

1-1-2018

On the growth of meromorphic solutions of some higher order linear differential equations

FARID MESBOUT

TAHAR ZERZAIHI

Follow this and additional works at: <https://journals.tubitak.gov.tr/math>



Part of the [Mathematics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

MESBOUT, FARID and ZERZAIHI, TAHAR (2018) "On the growth of meromorphic solutions of some higher order linear differential equations," *Turkish Journal of Mathematics*: Vol. 42: No. 3, Article 25.

<https://doi.org/10.3906/mat-1701-62>

Available at: <https://journals.tubitak.gov.tr/math/vol42/iss3/25>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by TÜBİTAK Academic Journals. It has been accepted for inclusion in Turkish Journal of Mathematics by an authorized editor of TÜBİTAK Academic Journals. For more information, please contact academic.publications@tubitak.gov.tr.

On the growth of meromorphic solutions of some higher order linear differential equations

Farid MESBOUT, Tahar ZERZAIHI*

Department of Mathematics,
Laboratory of Pure and Applied Mathematics (LMPA),
University of Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia, Jijel, Algeria

Received: 24.01.2017

Accepted/Published Online: 28.09.2017

Final Version: 08.05.2018

Abstract: Let k, m, n be integers such that $k \geq 1$, $n \geq 2$ and $1 \leq m \leq n$. In this article we study the order $\rho(f)$ and the hyperorder $\rho_2(f)$ of nonzero meromorphic solutions f of the differential equation

$$\sum_{j=1, j \neq m}^n A_j(z) f^{(j)}(z) + A_m(z) e^{p_m(z)} f^{(m)}(z) + (A_0(z) e^{p(z)} + B_0(z) e^{q(z)}) f(z) = 0,$$

where $B_0(z), A_0(z), \dots, A_n(z)$ are meromorphic functions such that $A_0 A_m A_n B_0 \neq 0$, $\max\{\rho(B_0), \rho(A_0), \dots, \rho(A_n)\} < k$, and $p(z), q(z), p_m(z)$ are polynomials of degree k . Under some conditions, we show that $\rho(f) = +\infty$ and $\rho_2(f) = k$. This is an extension of some recent results by Peng, Chen, Xu, and Zhang devoted to linear differential equations of the second order.

Key words: Meromorphic functions, Nevanlinna value distribution theory, linear differential equation, order of growth

1. Introduction and preliminary results

In this article, for a meromorphic function $f(z)$ in the whole complex plane \mathbb{C} , we use Nevanlinna value distribution theory notations such as $T(r, f)$, $m(r, f)$, and $N(r, f)$ (see, e.g., [5, 6, 9]). We also use $\rho(f)$, $\rho_2(f)$, $\lambda(f)$, and $\lambda(\frac{1}{f})$ to denote the order of growth of $f(z)$, the hyperorder of growth of $f(z)$, the exponent of convergence of the zero sequence of $f(z)$, and the exponents of convergence of the pole sequence of $f(z)$, respectively defined by:

$$\rho(f) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T(r, f)}{\log r}, \quad \rho_2(f) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log T(r, f)}{\log r}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(f) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log N(r, \frac{1}{f})}{\log r}.$$

Recently Peng and Chen [7] considered some second-order differential equations with entire coefficients of order less than 1 and obtained the following theorem:

*Correspondence: zerzaihi@yahoo.com

2010 AMS Mathematics Subject Classification: 34M10, 30D35

Theorem A Let $A_1(z), A_2(z)$ be nonzero entire functions such that $\max\{\rho(A_1), \rho(A_2)\} < 1$. Let a_1, a_2 be two distinct nonzero complex numbers ($|a_1| \leq |a_2|$). We suppose that $\arg a_1 \neq \pi$ or $a_1 < -1$. Then, for every nonzero meromorphic solution $f(z)$ of the equation

$$f'' + e^{-z} f' + (A_1 e^{a_1 z} + A_2 e^{a_2 z}) f = 0,$$

we have $\rho(f) = +\infty$ and $\rho_2(f) = 1$.

More recently, Xu and Zhang [8] extended this result to the case when the above equation has meromorphic coefficients:

Theorem B Let $A_0(z), A_1(z), A_2(z)$ be nonzero meromorphic functions such that $\max\{\rho(A_0), \rho(A_1), \rho(A_2)\} < 1$. Let a_1, a_2 be two distinct nonzero complex numbers ($|a_1| \leq |a_2|$). Let $a_0 < 0$. If $\arg a_1 \neq \pi$ or $a_1 < a_0$, then every nonzero meromorphic solution $f(z)$ whose poles are of uniformly bounded multiplicities of the equation

$$f'' + A_0 e^{a_0 z} f' + (A_1 e^{a_1 z} + A_2 e^{a_2 z}) f = 0$$

satisfies that we have $\rho(f) = +\infty$ and $\rho_2(f) = 1$.

