

FURTHER RESULTS ON UNICITY OF q - SHIFT DIFFERENCE DIFFERENTIAL POLYNOMIALS OF MEROMORPHIC FUNCTIONS

Abstract. This article is devoted to studying the uniqueness of q -shift difference-differential polynomials of transcendental meromorphic functions of zero order with weight l . Here we established unicity results on difference operators when two such functions sharing 1- points. Our findings extend some previous existing results.

Keywords: Meromorphic functions, Shift, Sharing values, Uniqueness, Differential polynomial, Zero order.

Subject Classification [2020]: Primary 30D35.

1. Introduction and Definitions

The Value Distribution Theory of Nevanlinna is about a century old and still is an active area of research. It has a wide range of applications within and outside function theory. In this paper, by meromorphic functions we will always mean meromorphic functions in the complex plane. We assume that the reader is familiar with the classical value distribution theory of meromorphic functions as described in say, the standard monograph (see [9,15,21]). For a nonconstant meromorphic function f , we denote by $T(r, f)$ the Nevanlinna characteristic of f and by $S(r, f)$ any quantity satisfying $S(r, f) = o\{T(r, f)\}$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ outside of a possible exceptional set E of finite linear measure. The meromorphic function $a(z)$ is called a small function of f if $T(r, a) = S(r, f)$. Two non-constant meromorphic functions f and g share a small function a CM (counting multiplicities) provided that $f - a$ and $g - a$ have the same set of zeros with the same multiplicities. f and g share a IM (ignoring multiplicities) if we do not consider the multiplicities.

Definition 1.1.[13] Let $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. We denote by $E_k(a; f)$ the set of all a points of f where an a - point of multiplicity m is counted m times if $m \leq k$ and $k + 1$ times if $m > k$. If $E_k(a; f) = E_k(a; g)$, we say that f, g share the value a with weight k .

Definition 1.2.[13,14] Let f, g share a value $(a, 0)$. We denote by $\bar{N}_*(r, a; f, g)$ the reduced counting function of those a -points of f whose multiplicities differ from the multiplicities of the corresponding a -points of g .

Clearly $\bar{N}_*(r, a; f, g) = \bar{N}_*(r, a; g, f)$ and $\bar{N}_*(r, a; f, g) = \bar{N}_L(r, a; f) + \bar{N}_L(r, a; g)$.

Definition 1.3.[12] Let $a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. We denote by $N(r, a; f | = 1)$ the counting function of simple a points of f . For $p \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $N(r, a; f | \leq p)$ the counting function of those a points of f whose multiplicities are not greater than p . By $\bar{N}(r, a; f | \leq p)$ we denote the corresponding reduced counting function.

Definition 1.4.[13] Let $p \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. We denote by $N_p(r, a; f)$ the counting function of a -points of f , where an a - point of multiplicity m is counted m times if $m \leq p$ and p times if

$m > p$. Then $N_p(r, a; f) = \bar{N}(r, a; f) + \bar{N}(r, a; |f| \geq 2) + \dots + \bar{N}(r, a; |f| \geq p)$. Clearly $N_1(r, a; f) = \bar{N}(r, a; f)$.

Definition 1.5.[23] Let f, g be two non-constant meromorphic functions such that f and g share $(a, 0)$. Let z_0 be an a -point of f with multiplicity p , an a -point of g with multiplicity q . We denote by $\bar{N}_L(r, a; f)$ the reduced counting function of those a -points of f and g where $p > q$, by $N_E^{(1)}(r, a; f)$ the counting function of those a -points of f and g where $p = q = 1$, by $N_E^{(2)}(r, a; f)$ the reduced counting function of those a -points of f and g where $p = q \geq 2$. In the same way we can define $\bar{N}_L(r, a; g)$, $N_E^{(1)}(r, a; g)$, $\bar{N}_E^{(2)}(r, a; g)$. In a similar manner we can define $\bar{N}_L(r, a; f)$ and $\bar{N}_L(r, a; g)$ for $a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. When f and g share (a, m) , $m \geq 1$, then $N_E^{(1)}(r, a; f) = N(r, a; |f| = 1)$.

