

# On the existence of entire solutions to a system of nonlinear Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations

Junfeng Xu, Sujoy Majumder\* and Debabrata Pramanik

**ABSTRACT.** The aim of this study is to investigate the precise form of finite-order entire solutions to the following system of Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations:

$$\begin{cases} \left( \frac{\partial f_1(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m)}{\partial z_1} \right)^{n_1} + f_2^{m_1}(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2, \dots, z_m + c_m) = 1, \\ \left( \frac{\partial f_2(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m)}{\partial z_1} \right)^{n_2} + f_1^{m_2}(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2, \dots, z_m + c_m) = 1 \end{cases}$$

for various combinations of the positive integers  $n_1, n_2, m_1$  and  $m_2$ . Our results extend the work of Xu et al. (Entire solutions for several systems of non-linear difference and partial differential-difference equations of Fermat-type, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 483(2), 2020), generalizing the setting  $\mathbb{C}^2$  to  $\mathbb{C}^m$ . Several examples are provided to illustrate the applicability and sharpness of the obtained results.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction and main results	1
1.1. Fermat type functional equation in $\mathbb{C}$	1
1.2. Fermat type functional equation in $\mathbb{C}^m$	3
1.3. Basic Notations in several complex variables	9
2. Key lemmas	10
3. Proof of Theorem 1.1	12
References	23

## 1. Introduction and main results

1.1. **Fermat type functional equation in  $\mathbb{C}$ .** The following functional equation

$$f^n(z) + g^n(z) = 1, \tag{1.1}$$

where  $n$  is a positive integer can be regarded as the Fermat diophantine equations  $x^n + y^n = 1$  over function fields. In 1927, Montel [27] proved that the equation (1.1) has no transcendental entire solutions for  $n \geq 3$ . Gross [11, Theorem 4] proved that equation (1.1) has no non-constant entire solutions when  $n > 2$ . The equation (1.1) has no non-constant meromorphic solutions when  $n > 3$  (see [10, Theorem 3]). For  $n = 2$ , Gross [11, Theorem 4] found that the equation (1.1) has entire solutions of the form  $f(z) = \sin(h(z))$  and  $g(z) = \cos(h(z))$ , where  $h(z)$  is an entire function. In Theorem 1, Gross [10] proved that all meromorphic solutions of the equation  $f^2(z) + g^2(z) = 1$  are the form

$$f(z) = \frac{1 - \alpha^2(z)}{1 + \alpha^2(z)} \text{ and } g(z) = \frac{2\alpha(z)}{1 + \alpha^2(z)},$$

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 39A45, 32H30, 39A14 and 35A20.

*Key words and phrases*: Several complex variables, meromorphic functions, Fermat-type equations, Nevanlinna theory, partial differential-difference equations.

\**Corresponding Author*: Sujoy Majumder.

Typeset by  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}\text{-}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{X}$ .

where  $\alpha(z)$  is a non-constant meromorphic function. For  $n = 3$ , Baker [4, Theorem 1] proved that the only non-constant meromorphic solutions of equation (1.1) are the functions

$$f = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ 1 + \frac{\wp^{(1)}(u)}{\sqrt{3}} \right\} / \wp(u) \quad \text{and} \quad g = \frac{\eta}{2} \left\{ 1 - \frac{\wp^{(1)}(u)}{\sqrt{3}} \right\} / \wp(u)$$

for a non-constant entire function  $u$  and a cubic root  $\eta$  of unity, where the Weierstrass  $\wp$ -function with periods  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_2$  defined as

$$\wp(z; \omega_1, \omega_2) = \frac{1}{z^2} + \sum_{\alpha, \beta: \alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1} \left\{ \frac{1}{(z + \alpha\omega_1 + \beta\omega_2)^2} - \frac{1}{(\alpha\omega_1 + \beta\omega_2)^2} \right\}$$

and it satisfies  $(\wp^{(1)})^2 = 4\wp^3 - 1$ .

In 1970, Yang [38] investigated the following Fermat-type equation

$$f^{m_1}(z) + g^{m_2}(z) = 1 \quad (1.2)$$

and obtained that equation (1.2) has no non-constant entire solutions when  $\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} < 1$  (see the proof of Theorem 1). Therefore it is clear that the equation (1.2) has no non-constant entire solutions when  $m_1 > 2$  and  $m_2 > 2$ . However, for the case when  $m_1 = m_2 = 2$  and  $g(z)$  has a specific relationship with  $f(z)$ , many authors investigated the existence of solutions of the equation (1.2). As a result, successively several research papers were published (see [8, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 39]).

In 2012, Liu et al. [23] studied the existence of solutions for the differential-difference equation

$$(f^{(1)}(z))^{m_1} + f^{m_2}(z + c) = 1 \quad (1.3)$$

and demonstrated that the equation (1.3) has no finite order transcendental entire solutions when  $m_1 \neq m_2$ , where  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are positive integers, and  $c(\neq 0)$  is a constant. Additionally, Liu et al. [23] obtained the following result

**Theorem 1.1.A.** [23, Theorem 1.3] *The transcendental entire solutions with finite order of*

$$(f^{(1)}(z))^2 + f^2(z + c) = 1 \quad (1.4)$$

*must satisfy  $f(z) = \sin(z \pm B\iota)$ , where  $B$  is a constant and  $c = 2k\pi$  or  $c = (2k + 1)\pi$ , with  $k$  being an integer.*

Recall that the pair  $(f(z), g(z))$  is referred to as a set of finite-order transcendental entire solutions for the system

$$\begin{cases} f^{n_1}(z) + g^{m_1}(z) = 1 \\ f^{n_2}(z) + g^{m_2}(z) = 1 \end{cases}$$

if  $f(z)$  and  $g(z)$  are transcendental entire functions and  $\rho = \max\{\rho(f), \rho(g)\} < \infty$ .

In 2016, Gao [8] addressed the problem of determining the form of solutions for the following system of Fermat-type differential-difference equations

$$\begin{cases} (f_1^{(1)}(z))^2 + f_2^2(z + c) = 1 \\ (f_2^{(1)}(z))^2 + f_1^2(z + c) = 1 \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

and derived the following result:

**Theorem 1.1.B.** [8, Theorem 1.1] *Suppose that  $(f_1(z), f_2(z))$  is a pair of finite order transcendental entire solutions for the system of differential-difference equations (1.5). Then  $(f_1(z), f_2(z))$  satisfies one of the following*

- (i)  $(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = (\sin(z - b\iota), \sin(z - b_1\iota)),$
- (ii)  $(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = (\sin(z + b\iota), \sin(z + b_1\iota)),$

where  $b, b_1$  are constants, and  $c = k\pi$ ,  $k$  is an integer.

**Remark 1.1.A.** When  $f_1(z) \equiv f_2(z) \equiv f(z)$ , it is easy to verify that the system of equations (1.5) reduces to the equation (1.4). Now, from the conclusion of Theorem 1.1.B, it is easy to get:  $f(z) = \sin(z \pm b\iota)$ , where  $b$  is a constant, and  $c = k\pi$ ,  $k$  is an integer. This shows that the conclusions of Theorem 1.1.B contain the conclusion of Theorem 1.1.A.

**1.2. Fermat type functional equation in  $\mathbb{C}^m$ .** The following theorem describes the entire and meromorphic solutions in  $\mathbb{C}^m$  of the Fermat-type Eq.

$$f^n + g^n = 1, \quad n > 1. \quad (1.6)$$

**Theorem 1.2.A.** [30, Theorem 1.3] For  $h : \mathbb{C}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  entire, the solutions of the Eq. (1.6) are characterized as follows:

- (a) for  $n = 2$ , the entire solutions are  $f = \cos(h)$  and  $g = \sin(h)$ ;
- (b) for  $n > 2$ , there are no non-constant entire solutions;
- (c) for  $n = 2$ , the meromorphic solutions are of the form  $f = \frac{1-\beta^2}{1+\beta^2}$  and  $g = \frac{2\beta}{1+\beta^2}$ , with  $\beta$  being meromorphic on  $\mathbb{C}^m$ ;
- (d) for  $n = 3$ , the meromorphic solutions are of the form

$$f = \frac{1}{2\wp(h)} \left( 1 + \frac{\wp^{(1)}(h)}{\sqrt{3}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad g = \frac{1}{2\wp(h)} \left( 1 - \frac{\wp^{(1)}(h)}{\sqrt{3}} \right);$$

- (e) for  $n > 3$ , there are no non-constant meromorphic solutions.

We define  $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \mathbb{Z}[0, +\infty) = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : 0 \leq n < +\infty\}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}^+ = \mathbb{Z}(0, +\infty) = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : 0 < n < +\infty\}$ . We define

$$\partial_{z_i}(f(z)) = \frac{\partial f(z)}{\partial z_i}, \dots, \partial_{z_i}^{l_i}(f(z)) = \frac{\partial^{l_i} f(z)}{\partial z_i^{l_i}}, \quad \partial^I(f(z)) = \frac{\partial^{|I|} f(z)}{\partial z_1^{i_1} \dots \partial z_m^{i_m}}$$

where  $l_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$  and  $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$  such that  $|I| = \sum_{j=1}^m i_j$ .

In 2008, Li [20, Theorem 1] proved that meromorphic solutions of the Fermat-type functional equation  $f^2 + g^2 = 1$  in  $\mathbb{C}^2$  must be constant if and only if  $\partial_{z_2}(f(z_1, z_2))$  and  $\partial_{z_1}(g(z_1, z_2))$  share 0 CM. Moreover if  $f(z_1, z_2) = \partial_{z_1}(u(z_1, z_2))$  and  $g(z_1, z_2) = \partial_{z_2}(u(z_1, z_2))$ , then any entire solutions of the partial differential equations:

$$(\partial_{z_1}(u(z_1, z_2)))^2 + (\partial_{z_2}(u(z_1, z_2)))^2 = 1$$

in  $\mathbb{C}^2$  are necessarily linear (see [17]). From the fact that the surface  $z_1^n + z_2^n = 1$  in  $\mathbb{C}^2$  is a Kobayashi hyperbolic manifold and thus there are no non-constant holomorphic curves  $(f_1, f_2)$  from the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$  (and thus  $\mathbb{C}^m$ ) to the surface (see [31, page 360]), one can easily prove that any entire solutions of the partial differential equations

$$(\partial_{z_1}(u(z_1, z_2)))^n + (\partial_{z_2}(u(z_1, z_2)))^n = 1,$$

where  $n \geq 3$  must also be linear. The solutions of Fermat-type partial differential equation was originally investigated by Li [19] and Saleeby [29].

Recently, many authors (see [1]-[3], [26], [33], [35], [36], [37]) have paid their attention to explore the existence of solutions of Fermat-type difference and partial differential-difference equations using the difference Nevanlinna theory for meromorphic functions (see [5, 6, 7, 18]) of higher dimension.

In 2018, Xu and Cao [33] investigated the existence of the finite order transcendental entire solutions for a specific type of Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations and obtained the following results.

**Theorem 1.2.B.** [33, Theorem 1.1] *Let  $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ . Then the Fermat-type partial differential-difference equation*

$$(\partial_{z_1}(f(z_1, z_2)))^{m_1} + f^{m_2}(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2) = 1 \quad (1.7)$$

*doesn't have any transcendental entire solution with finite order, where  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are two distinct positive integers.*

According to Theorem 1.2.B, the finite order transcendental entire solutions of (1.7) exist only possibly for the case  $m_1 = m_2$ . For finite order transcendental entire solutions of the following Fermat-type partial differential-difference equation

$$(\partial_{z_1}(f(z_1, z_2)))^2 + f^2(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2) = 1 \quad (1.8)$$

Xu and Cao [34] obtained the following result.

