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#### Abstract

In this paper, we deal with the problem of normal families concerning share-values. The results extend and improve some theorems put forward by Miranda, Pang, Chen, Hua and Fang. Moreover, we answer one question posed by Gu, Pang, Fang and so on.
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## 1. Introduction and main results

In this paper, it is assumed that the reader is familiar with the notations of Nevanlinna theory of meromorphic functions, for instance, $T(r, f), N(r, f), m(r, f), \bar{N}(r, f), \ldots$ We denote by $S(r, f)$ any function satisfying $S(r, f)=o\{T(r, f)\}$, as $r \rightarrow+\infty$, possibly outside of a set with a finite measure in $\mathbf{R}$.

Let $f$ be a non-constant meromorphic function defined in $\mathbf{D}$ and let $a$ be a finite complex number. Set

$$
\bar{E}_{f}(a)=f^{-1}(a)=\{z: f(z)-a=0, z \in \mathbf{D}\}
$$

Let $f$ and $g$ be meromorphic functions in a domain of complex plane. If $\bar{E}_{f}(a)=\bar{E}_{g}(a)$, then we say $f$ and $g$ share the value $a$. If $g(z)=b$ whenever $f(z)=a$, we write $f(z)=a \Rightarrow g(z)=b$. Moreover, if $f(z)=a \Rightarrow g(z)=b$ and $g(z)=b \Rightarrow f(z)=a$, we write $f(z)=a \Leftrightarrow g(z)=b$, as the notation $\bar{E}_{f}(a)=\bar{E}_{g}(b)$. When the case is $a \neq b$, if $\bar{E}_{f}(a) \cup \bar{E}_{f}(b)=\bar{E}_{g}(a) \cup \bar{E}_{g}(b)$, then we say $f$ and $g$ share the set $S(S=\{a, b\})$.

Let $\mathbf{D}$ be a domain in $\mathbb{C}$, and let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions defined in $\mathbf{D}$. The family $\mathfrak{F}$ is said to be normal in $\mathbf{D}$, according to Montel: if each sequence $\left\{f_{n}\right\} \subset \mathfrak{F}$ contains a subsequence $\left\{f_{n_{j}}\right\}$ that converges, spherically locally uniformly in $\mathbf{D}$, to a meromorphic function or $\infty$ (see $[5,6]$ ).

According to Bloch's Principle, many normality criteria have been obtained by starting to use the conditions known from Picrd-Type theorems.

The following result was proposed by Miranda [9].
Theorem Mi Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of holomorphic functions in a domain $\mathbf{D}, k$ be a positive integer,
and $a, b$ be two finite complex numbers in which $b \neq 0$. If, for each $f \in \mathfrak{F}, f \neq a, f^{(k)} \neq b$, then $\mathfrak{F}$ is normal in $\mathbf{D}$.

Another approach to normality criteria is to use conditions known from uniqueness theorems. The first attempt at this was made by Schwick who proved in [7] that if there exist three distinct finite values $a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $f(z)$ and $f^{\prime}(z)$ share $a_{j}(j=1,2,3)$ for each $f(z) \in \mathfrak{F}$, then $\mathfrak{F}$ is normal in $\mathbf{D}$. The corresponding statement that $f(z)$ and $f^{\prime}(z)$ share two distinct finite values $a_{1}, a_{2} \in \mathbb{C}$ remains valid [8].

Afterwards, some normality criteria concerning one shared-value were obtained $[1,10]$.
Theorem HC Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of holomorphic functions in a domain $\mathbf{D}$, and $a$ be a nonzero finite complex number. If, for each $f \in \mathfrak{F}, \bar{E}_{f}(a)=\bar{E}_{f^{\prime}}(a)=\bar{E}_{f^{\prime \prime}}(a)$, then $\mathfrak{F}$ is normal in $\mathbf{D}$.

Theorem PZ Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions in a domain $\mathbf{D}, k$ be an integer, $b(\neq 0)$ be a complex number, and $h$ be a finite positive number. If, for each $f \in \mathfrak{F}$, all zeros of $f$ have multiplicity at least $k$, and $f$ satisfies the following conditions:
(i) $\bar{E}_{f}(0)=\bar{E}_{f^{(k)}}(b)$,
(ii) $\bar{E}_{f}(0) \Rightarrow 0<\left|\bar{E}_{f^{(k+1)}}(z)\right|<h$,
then $\mathfrak{F}$ is normal in $\mathbf{D}$.
Recently, Fang and Zalcman [2] proved the following result, which is the complement of Theorem HC.

