Normal Families and Shared Values of Meromorphic Functions *

Xiaoyi Liu

Dept. Mathematics, Changshu Institute of Technology, Changshu, Jiangsu, 215500, China

E-mail: xyliu_99@163.com

September 7, 2013

Abstract Let a and b be two given meromorphic functions on a domain D. We study normality of the family $\mathcal{F}$ of meromorphic functions that satisfy $f(z)f^{(k)}(z) = a(z) \Leftrightarrow f^{(k)}(z) = b(z)$ for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$ on D. Examples are also given to show the necessity of the conditions in our results.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 30D45

Key words: meromorphic functions, normal families, shared values, shared functions.

1 Introduction and main result

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions on a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is said to be normal on D in the sense of Montel, if each sequence of $\mathcal{F}$ contains a subsequence which converges spherically uniformly on each compact subset of D to a meromorphic function which may be ∞ identically. See [4], [9], [13].

For two functions f and g meromorphic on D, and two complex numbers or meromorphic functions a and b, we write $f(z) = a(z) \Rightarrow g(z) = b(z)$ if $g(z) = b(z)$ whenever $f(z) = a(z)$, and write $f(z) = a(z) \Leftrightarrow g(z) = b(z)$ if $f(z) = a(z)$ if and only if $g(z) = b(z)$. When a is a complex value and $f(z) = a \Leftrightarrow g(z) = a$, we also say that f and g share the value a or a is a shared value of f and g. For families of meromorphic functions, the connection between normality and shared values has been studied frequently following

* *Received*: September 7, 2012; *Revised*: June 4, 2013.

Schwick's initial paper [10]. **Some recent theorems in this area appear in [5, 6, 8, 12, 14].**

The starting point of this paper is the following result.

Thoerem A([3, Theorem 2]) *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions on a domain D, k be a positive integer, and let $a \neq 0$ and b be two finite values. If, for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, all zeros of f have multiplicity at least k and $f(z)f^{(k)}(z) = a \Leftrightarrow f^{(k)}(z) = b$, then the family $\mathcal{F}$ is normal on D.*

In this paper, we prove the following result.

Theorem 1.1 *Let k be a positive integer, and let $a(z)(\not\equiv 0)$ and $b(z)$ be two functions meromorphic on D such that*
(i) all zeros of a have multiplicity at most $k-1$ and all poles of a have multiplicity at most k;
(ii) each pole of b that is not a zeroe of a has multiplicity at most $\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil - 1$; and each pole of b that is a zero of a with multiplicity m has multiplicity at most $\lceil \frac{k-m}{2} \rceil - 1$.
Then the family $\mathcal{F}$ of meromorphic functions on a domain D, all of whose zeros have multiplicity at least k, such that $f(z)f^{(k)}(z) = a(z) \Leftrightarrow f^{(k)}(z) = b(z)$ for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, is normal on D.

Here, $\lceil x \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer that is not less than x. For example, $\lceil 2.1 \rceil = 3$ and $\lceil 2 \rceil = 2$.

Example 1.1 Let $D = \{z : |z| < 1\}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \{f_n\}$, where

$$f_n(z) = e^{nz} - \frac{1}{n}.$$

Then $f_n'(z) = ne^{nz}$, and $f_n(z)f_n'(z) = n(e^{nz} - \frac{1}{n})e^{nz}$. It follows that $f_n(z)f_n'(z) = 0 \Leftrightarrow f_n'(z) = 1$, but $\mathcal{F}$ is not normal at 0. This shows that the condition $a(z) \not\equiv 0$ is necessary in Theorem 1.1.

Example 1.2 Let $D = \{z : |z| < 1\}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \{f_n\}$, where

$$f_n(z) = z + \frac{1}{nz},$$

and let $a(z) = z$ and $b = 1$. We see that $f_n'(z) = 1 - \frac{1}{nz^2} \neq 1$ and $f_n(z)f_n'(z) = z\left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2z^4}\right) \neq z$. So for every $f_n \in \{f_n\}$ satisfies that $f_n(z)f_n'(z) = a(z) \Leftrightarrow f_n'(z) =$

$b(z)$. But $\mathcal{F}$ is not normal at 0. This shows that the condition that every zero of a has multiplicity at most $k-1$ (at least for $k=1$) is sharp in Theorem 1.1.

Example 1.3 Let $D=\{z:|z|<1\}$ and $\mathcal{F}=\{f_n\}$, where $f_n(z)=nz^{k+1}$, and let $a(z)=z^{k+2}$ and $b(z)=z$. We see that $f_n^{(k)}(z)=n(k+1)!z$ and $f_n(z)f_n^{(k)}(z)=n^2(k+1)!z^{k+2}$. So for every $f_n\in\{f_n\}$ satisfies that $f_n(z)f_n^{(k)}(z)=a(z)\Leftrightarrow f_n^{(k)}(z)=b(z)$. But $\mathcal{F}$ is not normal at 0. This shows that the condition that every zero of a has multiplicity at most $k-1$ is necessary in Theorem 1.1.

Example 1.4 Let $D=\{z:|z|<1\}$ and $\mathcal{F}=\{f_n\}$, where $f_n(z)=1/nz$, and let $a(z)=1/z^{k+2}$ and $b=1/z^{k+1}$. We see that $f_n^{(k)}(z)=(-1)^k k!/nz^{k+1}$ and $f_n(z)f_n'(z)=(-1)^k k!/n^2z^{k+2}$. So for every $f_n\in\{f_n\}$ satisfies that $f_n(z)f_n'(z)=a(z)\Leftrightarrow f_n'(z)=b(z)$. But $\mathcal{F}$ is not normal at 0. This shows that the condition that every pole of a has multiplicity at most k is necessary in Theorem 1.1.

2 Some lemmas

In order to prove our theorem, we require the following results. We assume the standard notations of value distribution theory, as presented and used in [6]. In particular, we write $f_n \xrightarrow{\chi} f$ on D to denote that the sequence $\{f_n\}$ converges spherically locally uniformly to f on D and denote $f_n\to f$ on D if the convergence is in Euclidean metric.

