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#### Abstract

It is known that the Fatou set of the map $\exp (z) / z$ defined on the punctured plane $\mathbb{C}^{*}$ is empty. We consider the $M$-set of $\lambda \exp (z) / z$ consisting of all parameters $\lambda$ for which the Fatou set of $\lambda \exp (z) / z$ is empty. We prove that the $M$-set of $\lambda \exp (z) / z$ has infinite area. In particular, the Hausdorff dimension of the $M$-set is 2 . We also discuss the area of complement of the $M$-set.


## §1. Introduction and main results

The exponential family $E_{\lambda}(z)=\lambda \exp (z)$ is the simplest family of transcendental entire functions which is topologically complete. For $\lambda=1$, the Julia set of $e^{z}$ is the whole complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ (see [11, Main Theorem]). Moreover, it is proved in [8] that for almost all $z \in \mathbb{C}$, the $\omega$-limit set consists of the infinity and the postsingular orbit; in particular, $e^{z}$ is not recurrent. (A map $f$ is recurrent if, for every set $K$ of positive area, there is an integer $n \geq 1$ such that $f^{n}(K) \cap K$ has positive area, where $f^{n}$ is the $n$th iterate of $f$.) For the exponential family $E_{\lambda}(z)=\lambda \exp (z)$, the $M$-set of all $\lambda$-values for which $E_{\lambda}$ has no Fatou set was first studied in [7], where some topological structure of the $M$-set was described. From [12], one knows that the $M$-set has Hausdorff dimension 2. But it is still unknown whether the $M$-set has positive area. (For more information about the dynamics of the exponential family, see, e.g., [4]-[6], [15], [13], [14], [16]-[18].)

The family of functions $F_{\lambda}$ with parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{*}$ mapping the punctured plane $\mathbb{C}^{*}$ to itself, defined by $F_{\lambda}: z \mapsto \lambda \exp (z) / z$, may be regarded as the simplest family of transcendental meromorphic functions on $\mathbb{C}$ with exactly one pole which is a Picard exceptional value. For $\lambda=1$, it is proved in [19, Theorem 1.6] that the set $\Lambda$ of all points in $\mathbb{C}^{*}$ whose $\omega$-limit set of $\exp (z) / z$ does not equal $\{0, \infty\}$ has zero Lebesgue measure. In particular, the map

[^0]$\exp (z) / z$ is not recurrent. Moreover, the set $\Lambda$ has Hausdorff dimension 2 (see [20, Theorem 1.1]). In this paper, we consider the $M$-set of $F_{\lambda}$ consisting of all parameters $\lambda$ for which the Fatou set of $F_{\lambda}$ is empty. Before stating the main result, let us introduce some notation and definitions.

Notation. Let $\mathbb{C}$ denote the complex plane, let $\mathbb{C}^{*}=\mathbb{C} \backslash\{0\}$ denote the punctured plane, and let $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}=\mathbb{C} \cup\{\infty\}$. Let $F_{\lambda}^{n}$ be the $n$th iterate of $F_{\lambda}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\mathcal{J}\left(F_{\lambda}\right)$ be the Julia set of $F_{\lambda}$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{*}$. For $\rho>0$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$, let $D(z, \rho)$ denote an open disk centered at $z$ with radius $\rho$. For a bounded set $X \subset \mathbb{C}$, let area $(X)$ denote the Euclidean area of $X$.

## Definitions.

(1) The $\omega$-limit set of $F_{\lambda}$ at $z \in \mathbb{C}^{*}$, denoted by $\omega_{F_{\lambda}}(z)$, consists of all accumulation points of $\left\{F_{\lambda}^{n}(z)\right\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ on $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$.
(2) As in [19], we denote

$$
F(z)=\exp (z) / z
$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^{*}$. Recall that 1 is the only critical point of $F_{\lambda}: z \mapsto \lambda \exp (z) / z$. Furthermore, let

$$
G_{n}(\lambda)=F_{\lambda}^{n+1}(1)
$$

for $n \geq 1$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{*}$. Moreover, define

$$
\begin{aligned}
W & =\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{*} \mid \omega_{F_{\lambda}}(1) \subset\{0, \infty\}\right\} \\
M & =\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{*} \mid \mathcal{J}\left(F_{\lambda}\right)=\mathbb{C}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
M^{c}=\mathbb{C}^{*} \backslash M
$$

We prove the following.
Main Theorem. The $M$-set of the family $F_{\lambda}$ has infinite area. In particular, the Hausdorff dimension of the $M$-set is 2 .

Remark. The Main Theorem leads us to pose the following question: Does the complement of the $M$-set have infinite area? In the end, we show that the area of complement of the $M$-set is positive. In this paper, we are not able to prove that the complement of the $M$-set has finite or infinite area.

## §2. Preliminary lemmas

Lemma 2.1. The set $W$ is contained in the set $M$.
Proof. Note that for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{*}, F_{\lambda}$ has exactly one critical point 1 and one asymptotic value 0 , which implies that $F_{\lambda}$ has exactly two finite singular values, 0 and $\lambda e$. It follows that $F_{\lambda}$ has neither Baker domains nor wandering domains (see [1], [2], [9]).

If $\lambda \in W$, then any accumulation point of forward iterations of the critical point can be only either 0 or $\infty$; this implies that the closure of the forward orbit of the critical point contains no line segment. Using the facts that the boundary of a Siegel disk or a Herman ring is contained in the closure of the forward orbits of the singular values and that any periodic attracting or parabolic component of $F_{\lambda}$ will attract the forward orbit of a singular value (see [2]), we can conclude that $F$ has no Siegel disks, Herman rings, or attracting or parabolic periodic components. Therefore, the Fatou set of $F_{\lambda}$ is empty, and the Julia set of $F_{\lambda}$ is the whole complex plane $\mathbb{C}$. Hence, the set $W$ is contained in the set $M$.

The following is well known (refer to [3, Chapter I, Theorem 1.4]).
Lemma 2.2. If $f$ is univalent on a domain $D$, and if $z_{0} \in D$, then

$$
\frac{1}{4}\left|f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)\right| \operatorname{dist}\left(z_{0}, \partial D\right) \leq \operatorname{dist}\left(f\left(z_{0}\right), \partial(f(D))\right) \leq 4\left|f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)\right| \operatorname{dist}\left(z_{0}, \partial D\right)
$$

For two Lebesgue measurable subsets $A$ and $B$ of $\mathbb{C}$, we call

$$
\operatorname{dens}(A, B):=\frac{\operatorname{area}(A \cap B)}{\operatorname{area}(B)}
$$

the density of $A$ in $B$.
Let us introduce a criterion due to McMullen [10], which provides a tool for constructing a nested intersection of dynamically defined sets with positive area.

Lemma 2.3 (Nesting conditions). For all $k \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{E}_{k}$ denote a finite collection of subsets in $\mathbb{C}$ such that every two elements in $\mathcal{E}_{k}$ have an intersection of measure zero, and let $E_{k}$ denote the union of all elements in $\mathcal{E}_{k}$. Suppose that the sequence $\left(\mathcal{E}_{k}\right)_{k \geq 0}$ satisfies the following nesting conditions:
$\left(\mathrm{C}_{1}\right)$ every $U \in \mathcal{E}_{k+1}$ is contained in a unique $U^{\prime} \in \mathcal{E}_{k}$;
$\left(\mathrm{C}_{2}\right)$ every $U^{\prime} \in \mathcal{E}_{k}$ contains at least one element of $\mathcal{E}_{k+1}$;
$\left(\mathrm{C}_{3}\right)$ for all $k$ and all $U$ in $\mathcal{E}_{k}$,

$$
\operatorname{dens}\left(E_{k+1}, U\right) \geq \Delta_{k}
$$

Then for the set $E:=\bigcap_{k=0}^{\infty} E_{k}$, we have

$$
\operatorname{dens}\left(E, E_{0}\right) \geq \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \Delta_{k}
$$

## §3. Proof of Main Theorem

For $m, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, define

$$
S_{m, l}:=\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid m \leq \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \leq m+1, l \leq \operatorname{Im}(\lambda) \leq l+1\}
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{B}:=\left\{S_{m, l} \mid m, l \in \mathbb{Z}\right\}
$$

For all $t>0$, let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& V_{t}^{+}=\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \geq t\} \\
& V_{t}^{-}=\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \leq-t\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded subset. Suppose that $f$ is a univalent function in a neighborhood of $K$. We call

$$
T\left(f_{\mid K}\right):=\frac{\sup _{z \in K}\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|}{\inf _{z \in K}\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|}
$$

the distortion of $f$ on $K$. It is easy to see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
T\left(f_{\mid K}\right)=T\left(f_{\mid f(K)}^{-1}\right) \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and that, for any two Lebesgue measurable subsets $A$ and $B$ of $K$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{dens}(f(A), f(B)) \leq T\left(f_{\mid K}\right)^{2} \operatorname{dens}(A, B) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the following, all squares are closed squares whose sides are parallel to the coordinate axes. Applying the argument of [21, Lemma 2.5], we have the following.

