

UNIQUENESS OF MEROMORPHIC FUNCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THEIR SHIFTS CONCERNING DERIVATIVES

XIAOHUANG HUANG

ABSTRACT. An example in the article shows that the first derivative of $f(z) = \frac{2}{1-e^{-2z}}$ sharing 0 CM and $1, \infty$ IM with its shift πi cannot obtain they are equal. In this paper, we study the uniqueness of meromorphic function sharing small functions with their shifts concerning its k -th derivatives. We improves the author's result [9] from entire function to meromorphic function, the first derivative to its differential-difference polynomial, and also finite values to small functions. As for $k = 0$, we obtain: Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$, let c be a nonzero finite value, and let $a_1(z) \not\equiv \infty, a_2(z) \not\equiv \infty \in \hat{S}(f)$ be two distinct small functions of $f(z)$ such that $a_1(z)$ is a periodic function with period c and $b(z)$ is any small function of $f(z)$. If $f(z)$ and $f(z+c)$ share $a_1(z), \infty$ CM, and share $a_2(z)$ IM, then either $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$ or

$$e^{p(z)} \equiv \frac{f(z+c) - a_1(z+c)}{f(z) - a_1(z)} \equiv \frac{a_2(z+c) - a_1(z+c)}{a_2(z) - a_1(z)},$$

where $p(z)$ is a non-constant entire function of $\rho(p) < 1$ such that $e^{p(z+c)} \equiv e^{p(z)}$.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

Throughout this paper, we assume that the reader have a knowledge of the fundamental results and the standard notations of the Nevanlinna value distribution theory. See([6, 19, 20]). In the following, a meromorphic function f means meromorphic in the whole complex plane. Define

$$\rho(f) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log^+ T(r, f)}{\log r},$$

$$\rho_2(f) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log^+ \log^+ T(r, f)}{\log r}$$

by the order and the hyper-order of f , respectively. When $\rho(f) < \infty$, we say f is of finite order.

By $S(r, f)$, we denote any quantity satisfying $S(r, f) = o(T(r, f))$, as $r \rightarrow \infty$ outside of a possible exceptional set of finite logarithmic measure. A meromorphic function $a(z)$ satisfying $T(r, a) = S(r, f)$ is called a small function of f . We denote $S(f)$ as the family of all small meromorphic functions of f which includes the constants in \mathbb{C} . Moreover, we define $\hat{S}(f) = S(f) \cup \{\infty\}$. We say that two non-constant meromorphic functions f and g share small function a CM(IM) if $f-a$ and $g-a$ have the same zeros counting multiplicities (ignoring multiplicities). Moreover, we introduce the following notation: $S_{(m,n)}(a) = \{z | z \text{ is a common zero of } f(z +$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 30D35, 39A46.

Key words and phrases. Meromorphic functions; shifts; derivatives; small functions.

$c) - a(z)$ and $f(z) - a(z)$ with multiplicities m and n respectively}. $\overline{N}_{(m,n)}(r, \frac{1}{f-a})$ denotes the counting function of f with respect to the set $S_{(m,n)}(a)$. $\overline{N}_n(r, \frac{1}{f-a})$ denotes the counting function of all distinct zeros of $f-a$ with multiplicities at most n . $\overline{N}_{(n)}(r, \frac{1}{f-a})$ denotes the counting function of all zeros of $f-a$ with multiplicities at least n .

We say that two non-constant meromorphic functions f and g share small function a CM(IM)almost if

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + N(r, \frac{1}{g-a}) - 2N(r, f=a=g) = S(r, f) + S(r, g),$$

or

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-a}) - 2\overline{N}(r, f=a=g) = S(r, f) + S(r, g),$$

respectively.

For a meromorphic function $f(z)$, we denote its shift by $f_c(z) = f(z+c)$.

Rubel and Yang [18] studied the uniqueness of an entire function concerning its first order derivative, and proved the following result.

Theorem A Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant entire function, and let a, b be two finite distinct complex values. If $f(z)$ and $f'(z)$ share a, b CM, then $f(z) \equiv f'(z)$.
Zheng and Wang [22] improved Theorem A and proved

Theorem B Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant entire function, and let $a(z) \not\equiv \infty, b(z) \not\equiv \infty$ be two distinct small functions of $f(z)$. If $f(z)$ and $f^{(k)}(z)$ share $a(z), b(z)$ CM, then $f(z) \equiv f^{(k)}(z)$.

Li and Yang [16] improved Theorem B and proved

Theorem C Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant entire function, and let $a(z) \not\equiv \infty, b(z) \not\equiv \infty$ be two distinct small functions of $f(z)$. If $f(z)$ and $f^{(k)}(z)$ share $a(z)$ CM, and share $b(z)$ IM. Then $f(z) \equiv f^{(k)}(z)$.

Recently, the value distribution of meromorphic functions concerning difference analogue has become a popular research, see [1-9, 12-14, 16-18]. Heittokangas et al [7] obtained a similar result analogue of Theorem A concerning shifts.

Theorem D Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant entire function of finite order, let c be a nonzero finite complex value, and let a, b be two finite distinct complex values. If $f(z)$ and $f(z+c)$ share a, b CM, then $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$.

In 2022, Huang[9] obtained

Theorem E Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental entire function of finite order, let $\eta \neq 0$ be a finite complex number, $n \geq 1, k \geq 0$ two integers and let a, b be two distinct finite complex values. If $f(z)$ and $(\Delta_\eta^n f(z))^{(k)}$ share a_1 CM and share a_2 IM, then either $f(z) \equiv (\Delta_\eta^n f(z))^{(k)}$ or $a_1 = 2a_2$,

$$f(z) \equiv a_2 e^{2(cz+d)} - 2a_2 e^{cz+d} + 2a_2,$$

and

$$(\Delta_\eta^n f(z))^{(k)} \equiv a_2 e^{cz+d},$$

where $c = (-2)^{-\frac{n+1}{k}}$ for $k \geq 1$ and d are two finite constants.

In the following, we define the differential polynomials of a meromorphic function. Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant entire function and

$$g(z) = b_{-1} + \sum_{i=0}^n b_i f^{(k_i)}(z + c_i), \quad (1.1)$$

where b_{-1} and $b_i (i = 0 \dots, n)$ are small meromorphic functions of f , $k_i \geq 0 (i = 0 \dots, n)$ are integers and $c_i (i = 0 \dots, n)$ are finite complex numbers.

Of above theorem, it's naturally to ask whether the condition two finite complex numbers can be replaced by two distinct small functions, and f' can be replaced by g ?

In this article, we give a positive answer. In fact, we prove the following more general result.

Theorem 1 Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$ such that $\overline{N}(r, f) = S(r, f)$, let $g(z)$ be a differential polynomials of f as define in (1.1), and let a_1, a_2 be two distinct finite complex numbers. If $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ share a_1, ∞ CM, and a_2 IM. Then either $f(z) \equiv g(z)$ or

$$f(z) \equiv a_2 + (a_1 - a_2)(h - 1)^2,$$

and

$$g(z) \equiv a_1 + (a_1 - a_2)(h - 2),$$

where $h(z)$ is a non-constant meromorphic function of $\rho_2(h) < 1$.

Remark 1 When a_1 and a_2 are two distinct small functions of f , it is easy to see in the following proofs that Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.5 are still true under the assumptions that $N(r, a_1) + N(r, a_2) + \overline{N}(r, f) = S(r, f)$ and f and g share a_1 CM almost and a_2 IM almost. So we can know that Theorem 1 is still true when f and g share a_1 CM almost and a_2 IM almost.

