

FUNCTIONS OF SMALL GROWTH WITH NO UNBOUNDED FATOU COMPONENTS

P.J. RIPPON AND G.M. STALLARD

Abstract. We prove a form of the $\cos \pi \rho$ theorem which gives strong estimates for the minimum modulus of a transcendental entire function of order zero. We also prove a generalisation of a result of Hinkkanen that gives a sufficient condition for a transcendental entire function to have no unbounded Fatou components. These two results enable us to show that there is a large class of entire functions of order zero which have no unbounded Fatou components. On the other hand we give examples which show that there are in fact functions of order zero which not only fail to satisfy Hinkkanen's condition but also fail to satisfy our more general condition. We also give a new regularity condition that is sufficient to ensure that a transcendental entire function of order less than $1/2$ has no unbounded Fatou components. Finally, we observe that all the conditions given here which guarantee that a transcendental entire function has no unbounded Fatou components, also guarantee that the escaping set is connected, thus answering a question of Eremenko for such functions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let f be a transcendental entire function and denote by f^n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the n th iterate of f . The *Fatou set*, $F(f)$, is defined to be the set of points, $z \in \mathbb{C}$, such that $(f^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ forms a normal family in some neighbourhood of z . The complement, $J(f)$, of $F(f)$ is called the *Julia set* of f . An introduction to the basic properties of these sets can be found in, for example, [5].

This paper concerns the question of whether a transcendental entire function of small growth can have any unbounded components of its Fatou set, a question which was first studied by Baker [3]. An excellent survey article on this problem has been written by Hinkkanen [11].

The *order of growth*, ρ , of a transcendental entire function f is defined by

$$\rho = \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r}, \text{ where } M(r) = \max_{|z|=r} |f(z)|.$$

Defining σ by

$$\sigma = \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(r)}{r^\rho},$$

we say that the growth of f is of *minimal type* if $\sigma = 0$, *mean type* if $0 < \sigma < \infty$ and *maximal type* if $\sigma = \infty$.

It was shown by Zheng [21, Theorem 1] that there are no unbounded *periodic* Fatou components if the growth of f is at most order $1/2$, minimal type. This result is sharp. For example, Baker [3] showed that if $f(z) = z + \frac{\sin \sqrt{z}}{\sqrt{z}} + c$, for c sufficiently large, then f has an unbounded invariant Fatou component (which is in fact a Baker domain) and f has order $1/2$, mean type.

It is still unknown whether a transcendental entire function of order at most $1/2$, minimal type, can have any unbounded *wandering* components of the Fatou set. Baker [3, Theorem 2] showed that there are no unbounded Fatou components if

$$(1.1) \quad \log M(r) = O((\log r)^p), \text{ for some } p \in (1, 3).$$

In [18, Theorem B] we strengthened this to show that there are no unbounded Fatou components if there exist $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $R > 0$ such that

$$(1.2) \quad \log \log M(r) < \frac{(\log r)^{1/2}}{(\log \log r)^\epsilon}, \text{ for } r > R.$$

Although many authors have worked on this problem, all further results of this type have required some regularity condition on the growth. We discuss some of these regularity conditions in Section 7.

Hinkkanen [10, Theorem 1] showed that a transcendental entire function of order less than $1/2$ has no unbounded Fatou components if there exist $0 < \delta \leq 1$, $L > 1$ and $C > 0$ such that, for large r , there exists $t \in (r, r^L)$ with

$$(1.3) \quad \frac{\log m(t)}{\log M(r)} \geq L \left(1 - \frac{C}{(\log r)^\delta} \right),$$

where $m(r) = \min_{|z|=r} |f(z)|$.

He also suggested that it was plausible that condition (1.3) is satisfied by all functions of order at most $1/2$, minimal type. We shall show that there are in fact functions of order zero which fail to satisfy (1.3).

First, however, in Section 2 we obtain the following generalisation of Hinkkanen's result, using a somewhat simpler method of proof. In Section 5 we show that the conditions of this new result are satisfied for a much larger class of functions of order zero than those which satisfy (1.2). It follows that such functions have no unbounded Fatou components.

Theorem 1. *Let f be a transcendental entire function and let $R_1 > 0$ be such that the sequence R_n defined by $R_{n+1} = M(R_n)$ tends to ∞ . Suppose that there exist $L > 1$ and a positive sequence a_n such that, for all $r \in [R_n, R_{n+1})$, there exists $t \in (r, r^L)$ with*

$$(1.4) \quad \frac{\log m(t)}{\log M(r)} \geq L(1 - a_n)$$

and

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} a_n < \infty.$$

Then $F(f)$ has no unbounded components.

Remark. Hinkkanen's result follows from Theorem 1 by taking $a_n = C/(\log R_n)^\delta$ for some $C > 0$, $0 < \delta \leq 1$, where $R_{n+1} = M(R_n)$. To see that this is true, note that, for any transcendental entire function f , if R_n tends to ∞ then

$$\log M(R_n)/\log R_n \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

(In what follows we use this fact without further reference.) Thus

$$(1.5) \quad \log R_n > 2^n, \text{ for large } n,$$

and so $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} a_n = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{C}{(\log R_n)^\delta} < \infty$. We observe that Theorem 1 does not require the assumption that the order of f is less than $1/2$.

Many of the results on this subject use the version of the $\cos \pi \rho$ theorem proved by Barry [4, p.294]. This states that if f has order $\rho < 1/2$ then, for each $\alpha \in (\rho, 1/2)$, the set of values of r for which

$$\log m(r) > \cos \pi \alpha \log M(r)$$

has lower logarithmic density at least $1 - \rho/\alpha$. In order to show that the hypotheses of Theorem 1 are satisfied for many functions of order zero, in Sections 3 and 4 we prove the following result which can be regarded as a version of the $\cos \pi \rho$ theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let f be a transcendental entire function of order ρ , $\rho < \alpha < 1$ and put*

$$\epsilon(r) = \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(r) = \max_{r \leq t \leq r^{1/(1-\alpha)}} \epsilon(t).$$

Let $0 < \eta < 1/2$ and μ, ν be functions such that, for large r ,

$$0 < \mu(r) \leq 1, \quad 0 < \nu(r) \leq 1/4 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(r)\nu(r) > \frac{2\epsilon(r)}{1 - \delta(r)}.$$

Then, for large r , there exists $R \in (r^{(1-\delta(r))(1-\mu(r))}, r^{1-\delta(r)})$ such that

$$\log m(t) > (1 - 20 \log(2e/\eta)\nu(r)) \log M(t),$$

for $0 \leq t \leq R/2$ except in a set of intervals, the sum of whose lengths is at most ηR .

Theorem 2 gives a big improvement on existing estimates for the minimum modulus near values of r for which $M(r)$ is small. In particular, it gives very precise information for functions of order zero. In Section 5 we apply this result with $\rho = 0$, $\mu(r) = \sqrt{\epsilon(r)}$ and $\nu(r) = 3\sqrt{\epsilon(r)}$, in which case $\mu(r) \rightarrow 0$ and $\nu(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Together with Theorem 1, this enables us to prove the following result.

Theorem 3. *Let f be a transcendental entire function of order zero and let $R_1 > 0$ be such that the sequence R_n defined by $R_{n+1} = M(R_n)$ tends to ∞ and the sequence ϵ_n defined by*

$$\epsilon_n = \max_{R_n \leq r \leq R_{n+1}} \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r}$$

is positive. If

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{\epsilon_n} < \infty,$$

then $F(f)$ has no unbounded components.

