Hindawi Publishing Corporation
Abstract and Applied Analysis
Volume 2012, Article ID 260506, 15 pages
doi:10.1155/2012/260506

Research Article

Characteristic Functions and Borel Exceptional Values of E-Valued Meromorphic Functions

Zhaojun Wu[1] and Zuxing Xuan[2]

[1] *School of Mathematics and Statistics, Hubei University of Science and Technology, Hubei, Xianning 437100, China*
[2] *Beijing Key Laboratory of Information Service Engineering, Department of General Education, Beijing Union University, No. 97 Bei Si Huan Dong Road, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100101, China*

Correspondence should be addressed to Zuxing Xuan, xuanzuxing@ss.buaa.edu.cn

Received 27 April 2012; Accepted 16 September 2012

Academic Editor: Michiel Bertsch

The main purpose of this paper is to investigate the characteristic functions and Borel exceptional values of E-valued meromorphic functions from the $\mathbb{C}_R = \{z : |z| < R\}$, $0 < R \leq +\infty$ to an infinite-dimensional complex Banach space E with a Schauder basis. Results obtained extend the relative results by Xuan, Wu and Yang, Bhoosnurmath, and Pujari.

1. Introduction and Preliminaries

In 1980s, Ziegler [1] succeeded in extending the Nevanlinna theory of meromorphic functions to the vector-valued meromorphic functions in finite dimensional spaces. Later, Hu and Yang [2] established the Nevanlinna theory of meromorphic mappings with the range in an infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. In 2006, C.-G. Hu and Q. Hu [3] established the Nevanlinna's first and second main theorems of meromorphic mappings with the range in an infinite-dimensional Banach spaces E with a Schauder basis. Recently, Xuan and Wu [4] established the Nevanlinna's first and second main theorems for an E-valued meromorphic mapping from a generic domain $D \subsetneq \mathbb{C}$ to an infinite-dimensional Banach spaces E with a Schauder basis.

In [4], Xuan and Wu also proved Chuang's inequality (see, e.g., [5]) of E-valued meromorphic mapping $f(z)$ in the whole complex plane, which compares the relationship between $T(r, f)$ and $T(r, f')$, and also obtained that the order and the lower order of E-valued meromorphic mapping $f(z)$ and those of its derivative $f'(z)$ are the same. In Section 2, we shall prove that Chuang's inequality is valid for E-valued meromorphic mapping $f(z)$ in the unit disc and prove that for any infinite-order E-valued meromorphic function $f(z)$ defined in the unit disc has the same Xiong's proximate order as its derivative $f'(z)$.

In [5], Yang obtained much stronger results than those of Gopalakrishna and Bhoosnurmath [6] for the Borel exceptional values of meromorphic functions dealing with multiple values. In Section 3, we shall extend Le Yang's result to E-valued meromorphic functions of finite and infinite orders in

$$\mathbb{C}_R := \{z : |z| < R\}, \quad 0 < R \leq +\infty. \tag{1.1}$$

In the following, we introduce the definitions, notations, and results of [3, 4] which will be used in this paper.

Let $(E, \|\bullet\|)$ be an infinite dimension complex Banach space with Schauder basis $\{e_j\}$ and the norm $\|\bullet\|$. Thus, an E-valued meromorphic function $f(z)$ defined in $\mathbb{C}_R$, $0 < R \leq +\infty$ can be written as

$$f(z) = \left(f_1(z), f_2(z), \ldots, f_k(z), \ldots\right). \tag{1.2}$$

Let E_n be an n-dimensional projective space of E with a basis $\{e_j\}_1^n$. The projective operator $P_n : E \to E_n$ is a realization of E_n associated with basis.

The elements of E are called vectors and are usually denoted by letters from the alphabet: $a, b, c, \ldots$. The symbol 0 denotes the zero vector of E. We denote vector infinity, complex number infinity, and the norm infinity by $\widehat{\infty}, \infty$, and $+\infty$, respectively. A vector-valued mappings is called holomorphic (meromorphic) if all $f_j(z)$ are holomorphic (some of $f_j(z)$ are meromorphic). The jth derivative $j = 1, 2, \ldots$ of $f(z)$ is defined by

$$f^{(j)}(z) = \left(f_1^{(j)}(z), f_2^{(j)}(z), \ldots, f_k^{(j)}(z), \ldots\right). \tag{1.3}$$

A point $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}_r$ is called a "pole" (or $\widehat{\infty}$ point) of

$$f(z) = \left(f_1(z), f_2(z), \ldots, f_k(z), \ldots\right) \tag{1.4}$$

if z_0 is a pole (or ∞ point) of at least one of the component functions $f_k(z)$ $(k = 1, 2, \ldots)$. A point $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}_r$ is called a "zero" of $f(z) = (f_1(z), f_2(z), \ldots, f_k(z), \ldots)$ if z_0 is a zero of all the component functions $f_k(z)$ $(k = 1, 2, \ldots)$. A point $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}_r$ is called a pole or an $\widehat{\infty}$-point of $f(z)$ of multiplicity $q \in \mathbb{N}^+$, meaning that in such a point z_0 at least one of the meromorphic component functions $f_j(z)$ has a pole of this multiplicity in the ordinary sense of function theory. A point $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}_r$ is called a zero of $f(z)$ of multiplicity $q \in \mathbb{N}^+$, meaning that in such a point z_0 all component functions $f_j(z)$ vanish, each with at least this multiplicity.

