Annales Univ. Sci. Budapest., Sect. Comp. 54 (2023) 71–94

DETERMINING A MEROMORPHIC FUNCTION BY ITS PREIMAGES OF FINITE SETS

Vu Hoai An (Hai Duong, Vietnam)
Ha Huy Khoai (Hanoi, Vietnam)
Nguyen Duy Phuong (Thai Nguyen, Vietnam)

Communicated by Bui Minh Phong

(Received April 18, 2023; accepted June 3, 2023)

Abstract. We give some sufficient conditions for the zero set of a polynomial to be a unique range set for meromorphic functions, in cases of ignoring multiplicity and with m-truncated multipilicity. As consequences, we obtained some previous results of Yi ([23]).

1. Introduction. Main results

In this paper, by a meromorphic function we mean a meromorphic function on the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$.

Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function on $\mathbb{C}$. For every $a \in \mathbb{C}$, we define the function $\nu_f^a : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{N}$ by

$$\nu_f^a(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } f(z) \neq a \\ d & \text{if } f(z) = a \text{ with multiplicity } d, \end{cases}$$

and set $\nu_f^\infty = \nu_{\frac{1}{f}}^0$. Define the function $\overline{\nu}_f^a : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{N}$ by $\overline{\nu}_f^a(z) = \min\ \{\nu_f^a(z), 1\}$ and set $\overline{\nu}_f^\infty = \overline{\nu}_{\frac{1}{f}}^0$.

Key words and phrases: Meromorphic function, uniqueness.
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 30D35.

Let m be a positive integer. For every $a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, we define the function $\nu^a_{f,m)}$ from $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ into $\mathbb{N}$ by

$$\nu^a_{f,m)}(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \nu^a_f(z) > m \\ \nu^a_f(z) & \text{if } \nu^a_f(z) \le m, \end{cases}$$

and set $\nu^\infty_{f,m)} = \nu^0_{\frac{1}{f},m)}$, and define the function $\overline{\nu}^a_{f,m)}$ from $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ into $\mathbb{N}$ by $\overline{\nu}^a_{f,m)}(z) = \min\ \{\overline{\nu}^a_{f,m)}(z), 1\}$, and set $\overline{\nu}^\infty_{f,m)} = \overline{\nu}^0_{\frac{1}{f},m)}$.

We denote by $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{C})$ the field of meromorphic functions in $\mathbb{C}$. For $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{C})$ and $S \subset \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, $S \neq \emptyset$, we define *the preimage of S counting multiplicity* by

$$E_f(S) = \bigcup_{a \in S} \{(z, \nu^a_f(z)) : z \in \mathbb{C}\},$$

and *the preimage of S ignoring multiplicity* by

$$\overline{E}_f(S) = \bigcup_{a \in S} \{(z, \overline{\nu}^a_f(z)) : z \in \mathbb{C}\}.$$

Furthermore, we define *the preimage of S counting multiplicity with m-truncated multiplicity* by

$$E_{f,m)}(S) = \bigcup_{a \in S} \{(z, \nu^a_{f,m)}(z)) : z \in \mathbb{C}\},$$

and by a similar manner,

$$\overline{E}_{f,m)}(S) = \bigcup_{a \in S} \{(z, \overline{\nu}^a_{f,m)}(z)) : z \in \mathbb{C}\}.$$

Note that $E_{f,1)}(S) = \overline{E}_{f,1)}(S)$ and $E_{f,1)}(S) \subset \overline{E}_f(S)$.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a nonempty subset of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{C})$ and let a set $S \subset \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. Two functions f, g of $\mathcal{F}$ are said to *share S, counting multiplicity* (share S CM) if $E_f(S) = E_g(S)$, to *share S, ignoring multiplicity* (share S IM) if $\overline{E}_f(S) = \overline{E}_g(S)$, and to *share S, counting multiplicity with m-truncated multiplicity* (share $\mathrm{S}_{m)}$ CM) if $E_{f,m)}(S) = E_{g,m)}(S)$, and to *share S, ignoring multiplicity with m-truncated multiplicity* (share $S_{m)}$ IM) if $\overline{E}_{f,m)}(S) = \overline{E}_{g,m)}(S)$. Let f, g be two non-constant meromorphic (entire) functions. If the condition $E_f(S) = E_g(S)$ (resp., $\overline{E}_f(S) = \overline{E}_g(S)$) implies $f = g$ for any two non-constant meromorphic (entire) functions f, g, then S is called a unique range set counting multiplicity (resp., ignoring multiplicity) for meromorphic (entire) functions, or in brief, URSM (URSE) (resp., URSM-IM (URSE-IM)). $S_{m)}$ is called a unique range set counting multiplicity with m-truncated multiplicity (resp., ignoring multiplicity with m-truncated multiplicity) for meromorphic (entire) functions if the condition $E_{f,m)}(S) = E_{g,m)}(S)$ (resp., $\overline{E}_{f,m)}(S) = \overline{E}_{g,m)}(S)$) implies $f = g$ for any pair of non-constant meromorphic (entire) functions, or in brief, URSM$_{m)}$-CM (URSE$_{m)}$ -CM) (resp., URSM$_{m)}$-IM (URSE$_{m)}$ -IM)).

In 1976 F. Gross ([9]) proved that there exist three finite sets S_j ($j = 1, 2, 3$) such that any two entire functions f and g satisfying $E_f(S_j) = E_g(S_j)$, $j = 1, 2, 3$ must be identical. In the same paper F. Gross posed the following question:

Question 1. *Can one find two (or possible even one) finite set S_j $(j = 1, 2)$ such that any two entire functions f and g must be identical if $E_f(S_j) = E_g(S_j)$ $(j = 1, 2)$?*

H. X. Yi [18]–[20], [22], [24] first gave an affirmative answer to Question 1. Since then, many results have been obtained for this and related topics (see [2]–[14], [16],[18]–[24]).

Concerning Question 1, a natural question is the following.

Question 2. *What is the smallest cardinality for such a finite set S such that any two non-constant meromorphic functions f and g must be identical, if either $E_f(S) = E_g(S)$ or $\overline{E}_f(S) = \overline{E}_g(S)$?*

So far, the best answer to Question 2 for the case of URSM was obtained by Frank and Reinders ([6]). They proved the following result.

Theorem A. *The set $\{z \in \mathbb{C} |\ P_{FR}(z) = \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2} z^n + n(n-2)z^{n-1} + \frac{(n-1)n}{2} z^{n-2} - c = 0\}$, where $n \geq 11$ and $c \neq 0, 1$, is a unique range set for meromorphic functions counting multiplicity.*

In 1997, H. X. Yi ([21]) first gave an answer to Question 2 for the case of URSM-IM with 19 elements. He considered polynomials of the form

$$P_Y(z) \in \mathbb{C}[z] : \quad P_Y(z) = z^n + a^m + b,$$

where $(m, n) = 1$, $n > 2m + 14$ and $m \geq 2$ and proved that $S = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid P_Y(z) = 0\}$ is a URSM-IM. Bartels's Theorem ([3]) said that $S = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid P_{FR}(z) = 0\}$ is a URSM-IM if $n \geq 17$. So far, the best answer to Question 2 for the case of URSM-IM was obtained by B. Chakraborty ([4]). He proved the following result.

Theorem B. *Let $S = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid P_{FR}(z) = 0\}$. If $n \geq 15$, then S is a* URSM-IM.

In [1] the following new class of unique range sets for meromorphic functions ignoring multiplicity with 15 elements was given.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}^*, n \geq 3$. Consider polynomial $P(z)$:

$$P_K(z) = z^n - \frac{2na}{n-1} z^{n-1} + \frac{na^2}{n-2} z^{n-2} + 1 = Q_K(z) + 1, \tag{1.1}$$

where $a \in \mathbb{C},\ a \neq 0$. Suppose that

$$Q_K(a) \neq -1, \quad -2 \tag{1.2}$$

Theorem C ([1]). *Let $P_K(z)$ be defined by* (1.1) *with condition* (1.2)*, and let $S = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid P(z) = 0\}$. If $n \geq 15$, then S is a* URSM-IM*.*

In 2000, H. Fujimoto established a sufficient condition for a finite subset S of $\mathbb{C}$ to be a uniqueness range set for meromorphic functions. Let us recall his result.

