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# HAYMAN'S CONJECTURE IN A $p$-ADIC FIELD 

Jacqueline Ojeda


#### Abstract

In this paper we study the famous Hayman's conjecture for transcendental meromorphic functions in a $p$-adic field by using methods of $p$-adic analysis and particularly the $p$-adic Nevanlinna theory.

In $\mathbb{C}$, W. K. Hayman's stated that if $f$ is a transcendental meromorphic function, then $f^{\prime}+a f^{m}$ has infinitely many zeros that are not zeros of $f$ for each integer $m \geq 3$ and $a \in \mathbb{C} \backslash\{0\}$, which was proved in [2], [6], [8] and [11]. Here we examine the problem in an algebraically closed complete ultrametric field $\mathbb{K}$ of characteristic zero. Considering the function $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ with $T \in \mathbb{K}(x)$, we show that Hayman's statement holds for each $m \geq 5$ and $m=1$. Further, if the residue characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$ is zero, then the statement holds for each positive integer $m$ different from 2. We also examine the problem inside an "open" disc.


## 1. Introduction and Results

### 1.1 Definitions, Notations and Main Results

Throughout this paper, $\mathbb{K}$ will denote an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero, complete for an ultrametric absolute value. In $\mathbb{K}$, the valuation $v$ is defined by a logarithm function $\log : v(x)=-\log |x|$.

We denote by $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K})$ the set of entire functions in $\mathbb{K}$ and by $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ the set of meromorphic functions in $\mathbb{K}$, i.e., the field of fractions of $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K})$. Obviously, $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ contains the field $\mathbb{K}(x)$ of rational functions. We remember that the elements in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K}) \backslash \mathbb{K}(x)$ are called transcendental functions and have infinitely many zeros or infinitely many poles.

Given $a \in \mathbb{K}$ and $r_{1}, r_{2}$ such that $0<r_{1}<r_{2}$, we denote by $\Gamma\left(a, r_{1}, r_{2}\right)$ the annulus
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$\left\{x \in \mathbb{K}: r_{1}<|x-a|<r_{2}\right\}$, and given $r>0$, we denote by $d\left(a, r^{-}\right)$the open disc $\{x \in \mathbb{K}:|x-a|<r\}$, by $C(a, r)$ the circle $\{x \in \mathbb{K}:|x-a|=r\}$, and by $d(a, r):=d\left(a, r^{-}\right) \cup C(a, r)$ the closed disc. Consequently, we denote by $\mathcal{A}\left(d\left(a, r^{-}\right)\right)$the set of analytic functions in $d\left(a, r^{-}\right)$, i.e., the $\mathbb{K}$-algebra of power series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n}(x-a)^{n}$ converging in $d\left(a, r^{-}\right)$, and by $\mathcal{M}\left(d\left(a, r^{-}\right)\right)$the set of meromorphic functions inside $d\left(a, r^{-}\right)$, i.e., the field of fractions of $\mathcal{A}\left(d\left(a, r^{-}\right)\right)$. Moreover, we denote by $\mathcal{A}_{b}\left(d\left(a, r^{-}\right)\right)$the $\mathbb{K}$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}\left(d\left(a, r^{-}\right)\right)$consisted of the bounded analytic functions $f \in \mathcal{A}\left(d\left(a, r^{-}\right)\right)$, which satisfy $\sup _{n \in \mathbb{N}}\left|a_{n}\right| r^{n}<$ $+\infty$, and by $\mathcal{M}_{b}\left(d\left(a, r^{-}\right)\right)$the field of fractions of $\mathcal{A}_{b}\left(d\left(a, r^{-}\right)\right)$. Finally, we set $\mathcal{A}_{u}\left(d\left(a, r^{-}\right)\right)=\mathcal{A}\left(d\left(a, r^{-}\right)\right) \backslash \mathcal{A}_{b}\left(d\left(a, r^{-}\right)\right)$and $\mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(a, r^{-}\right)\right)=\mathcal{M}\left(d\left(a, r^{-}\right)\right)$ $\backslash \mathcal{M}_{b}\left(d\left(a, r^{-}\right)\right)$.

The paper aims at studying Hayman's conjecture for transcendental meromorphic functions, first in a field of any residue characteristic and next in a field of residue characteristic zero. The problem is the following one: let $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ be transcendental and $T \in \mathbb{K}(x)$. Can we conclude that $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ has infinitely many zeros that are not zeros of $f$ ?. Setting $g=\frac{1}{f}$, it is easily seen that the zeros of $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ which are not zeros of $f$ are those of $g^{\prime} g^{m-2}-T$. Thus, solving Hayman's conjecture is equivalent to answering the question whether, given $g \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ transcendental and $T \in \mathbb{K}(x), g^{\prime} g^{n}-T$ has infinitely many zeros.

Indeed, let

$$
g(x)=\frac{1}{f(x)}
$$

Then,

$$
\begin{align*}
f^{\prime}(x)+T f^{m}(x) & =\frac{-1}{[g(x)]^{2}} g^{\prime}(x)+\frac{T}{[g(x)]^{m}}  \tag{1}\\
& =\frac{-1}{[g(x)]^{m}}\left(g^{m-2} g^{\prime}(x)-T\right)
\end{align*}
$$

where we do $n=m-2$.
The question has been studied in complex analysis for many years, considering $T=a \in \mathbb{C}$. In 1959, W. K. Hayman [8] proved that if $g$ is a transcendental meromorphic function, $a \in \mathbb{C} \backslash\{0\}$ and $n \geq 3$, then $g^{\prime} g^{n}-a$ has infinitely many zeros. Twenty years later, E. Mues [11] solved the case $n=2$, and finally in 1995 W. Bergweiler and A. Eremenko [2], and independently H. H. Chen and M. L. Fang [6] proved that this also holds for $n=1$, which completed the proof of Hayman's conjecture. Thus, in the complex case, we could deduce that $f^{\prime}+a f^{m}$ has infinitely many zeros which are not zeros of $f$ when $m \geq 3$.

Remark 1. In $\mathbb{C}, f^{\prime}+f^{m}$ may have no zero if $m=1$ or $m=2$ as shown by $f(x)=\exp (x)$ and $f(x)=\tan (-x)$ respectively.

In $p$-adic analysis, we can also obtain results in a similar problem. Before stating the main theorems, we have to recall some notations used in several works in $p$-adic analysis, particularly those used by A. Escassut in [7].

Given $f(x)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n} x^{n} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K})$ (resp. in $\mathcal{A}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$) and $r>0$ (resp. $r \in] 0, R[)$, we set

$$
|f|(r)=\lim _{|x| \rightarrow r,|x| \neq r}|f(x)| .
$$

Indeed, this limit exists and $|*|$ is an absolute value on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K})\left(\right.$ resp. on $\left.\mathcal{A}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)\right)$. It has a natural continuation to $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.\mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)\right)$by setting $|f|(r)=$ $\frac{|g|(r)}{|h|(r)}$ whenever $f=\frac{g}{h}, g, h \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K})$ (resp. $g, h \in \mathcal{A}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$).

On the other hand, let $f=\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{n} x^{n} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ and let $r>0$. Consider $f$ in the circle $C(0, r)$. We will denote by $\nu^{+}(f, r)$ (resp. $\left.\nu^{-}(f, r)\right)$ the biggest integer $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ (resp. the smallest integer $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ ) such that $v\left(a_{i}\right)-i \log r=\inf _{n \in \mathbb{Z}} v\left(a_{n}\right)-n \log r$. We will only write $\nu(f, r)$ when $\nu^{+}(f, r)=\nu^{-}(f, r)$.

