

Uniqueness of $p(f)$ and $P[f]$

Kuldeep Singh CHARAK*, Banarsi LAL

Department of Mathematics, University of Jammu, Jammu, India

Received: 28.03.2015

Accepted/Published Online: 07.09.2015

Final Version: 08.04.2016

Abstract: Let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function, $a (\neq 0, \infty)$ be a meromorphic function satisfying $T(r, a) = o(T(r, f))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, and $p(z)$ be a polynomial of degree $n \geq 1$ with $p(0) = 0$. Let $P[f]$ be a nonconstant differential polynomial of f . Under certain essential conditions, we prove that $p(f) \equiv P[f]$, when $p(f)$ and $P[f]$ share a with weight $l \geq 0$. Our result generalizes the results due to Zhang and Lü, Banerjee and Majumdar, and Bhoosnurmath and Kabbur and answers a question asked by Zhang and Lü.

Key words: Meromorphic functions, small functions, sharing of values, differential polynomials, Nevanlinna theory

1. Introduction

Let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function in the complex plane \mathbb{C} . We assume that the reader is familiar with the standard notions of the Nevanlinna value distribution theory such as $T(r, f)$, $m(r, f)$, $N(r, f)$ (see e.g., [4, 5, 7]). By $S(r, f)$, as usual, we shall mean a quantity that satisfies

$$S(r, f) = o(T(r, f)) \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty,$$

possibly outside an exceptional set of finite logarithmic measure. A meromorphic function a is said to be a small function of f , if $T(r, a) = S(r, f)$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$.

For a small function a of f , we write $E(a, f) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : f(z) - a(z) = 0\}$, where a zero of $f - a$ is counted according to its multiplicity. Also by $\bar{E}(a, f)$, we denote the zeros of $f - a$, where a zero is counted only once. Let g be another nonconstant meromorphic function. We say that f and g share the function a CM (counting multiplicity) if $E(a, f) = E(a, g)$. Further, if $\bar{E}(a, f) = \bar{E}(a, g)$, then we say that f and g share the function a IM (ignoring multiplicity). Note that a can be a value in $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$.

A more general concept is the weighted sharing of meromorphic functions. For a nonnegative integer k , we denote by $E_k(a, f)$ the set of all zeros of $f - a$, where a zero of multiplicity m is counted m times if $m \leq k$ and $k + 1$ times if $m > k$. If $E_k(a, f) = E_k(a, g)$, then f and g are said to share the function a with weight k . We write “ f and g share (a, k) ” to mean that “ f and g share the function a with weight k ”. Since $E_k(a, f) = E_k(a, g)$ implies that $E_p(a, f) = E_p(a, g)$ for any integer $p (0 \leq p < k)$, if f and g share (a, k) , then f and g share (a, p) , $0 \leq p < k$. Moreover, we note that f and g share the function a IM (ignoring multiplicity) or CM (counting multiplicity) if and only if f and g share $(a, 0)$ or (a, ∞) , respectively. In particular, the small function a can be a value in $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$.

*Correspondence: kscharak7@rediffmail.com

2010 AMS Mathematics Subject Classification: 30D35, 30D30.

For notational purposes, let f and g share 1 IM, and let z_0 be a zero of $f - 1$ with multiplicity p and a zero of $g - 1$ with multiplicity q . We denote by $N_E^{(1)}(r, 1/(f - 1))$ the counting function of the zeros of $f - 1$ when $p = q = 1$. By $\overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1/(f - 1))$ we denote the counting function of the zeros of $f - 1$ when $p = q \geq 2$ and by $\overline{N}_L(r, 1/(f - 1))$ we denote the counting function of the zeros of $f - 1$ when $p > q \geq 1$; each point in these counting functions is counted only once; similarly, the terms $N_E^{(1)}(r, 1/(g - 1))$, $\overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1/(g - 1))$, and $\overline{N}_L(r, 1/(g - 1))$. In addition, we denote by $\overline{N}_{f>k}(r, 1/(g - 1))$ the reduced counting function of those zeros of $f - 1$ and $g - 1$ such that $p > q = k$, and similarly the term $\overline{N}_{g>k}(r, 1/(f - 1))$.