For a discrete subset $S = \{a_1, a_2, ..., a_n\} \subset \mathbb{C}$, we consider its generated polynomial with the following form

$$P(z) = (z - a_1)(z - a_2) \cdots (z - a_n). \tag{1.3}$$

Assume that the derivative of $P(z)$ has mutually distinct k zeros $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_k$ with multiplicities $m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_k$, respectively. We often consider polynomials satisfying the following condition introduced by Fujimoto [7]:

$$P(d_i) \neq P(d_j), 1 \leq i < j \leq k. \tag{1.4}$$

The number k is called the *derivative index* of $P(z)$.

A polynomial $P(z)$ is called a *strong uniqueness polynomial for meromorphic* (*entire*) *functions* if for arbitrary two non-constant meromorphic (entire) functions f and g, and a nonzero constant c, the condition $P(f) = cP(g)$ implies $f = g$ (see [2], [8], [12]). In this case we say $P(z)$ is a SUPM (SUPE).

Theorem D ([7]). *Let $P(z)$ be a polynomial of the form* (1.3) *satisfying the condition* (1.4)*. Suppose that $k \geq 3$, or $k = 2$ and $\min\{m_1, m_2\} \geq 2$, and $P(z)$ is a strong uniqueness polynomial.*

1. *If $n > 2k + 6$ ($n > 2k + 2$), then S is a* URSM (URSE)*.*
2. *If $n > 2k + 12$ ($n > 2k + 5$) , then S is a* URSM-IM (URSE-IM)*.*

Remark 1. Regarding theorems A, B, C, D, it is easy to see that, in the case of URSM (counting multiplicity), Theorem A is a consequence of Theorem D, since P_{FR} is a strong uniqueness polynomial of degree 8 [6, p. 191, Case 2]. However, in the case of URS-IM (ignoring multiplicity), Theorem B and Theorem C are not consequences of Theorem D, because with $k = 2$ we have $n \geq 17$.

From Remark 1, a natural question is the following.

Question 3. *Can one give some sufficient conditions for polynomial $P(z)$ such that $S = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid P(z) = 0\}$ is a* URSM-IM (URSE-IM) *for meromorphic (entire) functions, and then obtain Theorem B and Theorem C as consequences?*

Concerning Question 3, in 1997 H. X. Yi [23] considered $\text{URSM}_{m)}$ for polynomial P_{FR} and proved the following

Theorem E. *Let $S = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid P_{FR}(z) = 0\}$.*

1/ *If $n \geq 11$, then S is a* $\text{URSM}_{3)}$-CM.

2/ *If $n \geq 12$ ($n \geq 7$), then S is a* $\text{URSM}_{2)}$-CM ($\text{URSE}_{2)}$-CM).

3/ If $n \geq 15$ ($n \geq 9$), then S is a $\text{URSM}_{1)}$-CM ($\text{URSE}_{1)}$-CM).

In [12] it is given a sufficient condition for a finite subset S of $\mathbb{C}$ to be a $\text{URSM}_{m)}$-CM.

Theorem F. *Let $P(z)$ be a strong uniqueness polynomial of the form* (1.3) *satisfying the condition* (1.4) *with $P^{'}(z) = nz^{m_1}(z-d_2)^{m_2}\cdots(z-d_k)^{m_k}$ and $S = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid P(z) = 0\}$. Suppose that $k \geq 3$, or $k = 2$ and $\min\{m_1, m_2\} \geq 2$, and all zeros and poles of f and g have multiplicity at least s, l, respectively.*

1. *If $n > 2k - 2 + \frac{4}{s} + \frac{4}{l}$ ($n > 2k - 2 + \frac{4}{s}$), then S is a* URSM (URSE) *and is a* $\text{URSM}_{m)}$-CM ($\text{URSE}_{m)}$-CM) *with $m \geq 3$.*

2. *If $n > 2k - \frac{3}{2} + \frac{4}{s} + \frac{9}{2l}$ ($n > 2k - \frac{3}{2} + \frac{4}{s}$), then S is a* $\text{URSM}_{2)}$-CM ($\text{URSE}_{2)}$-CM)

3. *If $n > 2k + \frac{4}{s} + \frac{6}{l}$ ($n > 2k + \frac{4}{s}$), then S is a* $\text{URSM}_{1)}$-CM ($\text{URSE}_{1)}$-CM).

Remark 2. Regarding Theorems E, F, it is easy to see that, in the case of $\text{URSM}_{m)}$, Theorem E is a consequence of Theorem F, since P_{FR} is a strong uniqueness polynomial of degree 8 [6, p. 191, Case 2] and by taking $k = 2$, $s = 1, l = 1$ in Theorem F.

Note that $E_{f,1)}(S) = \overline{E}_{f,1)}(S)$, $E_{f,1)}(S) \subset \overline{E}_f(S)$ and $P^{'}_{FR}(z)$ and $P^{'}_{K}(z)$ both have a zero at 0 with higher multiplicities:

$$P^{'}_{FR}(z) = \frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{2} z^{n-3}(z-1)^2, \quad P^{'}_{K}(z) = nz^{n-3}(z-a)^2.$$

These facts and Remark 1, Remark 2 suggest us to consider polynomial $P(z)$ with $P^{'}(z) = nz^{m_1}(z-d_2)^{m_2}...(z-d_k)^{m_k}$.

We give some sufficient conditions for polynomial $P(z)$ such that $S = \{z \in \in \mathbb{C} \mid P(z) = 0\}$ is a uniqueness range set for the cases of ignoring multiplicity (URSM-IM and URSE-IM) and of ignoring multiplicity with m-truncated multiplicity ($\text{URSM}_{m)}$-IM and $\text{URSE}_{m)}$-IM). As consequences, we obtain Theorem

D in the case of URSM-IM and construct new uniqueness range sets for the cases of URSM-IM and URSE-IM, and of URSM$_{m)}$-IM and URSE$_{m)}$-IM. In particular, we obtain again Theorem B and Theorem C.

Now let us describe main results of the paper. We first give a sufficient condition for a finite subset S of $\mathbb{C}$ to be a uniqueness range set for the cases of URSM-IM and URSE-IM and of URSM$_{m)}$-IM and URSE$_{m)}$-IM.

Theorem 1. *Let $P(z)$ be a strong uniqueness polynomial of the form* (1.3) *satisfying the condition* (1.4) *with $P^{'}(z) = nz^{m_1}(z-d_2)^{m_2}\cdots(z-d_k)^{m_k}$ and $S = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid P(z) = 0\}$, and let m be a positive integer. Suppose $k \geq 3$, or $k = 2$ and $\min\{m_1, m_2\} \geq 2$.*

If $n > 2k + 10$ ($n > 2k + 4$), then S is a URSM-IM (URSE-IM) *and* URSM$_{m)}$-IM (URSE$_{m)}$-IM).

Corollary 2. *Theorem* 1 *implies Theorem D in the case of* URSM-IM (URSE-IM).

Indeed, suppose that $P(z)$ with $P^{'}(z) = n(z-d_1)^{m_1}(z-d_2)^{m_2}\cdots(z-d_k)^{m_k}$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem D in the case of URSM-IM. Write

$$P(z) = (z-d_1)^n + b_1(z-d_1)^{n-1} + \cdots + b_{n-1}z + b_0,$$

and set

$$R(z) = z^n + b_1 z^{n-1} + \cdots + b_{n-1}z + b_0, \quad t_i = d_i - d_1, \quad i = 1, \ldots, k,$$

and $T = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid R(z) = 0\}$. Then

$$P(z) = R(z-d_1), \; R^{'}(z) = nz^{m_1}(z-t_2)^{m_2}\cdots(z-t_k)^{m_k}.$$

Since $P(z)$ is a strong uniqueness polynomial and $\overline{E}_f(S) = \overline{E}_g(S)$, we see that $R(z)$ is a strong uniqueness polynomial of the form (1.3) satisfying the condition (1.4) with $R^{'}(z) = nz^{m_1}(z-t_2)^{m_2}\cdots(z-t_k)^{m_k}$ and $k \geq 3$, or $k = 2$ and $\min\{m_1, m_2\} \geq 2$ and $\overline{E}_f(T) = \overline{E}_g(T)$. Then, applying Theorem 1, we conclude that if $n > 2k+10$ ($n > 2k+4$), then T is a URSM-IM (URSE-IM). Therefore, S is a URSM-IM (URSE-IM) if $n > 2k+10$($n > 2k+4$).

