

Three results on transcendental meromorphic solutions of certain nonlinear differential equations

Nan Li^{a,*}, Lianzhong Yang^b

^a*University of Jinan, School of Mathematical Sciences, Jinan, Shandong, 250022, P.R. China*

^b*School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong Province, 250100, P.R.China*

Abstract

In this paper, we study the transcendental meromorphic solutions for the nonlinear differential equations: $f^n + P(f) = R(z)e^{\alpha(z)}$ and $f^n + P_*(f) = p_1(z)e^{\alpha_1(z)} + p_2(z)e^{\alpha_2(z)}$ in the complex plane, where $P(f)$ and $P_*(f)$ are differential polynomials in f of degree $n - 1$ with coefficients being small functions and rational functions respectively, R is a non-vanishing small function of f , α is a nonconstant entire function, p_1, p_2 are non-vanishing rational functions, and α_1, α_2 are nonconstant polynomials. Particularly, we consider the solutions of the second equation when p_1, p_2 are nonzero constants, and $\deg \alpha_1 = \deg \alpha_2 = 1$. Our results are improvements and complements of Liao (Complex Var. Elliptic Equ. 2015, 60(6): 748–756), and Rong-Xu (Mathematics 2019, 7, 539), etc., which partially answer a question proposed by Li (J. Math. Anal. Appl. 2011, 375: 310–319).

Keywords: Meromorphic functions, nonlinear differential equations, small functions, differential polynomials.

2010 MSC: 34M05, 30D30, 30D35

1. Introduction

Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic function in the complex plane \mathbb{C} . We assume that the reader is familiar with the standard notations and main results in Nevanlinna theory (see [4],[6],[12]). Throughout this paper, the term $S(r, f)$ always has the property that $S(r, f) = o(T(r, f))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, possibly outside a set E (which is not necessarily the same at each occurrence) of finite linear measure. A meromorphic function $a(z)$ is said to be a small function with respect to $f(z)$ if and only if $T(r, a) = S(r, f)$. In addition, $N_1(r, 1/f)$

*Corresponding author: Nan Li

Email addresses: nanli32787310@163.com (Nan Li), lzyang@sdu.edu.cn (Lianzhong Yang)

and $N_{(2)}(r, 1/f)$ are used to denote the counting functions corresponding to simple and multiple zeros of f , respectively.

In the past few decades, many scholars, see [7-10] etc., focus on the solutions of the nonlinear differential equations of the form

$$f^n + P(f) = h, \quad (1)$$

where $P(f)$ denotes a differential polynomial in f of degree at most $n - 2$, and h is a given meromorphic function.

In 2015, Liao [9] investigated the forms of meromorphic solutions of equation (1) for specific h , and obtained the following result.

Theorem A. *Let $n \geq 2$ and $P(f)$ be a differential polynomial in f of degree d with rational functions as its coefficients. Suppose that p is a non-zero rational function, α is a non-constant polynomial and $d \leq n - 2$. If the following differential equation*

$$f^n + P(f) = p(z)e^{\alpha(z)}, \quad (2)$$

admits a meromorphic function f with finitely many poles, then f has the following form $f(z) = q(z)e^{r(z)}$ and $P(f) \equiv 0$, where $q(z)$ is a rational function and $r(z)$ is a polynomial with $q^n = p$, $nr(z) = \alpha(z)$. In particular, if p is a polynomial, then q is a polynomial, too.

If the condition $d \leq n - 2$ is omitted, then the conclusions in Theorem A can not hold. For example, $f_0(z) = e^z - 1$ is a solution of the equation $f^2 + f' + f = e^{2z}$, here $n = 2$ and $d = 1 = n - 1$. So it's natural to ask what will happen to the solutions of equation (2) when $d = n - 1$? In this paper, we study this problem and obtain the following result, which is a complement of Theorem A.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer and $P(f)$ be a differential polynomial in f of degree $n - 1$ with coefficients being small functions. Then for any entire function α and any small function R , if the equation*

$$f^n + P(f) = R(z)e^{\alpha(z)} \quad (3)$$

possesses a meromorphic solution f with $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$, then f has the following form:

$$f(z) = s(z)e^{\alpha(z)/n} + \gamma(z),$$

where s and γ are small functions of f with $s^n = R$.

The following Example 1.2 shows that the case in Theorem 1.1 occurs.

Example 1.2. $f_0 = e^z + 1$ is a solution of the following equation

$$f^3 - 2ff' - (f')^2 - f = e^{3z}.$$

Here, $P(f) = -2ff' - (f')^2 - f$, $n = 3$, and $\deg P(f) = 2 = n - 1$.

In 2011, Li [7] considered to find all entire solutions of equation (1) for $h = p_1e^{\alpha_1z} + p_2e^{\alpha_2z}$, where α_1 and α_2 are distinct constants, and obtained the following result.

Theorem B. *Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer, $P(f)$ be a differential polynomial in f of degree at most $n - 2$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p_1, p_2$ be nonzero constants satisfying $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$. If f is a transcendental meromorphic solution of the following equation*

$$f^n(z) + P(f) = p_1e^{\alpha_1z} + p_2e^{\alpha_2z} \quad (4)$$

satisfying $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$, then one of the following relations holds:

- (1) . $f = c_0 + c_1e^{\frac{\alpha_1z}{n}}$;
- (2) . $f = c_0 + c_2e^{\frac{\alpha_2z}{n}}$;
- (3) . $f = c_1e^{\frac{\alpha_1z}{n}} + c_2e^{\frac{\alpha_2z}{n}}$ and $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 0$.

where $c_0(z)$ is a small function of f and constants c_1 and c_2 satisfy $c_1^n = p_1$ and $c_2^n = p_2$, respectively.

For further study, Li [7] proposed the following question:

Question 1. *How to find the solutions of equation (4) under the condition $\deg P(f) = n - 1$?*

For the case $\alpha_2 = -\alpha_1$, Li [7] has already given the detailed forms of the entire solutions of equation (4) when $\deg P(f) = n - 1$; For the case $\alpha_2 = \alpha_1$, (4) can be reduced to $f^n + P(f) = (p_1 + p_2)e^{\alpha_1z}$, then we can get the forms of entire solutions by using Theorem 1.1. So it's natural to ask: what will happen when $\alpha_2 \pm \alpha_1 \neq 0$.

Chen and Gao [2] studied the above question, and obtained the following result.