Corollary 1 Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$, let c be a nonzero finite value, k be a positive integer, and let $a(z) \not\equiv \infty, b(z) \not\equiv \infty \in \hat{S}(f)$ be two distinct small functions. If $f^{(k)}(z + c)$ and $f(z)$ share $a(z), \infty$ CM, and share $b(z)$ IM, then $f^{(k)}(z) \equiv f(z + c)$.

Example 1 [10] Let $f(z) = \frac{2}{1 - e^{-2z}}$, and let $c = \pi i$. Then $f'(z)$ and $f(z + c)$ share 0 CM and share $1, \infty$ IM, but $f'(z) \not\equiv f(z + c)$.

This example shows that for meromorphic functions, the conclusion of Theorem 1 doesn't hold even when sharing ∞ CM is replaced by sharing ∞ IM when $k = 1$. We believe there are examples for any k , but we can not construct them.

As for $k = 0$, Li and Yi [14] obtained

Theorem F Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental entire function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$, let c be a nonzero finite value, and let $a(z) \not\equiv \infty, b(z) \not\equiv \infty \in \hat{S}(f)$ be two distinct small functions. If $f(z)$ and $f(z + c)$ share $a(z)$ and $b(z)$ IM, then $f(z) \equiv f(z + c)$.

Remark 2 Theorem F holds when $f(z)$ is a non-constant meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$ such that $\overline{N}(r, f) = S(r, f)$.

Heittokangas, et. [8] proved.

Theorem G Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$, let c be a nonzero finite value, and let $a_1(z) \not\equiv \infty$, $a_2(z) \not\equiv \infty$ and $a_3(z) \not\equiv \infty \in \hat{S}(f)$ be three distinct small functions such that $a_1(z)$, $a_2(z)$ and $a_3(z)$ are periodic functions with period c . If $f(z)$ and $f(z+c)$ share $a_1(z), a_2(z)$ CM, and $a_3(z)$ IM, then $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$.

We can ask a question that whether the small periodic function $a_3(z)$ of $f(z)$ can be replaced by any small function of $f(z)$? In this paper, we obtain our second result.

Theorem 2 Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$, let c be a nonzero finite value, and let $a_1(z) \not\equiv \infty, a_2(z) \not\equiv \infty \in \hat{S}(f)$ be two distinct small functions of $f(z)$ such that $a(z)$ is a periodic function with period c and $b(z)$ is any small function of $f(z)$. If $f(z)$ and $f(z+c)$ share $a_1(z), \infty$ CM, and share $a_2(z)$ IM, then either $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$ or

$$e^{p(z)} \equiv \frac{f(z+c) - a_1(z+c)}{f(z) - a_1(z)} \equiv \frac{a_2(z+c) - a_1(z+c)}{a_2(z) - a_1(z)},$$

where $p(z)$ is a non-constant entire function of $\rho(p) < 1$ such that $e^{p(z+c)} \equiv e^{p(z)}$.

We can obtain the following corollary from the proof of Theorem 2.

Corollary 1 Under the same condition as in Theorem 2, then $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$ holds if one of conditions satisfies

- (i) $a_2(z)$ is a periodic function with period c or $2c$;
- (ii) $\rho(a_2(z)) < \rho(e^{p(z)})$;
- (iii) $\rho(a_2(z)) < 1$.

Example 2 Let $f(z) = \frac{e^z}{1-e^{-2z}}$, and let $c = \pi i$. Then $f(z+c) = \frac{-e^z}{1-e^{-2z}}$, and $f(z)$ and $f(z+c)$ share $0, \infty$ CM, but $f(z) \not\equiv f(z+c)$.

Example 3 Let $f(z) = e^z$, and let $c = \pi i$. Then $f(z+c) = -e^z$, and $f(z)$ and $f(z+c)$ share $0, \infty$ CM, $f(z)$ and $f(z+c)$ attain different values everywhere in the complex plane, but $f(z) \not\equiv f(z+c)$.

Above two examples of show that "2CM+1IM" is necessary.

Example 4 Let $f(z) = e^{e^z}$, then $f(z+\pi i) = \frac{1}{e^{e^z}}$. It is easy to verify that $f(z)$ and $f(z+\pi i)$ share $0, 1, \infty$ CM, but $f(z) \neq \frac{1}{f(z+\pi i)}$. On the other hand, we obtain $f(z) = f(z+2\pi i)$.

Example 4 tells us that if we drop the assumption $\rho_2(f) < 1$, we can get another relation.

By Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, we still believe the latter situation of Theorem 2 can be removed, that is to say, only the case $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$ occurs. So we raise a conjecture here.

Conjecture Under the same condition as in Theorem 2, is $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$?

2. SOME LEMMAS

Lemma 2.1. [6] *Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$, and let c be a non-zero complex number. Then*

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

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

Lemma 2.2. [6] *Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$, and let c be a non-zero complex number. Then*

$$T(r, f(z)) = T(r, f(z+c)) + S(r, f),$$

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

Lemma 2.3. [11, 19, 20] *Let f_1 and f_2 be two non-constant meromorphic functions in $|z| < \infty$, then*

$$N(r, f_1 f_2) - N\left(r, \frac{1}{f_1 f_2}\right) = N(r, f_1) + N(r, f_2) - N\left(r, \frac{1}{f_1}\right) - N\left(r, \frac{1}{f_2}\right),$$

where $0 < r < \infty$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$ such that $\overline{N}(r, f) = S(r, f)$, let $g(z)$ be a differential polynomial of f as define in (1.1), and let a_1, a_2 be two distinct finite complex numbers. If*

$$H = \frac{f'}{(f-a_1)(f-a_2)} - \frac{g'}{(g-a_1)(g-a_2)} \equiv 0,$$

And f and g share a_1 CM, and a_2 IM, then either $2T(r, f) \leq \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}\right) + S(r, f)$, or $f = g$.

Proof. Integrating H which leads to

$$\frac{g-a_2}{g-a_1} = C \frac{f-a_2}{f-a_1},$$

where C is a nonzero constant.

If $C = 1$, then $f = g$. If $C \neq 1$, then from above, we have

$$\frac{a_1 - a_2}{g - a_1} \equiv \frac{(C-1)f - Ca_2 + a_1}{f - a_1},$$

and

$$T(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g).$$

It follows that $N\left(r, \frac{1}{f - \frac{Ca_2 - a_1}{C-1}}\right) = N\left(r, \frac{1}{a_1 - a_2}\right) = S(r, f)$. Then by Lemma 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned} 2T(r, f) &\leq \overline{N}(r, f) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f - \frac{Ca_2 - a_1}{C-1}}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}\right) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

that is $2T(r, f) \leq \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}\right) + S(r, f)$. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$ such that $\overline{N}(r, f) = S(r, f)$, let $g(z)$ be a differential polynomial of f as define in (1.1), and let a_1, a_2 be two distinct finite complex numbers. If $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ share a_1 CM, and $N(r, \frac{1}{g(z) - (b_{-1} + b_0 a_1)}) = S(r, f)$, then Then there are two meromorphic functions h and H on \mathbb{C}^n such that either $g = Hh + G$, where $H \not\equiv 0$ and $G = b_{-1} + b_0 a_1$ are two small functions of h , or $T(r, h) = S(r, f)$.*