**Theorem 1.2.C.** [34, Theorem 1.1] *Let  $c = (c_1, c_2)$  be a constant in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Then any finite order transcendental entire solutions of the Fermat-type partial difference-differential equation (1.8) has the form of  $f(z_1, z_2) = \sin(Az_1 + Bz_2 + H(z_2))$ , where  $A$  and  $B$  are constants on  $\mathbb{C}$  satisfying  $A^2 = 1$  and  $Ae^{i(Ac_1 + Bc_2)} = 1$  and  $H(z_2)$  is a polynomial in one variable  $z_2$  such that  $H(z_2) = H(z_2 + c_2)$ . In the special case whenever  $c_2 = 0$ , we have  $f(z_1, z_2) = \sin(Az_1 + Bz_2 + \text{Constant})$ .*

If  $c = (0, 0)$ , then Theorem 1.2.C implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.2.A.** [34, Corollary 1.4] *Any transcendental entire solution with finite order of the partial differential equation of the Fermat-type*

$$(\partial_{z_1}(f(z_1, z_2)))^2 + f^2(z_1, z_2) = 1$$

*has the form of  $f(z_1, z_2) = \sin(z_1 + g(z_2))$ , where  $g(z_2)$  is a polynomial in one variable  $z_2$ .*

Also in the same paper, Xu and Cao [34] exhibited the following example to explain the conclusion of Theorem 1.2.C.

**Example 1.2.A.** [34, Example 1.2.] *Let  $A = 1$ ,  $B = 2$ , and let two constants  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  satisfy  $e^{\iota c_1} = 1$  and  $c_2 = 0$ . Then  $Ae^{\iota(Ac_1 + Bc_2)} = 1$ . The entire function  $f(z) = \sin(z_1 + 2z_2 + z_2^3 + 1)$  satisfies the following Fermat-type partial differential-difference equation*

$$(\partial_{z_1}(f(z_1, z_2)))^2 + f^2(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2) = 1 \text{ in } \mathbb{C}^2, \text{ where } c = (c_1, c_2).$$

Example 1.2.A shows that the function  $H(z_2)$  in the conclusion of Theorem 1.2.C may be a non-constant polynomial whenever  $c_2 = 0$ .

In 2020, Xu and Wang [36] again considered Eq. (1.7) to discuss the existence of finite order transcendental entire solutions for the case when  $m_1 \neq m_2$ . Actually Xu and Wang [36, Remark 1.7] proved that: If one of the following conditions holds:

- (i)  $m_2 > m_1$ ,
- (ii)  $m_1 > m_2 \geq 2$ ,

then Eq. (1.7) does not have any finite order transcendental entire solutions.

When  $m_1 = 2$  and  $m_2 = 1$ , Xu and Wang [36] obtained the following result regarding the finite order transcendental entire solutions of Eq. (1.7).

**Theorem 1.2.D.** [36, see pp.8] *Let  $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ . If  $f(z_1, z_2)$  is a finite order transcendental entire solution of the following Eq.*

$$(\partial_{z_1}(f(z_1, z_2)))^2 + f(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2) = 1, \quad (1.9)$$

*then  $f(z_1, z_2)$  takes the form*

$$\begin{aligned} & f(z_1, z_2) \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{4}c_1^2 - \frac{1}{4}z_1^2 + \frac{c_1}{2c_2}z_1z_2 - \frac{c_1^2}{2c_2}(z_2 - c_2) + (z_1 - c_1)G_1(z_2) - \left[ \frac{c_1}{2c_2}(z_2 - c_2) + G_1(z_2) \right]^2, \end{aligned}$$

*where  $G_1(z_2)$  is a finite order transcendental entire period function with period  $c_2$ .*

Recently Xu et al. [35] studied the existence and the forms of the finite order transcendental entire solutions to the following system of Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations:

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_{z_1}(f_1(z_1, z_2)))^{n_1} + f_2^{m_1}(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2) = 1, \\ (\partial_{z_1}(f_2(z_1, z_2)))^{n_2} + f_1^{m_2}(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2) = 1, \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

where  $m_i$  and  $n_i$  are positive integers for  $i = 1, 2$ .

Firstly, in the following result, Xu et al. [35] proved that the system of Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations (1.10) does not have any pair of finite order transcendental entire solutions under some restrictions on  $n_i$  and  $m_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

**Theorem 1.2.E.** [35, Theorem 1.1] *Let  $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$  and let  $m_i$  and  $n_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) be positive integers. If the system of Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations (1.10) satisfies one of the following conditions:*

- (i)  $m_1m_2 > n_1n_2$ ;
- (ii)  $m_j > \frac{n_j}{n_j-1}$  for  $n_j \geq 2$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ ,

*then the system of equations (1.10) does not have any pair of finite order transcendental entire solutions.*

Secondly, in the following result, Xu et al. [35] derived the solutions of the system of Fermat-type differential-difference equations (1.10) for the case when  $n_1 = n_2 = m_1 = m_2 = 2$ .

**Theorem 1.2.F.** [35, Theorem 1.3] *Let  $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ . Then any pair of finite order transcendental entire solutions for the following system of Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations*

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_{z_1}(f_1(z_1, z_2)))^2 + f_2^2(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2) = 1, \\ (\partial_{z_1}(f_2(z_1, z_2)))^2 + f_1^2(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2) = 1, \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

*have the following forms*

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = \left( \frac{e^{L(z)+B_1} + e^{-(L(z)+B_1)}}{2}, \frac{A_{21}e^{L(z)+B_1} + A_{22}e^{-(L(z)+B_1)}}{2} \right),$$

*where  $L(z) = a_1z_1 + a_2z_2$ ,  $B_1 \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $a_1, c, A_{21}, A_{22}$  satisfy one of the following cases*

- (i)  $A_{21} = -\iota, A_{22} = \iota$ , and  $a_1 = \iota, L(c) = (2k + \frac{1}{2})\pi\iota$ , or  $a_1 = -\iota, L(c) = (2k - \frac{1}{2})\pi\iota$ ;
- (ii)  $A_{21} = \iota, A_{22} = -\iota$ , and  $a_1 = \iota, L(c) = (2k - \frac{1}{2})\pi\iota$ , or  $a_1 = -\iota, L(c) = (2k + \frac{1}{2})\pi\iota$ ;
- (iii)  $A_{21} = 1, A_{22} = 1$ , and  $a_1 = \iota, L(c) = 2k\pi\iota$ , or  $a_1 = -\iota, L(c) = (2k + 1)\pi\iota$ ;
- (iv)  $A_{21} = -1, A_{22} = -1$ , and  $a_1 = \iota, L(c) = (2k + 1)\pi\iota$ , or  $a_1 = -\iota, L(c) = 2k\pi\iota$ .

If  $c = (0, 0)$ , then Theorem 1.2.F implies the following corollary:

**Corollary 1.2.B.** [35, Corollary 1.1] *Any pair of finite order transcendental entire solutions for the following system of Fermat-type partial differential equations*

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_{z_1}(f_1(z_1, z_2)))^2 + f_2^2(z_1, z_2) = 1, \\ (\partial_{z_1}(f_2(z_1, z_2)))^2 + f_1^2(z_1, z_2) = 1, \end{cases}$$

have the following forms

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = \left( \frac{e^{L(z)+B_1} + e^{-(L(z)+B_1)}}{2}, \eta \frac{e^{L(z)+B_1} + e^{-(L(z)+B_1)}}{2} \right),$$

where  $L(z) = a_1 z_1 + a_2 z_2$ ,  $B_1 \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $a_1, \eta$  satisfy (i)  $a_1 = \iota$  and  $\eta = 1$ ; (ii)  $a_1 = -\iota$  and  $\eta = -1$ .

In the study of existence and the forms of the finite order transcendental entire solutions to the system of the Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations (1.10), Theorems 1.2.E and 1.2.F unquestionably play a significant role. But, if we take  $f_1(z) \equiv f_2(z) \equiv f(z)$ , then the system of equations (1.11) reduces to the equation (1.8). Therefore from the conclusions of Theorem 1.2.F, it is easy to get:  $f(z) = \sin(Az_1 + Bz_2 + B_1)$ , where  $A, B$  and  $B_1$  are constants in  $\mathbb{C}$  satisfying  $A^2 = 1$  and  $Ae^{i(Ac_1+Bc_2)} = 1$ . One may therefore conclude that the result of Theorem 1.2.F for the case where  $f_1(z) \equiv f_2(z)$  is not complete by looking at Example 1.2.A.

Next, by considering the following example something more can be said about the precise form of the finite order transcendental entire solutions for the system of equations (1.11) than that are obtained in Theorem 1.2.F.

**Example 1.1.** *Let*

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = (\sin(Az_1 + A_{12}z_2 + Q_1(z_2)), \sin(Bz_1 + B_{12}z_2 + Q_2(z_2))),$$

where  $A = A_{12} = B = B_{12} = 1$ ,  $Q_1(z_2) = z_2^2$ ,  $Q_2(z_2) = z_2^2 + \pi$  and  $(c_1, c_2) = (2\pi, 0)$ . Note that  $Be^{2\iota(Ac_1+A_{12}c_2)} = A$  and  $Ae^{2\iota(Bc_1+B_{12}c_2)} = B$ . It is easy to verify that  $(f_1(z), f_2(z))$  satisfy the following system of equations

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_{z_1}(f_1(z_1, z_2)))^2 + f_2^2(z_1 + 2\pi, z_2) = 1, \\ (\partial_{z_1}(f_2(z_1, z_2)))^2 + f_1^2(z_1 + 2\pi, z_2) = 1. \end{cases}$$

The conclusion of Theorem 1.2.F shows that the order of the transcendental entire solutions  $(f_1(z), f_2(z))$  is 1, i.e,  $\rho(f_i) = 1$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . However, Example 1.1 demonstrates that the system of equations (1.11) may have transcendental entire solutions  $(f_1(z), f_2(z))$  with an order greater than 1.

Finding the exact form of the finite order transcendental entire solutions  $(f_1(z), f_2(z))$  of the system of equations (1.11) would therefore be intriguing. We also want to generalize Theorem 1.2.F in this study by taking into account the following system of Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_{z_1}(f_1(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m)))^{n_1} + f_2^{m_1}(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2, \dots, z_m + c_m) = 1, \\ (\partial_{z_1}(f_2(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m)))^{n_2} + f_1^{m_2}(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2, \dots, z_m + c_m) = 1 \end{cases} \quad (1.12)$$

in  $\mathbb{C}^m$ , where  $n_1, n_2, m_1, m_2$  are positive integers, and  $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m$  are constants in  $\mathbb{C}$ . For  $n_1 = n_2 = m_1 = m_2 = 1$ , it is easy to verify that  $(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = (e^{z_1+z_2+\dots+z_m} + 1, e^{z_1+z_2+\dots+z_m} - 1)$  is a solution of the Eq. (1.12), where  $e^{c_1+c_2+\dots+c_m} = -1$ . Therefore we

consider the Eq. (1.12) for the existence of entire solutions for the case when  $n_i + m_i > 2$ , where  $i = 1, 2$ .

