

# A SHARP GROWTH CONDITION FOR A FAST ESCAPING SPIDER'S WEB

P. J. RIPPON AND G. M. STALLARD

ABSTRACT. We show that the fast escaping set  $A(f)$  of a transcendental entire function  $f$  has a structure known as a spider's web whenever the maximum modulus of  $f$  grows below a certain rate. We give examples of entire functions for which the fast escaping set is not a spider's web which show that this growth rate is best possible. By our earlier results, these are the first examples for which the escaping set has a spider's web structure but the fast escaping set does not. These results give new insight into a conjecture of Baker and a conjecture of Eremenko.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a transcendental entire function and denote by  $f^n$ ,  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , the  $n$ th iterate of  $f$ . The *Fatou set*  $F(f)$  is the set of points  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $(f^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  forms a normal family in some neighborhood of  $z$ . The complement of  $F(f)$  is called the *Julia set*  $J(f)$  of  $f$ . An introduction to the properties of these sets can be found in [2].

In recent years, the escaping set defined by

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

has come to play an increasingly significant role in the study of the iteration of transcendental entire functions with much of the research being motivated by a conjecture of Eremenko [5] that all the components of the escaping set are unbounded. For partial results on this conjecture see, for example, [9] and [16].

The most general result on Eremenko's conjecture was obtained in [10] where it was proved that the escaping set always has at least one unbounded component. This result was proved by considering the fast escaping set  $A(f) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} f^{-n}(A_R(f))$ , where

$$A_R(f) = \{z : |f^n(z)| \geq M^n(R, f), \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Here

$$M(r) = M(r, f) = \max_{|z|=r} |f(z)|,$$

$M^n(r, f)$  denotes the  $n$ th iterate of  $M$  with respect to  $r$ , and  $R > 0$  is chosen so that  $M(r, f) > r$  for  $r \geq R$ . The set  $A(f)$  has many nice properties including the fact that all its components are unbounded – these properties are described in detail in [12].

There are many classes of transcendental entire functions for which the fast escaping set has the structure of a spider's web – see [12], [8] and [17]. We say

that a set  $E$  has this structure if  $E$  is connected and there exists a sequence of bounded simply connected domains  $G_n$  such that

$$\partial G_n \subset E, G_n \subset G_{n+1}, \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ and } \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G_n = \mathbb{C}.$$

As shown in [12], if  $A_R(f)$  has this structure then so do both  $A(f)$  and  $I(f)$ , and hence Eremenko's conjecture is satisfied. Also, the domains  $G_n$  can be chosen so that  $\partial G_n \subset A_R(f) \cap J(f)$  and so  $f$  has no unbounded Fatou components. This gives a surprising link between Eremenko's conjecture and a conjecture of Baker that all the components of the Fatou set are bounded if  $f$  is a transcendental entire function of order less than  $1/2$ . Recall that the *order* of a transcendental entire function  $f$  is defined to be

$$\rho = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r}.$$

For background and recent results on Baker's conjecture, see [6], [7], [11] and [13]. It was shown in [11] (see also [12]) that all earlier partial results on Baker's conjecture are in fact sufficient to imply the stronger result that  $A_R(f)$  is a spider's web. Here we give a sharp condition on the growth of the maximum modulus that is sufficient to imply that  $A_R(f)$  is a spider's web and hence that Baker's conjecture and Eremenko's conjecture are both satisfied. More precisely, we prove the following sufficient condition.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $f$  be a transcendental entire function and let  $R > 0$  be such that  $M(r, f) > r$  for  $r \geq R$ . Let*

$$R_n = M^n(R) \text{ and } \varepsilon_n = \max_{R_n \leq r \leq R_{n+1}} \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r}.$$

If

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

then  $A_R(f)$  is a spider's web.

We obtained a closely related result in [11, Theorem 3] with the stronger hypothesis that  $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{\varepsilon_n} < \infty$  and remarked there that the square root could be removed by introducing a more sophisticated argument. The method of proof given here is quite different, and more enlightening, than that used to prove [11, Theorem 3]. In fact, Theorem 1.1 follows surprisingly easily from a new local version of the classical  $\cos \pi \rho$  theorem; see Theorem 2.1.

*Remark.* Theorem 1.1, can be generalised to apply to the set of points that escape as fast as possible within a direct tract of a transcendental meromorphic function; see [3] for earlier results concerning the fast escaping set in a direct tract.

It turns out that the condition in Theorem 1.1 is, in a strong sense, best possible. In particular, the following result shows that the condition in Theorem 1.1 cannot be replaced by the weaker condition that  $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\varepsilon_n)^c < \infty$ , for some  $c > 1$ .

**Theorem 1.2.** *There exist transcendental entire functions of the form*

$$(1.1) \quad f(z) = z^3 \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{z}{a_n}\right)^{2p_n},$$

where  $p_n \in \mathbb{N}$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and the sequence  $(a_n)$  is positive and strictly increasing such that  $A(f) \cap (-\infty, 0] = \emptyset$ ; in particular,  $A(f)$  is not a spider's web.

Moreover, if  $(\delta_n)$  is a positive sequence such that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_n = \infty,$$

then we can choose the sequence  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and a value  $R > 0$  in such a way that, with

$$p_n = \lfloor a_n^{\delta_n/4} / 4 \rfloor, \quad R_n = M^n(R) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_n = \max_{R_n \leq r \leq R_{n+1}} \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r},$$

there exists a subsequence  $(n_k)$  such that

$$(1.2) \quad \varepsilon_{n_k} \leq \delta_k + \frac{1}{2^{n_k}}, \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N},$$

and

$$(1.3) \quad \varepsilon_{n_k+m} \leq \frac{\delta_k}{3^{m-1}} + \frac{1}{2^{n_k+m}}, \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq m < n_{k+1} - n_k.$$

Since it is possible to choose a positive sequence  $(\delta_n)$  with

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_n = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_n = 0,$$

Theorem 1.2 implies that there are functions of order zero for which  $A_R(f)$  fails to be a spider's web. Thus new techniques are needed in order to solve Baker's conjecture. One such technique is introduced in [13] where we show that all functions of order less than  $1/2$  with zeros on the negative real axis satisfy Baker's conjecture and also satisfy Eremenko's conjecture with  $I(f)$  being a spider's web. Since functions of the form (1.1) with  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n < 1/2$  are of this type, this gives the following corollary to Theorem 1.2, which answers a question in [12].

