R, f) > 2^n \log R > \frac{2(n+1)^2 \log(n+2)}{K_n}, \quad \forall n \geq 2.$$

We claim that $\forall n \geq 2$, we have

$$(4.2) \quad \hat{T}_n(R^K, f) \geq (n+1)^2 M_{n-1}(R, f)^{K_{n-1}}.$$

We show the Claim by induction. It is well-known from Poisson-Jensen formula that for arbitrary real numbers R and r with $R > r > 0$, we have

$$T(r, f) \leq \log M(r, f) \leq \frac{R+r}{R-r} T(R, f).$$

Note that

$$\frac{\hat{T}(R^K, f) - R^K}{\hat{T}(R^K, f) + R^K} > 1 - \frac{2R^K}{\hat{T}(R^K, f)} > 1 - \frac{1}{2^2}$$

and

$$\left(1 + \frac{4}{2^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^2}\right) > 1 + \frac{1}{2^2}, \quad M(R, f)^{K_{1/2^2}} > 3^2.$$

For $n = 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{T}_2(R^K, f) &\geq M(R^K, f)^{\frac{\hat{T}(R^K, f) - R^K}{\hat{T}(R^K, f) + R^K}} \\ &\geq M(R^K, f)^{1 - \frac{1}{2^2}} \\ &\geq M(R, f)^{K_1(1 + 1/2^2)} \\ &\geq 3^2 M(R, f)^{K_1}.\end{aligned}$$

We assume inductively that (4.2) holds for n . Consider the case of $n + 1$ for (4.2). Note that

$$\frac{\hat{T}_n(R^K, f) - M_{n-1}(R, f)^{K_{n-1}}}{\hat{T}_n(R^K, f) + M_{n-1}(R, f)^{K_{n-1}}} \geq \frac{(n+1)^2 - 1}{(n+1)^2 + 1} = 1 - \frac{2}{(n+1)^2 + 1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}K_{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{2}{(n+1)^2 + 1}\right) &= K_n \left(1 + \frac{4}{(n+1)^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{2}{(n+1)^2 + 1}\right) \\ &> K_n + \frac{K_n}{(n+1)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Then in view of (4.2) and (4.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{T}_{n+1}(R^K, f) &\geq M(M_{n-1}(R, f)^{K_{n-1}}, f)^{\frac{\hat{T}_n(R^K, f) - M_{n-1}(R, f)^{K_{n-1}}}{\hat{T}_n(R^K, f) + M_{n-1}(R, f)^{K_{n-1}}}} \\ &> M_n(R, f)^{K_{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{2}{(n+1)^2 + 1}\right)} \\ &> (n+2)^2 M_n(R, f)^{K_n}.\end{aligned}$$

We have shown the Claim (4.2).

For any point $z \in M(f)$ in whose definition we choose R^K instead of R , we have for some $L \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|f^{n+1+L}(z)| \geq \hat{T}_{n+1}(R^K, f), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In view of (4.2), we deduce

$$|f^{n+1+L}(z)| \geq M_n(R, f), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and this implies $z \in A(f)$. It follows that $M(f) \subseteq A(f)$. On the other hand, it is clear that $M_n(R, f) \geq \hat{T}_n(R, f)$ and thus for $z \in A(f)$, it follows from $|f^{n+L}(z)| \geq M_n(R, f)$ for some $L \in \mathbb{N}$ that $|f^{n+L}(z)| \geq \hat{T}_n(R, f)$ so that $z \in M(f)$. We show that $A(f) \subseteq M(f)$.

So far, we have shown that $M(f) = A(f)$. \square

Let us make remarks. Let f be a transcendental entire function. It was shown in [32] that

$A(f) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{there exists } L \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } |f^{n+L}(z)| \geq M(R, f^n), \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, which is the definition of $A(f)$ introduced in [12]. Since for large R , we have

$$T(2R^3, f^n) \geq \frac{1}{3} \log M(R^3, f^n) \geq \log M(R, f^n) \geq T(R, f^n),$$

we have

$$M(f) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{there exists } L \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } |f^{n+L}(z)| \geq \hat{T}(R, f^n), \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

It is clear that $T(R, f^n)$ is not available for a meromorphic function f with poles.