Lemma 2.1 ([2, Theorem 2],[7, Lemma 2]) *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of functions meromorphic on D, all of whose zeros have multiplicity at least k. Then if $\mathcal{F}$ is not normal at some point z_0 in D, there exist, for each $0\le\alpha<k$, points z_n in D with $z_n\to z_0$, positive numbers $\rho_n\to 0$ and functions $f_n\in\mathcal{F}$ such that $g_n(\zeta)=\rho_n^{-\alpha}f_n(z_n+\rho_n\zeta)\xrightarrow{\chi} g(\zeta)$ on $\mathbb{C}$, where g is a nonconstant meromorphic function on $\mathbb{C}$, all of whose zeros have multiplicity at least k, such that $g^\sharp(\zeta)\le g^\sharp(0)=1$. In particular, g has order at most two.*

Here, as usual, $g^\sharp(\zeta)=|g'(\zeta)|/(1+|g(\zeta)|^2)$ is the spherical derivative.

Lemma 2.2 ([3, Lemmas 9 and 10]) *Let g be a nonconstant meromorphic function in $\mathbb{C}$, and a be a nonzero constant. If all zeros of g have multiplicity at least k and $g^{(k)}\ne 0$, then the equation $gg^{(k)}=a$ has solutions on $\mathbb{C}$, where k is a positive integer.*

Lemma 2.3 ([11, Lemma 8]) *Let f be a nonplolynomial rational function such that $f'(z) \neq 1$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Then*

$$f(z) = z + c + \frac{a}{(z+b)^m},$$

where $a \neq 0, b, c$ are constants and m is a positive integer.

Lemma 2.4 ([1, Theorem 1.1]) *Let g be a transcendental meromorphic function on $\mathbb{C}$, and $R \not\equiv 0$ be a rational function. If all zeros and poles of g are multiple except possibly finitely many, then $g' - R$ has infinitely many zeros on $\mathbb{C}$.*

Lemma 2.5 *Let $k \geq 2$ and m be two integers, and let g be a meromorphic function on $\mathbb{C}$, all of whose zeros have multiplicity at least k. If $g(\zeta)g^{(k)}(\zeta) \neq \gamma\zeta^m$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $g^{(k)}(\zeta) \neq 0$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, where γ is a given nonzero constant, then $m \geq k$ or $m \leq -(k+2)$, and g must be a rational function of the form $g(\zeta) = C\zeta^{\frac{m+k}{2}}$ for some nonzero constant C.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\gamma = 1$. If not, we can use $G(\zeta) = \gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} g$ to replace g. The conditions guarantee that all zeros of g, possibly except $\zeta = 0$, have multiplicity k exactly.

Suppose first that g is transcendental. Then by Nevanlinna's second fundamental theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T\left(r, \frac{gg^{(k)}}{\zeta^m}\right) &\leq \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{gg^{(k)}}{\zeta^m}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{\frac{gg^{(k)}}{\zeta^m}}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{\frac{gg^{(k)}}{\zeta^m} - 1}\right) + S(r,g) \\ &= \overline{N}(r,g) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g}\right) + S(r,g). \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where $S(r,g) = o(T(r,g))$ as $r \to \infty$, possibly outside a set of finite measure. On the other hand, we have by Nevanlinna's first fundamental theorem

$$\begin{aligned} T\left(r, \frac{gg^{(k)}}{\zeta^m}\right) &\geq N\left(r, \frac{gg^{(k)}}{\zeta^m}\right) \geq N(r,g) + N(r,g^{(k)}) + S(r,g) \\ &= 2N(r,g) + k\overline{N}(r,g) + S(r,g) \\ &\geq (k+2)\overline{N}(r,g) + S(r,g) \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T\left(r, \frac{gg^{(k)}}{\zeta^m}\right) &\geq N\left(r, \frac{\zeta^m}{gg^{(k)}}\right) \geq N\left(r, \frac{1}{g}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{g^{(k)}}\right) + S(r,g) \\ &= k\overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g}\right) + S(r,g). \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Then by (2.1)–(2.3), we have

$$T\left(r, \frac{gg^{(k)}}{\zeta^m}\right) \leq \left(\frac{1}{k+2} + \frac{1}{k}\right) T\left(r, \frac{gg^{(k)}}{\zeta^m}\right) + S(r,g). \tag{2.4}$$

Since $k \geq 2$, we see from (2.4) that

$$T\left(r, \frac{gg^{(k)}}{\zeta^m}\right) = S(r,g). \tag{2.5}$$

Then by (2.2) and (2.3), we have

$$N(r,g) = S(r,g),\ N(r, \frac{1}{g}) = S(r,g). \tag{2.6}$$

Thus

$$T\left(r, \frac{g}{g^{(k)}}\right) = T\left(r, \frac{g^{(k)}}{g}\right) + O(1) = N\left(r, \frac{g^{(k)}}{g}\right) + S(r,g) = S(r,g), \tag{2.7}$$

and hence by (2.5) and (2.7),

$$2T(r,g) = T\left(r, \zeta^m \cdot \frac{gg^{(k)}}{\zeta^m} \cdot \frac{g}{g^{(k)}}\right) = S(r,g). \tag{2.8}$$

This is a contradiction. Hence there is no transcendental function that satisfies the conditions of the lemma.

Now we consider the case that g is a rational function.

Case 1. g has at least one nonzero pole. We denote by $\zeta_i (i = 1, 2, \cdots, n)$ all distinct poles of g on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, and $p_i (i = 1, 2, \cdots, n)$ their corresponding multiplicities. Since $g^{(k)} \neq 0$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $g^{(k)}$ has the form

$$g^{(k)}(\zeta) = \frac{\lambda \zeta^s}{\prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{p_i + k}}, \tag{2.9}$$

where $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ is an integer and λ is a nonzero constant. And since $g(\zeta) g^{(k)}(\zeta) \neq \zeta^m$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$g(\zeta) g^{(k)}(\zeta) = \zeta^m + \frac{\mu \zeta^l}{\prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{2p_i + k}} = \frac{\zeta^m \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{2p_i + k} + \mu \zeta^l}{\prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{2p_i + k}} \tag{2.10}$$

for some integer $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and nonzero constant μ. So, by (2.9) and (2.10),

$$g(\zeta) = \frac{\zeta^m \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{2p_i+k} + \mu\zeta^l}{\lambda\zeta^s \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{p_i}}. \tag{2.11}$$

Next, we consider three cases according to $m > l$, $m = l$ and $m < l$.