As a consequence of Theorem 1, we construct following new uniqueness range sets, which are URSM-IM (URSE-IM) and URSM$_{m)}$-IM (URSE$_{m)}$-IM).

Let l, p be positive integers, and let $a \in \mathbb{C}$ be a nonzero constant. Set

$$P(z) = (l+p+1)\Big(\sum_{i=0}^{p}\binom{p}{i}\frac{(-1)^i}{l+p+1-i}a^i z^{l+p+1-i}\Big) + 1, \tag{1.5}$$

For simplicity, we set $n = l + p + 1$ and

$$Q(z) = (l + p + 1)\Bigg(\sum_{i=0}^{p} \binom{p}{i} \frac{(-1)^i}{l + p + 1 - i} a^i z^{l+p+1-i}\Bigg).$$

Then $P(z) = Q(z) + 1$. Suppose that

$$Q(a) \neq -1, \; \neq -2. \tag{1.6}$$

Note that $P(z)$, defined by (1.5) with condition (1.6), is a polynomial of degree $n = l + p + 1$ having no multiple zeros.

So, $P^{'}(z) = nz^l(z - a)^p$ has a zero at 0 of order l.

Note that polynomials of the form (1.6) were investigated in [2] and [12].

Then we prove the following

Theorem 2. *Let $P(z)$ be defined by* (1.5) *with conditions* (1.6) *and let $S = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid P(z) = 0\}$. If $n \geq 15$ ($n \geq 7$), then S is a* URSM-IM (URSE-IM) *and* URSM$_{m)}$-IM (URSE$_{m)}$-IM)*.*

Remark 3. By using Theorem 1, we can construct uniqueness range sets for case $k \geq 2$. In paticular, we obtain Yi's Theorem in [21], Bartels's Theorem in [3], Theorem B, and Theorem C, by taking P_Y, P_{FR}, P_K to be strong uniqueness polynomials, respectively.

2. Lemmas and definitions

We assume that the reader is familiar with the notations of the Nevanlinna theory (see, for example, [5], [15]). We need some lemmas.

Lemma 2.1. ([5, p. 98], [15, p. 43]) *Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function on $\mathbb{C}$ and let $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_q$ be distinct points of $\mathbb{C}$. Then*

$$(q-1)T(r, f) \leq \overline{N}(r, f) + \sum_{i=1}^{q} \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f - a_i}) - N_0(r, \frac{1}{f'}) + S(r, f),$$

where $N_0(r, \frac{1}{f'})$ is the counting function of those zeros of f', which are not zeros of function $(f - a_1) \cdots (f - a_q)$, and $S(r, f) = o(T(r, f))$ for all r, except for a set of finite Lebesgue measure.

Lemma 2.2. ([17, Lemma 3]) *For any non-constant meromorphic function f,*

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f'}) \leq N(r, \frac{1}{f}) + \overline{N}(r, f) + S(r, f).$$

Definition. Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function, and k be a positive integer. For simplicity, we set $\nu_f(z) = \nu_f^0(z)$ and denote by $\overline{N}_{(k}(r,f)$ (resp., $\overline{N}_{(k}(r,\frac{1}{f})$) the counting function of the poles (resp., zeros of f with $\nu_f(z) \geq k$) with $\nu_f^\infty \geq k$, where each pole (zero) is counted only once. We also denote by $\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f'}; f \neq 0)$ the counting function of the zeros z of $f^{'}$ satisfying $f(z) \neq 0$, where each zero is counted only once.

Let be given two non-constant meromorphic functions f and g. For simplicity, denote by $\nu_1(z) = \nu_f(z)$ (resp., $\nu_2(z) = \nu_g(z)$), if z is a zero of f (resp., g). Let $\overline{E}_f(0) = \overline{E}_g(0)$. We denote by $N(r,\frac{1}{f};\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 1)$ (resp., $\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f};\nu_1 > \nu_2)$) the counting function of the common zeros z, satisfying $\nu_1(z) = \nu_2(z) = 1$ (resp., $\nu_1(z) > \nu_2(z) \geq 1$), where each zero is counted only once) and by $N(r,\frac{1}{f};\nu_1 \geq 2)$ the counting function of the zeros z of f, satisfying $\nu_1(z) \geq 2$. Similarly, we define the counting functions $\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g};\nu_2 > \nu_1)$, $\quad N(r,\frac{1}{g};\nu_2 \geq 2)$.

Let m be a positive integer and $\overline{E}_{f,m)}(0) = \overline{E}_{g,m)}(0)$.

We denote by $\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f}; m \geq \nu_1 > \nu_2)$ (resp., $\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g}; m \geq \nu_2 > \nu_1)$ the counting function of the common zeros z, satisfying $m \geq \nu_1(z) > \nu_2(z) \geq 1$ (resp., $m \geq \nu_2(z) > \nu_1(z) \geq 1$), where each zero is counted only once and by $N(r,\frac{1}{f}; m \geq \nu_1 \geq 2)$ (resp., $N(r,\frac{1}{g};\nu_2 \geq 2)$) the counting function of the zeros z of f, satisfying $m \geq \nu_1(z) \geq 2$ (resp., $m \geq \nu_2(z) \geq 2$).

Lemma 2.3. *Let f, g be two non-constant meromorphic functions. Set*

$$F = \frac{1}{f}, \quad G = \frac{1}{g}, \quad L = \frac{F^{''}}{F'} - \frac{G^{''}}{G'}, \quad S(r) = S(r,f) + S(r,g).$$

Suppose that $L \not\equiv 0$.

1) *If $E_{f,1)}(0) = E_{g,1)}(0)$, then*

$$\text{i)} \quad \overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f}) + \overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g}) \leq N(r,L) + \frac{1}{2}(N(r,\frac{1}{f}) + N(r,\frac{1}{g})) + S(r).$$

Moreover, if a is a common simple zero of f and g, then $L(a) = 0$.

$$\text{ii)} \quad N(r,L) \leq \overline{N}_{(2}(r,f) + \overline{N}_{(2}(r,g) + \overline{N}_{(2}(r,\frac{1}{f}) + \overline{N}_{(2}(r,\frac{1}{g}) +$$

$$+ \overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f'}; f \neq 0) + \overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g'}; g \neq 0).$$

2) *If* $\overline{E}_{f,m)}(0)=\overline{E}_{g,m)}(0)$, $m\geq 1$, *then*

i) $$\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f})+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g})+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f};m\geq\nu_1>\nu_2)+$$
$$+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g};m\geq\nu_2>\nu_1)\leq N(r,L)+\frac{1}{2}(N(r,\frac{1}{f})+N(r,\frac{1}{g}))+$$
$$+N(r,\frac{1}{f};m\geq\nu_1\geq 2)+N(r,\frac{1}{g};m\geq\nu_2\geq 2)+S(r).$$

ii) $$N(r,L)\leq\overline{N}_{(2}(r,f)+\overline{N}_{(2}(r,g)+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f};m\geq\nu_1>\nu_2)+$$
$$+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g};m\geq\nu_2>\nu_1)+\overline{N}_{(m+1}(r,\frac{1}{f})+\overline{N}_{(m+1}(r,\frac{1}{g})+$$
$$+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f'};f\neq 0)+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g'};g\neq 0).$$

iii) $$\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f})+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g})\leq\overline{N}_{(2}(r,f)+\overline{N}_{(2}(r,g)+$$
$$+\frac{1}{2}(N(r,\frac{1}{f})+N(r,\frac{1}{g}))+N(r,\frac{1}{f};\nu_1\geq 2)+N(r,\frac{1}{g};\nu_2\geq 2)+$$
$$+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f'};f\neq 0)+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g'};g\neq 0)+S(r).$$

