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Abstract It is shown that if equation

\[ f(z+1)^n = R(z, f), \]

where \( R(z, f) \) is rational in both arguments and \( \deg_f(R(z, f)) \neq n \), has a transcendental meromorphic solution, then the equation above reduces into one out of several types of difference equations where the rational term \( R(z, f) \) takes particular forms. Solutions of these equations are presented in terms of Weierstrass or Jacobi elliptic functions, exponential type functions or functions which are solutions to a certain autonomous first-order difference equation having meromorphic solutions with preassigned asymptotic behavior. These results complement our previous work on the case \( \deg_f(R(z, f)) = n \) of the equation above and thus provide a complete difference analogue of Steinmetz’ generalization of Malmquist’s theorem. Finally, a description of how to simplify the classification in the case \( \deg_f(R(z, f)) = n \) is given by using the new methods introduced in this paper.
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1 Introduction

Nevanlinna theory (see, e.g., [10]) is a powerful tool when analyzing meromorphic solutions of complex differential equations. For example, by utilizing Nevanlinna theory, Yosida [28] and Laine [14] provided elegant alternate proofs of the classical Malmquist theorem on first-order differential equations [16], while Steinmetz [22], and Bank and Kaufman [3] gave a precise classification of the differential equation

\[ (f')^n = R(z, f), \]  

(1.1)

where \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( R(z, f) \) is rational in both arguments. See also [15, Chapter 10] for Malmquist–Yosida–Steinmetz type theorems. In [13], we studied a natural difference analogue of equation (1.1), i.e., the first-order difference equation

\[ f(z + 1)^n = R(z, f), \]  

(1.2)

where \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( R(z, f) \) is rational in \( f \) with small functions of \( f \) as coefficients. Assuming that (1.2) has a meromorphic solution and \( \deg_f(R(z, f)) = n \), we showed that equation (1.2) can, by a bilinear
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transformation in \( f \), be transformed into one in a list of twelve equations. In particular, we considered meromorphic solutions of hyper-order less than 1 of (1.2) and showed that if such a solution exists, then equation (1.2) with rational coefficients has to reduce into the difference linear or Riccati equation, or one in a list of five equations including Fermat type difference equations and a special case of the symmetric Quispel–Roberts–Thompson (QRT) map [13,20]. We also showed that these five equations are explicitly solved in terms of Weierstrass or Jacobic elliptic functions, or of functions which are solutions of certain difference Riccati equations. These results provide a natural difference analogue of Steinmetz’s generalization of Malmquist’s theorem in the sense of Ablowitz, Halburd and Herbst [1], who proposed that the existence of sufficiently many finite-order meromorphic solutions of a difference equation is a good difference analogue of the Painlevé property. Their idea was successfully implemented on the second-order difference equation

\[
f(z + 1) + f(z − 1) = R(z, f),
\]

where \( R(z, f) \) is rational in \( f \) with small functions of \( f \) as coefficients, and it reduces equation (1.3) into a short list of canonical equations, including the difference Painlevé I and II equations [8]. The finite-order condition of the proposed difference Painlevé equation was relaxed into hyper-order strictly less than one by Halburd, the second author and Tohge [9], and recently into hyper-order equal to one with minimal type by Zheng and the second author [29].

The purpose of this paper is to find out all transcendental meromorphic solutions for the case \( \deg_r(R(z, f)) \neq n \) of equation (1.2) without growth conditions and provide a complete difference analogue of Steinmetz’s generalization of Malmquist’s theorem. As is pointed out in [13], in this case all the transcendental meromorphic solutions of (1.2) are of hyper-order at least one. Our work is a continuation of many mathematicians’ research on first-order difference equations. For example, in [21], Shimomura showed that the difference equation

\[
f(z + 1) = P(f(z)),
\]

where \( P(f(z)) \) is a polynomial in \( f(z) \) with constant coefficients, always has a non-trivial entire solution; in [26], Yanagihara showed that the difference equation

\[
f(z + 1) = R(f(z)),
\]

where \( R(f(z)) \) is rational in \( f(z) \) having constant coefficients, has a non-trivial meromorphic solution with preassigned asymptotic behavior in a sector for all choices of \( \hat{R} \neq 0 \). Yanagihara [26] also showed that if (1.5), where \( R(f(z)) \) is replaced by \( R(z, f) \), which is rational in both arguments, has a transcendental meromorphic solution of hyper-order less than 1, then (1.5) must reduce into the difference Riccati equation. This can be viewed as a natural difference analogue of Malmquist’s theorem on first-order differential equations. For the higher-degree equation (1.2), the classification work in the special case where the right-hand side (RHS) of (1.2) is a polynomial in \( f(z) \) with constant coefficients has been done by Nakamura and Yanagihara [18] and Yanagihara [27]. The results obtained in the present paper, supplemented with results of the first part of this study [13], can be summarized as follows.

**Theorem 1** If equation (1.2), where \( R(z, f) \) is rational in both arguments, has a transcendental meromorphic solution, then (1.2) can be reduced into one out of 28 equations in Theorems 3–7 below and in [13, Theorem 2].

Autonomous versions of all 28 equations can be solved in terms of elliptic and elementary functions.

In this paper, we shall confine ourselves to considering equation (1.2) with rational coefficients. The main tools from Nevanlinna theory we use, both in our previous paper [13] and in the present one, are the generalizations of Nevanlinna’s second main theorem given by Yamanou [24,25]. We refer to [10] pp. 42–43 for the standard definitions of \( \delta(a, f) \), \( \theta(a, f) \) and \( \Theta(a, f) \), etc. Recall that a value \( a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\} \) is said to be a completely ramified value of \( f(z) \) when \( f(z) = a = 0 \) has no simple roots. Denote the field of rational functions by \( \mathcal{R} \) and set \( \hat{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{R} \cup \{\infty\} \). Throughout the paper, we say that \( c(z) \in \hat{\mathcal{R}} \) is a completely ramified rational function of a transcendental meromorphic function \( f(z) \) when the equation \( f(z) = c(z) \) has at most finitely many simple roots and that \( c(z) \) is a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f(z) \) when \( N(r, c, f) = O(\log r) \). We also say that \( c(z) \) has multiplicity at least \( m \) if all the roots of \( f(z) = c(z) \) have multiplicity at least \( m \) with at most finitely many exceptions. As is mentioned in [13], the main theorem in [25] yields that the inequality

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{q} \Theta(c_i, f) \leq 2
\]

is valid.
holds for any collection of \(c_1, \ldots, c_q \in \mathcal{R}\) when \(f\) is transcendental. Moreover, we have

**Theorem 2** A non-constant transcendental meromorphic function \(f(z)\) can have at most four completely ramified rational functions.

As in [13], when considering a meromorphic solution \(f(z)\) of (1.2), we will do a transformation to \(f\) using some algebraic functions and end up in a situation such that the considered functions are meromorphic on a finite-sheeted Riemann surface. Such functions are called algebraic functions (see, e.g., [11]). We will ignore considering the degree of these functions in this paper since in any case we are dealing with at most finitely many algebraic branch points and the inequality (1.6) and Theorem 2 hold true for such functions.

The remainder of this paper is organized in the following way. In section 2 we will first set up some notation and build several lemmas concerning the roots of the numerator and the denominator of (2.1) in the case \(\deg f(R(z,f)) = n\). We denote

\[
\tilde{R} = R(z,f),
\]

where \(n \in \mathbb{N}\) and \(R(z,f)\) is rational in both arguments and \(\deg f(R(z,f)) \neq n\). We first set up some notation for (2.1) that will be used throughout the proofs in the following sections. We denote

\[
R(z,f) = \frac{P(z,f)}{Q(z,f)},
\]

where

\[
P(z,f) = a_pf^p + a_{p-1}f^{p-1} + \cdots + a_0
\]

and

\[
Q(z,f) = b_qf^q + b_{q-1}f^{q-1} + \cdots + b_0
\]

are two polynomials in \(f\) having no common factors, \(p, q \in \mathbb{N}\) and the coefficients \(a_p, \ldots, a_0, b_q, \ldots, b_0\) are rational functions. We have \(\deg f(P(z,f)) = p\) and \(\deg f(Q(z,f)) = q\). If \(n = 1\), then equation (2.1) is just

\[
\tilde{R} = R(z,f).
\]

As mentioned in the introduction, in the autonomous case, equation (2.1) always has an entire or meromorphic solution independently of the degree of \(R\). Therefore, we always assume that \(n \geq 2\) in what follows. Under this assumption, if the degree of \(R(z,f)\) in \(f\) in (2.1) equals 1, then we have

\[
f(z) = af^n + b,
\]

where \(a \neq 0\) and \(b\) are rational functions, or

\[
\tilde{f} = \frac{af^n + b}{cf^n + d},
\]

where the coefficients are rational functions such that \(ad - bc \neq 0\). The above two equations are included in (2.1) under the transformation \(x = -z\). So we also always assume that \(\deg f(R(z,f)) \geq 2\). Denote \(d = \deg f(R(z,f))\). Then we have \(d \geq 2\) and \(d = \max\{p, q\} \neq n\). We write \(P(z,f)\) and \(Q(z,f)\) in the algebraic factorization form

\[
P(z,f) = a_p \prod_{i=1}^M P_i(z,f)^{\mu_i},
\]

where \(
}
and
\[ Q(z, f) = b_0 \prod_{j=1}^{N} Q_j(z, f)^{\nu_j}, \]

where \( P_1(z, f) \) and \( Q_j(z, f) \) are irreducible polynomials in \( f \) of the form in (2.2) or (2.3), \( \mu_i, \nu_j \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_M = p \) and \( \nu_1 + \cdots + \nu_N = q \). In this paper, we shall use the term 'a polynomial in \( f \)' which means that the polynomial in \( f \) has rational or algebraic coefficients. Note that the inequality (1.6) also holds when \( f \) is replaced by an algebraic function with finitely many branch points and \( c_1, \cdots, c_q \) are replaced by algebraic functions. For convenience, in the following we always use the terms 'completely ramified rational function' and 'Picard exceptional rational function' of \( f \) even though sometimes they actually refer to algebraic functions. We also write (2.5) and (2.6) as
\[ P(z, f) = P_0(z, f)^n (f - \alpha_1)^{k_1} \cdots (f - \alpha_m)^{k_m}, \]

and
\[ Q(z, f) = Q_0(z, f)^n (f - \beta_1)^{l_1} \cdots (f - \beta_\nu)^{l_\nu}, \]

where \( \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m, \beta_1, \cdots, \beta_\nu \) are in general algebraic functions and \( k_i \) and \( l_j \) denote the orders of the roots \( \alpha_i \) and \( \beta_j \), respectively, and satisfy \( n \mid k_i \) and \( n \mid l_j \), and
\[ P_0(z, f) = a_p^{1/n} \prod_{i=1,n|\mu_i} M P_i(z, f)^{\mu_i/n} = a_p^{1/n} \prod_{i=1,n|\mu_i} (f - \alpha_i)^{\mu_i/n} \]

and
\[ Q_0(z, f) = b_q^{1/n} \prod_{j=1,n|\nu_j} N Q_j(z, f)^{\nu_j/n} = b_q^{1/n} \prod_{j=1,n|\nu_j} (f - \beta_j)^{\nu_j/n} \]

are two polynomials in \( f \) of degrees \( p_0 \) and \( q_0 \), respectively, with \( \alpha_i, \mu_i, \beta_j, \nu_j \) being in general algebraic functions, and \( \mu_i \) and \( \nu_j \) denoting the orders of these roots of \( P(z, f) \) or \( Q(z, f) \), respectively. We have \( p_0 = \deg_f(P_0(z, f)) \) and \( q_0 = \deg_f(Q_0(z, f)) \). Note that \( a_p^{1/n}, b_q^{1/n} \) are in general algebraic functions. For convenience, when \( q \geq 1 \), we always suppose that \( b_q = 1 \). Also note that \( \alpha_i \) and \( \beta_j \) are neither roots of \( P_0(z, f) \) nor roots of \( Q_0(z, f) \). Obviously, if \( n \mid \mu_i \) for all \( i = 1, \cdots, M \) or \( n \mid \nu_j \) for all \( j = 1, \cdots, N \), then \( P_0(z, f)^n = a_p \) or \( Q_0(z, f)^n = b_q \). On the other hand, if there are no such \( \mu_i \) or \( \nu_j \) that \( n \mid \mu_i \) and \( n \mid \nu_j \), then after taking the \( n \)-th root on both sides of (2.1), we get equation (2.2). So in the sequel we always suppose that there is at least one such \( \mu_i \) or \( \nu_j \). The combined number of \( \alpha_i \) and \( \beta_j \) in (2.7) and (2.8) is \( \mu + \nu \) and, for convenience, we always denote \( N_c := n/k \) even when there is no such \( \alpha_i \) or \( \beta_j \). Moreover, we may suppose that the greatest common divisor of \( n, k_1, \cdots, k_\mu, l_1, \cdots, l_\nu \), which is denoted by \( k = (n, k_1, \cdots, k_\mu, l_1, \cdots, l_\nu) \), is 1. Otherwise, after taking the \( k \)-th root on both sides of (2.1), we get a new equation of the same form as (2.1) with the power of \( f \) being \( n/k \).

With the above notation, now we are ready to build some lemmas concerning the roots of \( P(z, f) \) and \( Q(z, f) \) by elementary multiplicity analysis on \( f \). For simplicity, in what follows, when considering the zeros, poles or \( \alpha_i \)-points of \( f \), etc., we will omit giving the corresponding Taylor or Laurent series expansions for \( f \). The first lemma below provides some basic upper bounds for \( N_c \).

**Lemma 1** Let \( f \) be a transcendental meromorphic solution of equation (2.1). Then \( \alpha_i \) is either a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \) or a completely ramified rational function of \( f \) with multiplicity \( n/\lfloor n/k_i \rfloor \) and \( \beta_j \) is either a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \) or a completely ramified rational function of \( f \) with multiplicity \( n/\lfloor n/l_j \rfloor \). Moreover, if \( q = 0 \), then \( \infty \) is a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \) and \( N_\infty \leq 2 \) and, in particular, if \( n \geq 3 \), then \( N_\infty = 1 \); if \( q = 1 \), then \( N_\infty \leq 4 \) and, in particular, if \( n \geq 3 \), then \( N_\infty \leq 3 \); if \( q = 1 \) and \( n \nmid |p - q| \), then \( \infty \) is either a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \) or a completely ramified rational function of \( f \) with multiplicity \( n/\lfloor n/(p - q) \rfloor \) and \( N_c \leq 3 \).

**Proof.** By making use of the factorizations (2.7) and (2.8), it follows that \( \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_\mu \) and \( \beta_1, \cdots, \beta_\nu \) are roots of \( P(z, f) \) and \( Q(z, f) \), respectively. For each \( \alpha_i \), if \( \alpha_i \) is not a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \), then we let \( z_0 \in \mathbb{C} \) be such that \( f(z_0) - \alpha_i(z_0) = 0 \) with multiplicity \( m \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \). We write \( k_i = nk_{i1} + k_{i2} \), where \( k_{i1}, k_{i2} \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( k_{i2} < n \). Note that \( n/k_{i2} = (n, k_i) \). Now, \( n/k_{i2} \) with at most finitely many
exceptions since otherwise $z_0 + 1$ would be a branch point of $f$. Hence, $n \leq mk_{i_2}$ and so $m \geq n/(n, k_{i_2})$, i.e., $m \geq n/(n, k_i)$. Therefore, we have

$$N(r, \alpha_i, f) \leq \frac{(n, k_i)}{n} N(r, \alpha_i, f) + O(\log r). \tag{2.11}$$

In particular, we have $m \geq 2$ since $n/(n, k_i) > 1$. Thus $\alpha_i$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity at least $n/(n, k_i)$. The same analysis above applies for each $\beta_j$ by writing $l_j = nl_{j_1} + l_{j_2}$, where $l_{j_1}, l_{j_2} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $l_{j_2} < n$, as well. Therefore, if $\beta_j$ is not a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$, then we also have

$$N(r, \beta_j, f) \leq \frac{(n, l_j)}{n} N(r, \beta_j, f) + O(\log r), \tag{2.12}$$

and thus $\beta_j$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity at least $n/(n, l_j)$. Below we consider the two cases $q = 0$ and $q \geq 1$, respectively.

When $q = 0$, equation (2.11) takes the following form:

$$T^i = P(z, f). \tag{2.13}$$

We claim that $f$ has at most finitely many poles. Otherwise, let $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ be a pole of $f$ with multiplicity $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. We may choose $z_0$ such that $|z_0|$ is large enough so that none of the coefficients of $P(z, f)$ has poles or zeros outside of $\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < |z_0| \}$. When $n > p$, from (2.13) we see that $z_0 + 1$ is a pole of $f$ of order $pm/n$ and by iterating along the pole sequence we have $z_0 + s$ is a pole of $f$ of order $p^s/m/n^s$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$. By letting $s \to \infty$, it follows that there is necessarily a branch point of $f$ at some $z_0 + s_0$, $s_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, a contradiction to our assumption that $f$ is meromorphic. On the other hand, when $n < p$, from (2.13) we see that $z_0 - s$ is a pole of $f$ of order $n^s/m/p^s$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$, and by letting $s \to \infty$ we still get the same contradiction as above. Therefore, $f$ has at most finitely many poles, i.e., is a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$. Then the inequality (1.6) implies that $N_e \leq 2$. In particular, when $n \geq 3$, $N_e = 2$ is impossible; otherwise, $\alpha_i$ would have multiplicity at least $n$ for at least one index under our assumptions, a contradiction to the inequality (1.6). Thus we have the assertions for the case $q = 0$.

When $q \geq 1$, since $\alpha_i$, as well as $\beta_j$, is either a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$ or a completely ramified rational function of $f$, then by Picard’s theorem and Theorem 2 we conclude that $N_e \leq 4$. In particular, when $n \geq 3$, since $(n, k_i) = 1$ or $(n, l_j) = 1$ for at least one index $i$ or $j$ by our assumption, then such $\alpha_i$ or $\beta_j$ is either a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$ or a completely ramified rational function with multiplicity at least $n$ and so by the inequality (1.6) it follows that $N_e \leq 3$; when $n \nmid |p-q|$, by applying the above analysis to poles of $f$, it follows that $\infty$ is either a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$ or a completely ramified rational function of $f$, then by the inequality (1.6) we also have $N_e \leq 3$. Thus the assertions of the lemma for the case $q \geq 1$ follow and this also completes the proof.

By giving a more careful analysis on the roots of $P(z, f)$ and $Q(z, f)$, we have the four following Lemmas (2.5) which play key roles in reducing equation (2.1) into certain forms in the following sections.

**Lemma 2** Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic solution of equation (2.1). Suppose that some $\alpha_i$ in (2.7) is 0. Then 0 is a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$. Moreover, if $q = 0$, or $q \geq 1$ and $n \nmid |p-q|$, then $\infty$ is also a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$.

**Proof.** Suppose that $f$ has infinitely many zeros. Let $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ be a zero of $f$ with multiplicity $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. We may choose $z_0$ such that $|z_0|$ is large enough so that none of the coefficients of $P(z, f)$ and $Q(z, f)$ has poles or zeros outside of $\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < |z_0| \}$. Since some $\alpha_i$ is zero, from (2.1) we see that $z_0 + 1$ is a zero of $f$ of order $k_i m/n$ and by iterating along the zero sequence we have $z_0 + s$ is a zero of $f$ of order $k_i^s m/n^s$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$. By letting $s \to \infty$, since $n \nmid k_i$, it follows that there is necessarily a branch point of $f$ at some $z_0 + s_0$, $s_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, a contradiction to our assumption that $f$ is meromorphic. Therefore, $f$ has at most finitely many zeros, i.e., is a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$.

Moreover, if $q = 0$, or if $q \geq 1$ and $p < q$, then it follows immediately from the proof of Lemma 1 that $\infty$ is a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$. Consider the case when $p > q \geq 1$ and $n \nmid (p-q)$. Suppose that $f$ has infinitely many poles. Let $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ be a pole of $f$ with multiplicity $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. We may choose $z_0$ such that $|z_0|$ is large enough so that none of the coefficients of $P(z, f)$ and $Q(z, f)$ has poles or zeros outside of $\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < |z_0| \}$. From equation (2.1) we see that $f$ has a pole of order $(p-q)m/n$ at $z = z_0 + 1$ and by iterating along the pole sequence $z = z_0 + s$ is a pole of $f$ of order $(p-q)^s m/n^s$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $n \nmid (p-q)$, then by letting $s \to \infty$, it follows that there is necessarily a branch point of $f$
at \( z_0 + s_0 \) for some \( s_0 \in \mathbb{N} \), a contradiction to our assumption that \( f \) is meromorphic. Therefore, when \( p > q \geq 1 \) and \( n \nmid (p - q) \), \( f \) has at most finitely many poles, i.e., \( \infty \) is a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \). We complete the proof.

**Lemma 3** Let \( f \) be a transcendental meromorphic solution of equation (2.1) and \( \gamma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \) be a rational function. Then \( \gamma \) cannot be a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \). Moreover, if \( \gamma \) is a completely ramified function of \( f \) with multiplicity at least \( n \), then \( \omega \gamma \) is a completely ramified function of \( f \) with multiplicity at least \( n \), where \( \omega \) is the \( n \)-th root of 1.

**Proof.** To prove the assertions of the lemma, we divide equation (2.1) into the following three cases:

1. at least one of \( \alpha_i \) and \( \beta_j \) in (2.7) and (2.8) is non-zero and \( q = 0 \), or \( q \geq 1 \) and \( n \nmid |p - q| \);
2. at least one of \( \alpha_i \) and \( \beta_j \) in (2.7) and (2.8) is non-zero and \( q \geq 1 \) and \( n \nmid |p - q| \);
3. there is only one \( \alpha_i \) or \( \beta_j \) in (2.7) and (2.8) and this \( \alpha_i \) or \( \beta_j \) is zero.

We first suppose that \( \gamma \) is a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \). Under this assumption, below we show that each of the above three cases will lead to contradictions.

In the first case, we let \( \beta = \alpha_i \) or \( \beta = \beta_j \) for some \( \alpha_i \) or \( \beta_j \) in (2.7) and (2.8) and \( \beta \neq 0 \). Denote the order of this root \( \alpha_i \) or \( \beta_j \) by \( t_1 \).

\[
\gamma v = \frac{u}{f - \beta}, \quad v = \frac{1}{f - \beta},
\]  

(2.14)

Then \( u \) and \( v \) are two algebroid functions with at most finitely branch points and we have

\[
\gamma = \frac{u}{v}, \quad f = \frac{1}{v + \beta},
\]  

(2.15)

and it follows that (2.1) becomes

\[
u^n = \frac{P_1(z, v)}{Q_1(z, v)} v^{n_1},
\]  

(2.16)

where \( n_1 \in \mathbb{Z} \), \( P_1(z, v) \) and \( Q_1(z, v) \) are two polynomials in \( v \) having no common factors and none of the roots of \( P_1(z, v) \) or \( Q_1(z, v) \) is zero. Denote by \( p_1 = \text{deg}_v(P_1(z, v)) \) the degree of \( P_1(z, v) \) in \( v \) and by \( q_1 = \text{deg}_v(Q_1(z, v)) \) the degree of \( Q_1(z, v) \) in \( v \), respectively. Note that \( q = 0 \), or \( q \geq 1 \) and \( n \nmid |p - q| \). By elementary calculations, when \( q = 0 \) we get \( n = n - p \), \( p_1 = p - t_1 \) and \( q_1 = 0 \); when \( q \geq 1 \) and \( \beta = \alpha_i \), we get \( n_1 = n + q - p \), \( p_1 = p - t_1 \) and \( q_1 = q \); when \( q \geq 1 \) and \( \beta = \beta_j \), we get \( n_1 = n + q - p \), \( p_1 = p \) and \( q_1 = q - t_1 \). Therefore, we always have \( n_1 \neq 0 \), \( n_1 \neq n \) and \( p_1 - q_1 + n_1 \neq n \). We consider

\[
\gamma = \frac{u}{v}, \quad \gamma v = \frac{u}{v^2}.
\]  

(2.17)

Let \( u_0, v_0 \) be any pair of non-zero functions satisfying the following system of equations:

\[
u_0^n = \frac{P_1(z, v_0)}{Q_1(z, v_0)} v_0^{n_1}, \quad u_0 - \gamma v_0 = 0.
\]  

(2.18)

By assumption, the equation \( \gamma = \gamma v \) has at most finitely many roots. Let \( z_0 \in \mathbb{C} \) be such that \( u(z_0) = u_0(z_0), v(z_0) = v_0(z_0) \) and \( u_0 - \gamma v_0 \) hold simultaneously. Then from (2.17) we see that the equation \( u - \gamma v = 0 \) can have at most finitely many such roots \( z_0 \). Now we consider the equation \( \gamma - \omega \gamma = 0 \), where \( \omega \) is the \( n \)-th root of 1. We have

\[
\gamma - \omega \gamma = \frac{u}{v} - \omega \gamma = \frac{u - \omega \gamma v}{v},
\]  

(2.19)

Let \( z_0 \in \mathbb{C} \) be such that \( u(z_0) = 0 \) or \( v(z_0) = \infty \). Since \( n_1 \neq 0 \), \( n_1 \neq n \) and \( p_1 - q_1 + n_1 \neq n \), we see from (2.16) that the multiplicity of \( z_0 \) for \( v(z_0) = 0 \) or \( v(z_0) = \infty \) equals the multiplicity of \( z_0 \) for \( u(z_0) = 0 \) or \( u(z_0) = \infty \) for at most finitely many such \( z_0 \). Then it follows from (2.19) that the two equations \( v = 0 \) and \( \gamma - \omega \gamma = 0 \), as well as the two equations \( v = \infty \) and \( \gamma = \gamma v \), cannot have infinitely many common roots; otherwise, \( \gamma \) would be identically equal to 0 or \( \infty \), a contradiction to our assumption. Let \( u_1, v_1 \) be any pair of non-zero functions satisfying the following system of equations:

\[
u_1^n = \frac{P_1(z, v_1)}{Q_1(z, v_1)} v_1^{n_1}, \quad u_1 - \omega \gamma v_1 = 0.
\]  

(2.20)
Recall that $\omega$ is the $n$-th root of $1$. Then the two systems of equations in (2.18) and (2.20) yield identically the same algebraic equations for $v_0$ and $v_1$. Since $u_0^3$ and $u_1^3$ equals the same rational term in $v_0$ or $v_1$, we see that the two systems of equations in (2.18) and (2.20) have the same pair of non-zero solutions, apart from permutations. By summarizing the above results, we conclude that the equation $\overline{f} - \omega \overline{\gamma} = 0$ can have at most finitely many roots, i.e., $\omega \gamma$ is a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$.

Now, since $n \geq 2$, we must have $n = 2$; otherwise, $f$ would have three or more distinct Picard exceptional rational functions, a contradiction to Picard’s theorem. However, when $q = 0$, from Lemma 1 we know $\infty$ is also a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$, a contradiction to Picard’s theorem; when $q \geq 1$, since $n \nmid |p - q|$, from Lemma 1 we know $\infty$ is either a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$ or a completely ramified rational function of $f$, a contradiction to Picard’s theorem or the inequality (1.6).

In the second case, we must have $N_c \geq 2$ since $n \nmid |p - q|$. We let $\beta$ be such that $\beta = \alpha_i$ or $\beta = \beta_j$ for some $\alpha_i$ or $\beta_j$ in (2.7) and (2.8) and $\beta \neq 0$, and $\alpha$ be such that $\alpha = \alpha_i$ or $\alpha = \beta_j$ for another $\alpha_i$ or $\beta_j$ in (2.7) and (2.8) distinct from $\beta$. Put

$$u = \frac{\overline{T}(f - \alpha)}{f - \beta}, \quad v = \frac{\beta v - \alpha}{v - 1},$$

and it follows that (2.21) becomes

$$n^2 = \frac{P_2(z, v)}{Q_2(z, v)}v^{n_2},$$

where $n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $P_2(z, v)$ and $Q_2(z, v)$ are two polynomials in $v$ having no common factors and none of the roots of $P_2(z, v)$ or $Q_2(z, v)$ is zero. Denote by $p_2 = \deg_v(P_2(z, v))$ the degree of $P_2(z, v)$ in $v$ and by $q_2 = \deg_v(Q_2(z, v))$ the degree of $Q_2(z, v)$ in $v$, respectively. Note that $q \geq 1$ and $n \nmid |p - q|$. As in the previous case we can show that $n_2 \neq 0, n_2 \neq n$ and $p_2 - q_2 + n_2 \neq n$ by elementary calculations. Then we consider the roots of the equation $\overline{T} - \overline{\gamma} = 0$ and of the equation $\overline{T} - \omega \overline{\gamma} = 0$, respectively, and by the same arguments as in the previous case we get the same conclusion as there.

We have $n = 2$ in both cases (1) and (2). If some $\alpha_i$ or $\beta_j$ in (2.7) and (2.8) is distinct from $\pm \gamma$, then from Lemma 1 it follows that this $\alpha_i$ or $\beta_j$ is either a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$ or a completely ramified rational function of $f$, a contradiction to Picard’s theorem or the inequality (1.6) since $\pm \gamma$ are both Picard exceptional rational functions of $f$. Therefore, $N_c = 2$ and the two roots $\alpha_i$ or $\beta_j$ in (2.7) and (2.8) are equal to $\pm \gamma$. We consider

$$\overline{T}^2 - \overline{\gamma}^2 = \frac{P(z, f) - \overline{\gamma}^2Q(z, f)}{Q(z, f)} = \frac{a_{p_\tau}(f - \gamma_1)^{t_1} \cdots (f - \gamma_\tau)^{t_\tau}}{Q(z, f)},$$

where $\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_\tau$ are in general algebraic functions distinct from each other, $t_1, \cdots, t_\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the orders of the roots $\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_\tau$, respectively, and $t_1 + \cdots + t_\tau = p_\tau \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that the equation $\overline{T}^2 - \overline{\gamma}^2 = 0$ can have at most finitely many roots. If $p_\tau < q$, then we obtain from (2.21) that $\infty$ is a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$, a contradiction to Picard’s theorem. Therefore, $p_\tau \geq q$. From the previous discussions we see that none of $\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_\tau$ is equal to $\pm \gamma$. But then we have $\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_\tau$ are all Picard exceptional rational functions of $f$ by analyzing the roots of the equations $f - \gamma_i = 0, i = 1, \cdots, \tau$, again a contradiction to Picard’s theorem since $p_\tau \geq 1$.

In the third case, it is obvious that $n \nmid |p - q|$. Moreover, we have $q \geq 1$ and this $\alpha_i$ or $\beta_j$ is $\beta_1$ and $\beta_1 \equiv 0$; otherwise, this $\alpha_i$ or $\beta_j$ is $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_1 = 0$, but it follows by Lemma 2 that $0$ and $\infty$ are also both Picard exceptional rational functions of $f$, a contradiction to Picard’s theorem. Put

$$u = \frac{\overline{T}}{f}, \quad v = \frac{1}{f}.$$

Then $u$ and $v$ are two algebroid functions with at most finitely branch points and we have

$$\overline{T} = \frac{u}{v}, \quad f = \frac{1}{v}.$$
and it follows that (2.1) becomes
\[ u^n = \frac{P_3(z, v)}{Q_3(z, v)}v^{n_3}, \]
where \( n_3 \in \mathbb{Z} \), \( P_3(z, v) \) and \( Q_3(z, v) \) are two polynomials in \( v \) having no common factors and none of the roots of \( P_3(z, v) \) or \( Q_3(z, v) \) is zero. Denote by \( p_3 = \deg_v(P_3(z, v)) \) the degree of \( P_3(z, v) \) in \( v \) and by \( q_3 = \deg_v(Q_3(z, v)) \) the degree of \( Q_3(z, v) \) in \( v \), respectively. Since \( p < q \) and \( n \nmid |p-q| \), then as in case (1) we can show that \( n \equiv 0, n_3 \equiv n \) and \( p_1 - q_1 + n_3 \equiv n \) by elementary calculations. Then we consider the roots of the equation \( f - v = 0 \) and of the equation \( f - \omega v = 0 \), respectively, and by the same arguments as in case (1) we get that \( \omega \gamma \) is a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \). But this is impossible by the inequality (1.6) since from Lemma 4 it follows that \( \infty \) is either a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \) or a completely ramified rational function of \( f \).

From the above reasoning, we conclude that \( \gamma \) cannot be a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \). This gives our first assertion of the lemma.

Next, we suppose that \( \gamma \) is a completely ramified rational function of \( f \) with multiplicity at least \( m \). We also consider the three cases in the beginning of the proof. In the first case, we do the transformations in (2.13) and get the equation in (2.10). By assumption, all roots of the equation \( f - \gamma = 0 \) at most finitely many exceptions have multiplicities at least \( m \). Therefore, for any pair of non-zero functions \( u_0, v_0 \) such that the system of equations in (2.15) holds, if we let \( z_0 \in \mathbb{C} \) be such that \( u(z_0) = u_0(z_0) \), \( v(z_0) = v_0(z_0) \) and \( u = \gamma v_0 \) hold simultaneously, then from (2.17) we see that the equation \( u - \gamma v = 0 \) has at most finitely many such roots \( z_0 \) with multiplicity less than \( m \). Moreover, letting \( \hat{z}_0 \in \mathbb{C} \) be such that \( f(\hat{z}_0 + 1) - \omega \gamma(\hat{z}_0 + 1) = 0 \), from previous discussions we know that \( v(\hat{z}_0) = 0 \) or \( v(\hat{z}_0) = \infty \) for at most finitely many such \( \hat{z}_0 \). Also, we know that the two systems of equations in (2.18) and (2.20) have the same pair of solutions, apart from permutations. Then we conclude from the above reasoning that the equation \( f - \omega \gamma = 0 \) have at most finitely many roots with multiplicities less than \( m \). The second and the third cases can be discussed in an analogous way as above after doing the transformations in (2.21) and (2.25), respectively. We omit those details. Thus we have the second assertion of the lemma and also the complete proof.

