

# Uniqueness of entire functions concerning their linear differential polynomials in shift

Jeet Sarkar\* and Debabrata Pramanik

**ABSTRACT.** In the paper, we investigate the uniqueness problem of entire functions concerning their linear differential polynomial in shift and obtain three results which improve and generalize the recent result due to Qi (Ann. Polon. Math., 102 (2011), 129-142.) in a large extend.

## 1. Introduction and main results

We assume that the reader is familiar with standard notation and main results of Nevanlinna Theory (see [10, 34]). By  $S(r, f)$  we denote any quantity that satisfies the condition  $S(r, f) = o(T(r, f))$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  possibly outside of an exceptional set of finite linear measure. A meromorphic function  $a$  is said to be a small function of  $f$  if  $T(r, a) = S(r, f)$  and we denote by  $S(f)$  the set of functions which are small compared to  $f$ . Moreover, we use notations  $\rho(f)$  and  $\rho_1(f)$  for the order and the hyper-order of a meromorphic function  $f$  respectively. As usual, the abbreviation CM means “counting multiplicities”, while IM means “ignoring multiplicities”.

Let  $k, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $a_1, a_2 \in S(f)$ . Denote by  $S_{(m,n)}(a_1)$  the set of those points  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $z$  is an  $a_1$ -point of  $f$  of order  $m$  and an  $a_1$ -point of  $g$  of order  $n$ . The set  $S_{(m,n)}(a_2)$  can be defined similarly. Let  $\overline{N}_{(m,n)}(r, a_i; f)$  denote the reduced counting function of  $f$  with respect to the set  $S_{(m,n)}(a_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

The research on the uniqueness problem of meromorphic function sharing values or small functions with its derivatives is an active field and the study is based on the Nevanlinna value distribution theory. The research on this topic was started by Rubel and Yang [31]. Now we state their result.

**Theorem A.** [31] *Let  $f$  be a non-constant entire function and  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $b \neq a$ . If  $f$  and  $f'$  share  $a$  and  $b$  CM, then  $f \equiv f'$ .*

Mues and Steinmetz [27] further generalized Theorem A from sharing values CM to IM and obtained the following result.

**Theorem B.** [27] *Let  $f$  be a non-constant entire function and  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $b \neq a$ . If  $f$  and  $f'$  share  $a$  and  $b$  IM, then  $f \equiv f'$ .*

Recently the uniqueness of meromorphic functions sharing values with their shifts or difference operators has become a subject of great interest. Now, we recall the following result due to Heittokangas et al. [12], which is shift analogue of Theorem A.

**Theorem C.** [12] *Let  $f$  be a non-constant entire function of finite order,  $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$  be distinct. If  $f(z)$  and  $f(z+c)$  share  $a$  and  $b$  CM, then  $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$ .*

In 2011, Qi [28] further improved Theorem C and obtained the following result.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification:* Primary 30D35 and Secondary 39B32

*Key words and phrases:* Entire function, Shift, difference operator, finite order.

\**Corresponding Author:* Jeet Sarkar.

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

**Theorem D.** [28] *Let  $f$  be a non-constant entire function of finite order,  $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$  be distinct. If  $f(z)$  and  $f(z+c)$  share  $a$  and  $b$  IM, then  $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$ .*

The the time-delay differential equation

$$f'(x) = f(x - k),$$

$k > 0$  is well known and extensively studied in real analysis, which have numerous applications ranging from cell growth models to current collection systems for an electric locomotive to wavelets. For a complex variable counterpart, Liu and Dong [14] studied the complex differential-difference equation  $f'(z) = f(z+c)$ , where  $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Recently, many authors have started to consider the sharing values problems of meromorphic functions with their difference operators or shifts. Some results were considered in [1], [2], [3], [4], [7], [8], [9], [11]-[14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20], [21], [22], [23], [24], [25], [28]-[30], [32].

We now introduce a linear differential polynomial as follows

$$\mathcal{L}_k(f) = b_0 f + b_1 f' + \dots + b_k f^{(k)},$$

where  $c \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $b_j \in S(f)$  such that  $(b_0, b_1, \dots, b_k) \neq (0, 0, \dots, 0)$ .

In the paper, we have extended and improved Theorem D in the following three directions:

- (1) We replace  $f(z+c)$  by  $\mathcal{L}_k(f(z+c))$  in Theorem D.
- (2) We consider  $a$  and  $b$  as the small functions of  $f$  in Theorem D.
- (3) We replace  $\rho(f) < +\infty$  by  $\rho_1(f) < 1$  in Theorem D.

Now we state our results.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $f$  be a non-constant entire function with  $\rho_1(f) < 1$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $a_1, a_2 \in S(f)$  be distinct such that either  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are  $c$ -periodic or  $a'_1 - a'_2$  is non-constant. Let*

$$\phi = \frac{((a'_1 - a'_2)(f - a_1) - (a_1 - a_2)(f' - a'_1))(f - \mathcal{L}_k(f(z+c)))}{(f - a_1)(f - a_2)}. \quad (1.1)$$

*If  $f(z)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_k(f(z+c))$  share  $a_1, a_2$  IM, then either  $f(z) \equiv \mathcal{L}_k(f(z+c))$  or  $\sum_{i=1}^k b_i \psi_i = -b_0$ , where  $\psi_1(z) = (a'_1(z+c) - a'_2(z+c) - \phi(z+c))/(a_1(z+c) - a_2(z+c))$  and  $\psi_{i+1} = \psi'_i + \psi_1 \psi_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ .*

When  $a_1, a_2$  and  $b_0, b_1, \dots, b_k$  are constant, we have the following.

**Corollary 1.1.** *Let  $f$  be a non-constant entire function with  $\rho_1(f) < 1$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{C}$  be distinct. Let  $b_0, b_1, \dots, b_k \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $(b_0, b_1, \dots, b_k) \neq (0, 0, \dots, 0)$  and  $\phi$  be defined as in (1.1). If  $f(z)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_k(f(z+c))$  share  $a_1, a_2$  IM, then either  $f(z) \equiv \mathcal{L}_k(f(z+c))$  or  $\sum_{i=1}^k b_i \psi_i = -b_0$ , where  $\psi_1(z) = -\phi(z+c)/(a_1 - a_2)$  is a constant and  $\psi_{i+1} = \psi'_i + \psi_1 \psi_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ .*

When  $(b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k) = (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$ , we have the following.

**Corollary 1.2.** *Let  $f$  be a non-constant entire function with  $\rho_1(f) < 1$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $a_1, a_2 \in S(f)$  be distinct such that either  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are  $c$ -periodic or  $a'_1 - a'_2$  is non-constant. If  $f(z)$  and  $f(z+c)$  share  $a_1, a_2$  IM, then  $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$ .*

When  $(b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k) = (0, 0, 0, \dots, 1)$ , we have the following.

**Corollary 1.3.** *Let  $f$  be a non-constant entire function with  $\rho_1(f) < 1$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $a_1, a_2 \in S(f)$  be distinct such that either  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are  $c$ -periodic or  $a'_1 - a'_2$  is non-constant. If  $f(z)$  and  $f^{(k)}(z+c)$  share  $a_1, a_2$  IM, then  $f(z) \equiv f^{(k)}(z+c)$ .*

Following examples show that the condition “ $\rho_1(f) < 1$ ” in Theorem 1.1 is necessary.

**Example 1.1.** Let  $f(z) = e^{\sin z}$ ,  $c = \pi$ ,  $a_1(z) = 1$ ,  $a_2(z) = -1$ ,  $b_0(z) = \frac{1}{4}$  and  $b_1(z) = -\frac{3}{4\cos z}$ . Clearly  $\rho_1(f) = 1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_1(f(z+c)) = b_0(z)f(z+c) + b_1(z)f'(z+c) = e^{-\sin z}$ . Now from (1.1), we see that  $\phi(z) = -2\cos z$  and so  $\psi_1(z) = (a'_1(z+c) - a'_2(z+c) - \phi(z+c))/(a_1(z+c) - a_2(z+c)) = \cos z$ , but  $b_1(z)\psi_1(z) = -\frac{3}{4} \neq -b_0(z)$ . Clearly  $f(z)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_1(f(z+c))$  share 1 and  $-1$  CM, but  $f$  does not satisfy any case of Theorem 1.1.

**Example 1.2.** Let  $f(z) = e^{e^z}$ ,  $c = \pi i$ ,  $a_1 = 1$  and  $a_2(z) = -e^z$ . Note that  $\rho_1(f) = 1$ . Clearly  $f(z)$  and  $f'(z+c)$  share  $a_1, a_2$  IM, but  $f(z) \not\equiv f'(z+c)$ .

Following example asserts that condition “ $a_1, a_2(\neq \infty)$ ” is sharp in Theorem 1.1.

