

## On the separated maximum modulus points of meromorphic functions

E. Ciechanowicz

*Szczecin University, Institute of Mathematics  
15 Wielkopolska Str., Szczecin, 70451, Poland  
E-mail: ewa.ciechanowicz@poczta.onet.pl*

I.I. Marchenko

*Department of Mechanics and Mathematics, V.N. Karazin Kharkov National University  
4 Svobody Sq., Kharkov, 61077, Ukraine*

*Szczecin University, Institute of Mathematics  
15 Wielkopolska Str., Szczecin, 70451, Poland*

*E-mail: iim@ukr.net  
marchenko@wmf.univ.szczecin.pl*

Received April 15, 2004

Communicated by I.V. Ostrovskii

We consider the relationship between the number of separated maximum modulus points and the Eremenko's value  $b(\infty, f)$  for meromorphic functions.

Let  $\nu(r, g)$  denote the number of maximum modulus points of an entire function  $g(z)$  on the circle  $|z| = r$ . In 1964 P. Erdős set up the question whether it is possible to find an entire function  $g(z) \neq cz^m$  with  $\nu(r, g)$  unbounded. In 1968 F. Herzog and G. Piranian [10] gave a positive answer to this question. They constructed an entire function  $g(z)$  with  $\nu(r, g) \rightarrow \infty$  for  $r \rightarrow \infty$ .

In this paper we present an upper estimate of the number of separated maximum modulus points for meromorphic functions. We shall use the standard notations of value distribution theory:  $m(r, a, f)$ ,  $N(r, a, f)$  and  $T(r, f)$  [8]. Let  $f(z)$  be a meromorphic function.

Let's set  $\mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f) = \max_{|z|=r} \log^+ |f(z)|$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(r, a, f) = \mathcal{L}(r, \infty, \frac{1}{f-a})$ . The quantity

$$\beta(a, f) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{L}(r, a, f)}{T(r, f)}$$

---

Mathematics Subject Classification 2000: 30D35 (primary); 30D30 (secondary).

*Key words and phrases:* meromorphic function, subharmonic function, maximum modulus points.

This research was partly supported by the grant INTAS-99-0089.

is called *Petrenko's magnitude of deviation of meromorphic function  $f(z)$  at point  $a$* . V.P. Petrenko in [13] obtained a sharp upper estimate of the magnitude of deviation of meromorphic functions of finite lower order  $\lambda = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln T(r, f)}{\ln r}$ .

**Theorem A.** *If  $f(z)$  is a meromorphic function of finite lower order  $\lambda$ , then for each  $a \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$*

$$\beta(a, f) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{\pi\lambda}{\sin \pi\lambda} & \text{if } \lambda \leq 0.5, \\ \pi\lambda & \text{if } \lambda > 0.5. \end{cases}$$

We now introduce the quantities which count the number of separated maximum modulus points of a meromorphic function  $f(z)$  on the circle  $|z| = r$ . For  $0 < \eta \leq 1$  and  $r > 0$  we denote by  $p_\eta(r, \infty, f)$  the number of component intervals of the set

$$\{\theta : \ln |f(re^{i\theta})| > (1 - \eta)T(r, f)\}$$

possessing at least one maximum modulus point of the meromorphic function  $f(z)$ . Moreover, we set  $p_\eta(\infty, f) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} p_\eta(r, \infty, f)$  and  $p(\infty, f) = \sup_{\{\eta\}} p_\eta(\infty, f)$ .

In [3] the authors obtained the following estimate of the value  $p(\infty, f)$  through Petrenko's magnitude of deviation  $\beta(\infty, f)$ .

**Theorem B.** *For meromorphic functions  $f(z)$  of finite lower order  $\lambda$  the following inequality is true:*

$$p(\infty, f) \leq \max \left( \left[ 2 \frac{\pi\lambda}{\beta(\infty, f)} \right], 1 \right),$$

where  $[x]$  means the entire part of the number  $x$ .

For entire functions  $\beta(\infty, g) \geq 1$ , which leads us to the following conclusion.

**Corollary B.** *For entire functions  $g(z)$  of finite lower order  $\lambda$  we have*

$$p(\infty, g) \leq \max([2\pi\lambda], 1).$$

In case of meromorphic functions of infinite lower order the quantity  $\beta(a, f)$  may be infinite, so we apply the following result of Bergweiler and Bock [2].