**Lemma 4** Let \( f \) be a transcendental meromorphic solution of equation (2.1). Suppose that one of the following cases occurs:

1. \( q = 0 \) and \( P(z, f) \) has a root \( k \) of order \( k \) such that \( 2 \leq k < n \) and \( k \nmid n \), or \( k \geq n + 1 \);
2. \( q \geq 1 \) and \( P(z, f) \) has a root \( k \) of order \( k \) such that \( 2 \leq k < n \) and \( k \nmid n \), or \( k \geq n + 1 \);
3. \( q \geq 1 \) and \( Q(z, f) \) has a root \( k \) of order \( l \) such that \( 2 \leq l < n \) and \( l \nmid n \), or \( l \geq n + 1 \);
4. \( q \geq 1 \) and \( p \) and \( q \) satisfy \( 2 \leq |p-q| < n \) and \( |p-q| \nmid n \), or \( |p-q| \geq n + 1 \).

Then if \( q = 0 \), then \( f \) cannot have 2 completely ramified rational functions in \( \mathcal{R} \); if \( q \geq 1 \), then \( f \) cannot have 3 completely ramified rational functions in \( \mathcal{R} \) and cannot have 3 non-zero completely ramified rational functions \( \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3 \in \mathcal{R} \) such that \( \sum_{i=1}^{3} \Theta(\gamma_i, f) = 2 \).

**Proof.** First, when \( q = 0 \), by Lemma 1 we know that \( \infty \) is a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \) and thus \( \Theta(\infty, f) = 1 \). Suppose that \( \gamma_1 \) and \( \gamma_2 \) are both completely ramified rational functions of \( f \). By the inequality (1.6) it follows that \( \gamma_1 \) and \( \gamma_2 \) both have multiplicities \( 2 \) and that \( \Theta(\gamma_1, f) + \Theta(\gamma_2, f) = 1 \). Further, by the Second Main Theorem of Yamanoi for rational functions as targets [25], letting \( \gamma \) be any rational function distinct from \( \gamma_i \), we must have \( \gamma(r, \gamma, f) = T(r, f) + o(T(r, f)), N(r, \gamma, f) = T(r, f) + o(T(r, f)) \) and \( \gamma(r, \gamma, f) = \frac{1}{2} T(r, f) + o(T(r, f)) \), where \( r \to \infty \) outside an exceptional set \( E \) with finite linear measure. If either \( \gamma_1 = 0 \) or \( \gamma_2 = 0 \), say \( \gamma_1 = 0 \), then by Lemma 3 it follows that \( \omega \gamma_2 \) is a completely ramified rational function of \( f \), where \( \omega \) is the \( n \)-th root of 1, a contradiction to the inequality (1.6). Therefore, 0 is not a completely ramified rational function of \( f \). Let \( z_0 \in \mathbb{C} \) be such that \( f(z_0) = 0 \) with multiplicity \( m \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \). Since \( \alpha \) is a root of \( P(z, f) \) of order \( k \) such that \( 2 \leq k < n \) and \( k \nmid n \), or \( k \geq n + 1 \), then from (2.1) we see that \( z_0 \) is a root of \( f(z+1) = 0 \) with multiplicity \( m_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \) such that \( m_0 = mk/n \geq 2 \) with at most finitely many exceptions. By the Valiron–Mohon’ko identity (23.17) (see also [15]), we have from (2.1) that \( nT(r, \gamma) = dT(r, f) + O(|\log r|) \). Now there are at least \( T(r, f) + o(T(r, f)) \) many points \( z_0 \) such that \( f(z_0+1) = 0 \) with multiplicity \( m_0 \geq 2 \). This implies that \( m < d \). Denote by \( S \) the set of zeros of \( T \) in the finite disk \( D = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < t \} \), where \( t > 0 \), and by \( S_1 \) the set of zeros with multiplicity \( \geq 2 \) of \( T \) in \( D \). Denote by \( nS_1(t, 1/T) \) and \( \pi S_1(t, 1/T) \) the number of zeros of \( T \) in \( S_1 \), counting or ignoring multiplicities, respectively; denote by \( nS, S_1(t, 1/T) \) and \( \pi S, S_1(t, 1/T) \) the
number of zeros of $\overline{f}$ for the complement of $S_1$, counting or ignoring multiplicities, respectively. By the definition of the truncated counting function $N(r,1/\overline{f})$, we deduce that
\[
\overline{N}(r,1/\overline{f}) = \int_0^r \pi_{S_1}(t,1/\overline{f}) \frac{dt}{t} + \int_0^r \pi_{S_1}(t,1/\overline{f}) \frac{dt}{t}
\leq \int_0^r n_{S_1}(t,1/\overline{f}) \frac{dt}{t} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^r n_{S_1}(t,1/\overline{f}) \frac{dt}{t}
= \int_0^r n_{S_1}(t,1/\overline{f}) \frac{dt}{t} - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^r n_{S_1}(t,1/\overline{f}) \frac{dt}{t}
\leq T(r,1/\overline{f}) - \frac{1}{2} [T(r,f) + o(T(r,f))].
\]
By the First Main Theorem of Nevanlinna we have $T(r,1/\overline{f}) = T(r,\overline{f}) + O(1)$ and it follows that $T(r,1/\overline{f}) = \frac{n}{2} T(r,f) + O(\log r)$. Then by combining the above results together we get
\[
\Theta(0,\overline{f}) = 1 - \limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{\overline{N}(r,1/\overline{f})}{T(r,f)} \geq \frac{n}{2d}.
\]
In general, the quantity $\Theta(\gamma_i, f)$ may not be shift-invariant [12], but under our assumptions we already have $\sum_{i=1}^2 \Theta(\gamma_i, \overline{f}) = 1$, and thus the above inequality is impossible. Therefore, if case (1) occurs, then $f$ cannot have $2$ completely ramified rational functions in $R$. This is the first assertion of the lemma.

Second, we consider the case where $q \geq 1$. We suppose that $f$ has four completely ramified rational functions $\gamma_i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, in $R$. By Theorem 2, $f$ is not a completely ramified rational function of $f$. Moreover, none of $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ and $\gamma_4$ is zero; otherwise, say $\gamma_1 = 0$, by Lemma 3 it follows that $\omega_{\gamma_2}, \omega_{\gamma_3}$ and $\omega_{\gamma_4}$ are all completely ramified rational functions of $f$, where $\omega$ is the cubic root of $1$, and thus by Theorem 2 we must have $n \geq 3$. However, by Lemma 1 it follows that at least one of $\alpha_i$ in (2.7) and $\beta_j$ in (2.8) is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity $\geq 3$, a contradiction to the inequality (1.6). Therefore, 0 is not a completely ramified rational function of $f$. We consider the three cases (2), (3) and (4), respectively.

If case (2) occurs, then obviously $\alpha$ is not a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$. As in case (1), for the point $z_0 \in C$ be such that $f(z_0) - \alpha(z_0) = 0$ with multiplicity $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we have that $z_0$ is a root of $f(z + 1) = 0$ with multiplicity $nm \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $m_0 = mk/n \geq 2$ with at most finitely many exceptions. Since $f$ has four completely ramified rational functions $\gamma_i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, then by the inequality (1.6) we know that $\gamma_i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, all have multiplicities $2$. Further, by the Second Main Theorem of Yamanoi for rational functions as targets [23], letting $\gamma$ be any rational function distinct from $\gamma_i$, we must have $N(r,\gamma,f) = T(r,f) + o(T(r,f))$, $N(r,\gamma_i,f) = T(r,f) + o(T(r,f))$ and $\overline{N}(r,\gamma,f) = \frac{n}{2} T(r,f) + o(T(r,f))$, where $r \to \infty$ outside an exceptional set $E$ with finite linear measure. Then, similarly as in case (1), we can obtain a contradiction by computing $\Theta(0,\overline{f})$. Therefore, if case (2) occurs, then $f$ cannot have $4$ completely ramified rational functions.

If case (3) occurs, then for the point $z_0 \in C$ such that $f(z_0) - \beta(z_0) = 0$ we have that $z_0$ is a root of $f(z + 1) = 0$ with multiplicity $m_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $m_0 = ml/n \geq 2$ with at most finitely many exceptions, and then we can obtain a contradiction by computing $\Theta(\infty,\overline{f})$. Therefore, we still have the same conclusion as in case (2).

If case (4) occurs, then we let $z_0$ be a pole of $f$ with multiplicity $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and it follows that $z_0$ is a root of $f(z + 1) = 0$ or $f(z + 1) = \infty$ with multiplicity $m_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $m_0 = m|p - q|/n \geq 2$ with at most finitely many exceptions. If $p < q$, then we get a contradiction by computing $\Theta(0,f)$; if $p > q$, then we get a contradiction by computing $\Theta(\infty,f)$. Therefore, we still have the same conclusion as in case (2).

Last, we suppose that $f$ has $3$ non-zero completely ramified rational functions $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3 \in R$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^3 \Theta(\gamma_i,f) = 2$. From [10, p. 46] we know that the possible multiplicity sets ($m_1, m_2, m_3$) corresponding to $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ are (2, 4, 4), (2, 3, 6) or (3, 3, 3), apart from permutations. Also, by the Second Main Theorem of Yamanoi for rational functions as targets [23], we have $\overline{N}(r,\gamma_i,f) = \frac{n}{m} T(r,f) + o(T(r,f))$, where $r \to \infty$ outside an exceptional set $E$ with finite linear measure. Note that $\infty$ is not a completely ramified rational function of $f$. If one of the three cases (2), (3) or (4) occurs, then we can use the same arguments as above to compute $\Theta(0,\overline{f})$ or $\Theta(\infty,\overline{f})$ and obtain similar contradictions. Thus our assertion follows.

In Lemma 3 we did not deal with equation (2.1) for the case when $f$ has three non-zero completely ramified functions $\gamma_i$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^3 \Theta(\gamma_i,f) = 2$ and one $\gamma_i$ is $\infty$. We will exclude out this possibility in the proof of Theorem 6 in section 4 with applications of the analysis in the proof of Lemma 4.
Finally, we consider the equation $\overline{f}^\gamma - \gamma^n = 0$ further, where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity at least $m \geq 2$. By Lemma 3, $\omega \gamma$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity at least $m$, where $\omega$ is the $n$-th root of 1. By (2.1), when $q = 0$ we have

$$\overline{f}^\gamma - \gamma^n = P(z, f) - \gamma^n = a_p(f - \gamma_1)^t_1 \cdots (f - \gamma_r)^t_r,$$

(2.28)

or, when $q \geq 1$, we have

$$\overline{f}^\gamma - \gamma^n = \frac{P(z, f) - \gamma^n Q(z, f)}{Q(z, f)} = a_p(f - \gamma_1)^t_1 \cdots (f - \gamma_r)^t_r,$$

(2.29)

where $\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r$ are in general algebraic functions distinct from each other and $t_1, \cdots, t_r \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the orders of the roots $\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r$, respectively, and $t_1 + \cdots + t_r = p_r \in \mathbb{N}$. We apply the analysis in the proof of Lemma 3 to equations (2.28) and (2.29), respectively, and get the following

**Lemma 5** Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic solution of equation (2.1) and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ be a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity $m \geq 2$. Suppose that $\zeta_1, \cdots, \zeta_s$ are Picard exceptional rational functions of $f$ or completely ramified rational functions of $f$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^s \Theta(\zeta_i, f) = 2$. For each $\gamma_i$ in (2.28) or (2.29), if $\gamma_i$ is not a completely ramified rational function of $f$, then $t_1 = m$; if $\gamma_i$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity $m_i \geq 2$, then $t_1 m_i = m$. In particular, for (2.28), when $1 \leq p_r < q$, if $\infty$ is not a completely ramified rational function of $f$, then $q - p_r = m$; if $\infty$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity $m_\infty \geq 2$, then $(q - p_r)m_\infty = m$.

**Proof.** By the assumption $\sum_{i=1}^s \Theta(\zeta_i, f) = 2$, we know from the proof of Lemma 3 that $t = 3$ or $t = 4$. Moreover, for each $\gamma_i$ in (2.28) or (2.29) we have $\overline{N}(r, \gamma_i, f) = T(r, f) + o(T(r, f))$ when $\gamma_i$ is not a completely ramified rational function of $f$ and $\overline{N}(r, \gamma_i, f) = \frac{1}{m_i} T(r, f) + o(T(r, f))$ when $\gamma_i$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity $m_i$, where $r \to \infty$ outside an exceptional set $E$ with finite linear measure. In particular, we have $\overline{N}(r, \infty, f) = O(\log r)$ when $\infty$ is a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$ and, otherwise, we have $\overline{N}(r, \infty, f) = T(r, f) + o(T(r, f))$ when $\infty$ is not a completely ramified rational function of $f$ and $\overline{N}(r, \infty, f) = \frac{1}{m_\infty} T(r, f) + o(T(r, f))$ when $\infty$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity $m_\infty$, where again $r \to \infty$ outside an exceptional set $E$ with finite linear measure. Note that for equation (2.28), when $p_r \geq 1$, the proof of Lemma 3 we have that $\infty$ cannot be a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$. Obviously, we have $\overline{N}(r, \gamma, f) = \frac{1}{m} T(r, f) + o(T(r, f))$, where $r \to \infty$ outside an exceptional set $E$ with finite linear measure. Now there are $T(r, f) + o(T(r, f))$ many points $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $f(z_0) - \gamma_i(z_0) = 0$ (or $f(z_0) = \infty$ when $p_r < q$) and from (2.28) or (2.29) it follows that $f(z_0 + 1)^n - \gamma(z_0 + 1)^n = 0$. For such $z_0$, by comparing the multiplicities on both sides of the equation (2.28) or (2.29), we easily get the desired results. We omit those details.

3 Equation (2.1) with $q = 0$

3.1 Equation (2.1) with $q = 0$ and $n > p \geq 2$

For the case $q = 0$ and $n > p \geq 2$ of equation (2.1), we prove the following

**Theorem 3** Suppose that $q = 0$ and $n > p \geq 2$. Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic solution of equation (2.1). Then there exists a rational function $\alpha$ such that the linear transformation $f \to af$ reduces (2.1) into

$$\overline{f}^\gamma = c f^p,$$

(3.1)

where $c$ is a non-zero constant. Moreover, solutions of equation (3.1) are represented as

$$f = c \pi(z)^{n/p} \exp[\pi(z)(p/n)^2],$$

(3.2)

where $\pi(z)$ is an arbitrary periodic function with period 1.
Proof. From Lemma 1 we know that $\infty$ is a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$ and $N_c = 1$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathcal{J}^n = a_p(f - \alpha_1)^{k_1},$$

(3.3)

where $k_1 = p$ and $(n, k_1) = 1$. If $\alpha_1 \neq 0$, then by Lemmas 1 and 2 it follows that $\omega \alpha_1$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity at least $n$, where $\omega$ is the $n$-th root of 1, a contradiction to the inequality (1.6) since $n \geq 3$. Therefore, $\alpha_1 = 0$ and thus we have

$$\mathcal{J}^n = a_p f^p.$$  

(3.4)

By Lemma 2, it follows that 0 is also a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$. Then there is a non-zero rational function $\alpha$ such that $\alpha f$ is a zero-free entire function. Since $f$ satisfies (3.4), it follows that

$$(\alpha f)^n = \alpha^n a_p f^p = a_p \alpha^n (\alpha f)^p.$$  

(3.5)

By redefining $\alpha f$ as $f$, we have

$$f^n = c f_p.$$  

(3.6)

where $c = a_p \alpha^n$ is a non-zero constant. By taking the logarithm on both sides of (3.6), then $g = \log f$ is entire and satisfies

$$ng = \log c + pg.$$  

(3.7)

Therefore, we can solve $f$ as

$$f = c^{1/n} \exp[\pi(z)(p/n)^2],$$  

(3.8)

where $\pi(z)$ is an arbitrary entire periodic function with period 1. This completes the proof.

3.2 Equation (2.1) with $q = 0$ and $2 \leq n < p$

For the case $q = 0$ and $2 \leq n < p$ of equation (2.1), we prove the following

**Theorem 4** Suppose that $q = 0$ and $2 \leq n < p$. Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic solution of equation (2.1). Then there exists a rational function $\alpha$ such that by doing a linear transformation $f \to \alpha f$, we have either

1. equation (2.1) reduces into

$$\mathcal{J}^n = c f^p,$$

(3.9)

where $c$ is a non-zero constant; solutions of (3.9) are represented as

$$f(z) = c^{1/n} \exp[\pi(z)(p/n)^2],$$

(3.10)

where $\pi(z)$ is an arbitrary entire periodic function with period 1; or

2. when $n = 2$ and $p = 2p_0 + 1$, $p_0 \geq 1$, equation (2.1) reduces into

$$\mathcal{J}^2 = P_0(f)^2(f - 1),$$

(3.11)

and $P_0(f)$ is a polynomial in $f$ such that

$$P_0(f) = \pm \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} [U_{p_0}(f) + U_{p_0-1}(f)]$$

(3.12)

with the Chebyshev polynomials $U_{p_0}$ and $U_{p_0-1}$ of the second kind, i.e.,

$$U_{p_0}(\cos x) = \frac{\sin(p_0 + 1)x}{\sin x},$$

(3.13)

i.e.,

$$U_{p_0}(f) = \sum_{t=0}^{[p_0/2]} (-1)^t (p_0 - t)! (2f)^{p_0-2t},$$

(3.14)
therefore, if we write
\[ P_0(f) = \sum_{t=0}^{p_0} A_{p_0} f^{p_0}, \] 
then
\[ A_{p_0-2t} = (-1)^t 2^{p_0-2t} (p_0-t) \cdots (p_0-(2t+1)) \frac{t!}{t!}, \]
\[ A_{p_0-2t-1} = (-1)^t 2^{p_0-2t-1} (p_0-t-1) \cdots (p_0-2t) \frac{t!}{t!}; \]
solutions of (3.11) are represented as
\[ f(z) = \frac{1}{2} (\delta^2 + \delta^{-2}), \]
where \( \delta \) is given by
\[ \delta = (\pm i)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{\pi(z)(p_0 + 1/2)^2}, \]
or
\[ \delta = (\pm i)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\pi(z)(-p_0 - 1/2)^2}, \]
where \( \pi(z) \) is an arbitrary entire periodic function with period 1; or (2) when \( n = 2 \) and \( p = 2p_0 + 1, p_0 \geq 1 \), equation (2.1) reduces into
\[ f^2 = P_0(f)(f^2 - 1), \]
and \( P_0(f) \) is a polynomial in \( f \) such that
\[ P_0(f) = \pm i^{\lfloor p_0/2 \rfloor} \sum_{t=0}^{p_0} \left( \frac{p_0+1}{2t+1} \right) f^{p_0-2t}(f^2 - 1)^t, \]
where \( \lfloor p_0/2 \rfloor \) denotes the greatest integer not exceeding \( p_0/2 \); solutions of (3.20) are represented as
\[ f = \frac{1}{2} (\lambda + \lambda^{-1}), \]
where \( \lambda \) is given by
\[ \lambda = (\pm i)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{\pi(z)(p_0 + 1)^2}, \]
or
\[ \lambda = (\pm i)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\pi(z)(-p_0 - 1)^2}, \]
where \( \pi(z) \) is an arbitrary entire periodic function with period 1.

We remark that the solutions with the form (3.17) of equation (3.11) are not given in [18] where an existence theorem for entire solutions of (3.11) is stated instead; we also remark that the polynomial in (3.21) has different form from the one in [18, Theorem 4(a)] since we have chosen different form of the solutions (3.22).

Equations (3.1) and (3.9), as well as their solutions (3.2) and (3.10), are apparently of the same form. We note that in Theorem 4 when \( n \geq 3 \), we only have equation (3.9). In fact, when \( n \geq 3 \), if some \( \alpha_i \) in (2.7) is non-zero, then by Lemmas 1 and 3 we have a contradiction to the inequality (1.6) since \( \omega \alpha_i \) is a completely ramified rational function of \( f \), where \( \omega \) is the \( n \)-th root of 1, and \( \infty \) is a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \). Then (3.9) follows by applying Lemma 2 and Picard's theorem.
Proof of Theorem 4. From Lemma 1 we know that \( \alpha \) is a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \) and \( N_c \leq 2 \). If some \( \alpha_i \) in (2.27) is zero, then by Lemma 5 it follows that 0 is also a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \). Then by Picard’s theorem we conclude that \( P(z, f) \) cannot have any non-zero root and thus \( P_0(z, f)^n = a_p \), i.e., we have the following equation:

\[
T' = a_p f^p.
\]  
(3.25)

Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 4, there is a rational function \( \alpha \) such that by redefining \( \alpha f \) as \( f \) we have from (3.26) that

\[
\overline{f} = c f^p,
\]  
(3.26)

where \( c = \frac{a_p \overline{\alpha}}{\overline{\alpha}} \) is a non-zero constant and \( f \) above is a zero-free entire function. Moreover, solutions of (3.26) can be solved as

\[
f = c \sqrt[n]{\pi(z)\{p/n\}^2},
\]  
(3.27)

where \( \pi(z) \) is an arbitrary entire periodic function with period 1. This is the first part of Theorem 4.

From now on, we suppose that none of \( \alpha_i \) in (2.27) is zero. By Lemmas 1 and 3 it follows that \( \omega \alpha_i \) is a completely ramified rational function of \( f \), where \( \omega \) is the \( n \)-th root of 1. Since \( \infty \) is a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \), then by the inequality (1.9) we must have \( n = 2 \) and \( N_c \leq 2 \). Below we consider the two cases where \( N_c = 1 \) and \( N_c = 2 \) separately.

Case 1: \( N_c = 1 \).

In this case, \( \infty \) is a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \) and \( p \) is odd. Therefore, we have

\[
\overline{T} = P_0(z, f)^2 (f - \alpha_1)^{k_1},
\]  
(3.28)

where \( \alpha_1 \neq 0 \) and \( k_1 \) is an odd integer. By Lemmas 1 and 3 it follows that \( \pm \alpha_1 \) are both completely ramified rational functions of \( f \) with multiplicities 2. Then by Lemma 4 we must have \( k_1 = 1 \) and \( P_0(z, f) \) is a polynomial in \( f \) with simple roots only. We may let \( \alpha_1 = 1 \) by doing a linear transformation \( f \rightarrow \alpha_1 f \). We consider

\[
\overline{T}^2 - 1 = P_0(z, f)^2 (f - 1) - 1.
\]  
(3.29)

The RHS of (3.29) is a polynomial in \( f \) with odd degree and thus has at least one root, say \( \gamma_1 \), of odd order. Since \( f \) has no other completely ramified rational functions besides \( \pm 1 \), then by Lemma 5 we conclude that \( \gamma_1 \) must be \(-1\) and there is only one such \( \gamma_1 \); moreover, the RHS of (3.29) is of the form \( P_1(z, f)^2 (f + 1) \) for some polynomial \( P_1(z, f) \) in \( f \) with simple roots only. Now we have

\[
\overline{T} = P_0(z, f)^2 (f - 1),
\]  
(3.30)

and further that

\[
\overline{T}^2 - 1 = P_1(z, f)^2 (f + 1).
\]  
(3.31)

From (3.30) and (3.31), we see that the degree of \( P_1(z, f) \) is \( p_0 \), at least 1. Put

\[
f = \frac{1}{2} (\lambda + \lambda^{-1}).
\]  
(3.32)

Since both \( \pm 1 \) have multiplicities 2, we may write \( f + 1 = g^2 \) with an algebroid function \( g \) and \( g \) has at most finitely many algebraic branch points. It follows that the RHS of equation (3.31) becomes \([P_1(z, g^2 - 1)g]^2\), which implies that \( \lambda \) is an algebroid function with at most finitely many algebraic branch points. Moreover, 0 and \( \infty \) are both Picard exceptional rational functions of \( \lambda \). Put

\[
\lambda = \delta^2.
\]  
(3.33)

Then \( \delta \) is an algebroid function with at most finitely many algebraic branch points. Now it follows from equation (3.31) that

\[
\frac{1}{2} (\delta^2 - \delta^{-2}) = P_1(z, f) \frac{\delta^2 + 1}{2^{1/2} \delta^2}.
\]  
(3.34)

By solving equation (3.34) together with (3.30) and (3.31), we get

\[
\frac{\overline{T}}{\delta^2} = \left( \frac{P_1 \left( z, \frac{\delta^4 + 1}{2\delta^2} \right) (\delta^2 + 1) \pm P_0 \left( z, \frac{\delta^4 + 1}{2\delta^2} \right) (\delta^2 - 1)}{2^{1/2} \delta (2\delta^2)^{p_0}} \right)^2.
\]  
(3.35)
where $P_{11}(z, \delta)$ is a polynomial in $\delta$ of degree at most $4p_0 + 2$. Since 0 is a Picard exceptional rational function of $\lambda$, then by Picard’s theorem we see from equation (3.35) that $P_{11}(z, \delta)$ cannot have any non-zero root. By the Valiron–Mohon’ko identity [23,17] (see also [15]), we have from (3.30), (3.32) and (3.33) that $4T(r, \delta) = (4p_0 + 2)T(r, \delta) + O(\log r)$. Therefore, we have either
\[
\frac{\delta^2}{\delta} = T_0 \delta^{2p_0 - 1},
\]
(3.36)
or
\[
\frac{\delta^2}{\delta} = T_0 \delta^{-2p_0 - 1},
\]
(3.37)
where $T_0$ is an algebraic function. We write
\[
P_c(z, f) = c_{p_0} f^{p_0} + c_{p_0 - 1} f^{p_0 - 1} + \cdots + c_0,
\]
(3.38)
where $c_{p_0}, \cdots, c_0$ are algebraic functions and $c_{p_0} \neq 0$. If we have (3.30), then by substituting (3.32), (3.33) and (3.36) into (3.34) and then comparing the terms on both sides of the resulting equation together with (3.38), we get
\[
\frac{\delta^2}{\delta} = 2^{1/2} 2^{-p_0} c_{p_0} \delta^{2p_0 + 1},
\]
(3.39)
and
\[
\frac{\delta^2}{\delta} = -2^{-1/2} 2^{p_0} (1/c_{p_0}) \delta^2 p_0 + 1.
\]
(3.40)
On the other hand, if we have (3.37), then similarly as above from (3.32), (3.33), (3.34) and (3.35) we get
\[
\frac{\delta^2}{\delta} = 2^{1/2} 2^{-p_0} c_{p_0} \delta^{-2p_0 - 1},
\]
(3.41)
and
\[
\frac{\delta^2}{\delta} = -2^{-1/2} 2^{p_0} (1/c_{p_0}) \delta^{-2p_0 - 1}.
\]
(3.42)
We obtain from (3.39) and (3.40), as well as from (3.41) and (3.42), that
\[
c_{p_0} = \pm i 2^{p_0 - \frac{1}{2}},
\]
(3.43)
and it follows that
\[
T_0 = \pm i.
\]
(3.44)
Thus the solution $f$ of (3.30) is represented by (3.32) and (3.33) with $\delta$ such that
\[
\frac{\delta^2}{\delta} = \pm i \delta^{2p_0 + 1},
\]
(3.45)
or
\[
\frac{\delta^2}{\delta} = \pm i \delta^{-2p_0 - 1}.
\]
(3.46)
We claim that $\delta$ in (3.45) has no zeros, poles or branch points. Otherwise, we let $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ be a zero or a pole or a $k$-fold branch point of $\delta$. Since $p_0 \geq 1$, then it follows from (3.45) that $z_0 - 1$ is also a zero or a pole or a branch point of $\delta$ and by iteration we have $z_0 - s, s \in \mathbb{N}$, is an at least $k$-fold branch point of $\delta$ when $s$ is large. By letting $s \to \infty$, it follows that $\delta$ has infinitely many branch points, a contradiction to our assumption. Thus our assertion follows. For equation (3.46), if $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ is a zero or a pole or a $k$-fold branch point of $\delta$, then by iteration we easily show that $z_0 - 2s$ is an at least $k$-fold branch point of $\delta$ when $s$ is large. By letting $s \to \infty$, it follows that $\delta$ has infinitely many branch points, also a contradiction to our assumption. Hence $\delta$ in (3.46) has no zeros, poles or branch points either. Therefore, we can solve $\delta$ from (3.45) and (3.46) as
\[
\delta = (\pm i)^{1/p_0} \exp[\pi(z)(p_0 + 1/2)^2],
\]
(3.47)
or
\[
\delta = (\pm i)^{1/p_0} \exp[\pi(z)(-p_0 + 1/2)^2],
\]
(3.48)
respectively, where $\pi(z)$ is an arbitrary entire periodic function with period 1. We conclude that solutions of equation (3.30) are given by (3.32), (3.33) with (3.47) or (3.48).

Now we determine the polynomial $P_h(z, f)$ in $f$ in (3.30) by using (3.32), (3.33), (3.45) and (3.46). From (3.30) and (3.45) we have
\[
\frac{1}{2} (\pm i) (\delta^{2p_0 + 1} - \delta^{-2p_0 - 1}) = P_h(z, f) \frac{\delta^2 - 1}{2^{1/2}\delta}.
\]
(3.49)
Moreover, by (3.32) and (3.33) we have
\[
\delta^2 = f \pm (f^2 - 1)^{1/2},
\]
and also that
\[
\delta^{-2} = f \mp (f^2 - 1)^{1/2},
\]
and so by Theorem 2 we must have
\[
\alpha_1 = 0.
\]
We consider
\[
\mathcal{T}^2 = P_0(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2),
\]
and we have
\[
\mathcal{T}^2 - 1 = P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1) - 1.
\]
Since ±1 are both completely ramified rational functions of f with multiplicities 2 and f has no other completely ramified rational functions, then by Lemma 5 we conclude that the RHS of (3.57) is of the form $P_1(z, f)^2$ for some polynomial $P_1(z, f)$ in f with simple roots only. Now we have

$$\mathcal{J}^2 = P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1),$$

and further that

$$\mathcal{J}^2 - 1 = P_1(z, f)^2.$$  (3.59)

Put

$$f = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \lambda^{-1}).$$  (3.60)

Then from (3.59) we see that $\lambda$ is an algebroid function with at most finitely many algebraic branch points. Moreover, 0 is a Picard exceptional rational function of $\lambda$. It follows from (3.59) that

$$\frac{1}{2}(\lambda - \lambda^{-1}) = P_1(z, f).$$  (3.61)

From (3.58) and (3.59), we see that the degree of $P_1(z, f)$ in f is $p_0 + 1$, which is greater than or equal to 2. By solving equation (3.61) together with (3.58) and (3.59), we get

$$\lambda = T_0^2 \lambda^{p_0 + 1},$$  (3.63)

or

$$\lambda = T_0 \lambda^{-p_0 - 1},$$  (3.64)

where $T_0$ is an algebraic function. We write

$$P_1(z, f) = c_{p_0 + 1}f^{p_0 + 1} + c_{p_0}f^{p_0} + \cdots + c_0,$$  (3.65)

where $c_{p_0 + 1}, \cdots, c_0$ are in general algebraic functions and $c_{p_0 + 1} \neq 0$. If we have (3.64), then by substituting (3.64) into (3.61) and then comparing the terms on both sides of the resulting equation together with (3.65), we get

$$\lambda = (1/2^{p_0})c_{p_0 + 1} \lambda^{p_0 + 1},$$  (3.66)

and

$$\lambda = -2^{p_0}(1/c_{p_0 + 1}) \lambda^{-p_0 + 1}.$$  (3.67)

On the other hand, if we have (3.64), then similarly as above from (3.64), (3.61) and (3.65) we get

$$\lambda = (1/2^{p_0})c_{p_0 + 1} \lambda^{-p_0 - 1},$$  (3.68)

and

$$\lambda = -2^{p_0}(1/c_{p_0 + 1}) \lambda^{-p_0 - 1}.$$  (3.69)

We obtain from (3.66) and (3.67), as well as from (3.68) and (3.69), that

$$c_{p_0 + 1} = \pm i2^{p_0},$$  (3.70)

and it follows that

$$T_0 = \pm i.$$  (3.71)

Thus the solution f of equation (3.58) is represented by (3.60) with $\lambda$ such that

$$\lambda = \pm i \lambda^{p_0 + 1},$$  (3.72)
or
\[ \lambda = \pm i \lambda^{-p_0-1}. \]  
(3.73)

By applying the analysis on equations (3.45) and (3.46) directly to (3.72) and (3.73), respectively, we see that \( \lambda \) has no zeros, poles or branch points and thus we can solve \( \lambda \) from equations (3.72) and (3.73) as
\[ \lambda = (\pm i)^{-p_0} \exp[\pi(z)(p_0 + 1)^{-1}], \]  
(3.74)
of
\[ \lambda = (\pm i)^{1-p_0} \exp[\pi(z)(-p_0 - 1)^{-1}], \]  
(3.75)
respectively, where \( \pi(z) \) is an arbitrary entire periodic function with period 1. We conclude that solutions of equation (3.58) are given by (3.60) with (3.74) or (3.75).

Now we determine the polynomial \( P_0(z, f) \) in \( f \) in (3.58) by using (3.60) with (3.72) or with (3.73).