We conclude Section 5 by using Theorem 3 to prove the following result which relates the size of $M(r)$ to the existence of unbounded Fatou components.

Remark. By using a more sophisticated proof, we can remove the square root in the condition in Theorem 3. This improvement in Theorem 3 does not, however, lead to an improvement in Theorem 4 below and so we omit the details.

Theorem 4. *Let f be a transcendental entire function and suppose that there exist $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R > 0$ such that*

$$(1.6) \quad \log \log M(r) < \frac{\log r}{\log^m r}, \quad \text{for } r > R.$$

Then $F(f)$ has no unbounded components.

Note that \log^m denotes the m th iterated logarithm function.

Condition (1.6) is a significant improvement on condition (1.2) which was previously the best condition of this type. It still does not, however, cover all functions of order zero which need only satisfy

$$\log \log M(r) = o(1) \log r \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty.$$

In Section 6, we study functions of the form

$$(1.7) \quad f(z) = \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{z}{r_m}\right)^{r_m^{\epsilon_m}},$$

where ϵ_m is a decreasing null sequence and r_m is a strictly increasing sequence such that $r_m^{\epsilon_m} \in \mathbb{N}$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We show that if ϵ_m and r_m satisfy certain conditions, then f is a function of order zero that fails to satisfy Hinkkanen's condition (1.3). More generally, we show that there are functions of the form (1.7) that have order zero and fail to satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 1. These examples suggest that new techniques are needed to answer Baker's original question.

As mentioned earlier, many authors have shown that a transcendental entire function of order less than $1/2$ has no unbounded Fatou components provided that the growth of the function is sufficiently regular. In Section 7 we prove the following result of this type.

Theorem 5. *Let f be a transcendental entire function of order $\rho < 1/2$. Suppose that, for each $m > 1$, there exists a real function ψ defined on (r_0, ∞) , where $r_0 > 0$, such that, for $r \geq r_0$, we have $\psi(r) \geq r$ and*

$$(1.8) \quad M(\psi(r)) \geq \psi(M(r))^m.$$

Then $F(f)$ has no unbounded components.

We show that many of the known regularity conditions that have been used in connection with Baker's question can be written in the form (1.8) for some function ψ . We end Section 7 by proving the following result which gives a new regularity condition that is sufficient for the hypotheses of Theorem 5 to be satisfied. Here \exp^n and \log^n denote the n th iterated exponential and logarithm functions, respectively.

Theorem 6. *Let f be a transcendental entire function of order $\rho < 1/2$ and suppose that there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < q < 1$ such that*

$$(1.9) \quad M(r) \geq \exp^{n+1}((\log^n r)^q), \quad \text{for large } r.$$

Then the hypotheses of Theorem 5 hold with

$$\psi(r) = \exp^n((\log r)^p), \quad \text{where } pq > 1.$$

Hence $F(f)$ has no unbounded components.

We remark that condition (1.9) becomes less restrictive as n increases. Indeed, if $0 < q < 1$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then there exists $r(n, q) > 0$ such that

$$\exp^{n+2}((\log^{n+1} r)^q) \leq \exp^{n+1}((\log^n r)^q), \quad \text{for } r \geq r(n, q).$$

There are, however, many transcendental entire functions of order $\rho < 1/2$ that fail to satisfy (1.9) for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < q < 1$. Indeed, (1.9) implies that $\phi(t) = \log M(e^t)$ satisfies $\phi(t)/t^k \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, for all $k > 1$.

Theorem 6 generalises a result of Singh and Taniguchi (see, for example, [17]). They showed that a transcendental entire function of order $\rho < 1/2$ satisfying (1.9) with $n = 1$ has no unbounded Fatou components. Their result in turn generalised a result of Wang [20] who considered functions satisfying (1.9) with $n = 0$, that is, functions of positive lower order; an alternative proof of Wang's result is given in [11, p.205].

Finally, we point out that our results give several new sufficient conditions for the escaping set of a transcendental entire function to be connected. In [16, Corollary 5] we show that if f is a transcendental entire function that satisfies (1.2) or has order $\rho < 1/2$ and satisfies a certain regularity condition, then the escaping set,

$$I(f) = \{z : f^n(z) \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty\},$$

is connected. We remarked in that paper that in fact the escaping set is an unbounded connected set for any function satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 2.1 below. Thus such functions satisfy Eremenko's conjecture [9] that the escaping set of a transcendental entire function has no bounded components. In this paper, we show that the hypotheses of Lemma 2.1 are satisfied by any function satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 1, Theorem 3, Theorem 4, Theorem 5 or Theorem 6. Therefore, in each of these theorems, the conclusion that $F(f)$ has no unbounded components can be replaced by the conclusion that

$I(f)$ is connected and hence Eremenko's conjecture holds in these cases.

Note that in [16], when showing that the hypotheses of Lemma 2.1 are sufficient to ensure that the escaping set is connected, we actually obtain more detailed information about the structure of the escaping set for such functions. More precisely, we consider the set of fast escaping points defined by

$$B(f) = \{z : \text{there exists } L \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } f^{n+L}(z) \notin \widetilde{f^n(D)}, \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

and the subset of $B(f)$ defined by

$$B_D(f) = \{z : f^n(z) \notin \widetilde{f^n(D)}, \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

where D is any open disc meeting $J(f)$ and \widetilde{U} denotes the union of U and its bounded complementary components. (Note that the set $B(f)$ is independent of the choice of D . The set $B(f)$ was first introduced in [15] where we showed that it is equal to the set $A(f)$ introduced by Bergweiler and Hinkkanen in [6].) We show in [16] that if a transcendental entire function f satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 2.1, then $B_D(f)^c$ has a bounded component from which it follows that $B_D(f)$, $B(f)$ and $I(f)$ are all connected.

Remark. After preparing this paper, we learnt that results closely related to Theorem 1, Theorem 3, Theorem 4 and the examples in Section 6 have also been obtained by Hinkkanen and Miles; see [12].

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Many of the papers on this subject use the following result (proved in [18, Lemma 2.7]) which is a generalisation of a result by Baker [3, proof of Theorem 2].

Lemma 2.1. *Let f be a transcendental entire function and suppose that there exist sequences $R_n, \rho_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $c(n) > 1$ such that*

- (1) $R_{n+1} = M(R_n)$,
- (2) $R_n \leq \rho_n \leq R_n^{c(n)}$,
- (3) $m(\rho_n) \geq R_{n+1}^{c(n+1)}$.

Then $F(f)$ has no unbounded components.