**Theorem C.** *If  $f(z)$  is a meromorphic function of infinite lower order, then*

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f)}{rT'_-(r, f)} \leq \pi,$$

where  $T'_-(r, f)$  is the left derivative of Nevanlinna's characteristic function.

We have  $rT'_-(r, f) = A(r, f) + O(1)$ , where  $A(r, f)$  means the spherical area covered by the image of the disc  $\{z : |z| \leq r\}$  under  $f(z)$ , divided by the area of the Riemann's sphere. In connection with this equality and the above theorem A. Eremenko introduced the quantity

$$b(a, f) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{L}(r, a, f)}{A(r, f)}.$$

In [5] he proved the following estimate for  $b(a, f)$ .

**Theorem D.** *For a meromorphic function  $f(z)$  of lower order  $\lambda$ ,  $0 < \lambda \leq \infty$ , and for  $a \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$  we have*

$$b(a, f) \leq \begin{cases} \pi & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq \lambda \leq \infty, \\ \frac{\pi}{\sin \pi \lambda} & \text{if } 0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

In case of  $\eta = 1$  one of the authors in [12] obtained the upper estimate of  $p_1(\infty, f)$  through  $b(\infty, f)$ . Our main result is the upper estimate of  $p(\infty, f)$  through  $b(\infty, f)$  for meromorphic functions.

**Theorem 1.** *For a meromorphic function  $f(z)$  of lower order  $\lambda$ , where  $0 < \lambda \leq \infty$ , and for  $0 < \eta \leq 1$  we have*

$$p_\eta(\infty, f) \leq \max \left\{ 1, \left[ (2 - \eta) \frac{\pi}{b(\infty, f)} \right] \right\}.$$

**Corollary 1.** *For a meromorphic function of lower order  $\lambda$ ,  $0 < \lambda \leq \infty$  we have*

$$p(\infty, f) \leq \max \left\{ 1, \left[ 2 \frac{\pi}{b(\infty, f)} \right] \right\}.$$

### 1. Auxiliary results

For  $0 < \eta \leq 1$  let's consider the function

$$u_\eta(z) = \max(\log |f(z)|, (1 - \eta)T(|z|, f)),$$

where  $f(z)$  is a meromorphic function in  $\mathbb{C}$ .

**Lemma 1.** *The function  $u_\eta(z)$  is a  $\delta$ -subharmonic function in  $\mathbb{C}$ .*

*P r o o f.* Let  $g_1(z)$  and  $g_2(z)$  be entire functions without common zeros such that  $f(z) = \frac{g_1(z)}{g_2(z)}$ . Then we can write

$$u_\eta(z) = \max(\log |g_1(z)| - \log |g_2(z)|, (1 - \eta)T(|z|, f))$$

$$= \max(\log |g_1(z)|, (1 - \eta)T(|z|, f) + \log |g_2(z)|) - \log |g_2(z)|.$$

The characteristic function  $T(r, f)$  is a nondecreasing and convex function of  $\log r$  for  $r > 0$ , hence the function  $T(|z|, f)$  is a subharmonic function in  $\mathbb{C}$  [14]. Therefore  $u_\eta(z)$  is a difference of two subharmonic functions:  $U_1(z) = \max(\log |g_1(z)|, (1 - \eta)T(|z|, f) + \log |g_2(z)|)$  and  $U_2(z) = \log |g_2(z)|$ . This completes the proof of Lemma 1.

For a complex number  $z = re^{i\theta}$  let's put [1]

$$m^*(r, \theta, u_\eta) = \sup_{|E|=2\theta} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_E u_\eta(re^{i\varphi}) d\varphi,$$

$$T^*(r, \theta, u_\eta) = T^*(re^{i\theta}) = m^*(r, \theta, u_\eta) + N(r, \infty, f),$$

