

A Further Result of Nevanlinna's Four-Point Theorem *

YAO Wei-hong¹, YANG Dian-wu²

(1. Dept. of Math., Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai 200240, China;

2. Dept. of Math., Jinan University, Shandong 250002, China)

Abstract: In this paper, we proved a result that if two meromorphic functions share two values CM and two other values in the sense of $E_k(\beta, f) = E_k(\beta, g)$, ($k \geq 5$), then f is a Möbius transformation of g .

Key words: meromorphic function; sharing value CM(IM).

Classification: AMS(2000) 30D35/CLC number: O174.52

Document code: A **Article ID:** 1000-341X(2003)03-0397-06

1. Introduction

In this paper the term “meromorphic function” will mean a meromorphic function in C . We will use the standard notations of Nevanlinna theory:

$$T(r, f), S(r, f), m(r, \beta, f), N(r, \beta, f), \overline{N}(r, \beta, f), N_1(r, \beta, f), \\ \overline{N}_1(r, \beta, f), N_1(r, f), \overline{N}(r, f), \Theta(\beta, f), (\beta \in C \cup \{\infty\}), \dots,$$

and we assume that the reader is familiar with the basic results in Nevanlinna theory as found in [3].

For a nonconstant meromorphic function f , a number $\beta \in C \cup \{\infty\}$ and a positive integer k (or $+\infty$), we write $E_k(\beta, f)$ for the set of zeros of $f(z) - a$ with multiplicity $\leq k$ (counting multiplicity); we write $\overline{E}_k(\beta, f)$ for the set of zeros of $f(z) - a$ with multiplicity $\leq k$ (each zero counted only once).

If two nonconstant meromorphic function f and g satisfy $E_{+\infty}(\beta, f) = E_{+\infty}(\beta, g)$, then we say that f and g share β CM; If f and g satisfy $\overline{E}_{+\infty}(\beta, f) = \overline{E}_{+\infty}(\beta, g)$, then we say that f and g share β IM.

Gundersen^[2] proved the following result which generalizes a well-known result of Nevanlinna called *Four-Point Theorem*^[5].

*Received date: 2000-10-26

Foundation item: Supported by the NNSFC(10271077)

Biography: YAO Wei-hong (1962-), female, Ph.D., Associate Professor.

Theorem A Let f and g be nonconstant meromorphic functions. Assume that f and g share two values 0 and ∞ CM , and that they share two values 1 and $a (\neq 0, \infty, 1)$ IM .

- (i) If $a = -1$, then $fg \equiv 1$, or $f + g \equiv 0$, or $f \equiv g$.
- (ii) If $a = 1/2$, then $(f - (1/2))(g - (1/2)) \equiv 1/4$, or $f + g \equiv 1$ or $f \equiv g$.
- (iii) If $a = 2$, then $(f - 1)(g - 1) \equiv 1$, or $f + g \equiv 2$ or $f \equiv g$.
- (iv) If $a \neq -1, 1/2, 2$, then $f \equiv g$.

Because as we know if f and g share two values 0 and ∞ CM , and share two other values 1 and $a (\neq 0, \infty, 1)$ IM , they share all four values CM (See [5]). Theorem A is equivalent to say f and g share all four values CM and we get the same result.

In 1998, Hideharu Ueda got the following result.

Theorem B^[1] Let f and g be two non-constant meromorphic functions. Assume that f and g share two values 0 and ∞ CM , and that they satisfy $E_k(a_j, f) = E_k(a_j, g)$ for $j = 3, 4$, where $a_3 = 1, a_4 = a (\neq 0, \infty, 1, -1)$ and $k (\geq 12)$ is a positive integer. Then f and g satisfy one of the following cases:

- (i) $f \equiv g$;
- (ii) $f \equiv -g$ and $a = -1$;
- (iii) $f \equiv -g + 2$ and $a = 2$;
- (iv) $(f - \frac{1}{2})(g - \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{4}$ and $a = \frac{1}{2}$;
- (v) $fg \equiv 1$ and $a = -1$;
- (vi) $(f - 1)(g - 1) \equiv 1$ and $a = 2$;
- (vii) $f \equiv -g + 1$ and $a = \frac{1}{2}$.