From (3.58) and (3.72), or (3.58) and (3.73), we have
\[ \pm i \left( \lambda^{p_0+1} - \lambda^{-p_0-1} \right) = \frac{1}{2} (\lambda - \lambda^{-1}) P_0(z, f). \]  
(3.76)

By (3.60), we have
\[ \lambda = f \pm (f^2 - 1)^{1/2}, \]
\[ \lambda^{-1} = f \mp (f^2 - 1)^{1/2}, \]  
(3.77)
and it follows that
\[ \lambda^{p_0+1} - \lambda^{-p_0-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{p_0+1} \frac{p_0+1}{k} f^{p_0+1-k} \left\{ [\pm (f^2 - 1)^{1/2}]^k - [\mp (f^2 - 1)^{1/2}]^k \right\}, \]  
(3.78)

From (3.76), (3.77) and (3.78) we see that \( P_0(z, f) = P_0(f) \) is a polynomial in \( f \) with constant coefficients and
\[ P_0(f) = \pm i \sum_{l=0}^{[p_0/2]} \frac{p_0+1}{2l+1} f^{p_0-2l} (f^2 - 1)^l, \]  
(3.79)
where \([p_0/2]\) denotes the greatest integer not exceeding \( p_0/2 \). This corresponds to the third part of Theorem 4 and also completes the proof.

4 Equation (2.1) with \( q \geq 1 \) and \( d = \max\{p, q\} \geq 2 \)

4.1 Equation (2.1) with \( q \geq 1 \) and \( n > d \geq 2 \)

For the case \( q \geq 1 \) and \( n > d \geq 2 \) of equation (2.1), we prove the following

**Theorem 5** Suppose that \( q \geq 1 \) and \( n > d \geq 2 \). Let \( f \) be a transcendental meromorphic solution of equation (2.1). Then there exists a rational function \( \alpha \) such that the linear transformation \( f \rightarrow \alpha f \) reduces (2.1) into
\[ f^n = cf^{-q}, \]  
(4.1)
where \( c \) is a non-zero constant. Moreover, solutions of equation (4.1) are represented as
\[ f = c^{\frac{1}{q+n}} \exp[\pi(z)(-q/n)^2], \]  
(4.2)
where \( \pi(z) \) is an arbitrary entire periodic function with period 1.
Proof of Theorem 5. Suppose that $P(z, f)$ has a non-zero root, say $\alpha_1$. Since $n \geq 3$, then by Lemmas 1 and 3 it follows that $\omega_1$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$, where $\omega$ is the $n$-th root of 1. Then by the inequality (1.6) we conclude that $n = 3$ or $n = 4$. In particular, when $n = 3$ we see that $\eta_1$ has multiplicity 3 since the order $k_1$ of the root $\alpha_1$ equals 1 or 2 under the assumption that $n > d$, where $\eta$ is the cubic root of 1. Thus by the inequality (1.6), when $n = 3$ we have $\sum_{i=1}^{3} \Theta(\eta_i \alpha_1, f) = 2$, where $\eta_i$ are the four numbers such that $\eta_1^3 = 1$. On the other hand, when $n = 4$ we have $\sum_{i=1}^{4} \Theta(\omega_i \alpha_1, f) = 2$, where $\omega_i$ are the four numbers such that $\omega_1^4 = 1$. By Lemma 1 and the inequality (1.6) we see that 0 cannot be a root of $P(z, f)$ or $Q(z, f)$. Now, if $p \neq q$, then by Lemma 1 it follow that $\infty$ is either a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$ or a completely ramified function of $f$, a contradiction to the inequality (1.6). Therefore, $p = q$. From the above reasoning, when $n = 3$, we have $p = q = 2$ and by Lemma 4 we see that each of the roots of $P(z, f)$ and $Q(z, f)$ is simple since 0 is not a completely ramified rational function of $f$, i.e., we have $N_c = 4$, a contradiction to Lemma 1. When $n = 4$, we have $p = q = 2$ or $p = q = 3$, and by Lemma 4 we see that each of the roots of $P(z, f)$ and $Q(z, f)$ has double order since 0 is not a completely ramified rational function of $f$, but it follows that the case where $p = q = 3$ is impossible and when $p = q = 2$ we have a contradiction to our assumption that at least one of $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_j$ in (2.7) and (2.8) has order that is not divided by $n$. We conclude that $P(z, f)$ does not have any non-zero root. Similarly, $Q(z, f)$ cannot have any non-zero root either. Since $q \geq 1$, then by assumption we must have $P(z, f) = a_p$, i.e., we have the following equation:

$$f^n = a_p f^{-q}. \quad (4.3)$$

We claim that $f$ has at most finitely many poles. Suppose on the contrary that $f$ has infinitely many poles. Let $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ be a pole of $f$ with multiplicity $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. We may choose $z_0$ such that $|z_0|$ is large enough so that $a_p$ has no poles or zeros outside of $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < |z_0|\}$. Then from (4.3) we see that $z_0 + 1$ is a zero of $f$ of order $qm/n$ and it follows that $z_0 + 2$ is a pole of $f$ of order $q^2m/n^2$. By iteration we have that $f$ has a pole of order $q^k m/n^{k+1}$ at the point $z_0 + 2s$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $(n, q) = 1$, then by letting $s \to \infty$, it follows that there is necessarily a branch point at some $z_0 + 2s_0$, $s_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, a contradiction to our assumption that $f$ is meromorphic. Therefore, $f$ has at most finitely many poles. Obviously, from (4.3) we also have $f$ has at most finitely many zeros. Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 3 there is a rational function $\alpha$ such that by redefining $\alpha f$ as $f$ we have from (4.3) that

$$f^n = c f^{-q}. \quad (4.4)$$

where $c = a_p \pi^q \alpha^q$ is a non-zero constant and $f$ above is a zero-free entire function. By taking the logarithm on both sides of (4.3), then $g = \log f$ is entire and satisfies

$$n \bar{g} = \log c - qg. \quad (4.5)$$

Therefore, we can solve $f$ from (4.3) as

$$f = c \pi^{\bar{g}} \exp[\pi(z)(-q/n)^2], \quad (4.6)$$

where $\pi(z)$ is an arbitrary entire periodic function with period 1. This completes the proof.

4.2 Equation (2.1) with $q \geq 1$ and $2 \leq n < d$

In this section, we consider the two cases $n \nmid |p - q|$ and $n \nmid |p - q|$ of equation (2.1) separately. For the case $n \nmid |p - q|$, we actually have $N_c = 1$; we prove the following

**Theorem 6** Suppose that $q \geq 1$ and $2 \leq n < d$ and $n \nmid |p - q|$. Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic solution of equation (2.1). Then there exists a rational function $\alpha$ such that by doing a linear transformation $f \to \alpha f$, we have either

1. equation (2.1) reduces into

$$f^n = c f^{-q}, \quad (4.7)$$

and solutions of equation (4.7) are represented as

$$f = c \pi^{\bar{g}} \exp[\pi(z)(-q/n)^2], \quad (4.8)$$

where $\pi(z)$ is an arbitrary entire periodic function with period 1; or
(2) \( q \) is even and \( q = 2q_0, q_0 \geq 1, \) and equation (2.1) reduces into
\[
\overline{f}^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2}(f-1)^{k_1},
\]
where \( k_1 \) is an odd integer and \( 2p_0 + k_1 < 2q_0; \) moreover, we have
\[
Q_0(z, f) = Q_1(z, f)^2(f+1)^{l_0} = \frac{1}{2i}[P_{011}(z, f)^2 - P_{012}(z, f)^2(f-1)^{k_1}],
\]
where \( l_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) is zero or an odd integer, \( Q_1(z, f) \) is a polynomial in \( f \) and \( P_{011}(z, f) \) and \( P_{012}(z, f) \) are two polynomials in \( f \) with no common roots such that \( P_{011}(z, f)P_{012}(z, f) = P_0(z, f); \) solutions of (4.9) are represented as
\[
f = \frac{1}{2}(\delta^2 + \delta^{-2}),
\]
and \( \delta \) is a function such that
\[
\overline{\delta} = \pm i^{1/2} \frac{P_{021} \left( z, \frac{\delta^4+1}{2z^2} \right)}{P_{021} \left( z, \frac{\delta^4+1}{2z^2} \right) - \theta P_{022} \left( z, \frac{\delta^4+1}{2z^2} \right)} \frac{\delta^{k_1}}{P_{022} \left( z, \frac{\delta^4+1}{2z^2} \right)^{\frac{k_1}{2\theta}} - P_{022} \left( z, \frac{\delta^4+1}{2z^2} \right)^{\frac{k_1}{2\theta}}}, \quad \theta = \pm 1,
\]
when \( l_0 = 0, \) where \( P_{021}(z, f) \) and \( P_{022}(z, f) \) are two polynomials in \( f \) with no common roots such that \( P_{021}(z, f)P_{022}(z, f) = P_{012}(z, f), \) or such that
\[
\overline{\delta} = \pm i^{1/2} \frac{P_{023} \left( z, \frac{\delta^4+1}{2z^2} \right) \delta^{t_1} + \theta P_{024} \left( z, \frac{\delta^4+1}{2z^2} \right)}{P_{023} \left( z, \frac{\delta^4+1}{2z^2} \right) \delta^{t_1} - \theta P_{024} \left( z, \frac{\delta^4+1}{2z^2} \right)} \theta = \pm 1,
\]
when \( l_0 > 0, \) where \( t_1 \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\} \) is an odd integer, \( P_{023}(z, f) \) and \( P_{024}(z, f) \) are two polynomials in \( f \) with no common roots such that \( P_{023}(z, f)P_{024}(z, f) = P_{011}(z, f). \)

Equations (4.1) and (4.7), as well as their solutions (4.6) and (4.8), are apparently of the same form. We note that in Theorem 6 when \( n \geq 3, \) we only have equation (4.7). In fact, when \( n \geq 3, \) if some \( \alpha_i \) in (2.7) or \( \beta_j \) in (2.8) is non-zero, say \( \alpha_i \neq 0 \) for some \( i, \) then by Lemmas 1 and 3 we have a contradiction to the inequality (1.6) since \( \omega \alpha_i \) is a completely ramified rational function of \( f, \) where \( \omega \) is the \( n \)-th root of 1, and \( \infty \) is either a Picard exceptional rational function or a completely ramified rational function of \( f \) with multiplicity at least \( n. \) Then the reasoning in the proof of Theorem 5 easily yields equation (4.7).

In the autonomous case, the RHS of equation (4.12) or (4.13) becomes a rational term \( R_0(\delta) \) in \( \delta \) after multiplying \( (2^{1/2} \delta)^{q_0} \) to both the numerator and the denominator and thus \( \overline{\delta} = R_0(\delta) \) always has a meromorphic form for any given \( P_0(z, f) \) and \( Q_1(z, f) \) such that the relation in (4.10) holds, as mentioned in the introduction. We note that when \( l_0 > 0, \) the polynomials \( P_0(z, f) \) and \( Q_0(z, f) \) satisfying the relation in (4.10) exist. For example, for the two polynomials \( P_0(f) \) and \( P_1(f) \) satisfying (6.30) and (6.31) in the proof of Theorem 4 we have \( iP_0(f)^2(f-1) - iP_1(f)^2(f+1) = i. \) In the simplest case \( p_0 = k_1 = l_0 = 1, \) we have \( 2i(f-1)^2(f+1) - 2i(f+1)^2(f-1) = i \).

**Proof of Theorem 2** First, we show that under the assumptions of Theorem 6 the case \( p > q \) cannot occur. Since \( n \uparrow (p-q), \) then from the proof of Lemma 2 we see that \( \infty \) is a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \) no matter whether or not some \( \alpha_i \) in (2.7) is zero. Let \( \beta \) be any root of \( Q(z, f) \). Then from (2.1) we see that the equation \( f - \beta = 0 \) has at most finitely many roots and so \( \beta \) is a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f. \) By Picard’s theorem we see that there is only one such \( \beta. \) Then by Lemma and the inequality (1.6) we conclude that (2.1) takes the following form:
\[
\overline{f}^n = \frac{P_0(z, f)^n}{(f-\beta)^n},
\]
where \( \beta \) is a rational function. Moreover, since \( p > q, \) we see that \( \beta \neq 0 \) since otherwise all the roots of \( P_0(z, f) \) are Picard exceptional rational functions of \( f, \) a contradiction to Picard’s theorem. Denote \( g = (f-\beta)^{1/n}. \) Then \( g \) is an algebraic function with at most finitely many algebraic branch points and it follows that \( f = g^n + \beta. \) Then we can rewrite equation (4.14) as follows
\[
\overline{\delta}^n g^n = P_0(z, g^n + \beta) - \beta g^n.
\]

(4.15)
Note that 0 and $\infty$ are both Picard exceptional rational functions of $g$. Let $u_0$ be a function such that

$$P_0(z, u_0^n + \beta - \overline{\beta}u_0^n) = 0.$$ 

Then $u_0$ is an algebraic function. Since $q < p$ and $P_0(z, f)$ has at least one root distinct from $\beta$, we see that the above equation has at least one non-zero root and from (4.15) we see that for the non-zero $u_0$ we have that $g - u_0 = 0$ has at most finitely many roots, i.e., $u_0$ is a Picard exceptional rational function of $g$, a contradiction to Picard's theorem. Therefore, the case where $p > q \geq 1$ and $n \not\mid (q - p)$ cannot occur. In particular, since $p \neq q$, the above analysis also implies that the case where 0 is a root of $P(z, f)$ of order $k_0$ such that $n \not\mid k_0$ cannot occur; otherwise, by doing a bilinear transformation $f \rightarrow 1/f$ to (2.1), we always get

$$T^n = \frac{P_1(z, f)}{Q_1(z, f)},$$

(4.16)

where $P_1(z, f)$ is a polynomial in $f$ of degree $d$ and $Q_1(z, f)$ is a polynomial in $f$ of degree $d - k_0$, which is impossible from previous discussions.

Second, we show that $N_c = 1$. Suppose on the contrary that $N_c \geq 2$. Then at least one of $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_j$ is non-zero, say $\alpha_i$. By Lemmas 1 and 3, $\omega_\alpha$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$, where $\omega$ is the $n$-th root of 1. Moreover, since $p < q$ and $n \not\mid |p - q|$, then by Lemma 1 it follows that $\infty$ is also a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity at least $n$. By the inequality (1.6), we must have $n = 2$. In this case, we see that $N_c$ is an odd integer. If $N_c \geq 3$, then none of $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_j$ is zero; otherwise, 0 has multiplicity at least 2 and it follows that $\infty$ has multiplicity at least 4, a contradiction to the inequality (1.6). For convenience, we denote these $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_j$ by $\gamma_j$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, k$. By Lemmas 1 and 3, $\pm \gamma_j$ are all completely ramified rational functions of $f$. Then by Theorem 2 we conclude that $\gamma_i^2$ must be equal to each other for all $j$, i.e., $\gamma_1^2 = \gamma_2^2 = \cdots = \gamma_k^2$ holds for $k \geq 3$, which is impossible. Therefore, we must have $N_c = 1$.

Third, we show that 0 cannot be a root of $Q(z, f)$ of order $l_0 < q$ such that $n \not\mid l_0$. Note that now we have $0 \leq p < q$ under the assumption $p \neq q$. Otherwise, (2.1) can be written as

$$F^n = \frac{P(z, f)}{f^nQ(z, f)},$$

(4.17)

where $1 \leq l_0 \leq q - 1$ satisfies $n \not\mid l_0$, and $Q(z, f)$ is a polynomial in $f$ of degree $q - l_0$. Now we must have $n \not\mid (q - l_0)$ and $n \not\mid p$ by the fact that $N_c = 1$ and it follows that $q - p = k_0n + l_0$ for some integer $k_0$. Suppose that $f$ has infinitely many zeros and let $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ be a zero of $f$ with multiplicity $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. We may choose $z_0$ such that $|z_0|$ is large enough so that none of the coefficients of $P(z, f)$ and $Q(z, f)$ has poles or zeros outside of $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < |z_0|\}$. By (4.17), $z_0 + 1$ is a pole of $f$ of order $l_0m/n$. It follows that $z = z_0 + 2s$ has zeros of order $l_0m/n$. Then, by iteration it follows that $z = z_0 + 2s$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$, is a zero of $f$ of order $(l_0m + l_0)^{s}l_0m/n^{s+2}$. Since $n^2 \not\mid (k_0n + l_0), n^2$, then by letting $s \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that there is necessarily a branch point of $f$ at $z_0 + 2s_0$ for some $s_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, a contradiction to our assumption that $f$ is meromorphic. Therefore, $f$ has at most finitely many zeros, i.e., 0 is a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$. Also, from (4.17) we see that $f$ has at most finitely many poles since $p < q$ and then, since $l_0 \leq q - 1$, it follows that there exists another non-zero $\beta_j$ such that $\beta$ is a root of $Q(z, f)$ and $f - \beta = 0$ has at most finitely many roots, that is to say, $f$ has at least 3 Picard exceptional rational functions, a contradiction to Picard's theorem. Therefore, 0 cannot be a root of $Q(z, f)$ of order $l_0 < q$ such that $n \not\mid l_0$ when assuming $n \not\mid (q - p)$.

By combining all the above results together, we see that we only need to consider two cases of (2.1) under our assumption: (1) the case where 0 is the only root of $Q(z, f)$; or (2) the case where 0 is not a root of $Q(z, f)$ of order $0 < l_0 < q$ such that $n \not\mid l_0$. In particular, in the latter case if 0 is not a root of $Q_0(z, f)$, then from the previous discussions we can assume that 0 is not a root of $P(z, f)$ of order $k_0$ such that $n \not\mid k_0$.

Now, if 0 is the only root of $Q(z, f)$ and $n \not\mid q$, from the above reasoning we must have

$$T^n = \frac{P_0(z, f)^n}{f^q}.$$ 

In this case, since $p < q$ and $n \not\mid (q - p)$, then by applying exactly the same analysis as in the previous discussions on the case where 0 is a root of $P(z, f)$ of order $l_0 < q$ and $n \not\mid l_0$, we can show that $f$ has at most finitely many zeros and poles, i.e., 0 and $\infty$ are both Picard exceptional rational functions of $f$. By
Picard’s theorem, we see that $P_0(z, f)$ has no non-zero roots and thus $P_0(z, f)^n = a_p$. Then by doing a linear transformation $f \to \alpha f$ with a suitably chosen rational function $\alpha$, we get
\[
\mathcal{F}^0 = c f^{-q},
\]
where $c = \frac{\beta}{m \alpha}$ is a non-zero constant. Also, as in Theorem 3 solutions of (4.19) are represented as
\[
f = c \exp[\pi(z)(-q/n)^2],
\]
where $\pi(z)$ is an arbitrary entire periodic function with period 1. Otherwise, we have that 0 is the only root of $Q(z, f)$ with $n \mid q$, or 0 is not the only root of $Q(z, f)$. Recalling that we have excluded out the two possibilities that 0 is a root of $P(z, f)$ of order $k_0$ such that $n \nmid k_0$ and that 0 is a root of $Q(z, f)$ of order $l_0$ such that $l_0 < q$ and $n \nmid l_0$, we see that in either case the only $\alpha_i$ in $P(z, f)$ or $\beta_j$ in (2.8) is non-zero. Therefore, we only need to consider the following two equations:
\[
\mathcal{F} = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2} (f - \alpha_1)^{k_1},
\]
\[
\mathcal{F}^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2} (f - \beta_1)^{l_1},
\]
where $\alpha_1 \neq 0$ and $\beta_1 \neq 0$, $k_1, l_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ are odd integers, and in equation (4.21) we have $2\Pi_0 + 1 < 2\Pi_0$ and in equation (4.22) we have $2\Pi_0 < 2\Pi_0 + 1$. Below we discuss the above two equations separately.

**Subcase 1: Equation (4.21).**

From the previous discussions we see that $\pm \alpha_1$ and $\infty$ are all completely ramified rational functions of $f$. In fact, $\infty$ cannot be a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$; otherwise, the roots of $Q(z, f)$ are all Picard’s exceptional rational functions of $f$, which is impossible by the inequality (1.6). Also, from (4.21) we see that all roots of $f - \alpha_1 = 0$ with at most finitely many exceptions are of even multiplicities. If $Q_0(z, f)$ has a root, say $\beta$, of odd order, then by applying the same analysis as in the proof of Lemma 1 and considering the multiplicities of the roots of $f - \beta = 0$ together with the fact that $\infty$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$, we obtain that $\beta$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$. Moreover, $\beta \neq 0$ since otherwise from the proof of Lemma 1 we have that $\pm \alpha_1$ are completely ramified rational functions of $f$ with multiplicity 4, a contradiction to the inequality (1.6). By Lemma 3 it follows that $\pm \beta$ are both completely ramified rational functions of $f$. Then by Theorem 2 we must have $\beta = -\alpha_1$ and there is only one such $\beta$. We conclude that $Q_0(z, f)$ is of the form $Q_0(z, f) = Q_1(z, f)^2 \alpha_1^\ell_0$ for some polynomial $Q_1(z, f)$ in $f$ and $\Pi_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ is 0 or an odd integer. We may let $\alpha_1 = -1$ by doing a linear transformation $f \to \alpha_1 f$. We consider
\[
\mathcal{F}^2 - 1 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2 (f - 1)^{k_1} - Q_0(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2}.
\]
Note that the numerator of the RHS of (4.23) is a polynomial in $f$ with degree $2\Pi_0$. If it has two distinct roots, say $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$, of odd orders, then by considering the multiplicities of the roots of $f - \gamma_1 = 0$ and $f - \gamma_2 = 0$, respectively, together with the fact that $\pm 1$ are both completely ramified rational functions of $f$ and that the roots of $f \pm 1 = 0$ have even multiplicities with at most finitely many exceptions, we obtain that $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$ are both completely ramified rational functions of $f$. By Lemma 3 it follows that $\pm \gamma_1$ and $\pm \gamma_2$ are all completely ramified rational functions of $f$. For some polynomial $P_1(z, f)$ in $f$, we get that $\mathcal{F}^2 - 1 = \frac{P_1(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2}$. We now have
\[
\mathcal{F}^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2 (f - 1)^{k_1}}{Q_0(z, f)^2},
\]
and further that
\[
\mathcal{F}^2 - 1 = \frac{P_1(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2}.
\]
It follows that
\[
P_0(z, f)^2 (f - 1)^{k_1} = P_1(z, f)^2 + Q_0(z, f)^2 = [P_1(z, f) + iQ_0(z, f)][P_1(z, f) - iQ_0(z, f)],
\]
and so

\[ P_1(z, f) + iQ_0(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f), \]
\[ P_1(z, f) - iQ_0(z, f) = P_{02}(z, f), \] (4.27)

where \( P_{01}(z, f) \) and \( P_{02}(z, f) \) are two polynomials in \( f \) such that \( P_{01}(z, f)P_{02}(z, f) = P_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1} \). Since \( P_{01}(z, f) \) and \( P_{02}(z, f) \) have no common roots, without loss of generality, we may write

\[ P_{01}(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f)^2, \]
\[ P_{02}(z, f) = P_{012}(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1}, \] (4.28)

where \( P_{011}(z, f) \) and \( P_{012}(z, f) \) are two polynomials in \( f \) with no common roots and \( P_{011}(z, f)P_{012}(z, f) = P_0(z, f) \). From equations in (4.27) together with previous discussions we have

\[ Q_0(z, f) = \frac{1}{2\lambda}[P_{011}(z, f)^2 - P_{012}(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1}] = Q_1(z, f)^2(f + 1)^{\delta}, \]
\[ P_1(z, f) = \frac{1}{2}[P_{011}(z, f)^2 + P_{012}(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1}]. \] (4.29)

With the above two expressions for \( Q_0(z, f) \) and \( P_1(z, f) \), solutions of equation (4.24) can be obtained in the following way. Put

\[ f = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \lambda^{-1}). \] (4.30)

Note that the leading coefficient of the polynomial \( P_1(z, f)^2 \) is \(-1\). From (4.24) we see that \( \lambda \) is a meromorphic function and it follows that

\[ \frac{1}{2} \lambda^2 - 1 = \frac{P_1(z, f)}{Q_0(z, f)}. \] (4.31)

Since \( \infty \) is a completely ramified rational function of \( f \), then we see that \( 0 \) and \( \infty \) are both completely ramified rational functions of \( \lambda \). Moreover, since all zeros of \( f - 1 \) have multiplicities at least 2, from (4.24) we see that the leading coefficient of the polynomial \( P_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1} \) is a square of some rational function and it follows that all poles of \( f \) have even multiplicities. Put

\[ \lambda = \delta^2. \] (4.32)

Then \( \delta \) is a meromorphic function. By solving equation (4.31) together with (4.24), (4.25) and (4.32), we get

\[ \delta^2 = \frac{P_1(z, f)}{Q_0(z, f)} = \frac{P_0(z, f)(f - 1)^{k_1/2}}{Q_0(z, f)} = \frac{P_1 \left( z, \frac{\delta^4 + 1}{2\delta^3} \right) \pm P_0 \left( z, \frac{\delta^4 + 1}{2\delta^3} \right) \left( \frac{\delta^4 - 1}{2\delta^3} \right)^{k_1}}{Q_0 \left( z, \frac{\delta^4 + 1}{2\delta^3} \right)}. \] (4.33)

Note that \( P_0(z, f) = P_{011}(z, f)P_{012}(z, f) \). By combining the equations in (4.29), we have

\[ \delta^2 = \frac{P_{011} \left( z, \frac{\delta^4 + 1}{2\delta^3} \right) + \theta P_{012} \left( z, \frac{\delta^4 + 1}{2\delta^3} \right) \left( \frac{\delta^4 - 1}{2\delta^3} \right)^{k_1}}{P_{011} \left( z, \frac{\delta^4 + 1}{2\delta^3} \right) - \theta P_{012} \left( z, \frac{\delta^4 + 1}{2\delta^3} \right) \left( \frac{\delta^4 - 1}{2\delta^3} \right)^{k_1}}, \quad \theta = \pm 1. \] (4.34)

Denote the degrees of the polynomials \( Q_1(z, f), P_{011}(z, f) \) and \( P_{012}(z, f) \) by \( s_0, s_1, s_2 \), respectively. By comparing the degrees of the polynomials in the first equation of (4.29) on both sides, we see that if \( l_0 = 0 \), then \( s_0 = s_1 \) and if \( l_0 > 0 \), then \( 2s_0 + l_0 = 2s_2 + k_1 \). We discuss these two cases further below.

When \( l_0 = 0 \), we have from the first equation in (4.29) that

\[ [P_{011}(z, f) + (2i)^{1/2}Q_1(z, f)][P_{011}(z, f) - (2i)^{1/2}Q_1(z, f)] = P_{012}(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1}. \] (4.35)

It follows that

\[ P_{011}(z, f) + (2i)^{1/2}Q_1(z, f) = P_{013}(z, f), \]
\[ P_{011}(z, f) - (2i)^{1/2}Q_1(z, f) = P_{014}(z, f). \] (4.36)
where $P_{013}(z, f)$ and $P_{014}(z, f)$ are two polynomials in $f$ such that $P_{013}(z, f)P_{014}(z, f) = P_{012}(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1}$. Since $P_{013}(z, f)$ and $P_{014}(z, f)$ have no common roots, without loss of generality, we may write

$$P_{013}(z, f) = P_{021}(z, f)^2,$$

$$P_{014}(z, f) = P_{022}(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1},$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.37)

where $P_{021}(z, f)$ and $P_{022}(z, f)$ are two polynomials in $f$ with no common roots and $P_{021}(z, f)P_{022}(z, f) = P_{012}(z, f)$. Then we have from equations in (4.36) that

$$P_{011}(z, f) = \frac{1}{2} [P_{013}(z, f) + P_{014}(z, f)].$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.38)

By combining equations in (4.37) and (4.38), we have from equation (4.34) that

$$\delta = \pm i^{1/2} \frac{P_{021}(z, \frac{\delta^{i+1}}{2\delta^2}) + \theta P_{022}(z, \frac{\delta^{i+1}}{2\delta^2}) (\frac{\delta^{i+1}}{2\delta^2})^{k_1}}{P_{021}(z, \frac{\delta^{i+1}}{2\delta^2}) - \theta P_{022}(z, \frac{\delta^{i+1}}{2\delta^2}) (\frac{\delta^{i+1}}{2\delta^2})^{k_1}}, \quad \theta = \pm 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.39)

When $l_0 > 0$, we let $h$ and $g$ be such that $h^2 + 1 = f$ and $g^2 + 1 = f$, respectively. Then we have from the first equation in (4.29) that

$$[P_{012}(z, f)h^{k_1} + (-2i)^{1/2}Q_1(z, f)g^{l_0}]P_{012}(z, f)h^{k_1} - (-2i)^{1/2}Q_1(z, f)g^{l_0} = P_{011}(z, f)^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.40)

By (4.30) and (4.32), we may write $h$ and $g$ as $h = \frac{\delta^{1/2} - 1}{2\delta^2}$ and $g = \frac{\delta^{1/2} + 1}{2\delta^2}$, respectively, and it follows that

$$P_{012}(z, f)h^{k_1} = P_{012}(z, \frac{\delta^{i+1}}{2\delta^2}) \left( \frac{\delta^{i+1}}{2\delta^2} \right)^{k_1} = Q_{012}(z, \frac{\delta^{i+1}}{2\delta^2}),$$

$$Q_1(z, f)g^{l_0} = Q_1(z, \frac{\delta^{i+1}}{2\delta^2}) \left( \frac{\delta^{i+1}}{2\delta^2} \right)^{l_0} = Q_{11}(z, \frac{\delta^{i+1}}{2\delta^2}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.41)

where $P_{012}(z, \delta^2)$ and $Q_{11}(z, \delta^2)$ are two polynomials in $\delta^2$. Obviously, none of the roots of $P_{0121}(z, \delta^2)$ and $Q_{11}(z, \delta^2)$ in $\delta^2$ is equal to $\pm 1$. Note that the leading coefficients of the two polynomials $P_{012}(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1}$ and $-2Q_1(z, f)^2(f + 1)^{l_0}$ are equal. Recalling that $2s_0 + l_0 = 2s_2 + k_1$, we see that one of the two polynomials $P_{0121}(z, \delta^2) + (-2i)^{1/2}Q_{11}(z, \delta^2)$ and $P_{0121}(z, \delta^2) - (-2i)^{1/2}Q_{11}(z, \delta^2)$ in $\delta^2$ has some zero roots. Consider the pair of equations

$$P_{012}(z, f)h^{k_1} + (-2i)^{1/2}Q_1(z, f)g^{l_0} = 0,$$

$$P_{012}(z, f)h^{k_1} - (-2i)^{1/2}Q_1(z, f)g^{l_0} = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.42)

Since the two polynomials $P_{012}(z, f)$ and $Q_1(z, f)$ have no common roots, then together with the relations $h^2 + 1 = f$ and $g^2 + 1 = f$ we see that the above two equations with respect to $f$ cannot have any common solution and thus each root of the polynomial $P_{011}(z, f)^2$ satisfy only one of them. This implies the following two results: First, the two polynomials $P_{0121}(z, \delta^2) + (-2i)^{1/2}Q_{11}(z, \delta^2)$ and $P_{0121}(z, \delta^2) - (-2i)^{1/2}Q_{11}(z, \delta^2)$ in $\delta^2$ have no common non-zero roots; second, for each root $\gamma$ of $P_{011}(z, f)$, the two distinct non-zero solutions of the equation $\delta^4 - 2\gamma\delta^2 + 1 = 0$ with respect to $\delta^2$ must be either both roots of the polynomial $P_{0121}(z, \delta^2) + (-2i)^{1/2}Q_{11}(z, \delta^2)$ in $\delta^2$ or the polynomial $P_{0121}(z, \delta^2) - (-2i)^{1/2}Q_{11}(z, \delta^2)$ in $\delta^2$. Since $2s_0 + l_0$ is an odd integer and since $P_{011}(z, f) = P_{011}(z, \frac{1}{2}(\delta^2 + \delta^{-2}))$ is a rational function in $\delta^2$ whose denominator has only zero root, then from the above discussions we see that there must be an odd integer $t_1 \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$P_{012}(z, f)h^{k_1} + (-2i)^{1/2}Q_1(z, f)g^{l_0} = P_{015}(z, f)\delta^{t_1},$$

$$P_{012}(z, f)h^{k_1} - (-2i)^{1/2}Q_1(z, f)g^{l_0} = P_{016}(z, f)\delta^{-t_1},$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.43)

where $P_{015}(z, f)$ and $P_{016}(z, f)$ are two polynomials in $f$ with no common roots and $P_{015}(z, f)P_{016}(z, f) = P_{011}(z, f)^2$. We may write

$$P_{015}(z, f) = P_{023}(z, f)^2,$$

$$P_{016}(z, f) = P_{024}(z, f)^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.44)
where $P_{023}(z, f)$ and $P_{024}(z, f)$ are two polynomials in $f$ with no common roots and $P_{023}(z, f)P_{024}(z, f) = P_{011}(z, f)$. Then we have from equations in (4.43) that

$$P_{012}(z, f)k^i = \frac{1}{2}[P_{015}(z, f)\delta^i + P_{016}(z, f)\delta^{-i}].$$

(4.45)

By combining equations (4.44) and (4.45), we have from (4.34) that

$$\bar{\delta} = \pm i^{1/2} \frac{P_{023}\left(z, \frac{z^4 + 1}{z^4}\right)\delta^i + \theta P_{024}\left(z, \frac{z^4 + 1}{z^4}\right)}{P_{023}\left(z, \frac{z^4 + 1}{z^4}\right)\delta^i - \theta P_{024}\left(z, \frac{z^4 + 1}{z^4}\right)}, \ \theta = \pm 1.$$

(4.46)

We conclude that solutions of (4.24) are represented by (4.30) and (4.32), i.e., $f = \frac{1}{2}(\delta^2 + \delta^{-2})$ with $\delta$ being a solution of (4.39) or (4.46).

