

Uniqueness of Meromorphic Function and its Differential Polynomial Concerning Weakly Weighted-Sharing ¹

Hong-Yan Xu, Yi Hu

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce the definition of weakly weighted-sharing which is between "CM" and "IM". Using the notion of weakly weighted-sharing, we investigate problems of meromorphic functions that share a small function with its differential polynomial, and give some results and also answer some questions of Kit-Wing Yu, which were also studied by L.P.Liu and Y.X. Gu[L.P. Liu and Y.X.Gu, Uniqueness of meromorphic functions that share one small function with their derivatives, Kodai. Math. J. 27 (2004), 272-279.], S.H. Lin and W.C. Lin[S.H.Lin and W.C.Lin, Uniqueness of meromorphic functions concerning weakly weighted-sharing, Kodai.Math.J.,29 (2006),269-280.].

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 30D30, 30D35.

Key words and phrases: Meromorphic function, Uniqueness theorem, Small function, Weakly-sharing.

1 Introduction and results

In this paper a meromorphic function will mean meromorphic in the whole complex plane. We shall use the standard notation in Nevanlinna's value distribution theory of meromorphic functions such as $T(r, f)$, $N(r, f)$ and $m(r, f)$ (see [4] or [10]). We denote by $S(r, f)$ any quantity satisfying $S(r, f) = o(T(r, f))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ except possibly for a set of r of finite linear measure. A meromorphic function $a(z)$ is called a small function with respect to $f(z)$ if $T(r, a) = S(r, f)$. Let $S(f)$ be the set of meromorphic functions in the complex plane \mathbf{C} which are small functions with respect to f .

¹Received 04 March, 2010

Accepted for publication (in revised form) 30 August, 2011

Let $a \in S(f)$, we say that two meromorphic functions f and g share a *IM* (*CM*) provided that $f - a$ and $g - a$ have the same zeros ignoring (counting) multiplicities.

Mues and Steinmetz [8], Gundersen [3], Yang [12] and Yi [11], and many other authors have obtained elegant results on the uniqueness problems of entire functions that share values *CM* or *IM* with their first or n -th derivatives.

In 2003, Yu [9] considered the uniqueness problem of an entire function or meromorphic function when it shares one small function with its derivative and proved the following results.

Theorem A Let $n \geq 1$, let f be a non-constant entire function, $a \in S(f)$ and $a \neq 0, \infty$. If $f, f^{(n)}$ share a *CM* and $\delta(0, f) > \frac{3}{4}$, then $f \equiv f^{(n)}$.

Theorem B Let $n \geq 1$, let f be a non-constant non-entire meromorphic function, $a \in S(f)$ and $a \neq 0, \infty$, f and a do not have any common pole. If $f, f^{(n)}$ share a *CM* and $4\delta(0, f) + 2(8 + n)\Theta(\infty, f) > 19 + 2n$, then $f \equiv f^{(n)}$.

In the same paper, Yu [9] posed the following open question:

Question A Can a *CM* shared value be replaced by an *IM* shared value in Theorem A?

Question B Is the condition $\delta(0, f) > 3/4$ sharp in Theorem A?

Question C Is the condition $4\delta(0, f) + 2(8 + n)\Theta(\infty, f) > 19 + 2n$ sharp in Theorem B?

Question D Can the condition " f and a do not have any common pole" be deleted in Theorem B?

In 2004, Liu and Gu [7] applied a different method and obtained the following results.

Theorem C Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function, $a \in S(f)$ and $a \neq 0, \infty$. If $f, f^{(n)}$ share a *CM*, f and a do not have any common pole of same multiplicity and $2\delta(0, f) + 4\Theta(\infty, f) > 5$, then $f \equiv f^{(n)}$.

Theorem D Let $n \geq 1$, let f be a non-constant entire function, $a \in S(f)$ and $a \neq 0, \infty$. If $f, f^{(n)}$ share a *CM* and $\delta(0, f) > \frac{1}{2}$, then $f \equiv f^{(n)}$.

Let

$$L(f) = f^{(n)} + a_{n-1}f^{(n-1)} + \cdots + a_0f, \quad (*)$$

be a differential polynomial on f , where $a_j (j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1) \in S(f)$.

Question 1: what happens if $f^{(n)}$ is replaced by $L(f)$ in Theorem C and D?