In [1], H. Ueda points out that he doesn't know if we can still keep the result in Theorem B when $2 < k < 12$. In this paper, we obtain the following result, which tells that we can keep the result in Theorem B when $k (\geq 5)$. So it is an improvement of Theorem B.

Theorem 1 Let f and g be nonconstant meromorphic functions. Assume that f and g share two values 0 and ∞ CM , and that they satisfy $E_k(a_j, f) = E_k(a_j, g)$ for $j = 3, 4$, where $a_3 = 1, a_4 = a (\neq 0, \infty, 1, -1)$ and $k (\geq 5)$ is a positive integer.

- (i) If $a = -1$, then $fg \equiv 1$, or $f + g \equiv 0$, or $f \equiv g$.
- (ii) If $a = 1/2$, then $(f - (1/2))(g - (1/2)) \equiv 1/4$ or $f + g \equiv 1$ or $f \equiv g$.
- (iii) If $a = 2$, then $(f - 1)(g - 1) \equiv 1$ or $f + g \equiv 2$ or $f \equiv g$.
- (iv) If $a \neq -1, 1/2, 2$, then $f \equiv g$.

2. Notations and terminologies

In this Section, we introduce some essential notations and terminologies.

(i) Let f, g be distinct nonconstant meromorphic functions. For $r > 0$, let $T(r) = \max\{T(r, f), T(r, g)\}$. We write $\sigma(r) = S(r)$ for every function $\sigma : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty)$ satisfying $\sigma(r)/T(r) \rightarrow 0$ for $r \rightarrow +\infty$ possibly outside a set of finite Lebesgue measure.

(ii) Let f, g be nonconstant meromorphic functions. we denote by $\overline{N}_c(r, \beta; f, g) \equiv \overline{N}_c(r, \beta)$ (resp. $\overline{N}_d(r, \beta; f, g) \equiv \overline{N}_d(r, \beta)$) the counting function of those common β -points of f and g with the same multiplicity (resp. with the different multiplicities),

each point counted only once regardless of multiplicity, and we write

$$\overline{N}_i(r, \beta; f, g) \equiv \overline{N}_i(r, \beta) = \overline{N}_c(r, \beta) + \overline{N}_d(r, \beta).$$

We say that f and g share $\beta CM''$ if $\overline{N}(r, \beta, f) - \overline{N}_c(r, \beta) = S(r, f)$ and $\overline{N}(r, \beta, g) - \overline{N}_c(r, \beta) = S(r, g)$ hold. Similarly, if $\overline{N}(r, \beta, f) - \overline{N}_i(r, \beta) = S(r, f)$ and $\overline{N}(r, \beta, g) - \overline{N}_i(r, \beta) = S(r, g)$ hold, then we say that f and g share $\beta IM''$. These notions CM'' and IM'' are slight generalizations of CM and IM , respectively.

(iii) Let f and g be nonconstant meromorphic functions. For $\beta, \gamma (\in C \cup \{\infty\}), \beta \neq \gamma$ we put