Proof. Since $f(z)$ is a non-constant meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$, and $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ share a_1, ∞ CM, then there is a meromorphic function h such that

$$f - a_1 = h(g - G) + h(G - a_1), \quad (2.1)$$

where $G(z) = b_{-1} + b_0 a_1$, and the zeros and poles of h come from the zeros and poles of b_{-1} and $b_i (i = 0, 1, \dots, n)$

Suppose on the contrary that $T(r, h) \neq S(r, f)$. Set $Q = g - G$. Do induction from (2.2) that

$$Q = \sum_{i=0}^n b_i (hQ)^{(k_i)} + \sum_{i=0}^n b_i (h(G - a_1))^{(k_i)}. \quad (2.2)$$

Easy to see that $Q \not\equiv 0$. Then we rewrite (2.3) as

$$1 - \frac{\sum_{i=0}^n b_i (h(G - a_1))^{(k_i)}}{Q} = Fh, \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$F = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^n b_i (hQ)^{(k_i)}}{hQ} \quad (2.4)$$

Note that $N(r, \frac{1}{g-G}) = N(r, \frac{1}{Q}) = S(r, f)$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, F) &\leq \sum_{i=0}^n (T(r, \frac{(hQ)^{(k_i)}}{Qh}) + S(r, f)) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{(hQ)^{(k_i)}}{hQ}) + N(r, \frac{(hQ)^{(k_i)}}{hQ}) + \overline{N}(r, f) \\ &\quad + S(r, h) + S(r, f) = S(r, h) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

By (2.1) and Lemma 2.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, h) &\leq T(r, f) + T(r, g) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq 2T(r, f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Then it follows from (2.5) that $T(r, F) = S(r, f)$. Next we discuss two cases.

Case1. $h^{-1} - F \not\equiv 0$. Rewrite (2.4) as

$$h(h^{-1} - F) = \sum_{i=0}^n b_i (h(G - a_1))^{(k_i)}. \quad (2.7)$$

We claim that $F \equiv 0$. Otherwise, it follows from (2.9) that $N(r, \frac{1}{h^{-1}-F}) = S(r, f)$. Then use Lemma 2.4 to h we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, h) &= T(r, h^{-1}) + O(1) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, h^{-1}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{h^{-1}}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{h^{-1} - F}) \\ &\quad + O(1) = S(r, f), \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

which contradicts with assumption. Thus $F \equiv 0$. Then by (2.9) we get

$$g = \sum_{i=0}^n b_i (h(G - a_1)^{(k_i)}) + G = Hh + G, \quad (2.9)$$

where $H \neq 0$ is a small function of h .

Case2. $h^{-1} - F \equiv 0$. Immediately, we get $T(r, h) = S(r, f)$. \square

Lemma 2.6. [19] *Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function, and $R(f) = \frac{P(f)}{Q(f)}$, where*

$$P(f) = \sum_{k=0}^p a_k f^k \quad \text{and} \quad Q(f) = \sum_{j=0}^q a_j f^j$$

are two mutually prime polynomials in f . If the coefficients a_k and b_j are small functions of f and $a_p \neq 0$, $b_q \neq 0$, then

$$T(r, R(f)) = \max\{p, q\}T(r, f) + S(r, f).$$

Lemma 2.7. [19] *Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function, and let $P(f) = a_0 f^p + a_1 f^{p-1} + \dots + a_p$ ($a_0 \neq 0$) be a polynomial of degree p with constant coefficients a_j ($j = 0, 1, \dots, p$). Suppose that b_j ($j = 0, 1, \dots, q$) ($q > p$). Then*

$$m\left(r, \frac{P(f)f'}{(f - b_1)(f - b_2) \dots (f - b_q)}\right) = S(r, f).$$

Lemma 2.8. [19] *Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function, and let $P(f) = a_0 + a_1 f + a_2 f^2 + \dots + a_n f^n$, where a_i are small functions of f for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Then*

$$T(r, P(f)) = nT(r, f) + S(r, f).$$

Lemma 2.9. [12] *Let f and g be two non-constant meromorphic functions. If f and g share $0, 1, \infty$ IM, and f is a bilinear transformation of g , then f and g assume one of the following six relations: (i) $fg = 1$; (ii) $(f - 1)(g - 1) = 1$; (iii) $f + g = 1$; (iv) $f = cg$; (v) $f - 1 = c(g - 1)$; (vi) $[(c - 1)f + 1][(c - 1)g - c] = -c$, where $c \neq 0, 1$ is a complex number.*

In the proof of Theorem 2, we will use the following Lemma proved by G. G. Gundersen [3].

Lemma 2.10. [3] *Let f , F and g be three non-constant meromorphic functions, where $g = F(f)$. Then f and g share three values IM if and only if there exist an entire function h such that, by a suitable linear fractional transformation, one of the following cases holds:*

- (i) $f \equiv g$;
- (ii) $f = e^h$ and $g = a(1 + 4ae^{-h} - 4a^2e^{-2h})$ have three IM shared values $a \neq 0$, $b = 2a$ and ∞ ;
- (iii) $f = e^h$ and $g = \frac{1}{2}(e^h + a^2e^{-h})$ have three IM shared values $a \neq 0$, $b = -a$ and ∞ ;
- (iv) $f = e^h$ and $g = a + b - abe^{-h}$ have three IM shared values $ab \neq 0$ and ∞ ;
- (v) $f = e^h$ and $g = \frac{1}{6}e^{2h} - 2e^h + 2b$ have three IM shared values $b \neq 0$, $a = 2b$ and ∞ ;
- (vi) $f = e^h$ and $g = b^2e^{-h}$ have three IM shared values $a \neq 0$, 0 and ∞ .

Lemma 2.11. [11, 19, 20] *Let f and g be two non-constant meromorphic functions, and let $\rho(f)$ and $\rho(g)$ be the order of f and g , respectively. Then $\rho(fg) \leq \max\{\rho(f), \rho(g)\}$.*

Lemma 2.12. [21] *Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant meromorphic function, and let $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \hat{S}(f)$ be three distinct small functions of f . Then*

$$T(r, f) \leq \sum_{j=1}^3 \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f - a_j}\right) + S(r, f).$$

Remark 3 We can see from the proof that Lemma 2.9 [12] and Lemma 2.10 [19] are still true when f and g share three value IM almost.

Lemma 2.13. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function, let $k_j (j = 1, 2, \dots, q)$ be distinct constants, and let $a_1 \neq \infty$ and $a_2 \neq \infty$ be two distinct small functions of f . Again let $d_j = a - k_j(a - b)$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, q$). Then*

$$m\left(r, \frac{L(f)}{f - a_1}\right) = S(r, f), \quad m\left(r, \frac{L(f)}{f - d_j}\right) = S(r, f).$$

for $1 \leq i \leq q$ and

$$m\left(r, \frac{L(f)f}{(f - d_1)(f - d_2) \cdots (f - d_m)}\right) = S(r, f),$$

where $L(f) = (a'_1 - a'_2)(f - a_1) - (a_1 - a_2)(f' - a'_1)$, and $2 \leq m \leq q$.

