

On meromorphic functions sharing one value

Qiu Huiling

(Department of Mathematics, Jiangsu Institute of Education, Nanjing 210013, China)

(Department of Mathematics, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing 210097, China)

Abstract: The uniqueness of meromorphic functions with one sharing value and an equality on deficiency is studied. We show that if two nonconstant meromorphic functions $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ satisfy $\delta(0, f) + \delta(0, g) + \delta(\infty, f) + \delta(\infty, g) = 3$ or $\delta_2(0, f) + \delta_2(0, g) + \delta_2(\infty, f) + \delta_2(\infty, g) = 3$, and $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$ then $f(z), g(z)$ must be one of five cases.

Key words: meromorphic function; sharing value; deficiency

1 Introduction and the Main Result

In this paper, by meromorphic function we always mean a function which is meromorphic in the whole complex plane C . Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function, we shall use the following standard notations in Nevanlinna theory^[1,2]:

$$T(r, f), m(r, f), N(r, f), \bar{N}(r, f) \cdots$$

We denote by $S(r, f)$ any function satisfying

$$S(r, f) = o\{T(r, f)\}$$

as $r \rightarrow +\infty$, possibly outside a set of finite Lebesgue measure.

Let a be a complex number. Set

$$E(a, f) = \{z | f(z) - a = 0\}$$

where a zero point with multiplicity m is counted m times in the set.

Let $N_2\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right)$ be the counting function which only includes multiple zero of $f(z) - a$. Set

$$N_2\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right) = \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right) + \bar{N}_2\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right), \quad \delta_2(a, f) = 1 - \overline{\lim}_{\substack{r \rightarrow \infty \\ r \notin E}} \frac{N_2\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right)}{T(r, f)}$$

$$\delta(a, f) = 1 - \overline{\lim}_{\substack{r \rightarrow \infty \\ r \notin E}} \frac{N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right)}{T(r, f)}, \quad \Theta(r, f) = 1 - \overline{\lim}_{\substack{r \rightarrow \infty \\ r \notin E}} \frac{\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right)}{T(r, f)}$$

where E is a set of r with finite measure. In this paper, E may be different at different places^[3,4].

Theorem 1^[5] Let $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ be nonconstant meromorphic functions satisfying

$$\delta(\infty, f) = \delta(\infty, g) = 1, \quad \delta(0, f) + \delta(0, g) > 1$$

If $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$, then either $fg \equiv 1$ or $f \equiv g$, and the number 1 in the above inequality is sharp.

The following result gives an improvement of theorem 1^[6].

Theorem 2 Let $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ be nonconstant meromorphic functions satisfying

$$\delta(0, f) + \delta(0, g) + \Theta(\infty, f) + \Theta(\infty, g) > 3$$

If $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$, $E(\infty, f) = E(\infty, g)$, then either $fg \equiv 1$ or $f \equiv g$, and the number 3 in the above inequality is sharp.

Now, what conclusion can be made, if

$$\delta(0, f) + \delta(0, g) + \delta(\infty, f) + \delta(\infty, g) = 3?$$

Theorem 3 Let $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ be nonconstant meromorphic functions satisfying

$$\delta(0, f) + \delta(0, g) + \delta(\infty, f) + \delta(\infty, g) = 3 \text{ or } \delta_2(0, f) + \delta_2(0, g) + \delta_2(\infty, f) + \delta_2(\infty, g) = 3 \quad (1)$$

If $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$, then one of the following cases must occur:

(a) $\delta(0, f) = \delta(\infty, f) = 1$, $\delta(0, g) + \delta(\infty, g) = 1$, $\delta(a, g) = 0$ for any complex number $a (\neq 1, 0, \infty)$;

- (b) $\delta(0, f) = \delta(\infty, f) = 1$, $\delta(0, g) + \delta(\infty, g) = 1$, $\delta(a, f) = 0$ for any complex number $a (\neq 1, 0, \infty)$;
 (c) $\delta(0, f) + \delta(\infty, f) > 1$, $\delta(0, g) + \delta(\infty, g) > 1$, and $\delta(a, f) = \delta(a, g) = 0$, for any complex number $a (\neq 0, \infty)$;
 (d) $f \equiv (1 - a)g + a$, $a \neq 1$, in particular, if $a = 0$, $f \equiv g$;
 (e) $(f - a)(g - b) \equiv (1 - a)(1 - b)$, $a \neq 1, b \neq 1$.

