

Int. J. Open Problems Complex Analysis, Vol. 6, No. 3, November 2014
ISSN 2074-2827; Copyright ©ICSRS Publication, 2014
www.i-csrs.org

On the estimation of relative type based growth properties of differential monomials

Sanjib Kumar Datta

Department of Mathematics
University of Kalyani
P.O.- Kalyani, Dist-Nadia, PIN- 741235, West Bengal, India
e-mail:sanjib_kr_datta@yahoo.co.in

Tanmay Biswas

Rajbari, Rabindrapalli, R. N. Tagore Road
P.O. Krishnagar, P.S.- Kotwali, Dist-Nadia
PIN- 741101, West Bengal, India
e-mail: tanmaybiswas_math@rediffmail.com

Sarmila Bhattacharyya

Jhorehat F. C. High School for Girls
P.O.- Jhorehat, P.S.- Sankrail, Dist-Howrah
PIN- 711302, West Bengal, India
e-mail: bsarmila@gmail.com

Abstract

In this paper an approach is made to investigate the study of the comparative growth properties of composite entire and meromorphic functions on the basis of relative type and relative lower type of differential monomials generated by transcendental entire and transcendental meromorphic functions.

Keywords: *Transcendental entire function, transcendental meromorphic function, relative type, relative lower type, differential monomial.*

2010 Mathematical Subject Classification: 30D30, 30D35, 30D20.

1 Introduction

Let f be an entire function defined in the open complex plane \mathbb{C} . The function $M_f(r)$ on $|z| = r$ known as maximum modulus function corresponding to f is defined as follows:

$$M_f(r) = \max_{|z|=r} |f(z)| .$$

When f is meromorphic, $M_f(r)$ can not be defined as f is not analytic. In this situation one may define another function $T_f(r)$ known as Nevanlinna's Characteristic function of f , playing the same role as $M_f(r)$ in the following manner:

$$T_f(r) = N_f(r) + m_f(r) .$$

And given two meromorphic functions f and g the ratio $\frac{T_f(r)}{T_g(r)}$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ is called the growth of f with respect to g in terms of their Nevanlinna's Characteristic function.

When f is entire function, the Nevanlinna's Characteristic function $T_f(r)$ of f is defined as

$$T_f(r) = m_f(r) .$$

We called the function $N_f(r, a) \left(\bar{N}_f(r, a) \right)$ as counting function of a -points (distinct a -points) of f . In many occasions $N_f(r, \infty)$ and $\bar{N}_f(r, \infty)$ are denoted by $N_f(r)$ and $\bar{N}_f(r)$ respectively. We put

$$N_f(r, a) = \int_0^r \frac{n_f(t, a) - n_f(0, a)}{t} dt + \bar{n}_f(0, a) \log r ,$$

where we denote by $n_f(r, a) \left(\bar{n}_f(r, a) \right)$ the number of a -points (distinct a -points) of f in $|z| \leq r$ and an ∞ -point is a pole of f . Also we denote by $n_{f|=1}(r, a)$, the number of simple zeros of $f - a$ in $|z| \leq r$.

Accordingly, $N_{f|=1}(r, a)$ is defined in terms of $n_{f|=1}(r, a)$ in the usual way and we set

$$\delta_1(a; f) = 1 - \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, a; f | = 1)}{T_f(r)} \quad \{\text{cf. [8]}\} ,$$

the deficiency of ' a ' corresponding to the simple a - points of f i.e. simple zeros of $f - a$. In this connection Yang [7] proved that there exists at most a denumerable number of complex numbers $a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ for which

$$\delta_1(a; f) > 0 \text{ and } \sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; f) \leq 4.$$

