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Abstract. In this paper, we discuss the value distribution of the derivative of a meromorphic function.

## 1. Introduction, definitions and results

Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function defined in the open complex plane $\mathbb{C}$. Hayman ([9]) proved the following result.

Theorem A ([9]). If $n(\geq 3)$ is an integer then $\psi=f^{n} f^{\prime}$ assumes all finite values, except possibly zero, infinitely many times.

He ([11]) also conjectured that Theorem A remains valid if $n=1$ or 2 . Mues ([13]) proved the result for $n=2$ and the result for $n=1$ was proved by Bergweiler and Eremenko ([2]) and independently by Chen and Fang ([5]).

In 1994 Yik-Man Chiang raised the question of the value distribution of $f f^{\prime}-$ $a$, where $a=a(z)$ is a meromorphic function which is not identically zero and satisfies $T(r, a)=S(r, f)$ (cf.[3]). To answer this question Bergweiler ([3]) proved the following theorem.

Theorem B ([3]). Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order and let $c(\not \equiv 0)$ be a polynomial. Then $f f^{\prime}-c$ has infinitely many zeros.

Zhang ([16]) proved the following result which is also in the direction of the question of Chiang.

Theorem C ([16]). Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function such that $\delta(\infty ; f)>7 / 9$. Then $f f^{\prime}-a$ has infinitely many zeros, where $a(\not \equiv 0, \infty)$ is a meromorphic function satisfying $T(r, a)=S(r, f)$.

Recently Yu ([15]) and the authors ([12]) treated the general case and proved the following theorem.
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Theorem D. If $f$ is a transcendental meromorphic function and $a(\not \equiv 0, \infty)$ is a meromorphic function satisfying $T(r, a)=S(r, f)$ then one of $f f^{\prime}-a$ and $f f^{\prime}+a$ has infinitely many zeros.

However the result of Bergweiler ([3]) seems to be of interest as it imposes a restriction on the growth of the function $f$ (in contrast to Theorem C where a restriction on the poles is imposed) and only one target function is involved (in contrast to Theorem D where two target functions are involved). In the paper we see that if instead of a polynomial we choose a monomial as the target function then in Theorem B the order restriction can be dropped. In fact we prove the following result.

Theorem 1. Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function. Then $f^{p} f^{\prime}-a z^{n}$ has infinitely many zeros, where $a(\neq 0)$ is a constant and $n$ is a nonnegative integer, $p$ is a positive integer.

Actually Theorem 1 follows as a consequence of the following result.
Theorem 2. Let $Q(z)$ be a nonconstant polynomial having no simple zero and $P(z)=\frac{d}{d z} Q(z)$. If $f$ is a transcendental meromorphic function then $P(f(z)) f^{\prime}(z)-$ $a z^{n}$ has infinitely many zeros, where $a(\neq 0, \infty)$ is a complex number and $n$ is a nonnegative integer.

Also Theorem 2 follows from the following theorem.
Theorem 3. Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function having no simple zero and simple pole. Then $f^{\prime}(P(z))-\frac{a z^{n}}{P^{\prime}(z)}$ has infinitely many zeros, where $P(z)$ is a nonconstant polynomial, $a(\neq 0, \infty)$ is a complex number and $n$ is a nonnegative integer.

Fang ([7]) proved the following result.
Theorem E ([7]). Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function of infinite order. If $f$ and $f^{\prime}$ have the same zeros then $f^{\prime}(z)-a z^{n}$ has infinitely many zeros, where $a(\neq 0, \infty)$ is a complex number and $n$ is a nonnegative integer.

Considering $f(z)=\exp \left(\exp \left(z^{2}\right)\right)$ we see that though $f$ and $f^{\prime}$ have not the same set of zeros, $f^{\prime}(z)-a z^{n}$ has infinitely many zeros. In the following corollary to Theorem 3 we see that if we impose a minor restriction on the poles of $f$, the condition on the zeros of $f$ can be relaxed.

Corollary 1. Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function such that zeros of $f$ are the zeros of $f^{\prime}$. If $f$ has no simple pole then $f^{\prime}(z)-a z^{n}$ has infinitely many zeros, where $a(\neq 0, \infty)$ is a complex number and $n$ is a nonnegative integer.