Furthermore, it was shown in [32] that the fast escaping set $A(f)$ is invariant even if $M(r, f)$ is replaced by $\mu(r) = \varepsilon M(r, f)$ for a fixed $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and in [36] by $\mu(r) = \varepsilon(r)M(r, f)$ with somewhat more involved condition, $0 < \varepsilon(r) < 1$ and $\varepsilon(r)r \rightarrow \infty (r \rightarrow \infty)$. Actually, we can use $\mu(r) = M(r, f)^{1 - \frac{1}{\log_k r}}$ in the place of $M(r, f)$ in $A(f)$ to ensure the invariance of $A(f)$, where $\log_k r$ is the k th iterate of $\log r$ with respect to r . If $\frac{\log M(r, f)}{\log r \log_k r} > 2$, then

$$rM(r, f)^{-\frac{1}{\log_k r}} \rightarrow 0 (r \rightarrow \infty).$$

In [33], Rippon and Stallard investigated the following sets:

$$Q_\varepsilon(f) = \{z : \text{there exists } L \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } |f^{n+L}(z)| \geq \mu_\varepsilon^n(R), \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $\mu_\varepsilon(r) = M(r, f)^\varepsilon$. And they showed that $Q_\varepsilon(f) = A(f)$ if and only if f is so-called ε -regular and for $f \in \mathcal{B}$ (Eremenko-Lyubich class \mathcal{B} which consists of entire functions with bounded singular value set), $A(f) = \bigcup_{\varepsilon > 0} Q_\varepsilon(f)$.

Of course, we may also take into account the fast escaping set $M(f)$ of meromorphic functions in the way mentioned above.

For the proof of Theorem 6 we need the following lemma; see Lemma 1 of [31].

Lemma 7. *Let $E_n, n \geq 0$, be a sequence of compact sets in \mathbb{C} and $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ be a continuous function such that $E_{n+1} \subset f(E_n)$, for $n \geq 0$. Then there exists ζ such that $f^n(\zeta) \in E_n$ for $n \geq 0$.*

Proof of Theorem 6. For simplicity, we will here complete our proof for $C = 1$ and $c = 1$. The proof of general case needs just a little cumbersome calculation.

Put $S = \sqrt[3]{D} > e$. In view of (1.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log M(Sr, f) &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\log Sr}\right) T(Sr, f) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\log Sr}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\log S}{\log r}\right) T(r, f) \\ &\geq T(r, f) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ |f(Sre^{i\theta})| d\theta = m(Sr, f) \leq T(Sr, f).$$

Then there exists a point z_2 with $|z_2| = Sr$ such that

$$T(r, f) \leq \log |f(z_2)| \leq T(Sr, f).$$

It follows from (1.4) that there is a point z_1 with $|z_1| = S^2r$ such that

$$\log |f(z_1)| \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\log S^2r}\right) T(S^2r, f).$$

In view of (2.4) in Lemma 2 with $\tau = \frac{2}{3}$ and $\sigma = \frac{1}{3}$, we have

$$\frac{\pi}{3} \leq d_A(z_1, z_2) \leq \frac{\sqrt{3}\pi(\pi+1)}{3} < 7.52$$

for $A = A(r, Dr)$. Since, in view of (1.10), we have

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{\log S^2r}\right) T(S^2r, f) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\log S^2r}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\log S}{\log Sr}\right) T(Sr, f)$$

$$= T(Sr, f) + \frac{\log(S/e)}{\log Sr} T(Sr, f) > T(Sr, f) + \kappa\delta + \delta \log D$$

with $\delta = d_A(z_1, z_2)$, we have

$$|f(z_1)| > e^{\kappa\delta} D^\delta |f(z_2)|, \text{ i.e., } e^{-\kappa} \left(\frac{|f(z_1)|}{|f(z_2)|} \right)^{1/\delta} > D.$$

In view of Lemma 1, there exists a point $\hat{z} \in A(r, Dr)$ with $|f(z_2)| \leq |f(\hat{z})| \leq |f(z_1)|$ such that

$$f(A(r, Dr)) \supset \overline{A}(D^{-1}|f(\hat{z})|, D|f(\hat{z})|).$$

Now we take

$$r_1 = |f(\hat{z})| \geq |f(z_2)| \geq e^{T(r, f)} = \hat{T}(r, f)$$

and so

$$f(A(r, Dr)) \supset \overline{A}(r_1, Dr_1).$$

Inductively we get a sequence of positive numbers $\{r_n\}$ with $r_n \geq \hat{T}_n(r, f)$ such that $f(A(r_n, Dr_n)) \supset \overline{A}(r_{n+1}, Dr_{n+1})$. In view of Lemma 7, we can find a point $\zeta \in A(r, Dr)$ such that $|f^n(\zeta)| \geq \hat{T}_n(r, f)$. That is to say, $\zeta \in M(f)$ and so $\overline{U} \subset M(f)$. \square

For the proof of Theorem 7, we need the following lemma, which is Main Lemma of [18].

