Konuralp Journal of Mathematics, 7 (1) (2019) 146-167

Konuralp Journal of Mathematics

Journal Homepage: www.dergipark.gov.tr/konuralpjournalmath
e-ISSN: 2147-625X

Some Study on Slowly Changing Function Based Relative Growth of Meromorphic Function in the Unit Disc

Tanmay Biswas[1*]

[1]*Rajbari, Rabindrapalli, R. N. Tagore Road P.O.-Krishnagar, Dist-Nadia, PIN- 741101, West Bengal, India.*
[*]*Corresponding author E-mail: tanmaybiswas_math@rediffmail.com*

Abstract

In this paper we introduce the notion of relative $(p,q,t)L$-th order, relative $(p,q,t)L$-th type, and relative $(p,q,t)L$-th weak type of meromorphic functions in the unit disc with respect to an entire functions where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$ and then investigate some basic properties of it.

Keywords: *Meromorphic function, unit disc; relative $(p,q,t)L$-th order; relative $(p,q,t)L$-th type; relative $(p,q,t)L$-th weak type; Property (D).*
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: *30B10, 30J99*

1. Introduction, Definitions and Notations

Let us consider the functions which are meromorphic or analytic in the unit disc $D = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ and have unbounded growth according to some specific growth indicator. Also we consider that the reader is familiar with the fundamental results and the standard notations of the Nevanlinna theory in the unit disc $D = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ which are available in [5, 9, 13, 14]. Before starting the paper we just summarized the Nevanlinna theory for the reader's convenience. we denote by $n_f(r)$ the number of poles of f in $|z| \le r < 1$ where each pole is counted according to its multiplicity. Similarly $\overline{n}_f(r)$ stands for the number of distinct poles of f in $|z| \le r < 1$ disregarding the multiplicity. The Nevanlinna's Characteristic function of f is define as $T_f(r) = N_f(r) + m_f(r)$ where the function $N_f(r)$ and $m_f(r)$ are respectively known as counting function and proximity function which are as follows:

$$N_f(r) = \int_0^r \frac{n_f(t) - n_f(0)}{t} dt + n_f(0) \log r$$

$$\left(\overline{N}_f(r) = \int_0^r \frac{\overline{n}_f(t) - \overline{n}_f(0)}{t} dt + \overline{n}_f(0) \log r \right).$$

and

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

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

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

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

We define $\exp^{[k]} x = \exp\left(\exp^{[k-1]} x\right)$ and $\log^{[k]} x = \log\left(\log^{[k-1]} x\right)$ for $x \in [0,\infty)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ where $\mathbb{N}$ be the set of all positive integers. We also denote $\log^{[0]} x = x$, $\log^{[-1]} x = \exp x$, $\exp^{[0]} x = x$ and $\exp^{[-1]} x = \log x$.

Email addresses: **tanmaybiswas_math@rediffmail.com (Tanmay Biswas)**

Let f be a meromorphic function in D. Then, the order $\rho(f)$ and lower order $\lambda(f)$ of f [13] are defined by

$$\begin{matrix} \rho(f) \\ \lambda(f) \end{matrix} = \lim_{r\to 1} \begin{matrix} \sup \\ \inf \end{matrix} \frac{\log T_f(r)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{1-r}\right)}.$$

Further, if f is of order $\rho(f)$ $(0<\rho(f)<\infty)$, one may introduced the definitions of type $\sigma(f)$ and lower type $\overline{\sigma}(f)$ of f which are as follows:

$$\begin{matrix} \sigma(f) \\ \overline{\sigma}(f) \end{matrix} = \lim_{r\to 1} \begin{matrix} \sup \\ \inf \end{matrix} \frac{T_f(r)}{\left(\frac{1}{1-r}\right)^{\rho(f)}}.$$

However the above definition of order does not seem to be feasible if a meromorphic function f in D is of order zero. To over come this situation and in order to study the growth of meromorphic functions in the unit disc precisely, the concept of logarithmic order was introduced by increasing $\log^+$ once in the denominator. Therefore the logarithmic order $\rho_{\log}(f)$ and logarithmic lower order $\lambda_{\log}(f)$ of a meromorphic function f in D are define as

$$\begin{matrix} \rho_{\log}(f) \\ \lambda_{\log}(f) \end{matrix} = \lim_{r\to 1} \begin{matrix} \sup \\ \inf \end{matrix} \frac{\log T_f(r)}{\log^{[2]}\left(\frac{1}{1-r}\right)}.$$

Further the concept of (p,q)-th order and lower (p,q)-th order (p and q are any two positive integers with $p\geq q$) are not new and was introduced by Juneja et al. [6]. In the line of Juneja et al. [6], now we shall introduce the definitions of (p,q)-th order and (p,q)-th lower order respectively of a meromorphic function f in the unit disc D where $p,q\in\mathbb{N}$. In order to keep accordance with the definition of logarithmic order we will give a minor modification to the definition of (p,q)-order introduced by Juneja et al. [6].

Definition 1.1. *Let f be a meromorphic function in the unit disc D and $p,q\in\mathbb{N}$. Then (p,q)-th order $\rho^{(p,q)}(f)$ and (p,q)-th lower order $\lambda^{(p,q)}(f)$ of f are respectively define as:*

$$\begin{matrix} \rho^{(p,q)}(f) \\ \lambda^{(p,q)}(f) \end{matrix} = \lim_{r\to 1} \begin{matrix} \sup \\ \inf \end{matrix} \frac{\log^{[p]} T_f(r)}{\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}},$$

where p and $q\in\mathbb{N}$.

However during the last several years many authors have investigated different properties of meromorphic or analytic function in the unit disc D and derived so many great results (see e.g. [3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11]). The field of this investigate may be more influential through the intensive applications of the theories of slowly changing functions which in fact means that $L\left(\frac{a}{1-r}\right)\sim L\left(\frac{1}{1-r}\right)$ as $r\to 1$ for every positive constant a i.e., $\lim_{r\to 1}\frac{L\left(\frac{a}{1-r}\right)}{L\left(\frac{1}{1-r}\right)}=1$ where $L\equiv L\left(\frac{1}{1-r}\right)$ is a positive continuous function increasing slowly. Concepts of L-order was first introduced by Somasundaram and Thamizharasi [12]. Extending the notion of Somasundaram and Thamizharasi [12], one may introduce the definition of $(p,q,t)L$-th order and $(p,q,t)L$-th lower order of aa meromorphic function f in the unit disc D, where p, q are positive integers and $t\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$ in the following way:

$$\begin{matrix} \rho^{(p,q,t)L}(f) \\ \lambda^{(p,q,t)L}(f) \end{matrix} = \lim_{r\to 1} \begin{matrix} \sup \\ \inf \end{matrix} \frac{\log^{[p]} T_f(r)}{\log^{[q]}\left(\frac{1}{1-r}\right)+\exp^{[t]} L\left(\frac{1}{1-r}\right)}.$$

The notion of relative order was first introduced by Bernal [1, 2]. Considering this idea, now we introduce the definition of relative order and relative lower order of a meromorphic function f in the unit disc D with respect to an entire function in the following way:

Definition 1.2. *If f a meromorphic function f in the unit disc D and g be an entire function, then the relative order and relative lower order of f with respect to g, denoted by $\rho_g(f)$ and $\lambda_g(f)$ respectively are defined by*

$$\begin{matrix} \rho_g(f) \\ \lambda_g(f) \end{matrix} = \lim_{r\to 1} \begin{matrix} \sup \\ \inf \end{matrix} \frac{\log T_g^{-1}\left(T_f(r)\right)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{1-r}\right)}.$$

In order to make some progress in the study of relative order, now we introduce the concepts of (p,q)-th relative order $\rho_g^{(p,q)}(f)$ and (p,q)-th relative lower order $\lambda_g^{(p,q)}(f)$ of a meromorphic function f in the unit disc D with respect to an entire function g in the following approach:

$$\begin{matrix} \rho_g^{(p,q)}(f) \\ \lambda_g^{(p,q)}(f) \end{matrix} = \lim_{r\to 1} \begin{matrix} \sup \\ \inf \end{matrix} \frac{\log^{[p]} T_g^{-1}\left(T_f(r)\right)}{\log^{[q]}\left(\frac{1}{1-r}\right)},$$

where p and $q\in\mathbb{N}$.

In the case of relative order, it therefore seems reasonable to define suitably the relative $(p,q,t)L$-th order and relative $(p,q,t)L$-th lower order of a meromorphic function f in the unit disc D with respect to an entire function g respectively in the following way:

Definition 1.3. *Let f be any meromorphic function in the unit disc D and g be any entire function. Then relative $(p,q,t)L$-th order denoted as $\rho_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$ and relative $(p,q,t)L$-th lower order denoted as $\lambda_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$ of a meromorphic function f with respect to an entire function g are define by*

$$\begin{matrix} \rho_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f) \\ \lambda_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f) \end{matrix} = \lim_{r\to 1} \begin{matrix} \sup \\ \inf \end{matrix} \frac{\log^{[p]} T_g^{-1} T_f(r)}{\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)},$$

where $p,q\in\mathbb{N}$ and $t\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$.

A meromorphic function f in the unit disc D for which relative $(p,q,t)L$-th order and relative $(p,q,t)L$-th lower order with respect to an entire function g are the same is called a function of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g. Otherwise, f is said to be irregular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g.