Theorem C. *Let $a(z)$ be a nonzero polynomial and $p_1, p_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$ be nonzero constants such that $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$. Suppose that $f(z)$ is a transcendental entire solution of finite order of the differential equation*

$$f^2(z) + a(z)f'(z) = p_1e^{\alpha_1z} + p_2e^{\alpha_2z} \quad (5)$$

satisfying $N(r, 1/f) = S(r, f)$, then $a(z)$ must be a constant and one of the following relations holds:

- (1) . $f = c_1e^{\frac{\alpha_1z}{2}}$, $ac_1\alpha_1 = 2p_2$ and $\alpha_1 = 2\alpha_2$;
- (2) . $f = c_2e^{\frac{\alpha_2z}{2}}$, $ac_2\alpha_2 = 2p_1$ and $\alpha_2 = 2\alpha_1$,

where c_1 and c_2 are constants satisfying $c_1^2 = p_1$ and $c_2^2 = p_2$, respectively.

Later, Rong and Xu [11] improved Theorem C by removing the condition that $f(z)$ is a finite-order function. In [11], they also considered the general case in Question 1, and obtained the following result.

Theorem D. *Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer. Suppose that $P(f)$ is a differential polynomial in $f(z)$ of degree $n - 1$ and that α_1, α_2, p_1 and p_2 are nonzero constants such that $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$. If $f(z)$ is a transcendental meromorphic solution of the differential equation (4) satisfying $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$, then $\rho(f) = 1$ and one of the following relations holds:*

- (1) . $f(z) = c_1 e^{\frac{\alpha_1 z}{n}}$ and $c_1^n = p_1$;
- (2) . $f(z) = c_2 e^{\frac{\alpha_2 z}{n}}$ and $c_2^n = p_2$, where c_1 and c_2 are constants;
- (3) . $T(r, f) \leq N_1(r, 1/f) + T(r, \varphi) + S(r, f)$, where $\varphi (\neq 0)$ is equal to $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 f^2 - n(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) f f' + n(n - 1)(f')^2 + n f f''$.

In this paper, we go on investigating Question 1 and obtain the following results, which are improvements of Theorems C and D.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer. Suppose that $P_*(f)$ is a differential polynomial in $f(z)$ of degree $n - 1$ and with rational functions as its coefficients, α_1, α_2 be nonconstant polynomials, and p_1, p_2 be non-vanishing rational functions. If $f(z)$ is a transcendental meromorphic solution of the following nonlinear differential equation*

$$f^n(z) + P_*(f) = p_1(z)e^{\alpha_1(z)} + p_2(z)e^{\alpha_2(z)}, \quad (6)$$

with $\lambda_f = \max\{\lambda(f), \lambda(1/f)\} < \sigma(f)$, then $\sigma(f) = \deg \alpha_1 = \deg \alpha_2$, and one of the following relations holds:

- (I) . $\alpha_2' = \alpha_1'$. In this case, $f = s_1(z) \exp(\alpha_1(z)/n) = s_2(z) \exp(\alpha_2(z)/n)$, where s_1 and s_2 are rational functions satisfying $s_1^n = p_1 + p_2 c_2$ and $s_2^n = \frac{1}{c_2} p_1 + p_2$, $c_2 = e^{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}$ is a non-zero constant;
- (II) . $k_1 \alpha_1' = n \alpha_2'$, where k_1 is an integer satisfying $1 \leq k_1 \leq n - 1$. In this case, $f(z) = s_3(z) e^{\frac{\alpha_1(z)}{n}}$, where s_3 is a rational function satisfying $s_3^n = p_1$;
- (III) . $k_2 \alpha_2' = n \alpha_1'$, where k_2 is an integer satisfying $1 \leq k_2 \leq n - 1$. In this case, $f(z) = s_4(z) e^{\frac{\alpha_2(z)}{n}}$, where s_4 is a rational function satisfying $s_4^n = p_2$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer. Suppose that $P_*(f)$ is a differential polynomial in $f(z)$ of degree $n - 1$ with rational functions as its coefficients, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p_1, p_2$ be nonzero constants such that $\alpha_1 \pm \alpha_2 \neq 0$. If $f(z)$ is an transcendental meromorphic solution of the following nonlinear differential equation*

$$f^n(z) + P_*(f) = p_1 e^{\alpha_1 z} + p_2 e^{\alpha_2 z}, \quad (7)$$

satisfying $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$, then $\sigma(f) = 1$ and there exist two cases:

- (I) $N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) = S(r, f)$, then one of the following relations holds: (a) $k_1\alpha_1 = n\alpha_2$ and $f = s_1 \exp(\alpha_1 z/n)$; (b) $k_2\alpha_2 = n\alpha_1$ and $f = s_2 \exp(\alpha_2 z/n)$, where k_1, k_2 are integers satisfying $1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq n-1$, s_1, s_2 are constants with $s_1^n = p_1$ and $s_2^n = p_2$;
- (II) $N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) \neq S(r, f)$, then $T(r, f) \leq N_1\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + \frac{1}{2}T(r, \varphi) + \frac{1}{2}N\left(r, \frac{1}{\varphi}\right) + S(r, f)$, where $\varphi = \alpha_1\alpha_2 f^2 - n(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)ff' + n(n-1)(f')^2 + nff'' \neq 0$, and
- (1). if φ is a nonzero constant, then one of the following relations holds: (a) $(n-1)\alpha_1 = n\alpha_2$ and $f(z) = c_1 e^{\alpha_1 z/n} - \frac{1}{\alpha_1} \sqrt{\frac{n\varphi}{n-1}} (c_1^n = p_1)$, or $f(z) = c_3 e^{\alpha_1 z/n} + \frac{1}{\alpha_1} \sqrt{\frac{n\varphi}{n-1}} (c_3^n = p_1)$; (b) $(n-1)\alpha_2 = n\alpha_1$, and $f(z) = c_2 e^{\alpha_2 z/n} - \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \sqrt{\frac{n\varphi}{n-1}} (c_2^n = p_2)$ or $f(z) = c_4 e^{\alpha_2 z/n} + \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \sqrt{\frac{n\varphi}{n-1}} (c_4^n = p_2)$;
- (2). if φ is a nonconstant meromorphic function, then $T(r, \varphi) \neq S(r, f)$. Particularly, suppose $n = 2$ and $\varphi = P(z)e^{Q(z)}$, where P and Q are non-vanishing polynomials such that $\deg Q \geq 1$. Then we have $\deg Q = 1$ and $f^2 = d_1 e^{\alpha_1 z} + d_2 e^{\alpha_2 z} - R(z)e^{Q(z)}$, where d_1, d_2 are constants, and R is a non-vanishing polynomial with $\deg R \leq \deg P + 2$.

The following Examples 1.5 and 1.6 are shown to illustrate the cases (II)(1) and (II)(2) of Theorem 1.4.

Example 1.5. $f_0 = e^z - 1$ is a solution of the equation

$$f^2 + 2f' + f = e^{2z} + e^z.$$

Here $\alpha_1 = 2$, $\alpha_2 = 1$, $\alpha_1 = 2\alpha_2$ and $\varphi = 2$. It implies that case (II)(1)(a) occurs.

