

**ENTIRE SOLUTIONS OF SYSTEM OF FERMAT-TYPE
DIFFERENCE AND PARTIAL DIFFERENTIAL-DIFFERENCE
EQUATIONS IN \mathbb{C}^2**

GOUTAM HALDAR

ABSTRACT. In this paper we mainly study the existence and the form of entire solutions with finite order for the following system of Fermat-type difference and partial differential-difference equations

$$\begin{cases} f_1(z)^2 + (\Delta_c f_2(z))^2 = 1 \\ f_2(z)^2 + (\Delta_c f_1(z))^2 = 1, \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} a_1^2 f_1(z)^2 + (a_2 f_2(z+c) + a_3 f_2(z))^2 = 1 \\ a_1^2 f_2(z)^2 + (a_2 f_1(z+c) + a_3 f_1(z))^2 = 1, \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} (a_1 f_1(z+c) + a_2 f_1(z))^2 + (a_3 f_2(z+c) + a_4 f_2(z))^2 = 1 \\ (a_1 f_2(z+c) + a_2 f_2(z))^2 + (a_3 f_1(z+c) + a_4 f_1(z))^2 = 1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} (\partial^J f_1(z) + \partial^J f_1(z))^{n_1} + f_2(z+c)^{m_1} = 1 \\ (\partial^J f_2(z) + \partial^J f_2(z))^{n_2} + f_1(z+c)^{m_2} = 1 \end{cases}$$

in several complex variables. Some of our results are improvements and extensions of the previous theorems given by Zheng-Xu [57], Xu-Cao [45], Xu *et. al.* [50] and Li *et. al.* [25]. Moreover, we give some examples which are relevant to the content of the paper.

1. Introduction and main results

It is well known to all that Nevanlinna theory is an important tool to study value distribution of entire and meromorphic solutions on complex differential equations (see [11, 18, 55]). In 1995, Wiles and Taylor [43, 44] pointed out that the Fermat-type equation $x^n + y^m = 1$, where $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ does not admit nontrivial solution in rational numbers for $m = n \geq 3$, and does exist nontrivial solution in rational numbers for $m = n = 2$. Initially, Fermat-type functional equations were investigated by Montel [33], Gross [6, 7].

In 1939, Iyer [16] investigated the solutions of Fermat-type functional equation

$$f(z)^2 + g(z)^2 = 1$$

and proved that the entire solutions of the above equation are $f(z) = \cos \alpha(z)$ and $g(z) = \sin \alpha(z)$, where $\alpha(z)$ is an entire function, and no other solutions exist.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 39A45, 30D35, 32H30, 39A14, 35A20.

Key words and phrases. Several complex variables, meromorphic functions, transcendental entire functions, Fermat-type equations, Nevanlinna theory.

In 1970, Yang [52] considered the following functional equation

$$f^n + g^m = 1 \quad (1.1)$$

and proved the following interesting result.

Theorem A. [52] *There are no non-constant entire solutions of the functional equation (1.1), if m, n are positive integers satisfying $1/m + 1/n < 1$.*

After that many researchers started to investigate the existence and the form of entire and meromorphic solutions of some variations of equation (1.1) (see [3, 13, 18, 21, 22, 24, 28, 39, 40, 53]).

In recent years, after the development of difference analogues of Nevanlinna theory, specially the development of difference analogous lemma of the logarithmic derivative by Halburd and Korhonen [8, 9], and Chiang and Feng [4], independently, many researchers paid their considerable attention to study the existence of entire and meromorphic solutions of complex difference as well as complex differential-difference equations, and obtained a number of important and interesting results in the literature (see [10, 12, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 35, 36, 37, 42, 46, 47, 56]).

In view of Theorem A, Liu *et. al.* [29] proved that that Fermat-type difference equation $f^n(z) + f^m(z+c) = 1$ has no transcendental entire solution when $n > m > 1$ or $n = m > 2$, and for the case $n = m = 2$, the solutions must be of the form $f(z) = \sin(Az + B)$, where $c(\neq 0)$, $B \in \mathbf{C}$ and $A = (4k + 1)\pi/2c$, k is an integer. Later, in 2013, Liu and Yang [26] extended this result by considering the Fermat-type difference equation $f^2(z) + P^2(z)f^2(z+c) = Q(z)$ where $P(z)$ and $Q(z)$ are two non-zero polynomials.

After that Liu [27], Liu and Dong [30] considered some variations of Fermat-type equations with more general form

$$f(z)^2 + (f(z+c) - f(z))^2 = 1, \quad (1.2)$$

$$a_1^2 f(z)^2 + (a_2 f(z+c) + a_3 f(z))^2 = 1, \quad (1.3)$$

$$(a_1 f(z+c) + a_2 f(z))^2 + (a_3 f(z+c) + a_4 f(z))^2 = 1 \quad (1.4)$$

and obtained some results as follows: (i) there is no transcendental entire solutions with finite order of (1.2). (ii) (1.3) has transcendental entire solutions with finite order if $a_2^2 = a_1^2 + a_3^2$, and the form of the solution is $f(z) = \cos(az+b)/a_1$. (iii) (1.4) will have finite order transcendental entire solutions if $a_1^2 + a_3^2 = a_2^2 + a_4^2$, and the solution will be of the form $f(z) = (a_3 \cos(aiz + bi) + a_1 \sin(aiz + bi)) / (a_2 a_3 - a_1 a_4)$, where a_j 's are non-zero constants in \mathbf{C} with $a_2 a_3 - a_1 a_4 \neq 0$.

Hereafter, we denote $z+w = (z_1 + w_1, z_2 + w_2)$ for any $z = (z_1, z_2)$, $w = (w_1, w_2)$ and $c = (c_1, c_2)$, where $z, w, c \in \mathbf{C}^2$ except otherwise stated.

In 2018, Xu and Cao [45] extended Theorem 1.1 of Liu *et. al.* [29] to several complex variables as follows.

Theorem B. [45] *Let $c = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n) \in \mathbf{C}^n \setminus \{0\}$. Then any non-constant entire solution $f : \mathbf{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbf{C})$ with finite order of the Fermat-type difference equation $f(z)^2 + f(z+c)^2 = 1$ has the form of $f(z) = \cos(L(z) + B)$, where L is a linear function of the form $L(z) = a_1 z_1 + \dots + a_n z_n$ on \mathbf{C}^n such that $L(c) = -\pi/2 - 2k\pi$ ($k \in \mathbf{Z}$), and B is a constant on \mathbf{C} .*

Considering equations (1.2)–(1.4), Zheng and Xu [57], in 2021, extended the results due to Liu [27], Liu and Dong [30] to the case of several complex variables and obtained the results as follows.

Theorem C. [57] *Let $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}$. Then there are no transcendental entire solutions $f : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ with finite order of equation (1.2).*

Theorem D. [57] *Let $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and a_1, a_2, a_3 be nonzero constants in \mathbb{C} . If the equation (1.3) has a transcendental entire solution $f : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ with finite order, then $a_1^2 + a_3^2 = a_2^2$ and $f(z)$ is of the form*

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{a_1} \sin(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A),$$

where $L(z) = \alpha_1 z_1 + \alpha_2 z_2$, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, A \in \mathbb{C}$, $\Phi(t)$ is a polynomial in $t := c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2$ in \mathbb{C} , and $L(z)$ satisfies

$$L(c) = \alpha_1 c_1 + \alpha_2 c_2 = \theta + k\pi \pm \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad \tan \theta = \frac{a_3}{a_1}.$$

Theorem E. [57] *Let $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}$, a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 be nonzero constants in \mathbb{C} , and let $D := a_1 a_4 - a_2 a_3 \neq 0$. If equation (1.4) has a transcendental entire solution $f : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ with finite order, then $a_1^2 + a_3^2 = a_2^2 + a_4^2$ and $f(z)$ is of the form*

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{2D} \left[-(a_3 + ia_1)e^{L(z)+\Phi(t)+A} - (a_3 - ia_1)e^{-(L(z)+\Phi(t)+A)} \right],$$

where $L(z) = \alpha_1 z_1 + \alpha_2 z_2$, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, A \in \mathbb{C}$, $\Phi(t)$ is a polynomial in $t := c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2$ in \mathbb{C} , and $L(z)$ satisfies

$$e^{L(c)} = e^{\alpha_1 c_1 + \alpha_2 c_2} = -\frac{a_3 - ia_1}{a_4 - ia_2} = -\frac{a_4 + ia_2}{a_3 + ia_1}.$$

Now, we consider some system of Fermat-type functional equations as follows.

$$\begin{cases} f_1(z_1, z_2)^2 + (\Delta_c f_2(z_1, z_2))^2 = 1 \\ f_2(z_1, z_2)^2 + (\Delta_c f_1(z_1, z_2))^2 = 1, \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

where $c = (c_1, c_2)$ be a constant in \mathbb{C}^2 .

$$\begin{cases} a_1^2 f_1(z)^2 + (a_2 f_2(z+c) + a_3 f_2(z))^2 = 1 \\ a_1^2 f_2(z)^2 + (a_2 f_1(z+c) + a_3 f_1(z))^2 = 1, \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

$$\begin{cases} (a_1 f_1(z+c) + a_2 f_1(z))^2 + (a_3 f_2(z+c) + a_4 f_2(z))^2 = 1 \\ (a_1 f_2(z+c) + a_2 f_2(z))^2 + (a_3 f_1(z+c) + a_4 f_1(z))^2 = 1, \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

where $f_j : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$, $j = 1, 2$, $c = (c_1, c_2)$ be a constant in $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}$, a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 are nonzero constants in \mathbb{C} and $\Delta_c f(z) = f(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2) - f(z_1, z_2)$ as defined in [17].

As far as our knowledge is concerned, although there are some important and remarkable results about the existence and forms of transcendental entire solutions of Fermat-type difference and partial differential-difference equations in several complex variables (see [15, 45, 48, 49, 51, 57]), there are only few results about the solutions of the system of Fermat-type equations in the literature (see [5, 32, 50]). Some of these results are listed as follows.

Theorem F. [50] *Let $c = (c_1, c_2)$ be a constant in \mathbb{C}^2 . Then any pair of transcendental entire solutions with finite order for the system of Fermat-type difference equations*

$$\begin{cases} f_1(z_1, z_2)^2 + (f_2(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2))^2 = 1 \\ f_2(z_1, z_2)^2 + (f_1(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2))^2 = 1, \end{cases}$$

have the following forms

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = \left(\frac{e^{L(z)+B_1} + e^{-(L(z)+B_1)}}{2}, \frac{A_{21}e^{L(z)+B_1} + A_{22}e^{-(L(z)+B_1)}}{2} \right),$$

where $L(z) = \alpha_1 z_1 + \alpha_2 z_2$, B_1 is a constant in \mathbb{C} , and c, A_{21}, A_{22} satisfy one of the following cases

- (i) $L(c) = 2k\pi i$, $A_{21} = -i$ and $A_{22} = i$, or $L(c) = (2k+1)\pi i$, $A_{21} = i$ and $A_{22} = -i$, here and below k is an integer;
- (ii) $L(c) = (2k+1/2)\pi i$, $A_{21} = -1$ and $A_{22} = -1$, or $L(c) = (2k-1/2)\pi i$, $A_{21} = 1$ and $A_{22} = 1$.

