

SET SHARED BY AN ENTIRE FUNCTION WITH ITS k -TH DERIVATIVES USING NORMAL FAMILIES

MOLLA BASIR AHAMED

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study a problem of non-constant entire function f that shares a set $\mathcal{S} = \{a, b, c\}$ with its k -th derivative $f^{(k)}$, where a, b and c are any three distinct complex numbers. We have found a gap in the statement of the main result of *Chang-Fang-Zalcman* [11] and with some help of the method used by *Chang-Fang-Zalcman*, we have generalized the result of *Chang-Fang-Zalcman* in a more compact form. As an application, we generalize the famous Brück conjecture [9] with the idea of set sharing.

1. INTRODUCTION DEFINITIONS AND RESULTS

As we all know, Nevanlinna theory plays an important part in considering value distribution of meromorphic functions and non-trivial solutions of some complex differential equations. A function f is called meromorphic if it is analytic in the complex plane \mathbb{C} except at isolated poles. In what follows, we assume that the reader is familiar with the basic Nevanlinna Theory [18, 26]. It will be convenient to let E denote any set of positive real numbers of finite linear measure, not necessarily the same at each occurrence. Let f and g be two meromorphic functions having the same set of a -points with the same multiplicities, we then say that f and g share the value a *CM* (counting multiplicities) and if we do not consider the multiplicities then f and g are said to share the value a *IM* means the poles of f .

When $a = \infty$, the zeros of $f - a$ means the poles of f .

Definition 1.1. For a non-constant meromorphic function f and any set $\mathcal{S} \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}$, we define

$$E_f(\mathcal{S}) = \bigcup_{a \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ (z, p) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{N} : f(z) = a, \text{ with multiplicity } p \right\},$$

$$\overline{E}_f(\mathcal{S}) = \bigcup_{a \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ (z, 1) \in \mathbb{C} \times \{1\} : f(z) = a \right\}.$$

If $E_f(\mathcal{S}) = E_g(\mathcal{S})$ ($\overline{E}_f(\mathcal{S}) = \overline{E}_g(\mathcal{S})$) then we simply say f and g share \mathcal{S} Counting Multiplicities(CM) (Ignoring Multiplicities(IM)).

Evidently, if \mathcal{S} contains one element only, then it coincides with the usual definition of *CM(IM)* sharing of values.

In 1926, Nevanlinna first showed that a non-constant meromorphic function on the complex plane \mathbb{C} is uniquely determined by the pre-images, ignoring multiplicities, of 5 distinct values (including infinity). A few years latter, he showed that when multiplicities are taken into consideration, 4 points are enough and in that case either the two functions coincides or one is the bilinear transformation of the other one.

Recall that the spherical derivative of a meromorphic function f on a plane domain is

$$f^\#(z) = \frac{|f'(z)|}{1 + |f(z)|^2}.$$

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 30D45.

Key words and phrases: Normal families, entire functions, Set Sharing, Derivative.

Type set by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ - $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{X}$

The sharing value problem between an entire functions and their derivatives was first studied by *Rubel-Yang* [25] where they proved that if a non-constant entire function f and f' share two distinct finite numbers a, b *CM*, then $f \equiv f'$.

In 1979, *Mues-Steinmetz* [23] improved the above theorem in the following manner.

Theorem A. [23] *Let f be a non-constant entire function. If f and f' share two distinct values a, b *IM* then $f \equiv f'$.*

We next recall the following well known definition of set sharing.

Let S be a set of complex numbers and $E_f(S) = \bigcup_{a \in S} \{z : f(z) = a\}$, where each zero is counted according to its multiplicity. If we do not count the multiplicity, then the set $\bigcup_{a \in S} \{z : f(z) = a\}$ is denoted by $\overline{E}_f(S)$.

If $E_f(S) = E_g(S)$ we say that f and g share the set S *CM*. On the other hand $\overline{E}_f(S) = \overline{E}_g(S)$, we say that f and g share the set S *IM*. Evidently, if S contains only one element, then it coincides with the usual definition of *CM* (respectively, *IM*) sharing of values.

We see from the following example that results of *Rubel-Yang* or *Mues-Steinmetz* are not in general true when we consider the sharing of a set of two elements instead of values.

Example 1.1. *Let $S = \left\{ \frac{a}{3}, \frac{2a}{3} \right\}$, where $a (\neq 0)$ be any complex number. Let $f(z) = e^{-z} + a$, then $E_f(S) = E_{f'}(S)$ but $f \not\equiv f'$.*

So for the uniqueness of an entire function and its derivative sharing a set, the cardinality of the range set should be at least three.

In this regard in 2003, using the properties of Normal families, *Fang-Zalcman* [14] obtained the following result.