A differential polynomial $P[f]$ of a nonconstant meromorphic function f is defined as

$$P[f] := \sum_{i=1}^m M_i[f],$$

where $M_i[f] = a_i \cdot \prod_{j=0}^k (f^{(j)})^{n_{ij}}$ with $n_{i0}, n_{i1}, \dots, n_{ik}$ as nonnegative integers and $a_i (\neq 0)$ are meromorphic functions satisfying $T(r, a_i) = o(T(r, f))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. The numbers $\overline{d}(P) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \sum_{j=0}^k n_{ij}$ and $\underline{d}(P) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \sum_{j=0}^k n_{ij}$ are respectively called the degree and lower degree of $P[f]$. If $\overline{d}(P) = \underline{d}(P) = d$ (say), then we say that $P[f]$ is a homogeneous differential polynomial of degree d .

Inspired by a uniqueness result due to Mues and Steinmetz [6]: “If f is a non-constant entire function sharing two distinct values ignoring multiplicity with f' , then $f \equiv f'$ ”, the study of the uniqueness of f and $f^{(k)}$, f^n and $(f^m)^{(k)}$, f and $P[f]$ is carried out by numerous authors. For example, Zhang and Lü [8] proved:

Theorem A. *Let k, n be the positive integers, f be a nonconstant meromorphic function, and $a (\neq 0, \infty)$ be a meromorphic function satisfying $T(r, a) = o(T(r, f))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. If f^n and $f^{(k)}$ share a IM and*

$$(2k + 6)\Theta(\infty, f) + 4\Theta(0, f) + 2\delta_{2+k}(0, f) > 2k + 12 - n,$$

or f^n and $f^{(k)}$ share a CM and

$$(k + 3)\Theta(\infty, f) + 2\Theta(0, f) + \delta_{2+k}(0, f) > k + 6 - n,$$

then $f^n \equiv f^{(k)}$.

In the same paper, Zhang and Lü asked the following question:

Question 1: *What will happen if f^n and $(f^{(k)})^m$ share a meromorphic function $a (\neq 0, \infty)$ satisfying $T(r, a) = o(T(r, f))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$?*

Bhoosnurmath and Kabbur [3] proved:

Theorem B. *Let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function and $a (\neq 0, \infty)$ be a meromorphic function satisfying $T(r, a) = o(T(r, f))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Let $P[f]$ be a nonconstant differential polynomial of f . If f and $P[f]$ share a IM and*

$$(2Q + 6)\Theta(\infty, f) + (2 + 3\underline{d}(P))\delta(0, f) > 2Q + 2\underline{d}(P) + \overline{d}(P) + 7,$$

or if f and $P[f]$ share a CM and

$$3\Theta(\infty, f) + (\underline{d}(P) + 1)\delta(0, f) > 4,$$

then $f \equiv P[f]$.

Banerjee and Majumder [2] considered the weighted sharing of f^n and $(f^m)^{(k)}$ and proved the following result:

Theorem C. *Let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function, $k, n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and l be a nonnegative integer. Suppose $a(\neq 0, \infty)$ is a meromorphic function satisfying $T(r, a) = o(T(r, f))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ such that f^n and $(f^m)^{(k)}$ share (a, l) . If $l \geq 2$ and*

$$(k + 3)\Theta(\infty, f) + (k + 4)\Theta(0, f) > 2k + 7 - n,$$

or $l = 1$ and

$$\left(k + \frac{7}{2}\right)\Theta(\infty, f) + \left(k + \frac{9}{2}\right)\Theta(0, f) > 2k + 8 - n,$$

or $l = 0$ and

$$(2k + 6)\Theta(\infty, f) + (2k + 7)\Theta(0, f) > 4k + 13 - n,$$

then $f^n \equiv (f^m)^{(k)}$.