**Example 1.3.** Let  $f(z) = \sin z$ ,  $c = \pi$ ,  $a_1(z) = 0$  and  $a_2(z) = \infty$ . Clearly  $\rho_1(f) = 0 < 1$  and  $f(z)$  and  $f(z+c)$  share  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ , but  $f(z) \not\equiv f(z+c)$ .

Following example shows that Theorem 1.1 does not hold for non-constant meromorphic function  $f$  with  $N(r, f) \neq S(r, f)$ .

**Example 1.4.** Let  $f(z) = \frac{e^z+1}{e^z-1}$ ,  $e^c = -1$ ,  $a_1 = 1$  and  $a_2 = -1$ . Note that  $\rho_1(f) = 0 < 1$  and  $N(r, f) \neq S(r, f)$ . Clearly  $f(z)$  and  $f(z+c)$  share  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  CM, but  $f(z) \not\equiv f(z+c)$ .

## 2. Auxiliary lemmas

In the proof of Lemma 2.4 below, we make use of three key lemmas. For the convenience of the reader, we recall these lemmas here.

**Lemma 2.1.** [35] If  $f$  and  $g$  are non-constant meromorphic functions, then

$$N(r, f/g) - N(r, g/f) = N(r, f) + N(r, 0; g) - N(r, g) - N(r, 0; f).$$

**Lemma 2.2.** [9] Let  $f$  be a non-constant meromorphic function with  $\rho_1(f) < 1$  and  $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Then

$$m\left(r, \frac{f(z+c)}{f(z)}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{f(z)}{f(z+c)}\right) = S(r, f)$$

for all  $r$  outside of a possible exceptional set  $E$  with finite logarithmic measure.

Combining the lemma of logarithmic derivatives with Lemma 2.2, the key result for meromorphic function  $f$  with  $\rho_1(f) < 1$  is easily obtained

$$m\left(r, \frac{f^{(k)}(z+c)}{f(z)}\right) \leq m\left(r, \frac{f^{(k)}(z+c)}{f(z+c)}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{f(z+c)}{f(z)}\right) = S(r, f) \quad (2.1)$$

for all  $r$  outside of a possible exceptional set  $E$  with finite logarithmic measure, where  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** [32] Let  $f$  be a non-constant meromorphic function with  $\rho_1(f) < 1$  and  $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Then  $T(r, f(z+c)) = T(r, f) + S(r, f)$  and  $N(r, f(z+c)) = N(r, f) + S(r, f)$ .

We define  $g(z) = \mathcal{L}_k(f(z+c))$  and the following auxiliary functions

$$\psi = \frac{\delta(g)(f-g)}{(g-a_1)(g-a_2)}, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\delta(g) = (a'_1 - a'_2)(g - a_1) - (a_1 - a_2)(g' - a'_1) = (a'_1 - a'_2)(g - a_2) - (a_1 - a_2)(g' - a'_2)$ ,

$$H_{nm} = n\phi - m\psi \text{ and } H = \frac{\delta(f)}{(f-a_1)(f-a_2)} - \frac{\delta(g)}{(g-a_1)(g-a_2)}, \text{ where } m, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $f$  be a non-constant entire function with  $\rho_1(f) < 1$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $a_1, a_2 \in S(f)$  be distinct. If  $f$  and  $g$  share  $a_1, a_2$  IM and  $T(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f)$ , then  $f \equiv g$ .

*Proof.* If  $f \equiv g$ , then the proof is trivial. In the following, we assume that  $f \not\equiv g$ . Using second fundamental theorem for small functions (see [33]), we get  $T(r, f) \leq \overline{N}(r, a_1; f) + \overline{N}(r, a_2; f) + S(r, f)$ . Note that  $\sum_{i=1}^2 \overline{N}(r, a_i; f) \leq N(r, 0; f - g)$  and so from (2.1), we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \overline{N}(r, a_i; f) \leq T(r, f - g) + S(r, f) \leq m(r, f - g) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, f) + S(r, f). \quad (2.3)$$

Therefore

$$T(r, f) = \overline{N}(r, a_1; f) + \overline{N}(r, a_2; f) + S(r, f). \quad (2.4)$$

If possible, suppose  $\delta(g) \equiv 0$ . Then  $\frac{g' - a_1'}{g - a_1} \equiv \frac{a_1' - a_2'}{a_1 - a_2}$  and so  $g \equiv a_1 + c_0(a_1 - a_2)$ , where  $c_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Since  $T(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f)$ , we have  $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore  $\delta(g) \not\equiv 0$ . Similarly  $\delta(f) \not\equiv 0$ . Consequently  $\phi \not\equiv 0$  and  $\psi \not\equiv 0$ . Also by the given condition, it is easy to get  $N(r, \phi) = S(r, f)$ . Note that

$$m\left(r, \frac{\delta(f)}{(f - a_1)(f - a_2)}\right) = m\left(r, \frac{1}{a_1 - a_2} \left(\frac{\delta(f)}{f - a_1} - \frac{\delta(f)}{f - a_2}\right)\right) \leq S(r, f).$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\frac{\delta(f)f}{(f - a_1)(f - a_2)} = \frac{\delta(f)}{f - a_1} + \frac{a_2\delta(f)}{(f - a_1)(f - a_2)} \text{ and so } m\left(r, \frac{\delta(f)f}{(f - a_1)(f - a_2)}\right) = S(r, f).$$

Clearly

$$\phi = \frac{\delta(f)f}{(f - a_1)(f - a_2)} \left(1 - \frac{g}{f}\right) \quad (2.5)$$

and so from (2.1), we get  $m(r, \phi) = S(r, f)$ . Therefore  $T(r, \phi) = S(r, f)$ . Again from (2.5), we get  $m(r, 0; f) = S(r, f)$ . Let  $a_3 = a_1 + l(a_1 - a_2)$ , where  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then in view of (2.4) and using second fundamental theorem for small functions (see [33]), we get

$$2T(r, f) \leq \overline{N}(r, a_1; f) + \overline{N}(r, a_2; f) + \overline{N}(r, a_3; f) + S(r, f) \leq 2T(r, f) - m(r, a_3; f) + S(r, f),$$

i.e.,  $m(r, a_3; f) = S(r, f)$ . Therefore

$$m(r, 0; f) + m(r, a_3; f) = S(r, f). \quad (2.6)$$

Also in view of (2.4) and using second fundamental theorem for small functions (see [33]), we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2T(r, g) &\leq \overline{N}(r, a_1; g) + \overline{N}(r, a_2; g) + \overline{N}(r, a_3; g) + S(r, f) \\ &= \overline{N}(r, a_1; f) + \overline{N}(r, a_2; f) + T(r, g) - m(r, a_3; g) + S(r, f) \\ &= T(r, f) + T(r, g) - m(r, a_3; g) + S(r, f) = 2T(r, g) - m(r, a_3; g) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

from which we get

$$m(r, a_3; g) = S(r, f). \quad (2.7)$$

Now from (2.1) and (2.6), we get

$$m\left(r, \frac{g - a_3}{f - a_3}\right) \leq m\left(r, \frac{\mathcal{L}_k(f(z + c) - a_3(z + c))}{f - a_3}\right) + m(r, a_3; f) + S(r, f) = S(r, f),$$

i.e.,

$$m\left(r, \frac{g - a_3}{f - a_3}\right) = S(r, f). \quad (2.8)$$

Noting that  $T(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f)$  and so using Lemma 2.1, (2.6)-(2.8), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 m\left(r, \frac{f-a_3}{g-a_3}\right) &= T\left(r, \frac{f-a_3}{g-a_3}\right) - N\left(r, \frac{f-a_3}{g-a_3}\right) \\
 &= T\left(r, \frac{g-a_3}{f-a_3}\right) - N\left(r, \frac{f-a_3}{g-a_3}\right) + O(1) \\
 &= N\left(r, \frac{g-a_3}{f-a_3}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{g-a_3}{f-a_3}\right) - N\left(r, \frac{f-a_3}{g-a_3}\right) + O(1) \\
 &= N\left(r, \frac{g-a_3}{f-a_3}\right) - N\left(r, \frac{f-a_3}{g-a_3}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &= N(r, a_3; f) - N(r, a_3; g) + S(r, f) = T(r, f) - T(r, g) + S(r, f) = S(r, f),
 \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$m\left(r, \frac{f-a_3}{g-a_3}\right) = S(r, f). \quad (2.9)$$

Note that

$$\frac{\delta(g)(g-\alpha)}{(g-a_1)(g-a_2)} = \frac{\delta(g)}{g-a_1} + \frac{(a_2-\alpha)\delta(g)}{(g-a_1)(g-a_2)},$$

where  $\alpha$  is an arbitrary small function of  $f$  and so

$$m\left(r, \frac{\delta(g)(g-\alpha)}{(g-a_1)(g-a_2)}\right) = S(r, f). \quad (2.10)$$

Then from (2.9) and (2.10), we have

$$m(r, \psi) \leq m\left(r, \frac{\delta(g)(g-a_3)}{(g-a_1)(g-a_2)}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{f-a_3}{g-a_3}\right) + O(1) \leq S(r, f),$$

i.e.,  $m(r, \psi) = S(r, f)$ . Since  $f$  and  $g$  share  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  IM, we get  $N(r, \psi) = S(r, f)$  and so  $T(r, \psi) = S(r, f)$ . We now consider following two cases.