The Ahlfors-Shimizu characteristic function $T_{0}(r, f)$ of a meromorphic function $f$ is defined as

$$
T_{0}(r, f)=\int_{0}^{r} \frac{A(t, f)}{t} d t,
$$

where $A(t, f)=\frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{|z| \leq t}\left[f^{\#}(z)\right]^{2} d x d y$ and $f^{\#}(z)=\frac{\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|}{1+|f(z)|^{2}}$.
Also we know that $T(r, f)=T_{0}(r, f)+O(1)$. For the standard definitions and notations of the value distribution theory we refer to [10]. In the paper we adopt some techniques of Bergweiler ([3]) and Fang ([7]).

## 2. Lemmas

In this section we present the necessary lemmas.
Lemma 1. Let $f$ be a nonconstant rational function having no simple zero. If the number of poles of $f$, if there is any, is at least two (counted with multiplicity) then for any complex number $a(\neq 0, \infty), f^{\prime}+$ a has at least one zero.
Proof. If $f$ is a polynomial then the degree of $f$ is at least two and so $f^{\prime}$ is a non-constant polynomial. Hence $f^{\prime}+a$ has at least one zero.

Let $f=p / q$, where $p, q$ are polynomials of degree $m$ and $n(\geq 1)$ respectively and $p, q$ have no common factor.

If possible we suppose that $f^{\prime}+a$ has no zero. Now we consider the following cases.

Case 1. Let $m<n+1$. Then

$$
f^{\prime}+a=\frac{p^{\prime} q-p q^{\prime}+a q^{2}}{q^{2}}=\frac{R}{S}, \text { say. }
$$

Then $R, S$ are non-constant polynomials such that degree of $R=$ degree of $S$. Since $f^{\prime}+a$ has no zero, it follows that $R$ and $S$ share zeros (counting multiplicities). So $R=A S$, where $A$ is a constant. Therefore $f^{\prime}+a=A$ and so $f=(A-a) z+B$, where $B$ is a constant. This is impossible because $f$ is non-constant and has no simple zero.

Case 2. Let $m>n+1$. Then

$$
f=r+\frac{p_{1}}{q}
$$

where $p_{1}$ and $r$ are polynomials with respective degrees $m_{1}$ and $t(\geq 2)$ such that $m=t+n$ and $m_{1}<n$. So

$$
\begin{aligned}
f^{\prime}+a & =r^{\prime}+\frac{p_{1}^{\prime} q-p_{1} q^{\prime}}{q^{2}}+a \\
& =\frac{\left(r^{\prime}+a\right) q^{2}+p_{1}^{\prime} q-p_{1} q^{\prime}}{q^{2}} \\
& =\frac{R_{1}}{S}, \text { say. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $p_{1}=a_{m_{1}} z^{m_{1}}+\cdots+a_{1} z+a_{0}$ and $q=b_{n} z^{n}+\cdots+b_{1} z+b_{0}$, where $a_{m_{1}} \neq 0$, $b_{n} \neq 0$. Since the coefficient of the leading term of $p_{1}^{\prime} q-p_{1} q^{\prime}$ is $\left(m_{1}-n\right) a_{m_{1}} b_{n} \neq 0$,
the degree of $p_{1}^{\prime} q-p_{1} q^{\prime}$ is $m_{1}+n-1$. Since $m_{1}+n-1<2 n-1<2 n+t-1$, we see that degree of $R_{1} \geq$ degree of $S$. So as the Case $1 f$ becomes a linear polynomial, which is impossible.

Case 3. Let $m=n+1$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
f=\alpha z+\beta+\frac{p_{1}}{q} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\alpha, \beta$ are constants and $p_{1}$ is a polynomial of degree $m_{1}<n$.
Let $a+\alpha \neq 0$. Then

$$
f^{\prime}+a=\frac{p_{1}^{\prime} q-p_{1} q^{\prime}+(a+\alpha) q^{2}}{q^{2}}=\frac{R_{2}}{S}, \text { say. }
$$

Since the degree of $p_{1}^{\prime} q-p_{1} q^{\prime}$ is $m_{1}+n-1<2 n-1<2 n$, it follows that degree of $R_{2}=$ degree of $S$. So as the Case $1 f$ becomes a linear polynomial, which is impossible.