Recently, people have raised great interest in difference analogues of Nevanlinna's theory and many articles have focused on value distribution and uniqueness of difference polynomials of entire or meromorphic functions.

In 2013, Liu-Cao-Qi-Yi[17] studied the following theorem.

Theorem A.[17] Let $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ be two transcendental meromorphic functions of zero order. Suppose that q and c are two non-zero complex constants and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $f^n(qz + c)$ and $g^n(qz + c)$ share $(1, l)$.

- i. If $l = \infty$ and $n \geq 14$;
 - ii. If $l = 0$ and $n \geq 26$,
- then $f(z) \equiv tg(z)$ or $f(z)g(z) \equiv t$ for some constants t that satisfy $t^{n+1} = 1$.

In the same year, Huang[11] studied the analogous result considering q -shift operator for CM sharing while Qi-Yang[18] supplemented the same for IM sharing.

Theorem B.[11, 18] Let $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ be two transcendental meromorphic functions of zero order. Suppose that q is a non-zero complex constant and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $f^n(qz)$ and $g^n(qz)$ share $(1, l)$.

- i. If $l = \infty$ and $n \geq 14$;
 - ii. If $l = 0$ and $n \geq 26$,
- then $f(z) \equiv tg(z)$ or $f(z)g(z) \equiv t$ for some constants t that satisfy $t^{n+1} = 1$.

In 2015, J. P. Wang, Y. Liu and F. H. Liu[21] proved the following theorems and obtained the following results.

Theorem C.[21] Let $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and let f and g be two transcendental meromorphic functions and $n \geq 14$, $k \geq 3$ be two positive integers. If $E_k(1, f^n(z)f(z+c)) = E_k(1, g^n(z)g(z+c))$, then $f \equiv t_1g$ or $fg \equiv t_2$ for some constant t_1 and t_2 satisfying $t_1^{n+1} = 1$ and $t_2^{n+1} = 1$.

Theorem D.[21] Let $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and let f and g be two transcendental meromorphic functions and $n \geq 16$, $k = 2$ be two positive integers. If $E_2(1, f^n(z)f(z+c)) = E_2(1, g^n(z)g(z+c))$, then $f \equiv t_1g$ or $fg \equiv t_2$ for some constant t_1 and t_2 satisfying $t_1^{n+1} = 1$ and $t_2^{n+1} = 1$.

Theorem E.[21] Let $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and let f and g be two transcendental meromorphic functions and $n \geq 22$, $k = 1$ be two positive integers. If $E_1(1, f^n(z)f(z+c)) = E_1(1, g^n(z)g(z+c))$, then

$f \equiv t_1 g$ or $f g \equiv t_2$ for some constant t_1 and t_2 satisfying $t_1^{n+1} = 1$ and $t_2^{n+1} = 1$.

Let $P(z) = a_m z^m + a_{m-1} z^{m-1} + \dots + a_0$ is non-zero polynomial of degree m and $r_0 = m_1 + m_2$ and $r_1 = m_1 + 2m_2$, where m_1 and m_2 respectively be the number of simple and multiple zeros of $P(z)$.

Regarding Theorems C, D and E, one may ask the following question which is the motivation of the present paper.

Question 1. What can be said about the meromorphic functions f and g if we consider the difference operator of the form $\Delta_q f = f(qz + c) - f(z)$.

In this paper, we paid our attention to the above question and proved the following two theorems that extend Theorem C, D and Theorem E respectively. Indeed, the following theorems are the main results of the paper.