Case 1.1. Suppose that $m > l$. Then as all zeros of g, possibly except $\zeta = 0$, have multiplicity k exactly, we see from (2.11) that all zeros of the polynomial

$$P_1(\zeta) = \zeta^{m-l} \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{2p_i+k} + \mu \tag{2.12}$$

on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, and hence on $\mathbb{C}$ since $P_1(0) = \mu \neq 0$, have exact multiplicity $k \geq 2$. This shows that P_1 has

$$\tau_1 = \frac{\deg P_1}{k} = \frac{m - l + \sum_{i=1}^n (2p_i + k)}{k} > n \tag{2.13}$$

distinct zeros, and each zero of P_1 is a zero of P_1' with multiplicity $k - 1$.

By computation, we have

$$P_1'(\zeta) = \zeta^{m-l-1} \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{2p_i+k-1} \left[(m - l) \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i) + \zeta \sum_{i=1}^n (2p_i + k) \prod_{j \neq i} (\zeta - \zeta_j) \right]. \tag{2.14}$$

Since $P_1(\zeta_i) \neq 0$ and $P_1(0) \neq 0$, it follows that the polynomial

$$Q_1(\zeta) = (m - l) \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i) + \zeta \sum_{i=1}^n (2p_i + k) \prod_{j \neq i} (\zeta - \zeta_j) \tag{2.15}$$

has at least τ_1 distinct zeros with multiplicity $k - 1$. Thus,

$$n = \deg Q_1 \geq (k - 1)\tau_1 > (k - 1)n. \tag{2.16}$$

This is impossible, since $k \geq 2$.

Case 1.2. Suppose that $m = l$. Then as showed in Case 1, all zeros of the polynomial

$$P_2(\zeta) = \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{2p_i+k} + \mu \tag{2.17}$$

on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ have exact multiplicity $k \geq 2$. Denote by α the multiplicity if 0 is a zero of P_2, and say $\alpha = 0$ if $P_2(0) \neq 0$. This shows that P_2 has

$$\tau_2 = \frac{\deg P_2 - \alpha}{k} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (2p_i + k) - \alpha}{k} \tag{2.18}$$

distinct zeros on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$, and each zero of P_2 on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ is a zero of P_2' with multiplicity $k-1$.

We have

$$P_2'(\zeta)=\prod_{i=1}^{n}(\zeta-\zeta_i)^{2p_i+k-1}Q_2(\zeta),\ \text{where } Q_2(\zeta)=\sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+k)\prod_{j\neq i}(\zeta-\zeta_j). \tag{2.19}$$

Since $P_2(\zeta_i)\neq 0$, the polynomial Q_2 has at least τ_2 distinct zeros on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ with multiplicity $k-1$. Further, if $\alpha\geq 2$, then 0 is a zero of Q_2 with multiplicity $\alpha-1$. Let $\beta=\alpha-1$ if $\alpha\geq 2$, and $\beta=0$ if $\alpha=0$ or $\alpha=1$. Thus, we see that

$$n-1=\deg Q_2\geq (k-1)\tau_2+\beta=\frac{k-1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+k)+\beta-\frac{k-1}{k}\alpha\geq\frac{(k-1)(k+2)n}{k}+\beta-\alpha. \tag{2.20}$$

Then we have

$$\alpha-1\geq\frac{k^2-2}{k}n+\beta>\beta, \tag{2.21}$$

which is a contradiction.

Case 1.3. Suppose that $m<l$. Then as showed in Case 1, all zeros of the polynomial

$$P_3(\zeta)=\prod_{i=1}^{n}(\zeta-\zeta_i)^{2p_i+k}+\mu\zeta^{l-m} \tag{2.22}$$

on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ have exact multiplicity $k\geq 2$. Note that $P_3(0)\neq 0$. This shows that P_3 has

$$\tau_3=\frac{\deg P_3}{k} \tag{2.23}$$

distinct zeros on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$, and each zero of P_3 is a zero of P_3' with multiplicity $k-1$.

We have

$$\Big(\zeta^{m-l}P_3(\zeta)\Big)'=\zeta^{m-l-1}\prod_{i=1}^{n}(\zeta-\zeta_i)^{2p_i+k-1}Q_3(\zeta), \tag{2.24}$$

where

$$Q_3(\zeta)=(m-l)\prod_{i=1}^{n}(\zeta-\zeta_i)+\zeta\sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+k)\prod_{j\neq i}(\zeta-\zeta_j). \tag{2.25}$$

Since $P_3(\zeta_i)\neq 0$ and $P_3(0)\neq 0$, it follows that the polynomial Q_3 has at least τ_3 distinct zeros with multiplicity $k-1$. Thus,

$$\deg Q_3\geq (k-1)\tau_3. \tag{2.26}$$

If $\deg P_3\geq\sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+k)$, then $\tau_3\geq\sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+k)/k\geq (k+2)n/k$. This, together with (2.26) and the fact $\deg Q_3\leq n$, leads to a contradiction.

Thus $\deg P_3 < \sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+k)$. Since $\deg P_3 = \max\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+k),\ l-m\}$ if $\sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+k) \neq l-m$, we see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+k) = l-m \tag{2.27}$$

and $\mu = -1$. Hence $\deg Q_3 \leq n-1$, so that by (2.26)

$$\tau_3 \leq \frac{n-1}{k-1}. \tag{2.28}$$

Now since P_3 has τ_3 distinct zeros with exact multiplicity k, we can obtain that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n}(\zeta-\zeta_i)^{2p_i+k} - \zeta^{l-m} = c\left[\prod_{i=1}^{\tau_3}(\zeta-w_i)\right]^k \tag{2.29}$$

for some nonzero constant c and τ_3 distinct nonzero points w_i. It follows from (2.29) with the transformation $\zeta \to 1/z$ that

$$R(z) := \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1-\zeta_i z)^{2p_i+k} - 1 = cz^{l-m-\tau_3 k}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{\tau_3}(1-w_i z)\right]^k. \tag{2.30}$$

Thus 0 is a zero of R with multiplicity $l-m-\tau_3 k$. Since

$$R'(z) = \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1-\zeta_i z)^{2p_i+k-1}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+k)(-\zeta_i)\prod_{j\neq i}(1-\zeta_j z)\right], \tag{2.31}$$

we see that 0 is a zero of R' with multiplicity at most $n-1$. Hence

$$l-m-1-\tau_3 k \leq n-1. \tag{2.32}$$

This with (2.27) and (2.28) shows that

$$(k+2)n \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+k) = l-m \leq \tau_3 k + n \leq \frac{k(n-1)}{k-1} + n, \tag{2.33}$$

which is impossible.

