Existence of Invariant Measures for Transcendental Subexpanding Functions

Janina Kotus*
Faculty of Mathematics
and Information Sciences
Warsaw University of Technology
Warsaw 00-661, Poland.
Email: janinak@panim.impan.gov.pl
and
Mariusz Urbański†
Department of Mathematics
University of North Texas
P.O. Box 311430
Denton TX 76203-1430, USA.
Email: urbanski@unt.edu,
Web: http://www.math.unt.edu/~urbanski
Fax:940-565-4805

January 4, 2002

Abstract

We consider the problem of the existence of absolutely continuous invariant measures for transcendental meromorphic functions. We prove sufficient conditions for a subexpanding meromorphic function f to have σ-finite absolutely continuous invariant measure μ and we find a class of functions satisfying these assumptions.

*Supported in part by the Foundation for Polish Science, the Polish KBN Grant No 2 P03A 009 17 and TUW Grant no 504A 112000442200
†Supported in part by the NSF grant DMS 9801583

1 Introduction

The orbits of points under iteration by a meromorphic function fall into three categories: they may be infinite, they may become periodic and hence consist of a finite number of distinct points or they may terminate at a pole of the function. Points in the last category are called *prepoles*. For transcendental meromorphic functions with more than one pole, it follows from Picard's theorem that there are infinitely many prepoles.

The *Fatou set* $F(f)$ of a meromorphic function $f : \mathbb{C} \to \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ is defined in exactly the same manner as for rational functions; $F(f)$ is the set of points $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that all the iterates are defined and form a normal family on a neighborhood of z. The *Julia set* $J(f)$ is the complement of $F(f)$ in $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$. Thus, $F(f)$ is open, $J(f)$ is closed, $F(f)$ is completely invariant while $f^{-1}(J(f)) \subset J(f)$ and $f(J(f) \setminus \{\infty\}) = J(f)$. For description of the dynamics of meromorphic functions see e.g. [3]. We would however like to note that it easily follows from Montel's criterion of normality that if $f : \mathbb{C} \to \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ is either entire or has exactly one pole w and $w \notin f(\mathbb{C})$ (such functions f will be called subentire and for them $f : \mathbb{C} \setminus \{w\} \to \mathbb{C} \setminus \{w\}$ is well-defined), then there exists a set $E \subset \mathbb{C}$ consisting of at most one element and such that for every $z \in J(f) \setminus \{\infty\}$ if f is entire and for every $z \in J(f) \setminus \{w, \infty\}$ if f is subentire, every $r > 0$ and every $q \geq 1$

$$\bigcup_{n \geq 1} f^{qn}(B(z, r)) \supset \mathbb{C} \setminus E.$$

In the sequel E will be called the set of omitted values of f. It can be also defined for meromorphic functions which are not subentire. If f is meromorphic but not subentire nor entire, then (see [3])

$$J(f) = \overline{\bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(\infty)}.$$

The *singular set* $S(f) \subset \mathbb{C}$ of a meromorphic function f consists of those values at which f is not a regular covering. These are either critical values (algebraic singularities) or asymptotic values (transcendental singularities). The *postsingular set* $P(f)$ is the union of the forward orbits of all singular values, i.e.

$$P(f) = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f^n(S(f)).$$

If a singular value is a prepole (belongs to $\bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(\infty)$), we take the images in this union only until the image is equal to ∞ and then we stop. It follows from Iversen's (see [8]) theorem that $E \subset S(f)$ and, and consequently, $E \subset \overline{P(f)}$. By l_2 we denote the Lebesgue measure on the plane and by m the measure induced by the spherical metric on $\overline{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. Note that both measures l_2 and m are equivalent in the sense that they have the same sets of measure zero. Let

$$I_\infty(f) = \{z : f^n(z) \to \infty\}.$$

Given $z \in \mathbb{C}$ let $\omega(z)$ be the ω-limit set of z, i.e. the set of all accumulation points in $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ of the sequence $\{f^n(z)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$.

M. Lyubich has proved in [11] that there is no σ-finite measure absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure l_2 and invariant under the action of the map $z \mapsto e^z$. Aiming to give a positive contribution in the opposite direction we shall prove as our main result the following.