Example 1.6. $f_0 = e^{2z} + e^z$ is a solution of

$$f^2 + \frac{1}{2}f' - \frac{1}{2}f'' = e^{4z} + 2e^{3z}.$$

Here $\alpha_1 = 4$, $\alpha_2 = 3$, $n = 2$, $\varphi = 2e^{2z}$, and $f_0^2 = e^{4z} + 2e^{3z} + e^{2z}$. It implies that case (II)(2) occurs.

2. Preliminary Lemmas

The following lemma plays an important role in uniqueness problems of meromorphic functions.

Lemma 2.1 ([12]). *Let $f_j(z)$ ($j = 1, \dots, n$) ($n \geq 2$) be meromorphic functions, and let $g_j(z)$ ($j = 1, \dots, n$) be entire functions satisfying*

$$(i) \sum_{j=1}^n f_j(z)e^{g_j(z)} \equiv 0;$$

(ii) when $1 \leq j < k \leq n$, then $g_j(z) - g_k(z)$ is not a constant;

(iii) when $1 \leq j \leq n, 1 \leq h < k \leq n$, then

$$T(r, f_j) = o\{T(r, e^{g_h - g_k})\} \quad (r \rightarrow \infty, r \notin E),$$

where $E \subset (1, \infty)$ is of finite linear measure or logarithmic measure.

Then, $f_j(z) \equiv 0$ ($j = 1, \dots, n$).

Lemma 2.2. (the Clunie lemma [6]) Let f be a transcendental meromorphic solution of the equation:

$$f^n P(z, f) = Q(z, f),$$

where $P(z, f)$ and $Q(z, f)$ are polynomials in f and its derivatives with meromorphic coefficients $\{a_\lambda | \lambda \in I\}$ such that $m(r, a_\lambda) = S(r, f)$ for all $\lambda \in I$. If the total degree of $Q(z, f)$ as a polynomial in f and its derivatives is at most n , then $m(r, P(z, f)) = S(r, f)$.

Lemma 2.3. (the Weierstrass factorization theorem [3]) Let $f(z)$ be an entire function, and a_1, a_2, \dots denote all nonzero zeros of $f(z)$ repeated according to multiplicity, suppose also that $f(z)$ has a zero at $z = 0$ of multiplicity $m \geq 0$. Then there exists an entire function $g(z)$ and a sequence of nonnegative integers p_1, p_2, \dots such that

$$f(z) = E(z)e^{g(z)},$$

where $E(z) = z^m \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} E_{p_n} \left(\frac{z}{a_n} \right)$ is the canonical product formed by the zeros of $f(z)$, and $E_n(z)$ is given by

$$E_0(z) = 1 - z; \quad E_n(z) = (1 - z) \exp(z + z^2/2 + \dots + z^n/n), \quad n \geq 1.$$

A well known fact about Lemma 2.3 asserts that $\sigma(E) = \lambda(f) \leq \sigma(f)$, and $\sigma(f) = \sigma(e^g)$ when $\lambda(f) < \sigma(f)$.

The following lemma, which is a slight generalization of Tumura–Clunie type theorem, is referred to [5, Corollary], can also see [1, Theorem 4.3.1].

Lemma 2.4. ([1, 5]) Suppose that $f(z)$ is meromorphic and not constant in the plane, that

$$g(z) = f(z)^n + P_{n-1}(f),$$

where $P_{n-1}(f)$ is a differential polynomial of degree at most $n-1$ in f , and that

$$N(r, f) + N \left(r, \frac{1}{g} \right) = S(r, f).$$

Then $g(z) = (f + \gamma)^n$, where γ is meromorphic and $T(r, \gamma) = S(r, f)$.

Case II. $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$, and either $a = \alpha_1$ or $a = \alpha_2$. Then $2a - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 \neq 0$, and (10) reduces to

$$R'' + (2a - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2)R' = P_m(z). \quad (12)$$

We choose $R(z)$ is a polynomial with degree $m + 1$ as follow,

$$R(z) = c_{m+1}z^{m+1} + c_m z^m + \cdots + c_1 z. \quad (13)$$

By substituting (9) and (13) into (12), comparing the coefficients of the same power of z at both sides of equation (12), we get the following system of linear equations,

$$\begin{cases} a_m = (2a - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2)(m + 1)c_{m+1}, \\ a_i = (2a - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2)(i + 1)c_{i+1} + (i + 2)(i + 1)c_{i+2}, \quad i = m - 1, \dots, 1, 0. \end{cases}$$

Since $2a - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 \neq 0$, we can solve c_i ($i = 1, \dots, m + 1$) by using Cramer's rule to the above system.

Case III. $a = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2$. Then $2a - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 = 0$, $a^2 - a(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + \alpha_1\alpha_2 = 0$, and (10) reduces to

$$R'' = P_m(z). \quad (14)$$

We choose $R(z)$ is another polynomial with degree $m + 2$ as follow,

$$R(z) = d_{m+2}z^{m+2} + d_{m+1}z^{m+1} + \cdots + d_2 z^2. \quad (15)$$

By substituting (9) and (15) into (14), comparing the coefficients of the same power of z at both sides of equation (14), we get the following system of linear equations,

$$\begin{cases} a_m = (m + 2)(m + 1)d_{m+2}, \\ a_{m-1} = (m + 1)md_{m+1}, \\ \dots \\ a_0 = 2d_2. \end{cases}$$

Obviously, we can solve d_i ($i = 2, \dots, m + 2$) directly from the above system. \square

Lemma 2.7. *Let $n \geq 2$ be integers and $P_d(f)$ denote an algebraic differential polynomial in $f(z)$ of degree $d \leq n - 1$ with small functions of f as coefficients. If $p_1(z), p_2(z)$ are small functions of f , $\alpha_1(z), \alpha_2(z)$ are nonconstant entire functions and if f is a transcendental meromorphic solution of the equation*

$$f^n + P_d(f) = p_1 e^{\alpha_1} + p_2 e^{\alpha_2} \quad (16)$$

with $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$, then we have $T(r, f) = O(T(r, p_1 e^{\alpha_1} + p_2 e^{\alpha_2}))$, $T(r, p_1 e^{\alpha_1} + p_2 e^{\alpha_2}) = O(T(r, f))$, and $T(r, f^n + P_d(f)) \neq S(r, f)$.