Remark The following examples show that each of the above cases definitely occurs.

Example 1 Let $f(z) = e^z$, $g(z) = e^z(e^z - 1) + 1$. Obviously, $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$, $\delta(0, f) = \delta(\infty, f) = 1$, $\delta(0, g) + \delta(\infty, g) = 1$, $\delta(1, g) = \frac{1}{2} \neq 0$, $\delta(a, g) = 0$, for any $a (\neq 0, 1, \infty)$. Hence cases (a) and (b) occur.

Example 2 Let $f(z) = e^z(1 - e^z)$, $g(z) = e^{-z}(1 - e^{-z})$. Obviously, $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$, $\delta(0, f) + \delta(\infty, f) = \frac{3}{2} > 1$, $\delta(0, g) + \delta(\infty, g) = \frac{3}{2} > 1$, $\delta(a, f) = \delta(a, g) = 0$, for any $a (\neq 0, \infty)$. Hence case (c) occurs.

Example 3 Let $f(z) = e^z$, $g(z) = \frac{1}{2}e^z + \frac{1}{2}$. Obviously, case (d) occurs.

Example 4 Let $f(z) = \frac{1}{2}ze^{-z}$, $g(z) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{e^z}{z}$. Obviously, $f\left(g - \frac{1}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{2}$. Hence case (e) occurs.

2 One Lemma

To prove theorem 3, we need the following lemma.

Lemma Let $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ be nonconstant meromorphic functions satisfying

$$\textcircled{1} A = \sum_{a \neq 1} \delta_2(a, f) + \sum_{a \neq 1} \delta_2(a, g) + \min\{\delta_2(1, f), \delta_2(1, g)\} > 3$$

$$\textcircled{2} \sum_{a \neq 1} \mathbb{H}(a, f) > 1, \sum_{a \neq 1} \mathbb{H}(a, g) > 1$$

If $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$, then one of the following cases must occur:

- (a) $f \equiv (1 - b)g + b$, $b \neq 1$;
 (b) $(f - a)(g - b) \equiv (1 - a)(1 - b)$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$;
 (c) $f \equiv \frac{Ag + B}{Cg + D}$, $AD - BC \neq 0$ and $\mathbb{H}(0, f) + \mathbb{H}(\infty, f) + \mathbb{H}(0, g) + \mathbb{H}(\infty, g) \leq 2$.

Proof By $\textcircled{2}$ we deduce that

$$\sum_{i=1}^q \mathbb{H}(a_i, f) > 1, \sum_{i=1}^q \mathbb{H}(a_i, g) > 1 \quad (2)$$

where a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q are pairwise distinct complex numbers such that $a_i \neq 1$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, q$).

By the second fundamental theorem^[7] we have

$$(q - 1)T(r, f) \leq \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f - 1}\right) + \sum_{i=1}^q \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f - a_i}\right) + S(r, f) \quad (3)$$

$$(q - 1)T(r, g) \leq \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g - 1}\right) + \sum_{i=1}^q \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g - a_i}\right) + S(r, g) \quad (4)$$

It can be obtained from (2)–(4) and $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$ that

$$T(r, f) = O\{T(r, g)\}, T(r, g) = O\{T(r, f)\} \quad r \rightarrow \infty; r \notin E \quad (5)$$

where E is a set of r with finite measure. Hence $S(r, f) = S(r, g)$.

Set

$$\varphi = \frac{f''}{f'} - 2\frac{f'}{f - 1} - \frac{g''}{g'} + 2\frac{g'}{g - 1} \quad (6)$$

Since $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$, by a simple computation we see that if z_0 is a simple zero of both $f(z) - 1$ and $g(z) - 1$, then $\varphi(z_0) = 0$.

Next we shall prove that $\varphi(z) \equiv 0$. Suppose on the contrary that $\varphi(z) \not\equiv 0$, then

$$N_1\left(r, \frac{1}{f - 1}\right) = N_1\left(r, \frac{1}{g - 1}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{\varphi}\right) \leq T(r, \varphi) + o(1) \leq N(r, \varphi) + S(r, f) \quad (7)$$

where $N_1\left(r, \frac{1}{f - 1}\right)$ is the counting function which only counts simple zeros of $f(z) - 1$ in $\{z: |z| \leq r\}$.