Theorem 1. *Let $f : \mathbb{C} \to \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ be a transcendental meromorphic function satisfying the following two conditions:*

(a) $J(f) = \overline{\mathbb{C}}$

(b) $l_2(\{z : \omega(z) \subset \overline{P(f)} \cup \{\infty\}\}) = 0$

then there exists a σ-finite ergodic conservative f-invariant measure μ equivalent with the Lebesgue measure l_2.

Recall that ergodicity means that if G is a Borel set satisfying $f^{-1}(G) = G$, then either $\mu(G) = 0$ or $\mu(G^c) = 0$ and conservativity means that for every set G with positive measure, the measure of those z for which $f^n(z) \in G$ only for finitely many n's is equal to zero. Of course condition (b) implies that $l_2(I_\infty(f)) = 0$. Note that due to Lyubich's result from [11] the condition (b) of Theorem 1 fails for the function $z \mapsto e^z$ and due to Bock's result from [6] it fails for the map $z \mapsto \tan\left(\frac{\pi i z}{2}\right)$. The simplest examples of functions satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1 are given by the formula $f(z) = 2\pi i e^z$ and $g(z) = \pi i \tan(z)$. We also present below a larger class of meromorphic functions satisfying the assumptions of this theorem. As an immediate consequence of Theorem 1 we get the following.

Corollary 1. *Let*

$$f(z) = \frac{Ae^{z^p} + Be^{-z^p}}{Ce^{z^p} + De^{-z^p}}$$

$p \in \mathbb{N}$, $AD - BC \neq 0$. *If f satisfies the following conditions*

i) $J(f) = \overline{\mathbb{C}}$

ii) $l_2(\{z : \omega(z) \subset \overline{P(f)} \cup \{\infty\}\}) = 0$

then there exists a σ-finite ergodic conservative f-invariant measure μ equivalent with the Lebesgue measure m.

As the first step aiming to verify the assumptions of this corollary we shall prove the following.

Theorem 2. *If*

$$f(z) = \frac{Ae^{z^p} + Be^{-z^p}}{Ce^{z^p} + De^{-z^p}}$$

$p \in \mathbb{N}$, $AD - BC \neq 0$, *then* $l_2(I_\infty(f)) = 0$.

We will frequently use the following two versions of Koebe's distortion theorem.

Theorem A. (Koebe's Distortion Theorem, I) *There exists a function $k : [0, 1) \to [1, \infty)$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$, all $r > 0$, all $t \in [0, 1)$ and any univalent analytic function $H : B(z, r) \to \mathbb{C}$, we have*

$$\sup\{|H'(x)| : x \in B(z, tr)\} \leq k(t) \inf\{|H'(x)| : x \in B(z, tr)\}.$$

We put $K = k(1/2)$.

Theorem B. (Koebe's Distortion Theorem, II) *Given a number $s > 0$ there exists a function $k : [0, 1) \to [1, \infty)$ such that for any $z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$, $r > 0$, $t \in [0, 1)$ and any univalent analytic function $H : B(z, r) \to \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ such that the complement $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus H(B(z, r))$ contains a ball of radius s we have*

$$\sup\{|H'(x)| : x \in B(z, tr)\} \leq k(t) \inf\{|H'(x)| : x \in B(z, tr)\}.$$

2 Proof of Theorem 1

We start with the description of our setting. Let X be a compact metric space, m be a Borel measure such that $m(X) = 1$. Suppose $T : X \to X$ is a measurable map and m is a quasi-invariant measure, i.e. $m \circ T^{-1} << m$. In the proof of Theorem 1 we apply the following result of M. Martens (see [12]).

Theorem 2.1. *Let (X, m, T) be as above. Suppose we have a partition $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i : i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}$ of X such that A_i are Borel sets of positive measure, $m(X \setminus \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} A_i) = 0$ and they satisfy the following conditions:*

1. *T is ergodic and conservative with respect to the measure m.*
2. *$\forall i, j \geq 0\ \exists k \geq 0$ such that up to measure zero $T^k(A_i) \supset A_j$*
3. *$\forall i \geq 0\ \exists K_i \geq 1$, for all Borel sets $A, B \subset A_i$ and for all integers $n \geq 0$*
$$\frac{m(T^{-n}(A))}{m(T^{-n}(B))} \leq K_i \frac{m(A)}{m(B)}.$$

Then there exists σ-finite ergodic conservative measure μ equivalent with m and such that
$$\mu \circ T^{-1} = \mu$$
and for every Borel set A
$$\mu(A) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{n} m(T^{-k}(A))}{\sum_{k=0}^{n} m(T^{-k}(A_0))}.$$
(Note that due to conservativity of f, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} m(T^{-k}(A_0)) = \infty$.)

