Abstract. The existence of sufficiently many finite order meromorphic solutions of a differential equation, or difference equation, or differential-difference equation, appears to be a good indicator of integrability. In this paper, we investigate the nonlinear differential-difference equations of form
\[ f(z)^n + L(z, f) = q(z)e^{p(z)}, \] (*)
where \( n \geq 2, L(z, f) \neq 0 \) is a linear differential-difference polynomial in \( f(z) \), with small functions as its coefficients, \( p(z) \) and \( q(z) \) are non-vanishing polynomials. We first obtain that \( n = 2 \) and \( f(z) \) satisfies \( \lambda(f) = \sigma(f) = \deg p(z) \) under the assumption that the equation (*) possesses a transcendental entire solution of hyper order \( \sigma_2(f) < 1 \). Furthermore, we give the exact form of the solutions of equation (*) when \( p(z) = a, q(z) = b, \eta \) are constants and \( L(z, f) = g(z)f(z + \eta) + h(z)f'(z) + u(z)f(z) + v(z) \) is a linear differential-difference polynomial in \( f(z) \) with polynomial coefficients \( g(z), h(z), u(z) \) and \( v(z) \) such that \( L(z, f) \neq 0 \) and \( ab\eta \neq 0 \).

1. Introduction

Nevanlinna value distribution theory of meromorphic functions has been extensively applied to resolved growth\[10\], value distribution\[8, 10\], and solvability of meromorphic solutions of linear and nonlinear differential equations \[7, 10, 12, 13\]. However, meromorphic solutions of complex difference equations have been a subject of great interest in past decades, due to the application of classical Nevanlinna theory in difference by Ablowitz et. al.\[1\]. Especially, a number of fundamental results on difference analogues of Nevanlinna value distribution have been obtained, see \[3\]–\[6\], \[11\] .

In what follows, a meromorphic function \( f(z) \) is always understood to be nonconstant and meromorphic in the whole complex plane \( \mathbb{C} \). Concerning the value distribution of meromorphic functions, we assume that the reader is familiar with the basic Nevanlinna value distribution theory and its standard notations such as \( m(r, f), N(r, f), T(r, f), S(r, f), \) et. al., see e.g.\[8\] \[10\]. In particular, for a meromorphic function \( f(z) \), the notations of
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order
\[ \sigma(f) := \limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log^+ T(r, f)}{\log r}, \]
and the exponent of convergence of \( a \)-points of \( f \) as
\[ \lambda(f) := \limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log N(r, \frac{1}{f-a})}{\log r}, \]
will appear frequently in the subsequent considerations.

A meromorphic function \( a(z) \) is called a small function relative to \( f(z) \) if \( T(r, a(z)) = S(r, f(z)) \), where \( S(r, f) \) is used to denote any quantity satisfying \( S(r, f) = o(T(r, f)) \) as \( r \to \infty \), possibly outside of an exceptional set of finite logarithmic measure. Moreover, we shall use \( P_d(f) \) to denote a differential polynomial in \( f(z) \) and its derivatives \( f', f'', \ldots \), with a total degree \( d \), which has small functions relative to \( f(z) \) as its coefficients. However, without confusion, we also use \( P_d(f) \) to denote a differential-difference polynomial in \( f(z) \), namely a polynomial in \( f, f', f'', \ldots \), and its shifts \( f(z + c_j) \), where \( c_j (j = 1, 2, \ldots) \) are constants, with a total degree \( d \).

C.C. Yang\[15\] considered finite order transcendental entire solutions \( f(z) \) of
\[ (1.1) \quad L(z, f) - p(z) f^n = h(z), \]
where \( L(z, f) \) denotes a linear differential polynomial in \( f(z) \) with polynomial coefficients, \( p(z) \) is a non-vanishing polynomial, \( h(z) \) is entire and \( n \geq 3 \). In particular, he showed that \( f(z) \) has to be unique, unless \( L(f) \equiv 0 \). After later, Heittokangas et al.\[9\] investigated a slightly more general form of equation \((1.1)\), where \( p(z), h(z) \) and the coefficients of \( L(z, f) \) are meromorphic, and not necessarily of finite order. They showed that the method used by Yang could be modified to obtained similar uniqueness results for meromorphic solutions of this generalized equation, when \( n \geq 4 \). They also noted that if \( n = 1 \) then the equation \((1.1)\) with meromorphic coefficients reduces into a linear differential equation, while if \( n = 2 \) then \((1.1)\) contains the first and the second Painlevé differential equations and the Riccati differential equation.