Theorem FZ Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of holomorphic functions in a domain $\mathbf{D}$, and $a, c$ be two finite nonzero distinct complex numbers. If each $f \in \mathfrak{F}$ satisfies the following conditions:
(i) $\bar{E}_{f}(a)=\bar{E}_{f^{\prime}}(a)$,
(ii) $\bar{E}_{f^{\prime}}(c)=\bar{E}_{f^{\prime \prime}}(c)$,
then $\mathfrak{F}$ is normal in $\mathbf{D}$.
Now, we are interested in what will be stated if $\mathfrak{F}$ is a family of meromorphic functions in a domain $\mathbf{D}$ in Theorem FZ.

Question 1.1 ([11]) Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions in a domain $\mathbf{D}$ and satisfy the conditions given by Theorem FZ. Does the conclusion hold?

On the other hand, Fang [12] extended Schwick's result in the view of shared set. Actually, he proved the following theorem.

Theorem $\mathbf{F}$ Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of holomorphic functions in a domain $\mathbf{D}$, and let $a_{1}, a_{2}$, and $a_{3}$ be three distinct finite complex numbers. If, for each $f(z) \in \mathfrak{F}, f(z)$ and $f^{\prime}(z)$ share the set $S=\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}\right\}$, then $\mathfrak{F}$ is normal in $\mathbf{D}$.

Recently, by generalizing Theorem F from families of holomorphic functions to families of meromorphic functions, Liu and Pang [3] obtained the following result.

Theorem LP Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions in a domain $\mathbf{D}$, and let $a_{1}, a_{2}$, and $a_{3}$ be three distinct finite complex numbers. If, for each $f(z) \in \mathfrak{F}, f(z)$ and $f^{\prime}(z)$ share the set
$S=\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}\right\}$, then $\mathfrak{F}$ is normal in $\mathbf{D}$.
Naturally, we will think what can be stated if $S=\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}\right\}$ is replaced by $S=\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}\right\}$. However, Example 1 shows that the criterion will not be valid when the set $S=\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}\right\}$ in Theorem F and Theorem LP is replaced by $S=\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}\right\}$.

Example 1.1 Let $S=\{1,-1\}$. Set

$$
\mathfrak{F}=\left\{f_{n}(z), n=2,3,4, \ldots\right\}, f_{n}(z)=\frac{n+1}{2 n} e^{n z}+\frac{n-1}{2 n} e^{-n z}
$$

Then, for any $f_{n} \in \mathfrak{F}$, we have

$$
n^{2}\left[f_{n}^{2}(z)-1\right]=\left[f_{n}^{\prime}(z)\right]^{2}-1
$$

Then $f_{n}$ and $f_{n}^{\prime}$ share the set $S=\{1,-1\}$, but $\mathfrak{F}$ is not normal in $\mathbf{D}$.
In this paper, we have the following result.
Theorem 1.1 Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions in a domain $\mathbf{D}$; let $m$ be a positive integer; let $a, b$ and $c$ be three finite complex numbers in which $c \neq 0, a \neq(m+1) c, b \neq(m+1) c$. If, for each $f \in \mathfrak{F}, \bar{E}_{f^{\prime}}(a) \cup \bar{E}_{f^{\prime}}(b)=\bar{E}_{f}(a) \cup \bar{E}_{f}(b)$, and $f^{\prime \prime}=c$ whenever $f^{\prime}=c$, then $\mathfrak{F}$ is normal in $\mathbf{D}$.

From the direct result of Theorem 1, we have the following precise results.
Corollary 1.1 Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions in a domain $\mathbf{D}$; let $m$ be a positive integer; let $a$ and $c \neq 0$ be two finite complex numbers in which $a \neq(m+1) c$. If, for each $f \in \mathfrak{F}$, $\bar{E}_{f^{\prime}}(a)=\bar{E}_{f}(a)$ and $f^{\prime \prime}=c$ whenever $f^{\prime}=c$, then $\mathfrak{F}$ is normal in $\mathbf{D}$.