2. Main Results

Theorem 2.1. Let $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ be two transcendental meromorphic functions of zero order $c \in \mathbb{C}$, such that $f(qz + c) - f(z) \not\equiv 0$ and $g(qz + c) - g(z) \not\equiv 0$, where n, q and c are non zero complex constants. Suppose that $\mathcal{F}(z) = P(f)(z)\{f(qz + c) - f(z)\}$ and $\mathcal{G}(z) = P(g)\{g(qz + c) - g(z)\}$ share $(1, l)$. Now

- 1) if $l \geq 2$ and $n > 2r_1 + 13$;
- 2) if $l = 1$ and $n > 2r_1 + \frac{r_0}{2} + 15$;
- 3) if $l = 0$ and $n > 2r_1 + 3r_0 + 25$.

Then one of the following results holds:

- i) $P(f)(z)\{f(qz + c) - f(z)\}.P(g)\{g(qz + c) - g(z)\} \equiv 1$;
- ii) $P(f)(z)\{f(qz + c) - f(z)\} \equiv P(g)\{g(qz + c) - g(z)\}$;
- iii) $f \equiv t g$, for some constant t such that $t^{n+5} = 1$.

Theorem 2.2. Let $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ be two transcendental meromorphic functions of zero order $c \in \mathbb{C}$, such that $f(qz + c) - f(z) \not\equiv 0$ and $g(qz + c) - g(z) \not\equiv 0$, where n, q and c are non zero complex constants. Suppose that $(\mathcal{F}(z))^{(k)} = [P(f)(z)\{f(qz + c) - f(z)\}]^{(k)}$ and $(\mathcal{G}(z))^{(k)} = [P(g)(z)\{g(qz + c) - g(z)\}]^{(k)}$ share $(1, l)$. Now

- 1) if $l \geq 2$ and $n > 2(m_2 + 1)k + 2r_1 + 13$;
- 2) if $l = 1$ and $n > \left(\frac{5}{2}m_2 + 3\right)k + 2r_1 + \frac{r_0}{2} + 15$;
- 3) if $l = 0$ and $n > 5m_2 k + 8k + 2r_1 + 3r_0 + 25$.

Then one of the following results holds:

- i) $[P(f)(z)\{f(qz + c) - f(z)\}]^{(k)}[P(g)(z)\{g(qz + c) - g(z)\}]^{(k)} \equiv 1$.
- ii) $f \equiv t g$ for some constant t such that $t^d = 1$, where $d = LCM\{\zeta_j : j = 0, 1, \dots, n\}$
and

$$\zeta_j = \begin{cases} j + 1 & \text{if } a_j \neq 0, \\ n + 1 & \text{if } a_j = 0. \end{cases}$$

- iii) f and g satisfy the algebraic equation $R(f, g) = 0$, where

$$R(\mathfrak{w}_1, \mathfrak{w}_2) = P(\mathfrak{w}_1)(\mathfrak{w}_1(qz + c) - \mathfrak{w}_1(z)) - P(\mathfrak{w}_2)(\mathfrak{w}_2(qz + c) - \mathfrak{w}_2(z)).$$

3. Some Lemmas

For two non-constant meromorphic functions \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} , \mathcal{H} represents the following function.

$$\mathcal{H} = \left(\frac{\mathcal{F}''}{\mathcal{F}'} - \frac{2\mathcal{F}'}{\mathcal{F}-1} \right) - \left(\frac{\mathcal{G}''}{\mathcal{G}'} - \frac{2\mathcal{G}'}{\mathcal{G}-1} \right). \quad (3.1)$$

Lemma 3.1.[18] Let f be a zero order meromorphic function and $q \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Then

$$m\left(r, \frac{f(z)}{f(qz+c)}\right) = S(r, f) \text{ and } T(r, f(qz+c)) = T(r, f) + S(r, f).$$

Lemma 3.2.[26] Let f be a meromorphic function of finite order and $q \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Then

$$N(r, 0; f(qz+c)) \leq N(r, 0; f(z)) + S(r, f),$$

$$N(r, \infty; f(qz+c)) \leq N(r, \infty; f(z)) + S(r, f),$$

$$\bar{N}(r, 0; f(qz+c)) \leq \bar{N}(r, 0; f(z)) + S(r, f),$$

$$\bar{N}(r, \infty; f(qz+c)) \leq \bar{N}(r, \infty; f(z)) + S(r, f).$$

Lemma 3.3.[24] Let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} be two non-constant meromorphic functions sharing $(1,0)$ and $\mathcal{H} \not\equiv 0$. Then $N_E^{(1)}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) = N_E^{(1)}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) \leq N(r, \mathcal{H}) + S(r, \mathcal{F}) + S(r, \mathcal{G})$.