Proof. We first claim that $L(f) \not\equiv 0$. Otherwise, if $L(f) \equiv 0$, then we can get $\frac{f' - a'_1}{f - a_1} \equiv \frac{a'_1 - a'_2}{a_1 - a_2}$. Integrating both side of above we can obtain $f - a_1 = C_1(a_1 - a_2)$, where C_1 is a nonzero constant. So by Lemma 2.3, we have $T(r, f) = T(r, f_c) + S(r, f) = T(r, C(a_1 - a_2) + a_1) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. Hence $L(f) \not\equiv 0$. Obviously, we have

$$m\left(r, \frac{L(f)}{f - a_1}\right) \leq m\left(r, \frac{(a' - b')(f - a_1)}{f - a_1}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{(a - b)(f' - a'_1)}{f - a_1}\right) = S(r, f),$$

and

$$\frac{L(f)f}{(f - d_1)(f - d_2) \cdots (f - d_q)} = \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{C_i L(f)}{f - d_i},$$

where $C_i = \frac{d_j}{\prod_{j \neq i} (d_i - d_j)}$ are small functions of f . By Lemma 2.1 and above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m\left(r, \frac{L(f)f}{(f - d_1)(f - d_2) \cdots (f - d_q)}\right) &= m\left(r, \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{C_i L(f)}{f - d_i}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^q m\left(r, \frac{L(f_c)}{f_c - d_i}\right) + S(r, f) = S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

□

3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1

If $f \equiv g$, there is nothing to prove. Suppose $f \not\equiv g$. Since f is a non-constant meromorphic function, f and g share a_1, ∞ CM, then we get

$$\frac{g - a_1}{f - a_1} = q, \quad (3.1)$$

where q is a meromorphic function, and (2.2) implies $h = \frac{1}{q}$.

Since f and g share a_1, ∞ CM and share a_2 IM, then Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.12 we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) &\leq \overline{N}(r, f) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f - a_1}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f - a_2}\right) + S(r, f) = \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g - a_1}\right) \\ &\quad + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{g - b}\right) + S(r, f) \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{f - g}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, f - g) + S(r, f) \leq m(r, f - g) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m\left(r, f - \sum_{i=0}^n b_i f_{c_i}^{(k_i)}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m(r, f) + m\left(r, 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=0}^n b_i f_{c_i}^{(k_i)}}{f}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

That is

$$T(r, f) = \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f - a_1}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f - a_2}\right) + S(r, f). \quad (3.2)$$

According to (3.1) and (3.2) we have

$$T(r, f) = T(r, f - g) + S(r, f) = N\left(r, \frac{1}{f - g}\right) + S(r, f). \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, q) &= m(r, q) + S(r, f) \\ &= m\left(r, \frac{g - a_1}{f - a_1}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m\left(r, \frac{1}{f - a_1}\right) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Then it follows from (3.1) and (3.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} m\left(r, \frac{1}{f - a_1}\right) &= m\left(r, \frac{q - 1}{f - g}\right) \\ &\leq m\left(r, \frac{1}{f - g}\right) + m(r, q - 1) \\ &\leq T(r, q) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Then by (3.4) and (3.5)

$$T(r, q) = m\left(r, \frac{1}{f - a_1}\right) + S(r, f). \quad (3.6)$$

On the other hand, (3.1) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{g-f}{f-a_1} = q-1, \quad (3.7)$$

which implies

$$\overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}\right) \leq \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{q-1}\right) = T(r, q) + S(r, f). \quad (3.8)$$

Thus, by (3.2), (3.6) and (3.8)

$$\begin{aligned} m\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}\right) &= \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{q-1}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}\right) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}\right) = \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}\right) + S(r, f). \quad (3.9)$$

And then

$$\overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}\right) = T(r, q) + S(r, f). \quad (3.10)$$

Set

$$\varphi = \frac{f'(f-g)}{(f-a_1)(f-a_2)}, \quad (3.11)$$

and

$$\psi = \frac{g'(f-g)}{(g-a_1)(g-a_2)}. \quad (3.12)$$

Easy to know that $\varphi \not\equiv 0$ because of $f \not\equiv g$, and $N(r, \varphi) = S(r, f)$. By Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.7 we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, \varphi) &= m(r, \varphi) = m\left(r, \frac{f'(f-g)}{(f-a_1)(f-a_2)}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &= m\left(r, \frac{ff'}{(f-a_1)(f-a_2)} \frac{f - \sum_{i=0}^n b_i f^{(k_i)} c_i}{f}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{b_{-1} ff'}{(f-a_1)(f-a_2)}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m\left(r, \frac{ff'}{(f-a_1)(f-a_2)}\right) + m\left(r, 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=0}^n b_i f^{(k_i)} c_i}{f}\right) + S(r, f) = S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$T(r, \varphi) = S(r, f). \quad (3.13)$$

Let $d = a_1 - j(a_1 - b_1)(j \neq 0, 1)$. Obviously, by Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.12 and the First Fundamental Theorem of Nevanlinna, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2T(r, f) &\leq \overline{N}(r, f) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, f) + T(r, f) - m\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$m(r, \frac{1}{f}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.14)$$

And by (3.14)

$$\begin{aligned} m(r, \frac{1}{f-d}) &= m(r, \frac{f'(f-g)}{\varphi(f-a_1)(f-a_2)(f-d)}) \leq m(r, 1 - \frac{g}{f}) \\ &+ m(r, \frac{ff'}{(f-a_1)(f-a_2)(f-d)}) + S(r, f) = S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Set

$$\phi = \frac{g'}{(g-a_1)(g-a_2)} - \frac{f'}{(f-a_1)(f-a_2)}. \quad (3.16)$$

We discuss two cases.

Case 1 $\phi \equiv 0$. Integrating the both side of (3.16) which leads to

$$\frac{f-a_2}{f-a_1} = C \frac{g-a_2}{g-a_1}, \quad (3.17)$$

where C is a nonzero constant. Then by Lemma 2.4 we get

$$2T(r, f) \leq \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}) + S(r, f), \quad (3.18)$$

which contradicts with (3.2).

Case 2 $\phi \neq 0$. By (3.3), (3.13) and (3.16), we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m(r, f) &= m(r, f-g) + S(r, f) \\ &= m(r, \frac{\phi(f-g)}{\phi}) + S(r, f) = m(r, \frac{\psi-\varphi}{\phi}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \frac{\phi}{\psi-\varphi}) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, \psi-\varphi) + T(r, \phi) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \psi) + T(r, \phi) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \psi) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}) + S(r, f), \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

on the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, \psi) &= T(r, \frac{g'(f-g)}{(g-a_1)(g-a_2)}) \\ &= m(r, \frac{g'(f-g)}{(g-a_1)(g-a_2)}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{g'}{g-a_2}) + m(r, \frac{f-g}{g-a_1}) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}) + S(r, f) = \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

Hence combining (3.19) and (3.20), we obtain

$$T(r, f) \leq 2\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.21)$$

Next, Case 2 is divided into two subcases.