3) *If* $\overline{E}_f(0)=\overline{E}_g(0)$, *then* (see: [13, Lemma 2.4], [14, Lemma 2.2], [1, Lemma 2.3])

i) $$N(r,L)\leq\overline{N}_{(2}(r,f)+\overline{N}_{(2}(r,g)+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f};\nu_1>\nu_2)+$$
$$+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g};\nu_2>\nu_1)+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f'};f\neq 0)+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g'};g\neq 0).$$

ii) $$\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f})+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g})+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f};\nu_1>\nu_2)+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g};\nu_2>\nu_1)\leq N(r,L)+$$
$$+\frac{1}{2}(N(r,\frac{1}{f})+N(r,\frac{1}{g}))+N(r,\frac{1}{f};\nu_1\geq 2)+$$
$$+N(r,\frac{1}{g};\nu_2\geq 2)+S(r).$$

iii) $$\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f})+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g})\leq\overline{N}_{(2}(r,f)+\overline{N}_{(2}(r,g)+\frac{1}{2}(N(r,\frac{1}{f})+N(r,\frac{1}{g}))+$$
$$+N(r,\frac{1}{f};\nu_1\geq 2)+N(r,\frac{1}{g};\nu_2\geq 2)+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f'};f\neq 0)+$$
$$+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g'};g\neq 0)+S(r).$$

Proof. We have

$$L=\frac{f''}{f'}-2\frac{f'}{f}-\frac{g''}{g'}+2\frac{g'}{g}. \tag{2.1}$$

We now consider the poles of L. By (2.1), it is clear that L has only simple poles, moreover, if a is a pole of L, then:

+ $f(a) = \infty$, or $f^{'}(a) = 0$ with $f(a) \neq 0$, or $f(a) = 0$, or

+ $g(a) = \infty$, or $g^{'}(a) = 0$ with $g(a) \neq 0$, or $g(a) = 0$.

Now let a be a pole of f with $\nu_f^{\infty}(a) = 1$, set

$$F(z) = R(z)(z-a),$$

where $R(z)$ is a holomorphic function; $R(a) \neq 0$. Then, we have

$$\frac{F"}{F'} = \frac{R".(z-a) + 2R^{'}}{R'.(z-a) + R}, \tag{2.2}$$

and similarly for a pole of g. From this, it implies that L has no poles at simple poles of f and g

1) i) Note that

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 \geq 2) \leq \frac{1}{2}(N(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 \geq 2), \quad \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g}; \nu_2 \geq 2) \leq \frac{1}{2}(N(r, \frac{1}{g}; \nu_2 \geq 2).$$

From this and since $E_{f,1)}(0) = E_{g,1)}(0)$, we have

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 = 1) = N(r, \frac{1}{g}; \nu_2 = 1),$$

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}) = N(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 = 1) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 \geq 2) \leq$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}N(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 = 1) + \frac{1}{2}(N(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 = 1) + N(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 \geq 2) =$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}N(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 = 1) + \frac{1}{2}N(r, \frac{1}{f}),$$

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g}) = N(r, \frac{1}{g}; \nu_2 = 1) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g}; \nu_2 \geq 2) \leq$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}N(r, \frac{1}{g}; \nu_1 = 1) + \frac{1}{2}(N(r, \frac{1}{g}; \nu_1 = 1) + N(r, \frac{1}{g}; \nu_1 \geq 2) =$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}N(r, \frac{1}{g}; \nu_1 = 1) + \frac{1}{2}N(r, \frac{1}{g}), \ \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g}) \leq$$

$$\leq N(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 = \nu_2 = 1) + \frac{1}{2}(N(r, \frac{1}{f}) + N(r, \frac{1}{g})). \tag{2.3}$$

Suppose a is a zero of f with multiplicity $\nu_1 = 1$. Since $E_{f,1)}(0) = E_{g,1)}(0)$, a is a zero of g with multiplicity $\nu_2 = 1$. Set

$$F = \frac{F_1}{z-a}, \quad G = \frac{G_1}{z-a},$$

where F_1, G_1 are holomorphic functions; $F_1(a) \neq 0; G_1(a) \neq 0$.

By straight calculations, we have

$$L = \frac{F_1^{"}.(z-a)}{F_1^{'}.(z-a) - F_1} - \frac{G_1^{"}.(z-a)}{G_1^{'}.(z-a) - G_1}. \tag{2.4}$$

This shows $L(a) = 0$ if a is a common simple zero of f and g.

Moreover, by the logarithmic derivative lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m(r, L) = m(r, \frac{F^{''}}{F'} - \frac{G^{''}}{G'}) &\leq m(r, \frac{F^{''}}{F'}) + m(r, \frac{G^{''}}{G'}) = \\ &= S(r, F^{'}) + S(r, G^{'}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 2.2 we get

$$T(r, F^{'}) \leq 2T(r, f) + S(r, f),\ T(r, G^{'}) \leq 2T(r, g) + S(r, g).$$

So

$$S(r, F^{'}) = S(r, f),\ S(r, G^{'}) = S(r, g).$$

From this and (2.4) we get

$$\begin{aligned} N(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 = \nu_2 = 1) \leq N(r, \frac{1}{L}) \leq T(r, \frac{1}{L}) &= T(r, L) + O(1) = \\ &= N(r, L) + m(r, L) + O(1) \leq \\ &\leq N(r, L) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned}$$

From this and (2.3) we obtain conclusion i).

ii) By (2.1)- (2.4) and note that L has only simple poles, we can see that if a is a pole of L, then

\+ $f(a) = \infty$ with $\nu_f^{\infty}(a) \geq 2$, or $f^{'}(a) = 0$ with $f(a) \neq 0$, or $f(a) = 0$ with $\nu_f(a) \geq 2$,

or

\+ $g(a) = \infty$ with $\nu_g^{\infty}(a) \geq 2$, or $g^{'}(a) = 0$ with $g(a) \neq 0$, or $g(a) = 0$ with $\nu_g(a) \geq 2$.

From this we obtain conclusion ii).

2) If $m = 1$, then

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}; m \geq \nu_1 > \nu_2) = 0,\ \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g}; m \geq \nu_1 > \nu_2) = 0,\ N(r, \frac{1}{f}; m \geq \nu_1 \geq 2) = 0,$$

$$N(r, \frac{1}{g}; m \geq \nu_1 \geq 2) = 0,\ \overline{N}_{(m+1}(r, \frac{1}{f}) = \overline{N}_{(2}(r, \frac{1}{f}),\ \overline{N}_{(m+1}(r, \frac{1}{f}) = \overline{N}_{(2}(r, \frac{1}{f}).$$

From this and Part 1) it follows that inequality 2) holds with $m = 1$.

Now we prove the inequality for $m \geq 2$.

i) By the hypothesis we have $\overline{E}_{f,m)}(0) = \overline{E}_{g,m)}(0)$, $m \geq 2$.

