Value-sharing of meromorphic functions on a Riemann surface

ANDREAS SCHWEIZER

National Center for Theoretical Sciences
Mathematics Division
National Tsing Hua University
Hsinchu 300, Taiwan
e-mail: schweizer@math.cts.nthu.edu.tw

Abstract

We present some results on two meromorphic functions from $S$ to $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ sharing a number of values where $S$ is a Riemann surface of one of the following types: compact, compact minus finitely many points, the unit disk, a torus, the complex plane.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 30D35, 30F10

Introduction

We write $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ (or sometimes $\mathbb{P}^1$) for the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. Let $R$ be a Riemann surface. Two meromorphic functions $f_1, f_2 : R \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ are said to share the value $a \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ if for every $u \in R$ we have $f_1(u) = a \Leftrightarrow f_2(u) = a$. If moreover $f_1$ takes the value $a$ at each $u$ with the same multiplicity as $f_2$, we say that $f_1$ and $f_2$ share the value $a$ CM (counting multiplicities). If we don’t know the multiplicities or don’t care, we say that $a$ is shared IM (ignoring multiplicities).

In [Sa] Sauer proved among other results that if $S$ is a compact Riemann surface of genus $g > 0$ then two different non-constant meromorphic functions on $S$ cannot share more than $2 + 2\sqrt{g}$. If moreover one of the shared values is shared CM, the bound can be strengthened to $\frac{1}{4}(9 + \sqrt{32g + 17})$. In [Sch] these bounds have been slightly improved, and bounds in terms of other invariants of $S$ have also been given.

In this paper we show that there do indeed exist compact Riemann surfaces that can carry two meromorphic functions with many shared values and that one can even prescribe the shared values (Theorem 1). This question had been left open in [Sa] and [Sch]. The best examples one can find in the literature have 4 shared values. We also investigate how many values two functions that are meromorphic on a punctured compact Riemann surface can share (Section 3). In the last section we use the concept of weighted sharing to refine some known results.

1. Basic facts

Recall that the gonality $d$ of a compact Riemann surface $S$ is defined to be the smallest integer $m$ such that $S$ can be realized as an $m$-sheeted branched covering of the
Riemann sphere. Equivalently, $d$ is the smallest possible degree of a non-constant meromorphic function on $S$.

**Theorem A.** [Sch] Let $S$ be a compact Riemann surface of genus $g > 0$ and gonality $d$. Let $f_1, f_2 : S \to \mathbb{C}$ be two different non-constant meromorphic functions sharing $n$ values.

a) Then

$$n \leq M_0 = \min\{2 + \sqrt{2g + 2}, 2d + 1, 4 + \frac{2(g - 1)}{d}\}.$$  

b) If moreover one of these $n$ values is shared CM, then we even have

$$n \leq M_1 = \min\{\frac{1}{2}(5 + \sqrt{4g + 5 - 2d}), 2d + 1, 3 + \frac{2(g - 1)}{d}\}.$$  

c) If $g = 0$, i.e. $S = \mathbb{P}^1$, the optimal bound in both cases is known to be 3.

Actually, [Ba, Theorem 1] claims an inequality that is stronger than the key lemmas in [Sa] and [Sch] and that would consequently imply stronger results than Theorem A. But trying to follow the proof in [Ba], I have not been able to obtain the claimed inequality.

Besides the three articles already mentioned, the only other instance in the literature dealing with value-sharing of meromorphic functions on a compact Riemann surface (other than the Riemann sphere) seems to be [A&W]. It investigates functions sharing sets of values and is formulated in terms of functions on algebraic curves, which allows working over any algebraically closed field of characteristic 0, not just over $\mathbb{C}$. We point out that by the nature of their proofs the results in [Sa], [Sch] and some of the results we will obtain below (notably Theorem 1) also hold in such a general setting.

The most famous result on value-sharing is of course Rolf Nevanlinna’s theorem, that two meromorphic functions in the complex plane that share 5 values must be equal. A true generalization of this result to Riemann surfaces would, for example, be a statement about meromorphic functions on a punctured compact Riemann surface. I thank Jun-Muk Hwang who pointed this out to me and thus triggered my interest in this problem. Obviously, this is more difficult than working on a compact Riemann surface, as there are many more meromorphic functions, and algebraic arguments cannot suffice. Luckily, the local result one would like to have has already been proved by R. Nevanlinna.

**Theorem B.** [Ne] Let $f_1(z)$ and $f_2(z)$ be meromorphic functions in a neighbourhood of the point $z = \infty$, where they have an essential singularity. If for five different values (finite or not) of $w$ the equalities

$$f_1(z) = w, \quad f_2(z) = w,$$
outside some circle $|z| = r_0$ are satisfied for exactly the same values of $z$, then $f_1$ and $f_2$ are identical.

