

## UNIQUENESS OF MEROMORPHIC FUNCTIONS THAT SHARE THREE VALUES

BY SHOU-ZHEN YE

### 1. Introduction and Main Results.

Let  $f$  and  $g$  be two nonconstant meromorphic functions in the complex plane. If  $f$  and  $g$  have the same  $a$ -points with the same multiplicities, we say  $f$  and  $g$  share the value  $a$  CM. (see [1]). It is assumed that the reader is familiar with the notations of the Nevanlinna Theory (see, for example, [2]). Let  $E$  denote any set of finite linear measure of  $0 < r < \infty$ . The notation  $S(r, f)$  denotes any quantity satisfying

$$S(r, f) = o(T(r, f)) \quad (r \rightarrow \infty, r \notin E).$$

H. Ueda proved the following theorem.

**THEOREM A** (see [3]). *Let  $f$  and  $g$  be two distinct nonconstant entire functions such that  $f$  and  $g$  share  $0, 1$  CM., and let  $a$  be a finite complex number, and  $a \neq 0, 1$ . If  $a$  is lacunary for  $f$ , then  $1-a$  is lacunary for  $g$ , and*

$$(f-a)(g+a-1) \equiv a(1-a).$$

In [4] Yi Hong-Xun proved more generally the following theorem.

**THEOREM B.** *Let  $f$  and  $g$  be two distinct nonconstant entire functions such that  $f$  and  $g$  share  $0, 1$  CM., and let  $a$  be a finite complex number, and  $a \neq 0, 1$ . If  $\delta(a, f) > 1/3$ , then  $a$  and  $1-a$  are Picard exceptional values of  $f$  and  $g$  respectively, and*

$$(f-a)(g+a-1) \equiv a(1-a).$$

In this paper we extend the above theorems to meromorphic functions, and, in fact, prove the following theorem.

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $f$  and  $g$  be two distinct nonconstant meromorphic functions such that  $f$  and  $g$  share  $0, 1, \infty$  CM., and let  $a$  be a finite complex number, and  $a \neq 0, 1$ . If*

---

Received July 6, 1991; Revised November 5, 1991.

$$\delta(a, f) + \delta(\infty, f) > \frac{4}{3},$$

then  $a$  and  $1-a$  are Picard exceptional values of  $f$  and  $g$  respectively, and also  $\infty$  is so, and

$$(f-a)(g+a-1) \equiv a(1-a).$$

In place of Theorem 1, we prove more generally the following theorem which is a generalization of Theorem A, Theorem B and Theorem 1.

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $f$  and  $g$  be two distinct nonconstant meromorphic functions such that  $f$  and  $g$  share  $0, 1, \infty$  CM., and let  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p$  be  $p$  ( $\geq 1$ ) distinct finite complex numbers, and  $a_i \neq 0, 1$  ( $i=1, 2, \dots, p$ ). If*

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \delta(a_i, f) + \delta(\infty, f) > \frac{2(p+1)}{p+2}, \tag{1}$$

then there exists one and only one  $a_j$  in  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p$  such that  $a_j$  and  $1-a_j$  are Picard exceptional values of  $f$  and  $g$  respectively, and also  $\infty$  is so, and

$$(f-a_j)(g+a_j-1) \equiv a_j(1-a_j).$$

**2. Some Lemmas.**

The following lemmas will be needed in the proof of our theorems.

**LEMMA 1.** *Let  $f$  and  $g$  be two distinct nonconstant meromorphic functions such that  $f$  and  $g$  share  $0, 1, \infty$  CM., then*

$$f = \frac{1 - e^\beta}{1 - e^{\beta - \alpha}}, \tag{2}$$

$$f - 1 = \frac{e^{\beta - \alpha}(1 - e^\alpha)}{1 - e^{\beta - \alpha}}, \tag{3}$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are entire functions and  $e^\alpha \neq 1, e^\beta \neq 1, e^{\beta - \alpha} \neq 1$  and

$$T(r, e^\alpha) = O(T(r, f)) \quad (r \notin E),$$

$$T(r, e^\beta) = O(T(r, f)) \quad (r \notin E).$$

*Proof.* By assumption, we have

$$f = ge^\alpha \tag{4}$$

and

$$f - 1 = (g - 1)e^\beta, \tag{5}$$

where both  $e^\alpha$  and  $e^\beta$  are entire functions, and

$$e^\alpha \neq 1, \quad e^\beta \neq 1, \quad e^{\beta-\alpha} \neq 1.$$

It follows from (4) and (5) that (2) and (3) hold.