Let $a+\alpha=0$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime}+a=\frac{p_{1}^{\prime} q-p_{1} q^{\prime}}{q^{2}} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the degree of $p_{1}^{\prime} q-p_{1} q^{\prime}$ is $m_{1}+n-1$.
Now we consider the following two subcases.
Subcase 3.1. Let $p_{1}^{\prime} q-p_{1} q^{\prime}$ have no zero. Then $m_{1}+n=1$ and so $m_{1}=0$ and $n=1$ because $m_{1}<n$. So from (1) we see that

$$
f=\alpha z+\beta+\frac{D}{\gamma z+\delta}
$$

where $\gamma, \delta, D$ are constants.
This is impossible because $f$ is non-constant and has no simple zero and has at least two poles (counted with multiplicity), if there is any.

Subcase 3.2. Let $p_{1}^{\prime} q-p_{1} q^{\prime}$ have some zero. Since $f^{\prime}+a$ has no zero, it follows that all the factors of $p_{1}^{\prime} q-p_{1} q^{\prime}$ are factors of $q^{2}$. Hence we can write

$$
q^{2}=\left(p_{1}^{\prime} q-p_{1} q^{\prime}\right) q_{1}
$$

where $q_{1}$ is a polynomial of degree $n+1-m_{1}(>0)$.
From (2) we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime}+a=\frac{1}{q_{1}} . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \cdots, \alpha_{l}$ be distinct zeros of $q_{1}$ with respective multiplicities $k_{1}, k_{2}, \cdots, k_{l}$. Since $q_{1}$ is non-constant, we see that $l \geq 1$.

Since $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \cdots, \alpha_{l}$ are the only poles of $f^{\prime}$ with respective multiplicities $k_{1}, k_{2}, \cdots, k_{l}$, it follows that $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \cdots, \alpha_{l}$ are the only poles of $f$ with respective multiplicities $k_{1}-1, k_{2}-1, \cdots, k_{l}-1$. Hence we get from (1) and (3)

$$
k_{1}+k_{2}+\cdots+k_{l}=n+l \text { and } k_{1}+k_{2}+\cdots+k_{l}=n+1-m_{1} .
$$

So $m_{1}+l=1$. Since $l \geq 1$, it follows that $m_{1}=0, l=1$ and $k_{1}=n+1$. Therefore from (1) we get

$$
\begin{align*}
f & =\alpha z+\beta+\frac{D}{(\gamma z+\delta)^{n}}  \tag{4}\\
& =\frac{(\alpha z+\beta)(\gamma z+\delta)^{n}+D}{(\gamma z+\delta)^{n}},
\end{align*}
$$

where $\gamma, \delta$ and $D$ are constants. Since $f$ is not a linear polynomial, it follows that $D \neq 0$. Also we see that $z=-\delta / \gamma$ is the only pole of $f$.

Let $Q=(\alpha z+\beta)(\gamma z+\delta)^{n}+D$. Then $Q^{\prime}=(\gamma z+\delta)^{n-1}[\alpha(\gamma+n) z+\alpha \delta+n \beta]$. Since $f$ has no simple zero, it follows that a zero of $f$ is also a zero of $Q^{\prime}$ and so a zero of $\alpha(\gamma+n) z+\alpha \delta+n \beta$. So $f$ and $Q$ have only one double zero. Hence we get $n=1$. Therefore from (4) we get

$$
f=\alpha z+\beta+\frac{D}{\gamma z+\delta},
$$

which is impossible because $f$ is non-constant and has no simple zero and and has at least two poles (counted with multiplicity), if there is any. This proves the lemma.

Lemma 2 ([2]). Let $f$ be a meromorphic function of finite order. If $f$ has infinitely many multiple zeros then $f^{\prime}$ assumes every finite nonzero value infinitely many times.

Lemma 3 (p. $6 \mathbf{0}$ [10]). Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function. If $f$ has only finitely many zeros then $f^{\prime}$ assumes every finite nonzero value infinitely many times.

Combining the above lemmas we obtain the following lemma.
Lemma 4. Let $f$ be a nonconstant meromorphic function of finite order having no simple zero. If the number of poles of $f$, if there is any, is at least two (counted with multiplicity) then for every complex number $a(\neq 0, \infty), f^{\prime}+a$ has at least one zero.