Our proof of Theorem 1 is based on Lemma 2.1. We also use the following consequence of the convexity of $\log M(e^t)$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let f be a transcendental entire function. Then there exists $R > 0$ such that, for all $r \geq R$ and all $c > 1$,*

$$\log M(r^c) \geq c \log M(r).$$

Proof. Since $\phi(t) = \log M(e^t)$ is convex and $\phi(t)/t \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\phi'(t) \geq \frac{\phi(t)}{t}, \text{ for } t \geq T,$$

say. Here, for definiteness, ϕ' denotes the right derivative of ϕ . Thus, for $t \geq T$ and any $c > 1$,

$$\log \frac{\phi(ct)}{\phi(t)} = \int_t^{ct} \frac{\phi'(u)}{\phi(u)} du \geq \int_t^{ct} \frac{1}{u} du = \log c.$$

Hence the result holds with $R = e^T$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Let f be a function satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 1 and suppose that $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} a_n < \infty$. We may assume that $a_n < 1$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} a_n < \infty$, we have

$$0 < \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1 - a_n) < 1$$

and so, for a given $L > 1$, we can define

$$c(n) = \frac{L}{\prod_{m=n}^{\infty} (1 - a_m)}, \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Note that

$$(2.1) \quad L < c(n) < \infty \text{ and } c(n+1) = (1 - a_n) c(n) < c(n).$$

We will show that the conditions of Lemma 2.1 are satisfied for these values of $c(n)$. We may assume that R_1 has been chosen sufficiently large to ensure that $R_n^{c(n)/L} < R_{n+1}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. So, it follows from (1.4), (2.1) and Lemma 2.2 that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\rho_n \in (R_n^{c(n)/L}, R_n^{c(n)}) \subset (R_n, R_n^{c(n)})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \log m(\rho_n) &\geq L(1 - a_n) \log M(R_n^{c(n)/L}) \\ &\geq L(1 - a_n) \frac{c(n)}{L} \log M(R_n) \\ &= c(n+1) \log M(R_n) = c(n+1) \log R_{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\rho_n \in (R_n, R_n^{c(n)})$ such that $m(\rho_n) \geq R_{n+1}^{c(n+1)}$. The result of Theorem 1 now follows from Lemma 2.1.

3. RESULTS OF CARTWRIGHT

This section and the next are concerned with the proof of Theorem 2. We first consider the case that $f(0) = 1$ and use the following notation:

$n(r)$ is the number of zeros of f in $\{z : |z| \leq r\}$, counted according to multiplicity,

$$\begin{aligned} N(r) &= \int_0^r \frac{n(t)}{t} dt, \\ Q(r) &= r \int_r^\infty \frac{n(t)}{t^2} dt, \\ B(r) &= r \int_0^\infty \frac{n(t)}{t(r+t)} dt, \\ a(r) &= rB'(r) = r \int_0^\infty \frac{n(t)}{(r+t)^2} dt. \end{aligned}$$

It is well known that these integrals are convergent if f has order $\rho < 1$; this follows from Lemma 3.1(b) below. We show later that $B(r) = \log M(r)$ in the case that all the zeros of f are on the negative real axis.

Cartwright [8, Theorem 51 and Theorem 52] proved careful estimates for the minimum and maximum modulus of a function of order zero in terms of the quantities $N(r)$ and $Q(r)$. She then used these estimates to show that, for a function of order zero, $\log m(r)$ is asymptotically equal to $\log M(r)$ in a set of upper density 1. In this paper we build upon her results to show how the ratio $\log m(r)/\log M(r)$ depends on the rate of growth of the function.

The key idea in the proof is to use the quantities $a(r)$ and $B(r)$ to estimate $Q(r)$ and $N(r)$. An advantage of considering $a(r)/B(r)$ is that $a(r)$ is defined in terms of the derivative of $B(r)$. (Alternatively, similar arguments can be used with the quantities $Q(r)$ and $N(r) + Q(r)$ since $Q(r)$ can be expressed in terms of the derivative of $N(r) + Q(r)$. Each approach has some advantages and some disadvantages.)

In this section we give some preliminary results that will be useful in the proof of Theorem 2. We begin by noting various relationships between the quantities defined above.

Lemma 3.1. *Let f be a transcendental entire function of order $\rho < 1$ with $f(0) = 1$. Then, for $r > 0$,*

(a) $N(r) < \log M(r)$,

(b) $n(r) < \log M(3r)$,

(c) $n(r) \leq Q(r)$,

(d) $Q(r) \leq 4a(r)$,

(e) $B(r) \leq N(r) + 2a(r)$ and $B(r) \leq N(r) + Q(r)$.

Proof. (a) This follows from Jensen's theorem (see, for example, [19, second edition, p.125] for a proof).

(b) It follows from (a) that

$$n(r) \log 3 \leq \int_r^{3r} \frac{n(t)}{t} dt \leq N(3r) < \log M(3r).$$

(c) We have

$$Q(r) = r \int_r^\infty \frac{n(t)}{t^2} dt \geq rn(r) \int_r^\infty \frac{1}{t^2} dt = n(r).$$

(d) We have

$$Q(r) = r \int_r^\infty \frac{n(t)}{t^2} dt \leq 4r \int_r^\infty \frac{n(t)}{(r+t)^2} dt \leq 4a(r).$$

(e) We have

$$B(r) = r \int_0^\infty \frac{n(t)}{t(r+t)} dt = r \int_0^r \frac{n(t)}{t(r+t)} dt + r \int_r^\infty \frac{n(t)}{t(r+t)} dt.$$

Thus

$$B(r) \leq N(r) + 2a(r) \quad \text{and also} \quad B(r) \leq N(r) + Q(r),$$

as required. \square

The next result shows that, for a function of order less than 1, the growth of $B(r)$ is limited by the growth of $M(r)$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let f be a transcendental entire function of order ρ , $\rho < \alpha < 1$ with $f(0) = 1$ and put*

$$\epsilon(r) = \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(r) = \max_{r \leq t \leq r^{1/(1-\alpha)}} \epsilon(t).$$

Then, for large r , we have $0 < \delta(r) < \alpha < 1$ and

$$B(r^{1-\delta(r)}) < 3 \log M(r) \log r.$$

Proof. Clearly $0 < \delta(r) < \alpha < 1$ for large r , since $\rho < \alpha$. It follows from Lemma 3.1(b) that, for large t ,

$$n(t) < \log M(3t) < (3t)^\alpha.$$

Also, for large r and $r/3 \leq t \leq r^{1/(1-\alpha)}/3$,

$$n(t) < \log M(3t) < (3t)^{\delta(r)}.$$

Using these estimates for $n(t)$ and the fact that $f(0) = 1$ so that $n(t) = 0$ for $0 \leq t \leq r_1$, say, we have, for large r ,

$$\begin{aligned} B(r^{1-\delta(r)}) &= r^{1-\delta(r)} \int_0^{r/3} \frac{n(t)}{t(r^{1-\delta(r)} + t)} dt + r^{1-\delta(r)} \int_{r/3}^{r^{1/(1-\alpha)}/3} \frac{n(t)}{t(r^{1-\delta(r)} + t)} dt \\ &\quad + r^{1-\delta(r)} \int_{r^{1/(1-\alpha)}/3}^\infty \frac{n(t)}{t(r^{1-\delta(r)} + t)} dt \\ &\leq \log M(r) \int_{r_1}^{r/3} \frac{1}{t} dt + r^{1-\delta(r)} \int_{r/3}^{r^{1/(1-\alpha)}/3} \frac{(3t)^{\delta(r)}}{t^2} dt \\ &\quad + r^{1-\delta(r)} \int_{r^{1/(1-\alpha)}/3}^\infty \frac{(3t)^\alpha}{t^2} dt \\ &< 2 \log M(r) \log(r/3) + \frac{3^{\delta(r)} r^{1-\delta(r)}}{(r/3)^{1-\delta(r)} (1-\delta(r))} + \frac{3^\alpha r^{1-\delta(r)}}{(r^{1/(1-\alpha)}/3)^{1-\alpha} (1-\alpha)} \\ &< 2 \log M(r) \log(r/3) + \frac{3}{1-\delta(r)} + \frac{3}{1-\alpha} \\ &< 3 \log M(r) \log r, \end{aligned}$$

