Konuralp Journal of Mathematics
Volume 4 No. 2 pp. 230–246 (2016) ©KJM

COMPARATIVE GROWTH ESTIMATES OF DIFFERENTIAL MONOMIALS DEPENDING UPON THEIR RELATIVE ORDERS, RELATIVE TYPE AND RELATIVE WEAK TYPE

SANJIB KUMAR DATTA AND TANMAY BISWAS

Abstract. In this paper the comparative growth properties of composition of entire and meromorphic functions on the basis of their relative orders (relative lower orders), relative types and relative weak types of differential monomials generated by entire and meromorphic functions have been investigated.

1. Introduction, Definitions and Notations

Let f be an entire function defined in the open complex plane $\mathbb{C}$. The maximum modulus function relating to entire f is defined as $M_f(r) = \max\{|f(z)| : |z| = r\}$. If f is non-constant then it has the following property:

Property (A) ([2]) : A non-constant entire function f is said have the Property (A) if for any $\sigma > 1$ and for all sufficiently large values of r, $[M_f(r)]^2 \leq M_f(r^\sigma)$ holds. For examples of functions with or without the Property (A), one may see [2].

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:

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

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

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

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

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 30D20, 30D30, 30D35.

Key words and phrases. Entire function, meromorphic function, order (lower order), relative order (relative lower order), relative type, relative weak type, Property (A), growth, differential monomials.

The first author is greatly thankful to DST/PURSE for carrying out this paper.

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

$$\delta_1(a;f) = 1 - \limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{N(r,a;f\mid=1)}{T_f(r)} \quad \{\text{cf. } [17]\}\,,$$

the deficiency of 'a' corresponding to the simple a- points of f i,e. simple zeros of $f-a$. In this connection Yang [16] proved that there exists at most a denumerable number of complex numbers $a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ for which

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

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

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

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

Further we denote $\Theta(\infty;f)$ as

$$\Theta(\infty;f) = 1 - \limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{\overline{N}_f(r)}{T_f(r)}\ .$$

However, 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., $\frac{S_f(r)}{T_f(r)} \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$. Moreover for any transcendental meromorphic function f , we call $P[f] = bf^{n_0}(f^{(1)})^{n_1}...(f^{(k)})^{n_k}$, to be a differential monomial generated by it where $\sum_{i=0}^{k} n_i \ge 1$ (all $n_i \mid i = 0,1,...,k$ 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. [5]$\}$.

If f is a non-constant entire function then $T_f(r)$ is rigorously increasing and continuous function of r and its inverse $T_f^{-1} : (T_f(0), \infty) \to (0,\infty)$ exist where $\lim_{s\to\infty} T_f^{-1}(s) = \infty$. Also the ratio $\frac{T_f(r)}{T_g(r)}$ as $r \to \infty$ is known as growth of f with respect to g in terms of the Nevanlinna's Characteristic functions of the meromorphic functions f and g. Further in case of meromorphic functions, the growth markers such as order and lower order which are traditional in complex analysis are defined in terms of their growth with respect to the $\exp z$ function in the following way:

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

$$\left(\lambda_f = \liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{\log T_f(r)}{\log T_{\exp z}(r)} = \liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{\log T_f(r)}{\log\left(\frac{r}{\pi}\right)} = \liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{\log T_f(r)}{\log(r)+O(1)}\right),$$

and the growth of functions is said to be regular if their lower order coincides with their order.

In this connection the following two definitions are also well known:

Definition 1.1. The *type* σ_f and *lower type* $\overline{\sigma}_f$ of a meromorphic function f are defined as

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

If f is entire then

$$\sigma_f = \limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{\log M_f(r)}{r^{\rho_f}} \text{ and } \overline{\sigma}_f = \liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{\log M_f(r)}{r^{\rho_f}}, \ 0<\rho_f<\infty .$$

Definition 1.2. [7] The *weak type* τ_f and the growth indicator τ_f of a meromorphic function f of finite positive lower order λ_f are defined by

$$\overline{\tau}_f = \limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{T_f(r)}{r^{\lambda_f}} \text{ and } \tau_f = \liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{T_f(r)}{r^{\lambda_f}}, \ 0<\lambda_f<\infty .$$

When f is entire then

$$\overline{\tau}_f = \limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{\log M_f(r)}{r^{\lambda_f}} \text{ and } \tau_f = \liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{\log M_f(r)}{r^{\lambda_f}}, \ 0<\lambda_f<\infty .$$

However, extending the thought of relative order of entire functions as initiated by Bernal {[1], [2]}, Lahiri and Banerjee [13] introduced the definition of relative order of a meromorphic function f with respect to another entire function g, symbolized by $\rho_g(f)$ to avoid comparing growth just with $\exp z$ as follows:

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

The definition coincides with the classical one if $g(z) = \exp z$ {cf. [13] }.