Lemma 3.1. Let $t>0$ and $Q \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a square with side length 1 . Suppose that $f$ is a univalent map defined in a neighborhood of $Q$ and that there is a constant $C>0$ such that $T\left(f_{\mid Q}\right)<C$. Then for any $z_{0} \in Q$,

$$
\operatorname{dens}\left(\bigcup S_{m, l}, f(Q)\right) \geq 1-C^{3}\left(\frac{2 \sqrt{2} t+21}{\left|f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)\right|}+\frac{12}{C\left|f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)\right|^{2}}\right)
$$

where the union set takes over all $S_{m, l} \in \mathcal{B}$ and $S_{m, l} \subset f(Q) \cap\left(V_{t}^{+} \cup V_{t}^{-}\right)$.
Remark. Lemma 3.1 is for the case of vertical strip $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}||\operatorname{Re}(\lambda)| \geq$ $t\}$, which is a version of [21, Lemma 2.5] for the case of horizontal strip $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}||\operatorname{Im}(\lambda)| \geq t\} ;[21$, Lemma 2.5] is crucial for estimating the area of escaping parameters of the sine family $\lambda \sin z$ in squares lying away from the imaginary axis, since the forward orbits of escaping parameters go away from the imaginary axis. However, for the family $\lambda \exp (z) / z$, the forward orbits of parameters in the set $W$ go away from the real axis or approach 0 (the pole), so Lemma 3.1 is crucial for estimating the area of the set $W$ in squares lying away from the real axis. By the way, the constant $C$ is not essential for application, since the distortion of forward orbits of parameters in the set $W$ is controlled by a power of $e$, while the derivative of their forward orbits is larger than an iterate of the exponential.

To prove the Main Theorem, it suffices to prove the following.
Lemma 3.2. For each square $S_{m, m} \in \mathcal{B}$ with $m \geq 10^{2}$, there is a constant $\alpha>0$ such that

$$
\operatorname{area}\left(S_{m, m} \cap M\right) \geq \alpha
$$

### 3.1. Proof of Lemma 3.2

Take a fixed square $S_{m, m} \in \mathcal{B}$ with $m \geq 10^{2}$. For simplicity, denote

$$
Q_{0}=S_{m, m}, \quad \mathcal{Q}_{0}=\left\{Q_{0}\right\}
$$

and

$$
x_{0}=2 m, \quad x_{n}=2 \cdot \exp ^{n}(m)
$$

for all integers $n \geq 1$, where $\exp ^{n}(m)$ is the $n$th iterate of $m$ under exp. Let $\widetilde{Q}_{0}$ be an open square with the same center of $Q_{0}$ and side length 2 , which is a neighborhood of $Q_{0}$.

Proposition 3.3. The map $G_{1}$ is univalent in $\widetilde{Q}_{0}$ with

$$
\inf _{\lambda \in Q_{0}}\left|G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right| \geq \exp (m e)
$$

and

$$
T\left(G_{1 \mid Q_{0}}\right) \leq \exp (e)
$$

Proof. Recall that

$$
G_{1}(\lambda)=F_{\lambda}^{2}(1)=\exp (\lambda e) / e
$$

Since $\widetilde{Q}_{0}$ is contained in a horizontal strip of width less than $2 \pi / e$ and parallel to the real axis, $G_{1}$ is univalent in $\widetilde{Q}_{0}$.

For all $\lambda \in Q_{0}$, we have $\left|G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right|=\exp (\lambda e) \mid \geq \exp (m e)$. Hence,

$$
\inf _{\lambda \in Q_{0}}\left|G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right| \geq \exp (m e)
$$

and

$$
T\left(G_{1 \mid Q_{0}}\right)=\frac{\sup _{\lambda \in Q_{0}}\left|G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right|}{\inf _{\lambda \in Q_{0}}\left|G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right|} \leq \frac{\exp (m e+e)}{\exp (m e)}=\exp (e)
$$

Since $Q_{0}$ is mapped away by $G_{1}$, we consider the set $G_{1}\left(Q_{0}\right)$. It follows from Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 3.3 that $G_{1}\left(Q_{0}\right) \cap\left(V_{x_{1}}^{+} \cup V_{x_{1}}^{-}\right)$contains many squares in $\mathcal{B}$. So we can define for $\mu \in\{+,-\}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{1,1}^{\mu} & :=\left\{S \in \mathcal{B} \mid S \subset G_{1}\left(Q_{0}\right) \cap V_{x_{1}}^{\mu}\right\}, \\
P_{1} & :=\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{P}_{1,1}^{\mu} \mid \mu \in\{+,-\}} S, \\
\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{\mu} & :=\left\{K \subset Q_{0} \mid G_{1}(K) \in \mathcal{P}_{1,1}^{\mu}\right\}, \\
\mathcal{Q}_{1} & :=\left\{K \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{\mu} \mid \mu \in\{+,-\}\right\}, \\
Q_{1} & :=\bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{Q}_{1}} K
\end{aligned}
$$

From the definitions, we can see that $\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+} \cap \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}=\emptyset$ and that every two elements in $\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{\mu}$ with $\mu \in\{+,-\}$ have an intersection of measure zero. So $\mathcal{Q}_{1}$ is a finite collection of subsets in $\mathbb{C}$ satisfying that every two elements in $\mathcal{Q}_{1}$ have an intersection of measure zero.

Proposition 3.4. For $Q_{0}$, we have

$$
\operatorname{dens}\left(Q_{1}, Q_{0}\right) \geq 1-\exp \left(-\frac{x_{0}}{8}\right)
$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.3, $G_{1}$ is univalent in a neighborhood of $Q_{0}$. We can take an inverse branch of $G_{1}$ which maps $G_{1}\left(\widetilde{Q}_{0}\right)$ to $\widetilde{Q}_{0}$, denoted by $\varphi_{1}$. Using (3.1) and Proposition 3.3, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
T\left(\varphi_{1}\right):=T\left(\varphi_{1 \mid G_{1}\left(Q_{0}\right)}\right)=T\left(G_{1 \mid Q_{0}}\right) \leq \exp (e) \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $m \geq 10^{2}$, applying Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.3 we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \operatorname{dens}\left(P_{1}, G_{1}\left(Q_{0}\right)\right) \\
& \quad \geq 1-\exp (3 e)\left(\frac{2 \sqrt{2} x_{1}+21}{\inf _{\lambda \in Q_{0}}\left|G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right|}+\frac{12}{\exp (e) \cdot\left(\inf _{\lambda \in Q_{0}}\left|G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right|\right)^{2}}\right) \\
& \quad \geq 1-\exp (3 e)\left(\frac{2 \sqrt{2} x_{1}+21}{\exp (m e)}+\frac{12}{\exp (2 m e+e)}\right)  \tag{3.4}\\
& \quad \geq 1-\exp \left(-\frac{x_{0}}{4}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Since $\varphi_{1} \circ G_{1}=\mathrm{id}$ on $Q_{0}$ and $G_{1}\left(Q_{0} \backslash Q_{1}\right) \subset G_{1}\left(Q_{0}\right) \backslash P_{1}$, applying (3.2)(3.4) we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{dens}\left(Q_{1}, Q_{0}\right) & =1-\operatorname{dens}\left(Q_{0} \backslash Q_{1}, Q_{0}\right) \\
& =1-\operatorname{dens}\left(\varphi_{1} \circ G_{1}\left(Q_{0} \backslash Q_{1}\right), \varphi_{1} \circ G_{1}\left(Q_{0}\right)\right) \\
& \geq 1-T\left(\varphi_{1}\right)^{2} \operatorname{dens}\left(G_{1}\left(Q_{0} \backslash Q_{1}\right), G_{1}\left(Q_{0}\right)\right) \\
& \geq 1-T\left(\varphi_{1}\right)^{2} \operatorname{dens}\left(G_{1}\left(Q_{0}\right) \backslash P_{1}, G_{1}\left(Q_{0}\right)\right)  \tag{3.5}\\
& \geq 1-\exp (2 e)\left(1-\operatorname{dens}\left(P_{1}, G_{1}\left(Q_{0}\right)\right)\right) \\
& \geq 1-\exp \left(-\frac{x_{0}}{8}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Proposition 3.5. For each $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}$, the map $G_{2}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{K}$ of $K$ with

$$
\inf _{\lambda \in K}\left|\frac{G_{2}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)}\right| \geq \exp \left(\frac{3 x_{1}}{4}\right)
$$

and

$$
T\left(G_{2 \mid K}\right) \leq \exp (2 e)
$$

For each $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}, G_{3}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{K}$ of $K$ with

$$
\inf _{\lambda \in K}\left|\frac{G_{3}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)}\right| \geq \exp \left(\frac{3 x_{1}}{4}\right)
$$

and

$$
T\left(G_{3 \mid K}\right) \leq \exp (3 e)
$$

Proof. If $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}$, then there is a unique $S \in \mathcal{P}_{1,1}^{+}$such that $G_{1}(K)=S$. Note that $G_{1}\left(\widetilde{Q}_{0}\right)$ is a simply connected domain and contains $S$. Denote

$$
r=\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{1, \operatorname{dist}\left(S, \partial\left(G_{1}\left(\widetilde{Q}_{0}\right)\right)\right)\right\}>0
$$

Let $\widetilde{S}$ be an open square with the same center of $S$ and side length $1+2 r$. Then $\widetilde{S}$ is a neighborhood of $S$ and contained in $V_{x_{1}-1}^{+}$. Recall that $\varphi_{1}$ is the inverse branch of $G_{1}$ which maps $G_{1}\left(\widetilde{Q}_{0}\right)$ to $\widetilde{Q}_{0}$. Define $\widetilde{K}:=\varphi_{1}(\widetilde{S})$; then $\widetilde{K}$ is a neighborhood of $K$ with $\widetilde{K} \subset \widetilde{Q}_{0}$.

