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Abstract. Let \( f \) be a transcendental meromorphic function defined in the complex plane \( \mathbb{C} \), and \( \phi \neq 0, \infty \) be a small function of \( f \). In this paper, we give a quantitative estimation of the characteristic function \( T(r, f) \) in terms of \( N \left( r, \frac{1}{M[f]-\phi(z)} \right) \) as well as \( N \left( r, \frac{1}{M[f]-\phi(z)} \right) \), where \( M[f] \) is the differential monomial, generated by \( f \).

Moreover, we prove one normality criterion: Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a family of analytic functions on a domain \( D \) and let \( k \geq 1 \), \( q_0 \geq 3 \), \( q_i \geq 0 \) \( (i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1) \), \( \sum q_i \geq 1 \) be positive integers. If for each \( f \in \mathcal{F} \), \( f \) has only zeros of multiplicity at least \( k \), and \( f^{q_0}(f')^{q_1}(f^{(2)})^{q_2} \cdots (f^{(k)})^{q_k} \neq 1 \), then \( \mathcal{F} \) is normal on domain \( D \).

1. Introduction

In this paper, we use the standard notations of Nevanlinna theory (\([3]\)). Throughout this paper, we always assume that \( f \) is a transcendental meromorphic function defined in the complex plane \( \mathbb{C} \). It will be convenient to let that \( E \) denote any set of positive real numbers of finite linear (Lebesgue) measure, not necessarily same at each occurrence. For any non-constant meromorphic function \( f \), we denote by \( S(r, f) \) any quantity satisfying
\[
S(r, f) = o(T(r, f)) \quad \text{as} \quad r \to \infty, \quad r \notin E.
\]

Definition 1.1. Let \( f \) be a non-constant meromorphic function. A meromorphic function \( b(z) \neq 0, \infty \) is called a "small function" with respect to \( f \) if \( T(r, b(z)) = S(r, f) \).

Definition 1.2. (\([18]\)) Let \( a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\} \). For a positive integer \( k \) and for a complex constant \( a \), We denote
i) by \( N_k(r, a; f) \) the counting function of \( a \)-points of \( f \) with multiplicity \( \leq k \),
ii) by \( N_k(r, a; f) \) the counting function of \( a \)-points of \( f \) with multiplicity \( \geq k \),
iii) by \( N_k(r, a; f) \) the counting function of the \( a \)-points of \( f \) with multiplicity \( k \).

Similarly, the reduced counting functions \( N_k(r, a; f) \) and \( N_k(r, a; f) \) are defined.

In 1959, Hayman proved the following theorem:

Theorem A. (\([4]\)) If \( f \) is a transcendental meromorphic function and \( n \geq 3 \), then \( f^n f' \) assumes all finite values except possibly zero infinitely often.

Moreover, Hayman (\([4]\)) conjectured that the Theorem A remains valid for the cases \( n = 1, 2 \). In 1979, Mues (\([10]\)) confirmed the Hayman’s Conjecture for \( n = 2 \) and Chen and Fang (\([1]\)) ensured the conjecture for \( n = 1 \) in 1995.

In 1992, Q. Zhang (\([19]\)) gave the quantitative version of Mues’s result as follows:

Theorem B. For a transcendental meromorphic function \( f \), the following inequality holds:
\[
T(r, f) \leq 6N \left( r, \frac{1}{f^2 f' - 1} \right) + S(r, f).
\]

In (\([15]\)), Theorem B was improved by Xu and Yi as...
Theorem C. ([15]) Let \( f \) be a transcendental meromorphic function and \( \phi(z)(\neq 0) \) be a small function, then
\[
T(r, f) \leq 6N\left(r, \frac{1}{\phi f^2f^{(k)} - 1}\right) + S(r, f).
\]

Also, Huang and Gu (5) extended Theorem B by replacing \( f' \) by \( f^{(k)} \), \( k(\geq 1) \) is an integer.

Theorem D. ([5]) Let \( f \) be a transcendental meromorphic function and \( k \) be a positive integer. Then
\[
T(r, f) \leq 6N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{2}f^{(k)} - 1}\right) + S(r, f).
\]

Definition 1.3. ([8]) For a positive integer \( k \), we denote \( N^*_k(r, 0; f) \) the counting function of zeros of \( f \), where a zero of \( f \) with multiplicity \( q \) is counted \( q \) times if \( q \leq k \), and is counted \( k \) times if \( q > k \).