Similarly, one can define the relative lower order of a meromorphic function f with respect to an entire function g denoted by $\lambda_g(f)$ as follows :

$$\lambda_g(f) = \liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{\log T_g^{-1} T_f(r)}{\log r}.$$

To compare the relative growth of two entire functions having same non zero finite *relative order* with respect to another entire function, Roy [14] introduced the notion of *relative type* of two entire functions in the following way:

Definition 1.3. [14] Let f and g be any two entire functions such that $0 < \rho_g(f) < \infty$. Then the *relative type* $\sigma_g(f)$ of f with respect to g is defined as :

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma_g(f) \\ = \; & \inf\left\{k > 0 : M_f(r) < M_g\left(kr^{\rho_g(f)}\right) \text{ for all sufficiently large values of } r\right\} \\ = \; & \limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{M_g^{-1} M_f(r)}{r^{\rho_g(f)}} \; . \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, one can define the *relative lower type* of an entire function f with respect to an entire function g denoted by $\overline{\sigma}_g(f)$ as follows :

$$\overline{\sigma}_g(f) = \liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{M_g^{-1} M_f(r)}{r^{\rho_g(f)}}, \; 0 < \rho_g(f) < \infty \; .$$

Analogously, to determine the relative growth of two entire functions having same non zero finite *relative lower order* with respect to another entire function, Datta and Biswas [8] introduced the definition of *relative weak type* of an entire function f with respect to another entire function g of finite positive *relative lower order* $\lambda_g(f)$ in the following way:

Definition 1.4. [8] The *relative weak type* $\tau_g(f)$ of an entire function f with respect to another entire function g having finite positive *relative lower order* $\lambda_g(f)$ is defined as:

$$\tau_g(f) = \liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{M_g^{-1} M_f(r)}{r^{\lambda_g(f)}} \; .$$

Also one may define the growth indicator $\overline{\tau}_g(f)$ of an entire function f with respect to an entire function g in the following way :

$$\overline{\tau}_g(f) = \limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{M_g^{-1} M_f(r)}{r^{\lambda_g(f)}}, \; 0 < \lambda_g(f) < \infty \; .$$

In the case of meromorphic functions, it therefore seems reasonable to define suitably the *relative type* and *relative weak 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* or *relative lower order* with respect to an entire function. Datta and Biswas also [8] gave such definitions of *relative type* and *relative weak type* of a meromorphic function f with respect to an entire function g which are as follows:

Definition 1.5. [8] The *relative type* $\sigma_g(f)$ of a meromorphic function f with respect to an entire function g are defined as

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

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

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

Definition 1.6. [8] The *relative weak type* $\tau_g(f)$ of a meromorphic function f with respect to an entire function g with finite positive relative lower order $\lambda_g(f)$ is defined by

$$\tau_g(f) = \liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{T_g^{-1} T_f(r)}{r^{\lambda_g(f)}}.$$

In a like manner, one can define the growth indicator $\overline{\tau}_g(f)$ of a meromorphic function f with respect to an entire function g with finite positive relative lower order $\lambda_g(f)$ as

$$\overline{\tau}_g(f) = \limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{T_g^{-1} T_f(r)}{r^{\lambda_g(f)}}.$$

Considering $g = \exp z$ one may easily verify that Definition 1.3 , Definition 1.4, Definition 1.5 and Definition 1.6 coincide with the classical definitions of type (lower type) and weak type of entire are meromorphic functions respectively.

For entire and meromorphic functions, the notion of their growth indicators such as *order*, *type* and *weak 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* as well as *relative weak type* of entire and meromorphic functions with respect to another entire function was mostly unknown to complex analysists and they are not aware of the technical advantages of using the relative growth indicators of the functions. In this paper we wish to prove some newly developed results based on the growth properties of *relative order, relative type* and *relative weak type* of differential monomials generated by entire and meromorphic functions. We do not explain the standard definitions and notations in the theory of entire and meromorphic functions as those are available in [11] and [15].

2. Lemmas

In this section we present some lemmas which will be needed in the sequel.