Lemma 5 ([4], [14]). Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions defined in a domain $\mathfrak{D}$ such that every function $f \in \mathfrak{F}$ has zeros, if there is any, of multiplicities at least $k$. If $\mathfrak{F}$ is not normal at a point $z_{0} \in \mathfrak{D}$ then for $0 \leq \alpha<k$, there exist a sequence of functions $f_{j} \in \mathfrak{F}$, a sequence of complex numbers $z_{j} \rightarrow z_{0}$ and a sequence
of positive numbers $\rho_{j} \rightarrow 0$, such that $\rho_{j}^{-\alpha} f_{j}\left(z_{j}+\rho_{j} \zeta\right)$ converges spherically and locally uniformly to a nonconstant meromorphic function $g(\zeta)$ on $\mathbb{C}$. Moreover the order of $g$ is at most two and $g$ has only zeros, if there is any, of multiplicities at least $k$.

Lemma 6. Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of meromorphic functions in a domain $\mathfrak{D}$ and $a=$ $a(z)(\not \equiv 0)$ be a nonvanishing analytic function in $\mathfrak{D}$. If for every $f \in \mathfrak{F}$
(i) $f$ has no simple zero and simple pole,
(ii) $f(z)=a(z)$ whenever $f^{\prime}(z)=a(z)$,
then $\mathfrak{F}$ is a normal family.
Proof. If possible, let $\mathfrak{F}$ be not normal at a point $z_{0} \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then by Lemma 5 for $\alpha=1$ there exist a sequence of functions $f_{j} \in \mathfrak{F}$, a sequence of complex numbers $z_{j} \rightarrow z_{0}$ and a sequence of positive numbers $\rho_{j} \rightarrow 0$ such that $g_{j}(\zeta)=\rho_{j}^{-1} f_{j}\left(z_{j}+\rho_{j} \zeta\right)$ converges spherically and locally uniformly to a nonconstant meromorphic function $g(\zeta)$. Moreover $g$ is of finite order and has only multiple zeros (if there is any). Also we note that $g$ has at least two poles (counted with multiplicity), if there is any.

Since $a\left(z_{0}\right) \neq 0, \infty$, by Lemma 4 there exists $\zeta_{0} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $g^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)=a\left(z_{0}\right)$. Hence $g^{\prime}$ and so $g$ are analytic in some neighborhood of $\zeta_{0}$. Therefore in some neighborhood of $\zeta_{0} g_{j}$ 's are analytic for all sufficiently large values of $j$ and $g_{j} \rightarrow g$, $g_{j}^{\prime} \rightarrow g^{\prime}$ uniformly in that neighborhood of $\zeta_{0}$.

First we suppose that $g_{j}^{\prime}(\zeta)-a\left(z_{j}+\rho_{j} \zeta\right) \neq 0$ for infinitely many values of $j$ and in some neighborhood of $\zeta_{0}$. Since $g_{j}^{\prime}(\zeta)-a\left(z_{j}+\rho_{j} \zeta\right)$ converges uniformly to $g^{\prime}(\zeta)-a\left(z_{0}\right)$ in some neighborhood of $\zeta_{0}$, by Hurwitz's theorem we get $g^{\prime}(\zeta)-a\left(z_{0}\right) \equiv$ 0 in some neighborhood of $\zeta_{0}$. Since $g$ is meromorphic, it follows that $g^{\prime}(\zeta) \equiv a\left(z_{0}\right)$ in $\mathbb{C}$, which contradicts the fact that $g$ has no simple zero.

Next we suppose that there exists a sequence $\zeta_{j} \rightarrow \zeta_{0}$ such that $g_{j}^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{j}\right)=$ $f^{\prime}\left(z_{j}+\rho_{j} \zeta_{j}\right)=a\left(z_{j}+\rho_{j} \zeta_{j}\right)$. Since $f_{j}(z)=a(z)$ whenever $f_{j}^{\prime}(z)=a(z)$, it follows that $f_{j}\left(z_{j}+\rho_{j} \zeta_{j}\right)=a\left(z_{j}+\rho_{j} \zeta_{j}\right)$ and so $\rho_{j} g_{j}\left(\zeta_{j}\right)=a\left(z_{j}+\rho_{j} \zeta_{j}\right)$. This implies that $g_{j}\left(\zeta_{j}\right)=\frac{1}{\rho_{j}} a\left(z_{j}+\rho_{j} \zeta_{j}\right) \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, which contradicts the fact that $g_{j}\left(\zeta_{j}\right) \rightarrow g\left(\zeta_{0}\right) \neq \infty$. This proves the lemma.