Theorem B. [14] *Let $S = \{0, a, b\}$, where a, b are two non-zero distinct complex numbers satisfying $a^2 \neq b^2$, $a \neq 2b$, $a^2 - ab + b^2 \neq 0$. If for a non-constant entire function f , $E_f(S) = E_{f'}(S)$, then $f \equiv f'$.*

In order to generalize the range set in the above theorem, in 2007 *Chang-Fang-Zalcman* [11] obtained the following result.

Theorem C. [11] *Let f be a non-constant entire function and let $S = \{a, b, c\}$, where a, b and c are distinct complex numbers. If $E_f(S) = E_{f'}(S)$, then either*

- (1) $f(z) = Ce^z$; or
- (2) $f(z) = Ce^{-z} + \frac{2}{3}(a+b+c)$ and $(2a-b-c)(2b-c-a)(2c-a-b) = 0$; or
- (3) $f(z) = Ce^{\frac{-1 \pm i\sqrt{3}z}{2}} + \frac{3 \pm i\sqrt{3}}{6}(a+b+c)$ and $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - ab - bc - ca = 0$,

where C is a non-zero constant.

We see from the next example that, conclusion of *Theorem C* ceases to be hold if *CM* shared set S be replaced by *IM* shared set.

Example 1.2. [11] *Let $S = \{-1, 0, 1\}$ and $f(z) = \sin z$ or $\cos z$. then it is clear that f and f' share the set S *IM* and f takes none of the forms (1) – (3) in *Theorem C*.*

Remark 1.1. *In Example 1.2, one may consider k -th derivative of f instead of first derivative, when k is any odd positive integer to get the same.*

From the above discussions, one may note that a non-constant entire function and its first derivative when share a set of arbitrary three finite complex numbers a, b and c counting multiplicities, then it is possible to find out some specific forms of the function f .

Remark 1.2. *We have found a little gap in the statement of *Theorem C*. This is because of the fact that the authors *Chang-Fang-Zalcman* have been used Lemma 2.2 to prove their result *Theorem C* for the first derivative of a function f i.e., for $k = 1$. So one may noticed the following points.*

- (i). In the statement of the Theorem C, the author should mention the line from Lemma 2.2 as “let f be a non-constant entire function having zeros of multiplicities ≥ 1 ”.
- (ii). Since function f must have zeros, so it is natural that the possible form of the function should not be of the form $f(z) = Ce^z$ as it has no zeros at all.

So the natural question arises as follows:

Question 1.1. *Is it possible to extend Theorem C for k -th derivative of f ?*

If the answer of Question 1.1 is affirmative, then one may ask the following question:

Question 1.2. *What will be the possible forms of the non-constant entire function f ?*

Since f and $f^{(k)}$ share the set $\mathcal{S} = \{a, b, c\}$, so one may observe that among all the possible relationship between f and $f^{(k)}$, clearly $f^{(k)} \equiv f$ is the obvious one. So before going to state our main results, we want to discuss on a natural quarry *What is the general solution of $f^{(k)} \equiv f$?* The natural answer is $f(z) = \mathcal{L}_\theta(z)$ (see [1, 6]) where we defined $\mathcal{L}_\theta(z)$ as follows

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{L}_\theta(z) = c_0 e^z + c_1 e^{\theta z} + c_2 e^{\theta^2 z} + \dots + c_{k-1} e^{\theta^{k-1} z},$$

$c_i \in \mathbb{C}$ for $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$ with $c_{k-1} \neq 0$ and $\theta = \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{k}\right) + i \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{k}\right)$.

Answering all the questions mentioned above is the main motivation of writing this paper. We have tried to take care of the points we have mentioned in *Remark 1.2*. Following is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let f be a non-constant entire function, having zeros of multiplicity $\geq k$ and let $S = \{a, b, c\}$, where a, b and c are distinct complex numbers. If $E_f(S) = E_{f^{(k)}}(S)$, then f takes one of the following forms:*

- (1) $f(z) = \mathcal{L}_\theta(\beta z)$, where β is a root of the equation $z^k - 1 = 0$,
- (2) $f(z) = \mathcal{L}_\theta(\eta z) + \frac{2}{3}(a + b + c)$, where η is a root of the equation $z^k + 1 = 0$ and $(2a - b - c)(2b - c - a)(2c - a - b) = 0$,
- (3) $f(z) = \mathcal{L}_\theta(\zeta z) + \frac{3 \pm i\sqrt{3}}{6}(a + b + c)$, where $\zeta (\neq 1)$ is a root of the equation $z^{3k} - 1 = 0$ and $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - ab - bc - ca = 0$,

where $\mathcal{L}_\theta(z)$ is defined in (1.1).

2. SOME LEMMAS

We begin our investigation with the following lemmas, which are essential to prove our main results.