Of course one can transform this into a statement about meromorphic functions with an essential singularity in a punctured disk.

Together with Theorem A c), which is folklore, Theorem B implies Nevanlinna’s Five Value Theorem in the complex plane in the same way as the Big Picard Theorem implies the Little Picard Theorem.

2. Compact Riemann surfaces

No example seems to be known of a compact Riemann surface $S$ and two different nonconstant meromorphic functions $f_1, f_2 : S \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ that share more than 4 values. Moreover, [Sch] shows that “most” compact Riemann surfaces of a given genus do not allow more than 7 shared values.

So it is legitimate to wonder whether in this case there is an absolute bound on the number of shared values, valid for all compact Riemann surfaces. The final remarks of [Sch] advocate this point of view, suggesting that a possible approach could be to prove the existence of a bound for the number of shared values of two different meromorphic functions on the open unit disk. The logical connection is immediate by pulling back the functions from the Riemann surface to its universal covering, which for $g \geq 2$ is the open unit disk.

I am grateful to Jörg Winkelmann who showed to me that one can construct different meromorphic functions on the open unit disk with any finite number of shared values. Although his examples do not come from compact Riemann surfaces, they convinced me that there probably is no uniform bound for all compact Riemann surfaces and that one should rather try to find examples of compact Riemann surfaces that allow many shared values. By an algebraic argument we will now construct such examples. In fact, one can even prescribe the shared values.

**Theorem 1.** Let $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ be $n$ different values with $n \geq 2$.

a) There exists a compact Riemann surface $S$ of genus $g \leq n^2$ and two different non-constant meromorphic functions $f_1$ and $f_2$ from $S$ to $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ that share the values $a_1, \ldots, a_n$.

b) There exists a compact Riemann surface $S$ of genus $g \leq 2n^2 - 5n + 3$ and two different non-constant meromorphic functions $f_1$ and $f_2$ from $S$ to $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ that share the values $a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ IM and the value $a_n$ CM.

**Proof.**

a) After a Möbius transformation we can assume that all the values $a_i$ are finite and
non-zero. We consider the polynomial

\[ F(X,Y) = (X - Y)^{n+1} + Y \prod_{i=1}^{n} (Y - a_i) \prod_{i=1}^{n} (X - a_i). \]

As a polynomial in \( X \), the highest coefficient is 1, all other coefficients are divisible by \( Y \), and the absolute term is not divisible by \( Y^2 \). (Here we are using that the \( a_i \) are non-zero.) So it is an Eisenstein polynomial in \( X \) with respect to \( Y \). By the Eisenstein Criterion (see for example [Sti, Proposition III.1.14]) it is therefore irreducible in \( X \). Since the highest term is \( X^{n+1} \), we also cannot factor out a polynomial that depends only on \( Y \). So \( F(X,Y) \) is irreducible.

Let \( S \) be the compact Riemann surface of the algebraic equation

\[ F(X,Y) = 0. \]

Then the field of meromorphic functions on \( S \) is \( \mathbb{C}(X,Y) \) where \( X \) and \( Y \) are related by \( F(X,Y) = 0 \). In particular, \( X \) and \( Y \) are functions of degree \( n+1 \) from \( S \) to \( \hat{\mathbb{C}} \). If \( X \) takes the value \( a_i \) at some point of \( S \), we see from the equation that \( Y \) cannot have a pole at that point and that it must take the same value. And vice versa. Thus \( X \) and \( Y \) share the value \( a_i \).

To estimate the genus of \( S \) we apply the Castelnuovo Inequality. See [Sti, Theorem III.10.3] for an algebraic proof or [Ac, Theorem 3.5] for a proof that is more in the spirit of Riemann surfaces. The condition that the two maps do not factor over another Riemann surface corresponds to the condition that \( X \) and \( Y \) generate the function field of \( S \), which holds by construction. From the Castelnuovo Inequality we get

\[ g \leq (\deg(X) - 1)(\deg(Y) - 1) = n^2. \]

b) We can suppose that \( a_n = \infty \) and that \( a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1} \) are non-zero. This time we look at the Riemann surface corresponding to \( F(X,Y) = 0 \) where

\[ F(X,Y) = (X - Y)^{2n-1} + Y \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (Y - a_i) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (X - a_i). \]

As above we see that \( F(X,Y) \) is irreducible and that the functions \( X \) and \( Y \) share the values \( a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1} \). From the equation we also see that if \( X \) or \( Y \) has a pole at some point, then the other function must also have a pole at that point with the same multiplicity.