Lemma 7 ([6]). Let $f$ be a nonconstant meromorphic function and $F=\sum_{j=1}^{q} \frac{1}{f-\phi_{j}}$, where $\phi_{j}$ 's are meromorphic functions and $T\left(r, \phi_{j}\right)=o\{T(r, f)\}$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Then

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{q} m\left(r, \frac{1}{f-\phi_{j}}\right) \leq m(r, F)+S(r, f)
$$

Lemma 8 ([8]). Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function. Then for each positive number $\varepsilon$ and each positive integer $k$ we have

$$
k \bar{N}(r, f) \leq N\left(r, 0 ; f^{(k)}\right)+N(r, f)+\varepsilon T(r, f)+S(r, f)
$$

Lemma 9 ([2]). Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order. If $f$ has only finitely many critical values then $f$ has only finitely many asymptotic values.

Lemma 10 ([1]). Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function such that $f(0) \neq$ $\infty$. If the set of finite critical and asymptotic values $f$ is bounded then there exists $R(>0)$ such that

$$
\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \geq \frac{|f(z)|}{2 \pi|z|} \log \frac{|f(z)|}{R}
$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \backslash\{0\}$ which are not the poles of $f$.

## 3. Proof of the Theorems

Proof of Theorem 3. We consider the following cases.
Case I. Let $f(P)$ be of infinite order. Then $f(P(z)) / z^{n+1}$ is of infinite order. Hence

$$
\limsup _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T\left(r, \frac{f(P(z))}{z^{n+1}}\right)}{(\log r)^{2}}=\infty \text { and so } \limsup _{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A\left(r, \frac{f(P(z))}{z^{n+1}}\right)}{\log r}=\infty
$$

Let $\mathfrak{F}=\left\{g_{j}(z): g_{j}(z)=\frac{f\left(P\left(2^{j} z\right)\right)}{2^{(n+1) j} z^{n+1}}, j=1,2,3, \cdots ; \frac{1}{2}<|z|<\frac{5}{2}\right\}$. If possible we suppose that $\mathfrak{F}$ is a normal family. Then by Marty's criterion there exists $M>0$ such that

$$
g_{j}^{\#}(z) \leq M \text { for } j=1,2,3, \cdots ; 1 \leq|z| \leq 2
$$

Now

$$
\begin{aligned}
A\left(2^{j}, \frac{f(P(z))}{z^{n+1}}\right) & =\frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{|z|^{\prime} 2^{j}}\left(\left(\frac{f(P(z))}{z^{n+1}}\right)^{\#}\right)^{2} d x d y \\
& =\frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{m=0}^{j-1} \int_{2^{m} \leq|z| \leq 2^{m+1}}\left(\left(\frac{f(P(z))}{z^{n+1}}\right)^{\#}\right)^{2} d x d y+O(1) \\
& =\frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{m=0}^{j-1} \iint_{1 \leq|z| \leq 2}\left(g_{m}^{\#}(w)\right)^{2} d \xi d \eta+O(1) \\
& \leq 3 j M^{2}=K j
\end{aligned}
$$

where $w=\xi+i \eta$ and $K=3 M^{2}$.
So for any $r\left(2^{j-1} \leq r<2^{j}\right)$ we have

$$
A\left(r, \frac{f(P(z))}{z^{n+1}}\right) \leq A\left(2^{j}, \frac{f(P(z))}{z^{n+1}}\right) \leq K j \leq K\left(\frac{\log r}{\log 2}+1\right)
$$

a contradiction. So $\mathfrak{F}$ is not normal in $\frac{1}{2}<|z|<\frac{5}{2}$. Hence the family $\mathfrak{F}_{1}=\left\{h_{j}(z)\right.$ : $\left.h_{j}(z)=z^{n+1} g_{j}(z), j=1,2,3, \cdots\right\}$ is not normal in $\frac{1}{2}<|z|<\frac{5}{2}$.

Then for $a(z)=a z^{n}$ we see by Lemma 6 that there exists infinitely many $j$ and $z_{j}$ such that $h_{j}^{\prime}\left(z_{j}\right)=a z_{j}^{n}$ and so $f^{\prime}\left(P\left(2^{j} z_{j}\right)\right)=\frac{a\left(2^{j} z_{j}\right)^{n}}{P^{\prime}\left(2^{j} z_{j}\right)}$. Hence $f^{\prime}(P(z))-\frac{a z^{n}}{P^{\prime}(z)}$ has infinitely many zeros.