Lemma 2.1. [10] *The order of an entire function having bounded spherical derivative on \mathcal{C} is at most 1.*

Lemma 2.2. [14] *Let \mathcal{F} be a family of holomorphic functions in a domain D . Let k be a positive integer. Let a, b and c be three distinct finite complex numbers and M a positive number. If, for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, the zeros of f are of multiplicity $\geq k$ and $|f^{(k)}(z)| \leq M$ whenever $f(z) \in \{a, b, c\}$, then \mathcal{F} is normal in D .*

Lemma 2.3. [15] *Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function of finite order ρ , and $\epsilon > 0$ a constant. Then there exists a set $E \subset [0, 2\pi)$ which has linear measure zero, such that if $\psi_0 \in [0, 2\pi) - E$, then there is a constant $R_0 = R_0(\psi_0) > 0$ such that for all z satisfying $\arg z = \psi_0$ and $|z| > R_0$, we have*

$$\left| \frac{f^{(k)}(z)}{f(z)} \right| \leq |z|^{k(\rho + \epsilon - 1)}.$$

Lemma 2.4. *Let f be an entire function, and suppose that $|f^{(k)}(z)|$ is unbounded on some ray $\arg z = \theta$. Then there exists an infinite sequence of points $z_n = r_n e^{i\theta}$ where $r_n \rightarrow \infty$, such that $f^{(k)}(z_n) \rightarrow \infty$ and*

$$(2.1) \quad \left| \frac{f(z_n)}{f^{(k)}(z_n)} \right| \leq (1 + o(1)) |z_n|^k$$

as $z_n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Let $T(r, f^{(k)}, \theta) = \max_{\substack{0 \leq |z| \leq r \\ \arg z = \theta}} \left\{ \left| f^{(k)}(z) \right| \right\}$. It implies that there exists an infinite sequence

of points $z_n = r_n e^{i\theta}$ where $r_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $T(r, f^{(k)}, \theta) = |f^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta})|$ for all n . Therefore for each n , one can get the following easily

$$f(z_n) = f(0) + \int_0^{z_n} f'(z) dz,$$

$$f(z_n) = f(0) + \frac{z_n}{(1)!} \int_0^{z_n} \int_0^z f''(z) dz dz,$$

⋮

$$f(z_n) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{z_n^i}{(i)!} f^{(i)}(0) + \left\{ \int_0^{z_n} \overbrace{\int_0^z \dots \int_0^z}^{(k-1)\text{-times}} f^{(k)}(z) \overbrace{dz \dots dz}^{k\text{-times}} \right\}.$$

So, applying triangle inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & |f(z)| \\ & \leq \left| \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{z_n^i}{(i)!} f^{(i)}(0) \right| + \left| \left\{ \int_0^{z_n} \overbrace{\int_0^z \dots \int_0^z}^{(k-1)\text{-times}} f^{(k)}(z) \overbrace{dz \dots dz}^{k\text{-times}} \right\} \right| \\ & \leq \left| \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{z_n^i}{(i)!} f^{(i)}(0) \right| + \left| f^{(k)}(z) \right| \left| \left\{ \int_0^{z_n} \overbrace{\int_0^z \dots \int_0^z}^{(k-1)\text{-times}} dz \dots dz \right\} \right| \\ & \leq \left| \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{z_n^i}{(i)!} f^{(i)}(0) \right| + \left| f^{(k)}(z) \right| |z_n|^k. \end{aligned}$$

Since $f^{(k)}(z) \rightarrow \infty$, so we obtained (2.1). □

Lemma 2.5. [22] *A class \mathcal{C} of functions f meromorphic in a domain $D \subset \mathcal{C}$ is normal in D if and only if $f^\#$ is uniformly bounded on any compact subset of D for $f \in \mathcal{C}$.*

Lemma 2.6. [19, 24] *Let f be an entire function of order at most 1 and k be a positive integer. Then*

$$m \left(r, \frac{f^{(k)}}{f} \right) = o(\log r), \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty.$$

Lemma 2.7. *Let α be a non-constant entire function and a, b and c are three distinct finite complex numbers. Then there does not exist an entire function f satisfying the differential equation*

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{(f^{(k)} - a)(f^{(k)} - b)(f^{(k)} - c)}{(f - a)(f - b)(f - c)} = e^\alpha.$$

Proof. Let if possible there exists an entire function satisfying (2.2). Then we see that $|f^{(i)}(z)| \leq \max\{a, b, c\}$ whenever $f(z) \in \{a, b, c\}$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Thus by Lemma 2.2, the family $\mathcal{F}_w = \{f_w : w \in \mathbb{C}\}$, where $f_w(z) = f(w + z)$ is normal on the unit disc, so by Marty's Theorem, we get $f^\#(w) = (f_w)^\#(0)$ is uniformly bounded for all $w \in \mathbb{C}$. Therefore from Lemma 2.1, we get that f has order at most 1.