Motivated by Theorems B–E, one may ask the following question.

Question 1.1. *What can be said about the existence and the forms of transcendental entire solutions with finite order for the system of the Fermat-type functional equations (1.5)–(1.7)?*

The main purpose of this paper is to investigate the existence and form of transcendental entire solutions with finite order of system of nonlinear Fermat-type functional equations (1.5)–(1.7) with the help of Nevanlinna theory and difference logarithmic lemma in several complex variables (see [2, 17]). We extend Theorems B–E from the complex Fermat-type difference equations to the Fermat-type system of difference equations. Here we list our main results as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *There is no pair of transcendental entire solutions with finite order of the system of Fermat-type difference equation (1.5).*

Theorem 1.2. *Let a_1, a_2, a_3 be three non-zero complex constants in one variable and $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}$. If (f_1, f_2) is a pair of transcendental entire solution with finite order of simultaneous Fermat-type difference equation (1.6), then (f_1, f_2) takes one of the following form*

- I. $(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = \left(\frac{1}{a_1} \cos(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A), \frac{1}{a_1} \cos(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A + k) \right)$,
where $a_2^2 = a_1^2 + a_3^2$, $e^{2ik} = 1$, $e^{2iL(c)} = -\frac{a_1 - ia_3 e^{-ik}}{a_1 + ia_3 e^{ik}}$, $L(z) = \alpha_1 z_1 + \alpha_2 z_2$
with $A, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, k \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\Phi(t)$ is a polynomial in $t := c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2$.
- II. $(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = \left(\frac{1}{a_1} \cos(-(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) + k), \frac{1}{a_1} \cos(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) \right)$,
where $L(z), \Phi(t), A$ are defined as in I, satisfying one of the following conditions:
 - (a) $e^{iL(c)} = 1$, $e^{ik} = \pm i$ and $a_1 = \pm(a_2 + a_3)$;
 - (b) $e^{iL(c)} = -1$, $e^{ik} = \pm i$ and $a_1 = \pm(a_2 - a_3)$;

$$\text{III. } (f_1(z), f_2(z)) = \left(\frac{\cos(-(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) + L(c) + k)}{a_1}, \frac{\cos(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A)}{a_1} \right),$$

where $L(z)$, $\Phi(t)$, A are defined as in I, satisfying one of the following conditions:

- (a) $e^{iL(c)} = 1$, $e^{ik} = \pm i$ and $a_1 = \pm(a_2 + a_3)$;
- (b) $e^{iL(c)} = -1$, $e^{ik} = \pm i$ and $a_1 = \pm(a_2 - a_3)$;

The following examples show the existence of transcendental entire solutions with finite order of the system (1.6).

Example 1.1. Let $a_1 = 3$, $a_2 = 5$, $a_3 = 4$ and $L(z) = 7z_1 - 5z_2$. Choose $k \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $e^{ik} = 1$. Also, let $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ such that $e^{iL(c)} = \cos \frac{2\pi + \alpha}{2} + i \sin \frac{2\pi + \alpha}{2}$, where $\tan \alpha = \frac{24}{7}$. Then, it can be easily verified that

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = \left(\frac{\cos(7z_1 - 5z_2 + i(c_2z_1 - c_1z_2)^3 + 3)}{3}, \frac{\cos(7z_1 - 5z_2 + i(c_2z_1 - c_1z_2)^3 + 3 + k)}{3} \right)$$

is a solution of (1.6).

Example 1.2. Let $a_1 = 1$, $a_2 = -2$, $a_3 = \sqrt{3}$ and $L(z) = z_1 + 2z_2$. Choose $k \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $e^{ik} = 1$. Also, let $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ such that $e^{iL(c)} = (1 + i\sqrt{3})/2$. Then, it can be easily verified that

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = (\cos(z_1 + 2z_2 + 3), \cos(z_1 + 2z_2 + 3 + k))$$

is a solution of (1.6).

Example 1.3. Let $a_1 = 1$, $a_2 = -2$, $a_3 = \sqrt{3}$ and $L(z) = 5z_1 - 2z_2$. Choose $k \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $e^{ik} = -1$. Also, let $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ such that $e^{iL(c)} = (1 - i\sqrt{3})/2$. Then, it can be easily verified that

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = (\cos(5z_1 - 2z_2 + 10i), \cos(5z_1 - 2z_2 + 10i + k))$$

is a solution of (1.6).

Example 1.4. Let $a_1 = 12$, $a_2 = 7$, $a_3 = 5$ and $L(z) = z_1 + iz_2$. Choose $k \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $e^{ik} = i$. Also, let $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ such that $e^{iL(c)} = 1$. Then, it can be easily verified that

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = \left(\frac{1}{12} \cos(-(z_1 + iz_2 + 17i) + k), \frac{1}{12} \cos(z_1 + iz_2 + 17i) \right)$$

is a solution of (1.6).

Theorem 1.3. Let a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 be four non-zero constants in \mathbb{C} such that $a_1^2 + a_3^2 = a_2 + a_4^2$ and $D := a_1a_4 - a_2a_3 \neq 0$. Let $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}$. If (f_1, f_2) is a pair of transcendental entire solution with finite order of Fermat-type simultaneous difference equation (1.7), then $f_1(z)$ and $f_2(z)$ will be of the following form

$$f_1(z) = \frac{1}{-2D} \left((a_3 + ia_1e^k)e^{L(z)+A+\Phi(t)} + (a_3 - ia_1e^{-k})e^{-(L(z)+A+\Phi(t))} \right)$$

and

$$f_2(z) = \frac{1}{-2D} \left((a_3e^k + ia_1)e^{L(z)+A+\Phi(t)} + (a_3e^{-k} - ia_1)e^{-(L(z)+A+\Phi(t))} \right),$$

where $L(z) = \alpha_1 z_1 + \alpha_2 z_2$, $e^{2k} = 1$ with

$$e^{L(c)} = \frac{a_1 + ia_3 e^k}{a_2 + ia_4 e^k} = \frac{a_2 e^k - ia_4}{a_1 e^k - ia_3} = \frac{a_1 + ia_3 e^{-k}}{a_2 + ia_4 e^{-k}} = \frac{a_2 - ia_4 e^k}{a_1 - ia_3 e^k},$$

$\alpha_1, \alpha_2, A, k \in \mathbb{C}$, and $\Phi(t)$ is a polynomial in $t := c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2$.

The following examples show the existence of transcendental entire solutions with finite order of the system (1.7).

Example 1.5. Let us choose $a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = 1$, $a_4 = -1$, $L(z) = z_1 + 2z_2$ and $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ such that $c_1 + 2c_2 = (2m + 1/2)\pi$, m being an integer. Let

$$f_1(z) = \frac{1}{4} \left((1+i)e^{z_1+2z_2+(c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2)^n+3} + (1-i)e^{-(z_1+2z_2+(c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2)^n+3)} \right)$$

and

$$f_2(z) = \frac{1}{4} \left((1+i)e^{z_1+2z_2+(c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2)^n+3} - (i-1)e^{-(z_1+2z_2+(c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2)^n+3)} \right).$$

Then one can easily verify that $(f_1(z), f_2(z))$ is a solution of (1.7)

Example 1.6. Let us choose $a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = 1$, $a_4 = -1$, $L(z) = i(z_1 - z_2)$, $\Phi(t) = i(c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2)^5$, $A = 3$ and $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ such that $c_1 + 2c_2 = (2m - 1/2)\pi$, m being an integer. Let

$$f_1(z) = \frac{\cos(z_1 - z_2 + (c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2)^5 - 3i) + \sin(z_1 - z_2 + (c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2)^5 - 3i)}{2}$$

and

$$f_2(z) = -\frac{\cos(z_1 - z_2 + (c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2)^5 - 3i) + \sin(z_1 - z_2 + (c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2)^5 - 3i)}{2}$$

Then one can easily verify that $(f_1(z), f_2(z))$ is a solution of (1.7)

Besides finding the solutions of Fermat-type difference equations, Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations are also studied by many researchers (see [25, 32, 45, 49, 57]). For example, Xu and Cao [45] have investigated the entire solutions of Fermat-type partial differential-difference equation

$$\left(\frac{\partial f(z_1, z_2)}{\partial z_1} \right)^n + f^m(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2) = 1 \quad (1.8)$$

and obtained the following interesting result for the functions in \mathbb{C}^2 .

Theorem G. [45] Let $c = (c_1, c_2)$ be a constant in \mathbb{C}^2 . Then the Fermat-type partial differential-difference equation (1.8) does not have any transcendental entire solution with finite order, where m and n are two distinct positive integers.

In 2020, Xu and Wang [49] generalized Theorem G by considering the following Fermat-type partial differential-difference equation

$$\left(\frac{\partial f(z_1, z_2)}{\partial z_1} + \frac{\partial f(z_1, z_2)}{\partial z_2} \right)^n + f^m(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2) = 1 \quad (1.9)$$

and proved the following result.

Theorem H. [49] Let $c = (c_1, c_2)$ be a constant in \mathbb{C}^2 and m, n be two positive integers. If the Fermat-type partial differential-difference equation (1.9) satisfies one of the following conditions:

- (i) $m > n$;
- (ii) $n > m \geq 2$,

then (1.9) does not have any finite order transcendental entire solutions.

Corresponding to Theorem G, Xu *et. al.* [50] considered system of partial differential-difference equations and obtained the result as follows.

Theorem I. [50] *Let $c = (c_1, c_2)$ be a constant in \mathbb{C}^2 , and m_j, n_j ($j = 1, 2$) be positive integers. If the following system of Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations*

$$\begin{cases} \left(\frac{\partial f_1(z_1, z_2)}{\partial z_1} \right)^{n_1} + f_2(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2)^{m_1} = 1 \\ \left(\frac{\partial f_2(z_1, z_2)}{\partial z_1} \right)^{n_2} + f_1(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2)^{m_2} = 1, \end{cases}$$

satisfies one of the conditions

- (i) $m_1 m_2 > n_1 n_2$;
- (ii) $m_j > \frac{n_j}{n_j - 1}$, $j = 1, 2$,

then the above system does not have any pair of transcendental entire solution with finite order.

Liu and Xu [32], further extended Theorem I by considering Fermat-type systems of second-order partial differential-difference equation, obtained the following result.