Here, we mean to extend the results above to more general higher order linear differential equations with meromorphic coefficients of finite order. More precisely, we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1 Let k, m, n be integers such that $k \geq 1, n \geq 2$ and $1 \leq m \leq n$. Suppose that $B_0(z), A_0(z), \dots, A_n(z)$ are meromorphic functions such that $A_0 A_m A_n B_0 \neq 0$ and $\max\{\rho(B_0), \rho(A_0), \dots, \rho(A_n)\} = \sigma < k$. Let $p(z) = \alpha z^k + \dots, q(z) = \beta z^k + \dots, p_m(z) = \alpha_m z^k + \dots$ be polynomials of degree k . Suppose that $\alpha \neq \beta$ and that at least one of the two following conditions is satisfied:

- i) at least two among the numbers α, β, α_m are of distinct arguments,
- ii) $|\alpha_m| < \max\{|\alpha|, |\beta|\}$, (if $\arg \alpha = \arg \alpha_m = \arg \beta$).

Then, for every nonzero meromorphic solution $f(z)$ of the equation

$$\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq m}}^n A_j(z) f^{(j)}(z) + A_m(z) e^{p_m(z)} f^{(m)}(z) + \left(A_0(z) e^{p(z)} + B_0(z) e^{q(z)} \right) f(z) = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

we have $\rho(f) = +\infty$ and $\rho_2(f) \geq k$.

Remark 1.1 1) Our conditions on the numbers α, β, α_m in Theorem 1.1 are weaker than those of Theorems A and B.

2) Theorem 1.1 provides sufficient (but not necessary) conditions to have the stated properties. Indeed, let us consider the equation $f'''(z) + f''(z) - e^{2z} f'(z) - (2e^z + 4e^{2z}) f(z) = 0$. It is easily checked that the function $f(z) = e^{e^z}$ is a solution of this equation and $\rho(f) = +\infty$ and $\rho_2(f) = k = 1$. However, conditions (i) and (ii) of the theorem are not fulfilled.

Corollary 1.1 Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, we show that if $f(z)$ is a nonzero meromorphic solution of Equation (1.1), all of whose poles are of uniformly bounded multiplicity, then $\rho_2(f) = k$. This is, for instance, the case when f has only a finite number of poles and particularly when f is entire.

Theorem 1.2 Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied. Then, for every nonzero meromorphic solution $f(z)$ of (1.1), we have

$$1) \lambda(f+h) = \lambda\left(\frac{1}{f+h}\right) = \infty, \text{ for every nonzero meromorphic function } h \text{ of finite order.}$$

$$2) \lambda(f'+h) = \lambda\left(\frac{1}{f'+h}\right) = \infty, \text{ for every nonzero meromorphic function } h \text{ of order } < k.$$

$$3) \lambda(f''+h) = \lambda\left(\frac{1}{f''+h}\right) = \infty, \text{ for every nonzero meromorphic function } h \text{ of order } < k.$$

2. The proofs

We need the following lemmas:

Lemma 2.1 [4] Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite order ρ , $H = \{(k_1, j_1), (k_2, j_2), \dots, (k_q, j_q)\}$ be a finite set of distinct pairs of integers satisfying $k_i > j_i \geq 0$ ($i = 1, \dots, q$), and ϵ be a positive constant. Then there exists a subset $E_1 \subset]1, \infty[$, of finite logarithmic measure such that, for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|z| \notin [0, 1] \cup E_1$ and every $(k_i, j_i) \in H$, we have:

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

Lemma 2.2 [3] Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite order ρ ; then, for any given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a set $E_2 \subset]1, \infty[$, of finite logarithmic measure such that, for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|z| \notin [0, 1] \cup E_2$, we have: $|f(z)| \leq \exp\{|z|^{\rho + \epsilon}\}$.

Lemma 2.3 [4] Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function. Let $\lambda > 1$ be a constant, and let k and j be integers satisfying $k > j \geq 0$. Then there exist a subset $E_3 \subset]1, \infty[$ of finite logarithmic measure and a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|z| = r \notin [0, 1] \cup E_3$, we have $\left| \frac{f^{(k)}(z)}{f^{(j)}(z)} \right| \leq C \left[\frac{T(\lambda r, f)}{r} (\log r)^\lambda \log T(\lambda r, f) \right]^{(k-j)}$.

Lemma 2.4 Let $\varphi, \psi \in \left[-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right]$ and let k be an integer ≥ 1 . Let $E \subset \left[-\frac{\pi}{2k}, \frac{3\pi}{2k}\right]$ be a set of linear measure zero. If $\varphi \neq \psi$, then there exist infinitely many $\theta \in \left[-\frac{\pi}{2k}, \frac{3\pi}{2k}\right] \setminus E$, such that $\cos(\varphi + k\theta) \cos(\psi + k\theta) < 0$.