**Case 1.** Let  $H_{nm} \equiv 0$ . Then (1.1) and (2.2) give  $n\left(\frac{f'-a'_1}{f-a_1} - \frac{f-a'_2}{f-a_2}\right) \equiv m\left(\frac{g'-a'_1}{g-a_1} - \frac{g-a'_2}{g-a_2}\right)$ . On integration, we get  $\left(\frac{f-a_1}{f-a_2}\right)^n \equiv c_1\left(\frac{g-a_1}{g-a_2}\right)^m$ ,  $c_1 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . If  $n \neq m$ , then by Mohon'ko lemma [26], we get  $n T(r, f) = m T(r, g) + S(r, f)$ , which is impossible as  $T(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f)$ . Hence  $n = m$  and so  $\frac{f-a_1}{f-a_2} \equiv c_2 \frac{g-a_1}{g-a_2}$ , where  $c_2 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Since  $f \not\equiv g$ , we have  $c_2 \neq 1$  and so  $\frac{1-c_2}{c_2} \frac{f-a_4}{f-a_2} \equiv \frac{a_2-a_1}{g-a_2}$ , where  $a_4 = \frac{a_1-a_2c_2}{1-c_2}$  such that  $a_4 \not\equiv a_1, a_2$ . Since  $f$  is a non-constant entire function and  $f, g$  share  $a_2$  IM, we get  $N(r, a_4; f) = S(r, f)$ . Also we have  $F + \frac{c_2}{1-c_2} = \frac{f-a_4}{a_2-a_1}$ , where  $F = \frac{f-a_1}{a_2-a_1}$ . Then in view of the second fundamental theorem and using (2.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 2T(r, f) &\leq \overline{N}(r, \infty, F) + \overline{N}(r, 0, F) + \overline{N}(r, 1; F) + \overline{N}\left(r, -\frac{c_2}{1-c_2}; F\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &= \overline{N}(r, a_1; f) + \overline{N}(r, a_2; f) + S(r, f) = T(r, f) + S(r, f),
 \end{aligned}$$

which is impossible.

**Case 2.** Let  $H_{nm} \not\equiv 0$  for all  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $z_{m,n} \in S_{(m,n)}(a_1) \cup S_{(m,n)}(a_2)$  such that  $a_1(z_{m,n}), a_2(z_{m,n}) \neq 0, \infty$  and  $a_1(z_{m,n}) - a_2(z_{m,n}) \neq 0$ . Now from (1.1) and (2.2), we get

$$H_{nm} = (f-g) \left[ \left( n \frac{f'-a'_2}{f-a_2} - m \frac{g'-a'_2}{g-a_2} \right) - \left( n \frac{f'-a'_1}{f-a_1} - m \frac{g'-a'_1}{g-a_1} \right) \right]. \quad (2.11)$$

Then from (2.11), we get  $H_{nm}(z_{m,n}) = 0$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{N}_{(m,n)}(r, a_1; f) + \overline{N}_{(m,n)}(r, a_2; f) &\leq N(r, 0; H_{nm}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \phi) + T(r, \psi) + S(r, f) = S(r, f)\end{aligned}$$

and so from (2.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned}T(r, f) &= \overline{N}(r, a_1; f) + \overline{N}(r, a_2; f) + S(r, f) \\ &= \sum_{m,n} (\overline{N}_{(m,n)}(r, a_1; f) + \overline{N}_{(m,n)}(r, a_2; f)) + S(r, f) \\ &= \sum_{m+n \geq 5} (\overline{N}_{(m,n)}(r, a_1; f) + \overline{N}_{(m,n)}(r, a_2; f)) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{5} (N(r, a_1; f) + N(r, a_1; g) + N(r, a_2; f) + N(r, a_2; g)) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{5} (T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + S(r, f) = \frac{4}{5} T(r, f) + S(r, f),\end{aligned}$$

which is impossible.  $\square$

### 3. Proofs of the main results

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** We know that  $f$  and  $g$  share  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  IM, where  $a_1, a_2 \in S(f)$  are distinct such that either  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are  $c$ -periodic or  $a'_1 - a'_2$  is non-constant.

Now we divide the following two cases.

**Case 1.** Let  $\phi \neq 0$ , where  $\phi$  be defined by (1.1). Clearly  $f \neq g$ . Now from the proof of Lemma 2.4, we have  $\delta(f) \neq 0$  and  $T(r, \phi) = S(r, f)$ . Consequently  $\psi \neq 0$ , where  $\psi$  is defined by (2.2).

Denote by  $\overline{N}(r, a_1; f, g | \geq 2)$  the reduced counting function of multiple 0-points of  $f - a_1$  and  $g - a_1$ .

Let  $z_{p,q} \in S_{(p,q)}(a_1)$  (or  $S_{(p,q)}(a_2)$ ) such that  $p \geq 2$  and  $q \geq 2$ . Then from (1.1), one can easily conclude that  $z_{p,q}$  is a zero of  $\phi$ . Also from the proof of Lemma 2.4, we have  $T(r, \phi) = S(r, f)$  and so

$$\overline{N}(r, a_1; f, g | \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, a_2; f, g | \geq 2) = S(r, f). \quad (3.1)$$

Denote by  $N(r, 0; f - g | f \neq a_1, a_2)$  the counting function of those 0-points of  $f - g$  which are neither the 0-points of  $f - a_1$  nor the 0-points of  $f - a_2$ . Also we denote by  $\overline{N}_{(l+1)}(r, 0; f - g | f = a_1, a_2)$  the reduced counting function of those 0-points of  $f - g$  with multiplicity greater than  $l$  which are the 0-points of both  $f - a_1$  and  $f - a_2$ .

Now from (1.1), we can easily deduce that

$$\overline{N}_{(2)}(r, 0; f - g | f = a_1, a_2) + N(r, 0; \delta(f)(f - g) | f \neq a_1, a_2) = S(r, f). \quad (3.2)$$

Rewriting (1.1), we get

$$f' = \frac{\beta_{1,2}f^2 + \beta_{1,1}f + \beta_{1,0} + P_1}{f - g},$$

where  $\beta_{1,2} = \frac{a'_1 - a'_2 - \phi}{a_1 - a_2}$ ,  $\beta_{1,1} = a'_1 - a_1 \frac{a'_1 - a'_2}{a_1 - a_2} + \frac{(a_1 + a_2)\phi}{a_1 - a_2}$ ,  $\beta_{1,0} = -\frac{\phi a_1 a_2}{a_1 - a_2}$  and  $P_1 = -\frac{a'_1 - a'_2}{a_1 - a_2} f g - (a'_1 - a_1 \frac{a'_1 - a'_2}{a_1 - a_2}) g$ . Note that

$$f'(z + c) = \frac{\alpha_{1,2}f^2(z + c) + \alpha_{1,1}f(z + c) + \alpha_{1,0} + Q_1}{f(z + c) - g(z + c)}, \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\alpha_{1,j}(z) = \beta_{1,j}(z + c)$ ,  $j = 0, 1, 2$  and  $Q_1(z) = P_1(z + c)$ .

We now divide following two sub-cases.