Proof. By the proof of [13, Theorem 1.3] (or [6, Lemma 2.4.2.Clunie lemma]), we get that

$$m(r, P_d(f)) \leq dm(r, f) + S(r, f). \quad (17)$$

By combining (16), (17) with $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} nT(r, f) &= T(r, f^n) \leq m(r, p_1e^{\alpha_1} + p_2e^{\alpha_2}) + m(r, P_d(f)) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, p_1e^{\alpha_1} + p_2e^{\alpha_2}) + dT(r, f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

This gives that

$$(n - d)T(r, f) \leq T(r, p_1e^{\alpha_1} + p_2e^{\alpha_2}) + S(r, f),$$

i.e.,

$$T(r, f) = O(T(r, p_1e^{\alpha_1} + p_2e^{\alpha_2})). \quad (18)$$

From (17), $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$ and equation (16), we can also get

$$T(r, p_1e^{\alpha_1} + p_2e^{\alpha_2}) = O(T(r, f)). \quad (19)$$

Next, we prove that $T(r, f^n + P_d(f))$ can not be a small function of f . Otherwise, we will have $f^n + P_d(f) = \beta$ with $T(r, \beta) = S(r, f)$. Thus $f^n = \beta - P_d(f)$. Since $d \leq n - 1$, from Lemma 2.2, we get $m(r, f) = S(r, f)$. Then $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$ since $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. \square

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1.

Let f be a transcendental meromorphic solution of the equation (3) with $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$.

Since

$$N(r, f) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{R(z)e^{\alpha(z)}}\right) = S(r, f),$$

by Lemma 2.4 we get

$$(f - \gamma)^n = R(z)e^{\alpha(z)}, \quad T(r, \gamma) = S(r, f).$$

Thus we have

$$f = s(z)e^{\alpha(z)/n} + \gamma(z),$$

where s and γ are small functions of f with $s^n = R$.

4. Proof of Theorem 1.3.

Let f be a transcendental meromorphic solution of the equation (6) with $\lambda_f < \sigma(f)$. Then f is of regular growth, and we have

$$N(r, f) = S(r, f), \text{ and } N(r, 1/f) = S(r, f). \quad (20)$$

By combining with Lemma 2.7, we have

$$T(r, f^n + P_*(f)) \neq S(r, f), \quad (21)$$

and

$$\sigma(f) = \sigma(p_1 e^{\alpha_1} + p_2 e^{\alpha_2}) = \max\{\deg \alpha_1, \deg \alpha_2\}. \quad (22)$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2.3 we can factorize $f(z)$ as

$$f(z) = \frac{d_1(z)}{d_2(z)} e^{g(z)} = d(z) e^{g(z)}, \quad (23)$$

where g is a polynomial with $\deg g = \sigma(f) = \max\{\deg \alpha_1, \deg \alpha_2\} \geq 1$, d_1 and d_2 are the canonical products formed by zeros and poles of f with $\sigma(d_1) = \lambda(f) < \sigma(f)$ and $\sigma(d_2) = \lambda(1/f) < \sigma(f)$.

Next we assert that $\deg \alpha_1 = \deg \alpha_2$. Otherwise, we have $\deg \alpha_1 \neq \deg \alpha_2$.

Suppose that $\deg \alpha_1 < \deg \alpha_2$, then $T(r, e^{\alpha_1}) = S(r, e^{\alpha_2})$. From Lemma 2.7, we get

$$(1 + o(1))T(r, e^{\alpha_2}) = T(r, p_1 e^{\alpha_1} + p_2 e^{\alpha_2}) \leq K_1 T(r, f), \quad K_1 > 0,$$

which means that a small function of e^{α_2} is also a small function of f . So we have $T(r, e^{\alpha_1}) = S(r, f)$. We rewritten (6) as follow:

$$f^n(z) + P_*(f) - p_1 e^{\alpha_1} = p_2 e^{\alpha_2}. \quad (24)$$

Therefore, by using Theorem 1.1, we get that $f = s_0(z) \exp(\alpha_2(z)/n) + t_0(z)$, where s_0, t_0 are small functions of f with $s_0^n = p_2$. If $t_0 \not\equiv 0$, then combining (20) with Nevanlinna's Second Main Theorem, we have

$$T(r, f) \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{f - t_0}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + N(r, f) + S(r, f) = S(r, f),$$

a contradiction. So we have $t_0 \equiv 0$. Moreover, we also have that s_0 is a rational function because of the fact that p_2 is a rational function. Substituting $f = s_0(z) \exp(\alpha_2(z)/n)$ into (24), we get that

$$p_1 e^{\alpha_1} = P_*(f) = R_{n-1} e^{\frac{n-1}{n}\alpha_2} + \cdots + R_1 e^{\frac{1}{n}\alpha_2} + R_0,$$

where R_0, R_1, \dots, R_{n-1} are rational functions. By using Lemma 2.1 and $\deg \alpha_2 > \deg \alpha_1 > 0$, we get that $p_1 \equiv 0$, a contradiction.

Suppose that $\deg \alpha_1 > \deg \alpha_2$, we can also get a contradiction as in the case $\deg \alpha_1 < \deg \alpha_2$.

Therefore, $\deg \alpha_1 = \deg \alpha_2$. By combining with (22) and (23), we have $\sigma(f) = \deg g = \deg \alpha_1 = \deg \alpha_2$, and $S(r, f) = S(r, e^{\alpha_1}) = S(r, e^{\alpha_2})$.

Case 1. $(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)' = 0$. Then $\alpha_2 - \alpha_1$ is a constant, by equation (6), we get

$$f^n(z) + P_*(f) = (p_1 + p_2 c_2) e^{\alpha_1} = \left(\frac{1}{c_2} p_1 + p_2 \right) e^{\alpha_2},$$

where $c_2 = e^{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}$ is a non-zero constant. Obviously, from (21) we have that $p_1 + p_2 c_2 \neq 0$ and $\frac{1}{c_2} p_1 + p_2 \neq 0$. Therefore, by using Theorem 1.1, we get that $f = s_1(z) \exp(\alpha_1(z)/n) + t_1(z) = s_2(z) \exp(\alpha_2(z)/n) + t_2(z)$, where s_1, t_1, s_2, t_2 are small functions of f with $s_1^n = p_1 + p_2 c_2$ and $s_2^n = \frac{1}{c_2} p_1 + p_2$. Combining (20) with Nevanlinna's Second Main Theorem, we have $t_1 \equiv 0$ and $t_2 \equiv 0$. From p_1, p_2 are rational functions, we have s_1 and s_2 are rational functions. This belongs to Case I in Theorem 1.3.

Case 2. $(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)' \neq 0$. By differentiating both sides of (6), we have

$$n f^{n-1} f' + P'_*(f) = (p'_1 + p_1 \alpha'_1) e^{\alpha_1} + (p'_2 + p_2 \alpha'_2) e^{\alpha_2}. \quad (25)$$

Obviously, we have that $p'_1 + p_1 \alpha'_1 \neq 0$ and $p'_2 + p_2 \alpha'_2 \neq 0$. Otherwise, we will get that $p_1 = c_0 e^{-\alpha_1}$ and $p_2 = c_1 e^{-\alpha_2}$, where $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, which contradict with the fact that α_1, α_2 are nonconstant polynomials, and p_1, p_2 are non-vanishing rational functions.