Subcase 2.1 $a_1 = G$, where G is defined as (2.2) in Lemma 2.5. Then by (3.1) and Lemma 2.1 we can get

$$m(r, q) = m(r, \frac{g-G}{f-a_1}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.22)$$

Then by (3.10), (3.21) and (3.22) we can have $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2 $a_2 = G$. Then by (3.6), (3.10) and (3.21), we get

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) &\leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}) + \bar{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-G}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{1}{g-G}) + \bar{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-G}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, g) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

From the fact that

$$T(r, g) \leq T(r, f) + S(r, f), \quad (3.24)$$

which follows from (3.23) that

$$T(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f). \quad (3.25)$$

By Lemma 2.2, (3.2) and (3.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2T(r, f) &\leq 2T(r, g) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \bar{N}(r, g) + \bar{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-a_1}) + \bar{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-G}) + \bar{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-d}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \bar{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}) + \bar{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}) + T(r, \frac{1}{g-d}) - m(r, \frac{1}{g-d}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, f) + T(r, g) - m(r, \frac{1}{g-d}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq 2T(r, f) - m(r, \frac{1}{g-d}) + S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$m(r, \frac{1}{g-d}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.26)$$

From the First Fundamental Theorem, Lemma 2.1, (3.14)-(3.15), (3.25)-(3.26) and f is a non-constant meromorphic function, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m(r, \frac{f-d}{g-d}) &\leq m(r, \frac{f}{g-d}) + m(r, \frac{d}{g-d}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \frac{f}{g-d}) - N(r, \frac{f}{g-d}) + S(r, f) \\ &= m(r, \frac{g-d}{f}) + N(r, \frac{g-d}{f}) - N(r, \frac{f}{g-d}) \\ &\quad + S(r, f) \leq N(r, \frac{1}{f}) - N(r, \frac{1}{g-d}) + S(r, f) \\ &= T(r, \frac{1}{f}) - T(r, \frac{1}{g-d}) + S(r, f) \\ &= T(r, f) - T(r, g) + S(r, f) = S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get

$$m(r, \frac{f-d}{g-d}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.27)$$

It's easy to see that $N(r, \psi) = S(r, f)$ and (3.12) can be rewritten as

$$\psi = [\frac{a_1-d}{a_1-a_2} \frac{g'}{g-a_1} - \frac{a_2-d}{a_1-a_2} \frac{g'}{g-a_2}] [\frac{f-d}{g-d} - 1]. \quad (3.28)$$

Then by (3.27) and (3.28) we can get

$$T(r, \psi) = m(r, \psi) + N(r, \psi) = S(r, f). \quad (3.29)$$

By (3.2), (3.19), and (3.29) we get

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.30)$$

Moreover, by (3.2), (3.25) and (3.30), we have

$$m(r, \frac{1}{g-G}) = S(r, f), \quad (3.31)$$

which implies

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}) = m(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{g-G}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.32)$$

Then by (3.2) we obtain $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

Subcase 2.3 $a_1 \neq G, a_2 \neq G$. So by (3.6), (3.10), (3.21) and Lemma 2.1, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) &\leq 2m(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}) + S(r, f) \leq 2m(r, \frac{1}{g-G}) \\ &\quad + S(r, f) = 2T(r, g) - 2N(r, \frac{1}{g-G}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, g) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-a_1}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-a_2}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-G}) \\ &\quad - 2N(r, \frac{1}{g-G}) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, f) - N(r, \frac{1}{g-G}) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

which deduces that

$$N(r, \frac{1}{g-G}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.33)$$

It follows from (3.33) and Lemma 2.12 that

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, g) &\leq \overline{N}(r, g) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-G}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-a_1}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-a_1}) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, g) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$T(r, g) = \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-a_1}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.34)$$

Similarly

$$T(r, g) = \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-a_2}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.35)$$

Then by (3.21) we get

$$T(r, f) = 2T(r, g) + S(r, f). \quad (3.36)$$

Easy to see from (3.16) that

$$T(r, \phi) = N(r, \phi) + S(r, f) \leq \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-a_2}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.37)$$

We claim that

$$T(r, \phi) = \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-a_2}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.38)$$

Otherwise,

$$T(r, \phi) < \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-a_2}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.39)$$

We can deduce from (3.2), (3.12), Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, \psi) &= T(r, \frac{g'(f-g)}{(g-a_1)(g-a_2)}) = m(r, \frac{g'(f-g)}{(g-a_1)(g-a_2)}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{g'}{g-a_1}) + m(r, \frac{f-a_2}{g-a_2} - 1) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{g-a_2}{f-a_2}) + N(r, \frac{g-a_2}{f-a_2}) - N(r, \frac{f-a_2}{g-a_2}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}) + N(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}) - N(r, \frac{1}{g-a_2}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, f) - \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-a_2}) + S(r, f) \leq \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

which is

$$T(r, \psi) \leq \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.40)$$

Then combining (3.2), (3.39)-(3.40) and the proof of (3.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}) &= T(r, f) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}) + T(r, \phi) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-a_2}) \leq T(r, \phi) + S(r, f), \quad (3.41)$$

a contradiction. Similarly, we can also obtain

$$T(r, \psi) = \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{g-a_1}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.42)$$

By Lemma 2.5, if

$$g = Hh + G, \quad (3.43)$$

where $H \neq 0$ is a small function of h .

Rewrite (3.16) as

$$\phi \equiv \frac{g'(f-a)(f-b) - f'(g-a_1)(g-a_2)}{(f-a_1)(f-a_2)(g-a_1)(g-a_2)}. \quad (3.44)$$

Set $a = \frac{h'}{h}$. Since $N(r, h) + N(r, \frac{1}{h}) = S(r, f)$, we obtain from Lemma 2.1 that

$$T(r, a) = m(r, \frac{h'}{h}) + N(r, \frac{h'}{h}) = S(r, f),$$

which implies that a is a small function of f .

Combing (2.1) with (3.44), we can set

$$\begin{aligned} P &= g'(f-a)(f-b) - f'(g-a_1)(g-a_2) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^5 \alpha_i h^i, \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= (f-a_1)(f-a_2)(g-a_1)(g-a_2) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^6 \beta_j h^j, \end{aligned} \quad (3.46)$$

where α_i and β_j are small functions of h , and $\alpha_5 \neq 0$, $\beta_6 \neq 0$.

If P and Q are two mutually prime polynomials in e^p , then by Lemma 2.9 we can get $T(r, \phi) = 6T(r, h) + S(r, f)$. It follows from (3.10), (3.45)-(3.46) that $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

If P and Q are not two mutually prime polynomials in h , it's easy to see that the degree of Q is large than P .

According to (3.38), (3.45), (3.46) and by simple calculation, we must have

$$\phi = \frac{C}{g-a_2}, \quad (3.47)$$

where $C \neq 0$ is a small function of f .

Put (3.47) into (3.16) we have

$$\frac{C(g-a_1) - g'}{(g-a_1)(g-a_2)} \equiv \frac{-f'}{(f-a_1)(f-a_2)}. \quad (3.48)$$

By (3.43) and (3.48), we claim that $CH \equiv DH + aH$. Otherwise, combining (3.16), (3.38), (3.43) and Lemma 2.8, we can get $T(r, h) = S(r, f)$. It follows from (3.10) and (3.21) that $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. Then by (3.1), (3.48) and $CH \equiv H' + aH$, we have

$$\frac{G' - C(G-a_1)}{Hh + G - a_2} \equiv \frac{(2aH + H')h + a(G-a_1) + G'}{h(Hh + G - a_1) + a_1 - a_2}. \quad (3.49)$$

From above equality and $CH \equiv H' + aH$, we obtain the followings equalities.