Theorem J. [32] *Let $c = (c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, and m_j, n_j ($j = 1, 2$) be positive integers, and α, β be constants in \mathbb{C} that are not zero at the same time. If the following system of Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations*

$$\begin{cases} \left(\alpha \frac{\partial^2 f_1(z_1, z_2)}{\partial z_1^2} + \beta \frac{\partial^2 f_1(z_1, z_2)}{\partial z_2^2} \right)^{n_1} + f_2(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2)^{m_1} = 1 \\ \left(\alpha \frac{\partial^2 f_2(z_1, z_2)}{\partial z_1^2} + \beta \frac{\partial^2 f_2(z_1, z_2)}{\partial z_2^2} \right)^{n_2} + f_1(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2)^{m_2} = 1, \end{cases}$$

satisfies one of the conditions

- (i) $m_1 m_2 > n_1 n_2$;
- (ii) $m_j > \frac{n_j}{n_j - 1}$, $j = 1, 2$,

then the above system does not have any pair of transcendental entire solution with finite order.

As far as we know, it appears that the Fermat-type mixed partial differential-difference equations in several complex variables has not been addressed in the literature before. In order to generalize and also to establish a result which combines Theorem I and Theorem J, we consider the following partial differential-difference equation

$$\begin{cases} (a \partial^I f_1(z_1, z_2) + b \partial^J f_1(z_1, z_2))^{n_1} + f_2(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2)^{m_1} = 1 \\ (a \partial^I f_2(z_1, z_2) + b \partial^J f_2(z_1, z_2))^{n_2} + f_1(z_1 + c_1, z_2 + c_2)^{m_2} = 1, \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

where

$$\partial^I f_j(z_1, z_2) = \frac{\partial^{|I|} f_j(z_1, z_2)}{\partial z_1^{\alpha_1} \partial z_2^{\alpha_2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial^J f_j(z_1, z_2) = \frac{\partial^{|J|} f_j(z_1, z_2)}{\partial z_1^{\beta_1} \partial z_2^{\beta_2}}$$

with $I = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ and $J = (\beta_1, \beta_2)$ are two multi-index, where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1$ and β_2 are non-negative integers and $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$, not both zero. We denote by $|I|$ to denote the length of I , that is, $|I| = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$. Similarly, for J also.

As a matter of fact, we prove the next result for any order Fermat-type partial differential-difference equation (1.10).

Theorem 1.4. *Let $c = (c_1, c_2)$ be a constant in \mathbb{C}^2 and m_j, n_j be positive integers with $j = 1, 2$. If the Fermat-type simultaneous partial differential-difference equation (1.10) satisfies one of the following conditions:*

- (i) $m_1 m_2 > n_1 n_2$;
- (ii) $m_j > \frac{n_j}{n_j - 1}$, for $n_j \geq 2, j = 1, 2$

then (1.10) does not have any pair of finite order transcendental entire solutions of the form (f_1, f_2) .

2. Key Lemmas

In this section, we present some necessary lemmas which will play key role to prove the main results of this paper.

Lemma 2.1. [14] *Let $f_j \not\equiv 0$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, m; m \geq 3$) be meromorphic functions on \mathbb{C}^n such that f_1, \dots, f_{m-1} are not constants, $f_1 + f_2 + \dots + f_m = 1$ and such that*

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \left\{ N_{n-1} \left(r, \frac{1}{f_j} \right) + (m-1) \bar{N}(r, f_j) \right\} < \lambda T(r, f_j) + O(\log^+ T(r, f_j))$$

holds for $j = 1, \dots, m-1$ and all r outside possibly a set with finite logarithmic measure, where $\lambda < 1$ is a positive number. Then $f_m = 1$.

Lemma 2.2. [20, 38, 41] *For an entire function F on \mathbb{C}^n , $F(0) \not\equiv 0$ and put $\rho(n_F) = \rho < \infty$. Then there exist a canonical function f_F and a function $g_F \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $F(z) = f_F(z)e^{g_F(z)}$. For the special case $n = 1$, f_F is the canonical product of Weierstrass.*

Lemma 2.3. [34] *If g and h are entire functions on the complex plane \mathbb{C} and $g(h)$ is an entire function of finite order, then there are only two possible cases: either*

- (i) *the internal function h is a polynomial and the external function g is of finite order; or else*
- (ii) *the internal function h is not a polynomial but a function of finite order, and the external function g is of zero order.*

Lemma 2.4. [1, 54] *Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function on \mathbb{C}^n and let $I = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ be a multi-index with length $|I| = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j$. Assume that $T(r_0, f) \geq e$ for some r_0 . Then*

$$m \left(r, \frac{\partial^I f}{f} \right) = S(r, f)$$

holds for all $r \geq r_0$ outside a set $E \subset (0, +\infty)$ of finite logarithmic measure,

$$\int_E \frac{dt}{t} < \infty, \text{ where } \partial^I f = \frac{\partial^{|I|} f}{\partial z_1^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial z_n^{\alpha_n}}.$$

Lemma 2.5. [2, 17] *Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function with finite order on \mathbb{C}^n such that $f(0) \neq 0, \infty$, and let $\epsilon > 0$. Then for $c \in \mathbb{C}^n$,*

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

holds for all $r \geq r_0$ outside a set $E \subset (0, +\infty)$ of finite logarithmic measure, $\int_E \frac{dt}{t} < \infty$.

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Suppose that (f_1, f_2) is a pair of transcendental entire functions with finite order satisfying system (1.5). We write (1.5) as the following:

$$\begin{cases} (f_1(z) + i(f_2(z+c) - f_2(z)))(f_1(z) - i(f_2(z+c) - f_2(z))) = 1 \\ (f_2(z) + i(f_1(z+c) - f_1(z)))(f_2(z) - i(f_1(z+c) - f_1(z))) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

From the above equations we see that $f_i(z) \pm i(f_j(z+c) - f_j(z))$ have no zeros in \mathbb{C}^2 , where $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, 2$.

Since f_1, f_2 are transcendental entire functions with finite order, there exist polynomials $p_1(z), p_2(z)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} f_1(z) + i(f_2(z+c) - f_2(z)) = e^{p_1(z)} \\ f_1(z) - i(f_2(z+c) - f_2(z)) = e^{-p_1(z)} \\ f_2(z) + i(f_1(z+c) - f_1(z)) = e^{p_2(z)} \\ f_2(z) - i(f_1(z+c) - f_1(z)) = e^{-p_2(z)}. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

In view of (3.2), we obtain

$$\begin{cases} f_1(z) = \frac{1}{2} (e^{p_1(z)} + e^{-p_1(z)}) \\ f_2(z+c) - f_2(z) = \frac{1}{2i} (e^{p_1(z)} - e^{-p_1(z)}) \\ f_2(z) = \frac{1}{2} (e^{p_2(z)} + e^{-p_2(z)}) \\ f_1(z+c) - f_1(z) = \frac{1}{2i} (e^{p_2(z)} - e^{-p_2(z)}). \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

Form (3.3), we can easily obtain the following two equations:

$$-ie^{p_2(z)+p_1(z+c)} - ie^{p_2(z)-p_1(z+c)} + ie^{p_2(z)+p_1(z)} + ie^{p_2(z)-p_1(z)} + e^{2p_2(z)} = 1 \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$-ie^{p_1(z)+p_2(z+c)} - ie^{p_1(z)-p_2(z+c)} + ie^{p_1(z)+p_2(z)} + ie^{p_1(z)-p_2(z)} + e^{2p_1(z)} = 1. \quad (3.5)$$

Now we consider the following two cases.

Case 1: Suppose $p_2(z) - p_1(z)$ is constant. Let $p_2(z) - p_1(z) = k$, where $k \in \mathbb{C}$.

Then (3.4) and (3.5), respectively yield

$$-ie^{p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)+k} - ie^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)+k} + ie^{2p_1(z)+k} + e^{2p_1(z)+2k} = 1 - ie^k \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$-ie^{p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)+k} - ie^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)-k} + ie^{2p_1(z)+k} + e^{2p_1(z)} = 1 - ie^{-k}. \quad (3.7)$$

First we consider that $e^k \neq \pm i$. Then, after simple calculation, we obtain from (3.6) and (3.7) that

$$\frac{-ie^k}{1-ie^k}e^{p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} + \frac{-ie^k}{1-ie^k}e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} + \frac{(i+e^k)e^k}{1-ie^k}e^{2p_1(z)} = 1 \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\frac{-ie^k}{1-ie^{-k}}e^{p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} + \frac{-ie^{-k}}{1-ie^{-k}}e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} + \frac{(1+ie^k)e^k}{1-ie^{-k}}e^{2p_1(z)} = 1. \quad (3.9)$$

Using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.8) that

$$\frac{-ie^k}{1-ie^k}e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} = 1. \quad (3.10)$$

From (3.8) and (3.10), we get

$$e^{-p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} = 1 - ie^k. \quad (3.11)$$

Similarly, using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.9) that

$$\frac{-ie^{-k}}{1-ie^{-k}}e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} = 1. \quad (3.12)$$

Multiplying (3.11) and (3.12), we get $-ie^{-k} = (1 - ie^{-k})(1 - ie^k)$, which yields that $ie^k = 0$, which is not possible.

Next, suppose that $e^k = -i$. Then from (3.6), we obtain that

$$e^{p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} + e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} - 2e^{2p_1(z)} = 0,$$

which in turns into

$$e^{-p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} + e^{-(p_1(z)+p_1(z+c))} = -2,$$

which is not possible since the L.H.S. is transcendental entire, whereas the R.H.S. is constant.

If $e^k = i$, then after simplification, we obtain from (3.7) that

$$e^{-p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} - e^{-(p_1(z)+p_1(z+c))} = -2,$$

which is again a contradiction by the same reason as discussed for the case $e^k = -i$.

Case 2: Suppose $p_2(z) - p_1(z)$ is non-constant.

We claim that $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c)$ is non-constant. If not, then $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c) = \text{constant} = k$, say, where k is a complex constant in one variable.

This implies that $p_2(z) = L(z) + A$, where $L(z) = a_1z_1 + a_2z_2$, $a_1, a_2, A \in \mathbb{C}$, and hence $p_1(z+c) = L(z) + A - k$. From this we get $p_1(z) = L(z) + A - L(c) - k$.

Therefore, we must have $p_2(z) - p_1(z) = L(c) + k = \text{constant}$, which is a contradiction.

Now we consider the following subcases:

Subcase 2.1: Let $p_2(z) + p_1(z)$ be constant, say k , where $k \in \mathbb{C}$.

Then, it is easily seen that both $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c)$ and $p_1(z) - p_2(z+c)$ are non-constants.

Therefore, from (3.3) and (3.5), we obtain

$$-ie^{p_2(z)+p_1(z+c)} - ie^{p_2(z)-p_1(z+c)} + ie^{p_2(z)-p_1(z)} + e^{2p_2(z)} = 1 - ie^k \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$-ie^{p_1(z)+p_2(z+c)} - ie^{p_1(z)-p_2(z+c)} + ie^{p_1(z)-p_2(z)} + e^{2p_1(z)} = 1 - ie^k, \quad (3.14)$$

respectively.