Case II. Let $f(P)$ be of finite order. First we suppose that $f$ and so $f(P)$ have finitely many zeros. Now in view of Lemmas 7 and 8 we get for $b=a z^{n}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
m\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right)+m\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}-b}\right) \leq & m\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{(2)}}\right)+m\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{(2)}-b^{\prime}}\right) \\
\leq & m\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{(2)}}+\frac{1}{f^{(2)}-b^{\prime}}\right)+S(r, f) \\
\leq & m\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{(n+2)}}\right)+S(r, f) \\
= & T\left(r, f^{(n+2)}\right)-N\left(r, 0 ; f^{(n+2)}\right)+S(r, f) \\
\leq & m\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)+N\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)+(n+1) \bar{N}(r, f)-N\left(r, 0 ; f^{(n+2)}\right)+S(r, f) \\
\leq & T\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)+\frac{n+1}{n+2} N\left(r, 0 ; f^{(n+2)}\right)+\frac{n+1}{n+2} N(r, f)+\frac{1}{2 n+4} T(r, f) \\
& -N\left(r, 0 ; f^{(n+2)}\right)+S(r, f)
\end{aligned}
$$

i.e.,
$T(r, f)+T\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}-b}\right) \leq T\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)+\frac{1}{2 n+4} T(r, f)+N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}-b}\right)+\frac{n+1}{n+2} N(r, f)+S(r, f)$
and so

$$
T(r, f) \leq(2 n+4) N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}-b}\right)+S(r, f)
$$

Replacing $f$ by $f(P)$ in the above inequality we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
T(r, f(P)) & \leq(2 n+4) N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}(P(z)) P^{\prime}(z)-b}\right)+S(r, f(P)) \\
& \leq(2 n+4) N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}(P(z))-\frac{a z^{n}}{P^{\prime}(z)}}\right)+S(r, f(P))
\end{aligned}
$$

which shows that $f^{\prime}(P(z))-\frac{a z^{n}}{P^{\prime}(z)}$ has infinitely many zeros.
Next we suppose that $f$ and so $f(P)$ have infinitely many zeros. Let $z_{1}, z_{2}, z_{3}, \cdots$ be the zeros of $f(P)$. We put $g(z)=f(P(z))-a z^{n+1} /(n+1)$. We now suppose that $g^{\prime}(z)$ has finitely many zeros, then $g$ has finitely many critical values. So by Lemma $9, g$ has finitely many asymptotic values. Without loss of generality we suppose that $g(0)=f(P(0)) \neq \infty$. Then by Lemma 10 we get

$$
\frac{\left|z_{j} g^{\prime}\left(z_{j}\right)\right|}{\left|g\left(z_{j}\right)\right|} \geq \frac{1}{2 \pi} \log \frac{\left|g\left(z_{j}\right)\right|}{R}
$$

Since $\frac{1}{2 \pi} \log \frac{\left|g\left(z_{j}\right)\right|}{R} \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that $\frac{\left|z_{j} g^{\prime}\left(z_{j}\right)\right|}{\left|g\left(z_{j}\right)\right|} \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand $\frac{\left|z_{j} g^{\prime}\left(z_{j}\right)\right|}{\left|g\left(z_{j}\right)\right|} \rightarrow n+1$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, a contradiction. Therefore $g^{\prime}(z)$ and so $f^{\prime}(P(z))-\frac{a z^{n}}{P^{\prime}(z)}$ has infinitely many zeros. This proves the theorem.

Note 1. If we suppose that $f$ is a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order having no simple zero then similar to Case II of the above proof we can prove that $f^{\prime}(P(z))-\frac{Q(z)}{P^{\prime}(z)}$ has infinitely many zeros, where $Q(z)(\not \equiv 0)$ is a polynomial.

Proof of Theorem 2. Since $Q(f(z))$ has no simple zero and simple pole, by Theorem 3

$$
P(f(z)) f^{\prime}(z)-a z^{n}=\frac{d}{d z} Q(f(z))-a z^{n}
$$

has infinitely many zeros.
Proof of Theorem 1. Theorem 1 follows from Theorem 2 if we choose $Q(z)=\frac{z^{p+1}}{p+1}$. $\square$
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