In order to state our results, we first introduce the definition of weakly weighted-sharing as followed.

Definition 1 Let k be a positive integer, and let f be a meromorphic function and $a \in S(f)$.

- (i) $\overline{N}(r, a; f) \geq k$ denotes the counting function of zeros of $f - a$ whose multiplicities are not greater than k , where each zero is counted only once.
- (ii) $\overline{N}(r, a; f) \leq k$ denotes the counting function of zeros of $f - a$ whose multiplicities are not less than k , where each zero is counted only once.
- (iii) $N_p(r, a; f) = \overline{N}(r, a; f) + \sum_{k=2}^p \overline{N}(r, a; f) \geq k$.

Definition 2 [5] For any complex number $c \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, We denote by $\delta_p(c, f)$ the quantity

$$\delta_p(c, f) = 1 - \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_p(r, c; f)}{T(r, f)},$$

where p is a positive integer. Clearly $\delta_p(c, f) \geq \delta(c, f)$.

Let $N_E(r, a)$ be the counting function of all common zeros of $f - a$ and $g - a$ with the same multiplicities, and $N_0(r, a)$ be the counting functions of all common zeros of $f - a$ and $g - a$ ignoring multiplicities. Denotes by $\overline{N}_E(r, a)$ and $\overline{N}_0(r, a)$ the reduced counting functions of f and g corresponding to the counting functions $N_E(r, a)$ and $N_0(r, a)$, respectively. If

$$\overline{N}(r, a; f) + \overline{N}(r, a; g) - 2\overline{N}_E(r, a) = S(r, f) + S(r, g),$$

then we say that f and g share a "CM". If

$$\overline{N}(r, a; f) + \overline{N}(r, a; g) - 2\overline{N}_0(r, a) = S(r, f) + S(r, g),$$

then we say that f and g share a "IM".

Definition 3 Let f and g be two nonconstant meromorphic functions sharing a "IM", for $a \in S(f) \cap S(g)$, and a positive integer k or ∞ .

- (i) $\overline{N}_E^{(k)}(r, a)$ denotes the counting function of zeros of $f - a$ whose multiplicities are equal to the corresponding zeros of $g - a$, both of their multiplicities are not greater than k , where each zero is counted only once.
- (ii) $\overline{N}_0^{(k)}(r, a)$ denotes the reduced counting function of zeros of $f - a$ which are zeros of $g - a$, both of their multiplicities are not less than k , where each zero is counted only once.
- (iii) Let z_0 be the zeros of $f - a$ with multiplicity p and zeros of $g - a$ with multiplicity q . Denote by $\overline{N}_{f>k}(r, a; g)$ the reduced counting function of those zeros of $f - a$ and $g - a$ such that $p > q = k$. $\overline{N}_{g>k}(r, a; f)$ is defined analogously.
- (iv) $\overline{N}_*(r, a; f, g)$ denotes the reduce counting function of zeros of $f - a$ whose multiplicities differ from the multiplicities of the corresponding zeros of $g - a$.

Clearly

$$\overline{N}_*(r, a; f, g) \equiv \overline{N}_*(r, a; g, f) \text{ and } \overline{N}_*(r, a; f, g) = \overline{N}_L(r, a; f) + \overline{N}_L(r, a; g).$$

Definition 4 For $a \in S(f) \cap S(g)$, if k is a positive integer or ∞ , and

$$\overline{N}(r, a; |f| \leq k) - \overline{N}_E^{(k)}(r, a) = S(r, f), \overline{N}(r, a; |f| \geq k + 1) - \overline{N}_0^{(k+1)}(r, a) = S(r, f);$$

$$\overline{N}(r, a; |g| \leq k) - \overline{N}_E^{(k)}(r, a) = S(r, g), \overline{N}(r, a; |g| \geq k + 1) - \overline{N}_0^{(k+1)}(r, a) = S(r, g).$$

Or if $k = 0$ and

$$\overline{N}(r, a; f) - \overline{N}_0(r, a) = S(r, f), \quad \overline{N}(r, a; g) - \overline{N}_0(r, a) = S(r, g),$$

where $\overline{N}_0(r, a)$ is the reduce counting functions of all common zeros of $f - a$ and $g - a$ ignoring multiplicities, then we say f and g weakly share a with weight k . Here, we write f, g share " (a, k) " to mean that f, g weakly share a with weight k .