Let $z_0 \in E(1, f)$, then by a simple computation we deduce from $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$ and (6) that $\varphi(z_0) \neq \infty$. Therefore poles of φ only occur at zeros of f' and g' , and at multiple poles of f and g by (6).

Let a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n be pairwise distinct finite complex numbers such that $a_i \neq 1$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) and for some positive number ε ($< A - 3$),

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_2(a_i, f) + \delta_2(\infty, f) + \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_2(a_i, g) + \delta_2(\infty, g) + \min\{\delta_2(1, f), \delta_2(1, g)\} - 3 > \varepsilon \quad (8)$$

It can be obtained from (6) and (7) that

$$N_1\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) \leq N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{f'}\right) + N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{g'}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}(r, f) + \bar{N}_{(2)}(r, g) + \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_i}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{g-a_i}\right) \right] + S(r, f) \quad (9)$$

where $N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{f'}\right)$ only counts those zeros of f' but not those zeros of $(f-1) \prod_{i=1}^n (f-a_i)$.

By the second fundamental theorem, we have

$$nT(r, f) \leq \bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) + \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_i}\right) - N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{f'}\right) + S(r, f) \quad (10)$$

and

$$nT(r, g) \leq \bar{N}(r, g) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g-1}\right) + \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g-a_i}\right) - N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{g'}\right) + S(r, g) \quad (11)$$

It is easy to see that

$$\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g-1}\right) = 2\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) \leq N_1\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) + N_2\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) \quad (12)$$

Combining (9)–(12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} n[T(r, f) + T(r, g)] &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_i}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_i}\right) \right] + \bar{N}(r, f) + \\ &\quad \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g-a_i}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_i}\right) \right] + \bar{N}(r, g) + \\ &\quad N_2\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}(r, f) + \bar{N}_{(2)}(r, g) + S(r, f) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

With no loss of generality, we assume that

$$T(r, g) \leq T(r, f) \quad r \in I \quad (14)$$

where I is a set of infinite measure. By the definition of deficiency and $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$, we can deduce from (13) that as $r \rightarrow +\infty, r \notin E$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_2(a_i, f) + \delta_2(\infty, f) - 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right] T(r, f) + \\ &\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_2(a_i, g) + \delta_2(\infty, g) + \delta_2(1, g) - 2 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right] T(r, g) \leq o\{T(r, f)\} \end{aligned}$$

From (13) and the above inequality, we obtain that as $r \rightarrow \infty, r \in I \setminus E$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_2(a, f) + \delta_2(\infty, f) + \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_2(a_i, g) + \delta_2(\infty, g) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \min\{\delta_2(1, f), \delta_2(1, g)\} - 3 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right] T(r, g) \leq o\{T(r, f)\} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Thus we deduce from (8), (15) and $S(r, f) = S(r, g)$ that $T(r, g) = o\{T(r, g)\}$, $r \rightarrow \infty, r \in I \setminus E$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\varphi(z) \equiv 0$. We deduce from (6) that

$$f \equiv \frac{Ag + B}{Cg + D} \quad (16)$$

where A, B, C and D are finite complex numbers satisfying $AD - BC \neq 0$.

Next we consider five cases:

Case 1 $C = 0$, then we get from (15) that $f \equiv ag + b, a \neq 0$.

If $f \neq 1$, then we obtain from $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$ that $g \neq 1$. Thus, by $\sum_{a \neq 1} \delta_2(a, f) \leq 1$ and $\sum_{a \neq 1} \delta_2(a, g) \leq 1$. We have

$$\sum_{a \neq 1} \delta_2(a, f) + \sum_{a \neq 1} \delta_2(a, g) + \min\{\delta_2(1, f), \delta_2(1, g)\} \leq 3$$

which contradicts ①. Therefore there exists z_0 such that $f(z_0) = g(z_0) = 1$. Hence, we have $a + b = 1$. Thus we obtain $f \equiv (1 - b)g + b, b \neq 1$.

Case 2 $A = 0$, then we get from (16) that $f(g - b) \equiv c, c \neq 0$.

From $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$, we have $c = 1 - b$.

Hence $f(g - b) \equiv 1 - b, b \neq 1$.