Recently, several papers \[2, 16, 18\] have been published regarding entire solutions of difference and differential-difference equations of the form
\[ (1.2) \quad f(z)^n + L(z, f) = h(z), \]
where \( n \geq 2 \), \( L(z, f) \) is a linear differential-difference polynomial of \( f(z) \), and \( h(z) \) is a meromorphic function of finite order. We now recall some results as follows.

**Theorem 1.A\[16\].** Let \( n \geq 4 \) be an integer, \( L(z, f) \) be a linear differential-difference polynomial of \( f(z) \), not vanishing identically, and \( h(z) \) be a meromorphic function of finite order. Then the differential-difference equation \((1.2)\) possesses at most one transcendental entire solutions of finite order such that all coefficients of \( L(z, f) \) are small functions of \( f(z) \). If such a solution \( f(z) \) exists, then \( f(z) \) is of the same order as \( h(z) \).
They also noted that if $n = 3$ then the equation (1.2) possesses three distinct entire solutions under certain assumptions, i.e.,

**Theorem 1.B** [10, 18]. A nonlinear difference equation

$$(1.3) \quad f(z)^3 + q(z)f(z + 1) = c \sin bz,$$

where $q(z)$ is a nonconstant polynomial and $b, c \in \mathbb{C}$ are nonzero constants, does not admit entire solution of finite order. If $q(z) = q$ is a nonzero constant, then equation (1.3) possesses three distinct entire solutions of finite order, provided $b = 3\pi n$ and $q^3 = (-1)^{n+1}\frac{27}{4}c^2$ for a nonzero constant $n$.

Furthermore, they showed that if $n = 2$ then the equation (1.2) has no entire solution.

**Theorem 1.C** [16]. Let $p(z), q(z)$ be polynomials. Then a nonlinear difference equation of

$$(1.4) \quad f(z)^2 + q(z)f(z + 1) = p(z)$$

has no transcendental entire solutions of finite order.

Chen and Yang considered a more general form of (1.4), and obtained a similar result.

**Theorem 1.D** [2]. Let $p(z), h(z), g(z)$ be polynomials such that either $p(z)$ and $h(z)$ are linearly independent, or there is one and only one of $p(z)$ and $h(z)$ being identically equal to zero, and let $c, d_1, d_2, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ be constants such that $d_1d_2\lambda \neq 0$ and $e^{\lambda c} \neq 1$. Then the differential-difference equation

$$(1.5) \quad f(z)^2 + p(z)f(z + c) + h(z)f'(z) + g(z) = d_1e^{\lambda z} + d_2e^{-\lambda z}$$

has no entire solution of finite order.

Later, X.Qi, J.Dou and L.Yang considered the nonlinear difference equation of the form

$$(1.6) \quad f(z)^n + L(z, f) = q(z)e^{p(z)},$$

where $\Delta_c f = f(z + c) - f(z)$ and $c$ is a nonzero constant, and obtained

**Theorem 1.E** [14]. Consider the nonlinear difference equation of the form (1.5), where $p(z) \neq 0, q(z), r(z)$ are polynomials, $n$ and $m$ are positive integers. Suppose that $f(z)$ is a transcendental entire function of finite order, not of period $c$. If $n > m$, then $f(z)$ cannot be a solution of (1.5).

In this paper, we consider the following nonlinear differential-difference equations of form

$$(1.6) \quad f(z)^n + L(z, f) = q(z)e^{p(z)},$$

where $n \geq 2, L(z, f)$ is a linear differential-difference polynomial in $f(z)$, with small functions as its coefficients, $p(z)$ and $q(z)$ are non-vanishing polynomials.

The reminder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we investigate the value distribution of transcendental entire solutions of equation (1.6). We show that $\lambda(f) = \sigma(f) = \deg p(z)$ if equation (1.6) exactly exist.
a transcendental entire solution of hyper order \(\sigma_2(f) < 1\). In Section 3, we give the exact forms of transcendental entire solutions of equation (1.6).