By eliminating e^{α_2} from equations (6) and (25), we have

$$(p'_2 + p_2 \alpha'_2) f^n - n p_2 f^{n-1} f' + Q_1(f) = A_1 e^{\alpha_1}, \quad (26)$$

where

$$A_1 = p_1 (p'_2 + p_2 \alpha'_2) - p_2 (p'_1 + p_1 \alpha'_1), \quad (27)$$

and

$$Q_1(f) = (p'_2 + p_2 \alpha'_2) P_* - p_2 P'_*. \quad (28)$$

We assert that $A_1(z) \neq 0$. Otherwise, if $A_1(z) \equiv 0$, then we have

$$(p'_2 + p_2 \alpha'_2) p_1 = p_2 (p'_1 + p_1 \alpha'_1).$$

Therefore

$$p_2 e^{\alpha_2} = c_3 p_1 e^{\alpha_1}, \quad c_3 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (29)$$

So we get $\alpha_2 - \alpha_1$ is a constant, a contradiction with the assumption $(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)' \neq 0$. Therefore, $A_1(z) \neq 0$.

By differentiating (26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2)'f^n + np_2\alpha'_2f^{n-1}f' - np_2(n-1)f^{n-2}(f')^2 - np_2f^{n-1}f'' + Q'_1(f) \\ & = (A'_1 + A_1\alpha'_1)e^{\alpha_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

By eliminating e^{α_1} from equations (26) and (30), we obtain

$$f^{n-2}\varphi = Q(f), \quad (31)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi = & ((A'_1 + A_1\alpha'_1)(p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2) - A_1(p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2)')f^2 + n(n-1)p_2A_1(f')^2 \\ & - np_2(A'_1 + A_1(\alpha'_1 + \alpha'_2))ff' + np_2A_1ff''. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

and

$$Q(f) = A_1Q'_1(f) - (A'_1 + A_1\alpha'_1)Q_1(f). \quad (33)$$

Next we discuss two cases.

Subcase 2.1. $Q(f) \equiv 0$. Then by (31), we have $\varphi \equiv 0$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & ((A'_1 + A_1\alpha'_1)(p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2) - A_1(p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2)')f^2 = np_2(A'_1 + A_1(\alpha'_1 + \alpha'_2))ff' \\ & - n(n-1)p_2A_1(f')^2 - np_2A_1ff''. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Next we assert that f has at most finitely many zeros and poles. Otherwise, f has infinitely many zeros or poles.

Suppose that f has infinitely many zeros. let z_0 be a zero of f with multiplicity k but neither a zero nor a pole of the coefficients in equation (34), then $k \geq 2$ and $f(z) = a_k(z - z_0)^k + a_{k+1}(z - z_0)^{k+1} + \dots$ ($a_k \neq 0$) holds in some small neighborhood of z_0 .

If $(A'_1 + A_1\alpha'_1)(p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2) - A_1(p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2)' \equiv 0$, then we have

$$\frac{A'_1}{A_1} + \alpha'_1 = \frac{(p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2)'}{p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2}.$$

This gives that

$$A_1e^{\alpha_1} = c_4(p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2), \quad c_4 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\},$$

which yields a contradiction with $A_1 (\neq 0)$, $p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2 (\neq 0)$ are rational functions, and α_1 is a nonconstant polynomial. Therefore, $(A'_1 + A_1\alpha'_1)(p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2) - A_1(p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2)' \neq 0$.

Obviously, z_0 is a zero with multiplicity $2k$ of the left side of (34). As to the right side, the coefficient of $(z - z_0)^{2k-2}$ is

$$-nkp_2A_1((n-1)k + (k-1))a_k^2,$$

which can not equal to zero when $n, k \geq 2$. Therefore, z_0 is a zero with multiplicity $2k - 2$ of the right side of (34). This is a contradiction.

Suppose that f has infinitely many poles. Let z_1 be a pole of f with multiplicity m but neither a zero nor a pole of the coefficients in equation (34), then $f(z) = \frac{a_{-m}}{(z-z_1)^m} + \frac{a_{-m+1}}{(z-z_1)^{m-1}} + \cdots (a_{-m} \neq 0)$ holds in some small neighborhood of z_1 . Obviously, z_1 is a pole with multiplicity $2m$ of the left side of (34). As to the right side, the coefficient of $(z - z_0)^{-2(m+1)}$ is

$$-nmp_2A_1((n-1)m + (m+1))a_{-m}^2,$$

which can not equal to zero when $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 2$. Therefore, z_1 is a pole with multiplicity $2(m+1)$ of the right side of (34). This is a contradiction.

Therefore, f has at most finitely many zeros and poles. So

$$f(z) = d(z)e^{g(z)}, \quad (35)$$

where g is a polynomial with $\deg g = \deg \alpha_1 = \deg \alpha_2 \geq 1$, and d is a rational function.

By substituting (35) into equation (6), we get that

$$d^ne^{ng} + \tilde{R}_{n-1}e^{(n-1)g} + \cdots + \tilde{R}_1e^g + \tilde{R}_0 = p_1e^{\alpha_1} + p_2e^{\alpha_2}, \quad (36)$$

where $\tilde{R}_0, \tilde{R}_1, \dots, \tilde{R}_{n-1}$ are rational functions.

If neither $ng(z) - \alpha_1(z)$ nor $ng(z) - \alpha_2(z)$ are constants, then by Lemma 2.1, we get that $d(z) \equiv 0$, which yields a contradiction.

If $ng(z) - \alpha_1(z)$ is a constant, then $ng(z) - \alpha_2(z)$ is not a constant, otherwise we have $\alpha_2(z) - \alpha_1(z)$ is a constant, which yields a contradiction. We set $ng(z) - \alpha_1(z) = c_5$, then (36) can be reduced to

$$(d^n - p_1e^{-c_5})e^{ng} + \tilde{R}_{n-1}e^{(n-1)g} + \cdots + \tilde{R}_1e^g + \tilde{R}_0 - p_2e^{\alpha_2} = 0.$$

By Lemma 2.1, there must exists some integer k_1 ($1 \leq k_1 \leq n-1$) such that

$$k_1g' = \alpha_2' \quad \text{and} \quad d^n - p_1e^{-c_5} = 0.$$

Therefore, by combining with (35) we have

$$f(z) = s_3(z)e^{\frac{\alpha_1(z)}{n}},$$

where $s_3^n = p_1$, and $k_1\alpha_1' = n\alpha_2'$.