In 2003, I. Lahiri and S. Dewan ([8]) considered the value distribution of a differential polynomial in more general settings. They proved the following theorem.

Theorem E. Let \( f \) be a transcendental meromorphic function and \( \alpha = \alpha(z)(\neq 0, \infty) \) be a small function of \( f \). If \( \psi = \alpha(f)^n(f^{(k)})^p \), where \( n(\geq 0) \) \( p(\geq 1) \) are integers, then for any small function \( a = a(z)(\neq 0, \infty) \) of \( \psi \),
\[
(p + n)T(r, f) \leq N(r, \infty; f) + N(r, 0; f) + N^*_k(r, 0; f) + M\alpha^* + S(r, f).
\]

The next theorem is an immediate consequence of the above theorem.

Theorem F. Let \( f \) be a transcendental meromorphic function and \( a \) be a non-zero complex constant. Let \( l \geq 3 \), \( n \geq 1 \), \( k \geq 1 \) be positive integers. Then
\[
T(r, f) \leq \frac{1}{l-2}N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{(l)(f^{(k)})^n - a}}\right) + S(r, f).
\]

In this direction, in 2009, Xu, Yi and Zhang ([13]) proved the following theorem:

Theorem G. Let \( f \) be a transcendental meromorphic function, and \( k(\geq 1) \) be a positive integer. If \( N_1(r, 0; f) = S(r, f) \), then
\[
T(r, f) \leq 2N\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{2}f^{(k)} - 1}\right) + S(r, f).
\]

Later, in 2011, Xu, Yi and Zhang ([14]) removed the condition \( N_1(r, 0; f) = S(r, f) \) in above Theorem. They proved

Theorem H. Let \( f \) be a transcendental meromorphic function, and \( k(\geq 1) \) be a positive integer. Then
\[
T(r, f) \leq M\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{2}f^{(k)} - 1}\right) + S(r, f),
\]
where \( M \) is 6 if \( k = 1 \), or \( k \geq 3 \) and \( M = 10 \) if \( k = 2 \).

Recently, Karmakar and Sahoo ([7]) considered the value distribution of the differential polynomial \( f^n f^{(k)} - 1 \) where \( n(\geq 2) \) and \( k(\geq 1) \) are integers. Also, Xu and Ye ([16]) studied the value distribution of the differential polynomial \( \varphi f^2(f')^2 - 1 \), where \( f \) is a transcendental meromorphic function, and \( \varphi(z) \) is a small function of \( f(z) \).

Before going to furthermore, we need to introduce the following definition:

Definition 1.4. Let \( f \) be nonconstant meromorphic function defined in the complex plane \( \mathbb{C} \). Also, let \( q_0, q_1, ..., q_k \) be \((k + 1) \) \((k \geq 1) \) non-negative integers and \( a(z) \) be a small function of \( f \). Then the expression defined by
\[
M[f] = a(z)(f)^{q_0}(f')^{q_1}...(f^{(k)})^{q_k}
\]
is known as differential monomial generated by \( f \).

In this context, the terms \( \mu := q_0 + q_1 + ... + q_k \) and \( \mu_* := q_1 + 2q_2 + ... + kq_k \) are known as the degree and weight of the differential monomial respectively.
Since the differential monomial $M[f]$ is the general form of $(f)^{q_0}(f^{(k)})^{q_k}$, so from the above discussion, the following questions are natural:

**Question 1.1.** Does there exist positive constants $B_1(>0)$ and $B_2(>0)$ such that

1. $T(r, f) \leq B_1 N\left( r, \frac{1}{M[f] - T} \right) + S(r, f)$, and
2. $T(r, f) \leq B_2 N\left( r, \frac{1}{M[f] - T} \right) + S(r, f)$ hold?

In this paper, we deal with these questions.