since $\delta(r) < \alpha$ for large r . \square

The next result shows that, for a function of order less than 1, $\log M(r)$ is always bounded above by $B(r)$. This is similar to Cartwright's result [8, Theorem 51]. Note that the proof shows that we have equality in the case that all the zeros of f are on the negative real axis. This result follows, for example, from arguments in [19, p.271] but we include it here for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 3.3. *Let f be a transcendental entire function of order less than 1 with $f(0) = 1$. Then, for $r > 0$,*

$$\log M(r) \leq B(r) \leq N(r) + Q(r).$$

Proof. Let f be a transcendental entire function of order less than 1 with $f(0) = 1$ and let the zeros of f be at the points z_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with modulus r_n , where $0 < r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \dots$. It follows from Hadamard's factorization theorem (see, for example, [19, p.250]) that

$$f(z) = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1 - z/z_n)$$

and so

$$|f(z)| \leq \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1 + |z|/r_n).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \log M(r) &\leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \log(1 + r/r_n) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} n (\log(1 + r/r_n) - \log(1 + r/r_{n+1})) \\ &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} n \int_{r_n}^{r_{n+1}} \frac{r}{t(r+t)} dt = B(r). \end{aligned}$$

The result now follows from Lemma 3.1(e). \square

It is much harder to obtain estimates for the minimum modulus of an entire function. We will use the careful estimates obtained by Cartwright in [8, Theorem 52]. Her results are stated only for functions of order zero but the proofs apply for functions of order less than 1. Again, since this result is crucial to our argument, we include a proof for the sake of completeness. We state our results just for the case that $f(0) = 1$. The proof follows that of Cartwright which depends on the following covering lemma of Cartan [7, p.273].

Lemma 3.4. *Let z_1, \dots, z_m be m points distinct or coincident in \mathbb{C} , and let $h > 0$. Then $\{z : \prod_{n=1}^m |z - z_n| \leq h^m\}$ can be enclosed in at most m discs, the sum of whose radii is at most $2eh$.*

Following Cartwright, we now obtain a lower estimate for the minimum modulus in terms of $N(r)$ and $Q(r)$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let f be a transcendental entire function of order less than 1 with $f(0) = 1$, and let $0 < \eta < 1/2$. Then, for large R ,*

$$\log m(r) > N(R) - (1 + \log(2e/\eta))Q(R),$$

for $0 \leq r \leq R/2$ except in a set of intervals, the sum of whose lengths is at most ηR .

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we write

$$f(z) = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1 - z/z_n),$$

where the points z_n are the zeros of f and have modulus r_n , with $0 < r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \dots$. Suppose that $|z| = r \leq R/2$, where $R > r_1$, and let m denote the largest integer for which $r_m < R$. Then

$$(3.1) \quad \log |f(z)| = \log \prod_{n=1}^m |1 - z/z_n| + \log \prod_{n=m+1}^{\infty} |1 - z/z_n|.$$

We first obtain a lower bound for the last term in (3.1). Note that

$$(3.2) \quad \log \prod_{n=m+1}^{\infty} |1 - z/z_n| \geq \log \prod_{n=m+1}^{\infty} (1 - r/r_n) = \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} \log(1 - r/r_n).$$

If $n > m$ then $r_n \geq R \geq 2r$ and so $0 < r/r_n \leq 1/2$. Thus

$$\log(1 - r/r_n) > -2r/r_n$$

and so

$$(3.3) \quad \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} \log(1 - r/r_n) > - \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} 2r/r_n.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} r/r_n &\leq r \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} n(1/r_n - 1/r_{n+1}) \\ &= r \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} n \int_{r_n}^{r_{n+1}} \frac{1}{t^2} dt \\ &\leq r \int_R^{\infty} \frac{n(t)}{t^2} dt \leq \frac{1}{2} Q(R). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (3.2) and (3.3),

$$(3.4) \quad \log \prod_{n=m+1}^{\infty} |1 - z/z_n| \geq \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} \log(1 - r/r_n) \geq -Q(R).$$

We now estimate $\log \prod_{n=1}^m |1 - z/z_n|$. To do this we write $z = Rz'$ (so that $|z'| \leq 1/2$) and note that

$$|1 - z/z_n| = |1 - Rz'/z_n| = \left| \frac{R}{z_n} \left| \frac{z_n}{R} - z' \right| \right|.$$

Thus

$$(3.5) \quad \log \prod_{n=1}^m |1 - z/z_n| = \log \prod_{n=1}^m \frac{R}{r_n} + \log \prod_{n=1}^m \left| \frac{z_n}{R} - z' \right|.$$

We estimate the last term in (3.5) using Cartan's lemma (Lemma 3.4) with $h = \eta/(2e)$. This implies that

$$(3.6) \quad \prod_{n=1}^m \left| \frac{z_n}{R} - z' \right| > \left(\frac{\eta}{2e} \right)^m,$$

except for z' in a set of discs, the sum of whose radii is at most η ; that is, except for z in a set of discs, the sum of whose radii is at most ηR . Thus, by Lemma 3.1(c),

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \log \prod_{n=1}^m \left| \frac{z_n}{R} - z' \right| &> m \log(\eta/(2e)) = -m \log(2e/\eta) \\ &\geq -n(R) \log(2e/\eta) \geq -Q(R) \log(2e/\eta), \end{aligned}$$

except for z in a set of discs, the sum of whose radii is at most ηR .

It remains to consider the term $\log \prod_{n=1}^m R/r_n$ in (3.5). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^m \log \frac{R}{r_n} &= m \log R - \sum_{n=1}^m \log r_n \\ &= m \log R - m \log r_m + \sum_{n=1}^{m-1} n(\log r_{n+1} - \log r_n) \\ &= \int_0^R \frac{n(t)}{t} dt = N(R). \end{aligned}$$

Together with (3.1), (3.4), (3.5) and (3.7) this gives the required result. \square

4. A NEW $\cos \pi\rho$ -TYPE THEOREM

Recall that Theorem 2 states that, for a transcendental entire function f of order less than 1, there is a close relationship between the minimum and maximum modulus of f near places where the maximum modulus of f is small; in particular if f has order zero, this relationship exists on a set of upper density 1. It is sufficient to prove Theorem 2 in the case that $f(0) = 1$. Otherwise we have $g(0) = 1$ for some function of the form $g(z) = f(z)/(az^p)$, where $a \neq 0$, $p \in \mathbb{N}$, and the result for f follows from the result for g by a routine calculation.

We prove Theorem 2, in the case that $f(0) = 1$, by using the bounds for the maximum and minimum modulus given in Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.5. These lemmas show that we can find values of r for which

the minimum and maximum modulus are close by finding values of r for which $Q(r)/N(r)$ is (relatively) small. We do this by finding values of r for which $a(r)/B(r)$ is small and then using Lemma 3.1 to deduce that, for such values, $Q(r)/N(r)$ is also small.