**Sub-case 1.1.** Let  $\phi \not\equiv a'_1 - a'_2$ . Certainly  $\alpha_{1,2} \not\equiv 0$ . Now by induction and using (3.3) repeatedly, we obtain the following

$$f^{(i)}(z+c) = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{2i} \alpha_{i,j} f^j(z+c) + Q_i}{(f(z+c) - g(z+c))^{2i-1}}, i = 1, 2, \dots, k, \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$Q_i = Q_i(f, g, g', \dots, g^{(i-1)}) = \sum_{\substack{l < 2i \\ l+j_1+j_2+\dots+j_k \leq 2i}} \beta_{l,j_1,j_2,\dots,j_k} f^l(g)^{j_1} (g')^{j_2} \dots (g^{(2i-1)})^{j_k}. \quad (3.5)$$

Here  $\alpha_{k,j}, \beta_{l,j_1,j_2,\dots,j_k} \in S(f)$  and  $\psi_p := \alpha_{p,2p}$  satisfies the recurrence formula

$$\psi_1 = \alpha_{1,2}, \psi_{p+1} = \psi'_p + \psi_1 \psi_p, p = 1, 2, \dots, k-1. \quad (3.6)$$

Now using (3.4), we get

$$g(z) = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{2k} \gamma_j(z+c) f^j(z+c) + Q(z+c)}{(f(z+c) - g(z+c))^{2k-1}}, \quad (3.7)$$

where  $\gamma_j \in S(f)$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{2k}(z+c) &= b_0(z+c) + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i(z+c) \psi_i(z+c) \text{ and} \\ Q &= \sum_{\substack{l < 2i \\ l+j_1+j_2+\dots+j_k \leq 2k}} \zeta_{l,j_1,j_2,\dots,j_k} f^l(g)^{j_1} (g')^{j_2} \dots (g^{(i-1)})^{j_k}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Clearly  $\zeta_{l,j_1,j_2,\dots,j_k} \in S(f)$ . If  $\gamma_{2k} \equiv 0$ , then the proof is done. Next suppose  $\gamma_{2k} \not\equiv 0$ . Then from (3.7), we get

$$\sum_{j=0}^{2k} \gamma_j f^j(z+c) = g(z) (f(z+c) - g(z+c))^{2k-1} - Q(z+c). \quad (3.9)$$

Using (2.1), (2.6), (3.8) and the lemma of the logarithmic derivative, we deduce that

$$m\left(r, \frac{Q(z+c)}{f^{2k-1}(z+c)g}\right) = S(r, f). \quad (3.10)$$

Now from (2.1), (3.9) and (3.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & 2kT(r, f(z+c)) \\ &= T\left(r, \sum_{j=0}^{2k} \gamma_j f^j(z+c)\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m\left(r, \left(1 - \frac{g(z+c)}{f(z+c)}\right)^{2k-1} - \frac{Q(z+c)}{f^{2k-1}(z+c)g}\right) + m(r, f^{2k-1}(z+c)g) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m(r, f^{2k-1}(z+c)g) + S(r, f) \leq (2k-1)T(r, f(z+c)) + T(r, g(z)) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,  $T(r, f(z+c)) \leq T(r, g) + S(r, f)$  and so by Lemma 2.2, we get  $T(r, f) \leq T(r, g) + S(r, f)$ . Again (2.1) yields

$$T(r, g) = m(r, g) \leq m(r, f) + S(r, f) = T(r, f) + S(r, f). \quad (3.11)$$

Hence  $T(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f)$  and so from Lemma 2.4, we get  $f \equiv g$ , which is absurd.

**Sub-case 1.2.** Let  $\phi \equiv a'_1 - a'_2$ . If  $a'_1 - a'_2$  is not constant, then  $a''_1 \not\equiv a''_2$ . Next we suppose  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are  $c$ -periodic. We claim that  $a''_1 \not\equiv a''_2$ . If not, suppose  $a''_1 \equiv a''_2$ . On integration, we get  $a_1 - a_2 = c_0 z + c_1$ , where  $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $(c_0, c_1) \neq (0, 0)$ . Since  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are

$c$ -periodic,  $a_1 - a_2$  is also  $c$ -periodic. As  $a_1 - a_2$  is a polynomial, we see that  $a_1 - a_2$  is a constant. Then  $\phi \equiv 0$ , which is absurd. Hence  $a_1'' \neq a_2''$ . Differentiating (1.1) once, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & ((a_1'' - a_2'')(f - a_1) - (a_1 - a_2)(f'' - a_1''))(f - g) \\ & + ((a_1' - a_2')(f - a_1) - (a_1 - a_2)(f' - a_1'))(f' - g') \\ = & \phi'(f - a_1)(f - a_2) + \phi(f' - a_1')(f - a_2) + \phi(f - a_1)(f' - a_2'), \text{ i.e.,} \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & (a_1'' - a_2'')(f - a_1)^2 - (a_1'' - a_2'')(f - a_1)(g - a_1) - (a_1 - a_2)(f - a_1)(g'' - a_1'') \\ & + (a_1 - a_2)(g'' - a_1'')(g - a_1) + (a_1' - a_2')(f - a_1)(f' - a_1') \\ & - (a_1' - a_2')(f - a_1)((g' - a_1') - (a_1 - a_2)(f' - a_1'))^2 + (a_1 - a_2)(f' - a_1')((g' - a_1')) \\ = & (a_1'' - a_2'')(f - a_1)(f - a_2) + (a_1' - a_2')(f' - a_1')(f - a_2) + (a_1' - a_2')(f - a_1)(f' - a_2'). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Let  $z_{p,1} \in S_{(p,1)}(a_1)$  ( $p \geq 2$ ) such that  $a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1}) \neq 0, \infty$  and  $a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1}) \neq 0$ . Then in some neighbourhood of  $z_{p,1}$ , we get by Taylor's expansion

$$\begin{cases} f(z) - a_1(z) &= \tilde{b}_p(z - z_{p,1})^p + \tilde{b}_{p+1}(z - z_{p,1})^{p+1} + \dots (\tilde{b}_p \neq 0), \\ g(z) - a_1(z) &= c_1(z - z_{p,1}) + c_2(z - z_{p,1})^2 + \dots (c_1 \neq 0), \\ \phi(z) &= d_0 + d_1(z - z_{p,1}) + d_2(z - z_{p,1})^2 + \dots (d_0 \neq 0). \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

Clearly

$$\begin{cases} f'(z) - a_1'(z) &= p\tilde{b}_p(z - z_{p,1})^{p-1} + (p+1)\tilde{b}_{p+1}(z - z_{p,1})^p + \dots, \\ f''(z) - a_1''(z) &= p(p-1)\tilde{b}_p(z - z_{p,1})^{p-2} + p(p+1)\tilde{b}_{p+1}(z - z_{p,1})^{p-1} + \dots, \\ g'(z) - a_1'(z) &= c_1 + 2c_2(z - z_{p,1}) + \dots, \\ g''(z) - a_1''(z) &= 2c_2 + 6c_3(z - z_{p,1}) + \dots, \\ \phi'(z) &= d_1 + 2d_2(z - z_{p,1}) + 3d_3(z - z_{p,1})^2 \dots, \\ \phi''(z) &= 2d_2 + 6d_3(z - z_{p,1}) \dots \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

Now from (3.12), (3.14) and (3.15), we get

$$d_0 = pc_1, \text{ i.e., } g'(z_{p,1}) - a_1'(z_{p,1}) = c_1 = \frac{\phi(z_{p,1})}{p} = \frac{a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1})}{p}. \quad (3.16)$$

It is easy to calculate, from (3.13)-(3.16) that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\tilde{b}_p c_2 p^2 (p+1)(a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1})) - \tilde{b}_p (a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1}))^2 \\ & + \tilde{b}_{p+1} (p+1)^2 (a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1}))(a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1})) \\ & - p\tilde{b}_p ((a_1''(z_{p,1}) - a_2''(z_{p,1}))(a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1})) + (a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1}))^2) \\ & - \tilde{b}_{p+1} p (p+1)(a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1}))(a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1}))) (z - z_{p,1})^p \\ & + O((z - z_{p,1})^{p+1}) \equiv 0, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\tilde{b}_p c_2 p^2 (p+1)(a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1})) - \tilde{b}_p (a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1}))^2 \\ & + \tilde{b}_{p+1} (p+1)^2 (a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1}))(a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1})) \\ & - p\tilde{b}_p ((a_1''(z_{p,1}) - a_2''(z_{p,1}))(a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1})) + (a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1}))^2) \\ & - \tilde{b}_{p+1} p (p+1)(a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1}))(a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1}))) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$