On the other hand, $m\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right)$ is denoted by $m_f(r, a)$ and we mean $m_f(r, \infty)$ by $m_f(r)$, which is called the proximity function of f . We also put

$$m_f(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ |f(re^{i\theta})| d\theta, \quad \text{where}$$

$$\log^+ x = \max(\log x, 0) \quad \text{for all } x \geq 0.$$

Further a meromorphic function $b = b(z)$ is called small with respect to f if $T_b(r) = S_f(r)$ where $S_f(r) = o\{T_f(r)\}$ i.e., $\frac{S_f(r)}{T_f(r)} \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover for any transcendental meromorphic function f , we call $P[f] = bf^{n_0}(f^{(1)})^{n_1} \dots (f^{(k)})^{n_k}$, to be a differential monomial generated by it where $\sum_{i=0}^k n_i \geq 1$ (all $n_i \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, k$ are non-negative integers) and the meromorphic function b is small with respect to f . In this connection the numbers $\gamma_{P[f]} = \sum_{i=0}^k n_i$ and $\Gamma_{P[f]} = \sum_{i=0}^k (i+1)n_i$ are called the degree and weight of $P[f]$ respectively {cf. [1]}.

The *order* of a meromorphic function f which is generally used in computational purpose is defined in terms of the growth of f with respect to the exponential function as

$$\rho_f = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T_f(r)}{\log T_{\exp z}(r)} = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T_f(r)}{\log\left(\frac{r}{\pi}\right)} = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T_f(r)}{\log r + O(1)}.$$

Lahiri and Banerjee [5] introduced the *relative order* (respectively *relative lower order*) of a meromorphic function with respect to an entire function to avoid comparing growth just with $\exp z$. To compare the relative growth of two meromorphic functions having same non zero finite *relative order* with respect to another entire function, Datta and Biswas [2] introduced the notion of *relative type* of meromorphic functions with respect to an entire function. Extending these notions of *relative type* as cited in the reference, Datta, Biswas and Bhattacharyya [3] gave the definition of *relative type of differential monomials* generated by transcendental entire and transcendental meromorphic functions.

For entire and meromorphic functions, the notion of their growth indicators such as *order* and *type* are classical in complex analysis and during the past decades, several researchers have already been continuing their studies in the area of comparative growth properties of composite entire and meromorphic functions in different directions using the same. But at that time, the concept of *relative order* and consequently *relative type* of entire and meromorphic functions with respect to another entire function was mostly unknown to

complex analysts and they are not aware of the technical advantages of using the relative growth indicators of the functions. Therefore the growth of composite entire and meromorphic functions needs to be modified on the basis of their *relative order* and *relative type* some of which has been explored in this paper. Actually in this paper we establish some newly developed results based on the growth properties of *relative type* of *monomials* generated by transcendental entire and transcendental meromorphic functions.

2 Notation and preliminary remarks

We use the standard notations and definitions of the theory of entire and meromorphic functions which are available in [4] and [6]. Henceforth, we do not explain those in details. Now we just recall some definitions which will be needed in the sequel.

Definition 1. The order ρ_f and lower order λ_f of a meromorphic function f are defined as

$$\rho_f = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T_f(r)}{\log r} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_f = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T_f(r)}{\log r}.$$

The notion of *type* (*lower type*) to determine the relative growth of two meromorphic functions having same non zero finite order is classical in complex analysis and is given by

Definition 2. The type σ_f and lower type $\bar{\sigma}_f$ of a meromorphic function f are defined as

$$\sigma_f = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_f(r)}{r^{\rho_f}} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\sigma}_f = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_f(r)}{r^{\rho_f}}, \quad 0 < \rho_f < \infty.$$

Given a non-constant entire function f defined in the open complex plane \mathbb{C} , its Nevanlinna's Characteristic function is strictly increasing and continuous. Hence there exists its inverse function $T_g^{-1} : (T_g(0), \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ with $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} T_g^{-1}(s) = \infty$.

Lahiri and Banerjee [5] introduced the definition of *relative order* of a meromorphic function f with respect to an entire function g , denoted by $\rho_g(f)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_g(f) &= \inf \{ \mu > 0 : T_f(r) < T_g(r^\mu) \text{ for all sufficiently large } r \} \\ &= \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T_g^{-1} T_f(r)}{\log r}. \end{aligned}$$

The definition coincides with the classical one [5] if $g(z) = \exp z$.