Now from (2.2), we obtained $\alpha(z) = \mathcal{A}z + \mathcal{B}$, where \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are two constants. It is clear that $\mathcal{A} \neq 0$, since α is non-constant.

Next we claim that $abc \neq 0$. On contrary, let $abc = 0$. i.e., $a = 0$ or $b = 0$ or $c = 0$. Without any loss of generality, we may assume that $a = 0$. Then from (2.2), we get

$$\frac{f^{(k)}(f^{(k)} - b)(f^{(k)} - c)}{f(f - b)(f - c)} = e^{\mathcal{A}z + \mathcal{B}}.$$

Again we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{f^{(k)}(f^{(k)} - b)(f^{(k)} - c)}{f(f - b)(f - c)} \\ &= \frac{(f^{(k)})^3}{f(f - b)(f - c)} - \frac{(b + c)(f^{(k)})^2}{f(f - b)(f - c)} + \frac{bcf^{(k)}}{f(f - b)(f - c)} \\ &= \frac{f^{(k)}}{f} \frac{f^{(k)}}{f - b} \frac{f^{(k)}}{f - c} - \frac{b + c}{b - c} \left(\frac{f^{(k)}}{f - b} - \frac{f^{(k)}}{f - c} \right) + bc \left(\frac{\mathcal{A}_1 f^{(k)}}{f} + \frac{\mathcal{B}_1 f^{(k)}}{f - b} + \frac{\mathcal{B}_1 f^{(k)}}{f - c} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{B}_1$ and \mathcal{C}_1 are constants. Next we see that there exists $\mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{B}_2$ and \mathcal{C}_2 ([?]) such that

$$\begin{aligned} & m \left(r, \frac{f^{(k)}(f^{(k)} - b)(f^{(k)} - c)}{f(f - b)(f - c)} \right) \\ & \leq \mathcal{A}_2 m \left(r, \frac{f^{(k)}}{f} \right) + \mathcal{B}_2 m \left(r, \frac{f^{(k)}}{f - b} \right) + \mathcal{B}_2 m \left(r, \frac{f^{(k)}}{f - c} \right) + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus by Lemma 2.6, we get

$$T(r, e^{\mathcal{A}z + \mathcal{B}}) = m(r, e^{\mathcal{A}z + \mathcal{B}}) = o(\log r),$$

which is not possible since $\mathcal{A} \neq 0$.

Therefore $abc \neq 0$. Next we get

$$(2.3) \quad g(z) = f(z/\mathcal{A}) \text{ i.e., } g^{(k)}(z) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{A}^k} f^{(k)}(z/\mathcal{A}).$$

Using (2.3) in (2.2), we get

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{(g^{(k)} - a/\mathcal{A}^k)(g^{(k)} - b/\mathcal{A}^k)(g^{(k)} - c/\mathcal{A}^k)}{(g - a)(g - b)(g - c)} \equiv \mathcal{C}e^z,$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \frac{e^{\mathcal{B}}}{\mathcal{A}^{3k}} \neq 0$. Next (2.4) can be written as follows

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{(g^{(k)})^3 + \mathcal{C}_1 (g^{(k)})^2 + \mathcal{C}_2 g^{(k)}}{(g - a)(g - b)(g - c)} - \mathcal{C}e^z = \frac{\mathcal{C}_3}{(g - a)(g - b)(g - c)},$$

where \mathcal{C}_j are constants with $\mathcal{C}_3 \neq 0$. With $\epsilon = \frac{1}{3}$, Lemma 2.3 shows that there exists a set $E \subset [0, 2\pi)$ of measure zero such that for each $\psi_0 \in [0, 2\pi) - E$, there is a constant $R_0 = R_0(\psi_0) > 0$ such that whenever $\arg z = \psi_0$ and $|z| > R_0$,

$$(2.6) \quad \left| \frac{(g^{(k)})^3 + \mathcal{C}_1 (g^{(k)})^2 + \mathcal{C}_2 g^{(k)}}{(g - a)(g - b)(g - c)} \right| \leq K|z|,$$

for some positive constant K . Now we may suppose that $\pi/2$ and $3\pi/2$ are continued in the set E . Then $[0, 2\pi) - E = E_1 \cup E_2$, where $E_1 = \{\theta \in [0, 2\pi) : \cos \theta > 0\}$ and $E_2 = \{\theta \in [0, 2\pi) :$