Suppose $e^k \neq -i$. Then (3.13) and (3.14) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{-i}{1-ie^k}\right)e^{p_2(z)+p_1(z+c)} + \left(\frac{-i}{1-ie^k}\right)e^{p_2(z)-p_1(z+c)} + \left(\frac{i}{1-ie^k}\right)e^{p_2(z)-p_1(z)} \\ + \left(\frac{1}{1-ie^k}\right)e^{2p_2(z)} = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{-i}{1-ie^k}\right)e^{p_1(z)+p_2(z+c)} + \left(\frac{-i}{1-ie^k}\right)e^{p_1(z)-p_2(z+c)} + \left(\frac{i}{1-ie^k}\right)e^{p_1(z)-p_2(z)} \\ + \left(\frac{1}{1-ie^k}\right)e^{2p_1(z)} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.15) that

$$\left(\frac{-i}{1-ie^k}\right)e^{p_2(z)+p_1(z+c)} = 1. \quad (3.17)$$

From (3.15) and (3.17), we get after simple calculation that

$$e^{-(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} = -i(1 + ie^{-k}). \quad (3.18)$$

Using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.15) that

$$\left(\frac{-i}{1-ie^k}\right)e^{p_1(z)+p_2(z+c)} = 1. \quad (3.19)$$

From (3.16) and (3.19), we get after simple calculation that

$$e^{-(p_1(z)+p_2(z+c))} = -i(1 + ie^{-k}). \quad (3.20)$$

From (3.17) and (3.18), we obtain after simple calculation

$$ie^{2k} - e^k - i = 0. \quad (3.21)$$

Observing (3.17), we conclude that $p_2(z) + p_1(z+c)$ must be constant, and hence we may assume that $p_2(z) = L(z) + A$, where $L(z) = a_1z_1 + a_2z_2$, $a_1, a_2, A \in \mathbb{C}$.

From (3.17) and (3.19), we obtain

$$\left(\frac{-i}{1-ie^k}\right)e^{-L(z)+k} = 1 \quad (3.22)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{-i}{1-ie^k}\right)e^{L(z)+k} = 1. \quad (3.23)$$

Multiplying (3.22) and (3.23), we get $e^k = 1/2i$, which does not satisfy the relation (3.21).

If $e^k = -i$, then after simple calculation, (3.13) reduces to $e^{p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} + e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} = -2$, which is again a contradiction since, the L.H.S. of the equation is transcendental entire, whereas the R.H.S. of it is constant.

Subcase 2.2: Suppose $p_2(z) + p_1(z)$ is non-constant.

We claim that $p_2(z) + p_1(z+c)$ is constant. If not, then by Lemma 2.1 and (3.4), we obtain that $-ie^{p_2(z)-p_1(z+c)} = 1$, which yields $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c)$ is constant, say k , where $k \in \mathbb{C}$.

Thus, we may assume that $p_2(z) = L(z) + A$, where $L(z) = a_1z_1 + a_2z_2$, $a_1, a_2, A \in \mathbb{C}$. Therefore, $p_1(z+c) = L(z) + A - k$ and hence $p_1(z) = L(z) + A - L(c) - k$.

This implies that $p_2(z) - p_1(z) = L(c) + k$, a constant, which contradicts to our assumption.

Let $p_2(z) + p_1(z+c) = k_1$, a complex constant in one variable.

Then, (3.4) reduces to

$$-ie^{p_2(z)-p_1(z+c)} + ie^{p_2(z)+p_1(z)} + ie^{p_2(z)-p_1(z)} + e^{2p_2(z)} = 1 + ie^{k_1}. \quad (3.24)$$

Suppose $e^{k_1} \neq i$. Then using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.24) that

$$\left(\frac{-i}{1 + ie^{k_1}} \right) e^{p_2(z)-p_1(z+c)} = 1.$$

But this implies that $e^{p_2(z)-p_1(z+c)}$ and hence $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c)$ must be constant, say k_2 , where $k_2 \in \mathbb{C}$.

Therefore, we must have $p_2(z) = (k_1 + k_2)/2$, a constant, which contradicts to the fact that $p_2(z)$ is non-constant polynomial.

If $e^{k_1} = i$, then after simplification, (3.24) reduces to $e^{2p_1(z)} = -1$. But, then $p_1(z)$ becomes constant, which is a contradiction.

Subcase 2.3: Suppose $p_2(z) + p_1(z+c)$ is a constant, say k , where $k \in \mathbb{C}$.

Then we may assume $p_2(z) = L(z) + A$, where $L(z) = a_1z_1 + a_2z_2$, a_1, a_2, A are complex constants in one variable, and hence $p_1(z+c) = -(L(z) + A) + k$.

Then, it is clear that $p_1(z) = -(L(z)+A)+L(c)+k$, and therefore, $p_2(z)+p_1(z) = L(c) + k$ and $p_1(z) + p_2(z+c) = 2L(c) + k$. With these, (3.4) and (3.5), respectively reduce to

$$-ie^{p_2(z)-p_1(z+c)} + ie^{p_2(z)-p_1(z)} + e^{2p_2(z)} = 1 + ie^k \left(1 - e^{L(c)} \right) \quad (3.25)$$

and

$$-ie^{p_1(z)-p_2(z+c)} + ie^{p_1(z)-p_2(z)} + e^{2p_1(z)} = 1 - ie^{L(c)+k} \left(1 - e^{L(c)} \right). \quad (3.26)$$

First suppose $1 + ie^k (1 - e^{L(c)}) \neq 0$.

Then, using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.25) that

$$\left(\frac{-i}{1 + ie^k(1 - e^{L(c)})} \right) e^{p_2(z)-p_1(z+c)} = 1,$$

which implies that $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c)$ is constant. But This is not possible since $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c) = 2(L(z) + A) - k$.

Next Suppose that $1 + ie^k (1 - e^{L(c)}) = 0$.

Then after simple calculation, (3.25) yields

$$ie^{-(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} - ie^{-(p_2(z)+p_1(z))} = 1,$$

which implies that

$$ie^{-k} \left(1 - e^{-L(c)}\right) = 1. \quad (3.27)$$

Also,(3.26) yields

$$-ie^{p_1(z)-p_2(z+c)} + ie^{p_1(z)-p_2(z)} + e^{2p_1(z)} = 1 + e^{L(c)}. \quad (3.28)$$

Now, if $1 + e^{L(c)} \neq 0$, then using Lemma 2.1 to (3.28), we obtain

$$\left(\frac{-i}{1 + e^{L(c)}}\right) e^{p_1(z)-p_2(z+c)} = 1,$$

which implies that $p_1(z) - p_2(z + c)$ is constant, which is not possible since $p_1(z) - p_2(z + c) = -2(L(z) + A) + k$.

So, $e^{L(c)} = -1$. Therefore, putting the value of $e^{L(c)}$ to $1 + ie^k(1 - e^{L(c)}) = 0$, we obtain $e^{-k} = 2i$. Hence, from (3.27), we get $-4 = 1$, which is a contradiction.

Subcase 2.4: Suppose $p_2(z) + p_1(z + c)$ is non-constant.

If $p_2(z) - p_1(z + c)$ is constant, say B , where $B \in \mathbb{C}$, then we may assume $p_2(z) = L(z) + A$, where $L(z) = a_1z_1 + a_2z_2$ with $a_1, a_2, A \in \mathbb{C}$. Therefore, we have $p_1(z + c) = L(z) + A - B$, and hence $p_1(z) = L(z) + A - L(c) - B$.

This implies that $p_2(z) - p_1(z) = L(c) + B$, a constant, which is a contradiction. Hence, $p_2(z) - p_1(z + c)$ is non-constant.

Therefore, using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.4) that

$$ie^{(p_2(z)+p_1(z))} = 1. \quad (3.29)$$

Using (3.29) in (3.4), we get

$$ie^{(-p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} + ie^{-(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} - ie^{-(p_2(z)+p_1(z))} = 1. \quad (3.30)$$

From (3.29), we conclude that $p_2(z) + p_1(z) = \text{constant} = k$, say.

Using this in (3.30), we get

$$e^{-p_2(z)+p_1(z+c)} + e^{-(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} = -i(1 + ie^{-k}),$$

which is not possible since, the L.H.S. is transcendental entire whereas the R.H.S. is constant.

Hence, we conclude that there is no pair of transcendental entire solutions with finite order of the system (1.5). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. As we all know the fact that the entire solutions of the functional equation $f^2 + g^2 = 1$ are $f = \cos \alpha(z)$ and $g = \sin \alpha(z)$, where $\alpha(z)$ is an entire function. If f, g are finite order entire functions, then $p(z)$ must be a non-constant polynomial (see [6, 7, 33]).

Keeping in view of the above fact, we may obtain from (1.6) that

$$\begin{cases} a_1f_1(z) = \frac{1}{2} \left(e^{ip_1(z)} + e^{-ip_1(z)} \right) \\ a_2f_2(z+c) + a_3f_2(z) = \frac{1}{2i} \left(e^{ip_1(z)} - e^{-ip_1(z)} \right) \\ a_1f_2(z) = \frac{1}{2} \left(e^{ip_2(z)} + e^{-ip_2(z)} \right) \\ a_2f_1(z+c) + a_3f_1(z) = \frac{1}{2i} \left(e^{ip_2(z)} - e^{-ip_2(z)} \right), \end{cases} \quad (3.31)$$

where $p_1(z)$, $p_2(z)$ are two non-constant polynomials.

After some simple calculations, we obtain from (3.31) that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} - \frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))} - \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)+p_1(z))} \\ - \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z))} + e^{2ip_2(z)} = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)+p_2(z+c))} - \frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)-p_2(z+c))} - \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)+p_2(z))} \\ - \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)-p_2(z))} + e^{2ip_1(z)} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

We now consider the following two cases.

Case 1: Suppose $p_2(z) - p_1(z)$ is constant, say k , where $k \in \mathbb{C}$.

Then, it can be easily seen that $p_2(z)+p_1(z)$ and $p_2(z)+p_1(z+c)$ are non-constant polynomials.

Putting $p_2(z) - p_1(z) = k$ in (3.32) and (3.33), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} - \frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))} - \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)+p_1(z))} + e^{2ip_2(z)} \\ = \frac{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}{a_1} \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)+p_2(z+c))} - \frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)-p_2(z+c))} - \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)+p_2(z))} + e^{2ip_1(z)} \\ = \frac{a_1 + ia_3e^{-ik}}{a_1}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

respectively.