If $ng(z) - \alpha_2(z)$ is a constant, then $ng(z) - \alpha_1(z)$ is not a constant, following the similar reason, we have

$$f(z) = s_4(z)e^{\frac{\alpha_2(z)}{n}},$$

where $s_4^n = p_2$, and $k_2\alpha_2' = n\alpha_1'$ ($1 \leq k_2 \leq n-1$).

Subcase 2.2. $Q(f) \neq 0$. By combining Logarithmic Derivative Lemma with (32), we get

$$m\left(r, \frac{\varphi}{f^2}\right) = S(r, f). \quad (37)$$

We rewritten (31) as follow,

$$f^{n-1} \frac{\varphi}{f} = Q(f). \quad (38)$$

From (32), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varphi}{f} &= ((A'_1 + A_1\alpha'_1)(p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2) - A_1(p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2)') f + n(n-1)p_2A_1 \frac{f'}{f} \cdot f' \\ &\quad - np_2(A'_1 + A_1(\alpha'_1 + \alpha'_2)) f' + np_2A_1 f'', \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

is a polynomial in f , f' and f'' with meromorphic coefficients such that

$$m(r, (A'_1 + A_1\alpha'_1)(p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2) - A_1(p'_2 + p_2\alpha'_2)') = S(r, f), \quad m(r, p_2A_1) = S(r, f),$$

$$m\left(r, p_2A_1 \frac{f'}{f}\right) = S(r, f), \quad \text{and } m(r, p_2(A'_1 + A_1(\alpha'_1 + \alpha'_2))) = S(r, f).$$

By combining with (38), (39), (33), and Lemma 2.2, we have that

$$m\left(r, \frac{\varphi}{f}\right) = S(r, f). \quad (40)$$

From(20), (32), (37) and (40), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} 2T(r, f) + S(r, f) &= T\left(r, \frac{1}{f^2}\right) = m\left(r, \frac{1}{f^2}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m\left(r, \frac{\varphi}{f^2}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{1}{\varphi}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \varphi) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m\left(r, \frac{\varphi}{f}\right) + m(r, f) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, f) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

which yields a contradiction.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.4.

Let f be a transcendental meromorphic solution of the equation (7) with $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$. By Lemma 2.7, we have that f is of finite order and

$$\sigma(f) = \sigma(p_1 e^{\alpha_1 z} + p_2 e^{\alpha_2 z}) = 1. \quad (41)$$

If $N(r, 1/f) = S(r, f)$, by the proof of Theorem 1.3, we can get the conclusion.

Next, we consider the case when $N(r, 1/f) \neq S(r, f)$. By differentiating (7), we get

$$n f^{n-1} f' + P'_*(f) = p_1 \alpha_1 e^{\alpha_1 z} + p_2 \alpha_2 e^{\alpha_2 z} \quad (42)$$

By eliminating $e^{\alpha_2 z}$ from (7) and (42), we have

$$\alpha_2 f^n + \alpha_2 P_*(f) - n f^{n-1} f' - P'_*(f) = p_1 (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) e^{\alpha_1 z}. \quad (43)$$

Differentiating (43) yields

$$n \alpha_2 f^{n-1} f' + \alpha_2 P'_* - n(n-1) f^{n-2} (f')^2 - n f^{n-1} f'' - P''_* = p_1 \alpha_1 (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) e^{\alpha_1 z}. \quad (44)$$

It follows from (43) and (44) that

$$f^{n-2} \varphi = -P''_* + (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) P'_* - \alpha_1 \alpha_2 P_*, \quad (45)$$

where

$$\varphi(z) = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 f^2 - n(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) f f' + n(n-1) (f')^2 + n f f''. \quad (46)$$

Next we assert that $\varphi(z) \not\equiv 0$. Otherwise, we have

$$\alpha_1 \alpha_2 f^2 - n(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) f f' + n(n-1) (f')^2 + n f f'' = 0. \quad (47)$$

Since $N(r, 1/f) \neq S(r, f)$, let z_0 be a zero of f with multiplicity k . By (47) we have $k \geq 2$ and $f(z) = a_k (z - z_0)^k + a_{k+1} (z - z_0)^{k+1} + \cdots$ ($a_k \neq 0$) holds in some small neighborhood of z_0 . We rewrite (47) as follow,

$$\alpha_1 \alpha_2 f^2 = n(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) f f' - n(n-1) (f')^2 - n f f''. \quad (48)$$

Obviously, z_0 is a zero with multiplicity $2k$ of the left side of (48). As to the right side, the coefficient of $(z - z_0)^{2k-2}$ is

$$-nk((n-1)k + (k-1))a_k^2,$$

which can not equal to zero when $n, k \geq 2$. Therefore, z_0 is a zero with multiplicity $2k - 2$ of the right side of (48). This is a contradiction. Therefore, $\varphi(z) \not\equiv 0$.

From (45) and (46), by using Lemma 2.2 and Logarithmic Derivative Lemma, we have

$$m\left(r, \frac{\varphi}{f}\right) = S(r, f), \text{ and } m\left(r, \frac{\varphi}{f^2}\right) = S(r, f). \quad (49)$$

From (49), we have

$$2m\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) = m\left(r, \frac{1}{f^2}\right) \leq m\left(r, \frac{\varphi}{f^2}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{1}{\varphi}\right) \leq m\left(r, \frac{1}{\varphi}\right) + S(r, f) \quad (50)$$

By (46), we have

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) = N_1\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + N_2\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) \leq N_1\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{\varphi}\right) + S(r, f) \quad (51)$$

Combining with (50) and (51), we have

$$T(r, f) \leq N_1\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + \frac{1}{2}T(r, \varphi) + \frac{1}{2}N\left(r, \frac{1}{\varphi}\right) + S(r, f).$$

Case 1. $\varphi(z)$ is a nonzero constant. Since $N(r, 1/f) \neq S(r, f)$, let z_1 be a zero of f with multiplicity m . By (46) we have $n(n-1)(f')^2(z_1) = \varphi \neq 0$. Thus, $m = 1$, i.e., z_1 is a simple zero of f .