Let $f : \mathbb{C} \to \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ be a transcendental meromorphic function such that
$$l_2(\{z : \omega(z) \subset \overline{P(f)} \cup \{\infty\}\}) = 0.$$
Obviously this assumption implies that
$$l_2(\overline{P(f)}) = 0. \tag{1}$$
First we construct the partition $\mathcal{A}$, next we check that it satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2.1. We define a new metric on the plane $\mathbb{C}$ by putting
$$d_{min}(x, y) := \min\{1, |x - y|)\}$$
and we consider the family of balls
$$\left\{B\left(z, \frac{1}{2} d_{min}(z, \overline{P(f)})\right)\right\}_{z\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\overline{P(f)}}.$$
This family obviously covers $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{P(f)}$. Since $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{P(f)}$ is an open set, it is a Lindelöf space, and therefore we can choose a countable subcover of $\mathbb{C}\setminus\overline{P(f)}$, which we denote by
$$\left\{B\left(z_i, \frac{1}{2} d_{min}(z_i, \overline{P(f)})\right)\right\}_{i=1}^{\infty}.$$

We inductively define a partition $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{P(f)}$ as follows. Let

$$A_0 = \left\{ B\left(z_0, \frac{1}{2} d_{min}(z_0, \overline{P(f)})\right) \right\}.$$

Assume that we have defined the set $A_1, \dots, A_n$ such that

$$A_j \subset \left\{ B\left(z_j, \frac{1}{2} d_{min}(z_j, \overline{P(f)})\right) \right\}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Int} A_j \neq \emptyset.$$

Then A_{n+1} we define as

$$A_{n+1} = \left\{ B\left(z_{n+1}, \frac{1}{2} d_{min}(z_{n+1}, \overline{P(f)})\right) \right\} \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} A_j.$$

The set A_{n+1} is disjoint with the sets $A_1, \dots, A_n$ and

$$A_{n+1} \subset B\left(z_{n+1}, \frac{1}{2} d_{min}(z_{n+1}, \overline{P(f)})\right) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} B\left(z_j, \frac{1}{2} d_{min}(z_j, \overline{P(f)})\right).$$

Thus either $A_{n+1} = \emptyset$ or $\mathrm{Int} A_{n+1} \neq \emptyset$ and we remove all the empty sets.

Remark 1. *Since $\mathcal{A}$ is the partition of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{P(f)}$, we have $S(f) \cap A_j = \emptyset$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.*

Lemma 2.2. *Let $f : \mathbb{C} \to \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ be a transcendental meromorphic function. If $z \in J(f) \setminus \{\infty\}$, $r > 0$ and $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a compact set disjoint from the exceptional set E, then there exists $n \geq 1$ such that $f^n(B(z,r)) \supset K$.*

Proof: Suppose first that f is either entire or subentire. Since due to Baker's and Bhattacharyya's theorem (see [1] and [4], comp. [3]), the set of repelling periodic points is dense in the Julia set, we see that there exists a periodic point $x \in B(z,r)$, say of period $q \geq 1$. Since x is repelling there exists $s > 0$ so small that $B(x,s) \subset B(z,r)$ and $f^q(B(x,s)) \supset B(x,s)$. Since $\bigcup_{j\geq 1} f^{qj}(B(x,s)) \supset \mathbb{C} \setminus E$, since K is a compact subset of $\mathbb{C} \setminus E$ and since $\{f^{qj}(B(x,s))\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is an increasing family of open sets, there thus exists $k \geq 1$ such that $f^{qk}(B(x,s)) \supset K$. So, we are done in this case. Assume in turn that f is not entire nor subentire. Then $\overline{\bigcup_{n\geq 1} f^{-n}(\infty)} = \mathbb{C}$ and fix a point

$$w \in B(z,r) \cap \bigcup_{n\geq 1} f^{-n}(\infty).$$

So, $w \in f^{-n}(\infty)$ for some $n \geq 1$ and there exists $t > 0$ so small that $B(w,t) \cap \bigcup_{j=0}^{n-1} f^{-j}(\infty) = \emptyset$. Hence $f^n(B(w,t))$ is well-defined and it forms an open neighbourhood of $\infty \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$. Since ∞ is an essential singularity of f, by Picard's theorem the set $f(f^n(B(w,t)) \setminus \{\infty\})$ contains the whole $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$. The proof is complete. ∎

As an immediate consequence of this lemma we get the following.

