

УДК 517.53

D. C. PRAMANIK, JA. ROY

WEAKLY WEIGHTED-SHARING AND UNIQUENESS OF HOMOGENEOUS DIFFERENTIAL POLYNOMIALS

D. C. Pramanik, Ja. Roy. *Weakly weighted-sharing and uniqueness of homogeneous differential polynomials*, Mat. Stud. **51** (2019), 41–49.

In 2006, S. Lin and W. Lin introduced the definition of weakly weighted-sharing of meromorphic functions which is between “CM” and “IM”. In this paper, using the notion of weakly weighted-sharing, we study the uniqueness of nonconstant homogeneous differential polynomials $P[f]$ and $P[g]$ generated by meromorphic functions f and g , respectively. Our results generalize the results due to S. Lin and W. Lin, and H-Y. Xu and Y. Hu.

1. Introduction and main result. Let \mathbb{C} denote the complex plane and let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function defined on \mathbb{C} . We assume that the reader is familiar with the standard definitions and notions used in the value distribution theory, such as $T(r, f)$, $m(r, f)$, $N(r, f)$ (see [2, 6, 8]). By $S(r, f)$ we denote any quantity satisfying the condition $S(r, f) = o(T(r, f))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ possibly outside an exceptional set of r of finite linear measure. A meromorphic function a is called a *small function* with respect to f if either $a \equiv \infty$ or $T(r, a) = S(r, f)$. We denote by $S(f)$ the collection of all small functions with respect to f . Clearly $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\} \in S(f)$ and $S(f)$ is a field over the set of complex numbers. For $a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ the quantities

$$\delta(a, f) = 1 - \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, a; f)}{T(r, f)}, \quad \Theta(a, f) = 1 - \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\overline{N}(r, a; f)}{T(r, f)}.$$

are called the deficiency and ramification index of a for the function f , respectively.

For any two nonconstant meromorphic functions f and g , and $a \in S(f) \cap S(g)$, we say that f and g share a IM (CM) provided that $f - a$ and $g - a$ have the same zeros ignoring(counting) multiplicities. If $\frac{1}{f}$ and $\frac{1}{g}$ share 0 IM (CM), we say that f and g share ∞ IM (CM).

Definition 1. Let l be a nonnegative integer or infinity and $a \in S(f)$. We denote by $E_l(a, f)$ the set of all zeros of $f - a$, where a zero of multiplicity m is counted m times if $m \leq l$ and $l + 1$ times if $m > l$. If $E_l(a, f) = E_l(a, g)$, we say that f, g share the function a with weight l . We write f and g share (a, l) to mean that f and g share the function a with weight l . Since $E_l(a, f) = E_l(a, g)$ implies that $E_s(a, f) = E_s(a, g)$ for any integer s ($0 \leq s < l$), if f, g share (a, l) , then f, g share (a, s) , ($0 \leq s < l$). Moreover, we note that f and g share the function a IM or CM if and only if f and g share $(a, 0)$ or (a, ∞) , respectively.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 30D35, 30D45.

Keywords: meromorphic function; weakly weighted share; small function; differential polynomial.

doi:10.15330/ms.51.1.41-49

Definition 2 ([4]). 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 function of all common zeros of $f - a$ and $g - a$ ignoring multiplicities. We denote 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”.

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

(i) $\overline{N}_k(r, a; f)$ denotes the counting function of those a -points of f whose multiplicities are not greater than k , where each a -point is counted only once.

(ii) $\overline{N}_{(k)}(r, a; f)$ denotes the counting function of those a -points of f whose multiplicities are not less than k , where each a -point is counted only once.

(iii) $N_k(r, a; f)$ denotes the counting function of those a -points of f , where an a -point of f with multiplicity m counted m times if $m \leq k$ and k times if $m > k$.

We denote by $\delta_k(a, f)$ the quantity

$$\delta_k(a, f) = 1 - \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_k(r, a; f)}{T(r, f)}.$$

Clearly $\delta_k(a, f) \geq \delta(a, f)$.

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) $\overline{N}_k^E(r, a)$ denotes the counting function of those a -points of f whose multiplicities are equal to the corresponding a -points of g , both of their multiplicities are not greater than k , where each a -point is counted only once.

(ii) $\overline{N}_{(k)}^0(r, a)$ denotes the reduced counting function of those a -points of f which are a -points of g , both of their multiplicities are not less than k , where each a -point is counted only once.