Let $n(r,f)$ or $n(r,\widehat{\infty})$ denote the number of poles of $f(z)$ in $|z| \leq r$ and let $n(r,a,f)$ denote the number of a-points of $f(z)$ in $|z| \leq r$, counting with multiplicities. Define the volume function associated with E-valued meromorphic function $f(z)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} V(r,\widehat{\infty},f) = V(r,f) &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{C_r} \log\left|\frac{r}{\xi}\right| \Delta \log\|f(\xi)\| dx\wedge dy, \quad \xi = x+iy, \\ V(r,a,f) &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{C_r} \log\left|\frac{r}{\xi}\right| \Delta \log\|f(\xi)-a\| dx\wedge dy, \quad \xi = x+iy, \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

and the counting function of finite or infinite a-points by

$$N(r,f) = n(0,f)\log r + \int_0^r \frac{n(t,f)-n(0,f)}{t}dt, \tag{1.6}$$

$$N(r,\widehat{\infty}) = n(0,\widehat{\infty})\log r + \int_0^r \frac{n(t,\widehat{\infty}) - n(0,\widehat{\infty})}{t}dt, \tag{1.7}$$

$$N(r,a,f) = n(0,a,f)\log r + \int_0^r \frac{n(t,a,f)-n(0,a,f)}{t}dt, \tag{1.8}$$

respectively. Next, we define

$$\begin{aligned} m(r,f) = m(r,\widehat{\infty},f) &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \log^+\left\|f\left(re^{i\theta}\right)\right\| d\theta, \\ m(r,a) = m(r,a,f) &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ \frac{1}{\|f(re^{i\theta})-a\|} d\theta, \\ T(r,f) &= m(r,f) + N(r,f). \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$

Let $\overline{n}(r,f)$ or $\overline{n}(r,\widehat{\infty})$ denote the number of poles of $f(z)$ in $|z| \leq r$, and let $\overline{n}(r,a,f)$ denote the number of a-points of $f(z)$ in $|z| \leq r$, ignoring multiplicities. Similarly, we can define the counting functions $\overline{N}(r,f)$, $\overline{N}(r,\widehat{\infty})$, and $\overline{N}(r,a,f)$ of $\overline{n}(r,f)$, $\overline{n}(r,\widehat{\infty})$, and $\overline{n}(r,a,f)$.

If $f(z)$ is an E-valued meromorphic function in the whole complex plane, then the order and the lower order of $f(z)$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(f) &= \limsup_{r\to+\infty} \frac{\log^+ T(r,f)}{\log r}, \\ \mu(f) &= \liminf_{r\to+\infty} \frac{\log^+ T(r,f)}{\log r}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.10}$$

If $f(z)$ is an E-valued meromorphic function in $\mathbb{C}_R$, $0 < R < +\infty$, then the order and the lower order of $f(z)$ are defined by

$$\lambda(f) = \limsup_{r\to R^-} \frac{\log T(r,f)}{\log^+(1/(R-r))},$$
$$\mu(f) = \liminf_{r\to R^-} \frac{\log T(r,f)}{\log^+(1/(R-r))}. \tag{1.11}$$

Lemma 1.1. *Let $B(x)$ be a positive and continuous function in $[0,+\infty)$ which satisfies $\limsup_{x\to+\infty}(\log B(x)/\log x) = \infty$. Then there exists a continuously differentiable function $\rho(x)$, which satisfies the following conditions.*

(i) *$\rho(x)$ is continuous and nondecreasing for $x \geq x_0$ $(x_0 > 0)$ and tends to $+\infty$ as $x \to +\infty$.*

(ii) *The function $U(x) = x^{\rho(x)}$ $(x \geq x_0)$ satisfies the following:*

$$\lim_{x\to+\infty} \frac{\log U(X)}{\log U(x)} = 1, \quad X = x + \frac{x}{\log U(x)}. \tag{1.12}$$

(iii) $\limsup_{x\to+\infty}(\log B(x)/\log U(x)) = 1$.

Lemma 1.1 is due to K. L. Hiong (also Qinglai Xiong) and $\rho(x)$ is called the proximate order of Hiong. A simple proof of the existence of $\rho(r)$ was given by Chuang [7]. Suppose that $f(z)$ is an E-valued meromorphic function of infinite order in the unit disk $\mathbb{C}_1$. Let $x = 1/(1-r)$ and $X = 1/(1-R)$. From (ii) and (iii) in Lemma 1.1, we have

$$\lim_{r\to 1^-} \frac{\log U(1/(1-R))}{\log U(1/(1-r))} = 1, \quad R = \frac{r\log U(1/(1-r)) + 1}{\log U(1/(1-r)) + 1},$$
$$\limsup_{x\to 1^-} \frac{\log T(r,f)}{\log U(1/(1-r))} = 1. \tag{1.13}$$

Here, the functions $\rho(1/(1-r))$ and $U(1/(1-r))$ are called the proximate order and type function of $f(z)$, respectively.