By using properties of the Stieltjes integral (see [5, p. 14]), we get:

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f}) - n(0, \frac{1}{f}) = \sum_{0<|a_i|<r} \log \frac{r}{|a_i|},$$

where a_i are zeros of f, counting multiplicity and

$$N_{(m}(r, \frac{1}{f}) - n(0, \frac{1}{f}) = \sum_{0<|a_i|<r} \log \frac{r}{|a_i|},$$

where a_i are zeros of f, counting multiplicity with m-truncated multiplicity and

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}) - \overline{n}(0, \frac{1}{f}) = \sum_{0<|a_i|<r} \log \frac{r}{|a_i|},$$

where a_i are zeros of f, ignoring multiplicity and

$$\overline{N}_{(m}(r, \frac{1}{f}) - \overline{n}(0, \frac{1}{f}) = \sum_{0<|a_i|<r} \log \frac{r}{|a_i|},$$

where a_i are zeros of f, ignoring multiplicity with m-truncated multiplicity. We obtain the similar equalities for $N(r, \frac{1}{f}; m \geq \nu_1 \geq 2)$, $\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g})$, $N_{(m}(r, \frac{1}{g})$, $\overline{N}_{(m}(r, \frac{1}{g})$, $\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}; m \geq \nu_1 > \nu_2)$, $N(r, \frac{1}{g}; m \geq \nu_2 \geq 2)$, $\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g}; m \geq \nu_2 > \nu_1)$. We are going to prove Part 2 by using these inequalities and the arguments in [13, Lemma 2.4], [14, Lemma 2.2], and [4, Lemma 2.6].

Set

$$M = \overline{N}_{m)}(r, \frac{1}{f}) + \overline{N}_{m)}(r, \frac{1}{g}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}; m \geq \nu_1 > \nu_2) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g}; m \geq \nu_2 > \nu_1),$$

$$T = N(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 = \nu_2 = 1) + \frac{1}{2}(N_{m)}(r, \frac{1}{f}) + N_{m)}(r, \frac{1}{g}))+$$
$$+ N(r, \frac{1}{f}; m \geq \nu_1 \geq 2) + N(r, \frac{1}{g}; m \geq \nu_2 \geq 2).$$

We first prove that $M \leq T$.

Let a be a zero of f with multiplicity $p \leq m$. From $\overline{E}_{f,m)}(0) = \overline{E}_{g,m)}(0)$ it follows that a is a zero of g with multiplicity $q \leq m$. We consider the following cases:

Case 1. $p = q \leq m$.

If $p = q = 1$, then a is counted with $1 + 1 + 0 + 0 = 2$ times in M and it is counted with $1 + \frac{1}{2}(1 + 1) = 2$ times in T.

If $p = q \geq 2$, then a is counted with $1 + 1 + 0 + 0 = 2$ times on M and it is counted with $0 + \frac{1}{2}(p + p) + p + p = 3p > 2$ times in T.

Case 2. $q < p \leq m$.

If $q = 1$, then $p \geq 2$ and a is counted with $1+1+1+0 = 3$ times in M and we see that a is counted with $0 + \frac{1}{2}(p + 1) + p + 0 = p + \frac{p+1}{2} > 3$ times in T.

If $q \geq 2$, then $p > 2$ and a is counted with $1 + 1 + 1 + 0 = 3$ times in M. we see that a is counted with $0 + \frac{1}{2}(p + q) + p + q = 0 + \frac{3(p+q)}{2} > 3$ times in T.

Case 3. $p < q \leq m$.

The proof of Case 3 is completed by using the arguments similar to ones in Case 2.

So $M \leq T$. Moreover,

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}) = \overline{N}_{m)}(r, \frac{1}{f}) + \overline{N}_{(m+1}(r, \frac{1}{f}),\ \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g}) = \overline{N}_{m)}(r, \frac{1}{g}) + \overline{N}_{(m+1}(r, \frac{1}{g});$$

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f}) = N_{m)}(r, \frac{1}{f}) + N_{(m+1}(r, \frac{1}{f}),\ N(r, \frac{1}{g}) = N_{m)}(r, \frac{1}{g}) + N_{(m+1}(r, \frac{1}{g});$$

$$\overline{N}_{(m+1}(r, \frac{1}{f}) \leq \frac{1}{2}N_{(m+1}(r, \frac{1}{f}),\ \overline{N}_{(m+1}(r, \frac{1}{g}) \leq \frac{1}{2}N_{(m+1}(r, \frac{1}{g}).$$

From this and $M \leq T$ it follow that

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}; m \geq \nu_1 > \nu_2) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g}; m \geq \nu_2 > \nu_1) \leq$$
$$\leq N(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 = \nu_2 = 1) + \frac{1}{2}(N(r, \frac{1}{f}) + N(r, \frac{1}{g}))+$$
$$+ N(r, \frac{1}{f}; m \geq \nu_1 \geq 2) + N(r, \frac{1}{g}; m \geq \nu_2 \geq 2).$$

By the proof of i) of Part 1) we get $N(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 = \nu_2 = 1) \leq N(r, L) + S(r)$. Combining above inequalities we obtain conclusion i) of 2.

ii) Suppose a is a zero of f with multiplicity $\nu_1 = p \leq m$. Since $\overline{E}_{f,m)}(0) = \overline{E}_{g,m)}(0)$, a is a zero of g with multiplicity $\nu_2 = q \leq m$. Set

$$F = \frac{F_1}{(z - a)^p},\ G = \frac{G_1}{(z - a)^q},$$

where F_1, G_1 are holomorphic functions; $F_1(a) \neq 0; G_1(a) \neq 0$. By straight calculations, we have

$$L = \frac{F_1''.(z - a) + (1 - p)F_1'}{F_1'.(z - a) - pF_1} - \frac{G_1''.(z - a) + (1 - q)G_1'}{G_1'.(z - a) - qG_1} + \frac{q - p}{z - a}. \tag{2.5}$$

This relation shows that L has a pole at a only if $p \neq q$ with $p \leq m$ and $q \leq m$, i.e. when f and g have a zero at a with different multiplicities and both multiplicities are $\leq m$. By (2.1)- (2.5) and note that L has only simple poles, we can see that if a is a pole of L, then

+ $f(a) = \infty$ with $\nu_f^\infty(a) \geq 2$, or $f'(a) = 0$ with $f(a) \neq 0$,

or

+ $f(a) = 0$ with $m \geq \nu_1(a) > \nu_2(a)$, or $g(a) = 0$ with $m \geq \nu_2(a) > \nu_1(a)$,

or

+ $f(a) = 0$ with $\nu_f(a) \geq m + 1$, or $g(a) = \infty$ with $\nu_g^\infty(a) \geq 2$,

or

+ $g'(a) = 0$ with $g(a) \neq 0$, or $g(a) = 0$ with $\nu_g(a) \geq m + 1$.

From this we obtain conclusion ii).

iii) Note that

$$\begin{aligned} N(r, \frac{1}{f}; m \geq \nu_1 \geq 2) + \overline{N}_{(m+1}(r, \frac{1}{f}) = N(r, \frac{1}{f}; m \geq \nu_1 \geq 2) + \\ + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 \geq m + 1) \leq \\ \leq N(r, \frac{1}{f}; \nu_1 \geq 2). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$N(r, \frac{1}{g}; m \geq \nu_1 \geq 2) + \overline{N}_{(m+1}(r, \frac{1}{g}) \leq N(r, \frac{1}{g}; \nu_1 \geq 2).$$

From the above inequalities and i), ii) it follows iii).

3. iii) The proof of this part is completed by using the arguments similar to ones in 2. iii). ∎

Lemma 2.4. ([8, Theorem 1.4]) *Let $P(z)$ be a polynomial of degree n satisfying the condition* (1.4). *Then $P(z)$ is a uniqueness polynomial if and only if*

$$\sum_{1 \leq l < m \leq k} q_l q_m > \sum_{i=1}^{k} q_l,$$

where k is the derivative index of P.

In particular, the above inequality is always satisfied whenever $k \geq 4$. When $k = 3$ and $\max\{m_1, m_2, m_3\} \geq 2$, or when $k = 2$, $\min\{m_1, m_2\} \geq 2$, and $m_1 + m_2 \geq 5$, the above inequality also holds.

H. Fujimoto [7, Proposition 7.1] proved the following:

Lemma 2.5. *Let $P(z)$ be a polynomial of degree n satisfying the condition* (1.4)*. Assume furthermore that $n \geq 5$ and there are two non-constant meromorphic function f and g such that*

$$\frac{1}{P(f)} = \frac{c_0}{P(g)} + c_1$$

for two constants $c_0 \neq 0$ and c_1. If $k \geq 3$ or if $k = 2$, $\min\{m_1, m_2\} \geq 2$, then $c_1 = 0$.