Corollary 1.2 Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions in a domain $\mathbf{D}$; let $a, b$ and $c(c \neq 0)$ be three distinct finite complex numbers. If, for each $f \in \mathfrak{F}, f$ and $f^{\prime}$ share $\{a, b\}$ and $f^{\prime \prime}=c$ whenever $f^{\prime}=c$, then $\mathfrak{F}$ is normal in $\mathbf{D}$.

Corollary 1.3 Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions in a domain $\mathbf{D}$; let $m$ be a positive integer; let $a, b$ be two finite distinct complex numbers in which $a \neq 0$ and $b \neq(m+1) a$. If, for each $f \in \mathfrak{F}, f$ and $f^{\prime}$ share $\{a, b\}$ and $f^{\prime \prime}=a$ whenever $f^{\prime}=a$, then $\mathfrak{F}$ is normal in $\mathbf{D}$.

Corollary 1.4 Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions in a domain $\mathbf{D}$; let $0, c$ be two finite distinct complex numbers. If, for each $f \in \mathfrak{F}, \bar{E}_{f^{\prime}}(0)=\bar{E}_{f}(0), \bar{E}_{f^{\prime}}(c)=\bar{E}_{f^{\prime \prime}}(c)$, then $\mathfrak{F}$ is normal in $\mathbf{D}$.

Remarks (1) If $a=b=c$, Corollary 1 extends Miranda's criterion and Theorem HX.
(2) If $a=b \neq c$, then the condition (ii) of Theorem FZ, which requires that $\bar{E}_{f^{\prime}}(b)=\bar{E}_{f^{\prime \prime}}(b)$, is fairly strong and it is clearly stronger than the boundedness condition on $f^{\prime}=c$ in Theorem 1 and Corollary 1. As mentioned above, the condition $\bar{E}_{f^{\prime}}(a) \cup \bar{E}_{f^{\prime}}(b)=\bar{E}_{f}(a) \cup \bar{E}_{f}(b)$ is implicit in Theorem FZ when $a=b$.
(3) If $a \neq b$, Example 1 shows that the condition " $f^{\prime \prime}=c$ whenever $f^{\prime}=c$ " in Theorem 1 is necessary.

The following examples illustrate that some conditions of Theorem 1 cannot be omitted. Especially, some conditions are still necessary even if $\mathfrak{F}$ is a family of holomorphic functions.

Examples (1) Let $a, c$ be two nonzero numbers in which $a=(m+1) c$ where $m$ is a positive integer. Set

$$
f_{n}(z)=c\left(z-\frac{1}{n}\right)+a+\frac{1}{m(n z-1)^{m}}, \quad n=1,2, \ldots
$$

and let $\mathfrak{F}=\left\{f_{n}\right\}, \mathbf{D}=\{z:|z|<1\}$. Then $f_{n}^{\prime}(z)=c-\frac{n}{(n z-1)^{m+1}}$. Thus for each $f \in \mathfrak{F}$, $\bar{E}_{f^{\prime}}(a)=\bar{E}_{f}(a)$ and $f^{\prime}(z) \neq c$. But $\mathfrak{F}$ is not normal in $\mathbf{D}$, which means that " $a \neq(1+m) c$ " in Theorem 1 is necessary.
(2) Let $\mathfrak{F}=\left\{f_{n}=e^{n z}\right\}, \mathbf{D}=\{z:|z|<1\}, n=1,2, \ldots$. Then the spherical derivative $f_{n}^{\sharp}(0)=\frac{n}{2} \rightarrow \infty$. Thus $\mathfrak{F}$ is not normal in $\mathbf{D}$ by Marty's criterion. However, it is clear that $f_{n}, f_{n}^{\prime}$ and $f_{n}^{\prime \prime}$ share the value 0 . It implies that $\mathfrak{F}$ in Theorem 1 is not normal under the condition $" a=b=c=0 "$.
(3) Let $\mathfrak{F}=\left\{f_{n}=e^{n z}-a / n+a\right\}, \mathbf{D}=\{z:|z|<1\}$. Thus for each $f \in \mathfrak{F}, \bar{E}_{f^{\prime}}(a)=\bar{E}_{f}(a)$, and $f^{\prime} \neq 0$. But $\mathfrak{F}$ is not normal in $\mathbf{D}$. This means that " $c \neq 0$ " in Theorem 1 is necessary.