In the case of relative order, it therefore seems reasonable to define suitably the relative type of a meromorphic function with respect to an entire function to determine the relative growth of two meromorphic functions having same non zero finite relative order with respect to an entire function. Datta and Biswas [2] gave such definitions of relative type of a meromorphic function f with respect to an entire function g which is as follows:

Definition 3. [2] *The relative type $\sigma_g(f)$ of a meromorphic function f with respect to an entire function g are defined as*

$$\sigma_g(f) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_g^{-1}T_f(r)}{r^{\rho_g(f)}}, \quad \text{where } 0 < \rho_g(f) < \infty.$$

Likewise, one can define the lower relative type $\bar{\sigma}_g(f)$ in the following way:

$$\bar{\sigma}_g(f) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_g^{-1}T_f(r)}{r^{\rho_g(f)}}, \quad \text{where } 0 < \rho_g(f) < \infty.$$

3 Some Examples

In this section we present some examples in connection with definitions given in the previous section.

Example 1 (Order). *Given any natural number n , let $f(z) = \exp z^n$. Then $M_f(r) = \exp r^n$. Therefore putting $R = 2$ in the inequality $T_f(r) \leq \log M_f(r) \leq \frac{R+r}{R-r}T_f(R)$ {cf. [4]} we get that $T_f(r) \leq r^n$ and $T_f(r) \geq \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^n$. Hence*

$$\rho_f = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T_f(r)}{\log r} = n .$$

Further if we take $g = \exp^{[2]} z$, then $T_g(r) \sim \frac{\exp r}{(2\pi^3 r)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ ($r \rightarrow \infty$). Therefore

$$\rho_f = \infty .$$

Example 2 (Type (lower type)). *Let us consider $f = \exp z$. Then $T_f(r) = \frac{r}{\pi}$. and $\rho_f = 1$. So*

$$\sigma_f = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_f(r)}{r^{\rho_f}} = \frac{r}{r} = \frac{1}{\pi} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\sigma}_f = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_f(r)}{r^{\rho_f}} = \frac{r}{r} = \frac{1}{\pi} .$$

Similarly, if we consider $g = \frac{1}{1+\exp z}$, then we can also see that

$$\sigma_g = \bar{\sigma}_g = \frac{1}{\pi} .$$

Example 3 (Relative order). Suppose $f = g = \exp^{[2]} z$ then $T_f(r) = T_g(r) \sim \frac{\exp r}{(2\pi^3 r)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ ($r \rightarrow \infty$). Now we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} T_g(r) &\leq \log M_g(r) \leq 3T_g(2r) \quad \{\text{cf. [4]}\} \\ \text{i.e., } T_g(r) &\leq \exp r \leq 3T_g(2r) . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} T_g^{-1}T_f(r) &\geq \log \left(\frac{\exp r}{(2\pi^3 r)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \\ \text{i.e., } \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T_g^{-1}T_f(r)}{\log r} &\geq 1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T_g^{-1}T_f(r) &\leq 2 \log \left(\frac{3 \exp r}{(2\pi^3 r)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \\ \text{i.e., } \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T_g^{-1}T_f(r)}{\log r} &\leq 1 . \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\rho_g(f) = \lambda_g(f) = 1 .$$

Example 4 (Relative type (relative lower type)). Let $f = g = \exp z$. Now $T_f(r) = T_g(r) = T_{\exp z}(r) = \frac{r}{\pi}$.

Therefore

$$T_g^{-1}T_f(r) = T_g^{-1} \left(\frac{r}{\pi} \right) = r .$$

So

$$\rho_g(f) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T_g^{-1}T_f(r)}{\log r} = 1.$$

Hence

$$\sigma_g(f) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_g^{-1}T_f(r)}{r^{\rho_g(f)}} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\sigma}_g(f) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_g^{-1}T_f(r)}{r^{\rho_g(f)}} = 1.$$

4 Lemmas

In this section we present a lemma which will be needed in the sequel.

Lemma 1. [3] Suppose f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order and $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; f) = 4$. Also let g be a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order and $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; g) = 4$. Then the relative order of $P[f]$ with respect to $P[g]$ are same as those of f with respect to g .

