

**SOME RESULTS ON TRANSCENDENTAL ENTIRE SOLUTIONS  
OF CERTAIN NONLINEAR DIFFERENTIAL-DIFFERENCE  
EQUATIONS**

NAN LI, JIACHUAN GENG, AND LIANZHONG YANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study the transcendental entire solutions for the nonlinear differential-difference equations of the forms:

$$f^2(z) + \tilde{\omega}f(z)f'(z) + q(z)e^{Q(z)}f(z+c) = u(z)e^{v(z)},$$

and

$$f^n(z) + \omega f^{n-1}(z)f'(z) + q(z)e^{Q(z)}f(z+c) = p_1e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2e^{\lambda_2 z}, \quad n \geq 3,$$

where  $\omega$  is a constant,  $\tilde{\omega}, c, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, p_1, p_2$  are non-zero constants,  $q, Q, u, v$  are polynomials such that  $Q, v$  are not constants and  $q, u \not\equiv 0$ . Our results are improvements and complements of some previous results.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $f(z)$  be a transcendental meromorphic function in the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$ . We assume that the reader is familiar with the standard notations and main results in Nevanlinna theory (see [10],[12],[20]). Throughout this paper, the term  $S(r, f)$  always has the property that  $S(r, f) = o(T(r, f))$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , possibly outside a set  $E$  (which is not necessarily the same at each occurrence) of finite logarithmic measure. A meromorphic function  $a(z)$  is said to be a small function with respect to  $f(z)$  if and only if  $T(r, a) = S(r, f)$ .

In the past few decades, many scholars have investigated existence, order and value distribution of solutions of complex differential or difference equations, see [1, 6, 12, 16] etc.

In 1964, Hayman [10] considered the following non-linear differential equation

$$(1.1) \quad f^n(z) + Q_d(f(z)) = g(z),$$

where  $Q_d(f)$  is a differential polynomial in  $f$  with degree  $d$  and obtained the following result.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Suppose that  $f(z)$  is a nonconstant meromorphic function,  $d \leq n-1$ , and  $f, g$  satisfy  $N(r, f) + N(r, 1/g) = S(r, f)$  in (1.1). Then we have  $g(z) = (f(z) + \gamma(z))^n$ , where  $\gamma(z)$  is meromorphic and a small function of  $f(z)$ .*

After that, dozens of papers, see [13, 14, 15, 17] etc., focus on the solutions of the nonlinear differential equations of the forms

$$f^n(z) + P(f(z)) = h(z), \text{ or } f^n(z)f'(z) + P(f(z)) = h(z),$$

---

*Date:* December 31, 2021.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 30D35; Secondary 39B32.

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

where  $P(f)$  denotes a differential polynomial in  $f$  of degree at most  $n - 1$ , and  $h$  is a given meromorphic function such as  $ue^v$  (where  $u, v$  are polynomials),  $p_1e^{\alpha_1} + p_2e^{\alpha_2}$  (where  $p_1, p_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$  are polynomials), etc.

In 2012, Wen et al. [19] investigated and classified the finite order entire solutions of the equation

$$(1.2) \quad f^n(z) + q(z)e^{Q(z)}f(z+c) = P(z),$$

where  $q, Q, P$  are polynomials,  $n \geq 2$  is an integer, and  $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Later, Chen [2] replaced  $P(z)$  in (1.2) by  $p_1e^{\lambda z} + p_2e^{-\lambda z}$ , where  $p_1, p_2, \lambda$  are non-zero constants, and studied its finite order entire solutions when  $n \geq 3$ .

By observing all the above equations, we can see that there exists only one dominant term  $f^n$  or  $f^n f'$  on the left-hand side. Hence a natural interesting area of inquiry is the study of equations which may have two dominated terms on the left-hand side with the same degree.

Motivated by the above equations, Chen, Hu and Wang [4] investigated the following non-linear differential-difference equation

$$(1.3) \quad f^n(z) + \omega f^{n-1}(z)f'(z) + q(z)e^{Q(z)}f(z+c) = u(z)e^{v(z)},$$

where  $n$  is a positive integer,  $c \neq 0$ ,  $\omega$  are constants,  $q, Q, u, v$  are polynomials such that  $Q, v$  are not constants and  $q, u \not\equiv 0$ , and obtained the following result.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $n$  be an integer satisfying  $n \geq 3$  for  $\omega \neq 0$  and  $n \geq 2$  for  $\omega = 0$ . Suppose that  $f$  is a non-vanishing transcendental entire solution of finite order of (1.3). Then every solution  $f$  satisfies one of the following results:*

- (1)  $\rho(f) < \deg v = \deg Q$  and  $f = Ce^{-z/\omega}$ , where  $C$  is a constant.
- (2)  $\rho(f) = \deg Q \geq \deg v$ .

Then it's natural to ask: what will happen for the solutions of equation (1.3) when  $n = 2$  and  $\omega \neq 0$ ? In this paper, we study this problem and obtain the following result, which is a complement of Theorem 1.2.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $c, \tilde{\omega} \neq 0$  be constants,  $q, Q, u, v$  be polynomials such that  $Q, v$  are not constants and  $q, u \not\equiv 0$ . Suppose that  $f$  is a transcendental entire solution with finite order of*

$$(1.4) \quad f^2(z) + \tilde{\omega}f(z)f'(z) + q(z)e^{Q(z)}f(z+c) = u(z)e^{v(z)},$$

*satisfying  $\lambda(f) < \rho(f)$ , then  $\deg Q = \deg v$ , and one of the following relations holds:*

- (1)  $\sigma(f) < \deg Q = \deg v$ , and  $f = Ce^{-z/\tilde{\omega}}$
- (2)  $\sigma(f) = \deg Q = \deg v$ .

Two examples are given below to show that our estimates in Theorem 1.3 are sharp.

**Example 1.4.**  $f_0(z) = 2e^{-z}$  is a transcendental entire solution of the following differential-difference equation

$$f^2 + ff' + ze^{z^2+z+1}f(z+1) = 2ze^{z^2}.$$

Here  $\tilde{\omega} = 1 \neq 0$ ,  $Q = z^2 + z + 1$ ,  $v = z^2$  and  $0 = \lambda(f_0) < \sigma(f_0) = 1$ . Then we have  $\sigma(f_0) = 1 < 2 = \deg Q = \deg v$ , and  $f_0 = Ce^{-z/\tilde{\omega}}$ , where  $C = 2$ . This shows that Conclusion (1) of Theorem 1.3 occurs.

**Example 1.5.**  $f_1(z) = e^{z^2}$  is a transcendental entire solution of the following differential-difference equation

$$f^2 + ff' + e^{z^2-2z-1}f(z+1) = 2(z+1)e^{2z^2}.$$

Here  $\tilde{\omega} = 1 \neq 0$ ,  $Q = z^2 - 2z - 1$ ,  $v = 2z^2$  and  $0 = \lambda(f_1) < \sigma(f_1) = 2$ . Then we have  $\sigma(f_1) = 2 = \deg Q = \deg v$ . This illustrates that Conclusion (2) of Theorem 1.3 also exits.

It is also interesting to investigate the entire solutions with finite order of the following differential-difference equation

$$(1.5) \quad f^n(z) + \omega f^{n-1}(z)f'(z) + q(z)e^{Q(z)}f(z+c) = p_1e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2e^{\lambda_2 z},$$

where  $n$  is a positive integer,  $\omega$  is a constant and  $c, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, p_1, p_2$  are non-zero constants,  $q, Q$  are polynomials such that  $Q$  is not a constant and  $q \not\equiv 0$ .

