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Abstract. In this paper, we prove the following theorem: Let $F$ be a family of holomorphic functions in the unit disc $D$ and let $a$ be a nonzero complex number. If, for any $f \in F$, $f(z)=a \Rightarrow f^{\prime}(z)=a, f^{\prime}(z)=a \Rightarrow f^{\prime \prime}(z)=a$, then $F$ is uniformly normal in $D$, that is, there exists a positive constant $M$ such that $\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) f^{\#}(z) \leq M$ for each $f \in F$ and $z \in D$, where $M$ is independently of $f$. This result improves related results due to [2], [8], and [3].
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## 1. Introduction

Let $f$ and $g$ be two meromorphic functions, and let $a$ be a complex number. If $g(z)=a$ whenever $f(z)=a$, we denote it by $f=a \Rightarrow g=a$, and $f=a \Leftrightarrow g=a$ means $f(z)=a$ if and if only if $g(z)=a$.

Let $D$ denote the unit disk in the complex plane $\boldsymbol{C}$. A function $f$ meromorphic in $D$ is called a normal function, in the sense of [6], if there exist a constant $M(f)$ such that $\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) f^{\#}(z) \leq M(f)$ for each $z \in D$, where

$$
f^{\#}(z)=\frac{\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|}{1+|f(z)|^{2}}
$$

denotes the spherical derivative.
Let $F$ be a family of meromorphic functions defined in $D$. $F$ is said to be normal in $D$ (see [9]), in the sense of Montel, if for any sequence $f_{n} \in F$ there exists a subsequence $f_{n_{j}}$, such that $f_{n_{j}}$ converges spherically, locally and uniformly in $D$, to a meromorphic function or $\infty$.

Suppose that $F$ is a family of functions meromorphic in $D$ such that each function of $F$ is a normal function, then, for each function $f \in F$, there exists a constant $M(f)$ such that

$$
\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) f^{\#}(z) \leq M(f)
$$

for each $z \in D$. In general, $M(f)$ is a constant dependent on $f$, and we can not conclude that $\{M(f), f \in F\}$ is bounded. If $\{M(f), f \in F\}$ is bounded, we give the definition as follows

Definition. Let $F$ be a family of meromorphic functions in the unit disc D. If there exists a positive constant $M$ such that

$$
\sup \left\{\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) f^{\#}(z): z \in D, f \in F\right\}<M
$$

we call the family $F$ a uniformly normal family in $D$.
Remark 1. The idea of this definition is suggested by Pang (see [7]).
Remark 2. A well-known result due to Marty (see [4], [9] and [11]) says that a family $F$ of functions meromorphic in $D$ is a normal family if and only if for each compact subset $K$ of $D$ there exists a constant $M_{K}$ such that $f^{\#}(z) \leq M_{K}$ for each $f \in F$ and for each $z \in K$. Clearly, by Marty's criterion if $F$ is a uniformly normal family in $D$, then $F$ must be normal in $D$. However, it is obvious that the converse is not always true.

It is natural to ask: When is a normal family $F$ in $D$ also uniformly normal in $D$ ? (The question is first introduced by Bergweiler and Pang (see [7]).)

Schwick [10] discovered a connection between normality criteria and sharing values. He proved

Theorem A. Let $F$ be a family of meromorphic functions in the unit disc $D$ and let $a_{1}, a_{2}$ and $a_{3}$ be distinct complex numbers. If, for any $f \in F$, $f(z)=a_{i} \Leftrightarrow f^{\prime}(z)=a_{i}(i=1,2,3)$, then $F$ is normal in $D$.

Pang [7] proved that the family $F$ in Theorem A is also uniformly normal, as follows

Theorem B. Let $F$ be a family of meromorphic functions in the unit disc $D$ and let $a_{1}, a_{2}$ and $a_{3}$ be distinct complex numbers. If, for any $f \in F$,
$f(z)=a_{i} \Leftrightarrow f^{\prime}(z)=a_{i}(i=1,2,3)$, then $F$ is uniformly normal in $D$, that is, there exists a positive constant $M$ such that

$$
\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) f^{\#}(z) \leq M
$$

for each $f \in F$ and $z \in D$, where $M$ is independent of $f$.

Remark 3. In fact, from the proof in [7], we see that Theorem B still remains true if $f(z)=a_{i} \Rightarrow f^{\prime}(z)=a_{i}(i=1,2,3)$ for any $f \in F$.