Definition 3 ([4]). For $a \in S(f) \cap S(g)$, if l is a positive integer or ∞ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{N}_l(r, a; f) + \overline{N}_l(r, a; g) - 2\overline{N}_l^E(r, a) &= S(r, f) + S(r, g), \\ \overline{N}_{(l+1)}(r, a; f) + \overline{N}_{(l+1)}(r, a; g) - 2\overline{N}_{(l+1)}^0(r, a) &= S(r, f) + S(r, g), \end{aligned}$$

or if $l = 0$ and

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

then we say f and g *weakly share a with weight l* . Here, we write f, g share “ (a, l) ” to mean that f, g weakly share a with weight l .

Obviously if f and g share “ (a, l) ”, then f and g share “ (a, s) ” for any s ($0 \leq s < l$). 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.

Suppose F and G share 1 “IM”. By $\overline{N}_L(r, 1; F)$ we denote the counting function of the 1-points of F whose multiplicities are greater than 1-points of G . $\overline{N}_L(r, 1; G)$ is defined similarly.

Definition 4. Let $n (\geq 1)$ be a positive integer, $p (\geq 0)$ be an integer and f be a nonconstant meromorphic function. An expression of the form

$$P[f] = \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \prod_{j=0}^p (f^{(j)})^{l_{kj}}, \tag{1}$$

where $a_k \in S(f)$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and l_{kj} ($1 \leq k \leq n$; $0 \leq j \leq p$) are nonnegative integers and $d = \sum_{j=0}^p l_{kj}$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, is called a *homogeneous differential polynomial of degree d generated by f* . Also we denote by Q the quantity

$$Q = \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \sum_{j=0}^p j l_{kj}.$$

In 2006 S. Lin and W. Lin ([4]) defined and used the concept of weakly-weighted sharing of functions to prove the uniqueness of a meromorphic function and its derivative for the first time. They proved the following theorems.

Theorem 1. Let $n (\geq 1)$ be a positive integer and k be a positive integer or ∞ satisfying $2 \leq k \leq \infty$. Let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function, $a \in S(f)$ such that $a \neq 0, \infty$. If f and $f^{(n)}$ share “ (a, k) ” and

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

then $f = f^{(n)}$.

Theorem 2. Let $n (\geq 1)$ be a positive integer and let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function, $a \in S(f)$ such that $a \neq 0, \infty$. If f and $f^{(n)}$ share “ $(a, 1)$ ” and

$$\left(\frac{n+9}{2}\right)\Theta(\infty, f) + \frac{5}{2}\delta_{2+n}(0, f) > \frac{n}{2} + 6,$$

then $f = f^{(n)}$.

Theorem 3. Let $n (\geq 1)$ be a positive integer and let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function, $a \in S(f)$ such that $a \neq 0, \infty$. If f and $f^{(n)}$ share “ $(a, 0)$ ” and

$$(7 + 2n)\Theta(\infty, f) + 5\delta_{2+n}(0, f) > 2n + 11,$$

then $f = f^{(n)}$.

Later in 2011, H-Y. Xu and Y. Hu ([5]) generalize Theorems 1.1–1.3 by proving the following theorems.

Theorem 4. Let $n (\geq 1)$ be a positive integer, let k be a positive integer or ∞ satisfying $2 \leq k \leq \infty$ and let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function, $a \in S(f)$ such that $a \neq 0, \infty$. Suppose $L(f) = f^{(n)} + a_{n-1}f^{(n-1)} + \dots + a_0f$ where $a_j (\neq 0, \infty) \in S(f)$ for $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$. If f and $L(f)$ share “ (a, k) ” and

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

then $f = L(f)$.

Theorem 5. Let $n (\geq 1)$ be a positive integer, let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function, $a \in S(f)$ such that $a \neq 0, \infty$. Suppose $L(f)$ is defined as in Theorem 4. If f and $L(f)$ share “ $(a, 1)$ ” and

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

then $f = L(f)$.

Theorem 6. Let $n (\geq 1)$ be positive integer, let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function, $a \in S(f)$ such that $a \neq 0, \infty$. Suppose $L(f)$ be defined as in Theorem 4. If f and $L(f)$ share “ $(a, 0)$ ” and

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

then $f = L(f)$.

Motivated by such uniqueness investigation, it is natural to consider the problem in a more general setting: Let f and g be any two nonconstant meromorphic functions, $P[f]$ and $P[g]$ be nonconstant homogeneous differential polynomials of f and g respectively, and $a \in S(f) \cap S(g)$, $a \neq 0, \infty$. If $P[f]$ and $P[g]$ share “ (a, l) ”, then what will be the relation between $P[f]$ and $P[g]$? In this paper we prove that under certain conditions either $P[f] = P[g]$ or $P[f] \cdot P[g] = a^2$.