Lemma 4.1. *Let f be a transcendental entire function of order ρ , $\rho < \alpha < 1$ with $f(0) = 1$ and put*

$$\epsilon(r) = \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(r) = \max_{r \leq t \leq r^{1/(1-\alpha)}} \epsilon(t).$$

Let μ, ν be functions such that, for large r ,

$$0 < \mu(r) \leq 1, \quad 0 < \nu(r) \leq 1/4 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(r)\nu(r) > \frac{2\epsilon(r)}{1 - \delta(r)}.$$

Then, for large r , there exists $R \in (r^{(1-\delta(r))(1-\mu(r))}, r^{1-\delta(r)})$ such that

$$\frac{a(R)}{B(R)} \leq \nu(r) \quad \text{and hence} \quad \frac{Q(R)}{N(R)} \leq 8\nu(r).$$

Proof. Suppose that there exist arbitrarily large values of r such that

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{a(t)}{B(t)} > \nu(r), \quad \text{for all } t \in (r^{(1-\delta(r))(1-\mu(r))}, r^{1-\delta(r)}).$$

Now $a(t) = tB'(t)$ and so it follows from (4.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{r^{(1-\delta(r))(1-\mu(r))}}^{r^{1-\delta(r)}} \frac{B'(t)}{B(t)} dt &> \nu(r) \int_{r^{(1-\delta(r))(1-\mu(r))}}^{r^{1-\delta(r)}} \frac{1}{t} dt \\ &= \nu(r) \log r^{(1-\delta(r))\mu(r)} \\ &= \nu(r)\mu(r)(1 - \delta(r)) \log r \\ &> 2\epsilon(r) \log r. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for arbitrarily large values of r , we have

$$(4.2) \quad \log B(r^{1-\delta(r)}) > 2\epsilon(r) \log r.$$

It follows from Lemma 3.2, however, that, for large r ,

$$\begin{aligned} \log B(r^{1-\delta(r)}) &< \log(3 \log M(r) \log r) < \log((\log M(r))^2) \\ &= 2 \log \log M(r) = 2\epsilon(r) \log r. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts (4.2) and so our original supposition must be false.

Hence, for large r , there exists $R \in (r^{(1-\delta(r))(1-\mu(r))}, r^{1-\delta(r)})$ such that

$$a(R) \leq \nu(r)B(R) \leq B(R)/4,$$

and so, by Lemma 3.1(e),

$$B(R) \leq N(R) + 2a(R) \leq N(R) + B(R)/2.$$

Thus, for such R ,

$$(4.3) \quad B(R) \leq 2N(R).$$

We know from Lemma 3.1(d) that $Q(R) \leq 4a(R)$ and so, for such R ,

$$\frac{Q(R)}{N(R)} \leq \frac{8a(R)}{B(R)} \leq 8\nu(r),$$

as required. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Let f be a transcendental entire function of order ρ , $\rho < \alpha < 1$ with $f(0) = 1$ and put

$$\epsilon(r) = \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(r) = \max_{r \leq t \leq r^{1/(1-\alpha)}} \epsilon(t).$$

Let $0 < \eta < 1/2$ and let μ, ν be functions such that, for large r ,

$$0 < \mu(r) \leq 1, \quad 0 < \nu(r) \leq 1/4 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(r)\nu(r) > \frac{2\epsilon(r)}{1 - \delta(r)}.$$

It follows from Lemma 3.3, Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 4.1 that, for large r , there exists $R \in (r^{(1-\delta(r))(1-\mu(r))}, r^{1-\delta(r)})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log m(t)}{\log M(t)} &> \frac{N(R) - (1 + \log(2e/\eta))Q(R)}{N(R) + Q(R)} \\ &\geq \frac{1 - (1 + \log(2e/\eta))8\nu(r)}{1 + 8\nu(r)} \\ &> 1 - 20 \log(2e/\eta)\nu(r), \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq t \leq R/2$, except in a set of intervals, the sum of whose lengths is at most ηR . This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

5. A NEW GROWTH CONDITION FOR BAKER'S QUESTION

We begin this section by showing how Theorem 3 follows from Theorems 1 and 2. Let f be a transcendental entire function of order zero and put

$$\epsilon(r) = \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(r) = \max_{r \leq t \leq r^2} \epsilon(t).$$

For large r , we have $0 < \epsilon(r) \leq 1/144$ and $\delta(r) < 1/3$, and so we can apply Theorem 2 with $\alpha = 1/2$, $\eta = 1/8$, $\mu(r) = \sqrt{\epsilon(r)}$ and $\nu(r) = 3\sqrt{\epsilon(r)}$.

Now let $R_1 > 0$ be such that the sequence R_n defined by $R_{n+1} = M(R_n)$ tends to ∞ and the sequence ϵ_n defined by

$$\epsilon_n = \max_{R_n \leq r \leq R_{n+1}} \epsilon(r)$$

is positive, and suppose that $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{\epsilon_n} < \infty$. Let $r \in [R_n, R_{n+1})$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We may assume that R_1 has been chosen sufficiently large to ensure that, by Theorem 2, there exists

$$t \in (r^{(1-\delta(r))(1-\sqrt{\epsilon(r)})}/4, r^{1-\delta(r)}) \subset (r^{(1-\delta(r))(1-\sqrt{\epsilon(r)})-2/\log r}, r^{1-\delta(r)})$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \log m(t) &> \left(1 - 60 \log(16e) \sqrt{\epsilon(r)}\right) \log M(t) \\ (5.1) \qquad &> (1 - 230\sqrt{\epsilon_n}) \log M(t). \end{aligned}$$

Now let $L > 1$. We may assume that $R_{n+2} > R_{n+1}^{2L}$ and so $r^{2L} \in [R_n, R_{n+2})$. Thus

$$\epsilon(r^L) \leq \delta(r^L) \leq \delta_n, \text{ where } \delta_n = \max\{\epsilon_n, \epsilon_{n+1}\}.$$

We may also assume that R_1 has been chosen sufficiently large to ensure that $\epsilon_n < 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and that, by (5.1) and Lemma 2.2, there exists

$$t \in (r^{L(1-\delta_n)(1-\sqrt{\delta_n})-2/\log R_n}, r^L) \subset (r, r^L)$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \log m(t) &> \left(1 - 230\sqrt{\delta_n}\right) \log M\left(r^{L(1-\delta_n)(1-\sqrt{\delta_n})-2/\log R_n}\right) \\ &> L \left(1 - 230\sqrt{\delta_n}\right) \left((1 - \delta_n)(1 - \sqrt{\delta_n}) - \frac{2}{\log R_n}\right) \log M(r) \\ &> L \left(1 - 232\sqrt{\delta_n} - \frac{2}{\log R_n}\right) \log M(r). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\log R_n > 2^n$, for large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{\log R_n} < \infty$. Thus

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(232\sqrt{\delta_n} + \frac{2}{\log R_n}\right) < \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(464\sqrt{\epsilon_n} + \frac{2}{\log R_n}\right) < \infty$$

and so it follows from Theorem 1 with $a_n = 232\sqrt{\delta_n} + 2/\log R_n$ that $F(f)$ has no unbounded components. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

We now use the result of Theorem 3 to prove Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem 4. Suppose that there exist $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R > 0$ such that

$$\log \log M(r) < \frac{\log r}{\log^m r}, \text{ for } r > R.$$

Now take $R_1 > R$ so large that the sequence R_n defined by $R_{n+1} = M(R_n)$ tends to ∞ and the sequence ϵ_n defined by

$$\epsilon_n = \max_{R_n \leq r \leq R_{n+1}} \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r}$$

is positive. Then

$$(5.2) \quad \epsilon_n \leq \frac{1}{\log^m R_n}.$$

We will show that $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{\epsilon_n} < \infty$ and hence, by Theorem 3, $F(f)$ has no unbounded components. To do this, we show that the values of n satisfying

$$(5.3) \quad \epsilon_n \geq 1/n^4$$

are relatively sparsely distributed.