$$A \equiv (a + C)H, \quad (3.50)$$

$$[a(G-a_1) + G'](G-a_2) \equiv A(a_1 - a_2), \quad (3.51)$$

and

$$a(G-a_1) + G' + (a + C)(G-a_2) \equiv (a + C)(G-a_1), \quad (3.52)$$

where $A \equiv G' - C(G - a_1)$. By (3.50)-(3.52) we have

$$a_2 \equiv G + H. \quad (3.53)$$

Differential above we get

$$(H + G)' \equiv 0, \quad (3.54)$$

which implies

$$(C - a)H + (a + C)H + C(G - a_1) \equiv C(a_2 + H - a_1) \equiv 0. \quad (3.55)$$

Therefore, we can see from (3.53) and (3.55) that

$$G = 2a_2 - a_1, \quad (3.56)$$

it follows from (3.53) that

$$H = a_1 - a_2. \quad (3.57)$$

Combining (3.43), (3.56) and (3.57), we have

$$g = (a_1 - a_2)h + 2a_2 - a_1. \quad (3.58)$$

And then by (2.1) we have

$$f = a_2 + (a_1 - a_2)(h - 1)^2. \quad (3.59)$$

If $m(r, h) = S(r, f)$, then by (3.10) and (3.21), we deduce $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

4. THE PROOF OF COROLLARY 1

Assume that $f \equiv g$. Set $F = \frac{f-a_1}{a_2-a_1}$ and $G = \frac{g-a_1}{a_2-a_1}$. We know that F and G share 0 CM almost and 1 IM almost. Obviously, we know that G is still a differential-difference polynomial in F . Then by Theorem 1 and Remark 1, we have

$$G = (a_1 - a_2)h + 2a_2 - a_1, \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$F = a_2 + (a_1 - a_2)(h - 1)^2. \quad (4.2)$$

Therefore, if $g = f^{(k)}(z + c)$, since f is a transcendental meromorphic function with $\rho_2(f) < 1$ and $f_c^{(k)}$ and f share ∞ CM, we can see from Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.3 that

$$(1 + o(1))N(r, f) + S(r, f) = N(r, f_c) = N(r, f_c^{(k)}),$$

and on the other hand

$$k\overline{N}(r, f_c) + N(r, f_c) = N(r, f_c^{(k)}), \overline{N}(r, f_c) = \overline{N}(r, f_c^{(k)}) = \overline{N}(r, f),$$

which follows from above equalities that $\overline{N}(r, f) = S(r, f)$. By Theorem 1, we have

$$f = a_2 + (a_1 - a_2)(e^p - 1)^2, \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$f_c^{(k)} = (a_1 - a_2)e^p + 2a_2 - a_1, \quad (4.4)$$

where the reason $h = e^p$ with p a non-constant polynomial is that $f_c^{(k)}$ and f share a_1, ∞ CM, and by (2.1) we know that h is an entire function.

By (4.3) we have

$$f_c^{(k)} = P(z)e^{2p_c} + Q(z)e^{p_c} + a_2^{(k)}, \quad (4.5)$$

where $P(z) \not\equiv 0$ and $Q(z) \not\equiv 0$ are differential polynomial in

$$A_c, A'_c, \dots, A^{(k)}, p_c, p'_c, \dots, p^{(k)},$$

and $A = a_1 - a_2$. So we can not obtain (4.4) from (4.3).

And hence from above discussions, we only obtain $f \equiv f_c^{(k)}$.

5. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 2

If $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$, there is nothing to do. Assume that $f(z) \not\equiv f(z+c)$. Since $f(z)$ is a transcendental meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$, f and $f(z+c)$ share $a_1(z), \infty$ CM, then there is a nonzero entire function $p(z)$ of order less than 1 such that

$$\frac{f(z+c) - a_1(z)}{f(z) - a_1(z)} = e^{p(z)}, \quad (5.1)$$

then by Lemma 2.1 and $a(z)$ is a periodic function with period c ,

$$T(r, e^p) = m(r, e^p) = m(r, \frac{f(z+c) - a_1(z+c)}{f(z) - a_1(z)}) = S(r, f). \quad (5.2)$$

On the other hand, (4.1) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{f(z+c) - f(z)}{f(z) - a_1(z)} = e^{p(z)} - 1. \quad (5.3)$$

We put

$$\varphi(z) = \frac{L(f)(f(z+c) - f(z))}{(f(z) - a_1(z))(f(z) - a_2(z))}, \quad (5.4)$$

where $L(f)$ is defined as in Lemma 2.13. Then by Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.13 and the fact that $f(z)$ and $f(z+c)$ share $a_1(z)$ and ∞ CM, and $a_2(z)$ IM, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, \varphi(z)) &= m(r, \varphi(z)) + N(r, \varphi(z)) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{L(f)f(z)}{(f(z) - a_1(z))(f(z) - a_2(z))}) + m(r, \frac{f(z+c) - f(z)}{f(z)}) \\ &\quad + \overline{N}(r, f(z)) + S(r, f) \leq \overline{N}(r, f(z)) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

which implies $T(r, \varphi(z)) \leq \overline{N}(r, f(z)) + S(r, f)$. If $T(r, \varphi(z)) < \overline{N}(r, f(z)) + S(r, f)$, then we can know from the fact $f(z)$ and $f(z+c)$ share ∞ CM and the definition of $\varphi(z)$ that $\overline{N}(r, f(z)) = S(r, f)$. Then we can see from Theorem G and Remark 1 that $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$. Hence

$$T(r, \varphi(z)) = \overline{N}(r, f(z)) + S(r, f). \quad (5.5)$$

Because the zeros of $f(z+c) - f(z)$ but not the zeros of $f(z) - a(z)$ nor $f(z) - b(z)$ are the zeros of $e^{p(z)} - 1$, and hence by (5.4) we have

$$N(r, \frac{1}{\varphi(z)}) = N(r, \frac{1}{L(f)}) + N_{(2)}(r, \frac{1}{f - a_1}) + N_{(m,n)}(r, \frac{1}{f - a_2})$$

$$-\overline{N}_{(2)}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_1}) - \overline{N}_{(m,n)}(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}) + S(r, f). \quad (5.6)$$

On the other hand, we know from (5.1)-(5.4), Nevanlinna's first fundamental theorem, Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.13 that

$$\begin{aligned} m(r, \frac{1}{\varphi(z)}) &= m(r, \frac{1}{\varphi(z)(e^{p(z)}-1)}) + S(r, f) = m(r, \frac{f-a_2}{L(f)}) + S(r, f) \\ &= m(r, \frac{L(f)}{f-b}) + N(r, \frac{L(f)}{f-a_2}) - N(r, \frac{f-a_2}{L(f)}) + S(r, f) \\ &= N(r, L(f)) + N(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}) - N(r, f) - N(r, \frac{1}{L(f)}) + S(r, f) \\ &= \overline{N}(r, f) + N(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}) - N(r, \frac{1}{L(f)}) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

the first equality holds because $T(r, e^p) = S(r, f)$, so it follows from above that

$$m(r, \frac{1}{\varphi(z)}) = \overline{N}(r, f) + N(r, \frac{1}{f-a_2}) - N(r, \frac{1}{L(f)}) + S(r, f). \quad (5.7)$$