$\cos \theta < 0$ }. Let $\theta \in E_1$, then by (2.5) and (2.6), we have for sufficiently large r ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{\mathcal{C}_3}{(g(re^{i\theta}) - a)(g(re^{i\theta}) - b)(g(re^{i\theta}) - c)} \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{(g^{(k)}(re^{i\theta}))^3 + \mathcal{C}_1 (g^{(k)}(re^{i\theta}))^2 + \mathcal{C}_2 g^{(k)}(re^{i\theta})}{(g(re^{i\theta}) - a)(g(re^{i\theta}) - b)(g(re^{i\theta}) - c)} - \mathcal{C} e^{re^{i\theta}} \right| \\ &\geq |\mathcal{C}| e^{r \cos \theta} - Kr \\ &\rightarrow \infty, \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$(2.7) \quad g(re^{i\theta}) \rightarrow a, b \text{ or } c, \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty.$$

Next let $\theta \in E_2$. We claim that $|g^{(k)}(re^{i\theta})|$ is bounded as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose on the contrary that $|g^{(k)}(re^{i\theta})|$ is unbounded as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Then by Lemma 2.4, there exists a sequence $r_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $|g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta})| \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$(2.8) \quad \left| g(r_n e^{i\theta}) g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta}) \right| \leq (1 + o(1)) r_n^k.$$

Now with $|g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta})| \rightarrow \infty$, we note that

$$(2.9) \quad \left| \frac{(g(r_n e^{i\theta}) - a)(g(r_n e^{i\theta}) - b)(g(r_n e^{i\theta}) - c)}{(g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta}))^3 + \mathcal{C}_1 (g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta}))^2 + \mathcal{C}_2 g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta})} \right| \leq (1 + o(1)) r_n^{3k}.$$

Again since $|g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta})| \rightarrow \infty$, it follows from (2.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} (2.10) \quad & \left| \frac{(g(r_n e^{i\theta}) - a)(g(r_n e^{i\theta}) - b)(g(r_n e^{i\theta}) - c)}{r_n^{3k} \mathcal{C}_3} \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{(g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta}))^3 + \mathcal{C}_1 (g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta}))^2 + \mathcal{C}_2 g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta}) - \mathcal{C}_3}{r_n^{3k} |\mathcal{C}_3| |\mathcal{C}| e^{r_n e^{i\theta}}} \right| \\ &= r_n^{-3k} e^{-r_n \cos \theta} \frac{(g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta}))^3 + \mathcal{C}_1 (g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta}))^2 + \mathcal{C}_2 g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta}) - \mathcal{C}_3}{|\mathcal{C}_3 \mathcal{C}|} \\ &\rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus from (2.5), (2.9) and (2.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 - o(1) \\ &\leq \left| r_n^{3k} \frac{(g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta}))^3 + \mathcal{C}_1 (g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta}))^2 + \mathcal{C}_2 g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta}) - \mathcal{C}_3}{(g(r_n e^{i\theta}) - a)(g(r_n e^{i\theta}) - b)(g(r_n e^{i\theta}) - c)} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{r_n^{3k} \mathcal{C}_3}{(g(r_n e^{i\theta}) - a)(g(r_n e^{i\theta}) - b)(g(r_n e^{i\theta}) - c)} \right| + |\mathcal{C}| r_n^{3k} e^{r_n \cos \theta} \\ &\rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is absurd. Hence our suppositions that $|g^{(k)}(r_n e^{i\theta})|$ is bounded as $r \rightarrow \infty$ for each $\theta \in E_2$. One can get easily that

$$g(re^{i\theta}) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{z_n^i}{(i)!} f^{(i)}(0) + (e^{i\theta})^k \left\{ \int_0^r \overbrace{\int_0^t \dots \int_0^t}^{(k-1)\text{-times}} f^{(k)}(z) \overbrace{dt \dots dt}^{k\text{-times}} \right\}.$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.11) \quad & |g(re^{i\theta})| \\
 & \leq \left| \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{z_n^i}{(i)!} f^{(i)}(0) \right| + \left| \left\{ \int_0^r \overbrace{\int_0^t \dots \int_0^t}^{(k-1)\text{-times}} f^{(k)}(z) \overbrace{dt \dots dt}^{k\text{-times}} \right\} \right| \\
 & \leq \left| \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{z_n^i}{(i)!} f^{(i)}(0) \right| + \mathcal{M}r^k,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(\theta)$ is a positive constant depending on θ .