Case 2. g has no nonzero poles. Then as $g^{(k)}\zeta \neq 0$ on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$, we have $g^{(k)}(\zeta) = c\zeta^s$ for some constant $c \neq 0$ and integer $s \in \mathbb{Z}$.

If $s \geq 0$, then g is a polynomial with $\deg g = s+k$. And since $g(\zeta)g^{(k)}(\zeta) \neq \zeta^m$ on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$, we also have $g(\zeta)g^{(k)}(\zeta) = \zeta^m + \lambda\zeta^t$ for some constant $\lambda \neq 0$ and integer t. Thus

$$g(\zeta) = \frac{1}{c}\zeta^{m-s} + \frac{\lambda}{c}\zeta^{t-s}. \tag{2.34}$$

If $m \neq t$, then it can be seen that g has at least one simple zero on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$, which contradicts that all zeros of g on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ have multiplicity $k \geq 2$. Thus $m = t$, then $\lambda + 1 \neq 0$ and $g(\zeta) = (\lambda+1)\zeta^{m-s}/c$. Thus $m - s = \deg g = s + k$, and hence $m - s = (m+k)/2$, so that $g(\zeta) = C\zeta^{\frac{m+k}{2}}$ for some nonzero constant C and $m \geq k$.

If $s < 0$, then $\zeta = 0$ is the pole of g with multiplicity $-s - k > 0$. And since $g(\zeta)g^{(k)}(\zeta) \neq \zeta^m$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, we also have $g(\zeta)g^{(k)}(\zeta) = \zeta^m + \lambda\zeta^t$ for some constant $\lambda \neq 0$ and integer t. Thus

$$g(\zeta) = \frac{1}{c}\zeta^{m-s} + \frac{\lambda}{c}\zeta^{t-s}. \tag{2.35}$$

If $m \neq t$, then it can be seen that g has at least one simple zero on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$, which contradicts that all zeros of g on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ have multiplicity $k \geq 2$. Thus $m = t$, then $\lambda + 1 \neq 0$ and $g(\zeta) = (\lambda+1)\zeta^{m-s}/c$. Thus $-m + s = -s - k$, and hence $m - s = (m+k)/2 < 0$, so that $g(\zeta) = C\zeta^{\frac{m+k}{2}}$ for some nonzero constant C. Note, $m = 2s+k \leq -2(k+1)+k \leq -(k+2)$.

The lemma is proved.

Lemma 2.6 *Let g be a meromorphic function on $\mathbb{C}$. If $g'(\zeta) \neq 0$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, then the equation $g(\zeta)g'(\zeta) = \gamma/\zeta$ has solutions on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, where γ is a given nonzero constant.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\gamma = 1$.

Suppose first that g is transcendental. Then by Lemma 2.4, $\frac{1}{2}(g^2)' - \zeta^{-1}$ has infinitely many zeros on $\mathbb{C}$, hence $g(\zeta)g'(\zeta) = \zeta^{-1}$ has infinitely many zeros on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

Next we suppose that g is a polynomial. Since $g'(\zeta) \neq 0$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, we have $g(\zeta) = a\zeta^n + b$, where $a \neq 0$. Then $g(\zeta)g'(\zeta) - \zeta^{-1} = n\zeta^{-1}(a\zeta^{2n} + b\zeta^n + 1)$ must has zero on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

Finally, we suppose that g is non-polynomial rational function.

Case 1. If $g'(\zeta) \neq 0$ on $\mathbb{C}$, then by Lemma 2.3, $g(\zeta) = B + A/(z+a)^n$, where $A \neq 0, B$ are two constants. Then

$$g(\zeta)g'(\zeta) - \zeta^{-1} = \frac{-An[A + B(\zeta+a)^n]\zeta - (\zeta+a)^{2n+1}}{\zeta(\zeta+a)^{2n+1}}. \tag{2.36}$$

If $a \neq 0$, we see that $g(\zeta)g'(\zeta) - \zeta^{-1}$ must have zeros on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. If $a = 0$, then

$$g(\zeta)g'(\zeta) - \zeta^{-1} = \frac{-An(A + B\zeta^n) - \zeta^{2n}}{\zeta^{2n+1}} \tag{2.37}$$

also has zeros on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

Case 2. If $g'(\zeta) \neq 0$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $g'(0) = 0$, then we can suppose that

$$g'(\zeta) = \frac{\mu \zeta^l}{\prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{p_i+1}}, \tag{2.38}$$

where $\zeta_i \neq 0 (i = 1, 2, \cdots, n)$ are all distinct poles of g and $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ is a positive integer. If $g(\zeta)g'(\zeta) \neq \zeta^{-1}$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, then we can suppose that

$$g(\zeta)g'(\zeta) = \zeta^{-1} + \frac{\lambda \zeta^s}{\prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{2p_i+1}}. \tag{2.39}$$

We see that $s = -1$, otherwise $\zeta = 0$ would be a pole of gg', hence of g, which contradicts that $g'(0) = 0$. Then we have

$$g(\zeta)g'(\zeta) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{2p_i+1} + \lambda}{\zeta \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{2p_i+1}}, \tag{2.40}$$

hence

$$g(\zeta) = \frac{Q(\zeta)}{\mu \zeta^{l+1} \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{p_i}}, \text{ where } Q(\zeta) = \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{2p_i+1} + \lambda. \tag{2.41}$$

Case 2.1. If $g(0) = 0$, then $\zeta = 0$ is a zero of $Q(\zeta)$ with multiplicity $2(l+1)$ and

$$g(\zeta) = \frac{\zeta^{l+1} P(\zeta)}{\mu \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{p_i}}, \tag{2.42}$$

where $P(\zeta)$ is a monic polynomial and

$$\deg P = \deg Q - 2(l+1) = \sum_{i=1}^n (2p_i + 1) - 2(l+1) \geq 0. \tag{2.43}$$

Then we have

$$g'(\zeta) = \frac{\zeta^l P_1(\zeta)}{\mu \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{p_i+1},} \tag{2.44}$$

where $P_1(\zeta) = [(l+1)P(\zeta) + \zeta P'(\zeta)] \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i) - \zeta P(\zeta) \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \prod_{j \neq i} (\zeta - \zeta_j)$. We see that the polynomial $P_1(\zeta)$ is not a constant, since the first coefficient of $P_1(\zeta)$ is

$$l + 1 + \deg P - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = \sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + 1) - (l+1) \geq \frac{n}{2} > 0. \tag{2.45}$$

Hence comparing with (2.44) and (2.38), it is a contradiction.