where  $r \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $\theta \in [0, \pi]$ ,  $|E|$  is the Lebesgue's measure of the set  $E$  and  $N(r, \infty, f)$  is the Nevanlinna's counting function. Let's put  $\tilde{u}_\eta(z)$  for the circular symmetrization of the function  $u_\eta(z)$  [9]. The function  $\tilde{u}_\eta(re^{i\varphi})$  is nonnegative and nonincreasing on the interval  $[0, \pi]$ , even in  $\varphi$  and for each fixed  $r$  equimeasurable with  $u_\eta(re^{i\varphi})$ . Moreover, it satisfies the relations:

$$\tilde{u}_\eta(r) = \max(\log \max_{|z|=r} |f(z)|, (1 - \eta)T(r, f)),$$

$$\tilde{u}_\eta(re^{i\pi}) = \tilde{u}_\eta(-r) = \max(\log \min_{|z|=r} |f(z)|, (1 - \eta)T(r, f)),$$

$$m^*(r, \theta, u_\eta) = \sup_{|E|=2\theta} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_E u_\eta(re^{i\varphi}) d\varphi = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\theta \tilde{u}_\eta(re^{i\varphi}) d\varphi.$$

From Baernstein's theorem [1] the function  $T^*(r, \theta, u_\eta)$  is subharmonic in

$$D = \{re^{i\theta} : 0 < r < \infty, 0 < \theta < \pi\},$$

continuous in  $D \cup (-\infty, 0) \cup (0, +\infty)$  and logarithmically convex in  $r > 0$  for each fixed  $\theta \in [0, \pi]$ . Furthermore:

$$T^*(r, 0, u_\eta) = N(r, \infty, f),$$

$$T^*(r, \pi, u_\eta) \leq (2 - \eta)T(r, f),$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} T^*(r, \theta, u_\eta) = \frac{\tilde{u}_\eta(re^{i\theta})}{\pi} \quad \text{for } 0 < \theta < \pi,$$

where  $T(r, f)$  is the Nevanlinna's characteristic function of  $f(z)$ .

Let  $\alpha(r)$  be a real-valued function of a real variable  $r$  and

$$L\alpha(r) = \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\alpha(re^h) + \alpha(re^{-h}) - 2\alpha(r)}{h^2}.$$

When  $\alpha(r)$  is twice differentiable in  $r$ , then

$$L\alpha(r) = r \frac{d}{dr} r \frac{d}{dr} \alpha(r).$$

In [3] the authors obtained the following result.

**Lemma 2.** For all  $0 < \eta \leq 1$  and for almost all  $\theta \in [0, \pi]$  and for all  $r > 0$  such that on the set  $\{z : |z| = r\}$  the meromorphic function  $f(z)$  has neither zeros nor poles we have

$$LT^*(r, \theta, u_\eta) \geq -\frac{p_\eta^2(r, \infty, f)}{\pi} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_\eta(re^{i\theta})}{\partial \theta}.$$

W. Bergweiler and H. Bock in [2] introduced a generalization of Polya peaks [4] to functions of infinite lower order. Let's remind the basic facts of this construction.

For all sequences  $M_j \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$  there exist sequences  $\rho_j \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\mu_j \rightarrow \infty$  such that, for all  $r$ 's fulfilling the inequality  $|\log(\frac{r}{\rho_j})| \leq \frac{M_j}{\mu_j}$ , we have

$$T(r, f) \leq (1 + \varepsilon_j) \left(\frac{r}{\rho_j}\right)^{\mu_j} T(\rho_j, f). \tag{1}$$

We can choose the sequences  $\mu_j$  and  $M_j$  such that

$$\mu_j = o(\log^{\frac{3}{2}} T(\rho_j, f)), \quad M_j = o(\log T(\rho_j, f)), \quad j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let's put

$$P_j = \rho_j e^{-\frac{M_j}{\mu_j}}, \quad Q_j = \rho_j e^{\frac{M_j}{\mu_j}}.$$

Then the inequality (1) is true for all  $r \in [P_j, Q_j]$ . We shall assume that  $M_j > 1$ .

