

**Lemma 0.1** *Let  $G$  be a domain in  $\mathbb{C}$ , whose boundary  $\partial G$  consists of countably many pairwise disjoint curves  $\gamma_k$ , each either simple closed or simple and going to infinity in both directions, and assume that these do not accumulate at finite points in the following sense: each  $a \in \mathbb{C}$  has  $r_a > 0$  such that the open disc  $B(a, r_a)$  meets at most one  $\gamma_k$ . Let  $z_1, z_2$  be in  $G$ , and let  $\eta$  be a simple path from  $z_1$  to  $z_2$ . Then there exists a simple path  $\sigma$  from  $z_1$  to  $z_2$  such that  $\sigma$  is contained in  $G \cup \partial G$  and consists of sub-paths of  $\eta$  and arcs of boundary curves of  $G$ .*

Note that the hypotheses of the lemma are clearly satisfied if  $G$  is a component of the set  $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |f(z)| < R\}$ , where  $f$  is a meromorphic function on  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $R$  is such that  $|f(z)| = R$  implies  $f'(z) \neq 0$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $\eta$  is defined on  $I = [0, 1]$  and that  $\eta$  meets  $\partial G$ , since otherwise there is nothing to prove. By compactness,  $\eta$  is covered by finitely many open discs  $B(a, r_a/2)$  such that each  $B(a, r_a)$  meets at most one  $\gamma_k$ . Hence there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  (the minimum of finitely many  $r_a/2$ ) such that if  $a \in \eta$  then  $B(a, \varepsilon)$  meets at most one  $\gamma_k$ . Moreover, there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|\eta(s) - \eta(t)| < \varepsilon$  for all  $s, t \in I$  with  $|s - t| \leq \delta$ . If  $\gamma_k$  is bounded, then by the Jordan curve theorem its complement in  $\mathbb{C}$  consists of two disjoint domains,  $E_k$  and  $F_k$ . On the other hand, if  $\gamma_k$  is unbounded, adjoin to it the point at infinity, so that this time the complement of  $\gamma_k$  on the Riemann sphere consists of two disjoint domains,  $E_k$  and  $F_k$ . For each  $k$ , whether or not  $\gamma_k$  is bounded, we may assume that  $G \subseteq E_k$ .

Thus  $G \subseteq E = \bigcap E_k$ , and  $E$  is a connected subset of  $\mathbb{C}$ , by the chaining lemma. Moreover,  $E$  is open: to see this, take  $a \in E$ . Then  $a \in \mathbb{C}$  and there exists  $r > 0$  such that  $B(a, r)$  meets at most one  $\gamma_k$ . Hence  $B(a, r)$  lies in all but at most one  $E_k$ , and reducing  $r$  if necessary gives an open disc of centre  $a$  lying in  $E$ . It follows that  $E$  is a domain, with  $G \subseteq E$ . Suppose that  $G \neq E$ . Then there exists a path in  $E$  joining  $z_1 \in G$  to  $z_3 \notin G$ , and this path must meet  $\partial G$  and so meet some  $\gamma_k$ , a contradiction. Hence  $G = E$ .

Because  $z_1 \in G$  and  $\partial G$  is closed,  $t_0 = \min\{t \in [0, 1] : \eta(t) \in \partial G\}$  exists and is positive: choose  $\gamma_k$  such that  $\eta(t_0) \in \gamma_k$ , and let  $t_1 = \max\{t \in [0, 1] : \eta(t) \in \gamma_k\}$ . Since  $z_1, z_2 \in G \subseteq E_k$ , we have  $\eta(t) \in E_k$  for  $0 \leq t < t_0$  and  $t_1 < t \leq 1$ . Choose a bounded arc  $\lambda$  of  $\gamma_k$  joining  $\eta(t_0)$  to  $\eta(t_1)$  and replace the part of  $\eta$  for  $t_0 \leq t \leq t_1$  by  $\lambda$ . By the choice of  $t_0, t_1$ , this does not affect the injectivity of the path.

For  $t_1 < t \leq t_2 = \min\{t_1 + \delta, 1\}$  we have  $\eta(t) \in E_k \cap B(\eta(t_1), \varepsilon)$  and so  $\eta(t) \notin \bigcup \gamma_j$ , by the choice of  $\varepsilon$  and  $t_1$ . Assume that  $t_3 \in (t_1, t_2]$  has  $\eta(t_3) \notin G$ . Then  $\eta(t_3) \notin E$ , and so there exists  $m \neq k$  with  $\eta(t_3) \notin E_m$  and hence  $\eta(t_3) \in F_m$ . Since  $\eta(t) \notin \gamma_m$  for  $t_1 \leq t \leq t_3$ , we must have  $\eta(t_1) \in F_m$ . But  $\eta(t_1) \in \gamma_k \subseteq \partial G$ , and so  $G$  meets  $F_m$ , a contradiction.

Hence we have  $\eta(t) \in G$  for  $t_1 < t \leq t_2$ . If  $\eta(t) \notin G$  for some  $t \in [t_2, 1]$  then  $t_2 < 1$ ; hence we may take  $t_4 = \min\{t \in [t_2, 1] : \eta(t) \in \partial G\}$  and repeat the process, but the fact that  $t_4 - t_1 \geq \delta$  means that repetition cannot occur infinitely many times.