Lemma 2.1. [3] *Let f be meromorphic and g be entire then for all sufficiently large values of r,*

$$T_{f\circ g}(r) \leqslant \{1+o(1)\} \frac{T_g(r)}{\log M_g(r)} T_f(M_g(r)) \ .$$

Lemma 2.2. [4] *Let f be meromorphic and g be entire and suppose that $0 < \mu < \rho_g \leq \infty$. Then for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity,*

$$T_{f\circ g}(r) \geq T_f(\exp(r^\mu)) \ .$$

Lemma 2.3. [12] *Let f be meromorphic and g be entire such that $0 < \rho_g < \infty$ and $0 < \lambda_f$. Then for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity,*

$$T_{f\circ g}(r) > T_g(\exp(r^\mu)),$$

where $0 < \mu < \rho_g$.

Lemma 2.4. [6] *Let f be a meromorphic function and g be an entire function such that $\lambda_g < \mu < \infty$ and $0 < \lambda_f \leq \rho_f < \infty$. Then for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity,*

$$T_{f\circ g}(r) < T_f(\exp(r^\mu)) \ .$$

Lemma 2.5. [6] *Let f be a meromorphic function of finite order and g be an entire function such that $0 < \lambda_g < \mu < \infty$. Then for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity,*

$$T_{f\circ g}(r) < T_g(\exp(r^\mu)) \ .$$

Lemma 2.6. [9] *Let f be an entire function which satisfy the Property (A), $\beta > 0$, $\delta > 1$ and $\alpha > 2$. Then*

$$\beta T_f(r) < T_f\left(\alpha r^{\delta}\right).$$

Lemma 2.7. [10] *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order and $\sum\limits_{a \in \mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}} \delta_1(a;f) = 4$. Also let g be a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order and $\sum\limits_{a \in \mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}} \delta_1(a;g) = 4$. Then the relative order and relative lower order of $P[f]$ with respect to $P[g]$ are same as those of f with respect to g.*

Lemma 2.8. [10] *If f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order and $\sum\limits_{a \in \mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}} \delta_1(a;f) = 4$ and g be a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite type and $\sum\limits_{a \in \mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}} \delta_1(a;g) = 4$. 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.*

Lemma 2.9. [10] *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order and $\sum\limits_{a \in \mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}} \delta_1(a;f) = 4$ and g be a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite type and $\sum\limits_{a \in \mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}} \delta_1(a;g) = 4$. Then $\tau_{P[g]}(P[f])$ and $\overline{\tau}_{P[g]}(P[f])$ 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 $\lambda_g(f)$ is positive finite i.e.,*

$$\tau_{P[g]}(P[f]) = \left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}{\Gamma_{P[g]}-(\Gamma_{P[g]}-\gamma_{P[g]})\Theta(\infty;g)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_g}}.\tau_g(f) \text{ and}$$

$$\overline{\tau}_{P[g]}(P[f]) = \left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}{\Gamma_{P[g]}-(\Gamma_{P[g]}-\gamma_{P[g]})\Theta(\infty;g)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_g}}.\bar{\tau}_g(f) \ .$$

3. Main Results

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

Theorem 3.1. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with $\sum\limits_{a \in \mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}} \delta_1(a;f) = 4$, g be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with $\sum\limits_{a \in \mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}} \delta_1(a;h) = 4$, $0 < \rho_h(f) < \infty$, $\rho_h(f) = \rho_g$, $\sigma_g < \infty$ and $0 < \sigma_h(f) < \infty$. Also let h satisfy the Property (A). Then for any $\delta > 1$,*

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

Proof. From (3.9), we get for all sufficiently large values of r that

$$\log T_h^{-1} T_{f\circ g}(r) \leqslant \delta\left(\rho_h(f)+\varepsilon\right)\log M_g(r)+O(1)\ . \tag{3.1}$$

Using Definition 1.1, we obtain from (3.1) for all sufficiently large values of r that

$$\log T_h^{-1} T_{f\circ g}(r) \leqslant \delta\left(\rho_h(f)+\varepsilon\right)\left(\sigma_g+\varepsilon\right)\cdot r^{\rho_g}+O(1)\ . \tag{3.2}$$

Now in view of condition (ii), we obtain from (3.2) for all sufficiently large values of r that

$$\log T_h^{-1} T_{f\circ g}(r) \leqslant \delta\left(\rho_h(f)+\varepsilon\right)\left(\sigma_g+\varepsilon\right)\cdot r^{\rho_h(f)}+O(1)\ . \tag{3.3}$$

Again in view of Definition 1.5, we get for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity that

$$T_{M[h]}^{-1} T_{M[f]}(r) \geq \left(\sigma_{M[h]}\left(M[f]\right)-\varepsilon\right) r^{\rho_{M[h]}(M[f])}\ .$$