In this paper, our next goal is to investigate all possible finite-order transcendental entire solutions  $(f_1(z), f_2(z))$  for the system of equations (1.12) for all different combinations of  $n_1, n_2, m_1$  and  $m_2$ . Specifically, we focus on understanding the conditions under which such solutions exist and determining their explicit forms. Furthermore, we extend these findings to higher-dimensional settings  $\mathbb{C}^m$  and explore how the solutions behave when multiple variables are involved. Now we state our main results.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $c \in \mathbb{C}^m$ . Then any finite order transcendental entire solutions for the system of equations (1.12), where  $m_1, m_2, n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $m_i + n_i > 2$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  are characterized as follows:*

(1) if  $n_1 = m_1$ , then  $n_1 = n_2 = m_1 = m_2 = 2$  and

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = (\sin(L_1(z) + Q_1(z_2, \dots, z_m)), \sin(L_2(z) + Q_2(z_2, \dots, z_m))),$$

where  $L_1(z) = Az_1 + A_{11}z_2 + \dots + A_{1m}z_m$ ,  $L_2(z) = Bz_1 + B_{11}z_2 + \dots + B_{1m}z_m$ ,  $Q_i(z_2, \dots, z_m)$  is a polynomial such that  $Q_i(z_2 + 2c_2, \dots, z_m + 2c_m) = Q_i(z_2, \dots, z_m)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $A_{1i}, B_{1i} \in \mathbb{C}$  for  $i = 2, \dots, m$  such that  $A^2 = 1$ ,  $B^2 = 1$  and one of the following hold:

(i)  $Be^{2\iota(Ac_1 + A_{12}c_2 + \dots + A_{1m}c_m)} = A$  and  $Ae^{2\iota(Bc_1 + B_{12}c_2 + \dots + B_{1m}c_m)} = B$ ;

(ii)  $ABe^{2\iota(Ac_1 + A_{12}c_2 + \dots + A_{1m}c_m)} = 1$  and  $ABe^{2\iota(Bc_1 + B_{12}c_2 + \dots + B_{1m}c_m)} = 1$ ;

(2) if one of the following conditions hold:

(2)(i)  $m_1m_2 > n_1n_2$ ,

(2)(ii)  $n_i = m_i$  and  $n_j > m_j$  for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ ,

(2)(iii)  $n_i > m_i$  and  $n_1n_2 - n_i > 2$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ,

(2)(iv)  $n_i > m_i$  and  $m_j > n_j$  such that  $n_i \geq 3$  and  $m_j > \frac{n_i}{n_i - 2}$ , where  $i \neq j$  and  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ ,

then the system of equations (1.12) doesn't have any finite order transcendental entire solutions;

(3) if  $n_i > m_i$ , then  $m_i = 1$  and  $n_i = 2$  for  $i = 1, 2$  and

$$f_i(z) = 1 + \frac{K_i}{4}z_1^2 + z_1g_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m) - K_i^2g_i^2(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m)$$

where  $K_i^3 = -1$  and  $g_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m)$  is a finite order transcendental entire function such that  $g_i(z_2 + 2c_2, \dots, z_m + 2c_m) - g_i(z_2, \dots, z_m) = K_ic_1$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

We give two examples to explain the conclusion (1) of Theorem 1.1.

**Example 1.2.** Suppose that

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = (\sin(Az_1 + A_{12}z_2 + A_{13}z_3 + Q_1(z_2, z_3)), \sin(Bz_1 + B_{12}z_2 + B_{13}z_3 + Q_2(z_2, z_3))),$$

where  $A = A_{12} = A_{13} = B = B_{12} = B_{13} = 1$ ,  $Q_1(z_2, z_3) = (z_2 - z_3)^2$ ,  $Q_2(z_2, z_3) = (z_2 - z_3)^2 + \pi$  and  $(c_1, c_2, c_3) = (0, \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ . Note that  $Be^{2\iota(Ac_1 + A_{12}c_2 + A_{13}c_3)} = A$  and  $Ae^{2\iota(Bc_1 + B_{12}c_2 + B_{13}c_3)} = B$ . It is easy to verify that  $(f_1(z), f_2(z))$  satisfy the following system of equations

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_{z_1}(f_1(z_1, z_2, z_3)))^2 + f_2^2(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2, z_3 + c_3) = 1, \\ (\partial_{z_1}(f_2(z_1, z_2, z_3)))^2 + f_1^2(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2, z_3 + c_3) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (1.13)$$

**Example 1.3.** Suppose that

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = (\sin(Az_1 + A_{12}z_2 + A_{13}z_3 + Q_1(z_2, z_3)), \sin(Bz_1 + B_{12}z_2 + B_{13}z_3 + Q_2(z_2, z_3))),$$

where  $A = A_{12} = 1$ ,  $A_{13} = -1$ ,  $B = B_{12} = 1$ ,  $B_{13} = -1$ ,  $Q_1(z_2, z_3) = Q_2(z_2, z_3) = (z_2 - z_3)^3$  and  $(c_1, c_2, c_3) = (0, \pi, \pi)$ . Note that  $ABe^{\iota(Ac_1 + A_{12}c_2 + A_{13}c_3)} = 1$  and  $ABe^{2\iota(Bc_1 + B_{12}c_2 + B_{13}c_3)} = 1$ . It is easy to verify that  $(f_1(z), f_2(z))$  satisfy the system of equations (1.13).

Following example is provided to illustrate our conclusion (3) of Theorem 1.1.

**Example 1.4.** Suppose that

$$f_i(z_1, z_2, z_3) = 1 - \frac{1}{4}z_1^2 + g_i(z_2, z_3)z_1 - g_i^2(z_2, z_3),$$

where  $g_i(z_2, z_3) = \sin(z_2 + z_3)$  and  $c = (0, \pi, \pi)$ . We take  $K_i = -1$ . Note that  $g_i(z_2, z_3)$  is a transcendental entire function of finite order such that  $g_i(z_2 + 2c_2, z_3 + 2c_3) - g_i(z_2, z_3) = 0 = K_i c_1$ . It is easy to verify that  $(f_1(z), f_2(z))$  satisfy the following system of equations

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_{z_1}(f_1(z_1, z_2, z_3)))^2 + f_2(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2, z_3 + c_3) = 1, \\ (\partial_{z_1}(f_2(z_1, z_2, z_3)))^2 + f_1(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2, z_3 + c_3) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (1.14)$$

When  $f_1(z) \equiv f_2(z) \equiv f(z)$ ,  $n_2 = n_1$  and  $m_2 = m_1$ , it is easy to see that system (1.12) can be reduced as the following equation

$$(\partial_{z_1}(f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m)))^{n_1} + f^{m_1}(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2, \dots, z_m + c_m) = 1 \quad (1.15)$$

and so by Theorem 1.1, we get the following corollary:

**Corollary 1.1.** Let  $c \in \mathbb{C}^m$ . Then any finite order transcendental finite order entire solutions of the equation (1.15), where  $m_1, n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $m_1 + n_1 > 2$  are characterized as follows:

(i) if  $n_1 = m_1$ , then  $n_1 = m_1 = 2$  and

$$f(z) = \sin(Az_1 + \dots + A_m z_m + P(z_2, \dots, z_m)),$$

where  $A, A_2, \dots, A_m \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $A^2 = 1$  and  $Ae^{\iota(Ac_1 + \dots + A_m c_m)} = 1$  and  $P(z_2, \dots, z_m)$  is a polynomial such that  $P(z_2 + c_2, \dots, z_m + c_m) \equiv P(z_2, \dots, z_m)$ . In the special case whenever  $m = 2$  and  $c_2 \neq 0$ , we get  $f(z_1, z_2) = \sin(A_1 z_1 + A_2 z_2 + \text{Constant})$ ,

(ii) if  $n_1 \neq m_1$ , then  $n_1 = 2$ ,  $m_1 = 1$  and

$$f(z) = 1 + \frac{K_i}{4}z_1^2 + z_1 g(z_2, \dots, z_m) - K_i^2 g^2(z_2, \dots, z_m),$$

where  $g(z_2, \dots, z_m)$  is a transcendental entire function of finite order such that  $g(z_2 + c_2, \dots, z_m + c_m) - g(z_2, \dots, z_m) = \frac{1}{2}c_1$ .

**Remark 1.1.** It is evident that Corollary 1.1 extends Theorem 1.2.C from  $\mathbb{C}^2$  to  $\mathbb{C}^m$ .

If  $c = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$ , then Theorem 1.1 implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.2.** The transcendental entire solutions for the following system of Fermat-type partial differential equations

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_{z_1}(f_1(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m)))^{n_1} + f_2^{m_1}(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) = 1, \\ (\partial_{z_1}(f_2(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m)))^{n_2} + f_1^{m_2}(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) = 1, \end{cases} \quad (1.16)$$

where  $m_1, m_2, n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $m_i + n_i > 2$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  are characterized as follows:

(1) if  $n_1 = m_1$ , then  $n_1 = n_2 = m_1 = m_2 = 2$  and

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = (\sin(L_1(z) + Q_1(z_2, \dots, z_m)), \sin(L_2(z) + Q_2(z_2, \dots, z_m))),$$

where  $L_1(z) = Az_1 + A_{11}z_2 + \dots + A_{1m}z_m$ ,  $L_2(z) = Bz_1 + B_{11}z_2 + \dots + B_{1m}z_m$ ,  $Q_i(z_2, \dots, z_m)$  is a polynomial for  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $A_{1i}, B_{1i} \in \mathbb{C}$  for  $i = 2, \dots, m$  such that either  $A^2 = B^2 = 1$  or  $AB = 1$ ;

(2) if one of the following conditions hold:

- (2)(i)  $m_1 m_2 > n_1 n_2$ ,  
 (2)(ii)  $n_i = m_i$  and  $n_j > m_j$  for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ ,  
 (2)(iii)  $n_i > m_i$  and  $n_1 n_2 - n_i > 2$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  
 (2)(iv)  $n_i > m_i$  and  $m_j > n_j$  such that  $n_i \geq 3$  and  $m_j > \frac{n_i}{n_i - 2}$ , where  $i \neq j$  and  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  
 then the system of equations (1.16) doesn't have any finite order transcendental entire solutions;  
 (3) if  $n_i > m_i$ , then  $m_i = 1$  and  $n_i = 2$  for  $i = 1, 2$  and

$$f_i(z) = 1 + \frac{K_i}{4} z_1^2 + z_1 g_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m) - K_i^2 g_i^2(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m)$$

where  $K_i^3 = -1$  and  $g_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m)$  is a transcendental entire functions for  $i = 1, 2$ .

We now make the following observations on Theorem 1.1.

**Remark 1.2.** We have explored as many scenarios as possible for all values of  $n_i$  and  $m_i$ , where  $i = 1, 2$ . Theorems 1.2.E and 1.2.F did not address the following cases, which we have covered in Theorem 1.1 as follows:

- (i) For  $(n_1, m_1, n_2, m_2) = (2, 2, 2, 1)$ ,  $(n_1, m_1, n_2, m_2) = (2, 1, 2, 2)$  and  $(n_1, m_1, n_2, m_2) = (3, 1, 2, 1)$ , we observed from part-(2) of Theorem 1.1 that the system of equations (1.12) does not admit any finite order transcendental entire solutions. Moreover, for  $n_i > m_i$  and  $m_j > n_j$  such that  $n_i \geq 3$  and  $m_j > \frac{n_i}{n_i - 2}$ , where  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ , we demonstrated that the system of equations (1.12) does not admit any finite order transcendental entire solutions.  
 (ii) For  $n_i > m_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), we established that the system of Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations (1.12) have finite order transcendental entire solutions of the form

$$f_i(z) = 1 + \frac{K_i}{4} z_1^2 + z_1 g_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m) - K_i^2 g_i^2(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m),$$

where  $K_i^3 = -1$  and  $g_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m)$  is a finite order transcendental entire function satisfying  $g_i(z_2 + 2c_2, \dots, z_m + 2c_m) - g_i(z_2, \dots, z_m) = K_i c_1$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

This demonstrates unequivocally that by offering a thorough analysis of every additional scenario that could arise, our findings significantly outperform those of Xu et al. [35].

Now based on Theorem 1.1, we ask the following question:

**Question 1.1.** What can be inferred about the existence of finite order transcendental entire solutions for the system of Fermat-type partial differential equations (1.12) without the hypothesis “ $n_i > m_i$  and  $m_j > n_j$  such that  $n_i \geq 3$  and  $m_j > \frac{n_i}{n_i - 2}$ ,  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ ”?