Recall that $F(z)=\exp (z) / z$. Suppose that $G_{2}(a)=G_{2}(b)$ with $a, b \in \widetilde{K}$. That is,

$$
a F\left(G_{1}(a)\right)=b F\left(G_{1}(b)\right)
$$

Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
|a-b|\left|F\left(G_{1}(a)\right)\right|=|b|\left|F\left(G_{1}(b)\right)-F\left(G_{1}(a)\right)\right| . \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $G_{1}(\widetilde{K})=\widetilde{S} \subset V_{x_{1}-1}^{+}$and $\widetilde{K} \subset \widetilde{Q}_{0}$, applying Proposition 3.3 we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|F\left(G_{1}(b)\right)-F\left(G_{1}(a)\right)\right| & \geq|a-b| \inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}}\left|\frac{\mathrm{~d} F\left(G_{1}(\lambda)\right)}{\mathrm{d} \lambda}\right| \\
& \geq|a-b|\left(\inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}}\left|F\left(G_{1}(\lambda)\right) G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda) \frac{G_{1}(\lambda)-1}{G_{1}(\lambda)}\right|\right) \\
& \geq|a-b|\left(\inf _{\nu \in \widetilde{Q}_{0}}|F(\nu)|\right)\left(\inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{Q}_{0}}\left|G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right|\right)\left(\inf _{\nu \in \widetilde{S}}\left|\frac{\nu-1}{\nu}\right|\right) \\
& \geq|a-b|\left(\inf _{\nu \in \widetilde{Q}_{0}}|F(\nu)|\right) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \exp (m e-e)
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover,

$$
\left|F\left(G_{1}(a)\right)\right| \leq \sup _{\nu \in \tilde{Q}_{0}}|F(\nu)|
$$

and

$$
\frac{\sup _{\nu \in \widetilde{Q}_{0}}|F(\nu)|}{\inf _{\nu \in \widetilde{Q}_{0}}|F(\nu)|} \leq 2 e^{2}
$$

Since $|b| \geq m-1 \geq 99$, it follows from (3.6) that

$$
4 e^{2}|a-b| \geq 99|a-b| \exp (99 e)
$$

This implies that $a=b$. Therefore, $G_{2}$ is univalent in $\widetilde{K}$.
By calculation,

$$
\begin{align*}
& G_{2}^{\prime}(\lambda)=F\left(G_{1}(\lambda)\right)\left(1+\lambda G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda) \frac{G_{1}(\lambda)-1}{G_{1}(\lambda)}\right)  \tag{3.7}\\
& \frac{G_{2}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)}=F\left(G_{1}(\lambda)\right)\left(\frac{1}{G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)}+\lambda \frac{G_{1}(\lambda)-1}{G_{1}(\lambda)}\right) \tag{3.8}
\end{align*}
$$

Note that $G_{1}(K)=S \subset G_{1}\left(Q_{0}\right) \cap V_{x_{1}}^{+}$and $K \subset Q_{0}$. Then $|\lambda| \geq m \geq 10^{2}$ for all $\lambda \in K$ and $|\nu| \leq \exp \left(2 x_{0}\right)$ for all $\nu \in S$. Using Proposition 3.3 with (3.7) and (3.8), we have

$$
\inf _{\lambda \in K}\left|\frac{G_{2}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)}\right| \geq \inf _{\nu \in S}|F(\nu)| \cdot \frac{1}{2} \inf _{\lambda \in K}|\lambda| \geq \frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\exp \left(x_{1}\right)}{\exp \left(2 x_{0}\right)} \geq \exp \left(\frac{3 x_{1}}{4}\right)
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
T\left(G_{2 \mid K}\right) & \leq \frac{\sup _{\nu \in S}|F(\nu)|}{\inf _{\nu \in S}|F(\nu)|} \cdot \frac{\sup _{\lambda \in K}\left|1+\lambda G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda) \frac{G_{1}(\lambda)-1}{G_{1}(\lambda)}\right|}{\inf _{\lambda \in K}\left|1+\lambda G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda) \frac{G_{1}(\lambda)-1}{G_{1}(\lambda)}\right|} \\
& \leq \sqrt{2} e \cdot \sqrt{2} T\left(G_{1 \mid Q_{0}}\right) \leq \sqrt{2} e \cdot \sqrt{2} \exp (e) \leq \exp (2 e)
\end{aligned}
$$

If $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}$, then there also exists a corresponding neighborhood $\widetilde{K}$ of $K$ such that $\widetilde{K} \subset \widetilde{Q}_{0}$ and $G_{1}(\widetilde{K})$ is an open square contained in $V_{x_{1}-1}^{-}$with side length no more than 2.

Suppose that $G_{3}(a)=G_{3}(b)$ with $a, b \in \widetilde{K}$. Similar to (3.6), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
|a-b|\left|F\left(G_{2}(a)\right)\right|=|b|\left|F\left(G_{2}(b)\right)-F\left(G_{2}(a)\right)\right| \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $A=G_{2}(\widetilde{K})$; then $A$ is contained in a small annulus with outer radius no more than $\exp \left(-x_{1}\right)$ and $\bmod (A) \leq 2 e^{2}$. In particular, $\left|G_{2}(\lambda)\right| \leq \exp \left(-x_{1}\right)$
for each $\lambda \in \widetilde{K}$. Also note that $\widetilde{K} \subset \widetilde{Q}_{0}$; combining $\left|G_{1}(\lambda)\right| \geq x_{1}$ for each $\lambda \in \widetilde{K}$ with Proposition 3.3 and (3.7), we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}}\left|\frac{G_{2}(\lambda)-1}{G_{2}(\lambda)} G_{2}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right| & \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}}\left|\frac{G_{2}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{2}(\lambda)}\right| \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} \inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{Q}_{0}}\left|G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \exp (m e-e) \tag{3.10}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|F\left(G_{2}(b)\right)-F\left(G_{2}(a)\right)\right| \\
& \quad \geq|a-b| \inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}}\left|\frac{\mathrm{~d} F\left(G_{2}(\lambda)\right)}{\mathrm{d} \lambda}\right| \\
& \quad \geq|a-b|\left(\inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}}\left|F\left(G_{2}(\lambda)\right)\right|\right)\left(\inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}}\left|\frac{G_{2}(\lambda)-1}{G_{2}(\lambda)} G_{2}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right|\right) \\
& \quad \geq|a-b|\left(\inf _{\nu \in A}|F(\nu)|\right) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \exp (m e-e) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover,

$$
\left|F\left(G_{2}(a)\right)\right| \leq \sup _{\nu \in A}|F(\nu)|
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\sup _{\nu \in A}|F(\nu)|}{\inf _{\nu \in A}|F(\nu)|} \leq \bmod (A) \cdot \exp \left(2 \cdot \exp \left(-x_{1}\right)\right) \leq 4 e^{2} \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $|b| \geq m-1 \geq 99$, it follows from (3.9) that

$$
8 e^{2}|a-b| \geq 99|a-b| \exp (99 e)
$$

This implies that $a=b$. Therefore, $G_{3}$ is univalent in $\widetilde{K}$.
By calculation,

$$
\begin{align*}
& G_{3}^{\prime}(\lambda)=F\left(G_{2}(\lambda)\right)\left(1+\lambda G_{2}^{\prime}(\lambda) \frac{G_{2}(\lambda)-1}{G_{2}(\lambda)}\right)  \tag{3.12}\\
& \frac{G_{3}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)}=F\left(G_{2}(\lambda)\right)\left(\frac{G_{2}(\lambda)}{G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)}+\lambda \frac{\left(G_{1}(\lambda)-1\right)^{2}}{G_{1}(\lambda)}\right) \tag{3.13}
\end{align*}
$$

Note that $G_{2}(K) \subset A, G_{1}(K) \subset V_{x_{1}}^{-}, K \subset Q_{0}$, and $|\lambda| \geq m \geq 10^{2}$ for all $\lambda \in K$. Then $|\nu| \leq \exp \left(-x_{1}\right)$ for all $\nu \in G_{2}(K)$ and $\left|G_{1}(\lambda)\right| \geq x_{1}$ for all $\lambda \in K$. Using Proposition 3.3 and (3.13), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\inf _{\lambda \in K}\left|\frac{G_{3}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)}\right| & \geq \inf _{\nu \in A}|F(\nu)| \cdot \frac{1}{2} \inf _{\lambda \in K}|\lambda| \\
& \geq \frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\exp \left(x_{1}\right)}{2} \\
& \geq \exp \left(\frac{3 x_{1}}{4}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

By Proposition 3.3 with (3.11) and (3.12),

$$
\begin{aligned}
T\left(G_{3 \mid K}\right) & \leq \frac{\sup _{\nu \in A}|F(\nu)|}{\inf _{\nu \in A}|F(\nu)|} \cdot \frac{\sup _{\lambda \in K}\left|1+\lambda G_{2}^{\prime}(\lambda) \frac{G_{2}(\lambda)-1}{G_{2}(\lambda)}\right|}{\inf _{\lambda \in K}\left|1+\lambda G_{2}^{\prime}(\lambda) \frac{G_{2}(\lambda)-1}{G_{2}(\lambda)}\right|} \\
& \leq 4 e^{2} \cdot 2 \frac{\sup _{\lambda \in Q_{0}}\left|\frac{G_{2}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{2}(\lambda)}\right|}{\inf _{\lambda \in Q_{0}}\left|\frac{G_{2}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{2}(\lambda)}\right|} \\
& \leq 4 e^{2} \cdot 4 T\left(G_{1 \mid Q_{0}}\right) \leq 4 e^{2} \cdot 4 \exp (e) \leq \exp (3 e)
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that if $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}$, then $K^{\prime}$ is mapped away by $G_{2}$; if $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}$, then $K^{\prime}$ is mapped into a neighborhood of 0 (the pole) by $G_{2}$, before being mapped away by $G_{3}$. So we consider the set $G_{2}\left(K^{\prime}\right)$ for each $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}$and the set $G_{3}\left(K^{\prime}\right)$ for each $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}$. By Lemma 2.2 with Propositions 3.3 and 3.5, $G_{2}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \cap\left(V_{x_{2}}^{+} \cup V_{x_{2}}^{-}\right)$contains many squares in $\mathcal{B}$ for each $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}$, and $G_{3}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \cap\left(V_{x_{2}}^{+} \cup V_{x_{2}}^{-}\right)$contains many squares in $\mathcal{B}$ for each $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}$. Define for $\mu \in\{+,-\}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{2,1}^{\mu} & :=\bigcup_{K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}}\left\{S \in \mathcal{B} \mid S \subset G_{2}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \cap V_{x_{2}}^{\mu}\right\} \\
\mathcal{P}_{2,2}^{\mu} & :=\bigcup_{K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}}\left\{S \in \mathcal{B} \mid S \subset G_{3}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \cap V_{x_{2}}^{\mu}\right\} \\
P_{2} & :=\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{P}_{2, j}^{\mu} \mid \mu \in\{+,-\}, 1 \leq j \leq 2} S \\
\mathcal{Q}_{2,1}^{\mu} & :=\left\{K \subset Q_{1} \mid G_{2}(K) \in \mathcal{P}_{2,1}^{\mu}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_{2,2}^{\mu} & :=\left\{K \subset Q_{1} \mid G_{3}(K) \in \mathcal{P}_{2,2}^{\mu}\right\} \\
\mathcal{Q}_{2} & :=\left\{K \in \mathcal{Q}_{2, j}^{\mu} \mid \mu \in\{+,-\}, 1 \leq j \leq 2\right\} \\
Q_{2} & :=\bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{Q}_{2}} K
\end{aligned}
$$