Finally, \( F(X,Y) = 0 \) is a plane curve of degree \( d = 2n - 1 \). Using the formula for the genus of a plane curve ([Ac, p.5] or [Sti, Proposition III.10.5]), we get

\[ g \leq \frac{(d-1)(d-2)}{2} = (n-1)(2n - 3). \]

\[ \square \]
Remark 2. Together with the results from [Sa] (or Theorem A) this answers a question asked in [Sa]. In both cases (all values shared IM, or one of the values shared CM) the order of magnitude of the optimal bound in terms of the genus is $\sqrt{g}$.

There is still some room for further fine-tuning since the upper bounds from Theorem A grow asymptotically like $\sqrt{2g}$ resp. $\sqrt{g}$ whereas the examples from Theorem 1 grow asymptotically like $\sqrt{g}$ resp. $\sqrt{g}/2$.

Corollary 3. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}$. Then for every $k$ with $1 \leq k \leq n$ there exist two different meromorphic functions $h_1$ and $h_2$ from the open unit disk $D = \{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1 \}$ to $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ that

- omit the values $a_1, \ldots, a_{k-1}$;
- take every other value in $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ infinitely often;
- share the values $a_k, \ldots, a_n$;
- even share the value $a_n$ CM.

Proof. Take a compact Riemann surface $S$ of genus $g \geq 2$ and two different functions $f_i : S \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ sharing $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ as in Theorem 1 b). Remove the inverse images of $a_1, \ldots, a_{k-1}$ from $S$, and restrict $f_i$ to functions $\tilde{f_i}$ on the punctured Riemann surface $R$. Now we simply have to take $h_i = \tilde{f_i} \circ \pi$ where $\pi : D \to R$ is the universal covering. □

For a recent detailed study of value-sharing of meromorphic functions in the unit disk see [Ti].

3. Punctured Riemann surfaces

Let $P_1$ be a point of $\mathbb{P}^1$. By Nevanlinna’s Five Value Theorem, the maximum number of values that two different non-constant functions that are meromorphic on the punctured Riemann surface $\mathbb{P}^1 - \{ P_1 \}$ can share is 4, realized for example by $e^z$ and $e^{-z}$ on $\mathbb{C}$.

The same bound holds for $\mathbb{P}^1$ minus two points. After a Möbius transformation we can assume that $f_1$ and $f_2$ are meromorphic on $\mathbb{C} - \{ 0 \}$. Then $f_1(e^z)$ and $f_2(e^z)$ are meromorphic on $\mathbb{C}$ and share the same values; so their number is bounded by 4.

Examples 4.

a) Let $\zeta_r = e^{2\pi i/r}$ be a primitive $r$-th root of unity with $r \geq 2$. Then the functions

$$f_1(z) = z \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(z) = \zeta_r z$$
are obviously meromorphic on
\[ \mathbb{P}^1 - \{ \zeta_r^k : k = 0, \ldots, r - 1 \} \]
and share the \( r + 2 \) values
\[ \infty, 0 \text{ and } \zeta_r^k, \quad (k = 0, \ldots, r - 1). \]

b) For any fixed choice of three points \( P_1, P_2, P_3 \) on \( \mathbb{P}^1 \) we can always construct two meromorphic functions on \( \mathbb{P}^1 - \{ P_1, P_2, P_3 \} \) that share 5 values. Let \( T(z) \) be the Möbius transformation that maps \( P_1, P_2, P_3 \) to 1, \( \zeta_3 \), \( \zeta_2^3 \). Then \( T(z) \) and \( \zeta_3 T(z) \) share \( \infty, 0, 1, \zeta_3, \zeta_2^2 \), actually all CM.

c) On any fixed Riemann surface \( \mathbb{P}^1 - \{ P_1, \ldots, P_r \} \) with \( r \geq 4 \) we can realize at least 6 shared values. Let \( T_1(z) \) be the Möbius transformation that maps \( P_1, P_2, P_3 \) to \( \infty, 0, 1 \) and let \( c = T_1(P_4) \). Fix a square-root \( \sqrt{c} \) and set \( T_2(z) = \frac{z + \sqrt{c}}{z - \sqrt{c}} \). Then \( T_2 \) maps \( \infty, 0, 1, c \) to \( 1, -1, a, -a \). So the functions \( T_2(T_1(z)) \) and \( -T_2(T_1(z)) \) from \( \mathbb{P}^1 - \{ P_1, \ldots, P_r \} \) to \( \hat{\mathbb{C}} \) share \( \infty, 0, 1, -1, a, -a \), actually all CM.

d) If \( g \geq 2 \) and \( R_1, \ldots, R_{2g+2} \in \mathbb{C} \) are different, the compact Riemann surface \( S \) corresponding to
\[ Y^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+2} (X - R_i) \]
is hyperelliptic of genus \( g \). Moreover, the hyperelliptic map \( \kappa : S \to \mathbb{P}^1 \), corresponding to \( (X, Y) \mapsto X \), is ramified exactly above the points \( R_i \). If \( \{ R_1, \ldots, R_{2g+2} \} \) contains all \( r \)-th roots of unity and \( P_i = \kappa^{-1}(\zeta_r^i) \) for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, r \), then \( \kappa \) and \( \zeta_r \kappa \) share the \( r + 2 \) values \( \infty, 0, \zeta_r, \ldots, \zeta_r^{r-1} \) on \( S - \{ P_1, \ldots, P_r \} \).