Definition 1.2. An E-valued meromorphic function $f(z)$ in $\mathbb{C}_R$, $0 < R \leq +\infty$ is of compact projection, if for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, $\|P_n(f(z)) - f(z)\| < \varepsilon$ has sufficiently larg n in any fixed compact subset $D \subset C_R$.

Throughout this paper, we say that $f(z)$ is an E-valued meromorphic function meaning that $f(z)$ is of compact projection. C.-G. Hu and Q. Hu [3] established the following Nevanlinna's first and second main theorems of E-valued meromorphic functions.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $f(z)$ be a nonconstant E-valued meromorphic function in $\mathbb{C}_R$, $0 < R \leq +\infty$. Then for $0 < r < R$, $a \in E$, $f(z) \not\equiv a$,*

$$T(r, f) = V(r, a) + N(r, a) + m(r, a) + \log^+ \|c_q(a)\| + \varepsilon(r, a). \tag{1.14}$$

Here, $\varepsilon(r, a)$ is a function satisfying that

$$|\varepsilon(r, a)| \leq \log^+ \|a\| + \log 2, \quad \varepsilon(r, 0) \equiv 0, \tag{1.15}$$

and $c_q(a) \in E$ is the coefficient of the first term in the Laurent series at the point a.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $f(z)$ be a nonconstant E-valued meromorphic function in $\mathbb{C}_R$, $0 < R \leq +\infty$ and $a^{[k]} \in E \cup \{\widehat{\infty}\}$ $(k = 1, 2, \ldots, q)$ be $q \geq 3$ distinct points. Then for $0 < r < R$,*

$$(q - 2)T(r, f) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{q} \left[V\left(r, a^{[k]}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, a^{[k]}\right) \right] + S(r, f). \tag{1.16}$$

If $R = +\infty$, then

$$S(r, f) = O(\log T(r, f) + \log r) \tag{1.17}$$

holds as $r \to +\infty$ without exception if $f(z)$ has finite order and otherwise as $r \to +\infty$ outside a set J of exceptional intervals of finite measure $\int_J dr < +\infty$. If the order of $f(z)$ is infinite and $\rho(r)$ is the proximate order of $f(z)$, then

$$S(r, f) = O(\log U(r)) \tag{1.18}$$

holds as $r \to +\infty$ without exception.

If $0 < R < +\infty$, then

$$S(r, f) = O\left(\log T(r, f) + \log \frac{1}{R - r} \right) \tag{1.19}$$

holds as $r \to R$ without exception if $f(z)$ has finite order and otherwise as $r \to R$ outside a set J of exceptional intervals of finite measure $\int_J d((r/(R - r)) < +\infty$.

In all cases, the exceptional set J is independent of the choice of $a^{[k]}$.

2. Characteristic Function of E-Valued Meromorphic Functions in the Unit Disc $\mathbb{C}_1$

In [4], Xuan and Wu proved the following.

Theorem A. *Let $f(z)$ $(z \in \mathbb{C})$ be a nonconstant E-valued meromorphic function and $f(0) \neq \widehat{\infty}$. Then for $\tau > 1$ and $0 < r < R$, one has*

$$T(r,f) < C_\tau T(\tau r, f') + \log^+ \tau r + 4 + \log^+ \|f(0)\|, \tag{2.1}$$

where C_τ is a positive constant.

Theorem B. *Let $f(z)$ $(z \in \mathbb{C})$ be a nonconstant E-valued meromorphic function. Then we have*

$$T(r,f') < 2T(r,f) + O(\log r + \log^+ T(r,f)). \tag{2.2}$$

Theorem C. *For a nonconstant E-valued meromorphic function $f(z)$ $(z \in \mathbb{C})$ of order $\lambda(f) < +\infty$, one has $\lambda(f) = \lambda(f')$, $\mu(f) = \mu(f')$.*

In this section, we shall prove that Theorems A, B, and C are valid for E-valued meromorphic function in the unit disc $\mathbb{C}_1$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $f(z)$ be an E-valued meromorphic function defined in the unit disc, and $f(0) \neq \widehat{\infty}$. If $0 < R < R' < 1$, then there exists a $\theta_0 \in [0, 2\pi)$, such that for any $0 \le r \le R$, one has*

$$\log^+ \left\| f\left(re^{i\theta_0}\right) \right\| \le \frac{R' + R}{R' - R} m(R', f) + n(R', f) \log 4 + N(R', f). \tag{2.3}$$

Lemma 2.2. *Let $f(z)$ be an E-valued meromorphic function defined in the unit disc, and let $0 < R < R' < R'' < 1$. Then there exists a positive number $R \le \rho \le R'$, such that for $|z| = \rho$, one has*

$$\log^+ \left\| f\left(re^{i\theta_0}\right) \right\| \le \frac{R'' + R'}{R'' - R'} m(R'', f) + n(R'', f) \log \frac{8eR''}{R' - R}. \tag{2.4}$$

Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 are due to Xuan and Wu [4] for the E-valued meromorphic function defined in the whole complex plane. From the proof of Xuan and Wu [4], we know that Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 are also valid for the E-valued meromorphic function defined in the unit disc $\mathbb{C}_1$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $f(z)$ $(z \in \mathbb{C}_1)$ be a nonconstant E-valued meromorphic function and $f(0) \neq \widehat{\infty}$. Suppose that $h(r) \ge 1$, $R = (1 + rh(r))/(1 + h(r))$, then when r sufficiently tends to 1, one has*

$$n(r,f) \le \frac{6h(r)}{1-r} N(R,f). \tag{2.5}$$

Proof.

$$
\begin{aligned}
N(R,f) &= n(0,f)\log r + \int_0^R \frac{n(t,f)-n(0,f)}{t}\,dt = \int_0^R \frac{n(t,f)}{t}\,dt \\
&\geq \int_r^R \frac{n(t,f)}{t}\,dt \geq n(r,f)\log\frac{R}{r} \\
&= n(r,f)\log\left(1+\frac{1-r}{r(1+h(r))}\right) \geq n(r,f)\left(\frac{1-r}{r(1+h(r))} - \frac{((1-r)/r(+h(r)))^2}{2}\right) \\
&\geq n(r,f)\left(\frac{(1-r)/r(1+h(r))}{2}\right) \geq n(r,f)\frac{1-r}{6h(r)}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.6}
$$

□

Lemma 2.4 (see [4]). *Let $f(z)$ ($z \in \mathbb{C}_R$, $0 < R \leq +\infty$) be a nonconstant E-valued meromorphic function and $f(0) \neq \widehat{\infty}$, and L a curve from the origin along the segment* $\arg z = \theta_0$ *to $\rho e^{i\theta_0}$, and along $\{|z| = \rho < r\}$ turn a rotation to $\rho e^{i\theta_0}$. Then for any $\{|z| = r \leq \rho\}$, one has*

$$
\log^+\|f(z)\| \leq \log^+ M + O(1),
\tag{2.7}
$$

where $M = \max\{\|f'(z)\|, z \in L\}$.

Lemma 2.5 (see [3]). *Let $f(z)$ be a nonconstant E-valued meromorphic function in $\mathbb{C}_1$. Then for $0 < r < 1$,*

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \log^+\frac{\|f'(re^{i\theta})\|}{\|f(re^{i\theta})\|}\,d\theta < K\left(\log T(r,f) + \log\frac{1}{1-r}\right),
\tag{2.8}
$$

where K is a sufficiently large constant.

We are now in the position to establish the main results of this section.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $f(z)$ ($z \in \mathbb{C}_1$) be a nonconstant E-valued meromorphic function and $f(0) \neq \widehat{\infty}$. Then for $\varepsilon > 1$ and any real function $h(x) \geq 1$, when r sufficiently tend to 1, one has*

$$
T(r,f) < \frac{ch^{1+\varepsilon}(r)}{(1-r)^{1+\varepsilon}} T(R,f'), \quad R = \frac{1+rh(r)}{1+h(r)}.
\tag{2.9}
$$

Proof. Denote $R_1 = (R+2r)/3, R_2 = (r+2R)/3$, we can get

$$
\begin{gathered}
r < R_1 < R_2 < R, \quad R_1 - r = R_2 - R_1 = R - R_2 = \frac{R-r}{3}, \\
R = \frac{1-3R_2h(r)}{1+3h(r)}, \quad R_2 + R_1 = r + R < 2, \qquad 1 - R_2 = \frac{(1-r)(1+3h(r))}{3(1+h(r))} \geq \frac{1-r}{2}; \\
R - r = \frac{1-r}{1+h(r)} \geq \frac{1-r}{2h(r)}.
\end{gathered}
\tag{2.10}
$$

Applying Lemma 2.1 to $f'(z)$ and combining Lemma 2.3, we can find a real number $\theta_0 \in [0, 2\pi)$ such that for any $0 \leq t \leq R_1$, one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log^+ \left\| f'\left(te^{i\theta_0}\right) \right\| &\leq \frac{R_2 + R_1}{R_2 - R_1} m(R_2, f') + n(R_2, f') \log 4 + N(R_2, f') \\
&\leq \left(\frac{6}{R-r} + \frac{6h(r)}{1-R_2} \log 4 + 1 \right) T(R_2, f') \\
&\leq \left(\frac{6+6h(r)}{1-r} + \frac{12h(r)}{1-r} \log 4 + \frac{1-r}{1-r} \right) T(R, f') \\
&\leq \frac{6+6h(r)+24h(r)+1-r}{1-r} T(R, f') \leq \frac{40h(r)}{1-r} T(R, f').
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.11}
$$