**Corollary 1.3.** *There exist transcendental entire functions for which  $I(f)$  is a spider's web but  $A(f)$  is not a spider's web.*

*Remark.* In fact we show in [13] that functions of order less than  $1/2$  with zeros on the negative real axis have the stronger property that  $Q(f)$  contains a spider's web, where  $Q(f)$  is the quite fast escaping set. Thus Theorem 1.2 provides examples of functions for which  $Q(f) \neq A(f)$ ; these two sets are equal for many functions, including all functions in the Eremenko-Lyubich class  $\mathcal{B}$  as we show in [15].

The paper is arranged as follows. In Section 2 we prove Theorem 1.1 and then, in Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.2.

## 2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Let  $f$  be a transcendental entire function and  $R > 0$  be such that  $M(r) > r$  for  $r \geq R$ . Recall that

$$A_R(f) = \{z : |f^n(z)| \geq M^n(R), \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

and that  $A_R(f)$  is a spider's web if  $A_R(f)$  is connected and there exists a sequence of bounded simply connected domains  $G_n$  such that

$$\partial G_n \subset A_R(f), \quad G_n \subset G_{n+1}, \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G_n = \mathbb{C}.$$

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1 which gives a condition that is sufficient to ensure that  $A_R(f)$  is a spider's web. The key ingredient in our proof is the following result which can be viewed as a local version of the classical  $\cos \pi \rho$  theorem. For a discussion of results of this type, see [14].

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $f$  be a transcendental entire function. There exists  $r(f) > 0$  such that, if*

$$(2.1) \quad \log M(r) \leq r^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad r^{1-2\alpha} \geq r(f),$$

for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ , then there exists  $t \in (r^{1-2\alpha}, r)$  such that

$$\log m(t) > \log M(r^{1-2\alpha}) - 2.$$

*Proof.* We apply the following result of Beurling [4, page 96]:

Let  $f$  be analytic in  $\{z : |z| < r_0\}$ , let  $0 \leq r_1 < r_2 < r_0$ , and put

$$E = \{t \in (r_1, r_2) : m(t) \leq \mu\}, \quad \text{where } 0 < \mu < M(r_1).$$

Then

$$(2.2) \quad \log \frac{M(r_2)}{\mu} > \frac{1}{2} \exp \left( \frac{1}{2} \int_E \frac{dt}{t} \right) \log \frac{M(r_1)}{\mu}.$$

Taking  $r_2 = r$ ,  $r_1 = r^{1-2\alpha}$ ,  $\mu = M(r^{1-2\alpha})/e^2$ , and  $r(f) > 0$  such that  $M(r(f)) \geq e^2$ , we deduce from (2.1) and (2.2) that, if  $m(t) \leq \mu$  for  $t \in (r^{1-2\alpha}, r)$ , then

$$r^\alpha \geq \log M(r) \geq \log \frac{M(r)}{\mu} > \frac{1}{2} \exp \left( \frac{1}{2} \int_{r^{1-2\alpha}}^r \frac{dt}{t} \right) \log \frac{M(r^{1-2\alpha})}{\mu} = r^\alpha.$$

This is a contradiction and so there must exist  $t \in (r^{1-2\alpha}, r)$  such that  $m(t) > \mu$ ; that is,

$$\log m(t) > \log \mu = \log M(r^{1-2\alpha}) - 2,$$

as required.  $\square$

We also use the following results about spiders' webs proved in [12].

**Lemma 2.2.** [12, Corollary 8.2] *Let  $f$  be a transcendental entire function and let  $R > 0$  be such that  $M(r) > r$  for  $r \geq R$ . Then  $A_R(f)$  is a spider's web if there exists a sequence  $(\rho_n)$  such that, for  $n \geq 0$ ,*

$$(2.3) \quad \rho_n > M^n(R)$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad m(\rho_n) \geq \rho_{n+1}.$$

**Lemma 2.3.** [12, Lemma 7.1(d)] *Let  $f$  be a transcendental entire function, let  $R > 0$  be such that  $M(r) > r$  for  $r \geq R$ , and let  $R' > R$ . Then  $A_R(f)$  is a spider's web if and only if  $A_{R'}(f)$  is a spider's web.*

In addition, we need the following property of the maximum modulus function, which was proved in this form in [11].

**Lemma 2.4.** [11, Lemma 2.2] *Let  $f$  be a transcendental entire function. Then there exists  $R > 0$  such that, for all  $r \geq R$  and all  $c > 1$ ,*

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

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let  $R > 0$  be such that, for  $r \geq R$ , Lemma 2.4 holds and  $M(r) > r$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$R_n = M^n(R) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_n = \max_{R_n \leq r \leq R_{n+1}} \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r}.$$

Suppose that  $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \varepsilon_n < \infty$ . Then we can take  $N$  sufficiently large to ensure that

$$(2.5) \quad \sum_{n \geq N} \varepsilon_n < \frac{1}{8},$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad M(R_n)^{1/(8n^2)} = R_{n+1}^{1/(8n^2)} \geq e^2, \quad \text{for } n \geq N, \quad \text{and } R_{N+1}^{1/4} \geq R_N \geq r(f),$$

where  $r(f)$  is as defined in Theorem 2.1. Note that (2.6) is possible since  $\log M(r)/\log r \rightarrow \infty$  and so, for large  $n$ , we have  $\log R_{n+1} > 4 \log R_n$ .