Remark 2. We now have to recall certain classical properties of meromorphic functions (see Chapter $23[7])$. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$and let $\left.r \in\right] 0, R[$.
(1) The difference between the number of zeros and that of poles of $f$ in the circle $C(0, r)$, taking multiplicities into account, is equal to $\nu^{+}(f, r)-\nu^{-}(f, r)$.
(2) If $f$ has zeros and poles in the closed disc $d\left(0, r^{\prime}\right)$, and has no zeros and no poles in the annuli $\Gamma\left(0, r^{\prime}, r^{\prime \prime}\right)$, then $\left.\nu^{+}(f, r)=\nu^{-}(f, r) \quad \forall r \in\right] r^{\prime}, r^{\prime \prime}[$.

Throughout the paper we consider $\mathbb{N}^{*}=\mathbb{N} \backslash\{0\}, R>1$ an integer and $T=$ $\frac{A}{B} \in \mathbb{K}(x)$ with $A, B \in \mathbb{K}[x]$ having no common zeros.

Theorem 1. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ be transcendental (resp. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$). If $\lim _{r \rightarrow+\infty}|T|(r)>0\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.\lim _{r \rightarrow R}|T|(r)>\frac{1}{R}\right)$, then $f^{\prime}+T f$ has infinitely many zeros that are not zeros of $f$.

Theorem 2. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ be transcendental and $\operatorname{deg}(A) \geq \operatorname{deg}(B)$ (resp. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$). Let $m>2$ be an integer. If $\limsup _{r \rightarrow+\infty}|f|(r)>0$ (resp. $\left.\limsup _{r \rightarrow R}|f|(r)=+\infty\right)$, then $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ has infinitely many zeros that are not zeros of $\stackrel{r \rightarrow R}{ }$.

Corollary 1. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ be transcendental and $\operatorname{deg}(A) \geq \operatorname{deg}(B)$ (resp. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$). If $f$ has a finite number of poles and $m>2$ is an integer, then $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ has infinitely many zeros that are not zeros of $f$.

Proof. Since $f$ has a finite number of poles and $f$ is a transcendental meromorphic function in $\mathbb{K}$ (resp. $f \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$), then necessarily $f$ has infinitely many zeros. Therefore, $\lim _{r \rightarrow+\infty}|f|(r)=+\infty$ (resp. $\left.\lim _{r \rightarrow R}|f|(r)=+\infty\right)$. So, by Theorem 2, we can deduce the corollary.

Corollary 2. Let $g \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ be transcendental and $\operatorname{deg}(A) \geq \operatorname{deg}(B)$ (resp. Let $g \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$). If $g$ has a finite number of zeros, then $g^{\prime} g^{n}-T$ has infinitely many zeros for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$.

Proof. Since $g$ has a finite number of zeros, then $f=\frac{1}{g}$ has a finite number of poles. So, applying Theorem 2 to $f$ with $m \geq 3$, and considering that $n=m-2$, we can deduce the corollary.

Let $\widehat{\mathbb{K}}$ be an algebraic extension of the field $\mathbb{K}$. In the following lemma, which is very useful for the proofs of the following theorems, we will denote by $\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)$ the open disc $\{x \in \widehat{\mathbb{K}}:|x|<R\}$ contained in $\widehat{\mathbb{K}}$.

Lemma 1. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$and let $\widehat{f}$ be the meromorphic function defined by $f$ in $\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)$. Then the zeros and the poles of $\widehat{f}$ in $\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)$are exactly the zeros and the poles of $f$ in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$, taking multiplicities into account.

Remark 3. We remember that, given a meromorphic function $f$ in the open disc $d\left(0, R^{-}\right) \subset \mathbb{K}$, it is not always possible to find analytic functions $h, l$ in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$ without common zeros such that $f=\frac{h}{l}$, except if $\mathbb{K}$ is spherically complete, i.e., every decreasing filter on $\mathbb{K}$ has a center in $\mathbb{K}$ (see Chapter 3 [7] and [10]). In our case, $\mathbb{K}$ is an algebraically closed complete ultrametric field, therefore it admits a spherically complete algebraically closed extension $\widehat{\mathbb{K}}$ (see Chapter 7 [7]).

Now, in the field $\mathbb{K}$, consider $f \in \mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. It obviously defines a function $\widehat{f} \in \mathcal{M}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$in the field $\widehat{\mathbb{K}}$. And then, we may write $\widehat{f}$ in the form $\frac{h_{0}}{l_{0}}$ with $h_{0}, l_{0} \in \mathcal{A}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$having no common zeros. Moreover, by Lemma 1 , all zeros and poles of $\widehat{f}$ in $\widehat{\mathbb{K}}$ actually lie in $\mathbb{K}$. So, by Theorem 25.5 [7], there exists $h \in \mathcal{A}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$such that the function $\widehat{h} \in \mathcal{A}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$defined in $\widehat{\mathbb{K}}$ satisfies the following:
(1) $h_{0}$ divides $\widehat{h}$ in $\mathcal{A}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$.
(2) The function $u=\frac{\widehat{h}}{h_{0}}$ belongs to $\mathcal{A}_{b}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$.

Then we may set $l=u l_{0} \in \mathcal{A}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. Moreover, we check that $l$ has coefficients in $\mathbb{K}$ because $f=\frac{h}{l}$, hence $l=f h$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$and has no pole in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$.

In the following theorems, when it is necessary, we shall consider $f \in \mathcal{M}(\widehat{d}(0$, $\left.R^{-}\right)$) because clearly $\mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right) \subset \mathcal{M}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$.

In the general $p$-adic context, the following theorem is the equivalence of this proved by W. K. Hayman (Theorem 9 [8]). In the proofs of this theorem and the following theorems, the previous Remark 3 and Lemma 1 will be useful.

Theorem 3. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ be transcendental and $\operatorname{deg}(A) \geq \operatorname{deg}(B)$ (resp. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$). If $m \geq 5$ is an integer, then $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ has infinitely many zeros that are not zeros of $f$. Moreover, $f^{\prime}+f^{4}$ must have at least one zero in $\mathbb{K}$ that is not a zero of $f$.

Considering (1) and the previous theorem, we obtain the following corollaries.
Corollary 3. Let $g \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ be transcendental and $\operatorname{deg}(A) \geq \operatorname{deg}(B)$ (resp. Let $g \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$). If $n \geq 3$ is an integer, then $g^{\prime} g^{n}-T$ has infinitely many zeros.

Corollary 4. Let $g \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ be transcendental and $\operatorname{deg}(A) \geq \operatorname{deg}(B)$. Then $g^{\prime} g^{2}-T$ has at least one zero in $\mathbb{K}$.

In order to state Theorem 4, we need to recall some classical definitions. Let $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{K}}=\{x \in \mathbb{K}:|x| \leq 1\}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{K}}=\{x \in \mathbb{K}:|x|<1\}$ be the valuation ring and the valuation ideal of $\mathbb{K}$ respectively. The residue characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$ is the characteristic of the quotient of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{K}}$ by $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{K}}$ (see Chapter 1 [7]).