Corollary 2.3. *Let $f : \mathbb{C} \to \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ be a transcendental meromorphic function such that $J(f) = \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ and $l_2(\{z : \omega(z) \subset \overline{P(f)} \cup \{\infty\}\}) = 0$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a partition defined above, then $l_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} A_i) = 0$ and $\mathcal{A}$ satisfies the second assumption of Theorem 2.1 i.e.*

$$\forall i,j \geq 0 \;\; \exists k \geq 0 \text{ such that up to measure zero } f^k(A_i) \supset A_j.$$

Lemma 2.4. *Let $f : \mathbb{C} \to \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ be a transcendental meromorphic function such that $J(f) = \overline{\mathbb{C}}$. If $l_2(\{z : \omega(z) \subset \overline{P(f)} \cup \{\infty\}\}) = 0$, then f is ergodic an conservative with respect to the measure m.*

Proof: Let $\overline{P(f)}_{\_} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \omega(z) \subset \overline{P(f)} \cup \{\infty\}\}$. We shall prove first that every forward invariant ($f(F) \subset F$) subset F of $J(f)$ is either of measure 0 or 1. Indeed, suppose on the contrary that $0 < m(F) < 1$. Since $m(\overline{P(f)}_{\_}) = 0$, it suffices to show that

$$m(F \setminus \overline{P(f)}_{\_}) = 0.$$

Denote by Z the set of all points $z \in F \setminus \overline{P(f)}_{\_}$ such that

$$\lim_{r \to 0} \frac{m(B(z,r) \cap (F \setminus \overline{P(f)}_{\_}))}{m(B(z,r))} = 1. \tag{2}$$

In view of the Lebesgue density theorem (see for example Theorem 2.9.11 in [7]), $m(Z) = m(F)$. Since $m(F) > 0$ we find at least one point $z \in Z$. Since $z \in J(f) \setminus \overline{P(f)}_{\_}$, there exists $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{P(f)}$ and an increasing sequence $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ such that

$$x = \lim_{k \to \infty} f^{n_k}(z) \;\text{ and } |f^{n_k}(z) - x| < \delta/2$$

for every $k \geq 1$, where $\delta = \mathrm{dist}(x, \overline{P(f)}) > 0$. Suppose that $m(B(x,\delta) \setminus F) = 0$. Obviously $m(f(Y)) = 0$ for all Borel sets Y such that $m(Y) = 0$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = m\big(f^n(B(x,\delta) \setminus F)\big) &\geq m\big(f^n(B(x,\delta)) \setminus f^n(F)\big) \\ &\geq m\big(f^n(B(x,\delta)) \setminus F\big) \geq m\big(f^n(B(x,\delta))\big) - m(F) \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

for all $n \geq 0$. Since by Lemma 2.2, $\sup_{n\geq 1}\{m\big(f^n(B(x,\delta))\big)\} = 1$, this implies that $0 \geq 1-m(F)$ which is a contradiction. Consequently $m(B(x,\delta)\backslash F) > 0$. Hence for every $j \geq 1$ large enough, $m\big(B(f^{n_j}(z), 2\delta)\backslash F\big) \geq m\big(B(x,\delta)\backslash F\big) > 0$. Therefore, as $f^{-1}(J(f)\backslash F) \subset J(f)\backslash F$, the standard application of Koebe's Distortion Theorem II (Theorem B) shows that

$$\limsup_{r\to 0} \frac{m(B(z,r) \setminus F)}{m(B(z,r))} > 0$$

which contradicts (2). Thus either $m(F) = 0$ or $m(F) = 1$. In particular ergodicity is proven and conservativity is now straightforward. One needs to prove that for every Borel set $B \subset J(f)$ with $m(B) > 0$ one has $m(G) = 0$, where

$$G = \{x \in J(f) : \sum_{n\geq 0} \chi_B(f^n(x)) < +\infty\}.$$

Indeed, suppose that $m(G) > 0$ and for all $n \geq 0$ let

$$G_n = \{x \in J(f) : \sum_{k\geq n} \chi_B(f^n(x)) = 0\} = \{x \in J(f) : f^k(x) \notin B \text{ for all } k \geq n\}.$$