Now, we state the main result of this paper.

Theorem 7. Let f and g be two nonconstant meromorphic functions, $a (\neq 0, \infty) \in S(f) \cap S(g)$. Suppose that $P[f]$ and $P[g]$, as defined by (1), are nonconstant. If $P[f]$ and $P[g]$ share “ (a, l) ” with one of the following conditions:

(i) $l \geq 2$ and

$$\min \left\{ 2\delta(0, f) + \frac{Q+4}{d} \Theta(\infty, f), 2\delta(0, g) + \frac{Q+4}{d} \Theta(\infty, g) \right\} > \frac{Q+d+4}{d}, \quad (2)$$

(ii) $l = 1$ and

$$\min \left\{ \frac{5}{2} \delta(0, f) + \frac{3Q+9}{2d} \Theta(\infty, f), \frac{5}{2} \delta(0, g) + \frac{3Q+9}{2d} \Theta(\infty, g) \right\} > \frac{3Q+3d+9}{2d}, \quad (3)$$

(iii) $l = 0$ and

$$\min \left\{ 5\delta(0, f) + \frac{4Q+7}{d} \Theta(\infty, f), 5\delta(0, g) + \frac{4Q+7}{d} \Theta(\infty, g) \right\} > \frac{4Q+4d+7}{d}, \quad (4)$$

then either $P[f] = P[g]$ or $P[f] \cdot P[g] = a^2$.

2. Lemmas. In this section we present some lemmas which we needed in the sequel.

Lemma 1 ([3]). Let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function and $P[f]$ be defined by (1) then

$$(i) \quad T(r, P) \leq dT(r, f) + Q\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + S(r, f).$$

$$(ii) \quad N(r, 0; P) \leq T(r, P) - dT(r, f) + dN(r, 0; f) + S(r, f) \leq Q\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + dN(r, 0; f) + S(r, f).$$

Lemma 2 ([4]). *Let l be a nonnegative integer or infinity, F and G be nonconstant meromorphic functions, F and G share “(1, l)”. Let*

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

If $H \not\equiv 0$, then

(i) If $2 \leq l \leq \infty$, then

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

(ii) If $l = 1$, then

$$T(r, F) \leq N_2(r, \infty; F) + N_2(r, \infty; G) + N_2(r, 0; F) + N_2(r, 0; G) + \bar{N}_L(r, 1; F) + S(r, F) + S(r, G).$$

(iii) If $l = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, F) &\leq N_2(r, \infty; F) + N_2(r, \infty; G) + N_2(r, 0; F) + N_2(r, 0; G) \\ &\quad + 2\bar{N}_L(r, 1; F) + \bar{N}_L(r, 1; G) + S(r, F) + S(r, G). \end{aligned}$$

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

Lemma 3 ([5]). *Let F and G be nonconstant meromorphic functions such that F and G share “(1, 1)”. Then*

$$\bar{N}_L(r, 1; F) \leq \frac{1}{2} \bar{N}(r, 0; F) + \frac{1}{2} \bar{N}(r, \infty; F) + S(r, F).$$

Lemma 4 ([5]). *Let F and G be nonconstant meromorphic functions such that F and G share “(1, 0)”. Then*

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

Lemma 5 ([7]). *Let f be a nonconstant meromorphic function and let*

$$p(f) = a_n f^n + a_{n-1} f^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 f + a_0,$$

where $a_i \in S(f)$ for $i = 0, 1 \dots n$, $a_n \neq 0$ be a polynomial of degree n . Then $T(r, p(f)) = nT(r, f) + S(r, f)$.

3. Proof of the main Theorem.

Proof of Theorem 7. Let

$$F = \frac{P[f]}{a}, \quad G = \frac{P[g]}{a}.$$

Since $P[f]$ and $P[g]$ share “(a, l)”, it follows that F, G share “(1, l)” except at the zeros and poles of a .

Let H be same as in Lemma 2. Suppose that $H \not\equiv 0$. Now we consider the following three cases:

Case 1: $2 \leq l \leq \infty$.