Lemma 3.4.[13] If two non-constant meromorphic functions \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} share $(1,0)$ and $\mathcal{H} \not\equiv 0$. Then $\bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{H}) \leq \bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} | \geq 2) + \bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G} | \geq 2) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F} | \geq 2) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{G} | \geq 2) + \bar{N}_*(r, 1; \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) + \bar{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + \bar{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}')$,

where $\bar{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}')$ we mean the reduced counting function of those zeros of \mathcal{F}' which are not the zeros of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{F} - 1)$.

Lemma 3.5.[3] Let f and g be any two non-constant meromorphic functions sharing $(1, l)$ where $0 \leq l \leq \infty$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{N}(r, 1; f) + \bar{N}(r, 1; g) - N_E^{(1)}(r, 1; f) + \left(l - \frac{1}{2}\right) \bar{N}_*(r, 1; f, g) \\ \leq \frac{1}{2} [N(r, 1; f) + N(r, 1; g)]. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.6.[2] Let f and g be any two meromorphic function and suppose they share $(1, l)$, then

$$\bar{N}_*(r, 1; f, g) \leq \frac{1}{l+1} [\bar{N}(r, 0; f) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + \bar{N}(r, 0; g) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; g)] + S(r, f) + S(r, g).$$

Lemma 3.7.[13] Let f and g be two non-constant meromorphic functions sharing $(1,2)$. Then one of the following cases holds:

- i. $T(r, f) \leq N_2(r, 0; f) + N_2(r, 0; g) + N_2(r, \infty; f) + N_2(r, \infty; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g)$;
- ii. $f = g$;
- iii. $f, g = 1$.

Lemma 3.8.[1] Let f and g be two transcendental meromorphic functions sharing (1,1) and $\mathcal{H} \neq 0$. Then $T(r, f) \leq N_2(r, 0; f) + N_2(r, 0; g) + N_2(r, \infty; f) + N_2(r, \infty; g) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}(r, 0; f) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + S(r, f) + S(r, g)$.

Lemma 3.9.[1] Let f and g be two transcendental meromorphic functions sharing (1,0) and $\mathcal{H} \neq 0$. Then $T(r, f) \leq N_2(r, 0; f) + N_2(r, 0; g) + N_2(r, \infty; f) + N_2(r, \infty; g) + 2\bar{N}(r, 0; f) + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + 2\bar{N}(r, 0; g) + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g)$.

Lemma 3.10.[16] Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function and let p and k be two positive integers. Then

$$N_p\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{(k)}}\right) \leq T(r, f^{(k)}) - T(r, f) + N_{p+k}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + S(r, f);$$

$$N_p\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{(k)}}\right) \leq k\bar{N}(r, f) + N_{p+k}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + S(r, f).$$

Lemma 3.11.[22] Let $f(z)$ be non-constant meromorphic function, then

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

Lemma 3.12. Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order and let $\mathcal{F} = P(f)f(qz + c) - f(z)$, where n is a positive integer. Then $(n - 1)T(r, f) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, \mathcal{F})$.

Proof . From First fundamental theorem , Lemmas 3.1 and 3.11, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (n + 1)T(r, f) &= T(r, f(z)P(f)) + S(r, f) \leq T\left(r, \frac{f(z)\mathcal{F}}{f(qz + c) - f(z)}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \mathcal{F}) + T\left(r, \frac{f(qz + c) - f(z)}{f(z)}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \mathcal{F}) + m\left(r, \frac{f(qz + c)}{f(z)}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{f(qz + c)}{f(z)}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \mathcal{F}) + 2T(r, f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $(n - 1)T(r, f) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, \mathcal{F})$.