If $e^{ik} \neq ia_1/a_3$, $-ia_3/a_1$, then (3.34) and (3.35), respectively yield

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{-ia_2}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} + \left(\frac{-ia_2}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))} \\ + \left(\frac{-ia_3}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{i(p_2(z)+p_1(z))} + \left(\frac{a_1}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{2ip_2(z)} = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{-ia_2}{a_1 + ia_3e^{-ik}}\right)e^{i(p_1(z)+p_2(z+c))} + \left(\frac{-ia_2}{a_1 + ia_3e^{-ik}}\right)e^{i(p_1(z)-p_2(z+c))} \\ + \left(\frac{-ia_3}{a_1 + ia_3e^{-ik}}\right)e^{i(p_1(z)+p_2(z))} + \left(\frac{a_1}{a_1 + ia_3e^{-ik}}\right)e^{2ip_1(z)} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.37)$$

Now, using Lemma 3.1, we obtain from (3.36) and (3.37) that

$$\left(\frac{-ia_2}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))} = 1 \quad (3.38)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{-ia_2}{a_1 + ia_3e^{-ik}} \right) e^{i(p_1(z) - p_2(z+c))} = 1, \quad (3.39)$$

respectively.

Keeping in view of (3.38), (3.36) reduces to

$$ia_2e^{i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} + ia_3e^{i(p_2(z)+p_1(z))} = a_1e^{2ip_2(z)}.$$

i.e.,

$$ia_2e^{i(-p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} + ia_3e^{i(-p_2(z)+p_1(z))} = a_1.$$

i.e.,

$$ia_2e^{i(-p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} = a_1 - ia_3e^{-ik}. \quad (3.40)$$

Similarly, using (3.39) in (3.37), we obtain

$$ia_2e^{i(-p_1(z)+p_2(z+c))} = a_1 - ia_3e^{ik}. \quad (3.41)$$

Now, we divide (3.38) by (3.39) to get

$$e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z)+p_2(z+c)-p_1(z+c))} = 1.$$

As $p_2(z) - p_1(z) = k$, we obtain from the above equation

$$e^{2ik} = 1. \quad (3.42)$$

Also, multiplying (3.38) and (3.40), we obtain with the help of (3.42) that

$$a_2^2 = (a_1 + ia_3e^{ik})(a_1 - ia_3e^{-ik}).$$

i.e.,

$$a_2^2 = a_1^2 + a_3^2 - ia_1a_3e^{-ik} + ia_1a_3e^{ik}.$$

i.e.,

$$a_2^2 = a_1^2 + a_3^2. \quad (3.43)$$

Since, $p_2(z) - p_1(z) = k$, (3.38) reduces to

$$\left(\frac{-ia_2}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}} \right) e^{i(p_1(z) - p_1(z+c) + k)} = 1,$$

which implies that $e^{i(p_1(z) - p_1(z+c) + k)}$ and hence $p_1(z) - p_1(z+c)$ must be constant.

Therefore, we may assume that $p_1(z) = L(z) + \Phi(t) + A$, where $L(z) = \alpha_1z_1 + \alpha_2z_2$ with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, A \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\Phi(t)$ is a polynomial in $t := c_2z_1 - c_1z_2$.

Now, we divide (3.38) by (3.40) to get

$$e^{2i(p_2(z) - p_1(z+c))} = -\frac{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}{a_1 - ia_3e^{-ik}}.$$

Since $p_2(z) - p_1(z) = k$, $p_1(z) = L(z) + \Phi(t) + A$ and $e^{2ik} = 1$, we obtain from the above equation that

$$e^{2iL(c)} = -\frac{a_1 - ia_3e^{-ik}}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}.$$

Therefore, the solution of the system (1.6) is

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = \left(\frac{1}{a_1} \cos(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A), \frac{1}{a_1} \cos(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A + k) \right).$$

Case 2: Suppose $p_2(z) - p_1(z)$ is non-constant.

We claim that $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c)$ is non-constant. If not, suppose $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c) = k$, a constant in \mathbb{C} . Then we may assume that $p_2(z) = L(z) + \Phi(z) + A$, where $L(z)$, $\Phi(z)$, A is defined as in Case 1. This implies that $p_1(z+c) = L(z) + \Phi(z) + A - k$ and hence $p_1(z) = L(z) + \Phi(z) + A - L(c) - k$. But, then $p_2(z) - p_1(z) = L(c) + k$, a constant, which contradicts to our assumption. So, our claim is true.

Now, we discuss the following subcases:

Subcase 2.1: Let $p_2(z) + p_1(z) = k$, a constant, $k \in \mathbb{C}$. Then it can be easily verified that both $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c)$ and $p_1(z) - p_2(z+c)$ are non-constants.

Therefore, from (3.32) and (3.33), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} - \frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))} - \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z))} \\ + e^{2ip_2(z)} = \frac{1}{a_1}(a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)+p_2(z+c))} - \frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)-p_2(z+c))} - \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)-p_2(z))} \\ + e^{2ip_1(z)} = \frac{1}{a_1}(a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

respectively.

Suppose $a_1 + ia_3e^{ik} \neq 0$. Then (3.44) and (3.45), respectively can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{-ia_2}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} + \left(\frac{-ia_2}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))} \\ + \left(\frac{-ia_3}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z))} + \left(\frac{a_1}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{2ip_2(z)} = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (3.46)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{-ia_2}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{i(p_1(z)+p_2(z+c))} + \left(\frac{-ia_2}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{i(p_1(z)-p_2(z+c))} \\ + \left(\frac{-ia_3}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{i(p_1(z)-p_2(z))} + \left(\frac{a_1}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{2ip_1(z)} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

Now, using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.46) that

$$\left(\frac{-ia_2}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} = 1. \quad (3.48)$$

From (3.46) and (3.48), we get

$$ia_2e^{-i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} = a_1 - ia_3e^{-ik}. \quad (3.49)$$

Again using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.47) that

$$\left(\frac{-ia_2}{a_1 + ia_3e^{ik}}\right)e^{i(p_1(z)+p_2(z+c))} = 1. \quad (3.50)$$

From (3.46) and (3.48), we get

$$ia_2e^{-i(p_1(z)+p_2(z+c))} = a_1 - ia_3e^{-ik}. \quad (3.51)$$

We observe that L.H.S. of (3.48) is transcendental entire, whereas R.H.S. is constant.

Therefore, $e^{-i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))}$ and hence $p_2(z) + p_1(z+c)$ must be constant. Let $p_2(z) + p_1(z+c) = k_1$, where $k \in \mathbb{C}$. Then we may assume that $p_2(z) = L(z) + \Phi(t) + A$, where $L(z) = \alpha_1 z_1 + \alpha_2 z_2$, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, A \in \mathbb{C}$. This implies that $p_1(z+c) = -(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) + L(c) + k_1$.

Also, we may easily get that $p_1(z) = -(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) + L(c) + k_1$, $p_2(z) + p_1(z) = L(c) + k_1 = k$ and $p_1(z) + p_2(z+c) = 2L(c) + k_1 = L(c) + k$.

Therefore, from (3.31), we obtain

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = \left(\frac{1}{a_1} \cos(-L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) + k, \frac{1}{a_1} \cos(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) \right).$$

Now, from (3.49) and (3.51), we get $e^{ik_1} = e^{i(2L(c)+k_1)}$, which implies that

$$e^{2iL(c)} = 1.$$

Divide (3.48) by (3.49) to get

$$e^{2i(-L(c)+k)} = -\frac{a_1 + ia_3 e^{ik}}{a_1 - ia_3 e^{-ik}},$$

which implies that

$$e^{2ik} = -\frac{a_1 + ia_3 e^{ik}}{a_1 - ia_3 e^{-ik}}.$$

After simplification, we obtain from the last equation that $e^{2ik} = -1$.

If $e^{iL(c)} = 1$ and $e^{ik} = i$, then from (3.48), we get $a_1 = a_2 + a_3$.

If $e^{iL(c)} = 1$ and $e^{ik} = -i$, then from (3.48), we get $a_1 = -(a_2 + a_3)$.

If $e^{iL(c)} = -1$ and $e^{ik} = i$, then from (3.48), we get $a_1 = -(a_2 - a_3)$.

If $e^{iL(c)} = -1$ and $e^{ik} = -i$, then from (3.48), we get $a_1 = (a_2 - a_3)$.

If $a_1 + ia_3 e^{ik} = 0$, then (3.44) yields

$$-\frac{ia_2}{a_1} e^{i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} - \frac{ia_2}{a_1} e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))} - \frac{ia_3}{a_1} e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z))} + e^{2ip_2(z)} = 0.$$

i.e.,

$$ia_2 e^{i(-p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} + ia_2 e^{-i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} + ia_3 e^{-i(p_2(z)+p_1(z))} = a_1.$$

i.e.,

$$ia_2 \left(e^{i(-p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} + e^{-i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} \right) = a_1 - ia_3 e^{-ik},$$

which implies that

$$e^{i(-p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} + e^{-i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} = \frac{-i(a_1^2 - a_2^2)}{a_1 a_2},$$

which is not possible since L.H.S. is transcendental entire, whereas R.H.S. is constant.

Subcase 2.2: Suppose $p_2(z) + p_1(z)$ is non-constant.

We claim that $p_2(z) + p_1(z+c)$ is constant. If not, then by Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.32) that

$$-\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))} = 1,$$

which implies that $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c)$ is constant, say $k \in \mathbb{C}$. Thus, we may assume that $p_2(z) = L(z) + \Phi(t) + A$, where $L(z) = \alpha_1 z_1 + \alpha_2 z_2$, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, A \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\Phi(t)$ is a polynomial in $t := c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2$. This implies that $p_1(z+c) = (L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) - k$, and hence $p_1(z) = L(z) + \Phi(t) + A - k - L(c)$. But, then $p_2(z) - p_1(z) = L(c) + k =$ constant, which is a contradiction. So, our claim is true.

Suppose $p_2(z) + p_1(z+c) = k_1$, where $k_1 \in \mathbb{C}$. Then (3.32) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))} - \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)+p_1(z))} &= -\frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z))} + e^{2ip_2(z)} \\ &= \frac{1}{a_1}(a_1 + ia_2e^{ik_1}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.52)$$

If $a_1 + ia_2e^{ik_1} \neq 0$, then using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.52) that

$$\left(\frac{-ia_2}{a_1 + ia_2e^{ik_1}}\right)e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))} = 1.$$

This implies that $e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))}$ and hence $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c)$ is constant, say k_2 , $k_2 \in \mathbb{C}$. Therefore, we must have $p_2(z) = (k_1 + k_2)/2 =$ constant, which contradicts to the fact that $p_2(z)$ is non-constant.