2. Value distribution of transcendental entire solutions of differential-difference equations

Recently, difference versions of Nevanlinna theory have been established, including the lemma of difference analogue of logarithmic derivative, difference analogue of the Clunie lemma and Mohon’ko lemma, and the second main theorem in differences, which are good tools in dealing with the value distribution of difference polynomials, and the meromorphic solutions of complex difference equations. Thus, in this section, by using difference analogues of Nevanlinna theory, we investigate the value distribution of transcendental entire solutions of differential-difference equation (1.6), and obtain following theorem.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let \(n \geq 2\) be an integer, \(L(z, f)\) be a linear differential-difference polynomial of \(f(z)\), not vanishing identically and with small functions as its coefficients, \(p(z)\) and \(q(z)\) be two non-vanishing polynomials. If the differential-difference equation (1.6) possesses a transcendental entire solution of hyper order \(\sigma_2(f) < 1\), then \(n = 2\) and \(f(z)\) satisfies

\[
\lambda(f) = \sigma(f) = \deg p(z).
\]

**Remark 2.1.** The differential-difference equation

\[
f(z)^2 + h(z)f(z + \eta) - \eta e^\eta h(z)f'(z) + (\eta - 1)e^\eta h(z)f(z) = z^2e^{2z}
\]

is solved by \(f(z) = \pm ze^z\), but \(\lambda(f) = 0, \sigma(f) = \deg p(z) = 1\), where \(p(z) = 2z\) and \(L(z, f) = h(z)f(z + \eta) - \eta e^\eta h(z)f'(z) + (\eta - 1)e^\eta h(z)f(z) \equiv 0\). This shows that the assumption of \(L(z, f)\), which is not vanishing identically in Theorem 2.1, can not be omitted.

We now give some examples to show the result of Theorem 2.1 is arrived.

**Example 2.1.** The equation

\[
f(z)^2 + \frac{1}{2\pi i} z^2 f(z + 2\pi i) + \left(\frac{-1}{2\pi i} z^2 - 2z\right) f(z) = e^{2z}
\]

is solved by \(f(z) = \pm ze^z + z\), where \(p(z) = 2z\) and \(q(z) = 1\). Obviously, \(\lambda(f) = \sigma(f) = \deg p(z) = 1\).

**Example 2.2.** The equation

\[
f(z)^2 + \frac{z}{e} f(z + 1) + zf'(z) - 2f(z) - \frac{e - 1}{e} z(z + 1) = z^2e^{2z}
\]

is solved by \(f(z) = \pm ze^z - z\), where \(p(z) = 2z\) and \(q(z) = z^2\). Obviously, \(\lambda(f) = \sigma(f) = \deg p(z) = 1\).

In order to prove Theorem 2.1, we need some lemmas as follows.

The following Lemma 2.1 shows that non-vanishing polynomials \(p(z)\) and \(q(z)\) are necessary in Theorem 2.1.
Lemma 2.1. Under the assumption of $n$ and $L(z, f)$ in Theorem 2.1. If $p(z)$ is a constant or $q(z) \equiv 0$, then equation (1.6) has no entire solution of hyper order $\sigma_2(f) < 1$.

Proof. Contrary to our assertion, we suppose that equation (1.6) has an entire solution with hyper order $\sigma_2(f) < 1$. Since $p(z)$ is a constant or $q(z) \equiv 0$, we conclude from (1.6), Valiron and Mohon’ko lemma[10, Theorem 2.2.5], lemma of logarithmic derivative[10, Theorem 2.3.3] and its difference analogues on lemma of logarithmic derivative[6, Theorem 5.1] that

\[ nT(r, f) = T\left(r, q(z)e^{p(z)} - L(z, f)\right) \leq T(r, f) + S(r, f) \]

and so

\[(n - 1)T(r, f) \leq S(r, f),\]

which contradicts our assumption that $n \geq 2$. The proof of Lemma 2.1 is approved.

Lemma 2.2. Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer, $L(z, f)$ be a linear differential-difference polynomial of $f(z)$, not vanishing identically and with small functions as its coefficients, $p(z)$ and $q(z)$ be two non-vanishing polynomials. If the differential-difference equation (1.6) possesses a transcendental entire solution of hyper order $\sigma_2(f) < 1$, then $f(z)$ satisfies $\sigma(f) = \deg p(z)$.