Proof Without loss of generality, we may assume that $-\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \varphi < \psi < \frac{3\pi}{2}$ and we distinguish the following cases:

Case 1. Suppose that $-\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \varphi < \psi \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$. Then we have

$$0 \leq \frac{\pi}{2} - \psi < \frac{\pi}{2} - \varphi \leq \pi \leq \frac{3\pi}{2} - \psi. \tag{2.1}$$

As E is a set of linear measure zero, we see that $\left] \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \psi \right), \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \varphi \right) \right[\setminus E$ is an infinite subset of $\left] -\frac{\pi}{2k}, \frac{3\pi}{2k} \right[\setminus E$. Then, using Inequalities (2.1), we see that for every $\theta \in \left] \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \psi \right), \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \varphi \right) \right[\setminus E$, we have:

$$0 \leq \frac{\pi}{2} - \psi < k\theta < \frac{\pi}{2} - \varphi \text{ and } \frac{\pi}{2} - \psi < k\theta < \frac{\pi}{2} - \varphi \leq \frac{3\pi}{2} - \psi,$$

Hence, we have $-\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \varphi < \varphi + k\theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\frac{\pi}{2} < \psi + k\theta < \frac{3\pi}{2}$.

Therefore, in this case, we have $\cos(\varphi + k\theta) > 0$ and $\cos(\psi + k\theta) < 0$.

Case 2. Suppose that $\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \varphi < \psi < \frac{3\pi}{2}$, and let $\varphi' = \varphi - \pi$ and $\psi' = \psi - \pi$. Thus, we have $-\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \varphi' < \psi' < \frac{\pi}{2}$. From the previous case it is seen that, for every $\theta \in \left] \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \psi' \right), \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \varphi' \right) \right[\setminus E \subset \left] -\frac{\pi}{2k}, \frac{3\pi}{2k} \right[\setminus E$, we have $\cos(\varphi' + k\theta) \cos(\psi' + k\theta) < 0$. Since $\cos(\varphi' + k\theta) = -\cos(\varphi + k\theta)$ and $\cos(\psi' + k\theta) = -\cos(\psi + k\theta)$, it follows that $\cos(\varphi + k\theta) \cos(\psi + k\theta) < 0$.

Case 3. Suppose that $-\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \varphi < \frac{\pi}{2} < \psi < \frac{3\pi}{2}$. Thus, we have $0 < \frac{\pi}{2} - \varphi \leq \pi$ and $0 < \frac{3\pi}{2} - \psi < \pi$. Let $\alpha = \min\{\frac{\pi}{2} - \varphi, \frac{3\pi}{2} - \psi\}$. Then $\left] 0, \frac{\alpha}{k} \right[\setminus E$ is an infinite subset of $\left] -\frac{\pi}{2k}, \frac{3\pi}{2k} \right[\setminus E$. Moreover, for every $\theta \in \left] 0, \frac{\alpha}{k} \right[\setminus E$, we have $-\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \varphi < \varphi + k\theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\frac{\pi}{2} < \psi < \psi + k\theta < \frac{3\pi}{2}$. It follows that, in this case, $\cos(\varphi + k\theta) > 0$ and $\cos(\psi + k\theta) < 0$. □

Lemma 2.5 [1] *Let $k \geq 2$ and A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{k-1} be meromorphic functions.*

Let $\rho = \max\{\rho(A_j), j = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1\}$. Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic solution of the differential equation

$$f^{(k)} + A_{(k-1)}f^{(k-1)} + \dots + A_0f = 0.$$

If all poles of $f(z)$ are of uniformly bounded multiplicity, then we have $\rho_2(f) \leq \rho$.

Lemma 2.6 [2] *Let k be an integer ≥ 1 and let $A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{k-1}, F \not\equiv 0$ be finite order meromorphic functions.*

If $g(z)$ is an infinite order meromorphic solution of the equation

$$g^{(k)} + A_{(k-1)}g^{(k-1)} + \dots + A_0g = F,$$

then $g(z)$ satisfies $\lambda(g) = \lambda\left(\frac{1}{g}\right) = \infty$.

Lemma 2.7 [9] Suppose that $f_1(z), f_2(z), \dots, f_{n+1}(z)$ ($n \geq 1$) are meromorphic functions and $g_1(z), g_2(z), \dots, g_n(z)$ are entire functions satisfying the following conditions:

$$(1) \sum_{j=1}^n f_j(z)e^{g_j(z)} \equiv f_{n+1}(z).$$

(2) For $1 \leq j \leq n+1$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, the order of f_j is less than the order of $e^{g_k(z)}$, and furthermore the order of $f_j(z)$ is less than the order of $e^{g_h - g_k}$ for $n \geq 2$ and $1 \leq j \leq n+1$, $1 \leq h < k \leq n$

Then $f_j(z) \equiv 0$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, n+1$).