Now let

$$r_n = M^{n+1} \left( R_{N+1}^{\prod_{m=N}^{N+n} (1-2\varepsilon_m - 1/(8m^2))} \right), \quad \text{for } n \geq 0.$$

We note that, for  $n \geq 0$ , it follows from (2.5) that

$$\prod_{m=N}^{N+n} \left( 1 - 2\varepsilon_m - \frac{1}{8m^2} \right) > 1 - \sum_{m=N}^{N+n} 2\varepsilon_m - \sum_{m=N}^{N+n} \frac{1}{8m^2} \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

and so, by (2.6),

$$R_{N+n+2} > r_n > M^{n+1}(R_{N+1}^{1/2}) \geq M^{n+1}(R_N^2) = R_{N+n+1}^2.$$

We claim that, for  $n \geq 0$ , there exists  $\rho_n \in (R_{N+n+1}, r_n)$  with  $m(\rho_n) > r_{n+1}$ . Indeed, it follows from Theorem 2.1, (2.5), (2.6) and Lemma 2.4 that, for  $n \geq 0$ , there exists  $\rho_n \in (r_n^{1-2\varepsilon_{n+N+1}}, r_n) \subset (R_{N+n+1}, r_n)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} m(\rho_n) &\geq \frac{1}{e^2} M(r_n^{1-2\varepsilon_{n+N+1}}) \\ &\geq M(r_n^{1-2\varepsilon_{n+N+1}})^{1-1/(8(n+N+1)^2)} \\ &\geq M(r_n^{(1-2\varepsilon_{n+N+1})(1-1/(8(n+N+1)^2))}) \\ &\geq M(r_n^{(1-2\varepsilon_{n+N+1}-1/(8(n+N+1)^2))}) \\ &= M \left( \left( M^{n+1} \left( R_{N+1}^{\prod_{m=N}^{N+n} (1-2\varepsilon_m - 1/(8m^2))} \right) \right)^{(1-2\varepsilon_{n+N+1}-1/(8(n+N+1)^2))} \right) \\ &\geq M^{n+2} \left( R_{N+1}^{\prod_{m=N}^{N+n+1} (1-2\varepsilon_m - 1/(8m^2))} \right) \\ &= r_{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for  $n \geq 0$ , there exists  $\rho_n > R_{N+n}$  with  $m(\rho_n) \geq \rho_{n+1}$  and so, by Lemma 2.2,  $A_{R_{N+1}}(f)$  is a spider's web. It now follows from Lemma 2.3 that  $A_R(f)$  is a spider's web as claimed.  $\square$

## 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Let

$$f(z) = z^3 \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{z}{a_n}\right)^{2p_n},$$

where the sequence  $(a_n)$  is positive and strictly increasing. In addition, let  $(\delta_n)$  be a positive sequence such that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_n = \infty,$$

and let

$$(3.1) \quad p_n = [a_n^{\delta_n/4}/4].$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that

$$(3.2) \quad \delta_n < 1/2, \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Note that  $f((-\infty, 0]) \subset (-\infty, 0]$  and that  $m(r) = f(-r)$  and  $M(r) = f(r) > r^3$ , for  $r > 0$ . Further,  $M(r) > r$  for  $r \geq 1$ .

We first show that the sequence  $(a_n)$  can be chosen so that  $A(f) \cap (-\infty, 0] = \emptyset$ .

We choose the values of  $a_n$  carefully, beginning with  $a_1$ , then  $a_2$  and so on. Because of the way in which we choose the values of  $a_n$ , it is helpful to introduce the function  $g$  defined by

$$(3.3) \quad g(r) = \begin{cases} r^3, & 0 \leq r < a_1, \\ r^3 \prod_{a_n \leq r} \left(1 + \frac{r}{a_n}\right)^{2p_n}, & r \geq a_1. \end{cases}$$

Note that  $g$  is a strictly increasing function and that it is discontinuous at  $a_n$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . A key property of  $g$  which we use repeatedly is that

$$(3.4) \quad m(r) = -f(-r) < g(r) < M(r), \text{ for } r \geq 0.$$

Since  $g$  is increasing, (3.4) implies that

$$(3.5) \quad f([-r, 0]) \subset [-g(r), 0], \text{ for } r \geq 0.$$

We now set  $r_0 = 10$  and  $r_{n+1} = g(r_n) = g^{n+1}(10)$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and note that

$$(3.6) \quad r_{n+1} \geq r_n^3, \text{ for } n \geq 0.$$

Also, it follows from (3.5) that

$$(3.7) \quad f^n((-r_m, 0]) \subset (-r_{m+n}, 0], \text{ for } n, m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We begin by proving the following result.

**Lemma 3.1.** *If there exists a sequence  $(N_k)$  such that,*

$$(3.8) \quad f^{N_1}((-r_2, 0]) \subset (-r_{N_1}, 0]$$

and, for  $k \geq 2$ ,

$$(3.9) \quad f^{N_k}((-r_{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}+2k}, 0]) \subset (-r_{N_1+\dots+N_k}, 0],$$

then  $A(f) \cap (-\infty, 0] = \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* We first note that, if the hypotheses of Lemma 3.1 hold, then it follows from (3.7) and (3.9) that, for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f^{N_1+\dots+N_k}((-r_{2k}, 0]) &= f^{N_k}(f^{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}}((-r_{2k}, 0])) \\ &\subset f^{N_k}((-r_{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}+2k}, 0]) \\ &\subset (-r_{N_1+\dots+N_k}, 0]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(3.10) \quad f^{N_1+\dots+N_k}((-r_{2k}, 0]) \subset (-r_{N_1+\dots+N_k}, 0].$$

Now let  $z \in (-\infty, 0]$ . There exists  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  such that, for  $k \geq K$ , we have  $z \in (-r_k, 0]$  and hence, by (3.7), we have  $f^k(z) \in (-r_{2k}, 0]$ . Thus, by (3.10) and (3.4), for  $k \geq K$ ,

$$|f^{N_1+\dots+N_k+k}(z)| < r_{N_1+\dots+N_k} < M^{N_1+\dots+N_k}(10)$$

and hence

$$z \notin \{z : |f^{n+k}(z)| \geq M^n(10) \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Thus  $A(f) \cap (-\infty, 0] = \emptyset$  as required.  $\square$