### 2. Main Results

**Theorem 2.1.** Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function and $\varphi(z)(\not= 0, \infty)$ be a small function of $f$. If $q_0(\geq 1)$, $q_i(\geq 0)$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, k - 1)$, $q_k(\geq 1)$ are integers. Then

$$
\mu_T(r, f) \leq N(r, 1; f) + (\mu - q_0)N(r, 0; f) + (1 + \mu_*)N(r, 0; f) + N(r, \varphi(z); M[f]) + S(r, f).
$$

**Remark 2.1.** Clearly Theorem 2.1 extends Theorem E.

**Corollary 2.1.** Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function and $\varphi(z)(\not= 0, \infty)$ be a small function of $f$. If $q_0(\geq 3 + \mu_*)$, $q_i(\geq 0)$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, k - 1)$, $q_k(\geq 1)$ are integers. Then $M[f] - \varphi(z)$ has infinitely many zeros.

**Theorem 2.2.** Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function and $\varphi(z)(\not= 0, \infty)$ be a small function of $f$. If $q_0(\geq 3)$, $q_i(\geq 0)$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, k - 1)$, $q_k(\geq 1)$ are integers. Then

$$
T(r, f) \leq \frac{1}{q_0 - 2 - \mu_*} N\left( r, \frac{1}{M[f] - \varphi(z)} \right) + S(r, f).
$$

**Remark 2.2.** Clearly, Corollary 2.1 extends Theorem F.

**Corollary 2.2.** Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function and $\varphi(z)(\not= 0, \infty)$ be a small function of $f$. If $q_0(\geq 3 + \mu_*)$, $q_i(\geq 0)$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, k - 1)$, $q_k(\geq 1)$ are integers. Then $M[f] - \varphi(z)$ has infinitely many zeros.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function and $\varphi(z)(\not= 0, \infty)$ be a small function of $f$. If every pole of $f$ has multiplicity at least $l(\geq 1)$ and $q_0(\geq 1 + \frac{1}{l})$, $q_i(\geq 0)$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, k - 1)$, $q_k(\geq 1)$ are integers, then

$$
T(r, f) \leq \frac{l}{lq_0 - l - 1} N\left( r, \frac{1}{M[f] - \varphi(z)} \right) + S(r, f).
$$

**Corollary 2.3.** Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic function having no simple pole and $\varphi(z)(\not= 0, \infty)$ be a small function of $f$. If $q_0(\geq 2)$, $q_i(\geq 0)$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, k - 1)$, $q_k(\geq 1)$ are integers, then $M[f] - \varphi(z)$ has infinitely many zeros.

### 3. Lemmas

Let $M[f] = a(z)(f)^{q_0}(f')^{q_1} \cdots (f^{(k)})^{q_k}$ be a differential monomial generated by a transcendental meromorphic function $f$ and $a(z)$ be a small function of $f$.

In this paper, we assume that $q_0(\geq 1)$ and $q_k(\geq 1)$ and $f$ is a transcendental meromorphic function.
Lemma 3.1. \((\ref{17})\) Let \(f\) be a non-constant meromorphic function on \(\mathbb{C}\), and let \(a_1, \ldots, a_q\) be distinct meromorphic functions on \(\mathbb{C}\). Assume that \(a_i\) are small functions with respect to \(f\) for all \(i = 1, \ldots, q\). Then we have the second main theorem,
\[
(q - 2 - \varepsilon)T(r, f) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} N(r, a_i, f) + S(r, f),
\]
for all \(\varepsilon > 0\).

Lemma 3.2. For a non constant meromorphic function \(g\), we obtain
\[
N\left(r, \frac{g'}{g}\right) - N\left(r, \frac{g}{g'}\right) = N\left(r, g\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{g}\right).
\]

Proof. The proof is same as the formula (12) of \((\ref{8})\). \(\Box\)

Lemma 3.3. \((\ref{18})\) Let \(f\) be a transcendental meromorphic function defined in the complex plane \(\mathbb{C}\). Then
\[
limit_{r \to \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{\log r} = \infty.
\]

Lemma 3.4. Let \(M[f]\) be a differential polynomial generated by a transcendental meromorphic function \(f\). Then \(M[f]\) is non-constant.