Lemma 2.6. ([2, Lemma 2.2]) $\sum_{i=0}^{p} \binom{p}{i} \frac{(-1)^i}{l+p+1-i}$ *is not an integer, where $l, p \geq$ ≥ 1 are integers.*

In [2, Lemma 2.2], Banerjee proved Lemma 2.6 for $l, p \geq 3$, but it is clear that this lemma is valid for $l, p \geq 1$.

We recall that, $P(z)$ is defined by (1.5):

$$P(z) = (l+p+1)\Big(\sum_{i=0}^{p} \binom{p}{i} \frac{(-1)^i}{l+p+1-i} a^i z^{l+p+1-i}\Big) + 1 = Q(z) + 1.$$

$$Q(z) = (l+p+1)\Big(\sum_{i=0}^{p} \binom{p}{i} \frac{(-1)^i}{l+p+1-i} a^i z^{l+p+1-i}\Big),$$

with the condition (1.6) $Q(a) \neq -1, \neq -2$, and degree of $P(z)$ is $n = l+p+1$.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $P(z)$ be defined by* (1.5) *with condition* (1.6)*, and let $l \geq 3$ and $p \geq 2$. Then $P(z)$ is a strong uniqueness polynomial for meromorphic functions.*

Proof. Note that, $P'(z) = nz^l(z-a)^p$, and $P'(z)$ has a zero at 0 with multiplicity l and a zero at a with multiplicity p.

By Lemma 2.6, we see that $\sum_{i=0}^{p} \binom{p}{i} \frac{(-1)^i}{l+p+1-i}$ is not an integer. Set

$$A = \sum_{i=0}^{p} \tbinom{p}{i} \frac{(-1)^i}{l+p+1-i}.$$

Then $A \neq 0$. We have $P(0) = Q(0) + 1 = 1$, $P(a) = Q(a) + 1 = nAa^n + 1$. From this and $a \neq 0$, we get $P(a) \neq P(0)$. Set $F = P(f)$, $G = P(g)$. From $P(f) = cP(g), c \neq 0$, it implies

$$F = cG,\ T(r,f) + S(r,f) = T(r,g) + S(r,g),\ S(r,f) = S(r,g). \tag{2.6}$$

Now we consider the following possible cases:

Case 1. $c \neq 1$.

If $c = P(a)$, from (2.6) we have

$$F - 1 = P(a)(G - \frac{1}{P(a)}). \tag{2.7}$$

We consider $P(z) - \frac{1}{P(a)}$. By $P(0) = 1$ and $P(a) = c \neq 1$ we obtain $P(0) - \frac{1}{P(a)} \neq 0$. Because $P(z)$ satisfies the condition (1.6) we have $Q(a) + 1 \neq -1$. Moreover, since $P(a) = nAa^n + 1 = Q(a) + 1 \neq -1$ and $P(a) = c \neq 1$ we obtain $P(a) - \frac{1}{P(a)} \neq 0$. Therefore $P(z) - \frac{1}{P(a)}$ has only simple zeros, let they be given by $b_i^{'}, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Note that $P(z) - 1$ has a zero at 0 with multiplicity $n - p = l + 1$, and p distinct simple zeros. Let $c_i^{'}, i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ be distinct simple zeros of $P(z) - 1$. Applying Lemma 2.1 to the function g and the values $b_1^{'}, b_2^{'}, \dots, b_n^{'}$, and by (2.6), (2.7) we get

$$\begin{aligned}(n-1)T(r,g) = (l+p)T(r,g) \leq \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r,g) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g - b_i^{'}}) + S(r,g) \leq \\ &\leq T(r,g) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}) + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f - c_i^{'}}) + S(r,g) \leq \\ &\leq T(r,g) + T(r,f) + pT(r,f) + S(r,g) = \\ &= (p+2)T(r,g) + S(r,g)\end{aligned}$$

So $(l-2)T(r,g) \leq S(r,g)$, a contradiction to the assumption that $l \geq 3$.

If $c \neq P(a)$, then from (2.6) we have

$$F - c = c(G - 1). \tag{2.8}$$

We consider $P(z) - c$. By $P(0) = 1$ and $c \neq 1$ we have $P(0) - c = 1 - c \neq 0$. Moreover $c \neq P(a)$. So $P(a) - c \neq 0$, $P(0) - c \neq 0$. Therefore $P(z) - c$ has only simple zeros, let they be given by $e_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Now we consider $P(z) - 1$. We see that $P(0) = 1, P(z) - P(0) = P(z) - 1$ has a zero at 0 with multiplicity $n - p = l + 1$, and p distinct simple zeros. Let $t_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ be distinct simple zeros of $P(z) - 1$. Applying Lemma 2.1 to the function f and the values $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n$, and by (2.8) we get

$$\begin{aligned}(n-1)T(r,f) = (l+p)T(r,f) \leq \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r,f) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g - e_i}) + S(r,f) \leq\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq T(r,f)+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{g})+\sum_{i=1}^{p}\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{f-t_i})+S(r,f)\leq$$
$$\leq T(r,f)+T(r,g)+pT(r,g)+S(r,f)=$$
$$=(p+2)T(r,f)+S(r,f).$$

So, $(l-2)T(r,f)\leq S(r,f)$, a contradiction to the assumption that $l\geq 3$.

Case 2. $c=1$. Then

$$P(f)=P(g).$$

Applying Lemma 2.4 to (2.8) we obtain $f=g$. ■

3. Proof of Theorems

3.1. Proof of Theorem 1.

Recall that $P(z)$ is a strong uniqueness polynomial of the form (1.3), $P(z)= =(z-a_1)\cdots(z-a_n)$ with $P^{'}(z)=nz^{m_1}(z-d_2)^{m_2}\cdots(z-d_k)^{m_k}$ and $P(z)$ satisfies the condition (1.4), $P(d_i)\neq P(d_j), 1\leq i<j\leq k$, where k is the derivative index of $P(z)$.

Let $S=\{z\in\mathbb{C}|\ P(z)=0\}$ and m be a positive integer. Suppose that $k\geq 3$, or $k=2$ and $\min\{m_1,m_2\}\geq 2$. We are going to prove that, if $n>2k+10$ ($n>2k+4$), then S is a URSM-IM (URSE-IM) and URSM$_{m)}$-IM (URSE$_{m)}$-IM).

3.1.1. $\boldsymbol{n>2k+10}$**.** In this case we will prove that S is a URSM-IM. Set

$$F=\frac{1}{P(f)},\ G=\frac{1}{P(g)},L=\frac{F^{''}}{F^{'}}-\frac{G^{''}}{G^{'}},$$

$$T(r)=T(r,f)+T(r,g),S(r)=S(r,f)+S(r,g).$$

Then $T(r,P(f))=nT(r,f)+S(r,f)$ and $T(r,P(g))=nT(r,g)+S(r,g)$, and hence $S(r,P(f))=S(r,f)$ and $S(r,P(g))=S(r,g)$.

We consider two following cases:

Case 1. $L\equiv 0$. Then we have $\frac{1}{P(f)}=\frac{c}{P(g)}+c_1$ for some constants $c\neq 0$ and c_1. By Lemma 2.5 we obtain $c_1=0$.

Therefore, there is a constant $C\neq 0$ such that $P(f)=CP(g)$. Because $P(z)$ is a strong uniqueness polynomial, we obtain $f=g$.

Case 2. $L\not\equiv 0$.