In view of Lemma 2.2, there is a $\rho \in [r, R_1]$ such that for any $z \in \{|z| = \rho\}$, one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log^+ \| f'(z) \| &\leq \frac{R_2 + R_1}{R_2 - R_1} m(R_2, f') + n(R_2, f') \log \frac{8eR_2}{R_1 - R} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{6}{R-r} + \frac{6h(r)}{1-R_2} \log \frac{48eh(r)}{1-r} \right) T(R_2, f') \\
&\leq \left(\frac{6+6h(r)}{1-r} + \frac{12h(r)}{1-r} \log \frac{144h(r)}{1-r} \right) T(R, f') \\
&\leq \left(\frac{12h(r)}{1-r} \left(9 + \log \frac{h(r)}{1-r} \right) \right) T(R, f') \\
&\leq \left(\frac{12h(r)}{1-r} \left(9 + \left(\frac{h(r)}{1-r} \right)^{\varepsilon} \right) \right) T(R, f') \\
&\leq 120 \left(\frac{h(r)}{1-r} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} T(R, f').
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.12}
$$

From the origin along the segment $\arg z = \theta_0$ to $\rho e^{i\theta_0}$ and along $\{|z| = \rho\}$, turn a rotation to $\rho e^{i\theta_0}$. We denote this curve by L. In virtue of Lemma 2.4, we have

$$
\log^+ \| f(z) \| \leq \log^+ M + O(1)
\tag{2.13}
$$

holds for any $\{|z| = r \leq \rho\}$, where $M = \max\{\|f'(z)\|, z \in L\}$. In virtue of (2.11), (2.12), and (2.13), we have

$$m(r,f) \leq m(\rho,f) \leq m(\rho,f') \leq \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ M d\theta \leq 121\left(\frac{h(r)}{1-r}\right)^{1+\varepsilon} T(R,f'). \tag{2.14}$$

Hence,

$$T(r,f) = m(r,f) + N(r,f) \leq m(r,f) + 2N(r,f') \leq 123\left(\frac{h(r)}{1-r}\right)^{1+\varepsilon} T(R,f'). \tag{2.15}$$

□

Theorem 2.7. *Let $f(z)$ $(z \in \mathbb{C}_1)$ be a nonconstant E-valued meromorphic function and $f(0) \neq 0, \widehat{\infty}$. Then for any $0 < r < R < 1$, one has*

$$T(r,f') < 2T(r,f) + O\left(\log^+ \frac{1}{1-r} + \log^+ T(r,f)\right). \tag{2.16}$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r,f') &= m(r,f') + N(r,f') \\ &\leq m(r,f) + m\left(r, \frac{f'}{f}\right) + 2N(r,f) \\ &\leq 2T(r,f) + m\left(r, \frac{f'}{f}\right) \\ &\leq 2T(r,f) + O\left(\log^+ \frac{1}{1-r} + \log^+ T(r,f)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

□

Theorem 2.8. *For a nonconstant E-valued meromorphic function $f(z)$ $(z \in \mathbb{C}_1)$ of order $\lambda(f) < +\infty$, one has $\lambda(f) = \lambda(f')$, $\mu(f) = \mu(f')$.*

Theorem 2.8 only discussed the E-valued meromorphic function of finite order. In fact, for any E-valued meromorphic function of infinite order, we have the following.

Theorem 2.9. *If $f(z)$ $(z \in \mathbb{C}_1)$ is a nonconstant E-valued meromorphic function of order $\lambda(f) = +\infty$, then the proximate orders of $f(z)$ and $f'(z)$ are the same.*

Proof. Let $h(r) = \log U(1/(1-r))$, in view of Theorems 2.6 and 2.7, we can easily derive Theorem 2.9. □

3. E-Valued Borel Exceptional Values of Meromorphic Functions in $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{R}}$

Some definitions in this section can be found in [8].

Definition 3.1. Let $f(z)$ $(z \in \mathbb{C}_R, 0 < R \leq +\infty)$ be an E-valued meromorphic function and $a \in E \cup \{\widehat{\infty}\}$, if k is a positive integer, let $\overline{n}_k(r, f)$ or $\overline{n}_k(r, \widehat{\infty})$ denote the number of distinct poles of $f(z)$ of order $\leq k$ in $|z| \leq r$, and let $\overline{n}_k(r, a)$ denote the number of distinct a-points of $f(z)$ of order $\leq k$ in $|z| \leq r$. Similarly, we can define the counting functions $\overline{N}_k(r, f)$, $\overline{N}_k(r, \widehat{\infty})$, and $\overline{N}_k(r, a)$ of $\overline{n}_k(r, f)$, $\overline{n}_k(r, \widehat{\infty})$, and $\overline{n}_k(r, a)$.