In 2020, Chen, Hu and Wang [4] studied the special case  $\lambda_2 = -\lambda_1$  for the above problem and obtained the following result.

**Theorem 1.6.** *If  $f$  is a transcendental entire solution with finite order of*

$$(1.6) \quad f^n(z) + \omega f^{n-1}(z)f'(z) + q(z)e^{Q(z)}f(z+c) = p_1e^{\lambda z} + p_2e^{-\lambda z},$$

*then the following conclusions hold:*

- (i) *If  $n \geq 4$  for  $\omega \neq 0$  and  $n \geq 3$  for  $\omega = 0$ , then every solution  $f$  satisfies  $\rho(f) = \deg Q = 1$ .*
- (ii) *If  $n \geq 1$  and  $f$  is a solution of (1.6) which belongs to  $\Gamma_0$ , then*

$$f(z) = e^{\lambda z/n+B}, \quad Q(z) = -\frac{n+1}{n}\lambda z + b$$

or

$$f(z) = e^{-\lambda z/n+B}, \quad Q(z) = \frac{n+1}{n}\lambda z + b$$

where  $b, B \in \mathbb{C}$ , and  $\Gamma_0 = \{e^{\alpha(z)} : \alpha(z) \text{ is a non-constant polynomial}\}$ .

For the case  $\lambda_2 = \lambda_1$ , equation (1.5) can be reduced to  $f^n(z) + \omega f^{n-1}(z)f'(z) + q(z)e^{Q(z)}f(z+c) = (p_1 + p_2)e^{\lambda_1 z}$ , so we can get the order of entire solutions by using Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

Then it is natural to ask : what will happen for the entire solutions of equation (1.5) when  $\lambda_2 \neq \pm\lambda_1$  ? In this paper, we study this problem and obtain the following result.

**Theorem 1.7.** *If  $f$  is a transcendental entire solution with finite order of (1.5), then the following conclusions hold:*

- (1) *If  $n \geq 4$  for  $\omega \neq 0$  and  $n \geq 3$  for  $\omega = 0$ , then every solution  $f$  satisfies  $\sigma(f) = \deg Q = 1$ .*
- (2) *If  $n \geq 1$  and  $f$  is a solution of (1.5) with  $\lambda(f) < \sigma(f)$ , then*

$$f(z) = \left(\frac{p_2 n}{n + \omega \lambda_2}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} e^{\frac{\lambda_2 z}{n}}, \quad Q(z) = \left(\lambda_1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{n}\right)z + b_1,$$

or

$$f(z) = \left(\frac{p_1 n}{n + \omega \lambda_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} e^{\frac{\lambda_1 z}{n}}, \quad Q(z) = \left(\lambda_2 - \frac{\lambda_1}{n}\right)z + b_2,$$

where  $b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{C}$  satisfy  $p_1 = q \left( \frac{p_2 n}{n + \omega \lambda_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} e^{\frac{\lambda_2 c}{n} + b_1}$  and  $p_2 = q \left( \frac{p_1 n}{n + \omega \lambda_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} e^{\frac{\lambda_1 c}{n} + b_2}$ , respectively.

**Remark 1.** Obviously, let  $\lambda_2 = -\lambda_1$ , we can see that Theorem 1.7(1) is an improvement of Theorem 1.6 (i). Since any function  $f$  which belongs to  $\Gamma_0$  all satisfy the condition that  $\lambda(f) < \sigma(f)$ , thus Theorem 1.7(2) is also an improvement of Theorem 1.6 (ii).

By observing Conclusion (1) of Theorem 1.7, it is natural to ask what will happen for the entire solutions of equation (1.5) when  $n = 3$  and  $\omega \neq 0$ ? In this paper we also study this problem and obtain the following result.

**Theorem 1.8.** Let  $\omega, c, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, p_1, p_2$  be non-zero constants,  $q, Q$  be polynomials such that  $Q$  is not a constant and  $q \not\equiv 0$ . If  $f$  is a transcendental entire solution with finite order of

$$(1.7) \quad f^3(z) + \omega f^2(z)f'(z) + q(z)e^{Q(z)}f(z+c) = p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z},$$

satisfying  $N_1(r, 1/f) < (\kappa + o(1))T(r, f)$ , where  $0 \leq \kappa < 1$  and  $N_1(r, 1/f)$  denotes the counting functions corresponding to simple zeros of  $f$ , then  $\sigma(f) = \deg Q = 1$ .

The two examples below exhibit the sharpness of Theorem 1.8.

**Example 1.9.**  $f_2(z) = e^z$  is an transcendental entire solution of the nonlinear differential-difference equation

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

Here  $\omega = 1 \neq 0$ ,  $Q = -4z$ ,  $N_1(r, 1/f_2) = 0$  from the fact that 0 is a Picard exceptional value of  $f_2$ , and  $\sigma(f_2) = 1 = \deg Q$ .

**Example 1.10.**  $f_3(z) = e^{2z} - e^z$  is an transcendental entire solution of the nonlinear differential-difference equation

$$f^3 - f^2 f' - \frac{1}{5} e^{3z} f(z + \log 5) = -e^{6z} - 3e^{5z}.$$

Here  $\omega = -1 \neq 0$ ,  $Q = 3z$ ,  $N_1(r, 1/f_3) = N(r, 1/f_3) = r/\pi + o(r) < 2r/\pi + o(r) = T(r, f_3)$  by using the following Lemma 2.5, and  $\sigma(f_3) = 1 = \deg Q$ .

## 2. PRELIMINARY LEMMAS

The following two lemmas play important roles in uniqueness problems of meromorphic functions.

**Lemma 2.1** ([20]). Let  $f_j(z)$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ) ( $n \geq 2$ ) be meromorphic functions, and let  $g_j(z)$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ) be entire functions satisfying

- (i)  $\sum_{j=1}^n f_j(z)e^{g_j(z)} \equiv 0$ ;
- (ii) when  $1 \leq j < k \leq n$ , then  $g_j(z) - g_k(z)$  is not a constant;
- (iii) when  $1 \leq j \leq n, 1 \leq h < k \leq n$ , then

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

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

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

**Lemma 2.2** ([20]). *Let  $f_j(z)$ ,  $j = 1, 2, 3$  be meromorphic functions and  $f_1(z)$  is not a constant. If*

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 f_j(z) \equiv 1,$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 N\left(r, \frac{1}{f_j}\right) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^3 \bar{N}(r, f_j) < (\lambda + o(1))T(r), \quad r \in I,$$

where  $\lambda < 1$ ,  $T(r) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq 3} \{T(r, f_j)\}$  and  $I$  represents a set of  $r \in (0, \infty)$  with infinite linear measure. Then  $f_2 \equiv 1$  or  $f_3 \equiv 1$ .

The difference analogues of Logarithmic Derivative Lemma (see [3, 7, 8, 9, 11]) play important roles in the study of complex difference equations. The following version is a special case of [11, Lemma 2.2].

**Lemma 2.3.** [11] *Let  $f$  be a non-constant meromorphic function, let  $c, h$  be two complex numbers such that  $c \neq h$ . If the hyper-order of  $T(r, f)$  i.e.  $\sigma_2(f) < 1$ , then*

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

for all  $r$  outside of a set of finite logarithmic measure.