Therefore in view of Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 2.8, we obtain for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity that

$$\begin{aligned} & T_{M[h]}^{-1} T_{M[f]}(r) \\ \geq\ & \left(\sigma_h(f)\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}-\varepsilon\right) r^{\rho_h(f)}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Therefore from (3.3) and (3.4), it follows for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity that

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

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

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

Hence the theorem follows. □

Using the notion of *lower type* and *relative lower type*, we may state the following theorem without its proof as it can be carried out in the line of Theorem 3.1 :

Theorem 3.2. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$, g be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\rho_h(f)<\infty$, $\rho_h(f)=\rho_g$, $\overline{\sigma}_g<\infty$ and $0<\overline{\sigma}_h(f)<\infty$. Also let h satisfies the Property (A). Then for any $\delta>1$,*

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1} T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1} T_{M[f]}(r)} \leq \frac{\delta\cdot\rho_h(f)\cdot\overline{\sigma}_g}{\overline{\sigma}_h(f)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}\ .$$

Similarly using the notion of *type* and *relative lower type,* one may state the following two theorems without their proofs because those can also be carried out in the line of Theorem 3.1 :

Theorem 3.3. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum\limits_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$*, g be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum\limits_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$*, $0<\lambda_h(f)\le\rho_h(f)<\infty$, $\rho_h(f)=\rho_g$, $\sigma_g<\infty$ and $0<\overline{\sigma}_h(f)<\infty$. Also let h satisfies the Property (A). Then for any $\delta>1$,*

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r)}\le\frac{\delta\cdot\lambda_h(f)\cdot\sigma_g}{\overline{\sigma}_h(f)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Theorem 3.4. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum\limits_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$*, g be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum\limits_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$*, $0<\rho_h(f)<\infty$, $\rho_h(f)=\rho_g$, $\sigma_g<\infty$ and $0<\overline{\sigma}_h(f)<\infty$. Also let h satisfies the Property (A). Then for any $\delta>1$,*

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r)}\le\frac{\delta\cdot\rho_h(f)\cdot\sigma_g}{\overline{\sigma}_h(f)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Similarly, using the concept of *weak type* and *relative weak type*, we may state next four theorems without their proofs as those can be carried out with the help of Lemma 2.9 and in the line of Theorem 3.1, Theorem 3.2, Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 3.4 respectively.

Theorem 3.5. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum\limits_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$*, g be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum\limits_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$*, $0<\lambda_h(f)\le\rho_h(f)<\infty$, $\lambda_h(f)=\lambda_g$, $\overline{\tau}_g<\infty$ and $0<\overline{\tau}_h(f)<\infty$. Also let h satisfies the Property (A). Then for any $\delta>1$,*

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r)}\le\frac{\delta\cdot\rho_h(f)\cdot\overline{\tau}_g}{\overline{\tau}_h(f)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Theorem 3.6. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum\limits_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$*, g be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum\limits_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$*, $0<\lambda_h(f)\le\rho_h(f)<\infty$, $\lambda_h(f)=\lambda_g$, $\tau_g<\infty$ and $0<\tau_h(f)<\infty$. Also let h satisfies the Property (A). Then for any $\delta>1$,*

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r)}\le\frac{\delta\cdot\rho_h(f)\cdot\tau_g}{\tau_h(f)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Theorem 3.7. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum\limits_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$*, g be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum\limits_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=$

4, $0<\lambda_h(f)<\infty$, $\lambda_h(f)=\lambda_g$, $\overline{\tau}_g<\infty$ and $0<\tau_h(f)<\infty$. Also let h satisfies the Property (A). Then for any $\delta>1$,

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r)}\leq\frac{\delta\cdot\lambda_h(f)\cdot\overline{\tau}_g}{\tau_h(f)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Theorem 3.8. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$, g be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_h(f)\leq\rho_h(f)<\infty$, $\lambda_h(f)=\lambda_g$, $\overline{\tau}_g<\infty$ and $0<\tau_h(f)<\infty$. Also let h satisfies the Property (A). Then for any $\delta>1$,*

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r)}\leq\frac{\delta\cdot\rho_h(f)\cdot\overline{\tau}_g}{\tau_h(f)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Theorem 3.9. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$, g be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_h(f)\leq\rho_h(f)<\rho_g\leq\infty$ and $\sigma_h(f)<\infty$. Then*