Now in order to refine the above growth scale, we intend to introduce the definitions of an another growth indicators, such as relative $(p,q,t)L$-th type and relative $(p,q,t)L$-th lower type of meromorphic function in the unit disc D with respect to another entire function which are as follows:

Definition 1.4. *Let f be meromorphic in the unit disc D and g be an entire function with $0<\rho_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f)<\infty$ where $p,q\in\mathbb{N}$ and $t\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$, then the relative $(p,q,t)L$-th type and relative $(p,q,t)L$-th lower type denoted respectively by $\sigma_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$ and $\overline{\sigma}_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$ of f in the unit disc D with respect to g are respectively defined as follows:*

$$\begin{matrix}\sigma_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f)\\ \overline{\sigma}_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f)\end{matrix} = \lim_{r\to1}\begin{matrix}\sup\\ \inf\end{matrix}\frac{\log^{[p-1]}T_g^{-1}T_f(r)}{\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f)}}.$$

Analogously, to determine the relative growth of two meromorphic functions having same non zero finite relative $(p,q,t)L$-th lower order in the unit disc D with respect to another entire function, one can introduced the definition of relative $(p,q,t)L$-th weak type of a meromorphic f in the unit disc D with respect to an entire g of finite positive relative $(p,q,t)L$-th lower order $\lambda_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$ in the following way:

Definition 1.5. *Let f be meromorphic in the unit disc D and g be an entire function having finite positive relative $(p,q,t)L$-th lower order $\lambda_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$ $\left(0<\lambda_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f)<\infty\right)$ where $p,q\in\mathbb{N}$ and $t\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$. Then the relative $(p,q,t)L$-th weak type of f with respect to g is defined as :*

$$\tau_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f) = \liminf_{r\to1}\frac{\log^{[p-1]}T_g^{-1}T_f(r)}{\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f)}}.$$

Also one may define the growth indicator $\overline{\tau}_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$ of f with respect to g in the following manner

$$\overline{\tau}_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f) = \limsup_{r\to1}\frac{\log^{[p-1]}T_g^{-1}T_f(r)}{\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f)}},$$

where $p,q\in\mathbb{N}$ and $t\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$.

In this connection we state the following definition which will be needed in the sequel:

Definition 1.6. *For any two positive integers p, q and $t\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$, an entire function f is said to have Property (D), if for any $\delta>1$, $\mu>0$ and for all r, $0<r<1$, sufficiently close to 1*

$$\left(M_f\left(\exp^{[p]}\mu\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)\right)^2 < M_f\left(\left(\exp^{[p]}\mu\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)^{\delta}\right)$$

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

Here, in this paper, we aim at investigating some basic properties of relative $(p,q,t)L$-th order, relative $(p,q,t)L$-th type and relative $(p,q,t)L$-th weak type of a meromorphic function in the unit disc D with respect to an entire function where $p,q\in\mathbb{N}$ and $t\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$ under somewhat different conditions. Throughout this paper, we assume that all the growth indicators are all nonzero finite.

2. Lemmas

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

Lemma 2.1. *Let f be an entire function which satisfies the Property (D) then for any positive integer n and for all $\delta>1$,*

$$\left(M_f\left(\exp^{[p]}\mu\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)\right)^n < M_f\left(\left(\exp^{[p]}\mu\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)^{\delta}\right)$$

holds for all r, $0<r<1$, sufficiently close to 1, where $p,q\in\mathbb{N}$, $t\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$ and $\mu>0$.

Lemma 2.1 follows from a result of Bernal [2].

Lemma 2.2. *Let f be an entire function. Then*

$$T_f\left(\exp^{[p]}\mu\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right) \le$$
$$\log M_f\left(\exp^{[p]}\mu\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right) \le$$
$$3T_f\left(\left(2\left(\exp^{[p]}\mu\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)\right)\right)$$

for all r, $0<r<1$, sufficiently close to 1 , where $p,q\in\mathbb{N}$, $t\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$ and $\mu>0$.

Lemma 2.2 follows from Theorem 1.6 of [5].

3. Main Results

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

Theorem 3.1. *Let f_1, f_2 be meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1 be any entire function such that at least f_1 or f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$. Also let g_1 has the Property (D). Then*

$$\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) \le \max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}.$$

The equality holds when any one of $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ hold with at least f_j is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 where $i,j = 1,2$ and $i \ne j$.

Proof. The result is obvious when $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) = 0$. So we suppose that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) > 0$. We can clearly assume that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)$ is finite for $k = 1,2$. Now let us consider that $\max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\} = \Delta$ and f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1. Now for any arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ from the definition of $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, we have for a sequence $\{r_n\}$ values of r tending to 1 that

$$T_{f_1}(r) \le$$

$$T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p]}\left(\left(\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)+\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)\right)$$

$$i.e.,\ T_{f_1}(r) \le$$

$$T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p]}\left((\Delta+\varepsilon)\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)\right). \tag{3.1}$$

Also for any arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ from the definition of $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\ (= \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2))$, we obtain for all r, $0 < r < 1$, sufficiently close to 1 that

$$T_{f_2}(r) \le$$

$$T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p]}\left(\left(\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)+\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)\right)$$

$$i.e.,\ T_{f_2}(r) \le$$

$$T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p]}\left((\Delta+\varepsilon)\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)\right). \tag{3.2}$$

Since $T_{f_1 \pm f_2}(r) \le T_{f_1}(r) + T_{f_2}(r) + O(1)$, therefore there exists a sequence $\{r_n\}$ values of r tending to 1 for which we obtain in view of (3.1), (3.2) and Lemma 2.2 that

$$T_{f_1 \pm f_2}(r) \le$$

$$2\log M_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p]}\left((\Delta+\varepsilon)\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)\right)+O(1)$$

$$i.e.,\ T_{f_1 \pm f_2}(r) \le$$

$$3\log M_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p]}\left((\Delta+\varepsilon)\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)\right). \tag{3.3}$$

Therefore in view of Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we obtain from (3.3) for a sequence $\{r_n\}$ values of r tending to 1 and $\delta > 1$ that

$$T_{f_1 \pm f_2}(r) \le$$

$$\frac{1}{3}\log\left(M_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p]}\left((\Delta+\varepsilon)\left[\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right]\right)\right)\right)^9$$

$$i.e.,\ T_{f_1 \pm f_2}(r) \le$$

$$\frac{1}{3}\log M_{g_1}\left(\left(\exp^{[p]}\left((\Delta+\varepsilon)\left[\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right]\right)\right)^{\delta}\right)$$

$$i.e.,\ T_{f_1 \pm f_2}(r) \le$$

$$T_{g_1}\left(2\left(\exp^{[p]}\left((\Delta+\varepsilon)\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)\right)^{\delta}\right).$$

Now we get from above by letting $\delta \to 1^+$

$$i.e.,\ \liminf_{r\to 1}\frac{\log^{[p]}T_{g_1}^{-1}\left(T_{f_1 \pm f_2}(r)\right)}{\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)} < (\Delta+\varepsilon).$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary,

$$\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) \leq \Delta = \max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}.$$

Similarly, if we consider that f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 or both f_1 and f_2 are of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1, then one can easily verify that

$$\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) \leq \Delta = \max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}. \tag{3.4}$$

Further without loss of any generality, let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ and $f = f_1 \pm f_2$. Then in view of (3.4) we get that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f) \leq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. As, $f_2 = \pm(f - f_1)$ and in this case we obtain that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) \leq \max\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\}$. As we assume that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, therefore we have $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) \leq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$ and hence $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) = \max\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\}$. Thus the theorem is established. □

Theorem 3.2. *Let f_1 and f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1 be an entire function such that such that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ exists where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$. Also let g_1 has the Property (D). Then*

$$\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) \leq \max\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}.$$

The equality holds when $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.

We omit the proof of Theorem 3.2 as it can easily be carried out in the line of Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.3. *Let f_1 be a meromorphic function in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions such that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ exists where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$. Also let $g_1 \pm g_2$ has the Property (D). Then*

$$\lambda_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \min\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\}.$$

The equality holds when $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Proof. The result is obvious when $\lambda_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \infty$. So we suppose that $\lambda_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \infty$. We can clearly assume that $\lambda_{g_k}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ is finite for $k = 1,2$. Further let $\Psi = \min\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\}$. Now for any arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ from the definition of $\lambda_{g_k}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ where $k = 1,2$, we have for all r, $0 < r < 1$, sufficiently close to 1 that

$$T_{g_k}\left(\exp^{[p]}\left(\left(\lambda_{g_k}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) - \varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1} + \exp^{[t]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)\right) \leq T_{f_1}(r)$$

$$i.e,\ T_{g_k}\left(\exp^{[p]}\left((\Psi - \varepsilon)\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1} + \exp^{[t]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)\right) \leq T_{f_1}(r)$$

Now we obtain from above and Lemma 2.2 for all r, $0 < r < 1$, sufficiently close to 1 that

$$T_{g_1 \pm g_2}\left(\exp^{[p]}\left((\Psi - \varepsilon)\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1} + \exp^{[t]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)\right) \leq 2T_{f_1}(r) + O(1)$$

$$i.e.,\ T_{g_1 \pm g_2}\left(\exp^{[p]}\left((\Psi - \varepsilon)\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1} + \exp^{[t]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)\right) < 3T_{f_1}(r).$$

Therefore in view of Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we obtain from above for all r, $0 < r < 1$, sufficiently close to 1 and any $\sigma > 1$ that

$$\frac{1}{9}\log M_{g_1 \pm g_2}\left(\frac{\exp^{[p]}\left((\Psi - \varepsilon)\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1} + \exp^{[t]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)}{2}\right) < T_{f_1}(r)$$

$$i.e.,\ \log M_{g_1 \pm g_2}\left(\frac{\exp^{[p]}\left[(\Psi - \varepsilon)\left[\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1} + \exp^{[t]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right]\right]}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{9}} < T_{f_1}(r)$$

$$i.e.,\ \log M_{g_1 \pm g_2}\left(\left(\frac{\exp^{[p]}\left((\Psi - \varepsilon)\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1} + \exp^{[t]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}\right) < T_{f_1}(r)$$

$$i.e.,\ T_{g_1 \pm g_2}\left(\left(\frac{\exp^{[p]}\left((\Psi-\varepsilon)\left(\log^{[q]}(1-r)^{-1}+\exp^{[t]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)\right)}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}\right) < T_{f_1}(r).$$

As $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we get from above by letting $\sigma \to 1^+$

$$\lambda_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \Psi = \min\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\}. \tag{3.5}$$

Now without loss of any generality, we may consider that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $g = g_1 \pm g_2$. Then in view of (3.5) we get that $\lambda_{g}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Further, $g_1 = (g \pm g_2)$ and in this case we obtain that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \min\{\lambda_{g}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\}$. As we assume that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, therefore we have $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \lambda_{g}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and hence $\lambda_{g}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \min\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\}$. Thus the theorem follows. □

Theorem 3.4. *Let f_1 be a meromorphic function in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions such that f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to at least any one of g_1 or g_2 where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$. If $g_1 \pm g_2$ has the Property (D), then*

$$\rho_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\}.$$

The equality holds when any one of $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ hold with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_j where $i,j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$.