Lemma 8. *Let $\{G_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of compact subsets in \mathbb{C} such that*

- (i) $\mathbb{C} \setminus G_k$ is connected for every k ;
- (ii) $G_k \cap G_m = \emptyset$ for $k \neq m$;
- (iii) $\text{dist}(0, G_k) \rightarrow \infty (k \rightarrow \infty)$.

Then for any sequence of points $\{z_k\}$ with $z_k \in G_k$, any sequence of positive numbers $\{\varepsilon_k\}$ and any sequence of complex functions $\{\phi_k\}$ with ϕ_k being analytic in G_k for every k , there exists an entire function f satisfying, for every k ,

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z) - \phi_k(z)| &< \varepsilon_k, \quad \forall z \in G_k; \\ f(z_k) &= \phi_k(z_k), \quad f'(z_k) = \phi'_k(z_k). \end{aligned}$$

The same method as in the proof of Main Lemma of [18] can deduce that for a sequence of compact sets $\{G_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ only satisfying (ii) and (iii), there exists a meromorphic function $f(z)$ such that the results stated in Lemma 8 hold. This will apply to construction of desired meromorphic function of Theorem 7.

Proof of Theorem 7. Set

$$G_n = \overline{B}\left(a_n, \frac{1}{4}\alpha_n\right), \quad H_n = \overline{B}\left(-a_n, \frac{1}{4}\alpha_n\right),$$

$$C_n = \left\{ z : a_n + \frac{3}{8}\alpha_n \leq \text{Re}z \leq a_n + \frac{5}{8}\alpha_n, |\text{Im}z| \leq \beta_n \right\}$$

with $\alpha_n = \min\{a_n - a_{n-1}, a_{n+1} - a_n\}$, $1 < a_0 < a_1$ and $0 < \beta_n$ such that $\beta_n/(a_n - a_{n-1}) \rightarrow \infty (n \rightarrow \infty)$, and

$$\phi_n(z) = \frac{\alpha_{n+1}}{\alpha_n}(z - a_n) + a_{n+1} : G_n \rightarrow G_{n+1},$$

$$\varphi_n(z) = z + a_n + e^{a_n^2};$$

where when $\rho = \infty$, $e^{a_n^\rho}$ is replaced by $e^{e^{(\log a_n)^2}}$. We see that G_n, H_n and C_n don't intersect each other. In view of Lemma 8, there exists a transcendental entire function f such that for every n ,

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z) - \phi_n(z)| &< \varepsilon_n, \quad \forall z \in G_n; \\ |f(z) - \varphi_n(z)| &< \varepsilon_n, \quad \forall z \in H_n; \\ f(a_n) = \phi_n(a_n) = a_{n+1}, \quad f'(a_n) &= \frac{\alpha_{n+1}}{\alpha_n}; \\ f(-a_n) = \varphi_n(-a_n) = e^{a_n^\rho}, \quad f'(-a_n) &= 1; \\ |f(z)| &< \frac{1}{2}, \quad \forall z \in C_n \cup B(0, 1), \quad f(0) = 0, \quad f'(0) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$M(a_n, f) \geq |f(-a_n)| = e^{a_n^\rho}, \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log M(a_n, f)}{\log a_n} \geq \rho.$$

That is to say, the order of f is at least ρ .

According to the construction of f and the behavior of f on G_n , by the suitable choice of $\{\varepsilon_n\}$, we can show that $B(a_1, \frac{1}{5}\alpha_1)$ is in a Fatou component U of f and

$$f^n \left(B \left(a_1, \frac{1}{5}\alpha_1 \right) \right) \subset U_n.$$

Since $f^n(a_1) = a_{n+1} \rightarrow \infty (n \rightarrow \infty)$, U is escaping. And $C_m \cap \cup_{n=0}^{\infty} U_n = \emptyset$ for every m .