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\beta, \gamma}(r) &\equiv m_{\beta, \gamma}(r; f, g) = m(r, \beta, f) + m(r, \gamma, f) + m(r, \beta, g) + m(r, \gamma, g), \\ \overline{N}_{\beta, \gamma}(r) &\equiv \overline{N}_{\beta, \gamma}(r; f, g) = \overline{N}(r; f = \beta, g \neq \beta) + \overline{N}(r; f = \gamma, g \neq \gamma) + \\ &\quad \overline{N}(r; g = \beta, f \neq \beta) + \overline{N}(r; g = \gamma, f \neq \gamma), \\ \tilde{N}'_{\beta, \gamma}(r) &\equiv \tilde{N}'_{\beta, \gamma}(r; f, g) = \overline{N}_c(r, \beta) + \overline{N}_c(r, \gamma), \\ \tilde{N}''_{\beta, \gamma}(r) &\equiv \tilde{N}''_{\beta, \gamma}(r; f, g) = \overline{N}_d(r, \beta) + \overline{N}_d(r, \gamma), \\ \tilde{N}_{\beta, \gamma}(r) &\equiv \tilde{N}_{\beta, \gamma}(r; f, g) = \tilde{N}'_{\beta, \gamma}(r; f, g) + \tilde{N}''_{\beta, \gamma}(r; f, g) = \overline{N}_i(r, \beta; f, g) + \overline{N}_i(r, \gamma; f, g), \end{aligned}$$

where for example, $\overline{N}(r; f = \beta, g \neq \beta)$ denotes the counting function of those β -points of f which are not β -points of g , each point counted only once.

3. Preparations for the proof of Theorems 1

We need a slight generalization of Theorem A:

Theorem A' *Theorem A remains still valid if CM and IM are replaced by CM'' and IM'' , respectively.*

In order to prove this fact we only need to use the argument (due to Mues) in the proof of Theorem 1 in [4] by replacing CM and IM by CM'' and IM'' , respectively.

In the rest of this section, we assume that f and g are distinct nonconstant meromorphic functions sharing $a_1 = 0$ and $a_2 = \infty$ CM and satisfying $E_k(a_j, f) = E_k(a_j, g)$ for $j = 3, 4$, where $a_3 = 1, a_4 = a (\neq 0, \infty, 1)$ and $k (\geq 2)$ is a positive integer. We write, for example,

$$\begin{aligned} N(r, 0, f) &= N(r, 0, g) = N(r, 0), \\ N(r, \infty, f) &= N(r, \infty, g) = N(r, \infty), \\ \overline{N}(r, 0, f) &= \overline{N}(r, 0, g) = \overline{N}(r, 0), \\ \overline{N}(r, \infty, f) &= \overline{N}(r, \infty, g) = \overline{N}(r, \infty), \\ N_1(r, 0, f) &= N_1(r, 0, g) = N_1(r, 0), \\ N_1(r, \infty, f) &= N_1(r, \infty, g) = N_1(r, \infty), \\ \overline{N}_1(r, 0, f) &= \overline{N}_1(r, 0, g) = \overline{N}_1(r, 0), \\ \overline{N}_1(r, \infty, f) &= \overline{N}_1(r, \infty, g) = \overline{N}_1(r, \infty). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1^[6] $S(r) = S(r, f) = S(r, g)$.

Lemma 2^[1] Let $\tilde{n}(r; f' = g' = 0, f \neq 0, g \neq 0)$ denote the number of distinct common zeros of f' and g' which are neither zeros of f nor g in $|z| \leq r$. Put $\tilde{N}(r; f' = g' = 0, f \neq 0, g \neq 0) = \int_0^r \{\tilde{n}(t; f' = g' = 0, f \neq 0, g \neq 0) - \tilde{n}(0; f' = g' = 0, f \neq 0, g \neq 0)\}/tdt + \tilde{n}(0; f' = g' = 0, f \neq 0, g \neq 0) \log r$. If g/f is not a constant, then

$$\tilde{N}(r; f' = g' = 0, f \neq 0, g \neq 0) = S(r).$$

Lemma 3^[6] Let $n'_1(r, f)$ denote the number of multiple points of f in $|z| \leq r$ such that $f \neq 0, \infty, 1, a$, where a point of multiplicity m is counted $(m-1)$ times. Put $N'_1(r, f) = \int_0^r \{n'_1(t, f) - n'_1(0, f)\}/tdt + n'_1(0, f) \log r$. If $N'_1(r, g)$ is similarly defined, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{N}_{1,a}''(r; f, g) + k\overline{N}_{1,a}(r; f, g) + N'_1(r, f) + N'_1(r, g) \\ & \leq 2\{\overline{N}(r, 0) + \overline{N}(r, \infty)\} + S(r). \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Now, we introduce some auxiliary functions:

$$\varphi_1 = \frac{f'f}{(f-1)(f-a)} - \frac{g'g}{(g-1)(g-a)}, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\varphi_2 = \frac{f'}{f(f-1)(f-a)} - \frac{g'}{g(g-1)(g-a)}. \quad (3.3)$$

With the aid of these auxiliary functions, we obtain some basic conclusions:

Lemma 4^[6]

(i)

$$2\{N_1(r, 0) + N_1(r, \infty)\} + \overline{N}'_1(r, f) + \overline{N}'_1(r, g) \leq \overline{N}_{1,a}(r) + S(r). \quad (3.4)$$

(ii) If neither $\varphi_1 \equiv 0$ nor $\varphi_2 \equiv 0$, then

$$\overline{N}(r, 0) + \overline{N}(r, \infty) \leq 2\{\overline{N}_{1,a}(r) + \tilde{N}_{1,a}''(r)\} + S(r). \quad (3.5)$$

4. Proof of Theorem 1

In what follows we assume that f and g are distinct and satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1, and so there is an entire function α satisfying $g = e^\alpha f$ ($e^\alpha \neq 1$).

Case 1 We first consider the case that e^α is a constant C ($\neq 0, 1$). From the assumptions $E_k(1, f) = E_k(1, g)$ and $E_k(a, f) = E_k(a, g)$ it follows that

$$\Theta(1, g), \Theta(a, g) \geq k/(k+1).$$

If $C \neq a$, we also obtain

$$\Theta(C, g) \geq k/(k+1),$$

and so

$$\Theta(1, g) + \Theta(a, g) + \Theta(C, g) \geq 3k/(k+1) > 2,$$

a contradiction. This shows $C = a$. Further if $a^2 \neq 1$, we also obtain

$$\Theta(a^2, g) \geq k/(k+1),$$

and so

$$\Theta(1, g) + \Theta(a, g) + \Theta(a^2, g) \geq 3k/(k+1) > 2,$$

a contradiction. This shows $a^2 = 1$, i.e., $a = -1$ and $f + g \equiv 0$. In this case we remark that

$$N(r, 1, f) = N(r, -1, g), N(r, -1, f) = N(r, 1, g)$$

are not necessarily $S(r)$!

Case 2 We next consider the case that e^α is nonconstant. We divide our argument into several subcases:

2.1. The case $\varphi_1 \equiv 0$

$\varphi_1 \equiv 0$ implies that any 1- and a - point of f (resp. g) are a 1- or an a - point of g (resp. f). By Lemma 2, we deduce from the assumptions $E_k(a_j, f) = E_k(a_j, g)$ for $j = 3, 4$ with $a_3 = 1, a_4 = a$ that $\overline{N}(r; f = 1, g = a) + \overline{N}(r; f = a, g = 1) = S(r)$, (where $\overline{N}(r; f = 1, g = a)$ denote the counting function of common roots of $f = 1$ and $g = a$, each counted only once,) and so by Lemma 1, f and g share two values 1 and a IM". Hence by Theorem A', f and g are connected with one of the relations stated in Theorem A. Further, straightforward computations show that only two relations $(f - (1/2))(g - (1/2)) \equiv 1/4$ (with $a = 1/2$) and $(f - 1)(g - 1) \equiv 1$ (with $a = 2$) are suitable for $\varphi_1 \equiv 0$.

2.2. The case $\varphi_2 \equiv 0$

The same reasoning as in the case 2.1 shows that only two relations $f + g \equiv 2$, (with $a = 2$) and $f + g \equiv 1$ (with $a = 1/2$) are suitable for $\varphi_2 \equiv 0$.