Since $G = \bigcup_{n\geq 0} G_n$, there exists $k \geq 0$ such that $m(G_k) > 0$. Since all the sets G_n are forward invariant we conclude that $m(G_k) = 1$. But on the other hand all the sets $f^{-n}(B)$, $n \geq k$, are of positive measure and are disjoint from G_k. This contradiction finishes the proof. ■

Remark 2. *Notice that it immediately follows from this lemma that the set of transitive points of f has full measure, the result proven by H. Bock in [5] and [6].*

Lemma 2.5. *Let $f : \mathbb{C} \to \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ be a transcendental meromorphic function such that $l_2(\{z : \omega(z) \subset \overline{P(f)} \cup \{\infty\}\}) = 0$. If $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ is a partition defined above, then for every $i \geq 0$ there exists $K_i \geq 1$ such that for each $n \geq 0$ and all Borel sets $A, B \subset A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ with $m(B) > 0$, we have*

$$\frac{m(f^{-n}(A))}{m(f^{-n}(B))} \leq K_i \frac{m(A)}{m(B)}.$$

Proof: Fix $i \geq 0$. Note that all holomorphic invese branches of f^n, $n \geq 1$, are well-defined on $(B(z_i, (1/2)d_{min}(z_i, \overline{P(f)}))$. Denote the set they form by $\mathcal{F}_i$. It is well-known (see [2] where the proof is provided in the setting of rational functions) that $\mathcal{F}_i$ is a normal family. Since $J(f) = \overline{\mathbb{C}}$, all the limit functions of $\mathcal{F}_i$ are constant. Therefore there exists $r_i > 0$ such that if $f_\nu^{-n} \in \mathcal{F}_i$, then $f_\nu^{-n}(B(z_i, (3/4)d_{min}(z_i, \overline{P(f)}))$ is disjoint from a ball of radius r_i (with respect to the spherical metric). It therefore follows from Koebe's Distortion Theorem, II (Theorem B) that there exists $\tilde{K}_i \geq 1$ such that

$$\frac{|(f_\nu^{-n})'(y)|_\rho}{|(f_\nu^{-n})'(x)|_\rho} \leq \tilde{K}_i$$

for all $f_\nu^{-n} \in \mathcal{F}_i$ and all $x, y \in B(z_i, (1/2)d_{min}(z_i, \overline{P(f)}))$, where the subscript ρ indicates that the derivative is taken with respect to the spherical metric. Hence for all Borel sets $A, B \subset A_i$ we get

$$\frac{m(f_\nu^{-n}(A))}{m(f_\nu^{-n}(B))} = \frac{\int_A |(f_\nu^{-n})'|_\rho^2 dm}{\int_A |(f_\nu^{-n})'|_\rho^2 dm} \leq \frac{\sup_{A_i}\{|(f_\nu^{-n})'|_\rho\}^2 m(A)}{\inf_{A_i}\{|(f_\nu^{-n})'|_\rho\}^2 m(B)} \leq \tilde{K}_i^2 \frac{m(A)}{m(B)}.$$

In order to conclude the argument, note that

$$\begin{aligned} m(f^{-n}(A)) &= \sum_{\mathcal{F}_i} m\big(f_\nu^{-n}(A)\big) \leq \sum_{\mathcal{F}_i} \tilde{K}_i^2 \frac{m(A)}{m(B)} m\big(f_\nu^{-n}(B)\big) \\ &= \tilde{K}_i^2 \frac{m(A)}{m(B)} \sum_{\mathcal{F}_i} m\big(f_\nu^{-n}(B)\big) = \tilde{K}_i^2 \frac{m(A)}{m(B)} m(f^{-n}(B)) \end{aligned}$$

We are done. ■

The proof of Theorem 1 follows now immediately from Corollary 2.3, Lemma 2.4, Lemma 2.5 and from Theorem 2.1.