From the definitions, for $\mu \in\{+,-\}$ and $1 \leq j \leq 2$, we have $\mathcal{Q}_{2, j}^{+} \cap \mathcal{Q}_{2, j}^{-}=$ $\emptyset$, and every two elements in $\mathcal{Q}_{2, j}^{\mu}$ have an intersection of measure zero. Using $\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+} \cap \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}=\emptyset$ and the facts that, for $\mu \in\{+,-\}$, every $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{2,1}^{\mu}$ (resp., $\mathcal{Q}_{2,2}^{\mu}$ ) is contained in a unique $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}$(resp., $\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}$) and that every $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}$(resp., $\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}$) contains at least one element of $\mathcal{Q}_{2,1}^{+} \cup \mathcal{Q}_{2,1}^{-}$(resp., $\mathcal{Q}_{2,2}^{+} \cup \mathcal{Q}_{2,2}^{-}$, we have $\mathcal{Q}_{2, j_{1}}^{\mu_{1}} \cap \mathcal{Q}_{2, j_{2}}^{\mu_{2}}=\emptyset$ for any two distinct pairs $\left(j_{1}, \mu_{1}\right)$ and $\left(j_{2}, \mu_{2}\right)$.

Therefore, $\mathcal{Q}_{2}$ is a finite collection of subsets in $\mathbb{C}$ satisfying that every two elements in $\mathcal{Q}_{2}$ have an intersection of measure zero and that every $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{2}$ is contained in a unique $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{1}$, with each $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{1}$ containing at least one element in $\mathcal{Q}_{2}$.

Proposition 3.6. For each $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{1}$, we have

$$
\operatorname{dens}\left(Q_{2}, K\right) \geq 1-\exp \left(-\frac{x_{1}}{8}\right)
$$

Proof. If $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}$, by Proposition 3.5 $G_{2}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{K}$ of $K$. We can take an inverse branch of $G_{2}$ which maps $G_{2}(\widetilde{K})$ to $\widetilde{K}$, denoted by $\varphi_{2}$. Using (3.1) and Proposition 3.5, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
T\left(\varphi_{2}\right):=T\left(\varphi_{2 \mid G_{2}(K)}\right)=T\left(G_{2 \mid K}\right) \leq \exp (2 e) \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Recall that $\varphi_{1}$ is the inverse branch of $G_{1}$ which maps $G_{1}\left(\widetilde{Q}_{0}\right)$ to $\widetilde{Q}_{0}$. By construction of $\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}$, there is a unique square $S \in \mathcal{P}_{1,1}^{+}$such that $K=\varphi_{1}(S)$ for each $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}$, so Proposition 3.5 implies that $G_{2} \circ \varphi_{1}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{S}$ of $S$. By (3.1) with (3.3) and (3.14), we have

$$
T\left(G_{2} \circ \varphi_{1 \mid S}\right) \leq T\left(G_{2 \mid K}\right) \cdot T\left(G_{1 \mid K}\right) \leq T\left(\varphi_{2}\right) \cdot T\left(\varphi_{1}\right) \leq \exp (3 e)
$$

and

$$
\inf _{\nu \in S}\left|\left(G_{2} \circ \varphi_{1}\right)^{\prime}(\nu)\right|=\inf _{\lambda \in K}\left|\frac{G_{2}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)}\right| \geq \exp \left(\frac{3 x_{1}}{4}\right)
$$

This, together with Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.5, implies that

$$
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{dens}\left(P_{2}, G_{2}(K)\right) & =\operatorname{dens}\left(P_{2}, G_{2} \circ \varphi_{1}(S)\right) \\
& \geq 1-\exp (9 e)\left(\frac{2 \sqrt{2} x_{2}+21}{\exp \left(\frac{3 x_{1}}{4}\right)}+\frac{12}{\exp \left(3 e+\frac{3 x_{1}}{2}\right)}\right)  \tag{3.15}\\
& \geq 1-\frac{\exp (10 e)}{\exp \left(\frac{x_{1}}{4}\right)}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $\varphi_{2} \circ G_{2}=$ id on $K$ and $G_{2}\left(K \backslash Q_{2}\right) \subset G_{2}(K) \backslash P_{2}$, we can repeat the argument of (3.5) with (3.14) and (3.15) to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{dens}\left(Q_{2}, K\right) & \geq 1-\exp (4 e)\left(1-\operatorname{dens}\left(P_{2}, G_{2}(K)\right)\right) \\
& \geq 1-\frac{\exp (14 e)}{\exp \left(\frac{x_{1}}{4}\right)} \geq 1-\exp \left(-\frac{x_{1}}{8}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

If $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}$, then by (3.1) and Proposition $3.5, G_{3}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{K}$ of $K$ and there is an inverse branch $\varphi_{3}$ of $G_{3}$ which maps $G_{3}(\widetilde{K})$ to $\widetilde{K}$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
T\left(\varphi_{3}\right):=T\left(\varphi_{3 \mid G_{3}(K)}\right)=T\left(G_{3 \mid K}\right) \leq \exp (3 e) \tag{3.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

By construction of $\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}$, there is a unique square $S \in \mathcal{P}_{1,1}^{-}$such that $K=$ $\varphi_{1}(S)$, so Proposition 3.5 implies that $G_{3} \circ \varphi_{1}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{S}$ of $S$. By (3.1) with (3.3) and (3.16),

$$
T\left(G_{3} \circ \varphi_{1 \mid S}\right) \leq T\left(G_{3 \mid K}\right) \cdot T\left(G_{1 \mid K}\right) \leq T\left(\varphi_{3}\right) \cdot T\left(\varphi_{1}\right) \leq \exp (4 e)
$$

and

$$
\inf _{\nu \in S}\left|\left(G_{3} \circ \varphi_{1}\right)^{\prime}(\nu)\right|=\inf _{\lambda \in K}\left|\frac{G_{3}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)}\right| \geq l \cdot \exp \left(\frac{3 x_{1}}{4}\right)
$$

This, together with Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.5, implies that

$$
\operatorname{dens}\left(P_{2}, G_{3}(K)\right)=\operatorname{dens}\left(P_{2}, G_{3} \circ \varphi_{1}(S)\right)
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \geq 1-\exp (12 e)\left(\frac{2 \sqrt{2} x_{2}+21}{\exp \left(\frac{3 x_{1}}{4}\right)}+\frac{12}{\exp \left(4 e+\frac{3 x_{1}}{2}\right)}\right)  \tag{3.17}\\
& \geq 1-\frac{\exp (13 e)}{\exp \left(\frac{x_{1}}{4}\right)}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $\varphi_{3} \circ G_{3}=$ id on $K$ and $G_{3}\left(K \backslash Q_{2}\right) \subset G_{3}(K) \backslash P_{2}$, we can also repeat the argument of (3.5) with (3.16) and (3.17) to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{dens}\left(Q_{2}, K\right) & \geq 1-\exp (6 e)\left(1-\operatorname{dens}\left(P_{2}, G_{2}(K)\right)\right) \\
& \geq 1-\frac{\exp (19 e)}{\exp \left(\frac{x_{1}}{4}\right)} \geq 1-\exp \left(-\frac{x_{1}}{8}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $\mu \in\{+,-\}$. From the above construction, $\mathcal{Q}_{1}$ consists of two members $\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}$and $\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}$, where $\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{\mu}$ is generated by pullback of $G_{1}\left(Q_{0}\right) \cap V_{x_{1}}^{\mu}$ with an inverse branch of $G_{1}$, so $\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}$and $\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}$can be viewed as the "twins" of generation 1 of $\mathcal{Q}_{0} ; \mathcal{Q}_{2}$ consists of four members $\mathcal{Q}_{2,1}^{+}, \mathcal{Q}_{2,1}^{-}, \mathcal{Q}_{2,2}^{+}$, and $\mathcal{Q}_{2,2}^{-}$, where $\mathcal{Q}_{2,1}^{\mu}$ is generated by pullback of $G_{2}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \cap V_{x_{2}}^{\mu}$ with an inverse branch of $G_{2}$ for each $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}$, and $\mathcal{Q}_{2,2}^{\mu}$ is generated by pullback of $G_{3}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \cap V_{x_{2}}^{\mu}$ with an inverse branch of $G_{3}$ for each $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}$, so $\mathcal{Q}_{2,1}^{+}$and $\mathcal{Q}_{2,1}^{-}$can be viewed as the "twins" of generation 2 of $\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{+}$, and $\mathcal{Q}_{2,2}^{+}$and $\mathcal{Q}_{2,2}^{-}$can be viewed as the "twins" of generation 3 of $\mathcal{Q}_{1,1}^{-}$.