We omit the proof of Theorem 3.4 as it can easily be carried out in the line of Theorem 3.3.

Theorem 3.5. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions. Also let $g_1 \pm g_2$ has the Property (D). Then for $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$,*

$$\rho_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) \leq \max\left[\min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\}, \min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}\right]$$

when the following two conditions holds:
(i) $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_j for $i = 1, 2$, $j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$; and
(ii) $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ with at least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_j for $i = 1, 2$, $j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$.
The equality holds when $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) < \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ and $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) < \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ holds simultaneously for $i = 1,2$; $j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$.

Proof. Let the conditions (i) and (ii) of the theorem hold. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.4 we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max\left[\min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\}, \min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}\right] \\
&= \max\left[\rho_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right] \\
&\geq \rho_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Since $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) < \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ and $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) < \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ hold simultaneously for $i = 1,2$; $j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$, we obtain that either $\min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\} > \min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}$ or

$\min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\} > \min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\}$ holds.

Now in view of the conditions (i) and (ii) of the theorem, it follows from above that

either $\rho_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \rho_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\rho_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) > \rho_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$

which is the condition for holding equality in (3.6).
Hence the theorem follows. □

Theorem 3.6. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions. Also let g_1, g_2 and $g_1 \pm g_2$ satisfy the Property (D). Then for $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$,*

$$\lambda_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) \geq \min\left[\max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}, \max\left\{\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}\right]$$

when the following two conditions holds:
(i) $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ with at least f_j is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 for $i = 1, 2$, $j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$; and
(ii) $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ with at least f_j is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2 for $i = 1, 2$, $j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$.
The equality holds when $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ hold simultaneously for $i = 1,2$; $j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$.

Proof. Suppose that the conditions (i) and (ii) of the theorem holds. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.3, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min\left[\max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1),\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\},\max\left\{\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1),\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}\right]\\
&=\min\left[\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2),\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)\right]\\
&\geq \lambda_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2).
\end{aligned}\tag{3.7}$$

Since $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds simultaneously for $i=1,2$; $j=1,2$ and $i\neq j$, we get that either $\max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1),\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\} < \max\left\{\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1),\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}$ or

$\max\left\{\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1),\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\} < \max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1),\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}$ holds.

Since condition (i) and (ii) of the theorem holds, so it follows from above that either $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)$ or $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)$, which is the condition for holding equality in (3.7).

Hence the theorem follows. □

Theorem 3.7. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1 be any entire function such that at least f_1 or f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 where $p,q\in\mathbb{N}$ and $t\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$. Also let g_1 satisfy the Property (D). Then*

$$\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\cdot f_2)\leq \max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1),\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}.$$

The equality holds when any one of $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ hold with at least f_j is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 where $i,j=1,2$ and $i\neq j$.

Proof. Since $T_{f_1\cdot f_2}(r)\leq T_{f_1}(r)+T_{f_2}(r)$, therefore applying the same procedure as adopted in Theorem 3.1 we get that

$$\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\cdot f_2)\leq \max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1),\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}.$$

Now without loss of any generality, let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ and $f=f_1\cdot f_2$. Then $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)\leq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. Further, $f_2=\frac{f}{f_1}$ and and $T_{f_1}(r)=T_{\frac{1}{f_1}}(r)+O(1)$. Therefore $T_{f_2}(r)\leq T_f(r)+T_{f_1}(r)+O(1)$ and in this case we obtain that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\leq \max\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\}$. As we assume that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, therefore we have $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\leq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$ and hence $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)= \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)=\max\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\}$.

Hence the theorem follows. □

Next we prove the result for the quotient $\frac{f_1}{f_2}$, provided $\frac{f_1}{f_2}$ is meromorphic in the unit disc D.

Theorem 3.8. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1 be any entire function such that at least f_1 or f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 where $p,q\in\mathbb{N}$ and $t\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$. Also let g_1 satisfy the Property (D). Then*

$$\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)\leq \max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1),\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\},$$

provided $\frac{f_1}{f_2}$ is meromorphic in the unit disc D. The equality holds when at least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 and $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\neq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.

Proof. Since $T_{f_2}(r)=T_{\frac{1}{f_2}}(r)+O(1)$ and $T_{\frac{f_1}{f_2}}(r)\leq T_{f_1}(r)+T_{\frac{1}{f_2}}(r)$, we get in view of Theorem 3.1 that

$$\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)\leq \max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1),\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}.\tag{3.8}$$

Now in order to prove the equality conditions, we discuss the following two cases:

Case I. Suppose $\frac{f_1}{f_2}(=h)$ satisfies the following condition $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, and f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1. Now if possible, let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. Therefore from $f_1=h\cdot f_2$ we get that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ which is a contradiction. Therefore $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)\geq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ and in view of (3.8), we get that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)=\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.

Case II. Suppose $\frac{f_1}{f_2}(=h)$ satisfies the following condition $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, and f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1. Now from $f_1=h\cdot f_2$ we get that either $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\leq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)$ or $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\leq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. But according to our assumption $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\nleq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. Therefore $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)\geq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and in view of (3.8), we get that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)= \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Hence the theorem follows. □

Now we state the following theorem which can easily be carried out in the line of Theorem 3.7 and Theorem 3.8 and therefore its proof is omitted.

Theorem 3.9. *Let f_1 and f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1 be any entire function such that such that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ exists where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$. Also let g_1 satisfy the Property (D). Then*

$$\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) \leq \max\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}.$$

The equality holds when $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.
Similar results hold for the quotient $\frac{f_1}{f_2}$, provided $\frac{f_1}{f_2}$ is meromorphic in the unit disc D.

Theorem 3.10. *Let f_1 be a meromorphic function in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions such that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ exists where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$. Also let $g_1 \cdot g_2$ satisfy the Property (D). Then*

$$\lambda_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \min\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\}.$$

The equality holds when any one of $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ hold where $i,j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$ and g_i satisfy the Property (D).
Similar results hold for the quotient $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$, provided $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$ is entire and satisfy the Property (D). The equality holds when $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and g_1 satisfy the Property (D).

Proof. Since $T_{g_1 \cdot g_2}(r) \leq T_{g_1}(r) + T_{g_2}(r)$, therefore applying the same procedure as adopted in Theorem 3.3 we get that

$$\lambda_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \min\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\}.$$

Now without loss of any generality, we may consider that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $g = g_1 \cdot g_2$. Then $\lambda_{g}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Further, $g_1 = \frac{g}{g_2}$ and $T_{g_2}(r) = T_{\frac{1}{g_2}}(r) + O(1)$. Therefore $T_{g_1}(r) \leq T_g(r) + T_{g_2}(r) + O(1)$ and in this case we obtain that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \min\{\lambda_{g}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\}$. As we assume that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, so we have $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \lambda_{g}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and hence $\lambda_{g}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \min\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\}$. Hence the first part of the theorem follows.

Now we prove our results for the quotient $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$, provided $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$ is entire and $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Since $T_{g_2}(r) = T_{\frac{1}{g_2}}(r) + O(1)$ and $T_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}(r) \leq T_{g_1}(r) + T_{\frac{1}{g_2}}(r)$, we get in view of Theorem 3.3 that

$$\lambda_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \min\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\}. \tag{3.9}$$

Now in order to prove the equality conditions, we discuss the following two cases:

Case I. Suppose $\frac{g_1}{g_2}(= h)$ satisfies the following condition $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Now if possible, let $\lambda_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore from $g_1 = h \cdot g_2$ we get that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $\lambda_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \leq \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and in view of (3.9), we get that $\lambda_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Case II. Suppose that $\frac{g_1}{g_2}(= h)$ satisfies the following condition $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore from $g_1 = h \cdot g_2$, we get that either $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \lambda_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ or $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. But according to our assumption $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \ngeq \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore $\lambda_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \leq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and in view of (3.9), we get that $\lambda_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Hence the theorem follows. □

Theorem 3.11. *Let f_1 be any meromorphic function in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions such that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ exists where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$. Further let f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to at least any one of g_1 or g_2. Also let $g_1 \cdot g_2$ satisfy the Property (D). Then*

$$\rho_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\}.$$

The equality holds when any one of $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ hold with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_j where $i,j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$ and g_i satisfy the Property (D).

Theorem 3.12. *Let f_1 be any meromorphic function in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions such that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ exists where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$. Further let f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to at least any one of g_1 or g_2. Then*

$$\rho_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\},$$

provided $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$ is entire and satisfy the Property (D). The equality holds when at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2, $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and g_1 satisfy the Property (D).