The following lemma, which is a special case of [11, Theorem 3.1], gives a relationship for the Nevanlinna characteristics of meromorphic function with its shift.

**Lemma 2.4.** [11] *Let  $f(z)$  be a meromorphic function with the hyper-order less than one, and  $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Then we have*

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

The following lemma gives the Nevanlinna characteristic and counting functions of an exponential polynomial. For convenience of the readers, let's first recall some definitions and notations concerning exponential polynomial of the form

$$(2.1) \quad f(z) = P_1(z)e^{Q_1(z)} + \cdots + P_k(z)e^{Q_k(z)},$$

where  $P_j$  and  $Q_j$  are polynomials in  $z$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k$ . Following Steinmetz [18], (2.1) can be written in the normalized form

$$(2.2) \quad f(z) = H_0(z) + H_1(z)e^{\omega_1 z^q} + \cdots + H_m(z)e^{\omega_m z^q},$$

where  $H_j$  are either exponential polynomials of order  $< q$  or ordinary polynomials in  $z$ , the leading coefficients  $\omega_j$  are pairwise distinct, and  $m \leq k$ . In addition, the convex hull of a finite set  $W \subset \mathbb{C}$ , denoted by  $co(W)$ , is the intersection of finitely many closed half-planes each including  $W$ , and hence  $co(W)$  is either a compact polygon or a line segment. We denote the circumference of  $co(W)$  by  $C(co(W))$ . Concerning the exponential polynomial  $f(z)$  in (2.2), we denote  $W = \{\bar{\omega}_1, \dots, \bar{\omega}_m\}$  and  $W_0 = W \cup \{0\}$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** [18] *Let  $f(z)$  be given by (2.2). Then*

$$T(r, f) = C(co(W_0)) \frac{r^q}{2\pi} + o(r^q).$$

If  $H_0(z) \not\equiv 0$ , then

$$m\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) = o(r^q),$$

while if  $H_0(z) \equiv 0$ , then

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) = C(\text{co}(W)) \frac{r^q}{2\pi} + o(r^q).$$

The following lemma is a revised version of [12, Lemma 2.4.2].

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $f(z)$  be a transcendental meromorphic solution of the equation:*

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

where  $P(z, f)$  and  $Q(z, f)$  are polynomials in  $f$  and its derivatives with meromorphic coefficients, say  $\{a_\lambda | \lambda \in I\}$ ,  $n$  be a positive integer. If the total degree of  $Q(z, f)$  as a polynomial in  $f$  and its derivatives is at most  $n$ , then

$$m(r, P(z, f)) \leq \sum_{\lambda \in I} m(r, a_\lambda) + S(r, f).$$

**Lemma 2.7.** *(the Hadamard factorization theorem [20, Theorem 2.7] or [5, Theorem 1.9]) Let  $f$  be a meromorphic function of finite order  $\sigma(f)$ . Write*

$$f(z) = c_k z^k + c_{k+1} z^{k+1} + \dots \quad (c_k \neq 0)$$

near  $z = 0$  and let  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$  and  $\{b_1, b_2, \dots\}$  be the zeros and poles of  $f$  in  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ , respectively. Then

$$f(z) = z^k e^{Q(z)} \frac{P_1(z)}{P_2(z)},$$

where  $P_1(z)$  and  $P_2(z)$  are the canonical products of  $f$  formed with the non-null zeros and poles of  $f(z)$ , respectively, and  $Q(z)$  is a polynomial of degree  $\leq \sigma(f)$ .

**Remark 2.** *A well known fact about Lemma 2.7 asserts that  $\lambda(f) = \lambda(z^k P_1) = \sigma(z^k P_1) \leq \sigma(f)$ ,  $\lambda(1/f) = \lambda(P_2) = \sigma(P_2) \leq \sigma(f)$  if  $k \geq 0$ ; and  $\lambda(f) = \lambda(P_1) = \sigma(P_1) \leq \sigma(f)$ ,  $\lambda(1/f) = \lambda(z^{-k} P_2) = \sigma(z^{-k} P_2) \leq \sigma(f)$  if  $k < 0$ . So we have  $\sigma(f) = \sigma(e^Q)$  when  $\max\{\lambda(f), \lambda(1/f)\} < \sigma(f)$ .*

By combining [20, Theorem1.42] with [20, Theorem1.44], we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.8** ([20]). *Let  $f(z)$  be a non-constant meromorphic function in the complex plane. If  $0, \infty$  are Picard exceptional values of  $f(z)$ , then  $f(z) = e^{h(z)}$ , where  $h(z)$  is a non-constant entire function. Moreover,  $f(z)$  is of normal growth, and*

- (i) *if  $h(z)$  is a polynomial of degree  $p$ , then  $\sigma(f) = p$ ;*
- (ii) *if  $h(z)$  is a transcendental entire function, then  $\sigma(f) = \infty$ .*

The following lemma gives a relationship between the growth order of a function and its derivative.

**Lemma 2.9** ([20]). *Suppose that  $f(z)$  is meromorphic in the complex plane and  $n$  is a positive integer. Then  $f(z)$  and  $f^{(n)}(z)$  have the same order.*

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3.

Let  $f$  be a transcendental entire solution with finite order of equation (1.4) satisfying  $\lambda(f) < \sigma(f)$ . Then, by Lemma 2.7 and Remark 2, we can factorize  $f(z)$  as

$$(3.1) \quad f(z) = d(z) e^{h(z)},$$

where  $h$  is a polynomial with  $\deg h = \sigma(f)$ ,  $d$  is the canonical products formed by zeros of  $f$  with  $\sigma(d) = \lambda(f) < \sigma(f)$ . Obviously,  $h$  is a non-constant polynomial, otherwise we'll have  $\sigma(f) = \sigma(d) = \lambda(f)$ , a contradiction. Thus we have that  $\deg h \geq 1$ . Let  $\deg h = m (\geq 1)$ , and  $h(z) = a_m z^m + a_{m-1} z^{m-1} + \dots$ , where  $a_m \neq 0$ .

We rewrite (1.4) as

$$(3.2) \quad f^2 + \tilde{\omega} f f' + q e^Q f_c = u e^v,$$

where  $f_c = f(z+c)$ , for simplicity.

Obviously, we have  $\sigma(f_c) = \sigma(f) = \sigma(f')$  by Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.9. So from (3.2), by the order property, we get

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \deg v = \sigma(u e^v) &\leq \max\{\sigma(f') = \sigma(f) = \sigma(f_c), \sigma(e^Q), \sigma(q)\} \\ &= \max\{\deg h, \deg Q\}. \end{aligned}$$

By substituting (3.1) into (3.2), we get

$$(3.4) \quad (d^2 + \tilde{\omega} d \cdot (d' + dh')) e^{2h} + q d_c e^{Q+h_c} = u e^v.$$

**Case 1.**  $\sigma(f) > \deg Q$ , then we have  $\deg h > \deg Q \geq 1$ , and  $\deg v \leq \deg h$  from (3.3).

**Subcase 1.1.**  $\deg h > \deg v$ . From (3.4) we have

$$(3.5) \quad (d^2 + \tilde{\omega} d \cdot (d' + dh')) e^{h_1} e^{2a_m z^m} + q d_c e^{h_2} e^{a_m z^m} = u e^v,$$

where  $h_1 = 2a_{m-1} z^{m-1} + \dots$  and  $h_2 = Q + (a_m m c + a_{m-1}) z^{m-1} + \dots$  are all polynomials with degree at most  $m-1$ . So, combining with  $\sigma(d') = \sigma(d) = \sigma(d_c) < m$ , by using Lemma 2.1 to (3.5), we have

$$q d_c \equiv 0,$$

which yields a contradiction. Thus  $\deg h > \deg v$  can not holds.