Motivated by such uniqueness investigations, it is natural to consider the problem in a more general setting: Let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function, $P[f]$ be a nonconstant differential polynomial of f , $p(z)$ be a polynomial of degree $n \geq 1$, and $a(\neq 0, \infty)$ be a meromorphic function satisfying $T(r, a) = o(T(r, f))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. If $p(f)$ and $P[f]$ share (a, l) , $l \geq 0$, then is it true that $p(f) \equiv P[f]$?

Generally this is not true, but under certain essential conditions, we prove the following result:

Theorem 1.1 *Let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function, $a(\neq 0, \infty)$ be a meromorphic function satisfying $T(r, a) = o(T(r, f))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, and $p(z)$ be a polynomial of degree $n \geq 1$ with $p(0) = 0$. Let $P[f]$ be a nonconstant differential polynomial of f . Suppose $p(f)$ and $P[f]$ share (a, l) with one of the following conditions:*

(i) $l \geq 2$ and

$$(Q + 3)\Theta(\infty, f) + 2n\Theta(0, p(f)) + \bar{d}(P)\delta(0, f) > Q + 3 + 2\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P) + n, \tag{1.1}$$

(ii) $l = 1$ and

$$\left(Q + \frac{7}{2}\right)\Theta(\infty, f) + \frac{5n}{2}\Theta(0, p(f)) + \bar{d}(P)\delta(0, f) > Q + \frac{7}{2} + 2\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P) + \frac{3n}{2}, \tag{1.2}$$

(iii) $l = 0$ and

$$(2Q + 6)\Theta(\infty, f) + 4n\Theta(0, p(f)) + 2\bar{d}(P)\delta(0, f) > 2Q + 6 + 4\bar{d}(P) - 2\underline{d}(P) + 3n. \tag{1.3}$$

Then $p(f) \equiv P[f]$.

Example 1.2. Consider the function $f(z) = \cos\alpha z + 1 - 1/\alpha^4$, where $\alpha \neq 0, \pm 1, \pm i$ and $p(z) = z$. Then $p(f)$ and $P[f] \equiv f^{(iv)}$ share $(1, l)$, $l \geq 0$ and none of the inequalities (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3) is satisfied, and $p(f) \neq P[f]$. Thus the conditions in Theorem 1.1 cannot be removed.

Remark 1.3. Theorem 1.1 generalizes Theorem A, Theorem B, Theorem C (and also generalizes Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 of [2]) and provides an answer to Question 1 asked by Zhang and Lü [8].

The main tool of our investigations in this paper is Nevanlinna value distribution theory ([4, 5, 7]).

2. Proof of the main result

We shall use the following results in the proof of Theorem 1.1:

Lemma 2.1 [3] *Let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function and $P[f]$ be a differential polynomial of f .*

Then

$$m\left(r, \frac{P[f]}{f^{\bar{d}(P)}}\right) \leq (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))m\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + S(r, f), \tag{2.1}$$

$$N\left(r, \frac{P[f]}{f^{\bar{d}(P)}}\right) \leq (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + Q\left[\bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right)\right] + S(r, f), \tag{2.2}$$

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{P[f]}\right) \leq Q\bar{N}(r, f) + (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))m\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\bar{d}(P)}}\right) + S(r, f), \tag{2.3}$$

where $Q = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \{n_{i0} + n_{i1} + 2n_{i2} + \dots + kn_{ik}\}$.

Lemma 2.2 [1] *Let f and g be two nonconstant meromorphic functions.*

(i) *If f and g share $(1, 0)$, then*

$$\bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) \leq \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + \bar{N}(r, f) + S(r), \tag{2.4}$$

where $S(r) = o(T(r))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ with $T(r) = \max\{T(r, f); T(r, g)\}$.