Definition 3.2. Let $f(z)$ $(z \in \mathbb{C}_R, 0 < R \leq +\infty)$ be an E-valued meromorphic function and $a \in E \cup \{\widehat{\infty}\}$. If $R = +\infty$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\rho}_k(a, f) &= \limsup_{r \to +\infty} \frac{\log^+\left[V(a, f) + \overline{N}_k(r, a)\right]}{\log r}, \\ \overline{\rho}(a, f) &= \limsup_{r \to +\infty} \frac{\log^+\left[V(a, f) + \overline{N}(r, a)\right]}{\log r}, \\ \rho(a, f) &= \limsup_{r \to +\infty} \frac{\log^+\left[V(a, f) + N(r, a)\right]}{\log r}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

If $R < +\infty$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\rho}_k(a, f) &= \limsup_{r \to R^-} \frac{\log^+\left[V(a, f) + \overline{N}_k(r, a)\right]}{\log(1/(R - r))}, \\ \overline{\rho}(a, f) &= \limsup_{r \to R^-} \frac{\log^+\left[V(a, f) + \overline{N}(r, a)\right]}{\log(1/(R - r))}, \\ \rho(a, f) &= \limsup_{r \to R^-} \frac{\log^+\left[V(a, f) + N(r, a)\right]}{\log(1/(R - r))}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Definition 3.3. Let $f(z)$ $(z \in \mathbb{C}_R, 0 < R \leq +\infty)$ be an E-valued meromorphic function and $a \in E \cup \{\widehat{\infty}\}$ and k is a positive integer, we say that a is an

(i) E-valued evB (exceptional value in the sense of Borel) for f for distinct zeros of order $\leq k$ if $\overline{\rho}_k(a, f) < \lambda(f)$;

(ii) E-valued evB for f for distinct zeros if $\overline{\rho}(a, f) < \lambda(f)$;

(iii) E-valued evB for f (for the whole aggregate of zeros) if $\rho(a, f) < \lambda(f)$.

In [5], Yang proved the following result.

Theorem D. *Let $f(z)$ $(z \in \mathbb{C}_R,\ R = +\infty)$ be a meromorphic function with finite order $\lambda > 0$ and k_j $(j = 1, 2, \ldots, q)$ be q positive integers. a is called a pseudo-Borel exceptional value of $f(z)$ of order k if*

$$\limsup_{r \to +\infty} \frac{\log^{+} \overline{n}_k(r, a)}{\log r} < \lambda(f). \tag{3.3}$$

If $f(z)$ has q distinct pseudo-Borel exceptional values a_j of order k_j $(j = 1, 2, \ldots, q)$, then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k_j + 1}\right) \leq 2. \tag{3.4}$$

It is natural to consider whether there exists a similar result, if meromorphic function f is replaced by E-valued meromorphic function f. In this section, we extend the above theorem to E-valued meromorphic function in $\mathbb{C}_R, 0 < R \leq +\infty$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $f(z)$ $(z \in \mathbb{C}_R, 0 < R \leq +\infty)$ be an E-valued meromorphic function with finite order $\lambda > 0$, $a^{[j]}(j = 1, 2, \ldots, q)$ any system of distinct elements in $E \cup \{\widehat{\infty}\}$, and k_j $(j = 1, 2, \ldots, q)$ any system such that k_j is a positive integer or $+\infty$. If $a^{[j]}$ is an E-valued evB for f for distinct zeros of order $\leq k_j$ $(j = 1, 2, \ldots, q)$, then*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k_j + 1}\right) \leq 2. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. By Theorem 1.4, we have

$$(q-2)T(r, f) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{q} \left[V\left(r, a^{[j]}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, a^{[j]}\right)\right] + S(r, f) \tag{3.6}$$

holds for $0 < r < R$. For any $j = 1, 2, \ldots, q$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{N}\left(r, a^{[j]}\right) &\leq \frac{1}{k_j + 1} \left\{ k_j \overline{N}_{k_j}\left(r, a^{[j]}\right) + N\left(r, a^{[j]}\right) \right\}, \\ N\left(r, a^{[j]}\right) &\leq T(r, f) - V\left(r, a^{[j]}\right) + O(1). \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Using (3.7) and (7) in (3.6), we get

$$\begin{aligned}(q-2)T(r,f) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{q}\left(V\left(r,a^{[j]}\right)+\frac{1}{k_j+1}\left\{k_j\overline{N}_{k_j}\left(r,a^{[j]}\right)+N\left(r,a^{[j]}\right)\right\}\right)+S(r,f)\\ &=\sum_{j=1}^{q}\left(V\left(r,a^{[j]}\right)+\frac{k_j}{k_j+1}\overline{N}_{k_j}\left(r,a^{[j]}\right)+\frac{1}{k_j+1}N\left(r,a^{[j]}\right)\right)+S(r,f)\\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{q}\frac{k_j}{k_j+1}\left(V\left(r,a^{[j]}\right)+\overline{N}_{k_j}\left(r,a^{[j]}\right)\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{q}\frac{1}{k_j+1}T(r,f)+S(r,f).\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\left[\sum_{j=1}^{q}\left(1-\frac{1}{k_j+1}\right)-2\right]T(r,f)\leq\sum_{j=1}^{q}\frac{k_j}{k_j+1}\left(V\left(r,a^{[j]}\right)+\overline{N}_{k_j}\left(r,a^{[j]}\right)\right)+S(r,f). \tag{3.9}$$

By hypothesis, we have

$$\overline{\rho}_{k_j}\left(a^{[j]},f\right)<\lambda,\quad j=1,2,\dots,q. \tag{3.10}$$