Lemma 2. Let $f(x)=\sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} a_{n} x^{n}$ be a Laurent series converging for $r^{\prime}<|x|<$ $r^{\prime \prime}$ and have no zeros and no poles in $\Gamma\left(0, r^{\prime}, r^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Let $\left.q=\nu(f, r) \forall r \in\right] r^{\prime}, r^{\prime \prime}[$. If the residue characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$ does not divide $q$, then

$$
\left|f^{\prime}(x)\right|=\frac{|f(x)|}{|x|} \quad \forall x \in \Gamma\left(0, r^{\prime}, r^{\prime \prime}\right)
$$

Corollary 5. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, r^{\prime \prime}\right)\right)$. Assume that $f$ has $s$ zeros and $t$ poles in $d\left(0, r^{\prime}\right)$ and has no zeros and no poles in $\Gamma\left(0, r^{\prime}, r^{\prime \prime}\right)$. If the residue characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$ does not divide $s-t$, then $\left|f^{\prime}(x)\right|=\frac{|f(x)|}{|x|} \quad \forall x \in \Gamma\left(0, r^{\prime}, r^{\prime \prime}\right)$.

Proof. Indeed, by Theorem 23.4 [7], $\left.\nu^{+}(f, r)=\nu^{-}(f, r) \forall r \in\right] r^{\prime}, r^{\prime \prime}[$. If we consider $f=\frac{h}{l}$ with $h, l \in \mathcal{A}\left(d\left(0, r^{\prime \prime}\right)\right)$, we have

$$
\nu(f, r)=\nu(h, r)-\nu(l, r)=s-t,
$$

whenever $r \in] r^{\prime}, r^{\prime \prime}[$. So, by Lemma 2, we deduce the corollary.
Definition. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ (resp. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$).
A number $r \in] 0,+\infty[$ (resp. $r \in] 0, R[$ ) will be said to be $f$-suitable if the difference between the number of zeros and that of poles of $f$ in $d(0, r)$, taking multiplicities into account, is not a multiple of the residue characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$.

A sequence $\left.\left\{r_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset\right] 0,+\infty\left[\right.$ (resp. $\left.\left\{r_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset\right] 0, R[$ ) will be said to be $f$-suitable if each $r_{n}$ is $f$-suitable and $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}=+\infty$ (resp. $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}=R$ ).

The function $f$ will be said to be optimal if there exists a $f$-suitable sequence $\left\{r_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $] 0,+\infty[$ (resp. in $] 0, R[)$.

Theorem 4. Let $g \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ be transcendental (resp. Let $g \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$) and let $\left\{r_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a $g$-suitable sequence. Then $\frac{g^{\prime}}{g}$ has infinitely many zeros.

Corollary 6. Let $g \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ be transcendental (resp. Let $g \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$) and let $\left\{r_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a $g$-suitable sequence. Then $g^{\prime} g^{n}$ and $\frac{g^{\prime}}{g^{n}}$ have infinitely many zeros whenever $n \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$.

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe that $g^{\prime} g^{n}=\left(\frac{g^{\prime}}{g}\right) g^{n+1}$ and $\frac{g^{\prime}}{g^{n}}=\left(\frac{g^{\prime}}{g}\right) \frac{1}{g^{n-1}}$. Note that every zero of $\frac{g^{\prime}}{g}$ is neither a zero nor a pole of $g$, every zero and every pole of $g$ being a simple pole of $\frac{g^{\prime}}{g}$. Thereby, since $\frac{g^{\prime}}{g}$ has infinitely many zeros, we deduce that $g^{\prime} g^{n}$ and $\frac{g^{\prime}}{g^{n}}$ have infinitely many zeros in $\mathbb{K}$ (resp. in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$).

Theorem 5. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ be transcendental and optimal. If $\operatorname{deg}(A)=\operatorname{deg}(B)$ and if $m \geq 3$ is an integer, then $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ has infinitely many zeros that are not zeros of $f$.

Thus, by (1) we may derive the following corollary.
Corollary 7. Let $g \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ be transcendental and optimal. If $\operatorname{deg}(A)=\operatorname{deg}(B)$, then $g^{\prime} g^{n}-T$ has infinitely many zeros for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$.

Theorem 6. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$be an optimal function and let $U=\frac{\phi}{\psi} \in$ $\mathcal{M}_{b}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$have the same finite number of zeros and poles in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$. If $m$ $\geq 3$ is an integer, then $f^{\prime}+U f^{m}$ has infinitely many zeros that are not zeros of $f$.

By (1), the following corollary is immediate.
Corollary 8. Let $g \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$be an optimal function and let $U \in$ $\mathcal{M}_{b}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$have the same finite number of zeros and poles in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$. Then $g^{\prime} g^{n}-U$ has infinitely many zeros for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$.

Since almost every meromorphic function in a field of residue characteristic zero is optimal, by Theorems 5 and 6 , we can deduce Corollaries $9-10$ and 11-12 respectively.

Corollary 9. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ be transcendental and $\operatorname{deg}(A)=\operatorname{deg}(B)$. If $\mathbb{K}$ has residue characteristic zero and $m \geq 3$ is an integer, then $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ has infinitely many zeros that are not zeros of $f$.

Corollary 10. Let $g \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ be transcendental and $\operatorname{deg}(A)=\operatorname{deg}(B)$. If $\mathbb{K}$ has residue characteristic zero, then $g^{\prime} g^{n}-T$ has infinitely many zeros for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$.

Corollary 11. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$be such that $|f|(r)$ is not constant when $r$ tends to $R$, and let $U \in \mathcal{M}_{b}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$have the same finite number of zeros and poles in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$. If $\mathbb{K}$ has residue characteristic zero and $m \geq 3$ is an integer, then $f^{\prime}+U f^{m}$ has infinitely many zeros that are not zeros of $f$.

Corollary 12. Let $g \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$and let $U \in \mathcal{M}_{b}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$have the same finite number of zeros and poles in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$. If $\mathbb{K}$ has residue characteristic zero, then $g^{\prime} g^{n}-U$ has infinitely many zeros for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$.

Remark 4. If $\mathbb{K}$ has residue characteristic $p \neq 0$, the problem remains unsolved when $m=2,3$ and 4 . In particular, in a p-adic field, we don't know how to construct a counter-exemple such as $f(x)=\tan (-x)$ showing that Hayman's statement does not hold when $m=2$.

### 1.2. Nevanlinna Theory, Preliminary Results

We must now introduce some notations and results used in the $p$-adic Nevanlinna theory that we will employ for proving the previous theorems.

Let $\alpha \in d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$and $h \in \mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. If $h$ has a zero of order $n$ at $\alpha$, we set $\omega_{\alpha}(h)=n$, if $h$ has a pole of order $n$ at $\alpha$, we set $\omega_{\alpha}(h)=-n$, and finally, if $h(\alpha) \neq 0$ and $\infty$, we set $\omega_{\alpha}(h)=0$.

Let $f \in \mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$be such that 0 is neither a zero nor a pole of $f$. Let $r \in] 0, R\left[\right.$. We denote by $Z(r, f)$ the counting function of zeros of $f$ in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$

$$
Z(r, f)=\sum_{\omega_{\alpha}(f)>0} \omega_{\alpha \mid \leq r}(f)(\log r-\log |\alpha|),
$$

and similarly, we set

$$
\bar{Z}(r, f)=\sum_{\omega_{\alpha}(f)>0}(\log r-r \log |\alpha|) .
$$

We shall also consider the counting functions of poles of $f$ in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$

$$
N(r, f)=Z\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \bar{N}(r, f)=\bar{Z}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) .
$$

The Nevanlinna function $T(r, f)$ is defined by

$$
T(r, f)=\max \{Z(r, f)+\log |f(0)| ; N(r, f)\} .
$$

A. Boutabaa and A. Escassut in [5], A. Escassut in [7] and P. C. Hu and C. C. Yang in [9] give us results related to the $p$-adic Nevanlinna theory which we will use in the later proofs. Some of them are the followings.