(ii) *If f and g share $(1, 1)$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} 2\bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) + 2\bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{g-1}\right) + \bar{N}_E^{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) - \bar{N}_{f>2}\left(r, \frac{1}{g-1}\right) \\ \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{g-1}\right) - \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g-1}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Let $p(z) = z^n + a_{n-1}z^{n-1} + a_{n-2}z^{n-2} + \dots + a_1z$, where a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1} are constants, $F = p(f)/a$ and $G = P[f]/a$. Then

$$F - 1 = \frac{p(f) - a}{a} \text{ and } G - 1 = \frac{P[f] - a}{a}. \tag{2.6}$$

Since $p(f)$ and $P[f]$ share (a, l) , it follows that F and G share $(1, l)$ except at the zeros and poles of a . Also note that

$$\bar{N}(r, F) = \bar{N}(r, f) + S(r, f) \text{ and } \bar{N}(r, G) = \bar{N}(r, f) + S(r, f).$$

Define

$$\psi = \left(\frac{F''}{F'} - \frac{2F'}{F-1}\right) - \left(\frac{G''}{G'} - \frac{2G'}{G-1}\right). \tag{2.7}$$

Claim: $\psi \equiv 0$.

Suppose on the contrary that $\psi \not\equiv 0$. Then from (2.7) we have

$$m(r, \psi) = S(r, f).$$

By the second fundamental theorem of Nevanlinna we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 T(r, F) + T(r, G) &\leq 2\bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) \\
 &\quad + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) - N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{F'}\right) - N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{G'}\right) + S(r, f),
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.8}$$

where $N_0(r, 1/F')$ denotes the counting function of the zeros of F' , which are not the zeros of $F(F-1)$, and $N_0(r, 1/G')$ denotes the counting function of the zeros of G' , which are not the zeros of $G(G-1)$.

Case 1. When $l \geq 1$.

Then from (2.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 N_E^{(1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) &\leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{\psi}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq T(r, \psi) + S(r, f) \\
 &= N(r, \psi) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq \bar{N}(r, F) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) + \bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) \\
 &\quad + \bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{F'}\right) + N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{G'}\right) + S(r, f),
 \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) &= N_E^{(1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + \bar{N}_E^{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + \bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) \\
 &\quad + \bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq \bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) + 2\bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) \\
 &\quad + 2\bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + \bar{N}_E^{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) \\
 &\quad + N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{F'}\right) + N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{G'}\right) + S(r, f).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.9}$$

Subcase 1.1: When $l = 1$.

In this case we have

$$\bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2}N\left(r, \frac{1}{F'} \mid F \neq 0\right) \leq \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}(r, F) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right),
 \tag{2.10}$$

where $N\left(r, \frac{1}{F'} \mid F \neq 0\right)$ denotes the zeros of F' , which are not the zeros of F .

From (2.5) and (2.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 2\bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + 2\bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + \bar{N}_E^{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) \\
 \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + \bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}(r, F) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}(r, f) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + S(r, f). \tag{2.11}
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, from (2.9) and (2.11) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) \leq \bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) \\
 + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}(r, f) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) \\
 + N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{F'}\right) + N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{G'}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 \leq \bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) \\
 + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}(r, f) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + T(r, G) \\
 + N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{F'}\right) + N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{G'}\right) + S(r, f). \tag{2.12}
 \end{aligned}$$

From (2.3), (2.8), and (2.12) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 T(r, F) \leq 3\bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) \\
 + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}(r, f) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 \leq \frac{7}{2}\bar{N}(r, f) + 2\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 \leq \frac{7}{2}\bar{N}(r, f) + \frac{5}{2}\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{P[f]}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 \leq \left(Q + \frac{7}{2}\right)\bar{N}(r, f) + \frac{5}{2}\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))T(r, f) + \bar{d}(P)N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 \leq \left[\left(Q + \frac{7}{2}\right)\{1 - \Theta(\infty, f)\} + \frac{5n}{2}\{1 - \Theta(0, p(f))\} + \bar{d}(P)\{1 - \delta(0, f)\}\right]T(r, f) \\
 + (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))T(r, f) + S(r, f).
 \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\begin{aligned} nT(r, f) &= T(r, F) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \left[\left(Q + \frac{7}{2} \right) \{1 - \Theta(\infty, f)\} + \frac{5n}{2} \{1 - \Theta(0, p(f))\} + \bar{d}(P) \{1 - \delta(0, f)\} \right] T(r, f) \\ &\quad + (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))T(r, f) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

which yields that

$$\left[\left(Q + \frac{7}{2} \right) \Theta(\infty, f) + \frac{5n}{2} \Theta(0, p(f)) + \bar{d}(P) \delta(0, f) - Q - \frac{7}{2} - 2\bar{d}(P) + \underline{d}(P) - \frac{3n}{2} \right] T(r, f)$$

$\leq S(r, f)$.

