A NOTE ON MUES' CONJECTURE

INDRAJIT LAHIRI

(Received 14 September 2000 and in revised form 30 October 2000)

ABSTRACT. We prove that Mues' conjecture holds for the second- and higher-order derivatives of a square and higher power of any transcendental meromorphic function.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 30D35.

1. Introduction, definitions, and results. Let *f* be a transcendental meromorphic function defined in the open complex plane \mathcal{C} . For a positive integer *l* we denote by $N(r, \infty; f \mid \geq l)$ the counting function of the poles of *f* with multiplicities not less than *l*, where a pole is counted according to its multiplicity. Also for $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$, we denote by $N(r, \alpha; f \mid = 1)$ the counting function of simple zeros of $f - \alpha$. We do not explain the standard definitions and notations of the value distribution theory as they are available in [1, 6].

In 1971, Mues [4] conjectured that for a positive integer k the following relation might be true:

$$\sum_{a\neq\infty}\delta(a;f^{(k)})\leq 1.$$
(1.1)

Mues [4] himself proved the following theorem.

THEOREM 1.1. If $N(r, f) - \bar{N}(r, f) = o\{N(r, f)\}$, then for $k \ge 2$

$$\sum_{a\neq\infty}\delta(a;f^{(k)})\leq 1.$$
(1.2)

In this direction Ishizaki [3] proved the following result.

THEOREM 1.2. If for some $l(\geq 2)$ $N(r, \infty; f \mid \geq l) = o\{N(r, f)\}$, then for all $k \geq l$

$$\sum_{a\neq\infty}\delta(a;f^{(k)})\leq 1.$$
(1.3)

Yang and Wang [7] also worked on Mues' conjecture and proved the following theorem.

THEOREM 1.3. There exists a positive number K = K(f) such that for every positive integer $k \ge K$

$$\sum_{a\neq\infty}\delta(a;f^{(k)}) \le 1.$$
(1.4)

INDRAJIT LAHIRI

We see that in Theorem 1.3 the set of exceptional integers k is different for different function f. In this paper, we show that if f is a square or a higher power of a meromorphic function, then the relation (1.1) holds for any integer $k \ge 2$. This result follows as a consequence of the following theorem because such a function has no simple zero.

THEOREM 1.4. If $N(r, \alpha; f \mid = 1) = S(r, f)$ for some $\alpha \neq \infty$, then for $k \ge 2$

$$\sum_{a\neq\infty} \delta(a; f^{(k)}) \le 1.$$
(1.5)

2. Lemmas. In this section, we state two lemmas which will be needed in the proof of Theorem 1.4.

LEMMA 2.1 (see [2]). Let A > 1, then there exists a set M(A) of upper logarithmic density at most min{ $(2e^{A-1}-1)^{-1}, (1+e(A-1)\exp(e(1-A)))$ } such that for k = 1, 2, 3, ...

$$\limsup_{r \to \infty, \ r \notin M(A)} \frac{T(r, f)}{T(r, f^{(k)})} \le 3eA.$$
(2.1)

LEMMA 2.2 (see [5]). For any integer $k \ge 0$ and any positive number $\varepsilon > 0$, we get

$$(k-2)\bar{N}(r,f) + N(r,0;f) \le 2\bar{N}(r,0;f) + N(r,0;f^{(k)}) + \varepsilon T(r,f) + S(r,f).$$
(2.2)

3. Proof of Theorem 1.4. Without loss of generality, we may choose $\alpha = 0$. Let $g = f - \alpha$. Then $f^{(k)} = g^{(k)}$ and

$$N(r,0;g \mid = 1) = N(r,\alpha;f \mid = 1) = S(r,f) = S(r,g).$$
(3.1)

Applying the second fundamental theorem to $f^{(k)}$, we get for any q finite distinct complex numbers a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_q

$$m(r, f^{(k)}) + \sum_{j=1}^{q} m(r, a_j; f^{(k)})$$

$$\leq 2T(r, f^{(k)}) - N(r, 0; f^{(k+1)}) - 2N(r, f^{(k)}) + N(r, f^{(k+1)}) + S(r, f^{(k)}),$$
(3.2)

that is,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} m(r, a_j; f^{(k)}) \le T(r, f^{(k)}) + \bar{N}(r, f) - N(r, 0; f^{(k+1)}) + S(r, f^{(k)}).$$
(3.3)

By Lemma 2.2 and from (3.3) we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} m(r, a_j; f^{(k)}) \le T(r, f^{(k)}) + \bar{N}(r, f) + 2\bar{N}(r, 0; f) - N(r, 0; f) - (k-1)\bar{N}(r, f) + \varepsilon T(r, f) + S(r, f) + S(r, f^{(k)}).$$

$$(3.4)$$

426

Since $2\bar{N}(r,0;f) - N(r,0;f) \le N(r,0;f \mid = 1) = S(r,f)$ and $k \ge 2$, we get from (3.4)

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} m(r, a_j; f^{(k)}) \le T(r, f^{(k)}) + \varepsilon T(r, f) + S(r, f) + S(r, f^{(k)}).$$
(3.5)

Let *E* be the exceptional set arising out of Lemma 2.2, the second fundamental theorem, and the condition N(r, 0; f | = 1) = S(r, f). We choose a sequence of positive numbers $\{r_n\}$ tending to infinity such that $r_n \notin E \cup M(A)$. Then from (3.5) we get, for $r = r_n$ in view of Lemma 2.1,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} m(r_n, a_j; f^{(k)}) \le T(r_n, f^{(k)}) + 3eA\varepsilon T(r_n, f^{(k)}) + o\{T(r_n, f^{(k)})\},$$
(3.6)

which gives

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} \delta(a_j; f^{(k)}) \le 1 + 3eA\varepsilon.$$

$$(3.7)$$

Since ε (> 0) is arbitrary and *q* is an arbitrary positive number, we get from (3.7)

$$\sum_{a\neq\infty}\delta(a;f^{(k)})\leq 1.$$
(3.8)

This proves the theorem.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. The author is thankful to Prof K. S. L. N. Prasad, Karnataka Arts College, Dharwad, India, for drawing the author's attention to Mues' conjecture.

References

- W. K. Hayman, *Meromorphic Functions*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1964. MR 29#1337. Zbl 115.06203.
- W. K. Hayman and J. Miles, On the growth of a meromorphic function and its derivatives, Complex Variables Theory Appl. 12 (1989), no. 1-4, 245–260. MR 91e:30056. Zbl 643.30021.
- K. Ishizaki, Some remarks on results of Mues about deficiency sums of derivatives, Arch. Math. (Basel) 55 (1990), no. 4, 374–379. MR 91k:30073. Zbl 698.30029.
- [4] E. Mues, Über eine Defekt- und Verzweigungsrelation für die Ableitung meromorpher Funktionen, Manuscripta Math. 5 (1971), 275–297 (German). MR 45#3709. Zbl 225.30031.
- Y. F. Wang, On the deficiencies of meromorphic derivatives, Indian J. Math. 36 (1994), no. 3, 207–214. MR 96d:30036. Zbl 893.30019.
- [6] L. Yang, Value Distribution Theory, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993, translated and revised from the 1982 Chinese original. MR 95h:30039. Zbl 790.30018.
- [7] L. Yang and Y. F. Wang, Drasin's problems and Mues' conjecture, Sci. China Ser. A 35 (1992), no. 10, 1180–1190. MR 94e:30009. Zbl 760.30011.

INDRAJIT LAHIRI: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF KALYANI, WEST BENGAL 741235, INDIA

E-mail address: indrajit@cal2.vsnl.net.in