**Subcase 1.2.**  $\deg h = \deg v$ . Let  $v(z) = v_m z^m + v_{m-1} z^{m-1} + \dots$ , where  $v_m \neq 0$ . From (3.4) we have

$$(3.6) \quad (d^2 + \tilde{\omega} d \cdot (d' + dh')) e^{h_1} e^{2a_m z^m} + q d_c e^{h_2} e^{a_m z^m} = u e^{h_3} e^{v_m z^m}.$$

where  $h_3 = v_{m-1} z^{m-1} + \dots$  is a polynomial with degree at most  $m-1$ ,  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  are defined as in Subcase 1.1.

If  $v_m \neq 2a_m$  and  $v_m \neq a_m$ , combining with  $\sigma(d') = \sigma(d) = \sigma(d_c) < m$ , by using Lemma 2.1 to (3.6), we get  $u \equiv 0$ , a contradiction.

If  $v_m = 2a_m$ , then (3.6) can be reduced to

$$((d^2 + \tilde{\omega} d \cdot (d' + dh')) e^{h_1} - u e^{h_3}) e^{2a_m z^m} + q d_c e^{h_2} e^{a_m z^m} = 0.$$

Thus, by using Lemma 2.1, we have  $q d_c \equiv 0$ , a contradiction.

If  $v_m = a_m$ , then (3.6) can be reduced to

$$(d^2 + \tilde{\omega} d \cdot (d' + dh')) e^{h_1} e^{2a_m z^m} + (q d_c e^{h_2} - u e^{h_3}) e^{a_m z^m} = 0.$$

Similarly as above, by Lemma 2.1, we get

$$d^2 + \tilde{\omega} d \cdot (d' + dh') \equiv 0.$$

This gives that

$$d = c_1 e^{-\frac{1}{\tilde{\omega}} z - h}, \quad c_1 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Since  $\deg h > \deg Q \geq 1$ , so we have  $\sigma(d) = \deg h = \sigma(f)$ , which contradicts with the assumption that  $\sigma(d) < \sigma(f)$ .

**Case 2.**  $\sigma(f) = \deg Q$ . Let  $Q(z) = b_m z^m + b_{m-1} z^{m-1} + \dots$ , where  $b_m \neq 0$ . Suppose  $\deg v < \deg h = \deg Q$ . From (3.4) we have

$$(3.7) \quad (d^2 + \tilde{\omega}d \cdot (d' + dh')) e^{h_1} e^{2a_m z^m} + (qd_c e^{\tilde{h}_2}) e^{(a_m + b_m)z^m} = ue^v,$$

where  $\tilde{h}_2 = (a_m m c + a_{m-1} + b_{m-1})z^{m-1} + \dots$  is a polynomial with degree at most  $m-1$ , and  $h_1$  is defined as in Subcase 1.1.

If  $b_m \neq \pm a_m$ , combining with  $\sigma(d') = \sigma(d) = \sigma(d_c) < m$ , by using Lemma 2.1 to (3.7), we get  $u \equiv 0$ , which yields a contradiction.

If  $b_m = a_m$ , then (3.7) can be reduced to

$$\left( (d^2 + \tilde{\omega}d \cdot (d' + dh')) e^{h_1} + qd_c e^{\tilde{h}_2} \right) e^{2a_m z^m} = ue^v.$$

Thus, by using Lemma 2.1, we have  $u \equiv 0$ , a contradiction.

If  $b_m = -a_m$ , then (3.7) can be reduced to

$$(d^2 + \tilde{\omega}d \cdot (d' + dh')) e^{h_1} e^{2a_m z^m} = ue^v - qd_c e^{\tilde{h}_2}.$$

So by Lemma 2.1, we get

$$d^2 + \tilde{\omega}d \cdot (d' + dh') \equiv 0.$$

This gives that

$$d = c_2 e^{-\frac{1}{\tilde{\omega}}z-h}, \quad c_2 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Thus by  $\deg h > \deg v \geq 1$ , we have  $\sigma(d) = \deg h = \sigma(f)$ , which contradicts with the fact that  $\sigma(d) < \sigma(f)$ .

Therefore, we have  $\deg v = \deg h = \deg Q$  from (3.3), which implies that Conclusion (2) holds.

**Case 3.**  $\sigma(f) < \deg Q$ , then we have  $T(r, f) = S(r, e^Q)$ . Thus we get  $T(r, f') = S(r, e^Q)$  from Milloux's theorem and  $T(r, f_c) = S(r, e^Q)$  from lemma 2.4. Therefore, by (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, e^Q) + S(r, e^Q) &= T(r, f^2 + \tilde{\omega}ff' + qf_c e^Q) \\ &= T(r, ue^v) = T(r, e^v) + S(r, e^v). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\deg Q = \deg v.$$

Differentiating (3.2) yields

$$(3.8) \quad 2ff' + \tilde{\omega}(f')^2 + \tilde{\omega}ff'' + Ae^Q = (u' + uv')e^v,$$

with  $A = q'f_c + qf'_c + qf_c Q'$ .

Eliminating  $e^v$  from (3.2) and (3.8) to get

$$(3.9) \quad B_1 e^Q + B_2 = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= uA - qf_c(u' + uv'), \\ B_2 &= u[2ff' + \tilde{\omega}(f')^2 + \tilde{\omega}ff''] - (f^2 + \tilde{\omega}ff')(u' + uv'). \end{aligned}$$

Noticing that  $\sigma(f_c) = \sigma(f) < \deg Q$ , and  $\sigma(f'') = \sigma(f') = \sigma(f) < \deg Q$  from Lemma 2.9, thus by Lemma 2.1, we get  $B_1 \equiv B_2 \equiv 0$ . It follows from  $B_1 \equiv 0$  that

$$\frac{q'}{q} + \frac{f'_c}{f_c} + Q' = \frac{u'}{u} + v',$$



by integrating, we have  $qf_c e^Q = c_3 u e^v$ , where  $c_3$  is a non-zero constant.

If  $c_3 = 1$ , by substituting  $qf_c e^Q = u e^v$  into (3.2), we see that  $f^2 + \tilde{\omega} f f' = 0$ . Thus we can easily get  $f = c_4 e^{-z/\tilde{\omega}}$ , where  $c_4 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ , which implies that Conclusion (1) holds.

If  $c_3 \neq 1$ , we have  $f = c_3 u_{-c}/q_{-c} e^{v-c-Q-c}$ . By substituting it into (3.2), we get

$$\frac{c_3 u_{-c}}{q_{-c}} \left( \frac{c_3 u_{-c}}{q_{-c}} + \tilde{\omega} \left( \left( \frac{c_3 u_{-c}}{q_{-c}} \right)' + \frac{c_3 u_{-c}}{q_{-c}} (v_{-c} - Q_{-c})' \right) \right) e^{2(v_{-c}-Q_{-c})} = (1 - c_3) u e^v$$

Since  $1 \leq \deg h = \sigma(f) < \deg Q = \deg v$  and  $\sigma(f) = \deg(v_{-c} - Q_{-c})$ , so by Lemma 2.1 we can easily deduce a contradiction by the fact that  $c_3 \neq 1$  and  $u \neq 0$ .