## 2. Some lemmas

Lemma 2.1 ([1]) Let $k$ be a positive integer and let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions on the unit disc, all of whose zeros have multiplicity at least $k$, and suppose that there exists $A \geq 1$ such that $\left|f^{(k)}(z)\right| \leq A$ whenever $f(z)=0, f \in \mathfrak{F}$. Then if $\mathfrak{F}$ is not normal, there exist, for each $0 \leq \alpha \leq k$,
(a) a number $0<r<1$,
(b) points $z_{n},\left|z_{n}\right|<r$,
(c) functions $f_{n} \in \mathfrak{F}$, and
(d) positive numbers $\rho_{n} \rightarrow 0$
such that

$$
\frac{f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \xi\right)}{\rho_{n}^{\alpha}}=g_{n}(\xi) \rightarrow g(\xi)
$$

locally uniformly with respect to the spherical metric, where $g$ is a nonconstant meromorphic function on $\mathbb{C}$, all of whose zeros have multiplicity at least $k$, such that $g^{\sharp}(\xi) \leq g^{\sharp}(0)=k A+1$. Moreover, $g$ has order at most two. In particular, if $\mathfrak{F}$ is a family of holomorphic functions, then $g$ has order at most one.

Here, usually, $g^{\sharp}(z)=\left|g^{\prime}(z)\right| /\left(1+|g(z)|^{2}\right)$ is the spherical derivative.
Lemma $2.2([15])$ Let $f(z)=a_{n} z^{n}+a_{n-1} z^{n-1}+\cdots+a_{0}+\frac{p(z)}{q(z)}$, where $a_{0}, a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}(\neq 0), c(\neq 0)$ are constants, and $p(z)$ and $q(z)$ are two coprime polynomials with $\operatorname{deg} p(z)<\operatorname{deg} q(z)$, and let $k$ be a positive integer. If $f^{(k)} \neq c$, then

$$
f(z)=\frac{c}{k!} z^{k}+\cdots+a_{0}+\frac{1}{(a z+b)^{m}}
$$

where $a(\neq 0), b$ are constants, $m \in \mathbf{N}$.

Lemma 2.3 ([16]) Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function with finite order, all of whose zeros are of multiplicity at least $k$. Let $K$ be a positive number and $c$ be a nonzero finite complex number. If $\left|f^{(k)}(z)\right| \leq K$ whenever $f(z)=0$, then for each $l(1 \leq l \leq k), f^{(l)}(z)$ assumes any finite nonzero value infinitely often.

Lemma 2.4 ([13]) Let $f$ be a finite order meromorphic function on $\mathbb{C}$ and $b, d$ be two nonzero complex constants. If $f=0 \Rightarrow f^{\prime}=b$, and $f^{\prime} \neq d$, then $f(z)=b(z-C)$, or $f(z)=d(z-C)+$ $\frac{A}{m(z-C)^{m}}$, where $b=(m+1) d$ and $C, A(\neq 0) \in \mathbb{C}$.

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

We may assume that $\mathbf{D}=\Delta$, the unit disc. Suppose that $\mathfrak{F}$ is not normal on $\Delta$, then by Lemma 2.1 we can find $f_{n} \in \mathfrak{F}, z_{n} \in \Delta$, and $\rho_{n} \rightarrow 0^{+}$such that

$$
g_{n}(\zeta)=\frac{f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta\right)-a}{\rho_{n}} \Rightarrow g(\zeta)
$$

locally uniformly with respect to the spherical metric, where $g$ is a nonconstant meromorphic function on $\mathbb{C}$, such that $g^{\sharp}(\zeta) \leq g^{\sharp}(0)=(\max \{|a|,|b|\})+1$.

We claim that
(i) $g(\zeta)=0 \Leftrightarrow g^{\prime}(\zeta) \in S$, and
(ii) $g^{\prime}(\zeta) \neq c$.