We begin by noting that if n satisfies (5.3) then there exists $r_n \in [R_n, R_{n+1}]$ with $M(r_n) \geq \exp(r_n^{1/n^4})$ and so

$$(5.4) \quad R_{n+2} = M(R_{n+1}) \geq M(r_n) \geq \exp(r_n^{1/n^4}) \geq \exp(R_n^{1/n^4}).$$

Suppose that N satisfies (5.3) and that there exist N_1, N_2 satisfying (5.3) with

$$(5.5) \quad N_1 \geq N + 2 \text{ and } e^N \geq N_2 \geq N_1 + 2.$$

Then, by (5.4) and (5.5),

$$R_{N_2} \geq M(R_{N_1+1}) \geq \exp(R_{N_1}^{1/N_1^4}) \geq \exp(R_{N_1}^{1/e^{4N}})$$

and

$$R_{N_1} \geq M(R_{N+1}) \geq \exp(R_N^{1/N^4}).$$

Thus

$$R_{N_2} \geq \exp(\exp(R_N^{1/N^4}/e^{4N})).$$

We claim that if, in addition, N is sufficiently large, then

$$(5.6) \quad R_{N_2} \geq e^{R_N}.$$

This is true since

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(\exp(R_N^{1/N^4}/e^{4N})) &\geq e^{R_N} \\ \iff \frac{\log R_{N_2}}{N^4} - 4N &\geq \log \log R_N \\ \iff \frac{\log R_N}{\log \log R_N} &\geq N^4 \left(\frac{4N}{\log \log R_N} + 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, for large N , we have $\log R_N \geq 2^N$. Also, $r/\log r$ is increasing for $r \geq e$, so

$$\frac{\log R_N}{\log \log R_N} \geq \frac{2^N}{N \log 2} \geq N^4 \left(\frac{4N}{\log \log R_N} + 1 \right),$$

for large N . Thus (5.6) is true for large N , N_1 and N_2 satisfying (5.3) and (5.5).

Now suppose that N satisfies (5.3) and there exist N_i , $1 \leq i \leq 2m$, satisfying (5.3), with $e^N \geq N_{i+1} \geq N_i + 2$, for $1 \leq i \leq 2m - 1$, and $N_1 \geq N + 2$. It follows from (5.2) and repeated application of (5.6) that, if N is sufficiently large and $N_{2m} \leq n \leq e^N$, then

$$(5.7) \quad \epsilon_n \leq \frac{1}{\log^m R_n} \leq \frac{1}{\log^m R_{N_{2m}}} \leq \frac{1}{\log^m \exp^m R_N} = \frac{1}{R_N} \leq \frac{1}{\exp(2^N)} \leq \frac{1}{n^4}.$$

So, for large N , there are at most $4m + 1$ values of n with $N \leq n \leq e^N$ such that n satisfies (5.3). Thus, by (5.2),

$$\sum_{n=N}^{[e^N]} \sqrt{\epsilon_n} < \frac{4m + 1}{\sqrt{\log^m R_N}} + \sum_{n=N}^{[e^N]} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n^4}}.$$

Now, for large N , we have $R_N > N$ and so there exist constants $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{\epsilon_n} < C + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n^2} + (4m + 1) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log^m(\exp^k N_0)}} < \infty.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 4.

6. EXAMPLES

Let

$$f(z) = \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{z}{r_m} \right)^{r_m^{\epsilon_m}},$$

where ϵ_m is a decreasing null sequence of positive terms with $\epsilon_1 < 1$ and r_m is a strictly increasing sequence with $r_1 \geq 4$ such that $r_m^{\epsilon_m} \in \mathbb{N}$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We will show that if ϵ_m and r_m satisfy certain conditions, then f is a function of order zero that fails to satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 1. In particular, we give conditions which are sufficient to ensure that f is a function of order zero that fails to satisfy Hinkkanen's condition (1.3). We begin by giving a condition on r_k and ϵ_k which is sufficient to ensure that f has order zero.

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose that*

$$(6.1) \quad r_{k+1}^{\epsilon_{k+1}} \geq r_k^2, \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then f has order zero.

Proof. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $r_k \leq r < r_{k+1}$. Then, by (6.1),

$$(6.2) \quad M(r) = \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{r}{r_m}\right)^{r_m^{\epsilon_m}} \leq r^{\sum_{m=1}^k r_m^{\epsilon_m}} \left(1 + \frac{r}{r_{k+1}}\right)^{r_{k+1}^{\epsilon_{k+1}}} \prod_{m=k+2}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{1}{r_m^{1/2}}\right)^{r_m^{\epsilon_m}}.$$

Now, for $1 \leq m \leq k-1$, it follows from (6.1) that

$$r_m^{\epsilon_m} < r_m \leq r_{k-1} \leq r_k^{\epsilon_k/2}.$$

Also, by (6.1), for $k \geq 2$ we have $r_k^{\epsilon_k} \geq 4^k \geq (k-1)^2$ and so

$$\sum_{m=1}^k r_m^{\epsilon_m} \leq r_k^{\epsilon_k} + (k-1)r_k^{\epsilon_k/2} \leq 2r_k^{\epsilon_k}.$$

So, for large k , it follows from (6.1) and (6.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} \log M(r) &\leq \sum_{m=1}^k r_m^{\epsilon_m} \log r + \frac{r_{k+1}^{\epsilon_{k+1}} r}{r_{k+1}} + \sum_{m=k+2}^{\infty} r_m^{\epsilon_m - 1/2} \\ &\leq 2r_k^{\epsilon_k} \log r + r^{\epsilon_{k+1}} + \sum_{m=k+2}^{\infty} r_m^{-1/4} \\ &\leq 2r_k^{\epsilon_k} \log r + r^{\epsilon_{k+1}} + 1, \end{aligned}$$

since $r_m \geq 4^m$. Thus, for large k ,

$$(6.3) \quad \log M(r) \leq 3r^{\epsilon_k} \log r, \text{ for } r_k \leq r < r_{k+1}.$$

So, for large k ,

$$\frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r} \leq \frac{\log(3r^{\epsilon_k} \log r)}{\log r} = \epsilon_k + \frac{\log(3 \log r)}{\log r}, \text{ for } r_k \leq r < r_{k+1},$$

and hence $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r} = 0$. \square

The next lemma is the main result in this section.

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose that*

$$(6.4) \quad r_{k+1}^{\epsilon_{k+1}} \geq r_k^{k+1}, \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then, given any $L > 1$, there exists K_L such that, for all $k \geq K_L$,

$$\frac{\log m(t)}{\log M(r_k^{1/L})} \leq L(1 - \epsilon_k/4), \text{ for all } t \in (r_k^{1/L}, r_k).$$

Proof. We fix $L > 1$. First note that it follows from (6.4) that, for large k (depending on L),

$$M(r_k^{1/L}) = \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{r_k^{1/L}}{r_m}\right)^{r_m^{\epsilon_m}} > \prod_{m=1}^{k-1} \left(\frac{r_k^{1/L}}{r_m}\right)^{r_m^{\epsilon_m}} \geq \prod_{m=1}^{k-1} r_k^{(1/L)(1-\epsilon_k/8)r_m^{\epsilon_m}}.$$

Thus, for large k ,

$$(6.5) \quad M(r_k^{1/L}) \geq r_k^{(1/L)(1-\epsilon_k/8)N_k}, \text{ where } N_k = \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} r_m^{\epsilon_m}.$$