Lemma 2.8 [6] Let $F(r)$ and $G(r)$ be nondecreasing real-valued functions on $[0, \infty[$ such that $F(r) \leq G(r)$ for all r outside of a set $E \subset]1, \infty[$ of finite linear measure or outside of a set $H \cup [0, 1]$, where $H \subset]1, \infty[$ is of finite logarithmic measure. Then, for every constant $\alpha > 1$, there exists an $r_0 > 0$ such that $F(r) \leq G(\alpha r)$ for all $r > r_0$.

2.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1

We shall see that this theorem is an immediate consequence of the following proposition in which we are reduced to the case where the polynomials $p(z), q(z)$ and $p_m(z)$ are just monomials.:

Proposition 2.1 Let k, m, n be integers such that $k \geq 1$, $n \geq 2$ and $1 \leq m \leq n$. Suppose that $B_0(z), A_0(z), \dots, A_n(z)$ are meromorphic functions such that $A_0 A_m A_n B_0 \not\equiv 0$ and $\max\{\rho(B_0), \rho(A_0), \dots, \rho(A_n)\} = \sigma < k$. Let α, β, α_m be complex numbers such that $\alpha\beta \neq 0$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$. Suppose that at least one of the two following conditions is satisfied:

- i) at least two of the numbers α, β, α_m have distinct arguments,
- ii) $|\alpha_m| < \max\{|\alpha|, |\beta|\}$, (if $\arg \alpha = \arg \alpha_m = \arg \beta$).

Then, for every nonzero meromorphic solution $f(z)$ of the following equation:

$$\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq m}}^n A_j(z)f^{(j)}(z) + A_m(z)e^{\alpha_m z^k} f^{(m)}(z) + (A_0(z)e^{\alpha z^k} + B_0(z)e^{\beta z^k}) f(z) = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

we have $\rho(f) = +\infty$ and $\rho_2(f) \geq k$.

Proof Let us first show that every nonzero meromorphic solution of Equation (2.2), is of infinite order. Indeed, suppose that (2.2) admits a nonzero meromorphic solution $f(z)$ of finite order. Let us set $z = re^{i\theta}$, $\alpha = |\alpha|e^{i\varphi}$, $\alpha_m = |\alpha_m|e^{i\theta_m}$, and $\beta = |\beta|e^{i\psi}$ and let $0 < \epsilon < k - \sigma$. From the hypothesis, we easily check that:

$$\max \left\{ \rho \left(\frac{A_j}{A_0} \right), \rho \left(\frac{A_j}{B_0} \right), 0 \leq j \leq n \right\} \leq \sigma.$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.2 there exists a set $E \subset]1, \infty[$ of finite logarithmic measure such that, for every z such that $|z| = r \notin [0, 1] \cup E$, we have:

$$\max \left\{ \left| \frac{A_j(z)}{A_0(z)} \right|, \left| \frac{A_j(z)}{B_0(z)} \right|, 0 \leq j \leq n \right\} \leq \exp\{r^{\sigma+\epsilon}\}, \quad (2.3)$$

and we distinguish the following cases:

1) $\varphi \neq \psi$. By Lemma 2.4, there exists $\theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{2k}, \frac{\pi}{2k}[$ such that, $\cos(\varphi + k\theta) \cos(\psi + k\theta) < 0$. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $\cos(\varphi + k\theta) > 0$ and $\cos(\psi + k\theta) < 0$. Then, from Equation (2.2), we have

$$-e^{\alpha z^k} = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq m}}^n \frac{A_j(z)f^{(j)}(z)}{A_0(z)f(z)} + e^{\alpha_m z^k} \frac{A_m(z)f^{(m)}(z)}{A_0(z)f(z)} + e^{\beta z^k} \frac{B_0(z)}{A_0(z)}, \quad (2.4)$$

$$-e^{\beta z^k} = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq m}}^n \frac{A_j(z)f^{(j)}(z)}{B_0(z)f(z)} + e^{\alpha_m z^k} \frac{A_m(z)f^{(m)}(z)}{B_0(z)f(z)} + e^{\alpha z^k} \frac{A_0(z)}{B_0(z)}. \quad (2.5)$$

1.1) Suppose that $\cos(\theta_m + k\theta) \leq 0$. Then by Equations (2.3), (2.4) and Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\exp\{|\alpha| \cos(\varphi + k\theta)r^k\} \leq (n+1) \exp\{r^{\sigma+\epsilon}\} r^{n(\rho(f)-1+\epsilon)},$$

which is a contradiction with $\sigma + \epsilon < k$.

1.2) Suppose that $\cos(\theta_m + k\theta) > 0$. Letting $\theta' = \theta + \frac{\pi}{k}$, then we have $\cos(\theta_m + k\theta') < 0$ and $\cos(\psi + k\theta') > 0$.