Hence by (2.7) and (2.11), for every $\theta \in [0, 2\pi) - E$, there exists a positive constant $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(\theta)$ such that for $z = re^{i\theta}$ with $r > r_0$,

$$(2.12) \quad \left| \frac{g(z)}{z^k} \right| \leq \mathcal{L}.$$

Since g has order at most 1, it follows from (2.7), (2.12), the Phragén-Lindelöf Theorem [?], and by Liouville's Theorem, g is a polynomial of degree at most k , which is impossible by (2.4). This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Let $S = \{a, b, c\}$ where a, b and c be any three distinct finite complex numbers and \mathcal{A} a non-zero constant. If $E_f(S) = E_{f^{(k)}}(S)$, where f is an entire function having zeros of multiplicities $\geq k$ and satisfying $f^{(k)} \neq 0$ and*

$$(2.13) \quad \frac{(f^{(k)} - a)(f^{(k)} - b)(f^{(k)} - c)}{(f - a)(f - b)(f - c)} \equiv \mathcal{A},$$

then f must take one of the following forms:

- (1) $f(z) = \mathcal{L}_\theta(\beta z)$, where β is a root of the equation $z^k - 1 = 0$,
- (2) $f(z) = \mathcal{L}_\theta(\eta z) + \frac{2}{3}(a + b + c)$, where η is a root of the equation $z^k + 1 = 0$ and $(2a - b - c)(2b - c - a)(2c - a - b) = 0$,
- (3) $f(z) = \mathcal{L}_\theta(\zeta z) + \frac{3 \pm i\sqrt{3}}{6}(a + b + c)$, where $\zeta (\neq 1)$ is a root of the equation $z^{3k} - 1 = 0$ and $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - ab - bc - ca = 0$,

where \mathcal{C} is a non-zero constant.

Proof. From the proof of Lemma 2.7, we note that f has order at most 1. Since f and $f^{(k)}$ have the same order and f having zeros of multiplicities $\geq k$ satisfying $f^{(k)} \neq 0$ and $E_f(S) = E_{f^{(k)}}(S)$, so one must have the following form

$$(2.14) \quad f^{(k)}(z) = c_0 \alpha^k e^{\alpha z} + c_1 \alpha^k e^{\alpha \theta z} + \dots + c_{k-1} \alpha^k e^{\alpha \theta^{k-1} z} = \alpha^k \mathcal{L}_\theta(\alpha z), \text{ (say)}$$

where $c_i \in \mathbb{C}$, for $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$ with $c_{k-1} \neq 0$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{C} - \{0\}$,

$$\theta = \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{k}\right) + i \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{k}\right)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}_\theta(\alpha z) = c_0 e^{\alpha z} + c_1 e^{\alpha \theta z} + \dots + c_{k-1} e^{\alpha \theta^{k-1} z}.$$

On integrating (2.14) k -times, we get

$$(2.15) \quad f(z) = \mathcal{L}_\theta(\alpha z) + \mathcal{Q}_{k-1}(z),$$

where \mathcal{Q}_{k-1} is a polynomial of degree $\leq k-1$.

Next using (2.14) and (2.15), we get from (2.13)

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\alpha^{3k} - \mathcal{A}) (\mathcal{L}_\theta(\alpha z))^3 + (\mathcal{L}_1 \alpha^{2k} - 3\mathcal{A}\mathcal{Q}_{k-1} - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{L}_1) (\mathcal{L}_\theta(\alpha z))^2 \\ & + (\mathcal{L}_2 \alpha^k - 3\mathcal{A}\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}^2 - 2\mathcal{A}\mathcal{L}_1\mathcal{Q}_{k-1} - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{L}_2) \mathcal{L}_\theta(\alpha z) \\ & + (\mathcal{L}_3 - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}^3 - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{L}_1\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}^2 - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{L}_2\mathcal{Q}_{k-1} - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{L}_3) \equiv 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_1 = -(a + b + c)$, $\mathcal{L}_2 = ab + bc + ca$ and $\mathcal{L}_3 = -abc$. It follows that

$$(2.17) \quad \alpha^{3k} = \mathcal{A},$$

$$(2.18) \quad \mathcal{L}_1 \alpha^{2k} = \mathcal{A}(3\mathcal{Q}_{k-1} + \mathcal{L}_1),$$

$$(2.19) \quad \mathcal{L}_2 \alpha^k = \mathcal{A}(3\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}^2 + 2\mathcal{L}_1\mathcal{Q}_{k-1} + \mathcal{L}_2),$$

$$(2.20) \quad \mathcal{L}_3 = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}^3 + \mathcal{L}_1\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}^2 + \mathcal{L}_2\mathcal{Q}_{k-1} + \mathcal{L}_3).$$

We now discuss the following different cases.

Case 1. Let $\alpha \in \{z : z^k - 1 = 0\}$. Then from (2.17) and (2.18), we get $\mathcal{A} = 1$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{k-1} = 0$. Thus we see that

$$f(z) = \mathcal{L}_\theta(\beta z),$$

where β is a root of the equation $z^k - 1 = 0$.

Case 2. Let $\alpha \in \{z : z^k + 1 = 0\}$. Then from (2.17) and (2.18), we see that $\mathcal{A} = -1$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{k-1} = -\frac{2}{3}\mathcal{L}_1$. It follows from (2.20) that

$$2\mathcal{L}_1^3 - 9\mathcal{L}_1\mathcal{L}_2 + 27\mathcal{L}_3 = 0$$

which in turn implies that

$$(2a - b - c)(2b - c - a)(2c - a - b) = 0.$$

In this case, we get

$$f(z) = \mathcal{L}_\theta(\eta z) + \frac{2}{3}(a + b + c),$$

where η is a root of the equation $z^k + 1 = 0$.