Obviously, if f and g share " (a, k) ", then f and g share " (a, p) " for any p ($0 \leq p \leq k$). Also, we note that f and g share a "IM" or "CM" if and only if f and g share " $(a, 0)$ " or " (a, ∞) ", respectively.

Question 2: Can a CM shared value be replaced by weakly weighted-sharing in Theorem C and Theorem D?

In this paper, we obtain some uniqueness theorems which answer **Question 1** and **Question 2** as followed.

Theorem 1 Let $n \geq 1$ and $2 \leq k \leq \infty$, let f be a non-constant meromorphic function, $a \in S(f)$ and $a \neq 0, \infty$. Suppose that $L(f)$ is defined by (*), If $f, L(f)$ share " (a, k) " and

$$(1) \quad 4\Theta(\infty, f) + 2\delta_{2+n}(0, f) > 5,$$

then $f \equiv L(f)$.

Theorem 2 Let $n \geq 1$, let f be a non-constant meromorphic function, $a \in S(f)$ and $a \neq 0, \infty$. Suppose that $L(f)$ is defined by (*), If $f, L(f)$ share " $(a, 1)$ " and

$$(2) \quad \left(\frac{7}{2} + n\right)\Theta(\infty, f) + \frac{3}{2}\delta_2(0, f) + \delta_{2+n}(0, f) > n + 5,$$

then $f \equiv L(f)$.

Theorem 3 Let $n \geq 1$, let f be a non-constant meromorphic function, $a \in S(f)$ and $a \neq 0, \infty$. Suppose that $L(f)$ is defined by (*), If $f, L(f)$ share " $(a, 0)$ " and

$$(3) \quad (6 + 2n)\Theta(\infty, f) + \delta_2(0, f) + 2\Theta(0, f) + 2\delta_{2+n}(0, f) > (2n + 10),$$

then $f \equiv L(f)$.

From Theorem 1.5-1.7 we have

Corollary 1 Let f be a non-constant entire function and $a \equiv a(z) (\neq 0, \infty)$ be a meromorphic function such that $T(r, a) = S(r, f)$. If $f, L(f)$ share " (a, k) ", $k \geq 2$ and $\delta_{2+n}(0, f) > \frac{1}{2}$, or if $f, L(f)$ share " $(a, 1)$ " and $\delta_{2+n}(0, f) > \frac{3}{5}$, or if $f, L(f)$ share " $(a, 0)$ " and $\delta_{2+n}(0, f) > 2 - \frac{1}{2}(\delta_2(0, f) + 2\Theta(0, f))$, then $f \equiv L(f)$, where $L(f)$ is defined by (*).

2 Some lemmas

Next, we introduce some notations for the following lemmas.

Lemma 1 *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function, $L(f)$ be defined by (*), If $L(f) \neq 0$, we have*

- (i) $N_2(r, 0; L) \leq N_{2+n}(r, 0; f) + n\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + S(r, f);$
- (ii) $N_2(r, 0; L) \leq T(r, L) - T(r, f) + N_{2+n}(r, 0; f) + S(r, f).$

Proof: By the first fundamental theorem and the lemma of logarithmic derivatives, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
 N_2(r, 0; L) &\leq N(r, 0; L) - \sum_{p=3}^{\infty} \overline{N}(r, 0; L | \geq p) \\
 &= T(r, L) - m(r, \frac{1}{L}) - \sum_{p=3}^{\infty} \overline{N}(r, 0; L | \geq p) + O(1) \\
 &\leq T(r, L) - m(r, \frac{1}{f}) - m(r, \frac{L}{f}) - \sum_{p=3}^{\infty} \overline{N}(r, 0; L | \geq p) + O(1) \\
 &\leq T(r, L) - T(r, f) + N(r, 0; f) - \sum_{p=3}^{\infty} \overline{N}(r, 0; L | \geq p) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq T(r, L) - T(r, f) + N_{2+n}(r, 0; f) + \sum_{p=3+n}^{\infty} \overline{N}_{(p)}(r, 0; f) \\
 &\quad - \sum_{p=3}^{\infty} \overline{N}(r, 0; L | \geq p) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq T(r, L) - T(r, f) + N_{2+n}(r, 0; f) + S(r, f).
 \end{aligned}$$

So this proves Lemma (ii).