**1.3. Basic Notations in several complex variables.** As on  $\mathbb{C}^m$ , the exterior derivative  $d$  splits  $d = \partial + \bar{\partial}$  and twists to  $d^c = \frac{i}{4\pi} (\bar{\partial} - \partial)$  (see [15, 32]). Clearly  $dd^c = \frac{i}{2\pi} \partial\bar{\partial}$ . An exhaustion  $\tau_m$  of  $\mathbb{C}^m$  is defined by  $\tau_m(z) = \|z\|^2$ . The standard Kaehler metric on  $\mathbb{C}^m$  is given by  $v_m = dd^c \tau_m > 0$ . On  $\mathbb{C}^m \setminus \{0\}$ , we define  $\omega_m = dd^c \log \tau_m \geq 0$  and  $\sigma_m = d^c \log \tau_m \wedge \omega_m^{m-1}$ . For any  $S \subseteq \mathbb{C}^m$ , let  $S[r]$ ,  $S(r)$  and  $S\langle r \rangle$  be the intersection of  $S$  with respectively the closed ball, the open ball, the sphere of radius  $r > 0$  centered at  $0 \in \mathbb{C}^m$ .

The zero multiplicity  $\mu_f^0(a)$  of an entire function  $f$  in  $\mathbb{C}^m$  at a point  $a \in \mathbb{C}^m$  is defined to be the order of vanishing of  $f$  at  $a$ . If  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ , then  $\partial^I(f(a)) = 0$ , where  $|I| \leq \mu_f^0(a) - 1$ . In other words, we can write  $f(z) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} P_i(z - a)$ , where the term  $P_i(z - a)$  is either identically zero or a homogeneous polynomial of degree  $i$ . Certainly  $\mu_f^0(a) = \min\{i : P_i(z - a) \not\equiv 0\}$ .

Let  $f$  be a meromorphic function in  $\mathbb{C}^m$ . Then there exist holomorphic functions  $g$  and  $h$  such that  $hf = g$  on  $\mathbb{C}^m$  and  $\dim_z h^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap g^{-1}(\{0\}) \leq m-2$ . Therefore the  $c$ -multiplicity of  $f$  is just  $\mu_f^c = \mu_{g-ch}^0$  if  $c \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\mu_f^c = \mu_h^0$  if  $c = \infty$ . The function  $\mu_f^c : \mathbb{C}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is nonnegative and is called the  $c$ -divisor of  $f$ . If  $f \not\equiv 0$  on each component of  $\mathbb{C}^m$ , then  $\nu = \mu_f = \mu_f^0 - \mu_f^\infty$  is called the divisor of  $f$ . For  $t > 0$ , the counting function  $n_\nu$  is defined by

$$n_\nu(t) = t^{-2(m-1)} \int_{A[t]} \nu v_m^{m-1},$$

where  $A = \text{supp } \nu = \overline{\{z \in G : \nu_f(z) \neq 0\}}$ . The valence function of  $\nu$  is defined by

$$N_\nu(r) = N_\nu(r, r_0) = \int_{r_0}^r n_\nu(t) \frac{dt}{t} \quad (r \geq r_0).$$

We write  $N_{\mu_f^a}(r) = N(r, a; f)$  if  $a \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $N_{\mu_f^a}(r) = N(r, f)$  if  $a = \infty$ . For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , define the truncated multiplicity functions on  $\mathbb{C}^m$  by  $\mu_{f,k}^a(z) = \min\{\mu_f^a(z), k\}$ ,  $\mu_{f(k)}^a(z) = \mu_f^a(z)$  if  $\mu_f^a(z) \geq k$  and  $\mu_{f(k)}^a(z) = 0$  if  $\mu_f^a(z) < k$ . Also we define the truncated valence functions  $N_\nu(t) = \bar{N}(t, a; f)$  if  $\nu = \mu_{f,1}^a$  and  $N_\nu(t) = N_{(k)}(t, a; f)$ , if  $\nu = \mu_{f(k)}^a$ .

An algebraic subset  $X$  of  $\mathbb{C}^m$  is defined as a subset

$$X = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^m : P_j(z) = 0, 1 \leq j \leq l\}$$

with finitely many polynomials  $P_1(z), \dots, P_l(z)$ . A divisor  $\nu$  on  $\mathbb{C}^m$  is said to be algebraic if  $\nu$  is the zero divisor of a polynomial. In this case the counting function  $n_\nu$  is bounded (see [9, 32]).

With the help of the positive logarithm function, we define the proximity function of  $f$  by

$$m(r, f) = \int_{\mathbb{C}^m \langle r \rangle} \log^+ |f| \sigma_m \geq 0.$$

The characteristic function of  $f$  is defined by  $T(r, f) = m(r, f) + N(r, f)$ . We define  $m(r, a; f) = m(r, f)$  if  $a = \infty$  and  $m(r, a; f) = m(r, 1/(f - a))$  if  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ . Now if  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ , then the first main theorem becomes  $m(r, a; f) + N(r, a; f) = T(r, f) + O(1)$ , where  $O(1)$  denotes a bounded function when  $r$  is sufficiently large. We define the order of  $f$  by

$$\rho(f) := \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T(r, f)}{\log r}.$$

We define the linear measure  $m(E) := \int_E dt$ , the logarithmic measure  $l(E) := \int_{E \cap [1, \infty)} \frac{dt}{t}$  and the upper density measure

$$\overline{\text{dens}} E = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \int_{E \cap [1, r]} dt$$

for a set  $E \subset [0, \infty)$ . Moreover, if  $l(E) < +\infty$ , resp.,  $m(E) < +\infty$ , then  $E$  is of zero upper density. Let  $S(f) = \{g : \mathbb{C}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 \text{ meromorphic} : \| T(r, g) = o(T(r, f))\}$ , where  $\|$  indicates that the equality holds only outside a set  $E$  with zero upper density measure and the element in  $S(f)$  is called the small function of  $f$ .

## 2. Key lemmas

**Lemma 2.1.** [15, Lemma 1.37] *Let  $f$  be a non-constant meromorphic function in  $\mathbb{C}^m$  and  $I = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$  be a multi-index. Then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have*

$$m\left(r, \frac{\partial^I(f)}{f}\right) \leq |I| \log^+ T(r, f) + |I|(1 + \varepsilon) \log^+ \log T(r, f) + O(1)$$

for all  $r \notin E$ , where  $l(E) < +\infty$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** [14, Lemma 1.2] *Let  $f$  be a non-constant meromorphic function in  $\mathbb{C}^m$  and let  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q$  be different points in  $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Then*

$$\| (q-2)T(r, f) \leq \sum_{j=1}^q \bar{N}(r, a_j; f) + O(\log(rT(r, f))).$$

**Lemma 2.3.** [15, Theorem 1.26] *Let  $f$  be non-constant meromorphic function in  $\mathbb{C}^m$ . Assume that  $R(z, w) = \frac{A(z, w)}{B(z, w)}$ . Then*

$$T(r, R_f) = \max\{p, q\}T(r, f) + O\left(\sum_{j=0}^p T(r, a_j) + \sum_{j=0}^q T(r, b_j)\right),$$

where  $R_f(z) = R(z, f(z))$  and two coprime polynomials  $A(z, w)$  and  $B(z, w)$  are given respectively as follows:

$$A(z, w) = \sum_{j=0}^p a_j(z)w^j \quad \text{and} \quad B(z, w) = \sum_{j=0}^q b_j(z)w^j.$$

**Lemma 2.4.** [15, Lemma 3.2] *Let  $f_j \not\equiv 0$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, n; n \geq 3$ ) be meromorphic functions in  $\mathbb{C}^m$  such that  $f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}$  are non-constants and  $f_1 + \dots + f_n = 1$ . If*

$$\| \sum_{j=1}^n \left\{ N_{n-1}(r, 0; f_j) + (n-1)\bar{N}(r, f_j) \right\} < \lambda T(r, f_j) + O(\log^+(T(r, f_j)))$$

holds for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ , where  $\lambda < 1$ , then  $f_n \equiv 1$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** [13, Proposition 3.2] *Let  $P$  be a non-constant entire function in  $\mathbb{C}^m$ . Then*

$$\rho(e^P) = \begin{cases} \deg(P) & \text{if } P \text{ is a polynomial,} \\ +\infty. & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 2.6.** [7, Theorem 2.1] *Let  $f$  be a non-constant meromorphic function in  $\mathbb{C}^m$  and let  $c \in \mathbb{C}^m$ . If*

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T(r, f)}{r} = 0,$$

then

$$\| m\left(r, \frac{f(z+c)}{f(z)}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{f(z)}{f(z+c)}\right) = o(T(r, f)).$$

**Lemma 2.7.** [7, Theorem 2.2] *Let  $f$  be a non-constant meromorphic function on  $\mathbb{C}^m$  with*

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T(r, f)}{r} = 0,$$

then

$$\| T(r, f(z+c)) = T(r, f) + o(T(r, f))$$

holds for any constant  $c \in \mathbb{C}^m$ .

Let  $f$  be a non-constant meromorphic function in  $\mathbb{C}^m$ . Define complex differential-difference polynomials as follows:

$$P(f(z)) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in I} a_{\mathbf{p}}(z) f^{p_0}(z) (\partial^{\mathbf{i}_1}(f(z)))^{p_1} \cdots (\partial^{\mathbf{i}_l}(f(z)))^{p_l} f^{p_{l+1}}(z + \hat{q}_{l+1}) \cdots f^{p_{l+s}}(z + \hat{q}_{l+s}), \quad (2.1)$$

$$\mathbf{p} = (p_0, \dots, p_{l+s}) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{l+s+1},$$

$$Q(f(z)) = \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in J} c_{\mathbf{q}}(z) f^{q_0}(z) (\partial^{\mathbf{j}_1}(f(z)))^{q_1} \cdots (\partial^{\mathbf{j}_l}(f(z)))^{q_l} f^{q_{l+1}}(z + \tilde{q}_{l+1}) \cdots f^{q_{l+t}}(z + \tilde{q}_{l+t}), \quad (2.2)$$

$\mathbf{q} = (q_0, \dots, q_{l+t}) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{l+t+1}$  and

$$B(f(z)) = \sum_{k=0}^n b_k(z) f^k(z), \quad (2.3)$$

where  $I, J$  are finite sets of distinct elements,  $a_{\mathbf{p}}, b_k, c_{\mathbf{q}} \in S(f)$  such that  $b_n \neq 0$  and  $\hat{q}_i, \tilde{q}_j \in \mathbb{C}^m$ .