Let's consider the sets

$$A_j = \left\{ r \in [\rho_j, Q_j] : T(r, f) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_j}} \left(\frac{r}{\rho_j}\right)^{\mu_j} T(\rho_j, f) \right\},$$

$$B_j = \left\{ r \in [P_j, \rho_j] : T(r, f) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_j}} \left(\frac{r}{\rho_j}\right)^{\mu_j} T(\rho_j, f) \right\}.$$

Let's put

$$R_j = \begin{cases} \min A_j, & \text{if } A_j \neq \emptyset, \\ Q_j, & \text{if } A_j = \emptyset, \end{cases} \quad t_j = \begin{cases} \max B_j, & \text{if } B_j \neq \emptyset, \\ P_j, & \text{if } B_j = \emptyset, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

$$S_j = e^{-\frac{1}{\mu_j}} R_j, \quad T_j = e^{-\frac{2}{\mu_j}} R_j.$$

Then

$$t_j < \rho_j < T_j < S_j < R_j.$$

In [2] it is shown that

$$\frac{T(R_j, f)}{R_j^{\mu_j}} + \frac{T(t_j, f)}{t_j^{\mu_j}} = o\left(\mu_j \int_{t_j}^{R_j} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr\right), \quad j \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3)$$

Apart from that, it follows from the inequality (19) in [2] that

$$T(\rho_j, f) \leq T^{\frac{3}{2}}(t_j, f), \quad j \rightarrow \infty.$$

In order to prove our main results we shall need several additional lemmas.

**Lemma A [13].** *Let  $f(z)$  be a meromorphic function of finite lower order  $\lambda$ . Then there exist sequences  $S_k, R_k$  tending to infinity such that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_k}{R_k} = 0$  and for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , for all  $k \geq k_0(\varepsilon)$  we have*

$$\frac{T(2R_k, f)}{R_k^\lambda} + \frac{T(2S_k, f)}{S_k^\lambda} < \varepsilon \int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr.$$

Let's define new quantities

$$\begin{aligned} h(r, \lambda, p) &:= \mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f) \cos \frac{\lambda\psi}{p} - \frac{\pi\lambda}{p} T^*(r, \alpha, u_\eta) \sin \frac{\lambda(\alpha + \psi)}{p} \\ &+ \frac{\pi\lambda}{p} N(r, \infty, f) \sin \frac{\lambda\psi}{p} - \tilde{u}_\eta(r, \alpha) \cos \frac{\lambda(\alpha + \psi)}{p}, \\ h_\eta(r, \lambda) &:= h(r, \lambda, p_\eta(\infty, f)). \end{aligned}$$

The inequality, that we present as a lemma below, was proved in [3].

**Lemma B.** *Let  $f(z)$  be a meromorphic function of finite lower order  $\lambda$ . Then for  $0 < \alpha \leq \min(\pi, \frac{\pi p_\eta(\infty, f)}{2\lambda})$  and  $-\frac{\pi p_\eta(\infty, f)}{2\lambda} \leq \psi \leq \frac{\pi p_\eta(\infty, f)}{2\lambda} - \alpha$ , we have the asymptotic inequality*

$$\int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{h_\eta(r, \lambda)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr < \varepsilon \int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr, \quad k \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $S_k$  and  $R_k$  are the sequences from lemma A.

The following lemma is an analogue of lemma B for meromorphic functions of infinite lower order.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $f(z)$  be a meromorphic function of infinite lower order. Then for such numbers  $p$  that  $1 \leq p \leq \max\{1, p_\eta(\infty, f)\}$ ,  $0 < \alpha \leq \min\{\pi, \frac{\pi p}{2\mu_j}\}$ ,  $-\frac{\pi p}{2\mu_j} \leq \psi \leq \frac{\pi p}{2\mu_j} - \alpha$  we have*

$$\int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{h(r, \mu_j, p)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr < \varepsilon \mu_j \int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr, \quad j \rightarrow \infty, \tag{4}$$

where  $T_j$  and  $t_j$  were defined in (2).