That is,

$$\left(Q + \frac{7}{2} \right) \Theta(\infty, f) + \frac{5n}{2} \Theta(0, p(f)) + \bar{d}(P) \delta(0, f) \leq Q + \frac{7}{2} + 2\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P) + \frac{3n}{2},$$

which violates (1.2).

Subcase 1.2: When $l \geq 2$.

In this case we have

$$2\bar{N}_L \left(r, \frac{1}{F-1} \right) + 2\bar{N}_L \left(r, \frac{1}{G-1} \right) + \bar{N}_E^{(2)} \left(r, \frac{1}{F-1} \right) + \bar{N} \left(r, \frac{1}{G-1} \right) \leq N \left(r, \frac{1}{G-1} \right) + S(r, f).$$

Thus from (2.9) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{N} \left(r, \frac{1}{F-1} \right) + \bar{N} \left(r, \frac{1}{G-1} \right) &\leq \bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}_{(2)} \left(r, \frac{1}{F} \right) + \bar{N}_{(2)} \left(r, \frac{1}{G} \right) + N \left(r, \frac{1}{G-1} \right) \\ &\quad + N_0 \left(r, \frac{1}{F'} \right) + N_0 \left(r, \frac{1}{G'} \right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}_{(2)} \left(r, \frac{1}{F} \right) + \bar{N}_{(2)} \left(r, \frac{1}{G} \right) + T(r, G) \\ &\quad + N_0 \left(r, \frac{1}{F'} \right) + N_0 \left(r, \frac{1}{G'} \right) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

Now from (2.3), (2.8), and (2.13) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 T(r, F) &\leq 3\bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq 3\bar{N}(r, f) + 2\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq 3\bar{N}(r, f) + 2\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{P[f]}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq (Q + 3)\bar{N}(r, f) + 2\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))T(r, f) + \bar{d}(P)N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq [(Q + 3)\{1 - \Theta(\infty, f)\} + 2n\{1 - \Theta(0, p(f))\} + \bar{d}(P)\{1 - \delta(0, f)\}]T(r, f) \\
 &\quad + (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))T(r, f) + S(r, f).
 \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\begin{aligned}
 nT(r, f) &= T(r, F) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq [(Q + 3)\{1 - \Theta(\infty, f)\} + 2n\{1 - \Theta(0, p(f))\} + \bar{d}(P)\{1 - \delta(0, f)\}]T(r, f) \\
 &\quad + (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))T(r, f) + S(r, f),
 \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$[\{(Q + 3)\Theta(\infty, f) + 2n\Theta(0, p(f)) + \bar{d}(P)\delta(0, f)\} - \{(Q + 3 + 2\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P) + n)\}] T(r, f) \leq S(r, f).$$

That is,

$$(Q + 3)\Theta(\infty, f) + 2n\Theta(0, p(f)) + \bar{d}(P)\delta(0, f) \leq Q + 3 + 2\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P) + n,$$

which violates (1.1).

Case 2. When $l = 0$.

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 N_E^{(1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) &= N_E^{(1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + S(r, f), \\
 \bar{N}_E^{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) &= \bar{N}_E^{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + S(r, f),
 \end{aligned}$$

and also from (2.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) &\leq N_E^{(1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + \bar{N}_E^{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + \bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) \\
 &\quad + \bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq N_E^{(1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + \bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq \bar{N}(r, F) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) + 2\bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) \\
 &\quad + \bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{F'}\right) \\
 &\quad + N_0\left(r, \frac{1}{G'}\right) + S(r, f).
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