Proof. Suppose that equation (1.6) has an entire solution with hyper order $\sigma_2(f) < 1$, we again conclude from (1.6), Valiron and Mohon’ko lemma[10, Theorem 2.2.5], and difference analogues on lemma of logarithmic derivative[6, Theorem 5.1] that

\[ nT(r, f) = nm(r, f) = m(r, f(z)^n) \]

\[ = m\left(r, q(z)e^{p(z)} - L(z, f)\right) \]

\[ \leq m\left(r, q(z)e^{p(z)}\right) + m\left(r, f(z) \cdot \frac{L(z, f) - L(z, 0)}{f(z)}\right) + m(r, L(z, 0)) \]

\[ \leq T\left(r, q(z)e^{p(z)}\right) + T(r, f) + S(r, f), \]

and so

\[(2.1) \quad (n - 1)T(r, f) \leq T\left(r, q(z)e^{p(z)}\right) + S(r, f).\]

Therefore, we get from (2.1) that $\sigma(f) \leq \deg p(z)$. If $\sigma(f) < \deg p(z)$, we derive a contradiction from (1.6) since $\sigma(f^n(z) + q(z)f(z + 1)) < \deg p(z)$ and $\sigma(q(z)e^{p(z)}) = \deg p(z)$. This yields that any transcendental entire solution of equation (1.6) satisfies $\sigma(f) = \deg p(z)$. The proof of Lemma 2.2 is approved.

Lemma 2.3[11, Theorem 2.3]. Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic solution of finite order $\sigma$ of a difference equation of the form

\[ U(z, f)P(z, f) = Q(z, f), \]

where $U(z, f), P(z, f)$ and $Q(z, f)$ are difference polynomials such that the total degree $\deg U(z, f) = n$ in $f$ and its shifts, and let $\deg Q(z, f) \leq n$. 
Moreover, we assume that \( U(z, f) \) contains just one term of maximal total degree in \( f(z) \) and its shifts. Then for each \( \varepsilon > 0 \),

\[
m(r, P(z, f)) = O(r^{\sigma - 1 + \varepsilon}) + S(r, f),
\]

possibly outside of an exceptional set with finite logarithmic measure.

**Remark 2.2.** By using similar method\[10, Lemma 2.4.2\], we note that Lemma 2.3 is still valid if \( f(z) \) is a transcendental meromorphic function with \( \sigma(f) < \infty \), \( P(z, f) \) and \( Q(z, f) \) are differential-difference polynomials in \( f(z) \). Moreover,

\[
m(r, P(z, f)) = O(\log r),
\]

possibly outside of an exceptional set with finite logarithmic measure, if \( f(z) \) is a transcendental entire function with \( \sigma(f) = 1 \), \( P(z, f) \) and \( Q(z, f) \) are differential-difference polynomials in \( f(z) \), with polynomial coefficients.

Lemma 2.2 shows that any transcendental entire solution of equation (1.6) must be of finite order. Furthermore, we will obtain the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let \( n \geq 3 \) be an integer, \( L(z, f) \) be a linear differential-difference polynomial of \( f(z) \), not vanishing identically and with small functions as its coefficients, \( p(z) \) and \( q(z) \) be two non-vanishing polynomials. Then equation (1.6) does not possess any transcendental entire solutions of finite order.

**Proof.** Contrary to our assertion, we suppose that equation (1.6) possesses a transcendental entire solution of finite order.

Differentiating both sides of (1.6), we obtain

\[
n f(z)^{n - 1} f'(z) + L'(z, f) = [q'(z) + q(z)p'(z)]e^{p(z)}. \tag{2.2}
\]

By eliminating \( e^{p(z)} \) from (1.6) and (2.2), we conclude that

\[
f(z)^{n - 1} P(z, f) = Q(z, f), \tag{2.3}
\]

where

\[
P(z, f) = n f'(z) - \left( p'(z) + \frac{q'(z)}{q(z)} \right) f(z),
\]

and

\[
Q(z, f) = \left( p'(z) + \frac{q'(z)}{q(z)} \right) L(z, f) - L'(z, f).
\]

Now, we consider the following two cases.

**Case 1.** \( Q(z, f) \equiv 0 \). Then we have from (2.3) that

\[
P(z, f) = n f'(z) - \left( p'(z) + \frac{q'(z)}{q(z)} \right) f(z) \equiv 0.
\]
This shows that $f(z)^n = \mu q(z)e^{\mu(z)}$, and so $f(z) = r(z)e^{\frac{\mu(z)}{n}}$, where $\mu$ is a nonzero constant and $r(z)^n = \mu q(z)$. Substituting $f(z)$ into (1.6), we obtain

\begin{equation}
(\mu - 1)q(z)e^{\mu(z)} + L(z, f) = 0,
\end{equation}

and so $L(z, f) \equiv 0$ if $\mu \equiv 1$, a contradiction. If $\mu \neq 1$, we apply Valiron and Mohon’ko lemma to (2.4) to obtain that

\begin{equation}
T\left(r, e^{\frac{\mu(z)}{n}}\right) + S(r, f) = T\left(r, L(z, f)\right) = nT\left(r, e^{\frac{\mu(z)}{n}}\right) + S(r, f),
\end{equation}

and again get a contradiction since $n \geq 2$.