Differentiating (3.12), once we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& ((a_1''' - a_2''')(f - a_1) + (a_1'' - a_2'')(f' - a_1') - (a_1' - a_2')(g'' - a_1'') - (a_1 - a_2)(g''' - a_1''')) \times \\
& (f - g) + 2((a_1'' - a_2'')(f - a_1) - (a_1 - a_2)(g'' - a_1''))(f' - g') \\
& + ((a_1' - a_2')(f - a_1) - (a_1 - a_2)(f' - a_1'))(f'' - g'') \\
= & \phi''(f - a_1)(f - a_2) + 2\phi'(f' - a_1')(f - a_2) + 2\phi'(f - a_1)(f' - a_2') \\
& + \phi(f'' - a_1'')(f - a_2) + 2\phi(f' - a_1')(f' - a_2') + \phi(f - a_1)(f'' - a_2'')
\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}
& (a_1''' - a_2''')(f - a_1)^2 - (a_1''' - a_2''')(f - a_1)(g - a_1) + (a_1'' - a_2'')(f - a_1)(f' - a_1') \\
& - (a_1'' - a_2'')(f' - a_1')(g - a_1) - (a_1' - a_2')(f - a_1)(g'' - a_1'') + (a_1' - a_2')(g'' - a_1'')(g - a_1) \\
& - (a_1 - a_2)(f - a_1)(g''' - a_1''') + (a_1 - a_2)(g''' - a_1''')(g - a_1) + 2(a_1'' - a_2'')(f - a_1)(f' - a_1') \\
& - 2(a_1'' - a_2'')(f - a_1)((g' - a_1') - 2(a_1 - a_2)(f' - a_1')(g'' - a_1'') + (a_1' - a_2')(f - a_1)(g'' - a_1'')) \\
& + 2(a_1 - a_2)(g'' - a_1'')((g' - a_1') - (a_1' - a_2')(f - a_1)(g'' - a_1'')) \\
& - (a_1 - a_2)(f' - a_1')(g'' - a_1'') + (a_1 - a_2)(f' - a_1')((g'' - a_1'')) \\
= & (a_1''' - a_2''')(f - a_1)(f - a_2) + 2(a_1'' - a_2'')(f' - a_1')(f - a_2) + 2(a_1'' - a_2'')(f - a_1)(f' - a_2') \\
& + (a_1' - a_2')(g'' - a_1'')(f - a_2) + 2(a_1' - a_2')(f' - a_1')(f' - a_2') + (a_1' - a_2')(f - a_1)(g'' - a_1'').
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

It is easy to calculate, from (3.14)-(3.16) and (3.18) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\tilde{b}_p c_2 p^2 (p+1)(a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1})) + \tilde{b}_p (p-1)(a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1}))^2 \\
& + \tilde{b}_{p+1} (p+1)^2 (a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1}))(a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1})) \\
& - 2p\tilde{b}_p ((a_1''(z_{p,1}) - a_2''(z_{p,1}))(a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1})) + (a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1}))^2) \\
& - \tilde{b}_{p+1} p (p+1)(a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1}))(a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1}))) (z - z_{p,1})^{p-1} \\
& + O((z - z_{p,1})^p) \equiv 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{b}_p c_2 p^2 (p+1)(a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1})) + \tilde{b}_p (p-1)(a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1}))^2 \\
& + \tilde{b}_{p+1} (p+1)^2 (a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1}))(a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1})) \\
& - 2p\tilde{b}_p ((a_1''(z_{p,1}) - a_2''(z_{p,1}))(a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1})) + (a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1}))^2) \\
& - \tilde{b}_{p+1} p (p+1)(a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1}))(a_1'(z_{p,1}) - a_2'(z_{p,1})) = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Now from (3.17) and (3.19), we have

$$\tilde{b}_p p (a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1}))(a_1''(z_{p,1}) - a_2''(z_{p,1})) = 0. \tag{3.20}$$

Since  $\tilde{b}_p \neq 0$  and  $a_1(z_{p,1}) - a_2(z_{p,1}) \neq 0, \infty$ , from (3.20), we get  $a_1''(z_{p,1}) - a_2''(z_{p,1}) = 0$ . As  $a_1'' \neq a_2''$ , we deduce that

$$\sum_{p \geq 2} \overline{N}_{(p,1)}(r, a_1; f) \leq N(r, 0; a_1'' - a_2'') \leq S(r, f). \tag{3.21}$$

Let  $\hat{z}_{p,1} \in S_{(p,1)}(a_2)$  ( $p \geq 2$ ) such that  $\phi(\hat{z}_{p,1}) \neq 0, \infty$  and  $a_1(\hat{z}_{p,1}) - a_2(\hat{z}_{p,1}) \neq 0, \infty$ . Then in some neighbourhood of  $\hat{z}_{p,1}$ , we get by Taylor's expansion

$$\begin{cases} f(z) - a_2(z) &= \hat{b}_p (z - \hat{z}_{p,1})^p + \hat{b}_{p+1} (z - \hat{z}_{p,1})^{p+1} + \dots (\hat{b}_p \neq 0), \\ g(z) - a_2(z) &= \hat{c}_1 (z - \hat{z}_{p,1})^q + \hat{c}_2 (z - \hat{z}_{p,1})^2 + \dots (\hat{c}_1 \neq 0), \\ \phi(z) &= \hat{d}_0 + \hat{d}_1 (z - \hat{z}_{p,q}) + \hat{d}_2 (z - \hat{z}_{p,q})^2 + \dots (\hat{d}_0 \neq 0). \end{cases} \tag{3.22}$$

Similarly, we get

$$g'(\hat{z}_{p,1}) - a'_2(\hat{z}_{p,1}) = \hat{c}_1 = -\frac{\phi(\hat{z}_{p,1})}{p} = -\frac{a'_1(\hat{z}_{p,1}) - a'_2(\hat{z}_{p,1})}{p}.$$

Now proceeding in the same way as done above and using (3.22) instead of (3.14), we can conclude that  $a''_1(\hat{z}_{p,1}) - a''_2(\hat{z}_{p,1}) = 0$  and so

$$\sum_{p \geq 2} \bar{N}_{(p,1)}(r, a_2; f) \leq N(r, 0; a''_1 - a''_2) \leq S(r, f). \quad (3.23)$$

Therefore from (3.1), (3.21) and (3.23), we get

$$\bar{N}_{(2)}(r, a_1; f) + \bar{N}_{(2)}(r, a_2; f) \leq \sum_{p \geq 2} (\bar{N}_{(p,1)}(r, a_1; f) + \bar{N}_{(p,1)}(r, a_2; f)) = S(r, f). \quad (3.24)$$

On the other hand from (1.1), we get  $f - g = \frac{(a'_1 - a'_2)(f - a_1)(f - a_2)}{\delta(f)}$  and so

$$g - a_1 = \frac{-(a_1 - a_2)(f - a_1)(f' - a'_2)}{\delta(f)} \text{ and } g - a_2 = \frac{-(a_1 - a_2)(f - a_2)(f' - a'_1)}{\delta(f)}. \quad (3.25)$$

Let

$$\varphi_1 = \frac{f - g}{(f - a_1)(f - a_2)}. \quad (3.26)$$

Clearly  $\varphi_1 \neq 0$ . Since  $\phi = a'_1 - a'_2$ , from (1.1) and (3.26), we get

$$(a'_1 - a'_2) \left( f - a_1 - \frac{1}{\varphi_1} \right) = (a_1 - a_2)(f' - a'_1). \quad (3.27)$$

We claim that  $\varphi_1$  is non-constant. If not, suppose  $\varphi_1 = d \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Then from (3.27), we have

$$f' - a'_1 - \frac{a'_1 - a'_2}{a_1 - a_2}(f - a_1) = -d \frac{a'_1 - a'_2}{a_1 - a_2}.$$

Performing integration, we conclude that  $f - a_1$  is a small function of  $f$ , which is impossible.

Let  $\phi_1 = \frac{\varphi'_1}{\varphi_1}$ . Clearly  $\phi_1 \neq 0$ . Let  $z_{1,q} \in S_{(1,q)}(a_1)$  such that  $a_1(z_{1,q}) - a_2(z_{1,q}) \neq 0, \infty$ . Then  $z_{1,q}$  is a zero of  $f - g$  and so  $\varphi_1(z_{1,q}) \neq \infty$ . Similarly if  $\hat{z}_{1,q} \in S_{(1,q)}(a_2)$  such that  $a_1(\hat{z}_{1,q}) - a_2(\hat{z}_{1,q}) \neq 0, \infty$ , then  $\varphi_1(\hat{z}_{1,q}) \neq \infty$ . Now (3.1), (3.2) and (3.24) give  $\bar{N}(r, 0; \varphi_1) + N(r, \varphi_1) = S(r, f)$  and so  $T(r, \phi_1) = S(r, f)$ . Taking logarithmic differentiation on (3.26), we get

$$\phi_1 = \frac{f' - g'}{f - g} - \frac{f' - a'_1}{f - a_1} - \frac{f' - a'_2}{f - a_2}, \text{ i.e.,}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi_1(f - a_1)^2(f - a_2) - \phi_1(f - a_1)(f - a_2)(g - a_1) \\ &= -(f - a_1)(f - a_2)((g' - a'_1) + (f' - a'_1)(f - a_2)(g - a_1) \\ & \quad + (f - a_1)(f' - a'_2)(g - a_1) - (f - a_1)^2(f' - a'_2)) \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi_1(f - a_1)(f - a_2)^2 - \phi_1(f - a_1)(f - a_2)(g - a_2) \\ &= -(f - a_1)(f - a_2)((g' - a'_2) + (f' - a'_1)(f - a_2)(g - a_2) \\ & \quad + (f - a_1)(f' - a'_2)(g - a_2) - (f' - a'_1)(f - a_2)^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

We use  $N_{(l+1)}(r, a; f)$  to denote the counting function of  $a$ -points of  $f$  with multiplicity greater than  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ . Also  $\bar{N}_{(l+1)}(r, a; f)$  is the reduced counting function.