In Examples 4 a), b) and d) we actually have constructed \( r \) different functions that all share the same \( r + 2 \) values CM. Simple as these constructions may be, under certain conditions they will turn out to be essentially the only ones that realize the maximal possible number of shared values.

Now we combine Theorem B and algebraic arguments to derive upper bounds. Recall that if \( S \) is a compact Riemann surface and \( P_1, \ldots, P_r \) are \( r \) different points on \( S \) with \( 0 \leq r < \infty \), then the Euler characteristic of the Riemann surface \( R = S - \{ P_1, \ldots, P_r \} \) is defined to be
\[ \chi(R) = 2 - 2g(S) - r. \]

If \( \chi(R) < 0 \) then \( R \) is called hyperbolic. For \( r > 0 \) this only excludes the two cases \( g = 0, r \leq 2 \), which we have discussed at the beginning of this section.
Theorem 5. Let $S$ be a compact Riemann surface of genus $g$ and gonality $d$. Let $R = S - \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$ where $P_1, \ldots, P_r$ are $r$ different points on $S$.

If $R$ is hyperbolic, then two different non-constant meromorphic functions on $R$ can share at most

$$4 + \frac{2g - 2 + r}{d} = 4 - \frac{\chi(R)}{d}$$

values.

Moreover, if $4 - \frac{\chi(R)}{d}$ is an integer and if $f_1$ and $f_2$ realize this bound, then $f_1$ and $f_2$ must both be meromorphic on the compact Riemann surface $S$ and $\deg(f_1) = \deg(f_2) = d$.

Proof. First let us assume that one of the functions, say $f_1$ has an essential singularity at one of the points $P_i$. By the Big Picard Theorem, in every neighbourhood of $P_i$ the function $f_1$ can omit at most two of the shared values. Every other shared value is a limit of $f_2(z)$ when $z$ approaches $P_i$ along the corresponding inverse images. So if there are 4 or more shared values, then $f_2$ also has an essential singularity at $P_i$. By Theorem B in this case $f_1$ and $f_2$ cannot share more than 4 values.

Now suppose that none of the points $P_i$ is an essential singularity. Then $f_1$ and $f_2$ extend to meromorphic functions on the compact Riemann surface $S$. Let $d_i = \deg(f_i)$. Without loss of generality we can assume $d_1 \leq d_2$. After a Möbius transformation we can also assume that all $n$ shared values $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ lie in $\mathbb{C}$. Let $M$ consist of all $u \in S$ with $f_2(u) \in \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$. Then

$$r_2(M) := \sum_{u \in M} (\text{mult}_{f_2}(u) - 1)$$

measures the ramification of the covering $f_2 : S \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ above these values. Applying the Hurwitz formula we get

$$r_2(M) \leq r_2(S) = 2g(S) - 2 - d(S) - 2) = 2g - 2 + 2d_2.$$  

Also, every element of $M \cap R$ is a zero of $f_1 - f_2$, which is a function of degree $\leq 2d_2$. Together we obtain

$$nd_2 = |M \cap R| + |M \cap \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}| + r_2(M) \leq 2d_2 + r + 2g - 2 + 2d_2,$$

and after division

$$n \leq 4 + \frac{2g - 2 + r}{d_2} = 4 - \frac{\chi(R)}{d_2}.$$  

Since (by definition) $d \leq d_1 \leq d_2$, this establishes the bound, and it also shows that reaching the bound is only possible if $d_2 = d$. 

Corollary 6. Let $P_1, \ldots, P_r$ be $r$ different points on $\mathbb{P}^1$ with $r \geq 3$. Then two
different non-constant functions that are meromorphic on $\mathbb{P}^1 - \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$ cannot share more than $r + 2$ values.

Moreover, this bound is optimal (at least for a suitable choice of $P_1, \ldots, P_r$). If $f_1$ and $f_2$ attain this bound, they both must be functions of degree 1 on $\mathbb{P}^1$, that is, they must be fractional linear transformations.

**Proof.** Specialize Theorem 5. The bound is sharp by Example 4 a). □

Note that if $r > 4$ we do not claim that the bound in Corollary 6 is sharp for every choice of $P_1, \ldots, P_r$.

**Example 7.** If the 5 points $P_1, \ldots, P_5$ from $\mathbb{P}^1$ are not all lying on one circle or on one straight line, then two different non-constant meromorphic functions on $R = \mathbb{P}^1 - \{P_1, \ldots, P_5\}$ cannot share more than 6 values.