**Case 2.** $Q(z, f) \neq 0$. We note that $f(z)$ is a finite order entire solution, $p(z)$ and $q(z)$ are polynomials. If $n \geq 3$, we deduce from (2.3) and Lemma 2.3 that

\begin{align*}
T(r, P(z, f)) &= m(r, P(z, f)) + N(r, P(z, f)) = S(r, f), \\
T(r, fP(z, f)) &= m(r, fP(z, f)) + N(r, fP(z, f)) = S(r, f),
\end{align*}

and so

\begin{equation}
T(r, fP(z, f)/P(z, f)) \leq T(r, fP(z, f)) + T(r, 1/P(z, f)) = S(r, f),
\end{equation}

a contradiction. Lemma 2.4 is approved.

**Proof of Theorem 2.1.** According to Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.4, we just need to prove $\lambda(f) = \sigma(f)$ when $n = 2$ in equation (1.6).

Similar to the proof of Lemma 2.4, we can rewrite (2.3) as

\begin{equation}
f(z)P(z, f) = Q(z, f),
\end{equation}

where

\begin{equation}
P(z, f) = 2f'(z) - \left(p'(z) + \frac{q'(z)}{q(z)}\right)f(z),
\end{equation}

and

\begin{equation}
Q(z, f) = \left(p'(z) + \frac{q'(z)}{q(z)}\right)L(z, f) - L'(z, f).
\end{equation}

By using the same method in Lemma 2.4, we deduce a contradiction again when $Q(z, f) \equiv 0$. Thus, we just prove the case that $Q(z, f) \neq 0$, which shows that $L(z, f) \neq 0$.

We now deduce from (2.5), Lemma 2.3 and Remark 2.2 that

\begin{equation}
T(r, P(z, f)) = m(r, P(z, f)) + N(r, P(z, f)) = S(r, f),
\end{equation}

possibly outside of an exceptional set with finite logarithmic measure.
Furthermore, we conclude from (2.6) and lemma of logarithmic derivative that
\[ m \left( r, \frac{1}{f(z)} \right) \leq m \left( r, \frac{1}{P(z, f)} \right) + m \left( r, 2 \frac{f'(z)}{f(z)} - \left( p'(z) + \frac{q'(z)}{q(z)} \right) \right) \]
\[ \leq m \left( r, \frac{1}{P(z, f)} \right) + S(r, f), \] 
(2.8) possibly outside of an exceptional set with finite logarithmic measure.

We now assert that \( f(z) \) has infinitely many zeros. Otherwise, we can deduce \( T(r, f) = S(r, f) \) from (2.7), (2.8) and the first main theory, a contradiction.

Since \( p(z) \) and \( q(z) \) are polynomials, there are only finite common zeros between \( f(z) \), \( p(z) \) and \( q(z) \). Suppose that \( z_0 \) is a zero of \( f(z) \) with order \( k \) such that \( p(z_0) \neq 0 \) and \( q(z_0) \neq 0 \), then by (2.6), \( z_0 \) is also a zero of \( P(z, f) \) with order \( k - 1 \). Thus, we have
\[ N \left( r, \frac{1}{f(z)} \right) \leq N \left( r, \frac{1}{f(z)} \right) + N \left( r, \frac{1}{P(z, f)} \right) + O(\log r). \] 
(2.9) We then yield from (2.7) – (2.9) and the first main theory that
\[ T(r, f) = T \left( r, \frac{1}{f(z)} \right) + O(\log r) \]
\[ \leq N \left( r, \frac{1}{f(z)} \right) + T \left( r, \frac{1}{P(z, f)} \right) + S(r, f) \]
\[ \leq N \left( r, \frac{1}{f(z)} \right) + S(r, f), \] 
possibly outside of an exceptional set with finite logarithmic measure. This yields \( \sigma(f) \leq \lambda(f) \). Therefore, we have \( \lambda(f) = \sigma(f) \). The proof of Theorem 2.1 is approved.