From (i) of Lemma 2, we have

$$T(r, F) \leq 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; F) + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; G) + N(r, 0; F) + N(r, 0; G) + S(r, F) + S(r, G).$$

Using Lemma 1 in the above inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, F) &\leq 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; F) + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; G) + T(r, F) - dT(r, f) + dN(r, 0; f) \\ &\quad + Q\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + dN(r, 0; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} dT(r, f) &\leq 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + dN(r, 0; f) + (2 + Q)\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + \\ &\quad + dN(r, 0; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} dT(r, g) &\leq 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + dN(r, 0; g) + (2 + Q)\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + \\ &\quad + dN(r, 0; f) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Adding (5) and (6), we subsequently get

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) + T(r, g) &\leq 2N(r, 0; f) + \frac{Q + 4}{d}\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + 2N(r, 0; g) + \\ &\quad + \frac{Q + 4}{d}\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g), \\ &\quad \left\{ 2\delta(0, f) + \frac{Q + 4}{d}\Theta(\infty, f) - \frac{Q + d + 4}{d} \right\} T(r, f) + \\ &\quad + \left\{ 2\delta(0, g) + \frac{Q + 4}{d}\Theta(\infty, g) - \frac{Q + d + 4}{d} \right\} T(r, g) \leq S(r, f) + S(r, g), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts our hypothesis (2). Therefore $H \equiv 0$ and integrating twice we get

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

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

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

and

$$F = \frac{(B - A)G + (A - B - 1)}{BG - (B + 1)}. \quad (8)$$

Next we consider following three subcases: Subcase 1: $B \neq 0, -1$. Then from (8) we have

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

By using the Second Fundamental Theorem of Nevanlinna and (ii) of Lemma 1 we get

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, G) &< \bar{N}(r, \infty; G) + \bar{N}(r, 0; G) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{B + 1}{B}; G\right) + S(r, G) \leq \\ &\leq \bar{N}(r, \infty; G) + \bar{N}(r, 0; G) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; F) + S(r, G) \leq \\ &\leq \bar{N}(r, \infty; G) + T(r, G) - dT(r, g) + dN(r, 0; g) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; F) + S(r, g), \\ &\Rightarrow dT(r, g) < \bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + dN(r, 0; g) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

If $A - B - 1 \neq 0$, then it follows from (7) that

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

Applying Second Fundamental Theorem of Nevanlinna and Lemma 1, we subsequently obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, F) &< \bar{N}(r, \infty; F) + \bar{N}(r, 0; F) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{-A + B + 1}{B + 1}; F\right) + S(r, F), \\ dT(r, f) &< \bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + dN(r, 0; f) + Q\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + dN(r, 0; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

From (9) and (10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) + T(r, g) &\leq N(r, 0; f) + \frac{2}{d}\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + 2N(r, 0; g) + \\ &+ \frac{Q + 1}{d}\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g), \end{aligned}$$

which again contradict (2).

Therefore $A - B - 1 = 0$. Then from (7) it follows that

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

By applying the Second Fundamental Theorem of Nevanlinna and (ii) of Lemma 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, F) &< \bar{N}(r, \infty; F) + \bar{N}(r, 0; F) + \bar{N}\left(r, 0; F + \frac{1}{B}\right) + S(r, F) \leq \\ &\leq \bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + T(r, F) - dT(r, f) + dN(r, 0; f) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$dT(r, f) < \bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + dN(r, 0; f) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \quad (11)$$

Combining (9) and (11) we get

$$T(r, f) + T(r, g) \leq N(r, 0; f) + \frac{2}{d}\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + N(r, 0; g) + \frac{2}{d}\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g),$$

which violates assumption (2).

Subcase 2: $B = -1$. Then (7) and (8) we get

$$G = \frac{A}{A + 1 - F}, \quad F = \frac{(1 + A)G - A}{G}.$$

If $A + 1 \neq 0$, then

$$\bar{N}(r, A + 1; F) = \bar{N}(r, \infty; G), \quad \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{A}{A + 1}; G\right) = \bar{N}(r, 0; F).$$

By similar argument as in Subcase 1, we get a contradiction. Therefore $A + 1 = 0$, then $FG = 1 \Rightarrow P[f] \cdot P[g] = a^2$.

Subcase 3: $B = 0$. Then (7) and (8) gives $G = \frac{F+A-1}{A}$ and $F = AG + 1 - A$. If $A - 1 \neq 0$, $N(r, 0; A - 1 + F) = N(r, 0; G)$ and $N(r, \frac{A-1}{A}; G) = N(r, 0; F)$. Proceeding similarly as in Subcase 1 we get a contradiction. Therefore $A - 1 = 0$, then $F = G$ i.e., $P[f] = P[g]$. This completes the proof of Case 1.