It is easy to see from (5.5)-(5.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{N}(r, f(z)) &= T(r, \varphi(z)) + S(r, f) = m(r, \frac{1}{\varphi(z)}) + N(r, \frac{1}{\varphi(z)}) + S(r, f) \\ &= \overline{N}(r, f(z)) + N(r, \frac{1}{f(z)-a_2(z)}) - N(r, \frac{1}{L(f)}) + N(r, \frac{1}{L(f)}) \\ &+ N_{(2)}(r, \frac{1}{f(z)-a_1(z)}) + N_{(m,n)}(r, \frac{1}{f(z)-a_2(z)}) - \overline{N}_{(2)}(r, \frac{1}{f(z)-a_1(z)}) \\ &- \overline{N}_{(m,n)}(r, \frac{1}{f(z)-a_2(z)}) + S(r, f) = \overline{N}(r, f(z)) + N(r, \frac{1}{f(z)-a_2(z)}) + N_{(2)}(r, \frac{1}{f(z)-a_1(z)}) \\ &+ N_{(m,n)}(r, \frac{1}{f(z)-a_2(z)}) - \overline{N}_{(2)}(r, \frac{1}{f(z)-a_1(z)}) - \overline{N}_{(m,n)}(r, \frac{1}{f(z)-a_2(z)}) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$N_{(2)}(r, \frac{1}{f(z)-a_1(z)}) + N(r, \frac{1}{f(z)-a_2(z)}) = S(r, f). \quad (5.8)$$

We can know from (5.8), Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.3 that

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f(z+c)-a_2(z+c)}) = N(r, \frac{1}{f(z)-a_2(z)}) + S(r, f) = S(r, f). \quad (5.9)$$

Set

$$\psi(z) = \frac{f(z+c)-a_2(z+c)}{f(z)-a_2(z)}. \quad (5.10)$$

It is easy to see that

$$N(r, \frac{1}{\psi(z)}) \leq N(r, \frac{1}{f(z+c)-a_2(z+c)}) + N(r, a_2(z)) = S(r, f), \quad (5.11)$$

$$N(r, \psi(z)) \leq N(r, \frac{1}{f(z)-a_2(z)}) + N(r, a_2(z+c)) = S(r, f). \quad (5.12)$$

Hence by Lemma 2.1,

$$T(r, \psi(z)) = m(r, \psi(z)) + N(r, \psi(z))$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq m(r, \frac{f(z+c) - a_2(z+c)}{f(z) - a_2(z)}) + N(r, \frac{1}{f(z) - a_2(z)}) \\ &+ S(r, f) \leq S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

Subtracting (5.10) from (5.1), we have

$$(e^{p(z)} - \psi(z))f(z) + \psi(z)a_2(z) + a_1(z) - a_2(z+c) - a_1(z)e^{p(z)} \equiv 0. \quad (5.14)$$

We discuss following two cases.

Case 1 $e^{p(z)} \not\equiv \psi(z)$. Then by (4.2), (4.10) and (4.13) we obtain $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

Case 2 $e^{p(z)} \equiv \psi(z)$. Then by (5.1) we have

$$f(z+c) = e^{p(z)}(f(z) - a_1(z)) + a_1(z), \quad (5.15)$$

and

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f(z+c) - a_2(z)}) = N(r, \frac{1}{f(z) - a_1(z) + \frac{a_1(z) - a_2(z)}{e^{p(z)}}}) = S(r, f). \quad (5.16)$$

If $a_2(z)$ is a periodic function of period c , then by (5.11) we can get $e^{p(z)} \equiv 1$, which implies $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$, a contradiction. Obviously, $a_1(z) - \frac{a_1(z) - a_2(z)}{e^{p(z)}} \not\equiv a_1(z)$. Otherwise, we can deduce $a_1(z) \equiv a_2(z)$, a contradiction.

Next, we discuss three Subcases.

Subcase 2.1 $a_1(z) - \frac{a_1(z) - a_2(z)}{e^{p(z)}} \not\equiv a_2(z)$ and $a_1(z) - \frac{a_1(z) - a_2(z)}{e^{p(z)}} \not\equiv a_2(z-c)$. Then according to (5.5), (5.6), (5.16) and Lemma 2.12, we can get $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2 $a_1(z) - \frac{a_1(z) - a_2(z)}{e^{p(z)}} \equiv a_2(z)$, but $a_1(z) - \frac{a_1(z) - a_2(z)}{e^{p(z)}} \not\equiv a_2(z-c)$. It follows that $e^{p(z)} \equiv 1$. Therefore by (5.1) we have $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$, a contradiction.

Subcase 2.3 $a_1(z) - \frac{a_1(z) - a_2(z)}{e^{p(z)}} \not\equiv a_2(z)$ and $a_1(z) - \frac{a_1(z) - a_2(z)}{e^{p(z)}} \equiv a_2(z-c)$. It is easy to see that

$$\frac{a_1(z) - a_2(z)}{a_1(z-c) - a_2(z-c)} = e^{p(z)}. \quad (5.17)$$

Furthermore, (5.14) implies

$$\frac{a_1(z+c) - a_2(z+c)}{a_1(z) - a_2(z)} = e^{p(z)}, \quad (5.18)$$

$$\frac{a_1(z) - a_2(z)}{a_1(z-c) - a_2(z-c)} = e^{p(z-c)}. \quad (5.19)$$

It follows from (5.17) and (5.19) that

$$e^{p(z)} = e^{p(z+c)}. \quad (5.20)$$

We also set

$$F(z) = \frac{f(z) - a_1(z)}{a_2(z) - a_1(z)}, \quad G(z) = \frac{f(z+c) - a_1(z)}{a_2(z) - a_1(z)}. \quad (5.21)$$

Since $f(z)$ and $f(z+c)$ share $a_1(z)$ and ∞ CM, and $a_2(z)$ IM, so $F(z)$ and $G(z)$ share $0, \infty$ CM almost, and 1 IM almost. We claim that F is not a bilinear transform of

G. Otherwise, we can see from Lemma 2.9 that if (i) occurs, we have $F(z) \equiv G(z)$, that is $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$. If (ii) occurs, we have

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f(z) - a_1(z)}\right) = S(r, f), \quad N(r, f(z)) = S(r, f). \quad (5.22)$$

Then by (5.8), (5.22) and Lemma 2.13, we can get $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. If (iii) occurs, we have

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f(z) - a_1(z)}\right) = S(r, f), \quad N\left(r, \frac{1}{f(z) - a_2(z)}\right) = S(r, f). \quad (5.23)$$

Then it follows from above, $a_1(z) - \frac{a_1(z) - a_2(z)}{e^{p(z)}} \not\equiv a_1(z)$, $a_1(z) - \frac{a_1(z) - a_2(z)}{e^{p(z)}} \not\equiv a_2(z)$ and Lemma 2.13 that $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

If (iv) occurs, we have $F(z) \equiv jG(z)$, that is

$$f(z) - a_1(z) = j(f(z+c) - a_1(z)), \quad (5.24)$$

where $j \neq 0, 1$ is a finite constant. By (5.1) and (5.24), we have $e^{p(z)} \equiv j$. If $a_2(z+c) \not\equiv a_2(z-c)$, then by (5.9), (5.16) and Lemma 2.13, we get $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. Thus, we have $a_2(z+c) \equiv a_2(z-c)$. Moreover, since $a(z)$ is a periodic function with period c , we can deduce $j^2 = 1$ from $e^{p(z)} \equiv j$ and (5.18)-(5.19). If $j = 1$, we have $f(z+c) \equiv f(z)$, a contradiction. If $j = -1$, we obtain $f(z+c) = 2a_1(z) - f(z)$. Then by Lemma 2.10, we know that either $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$, a contradiction. Or $N(r, f(z)) = S(r, f)$, and in this case we can see from Theorem G and Remark 1 that $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$, a contradiction.