3. Forms of transcendental entire solutions of two order differential-difference equations

The existence of sufficiently many finite order meromorphic solutions of a difference equation appears to be a good indicator of integrability. In this section, we present the exact forms of transcendental entire solutions of a certain type of second order differential-difference equations, and have the following result.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \( L(z, f) = g(z)f(z + \eta) + h(z)f'(z) + u(z)f(z) + v(z) \) be a linear differential-difference polynomial in \( f(z) \) with polynomial coefficients \( g(z), h(z), u(z) \) and \( v(z) \) such that \( L(z, f) \neq 0 \), and let \( a, b, \eta \) be constants such that \( ab\eta \neq 0 \). Then any finite order entire solution of
\[ f(z)^2 + L(z, f) = be^{az} \] 
(3.1) must be form of
\[ f(z) = ce^{az} + f_0(z), \] 
(3.2)
where \( c^2 = b \) and \( f_0(z) = -\frac{1}{2} \left( e^{\frac{\pi}{2} i} g(z) + \frac{\pi}{2} h(z) + u(z) \right) \) is a non-vanishing polynomial.

The following example is listed to show that Theorem 3.1 is valid.

**Example 3.1.** Let \( \eta \) be a nonzero constant such that \( L(z, f) \neq 0 \) in Theorem 3.1 when
\[
g(z) = 2e^{-\eta}z, \quad h(z) = e^{-\eta}, \quad u(z) = -e^{-\eta}
\]
a = 2, \quad b = 1, \quad v(z) = (2 - e^\eta)e^{-\eta}z^2 + (2\eta - 1)e^{-\eta}z + e^{-\eta}.

Then \( f_0(z) = -z \) and the equation
\[
f(z)^2 + 2e^{-\eta}zf(z + \eta) + e^{-\eta}f'(z) - e^{-\eta}f(z)
\]
\[
+ \left[(2 - e^\eta)e^{-\eta}z^2 + (2\eta - 1)e^{-\eta}z + e^{-\eta}\right] = e^{2z}
\]
has entire solutions \( f(z) = \pm e^z - z \), which are the forms of (3.2).

We first give some lemmas.

**Lemma 3.1** [17, Theorem 1.51]. Suppose that \( n \geq 2 \) and let \( f_j(z), j = 1, 2, \cdots, n \) be meromorphic functions and \( g_j, j = 1, 2, \cdots, n \) be entire functions such that
1. \( \sum_{j=1}^n f_j(z)e^{g_j(z)} \equiv 0; \)
2. when \( 1 \leq j < k \leq n, g_j(z) - g_k(z) \) is not constant;
3. when \( 1 \leq j \leq n, 1 \leq h < k \leq n, \)
\[
T(r, f_j(z)) = o\{T(r, \exp\{g_h(z) - g_k(z)\})\} \quad r \to \infty, r \notin E,
\]
where \( E \subset (1, \infty) \) is of finite linear measure or finite logarithmic measure. Then \( f_j(z) \equiv 0, j = 1, 2, \cdots, n. \)

**Lemma 3.2.** Let \( a \) be a nonzero constant, and \( H(z) \) be a non-vanishing polynomial. Then the differential equation
\[
(3.3) \quad 2f'(z) - af(z) = H(z)
\]
has a special solution \( f_0(z) \) which is a non-vanishing polynomial.

**Proof.** If \( H(z) \) is a nonzero constant, then clearly \( f_0(z) = -\frac{H(z)}{a} \) is a special solution of (3.3). Thus, we now suppose that
\[
H(z) = \lambda_n z^n + \lambda_{n-1} z^{n-1} + \cdots + \lambda_1 z + \lambda_0,
\]
where \( n \geq 1 \) is an integer, and \( \lambda_n(\neq 0), \lambda_{n-1}, \cdots, \lambda_0 \) are constants.

We use the method of undetermined coefficients, to derive the polynomial solution \( f_0(z) \) satisfying (3.3) by \( a, \lambda_n, \lambda_{n-1}, \cdots, \lambda_0 \). Clearly, we see from (3.3) that \( \deg f_0 = \deg H \). If \( n = 1 \), equation (3.3) has a polynomial solution
\[
f_0(z) = -\frac{\lambda_1}{a} z + \left(-\frac{\lambda_0}{a} - 2\frac{\lambda_1}{a^2}\right).
\]
If \( n \geq 2 \), a general case, equation (3.3) has a polynomial solution
\[
f_0(z) = b_n z^n + b_{n-1} z^{n-1} + \cdots + b_1 z + b_0,
\]
where
\[ b_n = -\frac{\lambda_n}{a}, \quad b_j = \frac{2(j + 1)b_{j+1} - \lambda_j}{a}, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1. \]

Thus, equation (3.3) has a non-vanishing polynomial solution \( f_0(z) \).