*P r o o f.* Let's put [11, 6, 7]

$$\sigma(r) = \int_0^\alpha T^*(r, \theta, u_\eta) \cos \frac{\mu_j(\theta + \psi)}{p} d\theta.$$

Applying Lemma 2, the fact that  $LT^*(r, \theta, u_\eta) \geq 0$  and Fatou's lemma, we obtain that for almost all  $r \geq r_0$

$$r \frac{d}{dr} r \sigma'_-(r) \geq - \int_0^\alpha \frac{p_\eta^2(r, \infty, f)}{\pi} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_\eta(r, \theta)}{\partial \theta} \cos \frac{\mu_j(\theta + \psi)}{p} d\theta.$$

After applying integration by parts to the right side of the above inequality we have

$$r \frac{d}{dr} r \sigma'_-(r) \geq p^2 h(r, \mu_j, p) + \mu_j^2 \sigma(r).$$

We divide this inequality by  $r^{\mu_j+1}$  and integrate it over an interval  $[t_j, T_j]$ .

$$\int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{1}{r^{\mu_j}} \frac{d}{dr} r \sigma'_-(r) dr \geq p^2 \int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{h(r, \mu_j, p)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr + \mu_j^2 \int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{\sigma(r)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr. \tag{5}$$

Integrating by parts the left side of (5) and applying the monotonicity of  $r \sigma'_-(r)$ , we obtain

$$p^2 \int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{h(r, \mu_j, p)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr \leq \left( \frac{\sigma'_-(r)}{r^{\mu_j-1}} + \mu_j \frac{\sigma(r)}{r^{\mu_j}} \right) \Big|_{t_j}^{T_j}. \tag{6}$$

The definition of  $\sigma(r)$  implies that

$$\sigma(r) \leq \frac{(2 - \eta)p}{\mu_j} T(r, f).$$

Since  $r\sigma'_-(r)$  is monotonically increasing on  $[t_j, T_j]$ , we have

$$\sigma(S_j) - \sigma(T_j) = \int_{T_j}^{S_j} \sigma'_-(r) dr \geq T_j \sigma'_-(T_j) \log \frac{S_j}{T_j} = \frac{1}{\mu_j} T_j \sigma'_-(T_j).$$

Hence

$$T_j \sigma'_-(T_j) \leq \mu_j \sigma(S_j) \leq (2 - \eta) p T(S_j, f).$$

Apart from that, for all  $r \geq 1$  we have  $r\sigma'_-(r) \geq \sigma'_-(1)$ . Now, applying (6) and (3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} p^2 \int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{h(r, \mu_j, p)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr &\leq \frac{2(2 - \eta) p T(S_j, f)}{T_j^{\mu_j}} - \frac{\sigma'_-(1)}{t_j^{\mu_j}} \\ &< \frac{2(2 - \eta) p e^2 T(R_j, f)}{R_j^{\mu_j}} + \frac{T(t_j, f)}{t_j^{\mu_j}} < \varepsilon \mu_j \int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr, \quad j \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.

## 2. Main result

In this section we present the proof of Theorem 1.

If  $b(\infty, f) = 0$  or  $p_\eta(\infty, f) = 0$  then the statement is obviously true. Therefore let's take  $b(\infty, f) > 0$ . Then also  $p(\infty, f) > 0$ .

First we shall prove the statement for meromorphic functions of finite lower order  $\lambda$ . We consider the case when  $p(\infty, f) < \infty$ . For  $\lambda > 0$  we have

$$\int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr = \frac{T(2S_k, f)}{\lambda 2^\lambda S_k^\lambda} - \frac{T(R_k, f)}{\lambda R_k^\lambda} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{r T'_-(r, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr.$$

Thus, applying lemma A, we obtain

$$\int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr < \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{\lambda} \int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{A(r, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr, \quad k \rightarrow \infty. \tag{7}$$

Let's first assume that  $\frac{\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} > \frac{1}{2}$ . Then  $\frac{\pi p_\eta(\infty, f)}{2\lambda} < \pi$ . In Lemma B we put  $\alpha = \frac{\pi p_\eta(\infty, f)}{2\lambda}$ ,  $\psi = 0$ . Then, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$

$$\int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{\mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr < \left( \frac{\pi \lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} (2 - \eta) + \varepsilon \right) \int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr.$$



Inserting (7) into this inequality, we obtain

$$\int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{\mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr < \frac{1}{\lambda}(1 + \varepsilon) \left( \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)}(2 - \eta) + \varepsilon \right) \int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{A(r, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr, \quad k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore there exists a sequence  $r_k \in [2S_k, R_k]$  such that

$$\mathcal{L}(r_k, \infty, f) < \frac{1}{\lambda} \left[ \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)}(2 - \eta) + \varepsilon \right] (1 + \varepsilon)A(r_k, f), \quad k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Passing to the limit with  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain

$$b(\infty, f) \leq \frac{\pi}{p_\eta(\infty, f)}(2 - \eta).$$

This leads us to the statement in this case, as  $p_\eta(\infty, f)$  takes only integral values.