Now, take $t \in (r_k^{1/L}, r_k)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If k is large enough, then $r_{k-1} < r_k^{1/L}$, so

$$\begin{aligned} m(t) &= \prod_{m=1}^{k-1} \left(\frac{t}{r_m} - 1\right)^{r_m^{\epsilon_m}} \prod_{m=k}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{t}{r_m}\right)^{r_m^{\epsilon_m}} \\ &\leq \prod_{m=1}^{k-1} t^{r_m^{\epsilon_m}} \left(1 - \frac{t}{r_k}\right)^{r_k^{\epsilon_k}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for large k ,

$$(6.6) \quad m(t) \leq t^{N_k} \left(1 - \frac{t}{r_k}\right)^{r_k^{\epsilon_k}}, \text{ for } t \in (r_k^{1/L}, r_k).$$

Differentiating, we see that the right-hand side of this inequality takes its maximum value when

$$\frac{N_k}{t} - \frac{r_k^{\epsilon_k}}{r_k(1-t/r_k)} = 0;$$

that is, at t_0 where

$$t_0 = N_k r_k^{1-\epsilon_k} (1 - t_0/r_k).$$

Thus, by (6.6), for large k and for all $t \in (r_k^{1/L}, r_k)$,

$$m(t) \leq t_0^{N_k} \leq N_k^{N_k} r_k^{(1-\epsilon_k)N_k},$$

and so, by (6.5),

$$(6.7) \quad \frac{\log m(t)}{\log M(r_k^{1/L})} \leq \frac{N_k \log N_k + N_k(1-\epsilon_k) \log r_k}{(N_k/L)(1-\epsilon_k/8) \log r_k} = L \frac{\log N_k + (1-\epsilon_k) \log r_k}{(1-\epsilon_k/8) \log r_k}.$$

It follows from (6.4) that

$$N_k = \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} r_m^{\epsilon_m} \leq (k-1)r_{k-1}^{\epsilon_{k-1}} \leq r_{k-1}^2 < r_k^{2\epsilon_k/k}$$

and so, for large k ,

$$\log N_k + (1 - \epsilon_k) \log r_k < (2\epsilon_k/k) \log r_k + (1 - \epsilon_k) \log r_k < (1 - \epsilon_k/2) \log r_k.$$

Thus, by (6.7), for large k and for all $t \in (r_k^{1/L}, r_k)$,

$$\frac{\log m(t)}{\log M(r_k^{1/L})} \leq L \frac{(1 - \epsilon_k/2) \log r_k}{(1 - \epsilon_k/8) \log r_k} < L(1 - \epsilon_k/4),$$

as required. \square

The next lemma gives a condition on r_k and ϵ_k which is sufficient to ensure that if $L > 1$ then, for large values of n , each interval of the form $[R_n, R_{n+1})$ contains at most one point of the form $r_k^{1/L}$.

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose that*

$$(6.8) \quad r_{k+1}^{\epsilon_{k+1}} \geq e^{r_k}, \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N},$$

and let $R_1 > 0$ be such that the sequence R_n defined by $R_{n+1} = M(R_n)$ tends to ∞ . Now fix $L > 1$ and, for large k , let R_{n_k} be such that

$$r_k^{1/L} \in [R_{n_k}, R_{n_k+1}), \text{ where } R_{n_k+1} = M(R_{n_k}).$$

Then, for large k , $R_{n_{k+1}} \geq R_{n_k+1}$ and hence $n_{k+1} > n_k$.

Proof. Note that

$$R_{n_k+1} = M(R_{n_k}) \leq M(r_k^{1/L}) < M(r_k).$$

Since (6.8) is satisfied, (6.1) and hence (6.3) are also satisfied. It follows from (6.3) and (6.8) that, for large k ,

$$R_{n_k+1} < M(r_k) \leq \exp(3r_k^{\epsilon_k} \log r_k) < \exp(r_k) < r_{k+1}^{1/L}.$$

Thus $R_{n_{k+1}} \geq R_{n_k+1}$. \square

To construct the required example, we consider the function f given by (1.7), where $\epsilon_1 < 1$ and

$$(6.9) \quad \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \epsilon_m = \infty,$$

and the sequence r_m is chosen to satisfy $r_1 \geq 4$ and (6.8), and hence satisfies (6.1) and (6.4) (because $e^x \geq x^{k+1}$, for $x \geq (k+1)^2$ and $r_k \geq 4^k \geq (k+1)^2$). In particular, f has order zero by Lemma 6.1.

Now suppose that a_n is a positive sequence for which condition (1.4) of Theorem 1 is satisfied and let $R_1 > 0$ be such that the sequence R_n

defined by $R_{n+1} = M(R_n)$ tends to ∞ . Then for k large enough, there exists $t_k \in (r_k^{1/L}, r_k)$ such that

$$\frac{\log m(t_k)}{\log M(r_k^{1/L})} \geq L(1 - a_{n_k}),$$

where n_k is the integer such that

$$r_k^{1/L} \in [R_{n_k}, R_{n_k+1}).$$

Thus, by Lemma 6.2, we have

$$L(1 - \epsilon_k/4) \geq L(1 - a_{n_k}), \text{ so } a_{n_k} \geq \epsilon_k/4,$$

for all large k . Therefore, by Lemma 6.3 and (6.9), we deduce that $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} a_n = \infty$, so f is a transcendental entire function of order zero for which there is no positive sequence a_n satisfying all the conditions of Theorem 1.

Remark. Note that this function cannot satisfy the growth restriction in Theorem 4 since this would imply that it satisfies all the conditions of Theorem 1.

Finally, suppose that

$$(6.10) \quad \epsilon_k (\log r_k)^{1/k} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then, given $L > 1$ and $C, \delta > 0$, we have

$$\epsilon_k/4 > \frac{C}{(\log r_k^{1/L})^\delta}, \text{ for large } k,$$

and so, if (6.4) is also satisfied, then it follows from Lemma 6.2 that, for large k ,

$$\frac{\log m(t)}{\log M(r_k^{1/L})} \leq L \left(1 - \frac{C}{(\log r_k^{1/L})^\delta} \right), \text{ for all } t \in (r_k^{1/L}, r_k).$$

If (6.4) is satisfied, then so is (6.1) and so, by Lemma 6.1, f has order zero. Thus, if (6.10) and (6.4) are satisfied, then f is a function of order zero that fails to satisfy Hinkkanen's condition (1.3).

7. REGULARITY CONDITIONS

Many authors have shown that a function of order $\rho < 1/2$ has no unbounded Fatou components if the growth is sufficiently regular. We

now prove Theorem 5 and show that the regularity condition (1.8) includes various known regularity conditions.

We use the following result which is due to Baker [2, Satz 1]. (This result also follows from the version of the $\cos \pi \rho$ theorem proved by Barry [4].)

Lemma 7.1. *Let f be a transcendental entire function of order $\rho < 1/2$. There exist $m > 1$ and $R > 0$ such that, for all $r > R$, there exists r' satisfying*

$$r \leq r' \leq r^m, \quad \text{with } m(r') = M(r).$$

The following result is a direct consequence of Lemma 7.1.

Lemma 7.2. *Let f be a transcendental entire function of order $\rho < 1/2$ and let m be the constant given in Lemma 7.1. Suppose that there exist a sequence $R_n \rightarrow \infty$ defined by $R_{n+1} = M(R_n)$ and a function $\psi : [R_1, \infty) \rightarrow [R_1, \infty)$ such that $\psi(r) \geq r$ and*

$$(7.1) \quad M(\psi(R_n)) \geq \psi(R_{n+1})^m, \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then there exists a sequence ρ_n such that

- (1) $R_n \leq \psi(R_n) \leq \rho_n \leq \psi(R_n)^m$,
- (2) $m(\rho_n) \geq \psi(R_{n+1})^m$.