By Nevanlinna's second fundamental theorem, we obtain

$$T(r, g) < N\left(r, \frac{1}{g}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{g-1}\right) + N(r, g) + S(r, g) < 3T(r, f) + S(r, g).$$

Hence

$$T(r, g) < (3 + o(1))T(r, f) \quad (r \notin E).$$

It follows from Nevanlinna's first fundamental theorem that

$$T(r, e^\alpha) \leq T(r, f) + T\left(r, \frac{1}{g}\right) < (4 + o(1))T(r, f) \quad (r \notin E)$$

and

$$T(r, e^\beta) \leq T(r, f-1) + T\left(r, \frac{1}{g-1}\right) < (4 + o(1))T(r, f) \quad (r \notin E).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 1.

LEMMA 2 (see [5]). Let  $f_i (i=1, 2, \dots, n)$  be  $n$  linearly independent meromorphic functions satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f_i \equiv 1,$$

then for  $j=1, 2, \dots, n$  we have

$$T(r, f_j) < \sum_{i=1}^n N\left(r, \frac{1}{f_i}\right) + N(r, f_j) + N(r, D) - \sum_{i=1}^n N(r, f_i) - N\left(r, \frac{1}{D}\right) + O(\log r + \log T_n(r)) \quad (r \notin E),$$

where  $D$  denotes the Wronskian

$$D = \begin{vmatrix} f_1 & f_2 & \dots & f_n \\ f'_1 & f'_2 & \dots & f'_n \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ f_1^{(n-1)} & f_2^{(n-1)} & \dots & f_n^{(n-1)} \end{vmatrix}$$

and  $T_n(r)$  denotes the maximum of  $T(r, f_i) (i=1, 2, \dots, n)$ .

LEMMA 3. Let  $b$  be a finite complex number, and  $b \neq 0, 1$ . Suppose that  $f$  and  $g$  are two distinct nonconstant meromorphic functions such that  $f$  and  $g$  share  $0, 1, \infty$  CM. Using the notations of Lemma 1, let  $f_1 = (1/1-b)(f-b)(1-e^{\beta-\alpha})$ ,  $f_2 = (1/1-b)e^\beta$ ,  $f_3 = (-b/1-b)e^{\beta-\alpha}$ . If the  $f_i (i=1, 2, 3)$  are linearly independent, then

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) < N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-b}\right) + S(r, f),$$

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) < N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-b}\right) + S(r, f).$$

*Proof.* By assumption, from Lemma 1 we easily see that all  $f_i (i=1, 2, 3)$  are entire functions, and

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 f_i \equiv 1, \\ T_3(r) = O(T(r, f)),$$

where  $T_3(r)$  denotes the maximum of  $T(r, f_i) (i=1, 2, 3)$ .

Applying Lemma 2 to functions  $f_i (i=1, 2, 3)$  we obtain

$$T(r, e^\beta) < N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-b}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{e^{\beta-a}-1}\right) - N(r, f) + S(r, f).$$

Note that  $e^\beta \neq \text{const.}$  and (2), then we have

$$\begin{aligned} N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) &= N\left(r, \frac{1}{e^\beta-1}\right) - N\left(r, \frac{1}{e^{\beta-a}-1}\right) + N(r, f) \\ &= T(r, e^\beta) - N\left(r, \frac{1}{e^{\beta-a}-1}\right) + N(r, f) + S(r, f) \\ &< N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-b}\right) + S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

Let us put

$$g_1 = \frac{1}{b} e^{\alpha-\beta} (f-b)(1-e^{\beta-\alpha}), \quad g_2 = \frac{1}{b} e^\alpha, \quad g_3 = -\frac{1-b}{b} e^{\alpha-\beta}, \quad \text{then } \sum_{i=1}^3 g_i \equiv 1.$$