We will show that we can choose the values of  $a_n$  in such a way that the hypotheses of Lemma 3.1 hold. In order to do this, it is helpful to set certain restrictions on our choice of values. Firstly, we choose  $a_1$  and  $a_{n+1}/a_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , sufficiently large to ensure that

$$(3.11) \quad a_1^{\delta_1/4} \geq 4, \quad a_{n+1} > a_n^2, \quad a_{n+1}^{\delta_{n+1}/2} > 16a_n^{\delta_n}$$

and

$$(3.12) \quad a_{n+1}^{\delta_{n+1}/16} > a_n^{\delta_n} \log a_{n+1}.$$

We note that (3.11) implies that

$$(3.13) \quad p_1 \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad p_{n+1} \geq 2p_n^2, \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We also place certain restrictions on our choice of the values of  $a_n$  in relation to the values of  $r_n$ :

$$(3.14) \quad \text{if } a_k \in [r_n, r_{n+1}), \text{ then } a_m \notin [r_n, r_{n+4}) \text{ for } k, m \in \mathbb{N}, m \neq k.$$

We now show that, in order to prove that the hypotheses of Lemma 3.1 hold, it is sufficient to prove the following result.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose that, for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have defined the values of  $a_n$  for which  $a_n \leq r_m$  in such a way that they satisfy (3.11), (3.12) and (3.14). Then we can choose  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and the values of  $a_n$  for which  $r_m < a_n \leq r_{m+N-1}$  in such a way that they satisfy (3.11), (3.12) and (3.14) and, no matter how the later values of  $a_n$  are chosen,*

$$f^N((-r_{m+1}, 0]) \subset (-r_{m+N}, 0].$$

Proving Lemma 3.2 is the key part of the proof that we can choose the sequence  $(a_n)$  so as to ensure that  $A(f) \cap (-\infty, 0] = \emptyset$ . Before proving Lemma 3.2, we show that, if this result holds, then the hypotheses of Lemma 3.1 also hold. First, by applying Lemma 3.2 when  $m = 1$  we see that there exists  $N_{1,1} \in \mathbb{N}$  and a choice of  $a_n$  for  $r_1 < a_n \leq r_{N_{1,1}}$  such that

$$(3.15) \quad f^{N_{1,1}}((-r_2, 0]) \subset (-r_{N_{1,1}+1}, 0].$$

We then apply Lemma 3.2 with  $m = N_{1,1}$  and deduce that there exists  $N_{1,2} \in \mathbb{N}$  and a choice of  $a_n$  for  $r_{N_{1,1}} < a_n \leq r_{N_{1,1}+N_{1,2}-1}$  such that

$$(3.16) \quad f^{N_{1,2}}((-r_{N_{1,1}+1}, 0]) \subset (-r_{N_{1,1}+N_{1,2}}, 0].$$

It follows from (3.15) and (3.16) that

$$f^{N_{1,1}+N_{1,2}}(-r_2, 0] \subset f^{N_{1,2}}(-r_{N_{1,1}+1}, 0] \subset (-r_{N_{1,1}+N_{1,2}}, 0].$$

Putting  $N_1 = N_{1,1} + N_{1,2}$ , we deduce that we can choose the values of  $a_n$  for which  $r_1 < a_n \leq r_{N_1-1}$  in such a way that

$$f^{N_1}((-r_2, 0]) \subset (-r_{N_1}, 0].$$

Thus (3.8) holds.

Now suppose that, for some  $k \geq 2$ , we have defined  $N_j$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq k-1$ , and defined  $a_n$ , for  $r_1 < a_n \leq r_{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}-1}$ . We claim that we can use Lemma 3.2 to define  $N_k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $a_n$  with  $r_{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}-1} < a_n \leq r_{N_1+\dots+N_k-1}$  such that (3.9) holds for  $k$ . The argument is similar to that given above. First, we apply Lemma 3.2 with  $m = N_1 + \dots + N_{k-1} + 2k - 1$  to construct  $N_{k,1}$  and  $a_n$  with

$$r_{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}+2k-1} < a_n \leq r_{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}+N_{k,1}+2k-2}$$

such that

$$f^{N_{k,1}}((-r_{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}+2k}, 0]) \subset (-r_{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}+N_{k,1}+2k-1}, 0].$$

Then, for  $2 \leq j \leq 2k$ , we apply Lemma 3.2 repeatedly with

$$m = N_1 + \dots + N_{k-1} + N_{k,1} + \dots + N_{k,j-1} + 2k - j$$

to construct  $N_{k,j}$  and  $a_n$  with

$$r_{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}+N_{k,1}+\dots+N_{k,j-1}+2k-j} < a_n \leq r_{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}+N_{k,1}+\dots+N_{k,j}+2k-j-1}$$

such that

$$f^{N_{k,j}}((-r_{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}+N_{k,1}+\dots+N_{k,j-1}+2k-j+1}, 0]) \subset (-r_{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}+N_{k,1}+\dots+N_{k,j}+2k-j}, 0].$$

Putting  $N_k = N_{k,1} + \dots + N_{k,2k}$ , we deduce that  $a_n$  can be chosen with

$$r_{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}-1} < a_n \leq r_{N_1+\dots+N_k-1}$$

such that

$$f^{N_k}((-r_{N_1+\dots+N_{k-1}+2k}, 0]) \subset (-r_{N_1+\dots+N_k}, 0]$$

and hence (3.9) holds for  $k$ .

So, it remains to prove Lemma 3.2.