Suppose that there exists $\zeta_{0}$ such that $g\left(\zeta_{0}\right)=0$, then by Hurwitz's Theorem there exists a sequence $\zeta_{n}, \zeta_{n} \rightarrow \zeta_{0}$, for sufficiently large $n$, such that

$$
0=g_{n}\left(\zeta_{n}\right)=\frac{f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right)-a}{\rho_{n}}
$$

which implies that $f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right)=a$, thus $f^{\prime}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right) \in S$. Then without loss of generality, we can assume that there exists $a$ or $b$, such that $f^{\prime}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right)=a$, so

$$
g^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} g_{n}^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{n}\right)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} f^{\prime}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right) \in S
$$

proving $g(\zeta)=0 \Rightarrow g^{\prime}(\zeta) \in S$.
On the other hand, suppose that there exists $\zeta_{0}$ such that $g^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)=a$. We obtain $g^{\prime} \not \equiv a$. Indeed, if $g^{\prime}(\zeta) \equiv a \neq 0$, then $g$ will be a polynomial of exact degree 1 , so $g=a\left(\zeta-\zeta_{0}\right)$. Then a simple calculation shows that

$$
\left|g^{\sharp}(0)\right| \leq \begin{cases}1, & \left|\zeta_{1}\right| \geq 1  \tag{1a}\\ |a|, & \left|\zeta_{1}\right|<1 .\end{cases}
$$

So we have $g^{\sharp}(0)<(\max \{|a|,|b|\})+1$, which contradicts $g^{\sharp}(0)=(\max \{|a|,|b|\})+1$. Since $g^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)=a$ and $g^{\prime}(\zeta) \not \equiv a$, by Hurwitz's Theorem there exists a sequence $\zeta_{n}, \zeta_{n} \rightarrow \zeta_{0}$, for sufficiently large $n$, such that $g_{n}^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{n}\right)=f^{\prime}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right)=a$. This leads to $f\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right) \in S$. If there exists a positive number $N$, for any $n>N, f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right) \neq a$, then

$$
g\left(\zeta_{0}\right)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right)-a}{\rho_{n}}=\infty
$$

which is a contradiction by our hypotheses. Then there exists a subsequence of $f_{n}$, which we also denote by $f_{n}$, such that $f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right)=a$, and, so

$$
g\left(\zeta_{0}\right)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_{n}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right)-a}{\rho_{n}}=0
$$

proving $g(\zeta)=0 \Leftarrow g^{\prime}(\zeta)=a$. Similarly, we can obtain $g(\zeta)=0 \Leftarrow g^{\prime}(\zeta)=b$.
Suppose that there exists a $\zeta_{0}$ such that $g^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)=c$, then by claim(i) we have $g^{\prime}(\zeta) \not \equiv c$. By Hurwitz's Theorem there exists a sequence $\zeta_{n}, \zeta_{n} \rightarrow \zeta_{0}$, for sufficiently large $n$, such that $g_{n}^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{n}\right)=f^{\prime}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right)=c$, then $f^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right)=c$. Thus we obtain

$$
g^{\prime \prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left|g_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left(\zeta_{n}\right)\right|=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{n}\left|f^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}\right)\right|=0
$$

which implies $g^{\prime}(\zeta)=c \Rightarrow g^{\prime \prime}(\zeta)=0$.
Next, we will prove that $g^{\prime}(\zeta) \neq c$. Suppose that there exists a $\zeta_{0}$ such that $g^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)=c$. Thus $\zeta_{0}$ is a zero point of $g^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)-c$ with multiplicity $k(\geq 2)$, then $g^{(k+1)}\left(\zeta_{0}\right) \neq 0$, and there exists a $\delta(>0)$ such that

$$
g(\zeta) \neq 0, g^{\prime}(\zeta) \neq 0, g^{(k)}(\zeta) \neq 0 \text { in } 0<\left|\zeta-\zeta_{0}\right|<\delta
$$

The Argument Principle shows the existence of $k(\geq 2)$ sequences $\left\{\zeta_{n}^{(j)}\right\}(j=1,2, \ldots, k)$ each tending to $\zeta_{0}$, such that, for $n$ sufficiently large,

$$
g_{n}^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{n}^{(1)}\right)=\cdots=g_{n}^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{n}^{(j)}\right)=c
$$

which implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}^{(1)}\right)=\cdots=f^{\prime}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}^{(j)}\right)=c \tag{}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now (*) means that

$$
g^{\prime \prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)=0, \quad g_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left(\zeta_{n}^{(j)}\right)=\rho_{n} f^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{n}+\rho_{n} \zeta_{n}^{(j)}\right) \neq 0, \text { for } j=1,2, \ldots, k,
$$

so each zero of $g_{n}^{\prime}-c$ is simple. This rules out the possibility that any two sequences of $\left\{\zeta_{n}^{(j)}\right\}(j=$ $1,2, \ldots, k)$ might coincide.