For integers $1 \leq n \leq 2$ and $1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-1}$, let $t_{n, i}$ denote the number of generations of $\mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{+}$and $\mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{-}$. Then

$$
t_{1,1}=1, \quad t_{2,1}=2=1+t_{2-1,(1+1) / 2}, \quad t_{2,2}=3=2+t_{2-1,2 / 2}
$$

So we can use induction to define, for all integers $n \geq 3$ and $1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-1}$,

$$
t_{n, i}=1+t_{n-1,(i+1) / 2} \quad\left(\text { if } i \in I_{1, n}\right), \quad t_{n, i}=2+t_{n-1, i / 2} \quad\left(\text { if } i \in I_{2, n}\right)
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I_{1, n}:=\left\{i \in \mathbb{N}: i \text { is odd and } 1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-1}\right\} \\
& I_{2, n}:=\left\{i \in \mathbb{N}: i \text { is even and } 1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-1}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

We check that, for all integers $n \geq 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-1}$,

$$
n \leq t_{n, i} \leq 2 n-1
$$

Let $\mu \in\{+,-\}$. For each integer $n \geq 3$, we shall use induction to construct $\mathcal{Q}_{n}$ consisting of $2^{n}$ members $\mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{+}$and $\mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{-}\left(1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-1}\right)$ such that $\mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{\mu}$ is generated by pullback of $G_{t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \cap V_{x_{n}}^{\mu}$ with an inverse branch of $G_{t_{n, i}}$ for each $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n-1,(i+1) / 2}^{+}$(resp., $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n-1, i / 2}^{-}$) if $i \in I_{1, n}$ (resp., $i \in I_{2, n}$ ), and then $t_{n, i}$ is the number of generation of $\mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{+}$and $\mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{-}$, so $\mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{+}$and $\mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{-}$can
be viewed as the "twins" of generation $t_{n, i}$ of $\mathcal{Q}_{n-1,(i+1) / 2}^{+}$(resp., $\mathcal{Q}_{n-1, i / 2}^{-}$) if $i \in I_{1, n}$ (resp., $i \in I_{2, n}$ ). This can be seen in the following structure of sequence $\left(\mathcal{Q}_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ :
$\mathcal{Q}_{n}: \ldots \underbrace{\mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{+} \mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{-}}_{\text {generation } t_{n, i} \text { of } \mathcal{Q}_{n-1,(i+1) / 2}^{+}\left(\text {resp., } \mathcal{Q}_{n-1, i / 2}^{-}\right) \text {if } i \in I_{1, n}\left(\text { resp., } i \in I_{2, n}\right)} \ldots$

$$
\text { (structure of sequence } \left.\left(\mathcal{Q}_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\right)
$$

Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer. Assume that, for all integers $2 \leq s \leq n, 1 \leq i \leq$ $2^{s-1}$, and $\mu \in\{+,-\}$, all such $\mathcal{P}_{s, i}^{\mu}, P_{s}, \mathcal{Q}_{s, i}^{\mu}, \mathcal{Q}_{s}$, and $Q_{s}$ are well defined, satisfying the following properties.
(i) For each $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{s-1, i}^{+}$, the map $G_{1+t_{s-1, i}}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{K}$ of $K$ with

$$
\inf _{\lambda \in K}\left|\frac{G_{1+t_{s-1, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{t_{s-1, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}\right| \geq \exp \left(\frac{3 x_{s-1}}{4}\right)
$$

and

$$
T\left(G_{1+t_{s-1, i} \mid K}\right) \leq \exp \left(\left(1+t_{s-1, i}\right) e\right)
$$

For each $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{s-1, i}^{-}$, the map $G_{2+t_{s-1, i}}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{K}$ of $K$ with

$$
\inf _{\lambda \in K}\left|\frac{G_{2+t_{s-1, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{t_{s-1, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}\right| \geq \exp \left(\frac{3 x_{s-1}}{4}\right)
$$

and

$$
T\left(G_{2+t_{s-1, i} \mid K}\right) \leq \exp \left(\left(2+t_{s-1, i}\right) e\right)
$$

(ii) Each $\mathcal{Q}_{s}$ is a finite collection of subsets in $\mathbb{C}$ satisfying that every two elements in $\mathcal{Q}_{s}$ have an intersection of measure zero and that every $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{s}$
is contained in a unique $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{s-1}$, with each $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{s-1}$ containing at least one element in $\mathcal{Q}_{s}$.
(iii) For each $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{s-1}$, we have

$$
\operatorname{dens}\left(Q_{s}, K\right) \geq 1-\exp \left(-\frac{x_{s-1}}{8}\right)
$$

For $s=n+1$, we can inductively prove the following.
Proposition 3.7. Let $1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-1}$. For each $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{+}$, the map $G_{1+t_{n, i}}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{K}^{\prime}$ of $K^{\prime}$ with

$$
\inf _{\lambda \in K^{\prime}}\left|\frac{G_{1+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}\right| \geq \exp \left(\frac{3 x_{n}}{4}\right)
$$

and

$$
T\left(G_{1+t_{n, i} \mid K^{\prime}}\right) \leq \exp \left(\left(1+t_{n, i}\right) e\right)
$$

For each $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{-}$, the map $G_{2+t_{n, i}}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{K}^{\prime}$ of $K^{\prime}$ with

$$
\inf _{\lambda \in K^{\prime}}\left|\frac{G_{2+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}\right| \geq \exp \left(\frac{3 x_{n}}{4}\right)
$$

and

$$
T\left(G_{2+t_{n, i} \mid K^{\prime}}\right) \leq \exp \left(\left(2+t_{n, i}\right) e\right)
$$

Proof. If $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{+}$with $i \in I_{1, n}$ (resp., $i \in I_{2, n}$ ), then there exist a unique $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{n-1,(i+1) / 2}$ (resp., $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{n-1, i / 2}$ ) and a unique $S^{\prime} \in \mathcal{P}_{n, i}^{+}$such that $K^{\prime} \subset K$ and $G_{t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right)=S^{\prime}$. Note that $t_{n, 1}=1+t_{n-1,(i+1) / 2}$ if $i \in I_{1, n}$, and $t_{n, i}=2+t_{n-1, i / 2}$ if $i \in I_{2, n}$. By the hypothesis (i) for $s=n, G_{t_{n, i}}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{K}$ of $K$, so $G_{t_{n, i}}(\widetilde{K})$ is a simply connected domain and contains $S^{\prime}$. Denote

$$
r=\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{1, \operatorname{dist}\left(S^{\prime}, \partial\left(G_{t_{n, i}}(\widetilde{K})\right)\right)\right\}>0
$$

Let $\widetilde{S^{\prime}}$ be an open square with the same center of $S^{\prime}$ and side length $1+2 r$. Then $\widetilde{S}^{\prime}$ is a neighborhood of $S^{\prime}$ and contained in $V_{x_{n}-1}^{+}$. Define $\widetilde{K}^{\prime}:=$ $\varphi_{t_{n, i}}\left(\widetilde{S}^{\prime}\right)$, where $\varphi_{t_{n, i}}$ is the inverse branch of $G_{t_{n, i}}$ which maps $G_{t_{n, i}}(\widetilde{K})$ to $\widetilde{K}$. Then $\widetilde{K}^{\prime}$ is a neighborhood of $K^{\prime}$ with $\widetilde{K}^{\prime} \subset \widetilde{K}$.

Recall that $F(z)=\exp (z) / z$. Suppose that $G_{1+t_{n, i}}(a)=G_{1+t_{n, i}}(b)$ with $a, b \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}$. Similar to (3.6), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
|a-b|\left|F\left(G_{t_{n, i}}(a)\right)\right|=|b|\left|F\left(G_{t_{n, i}}(b)\right)-F\left(G_{t_{n, i}}(a)\right)\right| \tag{3.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

By $\widetilde{K}^{\prime} \subset \widetilde{K} \subset \widetilde{Q}_{0}$ and hypothesis (i) for $2 \leq s \leq n$,

$$
\inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}}\left|G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right| \geq \inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{Q}_{0}}\left|G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right| \geq \exp (m e-e)
$$

Combining this and $G_{t_{n, i}}\left(\widetilde{K}^{\prime}\right)=\widetilde{S}^{\prime} \subset V_{x_{n}-1}^{+}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|F\left(G_{t_{n, i}}(b)\right)-F\left(G_{t_{n, i}}(a)\right)\right| \\
& \quad \geq|a-b| \cdot \inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}}\left|\frac{\mathrm{d} F\left(G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)\right)}{\mathrm{d} \lambda}\right| \\
& \quad \geq|a-b|\left(\inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}}\left|F\left(G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)\right) G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda) \frac{G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)-1}{G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)}\right|\right) \\
& \quad \geq|a-b|\left(\inf _{\nu \in \widetilde{S}^{\prime}}|F(\nu)|\right)\left(\inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}}\left|G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right|\right)\left(\inf _{\nu \in \widetilde{S}^{\prime}}\left|\frac{\nu-1}{\nu}\right|\right) \\
& \quad \geq|a-b|\left(\inf _{\nu \in \widetilde{S}^{\prime}}|F(\nu)|\right) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \exp (m e-e) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover,

$$
\left|F\left(G_{t_{n, i}}(a)\right)\right| \leq \sup _{\nu \in \widetilde{S}^{\prime}}|F(\nu)|
$$

and

$$
\frac{\sup _{\nu \in \widetilde{S}^{\prime}}|F(\nu)|}{\inf _{\nu \in \widetilde{S}^{\prime}}|F(\nu)|} \leq 2 e^{2}
$$