We omit the proof of Theorem 3.11 and Theorem 3.12 as those can easily be carried out in the line of Theorem 3.10.

Now we state the following four theorems without their proofs as those can easily be carried out in the line of Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 3.6 respectively.

Theorem 3.13. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions. Also let $g_1 \cdot g_2$ be satisfy the Property (D). Then for $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\rho_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2)\\&\leq \max\left[\min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\}, \min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}\right],\end{aligned}$$

when the following two conditions holds:
(i) $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_j and g_i satisfy the Property (D) for $i = 1, 2,\ j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$; and
(ii) $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ with at least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_j and g_i satisfy the Property (D) for $i = 1, 2,\ j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$.
The equality holds when $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) < \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ and $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) < \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ holds simultaneously for $i = 1,2;\ j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$.

Theorem 3.14. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions. Also let $g_1 \cdot g_2$, g_1 and g_2 be satisfy the Property (D). Then for $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\lambda_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2)\\&\geq \min\left[\max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}, \max\left\{\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}\right]\end{aligned}$$

when the following two conditions holds:
(i) $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ with at least f_j is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 for $i = 1, 2,\ j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$; and
(ii) $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ with at least f_j is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2 for $i = 1, 2,\ j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$.
The equality holds when $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds simultaneously for $i = 1,2;\ j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$.

Theorem 3.15. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions such that $\frac{f_1}{f_2}$ is meromorphic in the unit disc D and $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$ is entire. Also let $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$ satisfy the Property (D). Then for $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\rho_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)\\&\leq \max\left[\min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\}, \min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}\right]\end{aligned}$$

when the following two conditions holds:
(i) At least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2 and $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$; and
(ii) At least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2 and $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) \neq \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.
The equality holds when $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) < \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ and $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) < \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ holds simultaneously for $i = 1,2;\ j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$.

Theorem 3.16. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions such that $\frac{f_1}{f_2}$ is meromorphic in the unit disc D and $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$ is entire. Also let $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$, g_1 and g_2 be satisfy the Property (D). Then for $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\lambda_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)\\&\geq \min\left[\max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}, \max\left\{\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}\right]\end{aligned}$$

when the following two conditions hold:
(i) At least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 and $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$; and
(ii) At least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2 and $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.
The equality holds when $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds simultaneously for $i = 1,2;\ j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$.

Next we intend to find out the sum and product theorems of relative $(p,q,t)L$-th type (respectively relative $(p,q,t)L$-th lower type) and relative $(p,q,t)L$-th weak type of meromorphic function in the unit disc with respect to an entire function taking into consideration of the above theorems.

Theorem 3.17. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions. Also let $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ are all non zero and finite where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$.*
***(A)** If any one of $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ hold for i, $j = 1,2$; $i \neq j$, and g_1 has the Property (D), then*

$$\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) = \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) \text{ and } \overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) = \overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) \mid i = 1,2.$$

***(B)** If any one of $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ hold with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_j for i, $j = 1,2$; $i \neq j$ and $g_1 \pm g_2$ has the Property (D), then*

$$\sigma_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \sigma_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \text{ and } \overline{\sigma}_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\sigma}_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \mid i = 1,2.$$

(C) *Assume the functions f_1, f_2, g_1 and g_2 satisfy the following conditions:*
(i) Any one of $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ hold with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_j for $i = 1, 2,\ j = 1, 2$ and $i \neq j$;
(ii) Any one of $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ hold with at least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_j for $i = 1, 2,\ j = 1, 2$ and $i \neq j$;
(iii) Any one of $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ and any one of $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ holds simultaneously for $i = 1, 2$; $j = 1, 2$ and $i \neq j$;
*(iv) $\rho_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l) =$
$\max\left[\min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\}, \min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}\right]$ where $l, m = 1, 2$, and $g_1 \pm g_2$ has the Property (D);
then*

$\sigma_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) = \sigma_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l)$ *and* $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) = \overline{\sigma}_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l) \mid l, m = 1, 2.$

Proof. From the definition of relative $(p,q,t)L$-th type and relative $(p,q,t)L$-th lower type of meromorphic function with respect to an entire function, we have for all r, $0 < r < 1$, sufficiently close to 1 that

$$T_{f_k}(r) \leq T_{g_l}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\sigma_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k) + \varepsilon\right)^{\rho_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)} \cdot \left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1} \cdot \exp^{[t+1]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)}\right), \tag{3.10}$$

$$T_{f_k}(r) \geq T_{g_l}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\overline{\sigma}_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k) - \varepsilon\right)^{\rho_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)} \cdot \left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1} \cdot \exp^{[t+1]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)}\right) \tag{3.11}$$

and for a sequence $\{r_n\}$ values of r tending to 1, we obtain that

$$T_{f_k}(r) \geq T_{g_l}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\sigma_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k) - \varepsilon\right)^{\rho_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)} \cdot \left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1} \cdot \exp^{[t+1]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)}\right) \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$T_{f_k}(r) \leq T_{g_l}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\overline{\sigma}_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k) + \varepsilon\right)^{\rho_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)} \cdot \left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1} \cdot \exp^{[t+1]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)}\right) \tag{3.13}$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is any arbitrary positive number $k = 1, 2$ and $l = 1, 2$.

Case I. Suppose that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ hold. Also let $\varepsilon (> 0)$ be arbitrary. Since $T_{f_1 \pm f_2}(r) \leq T_{f_1}(r) + T_{f_2}(r) + O(1)$, so in view of (3.10), we get for all r, $0 < r < 1$, sufficiently close to 1 that

$$T_{f_1 \pm f_2}(r) \leq (1 + A) T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) + \varepsilon\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)} \cdot \left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1} \cdot \exp^{[t+1]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)$$

where $A = \dfrac{T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) + \varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1} \cdot \exp^{[t+1]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)}\right)\right) + O(1)}{T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) + \varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1} \cdot \exp^{[t+1]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)\right)}$, and in view of $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, and for all r, $0 < r < 1$, sufficiently close to 1, we can make the term A sufficiently small.

Hence for any $\alpha = 1 + \varepsilon_1$ where $A = \varepsilon_1 > 0$, it follows from the above inequality for all r, $0 < r < 1$, sufficiently close to 1 that

$$T_{f_1 \pm f_2}(r) \leq (1 + \varepsilon_1) T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) + \varepsilon\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)} \cdot \left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1} \cdot \exp^{[t+1]} L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned} i.e.,\ T_{f_1\pm f_2}(r) &\leq \alpha T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)+\varepsilon\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\cdot\right. \\ &\left.\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence making $\alpha\to 1+$, we get in view of Theorem 3.2, $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)>\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ and above for all r, $0<r<1$, sufficiently close to 1 that

$$\limsup_{r\to 1}\frac{\log^{[p-1]}T_{g_1}^{-1}\left(T_{f_1\pm f_2}(r)\right)}{\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)}}\leq\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$$

$$i.e.,\ \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)\leq\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1). \tag{3.14}$$

Now we may consider that $f=f_1\pm f_2$. Since $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)>\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ hold. Then $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)\leq\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Further, let $f_1=(f\pm f_2)$. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.2 and $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)>\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, we obtain that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)>\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds. Hence in view of (3.14) $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\leq\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)$. Therefore $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\Rightarrow\sigma_{g_1}^{((p,q,t)L)}(f_1\pm f_2)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Similarly, if we consider $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, then one can easily verify that $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.

Case II. Let us consider that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)>\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ hold. Also let $\varepsilon(>0)$ are arbitrary. Since $T_{f_1\pm f_2}(r)\leq T_{f_1}(r)+T_{f_2}(r)+O(1)$, from (3.10) and (3.13), we get for a sequence $\{r_n\}$ values of r tending to 1 that

$$\begin{aligned} T_{f_1\pm f_2}(r_n) &\leq (1+B)\,T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)+\varepsilon\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\cdot\right. \\ &\left.\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $B=\dfrac{T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)+\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r_n)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r_n)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)}\right)\right)+O(1)}{T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)+\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r_n)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r_n)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)\right)}$, and in view of $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)>\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, we can make the term B sufficiently small for a sequence $\{r_n\}$ values of r tending to 1 and therefore using the similar technique for as executed in the proof of Case I we get from the above inequality that $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)=\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ when $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)>\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ hold.

Likewise, if we consider $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, then one can easily verify that $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)=\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.

Thus combining Case I and Case II, we obtain the first part of the theorem.

Case III. Let us consider that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2. We can make the term $C=\dfrac{T_{g_2}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)-\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r_n)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r_n)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)\right)+O(1)}{T_{g_2}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)-\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r_n)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r_n)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)\right)}$ sufficiently small by taking n sufficiently large, since $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Hence $C<\varepsilon_2$.