When $n$ is sufficiently large, $\left\{\zeta_{n}^{(i)}\right\} \neq\left\{\zeta_{n}^{(j)}\right\}(i \neq j \in\{1,2, \ldots, k\})$, so it shows that $\zeta_{0}$, as a zero of $g^{\prime}-c$, is a zero of $g^{\prime \prime}(\zeta)$ with multiplicity $k$. But this contradicts the statement that $\zeta_{0}$ is a zero of $g^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)-c$ with multiplicity $k$. Therefore, $g^{\prime}(\zeta) \neq c$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$.

Case $1 a \neq b$. We will discuss it based on the following two subcases.
Subcase 1.1 If $c \notin\{a, b\}$, then by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3, we have $g(\zeta)=c \zeta+t+\frac{n}{(\zeta-m)^{\iota}}$ or $g(\zeta)=\alpha \zeta+\beta$, where $\alpha(\neq 0, c), \beta, t, m$ are finite complex numbers, and $l$ is a positive integer. Then we will discuss the two cases, respectively.

Subcase 1.1.1 If $g(\zeta)=c \zeta+t+\frac{n}{(\zeta-m)^{l}}$, then by Claim (i), (ii) and Nevanlinna-Second-Fundamental-Theorem we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
2 T\left(r, g^{\prime}\right) & \leq \bar{N}\left(r, g^{\prime}\right)+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g^{\prime}-a}\right)+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g^{\prime}-b}\right)+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g^{\prime}-c}\right)+S\left(r, g^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq \bar{N}(r, g)+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g}\right)+S\left(r, g^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $g(\zeta)$ is a rational function, so $S\left(r, g^{\prime}\right)=S(r, g)=O(1)$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bar{N}(r, g)=\ln r+O(1) \\
& \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g}\right) \leq(l+1) \ln r+O(1) \\
& T\left(r, g^{\prime}\right)=(l+1) \ln r+O(1)
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we get

$$
2(l+1) \ln r \leq \ln r+(l+1) \ln r+O(1)
$$

which implies $l=0$, but this contradicts the fact that $l$ is a positive integer.
Subcase 1.1.2 If $g(\zeta)=\alpha \zeta+\beta$, then $g\left(\frac{-\beta}{\alpha}\right)=0, g^{\prime}(\zeta)=\alpha$, and particularly note that $g^{\prime}(0)=g^{\prime}\left(\frac{-\beta}{\alpha}\right)=\alpha,|\alpha| \leq \max \{|a|,|b|\}$. Thus

$$
|\alpha|=\left|g^{\prime}(0)\right| \geq g^{\sharp}(0)=\max \{|a|,|b|\}+1>|\alpha|
$$

is a contradiction.
Subcase 1.2 If $c \in\{a, b\}$, we will discuss it based on the following two subcases.
Subcase 1.2.1 If $c=a$, then by Claim (i), (ii), we obtain $g=0 \Leftrightarrow g^{\prime}=b$, and $g^{\prime} \neq c$. Thus by Lemma 2.4 and $b \neq(1+m) c$, we obtain $g(\zeta)=b\left(\zeta-\zeta_{0}\right)$, which is a contradiction by the above proof.

Subcase 1.2.2 If $c=b$, then the process of proof is the same as that of subcase 1.2.1.
Case 2 If $a=b$, then by Claims (i) and (ii), we obtain $g=0 \Leftrightarrow g^{\prime}=a$, and $g^{\prime} \neq c$. Thus by Lemma 2.4 and $a \neq(1+m) c$, we obtain $g(\zeta)=a\left(\zeta-\zeta_{0}\right)$, which is a contradiction by the above proof.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is completed.
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