By Equations (2.3) and (2.5) and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\exp\{|\beta| \cos(\psi + k\theta')r^k\} \leq (n+1) \exp\{r^{\sigma+\epsilon}\} r^{n(\rho(f)-1+\epsilon)},$$

which is a contradiction with $\sigma + \epsilon < k$.

2) $\varphi = \psi$. Since $\alpha \neq \beta$, then $|\alpha| \neq |\beta|$. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $|\alpha| < |\beta|$. Then we have the following subcases:

2.1) $\theta_m \neq \varphi = \psi$. Then, by Lemma 2.4, there exists $\theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{2k}, \frac{\pi}{2k}[$ such that $\cos(\varphi + k\theta) \cos(\theta_m + k\theta) < 0$, and we may suppose that $\cos(\varphi + k\theta) > 0$. Then, by Equations (2.3) and (2.5) and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\exp\{|\beta| \cos(\varphi + k\theta)r^k\} \leq (n+1) \exp\{r^{\sigma+\epsilon}\} r^{n(\rho(f)-1+\epsilon)} \exp\{|\alpha| \cos(\varphi + k\theta)r^k\},$$

and therefore, we have

$$\exp\{(|\beta| - |\alpha|) \cos(\varphi + k\theta)r^k\} \leq (n+1) \exp\{r^{\sigma+\epsilon}\} r^{n(\rho(f)-1+\epsilon)}.$$

This is a contradiction with $\sigma + \epsilon < k$.

2.2) $\theta_m = \varphi = \psi$. We choose $\theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}[$ such that $\cos(\varphi + k\theta) > 0$. If $|\alpha_m| \leq |\alpha|$, then by Equations (2.3) and (2.5) and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\exp\{(|\beta| - |\alpha|) \cos(\varphi + k\theta)r^k\} \leq (n+1) \exp\{r^{\sigma+\epsilon}\} r^{n(\rho(f)-1+\epsilon)},$$

a contradiction.

If $|\alpha| < |\alpha_m| < |\beta|$, by Equations (2.3) and (2.5) and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\exp\{(|\beta| - |\alpha_m|) \cos(\varphi + k\theta)r^k\} \leq (n+1) \exp\{r^{\sigma+\epsilon}\} r^{n(\rho(f)-1+\epsilon)},$$

and this is a contradiction.

Let us now show that every nonzero meromorphic solution $f(z)$ of Equation (2.2) satisfies $\rho_2(f) \geq k$.

By Lemma 2.3, we know that there exists a set $E_3 \subset]1, \infty[$, with finite logarithmic measure and a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $|z| = r \notin [0, 1] \cup E_3$, we get

$$\left| \frac{f^{(j)}(z)}{f(z)} \right| \leq C \left[\frac{T(2r, f)}{r} (\log r)^2 \log T(2r, f) \right]^j \leq C [T(2r, f)]^{j+1}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (2.6)$$

Using (2.6) and for the proof of the first step, we have

$$\exp\{h_1 r^k\} \leq C(n+1) \exp\{r^{\sigma+\epsilon}\} [T(2r, f)]^{n+1}, \quad (2.7)$$

where $h_1 > 0$ is a constant. By $h_1 > 0$, $\sigma + \epsilon < k$, (2.7), and Lemma 2.8, we know that there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that when $r > r_0$, we have $\rho_2(f) \geq k$. \square

We are now able to explain how to deduce Theorem 1.1 from the proposition above.

Let us set $\mathcal{A}_0(z) = A_0(z)e^{p(z)-\alpha z^k}$, $\mathcal{B}_0(z) = B_0(z)e^{q(z)-\beta z^k}$,

$\mathcal{A}_m(z) = A_m(z)e^{p_m(z)-\alpha_m z^k}$, and $\mathcal{A}_j(z) = A_j(z)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n; j \neq m$.

With these notations, Equation (1.1) becomes

$$\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq m}}^n \mathcal{A}_j(z) f^{(j)}(z) + \mathcal{A}_m(z) e^{\alpha_m z^k} f^{(m)}(z) + \left(\mathcal{A}_0(z) e^{\alpha z^k} + \mathcal{B}_0(z) e^{\beta z^k} \right) f(z) = 0, \quad (2.8)$$

which is of the same form as Equation (2.2). Moreover, it is easy to check that the functions $\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{A}_0, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ have the same proprieties as those of the functions B_0, A_0, \dots, A_n in Proposition (2.1). We just apply this proposition to conclude.

2.2. Proof of Corollary 1.1

Let f be a nonzero meromorphic solution of Equation (1.1) satisfying the conditions in the corollary. Then we have:

$$f^{(n)}(z) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} C_j(z) f^{(j)}(z) = 0,$$

where $C_j(z) = \frac{A_j(z)}{A_n(z)}$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{0, m\}$, $C_0(z) = \frac{A_0(z)e^{p(z)} + B_0(z)e^{q(z)}}{A_n(z)}$, and $C_m(z) = \frac{A_m(z)e^{p_m(z)}}{A_n(z)}$.