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

Proof. Since $\rho_h(f)<\rho_g$ and $T_h^{-1}(r)$ is a increasing function of r, we get from Lemma 2.2 for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity that

$$\begin{aligned}\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)&\geq\log T_h^{-1}T_f(\exp(r^\mu))\\ i.e.,\ \log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r&\geq(\lambda_h(f)-\varepsilon)\cdot r^\mu\\ i.e.,\ \log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)&\geq(\lambda_h(f)-\varepsilon)\cdot r^{\rho_h(f)}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.5}$$

Again in view of Definition 1.5, we get for all sufficiently large values of r that

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

Therefore in view of Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 2.8, we obtain for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity that

$$\begin{aligned}&T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r)\\ \leq&\left(\sigma_h(f)\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}+\varepsilon\right)r^{\rho_h(f)}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.6}$$

Now from (3.5) and (3.6), it follows for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity that

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

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

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

Thus the theorem follows. □

In the line of Theorem 3.9, the following theorem can be proved and therefore its proof is omitted:

Theorem 3.10. *Let f be a meromorphic function, g a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;g)=4$ and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_h(f)$, $0<\rho_h(g)<\rho_g\leq\infty$ and $\sigma_h(g)<\infty$. Then*

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

The following two theorems can also be proved in the line of Theorem 3.9 and Theorem 3.10 respectively and with help of Lemma 2.3. Hence their proofs are omitted.

Theorem 3.11. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$, g be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_h(g)$, $0<\lambda_f$, $0<\rho_h(f)<\rho_g<\infty$ and $\sigma_h(f)<\infty$. Then*

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

Theorem 3.12. *Let f be a meromorphic function, g a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;g)=4$ and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_h(g)$, $0<\lambda_f$, $0<\rho_h(g)<\rho_g<\infty$ and $\sigma_h(g)<\infty$. Then*

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

Now we state the following four theorems without their proofs as those can be carried out with the help of Lemma 2.9 and in the line of Theorem 3.9, Theorem 3.10, Theorem 3.11 and Theorem 3.12 and with the help of Definition 1.6:

Theorem 3.13. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$, g be entire and h a* *transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_h(f)<\rho_g\leq\infty$ *and* $\overline{\tau}_h(f)<\infty$. *Then*

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r)}\geq\frac{\lambda_h(f)}{\overline{\tau}_h(f)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Theorem 3.14. *Let f be a meromorphic function, g a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;g)=4$ *and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_h(f)$, $0<\lambda_h(g)<\rho_g\leq\infty$ *and* $\overline{\tau}_h(g)<\infty$. *Then*

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[g]}(r)}\geq\frac{\lambda_h(f)}{\overline{\tau}_h(g)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[g]}-(\Gamma_{P[g]}-\gamma_{P[g]})\Theta(\infty;g)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Theorem 3.15. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$, *$g$ be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_h(g)<\rho_g<\infty$, $0<\lambda_f$ *and* $\overline{\tau}_h(f)<\infty$. *Then*

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r)}\geq\frac{\lambda_h(g)}{\overline{\tau}_h(f)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Theorem 3.16. *Let f be a meromorphic function, g a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;g)=4$ *and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_h(g)<\rho_g<\infty$, $0<\lambda_f$ *and* $\overline{\tau}_h(g)<\infty$. *Then*

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[g]}(r)}\geq\frac{\lambda_h(g)}{\overline{\tau}_h(g)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[g]}-(\Gamma_{P[g]}-\gamma_{P[g]})\Theta(\infty;g)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Theorem 3.17. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of non zero finite order and lower order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$, *$g$ be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_g<\rho_h(f)<\infty$ *and* $\overline{\sigma}_h(f)>0$. *Then*

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r)}\leq\frac{\rho_h(f)}{\overline{\sigma}_h(f)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Proof. As $\lambda_g<\rho_h(f)$ and $T_h^{-1}(r)$ is a increasing function of r, it follows from Lemma 2.4 for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity that

$$\begin{aligned}\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r) &< \log T_h^{-1}T_f(\exp(r^{\mu}))\\ i.e.,\ \log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r &< (\rho_h(f)+\varepsilon)\cdot r^{\mu}\\ i.e.,\ \log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r) &< (\rho_h(f)+\varepsilon)\cdot r^{\rho_h(f)}\ .\end{aligned}\tag{3.7}$$

Further in view of Definition 1.5, we obtain for all sufficiently large values of r that

$$T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r) \geq \left(\overline{\sigma}_{M[h]}(M[f]) - \varepsilon\right) r^{\rho_{M[h]}(M[f])} .$$