Indeed, if $f_1$ and $f_2$ share 7 values, then by Corollary 6 they must be functions of degree 1 on $\mathbb{P}^1$. Moreover, two of the shared values must obviously be taken at points of $R$. Applying Möbius transformations to the values and to the arguments we can assume that these two shared values are $\infty$ (taken at the point $\infty$) and 0 (taken at the point 0). Hence $f_i(z) = c_i z$ with $c_i \in \mathbb{C}^\ast$. Without loss of generality we can assume $f_1(z) = z$. Then $f_2$ must permute the 5 punctures. This is only possible if $f_2$ is a rotation around 0 and if the 5 punctures are lying on a circle around 0. Since Möbius transformations respect circles on $\mathbb{P}^1$, the 5 original points $P_1, \ldots, P_5$ must lie on such a circle.

For $r = 0$ Theorem 5 gives one of the bounds from Theorem A. In view of the other bounds in Theorem A one might think that in the case where $d$ is small and $g$ is large it should be possible to get stronger bounds than Theorem 5. But even under this condition the bound in Theorem 5 is often sharp.

**Proposition 8.** For every compact Riemann surface $S$ there are infinitely many $r \in \mathbb{N}$ for which the bound in Theorem 5 is sharp (provided the points $P_1, \ldots, P_r$ are suitably chosen), and the values are even shared $CM$.

**Proof.** Fix a covering $\pi : S \to \mathbb{P}^1$ of degree $d$. We can assume that all ramified values $R_1, \ldots, R_m$ of $\pi$ are in $\mathbb{C}^\ast$.

If $Q_1, \ldots, Q_s$ are $s$ different points in $\mathbb{C}^\ast$, containing all $R_i$, then by the Hurwitz formula there are exactly $r = ds - (2d + 2g - 2)$ points $P_i$ of $S$ lying above $Q_1, \ldots, Q_s$.

If moreover the set $\{Q_1, \ldots, Q_s\}$ is closed under $Q_i \mapsto -Q_i$, then the functions $\pi$ and $-\pi$ from $S - \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$ to $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ share the $2 + s$ values $\infty, 0, Q_1, \ldots, Q_s$ CM and $2 + s = 4 + \frac{2g - 2 + r}{d}$. □

However, for $r$ in a certain range one can indeed improve on Theorem 5.
Theorem 9. Let $S$ be a compact Riemann surface of genus $g$ and gonality $d$. Let $R = S - \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$ where $P_1, \ldots, P_r$ are $r$ different points on $S$.

If $r \geq 2d$, then two different non-constant meromorphic functions on $R$ can share at most $r + 2$ values.

Moreover, if $f_1$ and $f_2$ realize this bound and $r > 2d$, then $f_1$ and $f_2$ must both be meromorphic on $S$ with $\deg(f_1) = \deg(f_2) = d$, and the coverings $f_i : S \to \mathbb{P}^1$ are totally ramified at all points $P_1, \ldots, P_r$.

Proof. As explained at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 5, we can assume that $f_1$ and $f_2$ are meromorphic on $S$. Without loss of generality $\deg(f_1) = d_1 \leq d_2 = \deg(f_2)$.

If $(d - 1)(d_2 - 1) \geq g$, i.e. $d_2 \geq \frac{g - 1 + d}{d - 1}$, from the last inequality in the proof of Theorem 5 we get

$$n \leq 4 + \frac{2g - 2 + r}{d_2} \leq 4 + \frac{(2g - 2 + r)(d - 1)}{g - 1 + d} = 4 + 2(d - 1) + \frac{(r - 2d)(d - 1)}{g - 1 + d},$$

which is smaller than $2 + 2d + r - 2d = r + 2$ if $r > 2d$ and equal to $r + 2$ if $r = 2d$.

If $(d - 1)(d_2 - 1) < g$, we proceed by induction on $d$, using Corollary 6 as induction basis.

If $d > 1$ let $F$ be the function field of $S$. Fix a rational subfield $R$ of index $d$ in $F$. Let $M$ be the compositum of $R$ and $\mathbb{C}(f_2)$ and let $c$ be the index of $M$ in $F$. By Castelnuovo’s inequality we have

$$g(M) \leq \frac{d}{c}(\frac{d_2}{c} - 1).$$

Now $c = 1$ would be equivalent to $M = F$ and hence contradict the Castelnuovo inequality. So $M$ is a proper subfield of $F$.