**Subcase 2:** Equation (4.22).

Since $\beta_1 \neq 0$, then by similar arguments as in the previous case we know that $\pm \beta_1$ and $\infty$ are all completely ramified rational functions of $f$. We may let $\beta_1 = 1$ by doing a linear transformation $f \rightarrow \beta_1 f$. Further, by considering the multiplicities of the roots of $f - 1 = 0$ together with the fact that $\infty$ has multiplicity at least 2 and by Lemma 5 we obtain from (4.22) that $\pm 1$ both have multiplicities 4 and it follows that $\Theta(\infty, f) + \Theta(1, f) + \Theta(-1, f) = 2$. Then by applying the analysis in the proof of Lemma 4 to the roots of $P_0(z, f)$ and poles of $f$ and comparing the multiplicities of the zeros on both sides of (4.48) and to the roots of $Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{1/2}$ and comparing the multiplicities of the poles on both sides of (4.48), respectively, we easily obtain that $l_1 = 1$, $p_0 = q_0$, $P_0(z, f)$ has simple roots only, $Q_0(z, f) = Q_1(z, f)^2$ for some polynomial $Q_1(z, f)$ in $f$ with simple roots only and none of these roots equals $\pm 1$. We consider

$$\mathbb{f}^2 - 1 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2 - Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)}.$$

(4.47)

The numerator of the RHS of (4.47) is a polynomial in $f$ with degree $2q_0 + 1$ and thus has at least one root, say $\gamma_1$, of odd order. By applying the same analysis as in the proof of Lemma 4 and considering the multiplicities of the roots of $f - \gamma_1 = 0$ together with the fact that both $\pm 1$ have multiplicities 4, we obtain that $\gamma_1$ is also a completely ramified rational function of $f$. By Lemma 5 and Theorem 2 we must have $\gamma_1 = -1$. Then by Lemma 5 we conclude that the order of $\gamma_1$ equals 1. Also, by Theorem 2 we see that there is only one such $\gamma_1$ that has odd order. Now we have

$$\mathbb{f}^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)}.$$

(4.48)

and also that

$$\mathbb{f}^2 - 1 = \frac{P_1(z, f)^2(f + 1)}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)}.$$

(4.49)

Moreover, by Lemma 6 it follows that $P_1(z, f) = P_2(z, f)^2$ for some polynomials $P_2(z, f)$ with simple roots only. We let $(f + 1)/(f - 1) = g^2$. Then $g$ is an algebroid function with at most finitely many algebraic branch points and it follows that the RHS of (4.49) becomes $[P_1(z, f)g/Q_0(z, f)]^2$. Put

$$f = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \lambda^{-1}).$$

(4.50)

With the setting $(f + 1)/(f - 1) = g^2$ we see from (4.39) that $\lambda$ is an algebroid function with at most finitely many algebraic branch points. Recall that $\pm 1$ both have multiplicities 4 and $\infty$ has multiplicity 2. By a simple multiplicity analysis on the zeros, poles and $\pm 1$-points of $\lambda$, we easily obtain from the definition in (4.50) that 0, $\infty$ and $\pm 1$ are all completely ramified rational functions of $\lambda$ with multiplicities 2. By substituting (4.50) into (4.49) we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{\lambda^2 - 1}{\lambda} = \frac{P_1(z, f)\lambda + 1}{Q_0(z, f)\lambda - 1}.$$

(4.51)

We put

$$\lambda = \delta^2.$$

(4.52)
Then $\delta$ is an algebroid function with at most finitely many algebraic branch points. Moreover, by the definition of $\lambda$ we see that $\pm 1$ and $\pm i$ are all completely ramified rational functions of $\delta$ with multiplicity 2. By solving equation (4.51) together with equations (4.48), (4.49) and (4.52), we get

$$
\frac{e^{2\lambda}}{e^{2\lambda}} = \frac{P_1(z, f)}{Q_1(z, f)} = \frac{P_0(z, f)}{Q_0(z, f)} + \frac{P_{10}(z, f)}{Q_{10}(z, f)} = \frac{P_0(z, f)}{Q_0(z, f)} + \frac{P_{10}(z, f)}{Q_{10}(z, f)} \cdot \frac{1}{(f - 1)^{1/2}}.
$$

Recall that $P_0 = Q_0$ from the beginning of this subcase. Also, from previous discussions we see that the degree of the polynomial $P_1(z, f)$ in (4.51), denoted by $p_1$, satisfies $p_1 = p_0$. By multiplying $(2\delta^2)^{p_0}$ to both of the numerator and the denominator of the RHS of (4.53), we have

$$
\frac{\delta^2}{e^{2\lambda}} = \frac{P_{10}(z, \delta^2)(\delta^2 + 1) + P_{00}(z, \delta^2)(2^{1/2}\delta)}{Q_{10}(z, \delta^2)(\delta^2 - 1)},
$$

where $P_{10}(z, \delta^2)$, $P_{00}(z, \delta^2)$ and $Q_{00}(z, \delta^2)$ are polynomials in $\delta$ of the same degree $4q_0$. Note that $\delta$ cannot have any other completely ramified rational function besides $\pm 1$ and $\pm i$. Since $\pm 1$ are not roots of $P_{10}(z, f)$, $Q_{10}(z, f)$ or $P_{00}(z, f)$, then from the above reasoning we see that $\pm 1$ and $\pm i$ are not roots of the polynomials $P_{10}(z, \delta^2)$, $P_{00}(z, \delta^2)$ or $Q_{00}(z, \delta^2)$. By applying Lemma 3 to equation (4.53), we conclude that the numerator of the RHS of (4.53) must be a square of some polynomial in $\delta$ with simple roots only and none of these roots is equal to $\pm 1$ or $\pm i$. Moreover, since $p < q$ and we have assumed $b_q = 1$, we see from the above reasoning that the leading coefficient of the numerator of the RHS of (4.53) is $\pm i$. Therefore, we may write

$$
P_{10}(z, \delta^2)(\delta^2 + 1) + P_{00}(z, \delta^2)(2^{1/2}\delta) = \pm i(\delta - \epsilon_1)^2 \cdots (\delta - \epsilon_{2q_0+1})^2 := P_{11}(z, \delta),
$$

where the roots $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_{2q_0+1}$ are distinct from each other and from $\pm 1$ and $\pm i$. Since $P_{11}(z, \delta)$ is a polynomial in $\delta$ of degree $4q_0 + 2$, we may denote by $\varrho_0, \varrho_1, \varrho_2, \ldots, \varrho_1 \cdot \varrho_1 \cdot \varrho_1$ the roots of $P_{11}(z, \delta)$. Then from the equations in (4.53) and (4.54) we see that $\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \ldots, \varrho_1 \cdot \varrho_1 \cdot \varrho_1$ are also roots of $P_{11}(z, \delta)$. However, since $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_{2q_0+1}$ are all distinct from each other, we see that $\varrho_1 = \varrho_2^{-1}$ for at least one $i \in \{4q_0+2, \ldots, 1\}$ and thus $\varrho_1 = \pm 1$, a contradiction to our previous observations. This implies that equation (4.48) cannot have any meromorphic solution and also completes the proof.

For the case $q 

\geq 1$ and $2 \leq n < d$ and $n | |p - q|$ of equation (2.2), we prove the following Theorem 7.

In this theorem, we will do a bilinear transformation $f \mapsto \alpha f$ or $f \mapsto 1/(\alpha f)$, (2.1) becomes (2.11), (3.21) or (4.9) or one of the following equations:

(1) the first equation is

$$
\frac{e^{2\lambda}}{e^{2\lambda}} = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)} \cdot (f - 1)^{k_1}(f + 1)^{k_2},
$$

where $k_1, k_2$ are odd integers; moreover, we have $P_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1}(f + 1)^{k_2} = P_{01}(z, f)P_{02}(z, f)$ and

$$
P_{01}(z, f) = P_{011}(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1}(f + 1)^{k_2},
$$

$$
P_{02}(z, f) = P_{012}(z, f)^2,
$$

or

$$
P_{01}(z, f) = P_{011}(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1},
$$

$$
P_{02}(z, f) = P_{012}(z, f)^2(f + 1)^{k_2},
$$

where $P_{011}(z, f)$ and $P_{012}(z, f)$ are two polynomials in $f$ with no common roots such that $P_0(z, f) = P_{011}(z, f)P_{012}(z, f)$, and we also have

$$
Q_0(z, f) = \frac{1}{2f}[P_{01}(z, f) - P_{02}(z, f)];
$$

(4.59)
solutions of (4.50) are represented as $f = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \lambda^{-1})$ and, when (4.57) holds, $\lambda$ satisfies

$$
\lambda = i \frac{P_{011} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2x} \right) (\lambda-1)^{\frac{k_1-k_2}{2}} + \theta P_{012} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2x} \right)}{P_{011} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2x} \right) (\lambda-1)^{\frac{k_1-k_2}{2}} - \theta P_{012} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2x} \right)}, \quad \theta = \pm 1, \tag{4.60}
$$
or, when (4.58) holds, $\lambda$ satisfies

$$
\lambda = i \frac{P_{011} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2x} \right) (\lambda-1)^{\frac{k_1-k_2}{2}} + \theta P_{012} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2x} \right)}{P_{011} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2x} \right) (\lambda-1)^{\frac{k_1-k_2}{2}} - \theta P_{012} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2x} \right)}, \quad \theta = \pm 1; \tag{4.61}
$$

(2) the second equation is

$$
\mathcal{T}^2 = -4\gamma^2 B \frac{(f^2 - a^2)^2 (f^2 - 1)}{[(f^2 - a^2)^2 - B(f^2 - 1)]^2}, \tag{4.62}
$$

where $\gamma$, $a$ and $B$ are constants such that $16\gamma^4 + (\eta^2 + 48\gamma^2)^2 + 16\eta = 0$, $a^2 - 2a^2 + \gamma^2 = 0$ and $B^2 = 4a^2(a^2 - 1)$, respectively, and $\eta$ is the cubic root of $1$; or

$$
\mathcal{T}^2 = -b^2 \frac{f^2 - 1}{(f^2 - b^2)^2}, \tag{4.63}
$$

where $b$ is a constant such that $4b^4 - 11b^2 + 8 = 0$; or

$$
\mathcal{T}^2 = \frac{f^2(f^2 - 1)}{(f^2 - b^2)^2}, \tag{4.64}
$$

where $b$ is a constant such that $2b^4 - 1 = 0$ or $2b^4 - 2b^2 + 1 = 0$;

(3) the third equation is

$$
\mathcal{T}^3 = \frac{P_0(f)^3(f - 1)}{Q_0(f)^3(f - \eta)}, \tag{4.65}
$$

where $\eta$ is a cubic root of 1 such that $\eta^2 + \eta + 1 = 0$, $P_0(f)$ and $Q_0(f)$ are two polynomials in $f$ with simple roots only and $p_0 - q_0 \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$; moreover, denoting $d_0 = \max\{p_0, q_0\}$, we have

$$
P_0(f) = P_{01} \left( \frac{f - 1}{f - \eta} \right) (f - \eta)^{d_0}, \tag{4.66}
$$

and $P_{01}(g)$ and $Q_0(g)$ are two polynomials in $g$ such that

$$
3P_{01}(g^3) = [P_{11}(g)^3 + P_{11}(\eta g)^3 + P_{11}(\eta^2 g)^3] \tag{4.67}
$$

$$
- \alpha_{11}[P_{11}(g)^3 + \eta P_{11}(\eta g)^3 + \eta^2 P_{11}(\eta^2 g)^3],
$$

$$
3Q_0(g^3) = [P_{11}(g)^3 + P_{11}(\eta g)^3 + P_{11}(\eta^2 g)^3] \tag{4.68}
$$

$$
- \alpha_{11}[P_{11}(g)^3 + \eta P_{11}(\eta g)^3 + \eta^2 P_{11}(\eta^2 g)^3],
$$

where $P_{11}(z, g)$ is a polynomial in $g$ of degree $d_0$ such that the coefficients of terms of degree $3d_0 - 1$, $3d_0 - 4$, $\cdots$, $2$ in the polynomial $P_{11}(z, g)^3(g - \alpha_{11})$, where $\alpha_{11} = -\eta$, vanish;

(4) the fourth equation is:

$$
\mathcal{T}^4 = \frac{P_0(f)^3}{Q_0(f)^3} (f^3 - 1), \tag{4.69}
$$

where $P_0(f)$ and $Q_0(f)$ are two polynomials in $f$ with simple roots only and $p_0 = q_0$ or $p_0 = q_0 - 1$, and $P_0(f)^3(f^3 - 1) - Q_0(f)^3 = P_1(f)^3$ for some polynomial $P_1(f)$ in $f$ with simple roots only; moreover, letting $\eta$ be a cubic root of $1$ such that $\eta^2 + \eta + 1 = 0$, when $p_0 = q_0$, we have $p_0 = 3k$ for some integer $k$ and

$$
3P_1(f) = [P_0(f)^3 + P_0(\eta^2 f)^3 + P_0(\eta f)^3]f \tag{4.70}
$$

$$
- \eta_1[P_0(f)^3 + \eta P_0(\eta^2 f)^3 + \eta^2 P_0(\eta f)^3],
$$

$$
3Q_0(f) = [P_0(f)^3 + \eta^2 P_0(\eta^2 f)^3 + \eta P_0(\eta f)^3]f \tag{4.71}
$$

$$
- \eta_1[P_0(f)^3 + P_0(\eta^2 f)^3 + P_0(\eta f)^3],
$$
where \( \eta_1 \) is a cubic root of 1 and \( P_{01}(f) \) is a polynomial in \( f \) of degree \( k \) such that the coefficients of terms of degree \( 3k - 1, 3k - 4, \ldots, 2 \) in the polynomial \( P_{01}(f)^3(f - \eta_1) \) vanish; or, when \( p_0 = q_0 - 1 \), we have \( A = 1, q_0 = 3k + 1 \) for some integer \( k \) and

\[
3P_1(f) = [P_{01}(f)^3 + \eta P_{01}(\eta f)^3 + \eta^2 P_{01}(\eta^2 f)^3]f
- \eta_1[P_{01}(f)^3 + P_{01}(\eta f)^3 + P_{01}(\eta^2 f)^3],
\]

\[
3Q_0(f) = [P_{01}(f)^3 + P_{01}(\eta f)^3 + P_{01}(\eta^2 f)^3]f
- \eta_1[P_{01}(f)^3 + \eta^2 P_{01}(\eta f)^3 + \eta P_{01}(\eta^2 f)^3],
\]

where \( \eta_1 \) is a cubic root of 1 and \( P_{01}(f) \) is a polynomial in \( f \) of degree \( k \) such that the coefficients of terms of degree \( 3k - 1, 3k - 4, \ldots, 2 \) in the polynomial \( P_{01}(f)^3(f - \eta_1) \) vanish; or

\[
T_1 = 3(\eta - \eta^2)f^3(f^3 - 1)(f^3 + \eta)^3.
\]

(5) the fifth equation is:

\[
T_2 = Af^{2\theta} \left( \frac{f^2 - \kappa^2}{f^2 - 1} \right),
\]

where \( \theta = \pm 1 \), \( 4A^2 + 3A + 1 = 0 \), \( A^2\kappa^2 = 1 \) when \( \theta = 1 \) and \( A^2 = \kappa^2 \) when \( \theta = -1 \);

(6) the sixth equation is

\[
T_3 = \pm 4f^2(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2)^2,(f^2 + \kappa^2)^2,
\]

where \( \kappa \) is a non-zero constant; or

\[
T_4 = -\frac{(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2)^2}{2f^2},
\]

where \( \kappa \) is a constant such that \( (\kappa^2 - 1)^2 = 4\kappa^2 \); or

\[
T_5 = A\frac{(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2)}{(f^2 \pm \kappa)^2},
\]

where \( A = \kappa^2 \) and \( \kappa^2 + 3\kappa + 4 = 0 \), or \( A = 1 \) and \( 4\kappa^2 - 3\kappa + 1 = 0 \).

For equation (4.56), in the autonomous case, the RHS of equation (4.60) or (4.61) becomes a rational term \( R_i(\lambda) \) in \( \lambda \) after multiplying \((2\lambda)^d\) to both of the numerator and the denominator; thus the equation \( r = R_1(\lambda) \) always has a meromorphic solution for any given \( P_{01}(z, f) \) and \( P_{02}(z, f) \) in (3.21) or in (3.22) and any given \( Q_0(z, f) \) such that (4.59) holds, as mentioned in the introduction. Meromorphic solutions for the other equations in Theorem 4 are elliptic functions and we will discuss them further in section 5.

Proof of Theorem 2 Since \( n \mid |p - q| \), then we have \( 2 \leq N_c \leq 4 \). Below we consider the three cases where \( N_c = 2, N_c = 3 \) and \( N_c = 4 \), respectively.

Case 1: \( N_c = 2 \).

Since \( n \mid |p - q| \), then we have the following three possibilities:

\[
T_1 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^n}{Q_0(z, f)^n}(f - \alpha_1)^{k_1}(f - \alpha_2)^{k_2},
\]

\[
T_2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^n}{Q_0(z, f)^n}(f - \beta_1)^{l_1}(f - \beta_2)^{l_2},
\]

\[
T_3 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^n}{Q_0(z, f)^n}(f - \gamma_1)^{k_1},
\]

where in (4.70) we have \( n \mid (k_1 + k_2) \), in (4.71) we have \( n \mid (l_1 + l_2) \) and in (4.72) we have \( n \mid |k_1 - l_1| \).

Since \( n \mid |p - q| \), we see that \( n \nmid k_i \) and \( n \nmid l_j \). For convenience, we denote \( \alpha_i \) or \( \beta_j \) in each of the above equations by \( \gamma_1 \) and \( \gamma_2 \). By Lemmas 1 and 3 it follows that if \( \gamma_i \neq 0 \), then \( \omega\gamma_i \) is a completely ramified rational function of \( f \) with multiplicity at least \( n \), where \( \omega \) is the \( n \)-th root of 1. Therefore, if one of \( \gamma_1 \)
and $\gamma_2$ is zero, we must have $n = 2$; otherwise, say $\gamma_1 = 0$, if $n \geq 3$, then 0 and $\omega \gamma_2$ are completely ramified rational functions of $f$ with multiplicity at least 3, a contradiction to the inequality (4.6).

For equation (4.77), we divide the following two cases: (1) $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$ are both non-zero, or (2) at least one of $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$ is zero. In the first case, if $p_0 \geq 2$ and $P_0(z, f)^n = a_p f^{n p_0}$ particularly, then the analysis in the proof of Lemma 2 applies and 0 is a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$; also, we have $p \geq q$ for otherwise $\omega$ is also a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$ by analyzing on the poles of $f$ and it follows that $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$ are both Picard exceptional rational functions of $f$, a contradiction to Picard’s theorem. Moreover, by the inequality (4.6), we must have $n = 2$ and $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = 0$ and it follows by Lemma 3 that $l_1 = l_2 = 1$. Then by doing a bilinear transformation $f \to 1/f$, we get equation (3.26), which leads to equation (3.29) in Theorem 3. Otherwise, by doing a bilinear transformation $f \to 1/f$, we get equation (4.73). In the second case, since $n = 2$, then by the bilinear transformation $f \to 1/f$, we get equation (4.21), which leads to equation (4.9) in Theorem 6. Therefore, in this section we only need to consider equations (4.76) and (4.78).

Further, for equation (4.76), we may suppose that $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ are both non-zero; otherwise, say $\alpha_1 = 0$, by doing the transformation $f \to 1/f$ we get equation (4.16) with $P_1(z, f)$ being a polynomial in $f$ of degree $d$ and $Q_1(z, f)$ being a polynomial in $f$ of degree $d - 1$, which cannot have any meromorphic solution as shown in the proof of Theorem 6. For equation (4.78), when $\alpha_1 = 0$, by Lemma 2 it follows that 0 is a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$. Similarly as in the previous paragraph, we easily show that $p \geq q$. Moreover, we have $P_0(z, f)^n = a_p$; otherwise, the roots of $P_0(z, f)$ are also Picard’s exceptional rational functions, a contradiction to Picard’s theorem. Since $n = 2$, then by doing a bilinear transformation $f \to 1/f$, we get equation (3.28), which leads to equation (4.11) in Theorem 3. When $\beta_1 = 0$, since $n = 2$, by doing a bilinear transformation $f \to 1/f$, we get equation (4.22) since $2 \mid |k_1 - l_1|$, which cannot have any meromorphic solution as shown in the proof of Theorem 6. Therefore, in this section we only need to consider equations (4.76) and (4.78) for the case where $\alpha_1$ and $\beta_2$ are both non-zero. Under this assumptions, below we consider these two equations separately.

**Subcase 1:** Equation (4.76) with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \neq 0$.

In this case, we claim that $n = 2$. Suppose that $n \geq 3$. By Lemma 3 it follows that $\omega \alpha_1$ and $\omega \alpha_2$ are completely ramified rational functions of $f$ with multiplicity at least 3, where $\omega$ is the $n$-th root of 1. By the inequality (4.6) we must have $n = 3$ and also that $\omega_1 = \omega_2$. However, since $3 \mid (k_1 + k_2)$, we have $k_1 \not\equiv 1 \not\equiv 1 \not\equiv 2 \not\equiv 2 \not\equiv 3$ and in either case we will get a contradiction to Lemma 3. Therefore, $n = 2$.

We first prove that $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 0$. Suppose on the contrary that $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \neq 0$. Then $\pm \alpha_1$ and $\pm \alpha_2$ are all completely ramified rational functions of $f$ with multiplicities 2. By Lemma 4 it follows that $P_0(z, f)$ and $Q_0(z, f)$ both have simple roots only and also that $k_1 = k_2 = 1$ and $p = q \in \{ -2, 0, 2 \}$. We consider

$$f^2 - \alpha_1^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2) - \alpha_2^2 Q_0(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2}.$$  

(4.79)

By analyzing the multiplicities of poles of $f$ as in the proof Lemma 3 we easily get that the numerator of the RHS of (4.79) is a polynomial in $f$ with even degree; moreover, if some root of this polynomial is not equal to $\pm \alpha_1$ or $\pm \alpha_2$, then this root has order two. Therefore, $-\alpha_1$ and $-\alpha_2$ are either both simple roots of the numerator of the RHS of (4.79), or neither of them are. In the first case, we then consider $f^2 = \alpha_1^2$ and conclude by Lemma 5 that the polynomial $P_0(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2) - \alpha_2^2 Q_0(z, f)^2$ is a square of some polynomial in $f$. In the latter case, we claim that $-\alpha_1$ and $-\alpha_2$ are both simple roots of the polynomial $P_0(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2) - \alpha_2^2 Q_0(z, f)^2$ when considering $f^2 = \alpha_1^2$. Otherwise, we may suppose that $R(z, -\alpha_1) = \gamma^2$ for some algebraic function $\gamma^2$ which is distinct from $\alpha_1^2$ and $\alpha_2^2$. Let $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $f(z_0) + \alpha_1(z_0) = 0$. Then we have $f(z_0 + 1)^2 - \gamma(z_0)^2 = 0$ and by applying the analysis in the proof of Lemma 3 we get that $z_0$ is a root of the equation $f(z_0 + 1) - \gamma(z_0) = 0$ or $f(z_0 + 1) + \gamma(z_0) = 0$ with multiplicity 2 and there are $T(r, f) + o(T(r, f))$ many such points, where $r \to \infty$ outside an exceptional set of finite linear measure. But we then get a contradiction to the inequality (4.6) by computing the quantity $\Theta(\gamma, f)$ or $\Theta(-\gamma, f)$ as in the proof of Lemma 3 since at least one of these two quantities is strictly positive. Therefore, without loss of generality, we may consider the following two equations:

$$f^2 - \alpha_1^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2(f + \alpha_1)(f + \alpha_2)}{Q_0(z, f)^2},$$  

(4.80)

and

$$f^2 - \alpha_2^2 = \frac{P_2(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2},$$  

(4.81)
where \(P_1(z, f)\) and \(P_2(z, f)\) are two polynomials in \(f\). By Lemma \[\[\] it follows that \(P_1(z, f)\) and \(P_2(z, f)\) both have simple roots only and none of the roots of \(P_1(z, f)\) and \(P_2(z, f)\) is equal to \(\pm \alpha_1\) or \(\pm \alpha_2\). Moreover, when \(p = q\) if \(a_p = \overline{\alpha_1}\) or \(a_p = \overline{\alpha_2}\), then the degree of the numerator in (4.80) or in (4.81) decreases since the terms with the highest degrees in \(P_0(z, f)^2\) and \(Q_0(z, f)^2\) cancel out when considering \(\overline{f}^2 - \overline{\alpha_1}^2 \) or \(\overline{f}^2 - \overline{\alpha_2}^2\); by Lemma \[\[\] we see that it decreases to be \(q - 2\). Now we have

\[
P_0(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2) - \overline{\alpha_1}Q_0(z, f)^2 = P_1(z, f)^2(f + \alpha_1)(f + \alpha_2),
\]

\[
P_0(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2) - \overline{\alpha_2}Q_0(z, f)^2 = P_2(z, f)^2.
\]

(4.82)

From the second equation of (4.82) we have

\[
[P_2(z, f) + \overline{\alpha_2}Q_0(z, f)] [P_2(z, f) - \overline{\alpha_2}Q_0(z, f)] = P_0(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2).
\]

(4.83)

It follows that

\[
P_2(z, f) + \overline{\alpha_2}Q_0(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f),
\]

\[
P_2(z, f) - \overline{\alpha_2}Q_0(z, f) = P_{02}(z, f),
\]

(4.84)

where \(P_{01}(z, f)\) and \(P_{02}(z, f)\) are two polynomials in \(f\) such that \(P_{01}(z, f)P_{02}(z, f) = P_0(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2)\). Obviously, \(P_{01}(z, f)\) and \(P_{02}(z, f)\) have no common roots and thus we can write

\[
P_{01}(z, f) = a_{11}P_{011}(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_1)^{\theta_{11}}(f - \alpha_2)^{\theta_{12}},
\]

\[
P_{02}(z, f) = a_{12}P_{012}(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_1)^{\theta_{11}}(f - \alpha_2)^{\theta_{22}},
\]

(4.85)

where \(\theta_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}, \theta_{11} + \theta_{21} = 1, a_{11}\) and \(a_{12}\) are in general algebraic functions, \(P_{011}(z, f)^2\) and \(P_{012}(z, f)^2\) are two monic polynomials in \(f\) with no common roots such that \(a_{11}a_{12}P_{011}(z, f)^2P_{012}(z, f)^2 = P_0(z, f)^2\). Note that \(a_{11}a_{12} = a_p\). From equations in (4.81) we have

\[
2i\overline{\alpha_2}Q_0(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f) - P_{02}(z, f).
\]

(4.86)

Note that \(f\) has no Picard exceptional rational functions. Denote the degrees of \(P_{01}(z, f)\) and \(P_{02}(z, f)\) by \(p_1\) and \(p_2\), respectively. Since \(p - q \in \{-2, 0, 2\}\), we see that \(p_1 - p_2 \in \{-2, 0, 2\}\). By comparing the leading coefficients of the polynomials in the above equation on both sides, we easily get \(2i\theta\overline{\alpha_2} = a_{11} - a_{12}\) when \(p_1 = p_2\) and \(a_{11} \neq a_{12}\), or \(a_{11} - a_{12} = 0\) when \(p = q\) and \(a_{11} = a_{12}\), or \(2i\theta\overline{\alpha_2} = a_{11}\) or \(2i\theta\overline{\alpha_2} = a_{12}\) when \(p_1 \neq p_2\), where \(\theta = \pm 1\). Below we consider the two cases where \(\theta_{11} = \theta_{12} = 1\) or \(\theta_{11} = 1\) and \(\theta_{12} = 0\), respectively. The other cases are similar. When \(\theta_{11} = \theta_{12} = 1\), we write equation (4.86) as

\[
2i\overline{\alpha_2}Q_0(z, f) = a_{11}P_{011}(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2) - a_{12}P_{012}(z, f)^2.
\]

(4.87)

On the other hand, by exchanging the role of \(\alpha_1\) and \(\alpha_2\), we also have

\[
2i\overline{\alpha_1}Q_0(z, f) = a_{13}P_{011}(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2) - a_{14}P_{012}(z, f)^2,
\]

(4.88)

where \(a_{13}\) and \(a_{14}\) are two algebraic functions such that \(a_{13}a_{14} = a_p\). Moreover, we have \(2i\theta\overline{\alpha_1} = a_{13} - a_{14}\) when \(p_1 = p_2\) and \(a_{13} \neq a_{14}\), or \(a_{13} - a_{14} = 0\) when \(p = q\) and \(a_{13} = a_{14}\), or \(2i\theta\overline{\alpha_1} = a_{13}\) or \(2i\theta\overline{\alpha_1} = a_{14}\) when \(p_1 \neq p_2\), where \(\theta = \pm 1\). From equations (4.87) and (4.88) we have

\[
(\overline{\alpha_1}a_{11} - \overline{\alpha_2}a_{13})P_{011}(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2) = (\overline{\alpha_1}a_{12} - \overline{\alpha_2}a_{14})P_{012}(z, f)^2.
\]

(4.89)

By comparing the leading coefficients of the polynomials on both sides of the above equation, we see that \(\overline{\alpha_1}a_{11} - \overline{\alpha_2}a_{13} = \overline{\alpha_1}a_{12} - \overline{\alpha_2}a_{14} = 0\). Recall that \(a_{11}a_{12} = a_{13}a_{14} = a_p\). If \(a_{11} = a_{12}\), then we also have \(a_{13} = a_{14}\) and thus \(a_{11} = a_{13}\) or \(a_{11} = a_{14}\). Then from equations (4.87) and (4.88) we have \(2i\overline{\alpha_2}Q_0(z, f) = 2i\overline{\alpha_1}Q_0(z, f)\) or \(2i\overline{\alpha_2}Q_0(z, f) = -2i\overline{\alpha_1}Q_0(z, f)\), both of which are impossible. Similarly, the case where \(a_{13} = a_{14}\) is also impossible. If \(2i\theta\overline{\alpha_1} = a_{11} - a_{12}\), i.e., \(a_{11}^2 - 2i\theta\overline{\alpha_1}a_{13} - a_{12} = 0\), then we also have \(2i\theta\overline{\alpha_1} = a_{13} - a_{14}\), i.e., \(a_{13}^2 - 2i\theta\overline{\alpha_1}a_{14} - a_{12} = 0\). Together with the relation \(\overline{\alpha_1}a_{11} = \overline{\alpha_2}a_{13}\) we get \(a_{12}^2 - 2i\theta\overline{\alpha_1}a_{13} - a_{12} = 0\), which and the equation \(a_{13}^2 - 2i\theta\overline{\alpha_1}a_{14} - a_{12} = 0\) yield that \(\overline{\alpha_1} = \overline{\alpha_2}\), a contradiction. We conclude that the case where \(\theta_{11} = \theta_{12} = 1\) cannot occur. When \(\theta_{11} = 1\) and \(\theta_{12} = 0\), we write equation (4.86) as

\[
2i\overline{\alpha_2}Q_0(z, f) = a_{11}P_{011}(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_1) - a_{12}P_{012}(z, f)^2(f - \alpha_2).
\]

(4.90)
If $P_{011}(z, f)$ and $P_{012}(z, f)$ both have at least one root, then we may suppose that $p_1 \leq p_2$. By exchanging the role of the roots of $P_{011}(z, f)$ and that of some roots of $P_{012}(z, f)$, we obtain from (4.90) that
\[
2\alpha_1^2 Q_0(z, f) = a_{11} P_{013}(z, f)^2 (f - \alpha_1) - a_{12} P_{011}(z, f)^2 P_{014}(z, f)^2 (f - \alpha_2),
\]
where $P_{013}(z, f)$ and $P_{014}(z, f)$ are two polynomials in $f$ such that neither of them have common roots with $P_{011}(z, f)$. Moreover, we have $\deg_f(P_{013}(z, f)) = p_1$ and $P_{012}(z, f)^2 = P_{013}(z, f)^2 P_{014}(z, f)^2$. From (4.90) and (4.91) we have
\[
[P_{011}(z, f)^2 - P_{013}(z, f)^2] [a_{11} (f - \alpha_1) - a_{12} (f - \alpha_2) P_{014}(z, f)^2] = 0.
\]
Obviously, the equation $a_{11} (f - \alpha_1) = a_{12} (f - \alpha_2) P_{014}(z, f)^2$ is impossible. But then from the above equation we have $P_{011}(z, f)^2 = P_{013}(z, f)^2$ and thus $P_{011}(z, f) = \pm P_{013}(z, f)$, a contradiction since $P_0(z, f)$ has simple roots only. Recalling that $p - q \in \{-2, 0, 2\}$, we conclude from the above reasoning that only one of $P_{011}(z, f)$ and $P_{012}(z, f)$ can have some roots and also that $P_0(z, f)$ has at most 2 distinct roots. Now, if $P_0(z, f)$ has 2 distinct roots, then we may write
\[
P_{01}(z, f) = a_{11} (f - \alpha)^2 (f - b)^2,
\]
where $a$ and $b$ are in general algebraic functions. If $P_0(z, f)$ has at most 1 root, then by substituting the equation in (4.80) into the first equation of (4.82), we have
\[
\alpha_1^2 [P_{01}(z, f) + \gamma_1 P_{02}(z, f)][P_{01}(z, f) + \gamma_2 P_{02}(z, f)] = 4\alpha_2^2 P_1(z, f)^2 (f + \alpha_1)(f + \alpha_2),
\]
where $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$ are two algebraic functions such that $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = 2\alpha_1^2 (1 - 2\alpha_2^2/\alpha_1^2)$ and $\gamma_1 \gamma_2 = 1$. Recall that $p - q \in \{-2, 0, 2\}$. Since $P_{01}(z, f) + \gamma_1 P_{02}(z, f)$ and $P_{01}(z, f) + \gamma_2 P_{02}(z, f)$ are two polynomials in $f$ with no common roots and the degree of the polynomial $P_1(z, f)^2 (f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2)$ in $f$ is 2 or 4, we may write
\[
P_{01}(z, f) + \gamma_1 P_{02}(z, f) = 2\alpha_1^2 P_1(z, f)^2,
\]
\[
P_{01}(z, f) + \gamma_2 P_{02}(z, f) = 2\alpha_1^2 (f + \alpha_1)(f + \alpha_2),
\]
where the degree of the polynomial $P_1(z, f)$, denoted by $p_1$, satisfies $p_1 = 0$ or $p_1 = 1$. Recall that $P_{01}(z, f)$ and $P_{02}(z, f)$ have no common roots and satisfy $P_{01}(z, f) P_{02}(z, f) = P_0(z, f)^2 (f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2)$. By solving $P_{01}(z, f)$ and $P_{02}(z, f)$ from the two equations (4.95), we easily see that
\[
P_{01}(z, f) = a_{11} (f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2),
\]
\[
P_{02}(z, f) = a_{12},
\]
or
\[
P_{01}(z, f) = a_{11} (f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2),
\]
\[
P_{02}(z, f) = a_{12} (f - c)^2,
\]
where $c$ is a rational function. However, none of the above three cases in (4.93), (4.96) and (4.97) is possible from the previous discussions. Therefore, we must have $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 0$.