We want to prove that U is not a Baker domain. Suppose that U is a Baker domain with period p , i.e., $f^p(U) \subseteq U$. By the Principle of Hyperbolic Metric, we have, for $n \geq 0$,

$$d_U(a_1, a_{p+1}) \geq d_{f^n(U)}(f^n(a_1), f^n(a_{p+1})) \geq d_{U_n}(a_{n+1}, a_{n+p+1}).$$

On the other hand, we want to estimate $d_{U_n}(a_{n+1}, a_{n+p+1})$ from below. Since Baker domains of an entire function are simply connected and unbounded, so is U_n . By the Koebe $\frac{1}{4}$ Theorem, it follows that

$$C_{U_n} = \min\{\lambda_{U_n}(z)\delta_{U_n}(z) : \forall z \in U_n\} \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

where $\delta_{U_n}(z)$ is the Euclidean distance from z to ∂U_n ; see [9]. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{U_n}(a_{n+1}, a_{n+p+1}) &= \inf_{\gamma_n} \int_{\gamma_n} \lambda_{U_n}(z) |dz| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \inf_{\gamma_n} \int_{\gamma_n} \frac{1}{\delta_{U_n}(z)} |dz| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \int_0^{\beta_{n+1}} \frac{1}{a_{n+1} - a_n} dt \\ &= \frac{\beta_{n+1}}{4(a_{n+1} - a_n)} \rightarrow \infty (n \rightarrow \infty), \end{aligned}$$

where the infimum is taken over all curves γ_n connecting a_{n+1} and a_{n+p+1} in U_n .

A contradiction is derived and hence we have shown that U is an escaping wandering domain of f . Take a component U_0 of $f^{-1}(U)$ and a point $z_0 \in U_0 \cup f^{-1}(a_1)$. Then $f^n(z_0) = a_n$. \square

We omit the specific construction of a meromorphic function which has wandering domain U such that $f^n(z) \sim a_n(n \rightarrow \infty)$ in U .

REFERENCES

- [1] I. N. Baker, The iteration of polynomials and transcendental entire functions, J. Aust. Math. Soc. (Ser. A) **30**(1981), 483-495
- [2] I. N. Baker, Multiply connected domains of normality in iteration theory, Math. Z., **81**(1963), 206-214
- [3] I. N. Baker, The domains of normality of an entire functions, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math. **1**(1975), no. 2, 277-283
- [4] I. N. Baker, An entire function wich has wandering domains, J. Aust. Math. Soc. (Ser. A) **22**(1976), 173-176
- [5] I. N. Baker, Wandering domains in the iteration of entire functions, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.(3)**49**(1984), 563-576
- [6] I. N. Baker, Infinite limits in the iteration of entire function, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **8**(1988), no.4, 503-507
- [7] I. N. Baker, J. Kotus and Y. Lü, *Iterates of meromorphic functions I*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **11**(1991), no. 2, 241-248
- [8] I. N. Baker, J. Kotus and Y. Lü, *Iterates of meromorphic functions II: Examples of wandering domains*, J. London Math. Soc. (2)**42**(1990), 267-278
- [9] A. F. Beardon and Ch. Pommerenke, *The Poincaré metric of plane domains*, J. London Math. Soc., **18**(2)(1978), 475-483
- [10] W. Bergweiler, *Iteration of meromorphic functions*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **29** (1993),151-188.
- [11] W. Bergweiler, An entire function with simply and multiply connected wandering domains, Pure Appl. Math. Quarterly (2)**7**(2011), 107-120
- [12] W. Bergweiler and A. Hinkenna, *On semiconjugation of entire functions*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc., **126**(1999), 565-574
- [13] W. Bergweiler, P. J. Rippon and G. M. Stallard, *Multiply connected wandering domains of entire functions*, Proc. London Math. Soc., (3) **107** (2013), no.6, 1261-1301
- [14] W. Bergweiler and Jianhua Zheng, On the uniform perfectness of the boundary of multiply connected wandering domains, J. Aust. Math. Soc. **91**(2011), no.3, 289-311
- [15] C. J. Bishop, Constructing entire functions by quasiconformal folding, Acta Math. **214**(2015), 1-60
- [16] P. Domínguez, Dynamics of transcendental meromorphic functions, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. **23**(1998), 225-250
- [17] A. E. Eremenko, *On the iteration of entire functions*, Dynamical system and ergodic theory, Banach Center Publications 23 (Polish Scientific Publishers, Warsaw, 1989)339-345
- [18] A. E. Eremenko and M. Yu. Lyubich, Examples of entire functions with pathological dynamics, J. London Math. Soc. (2)**36**(1987), 458-468
- [19] N. Fagella, S. Godillon and X. Jarque, Wandering domains for composition of entire functions, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **429**(2015), 478-496
- [20] W. K. Hayman, *Meromorphic functions*, Oxford University Press, 1964.
- [21] M. Herman, Exemples de fractions rationnelles ayant une orbite dense sur la sphère de Riemann, Bull. Soc. Math. France **112**(1984), 93-142
- [22] M. Kisaka and M. Shishikura, *On multiply connected wandering domains of entire functions*, Transcendental Dynamics and Complex Analysis (LMS Lecture Note Series vol. 348) ed P J Rippon and G M Stallard (Cambridge University Press, 2008) pp217-250
- [23] K. Lazebnik, Several constructions in the Eremenko-Lyubich class, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **448**(2017), 611-632
- [24] J. Osborne, The structure of spider's web fast escaping sets, Bull. London Math. Soc. (3)**44**(2012), 503-515
- [25] P.J. Rippon, Baker domains of meromorphic functions, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, **26**(2006), no. 4, 1225-1233
- [26] P.J. Rippon, Baker domains, Transcendental Dynamics and Complex Analysis (LMS Lecture Note Series vol. 348) ed P J Rippon and G M Stallard (Cambridge University Press, 2008) pp 371-395