Case 3. Let $\alpha \notin \{z : z^k - 1 = 0\} \cup \{z : z^k + 1 = 0\}$. Then by (2.17) and (2.18), we get

$$(2.21) \quad \mathcal{Q}_{k-1} = \frac{1 - \alpha^k}{3\alpha^k} \mathcal{L}_1.$$

Then by (2.17), (2.19) and (2.21), we get

$$(2.22) \quad \mathcal{L}_2 = \frac{(\mathcal{L}_1)^2}{3}.$$

Next by (2.17), (2.20), (2.21) and (2.22), we get

$$(2.23) \quad (1 - \alpha^{3k})\mathcal{L}_3 = \frac{1}{27}(1 - \alpha^{3k})\mathcal{L}_1^3.$$

Subcase 3.1. If $\alpha^{3k} \neq 1$, then $\mathcal{L}_3 = (\mathcal{L}_1)^3/27$. This with (2.22) shows that $a = b = c$, which is not possible.

Subcase 3.2. Hence $\alpha^{3k} - 1 = 0$. i.e., $\alpha^k = \frac{-1 \pm i\sqrt{3}}{2}$. Thus we have $\mathcal{Q}_{k-1} = -\frac{3 \pm i\sqrt{3}}{6}\mathcal{L}_1$. After simplifying (2.22), we get $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - ab - bc - ca = 0$. Therefore we see that

$$f(z) = \mathcal{L}_\theta(\zeta z) + \frac{3 \pm i\sqrt{3}}{6}(a + b + c),$$

where $\zeta (\neq 1)$ is a root of the equation $z^{3k} - 1 = 0$. □

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Since $E_f(S) = E_f^{(k)}(S)$, therefore it is clear that

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{(f^{(k)} - a)(f^{(k)} - b)(f^{(k)} - c)}{(f - a)(f - b)(f - c)} \equiv e^{\alpha(z)},$$

where α is an entire function. We note that by Lemma 2.7, α is constant. Then we set $\mathcal{A} = e^\alpha$. Thus from (3.1) changes to

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{(f^{(k)} - a)(f^{(k)} - b)(f^{(k)} - c)}{(f - a)(f - b)(f - c)} \equiv \mathcal{A}.$$

Next we discuss the following cases.

Case 1. If $f^{(k)} \neq 0$, then by Lemma 2.8, we see that f takes one of the three forms (1)-(3). So we are done.

Case 2. If $f^{(k)}$ vanishes at some point $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$. i.e., $f^{(k)}(z_0) = 0$. Now differentiating both sides of (3.2), we get

$$(3.3) \quad \left\{ 3 \left(f^{(k)} \right)^2 - 2(a + b + c)f^{(k)} + (ab + bc + ca) \right\} f^{(k+1)} \\ \equiv \mathcal{A} \left\{ 3f^2 - 2(a + b + c)f + (ab + bc + ca) \right\} f'.$$

Let $f^{(k)}(z_0) = 0$, $k \leq n$. So we may assume

$$f(z) = f(z_0) + A_n(z - z_0)^n + \dots$$

It is clear that $f^{(k)}(z) = B_n(z - z_0)^{n-k} + \dots$ and $f'(z) = nA(z - z_0)^{n-1} + \dots$. We see that *L.H.S* of (3.3) vanishes at z_0 to order $n - k$ while *R.H.S* of (3.3) vanishes to the order at least $n - 1$, which is not possible.

4. SOME APPLICATION

In 1996, the following conjecture was proposed by Brück [9].

Conjecture 4.1. [9] *Let f be a non-constant entire function. Suppose that $\rho_1(f)$ is not a positive integer or infinite. If f and f' share one finite value a CM, then*

$$\frac{f' - a}{f - a} = c,$$

for some non-zero constant c , where $\rho_1(f)$ is the first iterated order of f which is defined by

$$\rho_1(f) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log T(r, f)}{\log r}.$$

Many authors (for the case of differences see [20, 21] and for the cases of derivatives or differential polynomials see [2] - [8] and [12, 13, 16]) have studied the conjecture under some additional conditions. But the main conjecture is still open. In this direction, it is interesting to ask the following two questions.