4. Proof of the Theorems

Proof of the Theorem 2.1. Here we consider $\mathcal{F}(z) = P(f)(z)\{f(qz + c) - f(z)\}$ and $\mathcal{G}(z) = P(g)\{g(qz + c) - g(z)\}$. Then \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} share (1, l).

Case 1. Let $\mathcal{H} \neq 0$. Using Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} N_E^1(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) &\leq N(r, \mathcal{H}) + S(r, \mathcal{F}) + S(r, \mathcal{G}) \\ &\leq \bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} | \geq 2) + \bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G} | \geq 2) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F} | \geq 2) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{G} | \geq 2) \\ &\quad + \bar{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + \bar{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + \bar{N}_*(r, 1; \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

By the Second Fundamental Theorem. We get

$$T(r, \mathcal{F}) \leq \bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) + \bar{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) - \bar{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + S(r, f) \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$T(r, \mathcal{G}) \leq \bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{G}) + \bar{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) - \bar{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + S(r, g) \quad (4.3)$$

Combining (4.1),(4.2) and (4.3) with the help of Lemmas (3.5) and (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & [T(r, \mathcal{F}) + T(r, \mathcal{G})] \\ & \leq [\bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G})] + [\bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{G})] \\ & \quad + [\bar{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + \bar{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{G})] - [\bar{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + \bar{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + S(r, f) + S(r, g)] \\ & \leq N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + N_2(r, \infty; \mathcal{G}) + N_2(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) + [\bar{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + \bar{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) - \\ & \quad N_E^{(1)}(r, 1; \mathcal{F})] + \bar{N}_*(r, 1; \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ & \leq N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + N_2(r, \infty; \mathcal{G}) + N_2(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) + \frac{1}{2} [T(r, \mathcal{F}) + T(r, \mathcal{G})] - \\ & \quad \left(l - \frac{3}{2} \right) \bar{N}_*(r, 1; \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} [T(r, \mathcal{F}) + T(r, \mathcal{G})] + N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + N_2(r, \infty; \mathcal{G}) + N_2(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) + \\ & \quad \frac{(3-2l)}{2(l+1)} [\bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) + \bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{G})] + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \quad (4.4) \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} [T(r, \mathcal{F}) + T(r, \mathcal{G})] & \leq 2[N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + N_2(r, \infty; \mathcal{G}) + N_2(r, \infty; \mathcal{F})] + \frac{(3-2l)}{2(l+1)} \\ & [\bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{G}) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{G})] + \\ & + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \quad (4.5) \end{aligned}$$

Subcase 1.1. While $l \geq 2$, in view of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.12, from (4.5) we get

$$\begin{aligned} (n-1)[T(r, f) + T(r, g)] & \leq 2[(m_1 + 2m_2)T(r, f) + N(r, 0; f(qz+c) - f(z)) + (m_1 + 2m_2)T(r, g) \\ & \quad + N(r, 0; g(qz+c) - g(z)) + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + N(r, \infty; f(qz+c) - f(z)) + \\ & \quad + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + N(r, \infty; g(qz+c) - g(z))] + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \\ & \leq 2[(m_1 + 2m_2 + 6)]\{T(r, f) + T(r, g)\} + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \quad (4.6) \end{aligned}$$

From (4.6) it follows that

$$(n-1)[T(r, f) + T(r, g)] \leq [(2r_1 + 12)]\{T(r, f) + T(r, g)\} + S(r, f) + S(r, g),$$

which is a contradiction for $n > 2r_1 + 13$.