Chen and Hua [2], Pang and Zalcman [8] proved the following normality criterion.
Theorem C. Let $F$ be a family of holomorphic functions in the unit disc $D$ and let $a$ be a nonzero complex number. If, for any $f \in F, f(z)=a \Leftrightarrow f^{\prime}=a$, $f^{\prime}=a \Rightarrow f^{\prime \prime}(z)=a$, then $F$ is normal in $D$.

In [3], Fang improved Theorem C as follows
Theorem D. Let $F$ be a family of holomorphic functions in the unit disc $D$ and let a be $a$ nonzero complex number. If, for any $f \in F, f(z)=a \Rightarrow f^{\prime}(z)=a$, $f^{\prime}(z)=a \Rightarrow f^{\prime \prime}(z)=a$, then $F$ is normal in $D$.

In this paper, by using a method different from that used in [3], we obtain the following stronger result.

Theorem 1. Let $F$ be a family of holomorphic functions in the unit disc $D$ and let $a$ be a nonzero complex number. If, for any $f \in F, f(z)=a \Rightarrow f^{\prime}(z)=a$, $f^{\prime}(z)=a \Rightarrow f^{\prime \prime}(z)=a$, then $F$ is uniformly normal in $D$, that is, there exists a positive constant $M$ such that

$$
\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) f^{\#}(z) \leq M
$$

for each $f \in F$ and $z \in D$, where $M$ is independent of $f$.
Remark 4. The following example (see [2] and [3]) shows that $a \neq 0$ cannot be omitted in Theorem 1.

Let $F=\left\{f_{n}(z)=e^{n z}: n=1,2,3 \cdots\right\}, D=\{z:|z|<1\}$. Then, for every $f_{n} \in F$, it is easy to see that $f_{n}(z)=0 \Rightarrow f_{n}^{\prime}(z)=0 \Rightarrow f_{n}^{\prime \prime}(z)=0$. However, $f_{n}^{\#}(0)=n / 2 \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, thus $F$ is not uniformly normal in $D$.

We shall use the standard notations in Nevanlinna theory (see [4], [11]).

## 2. Lemmas

For convenience, we define

$$
\begin{aligned}
L D(r, f):= & c_{1} m\left(r, \frac{f^{\prime}}{f}\right)+c_{2} m\left(r, \frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}\right)+c_{3} m\left(r, \frac{f^{\prime}}{f-a}\right) \\
& +c_{4} m\left(r, \frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f-a}\right)+c_{5} m\left(r, \frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}-a}\right),(a \in \boldsymbol{C})
\end{aligned}
$$

where $c_{1}, c_{2}, c_{3}, c_{4}, c_{5}$ are constants, which may have different values at different occurrences.

Lemma 1. Let $f$ be a non-constant holomorphic functions on the unit disc $D$, and $a$ be a nonzero complex number. Let

$$
\psi(z):=\psi(f(z))=\frac{f^{\prime}(z)+f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f(z)-a}-\frac{2 f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)-a}
$$

If $f=a \Rightarrow f^{\prime}=a, \quad f^{\prime}=a \Rightarrow f^{\prime \prime}=a$ on $D$, and $f(0) \neq a, f^{\prime}(0) \neq a, f^{\prime \prime}(0) \neq 0$, $f^{\prime}(0) \neq f^{\prime \prime}(0)$ and $\psi(0) \neq 0$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
T(r, f) & \leq L D(r, f)+O(1)+3 \log \frac{|f(0)-a|}{\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)-f^{\prime}(0)\right|} \\
& +\log \frac{\left|(f(0)-a)\left(f^{\prime}(0)-a\right)\right|}{\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)\right|}+2 \log \frac{1}{|\psi(0)|} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Let $f\left(z_{0}\right)=a$. By the assumptions we may assume that, near $z_{0}$

$$
f(z)=a+a\left(z-z_{0}\right)+\frac{a}{2}\left(z-z_{0}\right)^{2}+b\left(z-z_{0}\right)^{3}+O\left(\left(z-z_{0}\right)^{4}\right),
$$

where $b=f^{(3)}\left(z_{0}\right) / 6$ is a constant. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f^{\prime}(z)=a+a\left(z-z_{0}\right)+3 b\left(z-z_{0}\right)^{2}+O\left(\left(z-z_{0}\right)^{3}\right) \\
& f^{\prime \prime}(z)=a+6 b\left(z-z_{0}\right)+O\left(\left(z-z_{0}\right)^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{f^{\prime}(z)+f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f(z)-a} & =\frac{2}{z-z_{0}}+\frac{6 b}{a}+O\left(z-z_{0}\right) \\
\frac{2 f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)-a} & =\frac{2}{z-z_{0}}+\frac{6 b}{a}+O\left(z-z_{0}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence $\psi\left(z_{0}\right)=0$, and