Case 2: $l = 1$. From (ii) of Lemma 2 we have

$$T(r, F) \leq 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; F) + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; G) + N(r, 0; F) + N(r, 0; G) + \bar{N}_L(r, 1; F) + S(r, F) + S(r, G).$$

Using Lemma 1 and Lemma 3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, F) &\leq 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; F) + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; G) + T(r, F) - dT(r, f) + dN(r, 0; f) \\ &\quad + Q\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + dN(r, 0; g) + \bar{N}_L(r, 1; F) + S(r, f) + S(r, g), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} dT(r, f) &\leq 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + dN(r, 0; f) + (2 + Q)\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) \\ &\quad + dN(r, 0; g) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + \frac{1}{2}Q\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + \frac{1}{2}dN(r, 0; f) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq \frac{5 + Q}{2}\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + \frac{3d}{2}N(r, 0; f) + (2 + Q)\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + dN(r, 0; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow dT(r, f) &\leq \frac{5 + Q}{2}\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + \frac{3d}{2}N(r, 0; f) + \\ &\quad + (2 + Q)\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + dN(r, 0; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Similarly,

$$dT(r, g) \leq \frac{5 + Q}{2}\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + \frac{3d}{2}N(r, 0; g) + (2 + Q)\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + dN(r, 0; f) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \quad (13)$$

Adding (12) and (13), we get

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) + T(r, g) &\leq \frac{3Q + 9}{2d}\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + \frac{5}{2}N(r, 0; f) + \frac{3Q + 9}{2d}\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + \\ &\quad + \frac{5}{2}N(r, 0; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts our hypothesis (3).

Proceeding similarly as in Case 1 we get the result for this case.

Case 3: $l = 0$. From (iii) of Lemma 2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, F) &\leq 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; F) + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; G) + N(r, 0; F) + \\ &\quad + N(r, 0; G) + 2\bar{N}_L(r, 1; F) + \bar{N}_L(r, 1; G) + S(r, F) + S(r, G). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 1 and Lemma 4 in the above inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, F) &\leq 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; F) + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; G) + T(r, F) - dT(r, f) + dN(r, 0; f) + \\ &\quad + Q\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + dN(r, 0; g) + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; F) + 2\bar{N}(r, 0; F) + \\ &\quad + \bar{N}(r, \infty; G) + \bar{N}(r, 0; G) + S(r, f) + S(r, g), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} dT(r, f) &\leq 4\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + dN(r, 0; f) + (3 + Q)\overline{N}(r, \infty; g) + dN(r, 0; g) + 2Q\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + \\ &\quad + 2dN(r, 0; f) + Q\overline{N}(r, \infty; g) + dN(r, 0; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g), \\ &\Rightarrow dT(r, f) \leq (4 + 2Q)\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + 3dN(r, 0; f) + \\ &\quad + (3 + 2Q)\overline{N}(r, \infty; g) + 2dN(r, 0; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} dT(r, g) &\leq (4 + 2Q)\overline{N}(r, \infty; g) + 3dN(r, 0; g) + \\ &\quad + (3 + 2Q)\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + 2dN(r, 0; f) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Combining (14) and (15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) + T(r, g) &\leq \frac{4Q + 7}{d}\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + 5N(r, 0; f) + \\ &\quad + \frac{4Q + 7}{d}\overline{N}(r, \infty; g) + 5N(r, 0; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts our hypothesis (4).

Approaching similarly as in Case 1 we get the required conclusion for this case. \square

REFERENCES

1. S. Bhoosnurmath, S.R. Kabbur, On entire and meromorphic functions that share one small function with their differential polynomial, Hindawi Publishing Corporation, Int. J. Analysis, 2013, Article ID 926340.
2. W.K. Hayman, Meromorphic function, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1964.
3. I. Lahiri, B. Pal, *Uniqueness of meromorphic functions with their homogeneous and linear differential polynomials sharing a small function*, Bull. Korean Math. Soc., **54** (2017), 825–838.
4. S. Lin, W. Lin, *Uniqueness of meromorphic functions concerning weakly weighted sharing*, Kodai. Math. J., **29** (2006), 269–280.
5. H.Y. Xu, Y. Hu, *Uniqueness of meromorphic function and its differential polynomial concerning weakly weighted sharing*, General Mathematics, **19** (2011), 101–111.
6. L. Yang, Value distributions theory, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.
7. C.C. Yang, *On deficiencies of differential polynomials II*, Math. Z., **125** (1972), 107–112.
8. H.X. Yi, C.C. Yang, Uniqueness theory of meromorphic functions, Science Press, Beijing, 1995. (in Chinese)

Department of Mathematics, University of North Bengal
Raja Rammohanpur, Darjeeling-734013, West Bengal, India
dcpramanik.nbu2012@gmail.com

Department of Mathematics, University of North Bengal
Raja Rammohanpur, Darjeeling-734013, West Bengal, India
jayantaroy983269@yahoo.com

Received 24.02.2019