**Proof of Theorem 3.1.** Suppose that \( f(z) \) is an entire solution of equation (3.1) with finite order. Similar to the proof of Lemma 2.4, we can obtain
\[ f(z)P(z, f) = Q(z, f), \tag{3.4} \]
where
\[ P(z, f) = 2f'(z) - af(z), \quad Q(z, f) = aL(z, f) - L'(z, f). \]

We now discuss the following two cases.

**Case 3.1.** \( Q(z, f) \equiv 0 \). Then equation (3.4) implies that \( P(z, f) = 2f'(z) - af(z) \equiv 0 \), which yields
\[ f(z) = ce^\frac{a}{2}z \tag{3.5} \]
for some non-zero constant \( c \). We now substitute (3.5) into (3.1), and conclude that
\[ (c^2 - b)e^{az} + c \left( e^{\frac{a}{2}g(z)} + \frac{a}{2}h(z) + u(z) \right) e^{\frac{a}{2}z} + v(z) = 0. \tag{3.6} \]
Thus, we deduce from Lemma 3.1 and (3.6) that
\[ c^2 = b, \quad e^{\frac{a}{2}g(z)} + \frac{a}{2}h(z) + u(z) \equiv 0 \text{ and } v(z) \equiv 0, \]
which yield \( L(z, f) \equiv 0 \), a contradiction.

**Case 3.2.** \( Q(z, f) \not\equiv 0 \). We first obtain from Theorem 2.1 that \( \sigma(f) = 1 \). Thus, we further apply Lemma 2.3 and Remark 2.2 to (3.4) that
\[ m(r, 2f'(z) - af(z)) = m(r, P(z, f)) = O(\log r), \tag{3.7} \]
possibly outside of an exceptional set with finite logarithmic measure. (3.7) implies that \( 2f'(z) - af(z) \) is a polynomial. Therefore, we have from (3.4) and \( Q(z, f) \not\equiv 0 \) that
\[ 2f'(z) - af(z) = H(z), \tag{3.8} \]
where \( H(z) \) is a nonvanishing polynomial. Thus, we obtain from Lemma 3.2 that the equation (3.8) must have a non-vanishing polynomial solution, say, \( f_0(z) \).

Since the differential equation
\[ 2f'(z) - af(z) = 0, \]
has a fundamental solution \( f(z) = e^\frac{a}{2}z \). It follows that the general solution \( f(z) \) of (3.8) can be express as
\[ f(z) = ce^\frac{a}{2}z + f_0(z), \tag{3.9} \]
where \( c \) is a nonzero constant, \( f_0(z) \) is a special non-vanishing polynomial solution.

Substituting (3.9) into (3.1), we conclude

\[
(c^2 - b)e^{az} + c \left( 2f_0(z) + e^{\frac{a}{2}g(z)} + \frac{a}{2}h(z) + u(z) \right) e^{\frac{a}{2}z} + f_0^2(z) + g(z)f_0(z + \eta) + h(z)f_0'(z) + u(z)f_0(z) + v(z) = 0.
\]

(3.10)

It follows from Lemma 3.1 and (3.10) that

\[
c^2 = b, \quad 2f_0(z) + e^{\frac{a}{2}g(z)} + \frac{a}{2}h(z) + u(z) \equiv 0, \quad f_0^2(z) + g(z)f_0(z + \eta) + h(z)f_0'(z) + u(z)f_0(z) + v(z) \equiv 0.
\]

We further conclude that

\[
f_0(z) = -\frac{1}{2} \left( e^{\frac{a}{2}g(z)} + \frac{a}{2}h(z) + u(z) \right),
\]

and, in this case,

\[
L(z,f) = -f_0(z) \left( f_0(z) + 2ce^{\frac{a}{2}z} \right) \neq 0,
\]

since \( a \neq 0 \) and \( f_0(z) \) is a non-vanishing polynomial.

Thus, any finite order entire solution of the equation (3.1) must be form of (3.2). The proof of Theorem 3.1 is approved.
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