$$
\begin{align*}
& N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{\psi}\right) \leq T(r, \psi)+\log \frac{1}{|\psi(0)|} \\
& \quad \leq N(r, \psi)+L D(r, f)+\log \frac{1}{|\psi(0)|}  \tag{2.1}\\
& \quad=N_{0}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}-a}\right)+L D(r, f)+\log \frac{1}{|\psi(0)|}
\end{align*}
$$

where $N_{0}\left(r, 1 /\left(f^{\prime}-a\right)\right)$ is the counting function for the zeros of $f^{\prime}-a$ which are not zeros of $f-a$. Since $f=a \Rightarrow f^{\prime}=a$, form (2.1) we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}-a}\right)+L D(r, f)+\log \frac{1}{|\psi(0)|} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, by the assumptions we have

$$
\begin{align*}
N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}-a}\right) \leq & N\left(r, \frac{1}{\frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}-1}\right) \leq T\left(r, \frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}\right)+\log \frac{\left|f^{\prime}(0)\right|}{\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)-f^{\prime}(0)\right|}+O(1) \\
& =N\left(r, \frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}\right)+\log \frac{\left|f^{\prime}(0)\right|}{\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)-f^{\prime}(0)\right|}+L D(r, f)+O(1)  \tag{2.3}\\
& =\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right)+\log \frac{\left|f^{\prime}(0)\right|}{\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)-f^{\prime}(0)\right|}+L D(r, f)+O(1)
\end{align*}
$$

Next we need the estimate of $\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right)$. Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
m\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right) & \leq m\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right)+L D(r, f) \\
& \leq T\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)-N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right)+L D(r, f)+\log \frac{1}{\left|f^{\prime}(0)\right|} \\
& \leq T(r, f)-N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right)+L D(r, f)+\log \frac{1}{\left|f^{\prime}(0)\right|} \\
& \leq T\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right)-N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right)+L D(r, f)+O(1)+\log \frac{|f(0)-a|}{\left|f^{\prime}(0)\right|} \\
= & m\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right)+N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right)-N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right)+L D(r, f)+O(1) \\
& +\log \frac{|f(0)-a|}{\left|f^{\prime}(0)\right|},
\end{aligned}
$$

we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right)+L D(r, f)+O(1)+\log \frac{|f(0)-a|}{\left|f^{\prime}(0)\right|} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, from (2.2), (2.3) and (2.4), we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right) \leq L D(r, f)+O(1)+\log \frac{|f(0)-a|}{\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)-f^{\prime}(0)\right|}+\log \frac{1}{|\psi(0)|},  \tag{2.5}\\
& N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}-a}\right) \leq L D(r, f)+O(1)+2 \log \frac{|f(0)-a|}{\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)-f^{\prime}(0)\right|}+\log \frac{1}{|\psi(0)|} . \tag{2.6}
\end{align*}
$$

Using Milloux's inequality, we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
T(r, f) \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right)+N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}-a}\right)+L D(r, f)+O(1) \\
\quad+\log \frac{\left|(f(0)-a)\left(f^{\prime}(0)-a\right)\right|}{\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)\right|}
\end{gathered}
$$

Substituting (2.5) and (2.6) in the above inequality yields the conclusion.

Lemma 2. (Bureau [1]) Let $b_{1}, b_{2}$, and $b_{3}$ be positive numbers and $U(r)$ a nonnegative, increasing and continuous function on an interval $\left[r_{0}, R\right), R<\infty$. If

$$
U(r) \leq b_{1}+b_{2} \log ^{+} \frac{1}{\rho-r}+b_{3} \log ^{+} U(\rho)
$$

for any $r_{0}<r<\rho<R$, then

$$
U(r) \leq B_{1}+B_{2} \log ^{+} \frac{1}{R-r}
$$

for $r_{0} \leq r<R$, where $B_{1}$ and $B_{2}$ depend on $b_{i}(1=1,2,3)$ only.
Lemma 3. (see Hiong [4]) If $f(z)$ is meromorphic in a disk $|z|<R$ such that $f(0) \neq 0, \infty$, then, for $o<r<\rho<R$,

$$
\begin{gathered}
m\left(r, \frac{f^{(k)}}{f}\right) \leq C_{k}\left\{1+\log ^{+} \log ^{+} \frac{1}{|f(0)|}+\log ^{+} \frac{1}{r}+\log ^{+} \frac{1}{\rho-r}\right. \\
\left.+\log ^{+} \rho+\log ^{+} T(\rho, f)\right\}
\end{gathered}
$$