Case 3 $B = 0$ and $A \neq 0, C \neq 0, D \neq 0$, then we get from (16) that $f \equiv \frac{Ag}{Cg + D}$.

$$\text{Thus } f - \frac{A}{C} = \frac{-AD/C}{Cg + D}.$$

Hence we have $(f - a)(g - b) \equiv c, c \neq 0$. Then, we deduce from $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$ that $c = (1 - a)(1 - b)$. Thus, we obtain

$$(f - b)(g - b) \equiv (1 - a)(1 - b) \quad a \neq 1; b \neq 1$$

Case 4 $D = 0$ and $A \neq 0, B \neq 0, C \neq 0$, then we get from (15) that $f \equiv \frac{Ag + B}{Cg}$. Then, $f - \frac{A}{C} \equiv \frac{B}{Cg}$.

Thus, we obtain from $E(1, f) = E(1, g)$ and the above equality that $(f - a)g \equiv 1 - a$.

Case 5 $A \neq 0, B \neq 0, C \neq 0$ and $D \neq 0$.

From (15), it is easy to see that

$$N(r, g) = N\left(r, \frac{1}{f - A/C}\right), \quad N\left(r, \frac{1}{g}\right) = N\left(r, \frac{1}{f - B/D}\right)$$

By the second fundamental theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2T(r, f) &\leq \bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f - A/C}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f - B/D}\right) = \\ &\bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + \bar{N}(r, g) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g}\right) + S(r, f) \leq \\ &[4 - \mathcal{H}(0, f) - \mathcal{H}(\infty, f) - \mathcal{H}(0, g) - \mathcal{H}(\infty, g) + \varepsilon]T(r, f) + S(r, f) \end{aligned}$$

where ε is a sufficiently small positive number.

If $\mathcal{H}(0, f) + \mathcal{H}(\infty, f) + \mathcal{H}(0, g) + \mathcal{H}(\infty, g) > 2$, we can deduce from the above inequality that $T(r, f) \leq o\{T(r, f)\}, r \rightarrow \infty, r \in I$, a contradiction. Therefore

$$\mathcal{H}(0, f) + \mathcal{H}(\infty, f) + \mathcal{H}(0, g) + \mathcal{H}(\infty, g) \leq 2$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.

3 Proof of Theorem 3

In order to prove theorem 3, we consider three cases:

Case 1 $\delta(0, f) = \delta(\infty, f) = 1$ and $\delta(0, g) + \delta(\infty, g) = 1$.

If $\delta(a, g) = 0$ for any complex member $a (\neq 1, 0, \infty)$, then the conclusion (a) is valid.

If there exists a complex $a (\neq 0, \infty, 1)$ such that $\delta(a, g) > 0$ then, by lemma, we can easily obtain that the conclusion (d) or (e) is valid.

Case 2 $\delta(0, f) + \delta(\infty, f) = 1, \delta(0, g) = \delta(\infty, g) = 1$.

By the same reasoning with case 1 we can obtain that the conclusion (b), (c) or (e) is valid.

Case 3 $\delta(0, f) + \delta(\infty, f) > 1$, and $\delta(0, g) + \delta(\infty, g) > 1$.

If both $\delta(a, f) = 0$ and $\delta(a, g) = 0$, for any complex number $a (\neq 0, \infty)$ then the conclusion (c) is valid.

If there exists a complex member $a (\neq 1, 0, \infty)$ such that $\max\{\delta(a, f), \delta(a, g)\} > 0$ or $\min\{\delta(1, f), \delta(1, g)\} > 0$. By lemma, we can easily obtain that one of the conclusions (d) or (e) is valid.

If $\min\{\delta(1, f), \delta(1, g)\} = 0$, but $\max\{\delta(1, f), \delta(1, g)\} > 0$, with no loss of generality, we can assume that $\delta(1, f) > 0$, and $\delta(1, g) = 0$.

If $\delta_2(1, g) > 0$, by lemma, we can easily obtain that either the conclusion (d) or (e) is valid.

If $\delta_2(1, g) = 0$, by using the same reasoning that was used to prove formula (13), we can also obtain $T(r, f) = O\{T(r, g)\}, T(r, g) = O\{T(r, f)\}, r \rightarrow \infty, r \notin E$, hence $S(r, f) = S(r, g)$. Set

$$\varphi(z) = \frac{f''}{f'} - 2\frac{f'}{f-1} - \frac{g''}{g'} + 2\frac{g'}{g-1} \quad (17)$$

Next we shall prove that $\varphi(z) \equiv 0$. Suppose on the contrary that $\varphi(z) \not\equiv 0$. Using the same reasoning that was

used to prove formula (13) we have

$$T(r,f)+T(r,g)\leqslant N_2\left(r,\frac{1}{f}\right)+N_2(r,f)+N_2\left(r,\frac{1}{g}\right)+N_2(r,g)+N_2\left(r,\frac{1}{f-1}\right)+S(r,f)\tag{18}$$

Let
$$\overline{\lim_{\substack{r\rightarrow\infty\\r\notin E}}}\frac{T(r,f)}{T(r,g)}=\lambda\tag{19}$$

From $\delta_2(1,f)>0$ and $\delta_2(1,g)=0$, we get that $\lambda>1$.