It is clear that $\max\{\rho(C_j), 0 \leq j \leq n\} \leq k$. Hence, by Lemma 2.5, we have $\rho_2(f) \leq k$. On the other hand, applying Theorem 1.1, we obtain $\rho_2(f) \geq k$. Then $\rho_2(f) = k$.

2.3. Proof of Theorem 1.2

1) According to Theorem 1.1, we have $\rho(f) = \infty$. Putting $g_0 = f + h$, we see that $\rho(g_0) = \rho(f) = \infty$ and we deduce from Equation (1.1) that:

$$g_0^{(n)} + C_{n-1}g_0^{(n-1)} + \dots + C_0g_0 = H_0, \tag{2.9}$$

where $C_0(z) = \frac{A_0(z)e^{p(z)} + B_0(z)e^{q(z)}}{A_n(z)}$, $C_m(z) = \frac{A_m(z)e^{p_m(z)}}{A_n(z)}$, $C_j(z) = \frac{A_j(z)}{A_n(z)}$, for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{m\}$ and $H_0(z) = \sum_{j=1}^n C_j h^j$.

Now it is clear that $H_0 \not\equiv 0$, because if $H_0 \equiv 0$, we deduce by Theorem 1.1 that $\rho(h) = \infty$, which is a contradiction.

We also easily see that the functions $C_0(z), \dots, C_{n-1}(z)$ and $H_0(z)$ are of finite order. Thus, applying Lemma 2.6 to Equation (2.9), we have $\lambda(f + h) = \lambda\left(\frac{1}{f + h}\right) = \infty$.

2) Suppose now that $\rho(h) < k$ and let us show that $\lambda(f' + h) = \lambda\left(\frac{1}{f' + h}\right) = \infty$.

Letting $g_1 = f' + h$, by derivation of both sides of (1.1), we obtain

$$\mathcal{A}'_0 f + \sum_{j=1}^n (\mathcal{A}_{j-1} + \mathcal{A}'_j) f^{(j)} + \mathcal{A}_n f^{(n+1)} = 0, \tag{2.10}$$

where $\mathcal{A}_0 = A_0 e^{p(z)} + B_0 e^{q(z)}$, $\mathcal{A}_m = A_m e^{p_m(z)}$, and $\mathcal{A}_j = A_j$, for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{m\}$.

Multiplying (2.10) by \mathcal{A}_0 and (1.1) by \mathcal{A}'_0 and making the difference, we obtain

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (\mathcal{A}_0(\mathcal{A}_j + \mathcal{A}'_{j+1}) - \mathcal{A}'_0 \mathcal{A}_{j+1}) (f')^{(j)} + \mathcal{A}_0 \mathcal{A}_n (f')^{(n)} = 0, \text{ i.e.}$$

$$\Delta(f') = 0, \tag{2.11}$$

where $\Delta(y) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (\mathcal{A}_0(\mathcal{A}_j + \mathcal{A}'_{j+1}) - \mathcal{A}'_0 \mathcal{A}_{j+1}) y^{(j)} + \mathcal{A}_0 \mathcal{A}_n y^{(n)}$.

Since $f' = g_1 - h$, we obtain from (2.11):

$$\Delta(g_1) = \Delta(h). \tag{2.12}$$

We have $\Delta(h) \not\equiv 0$. Indeed, if $\Delta(h) \equiv 0$, using the fact $\mathcal{A}_0 = A_0 e^{p(z)} + B_0 e^{q(z)}$ and $\mathcal{A}_m = A_m e^{p_m(z)}$, we get

$$G_\alpha e^{\alpha z^k} + G_\beta e^{\beta z^k} + G_{\alpha+\alpha_m} e^{(\alpha+\alpha_m)z^k} + G_{\alpha+\beta} e^{(\alpha+\beta)z^k} + G_{2\alpha} e^{2\alpha z^k} + G_{2\beta} e^{2\beta z^k} = 0, \tag{2.13}$$

where the coefficients of Equation (2.13) are meromorphic functions of order $< k$, with $G_{2\alpha} = (A_0 e^{p(z) - \alpha z^k})^2$ and $G_{2\beta} = (B_0 e^{q(z) - \alpha z^k})^2$.

Using the conditions of the theorem we easily show that $2\alpha \notin \{\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \alpha_m, \alpha_m + \beta, \alpha + \beta, 2\beta\}$ or $2\beta \notin \{\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \alpha_m, \alpha_m + \beta, \alpha + \beta, 2\alpha\}$. Indeed:

If $2\alpha \in \{\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \alpha_m, \alpha_m + \beta, \alpha + \beta, 2\beta\}$, we will show that $2\beta \notin \{\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \alpha_m, \alpha_m + \beta, \alpha + \beta, 2\alpha\}$. Since $\alpha\beta(\alpha - \beta) \neq 0$, we have $2\alpha \neq \alpha, \alpha + \beta, 2\beta$ and $2\beta \neq \beta, \alpha + \beta, 2\alpha$, so we have $2\alpha \in \{\beta, \alpha + \alpha_m, \alpha_m + \beta\}$ and it is sufficient to show that $2\beta \notin \{\alpha, \alpha + \alpha_m, \alpha_m + \beta\}$.