Since $T_{g_1\pm g_2}(r)\leq T_{g_1}(r)+T_{g_2}(r)+O(1)$, so for any $\alpha=1+\varepsilon_2$, we obtain in view of $C<\varepsilon_1$, (3.11) and (3.12) for a sequence $\{r_n\}$ values of r tending to 1 that

$$\begin{aligned} &T_{g_1\pm g_2}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)-\varepsilon\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\cdot\right. \\ &\left.\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)\leq\alpha T_{f_1}(r_n) \end{aligned}$$

Now making $\alpha\to 1+$, we obtain from above for a sequence $\{r_n\}$ values of r tending to 1 that

$$\left(\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)-\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r_n)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r_n)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}$$

$$<\log^{[p-1]}T_{g_1\pm g_2}^{-1}\left(T_{f_1}(r_n)\right)$$

Since $\varepsilon>0$ is arbitrary, we find that

$$\sigma_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\geq\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1). \tag{3.15}$$

Now we may consider that $g=g_1\pm g_2$. Also $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2. Then $\sigma_{g}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\sigma_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\geq \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Further let $g_1=(g\pm g_2)$. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.4 and $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, we obtain that $\rho_{g}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ as at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2. Hence in view of (3.15), $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\geq \sigma_{g}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\sigma_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore $\sigma_{g}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\Rightarrow \sigma_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Similarly if we consider $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)>\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1, then $\sigma_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Case IV. In this case suppose that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2. we can also make the term $D=\dfrac{T_{g_2}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)-\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)\right)+O(1)}{T_{g_2}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)-\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)\right)}$ sufficiently small by taking r sufficiently close to 1 as $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. So $D<\varepsilon_3$ for all r, $0<r<1$, sufficiently close to 1. As $T_{g_1\pm g_2}(r)\leq T_{g_1}(r)+T_{g_2}(r)+O(1)$, therefore from (3.11), we get for all r, $0<r<1$, sufficiently close to 1 that

$$T_{g_1\pm g_2}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)-\varepsilon\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\cdot\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)\leq(1+\varepsilon_3)\,T_{f_1}(r).$$

and therefore using the similar technique for as executed in the proof of Case III we get from above that $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ where $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2.

Likewise if we consider $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)>\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1, then $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Thus combining Case III and Case IV, we obtain the second part of the theorem.

The third part of the theorem is a natural consequence of Theorem 3.5 and the first part and second part of the theorem. Hence its proof is omitted. □

Theorem 3.18. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions. Also let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ are all non zero and finite where $p,q\in\mathbb{N}$ and $t\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$.*

***(A)** If any one of $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i)>\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ hold with at least f_j is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 for i, $j=1,2$; $i\neq j$, and g_1 has the Property (D), then*

$$\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)=\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i)\ \textit{and}\ \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)=\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i)\mid i=1,2.$$

***(B)** If any one of $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ hold for i, $j=1,2$; $i\neq j$ and $g_1\pm g_2$ has the Property (D), then*

$$\tau_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\tau_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\ \textit{and}\ \overline{\tau}_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\overline{\tau}_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\mid i=1,2.$$

***(C)** Assume the functions f_1,f_2,g_1 and g_2 satisfy the following conditions:*
(i) Any one of $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i)>\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ hold with at least f_j is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 for $i=j=1,2$ and $i\neq j$;
(ii) Any one of $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i)>\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ hold with at least f_j is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2 for $i=j=1,2$ and $i\neq j$;
(iii) Any one of $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and any one of $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)<\rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds simultaneously for $i=j=1,2$ and $i\neq j$;
(iv) $\lambda_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l)=$
$\min\left[\max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1),\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\},\max\left\{\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1),\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}\right]$ where $l,m=1,2$ and $g_1\pm g_2$ has the Property (D)
then we have

$$\tau_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)=\tau_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l)\ \textit{and}\ \overline{\tau}_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)=\overline{\tau}_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l)\mid l,m=1,2.$$

Proof. For any arbitrary positive number $\varepsilon(>0)$, we have for all r, $0<r<1$, sufficiently close to 1 that

$$T_{f_k}(r)\leq T_{g_l}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\overline{\tau}_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)+\varepsilon\right)^{\lambda_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)}\cdot\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)}\right),\tag{3.16}$$

$$T_{f_k}(r) \geq T_{g_l}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\tau_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)-\varepsilon\right)^{\lambda_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)}\cdot \left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)}\right) \quad (3.17)$$

and a sequence $\{r_n\}$ values of r tending to 1 we obtain that

$$T_{f_k}(r) \geq T_{g_l}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\overline{\tau}_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)-\varepsilon\right)^{\lambda_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)}\cdot \left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)}\right) \quad (3.18)$$

and

$$T_{f_k}(r) \leq T_{g_l}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\tau_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)+\varepsilon\right)^{\lambda_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)}\cdot \left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_l}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_k)}\right), \quad (3.19)$$

where $k=1,2$ and $l=1,2$.

Case I. Let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ with at least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1. Also let $\varepsilon\,(>0)$ be arbitrary. Since $T_{f_1\pm f_2}(r) \leq T_{f_1}(r)+T_{f_2}(r)+O(1)$, we get from (3.16) and (3.19), for a sequence $\{r_n\}$ values of r tending to 1 that

$$T_{f_1\pm f_2}(r_n) \leq (1+E)\,T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)+\varepsilon\right)^{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\cdot \left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r_n)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r_n)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)$$

where $E = \dfrac{T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)+\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r_n)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r_n)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)}\right)\right)+O(1)}{T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)+\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r_n)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r_n)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)\right)}$ and in view of $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, we can make the term E sufficiently small for a sequence $\{r_n\}$ values of r tending to 1. Now with the help of Theorem 3.1 and using the similar technique of Case I of Theorem 3.17, we get from above inequality that

$$\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2) \leq \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1). \quad (3.20)$$

Further, we may consider that $f = f_1 \pm f_2$. Also suppose that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ and at least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1. Then $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2) \leq \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Now let $f_1 = (f \pm f_2)$. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.1, $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ and at least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1, we obtain that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds. Hence in view of (3.20), $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \leq \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2)$. Therefore $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \Rightarrow \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Similarly, if we consider $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 then one can easily verify that $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.

Case II. Let us consider that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ with at least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1. Also let $\varepsilon\,(>0)$ be arbitrary. As $T_{f_1\pm f_2}(r) \leq T_{f_1}(r)+T_{f_2}(r)+O(1)$, we obtain from (3.16) for all sufficiently large values of r that

$$T_{f_1\pm f_2}(r) \leq (1+F)\,T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)+\varepsilon\right)^{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\cdot \left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r_n)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r_n)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)$$

where $F = \dfrac{T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)+\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)}\right)\right)+O(1)}{T_{g_1}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)+\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)\right)}$, and in view of $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, we can make the term F sufficiently small for all r, $0<r<1$, sufficiently close to 1 and therefore for similar reasoning of Case I we get from above inequality that $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\pm f_2) = \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ when $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ and at least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1.

Likewise, if we consider $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 then one can easily verify that $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) = \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$

Thus combining Case I and Case II, we obtain the first part of the theorem.

Case III. Let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore we can make the term $G = \dfrac{T_{g_2}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)-\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)\right)+}{T_{g_2}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)-\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)\right)}$ sufficiently small for all r, $0<r<1$, sufficiently close to 1 since $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. So $G < \varepsilon_4$. Since $T_{g_1\pm g_2}(r) \le T_{g_1}(r) + T_{g_2}(r) + O(1)$, we get from (3.17) for all sufficiently large values of r that

$$T_{g_1\pm g_2}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)-\varepsilon\right)^{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\cdot\right.$$
$$\left.\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right) \le (1+\varepsilon_4)\,T_{f_1}(r).$$

Therefore in view of Theorem 3.3 and using the similar technique of Case III of Theorem 3.17, we get from above that

$$\tau_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \ge \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1). \tag{3.21}$$

Further, we may consider that $g = g_1 \pm g_2$. As $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, so $\tau_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \ge \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Further let $g_1 = (g \pm g_2)$. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.3 and $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ we obtain that $\lambda_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ holds. Hence in view of (3.21) $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \ge \tau_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore $\tau_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \Rightarrow \tau_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Likewise, if we consider that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, then one can easily verify that $\tau_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Case IV. Let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore we can make the term $H = \dfrac{T_{g_2}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)-\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r_n)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r_n)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)\right)+}{T_{g_2}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\left(\tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)-\varepsilon\right)\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r_n)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r_n)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right)\right)}$ sufficiently small for a sequence $\{r_n\}$ values of r tending to 1, since $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore $H < \varepsilon_5$ for a sequence $\{r_n\}$ values of r tending to 1. As $T_{g_1\pm g_2}(r) \le T_{g_1}(r) + T_{g_2}(r) + O(1)$, we obtain from (3.17) and (3.18), we obtain for a sequence $\{r_n\}$ values of r tending to 1 that

$$T_{g_1\pm g_2}\left(\exp^{[p-1]}\left(\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)-\varepsilon\right)^{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\cdot\right.$$
$$\left.\left(\log^{[q-1]}(1-r)^{-1}\cdot\exp^{[t+1]}L\left((1-r)^{-1}\right)\right)^{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)}\right) \le (1+\varepsilon_5)\,T_{f_1}(r).$$

and therefore using the similar technique for as executed in the proof of Case IV of Theorem 3.17, we get from above that $\overline{\tau}_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ when $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Similarly, if we consider that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, then one can easily verify that $\overline{\tau}_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Thus combining Case III and Case IV, we obtain the second part of the theorem.

The proof of the third part of the Theorem is omitted as it can be carried out in view of Theorem 3.6 and the above cases. □

In the next two theorems we reconsider the equalities in Theorem 3.1 to Theorem 3.4 under somewhat different conditions.

Theorem 3.19. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions. Also let $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$.*

***(A)** The following condition is assumed to be satisfied:*

(i) Either $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \ne \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \ne \overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds and g_1 has the Property (D), then

$$\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2).$$

***(B)** The following conditions are assumed to be satisfied:*

(i) Either $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \ne \sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ or $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \ne \overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ holds and $g_1 \pm g_2$ has the Property (D);

(ii) f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to at least any one of g_1 or g_2, then

$$\rho_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1).$$

Proof. Let f_1, f_2, g_1 and g_2 be any four entire functions satisfying the conditions of the theorem.