3 Proof of Theorem 2

The idea of the proof is to obtain good estimates of the derivative of the function f around poles and to follow the scheme worked out in [10]. We can rewrite $f(z)$ in the form

$$f(z) = \frac{Ae^{2z^p} + B}{Ce^{2z^p} + D}.$$

It is easy to calculate that

$$f'(z) = \frac{2p(AD - BC)z^{p-1}e^{2z^p}}{(Ce^{2z^p} + D)^2} = \frac{2p(AD - BC)z^{p-1}e^{2z^p}(f(z))^2}{(Ae^{2z^p} + B)^2} \qquad (4)$$

For $p = 1$ the function f has no critical points. Let $p > 1$. Then $f'(z) = 0$ iff $z = 0$ and $f(0) = \frac{A+B}{C+D}$ is a critical value. Note that the assumption $AD - BC \neq 0$ implies that either $C \neq 0$ or $D \neq 0$. Assume that $C = 0$

then f is a transcendental entire map with one finite asymptotic value $\frac{B}{D}$. Analogously, if $D = 0$ then f is also a transcendental entire map with one finite asymptotic value $\frac{A}{C}$. For transcendental entire function the theorem follows from Theorem 7 in [9]. So, suppose that $C \neq 0$ and $D \neq 0$. It is strightforward to verify that the function $g(z) = (Ae^z + Be^{-z})/(Ce^z + De^{-z})$ satisfies the Riccati equation $g' = a + bg + cg^2$ with $a = -2AB/(AD - BC)$, $b = -2(AD + BC)/(AD - BC)$, $c = 2CD/(AD - BC)$. Since $f(z) = g(z^p)$, we therefore conclude that

$$f'(z) = pz^{p-1}(a + bf(z) + c(f(z))^2). \tag{5}$$

Fix now $R >> 1$, a pole z_q of f with $|z_q| \geq R$. Let $A_R = \{z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}} : |z| \geq R\}$ and let V_q be the connected component of $f^{-1}(A_R)$ containing z_q. Since $c \neq 0$, it then follows from (5) that with R sufficiently large

$$|f'(z)| \geq \frac{p}{2}|c||z|^{p-1}R^2 \geq R^p \tag{6}$$

for all $z \in V_q$. Fix now $R_1 > R$, put $A_{R,R_1} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : R < |z| < R_1\}$ and consider $\tilde{V}_{q,R_1}$, the connected component of $f^{-1}(A_{R,R_1})$ enclosing (in $\mathbb{C}$) the point z_q. It then follows from (5) that

$$|f'(z)| \leq 2p|c||z|^{p-1}R_1^2 \tag{7}$$

for all $z \in \tilde{V}_{q,R_1}$. Combining this with the first part of (6) we get that

$$\frac{\sup_{z \in \tilde{V}_{q,R_1}} |f'(z)|}{\inf_{z \in \tilde{V}_{q,R_1}} |f'(z)|} \leq L = 4C\left(\frac{R_1}{R}\right)^2, \tag{8}$$

where

$$C = \sup_q \frac{\sup\{|z| : z \in V_q\}}{\inf\{|z| : z \in V_q\}} < \infty$$

if R is large enough.

Since the map g is the composition of a Möbius transformation and the map $z \mapsto e^{2z}$ for every q large enough and since each holomorphic branch of $z^{1/p}$ sending the point z_q^p to z_q is univalent on the balls containing z_q^p, so big that applying Koebe's Distortion Theorem I (Theorem A) produces some radius γ_q such that

$$B(z_q, \gamma_q/4) \subset V_q \subset B(z_q, \gamma_q/2). \tag{9}$$

Let $\mathcal{V} = f^{-1}(A_R)$. A straightforward calculations show that

$$\lim_{R_1 \to \infty} \frac{l_2(A_{R,R_1} \setminus \mathcal{V})}{l_2(A_{R,R_1})} = 1 \tag{10}$$

and

$$\lim_{R_1\to\infty}\frac{l_2\left(\tilde V_{q,R_1}\right)}{l_2(V_q)}=1 \tag{11}$$

uniformly with respect to q. Therefore for every $R_1>0$ large enough

$$\frac{l_2(A_{R,R_1}\setminus\mathcal{V})}{l_2(A_{R,R_1})}\geq\frac{1}{2}\quad\text{and}\quad\frac{l_2\left(\tilde V_{q,R_1}\right)}{l_2(V_q)}\geq\frac{1}{2}. \tag{12}$$