By Lemma 2.7, we get $A_0^2 \equiv 0$ or $B_0^2 \equiv 0$, a contradiction because $A_0B_0 \neq 0$. Therefore, $\Delta(h) \neq 0$. Now applying Lemma (2.6) to Equation (2.12), we obtain

$$\lambda(f' + h) = \lambda\left(\frac{1}{f' + h}\right) = \infty.$$

3) Let us now prove that $\lambda(f'' + h) = \infty$. We pose $g_2 = f'' + h$, and then $\rho(g_2) = \rho(f'') = \infty$.

By derivation of (2.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_n f^{(n+2)} + (2\mathcal{A}'_n + \mathcal{A}_{n-1})f^{(n+1)} + \sum_{j=2}^n (\mathcal{A}_{j-2} + 2\mathcal{A}'_{j-1} + \mathcal{A}''_j)f^{(j)} \\ + (2\mathcal{A}'_0 + \mathcal{A}''_1)f' + \mathcal{A}''_0 f = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

Equation (1.1) enables us to express f as function of $f', f'', \dots, f^{(n)}$. Then a substitution of this in Equation (2.14) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_0 \mathcal{A}_n f^{(n+2)} + \mathcal{A}_0 (2\mathcal{A}'_n + \mathcal{A}_{n-1})f^{(n+1)} + \sum_{j=2}^n \left(\mathcal{A}_0 (\mathcal{A}_{j-2} + 2\mathcal{A}'_{j-1} + \mathcal{A}''_j) - \mathcal{A}''_0 \mathcal{A}_j \right) f^{(j)} \\ + \left(\mathcal{A}_0 (2\mathcal{A}'_0 + \mathcal{A}''_1) - \mathcal{A}''_0 \mathcal{A}_1 \right) f' = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

We put $D_0 = \mathcal{A}_0(\mathcal{A}_0 + \mathcal{A}'_1) - \mathcal{A}''_0 \mathcal{A}_1$ and $D_1 = \mathcal{A}_0(2\mathcal{A}'_0 + \mathcal{A}''_1) - \mathcal{A}''_0 \mathcal{A}_1$.

Multiplying (2.15) by D_0 and (2.11) by D_1 and making the difference, we have

$$\Gamma(f'') = 0, \tag{2.16}$$

where $\Gamma(y) = \mathcal{A}_0 D_0 \mathcal{A}_n y^{(n)} + \left(\mathcal{A}_0 D_0 (2\mathcal{A}'_n + \mathcal{A}_{n-1}) - \mathcal{A}_0 D_1 \mathcal{A}_n \right) y^{(n-1)} + \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} \left(D_0 (\mathcal{A}_0 (\mathcal{A}_j + 2\mathcal{A}'_{j+1} + \mathcal{A}''_{j+2}) - \mathcal{A}''_0 \mathcal{A}_{j+2}) - (\mathcal{A}_0 (\mathcal{A}_{j+1} + \mathcal{A}'_{j+2}) - \mathcal{A}''_0 \mathcal{A}_{j+2}) D_1 \right) y^{(j)}$. Since $f'' = g_2 - h$, we obtain from (2.16):

$$\Gamma(g_1) = \Gamma(h). \tag{2.17}$$

We have $\Gamma(h) \neq 0$. Indeed, if $\Gamma(h) \equiv 0$, then

$$\frac{\Gamma(h)}{\mathcal{A}_0} \equiv 0. \tag{2.18}$$

Let us distinguish two cases:

Case 1 If $m = 1$, replacing \mathcal{A}_0 and \mathcal{A}_1 by $A_0e^{p(z)} + B_0e^{q(z)}$ and $A_1e^{p_1(z)}$ in Equation (2.18), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & f_1(z)e^{(\alpha+\alpha_1)z^k} + f_2(z)e^{(\alpha_1+\beta)} + f_3(z)e^{2\alpha z^k} + f_4(z)e^{2\beta z^k} + f_5(z)e^{(\alpha+\beta)z^k} \\ & + f_6(z)e^{(2\alpha+\beta)z^k} + f_7(z)e^{(\alpha+2\beta)z^k} + f_8(z)e^{(2\alpha_1+\alpha)z^k} + f_9(z)e^{(2\alpha_1+\beta)z^k} \\ & + f_{10}(z)e^{(2\alpha+\alpha_1)z^k} + f_{11}(z)e^{(\alpha_1+2\beta)z^k} + f_{12}(z)e^{(\alpha+\alpha_1+\beta)z^k} + f_{13}(z)e^{3\alpha z^k} + f_{14}(z)e^{3\beta z^k} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the functions f_1, \dots, f_{14} are all of order $< k$ and particularly $f_{13}(z) = (A_0e^{p(z)-\alpha z^k})^3$ and $f_{14}(z) = (B_0e^{q(z)-\beta z^k})^3$.