Let  $z_{1,q} \in S_{(1,q)}(a_1)$  ( $q \geq 3$ ) such that  $a_1(z_{1,q}) - a_2(z_{1,q}) \neq 0, \infty$  and  $a'_1(z_{1,q}) - a'_2(z_{1,q}) \neq 0$ . Clearly  $\delta(f(z_{1,q})) \neq 0$  and so from (3.25), we see that  $z_{1,q}$  is a zero of  $f' - a'_2$  of multiplicity  $q - 1$ . Then from (3.28), we calculate that  $\phi_1(z_{1,q}) = 0$ . Since  $\phi_1 \not\equiv 0$ , we have

$$\sum_{q \geq 3} \bar{N}_{(1,q)}(r, a_1; f) \leq N(r, 0; \phi_1) \leq S(r, f)$$

and so from (3.1), we get  $\bar{N}_{(3)}(r, a_1; g) = S(r, f)$ . Similarly if  $\hat{z}_{1,q} \in S_{(1,q)}(a_2)$  ( $q \geq 3$ ) such that  $a_1(\hat{z}_{1,q}) - a_2(\hat{z}_{1,q}) \neq 0, \infty$  and  $a'_1(\hat{z}_{1,q}) - a'_2(\hat{z}_{1,q}) \neq 0$ , then  $\delta(f(\hat{z}_{1,q})) \neq 0$  and  $\hat{z}_{1,q}$  is a zero of  $f' - a'_1$  of multiplicity  $q - 1$  by (3.25). Also from (3.29), we get  $\phi_1(\hat{z}_{1,q}) = 0$  and so  $\sum_{q \geq 3} \bar{N}_{(1,q)}(r, a_2; f) \leq S(r, f)$ . Again from (3.1), we have  $\bar{N}_{(3)}(r, a_2; g) = S(r, f)$ . Therefore

$$\bar{N}_{(3)}(r, a_1; g) + \bar{N}_{(3)}(r, a_2; g) = S(r, f). \quad (3.30)$$

Let  $\alpha$  be an arbitrary small function of  $f$ . Then from (2.1), we get

$$m\left(r, \frac{g - \alpha}{f - \alpha}\right) = m\left(r, \frac{\mathcal{L}_k(f(z + c) - \alpha(z + c)) + \mathcal{L}_k(\alpha(z + c)) - \alpha}{f - \alpha}\right) \leq m\left(r, \frac{1}{f - \alpha}\right) + S(r, f) \quad (3.31)$$

Now using Lemma 2.1, we get from (2.2), (2.10) and (3.31) that

$$\begin{aligned} m(r, \psi) &= m\left(r, \frac{\delta(g)(g - \alpha)}{(g - a_1)(g - a_2)} \left(\frac{f - \alpha}{g - \alpha} - 1\right)\right) \\ &\leq m\left(r, \frac{\delta(g)(g - \alpha)}{(g - a_1)(g - a_2)}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{f - \alpha}{g - \alpha} - 1\right) \\ &\leq m\left(r, \frac{f - \alpha}{g - \alpha}\right) + S(r, f) = T\left(r, \frac{g - \alpha}{f - \alpha}\right) - N\left(r, \frac{f - \alpha}{g - \alpha}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &= m\left(r, \frac{g - \alpha}{f - \alpha}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{g - \alpha}{f - \alpha}\right) - N\left(r, \frac{f - \alpha}{g - \alpha}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m\left(r, \frac{1}{f - \alpha}\right) + N(r, 0; f - \alpha) - N(r, 0; g - \alpha) + S(r, f) \\ &= T(r, f) - N(r, \alpha; g) + S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $N(r, \psi) = S(r, f)$ , we have

$$T(r, \psi) \leq T(r, f) - N(r, \alpha; g) + S(r, f). \quad (3.32)$$

We use  $N(r, a; f | = l)$  to denote the counting function of  $a$ -points of  $f$  with multiplicity exactly  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ . Also  $\bar{N}(r, a; f | = l)$  is the reduced counting function.

Now we divide following two sub-cases.

**Sub-case 1.2.1.** Let  $\bar{N}(r, a_1; g | = 2) = S(r, f)$ . Then from (3.1) and (3.30), we get

$$\sum_{q \geq 2} \bar{N}_{(1,q)}(r, a_1; f) = S(r, f)$$

and so from (3.24), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{N}(r, a_1; f) &= \sum_{p,q} \bar{N}_{(p,q)}(r, a_1; f) = \bar{N}_{(1,1)}(r, a_1; f) + \sum_{p \geq 2} \bar{N}_{(p,1)}(r, a_1; f) \\ &\quad + \sum_{q \geq 2} \bar{N}_{(1,q)}(r, a_1; f) = \bar{N}_{(1,1)}(r, a_1; f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

First suppose  $H \equiv 0$ . On integration, we get  $\frac{f - a_1}{f - a_2} \equiv c_2 \frac{g - a_1}{g - a_2}$ , where  $c_2 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Using Mohon'ko lemma [26] we get  $T(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f)$  and so Lemma 2.4 gives  $f \equiv g$ , which is impossible.

Next suppose  $H \not\equiv 0$ . Clearly  $m(r, H) = S(r, f)$  and  $N(r, H) = \bar{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_2; f)$ . Therefore

$$T(r, H) = m(r, H) + N(r, H) = \bar{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_2; f) + S(r, f). \quad (3.34)$$

Now from (2.3) and (2.4), we get  $T(r, f) = m(r, f - g) + S(r, f)$ . Therefore from (1.1), (2.2), (3.32) and (3.34), we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) &= m\left(r, \frac{H(f-g)}{H}\right) + S(r, f) = m\left(r, \frac{\phi - \psi}{H}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &= T\left(r, \frac{H}{\phi - \psi}\right) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, \psi) + T(r, H) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, f) + \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_2; f) - N(r, \alpha; g) + S(r, f) \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$N(r, \alpha; g) \leq \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_2; f) + S(r, f). \quad (3.35)$$

Suppose  $\alpha = a_2$ . Then from (3.35), we get

$$\overline{N}(r, a_2; g) \leq \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_2; f) + S(r, f). \quad (3.36)$$

Since  $f$  and  $g$  share  $a_2$  IM, from (3.1), (3.24) and (3.30), we get

$$\overline{N}(r, a_2; g) + S(r, f) = \overline{N}(r, a_2; f) + S(r, f) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \overline{N}_{(1,i)}(r, a_2; f) + S(r, f)$$

and so from (3.36), we get  $\overline{N}_{(1,1)}(r, a_2; f) = S(r, f)$ . Let

$$G = \frac{g' - a'_1}{g - a_1} - \frac{f' - a'_1}{f - a_1} - \frac{a'_1 - a'_2}{a_1 - a_2}. \quad (3.37)$$

Clearly  $G \neq 0$ . Also from (3.33), we get  $N(r, G) = S(r, f)$ . Since  $m(r, G) = S(r, f)$ , we have  $T(r, G) = S(r, f)$ . Let  $\hat{z}_{1,2} \in S_{(1,2)}(a_2)$  such that  $a_1(\hat{z}_{1,2}) - a_2(\hat{z}_{1,2}) \neq 0, \infty$ ,  $a'_1(\hat{z}_{1,2}) - a'_2(\hat{z}_{1,2}) \neq 0$  and  $\phi(\hat{z}_{1,2}) \neq 0, \infty$ . Then  $g(\hat{z}_{1,2}) = a_2(\hat{z}_{1,2})$  and  $g'(\hat{z}_{1,2}) = a'_2(\hat{z}_{1,2})$ . Also from (3.25), we see that  $\hat{z}_{1,2}$  is a simple zero of  $f' - a'_1$ , i.e.,  $f'(\hat{z}_{1,2}) = a'_1(\hat{z}_{1,2})$ . Then from (3.37), we get  $G(\hat{z}_{1,2}) = 0$  and so  $\overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_2; f) \leq N(r, 0; G) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, G) + S(r, f) = S(r, f)$ . Therefore from (3.30), we get

$$\sum_{q \geq 2} \overline{N}_{(1,q)}(r, a_2; f) = S(r, f)$$

and so from (3.24), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{N}(r, a_2; f) &= \overline{N}_{(1,1)}(r, a_2; f) + \sum_{p \geq 2} \overline{N}_{(p,1)}(r, a_2; f) + \sum_{q \geq 2} \overline{N}_{(1,q)}(r, a_2; f) \\ &= \overline{N}_{(1,1)}(r, a_2; f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

Then from (2.4), (3.33) and (3.38), we get

$$T(r, f) = \overline{N}(r, a_1; f) + \overline{N}(r, a_2; f) + S(r, f) = \overline{N}_{(1,1)}(r, a_1; f) + \overline{N}_{(1,1)}(r, a_2; f) + S(r, f) \quad (3.39)$$

First suppose  $H_{11} \equiv 0$ . On integration, we get  $\frac{f-a_1}{f-a_2} \equiv c_1 \frac{g-a_1}{g-a_2}$ , where  $c_1 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Using Mohon'ko lemma [26] we get  $T(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f)$  and so Lemma 2.4 gives  $f \equiv g$ , which is impossible.