From (2.3), (2.4), (2.8), and (2.14) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 T(r, F) &\leq 3\bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) + \bar{N}_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) \\
 &\quad + 2\bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) + \bar{N}_L\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq 3\bar{N}(r, f) + 2\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) + 2\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) \\
 &\quad + 2\bar{N}(r, F) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) + \bar{N}(r, G) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq 6\bar{N}(r, f) + 4\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + 2N\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq 6\bar{N}(r, f) + 4\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + 2N\left(r, \frac{1}{P[f]}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq (2Q + 6)\bar{N}(r, f) + 4\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + 2(\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))T(r, f) + 2\bar{d}(P)N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq [(2Q + 6)\{1 - \Theta(\infty, f)\} + 4n\{1 - \Theta(0, p(f))\} + 2\bar{d}(P)\{1 - \delta(0, f)\}]T(r, f) \\
 &\quad + 2(\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))T(r, f) + S(r, f).
 \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\begin{aligned}
 nT(r, f) &= T(r, F) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq [(2Q + 6)\{1 - \Theta(\infty, f)\} + 4n\{1 - \Theta(0, p(f))\} + 2\bar{d}(P)\{1 - \delta(0, f)\}]T(r, f) \\
 &\quad + 2(\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))T(r, f) + S(r, f),
 \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\{[(2Q + 6)\Theta(\infty, f) + 4n\Theta(0, p(f)) + 2\bar{d}(P)\delta(0, f)] - \{2Q + 6 + 4\bar{d}(P) - 2\underline{d}(P) + 3n\}\}T(r, f) \leq S(r, f).$$

That is,

$$(2Q + 6)\Theta(\infty, f) + 4n\Theta(0, p(f)) + 2\bar{d}(P)\delta(0, f) \leq 2Q + 6 + 4\bar{d}(P) - 2\underline{d}(P) + 3n,$$

which violates (1.3).

This proves the claim and thus $\psi \equiv 0$. Therefore, (2.7) implies that

$$\frac{F''}{F'} - \frac{2F'}{F-1} = \frac{G''}{G'} - \frac{2G'}{G-1},$$

and so we obtain

$$\frac{1}{F-1} = \frac{C}{G-1} + D, \tag{2.15}$$

where $C \neq 0$ and D are constants.

Here, the following three cases can arise:

Case (i) : When $D \neq 0, -1$. Rewriting (2.15) as

$$\frac{G-1}{C} = \frac{F-1}{D+1-DF},$$

we have

$$\bar{N}(r, G) = \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F - (D+1)/D}\right).$$

In this case, the second fundamental theorem of Nevanlinna yields

$$\begin{aligned} nT(r, f) &= T(r, F) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \bar{N}(r, F) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F - (D+1)/D}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \bar{N}(r, F) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}(r, G) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq 2\bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &= [2\{1 - \Theta(\infty, f)\} + n\{1 - \Theta(0, p(f))\}]T(r, f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

\Rightarrow

$$\{2\Theta(\infty, f) + n\Theta(0, p(f))\} - 2]T(r, f) \leq S(r, f).$$

That is,

$$2\Theta(\infty, f) + n\Theta(0, p(f)) \leq 2,$$

which contradicts (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3).

Case (ii) : When $D = 0$. Then from (2.15) we have

$$G = CF - (C - 1). \tag{2.16}$$

Therefore, if $C \neq 1$, then

$$\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) = \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F - (C-1)/C}\right).$$

Now the second fundamental theorem of Nevanlinna and (2.3) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 nT(r, f) &= T(r, F) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq \bar{N}(r, F) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F - (C - 1)/C}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq \bar{N}(r, F) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq \bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{P[f]}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq \bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + Q\bar{N}(r, f) + (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))m\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) \\
 &\quad + N\left(r, \frac{1}{f\bar{d}(P)}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq (Q + 1)\bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))T(r, f) \\
 &\quad + \bar{d}(P)N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq [(Q + 1)\{1 - \Theta(\infty, f)\} + n\{1 - \Theta(0, p(f))\} + \bar{d}(P)\{1 - \delta(0, f)\}]T(r, f) \\
 &\quad + (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))T(r, f) + S(r, f).
 \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\{[(Q + 1)\Theta(\infty, f) + n\Theta(0, p(f)) + \bar{d}(P)\delta(0, f)] - \{Q + 1 + 2\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P)\}\}T(r, f) \leq S(r, f),$$

which implies that

$$(Q + 1)\Theta(\infty, f) + n\Theta(0, p(f)) + \bar{d}(P)\delta(0, f) \leq Q + 1 + 2\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P),$$

which contradicts (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3).