Subcase 1.2. While $l = 1$, in view of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.12, from (4.5) we get

$$\begin{aligned} (n-1)[T(r, f) + T(r, g)] & \leq 2[(m_1 + 2m_2)T(r, f) + N(r, 0; f(qz+c) - f(z)) + (m_1 + 2m_2)T(r, g) \\ & \quad + N(r, 0; g(qz+c) - g(z)) + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + N(r, \infty; f(qz+c) - f(z)) + \\ & \quad + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + N(r, \infty; g(qz+c) - g(z))] + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +N(r, 0; g(qz + c) - g(z)) + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + N(r, \infty; f(qz + c) - f(z)) + \\
& +2\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + N(r, \infty; g(qz + c) - g(z))] + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) [(m_1 + m_2)T(r, f) \\
& +N(r, 0; f(qz + c) - f(z)) + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; f) + (m_1 + m_2)T(r, g) + \\
& N(r, 0; g(qz + c) - g(z)) + 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; g) + (S(r, f) + S(r, g)). \\
\leq & \\
& \left[2(m_1 + 2m_2 + 6) + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) (m_1 + m_2 + 4)\right] \{T(r, f) + T(r, g)\} + \\
& (S(r, f) + S(r, g)). \tag{4.7}
\end{aligned}$$

From (4.7), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
(n - 1)[T(r, f) + T(r, g)] & \\
& \leq [2r_1 + 12 + \frac{r_0}{2} + 2] \{T(r, f) + T(r, g)\} + (S(r, f) \\
& + S(r, g)).
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction for $n > 2r_1 + \frac{r_0}{2} + 15$.

Subcase 1.3. Let $l = 0$. Again using Lemmas 3.2 and 3.12, from (4.5) we get

$$(n - 1)[T(r, f) + T(r, g)] \leq [2(m_1 + 2m_2 + 6) + 3(m_1 + m_2 + 4)\{T(r, f) + T(r, g)\} + (S(r, f) + S(r, g)). \tag{4.8}$$

From (4.8), we get

$$(n - 1)[T(r, f) + T(r, g)] \leq [2r_1 + 12 + 3r_0 + 12]\{T(r, f) + T(r, g)\} + (S(r, f) + S(r, g)).$$

Which is a contradiction for $n > 2r_1 + 3r_0 + 25$.

Case 2. Let $\mathcal{H} \equiv 0$, integrating (3.1) we get

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{F}-1} \equiv \frac{b\mathcal{G}+a-b}{\mathcal{G}-1} \tag{4.9}$$

where $a \neq 0, b$ are constants. From (4.9) it is clear that \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} share $(1, \infty)$. Now we consider the following cases.

Subcase2.1. Let $b \neq 0$ and $a \neq b$. If $b = -1$, from (4.9) we have

$$\mathcal{F} \equiv \frac{-a}{\mathcal{G}-a-1}.$$

From Lemma 3.2, we see that

$$\bar{N}(r, a + 1; \mathcal{G}) = \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) \leq 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; f).$$

So in view of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.12, using second fundamental theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(n - 1)T(r, g) & \leq \bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{G}) + \bar{N}(r, a + 1; \mathcal{G}) + S(r, g) \\
& \leq (m_1 + m_2 + 4)T(r, g) + 2T(r, f) + S(r, g).
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar manner, we can get

$$(n - 1)T(r, f) \leq (m_1 + m_2 + 4)T(r, f) + 2T(r, g) + S(r, f).$$

Combining the above equations, we can get

$$(n - 1)\{T(r, f) + T(r, g)\} \leq (r_0 + 6)\{T(r, f) + T(r, g)\} + S(r, f) + S(r, g).$$

a contradiction for $n > 2r_1 + 13$.

If $b \neq -1$, from (4.9) we get

$$\mathcal{F} - \left(1 + \frac{1}{b}\right) = \frac{-a}{b^2 \left[\mathcal{G} + \frac{a-b}{b}\right]}.$$

So ,
$$\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{b-a}{b}; \mathcal{G}\right) = \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}).$$

Using Lemmas 3.2 and 3.12 and with the same argument as used in the case for $b = -1$, we can get a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2. Let $b \neq 0$ and $a = b$. If $b = -1$ then from (4.9) we have

$$\mathcal{F}\mathcal{G} \equiv 1.$$

that is $P(f)(z)\{f(qz + c) - f(z)\}.P(g)\{g(qz + c) - g(z)\} \equiv 1$.