Question 4.1. *Does the conjecture hold if one considers a set having three arbitrary finite complex numbers instead of a value ?*

Question 4.2. *Is it possible to replace first derivative $f^{(1)}$ by a more general derivative $f^{(k)}$?*

Remark 4.1. *Note that Lemma 2.8 answers the above questions in some sense.*

REFERENCES

- [1] M. B. Ahamed, *Uniqueness of two differential polynomials of a meromorphic function sharing a set*, Commun. Korean Math. Soc., **33**(2018), no. 4, 1181–1203.
- [2] M. B. Ahamed and A. Banerjee, *Rational function and differential polynomial of a meromorphic function sharing a small function*, Bull. Transilvaniya Univ. Barso., Ser. III: Math. Info., **10**(59)(2017), no. 1, 1–18.
- [3] Al-Khaladi A., *On meromorphic functions that share one value with their derivatives*, Analysis(Munich), **25**(2005), no. 2, 131-140.
- [4] A. Banerjee and M. B. Ahamed, *Meromorphic function sharing a small function with its differential polynomial*, Acta Univ. Palacki. Olomuc., Fac. rer. nat., Mathematica, **54**(2015), no. 1, 33–45.
- [5] A. Banerjee and M. B. Ahamed, *Uniqueness of a polynomial and a differential monomial sharing a small function*, Analele Univ. de Vest Timisoara, Seria Math. - info., **54**(2016), no. 1, 55–71.
- [6] A. Banerjee and M. B. Ahamed, *Polynomial of a meromorphic function and its k th derivative sharing a set*, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo, II Ser, **67**(2018), no. 3, 581–598.
- [7] A. Banerjee and M. B. Ahamed, *Yu's result - a further extension*, Electronic J. Math. Anal. Appl., **6**(2018), no. 2, 330–348.
- [8] A. Banerjee and M. B. Ahamed, *Further investigations on some results of Yu*, J. Classical Anal., **14**(1)(2019), 1–16.
- [9] R. Brück, *On entire function which share one value CM with their first derivative*, Results in Math., **30**(1996), 21–24.
- [10] J. Clunie and W. K. Hayman, *The spherical derivative of integral and meromorphic functions*, Comment. Math. Helv., **40**(1966), 117–148.
- [11] J. Chang, M. Fang and L. Zalcman, *Entire functions that share a set with their derivatives*, Archiv der Mathematik, **89**(2007), 561–569.
- [12] Z. X. Chen and K. H. Shon, *On conjecture of R. Brück concerning the entire function sharing one value CM with its derivative*, Taiwanese J. Math., **8**(2)(2004), 235- 244.
- [13] Z. X. Chen and K. H. Shon, *On the entire function sharing one value CM with k -th derivatives*, J. Korean Math. Soc. **42**(2005), no. 1, 85-99.
- [14] M. L. Fang and L. Zalcman, *Normal families and uniqueness theorems for entire functions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **280**(2003), 273–283.
- [15] G. G. Gundersen, *Estimates for the logarithmic derivative of a meromorphic function*, plus similar estimates, J. London Math. Soc., **37**(1998), 88–104.
- [16] G. G. Gundersen and L. Z. Yang, *Entire functions that share one value with one or two of their derivatives*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **223**(1)(1998), 88-95.
- [17] G. G. Gundersen, *Finite order solution of second order linear differential equations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **305**(1998), 415-429.
- [18] W. K. Hayman, *Meromorphic functions*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1964.
- [19] J. Heittokangas, R. Korhonen and J. Rättyä, *Generalized logarithmic derivative estimates of Gol'dberg-Grinshtein type*, Bull. London. Math. Soc., **36**(2004),105–114.
- [20] J. Heittokangas, R. Korhonen, I. Laine, J. Rieppo and J. L. Zhang, *Value sharing results for shifts of meromorphic functions, and sufficient condition for periodicity*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **355**(2009), 352-363.
- [21] Z.B. Huang and R. R. Zhang, *Uniqueness of the differences of meromorphic functions*, Anal. Math. **44**(4)(2018), 461-473. Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1965.
- [22] F. Marty, *Researches sur la ré partition des valeurs d'une mérmorphe*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Univ. Toulouse, **23**(3)(1931),183–261.
- [23] E. Mues and N. Steimetz, *Meromorphe Funktionen die unit ihrer Ableitung Werte teilen*, Manuscripta Math., **29**(1979), 195–206.
- [24] V. Ngoan and I. V. Ostrovski, *The logarithmic derivative of a meromorphic function*, Akad. Nauk. Arjman. SSR. Doki. **41**(1965), 272–277.
- [25] L. A. Rubel and C. C. Yang, *Value shared by an entire function and its derivative*, Complex Analysis (Proc. Conf. Univ. Kentuky, Lexington, Ky., 1976), Lecture Notes in Math., **599**(1977), 101–103, Springer, Berlin.
- [26] L. Yang, *Value Distribution Theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KALIPADA GHOSH TARAI MAHAVIDYALAYA, WEST BENGAL 734014, INDIA.
 E-mail address: bsrhmd116@gmail.com, bsrhmd117@gmail.com.