When $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 0$, we may let $\alpha_1 = 1$ and $\alpha_2 = -1$ by doing a linear transformation $f \rightarrow \alpha_1 f$. We consider
\[
f^2 - 1 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2 (f - 1)^{k_1} (f + 1)^{k_2} - Q_0(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2}.
\]
If the numerator of the RHS of (4.98) has at least three distinct roots, say $\gamma_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, of odd order, then by applying the analysis in the proof of Lemma 1 together with the fact that $\pm 1$ are completely ramified rational functions of $f$ and that the roots of $f \pm 1 = 0$ have even multiplicities, we obtain that $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ are all completely ramified rational functions of $f$, a contradiction to Theorem 2 since $\gamma_i$ are all distinct from $\pm 1$. Therefore, the numerator of the RHS of (4.98) can have at most two distinct roots of odd order. Suppose that there is only one such root, say $\gamma_1$. Since $p$ and $q$ are both even integers, then we must have $p = q$ and $A = 1$ in which case the terms with the highest degrees in the polynomials $P_0(z, f)^2 (f - 1)^{k_1} (f + 1)^{k_2}$ and $Q_0(z, f)^2$ cancel out when considering (4.98) so that the degree of the polynomial $P_0(z, f)^2 (f - 1)^{k_1} (f + 1)^{k_2} - Q_0(z, f)^2$ decreases to be an odd integer. Then by considering the
multiplicity of the poles of $f$ as in the proof of Lemma 11 we see from (4.98) that $\infty$ is also a completely ramified rational function of $f$. If $\gamma_1 = 0$, then 0 is a completely ramified rational function of $f$. Then by considering the multiplicities of the roots of $f^{\pm 1} = 0$ as in the proof of Lemma 11 and then by Lemma 3, we obtain from (4.79) that $\pm 1$ both have multiplicities at least 4, a contradiction to the inequality (1.9). On the other hand, if $\gamma_1 \neq 0$, then by Lemma 3 it follows that $\pm \gamma_1$ are both completely ramified rational functions of $f$, a contradiction to Theorem 2 since $\infty$ is also a completely ramified rational function of $f$. Therefore, the numerator of the RHS of (4.98) has no roots of odd order, or has two distinct roots of odd order.

If the numerator of the RHS of (4.98) has no roots of odd order, then we have

$$f^2 - 1 = \frac{P_1(z,f)^2}{Q_0(z,f)^2},$$

(4.99)

where $P_1(z,f)$ is a polynomial in $f$. Then we have

$$P_0(z,f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1}(f + 1)^{k_2} - Q_0(z,f)^2 = P_1(z,f)^2.$$  

(4.100)

It follows that

$$P_0(z,f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1}(f + 1)^{k_2} = [P_1(z,f) + iQ_0(z,f)][P_1(z,f) - iQ_0(z,f)],$$

(4.101)

and so

$$P_1(z,f) + iQ_0(z,f) = P_{01}(z,f),$$

$$P_1(z,f) - iQ_0(z,f) = P_{02}(z,f),$$

(4.102)

where $P_{01}(z,f)P_{02}(z,f) = P_0(z,f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1}(f + 1)^{k_2}$. Since the two polynomials $P_{01}(z,f)$ and $P_{02}(z,f)$ have no common roots, we can write

$$P_{01}(z,f) = P_{011}(z,f)^2(f - 1)^{\theta_{11}k_{11}}(f + 1)^{\theta_{12}k_{12}},$$

$$P_{02}(z,f) = P_{012}(z,f)^2(f - 1)^{\theta_{21}k_{21}}(f + 1)^{\theta_{22}k_{22}},$$

(4.103)

where $\theta_{ij} \in \{0,1\}, \theta_{11}k_{11} + \theta_{21}k_{21} = k_1$ and $\theta_{12}k_{12} + \theta_{22}k_{22} = k_2$, and $P_{011}(z,f)$ and $P_{012}(z,f)$ are two polynomials in $f$ with no common roots such that $P_{011}(z,f)P_{012}(z,f) = P_0(z,f)$. Without loss of generality, we may write

$$P_{01}(z,f) = P_{011}(z,f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1}(f + 1)^{k_2},$$

$$P_{02}(z,f) = P_{012}(z,f)^2,$$

(4.104)

or

$$P_{01}(z,f) = P_{011}(z,f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1},$$

$$P_{02}(z,f) = P_{012}(z,f)^2(f + 1)^{k_2}.$$  

(4.105)

Then from equations in (4.102) we get

$$Q_0(z,f) = \frac{1}{2i}[P_{01}(z,f) - P_{02}(z,f)],$$

$$P_1(z,f) = \frac{1}{2}[P_{01}(z,f) + P_{02}(z,f)].$$

(4.106)

With the above two expressions for $Q_0(z,f)$ and $P_1(z,f)$, below we solve equation (4.99). Put

$$f = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \lambda^{-1}).$$

(4.107)

Then from (4.99) we see that $\lambda$ is an algebroid function with at most finitely many algebraic branch points and it follows that

$$\frac{1}{2}(\lambda - \lambda^{-1}) = \frac{P_1(z,f)}{Q_0(z,f)}.$$  

(4.108)
By solving equation (4.108) together with equation (4.99) and equations in (4.106), we get

$$
\lambda = \frac{1}{\theta} \left[ P_{01} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2a} \right) + P_{02} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2a} \right) \right] \pm \frac{P_{00} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2a} \right) (\lambda-1)^{i(k+1)/2}}{(2\theta)^{(k+1)/2}}.
$$

(4.109)

Therefore, when equations in (4.105) hold, we have

$$
\lambda = i \frac{P_{011} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2a} \right) (\lambda-1)^{i(k+1)/2} + \theta P_{102} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2a} \right)}{P_{011} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2a} \right) (\lambda-1)^{i(k+1)/2} - \theta P_{012} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2a} \right)}, \quad \theta = \pm 1,
$$

(4.110)
or, when equations in (4.105) hold, we have

$$
\lambda = i \frac{P_{011} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2a} \right) (\lambda-1)^{i(k+1)/2} + \theta P_{102} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2a} \right)}{P_{011} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2a} \right) (\lambda-1)^{i(k+1)/2} - \theta P_{012} \left( z, \frac{x^2+1}{2a} \right)}, \quad \theta = \pm 1.
$$

(4.111)

We conclude that solutions of equation (4.99) are represented by (4.107) with \(\lambda\) being a solution of equation (4.109) or (4.111). By combining the above results together, we have the first part of Theorem 7.

If the numerator of the RHS of (4.99) has two distinct roots of odd order, then we have \(P_0(z, f)^2(f-1)^{k_1}(f+1)^{k_2} - Q_0(z, f)^2 = P_1(z, f)^2(f-\gamma_1)^{k_1}(f-\gamma_2)^{k_2}\) for some polynomial \(P_1(z, f)\) in \(f\), and \(\gamma_1\) and \(\gamma_2\) are distinct from each other and are both non-zero. In this case, \(\gamma_1\) and \(\gamma_2\) are also both completely ramified rational functions of \(f\) and by Lemma [3] it follows that if \(\gamma_1 \neq 0\), then \(\pm \gamma_1\) are both completely ramified rational functions of \(f\). By Theorem 2 we must have \(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = 0\). Moreover, by Lemmas [4] and [5] we have \(k_1 = k_2 = t_1 = t_2 = 1\). Therefore, by denoting \(\gamma_1 = \gamma_1\), we have

$$
\mathbb{T}^2 - 1 = \frac{P_1(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2}(f^2 - \gamma^2).
$$

(4.112)

Now \(\pm 1\) and \(\pm \gamma\) are all completely ramified rational functions of \(f\) with multiplicities 2 and \(f\) has no other completely ramified rational functions and has no Picard exceptional rational functions. Thus by applying the analysis on (4.98) to \(\mathbb{T} - \mathbb{T}^2\) we conclude that the polynomial \(P_0(z, f)^2 - \mathbb{T}^2 Q_0(z, f)^2\) cannot have any root of odd order; otherwise, this root is distinct from \(\pm 1\) and \(\pm \gamma\) and is also a completely ramified rational function of \(f\), a contradiction to Theorem 2. Therefore, we have the following

$$
\mathbb{T}^2 - \mathbb{T}^2 = \frac{P_2(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2},
$$

(4.113)

where \(P_2(z, f)\) is a polynomial in \(f\). By Lemmas [4] and [5] we have \(P_0(z, f), Q_0(z, f), P_1(z, f)\) and \(P_2(z, f)\) all have simple roots only and none of the roots of \(P_1(z, f)\) and \(P_2(z, f)\) is equal to \(\pm 1\) or \(\pm \gamma\), and the degree \(p\) and \(q\) satisfy \(p - q \in \{-2, 0, 2\}\). Moreover, as for equations (4.80) and (4.81), when \(p = q\) and \(A = 1\), the degree of the numerator in (4.112) or in (4.113) decreases and by Lemma [3] it decreases by 2. From (4.70), (4.112) and (4.113) we have

$$
P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1) - Q_0(z, f)^2 = P_1(z, f)^2(f^2 - \gamma^2),
$$

$$
P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1) - \mathbb{T}^2 Q_0(z, f)^2 = P_2(z, f)^2.
$$

(4.114)

From the second equation of (4.114) we have

$$
[P_2(z, f) + i\mathbb{T}Q_0(z, f)][P_2(z, f) - i\mathbb{T}Q_0(z, f)] = P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1).
$$

(4.115)

It follows that

$$
P_2(z, f) + i\mathbb{T}Q_0(z, f) = P_0(z, f),
$$

$$
P_2(z, f) - i\mathbb{T}Q_0(z, f) = P_0(z, f),
$$

(4.116)

where \(P_0(z, f)\) and \(P_0(z, f)\) are two polynomials in \(f\) such that \(P_0(z, f)P_0(z, f) = P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1)\). Obviously, \(P_0(z, f)\) and \(P_0(z, f)\) have no common roots and thus we can write

$$
P_0(z, f) = a_{11} P_{011}(z, f)^2(f-1)^{2i_1}(f+1)^{2i_2},
$$

$$
P_0(z, f) = a_{12} P_{012}(z, f)^2(f-1)^{2i_1}(f+1)^{2i_2},
$$

(4.117)
where \( \theta_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}, \theta_{ij} + \theta_{ji} = 1, a_{11} \) and \( a_{12} \) are in general algebraic functions, \( P_{011}(z, f)^{2} \) and \( P_{012}(z, f)^{2} \) are two monic polynomials in \( f \) with no common roots such that \( a_{11}a_{12}P_{011}(z, f)^{2}P_{012}(z, f)^{2} = P_{0}(z, f)^{2} \). Note that \( a_{11}a_{12} = A. \) From equations in (4.116) we have
\[
2\gamma Q_{0}(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f) - P_{02}(z, f).
\] (4.118)

Note that \( f \) has no Picard exceptional rational functions. If \( P_{011}(z, f) \) and \( P_{012}(z, f) \) both have at least one root, then we may suppose that \( P_{011}(z, f) \) has no more roots than \( P_{012}(z, f) \). By the same arguments as in the reasoning after equation (4.107), we can exchange the role of the roots of \( P_{011}(z, f) \) and that of some roots of \( P_{012}(z, f) \) and obtain equation (4.118) and the resulting equation that
\[
[P_{011}(z, f)^{2} - P_{013}(z, f)^{2}][a_{11}(f - 1) - a_{12}(f + 1)P_{014}(z, f)^{2}] = 0,
\] (4.119)
or
\[
[P_{011}(z, f)^{2} - P_{013}(z, f)^{2}][a_{11}(f^{2} - 1) - a_{12}P_{014}(z, f)^{2}] = 0,
\] (4.120)
where \( P_{013}(z, f) \) and \( P_{014}(z, f) \) are two polynomials in \( f \) such that neither of them have common roots with \( P_{011}(z, f) \). Each of the above two equations yields that \( P_{011}(z, f)^{2} = P_{013}(z, f)^{2} \) and thus \( P_{011}(z, f) = \pm P_{013}(z, f) \), a contradiction since \( P_{0}(z, f) \) has simple roots only. Therefore, only one of \( P_{011}(z, f) \) and \( P_{012}(z, f) \) can have some roots. Denote the degrees of the two polynomials \( P_{01}(z, f) \) and \( P_{02}(z, f) \) by \( p_{1} \) and \( p_{2} \), respectively. Recalling that \( p - q \in \{-2, 0, 2\} \), we see from the equation (4.118) that \( p_{1} - p_{2} \in \{-2, 0, 2\} \). Then we see that \( P_{0}(z, f) \) has at most 2 distinct roots.

When \( P_{0}(z, f) \) has two distinct roots, by the above discussions, we must have
\[
P_{01}(z, f) = a_{11}(f - a)^{2}(f - b)^{2},
\]
\[
P_{02}(z, f) = a_{12}(f^{2} - 1),
\] (4.121)
where \( a \) and \( b \) are in general algebraic functions. By substituting the equation in (4.118) into the first equation of (4.111), we have
\[
[P_{01}(z, f) + \gamma_{1}P_{02}(z, f)][P_{01}(z, f) + \gamma_{2}P_{02}(z, f)] = 4\gamma^{2}P_{3}(z, f)^{2}(f^{2} - \gamma^{2}),
\] (4.122)
where \( \gamma_{1} \) and \( \gamma_{2} \) are two algebraic functions such that \( \gamma_{1} + \gamma_{2} = 2 - 4\gamma^{2} \) and \( \gamma_{1}\gamma_{2} = 1 \). Since \( P_{01}(z, f) + \gamma_{1}P_{02}(z, f) \) and \( P_{01}(z, f) + \gamma_{2}P_{02}(z, f) \) are two polynomials in \( f \) with no common roots, then by (4.121) and (4.122) we see that
\[
a_{11}(f - a)^{2}(f - b)^{2} + \gamma_{1}a_{12}(f^{2} - 1) = a_{11}(f - c)^{2}(f - d)^{2},
\]
\[
a_{11}(f - a)^{2}(f - b)^{2} + \gamma_{2}a_{12}(f^{2} - 1) = a_{12}(f - c)^{2}(f^{2} - \gamma^{2}),
\] (4.123)
where \( b_{11}, b_{12}, c, d \), and \( e \) are in general algebraic functions. We observe that \( a_{11} = b_{11} = b_{12} \). By expanding the polynomials in the first equation of (4.123) and comparing the terms of degree 3 and 1 of the polynomials in the resulting equation on both sides, respectively, we have
\[
-2a_{11}(a + b) = -2b_{11}(c + d),
\]
\[
-2a_{11}ab(a + b) = -2b_{12}cd(c + d).
\] (4.124)
Then we must have \( a + b = c + d = 0 \), for otherwise by noting that \( a_{11} = b_{11} = b_{12} \) we also have \( ab = cd \), a contradiction. Then we see from the second equation of (4.123) that \( e = 0 \). For simplicity, we denote \( B = a_{12}/a_{11} \) and rewrite equations in (4.123) as
\[
(f^{2} - a^{2})^{2} + \gamma_{1}B(f^{2} - 1) = (f^{2} - c^{2})^{2},
\]
\[
(f^{2} - a^{2})^{2} + \gamma_{2}B(f^{2} - 1) = f^{2}(f^{2} - \gamma^{2}).
\] (4.125)
By comparing the leading coefficients on both sides of the polynomial in (4.118) we have \( a_{11}^{2} = -4\gamma^{2} \) and it follows from equation (4.122) that \( b_{11}b_{12} = -4\gamma^{2} \). By expanding the polynomials in (4.122) and comparing the terms on both sides of the resulting equations, respectively, we have
\[
\gamma_{1}B = 2a^{2} - 2c^{2} = a^{4} - c^{4},
\]
\[
\gamma_{2}B = 2a^{2} - \gamma^{2} = a^{4}.
\] (4.126)
From the second equation in (4.120) we get \( a^4 - 2a^2 + \gamma^2 = 0 \). Together with this relation, from the first equation in (4.120) we get \( c^2 - 2c^2 + \gamma^2 = 0 \). Then we have \( a^2 + c^2 = 2 \) and also, by writing \( a^2 = 1 + t \), that \( t^2 = 1 - \gamma^2 \). Note that \( t \neq 0, \pm 1 \). From equations in (4.120), we obtain \( \gamma_1/\gamma_2 = 4(a^2 - 1)/a^4 = 4t/(1 + t)^2 \).

Recalling that \( \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = 2 - 4\gamma^2 \) and \( \gamma_1\gamma_2 = 1 \), then we have \( (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)^2 = (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)^2 - 4 = 16\gamma^2(\gamma^2 - 1) \) and also that \( \gamma_1\gamma_2 = \gamma_2^2 4t/(1 + t)^2 = 1 \). Therefore,

\[
\frac{(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)^2}{\gamma_1\gamma_2} = \left( \frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_2} - 1 \right)^2 \frac{(1 + t)^2}{4t} = \frac{(1 - t)^4}{4t(1 + t)^2} = -16\gamma^2(1 - \gamma^2). \tag{4.127}
\]

We see that \( t \) is a constant and satisfies \((1 - t)^3 = -64\gamma^3(1 + t)^3\), i.e., \( 4t^2 + \eta = (\eta - 4)\gamma t \), where \( \eta \) is the cubic root of unity. By taking the square on both sides of this equation and substituting \( t^2 = 1 - \gamma^2 \) into the resulting equation, we finally have \( 16\gamma^4 + (\eta^2 + 48)\gamma^2 + 16\eta = 0 \). Then by multiplying both sides of the two equations in (4.120) we obtain \( B^2 = 4a^2(a^2 - 1) \). Recalling that \( B = a_{12}/a_{11} \) and that \( a_{11}^2 = -4\gamma^2 \), then we have \( A = a_{11}a_{12} = -4\gamma^2B \). In this case, from (4.118), we see that \( Q_0(z, f)^2 = [(f^2 - a^2)^2 - B(f^2 - 1)^2] \).

Now we consider the case where \( P_0(z, f) \) has at most 1 root. If \( P_0(z, f) \) has no root, then by our assumptions that \( d \geq 2 \) and \( p - q \in \{-2, 0, 2\} \), we must have \( q_0 = 2 \). By equation (4.118) we see that \( P_{01}(z, f) \) and \( P_{02}(z, f) \) are of the following form:

\[
P_{01}(z, f) = a_{11}, \tag{4.128}
\]

\[
P_{02}(z, f) = a_{12}(f^2 - \gamma^2).
\]

Then, by (4.114) and (4.118), we see that \( Q_0(z, f)^2, P_1(z, f)^2 \) and \( P_2(z, f)^2 \) are all polynomials in \( f^2 \). If \( P_0(z, f) \) has one root and \( q = 6 \), then by equation (4.118) we see that \( P_{01}(z, f) \) and \( P_{02}(z, f) \) are of the following form:

\[
P_{01}(z, f) = a_{11}(f - a)^2(f + 1), \tag{4.129}
\]

\[
P_{02}(z, f) = a_{12}(f - 1),
\]

where \( a \) is in general an algebraic function. However, in this case, by exchanging the role of the two roots \(-1 \) and \( 1 \), we obtain from (4.118) and the resulting equation that \( a_{11}(f - a)^2(f + 1) - a_{12}(f - 1) = a_{11}(f - a)^2(f - 1) - a_{12}(f + 1) \), which is impossible. Therefore, we must have \( q = 4 \) or \( q = 2 \). Then \( P_{01}(z, f) \) and \( P_{02}(z, f) \) must be of the following form:

\[
P_{01}(z, f) = a_{11}(f - a)^2, \tag{4.130}
\]

\[
P_{02}(z, f) = a_{12}(f^2 - 1),
\]

where \( a \) is in general algebraic. Moreover, since \( P_{01}(z, f) + \gamma_1 P_{02}(z, f) \) and \( P_{01}(z, f) + \gamma_2 P_{02}(z, f) \) have no common roots, from (4.122) we have

\[
P_{01}(z, f) + \gamma_1 P_{02}(z, f) = 2\gamma P_1(z, f)^2, \tag{4.131}
\]

\[
P_{01}(z, f) + \gamma_2 P_{02}(z, f) = 2\gamma (f^2 - \gamma^2).
\]

We see from the second equation of (4.131) that \( a = 0 \). Then, by (4.114) and (4.118), we also have that \( P_0(z, f)^2, Q_0(z, f)^2, P_1(z, f)^2 \) and \( P_2(z, f)^2 \) are all polynomials in \( f^2 \). Recalling that \( P_0(z, f), Q_0(z, f), P_1(z, f) \) and \( P_2(z, f) \) all have simple roots only, we see from the first equation in (4.114) that the only possible simple root of \( P_0(z, f)^2 \) or \( P_1(z, f)^2 \), as two polynomials in \( f^2 \), is 0. This implies that the case where \( p = 4 \) and \( q = 2 \) and the case where \( p = q = 4 \) and \( A \neq 1 \) are both impossible. Therefore, in this case, for the two equations in (4.114),

(1) when \( p = 2 \) and \( q = 4 \), we have

\[
A(f^2 - 1) - (f^2 - b^2)^2 = f^2(f^2 - \gamma^2),
A(f^2 - 1) - \gamma^2(f^2 - b^2)^2 = \gamma^2(f^2 - c^2)^2, \tag{4.132}
\]

(2) when \( p = q = 4 \) and \( A = 1 \), we have

\[
f^2(f^2 - 1) - (f^2 - b^2)^2 = c_1(f^2 - \gamma^2),
\]

\[
f^2(f^2 - 1) - \gamma^2(f^2 - b^2)^2 = (1 - \gamma^2)(f^2 - c^2)^2, \tag{4.133}
\]
where \( b, c \) and \( c_1 \) are algebraic functions. By expanding the polynomials in (4.132) and comparing the coefficients of polynomials in the resulting equations on both sides, respectively, we get
\[
A + 2b^2 = \gamma^2,
\]
\[
-A - b^4 = 0,
\]
and
\[
A + 2\gamma^2b^2 = 2\gamma^2c^2,
\]
\[
-A - \gamma^2b^4 = -\gamma^2c^4.
\]
From the above four equations, we obtain \( A = -b^4 \) and \( 4b^4 - 11b^2 + 8 = 0 \). Similarly, from the equations in (4.133) we obtain \( 2b^4 - 1 = 0 \) or \( 2b^4 - 2b^2 + 1 = 0 \). Together with the results in the previous case where \( P_0(z, f) \) has 2 distinct roots, we have the second part of Theorem 7.

**Subcase 2:** Equation (4.138) with \( \alpha_1\beta_1 \neq 0 \).

In this case, we discuss the two cases \( n = 2 \) and \( n \geq 3 \) separately.

When \( n = 2 \), by Lemmas 11 and 3 it follows that \( \pm \alpha_1 \), as well as \( \pm \beta_1 \), are completely ramified rational functions of \( f \). We may let \( \alpha_1 = \kappa \) and \( \beta_1 = 1 \) by doing a linear transformation \( f \to \beta_1f \). We consider
\[
T^2 - 1 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2(f - \kappa)k_1 - Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)l_1}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)l_1}.
\]
Recall that the leading coefficient of the polynomial \( P_0(z, f)^2 \) is denoted by \( A \) and that the polynomial \( Q_0(z, f)^2 \) is monic. When \( p = q \) and \( A = 1 \), the degree of the numerator of the RHS of (4.133) decreases due to the cancellation of the terms with the highest degrees in \( P_0(z, f)^2(f - \kappa)k_1 \) and \( Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)l_1 \). Suppose that the degree of the polynomial \( P_0(z, f)^2(f - \kappa)k_1 - Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)l_1 \) in \( f \) decreases to be an even integer. By considering the multiplicities of the poles of \( f \) together with the fact that \( \pm 1 \) are both completely ramified rational functions of \( f \) and that the roots of \( f \pm 1 = 0 \) have even multiplicities with at most finitely many exceptions, we get that \( \infty \) is also a completely ramified rational function of \( f \). Further, by considering the multiplicities of the roots of \( f - 1 = 0 \) as in the proof of Lemma 3 we obtain from (4.78) that \( \pm 1 \) both have multiplicities at least 4. Now we have \( \Theta(\infty, f) + \Theta(-1, f) + \Theta(1, f) = 2 \).

Then by the inequality (4.6) and Lemma 5 we conclude that \( \kappa = -1 \) and \( k_1 = l_1 = 1 \) and also that \( Q_0(z, f) = Q_1(z, f)^2 \) for some polynomial \( Q_1(z, f) \) in \( f \) with simple roots only. Now we have
\[
T^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2(f + 1)}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)},
\]
and further, by Lemma 5 that \( P_0(z, f)^2(f - \kappa)k_1 - Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)l_1 \) must be a square of some polynomial \( P_1(z, f) \) in \( f \) with simple roots only, i.e.,
\[
T^2 - 1 = \frac{P_1(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)}.
\]
Denote the degree of the polynomial \( P_1(z, f) \) by \( p_1 \). Then by analyzing on the multiplicities of poles, we obtain from the above equation that \( p_1 = q_0 \). As for solving equations (4.138) and (4.139) in the proof of Theorem 9 we can put \( f = \frac{1}{2}(\delta^2 + \delta^{-2}) \), where \( \delta \) is an algebraic function with at most finitely many algebraic branch points and \( \pm 1 \) and \( \pm i \) are all completely ramified rational functions of \( \delta \) with multiplicities 2. Then by solving \( \delta^2 \) from equation (4.138) together with (4.137) we have
\[
\frac{1}{\delta^2} = \pm \frac{P_0(z, \delta^2 + 1) + P_1(z, \delta^2 + 2)(2^{1/2}\delta)}{Q_0(z, \delta^2 - 1)}.
\]
Also, since \( p_0 = q_0 = p_1 \), by multiplying \((2\delta^2)^{q_0}\) to both of the numerator and the denominator of the RHS of (4.139), we have
\[
\frac{1}{\delta^2} = \pm \frac{P_{00}(z, \delta^2)(\delta^2 + 1) + P_{0}(z, \delta^2)(2^{1/2}\delta)}{Q_{00}(z, \delta^2)(\delta^2 - 1)},
\]
where \( P_{00}(z, \delta^2) \), \( P_0(z, \delta^2) \) and \( Q_{00}(z, \delta^2) \) are polynomials in \( \delta^2 \) of the same degrees \( 2q_0 \). Moreover, since we have \( p_0 = q_0 \) and the leading coefficient of \( P_0(z, f)^2 \) equals 1, we see from the above reasoning that
the leading coefficient of the numerator of the RHS of (4.130) is $±1$. Since $±1$ and $±i$ are all completely ramified rational functions of $δ$ with multiplicities 2, then the analysis for equation (4.54) applies and we have

$$±P_{00}(z, δ^2)(δ^2 + 1) + P_{10}(z, δ^2)(2^{1/2}δ) = ±(δ - ϵ_1)^2 \cdots (δ - ϵ_{2q_0 + 1})^2,$$

(4.141)

where the roots $ϵ_1, \cdots, ϵ_{2q_0 + 1}$ are distinct from each other and from $±1$ and $±i$. By the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 3 for (4.53), we finally obtain a contradiction. Therefore, the degree of the polynomial $P_0(z, f)^2(f - κ)^{k_1} - Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{k_1}$ is always odd. This implies that the numerator of the RHS of equation (4.130) always has a root, say $γ$, of odd order. Then by applying the same analysis as in the proof of Lemma 1 together with the fact that $±1$ are completely ramified rational functions of $f$ we obtain that $γ$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$. If $κ \neq -1$, then by Lemma 3 $±1$ and $±κ$ are all completely ramified rational functions of $f$ and thus by Theorem 2 we have $γ = -1$ or $γ = -κ$ and thus $γ \neq 0$. If $κ = -1$, then by considering the multiplicities of the roots of $f + 1 = 0$ as in the proof of Lemma 1 and then by Lemma 3 we obtain from (4.78) that $±1$ both have multiplicities at least 4. But it follows by repeating the analysis after (4.130) that 0 is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity at least 4, a contradiction to the inequality (1.6). Therefore, when $κ = -1$, we also have $γ \neq 0$. Now, by Lemma 4 it follows that $±γ$ are both completely ramified rational functions of $f$. From the above reasoning, we see that $f$ has four completely ramified rational functions $±1$ and $±κ$ (or $±γ$), all of which have multiplicities 2. By Lemma 4 we must have $k_1 = l_1 = 1$ and all the roots of $P_0(z, f)$ and $Q_0(z, f)$ are simple and also that $p_0 - q_0 \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. Moreover, as for equations (4.80) and (4.81), when $p = q$, if the degree of the numerator in (4.130) decreases, then by Lemma 5 it decreases by 2. Now we have

$$J^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2(f - κ)}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)}.$$

(4.142)

Below we discuss the two cases where $κ = -1$ and $κ \neq -1$, respectively.