Proof. Here
\[
\left(\frac{1}{f}\right)^\mu = a(z) \left(\frac{f'}{f}\right)^{q_1} \left(\frac{f''}{f}\right)^{q_2} \cdots \left(\frac{f^{(k)}}{f}\right)^{q_k} \frac{1}{M[f]}.
\]
Thus by the first fundamental theorem and lemma of logarithmic derivative, we have
\[
\mu T(r, f) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} q_i N\left(r, \frac{f^{(i)}}{f}\right) + T(r, M[f]) + S(r, f)
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} iq_i \{N(r, 0; f) + N(r, \infty; f)\} + T(r, M[f]) + S(r, f)
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} iq_i \{N(r, 0; M[f]) + N(r, \infty; M[f])\} + T(r, M[f]) + S(r, f)
\]
\[
(3.1)
\]
\[
\leq (2\mu_\ast + 1)T(r, M[f]) + S(r, f),
\]
Since \(f\) is a transcendental meromorphic function, so by Lemma 3.3 and inequality (3.1), \(M[f]\) must be non-constant. \(\Box\)

Lemma 3.5. Let \(f\) be a transcendental meromorphic function and \(M[f]\) be a differential polynomial in \(f\), then
\[
T\left(r, M[f]\right) = O(T(r, f)) \quad \text{and} \quad S\left(r, M[f]\right) = S(r, f).
\]

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of the Lemma 2.4 of \((\ref{9})\). \(\Box\)

4. PROOF OF THE THEOREMS

Proof of Theorem 2.1 Now
\[
\frac{1}{f^\mu} = \frac{M[f]}{f^\mu} \frac{1}{M[f]}.
\]
Thus by the first fundamental theorem and lemma of logarithmic derivative, we have
\begin{align}
(4.1) \quad \mu T(r, f) &= N(r, \frac{1}{f^\mu}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f^\mu}) + O(1) \\
&\leq N(r, 0; f^\mu) + m \left( r, \frac{1}{M[f]} \right) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq N(r, 0; f^\mu) + T(r, M[f]) - N(r, 0; M[f]) + S(r, f).
\end{align}

Now, by Lemma 3.1, we have
\begin{align}
(4.2) \quad T(r, M[f]) \\
&\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; M[f]) + \overline{N}(r, \infty; M[f]) + \overline{N}(r, \varphi(z); M[f]) + \varepsilon T(r, f) + S(r, f),
\end{align}
for all \( \varepsilon > 0 \).

Let \( z_0 \) be a zero of \( f \) with multiplicity \( q(\geq 1) \). We assume that \( z_0 \) is not a zero or pole of \( \varphi(z) \). Now we consider two cases:

**Case-I** If \( q \geq k + 1 \), then \( z_0 \) is a zero of \( M[f] \) of order \( q\mu - \mu_* \). Now
\[ 
\mu q + 1 - (q\mu - \mu_*) \leq (\mu - q_0)q + (1 + \mu_*).
\]

**Case-II** If \( q \leq k \), then \( z_0 \) is a zero of \( M[f] \) of order \( q\mu_q + (q - 1)q_1 + (q - 2)q_2 + \ldots + 2q_{q-2} + q_{q-1} \).
Now
\[ 
\mu q + 1 - \{q\mu_q + (q - 1)q_1 + (q - 2)q_2 + \ldots + 2q_{q-2} + q_{q-1}\} \\
= (\mu - q_0)q + 1 + \{q_1 + 2q_2 + \ldots + (q - 2)q_{q-2} + (q - 1)q_{q-1}\} - (q\mu_q + q_1 + q_2 + \ldots + q_{q-1}) \\
\leq (\mu - q_0)q + (1 + \mu_*).
\]

Now, by the first fundamental theorem, we obtain
\[ 
N(r, 0; \varphi(z)) \leq T(r, \varphi(z)) + O(1) = S(r, f),
\]
and,
\[ 
N(r, \infty; \varphi(z)) \leq T(r, \varphi(z)) + O(1) = S(r, f),
\]
so from the above discussion, we have
\begin{align}
(4.3) \quad N(r, 0; f^\mu) + \overline{N}(r, 0; M[f]) - N(r, 0; M[f]) \\
&\leq (\mu - q_0)N(r, 0; f) + (1 + \mu_*)\overline{N}(r, 0; f).
\end{align}