2.3. The case $\varphi_1 \neq 0, \varphi_2 \neq 0$

From Lemma 2, noting that $E_k(a_j, f) = E_k(a_j, g)$, ($j = 3, 4$) we can get

$$\tilde{N}_{1,a}''(r) = S(r).$$

In fact, since $\tilde{N}_{1,a}''(r) \equiv \tilde{N}_{1,a}''(r; f, g) = \overline{N}_d(r, 1) + \overline{N}_d(r, a)$, and noting that $E_k(a_j, f) = E_k(a_j, g)$, ($j = 3, 4$) we have, for any common 1- (resp. a -)points z_0 of f and g with the different multiplicities, both of the multiplicities are more than $k(\geq 5)$. So we have $f'(z_0) = g'(z_0) = 0$, $f(z_0) = 1$ (resp. a) $\neq 0$ and $g(z_0) = 1$ (resp. a) $\neq 0$. Hence from Lemma 2, if g/f is not a constant, we can get

$$\tilde{N}_{1,a}''(r) \equiv \tilde{N}_{1,a}''(r; f, g) = \overline{N}_d(r, 1) + \overline{N}_d(r, a) \leq \tilde{N}(r; f' = g' = 0, f \neq 0, g \neq 0) = S(r).$$

If g/f is a constant, since f and g share two values 0 and ∞ CM, we can easily get that $f \equiv g$.

Combining (3.1) and (3.5), we have

$$(k-4)\overline{N}_{1,a}(r) \leq 3\tilde{N}_{1,a}''(r) + S(r). \quad (4.1)$$

Taking the fact $k \geq 5$ into account, we deduce that $\overline{N}_{1,a}(r) = S(r)$.

Hence, $\tilde{N}_{1,a}''(r) = S(r)$ and $\overline{N}_{1,a}(r) = S(r)$ hold. From (3.4) and (3.5) we obtain $N(r, 0) + N(r, \infty) = S(r)$, and so by Lemma 1 and the second fundamental theorem $\overline{N}(r, 1, f), \overline{N}(r, a, f) = T(r, f) + S(r)$ and $\overline{N}(r, 1, g), \overline{N}(r, a, g) = T(r, g) + S(r)$. On the other hand, $\overline{N}_{1,a}(r) = S(r)$ implies that f and g share two values 1 and a IM'', and so we deduce from Theorem A' that f and g are connected with one of the relations in Theorem A. Therefore we obtain $fg \equiv 1$ with $a \equiv -1$ in this case.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

References:

- [1] UEDA H. Meromorphic functions f and g that share two values CM and two other values in the sense of $E_k(\beta, f) = E_k(\beta, g)$ [J]. Kodai Math. J., 1998, 21: 273-284.
- [2] GUNDERSEN G G. Meromorphic functions that share four values [J]. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 1983, 277: 545-567.
- [3] HAYMAN W K. Meromorphic Functions [M]. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1964.
- [4] MUES E. Meromorphic functions sharing four values [J]. Complex Variables Theory Appl., 1989, 12: 169-179.
- [5] YI H X, YANG C C. Uniqueness Theory of Meromorphic Functions [M]. Beijing: Science Press, 1995.
- [6] YAO W H. On the Uniqueness of Meromorphic Functions Concerning Sharing Values and Small Functions [D]. Doctoral Thesis, 2000, 1-51.

关于 Nevanlinna 四值定理的改进

姚卫红¹, 杨殿武²

(1. 上海交通大学数学系, 上海 200240; 2. 济南大学数学系, 山东 济南 250002)

摘要: 在本文中, 我们证明了如果两个亚纯函数分担两个值 CM, 并且在 $E_k(\beta, f) = E_k(\beta, g)$ ($k \geq 5$), 意义下分担另外两个值, 则这两个亚纯函数一个是另一个的分式线性变换.

关键词: 亚纯函数; 小函数; 唯一性.