Lemma 3. If $f \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K}) \backslash \mathbb{K}[x]$ (resp. If $f \in \mathcal{A}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$), then $f$ has infinitely many zeros.

Lemma 4. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K})\left(\right.$ resp. Let $\left.f \in \mathcal{A}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)\right)$be such that $f(0) \neq 0$ and let $r>0$ (resp. let $r \in] 0, R[$. For any $b \in \mathbb{K}$, we have

$$
Z(r, f-b)=Z(r, f)+O(1) .
$$

Lemma 5. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K})\left(\right.$ resp. Let $\left.f \in \mathcal{A}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)\right)$be such that $f(0) \neq 0$ and let $r>0$ (resp. let $r \in] 0, R[)$. The functions $T(r, f)$ and $Z(r, f)$ are equivalent $u p$ to an additive constant.

Proposition 1. Let $f_{i} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ (resp. Let $f_{i} \in \mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$) be such that $f_{i}(0) \neq 0, \infty$ for $i=1, \ldots, k$. Then, for $r>0$ (resp. for $\left.r \in\right] 0, R[$ ), we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
Z\left(r, \prod_{i=1}^{k} f_{i}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} Z\left(r, f_{i}\right) \\
T\left(r, \sum_{i=1}^{k} f_{i}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} T\left(r, f_{i}\right), \quad T\left(r, \prod_{i=1}^{k} f_{i}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} T\left(r, f_{i}\right),
\end{gathered}
$$

and $T(r, f)$ is an increasing function of $r$.
As a corollary of Lemma 2.1 [5], considering the previous notations, we obtain the following Lemma 6 that also is known as the version $p$-adic of Jensen's formula.

Lemma 6. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})\left(\right.$ resp. Let $\left.f \in \mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)\right)$be such that 0 is neither a zero nor a pole of $f$. Then,

$$
\log |f|(r)=Z(r, f)-N(r, f)+\log |f(0)| .
$$

Proposition 2. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$be such that $f(0) \neq 0, \infty$. Then, $f \in \mathcal{M}_{b}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$if and only if $T(r, f)$ is bounded in $] 0, R[$.

Let $f \in \mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$be such that 0 is neither a zero nor a pole of $f^{\prime}$ and let $S$ be a finite subset of $\mathbb{K}$. We denote by $Z_{0}^{S}\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)$ the counting function of zeros of $f^{\prime}$ in $d(0, r)$ which are not zeros of any $f-s$ for $s \in S$. Then,

$$
Z_{0}^{S}\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)=\sum_{s \in S, w_{\alpha}(f-s)=0,|\alpha| \leq r} w_{\alpha}\left(f^{\prime}\right)(\log r-\log |\alpha|)
$$

Now we can state the ultrametric Nevanlinna Second Main Theorem in a basic form.

Theorem N. Let $\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{n} \in \mathbb{K}$ with $n \geq 2$, and let $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ (resp. let $f \in \mathcal{M}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$). Let $S=\left\{\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{n}\right\}$. Assume that none of $f, f^{\prime}$ and $f-\beta_{j}$ with $1 \leq j \leq n$ equals 0 or $\infty$ at the origin. Then, for all $r>0$ (resp. for all $r \in] 0, R[)$, we have

$$
(n-1) T(r, f) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} \bar{Z}\left(r, f-\beta_{j}\right)+\bar{N}(r, f)-Z_{0}^{S}\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)-\log r+O(1)
$$

In order to go on, we remember the interesting corollary of the Nevanlinna Second Main Theorem on three small functions for $p$-adic analytic functions (see Theorem 4 [12]), which we will use later in the proof of Theorem 3.

Theorem T. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K})\left(\right.$ resp. Let $\left.f \in \mathcal{A}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)\right)$be non-constant such that $f(0) \neq 0$, and let $u_{1}, u_{2} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K})$ (resp. let $u_{1}, u_{2} \in \mathcal{A}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$) be small functions with respect to $f$ and not zero at 0 . Then,

$$
T(r, f) \leq \bar{Z}\left(r, f-u_{1}\right)+\bar{Z}\left(r, f-u_{2}\right)+S(r)
$$

where $S(r)=2 T\left(r, u_{1}\right)+3 T\left(r, u_{2}\right)-\log r+O(1)$.

## 2. Proofs of the Main Lemmas and Theorems

### 2.1. Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. It is sufficient to show the claim whenever $f \in \mathcal{A}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. Let $f(x)=\sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} c_{i} x^{i}$. Clearly we can notice that every zero of $f$ in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$is also a zero of $\widehat{f}$ in $\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)$.

Let $r \in] 0, R\left[\right.$ and let $\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{q}$ be the zeros of $f$ in the circle $C(0, r)$ with $\omega_{\alpha_{i}}(f)=s_{i}$ for $i=1, \ldots, q$. Thereby, $f$ is factorized in the form $f=\prod_{i=1}^{q}(x-$ $\left.\alpha_{i}\right)^{s_{i}} g$, where $g \in \mathcal{A}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$and $g\left(\alpha_{i}\right) \neq 0$ for $i=1, \ldots, q$. Observe that this factorization also holds in $\mathcal{M}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. Hence $\alpha_{i}$ is also a zero of order $s_{i}$ of $\widehat{f}$ for $i=1, \ldots, q$. Now, suppose that $\widehat{f}$ admits other zeros $\alpha_{q+1}, \ldots, \alpha_{t}$ with $\omega_{\alpha_{i}}(\widehat{f})=s_{i}$ for $i=q+1, \ldots, t$. By Theorem 23.1 [7], for all $r \in] 0, R[$, we have

$$
\nu^{+}(f, r)-\nu^{-}(f, r)=\sum_{i=1}^{q} s_{i},
$$

and similarly, we have

$$
\nu^{+}(\widehat{f}, r)-\nu^{-}(\widehat{f}, r)=\sum_{i=1}^{t} s_{i} .
$$

But, we know that $\nu^{+}(f, r), \nu^{-}(f, r), \nu^{+}(\widehat{f}, r), \nu^{-}(\widehat{f}, r)$ are only defined by the coefficients of $f$. So, for $r \in] 0, R$, we have $\nu^{+}(f, r)=\nu^{+}(\widehat{f}, r)$ and $\nu^{-}(f, r)=\nu^{-}(\widehat{f}, r)$. Consequently $t=q$, which finishes the proof.

### 2.2. Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. Since $f$ has no zeros in $\Gamma\left(0, r^{\prime}, r^{\prime \prime}\right)$, then by Theorem 23.4 [7], $\left.\nu^{+}(f, r)=\nu^{-}(f, r) \forall r \in\right] r^{\prime}, r^{\prime \prime}[$. Moreover, since $q=\nu(f, r) \quad \forall r \in] r^{\prime}, r^{\prime \prime}[$, we have

$$
|f(x)|=\left|a_{q}\right||x|^{q} \quad \forall x \in \Gamma\left(0, r^{\prime}, r^{\prime \prime}\right)
$$

with $\left|a_{q}\right||x|^{q}>\left|a_{n} \| x\right|^{n} \quad \forall q \neq n$. Consequently, since $|q|=1$ by our assumption that the residue characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$ does not divide $q$, we have

$$
\left|f^{\prime}(x)\right|=\left|\sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} n a_{n} x^{n-1}\right|=\left|a_{q}\right||x|^{q-1}=\frac{1}{|x|}\left|a_{q}\right||x|^{q} .
$$

Therefore, we may deduce that $\left|f^{\prime}(x)\right|=\frac{|f(x)|}{|x|}$.