Thus, $C = 1$ and so in this case from (2.16) we obtain $F \equiv G$ and so

$$p(f) \equiv P[f].$$

Case (iii) : When $D = -1$. Then from (2.15) we have

$$\frac{1}{F - 1} = \frac{C}{G - 1} - 1. \tag{2.17}$$

Therefore, if $C \neq -1$, then

$$\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) = \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F - C/(C + 1)}\right),$$

and as in case (ii) we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
 nT(r, f) &\leq (Q + 1)\bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{p(f)}\right) + (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))T(r, f) \\
 &\quad + \bar{d}(P)N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + S(r, f),
 \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$[\{(Q + 1)\Theta(\infty, f) + n\Theta(0, p(f)) + \bar{d}(P)\delta(0, f)\} - \{Q + 1 + 2\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P)\}]T(r, f) \leq S(r, f).$$

That is,

$$(Q + 1)\Theta(\infty, f) + n\Theta(0, p(f)) + \bar{d}(P)\delta(0, f) \leq Q + 1 + 2\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P),$$

which contradicts (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3).

Therefore, $C = -1$ and so in this case from (2.17) we obtain $FG \equiv 1$ and so $p(f)P[f] = a^2$. Thus, in this case $\bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}(r, 1/f) = S(r, f)$.

Now, by using (2.1) and (2.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (n + \bar{d}(P))T(r, f) &\leq T\left(r, \frac{a^2}{f^{n+\bar{d}(P)}}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T\left(r, \left[1 + \frac{a_{n-1}}{f} + \dots + \frac{a_1}{f^{n-1}}\right] \cdot \frac{P[f]}{f^{\bar{d}(P)}}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq (n - 1)T(r, f) + T\left(r, \frac{P[f]}{f^{\bar{d}(P)}}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &= (n - 1)T(r, f) + m\left(r, \frac{P[f]}{f^{\bar{d}(P)}}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{P[f]}{f^{\bar{d}(P)}}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq (n - 1)T(r, f) + (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))m\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) \\ &\quad + Q\left[\bar{N}(r, f) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right)\right] + S(r, f) \\ &\leq (n - 1)T(r, f) + (\bar{d}(P) - \underline{d}(P))T(r, f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(1 + \underline{d}(P))T(r, f) \leq S(r, f),$$

which is a contradiction. □

Acknowledgment

The authors are thankful to the anonymous referee for his/her comments, which have improved the quality of the paper.

References

- [1] Banerjee A. Meromorphic functions sharing one value. *Int J Math Math Sci* 2005; 22: 3587-3598.
- [2] Banerjee A, Majumder S. Some uniqueness results related to meromorphic function that share a small function with its derivative. *Math Reports* 2014; 66: 95-111.
- [3] Bhoosnurmath S, Kabbur SR. On entire and meromorphic functions that share one small function with their differential polynomial, Hindawi Publishing Corporation. *Intl J Analysis* 2013; Article ID 926340.
- [4] Goldberg AA, Ostrovskii IV. Value Distribution of Meromorphic Functions. Translated from the 1970 Russian original by Mikhail Ostrovskii. With an appendix by Alexandre Eremenko and James K. Langley. *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*, 236. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, USA, 2008.

- [5] Hayman WK. Meromorphic Functions. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- [6] Mues E, Steinmetz N. Meromorphe funktionen die unit ihrer ableitung werte teilen. *Manuscripta Math* 1979; 29: 195-206 (in German).
- [7] Yang CC, Yi HX. Uniqueness Theory of Meromorphic Functions. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.
- [8] Zhang T, Lü W. Notes on a meromorphic function sharing one small function with its derivative. *Complex Variables and Elliptic Equations* 2008; 53: 857-867.