Therefore in view of Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 2.8, we get from above that

(3.8)
$$T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r) \geq \left(\overline{\sigma}_h(f)\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} - \varepsilon\right) r^{\rho_h(f)} .$$

Since $\varepsilon\,(>0)$ is arbitrary, therefore from (3.7) and (3.8) we have for a sequence of values of r tending to infinity that

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

$$i.e., \liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r)} \leq \frac{\rho_h(f)}{\overline{\sigma}_h(f)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)}{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} .$$

Hence the theorem is established. □

In the line of Theorem 3.17, the following theorem can be proved and therefore its proof is omitted:

Theorem 3.18. *Let f be a meromorphic function with non zero finite order and lower order, g a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;g) = 4$ and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h) = 4$, $\rho_h(f) < \infty$, $0 < \lambda_g < \rho_h(g) < \infty$ and $\overline{\sigma}_h(g) > 0$. Then*

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[g]}(r)} \leq \frac{\rho_h(f)}{\overline{\sigma}_h(g)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)}{\Gamma_{P[g]} - (\Gamma_{P[g]} - \gamma_{P[g]})\Theta(\infty; g)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} .$$

Moreover, the following two theorems can also be deduced in the line of Theorem 3.9 and Theorem 3.10 respectively and with help of Lemma 2.5 and therefore their proofs are omitted.

Theorem 3.19. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non zero lower order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f) = 4$, g be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h) = 4$, $\rho_h(g) < \infty$, $0 < \lambda_g < \rho_h(f) < \infty$ and $\overline{\sigma}_h(f) > 0$. Then*

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r)} \leq \frac{\rho_h(g)}{\overline{\sigma}_h(f)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]} - (\Gamma_{P[h]} - \gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty; h)}{\Gamma_{P[f]} - (\Gamma_{P[f]} - \gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty; f)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}} .$$

Theorem 3.20. *Let f be a meromorphic function with finite order, g a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;g) =$*

4 and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_g<\rho_h(g)<\infty$ *and* $\overline{\sigma}_h(g)>0$. *Then*

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[g]}(r)}\leq\frac{\rho_h(g)}{\overline{\sigma}_h(g)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[g]}-(\Gamma_{P[g]}-\gamma_{P[g]})\Theta(\infty;g)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Finally we state the following four theorems without their proofs as those can be carried out in view of Lemma 2.9 and in the line of Theorem 3.17, Theorem 3.18, Theorem 3.19 and Theorem 3.20 using the concept of *relative weak type:*

Theorem 3.21. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of non zero finite order and lower order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$, *g be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$ $0<\lambda_g<\lambda_h(f)\leq\rho_h(f)<\infty$ *and* $\tau_h(f)>0$. *Then*

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r)}\leq\frac{\rho_h(f)}{\tau_h(f)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Theorem 3.22. *Let f be a meromorphic function with non zero finite order and lower order, g a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;g)=4$ *and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $\rho_h(f)<\infty$, $0<\lambda_g<\lambda_h(g)<\infty$ *and* $\tau_h(g)>0$. *Then*

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[g]}(r)}\leq\frac{\rho_h(f)}{\tau_h(g)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[g]}-(\Gamma_{P[g]}-\gamma_{P[g]})\Theta(\infty;g)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Theorem 3.23. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non zero lower order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$, *g be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $\rho_h(g)<\infty$, $0<\lambda_g<\lambda_h(f)<\infty$ *and* $\tau_h(f)>0$. *Then*

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(r)}\leq\frac{\rho_h(g)}{\tau_h(f)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[f]}-(\Gamma_{P[f]}-\gamma_{P[f]})\Theta(\infty;f)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Theorem 3.24. *Let f be a meromorphic function with finite order, g a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;g)=4$ *and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_g<\lambda_h(f)\leq\rho_h(g)<\infty$ *and* $\tau_h(g)>0$. *Then*

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[g]}(r)}\leq\frac{\rho_h(g)}{\tau_h(g)}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{P[h]}-(\Gamma_{P[h]}-\gamma_{P[h]})\Theta(\infty;h)}{\Gamma_{P[g]}-(\Gamma_{P[g]}-\gamma_{P[g]})\Theta(\infty;g)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho_h}}.$$

Theorem 3.25. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with $\sum\limits_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$, g be entire and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with $\sum\limits_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_h(f)\le\rho_h(f)<\infty$ and $\sigma_g<\infty$. Also h satisfy the Property (A). Then for any $\delta>1$,*

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(\exp r^{\rho_g})}\le\frac{\delta\cdot\sigma_g\cdot\rho_h(f)}{\lambda_h(f)}\ .$$