We want to show that for every q we have

$$\frac{l_2(V_q\setminus f^{-1}(\mathcal{V}))}{l_2(V_q)}\geq(4L^2)^{-1}, \tag{13}$$

where L is the upper bound on distortion given by (8). And indeed, using (8) and (12), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{l_2(V_q\setminus f^{-1}(\mathcal{V}))}{l_2(V_q)}&=\frac{l_2([(V_q\setminus\tilde V_{q,R_1})\setminus f^{-1}(\mathcal{V})]\cup[\tilde V_{q,R_1}\setminus f^{-1}(\mathcal{V})])}{l_2(V_q)}\\&\geq\frac{l_2(\tilde V_{q,R_1}\setminus f^{-1}(\mathcal{V}))}{l_2(V_q)}=\frac{l_2(f_q^{-1}(A_{R,R_1}\setminus\mathcal{V}))}{l_2(f_q^{-1}(A_{R,R_1}))}\cdot\frac{l_2(\tilde V_{q,R_1})}{l_2(V_q)}\\&\geq\frac{1}{2}L^{-2}\frac{l_2(A_{R,R_1}\setminus\mathcal{V})}{l_2(A_{R,R_1})}\geq(4L^2)^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Suppose now on the contrary that $l_2(I_\infty(f))>0$. Since

$$I_\infty(f)\subset\bigcap_{n\geq1}\bigcup_{k\geq n}\bigcap_{l\geq k}f^{-l}(A_R)$$

there in particular exists $k\geq1$ such that $l_2\left(I_\infty(f)\cap\bigcap_{j\geq k}f^{-j}(A_R)\right)>0$. Let ξ_0 be a density point of the Lebesgue measure of the set $I_\infty(f)\cap\bigcap_{j\geq k}f^{-j}(A_R)$. For every $n\geq0$ put

$$\xi_n=f^n(\xi_0).$$

Since $\lim_{n\to\infty}\xi_n=\infty$, for every n large enough there exists $q(n)$ such that $\xi_n\in V_{q(n)}$, $\lim_{n\to\infty}|\xi_n^p-z_{q(n)}^p|=0$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty}q(n)=\infty$. Hence, using Koebe's Distortion Theorem I (Theorem A), we deduce that for all n large enough $|\xi_n-z_{q(n)}|\leq\gamma_{q(n)}/8$ (γ_q are the numbers defined in (9)) and combining this with (9), we conclude that

$$B(\xi_n,\gamma_{q(n)}/8)\subset V_{q(n)}\subset B(\xi_n,\gamma_{q(n)}) \tag{14}$$

Since each ξ_n is also a density point of the set $\bigcap_{j\ge k} f^{-j}(A_R)$, we may if needed replace ξ_0 by an appropriate iterate ξ_n and assume that all the numbers $q(n)$, $n \ge 1$ are so large as one wishes. Since for every q the map $f : V_q \to A_R$ is univalent, there exists its inverse map $g^{(q)} : A_R \to V_q$. Since in addition for all $n \ge 1$, $V_{q(n)} \subset A_R$, therefore the composition

$$g_n = g^{q(0)} \circ g^{q(1)} \circ g^{q(2)} \ldots \circ g^{q(n)} : A_R \to A_R$$

is well-defined (and obviously univalent). Moreover $g_n(V_{q(n)}) \subset V_{q(0)}$. By Koebe's $\frac{1}{4}$-Distortion Theorem and Koebe's Distortion Theorem I (Theorem A), we get

$$B\left(\xi_0, \frac{1}{4}|g_n'(\xi_n)|\gamma_n\right) \subset g_n(B(\xi_n,\gamma_n)) \subset B(\xi_0, K|g_n'(\xi_n)|\gamma_n),$$