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.7.

Suppose that  $f$  is a transcendental entire solution with finite order of equation (1.5). We rewrite (1.5) as

$$(4.1) \quad f^n + \omega f^{n-1} f' + q e^Q f_c = p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z},$$

where  $f_c = f(z+c)$ , for short. From Lemma 2.4, we have  $\sigma(f) = \sigma(f_c)$ .

By differentiating both sides of (4.1), we have

$$(4.2) \quad n f^{n-1} f' + \omega(n-1) f^{n-2} (f')^2 + \omega f^{n-1} f'' + A_1 e^Q = p_1 \lambda_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2 \lambda_2 e^{\lambda_2 z},$$

where  $A_1 = q' f_c + q f_c' + q f_c Q'$ .

By eliminating  $e^{\lambda_2 z}$  from equations (4.1) and (4.2), we get

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lambda_2 f^n + (\lambda_2 \omega - n) f^{n-1} f' - \omega(n-1) f^{n-2} (f')^2 - \omega f^{n-1} f'' + A_2 e^Q \\ & = p_1 (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) e^{\lambda_1 z}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $A_2 = \lambda_2 q f_c - A_1$ .

By differentiating (4.3), we have

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lambda_2 n f^{n-1} f' + (\lambda_2 \omega - n) [(n-1) f^{n-2} (f')^2 + f^{n-1} f''] \\ & - \omega(n-1) [(n-2) f^{n-3} (f')^3 + f^{n-2} 2 f' f''] - \omega(n-1) f^{n-2} f' f'' - \omega f^{n-1} f''' \\ & + (A_2' + A_2 Q') e^Q = p_1 (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \lambda_1 e^{\lambda_1 z}. \end{aligned}$$

By eliminating  $e^{\lambda_1 z}$  from equations (4.3) and (4.4), we obtain

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lambda_1 \lambda_2 f^n + (\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \omega - n \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 n) f^{n-1} f' - (n-1) [\lambda_1 \omega + \lambda_2 \omega - n] f^{n-2} (f')^2 \\ & - (\lambda_1 \omega + \lambda_2 \omega - n) f^{n-1} f'' + \omega(n-1)(n-2) f^{n-3} (f')^3 + 3\omega(n-1) f^{n-2} f' f'' \\ & + \omega f^{n-1} f''' + (\lambda_1 A_2 - A_2' - A_2 Q') e^Q = 0. \end{aligned}$$

**Case 1.**  $\sigma(f) < 1$ . By using logarithmic derivative lemma, Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.5, from (4.1) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
T(r, e^Q) &= m(r, e^Q) = m\left(r, \frac{p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z} - f^n - \omega f^{n-1} f'}{q f_c}\right) \\
&\leq m\left(r, \frac{f}{q f_c}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + m(r, p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z}) \\
&\quad + m\left(r, \frac{f^n + \omega f^{n-1} f'}{f^n}\right) + m(r, f^n) + O(1) \\
&\leq (n+1)T(r, f) + C(\text{co}(W_0)) \frac{r}{2\pi} + o(r) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq C(\text{co}(W_0)) \frac{r}{2\pi} + o(r),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $W_0 = \{0, \overline{\lambda_1}, \overline{\lambda_2}\}$ , thus we have  $\deg Q \leq 1$ , and noting that  $\deg Q \geq 1$ , we know that  $\deg Q = 1$ . We set  $Q = az + b$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{C}$ .

Thus, by using Lemma 2.1 to (4.5), we have

$$(4.6) \quad \lambda_1 A_2 - A'_2 - A_2 Q' = (\lambda_1 - a)A_2 - A'_2 \equiv 0.$$

**Subcase 1.1.**  $A_2 \equiv 0$ . That is  $\lambda_2 q f_c - q' f_c - q f'_c - q f_c a \equiv 0$ . This gives that

$$\lambda_2 - \frac{q'}{q} - \frac{f'_c}{f_c} - a \equiv 0.$$

By integrating, we have

$$q f_c = c_1 e^{(\lambda_2 - a)z}, \quad c_1 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

So we have  $a = \lambda_2$ , and  $f_c = c_1/q$ . Otherwise, if  $a \neq \lambda_2$ , then we get  $\sigma(f) = \sigma(f_c) = 1$ , which contradicts with our assumption that  $\sigma(f) < 1$ . So we have that  $f(z) = c_1/q(z - c)$  is a rational function, which contradicts with the assumption that  $f$  is transcendental.

**Subcase 1.2.**  $A_2 \not\equiv 0$ . From (4.6), we get

$$A_2 = c_2 e^{(\lambda_1 - a)z}, \quad c_2 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

This gives that

$$(4.7) \quad (q f_c)' + (a - \lambda_2)(q f_c) = -c_2 e^{(\lambda_1 - a)z}, \quad c_2 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Since  $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ , we discuss the following three subcases:

**Subcase 1.2.1.**  $a = \lambda_2$ . Then (4.7) reduces to  $(q f_c)' = -c_2 e^{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)z}$ . Thus, we have  $q f_c = \frac{c_2}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1} e^{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)z} + c_3$ , where  $c_3 \in \mathbb{C}$ . Therefore, by Lemma 2.5 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T(r, q f_c) &= T\left(r, \frac{c_2}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1} e^{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)z} + c_3\right) \\
&= C(\text{co}(W_1)) \frac{r}{2\pi} + o(r), \quad W_1 = \{0, \overline{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining with Lemma 2.4 and the fact that  $f$  is transcendental, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
C(\text{co}(W_1)) \frac{r}{2\pi} + o(r) = T(r, q f_c) &\leq T(r, f_c) + T(r, q) + O(1) \\
&= T(r, f) + S(r, f),
\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts with the assumption that  $\sigma(f) < 1$ .

**Subcase 1.2.2.**  $a = \lambda_1$ . Then (4.7) reduces to  $(qf_c)' + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(qf_c) = -c_2$ . Thus, we have  $qf_c = \frac{c_2}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1} + c_4 e^{(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)z}$ , where  $c_4 \in \mathbb{C}$ . We assert that  $c_4 \neq 0$ . Otherwise, if  $c_4 = 0$ , we get that  $f(z) = \frac{c_2}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1} \frac{1}{q(z-c)}$  is rational, which contradicts with the assumption that  $f$  is transcendental. Therefore, since  $c_4 \neq 0$  and  $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ , similarly as in Subcase 1.2.1, by combining with Lemma 2.4, Lemma 2.5, and the assumption that  $\sigma(f) < 1$ , we can also get a contradiction.

**Subcase 1.2.3.**  $a \neq \lambda_1$  and  $a \neq \lambda_2$ . Then by (4.7), we get that

$$qf_c = \frac{c_2}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1} e^{(\lambda_1 - a)z} + c_5 e^{(\lambda_2 - a)z}, \quad c_5 \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Therefore, since  $c_2 \neq 0$ ,  $a \neq \lambda_1$ , and  $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ , similarly as in Subcase 1.2.1, by combining with Lemma 2.4, Lemma 2.5, and the assumption that  $\sigma(f) < 1$ , we also get a contradiction.