Let's now assume that  $\frac{\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . Then  $\pi \leq \frac{\pi p_\eta(\infty, f)}{2\lambda}$ . In the definition of  $h_\eta(r, \lambda)$  we put  $\alpha = \pi$  and  $\psi = 0$ . Thus

$$h_\eta(r, \lambda) = \mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f) - \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)}T^*(r, \pi, u_\eta) \sin \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} - \tilde{u}_\eta(r, \pi) \cos \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)}.$$

If  $p_\eta(\infty, f) = 1$  then the statement is obvious. Let then  $p_\eta(\infty, f) \geq 2$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & h_\eta(r, \lambda) \\ &= \mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f) - \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)}T^*(r, \pi, u_\eta) \sin \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} - (1 - \eta)T(r, f) \cos \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)}. \end{aligned}$$

This leads us to inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{\mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr \\ & \leq \int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{h_\eta(r, \lambda) + (2 - \eta)\frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)}T(r, f) \sin \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} + (1 - \eta)T(r, f) \cos \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)}}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr. \end{aligned}$$

Applying lemma B, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{\mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr \\ & < [(2 - \eta)\frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} \sin \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} + (1 - \eta) \cos \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} + \varepsilon] \int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting (7) into this inequality, we obtain

$$\int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{\mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr$$

$$< \frac{(1 + \varepsilon)}{\lambda} \left[ (2 - \eta) \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} \sin \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} + (1 - \eta) \cos \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} + \varepsilon \right] \int_{2S_k}^{R_k} \frac{A(r, f)}{r^{\lambda+1}} dr.$$

Therefore there exists a sequence  $r_k \in [2S_k, R_k]$  such that

$$\lambda \mathcal{L}(r_k, \infty, f) < (1 + \varepsilon) \left[ (2 - \eta) \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} + (1 - \eta) \cos \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} + \varepsilon \right] A(r_k, f).$$

As the above inequality holds for any  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $\frac{\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} \leq \frac{1}{2}$  we have

$$\lambda \frac{\mathcal{L}(r_k, \infty, f)}{A(r_k, f)} < (1 + \varepsilon) \left[ (2 - \eta) \frac{\pi\lambda}{p_\eta(\infty, f)} + \varepsilon \right].$$

Passing to the limit with  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain the statement in this case. The proof for  $p(\infty, f) = \infty$  can be conducted similarly [11].

We now consider the case when  $f(z)$  is a meromorphic function of infinite lower order. Let  $p_\eta(\infty, f) \geq 1$  and let  $p$  be the number from Lemma 3. We take  $j_0$  such that for  $j \geq j_0$  we have (4) and  $\frac{p}{\mu_j} < 1$ . In Lemma 3 we put  $\psi = 0$  and  $\alpha = \frac{\pi p}{2\mu_j}$ . Then we have

$$h(r, \mu_j, p) = \mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f) - \frac{\pi\mu_j}{p} T^*(r, \alpha, u_\eta),$$

and

$$\int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{\mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr = \int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{h(r, \mu_j, p) + \frac{\pi\mu_j}{p} T^*(r, \alpha, u_\eta)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr.$$

Since  $T^*(r, \theta, u_\eta) \leq (2 - \eta)T(r, f)$  for all  $\theta \in [0, \pi]$

$$\int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{\mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr \leq \int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{h(r, \mu_j, p) + \frac{\pi\mu_j}{p} (2 - \eta)T(r, f)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr.$$