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
 T(r, L) &= m(r, L) + N(r, \infty; L) \\
 &\leq m(r, f) + m(r, \frac{L}{f}) + N(r, \infty; f) + n\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) \\
 &= T(r, f) + n\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + S(r, f).
 \end{aligned}$$

From this and Lemma (ii), we can prove Lemma (i).

Lemma 2 [11] *Let k be a nonnegative integer or ∞ , F and G be two nonconstant meromorphic functions, F and G share “(1, k)”. Let*

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

If $H \neq 0$, $2 \leq k \leq \infty$, then

$$T(r, F) \leq N_2(r, \infty; F) + N_2(r, 0; F) + N_2(r, \infty; G) + N_2(r, 0; G) + S(r, F) + S(r, G).$$

The same inequalities holds for $T(r, G)$.

When f and g share 1 “IM”, $\overline{N}_L(r, 1; f)$ denotes the counting function of the 1-points of f whose multiplicities are greater than 1-points of g , where each zero is counted only once. Similarly, we denote $\overline{N}_L(r, 1; g)$, $N_E^1(r, 1; f)$ denotes the counting function of those simple 1-points of f and g , and $\overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1; f)$ denotes the counting function of those multiplicity 1-points of f and g , each point in these counting functions is counted only once. In the same way, one can define $N_E^1(r, 1; g)$, $\overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1; g)$.

Lemma 3 *If f, g be two nonconstant meromorphic functions such that they share " $(1, 1)$ ", then*

$$2\overline{N}_L(r, 1; f) + 2\overline{N}_L(r, 1; g) + \overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1; f) - \overline{N}_{f>2}(r, 1; g) \leq N(r, 1; g) - \overline{N}(r, 1; g).$$

Lemma 4 *Let f, g share " $(1, 1)$ ". Then*

$$\overline{N}_{f>2}(r, 1; g) \leq \frac{1}{2}\overline{N}(r, 0; f) + \frac{1}{2}\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) - \frac{1}{2}\overline{N}_0(r, 0; f') + S(r, f).$$

Lemma 5 *Let f and g be two nonconstant meromorphic functions sharing " $(1, 0)$ ". Then*

$$\overline{N}_L(r, 1; f) + 2\overline{N}_L(r, 1; g) + \overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1; f) - \overline{N}_{f>1}(r, 1; g) - \overline{N}_{g>1}(r, 1; f) \leq N(r, 1; g) - \overline{N}(r, 1; g).$$

Lemma 6 *Let f, g share " $(1, 0)$ ". Then*

$$\overline{N}_L(r, 1; f) \leq \overline{N}(r, 0; f) + \overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + S(r, f).$$

Lemma 7 *Let f, g share " $(1, 0)$ ". Then*

- (i) $\overline{N}_{f>1}(r, 1; g) \leq \overline{N}(r, 0; f) + \overline{N}(r, \infty; f) - \overline{N}_0(r, 0; f') + S(r, f);$
- (ii) $\overline{N}_{g>1}(r, 1; f) \leq \overline{N}(r, 0; g) + \overline{N}(r, \infty; f) - \overline{N}_0(r, 0; f') + S(r, g);$

Using the method of [1] and [2], we can prove Lemmas 2.3-2.7 easily. Here, we omit them.

3 Proof of main Theorems

Proof of Theorem 1.5

Let

$$(4) \quad F = \frac{f}{a}, \quad G = \frac{L(f)}{a}.$$

From the conditions of Theorem 1.5, we know that F and G share " $(1, k)$ ", and from (4), we have

$$(5) \quad T(r, F) = O(T(r, f)) + S(r, f), \quad T(r, G) = O(T(r, f)) + S(r, f).$$

$$(6) \quad \overline{N}(r, \infty; F) = \overline{N}(r, \infty; G) + S(r, f).$$

Let H be defined as in Lemma 2.2. Suppose that $H \neq 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.2 that

$$T(r, G) \leq N_2(r, \infty; F) + N_2(r, 0; F) + N_2(r, \infty; G) + N_2(r, 0; G) + S(r, F) + S(r, G).$$