This, together with (3.18) and $|b| \geq m-1 \geq 99$, implies that

$$
4 e^{2}|a-b| \geq 99|a-b| \exp (99 e)
$$

So $a=b$. Therefore, $G_{1+t_{n, i}}$ is univalent in $\widetilde{K}^{\prime}$.
By calculation,

$$
\begin{align*}
G_{1+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda) & =F\left(G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)\right)\left(1+\lambda G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda) \frac{G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)-1}{G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)}\right)  \tag{3.19}\\
\frac{G_{1+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)} & =F\left(G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)\right)\left(\frac{1}{G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}+\lambda \frac{G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)-1}{G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)}\right) \tag{3.20}
\end{align*}
$$

Recall that $x_{0}=2 m, x_{j}=2 \cdot \exp ^{j}(m)$ for all integers $j \geq 1$, and note that $G_{t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right)=S^{\prime} \subset V_{x_{n}}^{+}$and that $K^{\prime} \subset K \subset S_{m, l}$. Then $|\lambda| \geq m \geq 10^{2}$ for all
$\lambda \in K^{\prime}$ and $|\nu| \leq \exp \left(2 \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} x_{j}\right)$ for all $\nu \in S^{\prime}$. By hypothesis (i) for $s=n$ with (3.19) and (3.20), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\inf _{\lambda \in K^{\prime}}\left|\frac{G_{1+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}\right| & \geq \inf _{\nu \in S^{\prime}}|F(\nu)| \cdot \frac{1}{2} \inf _{\lambda \in K^{\prime}}|\lambda| \\
& \geq \frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\exp \left(x_{n}\right)}{\exp \left(2 \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} x_{j}\right)} \geq \exp \left(\frac{3 x_{n}}{4}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
T\left(G_{1+t_{n, i} \mid K^{\prime}}\right) & \leq \frac{\sup _{\nu \in S^{\prime}}|F(\nu)|}{\inf _{\nu \in S^{\prime}}|F(\nu)|} \cdot \frac{\sup _{\lambda \in K^{\prime}}\left|1+\lambda G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda) \frac{G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)-1}{G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)}\right|}{\inf _{\lambda \in K^{\prime}}\left|1+\lambda G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda) \frac{G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)-1}{G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)}\right|} \\
& \leq \sqrt{2} e \cdot \sqrt{2} T\left(G_{t_{n, i} \mid K}\right) \leq \sqrt{2} e \cdot \sqrt{2} \exp \left(t_{n, i} \cdot e\right) \\
& \leq \exp \left(\left(1+t_{n, i}\right) e\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

If $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{-}$with $i \in I_{1, n}$ (resp., $i \in I_{2, n}$ ), then there also exist a unique $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{n-1,(i+1) / 2}$ (resp., $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{n-1, i / 2}$ ) and a unique $S^{\prime} \in \mathcal{P}_{n, i}^{-}$such that $K^{\prime} \subset K$ and $G_{t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right)=S^{\prime}$. By hypothesis (i) for $s=n$, there is also a corresponding neighborhood $\widetilde{K}^{\prime}$ of $K^{\prime}$ such that $\widetilde{K}^{\prime} \subset \widetilde{K} \subset \widetilde{Q}_{0}$ and $G_{t_{n, i}}\left(\widetilde{K}^{\prime}\right)$ is an open square contained in $V_{x_{n}-1}^{-}$with side length no more than 2.

Suppose that $G_{2+t_{n, i}}(a)=G_{2+t_{n, i}}(b)$ with $a, b \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}$. Similar to (3.18), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
|a-b|\left|F\left(G_{1+t_{n, i}}\right)\right|=|b|\left|F\left(G_{1+t_{n, i}}(b)\right)-F\left(G_{1+t_{n, i}}(a)\right)\right| \tag{3.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $A^{\prime}=G_{1+t_{n, i}}\left(\widetilde{K}^{\prime}\right)$; then $A^{\prime}$ is contained in a small annulus with outer radius no more than $\exp \left(-x_{n}\right)$ and $\bmod \left(A^{\prime}\right) \leq 2 e^{2}$, so $\left|G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)\right| \leq$ $\exp \left(-x_{n}\right)$ for each $\lambda \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}$. By $\widetilde{K}^{\prime} \subset \widetilde{K} \subset \widetilde{Q}_{0}$ and hypothesis (i) for $2 \leq s \leq n$,

$$
\inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}}\left|G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right| \geq \inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{Q}_{0}}\left|G_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right| \geq \exp (m e-e)
$$

This, together with (3.19) and $\left|G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)\right| \geq x_{n}$ for each $\lambda \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}$, implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}}\left|\frac{G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)-1}{G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)} G_{1+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right| & \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot \inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}}\left|\frac{G_{1+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)}\right| \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}}\left|G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \exp (m e-e)
\end{aligned}
$$

and that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|F\left(G_{1+t_{n, i}}(b)\right)-F\left(G_{1+t_{n, i}}(a)\right)\right| \\
& \quad \geq|a-b| \inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}}\left|\frac{\mathrm{d} F\left(G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)\right)}{\mathrm{d} \lambda}\right| \\
& \quad \geq|a-b|\left(\inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}}\left|F\left(G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)\right)\right|\right)\left(\inf _{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}^{\prime}}\left|\frac{G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)-1}{G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)} G_{1+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right|\right) \\
& \quad \geq|a-b|\left(\inf _{\nu \in A^{\prime}}|F(\nu)|\right) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \exp (m e-e)
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover,

$$
\left|F\left(G_{1+t_{n, i}}(a)\right)\right| \leq \sup _{\nu \in A^{\prime}}|F(\nu)|
$$

and

$$
\frac{\sup _{\nu \in A^{\prime}}|F(\nu)|}{\inf _{\nu \in A^{\prime}}|F(\nu)|} \leq \bmod \left(A^{\prime}\right) \cdot \exp \left(2 \cdot \exp \left(-x_{n}\right)\right) \leq 4 e^{2}
$$

This, together with (3.21) and $|b| \geq m-1 \geq 99$, implies that

$$
8 e^{2}|a-b| \geq 99|a-b| \exp (99 e)
$$

So $a=b$. Therefore, $G_{2+t_{n, i}}$ is univalent in $\widetilde{K}$.
By calculation,

$$
\begin{align*}
& G_{2+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)=F\left(G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)\right)\left(1+\lambda G_{1+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda) \frac{G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)-1}{G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)}\right)  \tag{3.22}\\
& \frac{G_{2+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}=F\left(G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)\right)\left(\frac{G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)}{G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}+\lambda \frac{\left(G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)-1\right)^{2}}{G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)}\right) \tag{3.23}
\end{align*}
$$

Note that $G_{1+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \subset A^{\prime}, G_{t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \subset V_{x_{n}}^{-}, K^{\prime} \subset Q_{0}$, and $|\lambda| \geq m \geq$ $10^{2}$ for all $\lambda \in K^{\prime}$. Then $|\nu| \leq \exp \left(-x_{n}\right)$ for all $\nu \in G_{1+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \subset A^{\prime}$ and $\left|G_{t_{n, i}}(\lambda)\right| \geq x_{n}$ for all $\lambda \in K^{\prime}$. By hypothesis (i) for $s=n$ with (3.22) and (3.23), we have

$$
\inf _{\lambda \in K^{\prime}}\left|\frac{G_{2+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}\right| \geq \inf _{\nu \in A^{\prime}}|F(\nu)| \cdot \frac{1}{2} \inf _{\lambda \in K^{\prime}}|\lambda| \geq \frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{\exp \left(x_{n}\right)}{2} \geq \exp \left(\frac{3 x_{n}}{4}\right)
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
T\left(G_{2+t_{n, i} \mid K^{\prime}}\right) & \leq \frac{\sup _{\nu \in A^{\prime}}|F(\nu)|}{\inf _{\nu \in A^{\prime}}|F(\nu)|} \cdot \frac{\sup _{\lambda \in K^{\prime}}\left|1+\lambda G_{1+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda) \frac{G_{1+t_{n, i}(\lambda)-1}}{G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)}\right|}{\inf _{\lambda \in K^{\prime}}\left|1+\lambda G_{1+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda) \frac{G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)-1}{G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)}\right|} \\
& \leq 4 e^{2} \cdot 2 \frac{\sup _{\lambda \in K^{\prime}}\left|\frac{G_{1+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)}\right|}{\inf _{\lambda \in K^{\prime}}\left|\frac{G_{1+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{1+t_{n, i}}(\lambda)}\right|} \leq 4 e^{2} \cdot 4 T\left(G_{t_{n, i} \mid K}\right) \\
& \leq 4 e^{2} \cdot 4 \exp \left(t_{n, i} \cdot e\right) \leq \exp \left(\left(2+t_{n, i}\right) e\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-1}$. Note that if $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{+}$, then $K^{\prime}$ is mapped away by $G_{1+t_{n, i}}$; if $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{-}$, then $K^{\prime}$ is mapped into a neighborhood of 0 (the pole) by $G_{1+t_{n, i}}$, before being mapped away by $G_{2+t_{n, i}}$. So we consider the set $G_{1+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right)$ for each $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{+}$, and the set $G_{2+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right)$ for each $K^{\prime} \in$ $\mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{-}$. By hypothesis (i) for $2 \leq s \leq n$ with Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 3.7, $G_{1+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \cap\left(V_{x_{n+1}}^{+} \cup V_{x_{n+1}}^{-}\right)$contains many squares in $\mathcal{B}$ for each $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{+}$, and $G_{2+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \cap\left(V_{x_{n+1}}^{+} \cup V_{x_{n+1}}^{-}\right)$contains many squares in $\mathcal{B}$ for each $K^{\prime} \in$ $\mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{-}$. For each integer $1 \leq j \leq 2^{n}$, we have two cases.