Let $\Omega = \{3\alpha, \alpha + \alpha_1 + \beta, \alpha_1 + 2\beta, 2\alpha + \alpha_1, 2\alpha_1 + \beta, 2\alpha_1 + \alpha, \alpha + 2\beta, 2\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \beta, 2\beta, 2\alpha, \alpha_1 + \beta, \alpha + \alpha_1\}$. Since $\alpha \neq \beta$, we have $3\alpha \neq 3\beta, \alpha + 2\beta, 2\alpha + \beta, 2\alpha$ and $3\beta \neq 3\alpha, \alpha + 2\beta, 2\alpha + \beta, 2\beta$.

Setting $\Omega_1 = \{\alpha + \alpha_1 + \beta, \alpha_1 + 2\beta, 2\alpha + \alpha_1, 2\alpha_1 + \beta, 2\alpha_1 + \alpha, \alpha + \beta, 2\beta, \alpha_1 + \beta, \alpha + \alpha_1\}$, then we have:

If $3\alpha \notin \Omega_1$, we deduce by Lemma 2.7 that $f_{13} \equiv 0$, i.e. $A_0 \equiv 0$, which is a contradiction.

If $3\alpha \in \Omega_1$, we have $3\beta \notin \Omega$. Then by Lemma 2.7, $f_{14} \equiv 0$, i.e. $B_0 \equiv 0$, which is a contradiction also.

Therefore, $\Gamma(h) \neq 0$. By Equation (2.18), since $\Gamma(h) \neq 0$ and $\rho(g_2) = \infty$, according to Lemma (2.6) we have $\lambda(g_2) = \lambda(f'' + h) = \lambda(\frac{1}{f''+h}) = \infty$.

Case 2 $m > 1$.

Using the fact $\mathcal{A}_0 = A_0e^{p(z)} + B_0e^{q(z)}$ and $\mathcal{A}_m = A_me^{p_m(z)}$, we obtain from Equation (2.18):

$$\begin{aligned} & f_1(z)e^{(\alpha+\alpha_m)z^k} + f_2(z)e^{(\alpha_m+\beta)} + f_3(z)e^{2\alpha z^k} + f_4(z)e^{2\beta z^k} + f_5(z)e^{(\alpha+\beta)z^k} \\ & + f_6(z)e^{(2\alpha+\beta)z^k} + f_7(z)e^{(\alpha+2\beta)z^k} + f_8(z)e^{\alpha z^k} + f_9(z)e^{\beta z^k} \\ & + f_{10}(z)e^{(2\alpha+\alpha_m)z^k} + f_{11}(z)e^{(\alpha_m+2\beta)z^k} + f_{12}(z)e^{(\alpha+\alpha_m+\beta)z^k} + f_{13}(z)e^{3\alpha z^k} + f_{14}(z)e^{3\beta z^k} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $f_{13}(z) = (A_0e^{p(z)-\alpha z^k})^3$, $f_{14}(z) = (B_0e^{q(z)-\beta z^k})^3$, and $\rho(f_j) < k$ ($j = 1, \dots, 14$). Then we conclude in the same way as in Case 1.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to show their gratitude to the anonymous referees and Professor A Boutabaa from Blaise Pascal University (France) for their careful reading, helpful comments, and constructive suggestions.

References

- [1] Chen WJ, Xu JF. Growth of meromorphic solutions of higher-order linear differential equations. Electron J Qual Theory Differ Equ 2009; 1: 1-13.
- [2] Chen ZX. Zeros of meromorphic solutions of higher order linear differential equations. Analysis 1994; 14: 425-438.
- [3] Chen ZX, Yang CC. Some oscillation theorems for linear differential equations with meromorphic coefficients. Southeast Asian Bulletin of Mathematics 1999; 23: 409-417.
- [4] Gundersen GG. Estimates for the logarithmic derivative of meromorphic functions, plus similar estimates. J London Math Soc 1988; 37: 88-104.
- [5] Hayman WK. Meromorphic Functions. Oxford, UK: Clarendon, 1964.

- [6] Laine L. Nevanlinna Theory and Complex Differential Equations. Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter, 1993.
- [7] Peng F, Chen ZX. On the growth of solutions of some second-order linear differential equations. J Inequal Appl 2011; 2011: 635604.
- [8] Xu J, Zhang X. Some results of meromorphic solutions of second-order linear differential equations. J Inequal Appl 2013; 304.
- [9] Yang CC, Yi HX. Uniqueness Theory of Meromorphic Functions. Beijing, China: Science Press, 2003.