Using Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, L) &\leq N_2(r, \infty; f) + N_2(r, 0; f) + N_2(r, \infty; L) + N_2(r, 0; L) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq N_{2+n}(r, 0; f) + T(r, L) - T(r, f) + N_{2+n}(r, 0; f) \\ &\quad + 4\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$T(r, f) \leq 2N_{2+n}(r, 0; f) + 4\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + S(r, f).$$

Which contradicts the assumption (1) of Theorem 1.5. Thus, $H \equiv 0$. That is

$$\frac{F''}{F'} - 2\frac{F'}{F-1} \equiv \frac{G''}{G'} - 2\frac{G'}{G-1}.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{1}{F-1} = \frac{A}{G-1} + B,$$

where $A (\neq 0)$ and B are constants. Thus

$$(7) \quad F = \frac{(B+1)G + (A-B-1)}{BG + (A-B)}$$

and $T(r, F) = T(r, G) + S(r, f)$.

Next, we consider three cases.

Case 1. $B \neq 0, -1$. If $A - B - 1 \neq 0$, then by (7) we know

$$\overline{N}\left(r, \frac{-A+B+1}{B+1}; G\right) = \overline{N}(r, 0; F).$$

By the Nevanlinna second fundamental theorem and Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, G) &< \overline{N}(r, \infty; G) + \overline{N}(r, 0; G) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{-A+B+1}{B+1}; G\right) + S(r, G) \\ &= \overline{N}(r, \infty; G) + \overline{N}(r, 0; G) + \overline{N}(r, 0; F) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, L) &< \overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + \overline{N}(r, 0; L) + \overline{N}(r, 0; f) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + T(r, L) - T(r, f) + N_{2+n}(r, 0; f) \\ &\quad + \overline{N}(r, 0; f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$T(r, f) < \overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + 2\overline{N}_{2+n}(r, 0; f) + S(r, f).$$

Which contradicts the assumption (1).

If $A - B - 1 = 0$, then by (7) we know $F = ((B+1)G)/(BG+1)$. Obviously,

$$\overline{N}\left(r, -\frac{1}{B}; G\right) = \overline{N}(r, \infty; F).$$

Similar to the arguments in the above, we also have a contradiction.

Case 2. $B = -1$. Then (7) becomes $F = A/(A+1-G)$.

If $A + 1 \neq 0$, then $\overline{N}(r, A + 1; G) = \overline{N}(r, \infty; F)$. Similarly, we can deduce a contradiction as in Case 1.

If $A + 1 = 0$, then $FG \equiv 1$, that is

$$(8) \quad f \cdot L(f) \equiv a^2.$$

From (8), we have

$$(9) \quad N(r, 0; f) + N(r, \infty; f) = S(r, f).$$

Since $N(r, f^{(n)}/f) = S(r, f)$, $m(r, f^{(n)}/f) = S(r, f)$, then $T(r, f^{(n)}/f) = S(r, f)$. From (9), we obtain

$$2T\left(r, \frac{f}{a}\right) = T\left(r, \frac{f^2}{a^2}\right) = T\left(r, \frac{a^2}{f^2}\right) + O(1) = T\left(r, \frac{L}{f}\right) + O(1) + S(r, f).$$

i.e.

$$T(r, f) = S(r, f),$$

we can get a contradiction.

Case 3. $B = 0$. Then (7) becomes $F = (G + A - 1)/A$.

If $A - 1 \neq 0$, then $\overline{N}(r, 1/(G + A - 1)) = \overline{N}(r, 1/F)$. Similarly, we can again deduce a contradiction as in Case 1.

If $A - 1 = 0$, then $F \equiv G$, that is

$$f \equiv L(f).$$

This completes the proof of the Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.6: Let F, G be given by (4), from the assumption of Theorem 1.6, we know that F and G share "(1, 1)".

Let H be defined as in Lemma 2.2. Suppose that $H \not\equiv 0$. Since F, G share "(1, 1)", we can get

$$(10) \quad \begin{aligned} & N(r, \infty; H) \\ & \leq \overline{N}(r, \infty; F) + \overline{N}(1; |F| \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; |F| \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, ; |G| \geq 2) \\ & \quad + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; F') + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; G') + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(11) \quad N(r, 1; |F| = 1) \leq N(r, 0; H) + S(r, f) \leq N(r, \infty; H) + S(r, f),$$

where $\overline{N}_0(r, 0; F')$ is the reduced counting function of those zeros of F' which are not the zeros of $F(F - 1)$, and $\overline{N}_0(r, 0; G')$ is similarly defined.