If $a_1 + ia_2e^{ik_1} = 0$, then (3.52) reduces to

$$-\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))} - \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)+p_1(z))} = \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z))} + e^{2ip_2(z)} = 0.$$

i.e.,

$$\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{-i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} + \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{-i(p_2(z)-p_1(z))} = \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{-i(p_2(z)+p_1(z))} + e^{2ip_2(z)} = 1.$$

i.e.,

$$ia_3 \left(e^{-i(p_2(z)-p_1(z))} - e^{-i(p_2(z)+p_1(z))} \right) = a_1 - ia_2e^{-ik_1}.$$

i.e.,

$$\left(e^{-i(p_2(z)-p_1(z))} - e^{-i(p_2(z)+p_1(z))} \right) = \frac{-i(a_1^2 - a_2^2)}{a_1^2 a_3},$$

which is not possible since L.H.S. is transcendental entire, whereas R.H.S. is constant.

Subcase 2.3: Suppose $p_2(z) + p_1(z+c) =$ constant $= k$, say, $k \in \mathbb{C}$.

Then, we may assume $p_2(z) = L(z) + \Phi(t) + A$, where $L(z) = \alpha_1 z_1 + \alpha_2 z_2$, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, A \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\Phi(t)$ is a polynomial in $t := c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2$. So, $p_1(z+c) = -(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) + k$, and hence $p_1(z) = -(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) + L(c) + k$, $p_2(z) + p_1(z) = L(c) + k$ and $p_1(z) + p_2(z+c) = 2L(c) + k$.

Therefore, we have from (3.31)

$$(f_1(z), f_2(z)) = \left(\frac{1}{a_1} \cos(-(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) + L(c) + k), \frac{1}{a_1} \cos(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) \right).$$

Now, (3.32) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))} & - \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z))} + e^{2ip_2(z)} \\ & = 1 + \frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{ik} + \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(L(c)+k)} \\ & = \frac{1}{a_1} \left(a_1 + ie^{ik} \left(a_2 + a_3e^{iL(c)} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.53)$$

Similarly, we obtain from (3.33) that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)-p_2(z+c))} & - \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)-p_2(z))} + e^{2ip_1(z)} \\ & = 1 + \frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{ik} + \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(L(c)+k)} \\ & = \frac{1}{a_1} \left(a_1 + ie^{i(L(c)+k)} \left(a_2e^{iL(c)} + a_3 \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.54)$$

If $a_1 + ie^{ik} (a_2 + a_3e^{iL(c)}) \neq 0$, then using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.53)

$$\frac{ia_2}{a_1 + ie^{ik}(a_2 + a_3e^{iL(c)})} e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))} = 1,$$

which implies that $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c)$ is constant, a contradiction as it is non-constant.

If $a_1 + ie^{ik} (a_2 + a_3e^{iL(c)}) = 0$, then (3.53) yields

$$-\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c))} - \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_2(z)-p_1(z))} + e^{2ip_2(z)} = 0.$$

i.e.,

$$\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{-i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c))} + \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{-i(p_2(z)+p_1(z))} = 1.$$

i.e.,

$$ie^{-ik} \left(a_2 + a_3e^{-iL(c)} \right) = a_1. \quad (3.55)$$

Using (3.55) in (3.54), we obtain

$$-\frac{ia_2}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)-p_2(z+c))} - \frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)-p_2(z))} + e^{2ip_1(z)} = 1 + e^{2i(L(c)+k)}. \quad (3.56)$$

If $1 + e^{2i(L(c)+k)} \neq 0$, then using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from that

$$\frac{-ia_2}{a_1(1 + e^{2i(L(c)+k)})} e^{i(p_1(z)-p_2(z+c))} = 1,$$

which implies that $p_1(z) - p_2(z+c)$ is constant. But, $p_1(z) - p_2(z+c) = -2(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) + 2L(c) + k$, which is non-constant. So, we get a contradiction.

So, it must be that

$$e^{2i(L(c)+k)} = -1. \quad (3.57)$$

Therefore, we obtain from (3.56) that

$$ie^{-i(L(c)+k)} \left(a_3 + a_2e^{-iL(c)} \right) = a_1. \quad (3.58)$$

Now, comparing (3.55) and (3.58), we get

$$e^{2iL(c)} = 1.$$

Hence, from (3.57), we get $e^{2ik} = -1$.

If $e^{iL(c)} = 1$ and $e^{ik} = i$, then from (3.55), we get $a_1 = a_2 + a_3$.

If $e^{iL(c)} = 1$ and $e^{ik} = -i$, then from (3.55), we get $a_1 = -(a_2 + a_3)$.

If $e^{iL(c)} = -1$ and $e^{ik} = i$, then from (3.55), we get $a_1 = a_2 - a_3$.

If $e^{iL(c)} = -1$ and $e^{ik} = -i$, then from (3.55), we get $a_1 = -(a_2 - a_3)$.

Subcase 2.4: Suppose $p_2(z) + p_1(z + c)$ is non-constant. Now, using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.32) that

$$-\frac{ia_3}{a_1}e^{i(p_1(z)+p_2(z))} = 1,$$

which implies that $p_2(z) + p_1(z)$ is constant, say k , where $k \in \mathbb{C}$.

Using these in (3.32), we get

$$e^{-i(p_2(z)-p_1(z+c)+e^{-i(p_2(z)+p_1(z+c)))}} = -\frac{i(a_1 - ia_3e^{-ik})}{a_2},$$

which is not possible since L.H.S. is transcendental entire, whereas R.H.S. is constant.

Hence the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Assume that (f_1, f_2) is a pair of transcendental entire solution of (1.7) with each f_j is of finite order, $j = 1, 2$.

Then, by similar argument as done in the proof of Theorem 1.2, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} a_1f_1(z+c) + a_2f_1(z) = \frac{1}{2}(e^{p_1(z)} + e^{-p_1(z)}) \\ a_3f_2(z+c) + a_4f_2(z) = \frac{1}{2i}(e^{p_1(z)} - e^{-p_1(z)}) \\ a_1f_2(z+c) + a_2f_2(z) = \frac{1}{2}(e^{p_2(z)} + e^{-p_2(z)}) \\ a_3f_1(z+c) + a_4f_1(z) = \frac{1}{2i}(e^{p_2(z)} - e^{-p_2(z)}), \end{cases}$$

where $p_1(z)$, $p_2(z)$ are two non-constant polynomials.

Since $D := a_1a_4 - a_2a_3 \neq 0$, solving the above system of equations, we get

$$f_1(z+c) = \frac{1}{2D} \left(a_4 \left(e^{p_1(z)} + e^{-p_1(z)} \right) + ia_2 \left(e^{p_2(z)} - e^{-p_2(z)} \right) \right), \quad (3.59)$$

$$f_1(z) = \frac{1}{-2D} \left(a_3 \left(e^{p_1(z)} + e^{-p_1(z)} \right) + ia_1 \left(e^{p_2(z)} - e^{-p_2(z)} \right) \right), \quad (3.60)$$

$$f_2(z+c) = \frac{1}{2D} \left(a_4 \left(e^{p_2(z)} + e^{-p_2(z)} \right) + ia_2 \left(e^{p_1(z)} - e^{-p_1(z)} \right) \right) \quad (3.61)$$

and

$$f_2(z) = \frac{1}{-2D} \left(a_3 \left(e^{p_2(z)} + e^{-p_2(z)} \right) + ia_1 \left(e^{p_1(z)} - e^{-p_1(z)} \right) \right). \quad (3.62)$$

From (3.59) and (3.60), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{ia_3}{a_1} e^{p_2(z)+p_1(z+c)} + \frac{ia_3}{a_2} e^{p_2(z)-p_1(z+c)} - \frac{a_1}{a_2} e^{p_2(z)+p_2(z+c)} + \frac{a_1}{a_2} e^{p_2(z)-p_2(z+c)} \\ & - \frac{ia_4}{a_2} e^{p_2(z)+p_1(z)} - \frac{ia_4}{a_2} e^{p_2(z)-p_1(z)} + e^{2p_2(z)} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.63)$$

From (3.61) and (3.62), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{ia_3}{a_1} e^{p_1(z)+p_2(z+c)} + \frac{ia_3}{a_2} e^{p_1(z)-p_2(z+c)} - \frac{a_1}{a_2} e^{p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} + \frac{a_1}{a_2} e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} \\ & - \frac{ia_4}{a_2} e^{p_1(z)+p_2(z)} - \frac{ia_4}{a_2} e^{p_1(z)-p_2(z)} + e^{2p_1(z)} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.64)$$

Now, we consider the following cases.

Case 1: Suppose $p_2(z) - p_1(z) = k$, where k is a constant in \mathbb{C} .

Then (3.63) and (3.64), respectively yield

$$\begin{aligned} & e^k (ia_3 - a_1 e^k) e^{p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} + (ia_3 e^k + a_1) e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} \\ & + e^k (a_2 e^k - ia_4) e^{2p_1(z)} = (a_2 + ia_4 e^k) \end{aligned} \quad (3.65)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & (ia_3 e^k - a_1) e^{p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} + (ia_3 e^{-k} + a_1) e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} \\ & + (a_2 - ia_4 e^k) e^{2p_1(z)} = (a_2 + ia_4 e^{-k}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.66)$$

Now, we show that all of $ia_3 - a_1 e^k$, $ia_3 e^k + a_1$, $a_2 e^k - ia_4$, $a_2 + ia_4 e^k$, $ia_3 e^k - a_1$, $ia_3 e^{-k} + a_1$, $a_2 - ia_4 e^k$ and $a_2 + ia_4 e^{-k}$ are non-zero.

Suppose $ia_3 - a_1 e^k = 0$. Then, clearly, $a_2 e^k - ia_4 = -iD/a_1 \neq 0$.

Therefore, (3.65) yields

$$(ia_3 e^k + a_1) e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} + e^k (a_2 e^k - ia_4) e^{2p_1(z)} = (a_2 + ia_4 e^k). \quad (3.67)$$

From (3.67), it is clear that $ia_3 e^k + a_1$ is non-zero. Otherwise, $p_1(z)$ would be constant, which is not possible.

Also, we claim that $a_2 + ia_4 e^k$ is non-zero. If not, then we must have from (3.67) that

$$- \left(\frac{ia_3 e^k + a_1}{a_2 e^k - ia_4} \right) e^{-(p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)+k)} = 1,$$

which implies that $p_1(z) + p_1(z+c)$ and hence $p_1(z)$ is constant, which is a contradiction.

Now, keeping in view of (3.67), we obtain

$$T \left(r, e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} \right) = T \left(r, e^{2p_1(z)} \right) + S \left(r, e^{2p_1(z)} \right).$$

Since $p_1(z)$ is a polynomial, it is easy to see that

$$N \left(r, \frac{1}{e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)}} \right) = N \left(r, e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} \right) = N \left(r, \frac{1}{e^{2p_1(z)}} \right) = S \left(r, e^{p_1(z)} \right).$$

Then, keeping in view of (3.67) and using second fundamental theorem of Nevanlinna in several complex variables, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T\left(r, e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)}\right) &\leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)}}\right) + N\left(r, e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)}\right) \\ &\quad + N\left(r, \frac{1}{e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} - \alpha}\right) + S\left(r, e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)}\right) \\ &\leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{e^{2p_1(z)}}\right) + S\left(r, e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)}\right) \\ &\leq S\left(r, e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)}\right) + S\left(r, e^{2p_1(z)}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha = (a_2 + ia_2e^k) / (ia_3e^k + a_1)$.