Assume that the  $g_i (i=1, 2, 3)$  are linearly dependent, then there would be constants  $d_i (i=1, 2, 3)$  which can't all equal zero, such that

$$d_1 g_1 + d_2 g_2 + d_3 g_3 = 0.$$

Multiplying the above equation by  $(b/1-b)e^{\beta-\alpha}$ , and noting that  $\sum_{i=1}^3 f_i \equiv 1$ , we obtain

$$(d_1 - d_3) f_1 + (d_2 - d_3) f_2 - d_3 f_3 = 0.$$

Since  $d_1 - d_3$  and  $d_2 - d_3$  can't all equal zero, hence the  $f_i (i=1, 2, 3)$  are also linearly dependent, contrary to the above assumption that the  $f_i (i=1, 2, 3)$  are linearly independent. So the  $g_i (i=1, 2, 3)$  must also be linearly independent. Noting that  $e^\alpha \neq \text{const.}$  and (3), in a similar manner, we can prove that

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) < N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-b}\right) + S(r, f).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.

By Nevanlinna's second fundamental theorem, we can easily prove the following lemma.

LEMMA 4. *Let  $f$  and  $g$  be two nonconstant meromorphic functions, and let  $c_1, c_2$  and  $c_3$  be three nonzero constants. If*

$$c_1f + c_2g \equiv c_3,$$

then

$$T(r, f) < \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g}\right) + \bar{N}(r, f) + S(r, f).$$

### 3. Proof of Theorem 2.

In the following, we shall use the notations of Lemma 1 and Lemma 3.

Suppose that the  $f_i (i=1, 2, 3)$  are linearly independent for any  $b=a_i (i=1, 2, \dots, p)$ . By Lemma 3

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) < N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_i}\right) + S(r, f) \quad (i=1, 2, \dots, p)$$

and

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) < N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_i}\right) + S(r, f) \quad (i=1, 2, \dots, p).$$

Hence we have

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) < \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_i}\right) + S(r, f)$$

and

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) < \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_i}\right) + S(r, f).$$

By Nevanlinna's second fundamental theorem

$$\begin{aligned} (p+1)T(r, f) &< N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) + N(r, f) + \sum_{i=1}^p N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_i}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &< \left(1 + \frac{2}{p}\right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^p N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_i}\right) + N(r, f)\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \frac{p+2}{p} \left\{p+1 - \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \delta(a_i, f) + \delta(\infty, f)\right)\right\} T(r, f) + S(r, f). \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\frac{p+2}{p} \left\{p+1 - \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \delta(a_i, f) + \delta(\infty, f)\right)\right\} < p+1,$$

so (6) is a contradiction. Hence the  $f_i (i=1, 2, 3)$  are linearly dependent for at

least one of the  $a_i(i=1, 2, \dots, p)$ , say for  $b=a_1$ . Thus for the fixed value  $b=a_1$  there would be three constants  $(c_1, c_2, c_3) \neq (0, 0, 0)$  such that

$$c_1f_1+c_2f_2+c_3f_3=0. \tag{7}$$

If  $c_1=0$ , from (7) we have  $c_2 \neq 0, c_3 \neq 0$  and  $e^\alpha \equiv k_1$ , where  $k_1=(bc_3/c_2)$  clearly is a constant which depends on  $b=a_1$ , and  $k_1 \neq 0, 1$ . Then we have  $f-1 \neq 0$  by (3). Hence by Nevanlinna's second fundamental theorem

$$\begin{aligned} pT(r, f) &< N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-1}\right) + N(r, f) + \sum_{i=1}^p N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_i}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &= N(r, f) + \sum_{i=1}^p N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_i}\right) + S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

So that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \delta(a_i, f) + \delta(\infty, f) \leq 1,$$

which contradicts the condition (1) of the theorem. Thus  $c_1 \neq 0$ .