When $κ = -1$, from the above discussions we know that $P_0(z, f)^2(f + 1) - Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)$ is of the form $P_1(z, f)^2(f + γ)$ for some non-zero algebraic function $γ$ and a polynomial $P_1(z, f)$ in $f$. Since $±1$ and $±γ$ are all completely ramified rational functions of $f$, then by Theorem 2 and Lemma 5 and considering $J^2 - γ^2$, we see that $P_0(z, f)^2(f + 1) - γ^2 Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)$ must be of the form $P_2(z, f)^2(f - γ)$ for some polynomial $P_2(z, f)$ in $f$; moreover, both $P_1(z, f)$ and $P_2(z, f)$ have simple roots only and none of these roots equals $±1$ or $±γ$. Now we have

$$J^2 - γ^2 = \frac{P_1(z, f)^2(f - γ)}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)},$$

(4.143)

and

$$J^2 - 1 = \frac{P_2(z, f)^2(f + γ)}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)}.$$

(4.144)

Let $(f + γ)/(f - γ) = g^2$. Since $f$ has four completely ramified rational functions $±1$ and $±γ$ with multiplicities 2, then $g$ is a meromorphic function with at most finitely many algebraic branch points and it follows that $f = γ(g^2 + 1)/(g^2 - 1)$. Note that $g$ has four completely ramified rational functions and has no Picard exceptional rational functions. We substitute the equation $f = γ(g^2 + 1)/(g^2 - 1)$ into (4.142) and get

$$J^2 = \frac{P_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - α_{11}^1)}{Q_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - α_{12}^1)},$$

(4.145)

where $α_{11}$ and $α_{12}$ are two algebraic functions such that $α_{11} = \frac{1 - γ}{1 + γ}$ and $α_{12} = \frac{1 + γ}{1 - γ}$, respectively, and $P_{01}(z, g^2)$ and $Q_{01}(z, g^2)$ are two polynomials in $g^2$ with simple roots only and of the same degrees $d_0 = \max\{p_0, q_0\}$. Further, we substitute the equation $f = γ(g^2 + 1)/(g^2 - 1)$ into (4.138) and (4.134), respectively, and get

$$J^2 - γ^2 = \frac{P_{21}(z, g^2)^2}{Q_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - α_{12}^2)},$$

(4.146)

and

$$J^2 - 1 = \frac{P_{21}(z, g^2)^2}{Q_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - α_{12}^2)},$$

(4.147)
where \( P_{01}(z, g^2) \) and \( P_{21}(z, g^2) \) are two polynomials in \( g^2 \) with simple roots only and of the same degrees \( d_0 + 1 \). From the above reasoning we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma P_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - \alpha_{11}^2) - \gamma^2 Q_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - \alpha_{12}^2) &= P_{11}(z, g^2)^2, \\
P_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - \alpha_{11}^2) - Q_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - \alpha_{12}^2) &= P_{21}(z, g^2)^2 g^2.
\end{align*}
\]
(4.148)

From equations in (4.148) we have
\[
\begin{align*}
(1 - \gamma^2)P_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - \alpha_{11}^2) &= \left[P_{11}(z, g^2)^2 + \gamma P_{21}(z, g^2)g\right]\left[P_{11}(z, g^2) - \gamma P_{21}(z, g^2)g\right], \\
(1 - \gamma^2)Q_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - \alpha_{12}^2) &= \left[P_{11}(z, g^2)^2 + P_{21}(z, g^2)g\right]\left[P_{11}(z, g^2)^2 - P_{21}(z, g^2)g\right].
\end{align*}
\]
(4.149)

Therefore, we may write
\[
\begin{align*}
P_{11}(z, g^2) + \gamma P_{21}(z, g^2)g &= P_{03}(z, g), \\
P_{11}(z, g^2) - \gamma P_{21}(z, g^2)g &= P_{04}(z, g), \\
P_{11}(z, g^2) + P_{21}(z, g^2)g &= Q_{03}(z, g), \\
P_{11}(z, g^2) - P_{21}(z, g^2)g &= Q_{04}(z, g),
\end{align*}
\]
(4.150)

where \( P_{03}(z, g) \) and \( P_{04}(z, g) \) are two polynomials in \( g \) and \( P_{03}(z, g)P_{04}(z, g) = (1 - \gamma^2)P_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - \alpha_{11}^2) \). \( Q_{03}(z, g) \) and \( Q_{04}(z, g) \) are two polynomials in \( g \) and \( Q_{03}(z, g)Q_{04}(z, g) = (1 - \gamma^2)Q_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - \alpha_{12}^2) \). We see that \( P_{03}(z, g) = P_{03}(z, -g) \) and \( Q_{04}(z, g) = Q_{03}(z, -g) \). Since \( P_{03}(z, g) \) and \( P_{04}(z, g) \), as well as \( Q_{03}(z, g) \) and \( Q_{04}(z, g) \), have no common roots, we can write
\[
\begin{align*}
P_{03}(z, g) &= iP_{01}(z, g)^2(g + \alpha_{11}), \\
P_{04}(z, g) &= -iP_{01}(z, -g)^2(g - \alpha_{11}), \\
Q_{03}(z, g) &= iP_{01}(z, g)^2(g + \alpha_{12}), \\
Q_{04}(z, g) &= -iP_{01}(z, -g)^2(g - \alpha_{12}),
\end{align*}
\]
(4.151)

where \( P_{011}(z, g) \) and \( Q_{011}(z, g) \) are two polynomials in \( g \) such that \( P_{011}(z, g)^2P_{011}(z, -g)^2 = (1 - \gamma^2)P_{01}(z, g^2)^2(1 - \gamma^2)Q_{01}(z, g^2)^2 \). From equations in (4.150), we get
\[
\begin{align*}
2P_{11}(z, g^2) &= P_{03}(z, g) + P_{04}(z, g) = Q_{03}(z, g) + Q_{04}(z, g), \\
2\gamma P_{21}(z, g^2)g &= P_{03}(z, g) - P_{04}(z, g) = \gamma\left[Q_{03}(z, g) - Q_{04}(z, g)\right].
\end{align*}
\]
(4.152)

Then by solving \( Q_{03}(z, g) \) and \( Q_{04}(z, g) \) from the above two equations we have
\[
\begin{align*}
(1 + \gamma)Q_{03}(z, g) - (1 - \gamma)Q_{04}(z, g) &= 2\gamma Q_{03}(z, g), \\
(1 - \gamma)Q_{03}(z, g) - (1 + \gamma)Q_{04}(z, g) &= -2\gamma Q_{04}(z, g).
\end{align*}
\]
(4.153)

Recall the two equations \( P_{03}(z, g)P_{04}(z, g) = (1 - \gamma^2)P_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - \alpha_{11}^2) \) and \( Q_{03}(z, g)Q_{04}(z, g) = (1 - \gamma^2)Q_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - \alpha_{12}^2) \). Together with equations in (4.151), by multiplying both sides of the two equations in (4.153) we obtain
\[
\begin{align*}
P_{011}(z, g)^2(g + \alpha_{11})^2 + P_{011}(z, -g)^4(g - \alpha_{11})^2 \\
+ 2(1 + \gamma^2)P_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - \alpha_{11}^2) = 4\gamma^2 Q_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - \alpha_{12}^2),
\end{align*}
\]
(4.154)

and it follows that
\[
\begin{align*}
[P_{011}(z, g)^4 + P_{011}(z, -g)^4]\left[g^2 + \alpha_{11}^2\right] + 2(1 + \gamma^2)P_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - \alpha_{11}^2) \\
+ 2\alpha_{11}\left[P_{011}(z, g)^4 - P_{011}(z, -g)^4\right]g = 4\gamma^2 Q_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - \alpha_{12}^2).
\end{align*}
\]
(4.155)

Note that \( P_{011}(z, g)^4 - P_{011}(z, -g)^4 \) is a polynomial in \( g \) with terms of odd degrees only. By exchanging the role of \( \alpha_{11} \) and \( -\alpha_{11} \), we conclude from (4.150) and the resulting equation that
\[
P_{011}(z, g)^4 = P_{011}(z, -g)^4.
\]
(4.156)

The above equation implies either \( P_{01}(z, g)^2 = P_{01}(z, -g)^2 \) or \( P_{01}(z, g)^2 = -P_{01}(z, -g)^2 \). In the first case, \( P_{01}(z, g) \) has only terms of even degrees and it follows that \( P_{01}(z, g^2) \) is actually a polynomial
in $g^2$ with multiple roots only, a contradiction to our assumption that $P_0(z, f)$ has simple roots only. In the latter case, $P_{011}(z, g)$ has only terms of odd degrees and thus $P_{011}(z, g)$ must be of degree 1, that is, $P_{01}(z, g^2) = a_{11}g^2$ for some algebraic function $a_{11}$, for otherwise $P_{01}(z, g^2)$ will be a polynomial in $g^2$ with some multiple roots, a contradiction to our assumption that $P_0(z, f)$ has simple roots only. However, from equations in (4.152) we can also obtain an equation similar to (4.155) which expresses $P_{01}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - a_{11}^2)$ in terms of $Q_{011}(z, g)^4(g + a_{12})^2$, $Q_{011}(z, g)^4(g - a_{12})^2$ and $Q_{011}(z, g^2)^2(g^2 - a_{12}^2)$; then by the same arguments as above we will also have $Q_{011}(z, g^2) = b_{11}g^2$ for some algebraic function $b_{11}$, which is impossible. Therefore, when $\kappa = -1$ equation (4.112) cannot have any meromorphic solution.

When $\kappa \neq -1$, by Theorem 2 and Lemma 6 and considering $\mathcal{F} - \kappa^2$ and $\mathcal{F} - 1$, respectively, we see that $P_{0}(z, f)^2(f - \kappa) - \kappa^2Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)$ (and also $P_0(z, f)^2(\kappa - f) - Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)$) must be of the form $P_1(z, f)^2(f + 1)$ or $P_2(z, f)^2(\kappa + f)$ for some polynomials $P_1(z, f)$ and $P_2(z, f)$ in $f$ with simple roots only and none of these roots equals $\pm \kappa$ and $\pm 1$. Without loss of generality, we may consider the following two equations:

\[
\mathcal{F}^2 - \kappa^2 = \frac{P_1(z, f)^2(f + \kappa)}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)},
\]

(4.157)

and

\[
\mathcal{F}^2 - 1 = \frac{P_2(z, f)^2(f + 1)}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)}.
\]

(4.158)

Let $(f + \kappa)/(f + 1) = g^2$. Since $f$ has four completely ramified rational functions $\pm 1$ and $\pm \kappa$ with multiplicities 2, then $\mathcal{F}$ is an algebroid function with at most finitely many algebraic branch points and it follows that $f = -(g^2 - \kappa)/(g^2 - 1)$. Note that $\mathcal{F}$ has four completely ramified rational functions and has no Picard exceptional rational functions. Similarly as in previous case, by substituting the equation $f = -(g^2 + \kappa)/(g^2 - 1)$ into (4.112), (4.157) and (4.158), respectively, and then following the same reasoning as there, we will also obtain a contradiction. We omit those details. Therefore, when $\kappa = -1$ equation (4.112) cannot have any meromorphic solution either.

Now consider the case when $n \geq 3$. Since $\omega_1$ and $\omega_3$ are all completely ramified rational functions $\omega$ is the $n$-th root of 1, then by the inequality (1.6) we must have $n = 3$ and $\omega_1 = \omega_3$. By Lemma 3 we conclude that $k_1 = l_1 = 1$. We fix one $\eta$ such that $\eta^2 + \eta + 1 = 0$ and choose without loss of generality that $\beta_1 = \eta\omega_1$. We may let $\omega_1 = 1$ by doing a linear transformation $f \to \omega_1f$. Then we have

\[
\mathcal{F}^3 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^3(f - 1)}{Q_0(z, f)^3(f - \eta)}.
\]

(4.159)

Also, by Lemma 3 we conclude that $P_0(z, f)$ and $Q_0(z, f)$ can have simple roots only and $p_0 - q_0 \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. We consider

\[
\mathcal{F}^3 - 1 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^3(f - 1) - Q_0(z, f)^3(f - \eta)}{Q_0(z, f)^3(f - \eta)}.
\]

(4.160)

Note that $f$ has three completely ramified rational functions with multiplicities 3. As for equations (4.150) and (4.151), when $p_0 = q_0$ and the leading coefficient of the polynomial $P_0(z, f)^3$ satisfies $A = 1$, the degree of the numerator of the RHS of (4.160) decreases and by Lemma 5 it decreases by 3. Therefore, the numerator of the RHS of the above equation always has one root of order $l_1$ such that $3 \nmid l_1$ and by Lemma 5 we must have $l_1 = 1$ and then by the inequality (1.6) we see that the root must be $\eta^2$. Therefore, the numerator of the RHS of (4.160) is of the form $P_1(z, f)^3(f - \eta^2)$ for a polynomial $P_1(z, f)$ in $f$ with simple roots only. Then

\[
\mathcal{F}^3 - 1 = \frac{P_1(z, f)^3(f - \eta^2)}{Q_0(z, f)^3(f - \eta)}.
\]

(4.161)

Let $(f - 1)/(f - \eta) = g^3$. Since $1, \eta$ and $\eta^2$ are completely ramified rational functions of $f$ with multiplicities 3, then $\mathcal{F}$ is an algebroid function with at most finitely many algebraic branch points and it follows that $f = (\eta^3 - 1)/(g^3 - 1)$. We substitute this equation into (4.159) and (4.161), respectively, and get

\[
\mathcal{F}^3 = \frac{P_0(z, g^3)^3g^3}{Q_0(z, g^3)^3},
\]

(4.162)

and

\[
\mathcal{F}^3 - 1 = -\frac{\eta P_0(z, g^3)^3(g^3 + \eta)}{Q_0(z, g^3)^3},
\]

(4.163)
where \( P_{01}(z, g^3), P_{02}(z, g^3) \) and \( Q_{01}(z, g^3) \) are three polynomials in \( g^3 \) with the same degree \( d_0 = \max\{p_0, q_0\} \). Thus we may write
\[
\mathcal{J} = \frac{P_{01}(z, g^3)g}{Q_{01}(z, g^3)}, \tag{4.164}
\]
Note that \(-\eta^{1/3}, -\eta\eta^{1/3} \) and \(-\eta^2\eta^{1/3}\) are completely ramified rational functions of \( g \) with multiplicities 3. We consider
\[
\mathcal{J} - 1 = \frac{P_{01}(z, g^3)g - Q_{01}(z, g^3)}{Q_{01}(z, g^3)},
\mathcal{J} - \eta = \frac{P_{01}(z, g^3)g - \eta Q_{01}(z, g^3)}{Q_{01}(z, g^3)}, \tag{4.165}
\mathcal{J} - \eta^2 = \frac{P_{01}(z, g^3)g - \eta^2 Q_{01}(z, g^3)}{Q_{01}(z, g^3)}.
\]
For simplicity, we denote
\[
P_{10}(z, g) = P_{01}(z, g^3)g - Q_{01}(z, g^3),
P_{20}(z, g) = P_{01}(z, g^3)g - \eta Q_{01}(z, g^3), \tag{4.166}
P_{30}(z, g) = P_{01}(z, g^3)g - \eta^2 Q_{01}(z, g^3).
\]
Then \( P_{10}(z, g), P_{20}(z, g) \) and \( P_{30}(z, g) \) are three polynomials in \( g \) of the same degree \( 3d_0 + 1 \). By equation (4.163), we see that
\[
P_{10}(z, g)P_{20}(z, g)P_{30}(z, g) = -\eta P_{02}(z, g^3)^3(g^3 + \eta). \tag{4.167}
\]
From the previous discussions, we know that \( P_{02}(z, g^3) \) is a polynomial in \( g \) with simple roots only. Since any two of the three polynomials \( P_{10}(z, g), P_{20}(z, g) \) and \( P_{30}(z, g) \) have no common roots and each of them has degree \( 3d_0 + 1 \), then \( P_{j0}(z, g), j = 1, 2, 3, \) must be of the form \( P_{j0}(z, g) = P_{1j}(z, g)^3(g - \alpha_{1j}) \), where \( \alpha_{1j} = -\eta \) and \( P_{1j}(z, g) \) is a polynomial in \( g \) of degree \( d_0 \) with simple roots only. Therefore, we have
\[
P_{01}(z, g^3)g - Q_{01}(z, g^3) = P_{11}(z, g)^3(g - \alpha_{11}),
P_{01}(z, g^3)g - \eta Q_{01}(z, g^3) = P_{12}(z, g)^3(g - \alpha_{12}), \tag{4.168}
P_{01}(z, g^3)g - \eta^2 Q_{01}(z, g^3) = P_{13}(z, g)^3(g - \alpha_{13}).
\]
By writing \( \alpha_{12} = \eta\alpha_{11} \) and \( \alpha_{13} = \eta^2\alpha_{11} \), we have either \( \eta_1 = \eta \) and \( \eta_2 = \eta^2 \) or \( \eta_1 = \eta^2 \) and \( \eta_2 = \eta \). Note that \( g \) has no Picard exceptional rational functions. We do the transformation \( g \to \eta \) for the second equation of (4.168) and then divide by \( \eta \) the both sides of the resulting equation and \( g \to \eta^2 \) for the third equation of (4.168) and then divide by \( \eta^2 \) the both sides of the resulting equation, respectively. In both cases we get the polynomial \( P_{10}(z, g) = P_{11}(z, g)^3(g - \alpha_{11}) \). Therefore, we must have \( \eta_1 = \eta \) and \( \eta_2 = \eta^2 \) and that \( P_{12}(z, \eta g^3)^3 = P_{11}(z, g^3)^3 \) and \( P_{13}(z, \eta^2 g^3)^3 = P_{11}(z, g^3)^3 \), i.e., \( P_{12}(z, g)^3 = P_{11}(z, \eta^2 g^3)^3 \) and \( P_{13}(z, g)^3 = P_{11}(z, \eta g^3)^3 \). Moreover, by comparing the polynomials on both sides of the first equation in (4.168), we see that the coefficients of terms of degree \( 3d_0 - 1, 3d_0 - 4, \cdots, 2 \) in the polynomial \( P_{11}(z, g)^3(g - \alpha_{11}) \) vanish. For each given \( d_0 \), we write
\[
P_{11}(z, g) = B(g^{d_0} + B_{d_0-1}g^{d_0-1} + \cdots + B_3g + B_0), \tag{4.169}
\]
where \( B, B_{d_0-1}, \cdots, B_0 \) are in general algebraic functions. By elementary computations, we have that
\[
P_{11}(z, g)^3 = B^3(g^{3d_0} + F_{3d_0-1}g^{3d_0-1} + F_{3d_0-2}g^{3d_0-2} + \cdots + F_1g + F_0), \tag{4.170}
\]
where \( F_{3d_0-1}, F_{3d_0-2}, \cdots, F_0 \) are polynomials of \( B_{d_0-1}, \cdots, B_0 \). Then we have the following \( d_0 \) equations:
\[
F_{3d_0-2} - F_{3d_0-1}\alpha_{11} = 0, 
F_{3d_0-5} - F_{3d_0-4}\alpha_{11} = 0, 
\cdots \tag{4.171}
F_{3} - F_{5}\alpha_{11} = 0, 
F_{1} - F_{2}\alpha_{11} = 0.
\]
For simplicity, we denote \( t = d_0 \). Denote the roots of \( P_1(z, g) \) by \( c_2, \ldots, c_1 \). Then we see that \( c_2, \ldots, c_1 \) are all non-zero and that \( B_{d_0-1}, \ldots, B_0 \) are elementary symmetric polynomials of \( c_2, \ldots, c_1 \). Then we may rewrite the equations in (4.171) as

\[
\begin{align*}
A_{1,k_1} c_{t_1}^{k_1} + A_{1,k_1-1} c_{t_1}^{k_1-1} + \cdots + A_{1,c_2} + A_{1,0} &= 0, \\
A_{2,k_2} c_{t_2}^{k_2} + A_{2,k_2-1} c_{t_2}^{k_2-1} + \cdots + A_{2,c_2} + A_{2,0} &= 0, \\
& \quad \vdots \\
A_{t,k_t} c_{t}^{k_t} + A_{t,k_t-1} c_{t}^{k_t-1} + \cdots + A_{t,c_2} + A_{t,0} &= 0,
\end{align*}
\]

(4.172)

where \( k_1, i = 1, \ldots, t, \) are positive integers and \( A_{i,k_i-j} \) are polynomials of \( c_{t-1}, \ldots, c_1 \). We may suppose that \( k_1 \leq \cdots \leq k_t \). We eliminate the terms \( c_{t_i}^{k_i}, i = 1, \ldots, t \), from the first and the \( i \)-th equations in (4.172) in the following way: By multiplying \( A_{i,k_i} c_{t_i}^{k_i} \) to both sides of the first equation in (4.172) and multiplying \( A_{i,k_i} \) to both sides of the \( i \)-th equation in (4.172), we get two equations of the same degree \( k_i \) and of the same leading coefficients and thus we can eliminate the terms \( c_{t_i}^{k_i} \) from these two equations by subtraction. Then we get a polynomial equation of degree \( \leq k_i - 1 \), by which and the \( i \)-th equation in (4.172) we get another equation of degree \( \leq k_i - 1 \) using the above method. By induction, we can eliminate the terms \( c_{t_i}^{k_i-1}, \ldots, c_{t_i} \) and finally obtain \( t - 1 \) polynomial equations with respect to \( c_{t-1}, \ldots, c_1 \). We then apply the above method to these \( t - 1 \) equations and eliminate \( c_{t-1}, \ldots, c_2 \), respectively, and finally obtain a polynomial equation with respect to \( c_1 \) with coefficients expressed in terms of \( \alpha_1 \). There is always such a non-trivial polynomial equation since \( c_1, \ldots, c_3 \) are distinct from each other and thus \( c_1 \) is a constant. By exchanging the role of \( c_1 \) to \( c_2, \ldots, c_t \), respectively, we have that \( c_2, \ldots, c_t \) all satisfy the same polynomial equation. Then it follows from the first equation of (4.168) that \( B \) is also a constant under our assumption that \( Q_0(z, f)^3 \) is monic and the transformation \((f - 1)/(f - \eta) = g^3\). Therefore, \( P_{11}(z, g), P_{01}(z, g^3) \) and \( Q_0(z, g^3) \) all have constant coefficients. Now, from equations in (4.168) we get

\[
3P_{01}(g^3)g = [P_{11}(g)^3 + P_{11}(\eta g)^3 + P_{11}(\eta g)^3]g - \alpha_1 [P_{11}(g)^3 + \eta P_{11}(\eta g)^3 + \eta^2 P_{11}(\eta g)^3],
\]

\[
3Q_{01}(g^3) = \alpha_1 [P_{11}(g)^3 + P_{11}(\eta g)^3 + P_{11}(\eta g)^3] - [P_{11}(g)^3 + \eta^2 P_{11}(\eta g)^3 + \eta P_{11}(\eta g)^3]g,
\]

(4.173)

Recalling that we have made the transformation \((f - 1)/(f - \eta) = g^3\) to obtain (4.162) from (4.159), from the above reasoning we finally have

\[
P_0(f) = P_{01} \left( \frac{f - 1}{f - \eta} \right) (f - \eta)^{d_0},
\]

\[
Q_0(f) = Q_{01} \left( \frac{f - 1}{f - \eta} \right) (f - \eta)^{d_0}.
\]

(4.174)

This corresponds to the third part of Theorem 7.

Case 2: \( N_i = 3 \).

Since \( n \mid |p - q| \), we must have \( n \geq 3 \). For convenience, we denote the three roots by \( \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \) and \( \gamma_3 \) and the orders of them by \( t_1, t_2 \) and \( t_3 \), respectively. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that \( \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \neq 0 \). Since \( n \geq 3 \), then by Lemmas 1 and 2 it follows that \( \omega_{\gamma_1} \) is a completely ramified rational function of \( f \), where \( \omega \) is the \( n \)-th root of 1, and so by the inequality (1.9) we must have \( n = 3 \) or 4. However, when \( n = 4 \), \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) must be both even integers; otherwise, \( \omega_{\gamma_1} \) (or \( \omega_{\gamma_2} \)) would have multiplicity at least 4, where \( \omega \) is the fourth root of 1, which is impossible. But since \( n \mid |p - q| \), we see that \( t_3 \) is also an even integer, a contradiction to our assumption that at least one of \( \alpha_i \) and \( \beta_j \) in (2.7) and (2.8) has no common factors with \( n \). Therefore, we must have \( n = 3 \). We see that \( \eta \gamma_1 \) has multiplicity 3 since we must have \( (n, t_1) = 1 \), where \( \eta \) is the cubic root of 1. Moreover, by the inequality (1.6) we have none of \( \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \) and \( \gamma_3 \) is zero and by Lemma 3 we also have \( t_1 = t_2 = t_3 = 1 \). By noting that \( n \mid |p - q| \), when \( n = 3 \) we have only the following two possibilities:

\[
\mathcal{T}^3 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^3}{Q_0(z, f)} (f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2)(f - \alpha_3),
\]

(4.175)

\[
\mathcal{T}^3 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^3}{Q_0(z, f)} \frac{1}{(f - \beta_1)(f - \beta_2)(f - \beta_3)}.
\]

(4.176)
For each of the above two equations, by Lemma 4 we have that all the roots of $P_0(z, f)$ and $Q_0(z, f)$ are simple and also that $p - q \in \{-3, 0, 3\}$. Now, for equation (4.174), if $0$ is the only root of $P_0(z, f)$, then $p = 3$ and it follows that $q = 6$ under our assumption that $n < d$; in this case we have $p_0 = q_0 = 1$ and that $Q_0(z, f)$ has a non-zero root. Since none of $\alpha_1$ and $\beta_1$ is zero, then by doing a bilinear transformation $f \to 1/f$, both of the above two cases of equation (4.174) become (4.175). Thus we only need to consider equation (4.175).

Since $\eta Q_0$ has multiplicity 3, where $\eta$ is the cubic root of 1, then by the inequality (4.16) we must have $\alpha_3^3 = \alpha_2^3 = \alpha_1^3$. We may let $\alpha_1 = 1$ by doing a linear transformation $f \to \alpha_1 f$. We consider

$$T^3 - 1 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^3(f^3 - 1) - Q_0(z, f)^3}{Q_0(z, f)^3}.$$  

Let $\eta$ a fixed cubic root of 1 such that $\eta^2 + \eta + 1 = 0$. Since 1, $\eta$ and $\eta^2$ all have multiplicities 3, then by Lemma 5 we conclude that the numerator of the RHS of equation (4.177) is of the form $P_1(z, f)^3$ for some polynomial $P_1(z, f)$ in $f$ with simple roots only and these roots are distinct from 1, $\eta$ and $\eta^2$. Moreover, as for equations (4.80) and (4.81) when $p = q$ and $A = 1$, the degree of the numerator in (4.177) decreases and by Lemma 5 it decreases by 3. Now we have

$$T^3 - 1 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^3(f^3 - 1)}{Q_0(z, f)^3},$$

and further that

$$T^3 - 1 = \frac{P_1(z, f)^3}{Q_0(z, f)^3}.$$  

It follows from (4.179) that $P_0(z, f)^3(f^3 - 1) - Q_0(z, f)^3 = P_1(z, f)^3$ and thus we may write

$$[P_1(z, f) + Q_0(z, f)][P_1(z, f) + \eta Q_0(z, f)][P_1(z, f) + \eta^2 Q_0(z, f)] = P_0(z, f)^3(f^3 - 1).$$  

(4.180)

Since any two of the polynomials $P_1(z, f) + Q_0(z, f)$, $P_1(z, f) + \eta Q_0(z, f)$ and $P_1(z, f) + \eta^2 Q_0(z, f)$ have no common roots, we can write

$$P_1(z, f) + Q_0(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f)^3(f - \eta_1),$$

$$P_1(z, f) + \eta Q_0(z, f) = P_{02}(z, f)^3(f - \eta_2),$$

$$P_1(z, f) + \eta^2 Q_0(z, f) = P_{03}(z, f)^3(f - \eta_3),$$

where $\theta_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\theta_{12} + \theta_{23} + \theta_{31} = 1$, and $P_{01}(z, f)$, $P_{02}(z, f)$ and $P_{03}(z, f)$ are three polynomials in $f$ such that $P_{01}(z, f)P_{02}(z, f)P_{03}(z, f) = P_0(z, f)$ and any two of them have no common roots. Denote the degrees of the three polynomials on the RHS of equation (4.181) by $p_1$, $p_2$ and $p_3$, respectively. Consider the case where $p_1 \leq p_2 \leq p_3$. By eliminating $P_1(z, f)$ from the first two equations in (4.181) and then from the second and the third equations, respectively, we can obtain two expressions for the polynomial $Q_0(z, f)$. By comparing the degrees of these two polynomials, we easily see that the cases where $p_1 < p_2 < p_3$ or $p_1 = p_2 < p_3$ cannot occur. Therefore, we have $p_1 < p_2 = p_3$ or $p_1 = p_2 = p_3$. Moreover, if the case $p_1 < p_2 = p_3$ occurs, then we must have that the two polynomials $P_1(z, f)$ and $Q_0(z, f)$ have the same degrees and also that the leading coefficients of them have opposite signs; in this case, we must have $p < q$ and we see from equations in (4.181) that $p_1 + p_2 + p_3 = p = q - 3$. It follows that $p_1 - 2p_2 + 3p_3 = 3q_0 - 3 = 3p_2 - 3$, which gives $p_2 = p_3 = 3$. We conclude that the three integers $p_1$, $p_2$ and $p_3$ are equal to each other or one is less by 3 than the other two. Recall that $P_0(z, f)$ and $Q_0(z, f)$ can have simple roots only. From the above reasoning, we have only the following two possibilities:

$$P_1(z, f) + Q_0(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f)^3(f - \eta_1),$$

$$P_1(z, f) + \eta Q_0(z, f) = P_{02}(z, f)^3(f - \eta_2),$$

$$P_1(z, f) + \eta^2 Q_0(z, f) = P_{03}(z, f)^3(f - \eta_3),$$

(4.182)

where $\eta_1$, $\eta_2$ and $\eta_3$ are the three distinct roots of 1, or

$$P_1(z, f) + Q_0(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f)^3(f^3 - 1),$$

$$P_1(z, f) + \eta Q_0(z, f) = P_{02}(z, f)^3,$$

$$P_1(z, f) + \eta^2 Q_0(z, f) = P_{03}(z, f)^3.$$  

(4.183)
Denote the degrees of the three polynomials $P_{01}(z, f), P_{02}(z, f)$ and $P_{03}(z, f)$ by $s_1, s_2$ and $s_3$, respectively. For equations in (4.182), we have $p_1 = 3s_1 + 1$, $p_2 = 3s_2 + 1$ and $p_3 = 3s_3 + 1$; for equations in (4.183), we have $p_1 = 3s_1 + 3$, $p_2 = 3s_2$ and $p_3 = 3s_3$.

Let us see equations in (4.182) first. Obviously, we have $q_2 = \eta q_1$ and $q_1 = \eta f_1$, or $q_2 = \eta^2 q_1$ and $q_1 = \eta q_1$. Recall that $P_0(z, f)^3(f^3 - 1) - Q_0(z, f)^3 = P_1(z, f)^3$ and that the leading coefficients of the two polynomials $P_0(z, f)^3(f^3 - 1)$ and $Q_0(z, f)^3$ are $A$ and $1$, respectively. We denote the degree of the polynomial $P_1(z, f)$ by $p_1$. Then by comparing the degrees of the polynomials in the three equations of (4.182) on both sides, respectively, we have the following possibilities:

1. When $p - q = 3$, we see that $p_1 = p_2 = p_1 = 3$ and $A = 1$; we claim that $P_1(z, f)$ is equal to each other. If $p = q + 3$, in this case, since $p_1 = p_2 = p_1 = 3$ and $s_1 = s_2 = s_3$; if $p = q = 0$, then we have $p_1 = p_2 = p_3$ and $s_1 = s_2 = s_3$; if $p = q = -3$, we see that $p_1 = p_1 = 3$ and $s_1 = s_2 = s_1 + 1$, or $p_1 = p_3 = p_2 = p_3 + 3$ and $s_1 = s_2 = s_3 + 1$, or $p_1 = p_3 = p_2 = p_3 + 3$ and $s_1 = s_2 = s_3 + 1$.