For the case, when  $P(f(z))$  and  $Q(f(z))$  are complex differential polynomials, Hu and Yang [16, Lemma 2.1] generalised Clunie-lemma to high dimension. In 2020, Cao and Xu [7, Theorem 3.6] improved and extended Laine-Yang's difference analogue of Clunie theorem in one variable [24, Theorem 2.3] to high dimension by using Lemma 2.9. Now by using Lemmas 2.1 and 2.9 and proceeding in the same way as done in the proofs of Lemma 2.1 [16] and Theorem 2.3 [24] we get the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $f$  be a non-constant meromorphic function in  $\mathbb{C}^m$  such that*

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T(r, f)}{r} = 0.$$

*Assume that  $f$  satisfies the complex differential-difference equation*

$$B(f)Q(f) = P(f),$$

*where  $P(f)$ ,  $Q(f)$  and  $B(f)$  are defined as in (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3) respectively. If  $\deg(P(f)) \leq n = \deg(B(f))$ , then*

$$\| m(r, Q(f)) = o(T(r, f)).$$

**Lemma 2.9.** [15, Lemma 1.68] *Let  $f_1 : \mathbb{C}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$  and  $f_2 : \mathbb{C}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$  be two non-constant meromorphic functions. Then for  $r > 0$  we have*

$$N(r, 0; f_1 f_2) - N(r, f_1 f_2) = N(r, 0; f_1) + N(r, 0; f_2) - N(r, f_1) - N(r, f_2).$$

### 3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

*Proof.* Let  $(f_1(z), f_2(z))$  be a pair of finite order non-constant entire solution of the system of equations (1.12). Set

$$F_1(z) = \frac{\partial f_1(z)}{\partial z_1} \quad \text{and} \quad F_2(z) = \frac{\partial f_2(z)}{\partial z_1}. \quad (3.1)$$

Since  $f_i(z)$  are entire functions for  $i = 1, 2$ , applying Lemma 2.1 to (3.1), we have

$$T(r, F_i) = m(r, F_i) \leq m\left(r, \frac{F_i}{f_i}\right) + m(r, f_i) \leq T(r, f_i) + o(T(r, f_i)) \quad (3.2)$$

and so  $o(T(r, F_i))$  can be replaced by  $o(T(r, f_i))$ , where  $i = 1, 2$ . Now using Lemma 2.3 to the system of equations (1.12), we get

$$\| n_i T(r, F_i) + o(T(r, F_i)) = m_i T(r, f_j(z+c)) + o(T(r, f_j(z+c))), \quad (3.3)$$

where  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ . Since  $\rho(f_i) < +\infty$ , we have

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T(r, f_i)}{r} = 0$$

for  $i = 1, 2$  and so by Lemma 2.7, we have

$$\| T(r, f_i(z+c)) = T(r, f_i) + o(T(r, f_i)), \quad (3.4)$$

where  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Now from (3.3) and (3.4), we get

$$\| n_i T(r, F_i) + o(T(r, F_i)) = m_i T(r, f_j) + o(T(r, f_j)), \quad (3.5)$$

where  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ . Clearly from (3.2) and (3.5), we obtain

$$m_i T(r, f_j) + o(T(r, f_j)) \leq n_i T(r, f_i) + o(T(r, f_i)), \quad (3.6)$$

where  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ . Consequently (3.6) shows that  $o(T(r, f_i))$  can be replaced by  $o(T(r, f_j))$ , where  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ . On the other hand, using Lemmas 2.1, 2.3, (3.4) and (3.5) to (1.12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \| m_i T(r, f_j) &= m_i T(r, f_j(z+c)) + o(T(r, f_j)) \\ &= T\left(r, f_j^{m_i}(z+c)\right) + o(T(r, f_j)) \\ &= T(r, 1 - F_i^{n_i}) + o(T(r, f_j)) \\ &= n_i T(r, F_i) + o(T(r, F_i)) + o(T(r, f_j)) \\ &= n_i m(r, F_i) + o(T(r, F_i)) + o(T(r, f_j)) \\ &\leq n_i \left( m\left(r, \frac{F_i}{f_i}\right) + m(r, f_i) \right) + o(T(r, F_i)) + o(T(r, f_j)) \\ &= n_i T(r, f_i) + o(T(r, f_j)), \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ .

First we suppose that  $m_1 m_2 - n_1 n_2 > 0$ . Then from (3.7), one can easily deduce that

$$\| (m_1 m_2 - n_1 n_2) T(r, f_j) \leq o(T(r, f_j)),$$

which is impossible, where  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ . Therefore in this case, the system of Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations (1.12) does not have any finite order transcendental entire solutions.

Next we suppose that  $m_1 m_2 - n_1 n_2 \leq 0$ . Let

$$h_i(z) = \frac{F_i^{n_i}(z) - 1}{F_i^{m_i}(z)}, \quad (3.8)$$

where  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Clearly  $h_i(z)$  is a non-constant meromorphic function in  $\mathbb{C}^m$ . Again using Lemma 2.3 to (3.8), we get

$$\| T(r, h_i) + o(T(r, h_i)) = n_i T(r, F_i) + o(T(r, F_i)), \quad (3.9)$$

where  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Now using (1.12) to (3.8), one can easily deduce that

$$\| \overline{N}(r, h_i) \leq \overline{N}(r, 0, F_i^{n_i}) = \overline{N}(r, 0, F_i) + o(T(r, F_i)),$$

$$\| \overline{N}(r, 0, h_i) = \overline{N}(r, 1, F_i^{n_i}) \leq \overline{N}(r, 0, f_j^{m_i}(z+c)) = \overline{N}(r, 0, f_j(z+c)) + o(T(r, f_j(z+c)))$$

and  $\| \overline{N}(r, 1, h_i) = 0$ , where  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ . Therefore in view of the first main theorem and using Lemma 2.2 and (3.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \| n_i T(r, F_i) &= T(r, h_i) + o(T(r, h_i)) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, h_i) + \overline{N}(r, 0, h_i) + \overline{N}(r, 1, h_i) + o(T(r, h_i)) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0, F_i) + \overline{N}(r, 0, f_j(z+c)) + o(T(r, F_i)) + o(T(r, f_j(z+c))) \\ &\leq T(r, F_i) + T(r, f_j(z+c)) + o(T(r, F_i)) + o(T(r, f_j(z+c))), \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

where  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ . Using (3.5) to (3.10), we get

$$\| \left( n_i - 1 - \frac{n_i}{m_i} \right) T(r, F_i) \leq o(T(r, F_i)),$$

where  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and so we have

$$\frac{1}{n_i} + \frac{1}{m_i} \geq 1, \quad (3.11)$$

where  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . We consider the following three cases.

**Case 1.** Let  $n_1 = m_1$ . Note that  $n_1 + m_1 > 2$  and so (3.11) gives  $n_1 = m_1 = 2$ . Since  $m_1 m_2 - n_1 n_2 \leq 0$ , it follows that  $m_2 \leq n_2$ . Now we consider following two sub-cases.

**Sub-case 1.1.** Let  $m_2 < n_2$ . In this case from (3.11), we obtain  $m_2 = 1$  and  $n_2 > 1$ . Since  $m_1 = n_1 = 2$ , from (1.12), we get

$$F_1^2(z) + f_2^2(z + c) = 1 \quad (3.12)$$

and

$$F_2^{n_2}(z) + f_1(z + c) = 1. \quad (3.13)$$

Clearly (3.13) gives

$$n_2 F_2^{n_2-1}(z) \frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1} + F_1(z + c) = 0$$

and so from (3.12), we get

$$\left( n_2 F_2^{n_2-1}(z) \frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^2 + f_2^2(z + 2c) = 1. \quad (3.14)$$

Now using Theorem 1.2.A to (3.14), one has

$$n_2 F_2^{n_2-1}(z) \frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1} = \cos(h(z)) \quad (3.15)$$

and

$$f_2(z + 2c) = \sin(h(z)), \quad (3.16)$$

where  $h : \mathbb{C}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a non-constant entire function. Since  $\rho(f_i) < +\infty$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , using Lemmas 2.3, 2.5 and (3.4) to (3.16), we conclude that  $h(z)$  is a non-constant polynomial in  $\mathbb{C}^m$ . Clearly from (3.16), we obtain

$$\begin{cases} F_2(z + 2c) = \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \cos(h(z)), \\ \frac{\partial F_2(z+2c)}{\partial z_1} = \frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2} \cos(h(z)) - \left( \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^2 \sin(h(z)). \end{cases} \quad (3.17)$$

Therefore from (3.15) and (3.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & n_2 \left( \left( \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^{n_2-1} \frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2} \cos(h(z)) - \left( \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^{n_2+1} \sin(h(z)) \right) \cos^{n_2-1}(h(z)) \\ &= \cos(h(z + 2c)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Clearly  $\frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \not\equiv 0$ . Note that the sets of multiple zeros of both  $\cos(h(z))$  and  $\cos(h(z + 2c))$  are algebraic. But if  $n_2 \geq 3$ , then the set of multiple zeros of  $\cos^{n_2-1}(h(z))$  is not algebraic and so from (3.18), we get a contradiction. Hence  $n_2 = 2$  and so (3.18) yields

$$2 \left( \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2} \cos(h(z)) - \left( \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^3 \sin(h(z)) \right) \cos(h(z)) = \cos(h(z + 2c)),$$

i.e.,

$$2 \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2} \cos^2(h(z)) - \left( \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^3 \sin(2h(z)) = \cos(h(z + 2c)). \quad (3.19)$$

First we suppose that  $\frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2} \equiv 0$ . Clearly  $\frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} = d(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m)$ , a polynomial in  $\mathbb{C}^{m-1}$ . Then from (3.19), we get

$$\iota d^3 e^{\iota(2h(z)+h(z+2c))} - \iota d^3 e^{\iota(-2h(z)+h(z+2c))} - e^{2\iota h(z+2c)} = 1. \quad (3.20)$$

Since both  $2h(z) + h(z + 2c)$  and  $-2h(z) + h(z + 2c)$  are non-constants, applying Lemma 2.4 to (3.20), we get a contradiction.

Next we suppose that  $\frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2} \not\equiv 0$ . By simple calculations on (3.19), we get

$$-\frac{1}{\frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2}} e^{\iota h(z+2c)} - \frac{1}{\frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2}} e^{-\iota h(z+2c)} + \frac{1}{2} G_1(z) e^{2\iota h(z)} + \frac{1}{2} G_2(z) e^{-2\iota h(z)} = 1, \quad (3.21)$$

where

$$G_1(z) = 1 - 2\iota \frac{\left(\frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1}\right)^2}{\frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2}} \quad \text{and} \quad G_2(z) = 1 + 2\iota \frac{\left(\frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1}\right)^2}{\frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2}}.$$

If  $G_1(z) \equiv 0$ , then from (3.21), we get

$$-\frac{1}{\frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2}} e^{\iota h(z+2c)} - \frac{1}{\frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2}} e^{-\iota h(z+2c)} + e^{-2\iota h(z)} = 1$$

and so using Lemma 2.4, we get a contradiction. Hence  $G_1(z) \not\equiv 0$ . Similarly we can prove that  $G_2(z) \not\equiv 0$ . Finally using Lemma 2.4 to (3.21), we get a contradiction.

**Sub-case 1.2.** Let  $n_2 = m_2$ . Since  $n_2 + m_2 > 2$ , from (3.11), we get  $n_2 = m_2 = 2$ . Consequently from (1.12), we obtain  $F_1^2(z) + f_2^2(z + c) = 1$  and  $F_2^2(z) + f_1^2(z + c) = 1$ , i.e.,

$$(F_1(z) + \iota f_2(z + c))(F_1(z) - \iota f_2(z + c)) = 1 \quad (3.22)$$

and

$$(F_2(z) + \iota f_1(z + c))(F_2(z) - \iota f_1(z + c)) = 1. \quad (3.23)$$

Clearly from (3.22) and (3.23), we see that the functions both  $F_1(z) + \iota f_2(z + c)$ ,  $F_1(z) - \iota f_2(z + c)$ ,  $F_2(z) + \iota f_1(z + c)$  and  $F_2(z) - \iota f_1(z + c)$  have no zeros. So we may assume that

$$F_1(z) + \iota f_2(z + c) = e^{\iota P_1(z)}, \quad (3.24)$$

$$F_1(z) - \iota f_2(z + c) = e^{-\iota P_1(z)}, \quad (3.25)$$

$$F_2(z) + \iota f_1(z + c) = e^{\iota P_2(z)} \quad (3.26)$$

and

$$F_2(z) - \iota f_1(z + c) = e^{-\iota P_2(z)}, \quad (3.27)$$

where  $P_1(z)$  and  $P_2(z)$  are polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}^m$ . Solving (3.24) and (3.25), we get

$$F_1(z) = \frac{\partial f_1(z)}{\partial z_1} = \frac{e^{\iota P_1(z)} + e^{-\iota P_1(z)}}{2} = \cos(P_1(z)) \quad (3.28)$$

and

$$f_2(z + c) = \frac{e^{\iota P_1(z)} - e^{-\iota P_1(z)}}{2\iota} = \sin(P_1(z)). \quad (3.29)$$

Again solving (3.26) and (3.27), we obtain

$$F_2(z) = \frac{\partial f_2(z)}{\partial z_1} = \frac{e^{\iota P_2(z)} + e^{-\iota P_2(z)}}{2} = \cos(P_2(z)) \quad (3.30)$$

and

$$f_1(z+c) = \frac{e^{\iota P_2(z)} - e^{-\iota P_2(z)}}{2\iota} = \sin(P_2(z)). \quad (3.31)$$

Clearly from (3.29) and (3.30), we have

$$\frac{\partial P_1(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{\iota(P_1(z)+P_2(z+c))} + \frac{\partial P_1(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{-\iota(P_1(z)-P_2(z+c))} - e^{2\iota P_2(z+c)} = 1, \quad (3.32)$$

which implies that  $\frac{\partial P_1(z)}{\partial z_1} \neq 0$ . Again from (3.28) and (3.31), we get

$$\frac{\partial P_2(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{\iota(P_2(z)+P_1(z+c))} + \frac{\partial P_2(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{-\iota(P_2(z)-P_1(z+c))} - e^{2\iota P_1(z+c)} = 1, \quad (3.33)$$

which shows that  $\frac{\partial P_2(z)}{\partial z_1} \neq 0$ . Thus, using Lemma 2.4 to (3.32) and (3.33), we have respectively

$$\text{either } \frac{\partial P_1(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{\iota(P_1(z)+P_2(z+c))} = 1 \text{ or } \frac{\partial P_1(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{-\iota(P_1(z)-P_2(z+c))} = 1$$

and

$$\text{either } \frac{\partial P_2(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{\iota(P_2(z)+P_1(z+c))} = 1 \text{ or } \frac{\partial P_2(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{-\iota(P_2(z)-P_1(z+c))} = 1.$$

Next, we consider the following four sub-cases.