If $R=+\infty$, then there is a positive number $\rho<\lambda$, such that for $j=1,2,\dots,q$, we can get

$$V\left(r,a^{[j]}\right)+\overline{N}_{k_j}\left(r,a^{[j]}\leq r^{\rho}\right). \tag{3.11}$$

Using (3.11) to (3.9), we have

$$\left[\sum_{j=1}^{q}\left(1-\frac{1}{k_j+1}\right)-2\right]T(r,f)\leq\sum_{j=1}^{q}\frac{k_j}{k_j+1}r^{\rho}+S(r,f). \tag{3.12}$$

If $\sum_{j=1}^{q}(1-(1/(k_j+1)))>2$, then by Theorem 1.4 and (3.12), we can get a contradiction $\lambda\leq\rho$. So

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q}\left(1-\frac{1}{k_j+1}\right)\leq 2. \tag{3.13}$$

If $R<+\infty$, then there is a positive number $\rho<\lambda$, such that for $j=1,2,\dots,q$, we can get

$$V\left(r,a^{[j]}\right)+\overline{N}_{k_j}\left(r,a^{[j]}\right)\leq\left(\frac{1}{R-r}\right)^{\rho}. \tag{3.14}$$

Using (3.14) to (3.9), we have

$$\left[\sum_{j=1}^{q}\left(1-\frac{1}{k_j+1}\right)-2\right]T(r,f)\leq\sum_{j=1}^{q}\frac{k_j}{k_j+1}\left(\frac{1}{R-r}\right)^{\rho}+S(r,f). \tag{3.15}$$

If $\sum_{j=1}^{q}(1-(1/(k_j+1)))>2$, then by Theorem 1.4 and (3.15), we can get a contradiction $\lambda\leq\rho$. So

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q}\left(1-\frac{1}{k_j+1}\right)\leq 2. \tag{3.16}$$

□

From the proof of Theorem 3.4, we can get the following.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $f(z)$ $(z\in\mathbb{C}_R, 0<R\leq+\infty)$ be a nonconstant E-valued meromorphic function. Then for any system $a^{[j]}$ $(j=1,2,\ldots t)$ of distinct elements in $E\cup\{\widehat{\infty}\}$ and any system k_j $(j=1,2,\ldots,t)$ such that k_j is a positive integer or $+\infty$, we have the following:*

(1) *if all of $a^{[j]}$ $(j=1,2,\ldots,q)$ in E, then*

$$\left(q-\sum_{j=1}^{q}\frac{1}{k_j+1}-2\right)T(r,f)\leq\sum_{j=1}^{q}\frac{k_j}{k_j+1}\left(V\left(r,a^{[j]},f\right)+\overline{N}_{k_j}\left(r,a^{[j]},f\right)\right)+S(r,f), \tag{3.17}$$

(2) *if one of $a^{[j]}$ $(j=1,2,\ldots,q)$ is $\widehat{\infty}$, say $a^{[q]}=\widehat{\infty}$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}\left(q-\sum_{j=1}^{q}\frac{1}{k_j+1}-2\right)T(r,f)\leq&\sum_{j=1}^{q-1}\frac{k_j}{k_j+1}\left(V\left(r,a^{[j]},f\right)+\overline{N}_{k_j}\left(r,a^{[j]},f\right)\right)\\&+\frac{k_q}{k_q+1}\overline{N}_{k_q}(r,f)+S(r,f).\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Remark 3.6. If $R=+\infty$, let $q=r+t+s$ and $k_j\equiv k$ $(j=1,2,\ldots,r)$, $k_j\equiv l$ $(j=r+1,\ldots,r+t)$ and $k_j\equiv m$ $(j=r+t+1,\ldots,r+t+s)$ in Theorem 3.4. We can get the following result by Bhoosnurmath and Pujari [8].

Theorem E. *Let $f(z)$ $(z\in\mathbb{C}_R, 0<R\leq+\infty)$ be an E-valued meromorphic function of order $\lambda(f)$, $0<\lambda(f)\leq+\infty$. If there exist distinct elements*

$$a^{[1]},a^{[2]},\ldots,a^{[r]};\qquad b^{[1]},b^{[2]},\ldots,b^{[t]};\qquad c^{[1]},c^{[2]},\ldots,c^{[s]} \tag{3.19}$$

in $E \cup \{\widehat{\infty}\}$ *such that* $a^{[1]}, a^{[2]}, \dots, a^{[r]}$ *are E-valued evB for* f *for distinct zeros of order* $\leq k$, $b^{[1]}, b^{[2]}, \dots, b^{[t]}$ *are E-valued evB for* f *for distinct zeros of order* $\leq l$, $c^{[1]}, c^{[2]}, \dots, c^{[s]}$ *are E-valued evB for* f *for distinct zeros of order* $\leq m$, *where* k, l, *and* m *are positive integers, then*

$$\frac{rk}{k+1} + \frac{tl}{l+1} + \frac{sm}{m+1} \leq 2. \tag{3.20}$$

Bhoosnurmath and Pujari [8] pointed out that Theorem E is valid for $0 \leq \lambda(f) \leq +\infty$. In fact, Definition 3.3 is not well in the case of $\lambda(f) = 0$. In the case of $\lambda(f) = +\infty$, a is an E-valued evB for f if and only if $\overline{\rho}_k(a, f)$ is finite. When $\overline{\rho}_k(a, f)$ is infinite, we shall give the following definitions.