If $j \in I_{1, n+1}$, then $t_{n+1, j}=1+t_{n,(j+1) / 2}$. Define for $\mu \in\{+,-\}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{n+1, j}^{\mu} & : \bigcup_{K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n,(j+1) / 2}^{+}}\left\{S \in \mathcal{B} \mid S \subset G_{t_{n+1, j}}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \cap V_{x_{n+1}}^{\mu}\right\} \\
\mathcal{Q}_{n+1, j}^{\mu} & =\left\{K \subset Q_{n} \mid G_{t_{n+1, j}}(K) \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1, j}^{\mu}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

If $j \in I_{2, n+1}$, then $t_{n+1, j}=2+t_{n, j / 2}$. Define for $\mu \in\{+,-\}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{P}_{n+1, j}^{\mu}:=\bigcup_{K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n, j / 2}^{-}}\left\{S \in \mathcal{B} \mid S \subset G_{t_{n+1, j}}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \cap V_{x_{n+1}}^{\mu}\right\} \\
& \mathcal{Q}_{n+1, j}^{\mu}:=\left\{K \subset Q_{n} \mid G_{t_{n+1, j}}(K) \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1, j}^{\mu}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Furthermore, we define

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{n+1} & :=\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1, j}^{\mu} \mid \mu \in\{+,-\}, 1 \leq j \leq 2^{n}} S \\
\mathcal{Q}_{n+1} & :=\left\{K \in \mathcal{Q}_{n+1, j}^{\mu} \mid \mu \in\{+,-\}, 1 \leq j \leq 2^{n}\right\} \\
Q_{n+1} & :=\bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{Q}_{n+1}} K
\end{aligned}
$$

By the definitions, for $1 \leq j \leq 2^{n}$ and $\mu \in\{+,-\}, \mathcal{Q}_{n+1, j}^{+} \cap \mathcal{Q}_{n+1, j}^{-}=\emptyset$, and every two elements of $\mathcal{Q}_{n+1, j}^{\mu}$ have an intersection of measure zero. By hypothesis (ii) for $s=n$, we have $\mathcal{Q}_{n, j_{1}}^{\mu_{1}} \cap \mathcal{Q}_{n, j_{2}}^{\mu_{2}}=\emptyset$ for any two distinct pairs $\left(j_{1}, \mu_{1}\right)$ and $\left(j_{2}, \mu_{2}\right)$; for $\mu \in\{+,-\}$, every $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{n+1, j}^{\mu}$ with $j \in I_{1, n+1}$ (resp., $\mathcal{Q}_{n+1, j}^{\mu}$ with $j \in I_{2, n+1}$ ) is contained in a unique $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n,(j+1) / 2}^{+}$ (resp., $\mathcal{Q}_{n, j / 2}^{-}$); and every $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n, j}^{+}$(resp., $\mathcal{Q}_{n, j}^{-}$) contains at least one element in $\mathcal{Q}_{n+1,2 j-1}^{+} \cup \mathcal{Q}_{n+1,2 j-1}^{-}$(resp., $\mathcal{Q}_{n+1,2 j}^{+} \cup \mathcal{Q}_{n+1,2 j}^{-}$). This implies that $\mathcal{Q}_{n+1, j_{1}}^{\mu_{1}} \cap \mathcal{Q}_{n+1, j_{2}}^{\mu_{2}}=\emptyset$ for any two distinct pairs $\left(j_{1}, \mu_{1}\right)$ and $\left(j_{2}, \mu_{2}\right)$.

Therefore, $\mathcal{Q}_{n+1}$ is a finite collection of subsets in $\mathbb{C}$ satisfying that every two elements in $\mathcal{Q}_{n+1}$ have an intersection of measure zero and that every $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{n+1}$ is contained in a unique $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n}$, with each $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n}$ containing at least one element in $\mathcal{Q}_{n+1}$.

Proposition 3.8. For each $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n}$, we have

$$
\operatorname{dens}\left(Q_{n+1}, K^{\prime}\right) \geq 1-\exp \left(-\frac{x_{n}}{8}\right)
$$

Proof. Let $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{+}$. By Proposition 3.7, $G_{1+t_{n, i}}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{K}^{\prime}$ of $K^{\prime}$. We can take an inverse branch of $G_{1+t_{n, i}}$ which maps $G_{1+t_{n, i}}\left(\widetilde{K}^{\prime}\right)$ to $\widetilde{K}^{\prime}$, denoted by $\varphi_{1+t_{n, i}}$. Using (3.1) and Proposition 3.7, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
T\left(\varphi_{1+t_{n, i}}\right) & :=T\left(\varphi_{1+t_{n, i} \mid G_{1+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right)}\right) \\
& =T\left(G_{1+t_{n, i} \mid K^{\prime}}\right) \leq \exp \left(\left(1+t_{n, i}\right) e\right) . \tag{3.24}
\end{align*}
$$

Recall that $\varphi_{t_{n, i}}$ is the inverse branch of $G_{t_{n, i}}$ which maps $G_{t_{n, i}}(\widetilde{K})$ to $\widetilde{K}$, where $K$ is the unique element of $\mathcal{Q}_{n-1,(i+1) / 2}$ (resp., $\mathcal{Q}_{n-1, i / 2}$ ) such that $K^{\prime} \subset K$ for $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n, i}$ with $i \in I_{1, n}$ (resp., $I_{2, n}$ ). By construction of $\mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{+}$, there is a unique square $S^{\prime} \in \mathcal{P}_{n, i}^{+}$such that $K^{\prime}=\varphi_{t_{n, i}}\left(S^{\prime}\right)$, so Proposition 3.7 implies that $G_{1+t_{n, i}} \circ \varphi_{t_{n, i}}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{S}^{\prime}$ of $S^{\prime}$. Since $K^{\prime} \subset K$, by hypothesis (i) for $s=n$ with (3.1) and (3.24), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
T\left(G_{1+t_{n, i}} \circ \varphi_{t_{n, i} \mid S^{\prime}}\right) & \leq T\left(G_{1+t_{n, i} \mid K^{\prime}}\right) \cdot T\left(G_{t_{n, i} \mid K}\right) \\
& \leq T\left(\varphi_{1+t_{n, i}}\right) \cdot \exp \left(t_{n, i} \cdot e\right) \leq \exp \left(\left(1+2 t_{n, i}\right) e\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\inf _{\nu \in S^{\prime}}\left|\left(G_{1+t_{n, i}} \circ \varphi_{t_{n, i}}\right)^{\prime}(\nu)\right|=\inf _{\lambda \in K^{\prime}}\left|\frac{G_{1+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}\right| \geq \exp \left(\frac{3 x_{n}}{4}\right)
$$

This, together with Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.7, implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{dens} & \left(P_{n+1}, G_{1+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
= & \operatorname{dens}\left(P_{n+1}, G_{1+t_{n, i}} \circ \varphi_{t_{n, i}}\left(S^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
\geq & 1-\exp \left(\left(3+6 t_{n, i}\right) e\right) \\
& \times\left(\frac{2 \sqrt{2} x_{n+1}+21}{\exp \left(\frac{3 x_{n}}{4}\right)}+\frac{12}{\exp \left(\frac{3 x_{n}}{2}+\left(1+2 t_{n, i}\right) e\right)}\right) \\
& \geq 1-\frac{\exp \left(\left(4+6 t_{n, i}\right) e\right)}{\exp \left(\frac{x_{n}}{4}\right)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $x_{n}=2 \exp ^{n}(m)$ and that $n \leq t_{n, i} \leq 2 n-1$ for all integers $1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-1}$. Since $\varphi_{1+t_{n, i}} \circ G_{1+t_{n, i}}=\mathrm{id}$ on $K^{\prime}$ and $G_{1+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime} \backslash Q_{n+1}\right) \subset$ $G_{1+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \backslash P_{n+1}$, we can repeat the argument of (3.5) with (3.24) and (3.25) to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{dens}\left(Q_{n+1}, K^{\prime}\right) & \geq 1-\exp \left(\left(2+2 t_{n, i}\right) e\right)\left(1-\operatorname{dens}\left(P_{n+1}, G_{1+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right)\right)\right) \\
& \geq 1-\frac{\exp \left(\left(6+8 t_{n, i}\right) e\right)}{\exp \left(\frac{x_{n}}{4}\right)} \\
& \geq 1-\frac{\exp (16 n e-2 e)}{\exp \left(\frac{x_{n}}{4}\right)} \geq 1-\exp \left(-\frac{x_{n}}{8}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

If $K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{-}$, then by (3.1) and Proposition 3.7, $G_{2+t_{n, i}}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{K}^{\prime}$ of $K^{\prime}$, and there is an inverse branch $\varphi_{2+t_{n, i}}$ of $G_{2+t_{n, i}}$ which maps $G_{2+t_{n, i}}\left(\widetilde{K}^{\prime}\right)$ to $\widetilde{K}^{\prime}$ with

$$
\begin{align*}
T\left(\varphi_{2+t_{n, i}}\right) & :=T\left(\varphi_{2+t_{n, i} \mid G_{2+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right)}\right)  \tag{3.26}\\
& =T\left(G_{2+t_{n, i} \mid K^{\prime}}\right) \leq \exp \left(\left(2+t_{n, i}\right) e\right)
\end{align*}
$$