**Case 2.**  $\sigma(f) > 1$ . Denote  $P = p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z}$ , then we have  $\sigma(P) = 1$  by Lemma 2.5, and equation (4.1) can be rewritten as:

$$(4.8) \quad f^n + \omega f^{n-1} f' + (qf_c)e^Q = P.$$

Differentiating (4.8) yields

$$(4.9) \quad n f^{n-1} f' + \omega(n-1) f^{n-2} (f')^2 + \omega f^{n-1} f'' + L e^Q = P',$$

where  $L = (qf_c)' + Q'(qf_c)$ .

**Subcase 2.1.**  $\omega \neq 0$  and  $n \geq 4$ . Eliminating  $e^Q$  from (4.8) and (4.9), we have

$$(4.10) \quad f^{n-2} H = PL - P'(qf_c),$$

where

$$H = Lf^2 + (\omega L - nqf_c)ff' - (n-1)\omega qf_c(f')^2 - \omega qf_c f f''.$$

**Subcase 2.1.1.**  $H \neq 0$ . From the assumptions that  $f$  is entire and  $q, Q$  are polynomials, we have that both  $H$  and  $fH$  are entire functions. We rewrite  $PL - P'(qf_c)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} & P[(qf_c)' + Q'(qf_c)] - P'(qf_c) \\ &= Pq \frac{(qf_c)'}{qf_c} \frac{f_c}{f} \cdot f + (PQ' - P')q \frac{f_c}{f} \cdot f \\ &= Pq \left( \frac{q'}{q} + \frac{f_c'}{f_c} \right) \frac{f_c}{f} \cdot f + (PQ' - P')q \frac{f_c}{f} \cdot f, \end{aligned}$$

and rewrite  $H$  as

$$\begin{aligned} & q \left( \frac{q'}{q} + \frac{f_c'}{f_c} + Q' \right) \frac{f_c}{f} \cdot f^3 + q \left( \omega \left( \frac{q'}{q} + \frac{f_c'}{f_c} + Q' \right) - n \right) \frac{f_c}{f} \cdot f^2 f' \\ & - (n-1)\omega q \frac{f_c}{f} \cdot f(f')^2 - \omega q \frac{f_c}{f} \cdot f^2 f'', \end{aligned}$$

thus both  $PL - P'(qf_c)$  and  $H$  are all differential polynomials with meromorphic coefficients. By logarithmic derivative lemma and Lemma 2.4, we have  $m(r, f_c'/f_c) = S(r, f_c) = S(r, f)$ ; by Lemma 2.3, we have  $m(r, f_c/f) = S(r, f)$ ; and by Lemma 2.5, we have  $m(r, P) = O(r)$ . Therefore, by using Lemma 2.6 to (4.10) and the fact that  $n \geq 4$  when  $\omega \neq 0$ , we obtain that

$$T(r, H) = m(r, H) = S(r, f) + O(r).$$

and

$$T(r, fH) = m(r, fH) = S(r, f) + O(r).$$

Thus, by  $H \not\equiv 0$  we have

$$T(r, f) \leq T(r, fH) + T\left(r, \frac{1}{H}\right) = S(r, f) + O(r),$$

which contradicts with the assumption that  $\sigma(f) > 1$ .

**Subcase 2.1.2.**  $H \equiv 0$ . Then from (4.10), we have

$$PL - P'(qf_c) = P[(qf_c)' + Q'(qf_c)] - P'(qf_c) \equiv 0.$$

This gives that

$$\frac{(qf_c)'}{qf_c} + Q' - \frac{P'}{P} \equiv 0.$$

By integration, we see that there exists a  $c_6 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$(4.11) \quad qf_c = c_6 P e^{-Q}.$$

By substituting (4.11) into (4.8), we get that

$$(4.12) \quad f^n + \omega f^{n-1} f' = (1 - c_6)P.$$

If  $c_6 = 1$ , then from (4.12) we have  $f + \omega f' = 0$ . By integration, we get that  $f = c_7 e^{-\frac{1}{\omega}z}$ ,  $c_7 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ , which contradicts with the assumption that  $\sigma(f) > 1$ . So we have  $c_6 \neq 1$ . From (4.11), we have

$$(4.13) \quad f = c_6 \frac{P_{-c}}{q_{-c}} e^{-Q_{-c}},$$

and  $\deg Q = \deg Q_{-c} = \sigma(f) > 1$  since  $\sigma(P_{-c}) = 1$  by lemma 2.5.

By Substituting (4.13) into (4.12), we have

$$\frac{c_6^n}{1 - c_6} \left( \left( \frac{P_{-c}}{q_{-c}} \right)^n + \omega \left( \frac{P_{-c}}{q_{-c}} \right)^{n-1} \left( \left( \frac{P_{-c}}{q_{-c}} \right)' + \frac{P_{-c}}{q_{-c}} (-Q_{-c})' \right) \right) e^{-nQ_{-c}} = P.$$

Then from  $\deg Q > 1$ ,  $\sigma(P_{-c}) = \sigma(P) = 1$  and Lemma 2.1, we get that  $P(z) \equiv 0$ , a contradiction.

**Subcase 2.2.**  $\omega = 0$  and  $n \geq 3$ . Eliminating  $e^Q$  from (4.8) and (4.9), we have

$$f^{n-1} (Lf - nqf_c f') = PL - P'(qf_c).$$

**Subcase 2.2.1.**  $Lf - nqf_c f' \not\equiv 0$ . Since  $n \geq 3$  and  $\omega = 0$ , similarly as in subcase 2.1.1, we have

$$T(r, Lf - nqf_c f') = m(r, Lf - nqf_c f') = S(r, f) + O(r).$$

and

$$T(r, f(Lf - nqf_c f')) = m(r, f(Lf - nqf_c f')) = S(r, f) + O(r).$$

Thus, by  $Lf - nqf_c f' \not\equiv 0$  we have

$$T(r, f) \leq T(r, f(Lf - nqf_c f')) + T\left(r, \frac{1}{Lf - nqf_c f'}\right) = S(r, f) + O(r),$$

which contradicts with the assumption that  $\sigma(f) > 1$ .

**Subcase 2.2.2.**  $Lf - nqf_c f' \equiv 0$ . Then

$$\frac{(qf_c)'}{qf_c} + Q' - n\frac{f'}{f} \equiv 0.$$

By integration, we see that there exists a  $c_8 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$(4.14) \quad qf_c e^Q = c_8 f^n.$$

Substituting (4.14) into (4.8) gives

$$(1 + c_8)f^n = P.$$

If  $c_8 \neq -1$ , we have  $nT(r, f) + S(r, f) = T(r, (1 + c_8)f^n) = T(r, P) = O(r)$ , which contradicts with the assumption that  $\sigma(f) > 1$ . If  $c_8 = -1$ , then  $P = p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z} \equiv 0$ , a contradiction.

**Case 3.**  $\sigma(f) = 1$ . By (4.1), Lemma 2.3, and logarithmic derivative lemma, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, e^Q) &= m(r, e^Q) = m\left(r, \frac{p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z} - f^n - \omega f^{n-1} f'}{qf_c}\right) \\ &\leq m\left(r, \frac{1}{qf_c}\right) + m(r, p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z}) + m(r, f^n + \omega f^{n-1} f') + O(1) \\ &\leq m\left(r, \frac{f}{f_c}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{f^n + \omega f^{n-1} f'}{f^n}\right) + m(r, f^n) \\ &\quad + T(r, p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z}) + O(\log r) \\ &\leq (n+1)T(r, f) + T(r, p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z}) + S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\deg Q \geq 1$ , then by combining with Lemma 2.5, we get

$$1 \leq \deg Q = \sigma(e^Q) \leq \max\{\sigma(f), \sigma(p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z})\} = 1,$$

that is  $\sigma(f) = \deg Q = 1$ . Thus, Conclusion (1) is proved.