We begin by proving four lemmas. The first describes the extent to which  $f$  is small close to a zero at  $-a_k$ , where  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$(3.17) \quad |f(z)| < 1, \text{ for } z \in (-a_k, -a_k^{1-\delta_k/16}).$$



*Proof.* This holds since, for such a  $z$ , it follows from (3.1), (3.11), (3.12) and (3.13) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|f(z)| &\leq a_k^3 \left(1 - \frac{a_k^{1-\delta_k/16}}{a_k}\right)^{2p_k} \prod_{m=1}^{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{a_k}{a_m}\right)^{2p_m} \prod_{m \geq k+1} \left(1 + \frac{a_k}{a_m}\right)^{2p_m} \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{a_k^{\delta_k/16}}\right)^{a_k^{\delta_k/4}} a_k^{3+2p_1+\dots+2p_{k-1}} \prod_{m \geq k+1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{a_m^{1-1/2^{m-k}}}\right)^{a_m^{1/2}} \\
&\leq \exp(-a_k^{\delta_k/16}) a_k^{a_k^{\delta_k-1/2}} e^{1+1/2+1/4+\dots} \\
&\leq a_k^{a_k^{\delta_k-1}} \exp(-a_k^{\delta_k/16}) < 1.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The second lemma shows that there is a large increase in the size of  $g(r)$  at  $r = a_k$ , where  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\log g(a_k) \geq p_k^{1/2} \log g(a_k^{1-\delta_k/16}).$$

*Proof.* For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , it follows from (3.11) that

$$\begin{aligned}
g(a_k^{1-\delta_k/16}) &< a_k^3 \prod_{m=1}^{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{a_k}{a_m}\right)^{2p_m} \\
&< a_k^{3+2\sum_{m=1}^{k-1} p_m} \leq a_k^{4p_{k-1}}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$g(a_k) \geq 2^{2p_k}.$$

Thus, by (3.11), (3.12) and (3.13),

$$\frac{\log g(a_k)}{\log g(a_k^{1-\delta_k/16})} \geq \frac{2p_k \log 2}{4p_{k-1} \log a_k} > \frac{p_k}{3p_{k-1} \log a_k} > p_k^{1/2}.$$

□

The third lemma shows that  $\log g$  has a convexity property.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $r > 0$  and  $t \geq 2$ . Then*

$$\log g(r^t) \geq t \log g(r).$$

*Proof.* Let  $r > 0$  and  $t \geq 2$ . We have

$$g(r^t) \geq r^{3t} \prod_{a_m \leq r} \left(1 + \frac{r^t}{a_m}\right)^{2p_m}$$

and

$$g(r)^t = r^{3t} \prod_{a_m \leq r} \left(1 + \frac{r}{a_m}\right)^{2p_m t}.$$

Thus it is sufficient to show that

$$\left(1 + \frac{r}{a_m}\right)^t \leq \left(1 + \frac{r^t}{a_m}\right),$$

when  $a_m \leq r$ . This is true since it follows from (3.11) that, for  $a_m \leq r$  and  $t \geq 2$ ,

$$\left(1 + \frac{r}{a_m}\right)^t \leq \left(\frac{r}{a_m^{1/2}}\right)^t = \frac{r^t}{a_m^{t/2}} < 1 + \frac{r^t}{a_m}.$$

□

The fourth lemma gives an upper bound on the growth of  $g$  on intervals where no point is the modulus of a zero of  $f$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $r > 0$ ,  $0 < s < 1/2$  and  $t > 1$  and suppose that there are no values of  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  for which  $a_n \in (r^s, r^t]$ . Then*

$$\log g(r^t) \leq t(1 + 2s) \log g(r).$$

*Proof.* It follows from (3.11) that

$$g(r^t) = r^{3t} \prod_{a_m \leq r^s} \left(1 + \frac{r^t}{a_m}\right)^{2p_m} < r^{3t} \prod_{a_m \leq r^s} r^{2p_m t} = r^{t(3 + \sum_{a_m \leq r^s} 2p_m)}$$

and

$$g(r) > r^3 \prod_{a_m \leq r^s} \left(\frac{r}{a_m}\right)^{2p_m} > r^{3 + \sum_{a_m \leq r^s} 2p_m(1-s)}.$$

Thus

$$\log g(r^t) / \log g(r) < t / (1 - s) \leq t(1 + 2s),$$

since  $s < 1/2$ . □

We are now in a position to prove Lemma 3.2.

*Proof of Lemma 3.2.* Suppose that  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and that we have defined the values of  $a_n$  for which  $a_n \leq r_m$ . We now define a sequence  $(s_k)$ ,  $0 \leq k \leq N$ , inductively according to certain rules that we give below. Each time we define a value  $s_k$ , we also add a zero of  $f$  at  $-s_k$  provided this is allowed by (3.11), (3.12) and (3.14); no other zeros of  $f$  are added. We choose our values  $s_k$  in such a way that

$$(3.18) \quad r_{m+k} \leq s_k \leq r_{m+k+1}, \text{ for } 0 \leq k < N,$$

$$(3.19) \quad s_N \leq r_{m+N}$$

and

$$(3.20) \quad f^k((-r_{m+1}, 0]) \subset (-s_k, 0], \text{ for } 0 \leq k \leq N.$$

The result of Lemma 3.2 follows directly from (3.19) and (3.20). The difficult part of the proof is to show that there exists an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  for which (3.19) is satisfied.

We define our sequence  $(s_k)$  as follows:

- set  $s_0 = r_{m+1}$ ;
- if  $s_k > r_{m+k}$  and there is a zero of  $f$  at  $-s_k$ , then we set

$$(3.21) \quad s_{k+1} = g(s_k^{1-\delta_{n_k}/16});$$

- if  $s_k > r_{m+k}$  and there is no zero of  $f$  at  $s_k$ , then we set

$$(3.22) \quad s_{k+1} = g(s_k);$$

- if  $s_k \leq r_{m+k}$ , then we terminate the sequence  $(s_k)$ .

It follows from Lemma 3.3 and (3.5) that, with this construction, (3.18), (3.19) and (3.20) are indeed satisfied.