Case 2.2. If $g(0) \neq 0$, then $\zeta = 0$ is a zero of $Q(\zeta)$ with multiplicity $l+1$ and

$$g(\zeta) = \frac{P(\zeta)}{\mu \prod_{i=1}^n (\zeta - \zeta_i)^{p_i}}, \tag{2.46}$$

where $P(\zeta)$ is a monic polynomial and

$$\deg P = \deg Q - (l+1) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+1) - (l+1) \geq 0. \tag{2.47}$$

Then we have

$$g'(\zeta) = \frac{P_2(\zeta)}{\mu \prod_{i=1}^{n}(\zeta - \zeta_i)^{p_i+1}}, \tag{2.48}$$

where $P_2(\zeta) = P'(\zeta)\prod_{i=1}^{n}(\zeta-\zeta_i) - P(\zeta)\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \prod_{j\neq i}(\zeta-\zeta_j)$. We see that the leading term of $P_2(\zeta)$ is

$$\left[\deg P - \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i\right]\zeta^{\deg P+n-1} = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}(p_i+1) - (l+1)\right]\zeta^{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+2)-(l+2)}. \tag{2.49}$$

If $\sum_{i=1}^{n}(p_i+1)-(l+1) \neq 0$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+2)-(l+2) \neq l$. Hence comparing with (2.48) and (2.38), it is a contradiction.

If $\sum_{i=1}^{n}(p_i+1)-(l+1) = 0$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{n}(2p_i+2)-(l+2) = l$. Hence comparing with (2.48) and (2.38), it is also a contradiction.

The lemma is proved.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we first prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1 *Let $\{f_n\}$ be a sequence of meromorphic functions on D whose zeros have multiplicity at least k, where k is a positive integer. Let $\{a_n\}$ and $\{h_n\}$ be two sequences of meromorphic functions on D such that $a_n(z) \xrightarrow{\chi} a(z)$ and $h_n(z) \xrightarrow{\chi} h(z)$ on D, where $a(z) \neq 0, \infty, h(z) \neq 0, \infty$ on D, and let $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ be an integer such that $2l < k$. Then the family $\{f_n\}$ is normal on D provided that $f_n(z)f_n^{(k)}(z) = a_n(z) \Leftrightarrow f_n^{(k)}(z) = z^{-l}h_n(z)$ for every $f_n \in \{f_n\}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\{f_n\}$ is not normal at some point $z_0 \in D$. Then by Lemma 2.1, there exist points $z_n \to z_0$, a subsequence of $\{f_n\}$ (we still denote $\{f_n\}$) and positive numbers $\rho_n \to 0$, such that

$$g_n(\zeta) = \rho_n^{-\frac{k}{2}} f_n(z_n + \rho_n\zeta) \xrightarrow{\chi} g(\zeta) \tag{3.1}$$

on D, where g a **nonconstant** meromorphic function with bounded spherical derivative (and hence of order at most two), all of whose zeros are of multiplicity at least k. We denote $a_0 = a(z_0)(\neq 0, \infty)$.

Case 1. $l \leq 0$, or $l > 0$ with $z_0 \neq 0$.

We claim that (i) $gg^{(k)} \not\equiv a_0$, and (ii) $g^{(k)} \not\equiv 0$.

In fact, if $gg^{(k)} \equiv a_0$, then g is a nonconstant entire function (and hence of exponential type) and $g \neq 0$. Hence $g(\zeta) = e^{c\zeta+d}$, where $c(\neq 0), d \in \mathbb{C}$. But then $g(\zeta)g^{(k)}(\zeta) = c^k e^{2c\zeta+2d} \not\equiv a_0$, a contradiction. Similarly, if $g^{(k)} \equiv 0$, then g is a nonconstant polynomial of degree less than k. This contradicts that all zeros of g have multiplicity at least k.

We further claim that (iii) $gg^{(k)} \neq a_0$, and (iv) $g^{(k)} \neq 0$.

To prove (iii), suppose that $g(\zeta_0)g^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = a_0$ for some $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{C}$. Then g is holomorphic on some close neighborhood U of ζ_0, and hence $g_n(\zeta)g_n^{(k)}(\zeta) - a_n(z_n+\rho_n\zeta) \to g(\zeta)g^{(k)}(\zeta) - a_0$ on U uniformly. Since $gg^{(k)} \not\equiv a_0$, by Hurwitz's theorem, there exist points $\zeta_n \to \zeta_0$ such that (for n sufficiently large)

$$a_n(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n) = g_n(\zeta_n)g^{(k)}(\zeta_n) = f_n(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n)f_n^{(k)}(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n). \tag{3.2}$$

Hence by the condition, $f_n^{(k)}(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n) = (z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n)^{-l}h_n(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n)$, so that $g_n^{(k)}(\zeta_n) = \rho_n^{\frac{k}{2}} f_n^{(k)}(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n) = \rho_n^{\frac{k}{2}}(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n)^{-l}h_n(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n)$. Thus $g^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = \lim_{n\to\infty} g^{(k)}(\zeta_n) = 0$, which contradicts that $g(\zeta_0)g^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = a_0 \neq 0$. This proves (iii).

Next we prove (iv). Suppose that $g^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = 0$ for some $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{C}$. Then g is holomorphic on some close neighborhood U of ζ_0, and hence $g_n^{(k)}(\zeta) - \rho_n^{\frac{k}{2}}(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n)^{-l}h_n(z_n + \rho_n\zeta) \to g^{(k)}(\zeta)$ on U uniformly. Since $g^{(k)}(\zeta) \not\equiv 0$, by Hurwitz's theorem, there exist points $\zeta_n \to \zeta_0$ such that (for n sufficiently large)

$$g_n^{(k)}(\zeta_n) - \rho_n^{\frac{k}{2}}(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n)^{-l}h_n(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n) = 0.$$

It follows that $f_n^{(k)}(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n) = (z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n)^{-l}h_n(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n)$, and hence by the condition, we have

$$a_n(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n) = f_n(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n)f_n^{(k)}(z_n + \rho_n\zeta_n) = g_n(\zeta_n)g_n^{(k)}(\zeta_n). \tag{3.3}$$

This leads to a contradiction that

$$a_0 = a(z_0) = \lim_{n\to\infty} g_n(\zeta_n)g_n^{(k)}(\zeta_n) = g(\zeta_0)g^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

(iv) is also proved.