**Sub-case 1.2.1.** Let

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial P_1(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{\iota(P_1(z)+P_2(z+c))} = 1 \\ \frac{\partial P_2(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{\iota(P_2(z)+P_1(z+c))} = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.34)$$

It follows from (3.34) that  $P_1(z+c) + P_2(z)$  and  $P_2(z+c) + P_1(z)$  are both constants. Consequently both  $P_1(z+2c) - P_1(z)$  and  $P_2(z+2c) - P_2(z)$  are constants. Assume that

$$e^{-\iota(P_1(z)+P_2(z+c))} = A \text{ and } e^{-\iota(P_2(z)+P_1(z+c))} = B. \quad (3.35)$$

Then from (3.34), we have

$$\frac{\partial P_1(z)}{\partial z_1} = A \text{ and } \frac{\partial P_2(z)}{\partial z_1} = B,$$

where  $A^2 = 1$  and  $B^2 = 1$ . Obviously  $P_1(z) = Az_1 + \tilde{Q}_1(z_2, \dots, z_m)$  and  $P_2(z) = Bz_1 + \tilde{Q}_2(z_2, \dots, z_m)$ , where  $\tilde{Q}_1(z_2, \dots, z_m)$  and  $\tilde{Q}_2(z_2, \dots, z_m)$  are polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}^{m-1}$ . Since both  $P_1(z+2c) - P_1(z)$  and  $P_2(z+2c) - P_2(z)$  are constants, it follows that  $\tilde{Q}_i(z_2+2c_2, \dots, z_m+2c_m) - \tilde{Q}_i(z_2, \dots, z_m)$  is also a constant for  $i = 1, 2$ . Therefore we may assume that

$$\begin{cases} P_1(z) = Az_1 + A_{12}z_2 + \dots + A_{1m}z_m + \hat{Q}_1(z_2, \dots, z_m), \\ P_2(z) = Bz_1 + B_{12}z_2 + \dots + B_{1m}z_m + \hat{Q}_2(z_2, \dots, z_m), \end{cases} \quad (3.36)$$

where  $A_{1i}, B_{1i} \in \mathbb{C}$  for  $i = 2, \dots, m$  and  $\hat{Q}_i(z_2, \dots, z_m)$  is a polynomial in  $\mathbb{C}^{m-1}$  such that  $\hat{Q}_i(z_2+2c_2, \dots, z_m+2c_m) = \hat{Q}_i(z_2, \dots, z_m)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . On the other hand, (3.35) gives

$$\frac{B}{A} e^{\iota(P_1(z+2c)-P_1(z))} = 1 \text{ and } \frac{A}{B} e^{\iota(P_2(z+2c)-P_2(z))} = 1.$$

Clearly from (3.36), we have respectively

$$\frac{B}{A} e^{2\iota(Ac_1+A_{12}c_2+\dots+A_{1m}c_m)} = 1 \text{ and } \frac{A}{B} e^{2\iota(Bc_1+B_{12}c_2+\dots+B_{1m}c_m)} = 1.$$

Finally, from (3.29) and (3.31), we may assume that

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = (\sin(L_1(z) + Q_1(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m)), \sin(L_2(z) + Q_2(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m))),$$

where  $L_1(z) = Az_1 + A_{12}z_2 + \dots + A_{1m}z_m$ ,  $L_2(z) = Bz_1 + B_{12}z_2 + \dots + B_{1m}z_m$ ,  $A_{1i}, B_{1i} \in \mathbb{C}$  for  $i = 2, \dots, m$  such that  $A^2 = 1$ ,  $B^2 = 1$ ,  $\frac{B}{A}e^{2\iota(Ac_1 + A_{12}c_2 + \dots + A_{1m}c_m)} = 1$  and  $\frac{A}{B}e^{2\iota(Bc_1 + B_{12}c_2 + \dots + B_{1m}c_m)} = 1$  and  $Q_i(z_2, \dots, z_m)$  is a polynomial such that for  $i = 1, 2$

$$Q_i(z_2 + 2c_2, \dots, z_m + 2c_m) = Q_i(z_2, \dots, z_m).$$

**Sub-case 1.2.2.** Let

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial P_1(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{\iota(P_1(z) + P_2(z+c))} = 1 \\ \frac{\partial P_2(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{-\iota(P_2(z) - P_1(z+c))} = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.37)$$

Clearly from (3.37), it follows that  $P_1(z+c) + P_2(z)$  and  $P_2(z+c) - P_1(z)$  are both constants. This means  $P_2(z+2c) + P_2(z)$  is also a constant, which contradicts the fact that  $P_2(z)$  is a non-constant polynomial.

**Sub-case 1.2.3.** Let

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial P_1(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{-\iota(P_1(z) - P_2(z+c))} = 1 \\ \frac{\partial P_2(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{\iota(P_2(z) + P_1(z+c))} = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.38)$$

We deduce from (3.38) that  $P_1(z) - P_2(z+c)$  and  $P_2(z) + P_1(z+c)$  are both constants. This means  $P_1(z+2c) + P_1(z)$  is also a constant, which is a contradiction.

**Sub-case 1.2.4.** Let

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial P_1(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{-\iota(P_1(z) - P_2(z+c))} = 1 \\ \frac{\partial P_2(z)}{\partial z_1} e^{-\iota(P_2(z) - P_1(z+c))} = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.39)$$

Clearly from (3.39), it follows that  $P_1(z+c) - P_2(z)$  and  $P_2(z+c) - P_1(z)$  are both constants. Consequently  $P_1(z+2c) - P_1(z)$  and  $P_2(z+2c) - P_2(z)$  are also constants. Assume that

$$e^{\iota(P_1(z) - P_2(z+c))} = \tilde{A} \quad \text{and} \quad e^{\iota(P_2(z) - P_1(z+c))} = \tilde{B}. \quad (3.40)$$

Then from (3.39), we have

$$\frac{\partial P_1(z)}{\partial z_1} = \tilde{A} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial P_2(z)}{\partial z_1} = \tilde{B},$$

where  $\tilde{A}^2 = 1$  and  $\tilde{B}^2 = 1$ . Clearly from (3.40), we have  $\tilde{A}\tilde{B}e^{\iota(P_i(z+2c) - P_i(z))} = 1$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Now proceeding in the same way as done in the proof of Sub-case 1.3.1, we can conclude that

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = (\sin(\tilde{L}_1(z) + R_1(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m)), \sin(\tilde{L}_2(z) + R_2(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m))),$$

where  $\tilde{L}_1(z) = \tilde{A}z_1 + \tilde{A}_{12}z_2 + \dots + \tilde{A}_{1m}z_m$ ,  $\tilde{L}_2(z) = \tilde{B}z_1 + \tilde{B}_{12}z_2 + \dots + \tilde{B}_{1m}z_m$ ,  $\tilde{A}_{1i}, \tilde{B}_{1i} \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $i = 2, \dots, m$  such that  $\tilde{A}^2 = 1$ ,  $\tilde{B}^2 = 1$ ,  $\tilde{A}\tilde{B}e^{2\iota(\tilde{A}c_1 + \tilde{A}_{12}c_2 + \dots + \tilde{A}_{1m}c_m)} = 1$ ,  $\tilde{A}\tilde{B}e^{2\iota(\tilde{B}c_1 + \tilde{B}_{12}c_2 + \dots + \tilde{B}_{1m}c_m)} = 1$  and  $R_i(z_2, \dots, z_m)$  is a polynomial such that for  $i = 1, 2$

$$R_i(z_2 + 2c_2, \dots, z_m + 2c_m) = R_i(z_2, \dots, z_m).$$

**Case 2.** Let  $m_1 > n_1$ . In this case from (3.11), we obtain  $m_1 > 1$  and  $n_1 = 1$ . Since  $m_1m_2 - n_1n_2 \leq 0$ , it follows that  $m_1m_2 - n_2 \leq 0$ . We now consider following sub-cases.

**Sub-case 2.1.** Let  $m_2 > n_2$ . Then (3.11) implies  $m_2 > 1$  and  $n_2 = 1$ . Therefore  $m_1m_2 - 1 \leq 0$ , i.e.,  $m_1m_2 \leq 1$ . Since  $m_1 + n_1 > 2$  and  $m_2 + n_2 > 2$ , we get a contradiction.

**Sub-case 2.2.** Let  $n_2 > m_2$  such that  $n_2 > 2$  and  $m_1 > \frac{n_2}{n_2-2}$ . Clearly (3.11) implies  $n_2 > 1$  and  $m_2 = 1$ . In this case, from (1.12), we get

$$F_1(z) + f_2^{m_1}(z+c) = 1 \quad (3.41)$$

and

$$F_2^{n_2}(z) + f_1(z+c) = 1. \quad (3.42)$$

By a simple calculation, (3.41) and (3.42) give

$$-n_2 F_2^{n_2-1}(z) \frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1} + f_2^{m_1}(z+2c) = 1. \quad (3.43)$$

Let  $\phi(z) = -n_2 F_2^{n_2-1}(z) \frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1}$ . Now using Lemmas 2.1, 2.3 and 2.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, F_2^{n_2}(z)) = m(r, F_2^{n_2}(z)) &= m\left(r, \phi(z) \frac{F_2(z)}{\frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1}}\right) \\ &\leq m(r, \phi(z)) + m\left(r, \frac{F_2(z)}{\frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1}}\right) \\ &\leq T(r, \phi(z)) + T\left(r, \frac{F_2(z)}{\frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1}}\right) - N\left(r, \frac{F_2(z)}{\frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1}}\right) + O(1) \\ &\leq T(r, \phi(z)) + T\left(r, \frac{\frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1}}{F_2(z)}\right) - N\left(r, \frac{F_2(z)}{\frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1}}\right) + O(1) \\ &\leq T(r, \phi) + N\left(r, \frac{\frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1}}{F_2(z)}\right) - N\left(r, \frac{F_2(z)}{\frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1}}\right) + o(T(r, F_2)) \\ &\leq T(r, \phi) + N(r, 0; F_2) - N\left(r, 0; \frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1}\right) + o(T(r, F_2)), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$(n_2 - 1)T(r, F_2) \leq T(r, \phi) - N\left(r, 0; \frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1}\right) + o(T(r, F_2)). \quad (3.44)$$

Therefore using Lemma 2.2, (3.43) to (3.44), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (n_2 - 1)T(r, F_2) &\leq \bar{N}(r, 0; \phi) + \bar{N}(r, 1; \phi) - N\left(r, 0; \frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1}\right) + o(T(r, F_2)) \quad (3.45) \\ &\leq \bar{N}(r, 0; F_2) + \bar{N}(r, 0; f_2(z+2c)) + o(T(r, F_2)) \\ &\leq T(r, F_2) + T(r, f_2(z+2c)) + o(T(r, F_2)). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, applying Lemmas 2.1 and 2.3 to (3.43), we get

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 T(r, f_2(z+2c)) = T(r, \phi) = m(r, \phi) &\leq n_2 m(r, F_2) + o(T(r, F_2)) \quad (3.46) \\ &= n_2 T(r, F_2) + o(T(r, F_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently (3.45) and (3.46) yield

$$\left(n_2 - 2 - \frac{n_2}{m_1}\right) T(r, F_2) \leq o(T(r, F_2)),$$

which contradicts the fact that  $m_1 > \frac{n_2}{n_2-2}$ .