If (v) occurs, we have

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f(z) - a_1(z)}\right) = S(r, f). \quad (5.25)$$

Then by Lemma 2.12, (5.9), (5.16) and $a_2(z-c) \not\equiv a_1(z)$, we obtain $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

If (vi) occurs, we have

$$N(r, f(z)) = S(r, f). \quad (5.26)$$

And hence we can see from Theorem G and Remark 1 that $f(z) \equiv f(z+c)$, a contradiction.

Therefore, $F(z)$ is not a linear fraction transformation of $G(z)$. If $a_2(z)$ is a small function with period $2c$, that is $a_2(z+c) \equiv a_2(z-c)$, we can set

$$\begin{aligned} D(z) &= (f(z) - a_2(z))(a_2(z) - a_2(z-c)) - (f(z+c) - a_2(z+c))(a_2(z+c) - a_2(z)) \\ &= (f(z) - a_2(z-c))(a_2(z) - a_2(z-c)) - (f(z+c) - a_2(z))(a_2(z+c) - a_2(z)) \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

If $D(z) \equiv 0$, then we have $f(z+c) \equiv a_2(z+c) + a_2(z) - f(z)$, that is to say $F(z)$ is a linear fraction transformation of $G(z)$, a contradiction. Hence $D(z) \not\equiv 0$, and by (5.9)-(5.10), (5.16) and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2T(r, f(z)) &= m\left(r, \frac{1}{f(z) - a_2(z)}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{1}{f(z) - a_2(z-c)}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &= m\left(r, \frac{1}{f(z) - a_2(z)} + \frac{1}{f(z) - a_2(z-c)}\right) + S(r, f) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq m(r, \frac{D(z)}{f(z) - a_2(z)} + \frac{D(z)}{f(z) - a_2(z - c)}) + m(r, \frac{1}{D(z)}) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq m(r, \frac{1}{(\psi(z) + 1)(f(z) - a_2(z))(a_2(z) - a_2(z - c))}) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq m(r, \frac{1}{f(z) - a_2(z)}) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, f) + S(r, f), \tag{5.28}
\end{aligned}$$

which implies $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

By (5.18) we have

$$\frac{\Delta_c a_2(z)}{1 - e^{p(z)}} + a_2(z) = a_1(z). \tag{5.29}$$

Combining (5.20) and the fact that $a(z)$ is a small function with period c , we can get

$$\frac{\Delta_c a_2(z + c)}{1 - e^{p(z)}} + a_2(z + c) = a_1(z). \tag{5.30}$$

According to (5.29) and (5.30), we obtain

$$e^{p(z)} = \frac{a_2(z + 2c) - a_2(z + c)}{\Delta_c^2 a_2(z)}. \tag{5.31}$$

So if $\rho(b(z)) < \rho(e^{p(z)})$, we can follow from (5.31) and Lemma 2.11 that

$$\rho(e^{p(z)}) = \rho\left(\frac{a_2(z + 2c) - a_2(z + c)}{\Delta_c^2 a_2(z)}\right) \leq \rho(a_2(z)) < \rho(e^{p(z)}), \tag{5.32}$$

which is a contradiction.

If $\rho(a_2(z)) < 1$, we claim that $p(z) \equiv B$ is a non-zero constant. Otherwise, the order of right hand side of (5.31) is 0, but the left hand side is 1, which is impossible. Therefore, by (5.1) we know that $f(z + c) - a_1(z) = B(f(z) - a_1(z))$, that is to say $F(z)$ is a linear fraction transformation of $G(z)$, a contradiction.

This completes Theorem 2.

Acknowledgements The author would like to thank to referee for his helpful comments and also to the previous referee for giving the Example 4. The author also would like to express his grateful to Tohge Kazuya for communication about this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. M. Chiang and S. J. Feng, *On the Nevanlinna characteristic of $f(z + \eta)$ and difference equations in the complex plane*, Ramanujan J. 16 (2008), no. 1, 105-129.
- [2] Y. M. Chiang and S. J. Feng, *On the growth of logarithmic differences, difference quotients and logarithmic derivatives of meromorphic functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 361 (2009), 3767-3791.
- [3] G. G. Gundersen, *Meromorphic Functions that Share Three or Four Values*, J. London Math. Soc. 20 (1979), 457-466.
- [4] R. G. Halburd and R. J. Korhonen, *Difference analogue of the lemma on the logarithmic derivative with applications to difference equations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 314 (2006), no. 2, 477-487.
- [5] R. G. Halburd and R. J. Korhonen, *Nevanlinna theory for the difference operator*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 31 (2006), no. 2, 463-478.
- [6] R. G. Halburd, R. J. Korhonen and K. Tohge, *Holomorphic curves with shift-invariant hyperplane preimages*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 366 (2014), no. 8, 4267-4298.

- [7] J. Heittokangas, R. Korhonen, I. Laine and J. Rieppo, *Uniqueness of meromorphic functions sharing values with their shifts*, Complex Var. Elliptic Equ. 56 (2011), 81-92.
- [8] J. Heittokangas, R. Korhonen, I. Laine and J. Rieppo, J. Zhang *Value sharing results for shifts of meromorphic functions, and sufficient conditions for periodicity*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 355 (2009) 352-363.
- [9] Huang, X.H. : *Correction to: Unicity on entire function concerning its differential-difference operators*, Results Math. **77**, Article number: 87 (2022)
- [10] X. H. Huang and M. L. Fang, *Unicity of Entire Functions Concerning their Shifts and Derivatives*, Comput. Methods Funct. Theory 21 (2021), 523–532.
- [11] W. K. Hayman, *Meromorphic functions*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs Clarendon Press, Oxford 1964.
- [12] I. Lahiri and A. Sarkar, *On a uniqueness theorem of Tohge*, Arch. Math. 84 (2005), 461–469.
- [13] I. Laine and C. C. Yang, *Clunie theorems for difference and q -difference polynomials*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. 76 (2007), 556-566.
- [14] X. M. Li and H. X. Yi , *Meromorphic functions sharing four values with their difference operators or shifts*, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. 53 (2016), 1213–1235
- [15] I. Laine and C. C. Yang, *Value distribution of difference polynomials*, Proc. Japan Acad. 83 (2007), 148-151.
- [16] P. Li and C. C. Yang, *Value sharing of an entire function and its derivatives*, J. Math. Soc. Japan. 51 (1999), no. 7, 781-799.
- [17] K. Liu and X. J. Dong, *Some results related to complex differential-difference equations of certain types*, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. 51 (2014), 1453-1467.
- [18] L. A. Rubel and C. C. Yang, *Values shared by an entire function and its derivative*, Lecture Notes in Math. Springer, Berlin, 599 (1977), 101-103.
- [19] C. C. Yang and H. X. Yi, *Uniqueness theory of meromorphic functions*, Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 2003.
- [20] L. Yang, *Value Distribution Theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.
- [21] K. Yamanoi, *The second main theorem for small functions and related problems*, Acta Math. **192**, 225-294 (2004)
- [22] J. H. Zheng and S. P. Wang, *On Unicity Properties of Meromorphic Functions and Their Derivatives*, Adv. in Math(China). 21 (1992), no. 3, 334-341.

XIAOHUANG HUANG: CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 1 DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SUN YAT-SEN UNIVERSITY,
GUANGZHOU, 510275, P.R. CHINA

Email address: 1838394005@qq.com