Case I. Suppose that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ $(0 < \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \infty)$. Now in view of Theorem 3.2 it is easy to see that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) \le \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. If possible let

$$\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) < \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2). \tag{3.22}$$

Let $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. Then in view of the first part of Theorem 3.17 and (3.22) we obtain that $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2 \mp f_2) = \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ which is a contradiction. Hence $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. Similarly with the help of the first part of Theorem 3.17, one can obtain the same conclusion under the hypothesis $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. This proves the first part of the theorem.

Case II. Let us consider that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ $(0 < \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \infty)$, f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to at least any one of g_1 or g_2 and $(g_1 \pm g_2)$ and $g_1 \pm g_2$ satisfy the Property (D). Therefore in view of Theorem 3.4, it follows that $\rho_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and if possible let

$$\rho_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1). \tag{3.23}$$

Let us consider that $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Then. in view of the proof of the second part of Theorem 3.17 and (3.23) we obtain that $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \sigma_{g_1 \pm g_2 \mp g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ which is a contradiction. Hence $\rho_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Also in view of the proof of second part of Theorem 3.17 one can derive the same conclusion for the condition $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and therefore the second part of the theorem is established. □

Theorem 3.20. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions. Also let $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$.*
***(A)** The following conditions are assumed to be satisfied:*
(i) $(f_1 \pm f_2)$ is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to at least any one of g_1 or g_2, and g_1, g_2 , $g_1 \pm g_2$ have the Property (D);
(ii) Either $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) \neq \sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2)$ or $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2)$;
(iii) Either $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$;
(iv) Either $\sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$; then

$$\rho_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2).$$

***(B)** The following conditions are assumed to be satisfied:*
(i) f_1 and f_2 are of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to at least any one of g_1 or g_2, and $g_1 \pm g_2$ has the Property (D);
(ii) Either $\sigma_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \sigma_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$;
(iii) Either $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ or $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$;
(iv) Either $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) \neq \sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$; then

$$\rho_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2).$$

We omit the proof of Theorem 3.20 as it is a natural consequence of Theorem 3.19.

Theorem 3.21. *Let f_1, f_2 be ant two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1,g_2 be any two entire functions.*
***(A)** The following conditions are assumed to be satisfied:*
(i) At least any one of f_1 or f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$;
(ii) Either $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds and g_1 has the Property (D), then

$$\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2).$$

***(B)** The following conditions are assumed to be satisfied:*
(i) f_1, g_1 and g_2 be any three entire functions such that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ exists where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$;
(ii) Either $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ or $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ holds and $g_1 \pm g_2$ has the Property (D), then

$$\lambda_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1).$$

Proof. Let f_1, f_2, g_1 and g_2 be any four entire functions satisfying the conditions of the theorem.

Case I. Let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ $(0 < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \infty)$ and at least f_1 or f_2 and $(f_1 \pm f_2)$ are of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1. Now, in view of Theorem 3.1, it is easy to see that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) \leq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. If possible let

$$\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2). \tag{3.24}$$

Let $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. Then in view of the proof of the first part of Theorem 3.18 and (3.24) we obtain that $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2 \mp f_2) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ which is a contradiction. Hence $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. Similarly in view of the proof of the first part of Theorem 3.18 , one can establish the same conclusion under the hypothesis $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. This proves the first part of the theorem.

Case II. Let us consider that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ $(0 < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \infty$. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.3, it follows that $\lambda_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and if possible let

$$\lambda_{g_1 \pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1). \tag{3.25}$$

Suppose $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Then in view of the second part of Theorem 3.18 and (3.25), we obtain that $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_1\pm g_2\mp g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ which is a contradiction. Hence $\lambda_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Analogously with the help of the second part of Theorem 3.18, the same conclusion can also be derived under the condition $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and therefore the second part of the theorem is established. □

Theorem 3.22. *Let $f_1,\ f_2$ be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and $g_1,\ g_2$ be any two entire functions.*
(A) *The following conditions are assumed to be satisfied:*
(i) At least any one of f_1 or f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 and g_2 where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$, and g_1, g_2, $g_1 \pm g_2$ have satisfy the Property (D);
(ii) Either $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) \neq \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2)$ or $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2)$;
(iii) Either $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$;
(iv) Either $\tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$; then

$$\lambda_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2).$$

(B) *The following conditions are assumed to be satisfied:*
(i) At least any one of f_1 or f_2 are of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to $g_1 \pm g_2$ where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$, and $g_1 \pm g_2$ has satisfy the Property (D);
(ii) Either $\tau_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\tau}_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds;
(iii) Either $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ or $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ holds;
(iv) Either $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) \neq \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds, then

$$\lambda_{g_1\pm g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \pm f_2) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2).$$

We omit the proof of Theorem 3.22 as it is a natural consequence of Theorem 3.21.

Theorem 3.23. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions. Also let $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ are all non zero and finite where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{-1,0\}$.*
(A) *Assume the functions f_1, f_2 and g_1 satisfy the following conditions:*
(i) Any one of $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ hold for i, $j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$;
(ii) g_1 satisfies the Property (D), then

$$\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) \text{ and } \overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) \mid i = 1,2 .$$

Similarly,

$$\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right) = \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) \text{ and } \overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right) = \overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) \mid i = 1,2$$

holds provided (i) $\frac{f_1}{f_2}$ is meromorphic in the unit disc D, (ii) $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j) \mid i = 1,2;\ j = 1,2;\ i \neq j$ and (iii) g_1 satisfy the Property (D).
(B) *Assume the functions g_1, g_2 and f_1 satisfy the following conditions:*
(i)Aany one of $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ hold with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_j for i, $j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$, and g_i satisfy the Property (D);
(ii) $g_1 \cdot g_2$ satisfy the Property (D), then

$$\sigma_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \sigma_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \text{ and } \overline{\sigma}_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\sigma}_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \mid i = 1,2.$$

Similarly,

$$\sigma_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \sigma_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \text{ and } \overline{\sigma}_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\sigma}_{gi}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \mid i = 1,2$$

holds provided (i) $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$ is entire and satisfy the Property (D), (ii) At least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2, (iii) $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \mid i = 1,2;\ j = 1,2;\ i \neq j$ and (iv) g_1 satisfy the Property (D).
(C) *Assume the functions f_1, f_2, g_1 and g_2 satisfy the following conditions:*
(i) $g_1 \cdot g_2$ satisfy the Property (D);
(ii) Any one of $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ hold with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_j for $i = 1,\ 2,\ j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$;
(iii) Any one of $\rho_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \rho_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ hold with at least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_j for $i = 1,\ 2,\ j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$;
(iv) Any one of $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ and any one of $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ holds simultaneously for $i = 1,2;\ j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$;
(v) $\rho_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l) =$
$\max\left[\min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\}, \min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}\right]$ where $l = m = 1,2$; then

$$\sigma_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \sigma_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l) \text{ and } \overline{\sigma}_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \overline{\sigma}_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l) \mid l,m = 1,2.$$

Similarly,

$$\sigma_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)=\sigma_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l) \text{ and } \overline{\sigma}_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)=\overline{\sigma}_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l) \mid l,m=1,2.$$

holds provided $\frac{f_1}{f_2}$ is meromorphic in the unit disc D and $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$ is entire function which satisfy the following conditions:
(i) $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$ satisfy the Property (D);
(ii) At least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2 and $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\neq\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$;
(iii) At least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2 and $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\neq\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$;
(iv) Any one of $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i)<\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ and any one of $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i)<\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ holds simultaneously for $i=1,2;\ j=1,2$ and $i\neq j$;
(v) $\rho_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l)=$
$\max\left[\min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1),\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\right\},\min\left\{\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2),\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}\right]$ *where $l=m=1,2$.*

Proof. Let us suppose that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ are all non zero and finite.

Case I. Suppose that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)>\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. Also let g_1 satisfy the Property (D). Since $T_{f_1\cdot f_2}(r)\leq T_{f_1}(r)+T_{f_2}(r)$ for all large r, therefore applying the same procedure as adopted in Case I of Theorem 3.17 we get that

$$\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\cdot f_2)\leq\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1). \tag{3.26}$$

Further without loss of any generality, let $f=f_1\cdot f_2$ and $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)<\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$. Then in view of (3.26), we obtain that $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\cdot f_2)\leq\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Also $f_1=\frac{f}{f_2}$ and $T_{f_2}(r)=T_{\frac{1}{f_2}}(r)+O(1)$. Therefore $T_{f_1}(r)\leq T_f(r)+T_{f_2}(r)+O(1)$ and in this case also we obtain from (3.26) that $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\leq\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\cdot f_2)$. Hence $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\Rightarrow\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\cdot f_2)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Similarly, if we consider $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, then one can verify that $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\cdot f_2)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.

Next we may suppose that $f=\frac{f_1}{f_2}$ with f_1, f_2 and f are all meromorphic functions in the unit disc D.

Sub Case I$_\mathbf{A}$. Let $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)<\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.9, $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)<\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$. We have $f_1=f\cdot f_2$. So, $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)$.

Sub Case I$_\mathbf{B}$. Let $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)>\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.9, $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)=\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$. Since $T_f(r)$ $=T_{\frac{1}{f}}(r)+O(1)=T_{\frac{f_2}{f_1}}(r)+O(1)$, So $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.

Case II. Let $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)>\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. Also let g_1 satisfy the Property (D). As $T_{f_1\cdot f_2}(r)\leq T_{f_1}(r)+T_{f_2}(r)$, therefore applying the same procedure as explored in Case II of Theorem 3.17, one can easily verify that $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\cdot f_2)=\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)=\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i)\mid i=1,2$ under the conditions specified in the theorem.

Similarly, if we consider $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, then one can verify that $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1\cdot f_2)=\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ and $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)=\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.