By construction of $\mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{-}$, there is a unique square $S^{\prime} \in \mathcal{P}_{n, i}^{-}$such that $K^{\prime}=\varphi_{t_{n, i}}\left(S^{\prime}\right)$, so Proposition 3.7 implies that $G_{2+t_{n, i}} \circ \varphi_{t_{n, i}}$ is univalent in a neighborhood $\widetilde{S}^{\prime}$ of $S^{\prime}$, where $\varphi_{t_{n, i}}$ is the same as in the proof of the case of $K^{\prime} \in K^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n, i}^{+}$. By hypothesis (i) for $s=n$ with (3.1) and (3.26), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
T\left(G_{2+t_{n, i}} \circ \varphi_{t_{n, i} \mid S^{\prime}}\right) & \leq T\left(G_{2+t_{n, i} \mid K^{\prime}}\right) \cdot T\left(G_{t_{n, i} \mid K}\right) \\
& \leq T\left(\varphi_{2+t_{n, i}}\right) \cdot \exp \left(t_{n, i} \cdot e\right) \leq \exp \left(\left(2+2 t_{n, i}\right) e\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\inf _{\nu \in S^{\prime}}\left|\left(G_{2+t_{n, i}} \circ \varphi_{t_{n, i}}\right)^{\prime}(\nu)\right|=\inf _{\lambda \in K^{\prime}}\left|\frac{G_{2+t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}{G_{t_{n, i}}^{\prime}(\lambda)}\right| \geq \exp \left(\frac{3 x_{n}}{4}\right)
$$

This, together with Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.7, implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{dens}\left(P_{n+1}, G_{2+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
&= \operatorname{dens}\left(P_{n+1}, G_{2+t_{n, i}} \circ \varphi_{t_{n, i}}\left(S^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
& \geq 1-\exp \left(\left(6+6 t_{n, i}\right) e\right) \\
& \quad \times\left(\frac{2 \sqrt{2} x_{n+1}+21}{\exp \left(\frac{3 x_{n}}{4}\right)}+\frac{12}{\exp \left(\frac{3 x_{n}}{2}+\left(2+2 t_{n, i}\right) e\right)}\right) \\
& \quad \geq 1-\frac{\exp \left(\left(7+6 t_{n, i}\right) e\right)}{\exp \left(\frac{x_{n}}{4}\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Also note that $x_{n}=2 \exp ^{n}(m)$ and $n \leq t_{n, i} \leq 2 n-1$ for all integers $1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-1}$. Since $\varphi_{2+t_{n, i}} \circ G_{2+t_{n, i}}=\mathrm{id}$ on $K^{\prime}$ and $G_{2+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime} \backslash Q_{n+1}\right) \subset$ $G_{2+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right) \backslash P_{n+1}$, we can repeat the argument of (3.5) with (3.26) and (3.27) to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{dens}\left(Q_{n+1}, K^{\prime}\right) & \geq 1-\exp \left(\left(4+2 t_{n, i}\right) e\right)\left(1-\operatorname{dens}\left(P_{n+1}, G_{1+t_{n, i}}\left(K^{\prime}\right)\right)\right) \\
& \geq 1-\frac{\exp \left(\left(11+8 t_{n, i}\right) e\right)}{\exp \left(\frac{x_{n}}{4}\right)} \\
& \geq 1-\frac{\exp (16 n e+3 e)}{\exp \left(\frac{x_{n}}{4}\right)} \geq 1-\exp \left(-\frac{x_{n}}{8}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

By the above construction, the sequence $\left(\mathcal{Q}_{n}\right)_{n \geq 0}$ satisfies the nesting conditions of Lemma 2.3. Denote $Q=\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} Q_{n}$ and

$$
\delta_{n}=1-\exp \left(-\frac{x_{n}}{8}\right)
$$

for all integers $n \geq 0$. Applying Lemma 2.3, we have

$$
\operatorname{dens}\left(Q, Q_{0}\right) \geq \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} \delta_{n}
$$

Note that $x_{0}=2 m$ and $x_{n}=2 \cdot \exp ^{n}(m)$ for all integers $n \geq 1$; then $x_{n} \geq(n+1) m$ for all integers $n \geq 0$. This, together with $m \geq 10^{2}$, implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp \left(-\frac{x_{n}}{8}\right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{(n+1) m}{8}\right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{m}{8}\right)<\frac{1}{2} \tag{3.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all integers $n \geq 0$. Using (3.28) and $\log (1-t)>-2 t$ for all $t \in(0,1 / 2)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log \left(\prod_{n=0}^{\infty} \delta_{n}\right) & =\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \log \left(1-\exp \left(-\frac{x_{n}}{8}\right)\right) \\
& \geq-2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \exp \left(-\frac{x_{n}}{8}\right) \geq-2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \exp \left(-\frac{(n+1) m}{8}\right) \\
& \geq-4 \exp \left(-\frac{m}{8}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Using $\exp (t) \geq 1+t$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{dens}\left(Q, Q_{0}\right) \geq 1-4 \exp \left(-\frac{m}{8}\right) \tag{3.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\lambda \in Q$, and let $n \geq 1$. From the construction of $Q$, we have three cases for each $G_{n}(\lambda)$.
(i) If $G_{n}(\lambda) \in S$ for $S \in \mathcal{P}_{k, j}^{+}$with $k \geq 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq 2^{k-1}$, then $\operatorname{Re} G_{n}(\lambda) \geq$ $x_{k}$ and

$$
G_{n+1}(\lambda) \in S^{\prime} \quad \text { for } S^{\prime} \in \mathcal{P}_{k+1,2 j-1}^{+} \cup \mathcal{P}_{k+1,2 j-1}^{-} \text {with }\left|\operatorname{Re} G_{n+1}(\lambda)\right| \geq x_{k+1}
$$

(ii) If $G_{n}(\lambda) \in S$ for $S \in \mathcal{P}_{k, j}^{-}$with $k \geq 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq 2^{k-1}$, then $\operatorname{Re} G_{n}(\lambda) \leq$ $-x_{k}$ and

$$
G_{n+1}(\lambda) \in G_{1+t_{k, j}}(K) \quad \text { for } K \in \mathcal{Q}_{k, j}^{-} \text {with }\left|G_{n+1}(\lambda)\right| \leq \exp \left(-x_{k}\right)
$$

(iii) If $G_{n}(\lambda) \in G_{1+t_{k, j}}(K)$ for $K \in \mathcal{Q}_{k, j}^{-}$with $k \geq 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq 2^{k-1}$, then $\left|G_{n}(\lambda)\right| \leq \exp \left(-x_{k}\right)$ and

$$
G_{n+1}(\lambda) \in S \quad \text { for } S \in \mathcal{P}_{k+1,2 j}^{+} \cup \mathcal{P}_{k+1,2 j}^{-} \text {with }\left|\operatorname{Re} G_{n+1}(\lambda)\right| \geq x_{k+1}
$$

This, together with $x_{k}=2 \exp ^{k}(m)$, implies that each accumulation point of $\left\{G_{n}(\lambda)\right\}_{n \geq 1}$ on $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is either 0 or $\infty$. So $\omega_{F_{\lambda}}(1) \subset\{0, \infty\}$ and $Q \subset W$. By (3.29),

$$
\operatorname{dens}\left(W, Q_{0}\right) \geq \operatorname{dens}\left(Q, Q_{0}\right) \geq 1-4 \exp \left(-\frac{m}{8}\right)
$$

Recall that $Q_{0}=S_{m, m}$. Using meas $\left(S_{m, m}\right)=1$ and $m \geq 10^{2}$, we have

$$
\operatorname{area}\left(S_{m, m} \cap W\right) \geq 1-4 \exp \left(-\frac{m}{8}\right) \geq 1-4 \exp \left(-\frac{10^{2}}{8}\right):=\alpha>0
$$

By Lemma 2.1,

$$
\operatorname{area}\left(S_{m, m} \cap M\right) \geq \operatorname{area}\left(S_{m, m} \cap W\right) \geq \alpha>0
$$

Hence, Lemma 3.2 follows.
The Main Theorem then follows from Lemma 3.2.
Remark. The family $F_{\lambda}$ has the property that the forward orbit of a singular point (the only critical point 1) goes far away after visiting a small neighborhood of 0 (the pole), while this property does not hold for the exponential family. This leads to the fact that an approach analogous to the one used in the proof of the Main Theorem cannot be applied for the exponential family.

Finally, we prove the following.
Proposition 3.9. The area of the complement $M^{c}$ of the $M$-set is positive.

Proof. If $F_{\lambda}$ has an attracting fixed point, say, $t$, then $\lambda \exp (t) / t=t$ and $\left|F_{\lambda}^{\prime}(t)\right|<1$. So $\lambda=t^{2} e^{-t}$ with $|t-1|<1$. Let

$$
\Omega=\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{*} \mid F_{\lambda} \text { has an attracting fixed point }\right\}
$$

Then

$$
\Omega=\left\{\lambda=t^{2} e^{-t}: t \in D(1,1)\right\} \subset M^{c}
$$

Denote $\lambda(t)=t^{2} e^{-t}$ for all $t \in D(1,1)$. Note that $\lambda(t)$ is analytic at the point $t=1$, which is not a critical point of $\lambda(t)$. There exists an $r \in(0,1)$ such that $\lambda(t)$ is univalent in $D(1, r)$. For all $t \in D(1, r)$, we have

$$
\left|\lambda^{\prime}(t)\right|=\left|t(2-t) e^{-t}\right| \geq(1-r)^{2} e^{-(r+1)}
$$

This implies that

$$
\operatorname{area}\left(M^{c}\right) \geq \operatorname{area}(\Omega) \geq \iint_{D(1, r)}\left|\lambda^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} d \sigma \geq \pi r^{2}(1-r)^{4} e^{-2(r+1)}>0
$$
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