It remains to prove that there exists  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  such that the sequence terminates at  $s_K$ ; that is, if

$$T_k = \frac{\log s_k}{\log r_{m+k}},$$

then there exists  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $T_K \leq 1$ .

We introduce the following terminology. We let  $L$  denote the largest integer for which  $a_L \leq r_m$  and define a (finite) subsequence  $(k_n)$  such that

$$(3.23) \quad a_{L+n} = s_{k_n}, \text{ for } n = 1, 2, \dots$$

The main idea is to show that, for each  $n \geq 2$  we have that  $T_{k_{n+1}}$  is less than  $T_{k_n}$ , with  $k_n$  defined as above. These decreases counteract the small increases that may occur from  $T_k$  to  $T_{k+1}$  for other values of  $k$  and, for  $n$  large enough, they will combine together to cause  $T_{k_{n+1}}$  to drop below 1.

We first estimate some quantities that will be useful in our calculations. We begin by noting that it follows from (3.23), (3.18) and Lemma 3.4 that, for  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \log r_{m+k_n+2} &= \log g(r_{m+k_n+1}) \\ &\geq \log g(s_{k_n}) \geq p_{L+n}^{1/2} \log g(s_{k_n}^{1-\delta_{L+n}/16}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (3.21)

$$(3.24) \quad \log r_{m+k_n+2} \geq p_{L+n}^{1/2} \log s_{k_n+1}, \text{ for } n \geq 1.$$

Together with (3.6), (3.24) implies that

$$(3.25) \quad \log r_{m+k_n+q} \geq 3^{q-2} p_{L+n}^{1/2} \log s_{k_n+1}, \text{ for } q \geq 2, n \geq 1.$$

Together with Lemma 3.5, (3.24) implies that

$$(3.26) \quad \frac{\log s_{k_n+q}}{\log r_{m+k_n+q+1}} \leq \frac{\log g^{q-1}(s_{k_n+1})}{\log g^{q-1}(r_{m+k_n+2})} \leq \frac{\log s_{k_n+1}}{\log r_{m+k_n+2}} \leq \frac{1}{p_{L+n}^{1/2}}, \text{ for } q \geq 2, n \geq 1.$$

Now fix  $n \geq 2$  and write

$$t_{n,q} = T_{k_n+q} = \frac{\log s_{k_n+q}}{\log r_{m+k_n+q}}, \text{ for } q \geq 2.$$

For  $2 \leq q < k_{n+1} - k_n$ , there are no zeros of  $f$  with modulus in the interval  $(s_{k_n}, s_{k_n+q})$  and so it follows from (3.22), Lemma 3.6 and (3.25) that, for such  $q$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \log s_{k_n+q+1} &= \log g(s_{k_n+q}) \\ &\leq t_{n,q} \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\log s_{k_n}}{\log r_{m+k_n+q}} \right) \log g(r_{m+k_n+q}) \\ &= t_{n,q} \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\log s_{k_n}}{\log r_{m+k_n+q}} \right) \log r_{m+k_n+q+1} \\ &\leq t_{n,q} \left( 1 + \frac{2}{3^{q-2} p_{L+n}^{1/2}} \right) \log r_{m+k_n+q+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for  $2 \leq q < k_{n+1} - k_n$ , we have

$$(3.27) \quad t_{n,q+1} \leq t_{n,q} \left( 1 + \frac{2}{3^{q-2} p_{L+n}^{1/2}} \right).$$

For  $q = k_{n+1} - k_n$ , there are no zeros of  $f$  with modulus in the interval  $(s_{k_n}, s_{k_{n+q}})$  and so it follows from (3.21), Lemma 3.6 and (3.25) that

$$\begin{aligned} \log s_{k_n+q+1} &= \log g(s_{k_n+q}^{1-\delta_{L+n+1}/16}) \\ &\leq t_{n,q} \left( 1 - \frac{\delta_{L+n+1}}{16} \right) \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\log s_{k_n}}{\log r_{m+k_n+q}} \right) \log g(r_{m+k_n+q}) \\ &= t_{n,q} \left( 1 - \frac{\delta_{L+n+1}}{16} \right) \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\log s_{k_n}}{\log r_{m+k_n+q}} \right) \log r_{m+k_n+q+1} \\ &\leq t_{n,q} \left( 1 - \frac{\delta_{L+n+1}}{16} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{2}{3^{q-2} p_{L+n}^{1/2}} \right) \log r_{m+k_n+q+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for  $q = k_{n+1} - k_n$ , we have

$$(3.28) \quad t_{n,q+1} \leq t_{n,q} \left( 1 - \frac{\delta_{L+n+1}}{16} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{2}{3^{q-2} p_{L+n}^{1/2}} \right).$$

Lastly, it follows from (3.14) that, if  $q = k_{n+1} - k_n + 1$ , then  $q - 1 \geq 2$ . Also, there are no zeros of  $f$  with modulus in the interval  $(s_{k_{n+1}}, s_{k_{n+1+1}}) = (s_{k_{n+1}}, s_{k_n+q})$  and so it follows from Lemma 3.6 and (3.26) that

$$\begin{aligned} \log s_{k_n+q+1} &= \log g(s_{k_n+q}) \\ &\leq t_{n,q} \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\log s_{k_{n+1}}}{\log r_{m+k_n+q}} \right) \log g(r_{m+k_n+q}) \\ &= t_{n,q} \left( 1 + 2 \frac{\log s_{k_n+q-1}}{\log r_{m+k_n+q}} \right) \log r_{m+k_n+q+1} \\ &\leq t_{n,q} \left( 1 + \frac{2}{p_{L+n}^{1/2}} \right) \log r_{m+k_n+q+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for  $q = k_{n+1} - k_n + 1$ , we have

$$(3.29) \quad t_{n,q+1} \leq t_{n,q} \left( 1 + \frac{2}{p_{L+n}^{1/2}} \right).$$