This implies that $(r, e^{2p_1(z)}) = o(T(r, e^{2p_1(z)}))$, which is not possible as $e^{p_1(z)}$ is transcendental entire.

Hence, we conclude that $ia_3 - a_1e^k \neq 0$. Similarly, we can prove that the others are also non-zero.

Now, Using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.65) that

$$\left(\frac{ia_3e^k + a_1}{a_2 + ia_4e^k}\right) e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} = 1. \quad (3.68)$$

Using (3.68) in (3.65), we obtain

$$-\left(\frac{ia_3 - a_1e^k}{a_2e^k - ia_4}\right) e^{-p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} = 1. \quad (3.69)$$

Again, Using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.66) that

$$\left(\frac{ia_3e^{-k} + a_1}{a_2 + ia_4e^{-k}}\right) e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} = 1. \quad (3.70)$$

Using (3.70) in (3.66), we obtain

$$-\left(\frac{ia_3e^k - a_1}{a_2 - ia_4e^k}\right) e^{-p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} = 1. \quad (3.71)$$

Keeping in view of the fact that $D \neq 0$, from (3.68) and (3.70), we obtain

$$e^{2k} = 1.$$

Multiplying (3.68) and (3.69), we obtain

$$((a_2^2 + a_4^2) - (a_1^2 + a_3^2))e^k + i(a_2a_4 - a_1a_3)(e^{2k} - 1) = 0.$$

As $e^{2k} = 1$, the above equation yields

$$a_2^2 + a_4^2 = a_1^2 + a_3^2.$$

Now, in view of (3.68), we conclude that $p_1(z) - p_1(z+c)$ is constant. Since $p_1(z)$ is a polynomial, we may assume that

$$p_1(z) = L(z) + \Phi(t) + A,$$

where $L(z) = \alpha_1z_1 + \alpha_2z_2$, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, A \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\Phi(t)$ is a polynomial in $t := c_2z_1 - c_1z_2$.

Therefore, from (3.68), (3.69), (3.70) and (3.71), we obtain

$$e^{L(c)} = \frac{a_1 + ia_3e^k}{a_2 + ia_4e^k} = \frac{a_2e^k - ia_4}{a_1e^k - ia_3} = \frac{a_1 + ia_3e^{-k}}{a_2 + ia_4e^{-k}} = \frac{a_2 - ia_4e^k}{a_1 - ia_3e^k}.$$

Case 2: Suppose $p_2(z) - p_1(z)$ is non-constant.

We claim that $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c)$ is non-constant. If not, then let $p_2(z) - p_1(z+c) = k$, where k is a constant in \mathbb{C} .

Since $p_1(z), p_2(z)$ are non-constants polynomials, we must have $p_2(z) = L(z) + \Phi(t) + A$, where $L(z) = \alpha_1 z_1 + \alpha_2 z_2$, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, A \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\Phi(t)$ is a polynomial in $t := c_2 z_1 - c_1 z_2$. This implies that $p_1(z) = L(z) + \Phi(t) + A - L(c) - k$.

Hence, $p_2(z) - p_1(z) = L(c) + k = \text{constant}$, which is a contradiction.

Also, we claim that $p_2(z) - p_2(z+c)$ is constant.

Suppose on contrary, $p_2(z) - p_2(z+c)$ is non-constant. Then $p_2(z) + p_1(z+c)$ is also non-constant.

Now, using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.63)

$$-\frac{ia_4}{a_2} e^{p_2(z)+p_1(z)} = 1. \quad (3.72)$$

Using (3.72) in (3.63) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -ia_3 e^{-k} e^{p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} + (a_1 - ia_3 e^{-k}) e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} &= a_1 e^{-2k} e^{-(p_1(z)+p_1(z+c))} \\ &= a_2 - ia_4 e^{-k}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.73)$$

If $a_1 - ia_3 e^{-k} = 0$, then we have from (3.73) that

$$ia_3 e^{-k} e^{2(p_1(z)+p_1(z+c))} + (a_2 - ia_4 e^{-k}) e^{p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} + a_1 e^{-2k} = 0,$$

which implies that $p_1(z) + p_1(z+c)$ and hence $p_1(z)$ is constant, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $a_1 - ia_3 e^{-k} \neq 0$.

If $a_2 - ia_4 e^{-k} = 0$, then (3.73) reduces to

$$-\frac{ia_3 e^k}{a_1} e^{2(p_1(z)+p_1(z+c))} + \frac{a_1 - ia_3 e^{-k}}{a_1 e^{-2k}} e^{2p_1(z)} = 1,$$

which implies that $T(r, e^{p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)}) = T(r, e^{p_1(z)}) + S(r, e^{p_1(z)})$.

Now, keeping in view of the above equation, and applying second fundamental theorem of Nevanlinna in several complex variables to $e^{2(p_1(z)+p_1(z+c))}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T\left(r, e^{2(p_1(z)+p_1(z+c))}\right) &\leq \overline{N}\left(r, e^{2(p_1(z)+p_1(z+c))}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{e^{2(p_1(z)+p_1(z+c))}}\right) \\ &+ \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{e^{2(p_1(z)+p_1(z+c))} - \omega}\right) + S\left(r, e^{p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)}\right) \\ &\leq \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{e^{2p_1(z)}}\right) + S\left(r, e^{p_1(z)}\right) = S\left(r, e^{p_1(z)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\omega = -a_1/(ia_3 e^k)$.

But this implies that $T(r, e^{p_1(z)}) = S(r, e^{p_1(z)})$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $a_2 - ia_4 e^{-k} \neq 0$.

Now, applying Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.73) that

$$\left(\frac{a_1 - ia_3 e^{-k}}{a_2 - ia_4 e^{-k}}\right) e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} = 1,$$

which implies that $p_1(z) - p_1(z+c)$ is constant. But, then we may assume $p_1(z) = L(z) + \Phi(t) + A$, where $L(z), \Phi(t), A$ are defined in Theorem 1.3.

Therefore, $p_2(z) = -(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) + \text{const}$. Hence, $p_2(z) - p_2(z+c) = L(c) = \text{constant}$, which contradicts the assumption. So, our claim is proved.

Now, we consider the following subcases.

Subcase 2.1: Suppose $p_2(z) + p_1(z) = k$, where k is a constant in \mathbb{C} .

Then from (3.63) and (3.64), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & (ia_3e^k + a_1) e^{-p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} + e^k (ia_3 - a_1e^k) e^{-(p_1(z)+p_1(z+c))} \\ & + e^k (a_2e^k - ia_4) e^{-2p_1(z)} = (a_2 + ia_4e^k) \end{aligned} \quad (3.74)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & (ia_3e^k + a_1) e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} + (ia_3e^{-k} - a_1) e^{p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} \\ & + (a_2 - ia_4e^{-k}) e^{2p_1(z)} = (a_2 + ia_4e^{-k}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.75)$$

In a similar manner as done in Case 1, we can prove that $ia_3e^k + a_1$, $ia_3 - a_1e^k$, $a_2e^k - ia_4$, $a_2 + ia_4e^k$, $ia_3e^{-k} + a_1$, $ia_3e^{-k} - a_1$, $a_2 - ia_4e^{-k}$ and $a_2 + ia_4e^{-k}$ are all non-constants.

Now, using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.74) that

$$\left(\frac{ia_3e^k + a_1}{a_2 + ia_4e^k} \right) e^{-p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} = 1. \quad (3.76)$$

Using (3.76) in (3.74), we obtain

$$- \left(\frac{ia_3 - a_1e^k}{a_2e^k - ia_4} \right) e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} = 1. \quad (3.77)$$

Again, using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from (3.75) that

$$\left(\frac{ia_3e^{-k} + a_1}{a_2 + ia_4e^k} \right) e^{p_1(z)-p_1(z+c)} = 1. \quad (3.78)$$

Using (3.78) in (3.75), we obtain

$$- \left(\frac{ia_3e^{-k} - a_1}{a_2 - ia_4e^{-k}} \right) e^{-p_1(z)+p_1(z+c)} = 1. \quad (3.79)$$

Now, from (3.76) and (3.79), we obtain $e^{2k} = 1$.

From (3.76)–(3.79), we obtain

$$\frac{a_2 + ia_4e^k}{a_1 + ia_3e^k} = \frac{a_1e^k - ia_3}{a_2e^k - ia_4} = \frac{ia_3e^k + a_1}{a_2 + ia_4e^k} = \frac{a_2 - ia_4e^{-k}}{a_1 - ia_3e^{-k}}. \quad (3.80)$$

Now, if $e^k = 1$, then from second and fifth terms of (3.80), we get $D = 0$, which is a contradiction.

Similarly, for $e^k = -1$, we get a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2: Suppose $p_2(z) + p_1(z)$ is non-constant. As we already proved that $p_2(z) - p_2(z+c)$ is constant, let it be k , $k \in \mathbb{C}$.

Then (3.63) yields

$$\begin{aligned} ia_3e^{p_2(z)+p_1(z+c)} & + ia_3e^{p_2(z)-p_1(z+c)} - a_1e^{p_2(z)+p_2(z+c)} - ia_4e^{p_2(z)+p_1(z)} \\ & - ia_4e^{p_2(z)-p_1(z)} + a_2e^{2p_2(z)} = a_2 + a_1e^k. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.1, we get from the above equation that

$$\left(\frac{ia_3}{a_2 + a_1 e^k}\right) e^{p_2(z) + p_1(z+c)} = 1,$$

which implies that $p_2(z) + p_1(z+c)$ is constant. But the $p_2(z) + p_1(z)$ must be constant, which is a contradiction to our assumption.

Subcase 2.3: Suppose $p_2(z) + p_1(z+c) = k$, where k is a constant in \mathbb{C} . Then we may write $p_2(z) = L(z) + \Phi(t) + A$, where $L(z)$, $\Phi(t)$, A are defined in Theorem 1.3.

Therefore, it may be easily seen that $p_1(z) = -(L(z) + \Phi(t) + A) + L(c) + k$, $p_2(z) + p_1(z) = L(c) + k$ and $p_2(z) - p_2(z+c) = -L(c)$. Thus, we can obtain from (3.63) that

$$\alpha e^{2p_2(z)} = \beta,$$

which implies that $p_2(z)$ is constant, a contradiction.

Subcase 2.4: Suppose $p_2(z) + p_1(z+c)$ is non-constant. As we know that $p_2(z) - p_2(z+c)$ is constant, let it be $k \in \mathbb{C}$.