Theorem 5 follows easily from Lemma 7.2.

Proof of Theorem 5. If the hypotheses of Theorem 5 are satisfied, then so are the hypotheses of Lemma 7.2. This implies that the hypotheses of Lemma 2.1 are also satisfied, since $\psi(R_n)^m = R_n^{c(n)}$, where $c(n) > 1$. Thus $F(f)$ has no unbounded components. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.

We stated earlier that many of the known regularity conditions associated with Baker's question can be written in the form (1.8). For example, we showed in [18, Theorem C] that a transcendental entire function of order $\rho < 1/2$ has no unbounded Fatou components if there exists a finite constant c such that

$$(7.2) \quad \frac{\log M(2r)}{\log M(r)} \rightarrow c \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty.$$

We showed in [18, equation (4.2)] that, for such a function with $\rho > 0$, the inequality (1.8) is satisfied with $\psi(r) = r^2$; for functions of order zero that satisfy (7.2) a more delicate argument was required.

Another regularity condition was given by Anderson and Hinkkanen [1]. They showed that an entire function of order $\rho < 1/2$ has no unbounded Fatou components if there exists $c > 0$ such that the function $\phi(x) = \log M(e^x)$ satisfies

$$(7.3) \quad \frac{\phi'(x)}{\phi(x)} \geq \frac{1+c}{x}, \quad \text{for large } x.$$

Note that (7.3) implies that, for large x and all $k > 1$,

$$\int_x^{kx} \frac{\phi'(t)}{\phi(t)} dt \geq \int_x^{kx} \frac{1+c}{t} dt$$

and so

$$\log(\phi(kx)/\phi(x)) \geq (1+c) \log k;$$

that is,

$$\phi(kx) \geq k^{1+c} \phi(x).$$

Thus, if $m > 1$ is given, then by taking $k = m^{1/c} > 1$, we obtain

$$\phi(kx) \geq km\phi(x), \quad \text{for large } x,$$

and so

$$M(r^k) \geq M(r)^{km}, \quad \text{for large } r.$$

Hence, if (7.3) holds, then the conditions of Theorem 5 are satisfied with $\psi(r) = r^k$.

Remark. We mention here the paper of Hua and Yang [13] in which further such regularity conditions are stated. Unfortunately, the proofs of the main results in [13] appear to contain gaps, as pointed out in the survey article [11].

Finally, we prove Theorem 6.

Proof of Theorem 6. Let f be a transcendental entire function of order $\rho < 1/2$ and suppose that there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < q < 1$ such that

$$M(r) \geq \exp^{n+1}((\log^n r)^q), \quad \text{for large } r.$$

Now let $m > 1$ and let

$$\psi(r) = \exp^n((\log r)^p), \quad \text{where } pq > 1.$$

We will show that, with $M(r)$ and $\psi(r)$ as given above, for large r we have $M(\psi(r)) \geq (\psi(M(r)))^m$. Since $\psi(r) \geq r$ for $r \geq e$, this is sufficient to show that the conditions of Theorem 5 are satisfied. The result then follows.

We begin by noting that, for large r ,

$$M(\psi(r)) \geq \exp^{n+1}((\log^n(\exp^n((\log r)^p)))^q) = \exp^{n+1}((\log r)^{pq}).$$

Also, since f has order less than $1/2$, we have, for large r ,

$$\psi(M(r))^m \leq \psi(e^{r^{1/2}})^m = \exp^n(r^{p/2})^m.$$

So it is sufficient to show that, for large r ,

$$\exp^{n+1}((\log r)^{pq}) \geq \exp^n(r^{p/2})^m;$$

that is,

$$(7.4) \quad \exp^{n-1}((\log r)^{pq}) \geq \log m + \exp^{n-2}(r^{p/2}), \quad \text{if } n \geq 2,$$

or

$$(7.5) \quad (\log r)^{pq} \geq \log m + (p/2) \log r, \quad \text{if } n = 1.$$

Since (7.5) is clearly true for large r , it remains to show that (7.4) is also true for large r . We note that, for large r ,

$$\begin{aligned} \exp^{n-1}((\log r)^{pq}) &= \exp^{n-2}(\exp((\log r)^{pq})) \\ &\geq \exp^{n-2}(2r^{p/2}) \\ &\geq 2 \exp^{n-2}(r^{p/2}) \\ &\geq \log m + \exp^{n-2}(r^{p/2}) \end{aligned}$$

and so (7.4) is true, as required. This completes the proof of Theorem 6.

REFERENCES

- (1) J.M. Anderson and A. Hinkkanen. Unbounded domains of normality. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 126 (1998), 3243–3252.
- (2) I.N. Baker. Zusammensetzungen ganzer Funktionen. *Math. Z.* 69 (1958), 121–163.
- (3) I.N. Baker. The iteration of polynomials and transcendental entire functions. *J. Austral. Math. Soc. (Series A)* 30 (1981), 483–495.
- (4) P.D. Barry. On a theorem of Besicovitch. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)* 14 (1963), 293–302.
- (5) W. Bergweiler. Iteration of meromorphic functions. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 29 (1993), 151–188.
- (6) W. Bergweiler and A. Hinkkanen. On semiconjugation of entire functions. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* 126 (1999), 565–574.
- (7) H. Cartan. Sur les systèmes de fonctions holomorphes à variétés linéaires et leurs applications. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (3)* 45 (1928), 255–346.

- (8) M.L. Cartwright. *Integral functions*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, No. 44, Cambridge University Press, 1962.
- (9) A.E. Eremenko. On the iteration of entire functions. *Dynamical systems and ergodic theory*, Banach Center Publ. 23 (Polish Scientific Publishers, Warsaw, 1989) 339–345.
- (10) A. Hinkkanen. Entire functions with no unbounded Fatou components. *Complex analysis and dynamical systems II*, 217–226. Contemp. Math. 382, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.
- (11) A. Hinkkanen. Entire functions with bounded Fatou components. To appear in *Transcendental dynamics and complex analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- (12) A. Hinkkanen and J. Miles. Growth conditions for entire functions with only bounded Fatou components. *Preprint*.
- (13) X. Hua and C.C. Yang. Fatou components of entire functions of small growth *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 19 (1999), 1281–1293.
- (14) P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard. On sets where iterates of a meromorphic function zip towards infinity. *Bull. London Math. Soc.* 32 (2000), 528–536.
- (15) P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard. On questions of Fatou and Eremenko. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 133 (2005), 1119–1126.
- (16) P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard. Escaping points of entire function of small growth. *Preprint*.
- (17) A.P. Singh. Composite entire functions with no unbounded Fatou components. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 335 (2007), 907–914.
- (18) G.M. Stallard. The iteration of entire functions of small growth. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* 114 (1993), 43–55.
- (19) E.C. Titchmarsh. *The theory of functions*. Oxford University Press, 1939.
- (20) Y. Wang. Bounded domains of the Fatou set of an entire function. *Israel J. Math.* 121 (2001), 55–60.
- (21) Jian-Hua Zheng. Unbounded domains of normality of entire functions of small growth. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* 128 (2000), 355–361.

Department of Mathematics,
The Open University,
Walton Hall,
Milton Keynes,

MK7 6AA.

E-mail: p.j.rippon@open.ac.uk; g.m.stallard@open.ac.uk