where $C_{k}$ is a constant depending only on $k$.
The following is the wellknown Zalcman's lemma [12].
Lemma 4. Let $F$ be a family of functions meromorphic in a domain $D$. If $F$ is not normal at $z_{0} \in D$, then there exist a sequence of points $z_{n} \in D, z_{n} \rightarrow z_{0}$, a sequence of positive numbers $\rho_{n} \rightarrow 0$, and a sequence of functions $f_{n} \in F$ such that

$$
g_{n}(\zeta)=f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta\right) \rightarrow g(\zeta)
$$

locally uniformly with respect to the spherical metric, where $g$ is a non-constant meromorphic function on $\boldsymbol{C}$.

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Suppose that $F$ is not uniformly normal in $D$. Then, we can find $f_{n} \in F, z_{n} \in D$, such that

$$
g_{n}(z)=f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) z\right)
$$

satisfies

$$
g_{n}^{\#}(0)=\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) f_{n}^{\#}\left(z_{n}\right) \rightarrow \infty
$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It follows that $\left\{g_{n}(z)\right\}$ is not normal at $z=0$. We distinguish two cases:
(1) $g_{n}=g_{n}^{\prime}$ for every $n \in N$ then $g_{n}(z)=C_{n} e^{z}$, which is normal at $z=0$.
(2) Consider the case that $g_{n}$ and $g_{n}^{\prime}$ are not identical. By Lemma 4, there exist a subsequence $g_{n}$ (without loss generality, we may assume $g_{n}$ ), a sequence $\eta_{n} \in D, \eta_{n} \rightarrow 0$, and a positive sequence $\rho_{n} \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$
G_{n}(\zeta)=g_{n}\left(\eta_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta\right)=f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta\right)
$$

converges uniformly to a non-constant entire function $G(\zeta)$ on each compact subset of C. Thus, for any positive integer $k$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{n}^{(k)}(\zeta)=\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{k} \rho_{n}^{k} f_{n}^{(k)}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta\right) \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We claim that $G(\zeta)$ is not a polynomial of degree less than 3. Indeed, if $G(\zeta)$ is a polynomial, then there exists a point $\zeta_{0}$ such that $G\left(\zeta_{0}\right)=a$. By Hurwitz' theorem, there is a sequence $\zeta_{n} \rightarrow \zeta_{0}$ such that

$$
G_{n}\left(\zeta_{n}\right)=g_{n}\left(\eta_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right)=f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right)=a
$$

for $n$ sufficiently large. It follows from the hypotheses on $F$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{n}^{\prime}\left(z_{n}\right. & \left.+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right) \\
& =f_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right)=a
\end{aligned}
$$

for $n$ sufficiently large. On the other hand, by (3.1), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G_{n}^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{n}\right)=\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} f_{n}^{\prime}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right) \rightarrow G^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right) \\
& G_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left(\zeta_{n}\right)=\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{2} \rho_{n}^{2} f_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right) \rightarrow G^{\prime \prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus $\quad G^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)=G^{\prime \prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)=0$.

Choose $\zeta_{1}$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
G\left(\zeta_{1}\right) \neq 0, a ; G^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{1}\right) \neq 0 ; G^{\prime \prime}\left(\zeta_{1}\right) \neq 0 \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{gathered}
\frac{1}{\rho_{n}^{2}\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{2}} \\
\times \frac{f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right)-a}{f_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right)-f_{n}^{\prime}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right)} \\
\rightarrow \frac{G\left(\zeta_{1}\right)}{G^{\prime \prime}\left(\zeta_{1}\right)}, \\
\frac{1}{\rho_{n}\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right)} \\
\times \frac{\left(f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right)-a\right)\left(f_{n}^{\prime}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right)-a\right)}{f_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right)} \\
\rightarrow \frac{G^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{1}\right)\left(G\left(\zeta_{1}\right)-a\right)}{G^{\prime \prime}\left(\zeta_{1}\right)} .
\end{gathered}
$$