Combining (4.1), (4.2) and (4.3), we have
\begin{align}
(4.4) \quad \mu T(r, f) \\
&\leq N(r, 0; f^\mu) + T(r, M[f]) - N(r, 0; M[f]) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq N(r, 0; f^\mu) + \overline{N}(r, 0; M[f]) + \overline{N}(r, \infty; M[f]) + \overline{N}(r, \varphi(z); M[f]) - N(r, 0; M[f]) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq \overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + (\mu - q_0)N(r, 0; f) + (1 + \mu_*)\overline{N}(r, 0; f) + \overline{N}(r, \varphi(z); M[f]) + S(r, f).
\end{align}

This completes the proof. \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem 2.2.** Assume that \( b = b(z) = \frac{1}{\varphi(z)} \). Now by Lemma 3.1, it is clear that \( b(z)M[f] \) is non-constant. Again
\[ 
\frac{1}{f^\mu} = \frac{bM[f]}{f^\mu} - \frac{(bM[f])'}{(bM[f])'(bM[f]-1)}.
\]
Thus in view of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.5, the first fundamental theorem and lemma of logarithmic derivative, we have

\[
(4.5) \quad \mu m \left( r, \frac{1}{f} \right) \leq m \left( r, \frac{bM[f]}{f^\mu} \right) + m \left( r, \frac{(bM[f])'}{f^\mu} \right) + m \left( r, \frac{bM[f] - 1}{(bM[f])'} \right) + O(1)
\]

\[
(4.6) \quad \mu T(r, f) \leq (\mu - q_0 + 1)N \left( r, \frac{1}{f} \right) + N \left( r, \frac{1}{M[f] - \varphi(z)} \right) - N (r, 0; h) + S(r, f).
\]

Let us define \( g := bM[f] - 1 \) and \( h := \frac{g'}{f^\mu} \). Then

\[
(4.7) \quad T(r, f) \leq \frac{1}{q_0 - 2} N \left( r, \frac{1}{M[f] - \varphi(z)} \right) + S(r, f).
\]

**Proof of Theorem 2.3** Using (4.6) and the first fundamental theorem, we have

\[
(\mu - q_0 + 1)m \left( r, \frac{1}{f} \right) + (q_0 - 1)T(r, f) \leq N \left( r, \frac{1}{M[f] - \varphi(z)} \right) + N (r, 0; h) + S(r, f).
\]

If \( q_0 \geq 3 \), then from (4.6), we have

\[
T(r, f) \leq \frac{1}{q_0 - 2} N \left( r, \frac{1}{M[f] - \varphi(z)} \right) + S(r, f).
\]

This completes the proof.

5. **Applications**

Let \( D \subset \mathbb{C} \) be a domain. A family \( \mathcal{F} \) of analytic functions in \( D \) is said to be normal if every sequence \( \{ f_n \} \subset \mathcal{F} \) has a convergent subsequence, which converges spherically, locally and uniformly in \( D \) to a analytic function or \( \infty \).

The aim of this section is to provide normality criterion for a family of analytic functions.

Using Mues’s result ([10]), Pang ([11]) proved the following result:

**Theorem I.** ([11]) Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a family of meromorphic function on a domain \( D \). If each \( f \in \mathcal{F} \) satisfies \( f^2 f' \neq 1 \), then \( \mathcal{F} \) is normal on domain \( D \).

In this sequel, in 2005, Huang and Gu ([5]) proved the following theorem:
Theorem J. (5) Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a family of meromorphic functions on a domain \( D \) and let \( k \) be a positive integer. If for each \( f \in \mathcal{F} \), \( f \) has only zeros of multiplicity at least \( k \) and \( f^2 f^{(k)} \neq 1 \), then \( \mathcal{F} \) is normal on domain \( D \).

Using Theorem 2.2, we provide a normality criterion for a family of analytic functions.

Theorem 5.1. Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a family of analytic functions on a domain \( D \) and let \( k(\geq 1), q_0(\geq 3), q_i(\geq 0) \) \( (i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1) \), \( q_k(\geq 1) \) be positive integers. If for each \( f \in \mathcal{F} \),

i. \( f \) has only zeros of multiplicity at least \( k \)

ii. \( f^{(0)}(f')^{q_1} \ldots (f^{(k)})^{q_k} \neq 1 \),

then \( \mathcal{F} \) is normal on domain \( D \).

Before going to prove the above result, we need to recall a lemma.