It follows from (3.27), (3.28), (3.29) and (3.13) that, for  $M \geq 2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{k_{M+1}+2} &= t_{M, k_{M+1}-k_M+2} \\
&= t_{2,2} \prod_{n=2}^M \prod_{q=2}^{k_{n+1}-k_n+1} \frac{t_{n,q+1}}{t_{n,q}} \\
&\leq t_{2,2} \prod_{n=2}^M \left(1 + \frac{2}{p_{L+n}^{1/2}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\delta_{L+n+1}}{16}\right) \prod_{q=2}^{k_{n+1}-k_n} \left(1 + \frac{2}{3^{q-2} p_{L+n}^{1/2}}\right) \\
&\leq t_{2,2} \prod_{n=2}^M \left( \left(1 + \frac{2}{p_{L+n}^{1/2}}\right)^3 \left(1 - \frac{\delta_{L+n+1}}{16}\right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (3.13) that  $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{p_{L+n}^{1/2}} < \infty$  and so, since  $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_{L+n+1} = \infty$ , we deduce that, for  $M$  sufficiently large,  $T_{k_{M+1}+2} \leq 1$ , as required.  $\square$

We have now proved Lemma 3.2. As noted earlier, this is sufficient to imply that the hypotheses of Lemma 3.1 hold and hence that  $A(f) \cap (-\infty, 0] = \emptyset$  as required.

We complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 by showing that, in addition, conditions (1.2) and (1.3) are satisfied. That is, we prove the following.

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let*

$$(3.30) \quad \varepsilon_n = \max_{R_n \leq r \leq R_{n+1}} \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r}.$$

*There exists a subsequence  $(n_k)$  such that*

$$(3.31) \quad \varepsilon_{n_k} \leq \delta_k + \frac{1}{2^{n_k}}, \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{N},$$

*and*

$$(3.32) \quad \varepsilon_{n_k+m} \leq \frac{\delta_k}{3^{m-1}} + \frac{1}{2^{n_k+m}}, \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq m < n_{k+1} - n_k.$$

*Proof.* We begin by setting  $R_0 = r_0 = 10$  and defining  $R_{n+1} = M(R_n)$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Clearly  $R_n \geq r_n$  by (3.4) and

$$(3.33) \quad R_{n+1} \geq R_n^3, \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We claim that

$$(3.34) \quad \text{if } a_k \in [R_n, R_{n+1}), \text{ then } a_m \notin [R_n, R_{n+2}) \text{ for } k, m \in \mathbb{N}, m \neq k.$$

In order to deduce this from (3.14), it is sufficient to show that, if  $r_p \in [R_n, R_{n+1})$ , for some  $p, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $r_{p+2} > R_{n+1}$ . We prove this in two steps. Firstly, we note that if  $r_p \in [R_n, R_n^3)$ , for some  $p, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then it follows from (3.6) that  $r_{p+1} \geq r_p^3 \geq R_n^3$ . Secondly, if  $r_p \in [R_n^3, R_{n+1})$ , for some  $p, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then we claim that

$$(3.35) \quad r_{p+1} = g(r_p) \geq g(R_n^3) > M(R_n) = R_{n+1}.$$

This is true since, if  $k$  is the smallest integer such that  $a_k > R_n^3$ , then

$$g(R_n^3) = R_n^9 \prod_{m=1}^{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{R_n^3}{a_m}\right)^{2p_m}$$

and so, by (3.1) and (3.11),

$$\begin{aligned} M(R_n) = f(R_n) &= R_n^3 \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{R_n}{a_m}\right)^{2p_m} \\ &< \frac{g(R_n^3)}{R_n^6} \left(1 + \frac{R_n}{a_k}\right)^{2p_k} \prod_{m \geq k+1} \left(1 + \frac{a_k}{a_m}\right)^{2p_m} \\ &< \frac{g(R_n^3)}{R_n^6} \left(1 + \frac{1}{a_k^{1/2}}\right)^{a_k^{1/2}} \prod_{m \geq k+1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{a_m^{1-1/2^{m-k}}}\right)^{a_m^{1/2}} \\ &\leq \frac{g(R_n^3)}{R_n^6} e^{1+1+1/2+1/4+\dots} < g(R_n^3). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (3.35) does indeed hold and, by the reasoning above, this is sufficient to show that (3.34) holds.

Now, for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we choose  $n_k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $a_k \in [R_{n_k}, R_{n_k+1})$ . Then, by (3.34), this defines a sequence  $(n_k)$  with  $n_j \neq n_k$  for  $j \neq k$ . Now suppose that  $r \in [R_{n_k}, R_{n_k+1}]$ , for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . It follows from (3.11) and (3.34) that

$$\begin{aligned} M(r) = f(r) &\leq r^3 \left(1 + \frac{r}{a_k}\right)^{2p_k} \prod_{m=1}^{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{r}{a_m}\right)^{2p_m} \prod_{m \geq k+1} \left(1 + \frac{r}{a_m}\right)^{2p_m} \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{r}{a_k}\right)^{2p_k} r^{3+2p_1+\dots+2p_{k-1}} \prod_{m \geq k+1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{a_m^{1-1/2^{m-k}}}\right)^{a_m^{1/2}} \\ &< \left(1 + \frac{r}{a_k}\right)^{a_k^{\delta_k}} r^{a_k^{\delta_{k-1}}} e^{1+1/2+1/4+\dots} \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$(3.36) \quad M(r) < e^2 r^{a_k^{\delta_{k-1}}} \left(1 + \frac{r}{a_k}\right)^{a_k^{\delta_k}}.$$

If  $r < a_k^{1/2}$ , then it follows from (3.2) and (3.36) that

$$M(r) < e^3 r^{a_k^{\delta_{k-1}}} < e^3 r^{r^{\delta_k}}$$

and hence, since  $r \geq R_1 \geq 1000$ ,

$$\frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r} < \frac{\delta_k \log r + 2 \log \log r}{\log r} = \delta_k + 2 \frac{\log \log r}{\log r} \leq \delta_k + 2 \frac{\log \log R_{n_k}}{\log R_{n_k}}.$$