If the compositum of $M$ and $\mathbb{C}(f_1)$ were $F$, then again by Castelnuovo’s inequality we would obtain $g \leq cg(M) + (c - 1)(d_1 - 1)$, and hence

$$(d - 1)(d_2 - 1) < g \leq c(\frac{d}{c} - 1)(\frac{d_2}{c} - 1) + (c - 1)(d_2 - 1).$$

Subtracting $(c - 1)(d_2 - 1)$ we get the contradiction $(d - c)(d_2 - 1) < (d - c)(\frac{d_2}{c} - 1)$.

We conclude that $R$, $\mathbb{C}(f_1)$ and $\mathbb{C}(f_2)$ are contained in a proper subfield $L$ of $F$. Let $\delta = [F : L]$. Then

$$f_i = \tilde{f}_i \circ \kappa$$

where $\tilde{f}_1$ and $\tilde{f}_2$ are meromorphic of degrees $\frac{d}{\delta}$ resp. $\frac{d_2}{\delta}$ on the compact Riemann surface $\tilde{S}$ corresponding to $L$ and $\kappa$ is the covering map from $S$ to $\tilde{S}$.

Now the image of $\{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$ under $\kappa$ is a subset of $\tilde{S}$ of cardinality $\tilde{r}$ where obviously

$$\frac{r}{\delta} \leq \tilde{r} \leq r.$$
Moreover, \( \tilde{r} \geq 2d^2 \) and \( \frac{d}{2} \) is the gonality of \( \tilde{S} \). By induction \( \tilde{f}_1 \) and \( \tilde{f}_2 \) can share at most \( \tilde{r} + 2 \) values, and if they share \( \tilde{r} + 2 \) values then \( \text{deg}(\tilde{f}_i) = \frac{d}{2} \) and \( \tilde{f}_1 \) and \( \tilde{f}_2 \) are totally ramified at all \( \kappa(P_i) \).

This proves the first statement of the theorem. It also shows that having \( r + 2 \) shared values is only possible if \( \tilde{r} = r \), i.e. if \( \kappa \) is totally ramified at \( P_1, \ldots, P_r \). \( \square \)

**Remarks 10.**

a) In the range \( 2d \leq r < \frac{2d}{d-1} + 2 \) the bound in Theorem 9 is better than Theorem 5 if \( d > 1 \). Of course, this range might be empty if \( d \) is sufficiently big with respect to \( g \).

b) By Example 4 d), for each pair \( (g, r) \) with \( 4 \leq r \leq 2g + 2 \) there exists a hyperelliptic Riemann surface \( S \), points \( P_1, \ldots, P_r \) on \( S \), and meromorphic \( f_1, f_2 \) on \( S - \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\} \) sharing \( r + 2 \) values.

On the other hand, if \( S \) is the hyperelliptic surface corresponding to

\[
Y^2 = (X - 1)(X - 2)(X - 3)(X - 1 - i)(X - 2 - i)(X - 3 - i),
\]

then by Theorem 9 and Example 7 for every choice of five points \( P_1, \ldots, P_5 \) on \( S \) we cannot get more than 6 shared values.

c) More generally, if \( d \geq 3 \) and \( g = \frac{1}{2}(d - 1)(md - 2) \) with \( m \geq 2 \), then for every \( r \) with \( 2d \leq r \leq md = \frac{2g}{d-1} + 2 \) there exists a compact Riemann surface \( S \) of genus \( g \) and gonality \( d \), points \( P_1, \ldots, P_r \) on \( S \), and meromorphic \( f_1, f_2 \) on \( S - \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\} \) that share \( r + 2 \) values.

Explicitly, let \( S \) be the Riemann surface of the function field \( F = \mathbb{C}(X, Y) \) with \( Y^d = f(X) \) where \( f(X) \in \mathbb{C}[X] \) is square-free, of degree \( md \) and divisible by \( X^r - 1 \). Using the Hurwitz formula one can calculate the genus of every intermediate field between \( \mathbb{C}(X) \) and \( F \). Then the Castelnuovo inequality shows that \( F \) indeed has gonality \( d \). Let \( \pi \) be the covering map from \( S \) to \( \mathbb{P}^1 \) corresponding to the extension \( F/\mathbb{C}(X) \). Let \( P_i = \pi^{-1}(\zeta_i) \) for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, r \). Then \( \pi \) and \( \zeta_i \pi \) share the values \( \infty, 0, 1, \zeta_i, \ldots, \zeta_{r-1} \) on \( S - \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\} \).

We finish this section with another example of which one can easily construct many explicit instances.

**Example 11.** Let \( F \) be the compositum of two quadratic extensions of \( \mathbb{C}(z) \). Then \( F \) is a Galois extension of \( \mathbb{C}(z) \) with Galois group \( \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \). Assume that \( F \) has genus \( g \geq 10 \) and that each of the three intermediate quadratic fields has genus at least 2. Then the Castelnuovo inequality implies that the gonality of \( F \) is 4 and that \( \mathbb{C}(z) \) is the only rational subfield over which \( F \) has degree 4. Moreover, no place is totally ramified in \( F/\mathbb{C}(z) \).
Let $S$ be the compact Riemann surface of $F$. Then Theorem 9 implies that for any choice of $r > 8$ different points $P_1, \ldots, P_r$ on $S$ two meromorphic functions on $S - \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$ cannot share more than $r + 1$ values.