Lemma 5.1. (12) Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a family of meromorphic functions on the unit disc \( \Delta \) such that all zeros of functions in \( \mathcal{F} \) have multiplicity at least \( k \). Let \( \alpha \) be a real number satisfying \( 0 \leq \alpha < k \). Then \( \mathcal{F} \) is not normal in any neighbourhood of \( z_0 \in \Delta \) if and only if there exist

(i) points \( z_k \in \Delta \), \( z_k \to z_0 \);

(ii) positive numbers \( \rho_k, \rho_k \to 0 \); and

(iii) functions \( f_k \in \mathcal{F} \)

such that \( \rho_k^k f_k(z_k + \rho_k \zeta) \to g(\zeta) \) spherically uniformly on compact subsets of \( \mathbb{C} \), where \( g \) is a nonconstant meromorphic function.

Proof of the Theorem 5.1. Since normality is a local property, we may assume that \( D = \Delta \). If possible, suppose that \( \mathcal{F} \) is not normal on \( \Delta \), then by Lemma 5.1, there exist \( \{f_n\} \subset \mathcal{F} \), \( z_n \in \Delta \) and positive numbers \( \rho_k \) with \( \rho_k \to 0 \) such that

\[ g_n(\zeta) = \rho_n^{-\alpha} f_n(z_n + \rho_n \zeta) \to g(\zeta) \]

locally, uniformly in spherical metric. Let

\[ H_n(\zeta) = (g_n(\zeta))^{q_0} (g_n'(\zeta))^{q_1} \ldots (g_n^{(k)}(\zeta))^{q_k} \]

and,

\[ H(\zeta) = (g(\zeta))^{q_0} (g'(\zeta))^{q_1} \ldots (g^{(k)}(\zeta))^{q_k} \]

Then

\[ H_n(\zeta) = \rho_n^{l_\alpha - \alpha\mu} (f_n(z_n + \rho_n \zeta))^{q_0} (f_n'(z_n + \rho_n \zeta))^{q_1} \ldots (f_n^{(k)}(z_n + \rho_n \zeta))^{q_k} \]

if we choose \( \mu_\ast - \alpha\mu = 0 \)

\[ \to H(\zeta) \] locally, uniformly in spherical metric.

Now, we made the following observations:

a. by Lemma 5.1, \( g(\zeta) \) is non-constant meromorphic function.

b. by Hurwitz’s Theorem (pp. 152, [2]), all zeros of \( g(\zeta) \) are of multiplicity atleast \( k \).

c. \( H(\zeta) \neq 0 \), otherwise, \( g(\zeta) \) will become a polynomial of degree atmost \( k - 1 \), which is impossible by (b).

d. by Hurwitz’s Theorem, \( H(\zeta) \neq 1 \), as \( H_n(\zeta) \neq 1 \).

e. by Theorem 2.2 and (d), \( g(\zeta) \) must be non-trancendental, i.e., non-constant rational function.

f. Since \( \mathcal{F} \) is a family of analytic functions, so \( g_n(\zeta) \) is analytic. Since, \( g_n(\zeta) \to g(\zeta) \)

locally, uniformly in spherical metric and \( g(\zeta) \) is non-constant, hence, \( g(\zeta) \) is analytic.

Thus using (e) and (f), we can conclude that \( g(\zeta) \) is a non-constant polynomial function, say, \( g(\zeta) = c_0 + c_1 \zeta + \ldots + c_l \zeta^l \). But by (b), \( l \) must be atleast \( k \). Thus \( H(\zeta) \) is a non-constant polynomial. So, by the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra, \( H(\zeta) = 1 \) has a solution, which contradicts (d). Thus our assumption is wrong. So \( \mathcal{F} \) is normal. This completes the proof. \( \square \)

Proceeding as above and using the result of Karmakar and Sahoo (Theorem 1.1 of [7]), the following result is obvious.
Corollary 5.1. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of analytic functions on a domain $D$ and let $k(\geq 1)$ and $n(\geq 2)$ be two positive integers. If for each $f \in \mathcal{F}$,

i. $f$ has only zeros of multiplicity at least $k$

ii. $f^n f^{(k)} \neq 1$,

then $\mathcal{F}$ is normal on domain $D$.
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