It follows from (3.33) that, in this case,

$$(3.37) \quad \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r} \leq \delta_k + 2 \frac{\log(3^{n_k} \log 10)}{3^{n_k} \log 10} < \delta_k + \frac{1}{2^{n_k}}.$$

If  $a_k^{1/2} \leq r \leq a_k$ , then

$$\left(1 + \frac{r}{a_k}\right)^{a_k^{\delta_k}} = \left(1 + \frac{r}{a_k}\right)^{(a_k/r)^{\delta_k} r^{\delta_k}} < \left(1 + \frac{r}{a_k}\right)^{(a_k/r) r^{\delta_k}} \leq e^{r^{\delta_k}}$$

and, if  $r > a_k$ , then

$$\left(1 + \frac{r}{a_k}\right)^{a_k^{\delta_k}} < r^{a_k^{\delta_k}} < r^{r^{\delta_k}}.$$

So, if  $r \geq a_k^{1/2}$ , it follows from (3.36) and (3.11) that

$$M(r) < e^2 r^{a_{k-1}^{\delta_{k-1}}} r^{r^{\delta_k}} < e^2 r^{a_k^{\delta_k/2}} r^{r^{\delta_k}} < e^2 r^{2r^{\delta_k}}$$

and hence

$$\frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r} < \frac{\delta_k \log r + 2 \log \log r}{\log r} = \delta_k + 2 \frac{\log \log r}{\log r} \leq \delta_k + 2 \frac{\log \log R_{n_k}}{\log R_{n_k}}.$$

As before, it follows from (3.33) that

$$(3.38) \quad \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r} \leq \delta_k + \frac{1}{2^{n_k}}.$$

Together with (3.37), this implies that (3.31) holds.

Now suppose that  $r \in [R_{n_k+m}, R_{n_k+m+1})$ , for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $1 \leq m < n_{k+1} - n_k$ . It follows from (3.11) and (3.33) that

$$\begin{aligned} M(r) = f(r) &\leq r^3 \prod_{m=1}^k \left(1 + \frac{r}{a_m}\right)^{2p_m} \prod_{m \geq k+1} \left(1 + \frac{r}{a_m}\right)^{2p_m} \\ &\leq r^{3+2p_1+\dots+2p_k} \prod_{m \geq k+1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{a_m^{1-1/2^{m-k}}}\right)^{a_m^{1/2}} \\ &\leq r^{a_k^{\delta_k}} e^{1+1/2+1/4+\dots} \\ &\leq e^2 r^{a_k^{\delta_k}} \leq e^2 r^{R_{n_k+1}^{\delta_k}} \\ &< e^2 r^{r^{\delta_k/3^{m-1}}} \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r} < \frac{\delta_k \log r / 3^{m-1} + 2 \log \log r}{\log r} < \frac{\delta_k}{3^{m-1}} + 2 \frac{\log \log r}{\log r} \leq \frac{\delta_k}{3^{m-1}} + 2 \frac{\log \log R_{n_k+m}}{\log R_{n_k+m}}.$$

As before, it follows from (3.33) that

$$(3.39) \quad \frac{\log \log M(r)}{\log r} \leq \frac{\delta_k}{3^{m-1}} + \frac{1}{2^{n_m+m}}$$

and so (3.32) holds.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] I.N. Baker, The iteration of polynomials and transcendental entire functions. *J. Austral. Math. Soc. (Series A)*, 30 (1981), 483–495.
- [2] W. Bergweiler, Iteration of meromorphic functions, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 29 (1993), 151–188.
- [3] W. Bergweiler, P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, Dynamics of meromorphic functions with direct or logarithmic singularities, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 97 (2008), 368–400.
- [4] A. Beurling, Étude sur un problème de majoration, Uppsala, 1933.
- [5] A.E. Eremenko, On the iteration of entire functions, *Dynamical systems and ergodic theory*, Banach Center Publications 23, Polish Scientific Publishers, Warsaw, 1989, 339–345.
- [6] A. Hinkkanen, Entire functions with bounded Fatou components, *Transcendental dynamics and complex analysis*, 187–216, Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [7] A. Hinkkanen and J. Miles, Growth conditions for entire functions with only bounded Fatou components, *Journal d'Analyse Math.*, 108 (2009), 87–118.
- [8] H. Mihaljević-Brandt and J. Peter, Poincaré functions with spiders' webs, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 140 (2012), 3193–3205.
- [9] L. Rempe, On a question of Eremenko concerning escaping components of entire functions, *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 39 (2007), 661–666.
- [10] P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, On questions of Fatou and Eremenko, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 133 (2005), 1119–1126.
- [11] P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, Functions of small growth with no unbounded Fatou components, *Journal d'Analyse Math.*, 108 (2009), 61–86.
- [12] P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, Fast escaping points of entire functions, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, doi: 10.1093/plms/pds001.
- [13] P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, Baker's conjecture and Eremenko's conjecture for functions with negative zeros. To appear in *Journal d'Analyse Math.*, arXiv: 1112.5103.
- [14] P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, Applications of an inequality of Beurling: local  $\cos \pi\rho$  theorems and regularity. In preparation.
- [15] P.J. Rippon and G.M. Stallard, Regularity and fast escaping points of entire functions. In preparation.
- [16] G. Rottenfußer, J. Rückert, L. Rempe and D. Schleicher, Dynamic rays of bounded-type entire functions, *Ann. of Math.*, 173 (2011), 77–125.
- [17] D.J. Sixsmith, Entire functions for which the escaping set is a spider's web. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 151 (2011), 551–571.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, THE OPEN UNIVERSITY, WALTON HALL, MILTON KEYNES MK7 6AA, UK

*E-mail address:* p.j.rippon@open.ac.uk

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, THE OPEN UNIVERSITY, WALTON HALL, MILTON KEYNES MK7 6AA, UK

*E-mail address:* g.m.stallard@open.ac.uk