However, by Lemma 2.2, there is no nonconstant meromorphic function g on $\mathbb{C}$ with the properties (iii) and (iv) such that all zeros have multiplicity at least k.

Case 2. $l \geq 1$ and $z_0 = 0$. Then we have $k > 2$ for the condition $2l < k$. In this part, we consider two cases.

Case 2.1. Suppose that $\frac{z_n}{\rho_n} \to \infty$. Let

$$G_n(\zeta) = z_n^{-\frac{k}{2}} f_n(z_n + z_n\zeta). \tag{3.5}$$

Then we see that

$$G_n(\zeta)G_n^{(k)}(\zeta) = a_n(z_n + z_n\zeta) \Longleftrightarrow G_n^{(k)}(\zeta) = z_n^{\frac{k}{2}-l}(1+\zeta)^{-l}h_n(z_n + z_n\zeta). \tag{3.6}$$

By Case 1, we see that $\{G_n\}$ is normal on $\Delta(0,1)$. Say $G_n \xrightarrow{\chi} G$ on $\Delta(0,1)$. We claim that $G(0) = 0$ and hence $G \not\equiv \infty$. Suppose $G(0) \neq 0$, then by $\frac{z_n}{\rho_n} \to \infty$, we have

$$g_n(\zeta) = \rho_n^{-\frac{k}{2}} f_n(z_n + \rho_n\zeta) = \left(\frac{z_n}{\rho_n}\right)^{\frac{k}{2}} G_n\left(\frac{\rho_n}{z_n}\zeta\right) \xrightarrow{\chi} \infty \tag{3.7}$$

on $\mathbb{C}$. This is a contradiction. Hence $G(0) = 0$, so that $G_n^{(k)} \to G^{(k)}$ in some neighborhood of 0. It follows that

$$g_n^{(k)}(\zeta) = \left(\frac{\rho_n}{z_n}\right)^{\frac{k}{2}} G_n^{(k)}\left(\frac{\rho_n}{z_n}\zeta\right) \xrightarrow{\chi} 0 \tag{3.8}$$

on $\mathbb{C}$. Thus $g^{(k)} \equiv 0$, which contradicts that all zeros of g have multiplicity at least k and g is nonconstant.

Case 2.2. So we may assume that $\frac{z_n}{\rho_n} \to c$, a finite complex number. Then we have

$$H_n(\zeta) = \rho_n^{-\frac{k}{2}} f_n(\rho_n\zeta) = g_n\left(\zeta - \frac{z_n}{\rho_n}\right) \xrightarrow{\chi} g(\zeta - c) := H(\zeta) \tag{3.9}$$

on $\mathbb{C}$, and all zeros of $H(\zeta)$ have multiplicity at least k. And since g is nonconstant, we see that H is also nonconstant. We see from the condition that

$$H_n(\zeta)H_n^{(k)}(\zeta) = a_n(\rho_n\zeta) \Longleftrightarrow H_n^{(k)}(\zeta) = \rho_n^{\frac{k}{2}-l}\zeta^{-l}h_n(\rho_n\zeta). \tag{3.10}$$

We claim that (i) $HH^{(k)} \not\equiv a_0$ and (ii) $H^{(k)} \not\equiv 0$.

If $HH^{(k)} \equiv a_0$, then H is a zero-free entire function of finite order and H is not a polynomial. Thus $H(\zeta) = e^{Q(\zeta)}$, where Q is a nonconstant polynomial, then $H^{(k)}(\zeta) = P(\zeta)e^{Q(\zeta)}$, where P is a polynomial. It follows that $H(\zeta)H^{(k)}(\zeta) = P(\zeta)e^{2Q(\zeta)} \not\equiv a_0$, which is a contradiction. So $HH^{(k)} \not\equiv a(0)$. If $H^{(k)} \equiv 0$, H would be a polynomial of degree less than k. Since H is nonconstant, H has at least one zero. The multiplicity of the zero can not be larger than the degree of the polynomial H. This contradicts that all zeros of H have multiplicity at least k.

We further claim that (iii) $HH^{(k)} \neq a_0$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, and (iv) $H^{(k)} \neq 0$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

Suppose that $H(\zeta_0)H^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = a_0$ at some point $\zeta_0 \neq 0$. Then $H(\zeta_0) \neq \infty$, and hence H is holomorphic on some close neighborhood U of ζ_0. Thus

$$H_n(\zeta)H_n^{(k)}(\zeta) - a_n(\rho_n\zeta) \to H(\zeta)H^{(k)}(\zeta) - a_0, \tag{3.11}$$

on U uniformly. Since $H(\zeta)H^{(k)}(\zeta) \not\equiv a_0$, by Hurwitz's theorem, there exist points $\zeta_n, \zeta_n \to \zeta_0$, such that (for n sufficiently large)

$$H_n(\zeta_n)H_n^{(k)}(\zeta_n) - a_n(\rho_n\zeta_n) = 0. \tag{3.12}$$

By (3.10), we have $H_n^{(k)}(\zeta_n) = \rho_n^{\frac{k}{2}-l}\zeta_n^{-l}h_n(\rho_n\zeta_n)$ and hence

$$H^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = \lim_{n\to\infty} H_n^{(k)}(\zeta_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \rho_n^{\frac{k}{2}-l}\zeta_n^{-l}h_n(\rho_n\zeta_n) = 0, \tag{3.13}$$

which contradicts that $H(\zeta_0)H^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = a_0 \neq 0$. The claim (iii) is proved.