Therefore, (3.63) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} ia_3 e^{p_2(z) + p_1(z+c)} + ia_3 e^{p_2(z) - p_1(z+c)} - a_1 e^{p_2(z) + p_2(z+c)} - ia_4 e^{p_2(z) + p_1(z)} \\ - ia_4 e^{p_2(z) - p_1(z)} + a_2 e^{2p_2(z)} = a_2 - a_1 e^k, \end{aligned}$$

where one can easily verify that $a_2 - a_1 e^k$ is non-zero.

Using Lemma 2.1, we obtain from the above equation

$$\left(\frac{-ia_4}{a_2 - a_1 e^k}\right) e^{p_2(z) + p_1(z)} = 1,$$

which implies that $p_2(z) + p_1(z) = \text{constant}$.

since $p_2(z) - p_2(z+c) = k$, we may assume that $p_2(z) = L(z) + \Phi(t) + A$, where $L(z)$, $\Phi(t)$ and A are defined in Theorem 1.3. But then we can get that $p_2(z) + p_1(z+c)$ is constant, which contradicts our assumption.

This completes the proof of the theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. The proof of this theorem can be carried out with similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 of [50]. So, we omit the details. \square

\square

Acknowledgment: The authors would like to thank the referee(s) for the helpful suggestions and comments to improve the exposition of the paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Biancofiore, W. Stoll, Another proof of the lemma of the logarithmic derivative in several complex variables. In: Fornæss, J. (ed.), Recent developments in several complex variables, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1981, pp. 29–45.
- [2] T.B. Cao, R.J. Korhonen, A new version of the second main theorem for meromorphic mappings intersecting hyperplanes in several complex variables, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 444 (2) (2016) 1114–1132.
- [3] M.F. Chen, Z.S. Gao, Entire solutions of differential-difference equation and Fermat-type q-difference-differential equations, Commun. Korean Math. Soc. 30 (4) (2015) 447–456.

- [4] Y.M. Chiang, S.J. Feng, On the Nevanlinna characteristic of $f(z+\eta)$ and difference equations in the complex plane, *Ramanujan J.* 16 (1) (2008) 105–129.
- [5] L.Y. Gao, Entire solutions of two types of systems of complex differential-difference equations, *Acta Math. Sinica (Chin. Ser.)* 59 (2016) 677–685.
- [6] F. Gross, On the equation $f^n(z) + g^n(z) = 1$, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 72 (1966) 86–88.
- [7] F. Gross, On the equation $f^n(z) + g^n(z) = h^n(z)$, *Amer. Math. Monthly.* 73 (1966) 1093–1096.
- [8] R.G. Halburd, R.J. Korhonen, Difference analogue of the lemma on the logarithmic derivative with applications to difference equations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 314 (2006) 477–487.
- [9] R.G. Halburd, R.J. Korhonen, Nevanlinna theory for the difference operator, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* 31 (2006) 463–478.
- [10] R.G. Halburd, R.J. Korhonen, Finite-order meromorphic solutions and the discrete Painlevé equations, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* 94 (2) (2007) 443–474.
- [11] W.K. Hayman, *Meromorphic Functions*, The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1964.
- [12] J. Heittokangas, R. Korhonen, I. Laine, J. Rieppo, K. Tohge, Complex difference equations of Malmquist type, *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory* 1 (1) (2001) 27–39.
- [13] P.C. Hu, Malmquist type theorem and factorization of meromorphic solutions of partial differential equations, *Complex Var.* 27 (1995) 269–285.
- [14] P.C. Hu, P. Li, C.C. Yang, *Unicity of Meromorphic Mappings, Advances in Complex Analysis and Its Applications*, vol. 1, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, London, 2003.
- [15] P.C. Hu, C.C. Yang, The Tumura-Clunie theorem in several complex variables, *Bull. Aust. Math. Soc.* 90 (2014) 444–456.
- [16] G. Iyer, On certain functional equations, *J. Indian. Math. Soc.* 3 (1939) 312–315.
- [17] R.J. Korhonen, A difference Picard theorem for meromorphic functions of several variables, *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory* 12 (1) (2012) 343–361.
- [18] I. Laine, *Nevanlinna Theory and Complex Differential Equations*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1993.
- [19] Z. Latreuch, On the existence of entire solutions of certain class of nonlinear difference equations, *Mediterr. J. Math.* 14 (3) (2017) 115.
- [20] P. Lelong, *Fonctionnelles Analytiques et Fonctions Entières (n variables)*, Presses de L'Université de Montréal, 1968.
- [21] B.Q. Li, On reduction of functional-differential equations, *Complex Var.* 31 (1996) 311–324.
- [22] B. Q. Li, On entire solutions of Fermat type partial differential equations, *Int. J. Math.* 15 (2004) 473–485.
- [23] B.Q. Li, On certain non-linear differential equations in complex domains, *Arch. Math.* 91 (2008) 344–353.
- [24] M.L. Liu, L.Y. Gao, Transcendental solutions of systems of complex differential-difference equations, *Sci. Sin. Math.* 49 (2019) 1–22 (in Chinese).
- [25] H. Li, K. Zhang, H. Xu, Solutions for systems of complex Fermat-type partial differential-difference equations with two complex variables, *AIMS Math.* 6 (11) (2021) 11796–11814.
- [26] K. Liu, L.Z. Yang, On Entire Solutions of Some Differential-Difference Equations, *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory* 13 (2012) 433–447.
- [27] K. Liu, Meromorphic functions sharing a set with applications to difference equations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 359 (2009) 384–393.
- [28] K. Liu, T.B. Cao, Entire solutions of Fermat type q -difference-differential equations, *Electron. J. Diff. Equ.* 59 (2013) 1–10.
- [29] K. Liu, T.B. Cao, H.Z. Cao, Entire solutions of Fermat-type differential-difference equations, *Arch. Math.* 99 (2012) 147–155.
- [30] K. Liu, X. Dong, Fermat-type differential and difference equations, *Electron. J. Differ. Equ.* 2015 (2015) 1–10.
- [31] K. Liu, L.Z. Yang, A note on meromorphic solutions of Fermat types equations, *An. Stiint. Univ. Al. I. Cuza Iasi Mat. (N. S.)*. 1 (2016) 317–325.
- [32] S.M. Liu, H.Y. Xu, Entire Solutions for Complex Systems of the Second-Order Partial Differential-Difference Equations of Fermat-Type, *J. Math.* Volume 2021, Article ID 4207579, 14 pages, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/4207579>
- [33] P. Montel, *Leçons sur les familles de normales fonctions analytiques et leurs applications*, Gauthier-Viuars Paris, (1927) 135–136.
- [34] G. Pólya, On an integral function of an integral function, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* 1 (1926) 12–15.

- [35] X.G. Qi, Y. Liu, L.Z. Yang, A note on solutions of some differential-difference equations, *J. Contemp. Math. Anal.* 52 (3) (2017) 128–133.
- [36] X.G. Qi, L.Z. Yang, Properties of meromorphic solutions to certain differential-difference equations, *Electron. J. Differ. Equ.* 2013 (135) (2013) 1–9.
- [37] J. Rieppo, On a class of complex functional equations, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* 32 (1) (2007) 151–170.
- [38] L.I. Ronkin, *Introduction to the Theory of Entire Functions of Several Variables*, Moscow: Nauka 1971 (Russian), American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1974.
- [39] E.G. Saleeby, Entire and meromorphic solutions of Fermat-type partial differential equations, *Analysis (Munich)* 19 (1999) 369–376.
- [40] E.G. Saleeby, On entire and meromorphic solutions of $\lambda u^k + \sum_{i=1}^n u_{z_i}^m = 1$, *Complex Var. Theory Appl.* 49 (2004) 101–107.
- [41] W. Stoll, *Holomorphic Functions of Finite Order in Several Complex Variables*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1974.
- [42] J.F. Tang, L.W. Liao, The transcendental meromorphic solutions of a certain type of non-linear differential equations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 334 (2007) 517–527.
- [43] R. Taylor, A. Wiles, Ring-theoretic properties of certain Hecke algebra, *Ann. Math.* 141 (1995) 553–572.
- [44] A. Wiles, Modular elliptic curves and Fermats last theorem, *Ann. Math.* 141 (1995) 443–551.
- [45] L. Xu, T.B. Cao, Solutions of complex Fermat-type partial difference and differential-difference equations, *Mediterr. J.Math.* 15 (2018) 1–14.
- [46] H.Y. Xu, J. Tu, Growth of solutions to systems of q-difference differential equations, *Electron. J. Differ. Equ.* 2016 (106) (2016) 1–14.
- [47] H.Y. Xu, S.Y. Liu, Q.P. Li, The existence and growth of solutions for several systems of complex nonlinear difference equations, *Mediterr. J. Math.* 16 (8) (2019) 1–30.
- [48] L. Xu, T.B. Cao, Correction to: Solutions of Complex Fermat-Type Partial Difference and Differential-Difference Equations, *Mediterr. J.Math.* 17 (2020) 1–4.
- [49] X.Y. Xu, H. Wang, Notes on the Existence of Entire Solutions for Several Partial Differential-Difference Equations, *Bull. Iran. Math. Soc.* 47 (2021) 1477–1489.
- [50] X.Y. Xu, S.Y. Liu, Q.P. Li, Entire solutions for several systems of nonlinear difference and partial differential-difference equations of Fermat-type, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 483 (2020) 123–641.
- [51] H.Y. Xu, D.W. Meng, S. Liu, H. Wang, Entire solutions for several second-order partial differential-difference equations of Fermat-type with two complex variables, *Adv. Differ. Equ.* (2021) 2021:52, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13662-020-03201-y>.
- [52] C.C. Yang, A generalization of a theorem of P. Montel on entire functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 26 (1970) 332–334.
- [53] C.C. Yang, P. Li, On the transcendental solutions of a certain type of non-linear differential equations, *Arch. Math.* 82 (2004) 442–448.
- [54] Z. Ye, On Nevanlinna's second main theorem in projective space, *Invent. Math.* 122 (1995) 475–507.
- [55] H.X. Yi, C.C. Yang, *Uniqueness Theory of Meromorphic Functions*, Science Press, Beijing, 1995.
- [56] X. Zhang, L.W. Liao, On a certain type of non-linear differential equations admitting transcendental meromorphic solutions, *Science China.* 56 (10) (2013) 2025–2034.
- [57] X.M. Zheng, X.Y. Xu, Entire solutions of some Fermat type functional equations concerning difference and partial differential in \mathbb{C}^2 , *Anal. Math.* DOI: 10.1007/s10476-021-0113-7.

GOUTAM HALDAR, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MALDA COLLEGE, MALDA - 732101, WEST BENGAL, INDIA.

Email address: goutamiit1986@gmail.com, goutamiitm@gmail.com