Therefore the first part of theorem follows from Case I and Case II.

Case III. Let $g_1\cdot g_2$ satisfy the Property (D) and $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2. Since $T_{g_1\cdot g_2}(r)\leq T_{g_1}(r)+T_{g_2}(r)$, therefore applying the same procedure as adopted in Case III of Theorem 3.17 we get that

$$\sigma_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\geq\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1). \tag{3.27}$$

Further without loss of any generality, let $g=g_1\cdot g_2$ and $\rho_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Then in view of (3.27), we obtain that $\sigma_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\sigma_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\geq\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Also $g_1=\frac{g}{g_2}$ and $T_{g_2}(r)=T_{\frac{1}{g_2}}(r)+O(1)$. Therefore $T_{g_1}(r)\leq T_g(r)+T_{g_2}(r)$ $+O(1)$ and in this case we obtain from (3.27) that $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\geq\sigma_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\sigma_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Hence $\sigma_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)\Rightarrow\sigma_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Similarly, if we consider $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)>\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1, then one can verify that $\sigma_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Next we may suppose that $g=\frac{g_1}{g_2}$ with g_1, g_2, g are all entire functions satisfying the conditions specified in the theorem.

Sub Case III$_\mathbf{A}$. Let $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.12, $\rho_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. We have $g_1=g\cdot g_2$. So $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\sigma_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\sigma_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Sub Case III$_\mathbf{B}$. Let $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)>\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.12, $\rho_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)<\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Since $T_g(r)=T_{\frac{1}{g}}(r)+O(1)=T_{\frac{g_2}{g_1}}(r)+O(1)$, So $\sigma_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)=\sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Case IV. Suppose $g_1 \cdot g_2$ satisfy the Property (D). Also let $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2. As $T_{g_1 \cdot g_2}(r) \leq T_{g_1}(r) + T_{g_2}(r)$, the same procedure as explored in Case IV of Theorem 3.17, one can easily verify that $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\overline{\sigma}_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\sigma}_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \mid i = 1,2$ under the conditions specified in the theorem.

Likewise, if we consider $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1, then one can verify that $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\overline{\sigma}_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore the second part of theorem follows from Case III and Case IV.

Proof of the third part of the Theorem is omitted as it can be carried out in view of Theorem 3.13 and Theorem 3.15 and the above cases. $\square$

Theorem 3.24. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions. Also let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_{1i})$, $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ are all non zero and finite where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$.*
***(A)** Assume the functions f_1, f_2 and g_1 satisfy the following conditions:*
(i) Any one of $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ hold with at least f_j is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 for i , $j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$;
(ii) g_1 satisfy the Property (D), then

$$\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) \text{ and } \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) \mid i = 1,2.$$

Similarly,

$$\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) \text{ and } \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right) = \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) \mid i = 1,2$$

holds provided $\frac{f_1}{f_2}$ is meromorphic in the unit disc D, at least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 where g_1 satisfy the Property (D) and $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j) \mid i = 1,2;\ j = 1,2;\ i \neq j$.
***(B)** Assume the functions g_1, g_2 and f_1 satisfy the following conditions:*
(i) Any one of $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ hold for i, $j = 1,2$, $i \neq j$; and g_i satisfy the Property (D)
(ii) $g_1 \cdot g_2$ satisfy the Property (D), then

$$\tau_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \text{ and } \overline{\tau}_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\tau}_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \mid i = 1,2.$$

Similarly,

$$\tau_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \text{ and } \overline{\tau}_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\tau}_{gi}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \mid i = 1,2$$

holds provided $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$ is entire and satisfy the Property (D), g_1 satisfy the Property (D) and $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \mid i = 1,2;\ j = 1,2;\ i \neq j$.
***(C)** Assume the functions f_1, f_2, g_1 and g_2 satisfy the following conditions:*
(i) $g_1 \cdot g_2$, g_1 and g_2 are satisfy the Property (D);
(ii) Any one of $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ hold with at least f_j is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 for $i = 1, 2$, $j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$;
(iii) Any one of $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_i) > \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_j)$ hold with at least f_j is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2 for $i = 1, 2$, $j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$;
(iv) Any one of $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and any one of $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds simultaneously for $i = 1,2$; $j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$;
(v) $\lambda_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l) =$
$\min\left[\max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}, \max\left\{\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}\right]$ where $l = m = 1,2$; then

$$\tau_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \tau_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l) \text{ and } \overline{\tau}_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \overline{\tau}_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l) \mid l,m = 1,2.$$

Similarly,

$$\tau_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right) = \tau_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l) \text{ and } \overline{\tau}_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right) = \overline{\tau}_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l) \mid l,m = 1,2.$$

holds provided $\frac{f_1}{f_2}$ is meromorphic in the unit disc D and $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$ is entire functions which satisfy the following conditions:
(i) $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$, g_1 and g_2 satisfy the Property (D);
(ii) At least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 and $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$;
(iii) At least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_2 and $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$;
(iv) Any one of $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and any one of $\lambda_{g_i}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \lambda_{g_j}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds simultaneously for $i = 1,2$; $j = 1,2$ and $i \neq j$;
(v) $\lambda_{g_m}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_l) =$
$\min\left[\max\left\{\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}, \max\left\{\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)\right\}\right]$ where $l = m = 1,2$.

Proof. Let us consider that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$, $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ are all non zero and finite.
Case I. Suppose $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ with at least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 and g_1 satisfy the Property (D). Since $T_{f_1\cdot f_2}(r) \le T_{f_1}(r) + T_{f_2}(r)$, therefore applying the same procedure as adopted in Case I of Theorem 3.18 we get that

$$\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) \le \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1). \tag{3.28}$$

Further without loss of any generality, let $f = f_1 \cdot f_2$ and $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$. Then in view of (3.28), we obtain that $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) \le \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Also $f_1 = \frac{f}{f_2}$ and $T_{f_2}(r) = T_{\frac{1}{f_2}}(r) + O(1)$. Therefore $T_{f_1}(r) \le T_f(r) + T_{f_2}(r)$ $+ O(1)$ and in this case we obtain from the above arguments that $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \le \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2)$. Hence $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \Rightarrow \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Similarly, if we consider $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1, then one can easily verify that $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.

Next we may suppose that $f = \frac{f_1}{f_2}$ with f_1, f_2 and f are all meromorphic functions in the unit disc D satisfying the conditions specified in the theorem.

Sub Case I$_{\mathbf{A}}$. Let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.8, $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$. We have $f_1 = f \cdot f_2$. So $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right)$.

Sub Case I$_{\mathbf{B}}$. Let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.8, $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f)$. Since $T_f(r)$ $= T_{\frac{1}{f}}(r) + O(1) = T_{\frac{f_2}{f_1}}(r) + O(1)$, So $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1}{f_2}\right) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.

Case II. Let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ with at least f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 where g_1 satisfy the Property (D). As $T_{f_1\cdot f_2}(r) \le T_{f_1}(r) + T_{f_2}(r)$, so applying the same procedure as adopted in Case II of Theorem 3.18 we can easily verify that $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\overline{\tau}_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\tau}_{gi}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \mid i = 1,2$ under the conditions specified in the theorem.

Similarly, if we consider $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ with at least f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1, then one can easily verify that $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$.

Therefore the first part of theorem follows Case I and Case II.
Case III. Let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $g_1 \cdot g_2$ satisfy the Property (D).Since $T_{g_1\cdot g_2}(r) \le T_{g_1}(r) + T_{g_2}(r)$, therefore applying the same procedure as adopted in Case III of Theorem 3.18 we get that

$$\tau_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \le \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1). \tag{3.29}$$

Further without loss of any generality, let $g = g_1 \cdot g_2$ and $\lambda_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Then in view of (3.29), we obtain that $\tau_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \ge \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Also $g_1 = \frac{g}{g_2}$ and $T_{g_2}(r) = T_{\frac{1}{g_2}}(r) + O(1)$. Therefore $T_{g_1}(r) \le T_g(r) + T_{g_2}(r) +$ $O(1)$ and in this case we obtain from above arguments that $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \ge \tau_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Hence $\tau_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ $\Rightarrow \tau_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

If $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, then one can easily verify that $\tau_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Next we may suppose that $g = \frac{g_1}{g_2}$ with g_1, g_2, g are all entire functions satisfying the conditions specified in the theorem.

Sub Case III$_{\mathbf{A}}$. Let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.10, $\lambda_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. We have $g_1 = g \cdot g_2$. So $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Sub Case III$_{\mathbf{B}}$. Let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore in view of Theorem 3.10, $\lambda_g^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Since $T_g(r) = T_{\frac{1}{g}}(r) + O(1) = T_{\frac{g_2}{g_1}}(r) + O(1)$, So $\tau_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Case IV. Suppose $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $g_1 \cdot g_2$ satisfy the Property (D). Since $T_{g_1\cdot g_2}(r) \le T_{g_1}(r) + T_{g_2}(r)$, then adopting the same procedure as of Case IV of Theorem 3.18, we obtain that $\overline{\tau}_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and $\overline{\tau}_{\frac{g_1}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\tau}_{gi}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \mid i = 1,2$.

Similarly if we consider that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$, then one can easily verify that $\overline{\tau}_{g_1\cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.

Therefore the second part of the theorem follows from Case III and Case IV.