4. Weighted sharing

In order to refine the results we recall the concept of weighted sharing as introduced by Lahiri in [La]. A shared value $a$ is shared with weight $m \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$ if for all inverse images $u$ of $a$ we have

$$\operatorname{mult}_{f_1}(u) = \mu \leq m \Leftrightarrow \operatorname{mult}_{f_2}(u) = \mu \leq m$$

and

$$\operatorname{mult}_{f_1}(u) > m \Leftrightarrow \operatorname{mult}_{f_2}(u) > m.$$  

In particular, $f_1$ and $f_2$ sharing the value $a$ with weight one means that the simple $a$-points of $f_1$ are exactly the simple $a$-points of $f_2$ and the multiple $a$-points of $f_1$ are exactly the multiple $a$-points of $f_2$, where in the latter case the multiplicities are not necessarily the same.

Obviously, sharing with weight 0 simply means sharing IM, and sharing with weight $\infty$ is the same as sharing CM.

In the sequel we write $(m_1, \ldots, m_n)$ to indicate that the value $a_i$ is shared with weight $m_i$.

Since a meromorphic function on a compact Riemann surface $S$ is determined up to a multiplicative constant by its divisor, we cannot have two different non-constant meromorphic functions on $S$ sharing 3 values with weights $(\infty, \infty, 0)$. (Apply a Möbius transformation to move the two CM-shared values to 0 and $\infty$.) But for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ sharing with weights $(\infty, m, 0)$ is possible on every $S$.

Example 12. From [Pi] we take the example of the functions

$$f_1(z) = \frac{-4z^3}{(z-1)^3(z+1)} \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(z) = \frac{-4z}{(z-1)(z+1)^3}$$

from $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ to $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$. They share the value 1 CM (taken with multiplicity 1 at the zeroes of $(z^2 + 1)(z^2 + 2z - 1)$), and the values 0 and $\infty$, both IM. Since the value 0 is taken exactly at the points 0 and $\infty$, the functions $h_i(z) = f_i(z^{m+1})$ take this value at these two points with multiplicity at least $m + 1$. So, somewhat trivially, they share the value 0 with weight $m$.

Finally, if $S$ is any compact Riemann surface, there is a covering $\pi : S \to \mathbb{P}^1$. Then $h_1 \circ \pi$ and $h_2 \circ \pi$ are two meromorphic functions on $S$ that share the values 1, 0 and $\infty$ with respective weights $(\infty, m, 0)$. Applying a suitable Möbius transformation, we can get any 3 values shared with these weights.
Remark 13. If $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, with the same trick we can even construct a compact Riemann surface $R$ and two functions $h_1, h_2$ from $R$ to $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ that share the values $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ with respective weights $(\infty, m, m, \ldots, m)$. We only have to take $S$ and $f_1, f_2$ as in Theorem 1 b), take a finite covering $\pi: R \to S$ of compact Riemann surfaces that is totally ramified above all inverse images of the shared values with ramification index at least $m + 1$, and set $h_i = f_i \circ \pi$.

The same weighted sharing can then of course also be obtained in Corollary 3.

Admittedly, in the preceding examples the weight $m$ of the sharing does not really tell much, as we simply have artificially increased the multiplicities. However, if one restricts the nature of the underlying Riemann surface, one can get non-trivial information, as we will show now by improving a result from [Sch].

The following lemma can be easily obtained as a special case of known results on two meromorphic functions in the complex plane that share 4 values (cf. [Gu1], [Gu2], [Mu], [Y&Y]). We prefer to give a direct algebraic proof. Besides being conceptually much simpler, it has the advantage to be valid for rational functions on an elliptic curve over any algebraically closed field of characteristic 0.

Lemma 14. Let $S$ be a compact Riemann surface of genus 1 and $f_1, f_2$ two non-constant meromorphic functions from $S$ to $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ that share the 4 values $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}$. Let $M = f_i^{-1}\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\} \subseteq S$. Then

a) $\deg(f_1) = \deg(f_2)$;

b) $|M| = 2 \deg(f_i)$;

c) the map $f_i: S \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ is unramified outside $M$;

d) $f_1(u) \neq f_2(u)$ for every $u \notin M$;

e) at each point $u \in M$ at least one of the two functions takes the shared value $a_j = f_i(u)$ with multiplicity 1.