Next, we prove Conclusion (2). Suppose that  $f$  is a transcendental entire solution with finite order of equation (1.5) with  $\lambda(f) < \sigma(f)$ . Then, by Lemma 2.7 and Remark 2, we can factorize  $f(z)$  as

$$(4.15) \quad f(z) = d(z)e^{h(z)},$$

where  $h$  is a polynomial with  $\deg h = \sigma(f)$ ,  $d$  is the canonical products formed by zeros of  $f$  with  $\sigma(d) = \lambda(f) < \sigma(f)$ . Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we have  $\sigma(f) = \deg h \geq 1$ .

By substituting (4.15) into (1.5), we get

$$(4.16) \quad d^{n-1}(d + \omega(d' + dh'))e^{nh} + qd_c e^{Q+h_c} = p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z}.$$

Dividing both sides of (4.16) by  $p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z}$ , we obtain

$$(4.17) \quad f_1 + f_2 + f_3 = 1,$$

where

$$f_1 = -\frac{p_1}{p_2} e^{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)z}, f_2 = \frac{d^{n-1}(d + \omega(d' + dh'))}{p_2} e^{nh - \lambda_2 z}, f_3 = \frac{qd_c}{p_2} e^{Q+h_c - \lambda_2 z}.$$

Obviously,  $f_1$  is not a constant since  $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ . Next we discuss two cases:  $\sigma(f) > 1$  and  $\sigma(f) = 1$ , respectively. We set  $T(r) = \max\{T(r, f_1), T(r, f_2), T(r, f_3)\}$ .

If  $\sigma(f) > 1$ , then  $d^{n-1}(d + \omega(d' + dh'))/p_2e^{-\lambda_2 z}$  is a small function of  $e^h$  since  $\max\{\sigma(d') = \sigma(d), 1\} < \deg h$ . So we have  $T(r) \geq T(r, f_2) = nT(r, e^h) + S(r, e^h)$ . Thus, by Milloux's theorem and Lemma 2.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{N\left(r, \frac{1}{f_2}\right)}{T(r)} &= \frac{N\left(r, \frac{1}{d^{n-1}(d + \omega(d' + dh'))}\right)}{T(r)} \leq \frac{T\left(r, d^{n-1}(d + \omega(d' + dh'))\right)}{T(r)} \\ &= \frac{O(T(r, d)) + O(\log r)}{T(r, e^h)} \cdot \frac{T(r, e^h)}{T(r)} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{N\left(r, \frac{1}{f_3}\right)}{T(r)} = \frac{N\left(r, \frac{1}{qd_c}\right)}{T(r)} \leq \frac{T(r, qd_c)}{T(r)} \leq \frac{T(r, d) + S(r, d) + O(\log r)}{T(r, e^h)} \cdot \frac{T(r, e^h)}{T(r)} \rightarrow 0$$

as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ .

Therefore, by using Lemma 2.2, we can deduce that  $f_2 \equiv 1$  or  $f_3 \equiv 1$ .

If  $f_2 \equiv 1$ , that is  $d^{n-1}(d + \omega(d' + dh'))e^{nh - \lambda_2 z} \equiv p_2$ . Obviously,  $d^{n-1}(d + \omega(d' + dh')) \not\equiv 0$ . Otherwise, if  $d^{n-1}(d + \omega(d' + dh')) \equiv 0$ , we'll have  $p_2 \equiv 0$ , a contradiction. So, by Lemma 2.5 and Milloux's theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S(r, e^h) + nT(r, e^h) &= T(r, e^{nh}) = T\left(r, \frac{p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z}}{d^{n-1}(d + \omega(d' + dh'))}\right) \\ &\leq T(r, p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z}) + T(r, d^{n-1}(d + \omega(d' + dh'))) + O(1) \\ &= O(r) + O(T(r, d)), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts with the assumption that  $\deg h = \sigma(f) > \max\{\sigma(d), 1\}$ .

If  $f_3 \equiv 1$ , then by (4.17), we have  $f_1 + f_2 \equiv 0$ . That is

$$d^{n-1}(d + \omega(d' + dh'))e^{nh} = p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z}.$$

Following the similar reason as above, we can also get a contradiction.

If  $\sigma(f) = 1$ , then we have  $\sigma(d) < 1 = \deg h = \sigma(e^{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)z})$  and  $T(r) \geq T(r, f_1) = T(r, e^{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)z}) + S(r, e^{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)z})$ . Thus, by Milloux's theorem and Lemma 2.4, we get

$$\frac{N\left(r, \frac{1}{f_2}\right)}{T(r)} = \frac{O(T(r, d)) + O(\log r)}{T(r, e^{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)z})} \cdot \frac{T(r, e^{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)z})}{T(r)} \rightarrow 0,$$

and

$$\frac{N\left(r, \frac{1}{f_3}\right)}{T(r)} \leq \frac{T(r, d) + S(r, d) + O(\log r)}{T(r, e^{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)z})} \cdot \frac{T(r, e^{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)z})}{T(r)} \rightarrow 0,$$

as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ .

Therefore, by using Lemma 2.2, we can deduce that  $f_2 \equiv 1$  or  $f_3 \equiv 1$ .

If  $f_2 \equiv 1$ , that is

$$(4.18) \quad d^{n-1}(d + \omega(d' + dh'))e^{nh - \lambda_2 z} = p_2.$$

We assert that  $h' = \lambda_2/n$ . Otherwise, suppose that  $h' \neq \lambda_2/n$ , then from  $\sigma(d') = \sigma(d) < 1 = \deg(nh - \lambda_2 z)$ , by using Lemma 2.1 to (4.18), we get  $p_2 \equiv 0$ , a

contradiction. Thus  $h' = \lambda_2/n$ . We set  $h = \lambda_2 z/n + B$ , where  $B$  is a constant. By substituting it into (4.18), we have

$$(4.19) \quad d^{n-1} \left( d + \omega \left( d' + \frac{\lambda_2 d}{n} \right) \right) = p_2 e^{-nB}.$$

Next, we assert that  $d$  is a constant. Otherwise, if  $d$  is a non-constant entire function, then from (4.19) we get that 0 is a Picard exceptional value of  $d$ . Thus by Lemma 2.8, we have  $d = e^\alpha$ , where  $\alpha$  is a non-constant polynomial, which contradicts with the assumption that  $\sigma(d) < 1$ . So we have that  $d$  is a non-zero constant, and (4.19) reduces to

$$d^n e^{nB} \left( 1 + \omega \frac{\lambda_2}{n} \right) = p_2.$$

Therefore,

$$f = de^h = de^B e^{\lambda_2 z/n} = \left( \frac{p_2 n}{n + \omega \lambda_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} e^{\frac{\lambda_2 z}{n}}.$$

Moreover, from  $f_2 \equiv 1$  and (4.17), we also have  $f_1 + f_3 \equiv 0$ . That is

$$p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} = q d_c e^{Q+h_c},$$

which implies that

$$Q = \left( \lambda_1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{n} \right) z + b_1,$$

where  $b_1$  satisfies  $p_1 = q \left( \frac{p_2 n}{n + \omega \lambda_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} e^{\frac{\lambda_2 c}{n} + b_1}$ .