Below we discuss the above three possibilities separately. Note that $f$ has no Picard exceptional rational functions. From equations in (4.182), we have

$$P_{01}(z, f)^3(f - q_1) + \eta P_{02}(z, f)^3(f - q_2) + \eta^2 P_{03}(z, f)^3(f - q_3) = 0. \tag{4.184}$$

Consider first the case when $p = q + 3$. In this case, since $p_1 = p_2 = p_1 = 3$, from (4.182) we see that the leading coefficients of the three polynomials of $P_{01}(z, f)^3$, $P_{02}(z, f)^3$ and $P_{03}(z, f)^3$, denoted by $a_{11}, a_{12}$ and $a_{13}$, respectively, are equal to each other. If $q_2 = \eta q_1$ and $q_3 = \eta^2 q_1$, then we do the transformations $f \rightarrow \eta f$ and $f \rightarrow \eta^2 f$, respectively, and obtain from equation (4.184) that

$$P_{02}(z, \eta f)^3(f - q_1) + \eta P_{03}(z, \eta f)^3(f - q_1) + \eta^2 P_{02}(z, \eta f)^3(f - q_1) = 0,$$

$$P_{03}(z, \eta^2 f)^3(f - q_1) + \eta P_{03}(z, \eta f)^3(f - q_1) + \eta^2 P_{02}(z, \eta^2 f)^3(f - q_1) = 0. \tag{4.185}$$

By the above two equations, we claim that $P_{01}(z, f)^3 = P_{02}(z, \eta f)^3 = P_{03}(z, \eta f)^3$, i.e., $P_{02}(z, f)^3 = P_{01}(z, f)^3$ and $P_{03}(z, f)^3 = P_{01}(z, f)^3$. Otherwise, by exchanging the role of $\eta$ and $\eta^2$ in the first equation of (4.185), we obtain from the resulting equation and the second equation of (4.185) that

$$[P_{02}(z, \eta f)^3 - P_{03}(z, \eta f)^3][(f - q_1) - \eta^2(f - \eta^2 q_1)] = 0, \tag{4.186}$$

which yields $P_{02}(z, f)^3 = P_{03}(z, f)^3$, a contradiction to our assumption that $P_0(z, f)$ has simple roots only. Now equations in (4.182) becomes

$$P_1(z, f) + Q_0(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f)^3(f - q_1),$$

$$P_1(z, f) + \eta Q_0(z, f) = P_{02}(z, \eta f)^3(f - q_1),$$

$$P_1(z, f) + \eta^2 Q_0(z, f) = P_{03}(z, \eta^2 f)^3(f - q_1). \tag{4.187}$$

By doing the transformation $f \rightarrow \eta f$ for the second equation in (4.187) and dividing by $\eta$ both sides of the resulting equation and applying the transformation $f \rightarrow \eta^2 f$ for the third equation in (4.187) and dividing by $\eta^2$ both sides of the resulting equation, respectively, we have

$$P_1(z, f) + Q_0(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f)^3(f - q_1),$$

$$\eta P_1(z, \eta f) + Q_0(z, \eta f) = P_{01}(z, f)^3(f - q_1),$$

$$\eta^2 P_1(z, \eta^2 f) + Q_0(z, \eta^2 f) = P_{01}(z, f)^3(f - q_1). \tag{4.188}$$

Denote the terms free of $f$ in the polynomials $P_1(z, f)$ and $Q_0(z, f)$ by $a_{10}$ and $b_{10}$, respectively. Then by comparing the terms free of $f$ in the polynomials on both sides of above three equations, respectively, we see that $a_{10} + b_{10} = \eta^2 a_{10} + a_{10} = \eta^2 a_{10} + b_{10}$, which yields $a_{10} = 0$. Therefore, $P_1(z, f)$ is of the form

$$P_1(z, f) = P_{11}(z, f) f$$

for some polynomial $P_{11}(z, f)$ in $f$ and it follows that

$$P_{11}(z, f) f + Q_0(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f)^3(f - q_1),$$

$$P_1(z, \eta f) f + Q_0(z, \eta f) = P_{01}(z, f)^3(f - q_1),$$

$$P_1(z, \eta^2 f) f + Q_0(z, \eta^2 f) = P_{01}(z, f)^3(f - q_1). \tag{4.189}$$
Note that $P_{11}(z, f) + P_{11}(z, \eta f) + P_{11}(z, \eta f^2) = 3P_{11}(z, f^3)$ and $Q_{0}(z, f) + Q_{0}(z, \eta f) + Q_{0}(z, \eta^2 f) = 3Q_{0}(z, f^3)$ for two polynomials $P_{11}(z, f^3)$ and $Q_{0}(z, f^3)$ in $f^3$, respectively. By adding the polynomials in the three equations in (4.189) on both sides we get

$$P_{11}(z, f^3)f + Q_{01}(z, f^3) = P_{01}(z, f^3)(f - \eta_1).$$

By comparing the terms on both sides in the polynomials above, we see that the coefficients of terms of degree $3s_1 - 1$, $3s_1 - 4$, $\cdots$, $2$ in the polynomial $P_{01}(z, f^3)(f - \eta_1)$ vanish. As for equation (4.189), we can show that all the roots of the polynomial $P_{01}(z, f)$ are constants and it follows that $P_{11}(z, f)$ and $Q_{0}(z, f)$ both have constant coefficients since we have assumed that $Q_{0}(z, f^3)$ is monic. Then from equations in (4.189) and (4.190) we see that $P_{11}(z, f) = P_{11}(z, f^3)$ and $Q_{0}(z, f) = Q_{0}(z, f^3)$. Now, from equations in (4.182) we have

$$3P_{1}(f) = \left[ P_{01}(f)^3 + P_{01}(\eta f)^3 + P_{01}(\eta^2 f)^3 \right]f$$
$$- \eta_1 [P_{01}(f)^3 + \eta P_{01}(\eta^2 f)^3 + \eta^2 P_{01}(\eta f)^3],$$
$$3Q_{0}(f) = [P_{01}(f)^3 + \eta^2 P_{01}(\eta f)^3 + \eta P_{01}(\eta^2 f)^3]f$$
$$- \eta_1 [P_{01}(f)^3 + \eta P_{01}(\eta^2 f)^3 + \eta^2 P_{01}(\eta f)^3].$$

(4.191)

Similarly, if $\eta_2 = \eta^2 \eta_1$ and $\eta_3 = \eta \eta_1$, then we do the transformations $f \rightarrow \eta f$ and $f \rightarrow \eta^2 f$, respectively, and obtain from equation (4.184) that

$$P_{03}(z, \eta f)^3(f - \eta_1) + \eta P_{03}(z, \eta^2 f)^3(f - \eta_1) + \eta^2 P_{03}(z, \eta f)^3(f - \eta_1) = 0,$$
$$P_{02}(z, \eta^2 f)^3(f - \eta_1) + \eta P_{02}(z, \eta f)^3(f - \eta_1) + \eta^2 P_{02}(z, \eta^2 f)^3(f - \eta_1) = 0.$$ (4.192)

By the same arguments as before, we can also show that $P_{01}(z, f)^3 = P_{03}(z, \eta f)^3 = P_{02}(z, \eta^2 f)^3$, i.e., $P_{02}(z, f)^3 = P_{01}(z, \eta f)^3$ and $P_{03}(z, f)^3 = P_{01}(z, \eta^2 f)^3$. By doing the transformation $f \rightarrow \eta f$ for the second equation in (4.187) and divide by $\eta^3$ both sides of the resulting equation and the transformation $f \rightarrow \eta^2 f$ for the third equation in (4.187) and divide by $\eta$ both sides of the resulting equation, respectively, we have

$$P_{1}(z, f) + Q_{0}(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f^3)(f - \eta_1),$$
$$\eta P_{1}(z, \eta f) + \eta^2 Q_{0}(z, \eta^2 f) = P_{01}(z, f^3)(f - \eta_1),$$
$$\eta^2 P_{1}(z, \eta^2 f) + \eta Q_{0}(z, \eta f) = P_{01}(z, f^3)(f - \eta_1).$$ (4.193)

Then by comparing the terms free of $f$ in the polynomials on both sides of above three equations, respectively, we see that $a_{10} + b_{10} = \eta a_{10} + \eta^2 b_{10} = \eta^2 a_{10} + \eta b_{10}$, where $a_{10}$ and $b_{10}$ denote the terms free of $f$ in the polynomials $P_{1}(z, f)$ and $Q_{0}(z, f)$, respectively, which yields $a_{10} = b_{10} = 0$. But it follows that $P_{1}(z, f)$ and $Q_{0}(z, f)$ are of the form $P_{1}(z, f) = P_{11}(z, f)\eta$ and $Q_{0}(z, f) = Q_{01}(z, f)\eta$ for some polynomial $P_{11}(z, f)$ and $Q_{01}(z, f)$ in $f$, respectively, a contradiction. Therefore, the case where $\eta_2 = \eta^2 \eta_1$ and $\eta_3 = \eta \eta_1$ is impossible. When $p = q$, if $A = 1$, then we see that we can deal with (4.182) in exactly the same way as above by just changing the positions of $P_{1}(z, f)$ and $Q_{0}(z, f)$. In this case, we have $\eta_2 = \eta^2 \eta_1$, $\eta_3 = \eta \eta_1$ and $P_{12}(z, f)^3 = \eta P_{11}(z, \eta f)^3$ and $P_{03}(z, f)^3 = \eta^2 P_{01}(z, \eta^2 f)^3$. Also, $P_{1}(z, f)$ and $Q_{0}(z, f)$ both have constant coefficients. Then from equations in (4.182), we have

$$3P_{1}(f) = \left[ P_{01}(f)^3 + \eta P_{01}(\eta f)^3 + \eta^2 P_{01}(\eta^2 f)^3 \right]f$$
$$- \eta_1 [P_{01}(f)^3 + \eta P_{01}(\eta^2 f)^3 + \eta^2 P_{01}(\eta f)^3],$$
$$3Q_{0}(f) = [P_{01}(f)^3 + \eta P_{01}(\eta f)^3 + \eta^2 P_{01}(\eta^2 f)^3]f$$
$$- \eta_1 [P_{01}(f)^3 + \eta P_{01}(\eta^2 f)^3 + \eta^2 P_{01}(\eta f)^3].$$

(4.194)

where $P_{01}(z, f)$ is a polynomial in $f$ such that the coefficients of terms of degree $3s_1 - 1$, $3s_1 - 4$, $\cdots$, $2$ in the polynomial $P_{01}(z, f)^3(f - \eta_1)$ vanish. If $A \neq 1$, by denoting the leading coefficients the polynomials $P_{1}(z, f)$ and $Q_{0}(z, f)$ by $a_{11}$ and $b_{11}$, respectively, and doing the transformations $f \rightarrow \eta f$ and $f \rightarrow \eta^2 f$, respectively, to $f$ in (4.182), then by similar arguments as in previous cases, we obtain from the resulting equations that $a_{11} + b_{11} = a_{11} + 2b_{11} = a_{11} + \eta b_{11}$. But this yields $a_{11} = b_{11} = 0$, which is impossible since $a_{11} = A - 1$ and $b_{11} = 1$. Therefore, this case cannot occur. Finally, when $p = q - 3$, by following the same processes as in previous cases, we will obtain $P_{01}(z, f)^3 = P_{02}(z, \eta f)^3 = P_{03}(z, \eta^2 f)^3$. 
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or $P_{01}(z, f)^3 = P_{02}(z, \eta^2 f)^3 = P_{03}(z, \eta f)^3$, both of which are impossible since the degrees $s_1$, $s_2$ and $s_3$ are not equal to each other. Therefore, the case $p = q - 3$ cannot occur either.

Now let us see equations in (4.183). Similarly as in previous case, by comparing the degrees of the polynomials in the three equations in (4.183) on both sides, respectively, we have the following possibilities:

(1) when $p - q = 3$, we see that $p_r = q_0 + 1$ and then we have $p_1 = p_2 = p_3$ and $s_2 = s_3 = s_1 + 1$;
(2) when $p - q = 0$, if $A = 1$, we see that $p_r = q_0 = 1$ and then we have $p_1 = p_2 = p_3$ and $s_2 = s_3 = s_1 + 1$; if $A \neq 1$, we see that $p_r = q_0$ and then we have $p_1 = p_2 = p_3$ and $s_2 = s_3 = s_1 + 1$;
(3) when $p - q = -3$, we see that $p_r = q_0$ and then we have $p_2 = p_3 = p_1 + 3$ and $s_2 = s_3 = s_1 + 2$, or $p_3 = p_2 + 3 = p_1 + 3$ and $s_3 = s_2 + 1 = s_1 + 1$, or $p_2 = p_3 + 3 = p_1 + 3$ and $s_2 = s_3 + 1 = s_1 + 1$.

Note that $f$ has no Picard exceptional rational functions. From equations in (4.183), we have

$$P_{01}(z, f)^3(f^3 - 1) + \eta P_{02}(z, f)^3 + \eta^2 P_{03}(z, f)^3 = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.195)

We do the transformations $f \to \eta f$ and $f \to \eta^2 f$, respectively, and obtain from the above equation that

$$P_{01}(z, \eta f)^3(f^3 - 1) + \eta P_{02}(z, \eta f)^3 + \eta^2 P_{03}(z, \eta f)^3 = 0,$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.196)

By the above two equations, we claim that only one of the two polynomials $P_{02}(z, f)$ and $P_{03}(z, f)$ can have roots. Otherwise, by exchanging the role of $\eta$ and $\eta^2$ in the first equation of (4.195), we obtain from the resulting equation and the second equation of (4.196) that

$$[P_{02}(z, \eta^2 f)^3 - P_{03}(z, \eta^2 f)^3](\eta^2 - \eta) = 0,$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.197)

which yields $P_{02}(z, f)^3 = P_{03}(z, \eta^2 f)^3$, a contradiction to our assumption that $P_0(z, f)$ has simple roots only. Then from the above degree relations we see that $p = q - 3$ and that either $p_2 = p_3 = p_1 + 3$ or $p_2 = p_3 + 3 = p_1 + 3$, which means that $P_{01}(z, f)^3$ as well as one of $P_{02}(z, f)^3$ and $P_{03}(z, f)^3$ has no roots. Therefore, either $P_{02}(z, f)^3$ or $P_{03}(z, f)^3$ is of the form $a_{11} f^3$ for some algebraic function $a_{11}$. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that the polynomial $P_{02}(z, f^3)$ has no roots. Moreover, we always have $P_{01}(z, f)^3 = \eta P_{02}(z, \eta f)^3 = \eta^2 a_{11}$ even if we exchange the role of $\eta$ and $\eta^2$. By letting $Q_0(z, f)$ be monic and expanding the polynomials in (4.196), and comparing the coefficients of the polynomials of the resulting equation on both sides, we easily get

$$P_{01}(z, f)^3 = 1 - \eta,$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.198)
$$P_{02}(z, f)^3 = \eta^2 - 1,$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.199)
$$P_{03}(z, f)^3 = (\eta^2 - \eta)f^3.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.200)

It follows that $P_0(z, f)^3 = 3(\eta - \eta^2)f^3(f^3 - 1)$, $Q_0(z, f) = f^3 + \eta$ and $P_1(z, f) = -\eta(f^3 + \eta^2)$. By taking all the results above, we have the fourth part of Theorem 7

**Case 3:** $N_c = 4$.

In this case, by Lemma 11 we know that $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_j$ are all completely ramified rational functions of $f$. Then by the inequality (1.10) we must have $n = 2$. By noting that $2 \mid |p - q|$ and Lemma 11 we have the following possibilities:

$$I^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2} \frac{(f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2)}{(f - \beta_1)(f - \beta_2)},$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.199)
$$J^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2} \frac{(f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2)(f - \alpha_3)(f - \alpha_4)}{(f - \beta_1)(f - \beta_2)(f - \beta_3)(f - \beta_4)},$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.200)
$$K^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2} \frac{1}{(f - \beta_1)(f - \beta_2)(f - \beta_3)(f - \beta_4)},$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.201)
$$L^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2} \frac{(f - \alpha_1)(f - \alpha_2)(f - \alpha_3)}{(f - \beta_1)},$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.202)
$$M^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2} \frac{(f - \alpha_1)}{(f - \beta_1)(f - \beta_2)(f - \beta_3)}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.203)
For convenience, we denote the four roots $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_j$ in each of the above equations by $\gamma_1$, $\gamma_2$, $\gamma_3$ and $\gamma_4$. If $\gamma_i \neq 0$ for some $i$, then by Lemmas 1 and 3 it follows that $\pm \gamma_i$ are both completely ramified rational functions of $f$ with multiplicities 2. This implies that none of $\gamma_1$, $\gamma_2$, $\gamma_3$ and $\gamma_4$ is zero for otherwise $f$ would have at least five completely ramified rational functions, a contradiction to Theorem 2. Moreover, by the inequality (4.3) we must have $\gamma_1^2 = \gamma_2^2$ and $\gamma_3^2 = \gamma_4^2$, apart from permutations. Also, by Lemma 4 we know that in each of the above equations all the roots of $P_0(z, f)$ and $Q_0(z, f)$ are simple and the degrees of $P(z, f)$ and $Q(z, f)$ satisfy $p - q \in \{-2, 0, 2\}$. In particular, for equation (4.201), we see that if $0$ is the only root of $P_0(z, f)$ then we must have $p = 2$ and $q = 4$ under the assumption that $n < d$. Therefore, by doing a linear transformation $f \to 1/f$, equations (4.201) and (4.202) become (4.200) and (4.202), respectively. From the above reasoning we have

From equations in (4.209) we have

$$\gamma^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - \kappa^2)}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1)}.$$  

Since $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ and $\beta_4$ are four completely ramified rational functions of $f$, then by Lemma 5 we conclude that the RHS of equation (4.201) is of the form $P_1(z, f)^2$ for some polynomial $P_1(z, f)$ in $f$ with simple roots only and none of these roots is equal to $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ or $\beta_4$. Note that $p - q \in \{-2, 0, 2, 4\}$. Since the degrees $p$ and $q$ are both odd integers, this is possible only when $p = q$ and the leading coefficient $a_p$ of the numerator $P(z, f)$ satisfies $a_p = \gamma^2_1$ so that the terms with the highest degree in the two polynomials $P_1(z, f)^2(f^2 - \kappa^2)(f + \beta_4)$ and $\gamma^2_1 Q_0(z, f)^2(f - \beta_4)$ cancel out. It follows by these arguments that $a_p = \gamma^2_1 = \gamma^2_2 = \gamma^2_3 = \gamma^2_4$, which is impossible. Therefore, we only need to consider the two equations (4.199) and (4.200). Below we discuss them, respectively.

**Subcase 1: Equation (4.199).**

From the previous discussions, we have two cases to consider: (1), $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 0$, $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = 0$; or (2), $\alpha_1 + \beta_1 = 0, \alpha_2 + \beta_2 = 0$.

See the first case. We may let $\alpha_1 = \kappa$ and $\beta_1 = 1$ by doing a linear transformation $f \to \beta_1 f$. We consider

$$\mathcal{T}^2 - \kappa^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - \kappa^2) - \kappa^2 Q_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1)}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1)}.$$  

(4.205)

Since $\pm 1$ and $\pm \kappa$ are four completely ramified rational functions of $f$, then by Lemma 5 we conclude that the numerator of the RHS of equation (4.205) is of the form $P_1(z, f)^2$ for some polynomial $P_1(z, f)$ in $f$ with simple roots only and none of these roots is $\pm 1$ or $\pm \kappa$. Similarly, by considering $\mathcal{T}^2 - 1$, we also have $P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - \kappa^2) - Q_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1) = P_2(z, f)^2$ for some polynomial $P_2(z, f)$ in $f$ with simple roots only and none of these roots is $\pm 1$ or $\pm \kappa$. Now we have

$$\mathcal{T}^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - \kappa^2)}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1)},$$  

(4.206)

and further that

$$\mathcal{T}^2 - \kappa^2 = \frac{P_1(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1)}.$$  

(4.207)

and

$$\mathcal{T}^2 - 1 = \frac{P_2(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1)}.$$  

(4.208)

Moreover, as for equations (4.80) and (4.81), when $p = q$ and $A = 1$, the degree of the numerator in (4.207) or in (4.208) decreases and by Lemma 5 it decreases by 2. From the above reasoning we have

$$P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - \kappa^2) - \kappa^2 Q_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1) = P_1(z, f)^2,$$

(4.209)

and

$$P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - \kappa^2) - Q_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1) = P_2(z, f)^2.$$  

From equations in (4.209) we have

$$(1 - \kappa^2)P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - \kappa^2) = [P_1(z, f) + \kappa P_2(z, f)][P_1(z, f) - \kappa P_2(z, f)],$$

$$1 - \kappa^2)Q_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1) = [P_1(z, f) + P_2(z, f)][P_1(z, f) - P_2(z, f)].$$  

(4.210)
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Therefore, we may write
\[
\begin{align*}
P_1(z, f) + \pi P_2(z, f) &= (1 + \pi) P_0(z, f), \\
P_1(z, f) - \pi P_2(z, f) &= (1 - \pi) P_0(z, f), \\
P_1(z, f) + P_2(z, f) &= (1 + \pi) Q_0(z, f), \\
P_1(z, f) + P_2(z, f) &= (1 + \pi) Q_0(z, f),
\end{align*}
\]
(4.211)
where \( P_0(z, f) \) and \( P_0(z, f) \) are two polynomials in \( f \) such that \( P_0(z, f)P_0(z, f) = P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - \kappa^2) \) and \( Q_0(z, f) \) and \( Q_0(z, f) \) are two polynomials in \( f \) such that \( Q_0(z, f) Q_0(z, f) = Q_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1) \). Since \( P_0(z, f) \) and \( P_0(z, f) \), as well as \( Q_0(z, f) \) and \( Q_0(z, f) \), have no common roots, we can write
\[
\begin{align*}
P_0(z, f) &= a_{11} P_0(z, f)^2(f - \kappa)^{0_{11}}, \\
P_0(z, f) &= a_{12} P_0(z, f)^2(f - \kappa)^{0_{22}}, \\
Q_0(z, f) &= b_{11} Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{0_{11}}, \\
Q_0(z, f) &= b_{12} Q_0(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{0_{22}},
\end{align*}
\]
(4.212)
where \( \theta_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \), \( \theta_{11} + \theta_{22} = 1 \) and \( \theta_{31} + \theta_{41} = 1 \), \( a_{11}, a_{12}, b_{11} \) and \( b_{12} \) are in general algebraic functions, \( P_0(z, f)^2 \) and \( P_0(z, f)^2 \) are two monic polynomials in \( f \) with no common roots such that \( a_{11} \b_2 \b_1^2 P_0(z, f)^2 P_0(z, f)^2 = P_0(z, f)^2 \) and \( Q_0(z, f)^2 \) and \( Q_0(z, f)^2 \) are two monic polynomials in \( f \) with no common roots such that \( b_{11} b_{22} Q_0(z, f)^2 Q_0(z, f)^2 = Q_0(z, f)^2 \). Note that \( a_{11} a_{12} = A \) and \( b_{11} b_{12} = 1 \). From equations in (4.211), we get
\[
\begin{align*}
2P_1(z, f) &= (1 + \pi) P_0(z, f) + (1 - \pi) P_0(z, f) = (1 + \pi) Q_0(z, f) + (1 - \pi) Q_0(z, f), \\
2\pi P_2(z, f) &= (1 + \pi) P_0(z, f) - (1 - \pi) P_0(z, f) = \pi[(1 + \pi) Q_0(z, f) - (1 - \pi) Q_0(z, f)].
\end{align*}
\]
(4.213)
By solving \( Q_0(z, f) \) and \( Q_0(z, f) \) from the above two equations in (4.213) we have
\[
\begin{align*}
2\pi(1 + \pi) Q_0(z, f) &= (1 + \pi)^2 P_0(z, f) - (1 - \pi)^2 P_0(z, f), \\
-2\pi Q_0(z, f) &= (1 + \pi) P_0(z, f) - (1 - \pi) P_0(z, f).
\end{align*}
\]
(4.214)
Note that \( f \) has no Picard exceptional rational functions. Since \( \kappa^2 \neq 1 \), if both \( P_0(z, f) \) and \( P_0(z, f) \) have roots, then by the same arguments as in the reasoning after equation (4.111), we can exchange the role of the roots of \( P_0(z, f) \) and \( P_0(z, f) \) and obtain a contradiction from any of the two equations in (4.111). We omit those details. Therefore, only one of the two polynomials \( P_0(z, f) \) and \( P_0(z, f) \) can have roots, which implies that \( P_0(z, f) \) has at most 2 distinct roots. If \( P_0(z, f) \) has 2 distinct roots, then, without loss of generality, we may suppose that \( P_0(z, f) \) has two roots and \( P_0(z, f) \) has no roots. It follows that the degree of \( P_0(z, f) \) is greater than the degree of \( P_0(z, f) \) since \( p - q \in \{-2, 0, 2\} \), and thus the degree of \( Q_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1) \) is at least 8, which implies that \( Q_0(z, f) \) and \( Q_0(z, f) \) both have at least one root. However, from equations in (4.213) we can also solve \( P_0(z, f) \) and \( P_0(z, f) \) and linearly express \( P_0(z, f) \) and \( P_0(z, f) \) in terms of \( Q_0(z, f) \) and \( Q_0(z, f) \). This leads to a contradiction as above. Therefore, \( P_0(z, f) \) as well as \( Q_0(z, f) \) has at most one root. Further, if \( P_0(z, f) \) and \( Q_0(z, f) \) both have one root, then we may write \( P_0(z, f) \), \( P_0(z, f) \), \( Q_0(z, f) \) and \( Q_0(z, f) \) in the following form
\[
\begin{align*}
P_0(z, f) &= a_{11}(f - a)^2, \\
P_0(z, f) &= a_{12}(f^2 - \kappa^2), \\
Q_0(z, f) &= b_{11}(f - b)^2, \\
Q_0(z, f) &= b_{12}(f^2 - 1),
\end{align*}
\]
(4.215)
where \( a \) and \( b \) are in general algebraic functions. By equations in (4.215) we have
\[
\begin{align*}
2\pi(1 + \pi)b_{11}(f - b)^2 &= (1 + \pi)^2 a_{11}(f - a)^2 - (1 - \pi)^2 a_{12}(f^2 - \kappa^2), \\
-2\pi b_{12}(f^2 - 1) &= (1 + \pi)a_{11}(f - a)^2 - (1 - \pi)a_{12}(f^2 - \kappa^2)
\end{align*}
\]
(4.216)
By expanding the polynomials in the above equations and comparing the terms of degree 1 in the resulting equations on both sides, we easily get \( a = b = 0 \), a contradiction. This implies that either \( P_0(z, f) \) or \( Q_0(z, f) \) has one root. Then by writing \( P_0(z, f) \), \( P_0(z, f) \), \( Q_0(z, f) \) and \( Q_0(z, f) \) as in the form of (4.215), it is easy to show by the previous method that this root of \( P_0(z, f) \) and \( Q_0(z, f) \) is 0. Now, for equations in (4.209), we conclude from the above discussions that
(1) when \( p = 4 \) and \( q = 2 \), we have
\[
Af^2(f^2 - \kappa^2) - \overline{\kappa}f(f^2 - 1) = A(f^2 - c_1^2),
\]
\[
Af^2(f^2 - \kappa^2) = (f^2 - c_2^2),
\]  
(4.217)

(2) when \( p = 2 \) and \( q = 4 \), we have
\[
A(f^2 - \kappa^2) = -\overline{\kappa}^2(f^2 - d_1^2),
\]
\[
A(f^2 - \kappa^2) = -(f^2 - d_2^2),
\]  
(4.218)

where \( c_1^2, c_2^2, d_1^2 \) and \( d_2^2 \) are in general algebraic functions. By using the method for solving equation (4.222), i.e., expanding the polynomials in (4.217) and comparing the coefficients of the resulting equations on both sides, respectively, we finally obtain \( A^2\kappa^2 = 1 \), \( (A + 1)^2 = 4A^3 \), \( 2A^3c_1^2 = A + 1 \) and \( 2A^3c_2^2 = A + 1 \). Since \( A \neq 1 \), we see that \( 4A^2 + 3A + 1 = 0 \). Similarly, from the equations in (4.218), we obtain \( A^2 = \kappa^2 \), \( 4A^2 + 3A + 1 = 0 \), \( 2Ad_1^2 = A + 1 \) and \( 2d_2^2 = A + 1 \). Thus we have the fifth part of Theorem 7.

See the second case. We may let \( \alpha_1 = \kappa \) and \( \alpha_2 = 1 \) by doing a linear transformation \( f \rightarrow \alpha_2f \). Now we have
\[
\mathcal{T}^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2(f - \kappa)(f - 1)}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f + \kappa)(f + 1)},
\]  
(4.219)

and further, by considering \( \mathcal{T}^2 - 1 \) and \( \mathcal{T}^2 - \overline{\kappa}^2 \) similarly as in the first case, respectively, we have
\[
\mathcal{T}^2 - \overline{\kappa}^2 = \frac{P_1(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f + \kappa)(f + 1)},
\]  
(4.220)

and
\[
\mathcal{T}^2 - 1 = \frac{P_2(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2(f + \kappa)(f + 1)},
\]  
(4.221)

where \( P_1(z, f) \) and \( P_2(z, f) \) are two polynomials in \( f \) with simple roots only and none of these roots is equal to \( \pm \kappa \) or \( \pm \overline{\kappa} \). Moreover, as for equations (4.219) and (4.221), when \( p = q \) and \( A = 1 \), the degree of the numerator in (4.220) or in (4.221) decreases by \( 2 \). Then we have
\[
P_0(z, f)^2(f - \kappa)(f - 1) - \overline{\kappa}^2Q_0(z, f)^2(f + \kappa)(f + 1) = P_1(z, f)^2,
\]
\[
P_0(z, f)^2(f - \kappa)(f - 1) - Q_0(z, f)^2(f + \kappa)(f + 1) = P_2(z, f)^2.
\]  
(4.222)

Similarly as in the first case, we can obtain from equations in (4.222) that \( P_0(z, f)^2(f - \kappa)(f - 1) = P_{01}(z, f)P_{02}(z, f) \) and \( Q_0(z, f)^2(f + \kappa)(f + 1) = Q_{01}(z, f)Q_{02}(z, f) \), and \( P_{01}(z, f), P_{02}(z, f), Q_{01}(z, f) \) and \( Q_{02}(z, f) \) are polynomials in \( f \) and of the following form:
\[
P_{01}(z, f) = a_{11}P_{01}(z, f)^2(f - \kappa)^{\theta_{11}}(f - 1)^{\theta_{12}},
\]
\[
P_{02}(z, f) = a_{12}P_{02}(z, f)^2(f - \kappa)^{\theta_{21}}(f - 1)^{\theta_{22}},
\]
\[
Q_{01}(z, f) = b_{11}Q_{01}(z, f)^2(f + \kappa)^{\gamma_{11}}(f + 1)^{\gamma_{12}},
\]
\[
Q_{02}(z, f) = b_{12}Q_{02}(z, f)^2(f + \kappa)^{\gamma_{21}}(f + 1)^{\gamma_{22}},
\]
where \( \theta_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}, \theta_{ij} + \theta_{1j} = 1 \) and \( \theta_{ij} + \theta_{2j} = 1 \), \( a_{11}, a_{12}, b_{11} \) and \( b_{12} \) are in general algebraic functions, \( P_{01}(z, f)^2 \) and \( P_{02}(z, f)^2 \) are two monic polynomials in \( f \) with no common roots such that \( a_{11}b_{11}P_{01}(z, f)^2P_{02}(z, f)^2 = P_{0}(z, f)^2 \), and \( Q_{01}(z, f)^2 \) and \( Q_{02}(z, f)^2 \) are two monic polynomials in \( f \) with no common roots such that \( b_{11}b_{12}Q_{01}(z, f)^2Q_{02}(z, f)^2 = Q_{0}(z, f)^2 \). Note that \( a_{11}a_{12} = A \) and \( b_{11}b_{12} = 1 \). Moreover, \( P_{01}(z, f), P_{02}(z, f), Q_{01}(z, f) \) and \( Q_{02}(z, f) \) satisfy the relations in (4.218) and (4.219). Since \( \kappa^2 \neq 1 \), then by similar arguments as in the first case, we can show that \( P_{0}(z, f) \) as well as \( Q_{0}(z, f) \) has at most one root. Since \( p - q \in \{-2, 0, 2\} \), then by the relations in (4.214) we see that for each of the three cases where \( p = q = 4 \), or \( p = 4 \) and \( q = 2 \), or \( p = 2 \) and \( q = 4 \), we can assume that \( P_{01}(z, f) \) is of the form \( a_{11}(f - 1)(f - \kappa) \) and that \( Q_{01}(z, f) \) is of the form \( b_{11}(f + 1)(f + \kappa) \). Now we have the relation in (4.214), i.e.,
\[
2(1 + \overline{\kappa})b_{11}(f + 1)(f + \kappa) = (1 + \overline{\kappa})^2a_{11}(f - 1)(f - \kappa) - (1 - \overline{\kappa})^2a_{12}P_{01}(z, f)^2,
\]
\[
-2\overline{\kappa}b_{12}Q_{01}(z, f)^2 = (1 + \overline{\kappa})a_{11}(f - 1)(f - \kappa) - (1 + \overline{\kappa})a_{12}P_{01}(z, f)^2.
\]  
(4.223)
Recall that we have made the transformation $f \rightarrow \alpha_1 f$ for equation (4.199). By the same arguments as in the reasoning after equation (4.80), we may exchange the role of the roots 1 and $\kappa$ and obtain from any of the equations in (4.226) and the resulting equation that $\kappa = 1$, a contradiction. We omit those details. Therefore, equation (4.199) cannot have any meromorphic solution when $\alpha_1 + \beta_1 = 0$, $\alpha_2 + \beta_2 = 0$.

**Subcase 2: Equation (4.200).**

We have $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 0$ and $\alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = 0$. We may suppose that $\alpha_1 = 1$ and $\alpha_3 = \kappa$ by doing a linear transformation $f \rightarrow \alpha_1 f$. Now we have

$$
\mathcal{T}^2 = \frac{P_0(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2}(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2),
$$

(4.224)

and, further, by applying the analysis after equation (4.205) to $\mathcal{T}^2 - 1$ and $\mathcal{T}^2 - \mathcal{Q}^2$, respectively, we have

$$
\mathcal{T}^2 - 1 = \frac{P_1(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2},
$$

(4.225)

and

$$
\mathcal{T}^2 - \mathcal{Q}^2 = \frac{P_2(z, f)^2}{Q_0(z, f)^2},
$$

(4.226)

where $P_1(z, f)$ and $P_2(z, f)$ are two polynomials in $f$ with simple roots only and none of these roots is equal to $\pm \kappa$ or $\pm 1$. Moreover, as for equations (4.80) and (4.81), when $p = q$ and $A = 1$, the degree of the numerator in (4.225) or in (4.226) decreases and by Lemma 5 it decreases by 2. Now we have

$$
P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2) - \mathcal{Q}^2Q_0(z, f)^2 = P_1(z, f)^2,
$$

(4.227)

and

$$
P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2) - Q_0(z, f)^2 = P_2(z, f)^2.
$$

From the first equation of (4.227) we get

$$
[P_1(z, f) + i\kappa Q_0(z, f)][P_1(z, f) - i\kappa Q_0(z, f)] = P_0(z, f)^2(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2),
$$

(4.228)

and it follows that

$$
P_1(z, f) + i\kappa Q_0(z, f) = P_0(z, f),
$$

(4.229)

$$
P_1(z, f) - i\kappa Q_0(z, f) = P_0(z, f),
$$

(4.229)

where $P_{01}(z, f)$ and $P_{02}(z, f)$ are two polynomials in $f$ such that $P_{01}(z, f)P_{02}(z, f) = P_0(z, f)^2(1)(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2)$. Since $P_{01}(z, f)$ and $P_{02}(z, f)$ have no common roots, we can write

$$
P_{01}(z, f) = a_{11}P_{011}(z, f)f^{-1}(f + 1)\theta_{11}(f - \kappa)^{\theta_{11}}(f - \kappa)^{\theta_{14}},
$$

(4.230)

$$
P_{02}(z, f) = a_{12}P_{012}(z, f)f^{-1}(f + 1)\theta_{21}(f - \kappa)^{\theta_{21}}(f - \kappa)^{\theta_{24}},
$$

(4.230)

where $\theta_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\theta_{ij} + \theta_{2j} = 1$, $a_{11}$ and $a_{12}$ are in general algebraic functions, $P_{011}(z, f)^2$ and $P_{012}(z, f)^2$ are two monic polynomials in $f$ with no common roots such that $a_{11}a_{12}P_{011}(z, f)^2P_{012}(z, f)^2 = P_0(z, f)^2$. Note that $a_{11}a_{12} = A$. Then from equations in (4.229) we obtain

$$
2i\kappa Q_0(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f) - P_{02}(z, f),
$$

(4.231)

$$
2P_1(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f) + P_{02}(z, f).
$$

(4.231)

Similarly, from the second equation of (4.227), we obtain

$$
2iQ_0(z, f) = P_{03}(z, f) - P_{04}(z, f),
$$

(4.232)

$$
2P_2(z, f) = P_{03}(z, f) + P_{04}(z, f),
$$

(4.232)

where $P_{03}(z, f)$ and $P_{04}(z, f)$ are two polynomials in $f$ such that $P_{03}(z, f)P_{04}(z, f) = P_0(z, f)^2(1)(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2)$ and

$$
P_{03}(z, f) = a_{13}P_{013}(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{\theta_{31}}(f + 1)^{\theta_{32}}(f - \kappa)^{\theta_{33}}(f - \kappa)^{\theta_{34}},
$$

(4.233)

$$
P_{04}(z, f) = a_{14}P_{014}(z, f)^2(f - 1)^{\theta_{41}}(f + 1)^{\theta_{42}}(f - \kappa)^{\theta_{43}}(f - \kappa)^{\theta_{44}},
$$

(4.233)
where $\theta_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\theta_{3j} + \theta_{4j} = 1$, $a_{13}$ and $a_{14}$ are in general algebraic functions, $P_{013}(z, f)^2$ and $P_{014}(z, f)^2$ are two monic polynomials in $f$ with no common roots and $a_{13}a_{14}P_{014}(z, f)^2P_{013}(z, f)^2 = P_0(z, f)^2$. Note that $a_{13}a_{14} = A$. Denote the degrees of the two polynomials $P_{01}(z, f)$ and $P_{02}(z, f)$ by $p_1$ and $p_2$ and the two polynomials $P_{03}(z, f)$ and $P_{04}(z, f)$ by $p_3$ and $p_4$, respectively. Since $p - q \in \{-2, 0, 2\}$, we see that $p_1 - p_2 \in \{-2, 0, 2\}$ and $p_3 - p_4 \in \{-2, 0, 2\}$. It follows from the first equations in (4.231) and (4.232) that

$$2\kappa Q_0(z, f) = P_{01}(z, f) - P_{02}(z, f) = \pi_i P_{03}(z, f) - P_{04}(z, f).$$

(4.234)

Note that $f$ has no Picard exceptional rational functions. Since $\kappa^2 \neq 1$, then by the same arguments as in the reasoning after equation (4.118), we easily show that only one of $P_{011}(z, f)$ and $P_{012}(z, f)$ can have some roots and that only one of $P_{013}(z, f)$ and $P_{014}(z, f)$ can have some roots as well. This implies that $P_0(z, f)$ has at most one root.