Lemma 2. [3] *If f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order and $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; f) = 4$ and g be a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite type and $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; g) = 4$. Then the relative type and relative lower type of $P[f]$ with respect to $P[g]$ are $\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[g]} - (\Gamma_{P[g]} - \gamma_{P[g]})\Theta(\infty; g)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_g}}$ times that of f with respect to g if $\rho_g(f)$ is positive finite.*

5 Theorems

In this section we present the main results of the paper.

Theorem 3. *Suppose f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order and $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; f) = 4$. Also let h be a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite type with $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; h) = 4$ and g be any entire function with $0 < \bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g) \leq \sigma_h(f \circ g) < \infty$, $0 < \bar{\sigma}_h(f) \leq \sigma_h(f) < \infty$ and $\rho_h(f \circ g) = \rho_h(f)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g)}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \sigma_h(f)} &\leq \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1} T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1} T_{P[f]}(r)} \\ &\leq \frac{\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g)}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_h(f)} \\ &\leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1} T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1} T_{P[f]}(r)} \leq \frac{\sigma_h(f \circ g)}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_h(f)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From the definition of $\sigma_h(f)$, $\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g)$ and in view of Lemma 1, Lemma 2 we have for arbitrary positive ε and for all sufficiently large values of r that

$$T_h^{-1} T_{f \circ g}(r) \geq (\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g) - \varepsilon) (r)^{\rho_h(f \circ g)} \quad (1)$$

and

$$T_{P[h]}^{-1} T_{P[f]}(r) \leq (\sigma_{P[h]}(P[f]) + \varepsilon) (r)^{\rho_{P[h]}(P[f])}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &i.e., T_{P[h]}^{-1} T_{P[f]}(r) \\ &\leq \left(\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \sigma_h(f) + \varepsilon \right) (r)^{\rho_h(f)}. \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

Now from (1), (2) and using the condition $\rho_h(f \circ g) = \rho_h(f)$, it follows for all large values of r that

$$\frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} \geq \frac{(\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g) - \varepsilon)}{\left(\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \sigma_h(f) + \varepsilon \right)}.$$

As $\varepsilon (> 0)$ is arbitrary, we obtain from above that

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} \geq \frac{\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g)}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \sigma_h(f)}. \quad (3)$$

Again for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity,

$$T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r) \leq (\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g) + \varepsilon) (r)^{\rho_h(f \circ g)} \quad (4)$$

and for all sufficiently large values of r ,

$$\begin{aligned} T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r) &\geq (\bar{\sigma}_{P[h]}(P[f]) - \varepsilon) (r)^{\rho_{P[h]}(P[f])} \\ \text{i.e., } T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r) &\geq \left(\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_h(f) - \varepsilon \right) (r)^{\rho_h(f)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Combining (4) and (5) and in view of $\rho_h(f \circ g) = \rho_h(f)$, we get for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity that

$$\frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} \leq \frac{(\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g) + \varepsilon)}{\left(\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_h(f) - \varepsilon \right)}.$$

Since $\varepsilon (> 0)$ is arbitrary, it follows from above that

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} \leq \frac{\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g)}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_h(f)}. \quad (6)$$

Also for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity,

$$\begin{aligned} T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r) &\leq (\bar{\sigma}_{P[h]}(P[f]) + \varepsilon) (r)^{\rho_{P[h]}(P[f])} \\ \text{i.e., } T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r) &\leq \left(\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_h(f) + \varepsilon \right) (r)^{\rho_h(f)}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Now from (1), (7) and also using the condition $\rho_h(f \circ g) = \rho_h(f)$, we obtain for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity that

$$\frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} \geq \frac{(\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g) - \varepsilon)}{\left(\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_h(f) + \varepsilon \right)}.$$

As $\varepsilon (> 0)$ is arbitrary, we get from above that

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} \geq \frac{\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g)}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_h(f)}. \quad (8)$$

Also for all sufficiently large values of r ,

$$T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r) \leq (\sigma_h(f \circ g) + \varepsilon)(r)^{\rho_h(f \circ g)}. \quad (9)$$

As the condition $\rho_h(f \circ g) = \rho_h(f)$ holds, it follows from (5) and (9) for all sufficiently large values of r that

$$\frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} \leq \frac{(\sigma_h(f \circ g) + \varepsilon)}{\left(\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_h(f) - \varepsilon \right)}.$$

Since $\varepsilon (> 0)$ is arbitrary, we obtain that

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} \leq \frac{\sigma_h(f \circ g)}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_h(f)}. \quad (10)$$

Thus the theorem follows from (3), (6), (8) and (10). \square

The following theorem can be proved in the line of Theorem 3 and so its proof is omitted.