By the second fundamental theorem, we see that

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} & T(r, F) + T(r, G) \\ & \leq \overline{N}(r, \infty; F) + \overline{N}(r, 0; F) + \overline{N}(r, \infty; G) + \overline{N}(r, 0; G) \\ & \quad + \overline{N}(r, 1; F) + \overline{N}(r, 1; G) - N_0(r, 0; F') \\ & \quad - N_0(r, 0; G') + S(r, F) + S(r, G). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4, (10) and (11) we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \overline{N}(r, 1; F) + \overline{N}(r, 1; G) \\
 \leq & N(r, 1; F| = 1) + \overline{N}_L(r, 1; F) + \overline{N}_L(r, 1; G) \\
 & + \overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1; F) + \overline{N}(r, 1; G) \\
 \leq & N(r, 1; F| = 1) + N(r, 1; G) - \overline{N}_L(r, 1; F) \\
 (13) \quad & - \overline{N}_L(r, 1; G) + \overline{N}_{F>2}(r, 1; G) \\
 \leq & \overline{N}(r, 0; F| \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; G| \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, \infty; F) \\
 & + \overline{N}_*(r, 1; F, G) + T(r, G) - m(r, 1; G) + O(1) + \frac{1}{2}\overline{N}(r, \infty; F) \\
 & - \overline{N}_L(r, 1; F) - \overline{N}_L(r, 1; G) + \frac{1}{2}\overline{N}(r, 0; F) \\
 & + N_0(r, 0; F') + N_0(r, 0; G') + S(r, F) + S(r, G).
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (12) and (13), we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 T(r, F) & \leq \frac{7}{2}\overline{N}(r, \infty; F) + N_2(r, 0; F) + N_2(r, 0; G) + \frac{1}{2}\overline{N}(r, 0; F) \\
 & \leq \frac{7}{2}\overline{N}(r, \infty; F) + \frac{3}{2}N_2(r, 0; F) + N_2(r, 0; G) + S(r, f).
 \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of F, G and Lemma 2.1(i), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 T(r, f) & \leq \frac{7}{2}\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + \frac{3}{2}N_2(r, 0; f) + N_2(r, 0; L) + S(r, f) \\
 & \leq \left(\frac{7}{2} + n\right)\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + \frac{3}{2}N_2(r, 0; f) + N_{2+n}(r, 0; f) + S(r, f).
 \end{aligned}$$

By the Lemma 2.1, we have

$$T(r, f) \leq \left(\frac{7}{2} + n\right)\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + \frac{3}{2}N_2(r, 0; f) + N_{2+n}(r, 0; f) + S(r, f).$$

So

$$\left(\frac{7}{2} + n\right)\Theta(\infty, f) + \frac{3}{2}\delta_2(0, f) + \delta_{2+n}(0, f) \leq n + 5.$$

Which contradicts the assumption (2) of Theorem 1.6. Thus, $H \equiv 0$.

Similar to the arguments in Theorem 1.5, we can prove that the conclusions of Theorem 1.6 hold.

Proof of Theorem 1.7: Let F, G be given by (4), from the assumption of Theorem 1.6, we know that F and G share "(1, 0)".

Let H be defined as in Lemma 2.2. Suppose that $H \not\equiv 0$. Since F, G share "(1, 0)", we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
 (14) \quad N(r, \infty; H) & \leq \overline{N}(r, \infty; F) + \overline{N}(1; F| \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; F| \geq 2) \\
 & + \overline{N}(r, ; G| \geq 2) + \overline{N}_L(r, 1; F) + \overline{N}_L(r, 1; G) \\
 & + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; F') + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; G') + S(r, f),
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$N_E^{(1)}(r, 1; F) = N_E^{(1)}(r, 1; G) + S(r, f), \quad N_E^{(2)}(r, 1; F) = N_E^{(2)}(r, 1; G) + S(r, f),$$