Next we suppose that $H^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = 0$ at some point $\zeta_0 \neq 0$. Then $H(\zeta_0) \neq \infty$, so that H is holomorphic on some close neighborhood U of ζ_0, and hence

$$H_n^{(k)}(\zeta) - \rho_n^{\frac{k}{2}-l}\zeta^{-l}h_n(\rho_n\zeta) \to H^{(k)}(\zeta) \tag{3.14}$$

on U uniformly. Since $H^{(k)}(\zeta) \not\equiv 0$, by Hurwitz's theorem, there exist points $\zeta_n, \zeta_n \to \zeta_0$, such that (for n sufficiently large)

$$H^{(k)}(\zeta_n) - \rho_n^{\frac{k}{2}-l}\zeta_n^{-l}h_n(\rho_n\zeta_n) = 0. \tag{3.15}$$

Then by (3.10), we have $H_n(\zeta_n)H_n^{(k)}(\zeta_n) = a_n(\rho_n\zeta_n)$, and hence

$$H(\zeta_0)H^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = \lim_{n\to\infty} H_n(\zeta_n)H_n^{(k)}(\zeta_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} a_n(\rho_n\zeta_n) = a_0. \tag{3.16}$$

This contradicts the claim (iii). The claim (iv) is also proved.

Thus, by Lemma 2.3 with $m = 0$, $H(\zeta) = C\zeta^{\frac{k}{2}}$. This contradicts that all zeros of H have multiplicity at least k.

Hence $\mathcal{F}$ is normal on D. The proof is completed. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By the proof of Theorem 3.1, we have showed that $\mathcal{F}$ is normal on $D\setminus a^{-1}(0)\bigcup a^{-1}(\infty)$, where $a^{-1}(0)$ stands for the set of zeros of a and $a^{-1}(\infty)$ stands for the set of poles of a. Next, we prove that $\mathcal{F}$ is also normal at every zero or pole of a in D.

Suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ is not normal at $z_0\in D$, where z_0 is a zero or a pole of a. Without loss of generality, we may say $z_0=0$ and assume that $a(z)=z^m h(z)$ and $b(z)=z^{-l}b_1(z)$, where $m,l\in\mathbb{Z}$, $h(z)$ and $b_1(z)$ are holomorphic and zero-free on $\Delta(0,\delta)\subset D$. We assume that $h(0)=1$. We note by the condition that $-k\le m\le k-1, m\neq 0$ and $l<\frac{k-m}{2}$ if $l>0$. In particular, $0\le\frac{m+k}{2}<k$.

Then by Lemma 2.1, there exist points $z_n\to 0$, functions $f_n\in\mathcal{F}$ and positive numbers $\rho_n\to 0$ such that

$$g_n(\zeta)=\rho_n^{-\frac{m+k}{2}}f_n(z_n+\rho_n\zeta)\xrightarrow{\chi}g(\zeta)\tag{3.17}$$

on $\mathbb{C}$, where g is a nonconstant meromorphic function of finite order, and all zeros of g have multiplicity at least k.

Case 1. Suppose that $\frac{z_n}{\rho_n}\to\infty$. Let

$$G_n(\zeta)=z_n^{-\frac{m+k}{2}}f_n(z_n+z_n\zeta).\tag{3.18}$$

Then by the condition $f(z)f^{(k)}(z)=a(z)\Leftrightarrow f^{(k)}(z)=b(z)$, we have

$$G_n(\zeta)G_n^{(k)}(\zeta)=(1+\zeta)^m h(z_n+z_n\zeta)\Longleftrightarrow G_n^{(k)}(\zeta)=z_n^{\frac{k-m}{2}-l}(1+\zeta)^{-l}b_1(z_n+z_n\zeta).\tag{3.19}$$

Since $z_n\to 0$ and $h(0),\ b_1(0)\neq 0,\infty$, by Theorem 3.1, we see that $\{G_n\}$ is normal on $\Delta(0,1)$. Say $G_n\xrightarrow{\chi}G$ on $\Delta(0,1)$. We claim that $G(0)=0$ and hence $G\not\equiv\infty$. Suppose $G(0)\neq 0$, then by $\frac{z_n}{\rho_n}\to\infty$, we have

$$g_n(\zeta)=\rho_n^{-\frac{m+k}{2}}f_n(z_n+\rho_n\zeta)=\left(\frac{z_n}{\rho_n}\right)^{\frac{m+k}{2}}G_n\left(\frac{\rho_n}{z_n}\zeta\right)\xrightarrow{\chi}\begin{cases}\infty, & m+k>0,\\ G(0), & m+k=0\end{cases}\tag{3.20}$$

on $\mathbb{C}$. This is a contradiction. Hence $G(0)=0$, so that $G_n^{(k)}\to G^{(k)}$ in some neighborhood of 0. It follows that

$$g_n^{(k)}(\zeta)=\left(\frac{\rho_n}{z_n}\right)^{\frac{k-m}{2}}G_n^{(k)}\left(\frac{\rho_n}{z_n}\zeta\right)\xrightarrow{\chi}0\tag{3.21}$$

on $\mathbb{C}$. Thus $g^{(k)}\equiv 0$, which contradicts that all zeros of g have multiplicity at least k and g is nonconstant.

Case 2. So we may assume that $\frac{z_n}{\rho_n} \to c$, a finite complex number. Then we have

$$H_n(\zeta) = \rho_n^{-\frac{m+k}{2}} f_n(\rho_n \zeta) = g_n\left(\zeta - \frac{z_n}{\rho_n}\right) \xrightarrow{\chi} g(\zeta - c) := H(\zeta) \tag{3.22}$$

on $\mathbb{C}$, and all zeros of $H(\zeta)$ have multiplicity at least k. And since g is nonconstant, we see that H is also nonconstant. We see from the condition that

$$H_n(\zeta)H_n^{(k)}(\zeta) = \zeta^m h(\rho_n \zeta) \Longleftrightarrow H_n^{(k)}(\zeta) = \rho_n^{\frac{k-m}{2}-l} \zeta^{-l} b_1(\rho_n \zeta). \tag{3.23}$$

We claim that (i) $H(\zeta)H^{(k)}(\zeta) \not\equiv \zeta^m$ and (ii) $H^{(k)}(\zeta) \not\equiv 0$.