**Sub-case 2.3.** Let  $n_2 = m_2$ . Then (3.11) gives  $n_2 = m_2 = 2$  and so from (1.12), we get

$$F_2^2(z) + f_1^2(z+c) = 1. \quad (3.47)$$

Now using Theorem 1.2.A to (3.47), one has

$$F_2(z) = \cos(h(z)) \quad (3.48)$$

and

$$f_1(z + c) = \sin(h(z)), \quad (3.49)$$

where  $h : \mathbb{C}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a non-constant polynomial. Clearly from (3.48) and (3.49), we obtain

$$\begin{cases} F_1(z + c) = \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \cos(h(z)) = \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} F_2(z), \\ \frac{\partial F_1(z+c)}{\partial z_1} = \frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2} F_2(z) + \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1}. \end{cases} \quad (3.50)$$

Clearly  $\frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \neq 0$ . On the other hand, (3.41) yields

$$\frac{\partial F_1(z)}{\partial z_1} + m_1 f_2^{m_1-1}(z + c) F_2(z + c) = 0,$$

i.e.,

$$\left( \frac{\partial F_1(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^{m_1} = (-m_1)^{m_1} (F_1(z) - 1)^{m_1-1} F_2^{m_1}(z + c). \quad (3.51)$$

Now using (3.50) to (3.51), we get

$$\left( \frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2} F_2(z) + \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^{m_1} = (-m_1)^{m_1} \left( \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} F_2(z) - 1 \right)^{m_1-1} F_2^{m_1}(z + 2c). \quad (3.52)$$

Applying Lemma 2.8 to (3.52), we deduce that

$$m \left( r, \left( \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} F_2(z) - 1 \right)^{m_1-1} \right) = o(T(r, F_2))$$

and so by Lemma 2.3, we get  $(m_1 - 1)T(r, F_2) = o(T(r, F_2))$ , which is impossible.

**Case 3.** Let  $n_1 > m_1$ . In this case from (3.11), we obtain  $m_1 = 1$  and  $n_1 > 1$ . Since  $m_1 m_2 - n_1 n_2 \leq 0$ , it follows that  $m_2 - n_1 n_2 \leq 0$ . We now consider following sub-cases.

**Sub-case 3.1.** Let  $m_2 > n_2$  such that  $n_1 \geq 3$  and  $m_2 > \frac{n_1}{n_1-2}$ . Therefore (3.11) implies that  $m_2 > 1$  and  $n_2 = 1$ . In this case, from (1.12), we get

$$F_1^{n_1}(z) + f_2(z + c) = 1 \quad (3.53)$$

and

$$F_2(z) + f_1^{m_2}(z + c) = 1. \quad (3.54)$$

By simple calculations on (3.53) and (3.54) give

$$-n_1 F_1^{n_1-1}(z) \frac{\partial F_1(z)}{\partial z_1} + f_1^{m_2}(z + 2c) = 1.$$

Since  $m_2 > \frac{n_1}{n_1-2}$ , proceeding in the same way as done in the proof of Sub-case 2.2, we get a contradiction.

**Sub-case 3.2.** Let  $m_2 < n_2$ . In this case, (3.11) implies that  $m_2 = 1$  and  $n_2 > 1$ . Since  $m_2 - n_1 n_2 \leq 0$ , it follows that  $n_1 n_1 \geq 1$ . Therefore (1.12) gives

$$F_i^{n_i}(z) + f_j(z + c) = 1 \quad (3.55)$$

for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ . Differentiating (3.55) partially with respect to  $z_1$ , we get

$$n_i F_i^{n_i-1}(z) \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} + F_j(z + c) = 0. \quad (3.56)$$

for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ . Clearly (3.55) and (3.56), we obtain

$$\left( -n_i F_i^{n_i-1}(z) \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^{n_j} + f_i(z + 2c) = 1. \quad (3.57)$$

for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ . Differentiating (3.57) partially with respect to  $z_1$ , we get

$$F_i^{n_1 n_2 - n_j - 1}(z) \alpha_i(z) = -F_i(z + 2c), \quad (3.58)$$

where

$$\alpha_i(z) = (-n_i)^{n_j n_j} \left( \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^{n_j - 1} \left[ (n_i - 1) \left( \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^2 + F_i(z) \frac{\partial^2 F_i(z)}{\partial z_1^2} \right]. \quad (3.59)$$

for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ . Clearly  $\alpha_i \not\equiv 0$ , otherwise from (3.59), we get  $F_i(z + 2c) \equiv 0$ , i.e.,  $F_i(z) \equiv 0$ , which is impossible for  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $n_i > 1$ , we have  $n_1 n_2 - n_i \geq 2$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Therefore applying Lemma 2.8 to (3.58), we get  $\|m(r, \alpha_i) = o(T(r, F_i))$  and so  $\|T(r, \alpha_i) = o(T(r, F_i))$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Now we have to consider following sub-cases.

**Sub-case 3.2.1.** Let  $n_1 n_2 - n_i > 2$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Now using Lemma 2.8 to (3.58), we get  $\|m(r, F_i \alpha) = o(T(r, F_i))$  and so  $\|T(r, F_i \alpha) = o(T(r, F_i))$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $\|T(r, \alpha_i) = o(T(r, F_i))$ , it follows that

$$\|T(r, F_i) \leq T(r, F_i \alpha_i) + T\left(r, \frac{1}{\alpha_i}\right) = T(r, F_i \alpha_i) + T(r, \alpha_i) = o(T(r, F_i)),$$

which is impossible for  $i = 1, 2$ .

**Sub-case 3.2.2.** Let  $n_1 n_2 - n_i = 2$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . In this case, we must have  $n_1 = n_2 = 2$ . Then from (3.58) and (3.59), we have respectively

$$-F_i(z) \alpha_i(z) = F_i(z + 2c) \quad (3.60)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$  and

$$\alpha_i(z) = 8 \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^2 + F_i(z) \frac{\partial^2 F_i(z)}{\partial z_1^2} \right] = 8 \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \frac{\partial \left( F_i(z) \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)}{\partial z_1}, \quad (3.61)$$

i.e.,

$$\alpha_i(z) F_i(z) = 8 F_i(z) \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^2 + F_i(z) \frac{\partial^2 F_i(z)}{\partial z_1^2} \right] = 4 \frac{\partial \left( F_i(z) \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^2}{\partial z_1} \quad (3.62)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . Differentiating (3.60) partially with respect to  $z_1$ , we get

$$\frac{\partial F_i(z + 2c)}{\partial z_1} = - \left( \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \alpha_i(z) + \frac{\partial \alpha_i(z)}{\partial z_1} F_i(z) \right) \quad (3.63)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . On the other hand, from (3.56) and (3.62), we obtain

$$F_i(z) = \frac{2}{\alpha_i(z)} F_j(z + c) \frac{\partial F_j(z + c)}{\partial z_1}$$

and so (3.56) yields

$$F_i(z) \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} + \frac{1}{\alpha_j(z + c)} F_i(z + 2c) \frac{\partial F_i(z + 2c)}{\partial z_1} = 0 \quad (3.64)$$

for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ . Consequently from (3.60), (3.63) and (3.64), we get

$$F_i(z) \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} + \frac{\alpha_i(z)}{\alpha_j(z + c)} F_i(z) \left( \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \alpha_i(z) + \frac{\partial \alpha_i(z)}{\partial z_1} F_i(z) \right) = 0,$$

i.e.,

$$\left( 1 + \frac{\alpha_i^2(z)}{\alpha_j(z + c)} \right) \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} + \frac{\alpha_i(z)}{\alpha_j(z + c)} \frac{\partial \alpha_i(z)}{\partial z_1} F_i(z) = 0 \quad (3.65)$$

for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ . We divide following sub-cases.

**Sub-case 3.2.2.1.** Let  $\frac{\partial \alpha_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \not\equiv 0$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Note that  $\|T(r, \alpha_i) = o(T(r, F_i))$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Therefore from (3.62), it is easy to verify that

$$\|N\left(r, 0; \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1}\right) \leq N(r, 0; \alpha_i) \leq T(r, \alpha_i) = o(T(r, F_i)) \quad (3.66)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . Consequently from (3.65) and (3.66), we conclude that

$$\|N(r, 0; F_i) = o(T(r, F_i)) \quad (3.67)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . Now (3.62) gives

$$\frac{\alpha_i(z)}{F_i^3(z)} = 8 \left( \frac{\frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1}}{F_i(z)} \right)^3 + 8 \frac{\frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1}}{F_i(z)} \times \frac{\frac{\partial^2 F_i(z)}{\partial z_1^2}}{F_i(z)}$$

and so by Lemma 2.1, we get

$$\|m(r, 0; F_i(z)) = o(T(r, F_i)) \quad (3.68)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . Now in view of the first main theorem and using (3.67) and (3.68), we obtain  $\|T(r, F_i) = o(T(r, F_i))$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , which is impossible.

**Sub-case 3.2.2.2.** Let  $\frac{\partial \alpha_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \equiv 0$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Now from (3.65), we get  $\alpha_i^2(z) = -\alpha_j(z+c)$  for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$  and so

$$\alpha_i^4(z) = -\alpha_i(z+2c) \quad (3.69)$$

for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . If  $\alpha_i(z)$  is transcendental, then using Lemma 2.8 to (3.69), we get  $\|m(r, \alpha_i) = o(T(r, \alpha_i))$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $\alpha_i(z)$  are entire for  $i = 1, 2$ , we have  $\|T(r, \alpha_i) = o(T(r, \alpha_i))$ , leading to a contradiction. Hence  $\alpha_i(z)$  is a polynomial in  $\mathbb{C}^m$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . It is easy to deduce from (3.69) that  $\alpha_i(z)$  must be a constant, say  $k_i (\neq 0)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then from (3.69), we have  $k_i^4 = -k_i$ , which implies that  $k_i^3 = -1$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $\alpha_i^2(z) = -\alpha_j(z+c)$  for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ , we get  $k_i^2 = -k_j$  for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ . Now differentiating (3.61) partially with respect to  $z_1$ , we get

$$4 \left( \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^2 \frac{\partial^2 F_i(z)}{\partial z_1^2} + F_i(z) \left( \left( \frac{\partial^2 F_i(z)}{\partial z_1^2} \right)^2 + \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} \frac{\partial^3 F_i(z)}{\partial z_1^3} \right) = 0 \quad (3.70)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . We consider following two sub-cases.