From (18), (19) and $\delta_2(1,g)=0$, we have

$$\lambda+1=\overline{\lim_{\substack{r\rightarrow\infty\\r\notin E}}}\frac{T(r,f)}{T(r,g)}+1\leqslant\overline{\lim_{\substack{r\rightarrow\infty\\r\notin E}}}\frac{N_2\left(r,\frac{1}{f}\right)}{T(r,g)}+\overline{\lim_{\substack{r\rightarrow\infty\\r\notin E}}}\frac{N_2(r,f)}{T(r,g)}\leqslant\\[1-\delta_2(0,f)]\lambda+[1-\delta_2(\infty,f)]\lambda+[1-\delta_2(0,g)]+[1-\delta_2(\infty,g)]+1$$

Hence we obtain

$$[\delta_2(0,f)+\delta_2(\infty,f)-1]\lambda\leqslant 2-\delta_2(0,g)-\delta_2(\infty,g)$$

Since $\delta_2(0,f)+\delta_2(\infty,f)\geqslant\delta(0,f)+\delta(\infty,f)>1$ and $\lambda>1$, we obtain

$$\delta_2(0,f)+\delta_2(\infty,f)-1<2-\delta_2(0,g)-\delta_2(\infty,g)$$

That is $\delta_2(0,f)+\delta_2(\infty,f)+\delta_2(0,g)+\delta_2(\infty,g)<3$, which contradicts (1). Therefore we have $\varphi(z)\equiv 0$. Hence we deduce from (17) that

$$f\equiv\frac{Ag+B}{Cg+D}$$

where A, B, C and D are finite complex numbers satisfying $AD-BC\neq 0$.

If $f\neq 1$, by $\delta(0,f)+\delta(\infty,f)>1$, we have $\delta(0,f)+\delta(\infty,f)+\delta(1,f)>2$, which contradicts $\sum_a\delta(a,f)\leqslant 2$. Therefore, there exists z_0 such that $f(z_0)=g(z_0)=1$. According to the proof of lemma we can easily obtain that one of the conclusion (d) or (e) is valid.

The proof of theorem 3 is complete.

References

[1] Hayman W K. *Meromorphic functions*[M]. Clarendon; Oxford University Press, 1964.1-20
[2] Yang L. *Value distribution theory*[M]. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1993.
[3] Li P, Yang C C. Some further results on the unique range sets of meromorphic functions[J]. *Kodai Math J*, 1995,**18**: 437-450.
[4] Yang C C. On deficiencies of differential polynomials[J]. *Math Z*, 1972, **125**: 107-112.
[5] Yi H X. Meromorphic functions with two deficient values[J]. *Acta Math*, 1987, **30**: 588-597. (in Chinese)
[6] Xu W S, Fang M L. On a theorem of Ozawa[J]. *Math Study*, 1996, **29**:25-28.
[7] Nevanlinna R. Einige eindeutigkeitssätze in der theorie der meromorphen funktionen[J]. *Acta Math*, 1926,**48**: 367-391.

分担一个值的亚纯函数

仇惠玲

(江苏教育学院数学系, 南京 210013)
(南京师范大学数学系, 南京 210097)

摘 要 研究了分担一个值且具有一个亏量等式的亚纯函数的惟一性问题. 讨论了对任何 2 个非常数亚纯函数 $f(z), g(z)$ 只要满足: $\delta(0,f)+\delta(0,g)+\delta(\infty,f)+\delta(\infty,g)=3$ 或者 $\delta_2(0,f)+\delta_2(0,g)+\delta_2(\infty,f)+\delta_2(\infty,g)=3$ 且 $E(1,f)=E(1,g)$, 那么, $f(z), g(z)$ 必定具有 5 种情形之一.

关键词 亚纯函数; 分担值; 亏量

中图分类号 O174.5