### 2.3. Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Let $r>0$ (resp. Let $r \in[1, R[$ ). By Lemma 4 [3], we know that $\left|f^{\prime}\right|(r) \leq \frac{1}{r}|f|(r)$. We shall check that there exists a $\left.\rho \in\right] 0,+\infty[$ (resp. $\rho \in[1, R[$ ) such that $\left.\left|f^{\prime}\right|(r)<|T f|(r) \forall r \in\right] \rho,+\infty[$ (resp. $\forall r \in] \rho, R[$ ). Indeed, if $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$ the existence of $\rho$ is immediate because $\lim _{r \rightarrow+\infty}|T|(r)>0$. Now, suppose that
$f \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. Since $\lim _{r \rightarrow R}|T|(r)>\frac{1}{R}$, by continuity, we can find a $\rho \in[1, R[$ such that $\left.|T|(r)>\frac{1}{r} \forall r \in\right] \rho, R[$. So we have proved the existence of $\rho \in] 0,+\infty[$ (resp. $\rho \in\left[1, R[)\right.$ such that $\left|f^{\prime}\right|(r) \leq \frac{1}{r}|f|(r)<|T f|(r)$. Consequently

$$
\left|f^{\prime}+T f\right|(r)=|T f|(r) \quad \forall r>\rho \quad(\text { resp. } \quad \forall r \in] \rho, R[)
$$

Suppose first that $f$ has a finite number of poles. Then, $f$ has infinitely many zeros in $\mathbb{K}$ (resp. in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$) because $f$ is transcendental in $\mathbb{K}$ (resp. is unbounded in $\left.d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. Moreover, there exists an increasing sequence $\left\{r_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}=$ $+\infty$ (resp. $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}=R$ ), such that $f$ admits zeros and no poles in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$, such that $T$ has no zeros and no poles in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$ and such that

$$
\left|f^{\prime}+T f\right|(r)=|T f|(r) \quad \forall r \geq r_{1}
$$

Since $\left|f^{\prime}+T f\right|(r)=|T f|(r)$ in a neighborhood of $r_{n}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu^{+}\left(f^{\prime}+T f, r_{n}\right)-\nu^{-}\left(f^{\prime}+T f, r_{n}\right)=\nu^{+}\left(f, r_{n}\right)-\nu^{-}\left(f, r_{n}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\nu^{+}\left(f, r_{n}\right)-\nu^{-}\left(f, r_{n}\right)$ is the number of zeros of $f$ in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$ and $\nu^{+}\left(f^{\prime}\right.$ $\left.+T f, r_{n}\right)-\nu^{-}\left(f^{\prime}+T f, r_{n}\right)$ is the number of zeros of $f^{\prime}+T f$ in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$ (counting multiplicities). Hence, we may deduce that $f^{\prime}+T f$ has zeros in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$ and the number of zeros of $f^{\prime}+T f$ is equal to the number of zeros of $f$ in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$ (counting multiplicities).

On the other hand, since each zero of $f$ in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$ either is not a zero of $f^{\prime}+T f$ or is a zero of $f^{\prime}+T f$ of order strictly lower than its order as a zero of $f$, by (2) there does exist at least a zero of $f^{\prime}+T f$ that is not a zero of $f$ in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$. Since this is true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain that $f^{\prime}+T f$ has infinitely many zeros in $\mathbb{K}\left(\right.$ resp. in $\left.d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$that are not zeros of $f$.

Now, suppose that $f$ has infinitely many poles. Then, there exists an increasing sequence $\left\{r_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}=+\infty$ (resp. $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}=R$ ), such that $f$ admits poles in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$, such that $T$ has no zeros and no poles in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$ and such that

$$
\left|f^{\prime}+T f\right|(r)=|T f|(r) \quad \forall r \geq r_{1}
$$

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $s_{n}$ and $t_{n}$ be the number of zeros and that of poles of $f$ in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$ respectively, and let $\gamma_{n}$ and $\tau_{n}$ be the number of zeros and that of poles of $f^{\prime}+T f$ in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$ respectively. Then, we deduce that

$$
\nu^{+}\left(f, r_{n}\right)-\nu^{-}\left(f, r_{n}\right)=s_{n}-t_{n} \quad \text { and } \quad \nu^{+}\left(f^{\prime}+T f, r_{n}\right)-\nu^{-}\left(f^{\prime}+T f, r_{n}\right)=\gamma_{n}-\tau_{n}
$$

Since $\left|f^{\prime}+T f\right|(r)=|T f|(r)$ in a neighborhood of $r_{n}$, we have again

$$
\nu^{+}\left(f, r_{n}\right)-\nu^{-}\left(f, r_{n}\right)=\nu^{+}\left(f^{\prime}+T f, r_{n}\right)-\nu^{-}\left(f^{\prime}+T f, r_{n}\right)
$$

Consequently, $\gamma_{n}-\tau_{n}=s_{n}-t_{n}$ in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$. But we may observe that $\tau_{n}$ is the number of poles of $f^{\prime}$ in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$ (counting multiplicities). So, since $T$ has no zeros and no poles in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$, we have $\tau_{n}>t_{n}$ which implies that $\gamma_{n}>s_{n}$. Thus, $f^{\prime}+T f$ must have at least one zero in $C\left(0, r_{n}\right)$ that is not a zero of $f$. Since this is true for all $n \in N$, we deduce that $f^{\prime}+T f$ has infinitely many zeros in $\mathbb{K}$ (resp. in $\left.d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$which are not zeros of $f$.

### 2.4. Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Assume, without loss of generality, that 0 is neither a zer nor a pole $T f^{m}$ and $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$. We shall prove that $f$ has infinitely many zeros in $\mathbb{K}$ (resp. in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$). First we suppose $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$. By hypothesis $\limsup _{r \rightarrow+\infty}|f|(r)>0$, i.e., there exist a sequence $\left\{\Gamma\left(0, r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}\right)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}^{\prime \prime}=+\infty$, and a constant $C>0$, such that $\left.Z(r, f) \geq N(r, f)+C \quad \forall r \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\right] r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}[$. If $f$ has a finite number of zeros, say, $q$, then $Z(r, f)=q \log r$ and so $N(r, f)+C \leq q \log r$. Consequently $f$ has a finite number of poles, a contradiction because $f$ is transcendental.

Now, suppose $f \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. If $f$ has a finite number of zeros in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$, then $\lim _{r \rightarrow R} Z(r, f)<+\infty$ and hence $\limsup _{r \rightarrow R}|f|(r)<+\infty$, a contradiction to our hypothesis.