Proof. Let $d_i = \deg(f_i)$. Without loss of generality we can assume $d_1 \leq d_2$. Let

$$r_2(M) := \sum_{u \in M} (\text{mult}_{f_2}(u) - 1).$$

Applying the Hurwitz formula to the covering $f_2: S \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ we get

$$r_2(M) \leq r_2(S) = 2g(S) - 2 - d_2(2g(\hat{\mathbb{C}}) - 2) = 2d_2.$$

After a Möbius transformation we can assume $a_1, \ldots, a_4 \in \mathbb{C}$. Since every $u \in M$ is a zero of $f_1 - f_2$, we have

$$d_1 + d_2 \geq \deg(f_1 - f_2) \geq |M| = 4d_2 - r_2(M) \geq 2d_2.$$
This shows $d_1 = d_2$ and $|M| = 2d_2$ and also $r_2(M) = 2d_2$, which means that $f_2$ is unramified outside $M$. Since $d_1 = d_2$ we can interchange $f_1$ and $f_2$, so $f_1$ is also unramified outside $M$.

Moreover, we see $\deg(f_1 - f_2) = 2d_2$. This shows that $f_1$ and $f_2$ have no common poles. Finally, since $f_1 - f_2$ vanishes at the $2d_2$ different points in $M$, it cannot vanish outside $M$ (so claim d) holds) and it cannot have a multiple zero, which implies statement e).

\[\square\]

**Corollary 15.** Let $S$ be a compact Riemann surface of genus 1 and $f_1$, $f_2$ two non-constant meromorphic functions from $S$ to $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ that share 4 values with respective weights $(1, 0, 0, 0)$. Then $f_1 = f_2$.

**Proof.** By Lemma 14 e) the value that is shared with weight one is actually shared CM. By part b) of Theorem A this implies $f_1 = f_2$. \[\square\]

**Corollary 16.** Let $f_1$ and $f_2$ be two non-constant elliptic functions on the complex plane (not necessarily with commensurable period lattices). If $f_1$ and $f_2$ share 4 values, of which one is shared with weight one, then the functions $f_1$ and $f_2$ are equal.

**Proof.** Let $\Lambda_i$ be the period lattice of $f_i$. Translating the variable $z$ we can assume that $f_1(0)$ is one of the shared values. Then $f_1$ (and also $f_2$) takes this value at all points of the $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2$. Since $f_1$ is not constant, $\Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2$ must be discrete and hence a rank 2 lattice. Thus $\Lambda_1$ and $\Lambda_2$ are commensurable. Let $\Lambda$ be the rank 2 lattice $\Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2$. Then we can consider $f_1$ and $f_2$ as meromorphic functions on the torus $\mathbb{C}/\Lambda$ and apply the previous corollary. \[\square\]

This result, presumably well known to specialists, has inspired the following modification of a famous problem. Let $f_1$ and $f_2$ be two non-constant meromorphic functions in the complex plane sharing 4 values. Gundersen [Gu1] has shown that if 2 of these 4 values are shared CM then all 4 values must be shared CM. He also asked whether one CM-shared value would already be enough for the same conclusion. Although there are positive answers under different additional conditions (see for example [Mu], [Gu2], [Y&Y, Chapter 4], [Hu]), this is still an open problem.

But the notion of weighted sharing opens up infinitely many more possibilities between weights $(\infty, 0, 0, 0)$ and $(\infty, \infty, 0, 0)$. So one might ask: Does sharing with weights $(\infty, m, 0, 0)$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ imply weights $(\infty, \infty, \infty, \infty)$? It turns out that a much weaker condition, namely that the weights of sharing are $(1, 1, 0, 0)$, already suffices.

**Theorem 17.** Let $f_1$ and $f_2$ be two non-constant meromorphic functions in the complex plane sharing 4 values. If 2 of these values are shared with weight one, then all 4 values are shared CM.
Proof. If \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) share 4 values, then by [Mu, Lemma 1] for each shared value \( a_j \) the counting function of the points that are multiple \( a_j \)-points for both functions is \( S(r, f_i) \). Thus a value that is shared with weight one is shared “CM” in the sense of [Mu], that is, the counting function of the points where the value is taken with different multiplicities is \( S(r, f_i) \). But by [Gu2, Theorem C*], two “CM”-shared values imply that all four values are shared CM.

Modifying the condition that one value is shared CM in the other direction by relaxing it, we obtain the following problem.

**Question:** Given \( m \in \mathbb{N} \). If two non-constant meromorphic functions in the complex plane share 4 values with respective weights \((m,0,0,0)\), does this imply that all four values are shared CM?

This is presumably a very difficult question. A positive answer would settle the famous problem on 1 CM plus 3 IM shared values. And a counterexample would be a new example of two meromorphic functions in the complex plane sharing 4 values not all of which are shared CM. There are essentially only 3 known examples of such functions, namely the ones described in [Gu1], [Ste] and [Re].
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