$$(15) \quad N_E^1(r, 1; F) \leq N(r, \infty; H) + S(r, f).$$

Using Lemmas 2.5-2.7 and (14) and (15), we get

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \overline{N}(r, 1; F) + \overline{N}(r, 1; G) \\ & \leq \overline{N}_L(r, 1; F) + \overline{N}_L(r, 1; G) + \overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1; F) + \overline{N}(r, 1; G) \\ & \leq N_E^1(r, 1; F) + N(r, 1; G) - \overline{N}_L(r, 1; G) \\ & \quad + \overline{N}_{F>1}(r, 1; G) + \overline{N}_{G>1}(r, 1; G) \\ & \leq \overline{N}(r, 0; F | \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; G | \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, \infty; F) \\ & \quad + \overline{N}_*(r, 1; F, G) + T(r, G) - m(r, 1; G) + O(1) \\ & \quad - \overline{N}_L(r, 1; G) + \overline{N}_{F>1}(r, 1; G) + \overline{N}_{G>1}(r, 1; G) \\ & \quad + N_0(r, 0; F') + N_0(r, 0; G') + S(r, F) + S(r, G). \end{aligned}$$

Combining (12) and (16) and by Lemma 2.1, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) & \leq 6\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + N_2(r, 0; f) + 2\overline{N}(r, 0; f) + 2\overline{N}_2(r, 0; L) + S(r, f) \\ & \leq (2n + 6)\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + N_2(r, 0; f) + 2\overline{N}(r, 0; f) \\ & \quad + 2\overline{N}_{2+n}(r, 0; f) + S(r, f) \end{aligned}$$

So

$$(6 + 2n)\Theta(\infty, f) + \delta_2(0, f) + 2\Theta(0, f) + 2\delta_{2+n}(0, f) \leq (2n + 10).$$

Which contradicts the assumption (3) of Theorem 1.7. Thus, $H \equiv 0$.

Similar to the arguments in Theorem 1.5, we can prove that the conclusions of Theorem 1.7 hold.

4 Acknowledgements

The authors want to thanks the referee for his/her thorough review. This work was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of Jiang-Xi Province in China(Grant No. 2010GQS0119) and the Youth Foundation of Education Bureau of Jiangxi Province in China(Grant No. GJJ10223).

References

- [1] T. C. Alzahary, H.-X. Yi, *Weighted value sharing and a question of I. Lahiri*, Complex Var. Theory Appl., 49(15), 2004, 1063-1078.
- [2] A. Banerjee, *Meromorphic functions sharing one value*, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci., 22, 2005, 3587-3598.
- [3] G. G. Gundersen, *Meromorphic functions that share finite values with their derivative*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 75, 1980, 441-446, correction 86, 1982, 307.
- [4] W. K. Hayman, *Meromorphic function*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1964.

- [5] I. Lahiri, A. Sarkar, *Uniqueness of a meromorphic function and its derivative*, J. Inequal. Pure and Appl. Math., 5 2004, 1-9.
- [6] S.-H. Lin, W.-C. Lin, *Uniqueness of meromorphic functions concerning weakly weighted-sharing*, Kodai. Math. J., 29, 2006, 269-280.
- [7] L.-P. Liu, Y.-X. Gu, *Uniqueness of meromorphic functions that share one small function with their derivatives*, Kodai. Math. J., 27, 2004, 272-279.
- [8] E. Mues, N. Steinmetz, *Meromorphe funktionen, die mit ihrer ersten und zweiten ableitung einen endlichen wert teilen*, Complex Var. Theory Appl., 6, 1986, 51-71.
- [9] K.-W. Yu, *On entire and meromorphic functions that share small functions with their derivatives*, J. Inequal. Pure and Appl. Math., 4, 2003, 1-7.
- [10] L. Yang, Value distribution theory, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.
- [11] H.-X. Yi, *Uniqueness theorems for meromorphic functions whose n -the derivatives share the same 1-points*, Complex Var. Theory Appl., 34, 1997, 421-436.
- [12] L.-Z. Yang, *Entire functions that share finite values with their derivatives*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc., 41, 1990, 337-342.

Corresponding author: Hong-Yan XU

Jingdezhen Ceramic Institute
Department of Informatics and Engineering
Jingdezhen, Jiangxi, 333403, China
e-mail: xhyhhh@126.com

Yi HU

Jingdezhen Ceramic Institute
Department of Informatics and Engineering
Jingdezhen, Jiangxi, 333403, China
e-mail: hhhaaa123@163.com