Theorem 4. *Suppose g be a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order and $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; f) = 4$. Also let h be a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite type with $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; h) = 4$ and f be any meromorphic function such that $0 < \bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g) \leq$*

$\sigma_h(f \circ g) < \infty$, $0 < \bar{\sigma}_h(g) \leq \sigma_h(g) < \infty$ and $\rho_h(f \circ g) = \rho_h(g)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g)}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[g]} - (\Gamma_{P[g]} - \gamma_{P[g]})\Theta(\infty; g)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \sigma_h(g)} &\leq \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[g]}(r)} \\ &\leq \frac{\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g)}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[g]} - (\Gamma_{P[g]} - \gamma_{P[g]})\Theta(\infty; g)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_h(g)} \\ &\leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[g]}(r)} \leq \frac{\sigma_h(f \circ g)}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[g]} - (\Gamma_{P[g]} - \gamma_{P[g]})\Theta(\infty; g)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_h(g)}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 5. Suppose f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order and $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; f) = 4$. Also let h be a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite type with $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; h) = 4$ and g be any entire function with $0 < \sigma_h(f \circ g) < \infty$, $0 < \sigma_h(f) < \infty$ and $\rho_h(f \circ g) = \rho_h(f)$. Then

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} \leq \frac{\sigma_h(f \circ g)}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \sigma_h(f)} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)}.$$

Proof. From the definition of $\sigma_{P[h]}(P[f])$ and in view of Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, we get for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity that

$$\begin{aligned} T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r) &\geq (\sigma_{P[h]}(P[f]) - \varepsilon)(r)^{\rho_{P[h]}(P[f])} \\ \text{i.e., } T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r) &\geq \left(\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \sigma_h(f) - \varepsilon \right) (r)^{\rho_h(f)}. \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

Now from (9), (11) and the condition $\rho_h(f \circ g) = \rho_h(f)$, it follows for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity that

$$\frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} \leq \frac{(\sigma_h(f \circ g) + \varepsilon)}{\left(\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \sigma_h(f) - \varepsilon \right)}.$$

As $\varepsilon (> 0)$ is arbitrary, we obtain that

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} \leq \frac{\sigma_h(f \circ g)}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \sigma_h(f)}. \quad (12)$$

Again for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity ,

$$T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r) \geq (\sigma_h(f \circ g) - \varepsilon)(r)^{\rho_h(f \circ g)} . \quad (13)$$

Combining (2) and (13) and in view of the condition $\rho_h(f \circ g) = \rho_h(f)$, we get for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity ,

$$\frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} \geq \frac{(\sigma_h(f \circ g) - \varepsilon)}{\left(\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \sigma_h(f) + \varepsilon \right)} .$$

Since $\varepsilon (> 0)$ is arbitrary, it follows that

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} \geq \frac{\sigma_h(f \circ g)}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \sigma_h(f)} . \quad (14)$$

Thus the theorem follows from (12) and (14). \square

The following theorem can be carried out in the line of Theorem 5 and therefore we omit its proof.