Proof of the third part of the Theorem is omitted as it can be carried out in view of Theorem 3.14 , Theorem 3.16 and the above cases. □

Theorem 3.25. *Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions. Also let $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$.*
***(A)** The following condition is assumed to be satisfied:*
(i) Either $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \ne \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \ne \overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds;
(ii) g_1 satisfies the Property (D), then

$$\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2).$$

(B) *The following conditions are assumed to be satisfied:*
(i) Either $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ *or* $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ *holds;*
(ii) f_1 *is of regular relative* (p,q,t) *growth with respect to at least any one of* g_1 *or* g_2*. Also* $g_1 \cdot g_2$ *satisfy the Property (D). Then we have*

$$\rho_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1).$$

Proof. Let f_1, f_2 be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions satisfying the conditions of the theorem.

Case I. Suppose that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ $(0 < \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \infty)$ and g_1 satisfy the Property (D). Now in view of Theorem 3.9, it is easy to see that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) \leq \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. If possible let

$$\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) < \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2). \tag{3.30}$$

Let $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. Now in view of the first part of Theorem 3.23 and (3.30) we obtain that $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1 \cdot f_2}{f_2}\right)$ $= \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ which is a contradiction. Hence $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. Similarly with the help of the first part of Theorem 3.23, one can obtain the same conclusion under the hypothesis $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. This prove the first part of the theorem.
Case II. Let us consider that $\rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ $(0 < \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \infty)$, f_1 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to at least any one of g_1 or g_2. Also $g_1 \cdot g_2$ satisfy the Property (D). Therefore in view of Theorem 3.11, it follows that $\rho_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ $\geq \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and if possible let

$$\rho_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1). \tag{3.31}$$

Further suppose that $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Therefore in view of the proof of the second part of Theorem 3.23 and (3.31), we obtain that $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \sigma_{\frac{g_1 \cdot g_2}{g_2}}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ which is a contradiction. Hence $\rho_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$.
Likewise in view of the proof of second part of Theorem 3.23, one can obtain the same conclusion under the hypothesis $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. This proves the second part of the theorem. □

Theorem 3.26. *Let* f_1, f_2 *be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and* g_1, g_2 *be any two entire functions. Also let* $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1, 0\}$.
(A) *The following conditions are assumed to be satisfied:*
(i) $(f_1 \cdot f_2)$ *is of regular relative* (p,q,t) *growth with respect to at least any one* g_1 *or* g_2*;*
(ii) $(g_1 \cdot g_2)$, g_1 *and* g_2 *all satisfy the Property (D);*
(iii) Either $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) \neq \sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2)$ *or* $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2)$*;*
(iv) Either $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ *or* $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$*;*
(v) Either $\sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ *or* $\overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$*; then*

$$\rho_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2).$$

(B) *The following conditions are assumed to be satisfied:*
(i) $(g_1 \cdot g_2)$ *satisfy the Property (D);*
(ii) f_1 *and* f_2 *are of regular relative* (p,q,t) *growth with respect to at least any one* g_1 *or* g_2*;*
(iii) Either $\sigma_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \sigma_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ *or* $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$*;*
(iv) Either $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ *or* $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$*;*
(v) Either $\sigma_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) \neq \sigma_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ *or* $\overline{\sigma}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) \neq \overline{\sigma}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$*; then*

$$\rho_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \rho_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2).$$

We omit the proof of Theorem 3.26 as it is a natural consequence of Theorem 3.25.

Theorem 3.27. *Let* f_1, f_2 *be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and* g_1, g_2 *be any two entire functions.*
(A) *The following conditions are assumed to be satisfied:*
(i) At least any one of f_1 *or* f_2 *are of regular relative* (p,q,t) *growth with respect to* g_1 *where* $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1, 0\}$*;*
(ii) Either $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ *or* $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ *holds.*
(iii) g_1 *satisfy the Property (D), then*

$$\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2).$$

(B) *The following conditions are assumed to be satisfied:*
(i) f_1 *be any meromorphic function and* g_1, g_2 *be any two entire functions such that* $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ *and* $\lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ *exist where* $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1, 0\}$, *and* $g_1 \cdot g_2$ *satisfy the Property (D);*
(ii) Either $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ *or* $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ *holds, then*

$$\lambda_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1).$$

Proof. Let $f_1,\ f_2$ be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions satisfy the conditions of the theorem.

Case I. Let $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ $(0 < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) < \infty)$, g_1 satisfy the Property (D) and at least f_1 or f_2 is of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1. Now in view of Theorem 3.7 it is easy to see that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) \leq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. If possible let

$$\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2). \tag{3.32}$$

Also let $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. Then in view of the proof of first part of Theorem 3.24 and (3.32), we obtain that $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}\left(\frac{f_1 \cdot f_2}{f_2}\right) = \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ which is a contradiction. Hence $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. Analogously, in view of the proof of first part of Theorem 3.24, one can derived the same conclusion under the hypothesis $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$. Hence the first part of the theorem is established.

Case II. Let us consider that $\lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ $(0 < \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1), \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) < \infty$ and $g_1 \cdot g_2$ satisfy the Property (D). Therefore in view of Theorem 3.10, it follows that $\lambda_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \geq \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and if possible let

$$\lambda_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) > \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1). \tag{3.33}$$

Further let $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Then in view of second part of Theorem 3.24 and (3.33), we obtain that $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \tau_{\frac{g_1 \cdot g_2}{g_2}}^{((p,q,t)L)}(f_1) = \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ which is a contradiction. Hence $\lambda_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$. Similarly by second part of Theorem 3.24, we get the same conclusion when $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ and therefore the second part of the theorem follows. □

Theorem 3.28. *Let $f_1,\ f_2$ be any two meromorphic functions in the unit disc D and g_1, g_2 be any two entire functions.*
(A) *The following conditions are assumed to be satisfied:*
(i) $g_1 \cdot g_2$, g_1 and g_2 satisfy the Property (D);
(ii) At least any one of f_1 or f_2 are of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to g_1 and g_2 where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$;
(iii) Either $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) \neq \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2)$ or $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2)$;
(iv) Either $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$;
(v) Either $\tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$; then

$$\lambda_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2).$$

(B) *The following conditions are assumed to be satisfied:*
(i) $g_1 \cdot g_2$ satisfy the Property (D);
(ii) At least any one of f_1 or f_2 are of regular relative (p,q,t) growth with respect to $g_1 \cdot g_2$ where $p,q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1,0\}$;
(iii) Either $\tau_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\tau}_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds;
(iv) Either $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ or $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1)$ holds;
(v) Either $\tau_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) \neq \tau_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ or $\overline{\tau}_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) \neq \overline{\tau}_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2)$ holds, then

$$\lambda_{g_1 \cdot g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1 \cdot f_2) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_1}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_1) = \lambda_{g_2}^{(p,q,t)L}(f_2).$$

We omit the proof of Theorem 3.28 as it is a natural consequence of Theorem 3.27.

Remark 3.29. *If we take $\frac{f_1}{f_2}$ instead of $f_1 \cdot f_2$ and $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$ instead of $g_1 \cdot g_2$ where $\frac{f_1}{f_2}$ is meromorphic in the unit disc D and $\frac{g_1}{g_2}$ is entire function, and the other conditions of Theorem 3.25, Theorem 3.26, Theorem 3.27 and Theorem 3.28 remain the same, then conclusion of Theorem 3.25, Theorem 3.26, Theorem 3.27 and Theorem 3.28 remains valid.*

Acknowledgment

The author is extremely grateful to the anonymous learned referee for his keen reading, valuable suggestion and constructive comments for the improvement of the paper.

References

[1] Bernal, L., *Crecimiento relativo de funciones enteras. Contribución al estudio de lasfunciones enteras con índice exponencial finito*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Seville, Spain, 1984.
[2] Bernal, L., Orden relativo de crecimiento de funciones enteras, Collect. Math. Vol: 39 (1988), 209-229.
[3] Fenton, P. C. and Rossi, J., ODEs and Wiman–Valiron theory in the unit disc, J. Math. Anal. Appl., Vol: 367 (2010), 137-145.
[4] Girnyk, M. A., On the inverse problem of the theory of the distribution of values for functions that are analytic in the unit disc, (Russian) Ukrain. Mat. Ž., Vol: 29, No. 1 (1977), 32-39.
[5] Hayman, W.K., *Meromorphic Functions,*Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Clarendon Press, Oxford (1964).
[6] Juneja, O. P., Kapoor, G. P. and Bajpai, S. K., On the (p,q)-order and lower (p,q)-order of an entire function, J. Reine Angew. Math., Vol: 282 (1976), 53-67.
[7] Juneja, O. P. and Kapoor, G. P., *Analytic functions-growth aspects*. Research Notes in Mathematics 104, Pitman Adv. Publ. Prog., Boston-London-Melbourne, 1985.
[8] Kapoor, G. P. and Gopal, K., Decomposition theorems for analytic functions having slow rates of growth in a finite disc. J. Math. Anal. Appl. Vol: 74, (1980), 446-455.
[9] Laine, I., Complex differential equations. Handbook of differential equations: ordinary differential equations, Vol: IV, 269-363, Handb. Differ. Equ., Amsterdam: Elsevier/North-Holland, 2008.

[10] Li, Y. Z., On the growth of the solution of two-order differential equations in the unit disc, Pure Appl. Math., Vol: 4 (2002), 295-300.
[11] Nicholls, P. J. and Sons, L. R., Minimum modulus and zeros of functions in the unit disc. Proc. Lond.Math. Soc., Vol: 31 (3) (1975), 99-113.
[12] Somasundaram, D. and Thamizharasi, R., A note on the entire functions of L-bounded index and L-type, Indian J. Pure Appl.Math., Vol: 19, No. 3, (1988), 284-293.
[13] Sons, L. R., Unbounded functions in the unit disc, Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci., Vol: 6, No. 2 (1983), 201-242.
[14] Tsuji, M., *Potential Theory in Modern Function Theory*, Chelsea, New York, (1975), reprint of the 1959 edition.