- [27] P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, *On sets where iterates of a meromorphic function zip towards infinity*, Bull. London Math. Soc., 32(2000), no.5, 528-536
- [28] P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, *On questions of Fatou and Eremenko*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **133**(2005), 1119-1126
- [29] P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, *Escaping points of meromorphic functions with a finite number of poles*, J. Anal. Math. **96**(2005), 225-245
- [30] P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, *On multiply connected wandering domains of meromorphic functions*, J. London Math. Soc. (2)**77**(2008), 405-423
- [31] P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, *Slow escaping points of meromorphic functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **363**(2011), 4171-4201
- [32] P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, *Fast escaping points of entire functions*, Proc. London Math. Soc., 105(2012), 787-820
- [33] P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, *Regularity and fast escaping points of entire functions*, Intern. Math. Res. Notices, (19) **2014** (2013), 5203-5229
- [34] P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, *Eremenko points and the structure of the escaping set*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **372**(2019), 3083-3111
- [35] W. Rudin, *Real and complex analysis* (McGraw-Hill, 1986)
- [36] D. J. Sixsmith, *Simply connected fast escaping Fatou components*, Pure Appl. Math. Q. (4)**8**(2012), 1029-1046
- [37] D. J. Sixsmith, *On fundamental loops and the fast escaping set*, J. London Math. Soc. (3)**88**(2013), 716-736
- [38] D. J. Sixsmith, *Maximally and non-maximally fast escaping points of transcendental entire functions*, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc., **158**(2015), 365-383
- [39] T. Sugawa, *Various domain constants related to uniform perfectness*, *Complex Variables*, 36(1998), 311-345
- [40] H. Töpfer, *Über die Iteration der ganzen transzendenten Funktionen, insbesondere von $\sin z$ und $\cos z$* , Math. Ann., **117**(1939), 65-84
- [41] J. H. Zheng, *Value Distribution of Meromorphic Functions*, Tsinghua University Press Beijing and Springer-Verlag Berlin, 2010.
- [42] J. H. Zheng, *On multiply-connected Fatou components in iteration of meromorphic functions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 313(2006), 24-37
- [43] J. H. Zheng, *On non-existence of unbounded domains of normality of meromorphic functions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 264(2001), 479-494
- [44] J. H. Zheng, *Dynamics of Transcendental Meromorphic Functions (in Chinese)*, Tsinghua University Press, 2004
- [45] J. H. Zheng, *Hyperbolic metric and multiply connected wandering domains of meromorphic functions*, Proc. Edinburg Math. Soc., 60(2017), 787-810.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100084, P. R. CHINA

Email address: zheng-jh@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, SHENZHEN UNIVERSITY, SHENZHEN, 518060, P. R. CHINA

Email address: cfwu@szu.edu.cn