In the following, suppose that  $c_1 \neq 0$ . From (7) we get

$$f_1 = -\frac{c_2}{c_1}f_2 - \frac{c_3}{c_1}f_3.$$

Hence

$$\left(1 - \frac{c_2}{c_1}\right)f_2 + \left(1 - \frac{c_3}{c_1}\right)f_3 \equiv 1. \tag{8}$$

We shall discuss the following four cases:

a) Assume  $1-(c_2/c_1) \neq 0$  and  $1-(c_3/c_1) \neq 0$ .

If both  $e^\beta$  and  $e^{\beta-\alpha}$  are nonconstants, then, by Lemma 4, we obtain

$$T(r, e^\beta) < \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{e^\beta}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{e^{\beta-\alpha}}\right) + \bar{N}(r, e^\beta) + S(r, e^\beta) = o(T(r, e^\beta)) \quad (r \notin E),$$

which is impossible. Thus at least one of  $e^\beta=(1-b)f_2$  and  $e^{\beta-\alpha}=(1-b/b)f_3$  would equal a constant, so that both of them would be so by (8). Hence  $f$  and  $g$  are reduced to constants, which is a contradiction. Therefore this case is impossible.

b) Assume  $1-(c_2/c_1)=0$  and  $1-(c_3/c_1) \neq 0$ .

Clearly  $e^{\beta-\alpha} \equiv k_2$ , where  $k_2$  is a constant which depends on  $b=a_1$ , and  $k_2 \neq 0, 1$ .

Then we have  $f=(1-e^\beta/1-k_2)$  by (2). For any complex number  $c$  we obtain

$$f-c = \frac{1}{1-k_2} \{1-c(1-k_2)-e^\beta\}.$$

If  $1 - c(1 - k_2) \neq 0$ , then

$$\delta(c, f) = 0.$$

Since  $\delta(\infty, f) = 1$ , it follows from (1)

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \delta(a_i, f) > \frac{p}{p+2}.$$

Hence there exists one and only one  $a_j$  in  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p$  such that

$$1 - a_j(1 - k_2) = 0.$$

Thus

$$f = a_j(1 - e^\beta), \quad g = (1 - a_j)(1 - e^{-\beta}).$$

Consequently

$$(f - a_j)(g + a_j - 1) \equiv a_j(1 - a_j),$$

and in this case  $a_j$  and  $1 - a_j$  are Picard exceptional values of  $f$  and  $g$  respectively, and also  $\infty$  is so.

c) Assume  $1 - (c_2/c_1) \neq 0$  and  $1 - (c_3/c_1) = 0$ .

Clearly  $e^\beta \equiv \text{const.}$ . As the same as the case when  $c_1 = 0$ , this case is impossible too.

In fact, then we have  $f \neq 0$  and

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \delta(a_i, f) + \delta(\infty, f) \leq 1$$

by Nevanlinna's second fundamental theorem.

d) Assume  $1 - (c_2/c_1) = 0$  and  $1 - (c_3/c_1) = 0$ .

Clearly we have  $c_1 = c_2 = c_3$ , which contradicts  $\sum_{i=1}^3 f_i \equiv 1$ . Thus this case is also impossible.

Summarize the above, we conclude that under the hypotheses of the theorem, there exists one and only one  $a_j$  in  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p$  such that  $a_j$  and  $1 - a_j$  are Picard exceptional values of  $f$  and  $g$  respectively, and also  $\infty$  is so, and

$$(f - a_j)(g + a_j - 1) \equiv a_j(1 - a_j).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

*Acknowledgement.* I am grateful to the referee for valuable comments.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] G.G. GUNDERSEN, Meromorphic functions that share three or four values, J. London Math. Soc., (2), 20 (1979), 457-466.
- [2] W.K. HAYMAN, Meromorphic functions, Clarendon Press. Oxford, 1964.
- [3] H. UEDA, Unicity theorems for meromorphic or entire functions, Kodai Math. J., 3 (1980), 457-471.

- [ 4 ] HONG-XUN YI, Meromorphic functions that share three values, Chin. Ann. Math., **9A** (1988), 434-439.
- [ 5 ] F. GROSS, Factorization of meromorphic functions, U.S. Govt. Printing Office Publication, Washington D.C., 1972.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
WENZHOU TEACHER'S COLLEGE  
WENZHOU, ZHEJIANG, 325000  
P. R. OF CHINA