On the other hand, we claim that there are only finitely many $f_{n}$ such that $\psi\left(f_{n}\right) \equiv 0$. Indeed, suppose that there is a subsequence $\left\{f_{n_{j}}\right\} \subset\left\{f_{n}\right\}$ such that $\psi\left(f_{n_{j}}\right) \equiv 0$.
Then

$$
\begin{gathered}
\frac{f_{n_{j}}^{\prime}\left(z_{n_{j}}+\left(1-\left|z_{n_{j}}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n_{j}}+\left(1-\left|z_{n_{j}}\right|\right)^{2} \rho_{n_{j}} \zeta\right)+f_{n_{j}}^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{n_{j}}+\left(1-\left|z_{n_{j}}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n_{j}}+\left(1-\left|z_{n_{j}}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n_{j}} \zeta\right)}{f_{n_{j}}\left(z_{n_{j}}+\left(1-\left|z_{n_{j}}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n_{j}}+\left(1-\left|z_{n_{j}}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n_{j}} \zeta\right)-a} \\
=\frac{2 f_{n_{j}}^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{n_{j}}+\left(1-\left|z_{n_{j}}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n_{j}}+\left(1-\left|z_{n_{j}}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n_{j}} \zeta\right)}{f_{n_{j}}^{\prime}\left(z_{n_{j}}+\left(1-\left|z_{n_{j}}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n_{j}}+\left(1-\left|z_{n_{j}}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n_{j}} \zeta\right)-a},
\end{gathered}
$$

and thus

$$
\frac{\rho_{n_{j}}\left(1-\left|z_{n_{j}}\right|^{2}\right) G_{n_{j}}^{\prime}(\zeta)+G_{n_{j}}^{\prime \prime}(\zeta)}{G_{n_{j}}(\zeta)-a}=\frac{2 \rho_{n_{j}}\left(1-\left|z_{n_{j}}\right|^{2}\right) G_{n_{j}}^{\prime \prime}(\zeta)}{G_{n_{j}}^{\prime}(\zeta)-a \rho_{n_{j}}\left(1-\left|z_{n_{j}}\right|^{2}\right)} .
$$

Letting $j \rightarrow \infty$, we get $G^{\prime \prime}(\zeta) \equiv 0$, a contradiction. Then we may assume that $\psi\left(f_{n}\right) \not \equiv 0$, for all $n$. Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{n}^{2} \psi_{n}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right) \rightarrow \frac{G^{\prime \prime}(\zeta)}{G\left(\zeta_{1}\right)-a}, \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\psi_{n}=\psi\left(f_{n}\right)$. So we have

$$
\log \frac{\left|f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right)-a\right|}{\left|f_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right)-f_{n}^{\prime}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right)\right|}
$$

$\log \frac{\left|\left(f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right)-a\right)\left(f_{n}^{\prime}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right)-a\right)\right|}{\left|f_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right)\right|}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rightarrow-\infty, \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\log \frac{1}{\left|\psi_{n}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right)\right|} \rightarrow-\infty, \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For $n=1,2, \cdots$, set

$$
P_{n}(z)=f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}+z\right)
$$

Let $n$ be sufficiently large. Then $P_{n}$ is defined and holomorphic on the disk $0<|z|<\frac{1}{2}$, since

$$
z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1} \rightarrow 0
$$

By (3.2) and (3.3), we have

$$
\begin{gather*}
P_{n}(0)=G_{n}\left(\zeta_{1}\right) \rightarrow G\left(\zeta_{1}\right) \neq 0, a,  \tag{3.7}\\
P_{n}^{\prime}(0)=\frac{1}{\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n}} G_{n}^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{1}\right) \rightarrow \infty,  \tag{3.8}\\
P_{n}^{\prime \prime}(0)=\frac{1}{\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{2} \rho_{n}^{2}} G_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left(\zeta_{1}\right) \rightarrow \infty,  \tag{3.9}\\
\psi\left(P_{n}(0)\right)=\psi_{n}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right) \rightarrow \infty . \tag{3.10}
\end{gather*}
$$

Therefore, by (3.7)-(3.10) we may apply Lemma 1 to $P_{n}(z)$, and using (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6) we obtain

$$
T\left(r, P_{n}\right) \leq L D\left(r, P_{n}\right)
$$

for sufficiently large $n$. Hence by Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, we get

$$
T\left(\frac{1}{4}, P_{n}\right) \leq M
$$

where $M$ is a constant independent of $n$. It follows that $f_{n}(z)$ are bounded for sufficiently large $n$ and $|z|<\frac{1}{8}$. But, from

$$
\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{2} \rho_{n}^{2} f_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \eta_{n}+\left(1-\left|z_{n}\right|^{2}\right) \rho_{n} \zeta_{1}\right)=G_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left(\zeta_{1}\right) \rightarrow G^{\prime \prime}\left(\zeta_{1}\right) \neq 0
$$

we know that $f_{n}(z)$ cannot be bounded in $|z|<\frac{1}{8}$. We arrive at a contradiction. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.
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