Definition 3.7. Let $f(z)$ $(z \in \mathbb{C})$ be an E-valued meromorphic function of infinite order and $\rho(r)$ is a proximate order of f and $a \in E \cup \{\widehat{\infty}\}$. We say that a is an

(i) E-valued evB (exceptional value in the sense of Borel) for f for distinct zeros of order $\leq k$ if

$$\limsup_{r \to +\infty} \frac{\log^+ \left[V(a, f) + \overline{N}_k(r, a)\right]}{\log U(r)} < 1; \tag{3.21}$$

(ii) E-valued evB for f for distinct zeros if

$$\limsup_{r \to +\infty} \frac{\log^+ \left[V(a, f) + \overline{N}(r, a)\right]}{\log U(r)} < 1; \tag{3.22}$$

(iii) E-valued evB for f (for the whole aggregate of zeros) if

$$\limsup_{r \to +\infty} \frac{\log^+ \left[V(a, f) + N(r, a)\right]}{\log U(r)} < 1. \tag{3.23}$$

Theorem 3.8. *Let* $f(z)$ $(z \in \mathbb{C})$ *be an E-valued meromorphic function of infinite order and* $\rho(r)$ *is a proximate order of* f, $a^{[j]}(j = 1, 2, \dots, q)$ *any system of distinct elements in* $E \cup \{\widehat{\infty}\}$, *and* $k_j(j = 1, 2, \dots, q)$ *any system such that* k_j *is a positive integer or* $+\infty$. *If* $a^{[j]}$ *is an E-valued evB for* f *for distinct zeros of order* $\leq k_j(j = 1, 2 \dots, q)$, *then*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k_j + 1}\right) \leq 2. \tag{3.24}$$

Proof. By Corollary 3.5, we have

$$\left(q - \sum_{j=1}^{q} \frac{1}{k_j + 1} - 2\right) T(r, f) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{q} \frac{k_j}{k_j + 1} \left(V\left(r, a^{[j]}\right) + \overline{N}_{k_j}\left(r, a^{[j]}\right)\right) + S(r, f). \tag{3.25}$$

By hypothesis, there exists a positive number $\eta < 1$ such that

$$V\left(r, a^{[j]}\right) + \overline{N}_{k_j}\left(r, a^{[j]}\right) < U^{\eta}(r), \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, q. \tag{3.26}$$

Using (3.25) to (3.26), we have

$$\left[\sum_{j=1}^{q}\left(1 - \frac{1}{k_j + 1}\right) - 2\right] T(r, f) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{q} \frac{k_j}{k_j + 1} U^{\eta}(r) + S(r, f). \tag{3.27}$$

If $\sum_{j=1}^{q}(1 - (1/(k_j + 1))) > 2$, then by Theorem 1.4 and (3.27), we can get a contradiction. So

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q}\left(1 - \frac{1}{k_j + 1}\right) \leq 2. \tag{3.28}$$

□

Acknowledgments

The first author is supported in part by the Science Foundation of Educational Commission of Hubei Province (Grant nos. T201009, Q20112807). The second author is supported in part by the Science and Technology Research Program of Beijing Municipal Commission of Education (KM201211417011).

References

[1] H. J. W. Ziegler, *Vector Valued Nevanlinna Theory*, vol. 73 of *Research Notes in Mathematics*, Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, Mass, USA, 1982.

[2] C.-G. Hu and C.-C. Yang, "Some remarks on Nevanlinna's theory in a Hilbert space," *Bulletin of the Hong Kong Mathematical Society*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 267–271, 1997.

[3] C.-G. Hu and Q. Hu, "The Nevanlinna's theorems for a class," *Complex Variables and Elliptic Equations*, vol. 51, no. 8–11, pp. 777–791, 2006.

[4] Z.-X. Xuan and N. Wu, "On the Nevanlinna's theory for vector-valued mappings," *Abstract and Applied Analysis*, vol. 2010, Article ID 864539, 15 pages, 2010.

[5] L. Yang, *Value Distribution Theory*, Springer, Berlin, Germany, Science Press Beijing, Beijing, China, 1993, Translated and revised from the 1982 Chinese original.

[6] H. S. Gopalakrishna and S. S. Bhoosnurmath, "Exceptional values of meromorphic functions," *Annales Polonici Mathematici*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 83–93, 1976.

[7] C.-T. Chuang, "Sur les fonctions-types," *Scientia Sinica*, vol. 10, pp. 171–181, 1961 (French).

[8] S. S. Bhoosnurmath and V. L. Pujari, "*E*-valued Borel exceptional values of meromorphic functions," *International Journal of Mathematical Analysis*, vol. 4, no. 41–44, pp. 2089–2099, 2010.