Suppose that the set of zeros of $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ which are not zeros of $f$ is finite. Then, there exists a $\rho>0$ (resp. $\rho \in\left[1, R\left[\right.\right.$ ) such that $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ has no zeros other than the multiple zeros of $f$ in $\mathbb{K} \backslash d(0, \rho)$ (resp. in $\Gamma(0, \rho, R)$ ) and such that $T$ has no zeros and no poles in $\mathbb{K} \backslash d(0, \rho)$ (resp. in $\Gamma(0, \rho, R)$ ). So, each pole of $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ is a pole of $f^{m}$ of the same multiplicity. Hence,

$$
\begin{align*}
& N\left(r, f^{\prime}+T f^{m}\right)-N\left(\rho, f^{\prime}+T f^{m}\right) \\
= & N\left(r, f^{m}\right)-N\left(\rho, f^{m}\right) \quad \forall r \in \mathbb{K} \backslash d(0, \rho) \quad(\text { resp. } \forall r \in] \rho, R[) . \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

Let $\sigma>\rho$ be such that $C(0, \sigma)$ contains at least one zero of $f$. Each zero of $f$, say, of order $q$, either is not a zero of $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ or is a zero of $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ with order $q-1$. Since $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ has no zeros in $C(0, r)$ other than the zeros of $f$ and $T$ has no zeros and no poles in $C(0, r)$, clearly the number of zeros of $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ in $C(0, r)$ (counting multiplicities) is strictly inferior to the number of zeros of $T f^{m}$ (counting multiplicities). So, the function

$$
\Psi(r)=Z\left(r, f^{m}\right)-Z\left(\rho, f^{m}\right)-\left[Z\left(r, f^{\prime}+T f^{m}\right)-Z\left(\rho, f^{\prime}+T f^{m}\right)\right]
$$

is strictly increasing in $[\sigma,+\infty[$ (resp. in $[\sigma, R[)$.

Now, we will show that there exists an increasing sequence of intervals $] r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}[$ with
$\rho<r_{n}^{\prime}<r_{n}^{\prime \prime}<r_{n+1}^{\prime}$ and $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}^{\prime \prime}=+\infty$ (resp. $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}^{\prime \prime}=R$ ), such that $\left.\left|f^{\prime}+T f^{m}\right|(r)=\left|T f^{m}\right|(r) \forall r \in\right] r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}[$. Suppose first that $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$. Since $\limsup |f|(r)>0$, there exist a sequence of annulus $\left\{\Gamma\left(0, r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}\right)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\rho<$ $r \rightarrow+\infty$ $r_{n}^{\prime}<r_{n}^{\prime \prime}$ and $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}^{\prime \prime}=+\infty$, and a constant $C>0$ such that

$$
|f|(r)>C \quad \forall r \in] r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}[\quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}
$$

Since $T$ has no zeros and no poles in $] r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}[$ and $\operatorname{deg}(A) \geq \operatorname{deg}(B)$, then there exists a constant $\lambda>0$ such that $|T|(r) \geq \lambda \quad \forall r \in] r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}[$. So

$$
\left.\left|T f^{m}\right|(r)>C^{m} \lambda \quad \forall r \in\right] r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}[\quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}
$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 4 [3], $\left|f^{\prime}\right|(r) \leq \frac{1}{r}|f|(r)$. So, if we consider the previous observation, we can deduce that

$$
\left|\frac{f^{\prime}}{T f^{m}}\right|(r) \leq \frac{1}{r} \frac{1}{\left|T f^{m-1}\right|(r)}<\frac{1}{\lambda r}\left(\frac{1}{C}\right)^{m-1}
$$

However, for $r$ sufficiently large, we have $\frac{1}{\lambda r}\left(\frac{1}{C}\right)^{m-1}<1$. Hence $\left|f^{\prime}\right|(r)<$ $\left|T f^{m}\right|(r)$. Thereby,
$\left|f^{\prime}+T f^{m}\right|(r)=\left|T f^{m}\right|(r)$. Thus, this equality holds in all annulus $\Gamma\left(0, r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ when $r_{n}^{\prime}$ is sufficiently large. Consequently, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\left.\left|f^{\prime}+T f^{m}\right|(r)=\left|T f^{m}\right|(r) \quad \forall r \in\right] r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}[\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now, we suppose that $f \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. Since $\limsup _{r \rightarrow R}|f|(r)=+\infty$ there exists a sequence of annulus $\left\{\Gamma\left(0, r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}\right)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\stackrel{r \rightarrow R}{\rho}<r_{n}^{\prime}<r_{n}^{\prime \prime}$ and $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}^{\prime \prime}=R$, such that $\left.|f|(r) \geq n \forall r \in\right] r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}[$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $T \in \mathbb{K}(x)$, there exists a constant $\lambda>0$ such that $\inf _{r \in[1, R[ }|T|(r)=\lambda$. Then, $\left|T f^{m}\right|(r) \geq \lambda|f|(r) n^{m-1}$ $\forall r \in] r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left[\right.$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, we can see that $\left.\left|f^{\prime}\right|(r)<|f|(r) \forall r \in\right] r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}[$ because $r_{n}^{\prime}>1$. Consequently, when $n$ is sufficiently large, we have $\left.\left|f^{\prime}\right|(r)<|f|(r)<\lambda n^{m-1}|f|(r) \leq\left|T f^{m}\right|(r) \quad \forall r \in\right] r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}[$, which implies that $\left.\left|f^{\prime}+T f^{m}\right|(r)=\left|T f^{m}\right|(r) \forall r \in\right] r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}[$.

Therefore, by Lemma 6, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& Z\left(r, T f^{m}+f^{\prime}\right)-N\left(r, T f^{m}+f^{\prime}\right) \\
= & \left.Z\left(r, f^{m}\right)-N\left(r, f^{m}\right)+\chi \quad \forall r \in\right] r_{n}^{\prime}, r_{n}^{\prime \prime}[ \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\chi$ is defined as $m \log |f(0)|-\log \left|T(0) f^{m}(0)+f^{\prime}(0)\right|$. And by (3) and (4), we can check that

$$
\Psi(r)=Z\left(\rho, f^{\prime}+T f^{m}\right)-N\left(\rho, f^{\prime}+T f^{m}\right)-\left[Z\left(\rho, f^{m}\right)-N\left(\rho, f^{m}\right)+\chi\right]
$$

Consequently $\Psi$ is constant in $[\sigma,+\infty[$ (resp. in $[\sigma, R[$ ), a contradiction because we have showed that it is strictly increasing.

### 2.5. Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. In order to prove Theorem 3, thanks to Lemma 1, we can place ourselves in $\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right) \subset \widehat{\mathbb{K}}$ in the case when $f \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. Since $f$ is a transcendental meromorphic function in $\mathbb{K}$ (resp. unbounded in $\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)$), there exist entire functions $h, l \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K})\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.h, l \in \mathcal{A}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)\right)$without common zeros and at least one of them being transcendental (resp. unbounded) such that $f=\frac{h}{l}$. We can write $h$ in the form $\bar{h} \widetilde{h}$, where the zeros of $\bar{h}$ are exactly the different zeros of $h$ but all with multiplicity 1 . Then, necessarily, $h^{\prime}$ is multiple of $\widetilde{h}$ in $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K})$ (resp. in $\left.\mathcal{A} \widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. So $h^{\prime}=u \widetilde{h}$ with $u \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K})$ (resp. $u \in \mathcal{A}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$).