Claim 1. We show that

$$(3.1)\quad (n-2)T(r)\leq\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{P(f)})+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{P(g)})-N_0(r,\frac{1}{f^{'}})-N_0(r,\frac{1}{g^{'}})+S(r),$$

where $N_0(r, \frac{1}{f'})$ ($N_0(r, \frac{1}{g'})$) is the counting function of those zeros of f', which are not zeros of function

$$(f - a_1)...(f - a_n)f(f - d_2)...(f - d_k)((g - a_1)...(g - a_n)g(g - d_2)...(g - d_k)).$$

Indeed, applying Lemma 2.1 to the functions f, g and the values $a_1, \ldots, a_n$, $0, d_2, ..., d_k$, and noting that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f - a_i}) = \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{P(f)}),\ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g - a_i}) = \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{P(g)}),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(n + k - 1)T(r) \leq & \overline{N}(r, f) + \overline{N}(r, g) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{P(f)}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{P(g)}) + \\ & + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g}) + \sum_{i=2}^{k} \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f - d_i}) + \\ & + \sum_{i=2}^{k} \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g - d_i}) - N_0(r, \frac{1}{f'}) - N_0(r, \frac{1}{g'}) + S(r). \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{N}(r, f) + \overline{N}(r, g) &\leq (T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + S(r) = T(r) + S(r), \\ \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g}) &\leq (T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + S(r) = T(r) + S(r), \\ \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f - d_i}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g - d_i}) &\leq (k - 1)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + S(r) \\ &= (k - 1)T(r) + S(r), \quad i = 2, \ldots, k. \end{aligned}$$

From this and (3.2) we obtain (3.1).

Claim 2. We show that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{P(f)}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{P(g)}) \leq & (\frac{n}{2} + 3)T(r) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{[P(f)]'}; P(f) \neq 0) + \\ & + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{[P(g)]'}; P(g) \neq 0) + S(r). \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, by $\overline{E}_f(S) = \overline{E}_g(S)$ we get $(P(f))^{-1}(0) = (P(g))^{-1}(0)$. For simplicity, we set $\nu_1 = \nu_1(z)$, $\nu_2 = \nu_2(z)$, where $\nu_1(z) = \nu_{P(f)}(z)$, $\nu_2(z) = \nu_{P(g)}(z)$. Note that

$$\overline{N}_{(2}(r, P(f)) = \overline{N}(r, f),\ \overline{N}_{(2}(r, P(g)) = \overline{N}(r, g),$$

$$S(r, P(f)) = S(r, f),\ S(r, P(g)) = S(r, g), S(r) = S(r, f) + S(r, g).$$

Applying Part 3).iii) of Lemma 2.3 to the functions $P(f), P(g)$, we obtain

$$\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{P(f)})+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{P(g)}) \leq \overline{N}(r,f)+\overline{N}(r,g)+\frac{1}{2}(N(r,\frac{1}{P(f)})+N(r,\frac{1}{P(g)}))+$$
$$+N(r,\frac{1}{P(f)};\nu_1\geq 2)+N(r,\frac{1}{P(g)};\nu_2\geq 2))+$$
$$+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{[P(f)]'};P(f)\neq 0)+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{[P(g)]'};P(g)\neq 0)+S(r). \tag{3.3}$$

Moreover,

$$\overline{N}(r,f)+\overline{N}(r,g)\leq T(r)+S(r). \tag{3.4}$$

Obviously,

$$N(r,\frac{1}{P(f)}) \leq nT(r,f)+S(r,f);$$
$$N(r,\frac{1}{P(g)}) \leq nT(r,g)+S(r,g),$$
$$N(r,\frac{1}{P(f)})+N(r,\frac{1}{P(g)}) \leq nT(r)+S(r). \tag{3.5}$$

On the other hand, from $P(f)=(f-a_1)\cdots(f-a_n)$ it follows that, if z_0 is a zero of $P(f)$ with multiplicity ≥ 2, then z_0 is a zero of $f-a_i$ with multiplicity ≥ 2 for some $i\in\{1,2,\ldots,n\}$, and therefore, it is a zero of f', so we have

$$N(r,\frac{1}{P(f)};\nu_1\geq 2)\leq N(r,f').$$

From this and Lemma 2.2 we obtain

$$N(r,\frac{1}{P(f)};\nu_1\geq 2)\leq N(r,f')\leq N(r,\frac{1}{f})+\overline{N}(r,f)+S(r,f)\leq 2T(r,f)+S(r,f).$$

Similarly, we have

$$N(r,\frac{1}{P(g)};\nu_2\geq 2)\leq N(r,g')\leq N(r,\frac{1}{g})+\overline{N}(r,g)+S(r,g)\leq 2T(r,g)+S(r,g).$$

Therefore,

$$N(r,\frac{1}{P(f)};\nu_1\geq 2)+N(r,\frac{1}{P(g)};\nu_2\geq 2)\leq 2T(r)+S(r). \tag{3.6}$$

Combining (3.1)–(3.6) we get

$$\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{P(f)})+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{P(g)}) \leq (\frac{n}{2}+3)T(r)+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{[P(f)]'};P(f)\neq 0)+$$
$$+\overline{N}(r,\frac{1}{[P(g)]'};P(g)\neq 0)+S(r).$$

Claim 2 is proved.

Claim 3. We have

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{[P(f)]'}; P(f) \neq 0) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{[P(g)]'}; P(g) \neq 0) \leq$$
$$\leq kT(r) + N_0(r, \frac{1}{f'}) + N_0(r, \frac{1}{g'}) + S(r).$$

Indeed,

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{[P(f)]'}; P(f) \neq 0) = \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f^{m_1}(f-d_2)^{m_2}\cdots(f-d_k)^{m_k} f'}; P(f) \neq 0) \leq$$
$$\leq \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}) + \sum_{i=2}^{k} \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-d_i}) + \overline{N}_0(r, \frac{1}{f'}) \leq$$
$$\leq kT(r,f) + \overline{N}_0(r, \frac{1}{f'}) + S(r,f). \tag{3.7}$$

Similarly,

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{[P(g)]'}; P(g) \neq 0) \leq kT(r,g) + \overline{N}_0(r, \frac{1}{g'}) + S(r,g). \tag{3.8}$$

Inequalities (3.7) and (3.8) give us

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{[P(f)]'}; P(f) \neq 0) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{[P(g)]'}; P(g) \neq 0) \leq$$
$$\leq kT(r) + \overline{N}_0(r, \frac{1}{f'}) + \overline{N}_0(r, \frac{1}{g'}) + S(r).$$

Claim 3 is proved.

Claim 1, 2, 3 give us:

$$(n-2)T(r) \leq (\frac{n}{2} + 3 + k)T(r) + S(r).$$

Therefore, $(n - 2k - 10)T(r) \leq S(r)$, this is a contradiction to the assumption that $n > 2k + 10$. So $L \equiv 0$. Therefore $f = g$.

3.1.2. $n > 2k + 4$. We will prove that S is a URSE-IM. Note that, if f, g are entire functions, then

$$N(r,f) = 0, \quad N(r,g) = 0,$$
$$N(r,f') \leq N(r, \frac{1}{f}) + \overline{N}(r,f) + S(r,f) \leq$$
$$\leq T(r,f) + S(r,f),$$
$$N(r,g') \leq N(r, \frac{1}{g}) + \overline{N}(r,g) + S(r,g) \leq$$
$$\leq T(r,g) + S(r,g).$$

From this and by similar arguments as in the case of URSM-IM we see that, if $L \not\equiv 0$, then

$$(n-1)T(r) \leq \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{P(f)}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{P(g)}) - N_0(r, \frac{1}{f'}) - N_0(r, \frac{1}{g'}) + S(r),$$

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{P(f)}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{P(g)}) \leq (\frac{n}{2} + 1)T(r) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{[P(f)]'}; P(f) \neq 0) +$$

$$+\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{[P(g)]'}; P(g) \neq 0) + S(r),$$

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{[P(f)]'}; P(f) \neq 0) = \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f^{m_1}(f-d_2)^{m_2} \cdots (f-d_k)^{m_k} f'}; P(f) \neq 0) \leq$$

$$\leq \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f}) + \sum_{i=2}^{k} \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-d_i}) + \overline{N}_0(r, \frac{1}{f'}) \leq$$

$$\leq kT(r, f) + \overline{N}_0(r, \frac{1}{f'}) + S(r, f),$$

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{[P(g)]'}; P(g) \neq 0) \leq kT(r, g) + \overline{N}_0(r, \frac{1}{g'}) + S(r, g).$$

Combining above inequalities we obtain:

$$(n-1)T(r) \leq (\frac{n}{2} + 1 + k)T(r) + S(r).$$

So, $(n-2k-4)T(r) \leq S(r)$, a contradiction to the assumption that $n > 2k+4$. Thus we have $L \equiv 0$. The proof of this case is completed by using the arguments similar to ones in the case of URSM-IM.