If  $f_3 \equiv 1$ , then from (4.17) we have  $f_1 + f_2 = 0$ . This gives that

$$d^{n-1} (d + \omega (d' + dh')) e^{nh - \lambda_1 z} = p_1.$$

By using the similar methods as in the case  $f_2 \equiv 1$ , we get

$$f(z) = \left( \frac{p_1 n}{n + \omega \lambda_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} e^{\frac{\lambda_1 z}{n}}.$$

Furthermore, from  $f_3 \equiv 1$ , we have  $q d_c e^{Q+h_c - \lambda_2 z} \equiv p_2$ . Thus we can deduce

$$Q = \left( \lambda_2 - \frac{\lambda_1}{n} \right) z + b_2,$$

where  $b_2$  satisfies  $p_2 = q \left( \frac{p_1 n}{n + \omega \lambda_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} e^{\frac{\lambda_1 c}{n} + b_2}$ . From the above discussion, the proof of Conclusion (2) is complete.

## 5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.8.

Suppose that  $f$  is a transcendental entire solution with finite order of equation (1.7).

If  $\sigma(f) < 1$ , then following the similar method as in the proof of Case 1 of Theorem 1.7, we can get a contradiction.

If  $\sigma(f) > 1$ . We denote  $P = p_1 e^{\lambda_1 z} + p_2 e^{\lambda_2 z}$ , and rewrite (1.7) as:

$$(5.1) \quad f^3 + \omega f^2 f' + (q f_c) e^Q = P.$$

Differentiating (5.1) yields

$$(5.2) \quad 3f^2 f' + \omega 2f(f')^2 + \omega f^2 f'' + Le^Q = P',$$

where  $L = (qf_c)' + Q'(qf_c)$ .

Eliminating  $e^Q$  from (5.1) and (5.2), we have

$$(5.3) \quad fH = PL - P'(qf_c),$$

where

$$H = Lf^2 + (\omega L - nqf_c)ff' - (n-1)\omega qf_c(f')^2 - \omega qf_c f f''.$$

If  $H \equiv 0$ , then from (5.3) we have  $PL - P'(qf_c) \equiv 0$ . Similarly as in the proof of Subcase 2.1.2 of Theorem 1.7, we get a contradiction. Therefore,  $H \not\equiv 0$ . From the assumptions that  $f$  is entire and  $q, Q$  are polynomials, we have that  $H$  is an entire function. Since both  $PL - P'(qf_c)$  and  $H/f$  are all differential polynomials with meromorphic coefficients, similarly as in the proof of Subcase 2.1.1 of Theorem 1.7, by using Lemma 2.6 to (5.3), we obtain that

$$T(r, H) = m(r, H) = S(r, f) + O(r).$$

and

$$m(r, H/f) = S(r, f) + O(r).$$

By observing we see that the poles of  $H/f$  all arise from the poles of  $(f')^2/f$ , thus might arise from the zeros of  $f$ . Suppose that  $z_0$  is a zero of  $f$  with multiplicity  $p$ , then it is a pole of  $(f')^2/f$  with multiplicity 1 when  $p = 1$ ; and is a zero of  $(f')^2/f$  with multiplicity  $p - 2$  when  $p \geq 2$ . So we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, H/f) &= m(r, H/f) + N(r, H/f) = m(r, H/f) + N_1(r, 1/f) \\ &< (\kappa + o(1))T(r, f) + S(r, f) + O(r). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by  $H \not\equiv 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) &= T(r, 1/f) + O(1) \leq T\left(r, \frac{H}{f}\right) + T\left(r, \frac{1}{H}\right) + O(1) \\ &< (\kappa + o(1))T(r, f) + S(r, f) + O(r), \quad 0 \leq \kappa < 1. \end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$T(r, f) = S(r, f) + O(r),$$

which contradicts with the assumption that  $\sigma(f) > 1$ .

If  $\sigma(f) = 1$ , then following the similar method as in the proof of Case 3 of Theorem 1.7, we can get that  $\sigma(f) = \deg Q = 1$ .

**Acknowledgements.** Thanks are due to the referee for valuable comments and suggestions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Z. X. Chen, *Complex Differences and Difference Equations*, Science Press, 2014.
- [2] M. F. Chen, Z. S. Gao and J. L. Zhang, *Entire solutions of certain type of non-linear difference equations*, *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory* **19**(1), (2019) 17–36.
- [3] 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** (7) (2009) 3767–3791. 521–523.
- [4] W. Chen, P. C. Hu and Q. Wang, *Entire Solutions of Two Certain Types of Non-linear Differential-Difference Equations*, *Computational Methods and Function Theory*, 2020(3–4).
- [5] J. B. Conway, *Functions of One Complex Variable I*, 2nd ed., springer.com: Springer, 1995.



- [6] G. G. Gundersen, *Questions on meromorphic functions and complex differential equations*, Comput. Methods Funct. Theory. **17**, (2017), 195–209.
- [7] 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** (2) (2006) 477–487.
- [8] ———, *Nevanlinna theory for the difference operator*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. **31** (2006) 463–478.
- [9] R. G. Halburd, R. J. Korhonen and K. Tohge, *Holomorphic curves with shift-invariant hyperplane preimages*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **366** (2014) no. 8, 4267–4298.
- [10] W. K. Hayman, *Meromorphic Functions*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1964.
- [11] R. Korhonen, *An extension of Picard’s theorem for meromorphic functions of small hyper-order*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **357** (2009) 244–253.
- [12] I. Laine, *Nevanlinna theory and complex differential equations*, W. de Gruyter, Berlin, 1993.
- [13] P. Li, *Entire solutions of certain type of differential equations II*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **375** (2011), 310–319.
- [14] L. W. Liao, C. C. Yang and J. J. Zhang, *On meromorphic solutions of certain type of non-linear differential equations*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. **38** (2013), 581–593.
- [15] L. Liao, *Non-linear differential equations and Hayman’s theorem on differential polynomials*, Complex Var. Elliptic Equ. **60**(6) (2015), 748–756.
- [16] J. R. Long, J. Heittokangas, and Z. Ye, *On the relationship between the lower order of coefficients and the growth of solutions of differential equations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **444**(1) (2016), 153–166.
- [17] X. Q. Lu, L. W. Liao and J. Wang, *On meromorphic solutions of a certain type of nonlinear differential equations*, Acta Math. Sin.(Engl. Ser.), **33**(12) (2017), 1597–1608.
- [18] N. Steinmetz, *Zur Wertverteilung von Exponentialpolynomen*, Manuscr. Math. **26**(1–2) (1978–1979) 155–167.
- [19] Z. T. Wen, J. Heittokangas and I. Laine, *Exponential polynomials as solutions of certain nonlinear difference equations*, Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B **28**(7) (2012), 1295–1306.
- [20] C. C. Yang and H. X. Yi, *Uniqueness theory of meromorphic functions*, Mathematics and its Applications, 557. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 2003.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, QILU NORMAL UNIVERSITY, JINAN, SHANDONG, 250200, P.R. CHINA  
Email address: nanli32787310@163.com

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY, SHANDONG UNIVERSITY OF FINANCE AND ECONOMICS, JINAN, SHANDONG, 250014, P.R.CHINA  
Email address: cosart@126.com

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SHANDONG UNIVERSITY, JINAN, SHANDONG, 250100, P.R.CHINA  
Email address: lzyang@sdu.edu.cn