Subcase 1.1. z_1 is a zero of $f'(z) - \sqrt{\varphi/n(n-1)}$. Then we set

$$h(z) = \frac{f'(z) - \sqrt{\frac{\varphi}{n(n-1)}}}{f(z)}. \quad (52)$$

Obviously, meromorphic function $h(z) \not\equiv 0$. Otherwise, f will be a polynomial, a contradiction. By (49), Logarithmic Derivative Lemma and $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$, we get $T(r, h) = m(r, h) + N(r, h) = S(r, f)$. Therefore, $h(z)$ is a small function of f . We rewrite (52) as follow,

$$f' = hf + \sqrt{\frac{\varphi}{n(n-1)}}, \quad (53)$$

then,

$$f'' = h'f + hf' = (h^2 + h')f + h\sqrt{\frac{\varphi}{n(n-1)}}. \quad (54)$$

Substituting (53) and (54) into (46), we get that

$$A_1f + A_2 = 0, \quad (55)$$

where

$$A_1 = \alpha_1\alpha_2 - n(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)h + n^2h^2 + nh'$$

and

$$A_2 = ((2n - 1)h - (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)) \sqrt{n\varphi/(n - 1)}.$$

Suppose that $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - (2n - 1)h \neq 0$, then by (55) and $T(r, h) = S(r, f)$, we have

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{A_2}\right) + N(r, A_1) = S(r, f),$$

a contradiction with the assumption that $N(r, 1/f) \neq S(r, f)$. Therefore, combining with (55) we have

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_1\alpha_2 - n(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)h + n^2h^2 + nh' \equiv 0, \\ \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - (2n - 1)h \equiv 0. \end{cases}$$

Thus

$$(n - 1)\alpha_1 = n\alpha_2 \quad \text{or} \quad (n - 1)\alpha_2 = n\alpha_1.$$

If $(n - 1)\alpha_1 = n\alpha_2$, then $h = \frac{\alpha_2}{n-1} = \frac{\alpha_1}{n}$, and $f' - \frac{\alpha_1}{n}f = \sqrt{\frac{\varphi}{n(n-1)}}$. Thus the general solutions can be represented in the form $f(z) = c_1 e^{\frac{\alpha_1}{n}z} - \frac{1}{\alpha_1} \sqrt{\frac{n\varphi}{n-1}}$, where c_1 is a constant. By substituting it into equation (7), we get $c_1^n = p_1$.

If $(n - 1)\alpha_2 = n\alpha_1$, then $h = \frac{\alpha_1}{n-1} = \frac{\alpha_2}{n}$, and $f' - \frac{\alpha_2}{n}f = \sqrt{\frac{\varphi}{n(n-1)}}$. Thus the solution can be represented in the form $f(z) = c_2 e^{\frac{\alpha_2}{n}z} - \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \sqrt{\frac{n\varphi}{n-1}}$, where c_2 is a constant satisfying $c_2^n = p_2$.

Subcase 1.2. z_1 is a zero of $f'(z) + \sqrt{\varphi/n(n-1)}$. By using the similar arguments as above, we can get the conclusions that $(n - 1)\alpha_1 = n\alpha_2$ and $f(z) = c_3 e^{\frac{\alpha_1}{n}z} + \frac{1}{\alpha_1} \sqrt{\frac{n\varphi}{n-1}}$, or $(n - 1)\alpha_2 = n\alpha_1$ and $f(z) = c_4 e^{\frac{\alpha_2}{n}z} + \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \sqrt{\frac{n\varphi}{n-1}}$, where c_3, c_4 are constants satisfying $c_3^n = p_1$ and $c_4^n = p_2$.

Case 2. $\varphi(z)$ is a nonconstant small function of f . Differentiating (46) gives

$$\varphi' = 2\alpha_1\alpha_2 f f' - n(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)(f')^2 - n(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) f f'' + n(2n - 1) f' f'' + n f f''' \quad (56)$$

It follows from (46) and (56) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha_1\alpha_2\varphi' f^2 - [n(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)\varphi' + 2\alpha_1\alpha_2\varphi] f f' + n[(n - 1)\varphi' + (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)\varphi] (f')^2 \\ & + n[(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)\varphi + \varphi'] f f'' - n(2n - 1)\varphi f' f'' - n\varphi f f''' = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Since $N(r, 1/f) \neq S(r, f)$ and $T(r, \varphi) = S(r, f)$, let z_2 be a zero of f , which is neither a zero of φ nor a pole of the coefficients in (57), with multiplicity l ,

then by (46) we have $l = 1$, i.e., z_2 is a simple zero of f . And it follows from (57) that z_2 is also a zero of $[(n-1)\varphi' + (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)\varphi]f' - (2n-1)\varphi f''$.

We set

$$g = \frac{(2n-1)\varphi f'' - [(n-1)\varphi' + (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)\varphi]f'}{f}, \quad (58)$$

then by combining with Logarithmic Derivative Lemma, $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$, and $T(r, \varphi) = S(r, f)$, we have

$$T(r, g) = O\left(m(r, \varphi) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{\varphi}\right) + N(r, \varphi) + N(r, f)\right) + S(r, f) = S(r, f),$$

i.e., g is a small function of f . We rewrite (58) as follow,

$$f'' = t_1 f' + \frac{g}{(2n-1)\varphi} f, \quad \text{where } t_1 = \frac{1}{2n-1} \left((n-1)\frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \right). \quad (59)$$

Differentiating (59) gives that

$$f''' = \left(t_1^2 + t_1' + \frac{g}{(2n-1)\varphi} \right) f' + \frac{1}{2n-1} \left(t_1 \frac{g}{\varphi} + \left(\frac{g}{\varphi} \right)' \right) f. \quad (60)$$

By substituting (59) and (60) into (57), combining with $\varphi \neq 0$, we get

$$B_1 f = B_2 f', \quad (61)$$

where

$$B_1 = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} + n \left(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} \right) \frac{g}{(2n-1)\varphi} - \frac{n}{2n-1} \left(\left(\frac{g}{\varphi} \right)' + t_1 \frac{g}{\varphi} \right),$$

and

$$B_2 = n(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \left(\frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} - t_1 \right) + 2\alpha_1 \alpha_2 - n \frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} t_1 + \frac{ng}{\varphi} + n \left(t_1' + \frac{g}{(2n-1)\varphi} + t_1^2 \right).$$

If $B_2 \neq 0$, then from (61) and f is transcendental, we have $B_1 \neq 0$. Since $N(r, 1/f) \neq S(r, f)$, $T(r, \varphi) = S(r, f)$, and $T(r, g) = S(r, f)$, let z_3 be a zero of f with multiplicity q , which is neither a zero nor a pole of B_1 and B_2 . Then z_3 is a zero with multiplicity q of the left side of (61), but a zero with multiplicity $q-1$ of the right side, which yields a contradiction. Therefore, we have $B_2 \equiv 0$ and $B_1 \equiv 0$, i.e.,

$$\left(\frac{g}{\varphi} \right)' = \left(\frac{2(n-1)}{2n-1}(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + \frac{n}{2n-1}\gamma \right) \frac{g}{\varphi} + \frac{2n-1}{n} \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \gamma, \quad (62)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{2n}{2n-1} \frac{g}{\varphi} &= (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)\gamma + \frac{2}{n} \alpha_1 \alpha_2 - \frac{1}{2n-1} (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \gamma)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + (n-1)\gamma) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(2n-1)^2} (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + (n-1)\gamma)^2 + \frac{n-1}{2n-1} \gamma', \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where $\gamma = \frac{\varphi'}{\varphi}$.