Theorem 6. *Suppose g be a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order and $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; f) = 4$. Also let h be a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite type with $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; h) = 4$ and f be any meromorphic function such that $0 < \sigma_h(f \circ g) < \infty$, $0 < \sigma_h(g) < \infty$ and $\rho_h(f \circ g) = \rho_h(g)$. Then*

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[g]}(r)} \leq \frac{\sigma_h(f \circ g)}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[g]} - (\Gamma_{P[g]} - \gamma_{P[g]})\Theta(\infty; g)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} \cdot \sigma_h(g)} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[g]}(r)} .$$

The following theorem is a natural consequence of Theorem 3 and Theorem 5:

Theorem 7. *Suppose f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order and $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; f) = 4$. Also let h be a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite type with $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; h) = 4$ and g be any entire function with $0 < \bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g) \leq \sigma_h(f \circ g) < \infty$, $0 < \bar{\sigma}_h(f) \leq \sigma_h(f) < \infty$ and $\rho_h(f \circ g) = \rho_h(f)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} &\leq \min \left\{ A \cdot \frac{\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g)}{\bar{\sigma}_h(f)}, A \cdot \frac{\sigma_h(f \circ g)}{\sigma_h(f)} \right\} \\ &\leq \min \left\{ A \cdot \frac{\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g)}{\bar{\sigma}_h(f)}, A \cdot \frac{\sigma_h(f \circ g)}{\sigma_h(f)} \right\} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1}T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1}T_{P[f]}(r)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where } A = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})^{\Theta(\infty; f)}}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})^{\Theta(\infty; h)}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}}.$$

The proof is omitted.

Analogously one may state the following theorem without its proof.

Theorem 8. Suppose g be a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order and $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; g) = 4$. Also let h be a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite type with $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; h) = 4$ and f be any meromorphic function such that $0 < \bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g) \leq \sigma_h(f \circ g) < \infty$, $0 < \bar{\sigma}_h(g) \leq \sigma_h(g) < \infty$ and $\rho_h(f \circ g) = \rho_h(g)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1} T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1} T_{P[g]}(r)} &\leq \min \left\{ B \cdot \frac{\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g)}{\bar{\sigma}_h(g)}, B \cdot \frac{\sigma_h(f \circ g)}{\sigma_h(g)} \right\} \\ &\leq \min \left\{ B \cdot \frac{\bar{\sigma}_h(f \circ g)}{\bar{\sigma}_h(g)}, B \cdot \frac{\sigma_h(f \circ g)}{\sigma_h(g)} \right\} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_h^{-1} T_{f \circ g}(r)}{T_{P[h]}^{-1} T_{P[g]}(r)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where } B = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[g]} - (\Gamma_{P[g]} - \gamma_{P[g]})^{\Theta(\infty; g)}}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})^{\Theta(\infty; h)}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}}.$$

6 Open Problem

Actually this paper deals with the extension of the works on the growth properties of *differential monomials* generated by transcendental entire and transcendental meromorphic functions on the basis of their *relative types*. These theories can also be modified by the treatment of the notions of *generalized relative type* and *(p,q)-th relative type*. In addition some extensions of the same may be done in the light of slowly changing functions. Moreover, the notion of *relative type* of *differential monomials* generated by transcendental entire and transcendental meromorphic functions should have a wide range of applications in complex dynamics, factorization theory of entire functions of single complex variable, the solution of complex differential equations etc. which may be an ample scope of further research.

References

- [1] W. Doeringer, *Exceptional values of differential polynomials*, Pacific J. Math., Vol.98, No.1 (1982), pp.55-62.
- [2] S. K. Datta and A. Biswas, *On relative type of entire and meromorphic functions*, Advances in Applied Mathematical Analysis, Vol. 8, No. 2 (2013), pp. 63-75.

- [3] S. K. Datta, T. Biswas and S. Bhattacharyya, *On relative order and relative type based growth properties of differential monomials*, Journal of Indian Mathematical Society, to appear.
- [4] W. K. Hayman, *Meromorphic Functions*, The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1964.
- [5] B. K. Lahiri and D. Banerjee, *Relative order of entire and meromorphic functions*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. India, Vol.69(A) No. III(1999), pp.339-354.
- [6] G. Valiron, *Lectures on the General Theory of Integral Functions*, Chelsea Publishing Company, 1949.
- [7] L. Yang, *Value distribution theory and new research on it*, Science Press, Beijing (1982).
- [8] H. X. Yi, *On a result of Singh*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc., Vol.41 (1990), pp.417-420.