Proof. Let us suppose that $\alpha>2$.
Since $T_h^{-1}(r)$ is an increasing function r, it follows from Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.6 and the inequality $T_g(r)\le\log M_g(r)$ $\{cf.\ [11]\}$ for all sufficiently large values of r that

$$T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)\leqslant T_h^{-1}\left[\{1+o(1)\}T_f(M_g(r))\right]$$

$$i.e.,\ T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)\leqslant\alpha\left[T_h^{-1}T_f(M_g(r))\right]^{\delta}$$

$$i.e.,\ \log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)\leqslant\delta\log T_h^{-1}T_f(M_g(r))+O(1)\tag{3.9}$$

$$i.e.,\ \frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(\exp r^{\rho_g})}\le\frac{\delta\log T_h^{-1}T_f(M_g(r))+O(1)}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(\exp r^{\rho_g})}=\frac{\delta\log T_h^{-1}T_f(M_g(r))+O(1)}{\log M_g(r)}\cdot\frac{\log M_g(r)}{r^{\rho_g}}\cdot\frac{\log\exp r^{\rho_g}}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(\exp r^{\rho_g})}\tag{3.10}$$

$$i.e.,\ \limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(\exp r^{\rho_g})}\le\limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\delta\log T_h^{-1}T_f(M_g(r))+O(1)}{\log M_g(r)}\cdot\limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log M_g(r)}{r^{\rho_g}}\cdot\limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log\exp r^{\rho_g}}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(\exp r^{\rho_g})}$$

$$i.e.,\ \limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(\exp r^{\rho_g})}\le\delta\cdot\rho_h(f)\cdot\sigma_g\cdot\frac{1}{\lambda_{M[h]}(M[f])}\ .$$

Therefore in view of Lemma 2.7, we obtain from above that

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(\exp r^{\rho_g})}\le\frac{\delta\cdot\sigma_g\cdot\rho_h(f)}{\lambda_h(f)}\ .$$

Thus the theorem is established. □

In the line of Theorem 3.25 the following theorem can be proved :

Theorem 3.26. *Let f be a meromorphic function, g a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with $\sum\limits_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;g)=4$ and h a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with*

$\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $\lambda_h(g)>0$, $\rho_h(f)<\infty$, $\sigma_g<\infty$ *and also* h *satisfy the Property (A). Then for any* $\delta>1$,

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[g]}(\exp r^{\rho_g})}\leq\frac{\delta\cdot\sigma_g\cdot\rho_h(f)}{\lambda_h(g)}\ .$$

Using the notion of l*ower type*, we may state the following two theorems without their proofs because those can be carried out in the line of Theorem 3.25 and Theorem 3.26 respectively.

Theorem 3.27. *Let* f *be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$, g *be entire and* h *a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_h(f)\leq\rho_h(f)<\infty$, $\overline{\sigma}_g<\infty$ *and also* h *satisfy the Property (A). Then for any* $\delta>1$,

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(\exp r^{\rho_g})}\leq\frac{\delta\cdot\overline{\sigma}_g\cdot\rho_h(f)}{\lambda_h(f)}\ .$$

Theorem 3.28. *Let* f *be a meromorphic function,* g *a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;g)=4$ *and* h *a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $\lambda_h(g)>0$, $\rho_h(f)<\infty$, $\overline{\sigma}_g<\infty$ *and also* h *satisfy the Property (A). Then for any* $\delta>1$,

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[g]}(\exp r^{\rho_g})}\leq\frac{\delta\cdot\overline{\sigma}_g\cdot\rho_h(f)}{\lambda_h(g)}\ .$$

Using the concept of the growth indicators τ_g and $\overline{\tau}_g$ of an entire function g, we may state the subsequent four theorems without their proofs since those can be carried out in the line of Theorem 3.25, Theorem 3.26, Theorem 3.27 and Theorem 3.28 respectively.