**Sub-case 3.2.2.2.1.** Let  $\frac{\partial^2 F_i(z)}{\partial z_1^2} \not\equiv 0$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Now in view of the first main theorem and using Lemma 2.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|N\left(r, 0; \frac{\partial^2 F_i(z)}{\partial z_1^2}\right) &\leq N\left(r, 0; \frac{\frac{\partial^2 F_i(z)}{\partial z_1^2}}{\frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1}}\right) + N\left(r, 0; \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1}\right) \\ &\leq T\left(r, \frac{\frac{\partial^2 F_i(z)}{\partial z_1^2}}{\frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1}}\right) + N\left(r, 0; \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1}\right) + O(1) \\ &\leq N\left(r, \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1}\right) + 2N\left(r, 0; \frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1}\right) + o(T(r, F_i)) \end{aligned} \quad (3.71)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $F_i(z)$  is an entire functions, from (3.66) and (3.71), we obtain

$$\|N\left(r, 0; \frac{\partial^2 F_i(z)}{\partial z_1^2}\right) = o(T(r, F_i)) \quad (3.72)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . Therefore using (3.66) and (3.72) to (3.70), we deduce that  $\|N(r, 0; F_i) = o(T(r, F_i))$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Now proceeding in the same way as done in the proof of Sub-case 3.2.2.1, we get a contradiction.

**Sub-case 3.2.2.2.2.** Let  $\frac{\partial^2 F_i(z)}{\partial z_1^2} \equiv 0$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . We know that  $\alpha_i(z) = k_i$ , where  $k_i^3 = -1$  and  $k_i^2 = -k_j$  for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ . Then from (3.61), we obtain

$$\frac{\partial F_i(z)}{\partial z_1} = \frac{K_i}{2}, \quad (3.73)$$

where  $K_i^3 = k_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Clearly (3.73) implies

$$\frac{\partial f_i(z)}{\partial z_1} = F_i(z) = \frac{K_i}{2} z_1 + g_i(z_2, \dots, z_m), \quad (3.74)$$

where  $g_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m)$  is a finite order transcendental entire function for  $i = 1, 2$ . On the other hand, from (3.60), we have  $F_i(z + 2c) = -k_i F_i(z)$ . Therefore (3.74) gives

$$\frac{K_i}{2}(z_1 + 2c_1) + g_i(z_2 + 2c_2, \dots, z_m + 2c_m) = -k_i \left( \frac{K_i}{2} z_1 + g_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m) \right),$$

which implies  $k_i = -1$  and so

$$g_i(z_2 + 2c_2, \dots, z_m + 2c_m) - g_i(z_2, \dots, z_m) = K_i c_1 \quad (3.75)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . Again from (3.74), we have

$$f_i(z) = \frac{K_i}{4} z_1^2 + z_1 g_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m) + G_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m), \quad (3.76)$$

where  $G_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m)$  is a finite order transcendental entire function for  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $F_i(z + 2c) = F_i(z)$ , from (3.55), we get  $f_j(z + 3c) = 1 - F_i(z + 2c)^2 = 1 - F_i^2(z) = f_j(z + c)$  for  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $i \neq j$ , which shows that  $f_i(z)$  is  $2c$ -periodic for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then from (3.76), we get

$$f_i(z) = f_i(z + 2c) = \frac{K_i}{4} z_1^2 + z_1 g_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m) + G_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m) \quad (3.77)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . Using (3.74) and (3.77) to (3.57), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & K_i^2 \left( \frac{K_i^2}{4} z_1^2 + K_i z_1 g_i(z_2, \dots, z_m) + g_i^2(z_2, \dots, z_m) \right) \\ & + \frac{K_i}{4} z_1^2 + z_1 g_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m) + G_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m) = 1, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,  $G_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m) = 1 - K_i^2(g_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m))^2$  for  $i = 1, 2$  and so from (3.77), we have

$$f_i(z) = 1 + \frac{K_i}{4} z_1^2 + z_1 g_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m) - K_i^2 g_i^2(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m),$$

where  $K_i^3 = -1$  and  $g_i(z_2, z_3, \dots, z_m)$  is a finite order transcendental entire function such that (3.75) holds.

**Sub-case 3.3.** Let  $m_2 = n_2$ . Then (3.11) gives  $n_2 = m_2 = 2$  and so from (1.12), we get

$$F_2^2(z) + f_1^2(z + c) = 1. \quad (3.78)$$

Now using Theorem 1.2.A to (3.78), we arrive at (3.48)-(3.50). Differentiating (3.53) partially with respect to  $z_1$ , we get

$$n_1 F_1^{n_1-1}(z + c) \frac{\partial F_1(z + c)}{\partial z_1} + F_2(z + 2c) = 0. \quad (3.79)$$

Now using (3.48) to (3.79), we get

$$F_2^{n_1-1}(z)n_1 \left( \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^{n_1-1} \left( \frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2} F_2(z) + \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \frac{\partial F_2(z)}{\partial z_1} \right) = -F_2(z+2c). \quad (3.80)$$

We know that the set of multiple zeros of  $F_2(z)$  is algebraic. Therefore from (3.48) and (3.80), we can easily conclude that  $n_1 = 2$  and so

$$2 \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \left( \frac{\partial^2 h(z)}{\partial z_1^2} \cos^2(h(z)) - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial z_1} \right)^2 \sin(2h(z)) \right) = -\cos h((z+2c)).$$

Now proceeding in the same way as done in the proof of Sub-case 1.2, we get a contradiction. Hence the proof is complete.  $\square$

### Compliance of Ethical Standards:

**Conflict of Interest.** The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

**Data availability statement.** Data sharing not applicable to this article as no data sets were generated or analysed during the current study.

### REFERENCES

- [1] M. B. AHAMED and V. ALLU, Transcendental solutions of Fermat-type functional equations in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , *Anal. Math. Phys.*, **13**, 69 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13324-023-00828-4>.
- [2] M. B. AHAMED and S. MANDAL, Solutions for quadratic trinomial partial differential-difference equations in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , *J. Korean Math. Soc.*, **61** (5) (2024), 975-995.
- [3] M. B. AHAMED and S. MANDAL, Solutions of several general quadratic partial differential-difference equations in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ , *Demonstratio Mathematica*, **58** (1) (2025), 553-572.
- [4] I. N. BAKER, On a class of meromorphic functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **17** (1966), 819-822.
- [5] T. B. CAO, Difference analogues of the second main theorem for meromorphic functions in several complex variables, *Math. Nachr.*, **287** (5) (2014), 530-545.
- [6] T. B. CAO and R. J. KORHONEN, A new version of the second main theorem for meromorphic mappings intersecting hyperplanes in several complex variables, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **444** (2) (2016), 1114-1132.
- [7] T. B. CAO and L. XU, Logarithmic difference lemma in several complex variables and partial difference equations, *Ann. Mat. Pura. Appl.*, **199** (2) (2020), 767-794.
- [8] L. Y. GAO, Entire solutions of two types of systems of complex differential-difference equations, *Acta Math. Sinica (Chin. Ser.)*, **59** (2016), 677-685.
- [9] P. GRIFFITHS and J. KING, Nevanlinna theory and holomorphic mappings between algebraic varieties, *Acta Math.*, **130** (1973), 145-220.
- [10] F. GROSS, On the equation  $f^n + g^n = 1$ , *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **72** (1966), 86-88.
- [11] F. GROSS, On the functional equation  $f^n + g^n = h^n$ , *Amer. Math. Mon.*, **73** (1966), 1093-1096.
- [12] F. GROSS, On the equation  $f^n + g^n = 1$  II, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **74** (1968), 647-648.
- [13] P. C. HU and C. C. YANG, Factorization of holomorphic mappings, *Complex variables*, **27** (1995), 235-244.
- [14] P. C. HU and C. C. YANG, Uniqueness of meromorphic functions on  $\mathbb{C}^m$ , *Complex variables*, **30** (1996), 235-270.
- [15] P. C. HU, P. LI and C. C. YANG, Unicity of Meromorphic Mappings. Springer, New York (2003).
- [16] P. C. HU and C. C. YANG, The Tumura-Clunie theorem in several complex variables, *Bull. Aust. Math. Soc.*, **90** (2014), 444-456.
- [17] D. KHAVINSON, A note on entire solutions of the eiconal equation, *Am. Math. Mon.*, **102** (1995), 159-161.
- [18] R. J. KORHONEN, A difference Picard theorem for meromorphic functions of several variables, *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory*, **12** (1) (2012), 343-361.
- [19] B. Q. LI, On entire solutions of Fermat type partial differential equations, *Int. J. Math.*, **15** (2004), 473-485.
- [20] B. Q. LI, On meromorphic solutions of  $f^2 + g^2 = 1$ , *Math. Z.*, **258** (4) (2008), 763-771.
- [21] K. LIU, Meromorphic functions sharing a set with applications to difference equations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **359** (2009), 384-393.

- [22] K. LIU, L. YANG and X. LIU, Existence of entire solutions of nonlinear difference equations, *Czech. Math. J.*, **61** (2011), 565-576.
- [23] K. LIU, T. B. CAO and H. Z. CAO, Entire solutions of Fermat type differential-difference equations, *Arch. Math.*, **99** (2012), 147-155.
- [24] K. LIU and L. Z. YANG, On entire solutions of some differential-difference equations, *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory*, **13** (3) (2013), 433-447.
- [25] F. LÜ and Q. HAN, On the Fermat-type equation  $f^3(z) + f^3(z + c) = 1$ , *Aequat. Math.*, **91** (2017), 129-136.
- [26] S. MAJUMDER, N. SARKAR and D. PRAMANIK, Solutions of complex Fermat-type difference equations in several variables, *Houston J. math.* (accepted for publication).
- [27] P. MONTEL, Lecons sur les familles normales de fonctions analytiques et leurs applications, *Gauthier-Villars, Paris* (1927), 135-136. .
- [28] E. H. NEVILLE, The expression of an arbitrary elliptic function in terms of the Weierstrassian function, *Math. Gazette*, **25** (1941), 243-245.
- [29] E. G. SALEEBY, Entire and meromorphic solutions of Fermat type partial differential equations, *Analysis*, **19** (1999), 369-376.
- [30] E. G. SALEEBY, On complex analytic solutions of certain trinomial functional and partial differential equations, *Aequat. Math.*, **85** (2013), 553-562.
- [31] B. V. SHABAT, Functions of Several Variables, Introduction to Complex Analysis, Part II, Translation Mathematical Monographs, vol. 110. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (1992).
- [32] W. STOLL, Value distribution on parabolic spaces, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, **600** (1977), Springer-Verlag.
- [33] L. XU and T. B. CAO, Solutions of complex Fermat-Type partial difference and differential-difference equations, *Mediterr. J. Math.*, **15** (2018), 227.
- [34] L. XU and T. B. CAO, Correction to: Solutions of Complex Fermat-Type Partial Difference and Differential-Difference Equations, *Mediterr. J. Math.*, **17** (2020), 1-4.
- [35] H. Y. XU, S. LIU and Q. P. LI, Entire solutions for several systems of nonlinear difference and partial differential-difference equations of Fermat-type, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **483** (2) (2020), 123641.
- [36] H. Y. XU and H. WANG, Notes on the existence of entire solutions for several partial differential-difference equations, *Bull. Iran. Math. Soc.*, **47** (2020), 1477-1489.
- [37] H. Y. XU and H. M. SRIVASTAVA, A study of transcendental entire solutions of several nonlinear partial differential equations, *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc.* Published online 2025:1-41. doi:10.1017/S0013091525100825.
- [38] C. C. YANG, A generalization of a theorem of P. Montel on entire functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **26** (1970), 332-334.
- [39] C. C. YANG and P. LI, On the transcendental solutions of a certain type of nonlinear differential equations, *Arch. Math.*, **82** (2004), 442-448.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, WUYI UNIVERSITY, JIANGMEN 529020, GUANGDONG, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

Email address: xujunf@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RAIGANJ UNIVERSITY, RAIGANJ, WEST BENGAL-733134, INDIA.

Email address: sm05math@gmail.com, sjm@raiganjuniiversity.ac.in

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RAIGANJ UNIVERSITY, RAIGANJ, WEST BENGAL-733134, INDIA.

Email address: debumath07@gmail.com