Substituting (59) into (46),

$$\varphi(z) = af^2 + bff' + n(n-1)(f')^2.$$

where

$$a = \alpha_1\alpha_2 + \frac{n}{2n-1}\frac{g}{\varphi}, \quad \text{and} \quad b = \frac{n(n-1)}{2n-1}(\gamma - 2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)).$$

If $a \neq 0$, then by Lemma 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} n(n-1)(b^2 - 4an(n-1))\frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} + b(b^2 - 4an(n-1)) \\ - n(n-1)(b^2 - 4an(n-1))' = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Suppose that $b^2 - 4an(n-1) \neq 0$. It follows from (64) that

$$2n\frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} = (2n-1)\frac{(b^2 - 4an(n-1))'}{b^2 - 4an(n-1)} + 2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2). \quad (65)$$

By integration, we see that there exists a $c_5 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$e^{2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)z} = c_5\varphi^{2n}(b^2 - 4an(n-1))^{-(2n-1)},$$

which implies $e^{2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)z} \in S(r, f)$, then $\alpha_2 = -\alpha_1$, a contradiction.

Suppose that $b^2 - 4an(n-1) \equiv 0$. Then we have

$$\frac{n(n-1)}{(2n-1)^2}(\gamma - 2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2))^2 = 4\left(\alpha_1\alpha_2 + \frac{n}{2n-1}\frac{g}{\varphi}\right). \quad (66)$$

Differentiating (66) yields

$$\frac{n-1}{2n-1}(\gamma - 2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2))\gamma' = 2\left(\frac{g}{\varphi}\right)'. \quad (67)$$

Differentiating (63) yields

$$2\left(\frac{g}{\varphi}\right)' = \frac{2(n-1)}{2n-1}\gamma\gamma' - \frac{(2n+1)(n-1)}{(2n-1)n}(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)\gamma' - \frac{n-1}{n}\gamma''. \quad (68)$$

Combining with (67) and (68), we obtain that

$$n\gamma\gamma' = (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)\gamma' + (2n-1)\gamma''. \quad (69)$$

We assert that $\gamma' \neq 0$. Otherwise, by $\gamma' \equiv 0$ and φ is nonconstant we have

$$\frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} = c_6, \quad c_6 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Then

$$\varphi = c_7 e^{c_6 z}, \quad c_7 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\},$$

which contradicts with the assumption that φ is a nonconstant small function of f .

Therefore, (69) gives that

$$\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = n\gamma - (2n - 1) \frac{\gamma''}{\gamma'}. \quad (70)$$

Thus

$$c_8 e^{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)z} = \varphi^n \left(\left(\frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} \right)' \right)^{-(2n-1)}, \quad c_8 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\},$$

which implies that $e^{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)z} \in S(r, f)$, then $\alpha_2 = -\alpha_1$, a contradiction.

If $a \equiv 0$, that is $\frac{g}{\varphi} = -\frac{2n-1}{n}\alpha_1\alpha_2$. By substituting it into (62), we get

$$\frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} = 2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2).$$

So we have

$$\varphi = c_9 e^{2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)z}, \quad c_9 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\},$$

which implies that $e^{2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)z} \in S(r, f)$, then $\alpha_2 = -\alpha_1$, a contradiction.

Case 3. $n = 2$ and $\varphi(z) = P(z)e^{Q(z)}$, where P, Q are nonvanishing polynomials and Q is non-constant. By (41) and (46), we get $\sigma(\varphi) \leq \sigma(f) = 1$, combining with $\deg Q \geq 1$, we have $\deg Q = \sigma(\varphi) = 1$. Let $Q(z) = az + b$, where $a(\neq 0), b$ are constants, then $\varphi = e^b P e^{az}$. By (45) we get that

$$P_*'' - (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)P_*' + \alpha_1\alpha_2 P_* = -e^b P(z)e^{az}. \quad (71)$$

From Lemma 2.6 and the theory of ordinary differential equations, the general solutions of equation (71) can be represented in the form

$$P_* = c_{10} e^{\alpha_1 z} + c_{11} e^{\alpha_2 z} + R(z)e^{Q(z)}, \quad (72)$$

where c_{10}, c_{11} are constants, and R is a polynomial with $\deg R \leq \deg P + 2$.

By combining with (7), we get

$$f^2 = d_1 e^{\alpha_1 z} + d_2 e^{\alpha_2 z} - R(z)e^{Q(z)},$$

where $d_1 = p_1 - c_{10}$, and $d_2 = p_2 - c_{11}$.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by NNSF of China (No.11801215 & No.11626112 & No. 11371225), and the NSF of Shandong Province, P. R. China (No.ZR2016AQ20 & No. ZR2018MA021).

References

References

- [1] Z. X. Chen, *Complex Differences and Difference Equations*, Science Press, 2014.
- [2] M. F. Chen and Z. S. Gao, Entire solutions of certain type of nonlinear differential equations and differential-difference equations, *J. Comput. Anal. Appl.* 2018, 24: 137–147.
- [3] J. B. Conway, *Functions of One Complex Variable I*, 2nd ed., springer.com: Springer, 1995.
- [4] W. K. Hayman, *Meromorphic Functions*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1964.
- [5] X. H. Hua, Some extensions of the Tumura-Clunie theorem *Complex Var. Elliptic Equ.* 1991, 16(1): 69–77.
- [6] I. Laine, *Nevanlinna theory and complex differential equations*, W. de Gruyter, Berlin, 1993.
- [7] P. Li, Entire solutions of certain type of differential equations II. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 2011, 375: 310–319.
- [8] L. W. Liao, C. C. Yang and J. J. Zhang, On meromorphic solutions of certain type of non-linear differential equations. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* 2013, 38: 581–593.
- [9] L. Liao, Non-linear differential equations and Hayman’s theorem on differential polynomials , *Complex Var. Elliptic Equ.* 2015, 60(6): 748–756.
- [10] X. Q. Lu, L. W. Liao and J. Wang, On meromorphic solutions of a certain type of nonlinear differential equations, *Acta Math. Sin.(Engl. Ser.)*, 2017, 33(12): 1597–1608.
- [11] J. X. Rong and J. F. Xu, Three Results on the Nonlinear Differential Equations and Differential-Difference Equations. *Mathematics* 2019, 7, 539.
- [12] C. C. Yang and H. X. Yi, *Uniqueness theory of meromorphic functions*, *Mathematics and its Applications*, 557. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 2003.
- [13] J. J. Zhang and L. W. Liao, A note on Malmquist-Yosida on type theorem of higher order algebraic differential equations, *Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B Engl. Ed.* 2018, 38(2): 471–478.