Next suppose  $H_{11} \neq 0$ . Let  $z_{1,1} \in S_{(1,1)}(a_1) \cup S_{(1,1)}(a_2)$ . Clearly  $H_{11}(z_{1,1}) = 0$  and so

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \overline{N}_{(1,i)}(r, a_i; f) \leq N(r, 0; H_{11}) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, H_{11}) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, \psi) + S(r, f) \quad (3.40)$$

and so from (3.32) and (3.39), we get  $T(r, f) \leq T(r, \psi) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, f) - N(r, \alpha; g) + S(r, f)$ , i.e.,  $N(r, \alpha; g) = S(r, f)$ . In particular, we have  $\overline{N}(r, a_1; g) + \overline{N}(r, a_2; g) = S(r, f)$ , i.e.,  $\overline{N}(r, a_1; f) + \overline{N}(r, a_2; f) = S(r, f)$  and so from (2.4), we get a contradiction.

**Sub-case 1.2.2.** Let  $\overline{N}(r, a_1; g \mid = 2) \neq S(r, f)$ . If  $\overline{N}(r, a_2; g \mid = 2) = S(r, f)$ , then proceeding in the way as done in Sub-case 1.2.1, we get a contradiction. Hence we assume  $\overline{N}(r, a_2; g \mid = 2) \neq S(r, f)$ . In this case, from (2.4), (3.24) and (3.30), we get

$$T(r, f) = \sum_{i=1}^2 (\overline{N}_{(1,1)}(r, a_i; f) + \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_i; f)) + S(r, f). \quad (3.41)$$

Clearly  $H_{11} \neq 0$ , otherwise we get  $T(r, g) = T(r, f) + S(r, f)$  and so by Lemma 2.4, we get a contradiction. Let  $z_{1,1} \in S_{(1,1)}(a_1) \cup S_{(1,1)}(a_2)$ . Then from (3.32) and (3.40), we see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \overline{N}_{(1,1)}(r, a_i; f) \leq T(r, f) - N(r, \alpha; g) + S(r, f)$$

and so from (3.41), we get

$$\overline{N}(r, \alpha; g) \leq N(r, \alpha; g) \leq \sum_{i=1}^2 \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_i; f) + S(r, f). \quad (3.42)$$

Suppose  $\alpha = a_1$ . Now from (3.24) and (3.30), we have  $\overline{N}(r, a_1; g) = \overline{N}(r, a_1; f) = \overline{N}_{(1,1)}(r, a_1; f) + \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_1; f) + S(r, f)$ . Therefore from (3.42), we get  $\overline{N}_{(1,1)}(r, a_1; f) \leq N_{(1,2)}(r, a_2; f) + S(r, f)$ . Again if we take  $\alpha = a_2$ , then from (3.42), we get  $\overline{N}_{(1,1)}(r, a_2; f) \leq N_{(1,2)}(r, a_1; f) + S(r, f)$ . Consequently from (3.41), we have

$$T(r, f) \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^2 \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_i; f) + S(r, f). \quad (3.43)$$

First suppose  $H_{21} \equiv 0$ . On integration, we have  $\left(\frac{f-a_1}{f-a_2}\right)^2 = c_1 \frac{g-a_1}{g-a_2}$ , where  $c_1 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Using Mohon'ko lemma [26], we get  $2T(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f)$ . Then from (3.11), we have  $2T(r, f) \leq T(r, f) + S(r, f)$ , which is impossible.

Next suppose  $H_{21} \neq 0$ . Let  $z_{1,2} \in S_{(1,2)}(a_1) \cup S_{(1,2)}(a_2)$ . Clearly  $H_{21}(z_{1,2}) = 0$  and so

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_i; f) \leq N(r, 0; H_{21}) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, H_{21}) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, \psi) + S(r, f) \quad (3.44)$$

Now from (3.32) and (3.44), we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_i; f) \leq T(r, f) - N(r, \alpha; g) + S(r, f). \quad (3.45)$$

Then from (3.45), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_i; f) \leq T(r, f) - N(r, a_1; g) + S(r, f) \quad (3.46)$$

$$\text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^2 \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_i; f) \leq T(r, f) - N(r, a_2; g) + S(r, f). \quad (3.47)$$

Adding (3.46) and (3.47), we get

$$2 \sum_{i=1}^2 \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_i; f) \leq 2T(r, f) - N(r, a_1; g) - N(r, a_2; g) + S(r, f). \quad (3.48)$$

Now using (3.43), from (3.48), we get

$$N(r, a_1; g) + N(r, a_2; g) \leq T(r, f) + S(r, f). \quad (3.49)$$

Again from (3.43) and (3.49), we conclude that

$$N(r, a_1; g) + N(r, a_2; g) \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^2 \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_i; f) + S(r, f). \quad (3.50)$$

Note that  $\sum_{i=1}^2 (\overline{N}_{(1,1)}(r, a_i; f) + 2\overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_i; f)) \leq N(r, a_1; g) + N(r, a_2; g) + S(r, f)$  and so from (3.50) we get  $\sum_{i=1}^2 \overline{N}_{(1,1)}(r, a_i; f) = S(r, f)$ . Then from (3.41), we get

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) &= \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_1; f) + \overline{N}_{(1,2)}(r, a_2; f) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}_{(2)}(r, a_1; g) + \overline{N}_{(2)}(r, a_2; g) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, g) + S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore from (3.11), we get  $T(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f)$ , which is absurd by Lemma 2.4.

**Case 2.** Suppose  $\phi \equiv 0$ . Since  $\delta(f) \not\equiv 0$ , we get  $f \equiv g$ , i.e.,  $f(z) \equiv \mathcal{L}_k(f(z+c))$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 1.1.** If  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are constants, then  $a'_1 - a'_2 \equiv 0$ . Now if  $\phi \equiv a'_1 - a'_2$ , then immediately  $\phi \equiv 0$ . Therefore if we follow the proof of Theorem 1.1, then Sub-case 1.2 does not occur in the proof of Corollary 1.1. Now from the proof of Theorem 1.1, we need only to consider the case when  $\gamma_{2k} \equiv 0$ . Clearly  $\gamma_{2k} \equiv 0$  gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^k b_i \psi_i = -b_0. \quad (3.51)$$

Now from the recurrence formula (3.6) for  $\psi_i$ , we derive the expression

$$\psi_i = \psi_1^i + R_{i-1}(\psi_1), \quad (3.52)$$

where  $R_{i-1}(\psi_1)$  is a differential polynomial. Then using (3.52), we get from (3.51) that

$$b_k \psi_1^k = \tilde{R}_{k-1}(\psi_1), \quad (3.53)$$

where  $\tilde{R}_{k-1}(\psi_1)$  is a differential polynomial in  $\psi_1$ . Clearly  $\phi$  is an entire function and so is  $\psi_1$ .

First suppose  $\psi_1$  is transcendental. Then using Clunie lemma (see [6]) to (3.53), we get  $m(r, \psi_1) = S(r, \psi_1)$ . Since  $N(r, \psi_1) = 0$ , it follows that  $T(r, \psi_1) = S(r, \psi_1)$ , which is impossible.

Next suppose  $\psi_1$  is a polynomial. If  $\psi_1$  is non-constant, then from (3.53), we get a contradiction. Hence  $\psi_1$  is a constant.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 1.2.** From the proof of Theorem 1.1, we need only to consider the case when  $\phi \not\equiv a'_1 - a'_2$ . Now from (3.4), we get

$$f^{(k)}(z+c) = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{2k} \alpha_{k,j} f^j(z+c) + Q_k}{(f(z+c) - g(z+c))^{2k-1}}, \quad (3.54)$$

where

$$Q_k = \sum_{\substack{l < 2k \\ l+j_1+j_2+\dots+j_k \leq 2k}} \beta_{l,j_1,j_2,\dots,j_k} f^l(g)(g')^{j_1} (g'')^{j_2} \dots (g^{(2k-1)})^{j_k}.$$

Here  $\alpha_{k,j}, \beta_{l,j_1,j_2,\dots,j_k} \in S(f)$  and  $\psi_p := \alpha_{p,2p}$  satisfies the recurrence formula defined by (3.6).