If $P_0(z, f)$ has one root, then $p = 6$ and we see that $p_1 = 2$ or $p_2 = 2$. Denote the degrees of the two polynomials $P_{03}(z, f)$ and $P_{04}(z, f)$ by $p_3$ and $p_4$, respectively. We may suppose that $p_1 = p_3 = 4$ and $p_2 = p_4 = 2$. From the equations in (4.234) we see that the polynomials $P_{01}(z, f)$ and $\pi P_{01}(z, f)$ have the same leading coefficients and the polynomial $P_{01}(z, f) - \pi P_{03}(z, f)$ has degree 2. Therefore, without loss of generality, we may write

$$P_{01}(z, f) = a_{11}(f - a)^2(f^2 - \kappa^2),$$

$$P_{02}(z, f) = a_{12}(f^2 - 1),$$

$$P_{03}(z, f) = a_{13}(f - a)^2(f^2 - 1),$$

$$P_{04}(z, f) = a_{14}(f^2 - \kappa^2),$$

where $a$ is in general an algebraic function. By the equations in (4.234), we have

$$a_{11}(f - a)^2(f^2 - \kappa^2) - \pi a_{13}(f - a)^2(f^2 - 1) = a_{12}(f^2 - 1) - \pi a_{14}(f^2 - \kappa^2).$$

(4.236)

Since $a_{11} = \pi a_{13}$, we easily see that $a = 0$, $\pi a_{13}(1 - \kappa^2) = a_{12} - \pi a_{14}$ and $a_{12} = \pi \kappa^2 a_{14}$. Note that $a_{11}a_{12} = a_{13}a_{14}$. From these equations we obtain $\pi^2 = \kappa^2$, which implies that $\kappa$ is a constant. Then we have $a_{12} = -\kappa^2 a_{11}$ and $a_{14} = -a_{13}$. Now from the first equations in (4.231) and (4.232) we have

$$2\kappa Q_0(z, f) = a_{11}(f^4 - \kappa^2) = \kappa a_{13}(f^4 - \kappa^2).$$

(4.237)

Recall that we have assumed the leading coefficient of $Q_0(z, f)^2$ to be 1. Then we have $\kappa^2 a_{13} = -4$ and it follows that $a_{13} = -\kappa^2 a_{12} = -4\kappa^2$. Therefore, we have $A^2 = 16$ and thus $A = \pm 4$.

If $P_0(z, f)$ has no roots, then from the equations in (4.234) we easily see that: If $p_1 \neq p_2$, then we have $p_1 = 2$ and $p_2 = 0$ and it follows that $q = 4$; if $p_1 = p_2$, then we have $p_1 = p_2 = 2$ and it follows that $q = 2$ or $q = 4$. When $q = 4$, $P_{01}(z, f)$ and $P_{02}(z, f)$, as well as $P_{03}(z, f)$ and $P_{04}(z, f)$, are both polynomials in $f$ of degree 2. Suppose that $p = q = 4$ and $A \neq 1$ and $A \neq \pi^2$. By equations in (4.234), we see that the leading coefficients of $P_1(z, f)$ and $P_2(z, f)$, denoted by $A_1$ and $A_2$ satisfy $A_1^2 = A - \pi^2$ and $A_2^2 = A - \pi^2$, respectively. Note that $a_{11}a_{12} = a_{13}a_{14} = A$. By the equations in (4.231) and (4.232), we expand the polynomials there and compare the leading coefficients of the resulting equations on both sides and get

$$a_{11}^2 - 2\pi i a_{11} - A = 0,$$

$$a_{12}^2 - 2A_1 a_{11} - A = 0,$$

(4.238)

and

$$a_{13}^2 - 2i a_{13} - A = 0,$$

$$a_{14}^2 - 2A_2 a_{13} - A = 0.$$  

(4.239)

Together with the assumption $\pi^2 \neq 1$ and the relations $A_1^2 = A - \pi^2$ and $A_2^2 = A - \pi^2$, it is easy to check by elementary computations that the two quadratic equations with respect to $a_{11}$ in (4.238), as well as the two quadratic equations with respect to $a_{13}$ in (4.239), have no common solutions. This implies that when $p = q = 4$, we must have $A = 1$ or $A = \pi^2$. Therefore, in this case, for equations in (4.227),
(1) when \( p = 4 \) and \( q = 2 \), we have
\[
A(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2) - \pi^2(f - \alpha)^2 = A(f - c_1)^2(f - d_1)^2,
\]
(4.240)
\[
A(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2) - (f - \alpha)^2 = A(f - c_2)^2(f - d_2)^2,
\]
(2) when \( p = q = 4 \) and \( A = \pi^2 \), we have
\[
\pi^2(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2) - \pi^2(f - \alpha)^2(f - b)^2 = c(f - c_1)^2,
\]
(4.241)
\[
\pi^2(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2) - (f - \alpha)^2(f - b)^2 = (\pi^2 - 1)(f - c_2)^2(f - d_2)^2,
\]
(3) when \( p = q = 4 \) and \( A = 1 \), we have
\[
(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2) - \pi^2(f - \alpha)^2(f - b)^2 = (1 - \pi^2)(f - c_1)^2(f - d_1)^2,
\]
(4.242)
\[
(f^2 - 1)(f^2 - \kappa^2) - (f - \alpha)^2(f - b)^2 = c(f - c_2)^2,
\]
where \( a, b, c, c_1, d_1, c_2 \) and \( d_2 \) are in general algebraic functions. As for solving equation \([13, \text{Theorem 2}]\), by expanding the equations in \([4.210]\) and comparing the coefficients of the resulting equations on both sides, respectively, we first easily observe from the terms of degree 3 in the resulting equations that \( c_1 + d_1 = c_2 + d_2 = 0 \) and it follows that \( a = 0 \); we finally obtain \( A = -1/2 \), \((\kappa^2 - 1)^2 = 4\kappa^2, c_1^2 = 1 - \kappa^2 \) and \( c_2^2 = \kappa^2 - 1 \). Similarly, from equations in \([4.211]\) we obtain \( c_3 = 0, a + b = 0, c_2 + d_2 = 0, c_1^2 + c_2^2 = 0, \kappa^2 = a^4, c = -\kappa^2(\kappa \pm 1)^2, \kappa^2 + 3\kappa + 4 = 0 \) and from equations in \([4.212]\) we obtain \( c_2 = 0, a + b = 0, c_1 + d_1 = 0, a^2 + c_2^2 = 0, \kappa^2 = c_2, c = -(\kappa \pm 1)^2, 4\kappa^2 - 3\kappa + 1 = 0 \). The above results together give the sixth part of Theorem \([7]\) and also the complete proof.

5 Discussion

In sections \([2,4]\) we gave the classification of equation \([2.1]\) under the assumptions that equation \([2.1]\) has a transcendental meromorphic solution and the degree of \( R(z, f) \) in \( f \) satisfies \( d \neq n \). This classification is according to the number \( N_c \) of the roots \( \alpha_i \) in \([2.7]\) and \( \beta_j \) in \([2.8]\) and whether some of these roots is zero. We did this by mainly using five lemmas, i.e., Lemmas \([1,5,9]\) in section \([2]\). From their proofs, we see that with some simple adjustments these lemmas also apply to the case \( d = n \) of equation \([2.1]\), which is studied in our previous paper \([13]\). By applying these lemmas to equation \([2.1]\) for the case \( d = n \) and using the method in the proofs of Theorems \([5,7]\) of the proof of \([13]\) Theorem \([2]\) may be simplified. Below we first show how this may happen.

Suppose now we have \( \deg(R(z, f)) = n \) in \([2.1]\). We also assume the notation in section \([2]\). Note that \( P_0(z, f)^n = a_0 \) or \( P_0(z, f)^n = a_0(f - \alpha)^n \) in \([2.7]\) and \( Q_0(z, f)^n = 1 \) or \( Q_0(z, f)^n = (f - \beta)^n \) in \([2.8]\).

From the proof of \([13, \text{Theorem 2}]\), we easily get the following Lemmas \([5,7]\).

**Lemma 6** Let \( f \) be a transcendental meromorphic solution of equation \([2.1]\). Then \( \alpha_i \) is either a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \) or a completely ramified rational function of \( f \) with multiplicity \( n/(n, k_i) \) and \( \beta_j \) is either a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \) or a completely ramified rational function of \( f \) with multiplicity \( n/(n, l_j) \). Moreover, if \( q = 0 \), then \( N_c \in \{2, 3]\); if \( q \geq 1 \), then \( N_c \in \{2, 3, 4\} \).

**Proof.** The assertions that \( \alpha_i \) is either a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \) or a completely ramified rational function of \( f \) with multiplicity \( n/(n, k_i) \) and \( \beta_j \) is either a Picard exceptional rational function of \( f \) or a completely ramified rational function of \( f \) with multiplicity \( n/(n, l_j) \) are direct results from the proof of \([13]\). Now the inequality \([1.6]\) implies that \( N_c \leq 4 \). However, when \( q = 0 \), if \( N_c = 4 \), then by the inequality \([1.6]\) we have that the multiplicities of \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_4 \) are all equal to \( 2 \), implying that \( k_i = n/2 \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \), which is impossible. Therefore, when \( q = 0 \) we have \( N_c = 2 \) or \( N_c = 3 \). The proof is complete.

**Lemma 7** Let \( f \) be a transcendental meromorphic solution of equation \([2.1]\). Then none of \( \alpha_i \) in \([2.7]\) is 0. Moreover, if \( q \geq 1 \), then after doing a bilinear transformation \( f \rightarrow 1/f \), we have \( p = q = n \).

By Lemma \([7]\) below we only consider \([2.1]\) for the two cases where \( p = n \), \( q = 0 \) or \( p = q = n \). Moreover, if \( P(z, f) \) has two or more distinct roots, then none of them vanishes identically. Note that now we have either \( \mu = 0 \) or \( \mu \geq 2 \) in \([2.4]\) and either \( \nu = 0 \) or \( \nu \geq 2 \) in \([2.8]\). Below we use the idea in the proof of Lemma \([3]\) to prove the following.
Lemma 8 Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic solution of equation (2.1) and $γ \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ be a rational function. Then $γ$ cannot be a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$. Moreover, if $γ$ is a completely ramified function of $f$ with multiplicity at least $m$, then $ωγ$ is a completely ramified function of $f$ with multiplicity at least $m$, where $ω$ is the $n$-th root of 1. In particular, if $0$ is a root of $Q(z, f)$, then $0$ is not a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$.

Proof. Suppose that $γ \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ is a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$. Under our assumptions on equation (2.1), we have that at least one of $α_i$ and $β_j$ in (2.7) and (2.8) is non-zero. Denote this $α_i$ or $β_j$ by $β$ and the order of this root by $t_1$. As in the proof of Lemma 8 we also put

$$u = \frac{\mathcal{f}}{f - β}, \quad v = \frac{1}{f - β}, \quad (5.1)$$

Then $u$ and $v$ are two algebroid functions with at most finitely branch points and we have

$$\mathcal{f} = \frac{u}{v}, \quad f = \frac{1}{v} + β, \quad (5.2)$$

and it follows that (2.1) becomes

$$u^n = \frac{P_i(z, v)}{Q_i(z, v)} e^{\omega n}, \quad (5.3)$$

where $n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $P_i(z, v)$ and $Q_i(z, v)$ are two polynomials in $v$ having no common factors and none of the roots of $P_i(z, v)$ or $Q_i(z, v)$ is zero. Denote by $p_1 = \deg_v(P_i(z, v))$ the degree of $P_i(z, v)$ in $v$ and by $q_1 = \deg_v(Q_i(z, v))$ the degree of $Q_i(z, v)$ in $v$, respectively. By simple calculations, when $p = n$, $q = 0$ we get $n_1 = 0$, $p_1 = p - t_1$ and $q_1 = 0$; when $p = q = n$ and $β = α_i$ we get $n_1 = n$, $p_1 = p - t_1$, and $q_1 = n$; when $p = q = n$ and $β = β_j$ we get $n_1 = n$, $p_1 = n$ and $q_1 = n - t_1$. Therefore, we always have $p_1 - q_1 + n_1 \neq n$. Then by the same arguments in the proof of Lemma 8 we may consider the roots of $\mathcal{f} - \omega = 0$ and also $\mathcal{f} - \omega_{-1} = 0$, where $ω$ is the $n$-th root of 1, and finally obtain that the equation $\mathcal{f} - \omega = 0$ can have at most finitely many roots, i.e., $ωγ$ is a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$.

This implies that $n = 2$. Recall that there are at least two distinct $α_i$ and $β_j$ in (2.7) and (2.8) and $γ$ is non-zero. Even though $γ = β$, by Lemma 9 the other $α_i$ or $β_j$ is either a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$ or a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity, a contradiction to Picard’s theorem or the inequality (1.6). Therefore, $γ$ cannot be a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$.

Next, we suppose that $γ \neq 0$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity at least $m$. We also do the transformations in (5.1) and get the equation in (5.3). Then by the same arguments in the proof of Lemma 8 we easily obtain that the equation $\mathcal{f} - \omega = 0$ can have at most finitely many roots with multiplicities less than $m$, i.e., $ωγ$ is also a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity at least $m$.

Finally, since there are at least two distinct $α_i$ and $β_j$ in (2.7) and (2.8) and one of them, say $γ$, is non-zero, then $ωγ$ is a completely ramified function of $f$ with multiplicity at least $m \geq 2$, where $ω$ is the $n$-th root of 1. Now, if $0$ is a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$, then by Lemma 9 we have that there is only one such non-zero $β_j$. But it follows that the only root of $P(z, f)$ is also a Picard exceptional rational function of $f$, a contradiction to (1.6). The proof is complete.

Corresponding to Lemma 8 in the case when $\deg(R(z, f)) \neq n$, we have the following

Lemma 9 Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic solution of equation (2.1). Then $n = 2$ or $n = 3$. Moreover, $α_i$ and $β_j$ in (2.7) and (2.8) are all simple.

Proof. We consider the cases $q = 0$ and $p = q = n$, respectively. When $q = 0$, if $n \geq 4$, then at least one of $α_i$ in (2.7) has multiplicity at least $n$ and, since $α_i \neq 0$, by Lemma 8 it follows that $f$ has 4 completely ramified rational functions with multiplicity at least $n$, a contradiction to the inequality (4.1). Therefore, when $q = 0$ we have $n = 2$ or $n = 3$. When $p = q = n \geq 4$, we recall that $N_e = 3$. If some $α_i$ in (2.7) has multiplicity at least 3, then we get a similar contradiction as in the case $q = 0$ and thus each $α_i$ in (2.7) has multiplicity at most 2; since $n \geq 4$, this implies that either $P(z, f)$ has only one root or that there are two distinct $α_i$ and each $k_i$ satisfies $k_i = n/2$. In the first case, we see that none of $β_j$ in (2.8) is zero for otherwise by Lemma 8 it follows that $f$ has 5 completely ramified rational functions, a contradiction to Theorem 2 but then we also have a contradiction as in the case $q = 0$ since at least one $β_j$ is a completely ramified rational function with multiplicity at least $n$. In the latter case, $Q(z, f)$ must
have two distinct roots and none of $\beta_j$ in (2.8) is zero for otherwise $\alpha_i$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity at least 4 and then by Lemma 8 we get a contradiction to the inequality (1.6); but then we also have a contradiction as in the case $q = 0$ since at least one $\beta_j$ is a completely ramified rational function with multiplicity at least 3. Therefore, when $p = q = n$, we also have $n = 2$ or $n = 3$.

Clearly, when $n = 2$, $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_j$ in (2.4) and (2.8) are all simple. We claim that $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_j$ in (2.4) and (2.8) are also simple when $n = 3$. In fact, when $n = 3$, since $f$ has 3 non-zero completely ramified rational functions with multiplicities 3 it follows that 0 and $\infty$ are both not completely ramified rational functions of $f$. If one $\alpha_i$ or $\beta_j$ in (2.4) and (2.8) is not simple, then by a simple analysis as in the proof of Lemma 8 we conclude that there are at least $T(r, f) + o(T(r, f))$ many points $z_0$ such that $f(z_0 + 1) = 0$ or $f(z_0 + 1) = \infty$ with multiplicity $m_0 \geq 2$ and then by computing $N(r, 1/\gamma)$ or $N(r, \gamma)$ as in the proof of Lemma 4 we will get a contradiction. We omit those details.

Now supposing that $\gamma \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{0\}$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity at least $m \geq 2$, we further consider the equation $\gamma = 0$. In particular, we may suppose that $\gamma = \alpha_i$ or $\gamma = \beta_j$. By Lemma 8, $\omega_i$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity at least $m$, where $\omega$ is an $n$-th root of 1. By (2.1), when $q = 0$, we have

$$\bar{\gamma}^n - \gamma^n = P(z, f) - \bar{\gamma}^n = a_p(f - \gamma_1)^{t_1} \cdots (f - \gamma_r)^{t_r},$$

(5.4)

or, when $p = q = n$, we have

$$\bar{\gamma}^n - \gamma^n = \frac{P(z, f) - \gamma Q(z, f)}{Q(z, f)} = a_{p_r}(f - \gamma_1)^{t_1} \cdots (f - \gamma_r)^{t_r},$$

(5.5)

where $\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r$ are in general algebraic functions distinct from each other and $t_1, \cdots, t_r \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the orders of the roots $\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r$, respectively, and $t_1 + \cdots + t_r = p_r \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, in (5.4) we have $p_r = n$ and in (5.5) we have $p_r \leq n$. We apply the analysis in the proof of Lemma 4 to equations (5.4) and (5.5), respectively, and get the following

Lemma 10 Let $f$ be a transcendental meromorphic solution of equation (2.1) and $\gamma \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{0\}$ be a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity $m \geq 2$. Suppose that $\zeta_1, \cdots, \zeta_i$ are Picard exceptional rational functions of $f$ or completely ramified rational functions of $f$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{I} \Theta(\zeta_i, f) = 2$. For each $\gamma_i$ in (5.4) or (5.5), if $\gamma_i$ is not a completely ramified rational function of $f$, then $\gamma_i = 0$; if $\gamma_i$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity $m_i \geq 2$, then $t_i m_i = m$. In particular, for (5.5), when $1 \leq p_r < q$, if $\infty$ is not a completely ramified rational function of $f$, then $q - p_r = m$; if $\infty$ is a completely ramified rational function of $f$ with multiplicity $m_\infty \geq 2$, then $(q - p_r)m_\infty = m$.

By Lemma 9 we may divide equation (2.1) into the following cases:

(1) $n = 2, q = 0$ and $P(z, f)$ has two distinct non-zero roots $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$;
(2) $n = 3, q = 0$ and $P(z, f)$ has three distinct non-zero roots $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$ and $\alpha_3$;
(3) $p = q = n = 2, P(z, f)$ has two distinct non-zero roots $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ and $Q(z, f)$ has only one root $\beta$;
(4) $p = q = n = 2, P(z, f)$ has only one root $\alpha$ and $Q(z, f)$ has two distinct roots $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$;
(5) $p = q = n = 2, P(z, f)$ has two distinct non-zero roots $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ and $Q(z, f)$ has two distinct roots $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$;
(6) $p = q = n = 3, P(z, f)$ has three distinct non-zero roots $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$ and $\alpha_3$ and $Q(z, f)$ has only one root $\beta$;
(7) $p = q = n = 3, P(z, f)$ has only one root $\alpha$ and $Q(z, f)$ has three distinct roots $\beta_1, \beta_2$ and $\beta_3$;

For each of the above cases, we may use Lemma 10 together with Picard’s theorem, Theorem 2 or the inequality (1.6) to consider (5.4) and (5.5) as in the proofs of Theorems 3 and 4 and find the restrictions for the coefficients in (2.1), which yield the 10 equations in (13). Theorem 2) after doing a bilinear transformation $f \to \alpha/f$ with a suitable algebraic function $\alpha$. We easily see that many computations in the proof of Theorem 2 can be thus omitted.

Now let’s return to equation (2.1) for the case $\deg(R(z, f)) = n$. We have shown that if equation (2.1) with $d \neq n$ has a transcendental meromorphic solution, then (2.1) reduces into one in a list of sixteen equations. In what follows, we show that these equations possess meromorphic solutions. In the beginning of section 2, we point out that equation (2.1) may reduce into (2.4) in some special cases. In section 3 we consider the case where $q = 0$: from the results in Theorems 2 and 3 we see that the polynomial term
$P(z, f)$ takes particular form and the solutions $f$ are expressed in terms of exponential type functions explicitly. In section 4 we consider the case where $q > 1$. In this case, if $n > d$ or $3 \leq n < d$, then from Theorems 4 and 6 we see that solutions of (2.11) are also expressed in terms of exponential type functions. But for the case $n = 2$ and $n < d$, equation (2.24), as well as its solutions, becomes much more complicated. When $q \geq 1$, $n = 2$ and $n \nmid |p - q|$, the four polynomials $P_0(z, f)$ and $Q_0(z, f)$ are clear, as seen in Theorem 6. Below we discuss the ten equations (4.62), (4.63), (4.64), (4.65), (4.68), (4.71), (4.72), (4.73), (4.74) and (4.75) in Theorem 7 and their solutions.

We first note that, for each of these ten equations, the function $\alpha$ in the transformation $f \to \alpha f$ or $f \to 1/(\alpha f)$ is in fact rational. For example, for equation (4.62), from the proof we also have the following two equations:

$$T^2 - 1 = -f^2(f^2 - c^2)^2(f^2 - \gamma^2)$$

$$[f^2 - a^2]^2 - B(f^2 - 1)^2,$$

where $c^2$ is a constant distinct from $a^2$ such that $c^4 - 2c^2 + \gamma^2 = 0$, and

$$T^2 - \gamma^2 = -\gamma^2[(f^2 - a^2)^2 + B(f^2 - 1)^2]^2.$$  

For simplicity, denote $Q_0(f) = (f^2 - a^2)^2 - B(f^2 - 1)$. By substituting equations (5.6) and (5.7) into (4.62), we have

$$T^2 = -4\gamma^4E[f^2(f^2 - a^2)^2]Q_0(f)^2Q_0(f)^2Q_0(f)^2Q_0(f)^2.$$

Now we do the converse transformation $f \to f/\alpha_1$ and easily obtain from the above equation that $\alpha^2_1/\alpha_1^2 = G(z, f, f, \overline{f})^2$, where $G = G(z, f, f, \overline{f})$ is rational in $z$, $f$, and $\overline{f}$ under the assumptions of Theorem 7. Therefore, the root $\alpha_1$ in (4.76) is a rational function. For the eight equations (4.63), (4.64), (4.65), (4.68), (4.71), (4.72), (4.73), (4.74) and (4.75), by substituting $f^3 - a_1^3$ or $f^2 - a_1^2$ or $f^2 - a_1^2$ or $f^2 - \alpha_1^2$ into the equation $T^2 = R(z, f)$, where $n = 2$ or $n = 3$, we will obtain similar equations to (5.8) and conclude that $\alpha_1$ is rational. We omit those details. Since the function $\alpha$ in the transformation $f \to \alpha f$ when obtaining the three equations (5.20), (5.11) or (4.19) are also rational, we see that the algebraic case for $\alpha$ in the transformations of Theorem 7 can only occur when obtaining equation (4.59) and, more specifically, can only occur when $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$ in (4.59) are equal.

For equation (4.65), if we change the positions of the cubic roots 1, $\eta$ and $\eta^2$, then we will get an equation of different form. We can compute the roots of the polynomial $P_{11}(g^3)(g - \alpha_{11})$ by using the method after equation (4.170). For example, when $P_{11}(g)$ has only one root, it is easy to obtain that $P_{11}(g)^3 = -\frac{1}{3}(g + \alpha_{11})^3$ when assuming that $Q_{11}(g^3)$ is monic. In general, each of the three cases where $p_0 = q_0 - 1$, $p_0 = q_0$ or $p_0 = q_0 + 1$ may occur, but once $d_0 = \max\{p_0, q_0\}$ is given, we can determine $p_0$ and $q_0$ by computations above. The equation (4.59) can be dealt with in an analogous way. We note that the two polynomials $P_0(f)$ and $Q_0(f)$ in equation (4.62) can also be determined in another way: Letting $(f - 1)/(f - \eta) = 1/g^3$, then $g$ is a meromorphic function and it follows that $f = (g^3 - \eta)/(g^3 - 1)$. By substituting this equation into (4.159) we get

$$T^2 = \frac{P_{01}(g^3)^3}{Q_0(g^3)^g},$$

where $P_{01}(g^3)$ and $Q_0(g^3)$ are two polynomials in $g^3$ with the same degree $d_0 = \max\{p_0, q_0\}$. Then by following the same procedure as in the proof, we will obtain

$$3P_{01}(g^3) = [P_{11}(g)^3 + \eta P_{11}(\eta g)^3 + \eta^2 P_{11}(\eta g)^3]^3g$$

$$-\beta_{11}[P_{11}(g)^3 + P_{11}(\eta g)^3 + P_{11}(\eta g^3)^3],$$

$$3Q_{01}(g^3) = \beta_{11}[P_{11}(g)^3 + P_{11}(\eta g)^3 + P_{11}(\eta^2 g)^3]$$

$$-P_{11}(g)^3 + \eta^2 P_{11}(\eta g)^3 + \eta P_{11}(\eta^2 g)^3]g,$$

and $P_{11}(g)$ is a polynomial in $g$ of degree $d_0$ such that the coefficients of terms of degree $3d_0 - 1$, $3d_0 - 4$, ..., 2 in the polynomial $P_{11}(g)^3(g - \beta_{11})$, where $\beta_{11} = -\eta^2$, vanish.

Solutions of the ten autonomous equations (4.62), (4.63), (4.64), (4.65), (4.68), (4.71), (4.72), (4.73), (4.74) and (4.75) are elliptic functions composed with entire functions, as is shown below.
Solutions to the equations \([1.65], [1.68]\) and \([1.71]\) are Weierstrass elliptic functions, composed with entire functions. Recall from \([2.67]\) that all solutions of the Fermat type equation \(h^3 + g^3 = 1\) can be represented as: \(h = H(\varphi), \ g = \eta G(\varphi) = \eta H(-\varphi) = H(-\eta^2 \varphi)\), where \(\varphi = \varphi(z)\) is an entire function and \(\eta\) is a cubic root of 1, and

\[
H(z) = \frac{1 + \varphi'(z)/\sqrt{3}}{2\varphi(z)}, \quad G(z) = \frac{1 - \varphi'(z)/\sqrt{3}}{2\varphi(z)},
\]  

is a pair of solutions of the Fermat equation \(H^3 + G^3 = 1\) with \(\varphi(z)\) being the particular Weierstrass elliptic function such that \(\varphi'(z)^2 = 4\varphi(z)^3 - 1\). For equation \([1.65]\), recall from the proof that we have equation \([1.161]\) and \(1, \eta_1, \eta_2^2\), where \(\eta_1\) is a cubic root of 1 such that \(\eta_1^2 + \eta_1 + 1 = 0\), are completely ramified values of \(f\) with multiplicities 3. We let \((f - \eta_1^3)/(f - \eta_1) = g^3\). Then \(g\) is a meromorphic function and it follows that \(f = (\eta_1 g^3 - \eta_1^2)/(g^3 - 1)\). By substituting this equation into \([1.161]\), we get

\[
\mathcal{T}^3 + \left(-\frac{P_0(g^3)g}{Q_0(g^3)}\right)^3 = 1,
\]  

where \(P_0(g^3)\) and \(Q_0(g^3)\) are two polynomials in \(g\) with the same degree. Then we have \(\mathcal{T} = H(\varphi_1)\) and \(P_0(g^3)g/Q_0(g^3) = -\eta G(\varphi_1)\), where \(\varphi_1\) is an entire function of \(z\), and \(H(z)\) and \(G(z)\) are defined as in \([5.11]\). Moreover, there exist two constants \(A_1 \neq 0\) and \(B_1\) dependent on the coefficients of \(P_0(f)\) and \(Q_0(f)\) such that \(\varphi_1 = A_1 \varphi_1 + B_1\). For equations \([1.68]\) and \([1.71]\), it follows from equation \([1.179]\) that

\[
\mathcal{T}^3 + \left[-\frac{P_1(f)}{Q_0(f)}\right]^3 = 1.
\]  

Therefore, we have \(\mathcal{T} = H(\varphi_2)\) and \(P_1(f)/Q_0(f) = -\eta G(\varphi_2)\), where \(\varphi_2\) is an entire function of \(z\), and \(H(z)\) and \(G(z)\) are defined as in equation \([5.11]\). Moreover, there exist two constants \(A_2 \neq 0\) and \(B_2\) dependent on the coefficients of \(P(f)\) and \(Q(f)\) such that \(\varphi_2 = A_2 \varphi_2 + B_2\).

For equation \([1.72]\), \([1.73]\), \([1.74]\) and \([1.75]\), from the two equations \([1.207]\) and \([1.208]\), or from the two equations \([1.225]\) and \([1.226]\), we can get an equation of the following form:

\[
\frac{\mathcal{T}^2 - \kappa^2}{\mathcal{T}^2 - 1} = \frac{P_1(f)^2}{P_2(f)^2},
\]  

where \(P_1(f)\) and \(P_2(f)\) are two polynomials in \(f\) with simple roots only and of degrees 1 or 2 or 4. By denoting \(R_1(f) = P_1(f)/P_2(f)\), then we have \(\text{deg}_f(R_1(f)) = 2\) or \(\text{deg}_f(R_1(f)) = 4\) and it follows that

\[
\mathcal{T}^2 R_1(f)^2 - \left[\mathcal{T}^2 + R_1(f)^2\right] + \kappa^2 = 0,
\]  

which is a symmetric biquadratic equation in \(\mathcal{T}\) and \(R_1\) (see [3, p. 471]). The above equation can be solved as \(\mathcal{T} = k_1^{1/2} \sin(\varphi_1(z) \pm \tau_1)\) and \(R_1(f) = k_1^{1/2} \sin(\varphi_1(z))\), where \(k_1\) and \(\tau_1\) are two parameters dependent on the constant \(\kappa^2\), \(\sin(\varphi_1)\) is the Jacobi elliptic function with modulus \(k_1\) and \(\varphi_1\) is an entire function of \(z\). Then there are two constants \(C_1 \neq 0\) and \(D_1\) such that \(C_1 \varphi_1 + D_1\).

Equations \([1.62], [1.63]\) and \([1.64]\) can also be transformed into symmetric biquadratic equations similar to \([5.15]\) in the following way: Letting \((f + \gamma)/(f - \gamma) = g^2\), since \(\pm 1 + \pm \gamma\) are completely ramified values of \(g\) with multiplicities 2, then \(g\) is a meromorphic function and it follows that \(f = \gamma(g^2 + 1)/(g^2 - 1)\). We divide \([1.113]\) by \([1.112]\) on both sides and substitute the equation \(f = \gamma(g^2 + 1)/(g^2 - 1)\) into the resulting equation and get

\[
\frac{\mathcal{T}^2 - \gamma^2}{\mathcal{T}^2 - 1} = \frac{P_0(g)^2}{P_0(g)^2},
\]  

where \(P_0(g)\) and \(P_0(g)\) are two polynomials in \(g\) with simple roots only and of the degrees 3 and 4, respectively. By denoting \(R_2(g) = P_0(g)/P_0(g)\), it follows that

\[
\mathcal{T}^2 R_2(g)^2 - \left[\mathcal{T}^2 + R_2(g)^2\right] + \gamma^2 = 0,
\]  

which is a symmetric biquadratic equation in \(\mathcal{T}\) and \(R_2\). Then we have \(\mathcal{T} = k_2^{1/2} \sin(\varphi_2(z) \pm \tau_2)\) and \(R_2(g) = k_2^{1/2} \sin(\varphi_2(z))\), where \(k_2\) and \(\tau_2\) are two parameters dependent on the constant \(\gamma^2\), \(\sin(\varphi_2)\) is the Jacobi elliptic function with modulus \(k_2\) and \(\varphi_2\) is an entire function of \(z\). Moreover, there are two constants \(C_2 \neq 0\) and \(D_2\) such that \(C_2 \varphi_2 + D_2\).
References