where we abbreviated $\gamma_{q(n)}$ to γ_n. Using Koebe's Distortion Theorem I (Theorem A) again along with (14), we can estimate as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{l_2\big(B(\xi_0, K|g_n'(\xi_n)|\gamma_n) \cap f^{-(n+2)}(A_R)\big)}{l_2\big(B((\xi_0, K|g_n'(\xi_n)|\gamma_n)\big)} \\
&= 1 - \frac{l_2\big(B(\xi_0, K|g_n'(\xi_n)|\gamma_n) \setminus f^{-(n+2)}(A_R)\big)}{l_2\big(B((\xi_0, K|g_n'(\xi_n)|\gamma_n)\big)} \\
&\le 1 - \frac{l_2(g_n(B(\xi_n,\gamma_n)) \setminus f^{-(n+2)}(A_R))}{l_2\big(B((\xi_0, K|g_n'(\xi_n)|\gamma_n)\big)} = 1 - \frac{l_2(g_n(B(\xi_n,\gamma_n) \setminus f^{-1}(\mathcal{V})))}{(4K)^2 l_2\big(B(\xi_0, \frac{1}{4}|g_n'(\xi_n)|\gamma_n)\big)} \\
&\le 1 - \frac{1}{16K^2}\frac{l_2(g_n(B(\xi_n,\gamma_n) \setminus f^{-1}(\mathcal{V})))}{l_2\big(g_n(B(\xi_n,\gamma_n))\big)} \le 1 - \frac{1}{16K^4}\frac{l_2\big(B(\xi_n,\gamma_n) \setminus f^{-1}(\mathcal{V})\big)}{l_2\big(B(\xi_n,\gamma_n)\big)} \\
&\le 1 - \frac{1}{2^{10}K^4}\frac{l_2\big(V_{q(n)} \setminus f^{-1}(\mathcal{V})\big)}{l_2\big(B(\xi_n,\gamma_n/8)\big)} \le 1 - \frac{1}{2^{10}K^4}\frac{l_2\big(V_{q(n)} \setminus f^{-1}(\mathcal{V})\big)}{l_2\big(V_{q(n)}\big)} \\
&\le 1 - \frac{1}{2^{12}K^4L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where writing the last inequality we have used (13). Hence, for every $n \ge k$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{l_2\big(B(\xi_0, K|g_n'(\xi_n)|\gamma_n) \cap \bigcap_{j\ge k} f^{-j}(A_R)\big)}{l_2\big(B((\xi_0, K|g_n'(\xi_n)|\gamma_n)\big)} &\le \frac{l_2\big(B(\xi_0, K|g_n'(\xi_n)|\gamma_n) \cap f^{-(n+2)}(A_R)\big)}{l_2\big(B((\xi_0, K|g_n'(\xi_n)|\gamma_n)\big)} \\
&\le 1 - \frac{1}{2^{12}K^4L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus ξ_0 is not a density point of the set $\bigcap_{j\ge k} f^{-j}(A_R)$ and consequently not a density point of the set $I_\infty(f) \cap \bigcap_{j\ge k} f^{-j}(A_R)$. This contradiction finishes the proof of our theorem.

Acknowledgment. The authors wish to thank Feliks Przytycki and Grzegorz Swiatek for their remarks which enabled them to simplify our assumptions. They are also grateful to the referee whose criticism and valuable comments improved the exposition of this article.

References

[1] I. N. Baker, Repulsive fixed points of entire functions, *Math. Z.* 104 (1968), 252-256.

[2] A. F. Beardon, Iteration of rational functions, Springer-Verlag 1991.

[3] W. Bergweiler, Iteration of meromorphic functions. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 29:2 (1993), 151-188.

[4] P. Bhattacharyya, Iteration of analytic functions, PhD Thesis, University of London, 1969.

[5] H. Bock, On the dynamics of entire functions on the Julia set *Result. Math.* 30 (1996), 16-20.

[6] H. Bock, Über das Iterationsverhalten meromorpher Funktionen auf der Juliamenge, PhD Thesis, Aachen, 1998.

[7] H. Federer, Geometric Measure Theory, Springer-Verlag 1969.

[8] A. A. Gol'dberg, I. V. Ostrovskij, Raspredelenie znacenij meromorfnych funkcij. *Moskva 1970, Izdat.Nauka*

[9] A. Eremenko and M. Lyubich. Dynamical properties of some classes of entire functions. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré*, 42 (1992), 989-1020.

[10] L. Keen, J. Kotus, Ergodicity of some classes of meromorphic functions. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn.*, 24 (1999), 133-145.

[11] M. Lyubich, The measurable dynamics of the exponential map, *Siberian J. Math.* 28 (1987), 111-127.

[12] M. Martens. The existence of σ-finite invariant measures, Applications to real one-dimensional dynamics, *Preprint.*