Now we divide the following two cases.

**Case 1.** Let  $\psi_k = \alpha_{k,2k} \not\equiv 0$  for  $p = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ . Now following the same procedure as done in Sub-case 1.1 in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we get a contradiction.

**Case 2.** Let  $\psi_k = \alpha_{k,2k} \equiv 0$ . Now from (3.6), we get  $\psi'_{k-1} + \psi_1 \psi_{k-1} \equiv 0$ . On integration, we have  $\psi_{k-1}(z) = c_0 e^{\xi(z)}$ , where  $\xi(z) = -\int_0^z \psi_1(z) dz$  is a non-constant meromorphic function and  $c_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . We know that if  $\xi(z)$  has a pole at the point  $z_0$ , then  $z_0$  is an essential singularity of  $e^{\xi(z)}$ . Since  $\psi_{k-1}$  is a non-constant meromorphic function, we deduce that  $\xi$  is a non-constant entire function and so  $\psi_1$  is also non-constant entire function. Now if  $\psi_1$  is a polynomial, then  $\psi_{i+1}$  is also a polynomial for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ . Therefore we immediately get a contradiction. Hence  $\psi_1$  is a transcendental entire function. Now from (3.52), we get  $b_k \psi_1^k = \tilde{R}_{k-1}(\psi_1)$ . By Clunie lemma (see [6]), we get  $m(r, \psi_1) = S(r, \psi_1)$ . Since  $N(r, \psi_1) = 0$ , we have  $T(r, \psi_1) = S(r, \psi_1)$ , which is impossible.  $\square$

**Remark 3.1.** We can easily conclude that Theorem 1.1 and Corollaries 1.1-1.3 are still valid for non-constant meromorphic function satisfying  $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$ .

### Statements and declarations:

**Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

**Funding:** There is no funding received from any organizations for this research work.

**Data availability statement:** Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no database were generated or analyzed during the current study.

### REFERENCES

- [1] A. BANERJEE and S. MAJUMDER, On the uniqueness of certain types of differential-difference polynomials, *Anal. Math.*, **43** (3) (2017), 415-444.
- [2] A. BANERJEE and S. MAJUMDER, Uniqueness of certain type of differential-difference and difference polynomials, *Tamkang J. Math.*, **49** (1) (2018), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.5556/j.tkjm.49.2018.2234>.
- [3] A. BANERJEE and S. MAJUMDER, Uniqueness of entire functions whose difference polynomials sharing a polynomial of certain degree with finite weight, *An. Univ. Craiova Ser. Mat. Inform.*, **47** (2) (2020), 215-225.
- [4] C. X. CHEN and Z. X. CHEN, Entire functions and their high order differences, *Taiwanese J. Math.*, **18** (3) (2014), 711-729.
- [5] Y. M. CHIANG and S. J. FENG, On the Nevanlinna characteristic of  $f(z + \eta)$  and difference equations in the complex plane, *Ramanujan J.*, **16** (1) (2008), 105-129.
- [6] J. CLUNIE, On integral and meromorphic functions, *J. London Math. Soc.*, **37** (1962), 17-22.
- [7] A. DAM and S. MAJUMDER, A power of a combination of meromorphic function with its shift sharing small function with its derivative, *Quaestiones Mathematicae*, **43** (4) (2019), 449-466. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073606.2019.1578835>
- [8] M. L. FANG, H. LI, W. SHEN and X. YAO, A difference version of the Rubel-Yang-Mues-Steinmetz-Gundersen theorem, *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory*, **24** (2024), 811-832.
- [9] R. HALBURD, R. J. KORHONEN and K. TOHGE, Holomorphic curves with shift-invariant hyperplane preimages, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **366** (2014), 4267-4298.
- [10] W. K. HAYMAN, Meromorphic functions, Clarendon Press, Oxford (1964).
- [11] J. HEITTOKANGAS, R. J. KORHONEN, I. LAINE, J. RIEPPO and J. L. ZHANG, Value sharing results for shifts of meromorphic functions and sufficient conditions for periodicity, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **355** (1) (2009), 352-363.
- [12] J. HEITTOKANGAS, R. J. KORHONEN, I. LAINE and J. RIEPPO, Uniqueness of meromorphic functions sharing values with their shifts, *Complex Var. Elliptic Equ.*, **56** (1-4) (2011), 81-92.
- [13] X. H. HUANG and M. L. FANG, Unicity of entire functions concerning their shifts and derivatives, *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory*, **21** (2021), 523-532.
- [14] K. LIU and X. J. DONG, Some results related to complex differential-difference equations of certain types, *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.*, **51** (2014), 1453-1467.
- [15] S. MAJUMDER, Uniqueness and value distribution of differences of meromorphic functions, *Appl. Math. E-Notes*, **17** (2017), 114-123.
- [16] S. MAJUMDER, Meromorphic functions sharing one value with their derivatives concerning the difference operator, *Commun. Math. Stat.*, **5**
- [17] S. MAJUMDER and P. DAS, Growth of meromorphic solution related to linear difference equations and value sharing, *Complex Var. and Elliptic Equ.*, **70** (5) (2025), 789-819.
- [18] S. MAJUMDER and P. DAS, Meromorphic functions sharing three values with their shift, *Ukr. Math. J.*, **76** (2024), 988-1004. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11253-024-02368-x>.
- [19] S. MAJUMDER and D. PRAMANIK, On the conjecture of Chen and Yi, *Houston J. math.*, **49** (3) (2023), 509-530.
- [20] S. MAJUMDER and D. PRAMANIK, On meromorphic solutions of a certain type of nonlinear differential-difference equation, *Rend. Istit. Mat. Univ. Trieste*, **55** (2) (2023), 1-24. DOI: 10.13137/2464-8728/34711.
- [21] S. MAJUMDER and S. SAHA, Power of meromorphic function sharing polynomials with derivative of it's combination with it's shift, *Mathematica Slovaca*, **69** (5) (2019), 1037-1052. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ms-2017-0288>.
- [22] S. MAJUMDER and S. SAHA, A note on the uniqueness of certain types of differential-difference polynomials, *Ukr. Math. J.*, **73** (2021), 791-810. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11253-021-01960-9>.

- [23] S. MAJUMDER and J. SARKAR, Results on uniqueness of entire functions related to differential-difference polynomial, *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov. Mathematics, Informatics, Physics. Series III; Brasov*, **13** (2) (2020), 623-648. DOI:10.31926/but.mif.2020.13.62.2.19.
- [24] S. MAJUMDER, N. SARKAR and D. PRAMANIK, Entire functions and their high order difference operators, *J. Contemp. Mathemat. Anal.*, **58** (6) (2023), 405-415.
- [25] S. MAJUMDER and N. SARKAR, Entire functions sharing two small functions with their difference operators, *Ann. Univ. Ferrara*, **70**
- [26] A. Z. MOHON'KO, On the Nevanlinna characteristics of some meromorphic functions, *Theory of Functions, Functional Analysis and Their Applications*, **14** (1971), 83-87.
- [27] E. MUES and N. STEINMETZ, Meromorphe Funktionen, die mit ihrer Ableitung Werte teilen, *Manuscripta Math.*, **29** (1979), 195-206.
- [28] X. G. QI, Value distribution and uniqueness of difference polynomials and entire solutions of difference equations, *Ann. Polon. Math.*, **102** (2011), 129-142.
- [29] X. G. QI, N. LI and L. Z. YANG, Uniqueness of meromorphic functions concerning their differences and solutions of difference Painlevé equations, *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory*, **18** (2018), 567-582.
- [30] X. G. QI and L. Z. YANG, Uniqueness of meromorphic functions concerning their shifts and derivatives, *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory*, **20** (1) (2020), 159-178.
- [31] L. A. RUBEL and C. C. YANG, Values shared by an entire function and its derivative, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, **599** (1977), 101-103.
- [32] H. Y. XU, On the value distribution and uniqueness of difference polynomials of meromorphic functions, *Adv. Differ Equ* 2013, **90** (2013) <https://doi.org/10.1186/1687-1847-2013-90>.
- [33] K. YAMANOI, The second main theorem for small functions and related problems, *Acta Math.*, **192** (2004), 225-294.
- [34] C. C. YANG and H. X. YI, Uniqueness theory of meromorphic functions, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht/Boston/London, 2003.
- [35] L. YANG, Value distribution theory, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ST. THOMAS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY, KOLKATA, WEST BENGAL-70003, INDIA.

Email address: [jeetsarkar.math@gmail.com](mailto:jeetsarkar.math@gmail.com)

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

Email address: [debumath07@gmail.com](mailto:debumath07@gmail.com)