Theorem 3.29. *Let* f *be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;f)=4$, g *be entire and* h *a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $0<\lambda_h(f)\leq\rho_h(f)<\infty$, $\overline{\tau}_g<\infty$ *and also* h *satisfy the Property (A). Then for any* $\delta>1$,

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log T_h^{-1}T_{f\circ g}(r)}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1}T_{M[f]}(\exp r^{\lambda_g})}\leq\frac{\delta\cdot\overline{\tau}_g\cdot\rho_h(f)}{\lambda_h(f)}\ .$$

Theorem 3.30. *Let* f *be a meromorphic function,* g *a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;g)=4$ *and* h *a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}}\delta_1(a;h)=4$, $\lambda_h(g)>0$, $\rho_h(f)<\infty$, $\overline{\tau}_g<\infty$ *and also* h *satisfy the*

Property (A). Then for any $\delta > 1$,

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{\log T_h^{-1} T_{f\circ g}(r)}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1} T_{M[g]}(\exp r^{\lambda_g})} \leq \frac{\delta \cdot \overline{\tau}_g \cdot \rho_h(f)}{\lambda_h(g)} .$$

Theorem 3.31. *Let* f *be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; f) = 4$, g *be entire and* h *a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; h) = 4$, $0 < \lambda_h(f) \leq \rho_h(f) < \infty$, $\tau_g < \infty$ *and also* h *satisfy the Property (A). Then for any* $\delta > 1$,

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{\log T_h^{-1} T_{f\circ g}(r)}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1} T_{M[f]}(\exp r^{\lambda_g})} \leq \frac{\delta \cdot \tau_g \cdot \rho_h(f)}{\lambda_h(f)} .$$

Theorem 3.32. *Let* f *be a meromorphic function,* g *a transcendental entire function of finite order or of non-zero lower order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; g) = 4$ *and* h *a transcendental entire function of regular growth having non zero finite order with* $\sum_{a\in\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}} \delta_1(a; h) = 4$, $\lambda_h(g) > 0$, $\rho_h(f) < \infty$, $\tau_g < \infty$ *and also* h *satisfy the Property (A). Then for any* $\delta > 1$,

$$\liminf_{r\to\infty} \frac{\log T_h^{-1} T_{f\circ g}(r)}{\log T_{M[h]}^{-1} T_{M[g]}(\exp r^{\lambda_g})} \leq \frac{\delta \cdot \tau_g \cdot \rho_h(f)}{\lambda_h(g)} .$$

References

[1] Bernal, L., *Crecimiento relativo de funciones enteras. Contribución al estudio de lasfunciones enteras con índice exponencialfinito*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Seville, Spain, 1984.

[2] Bernal, L., *Orden relative de crecimiento de funciones enteras*, Collect. Math., Vol:39 (1988), 209-229.

[3] Bergweiler, W., *On the Nevanlinna characteristic of a composite function*, Complex Variables, Vol:10 (1988), 225-236.

[4] Bergweiler, W., *On the growth rate of composite meromorphic functions*, Complex Variables, Vol:14 (1990), 187-196.

[5] Doeringer, W., *Exceptional values of differential polynomials*, Pacific J. Math., Vol:98, No.1 (1982), 55-62.

[6] Datta, S. K. and Biswas, T., *On a result of Bergweiler*, International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics (IJPAM), Vol:51, No. 1 (2009), 33-37.

[7] Datta, S. K. and Jha, A., *On the weak type of meromorphic functions*, Int. Math. Forum, Vol:4, No.12 (2009), 569-579.

[8] Datta, S. K. and Biswas, A., *On relative type of entire and meromorphic functions*, Advances in Applied Mathematical Analysis, Vol:8, No.2 (2013),63-75.

[9] Datta, S. K., Biswas, T. and Biswas, C., *Measure of growth ratios of composite entire and meromorphic functions with a focus on relative order*, International J. of Math. Sci. & Engg. Appls. (IJMSEA), Vol:8, No. IV (July, 2014), 207-218.

[10] Datta, S. K., Biswas, T. and Bhattacharyya, S., *On relative order and relative type based growth properties of differential monomials*, Journal of the Indian Math. Soc., Vol. 82, Nos. (3 - 4), (2015), pp. 39–52.

[11] Hayman, W. K. *Meromorphic Functions*, The Clarendon Press, Oxford (1964).

[12] Lahiri, I. and Sharma, D. K., *Growth of composite entire and meromorphic functions*, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math., Vol:26, No.5 (1995), 451-458.

[13] Lahiri, B. K. and Banerjee, D., *Relative order of entire and meromorphic functions*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. India Ser. A., Vol:69(A), No. 3 (1999), 339-354.

[14] Roy, C., *Some properties of entire functions in one and several complex vaiables*, Ph.D. Thesis (2010), University of Calcutta.
[15] Valiron, G., *Lectures on the general theory of integral functions*, Chelsea Publishing Company, 1949.
[16] Yang, L., *Value distribution theory and new research on it*, Science Press, Beijing (1982).
[17] Yi, H. X., *On a result of Singh*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc., Vol:41 (1990), 417-420.

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

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