Suppose that $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ has a finite number of zeros in $\mathbb{K}$ (resp. in $\left.\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$ which are not zeros of $f$. Then, there exists a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{K}[x]$ of degree $q$, having no common zeros with $B l$, such that

$$
f^{\prime}+T f^{m}=\frac{P \widetilde{h}}{B l^{m}} .
$$

This implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{f^{\prime}}{f^{m}}=\frac{P \widetilde{h}-A h^{m}}{B h^{m}}=\frac{P-A \bar{h} h^{m-1}}{B \bar{h}^{m} \widetilde{h}^{m-1}} . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, we note that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{f^{\prime}}{f^{m}}=\frac{l^{m-2}\left(h^{\prime} l-h l^{\prime}\right)}{h^{m}}=\frac{l^{m-2}\left(u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)}{\bar{h}^{m} \widetilde{h}^{m-1}} . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

So, by (5) and (6),

$$
B l^{m-2}\left(u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)=P-A \bar{h} h^{m-1} .
$$

Let $F=B l^{m-2}\left(u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)$ and $s=\operatorname{deg}(A)$. Let $r>0($ resp. Let $r \in[1, R[)$. Applying Theorem $T$ to $F$, and noting that $\bar{Z}(r, h)=\bar{Z}\left(r, \bar{h} h^{m-1}\right)=Z(r, \bar{h})$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
T(r, F) \leq & \bar{Z}(r, F)+\bar{Z}(r, F-P)+3 T(r, P)-\log r+O(1) \\
\leq & \left.\bar{Z}(r, B)+\bar{Z}\left(r, l^{m-2}\right)+\bar{Z}\left(r, u l-\overline{h l^{\prime}}\right)\right) \\
& +\bar{Z}(r, A)+\bar{Z}(r, h)+(3 q-1) \log r+O(1)  \tag{7}\\
\leq & Z(r, B)+Z(r, l) \\
& +Z\left(r, u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)+Z(r, h)+(3 q+s-1) \log r+O(1) .
\end{align*}
$$

Moreover, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
T(r, F) & =T(r, B)+T\left(r, l^{m-2}\right)+T\left(r, u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)+O(1) \\
& =Z(r, B)+(m-2) Z(r, l)+Z\left(r, u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)+O(1) \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

Let $d=3 q+s-1$. By (7) and (8), we deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
(m-3) Z(r, l) \leq Z(r, h)+d \log r+O(1) . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since we assume that the set of zeros of $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ that are not zeros of $f$ is finite, by Theorem 2, we can restrict ourselves to the assumption $\limsup _{r \rightarrow+\infty}|f|(r)=$ 0 (resp. $\underset{r \rightarrow R}{\limsup }|f|(r)<+\infty$ ) and therefore $\limsup _{r \rightarrow+\infty}[Z(r, l)-Z(r, h)]=+\infty$ (resp. $\left.\limsup _{r \rightarrow R}[Z(r, h)-Z(r, l)]<+\infty\right)$. Consequently, there exist a sequence $\left\{r_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}=+\infty$ (resp. $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}=R$ ), and a constant $C>0$ such that $Z\left(r_{n}, h\right)<Z\left(r_{n}, l\right)+C \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. So, by (9), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
(m-4) Z\left(r_{n}, l\right)<d \log r_{n}+O(1) \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we assume $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{K})$, then by hypothesis, $\limsup _{r \rightarrow+\infty}|f|(r)=0$ and so $l$ is a transcendental function. Thereby, when $m \geq 5$, we have $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} Z\left(r_{n}, l\right)=$ $+\infty$, a contradiction to (10). Now, if we assume $f \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$, then at least one of the two functions $h, l$ belongs to $\mathcal{A}_{u}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. Since, by hypothesis, $\lim \sup |f|(r)<+\infty$, we deduce that $l$ must lie in $\mathcal{A}_{u}\left(\hat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$because if $l \in$ $\mathcal{A}_{b}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$, then $h \in \mathcal{A}_{u}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$and in this case $\limsup _{r \rightarrow R}|f|(r)=+\infty$, a contradiction. Hence $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} Z\left(r_{n}, l\right)=+\infty$, a contradiction to (10) again.

Thus, when $m \geq 5, f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ has infinitely many zeros in $\mathbb{K}$ (resp. in $\left.\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$ which are not zeros of $f$. Consequently, by Lemma $1, f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ has infinitely many zeros in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$that are not zeros of $f$.

Now, consider $T \equiv 1$ and suppose that $f^{\prime}+f^{4}$ has no zeros in $\mathbb{K}$ which are not zeros of $f$. Then $d=-1$. So, by (10), we obtain

$$
0<-\log r_{n}+O(1) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},
$$

and hence we have a contradiction when $n \rightarrow+\infty$. Consequently, $f^{\prime}+f^{4}$ has at least one zero in $\mathbb{K}$ that is not a zero of $f$.

### 2.6. Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. Let $\left\{r_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a $g$-suitable sequence. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$, there exists $\left.r_{n}^{\prime} \in\right] r_{n}, r_{n+1}\left[\right.$ such that $g$ has no zero and no pole in the annulus $\Gamma\left(0, r_{n}, r_{n}^{\prime}\right)$. Consequently, by Lemma 2, we have $\frac{\left|g^{\prime}(x)\right|}{|g(x)|}=\frac{1}{|x|} \quad \forall x \in \Gamma\left(0, r_{n}, r_{n}^{\prime}\right)$. So, $\left.\nu\left(\frac{g^{\prime}}{g}, r\right)=-1 \quad \forall r \in\right] r_{n}, r_{n}^{\prime}[$.

Observe that the poles of $\frac{g^{\prime}}{g}$ are all simple ones and correspond to the zeros and the poles of $g$. Since $g$ is a transcendental meromorphic function in $\mathbb{K}$ (resp. $g$ is unbounded in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$), we derive that $\frac{g^{\prime}}{g}$ has infinitely many poles in $\mathbb{K}$ (resp. in $\left.d\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. Moreover, since $\nu\left(\frac{g^{\prime}}{g}, r\right)=-1$ whenever $\left.r \in\right] r_{n}, r_{n}^{\prime}[$, by Corollary 5 , the difference between the number of poles and the number of zeros of $\frac{g^{\prime}}{g}$ in $d(0, r)$ is just 1 . Then clearly, $\frac{g^{\prime}}{g}$ has infinitely many zeros in $\mathbb{K}$ (resp. in $d\left(0, R^{-}\right)$).

### 2.7. Proof of Theorem 5

Proof. Here we assume $\operatorname{deg}(A)=\operatorname{deg}(B)$. Let $f$ be of the form $\frac{h}{l}$ with $h, l \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K})$ having no common zeros. As in the proofs of Theorem 3, we can write $h$ in the form $\bar{h} \widetilde{h}$, where the zeros of $\bar{h}$ are exactly the different zeros of $h$ but all with multiplicity 1 , and $h^{\prime}$ is of the form $\widetilde{h} u$ with $u \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K})$.

Suppose that $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ only has finitely many zeros which are not zeros of $f$. There exists a $P \in \mathbb{K}[x]$ such that $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}=\frac{P \widetilde{h}}{B l^{m}}$ with $P \widetilde{h}$ and $B l^{m}$ having no common zeros in $\mathbb{K}$.

On the other hand, we have

$$
f^{\prime}+T f^{m}=\frac{\left[B l^{m-2}\left(u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)+A \bar{h}^{m} \widetilde{h}^{m-1}\right] \tilde{h}}{B l^{m}} .
$$

Since $h, l$ have no common zeros and since $A, B$ have no common zeros either, each zero $\alpha$ of $\left[B l^{m-2}\left(u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)+A \bar{h}^{m} \widetilde{h}^{m-1}\right]$ that is not a zero of $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ must be a zero of $A$ or a zero of $B$ or $l$. But note that if $\alpha$ is a zero of $l$ then it is a zero of $A$. Thus the zeros of $\left[B l^{m-2}\left(u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)+A \bar{h}^{m} \widetilde{h}^{m-1}\right]$ which are not zeros of $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ must be zeros of $A$ or $B$ and therefore are a finite number. Moreover, we notice that a zero $\alpha$ of $\left[B l^{m-2}\left(u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)+A \bar{h}^{m} \widetilde{h}^{m-1}\right]$ is not a zero of $f$ except if it is a zero of $B$, because a zero of $f$ cannot be a zero of $u$. Consequently, the zeros of $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ that are not zeros of $f$ are the zeros of $B l^{m-2}\left(u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)+A \bar{h}^{m} \widetilde{h}^{m-1}$ (counting multiplicities), except a finite number.