3.1.3. $\boldsymbol{n > 2k+10}$**.** We prove that S is a URSM$_{m)}$. By the similar arguments as in the case of URSM-IM we can see that if $L \not\equiv 0$, then

$$(n-2)T(r) \leq \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{P(f)}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{P(g)}) - N_0(r, \frac{1}{f'}) - N_0(r, \frac{1}{g'}) + S(r).$$

Note that $E_{f,m)}(S) = \overline{E}_{f,m)}(S)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{N}_{(2}(r, P(f)) =& \overline{N}(r, f) \leq T(r, f) + S(r, f), \\
\overline{N}_{(2}(r, P(g)) =& \overline{N}(r, g) \leq T(r, g) + S(r, g), \\
S(r, P(f)) =& S(r, f),\ S(r, P(g)) = S(r, g), S(r) = S(r, f) + S(r, g).
\end{aligned}$$

Then applying Part 2).iii) of Lemma 2.3 to the functions $P(f), P(g)$ we get

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{P(f)}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{P(g)}) \leq \overline{N}(r, f) + \overline{N}(r, g) + \frac{1}{2}(N(r, \frac{1}{P(f)}) + \\ + N(r, \frac{1}{P(g)})) + N(r, \frac{1}{P(f)}; \nu_1 \geq 2) + N(r, \frac{1}{P(g)}; \nu_2 \geq 2)) + \\ + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{[P(f)]'}; P(f) \neq 0) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{[P(g)]'}; P(g) \neq 0) + S(r).$$

By the similar argument as in Claims 2, 3 of the case URSM-IM we get a contradiction to the assumption that $n > 2k + 10$. So $L \equiv 0$. The proof of this case is completed by using the arguments similar to ones in the case of URSM-IM.

3.1.4. $n > 2k + 4$. By using the arguments similar to ones in the cases of URSE-IM and URSM$_{m)}$ we can prove that S is a URSE$_{m)}$.

Theorem 1 is proved. ■

3.2. Proof of Theorem 2.

We recall that, $P(z)$ is defined by (1.5),

$$P(z) = (l + p + 1)\Big(\sum_{i=0}^{p} \tbinom{p}{i} \frac{(-1)^i}{l + p + 1 - i} a^i z^{l+p+1-i}\Big) + 1 = Q(z) + 1.$$

$$Q(z) = (l + p + 1)\Big(\sum_{i=0}^{p} \tbinom{p}{i} \frac{(-1)^i}{l + p + 1 - i} a^i z^{l+p+1-i}\Big),$$

with the condition (1.6), $Q(a) \neq -1, \quad Q(a) \neq -2$, and the degree of $P(z)$ is $n = l + p + 1$.

Then applying Lemma 2.7 we see that $P(z)$ is a strong uniqueness polynomial for meromorphic functions of degree $n \geq 6$, if $l \geq 3$ and $p \geq 2$. Polynomial $P(z)$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1 with $k = 2$. Then applying Theorem 1 to polynomial $P(z)$ we conclude that S is a URSM-IM (URSE-IM) and URSM$_{m)}$-IM (URSE$_{m)}$-IM) if $n \geq 15$($n \geq 7$).

References

[1] **Hoai An, V.H.,** A new class of unique range sets for meromorphic functions ignoring multiplicity with 15 elements, *J. Math. and Math. Sci.*, **1** (2022), 1–14.

[2] **Banerjee, A.,** A new class of strong uniqueness polynomial satisfying Fujimoto's conditions, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.*, **40** (2015), 465–474.

[3] **Bartels, S.,** Meromorphic functions sharing a set with 17 elements ignoring multiplicities, *Compl. Var. Theory Appl.*, **39** (1999), 85–92 .

[4] **Chakraborty, B.,** On the cardinality of a reduced unique-range set, *Ukr. Math. J.*, **72(11)** (2021), 1794–1806. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11253-021-01889-z

[5] **Goldberg, A.A. and I.V. Ostrovskii,** *Value Distribution of Meromorphic Functions*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs (2008), V.236.

[6] **Frank, G. and M. Reinders,** A unique range set for meromorphic functions with 11 elements, *Compl. Var. Theory Appl.*, **37(1)** (1998), 185–193.

[7] **Fujimoto, H.,** On uniqueness of meromorphic functions sharing finite sets, *Amer. J. Math.*, **122** (2000), 1175–1203.

[8] **Fujimoto, H.,** On uniqueness polynomials for meromorphic functions, *Nagoya Math. J.*, **170** (2003), 33–46 .

[9] **Gross, F.,** Factorization of meromorphic functions and some open problems, in: *Complex Analysis* (Proc. Conf . Univ. Kentucky, Lexington, Ky. 1976), pp. 51–69, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, Vol. 599, 1977, Springer, Berlin.

[10] **Khoai, H.H.,** Some remarks on the genericity of unique range sets for meromorphic functions, *Sci. China Ser. A Mathematics*, **48** (2005), 262–267.

[11] **Khoai, H.H., V.H. An and P.N. Hoa,** On functional equations for meromorphic functions and applications, *Arch. Math*,**109** (2017), 539–549. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00013-017-1093-5

[12] **Khoai, H.H., V.H. An and N.X. Lai,** Strong uniqueness polynomials of degree 6 and unique range sets for powers of meromorphic functions, *Intern. J. Math.*, **29(5)** (2018). https://doi.org/10.1142/S0129167X18500374

[13] **Khoai, H.H., V.H. An and L.Q. Ninh,** Value-sharing and uniqueness for L-functions, *Ann. Polonici Math.*, 2021.

[14] **Khoai, H.H. and V.H. An,** Determining an L-function in the extended Selberg class by its preimages of subsets, *Ramanujan Journal*, **58** (2022), 253–267. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11139-021-00483-y

[15] **Hayman, W.K,** *Meromorphic Functions*, Clarendon, Oxford, 1964.

[16] **Li, P. C.C. Yang,** Some further results on the unique range sets of meromorphic functions, *Kodai Math. J.*, **18** (1995), 437–450.

[17] **Yi, H.X.,** Uniqueness of rneromorphic functions and a question of Yang, C. C., *Complex Variables*, **14** (1990), 169–176.

[18] **Yi, H.X.,** Uniqueness of meromorphic functions and question of Gross, *Sci. China* (*Ser. A*), **37(7)** (1994), 802–813.

[19] **Yi, H.X.,** A question of Gross and the uniqueness of entire functions, *Nagoya Math. J.*, **138** (1995), 169–177.

[20] **Yi, H.X.,** Unicity theorems for meromorphic and entire functions III, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.*, **53** (1996), 71–82 .

[21] **Yi, H.X.,** The reduced unique range sets for entire or meromorphic functions, *Compl. Var. Theory Appl.*, **32** (1997), 191–198 .

[22] **Yi, H.X.,** On a question of Gross concerning uniqueness of entire functions, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.*, **57** (1998), 343–349.

[23] **Yi, H.X.,** Some further results on uniqueness of meromorphic functions, *Compl. Var. Theory Appl.*, **38** (1999), 375–385.

[24] **Yi, H.X. and W.C. Lin,** Uniqueness theorems concerning a question of Gross, *Proc. Japan Acad., Ser. A*, **80** (2004), 136–140.

Vu Hoai An
Hai Duong College
Hai Duong Province
vuhoaianmai@yahoo.com

Ha Huy Khoai
Thang Long Institute of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences
Thang Long University
Hanoi, Vietnam
hhkhoai@math.ac.vn

Nguyen Duy Phuong
Thai Nguyen University
Thai Nguyen Province
Vietnam
phuongnd@tnu.edu.vn