In fact, if $H(\zeta)H^{(k)}(\zeta) \equiv \zeta^m$, then $\zeta = 0$ is the only possible zero or pole of H. If H is a transcendental function, then $H(\zeta) = \zeta^\alpha e^{Q(\zeta)}$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$ and polynomial Q. Thus $H^{(k)}(\zeta) = P(\zeta)e^{Q(\zeta)}$, where $P(\zeta)(\not\equiv 0)$ is a rational function. It follows that $HH^{(k)}$ is also a transcendental function, which is a contradiction. If H is a rational function and $\zeta = 0$ is a pole of H, then $\zeta = 0$ is the pole of $HH^{(k)}$ with multiplicity at least $k+2$, which contradicts $H(\zeta)H^{(k)}(\zeta) \equiv \zeta^m, -k \le m \le k-1$. If H is a rational function and $\zeta = 0$ is not a pole of H, then H is a polynomial. If $\deg H \ge k$, then $\deg(HH^{(k)}) \ge k$. Otherwise, $HH^{(k)} \equiv 0$. Both cases contradicts that $H(\zeta)H^{(k)}(\zeta) \equiv \zeta^m$. So $H(\zeta)H^{(k)}(\zeta) \not\equiv \zeta^m$.

If $H^{(k)} \equiv 0$, H would be a polynomial of degree less than k. Since H is nonconstant, H has at least one zero. The multiplicity of the zero can not be larger than the degree of the polynomial H. This contradicts that all zeros of H have multiplicity at least k.

We further claim that (iii) $H(\zeta)H^{(k)}(\zeta) \neq \zeta^m$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, and (iv) $H^{(k)}(\zeta) \neq 0$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

Suppose that $H(\zeta_0)H^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = \zeta_0^m, \zeta_0 \neq 0$. Then $H(\zeta_0) \neq \infty$. H is holomorphic on some close neighborhood U of ζ_0, and hence

$$H_n(\zeta)H_n^{(k)}(\zeta) - \zeta^m h(\rho_n \zeta) \to H(\zeta)H^{(k)}(\zeta) - \zeta^m, \tag{3.24}$$

on U uniformly. Since $H(\zeta)H^{(k)}(\zeta) \not\equiv \zeta^m$, by Hurwitz's theorem, there exist points $\zeta_n, \zeta_n \to \zeta_0$, such that (for n sufficiently large)

$$H_n(\zeta_n)H_n^{(k)}(\zeta_n) - \zeta_n^m h(\rho_n \zeta_n) = 0.$$

By (3.23), we have

$$H_n^{(k)}(\rho_n \zeta_n) = \rho_n^{\frac{k-m}{2}-l} \zeta_n^{-l} b_1(\rho_n \zeta_n). \tag{3.25}$$

By the condition $\frac{k-m}{2} - l > 0$ and $\zeta_n \to \zeta_0 \neq 0$, we have

$$H^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = \lim_{n\to\infty} H_n^{(k)}(\zeta_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \rho_n^{\frac{k-m}{2}-l} \zeta_n^{-l} b_1(\rho_n\zeta_n) = 0, \tag{3.26}$$

which contradicts that $H(\zeta_0)H^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = \zeta_0^m \neq 0$. Then (iii) is proved.

Next we suppose that $H^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = 0, \zeta_0 \neq 0$. Thus $H(\zeta_0) \neq \infty$. H is holomorphic on some close neighborhood U of ζ_0, and hence

$$H_n^{(k)}(\zeta) - \rho_n^{\frac{k-m}{2}-l} \zeta^{-l} b_1(\rho\zeta) \to H^{(k)}(\zeta), \tag{3.27}$$

on U uniformly. Since $H^{(k)}(\zeta) \not\equiv 0$, by Hurwitz's theorem, there exist points $\zeta_n, \zeta_n \to \zeta_0$, such that (for n sufficiently large)

$$H^{(k)}(\zeta_n) - \rho_n^{\frac{k-m}{2}-l} \zeta_n^{-l} b_1(\rho\zeta_n) = 0. \tag{3.28}$$

Then we have $H_n(\zeta_n)H_n^{(k)}(\zeta_n) = \zeta_n^m h(\rho_n\zeta_n)$, thus

$$H(\zeta_0)H^{(k)}(\zeta_0) = \lim_{n\to\infty} H_n(\zeta_n)H_n^{(k)}(\zeta_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \zeta_n^m h(\rho_n\zeta_n) = \zeta_0^m. \tag{3.29}$$

This contradicts to claim (iii). So (iv) is proved.

If $k \geq 2$, then by Lemma 2.5 and claims (iii) and (iv), we get $m \geq k$ or $m \leq -(k+2)$, wih are ruled out by the assumption.

If $k = 1$, then $m = -1$. By Lemma 2.6, there is no meromorphic function satisfying claims (iii) and (iv).

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is completed.

Acknowledgement. This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11171045).

References

[1] W. Bergweiler and X. C. Pang, On the derivative of meromorphic functions with multiple zeros, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **278** (2003), 285–292.

[2] H. H. Chen and Y. X. Gu, Improvement of Marty's criterion and its applications, *Sci. China, Ser. A*, **36** (1993), 674–681.

[3] M. L. Fang and L. Zalcman, Normal families and shared values of meromorphic functions II, *Comput. Methods Funct.*, **1** (2001), 289–299.

[4] W. K. Hayman, *Meromorphic functions*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1964.

[5] D. Liu, B. M. Deng and D. G. Yang, Normal families of meromorphic functions with sharing functions, *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.*, accepted.

[6] D. W. Meng and P. C. Hu, Normality criteria of meromorphic functions sharing a holomorphic function, *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.*, accepted.

[7] X. C. Pang and L. Zalcman, Normal families and shared values, *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, **32** (2000), 325–331.

[8] J. M. Qi, D. Jie and L. Z. Yang, Normality criteria for families of meromorphic function concerning shared values, *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.*, **35** (2012), no. 2, 449–457.

[9] J. L. Schiff, *Normal families*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.

[10] W. Schwick, Exceptional functions and normality, *Bull. London. Math. Soc.*, **29** (1997), 425–432.

[11] Y. F. Wang and M. L. Fang, Picard values and normal families of meromorphic functions with multiple zeros, *Acta Math. Sinica*, **14**(1998), 17–26.

[12] J. Y. Xia and Y. Xu, Normality criterion concerning sharing functions II, *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.*, **33**(2010), no. 3, 479–486.

[13] L. Yang, *Value distribution theory*, Spring-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.

[14] S. H. Zeng and I. Lahiri, Montel's criterion and shared set, *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.*, accepted.