Next, we may notice that $h \notin \mathbb{K}[x]$. Indeed, suppose $h \in \mathbb{K}[x]$. Since $f \notin$ $\mathbb{K}(x)$, then $l \notin \mathbb{K}[x]$ and hence $B l^{m-2}\left(u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)+A \bar{h}^{m} \widetilde{h}^{m-1} \notin \mathbb{K}[x]$. Therefore, $B l^{m-2}\left(u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)+A \bar{h}^{m} \widetilde{h}^{m-1}$ has infinitely many zeros which are not zeros of $f$, a contradiction to our initial supposition.

Now, we consider $H=\frac{f^{\prime}}{f^{m}}=-\frac{A}{B}+\frac{P \widetilde{h}}{B h^{m}}=-\frac{A}{B}+\frac{P}{B h^{m-1} \bar{h}}$. Since $h$ is not a polynomial in $\mathbb{K}$ we have $\lim _{|x| \rightarrow+\infty}\left|\frac{P(x)}{\left(B h^{m-1} \bar{h}\right)(x)}\right|=0$. Moreover, since $\operatorname{deg}(A)=\operatorname{deg}(B), A$ and $B$ have the same number of zeros, taking multiplicities into account and hence we may derive that $\lim _{|x| \rightarrow+\infty}\left|\frac{A(x)}{B(x)}\right|=a$ with $a \in \mathbb{R}_{+}$. Hence, $\lim _{|x| \rightarrow+\infty}|H(x)|=a$. Consequently, there exists a $\rho>0$ such that $\nu(H, r)=$ $0 \forall r \geq \rho$.

On the other hand, since $f$ is an optimal function, there exists a $f$-suitable sequence $\left\{r_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}=+\infty$. Let $\left\{s_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be another sequence such that $r_{n}<s_{n}<r_{n+1}$ and such that $\nu(f, r)$ is constant inside $] r_{n}, s_{n}[$. By Proposition 20.9 [7], we have $\nu\left(\frac{f^{\prime}}{f^{m}}, r\right)=\nu\left(f^{\prime}, r\right)-m \nu(f, r)$, and by Corollary 5 , we have $\left.\nu\left(f^{\prime}, r\right)=\nu(f, r)-1 \quad \forall r \in\right] r_{n}, s_{n}[$. Consequently,

$$
0=\nu(H, r)=(1-m) \nu(f, r)-1 \quad \forall r \in] r_{n}, s_{n}[,
$$

a contradiction when $m \geq 3$. Thus, $f^{\prime}+T f^{m}$ has infinitely many zeros in $\mathbb{K}$ which are not zeros of $f$.

### 2.8. Proof of Theorem 6

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 3, without loss of generality, we may place ourselves in the spherically complete field $\widehat{\mathbb{K}}$ and consider $f \in \mathcal{M}_{u}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. So, there exist functions $h, l \in \mathcal{A}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$having no common zeros, such that $f=\frac{h}{l}$. Moreover, at least one of them is unbounded. As in the proofs of Theorems 3 and 5 , we can write $h$ in the form $\bar{h} \widetilde{h}$, where the zeros of $\bar{h}$ are exactly the different zeros of $h$ but all with order 1 . Then $h^{\prime}=\widetilde{h} u$ with $u \in \mathcal{A}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$.

Suppose that $f^{\prime}+U f^{m}$ only has a finite number of zeros which are not zeros of $f$. The proof now is similar to this of Theorem 5. There exists $P \in \widehat{\mathbb{K}}[x]$ such that $f^{\prime}+U f^{m}$ is of the form $\frac{P \widetilde{h}}{\psi l^{m}}$ with $P \widetilde{h}$ and $\psi l^{m}$ having no common zeros in $\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)$. Consequently, $\frac{f^{\prime}}{f^{m}}=\frac{P \widetilde{h}-\phi h^{m}}{\psi h^{m}}$. Since $f$ is an optimal function, there exists a $f$-suitable sequence $\left\{r_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} r_{n}=R$. Let $\left\{s_{n}\right\}$ be another sequence such that $r_{n}<s_{n}<r_{n+1}$ and such that $\nu(f, r)$ is constant inside $] r_{n}, s_{n}[$. By Corollary 5, we have $\left.\nu\left(f^{\prime}, r\right)=\nu(f, r)-1 \quad \forall r \in\right] r_{n}, s_{n}$ [, and by Proposition 20.9 [7], we have $\nu\left(\frac{f^{\prime}}{f^{m}}, r\right)=\nu\left(f^{\prime}, r\right)-m \nu(f, r)$. Consequently, as in the proof of the previous theorem, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\nu\left(\frac{f^{\prime}}{f^{m}}, r\right)=-(m-1) \nu(f, r)-1 \forall r \in\right] r_{n}, s_{n}[. \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, considering that $f$ is of the form $\frac{\bar{\hbar} \widetilde{h}}{l}$ we deduce that

$$
f^{\prime}+U f^{m}=\frac{\left[\psi l^{m-2}\left(u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)+\phi \bar{h}^{m} \widetilde{h}^{m-1}\right] \widetilde{h}}{\psi l^{m}}
$$

Let $H=\frac{P \widetilde{h}-\phi h^{m}}{\psi h^{m}}$. We shall prove that $h$ is unbounded in $\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)$. Suppose that $h \in \mathcal{A}_{b}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. Since $\phi$ and psi belons to $\mathcal{A}_{b}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$, then $H$ belong to $\mathcal{M}_{b}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$, hence $l \in \mathcal{A}_{u}\left(\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)\right)$. Thereby, $\psi l^{m-2}\left(u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)+\phi \bar{h}^{m} \widetilde{h}^{m-1}$ is an unbounded analytic function in $\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)$. So, by Lemma 3, $\psi l^{m-2}\left(u l-\bar{h} l^{\prime}\right)+$ $\phi \bar{h}^{m} \widetilde{h}^{m-1}$ has infinitely many zeros in $\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)$, but these zeros are the zeros of $f^{\prime}+U f^{m}$ that are not zeros of $f$ except a finite number of them (see arguments in the proof of Theorem 5), a contradiction to our supposition. Hence, we may deduce that $\lim _{r \rightarrow R^{-}}\left|\frac{P}{\psi h^{m-1} \bar{h}}\right|(r)=0$.

Now, since $\phi$ and $\psi$ have the same finite number of zeros in $\widehat{d}\left(0, R^{-}\right)$(counting multiplicities), there exists a $\rho<R$ such that $\nu\left(\frac{\phi}{\psi}, r\right)=0 \forall r \in[\rho, R[$, and therefore $|U|(r)$ is a constant $c$ in $\left[\rho, R\left[\right.\right.$. Consequently, there exists a $\rho^{\prime} \in[\rho, R[$ such that $|H|(r)=|U|(r)=c \quad \forall r \in\left[\rho^{\prime}, R\left[\right.\right.$. Thus, $\nu(H, r)=0 \quad \forall r \in\left[\rho^{\prime}, R[\right.$.

The end of the proof is then similar to that of the previous theorem. By (11) and the previous observation, we have $(m-1) \nu(f, r)=-1 \quad \forall r \in] r_{n}, s_{n}[\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, which is absurd because $m \geq 3$. Hence $f^{\prime}+U f^{m}$ has infinitely many zeros which are not zeros of $f$ whenever $m \geq 3$.
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