Hence, on the basis of Lemma 3

$$\int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{\mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr < \left[ \frac{\pi}{p} (2 - \eta) + \varepsilon \right] \mu_j \int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr, \quad j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Using integration by parts and applying (3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_j \int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr &= \frac{T(t_j, f)}{t_j^{\mu_j}} - \frac{T(T_j, f)}{T_j^{\mu_j}} + \int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{rT'_-(r, f)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr \\ &< (1 + \varepsilon) \int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{A(r, f)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr, \quad j \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{\mathcal{L}(r, \infty, f)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr < \left[ \frac{\pi}{p}(2 - \eta) + \varepsilon \right] (1 + \varepsilon) \int_{t_j}^{T_j} \frac{A(r, f)}{r^{\mu_j+1}} dr, \quad j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore there is such a sequence  $r_j \in [t_j, T_j]$  that

$$\mathcal{L}(r_j, \infty, f) < \left[ \frac{\pi}{p}(2 - \eta) + \varepsilon \right] (1 + \varepsilon) A(r, f). \quad (8)$$

The definition of the sequence  $(t_j)$  implies that  $t_j \geq P_j = \rho_j e^{-\frac{M_j}{\mu_j}}$  where  $\rho_j \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\frac{M_j}{\mu_j} \rightarrow 0$ . The sequence  $P_j \rightarrow \infty$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus  $t_j \rightarrow \infty$  and  $r_j \rightarrow \infty$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . From the definition of  $b(\infty, f)$  and from (8) we get

$$b(\infty, f) \leq \left[ \frac{\pi}{p}(2 - \eta) + \varepsilon \right] (1 + \varepsilon).$$

As it is true for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , therefore for all numbers  $p$  such that  $1 \leq p \leq p_\eta(\infty, f)$  we have

$$b(\infty, f) \leq \frac{\pi}{p}(2 - \eta). \quad (9)$$

If  $p_\eta(\infty, f) < \infty$  then, putting in (9)  $p = p_\eta(\infty, f)$ , we obtain the statement. If, on the other hand,  $p_\eta(\infty, f) = \infty$  then the inequality (9) is true for all numbers  $p \geq 1$ . Hence in this case  $b(\infty, f) = 0$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

### References

- [1] *A. Baernstein*, Integral means, univalent functions and circular symmetrization. — *Acta Math.* (1974), v. 133, No. 3–4, p. 139–169.
- [2] *W. Bergweiler and H. Bock*, On the growth of meromorphic functions of infinite order. — *J. Anal. Math.* (1994), v. 64, p. 327–336.

- [3] *E. Ciechanowicz and I.I. Marchenko*, On the maximum modulus points of entire and meromorphic functions. — *Mat. Stud.* (2004), v. 21, No. 1, p. 25–34.
- [4] *A. Edrei*, Sums of deficiencies of meromorphic functions. — *J. Anal. Math.* (1965), v. 14, p. 79–104.
- [5] *A. Eremenko*, An analogue of the defect relation for the uniform metric. — *Comp. Variables Theory Appl.* (1997), v. 34, p. 83–97.
- [6] *M. Essen and D.F. Shea*, Applications of Denjoy integral inequalities and differential inequalities to growth problems for subharmonic and meromorphic functions. — *Proc. Roy. Irish Acad.* (1982), v. A82, p. 201–216.
- [7] *R. Gariépy and J.L. Lewis*, Space analogues of some theorems for subharmonic and meromorphic functions. — *Ark. Mat.* (1975), v. 13, p. 91–105.
- [8] *A.A. Gol'dberg and I.V. Ostrowskii*, Distribution of values of meromorphic functions. Nauka, Moscow (1970). (Russian)
- [9] *W.K. Hayman*, Multivalent Functions. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge (1958).
- [10] *F. Herzog and G. Piranian*, The counting function for points of maximum modulus. In: Proc. Symp. Pure Math. (1968), v. 11. Entire Functions and Related Parts Analysis, AMS, p. 240–243.
- [11] *I.I. Marchenko*, On the magnitudes of deviations and spreads of meromorphic functions of finite lower order. — *Mat. Sb.* (1995), v. 186, p. 391–408.
- [12] *I.I. Marchenko*, On the growth of entire and meromorphic functions. — *Mat. Sb.* (1998), v. 189, No. 6, p. 59–84. (Russian)
- [13] *V.P. Petrenko*, The growth of meromorphic functions of finite lower order. — *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR* (1969), v. 33, No. 2, p. 414–454. (Russian)
- [14] *L.I. Ronkin*, Introduction into the theory of entire functions of many variables. Nauka, Moscow (1971). (Russian)