In particular, when $P(f) = f^n$, take $\mathcal{M}(z) = f(z)g(z)$. When $\mathcal{M}(z)$ is non-constant. We have from the above by using first fundamental theorem and Lemma 3.1, we have

$$T(r, \mathcal{M}^n) = 4T(r, \mathcal{M}) + S(r, \mathcal{M}),$$

a contradiction . So $\mathcal{M}(z)$ must be a constant and $\mathcal{M}(z)^{n+5} \equiv 1$ which implies $f g \equiv t$ where $t^{n+5} = 1$.

If $b \neq -1$, from (4.9) we have

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{F}} \equiv \frac{b\mathcal{G}}{(1+b)\mathcal{G} - 1}$$

Therefore,
$$\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{1+b}; \mathcal{G}\right) = \bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}).$$

So in view of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.12, using second fundamental theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (n - 1)T(r, g) &\leq \bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{G}) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{1+b}; \mathcal{G}\right) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq (m_1 + m_2 + 4)T(r, g) + (m_1 + m_2 + 2)(T(r, f) + S(r, g)). \end{aligned}$$

In a similar manner, we can get

$$(n - 1)T(r, f) \leq (m_1 + m_2 + 4)T(r, f) + (m_1 + m_2 + 2)T(r, g) + S(r, f).$$

Combining the above equations, we can get

$$(n - 1)\{T(r, f) + T(r, g)\} \leq (2r_0 + 6)\{T(r, f) + T(r, g)\} + S(r, f) + S(r, g).$$

a contradiction for $n > 2r_1 + 13$.

Subcase 2.3. Let $b = 0$. From (4.9), we obtain

$$\mathcal{F} \equiv \frac{g+a-1}{a} \quad (4.10)$$

If $a \neq 1$ then from (4.10) we obtain $\bar{N}(r, 1 - a; \mathcal{G}) = \bar{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F})$.

Now using a similar process as done in Case 2, for $b \neq -1$, we can deduce a contradiction.

Therefore $a = 1$ and from (4.10) we obtain $\mathcal{F} \equiv \mathcal{G}$.

That is $P(f)(z)\{f(qz + c) - f(z)\} \equiv P(g)\{g(qz + c) - g(z)\}$.

This completes the proof.

Proof of the Theorem 2.2.

Let $\Phi = (\mathcal{F}(z))^{(k)} = [P(f)(z)\{f(qz + c) - f(z)\}]^{(k)}$ and

$$\Psi = (\mathcal{G}(z))^{(k)} = [P(g)(z)\{g(qz + c) - g(z)\}]^{(k)}$$

Then Φ and Ψ share $(1, l)$. Applying Lemmas 3.1, 3.2 and 3.10 we have

$$\begin{aligned} N_2(r, 0; \Phi) &= N_2(r, 0; (\mathcal{F})^{(k)}) \leq N_{k+2}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + k\bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq [(m_2 + 2)k + r_1 + 2]T(r, f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} N_2(r, \infty; \Phi) &= N_2(r, \infty; (\mathcal{F})^{(k)}) + S(r, f) \leq N_2(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq 4T(r, f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{N}(r, 0; \Phi) &= \bar{N}(r, 0; (\mathcal{F})^{(k)}) + S(r, f) \leq N_{k+1}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + k\bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq [(m_2 + 2)k + r_0 + 2]T(r, f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Phi) &= \bar{N}(r, \infty; (\mathcal{F})^{(k)}) + S(r, f) \leq \bar{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq 2T(r, f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Here two cases arise.

Case 1. Let $\mathcal{H} \neq 0$. Now by applying Lemma 3.10 we have

$$\begin{aligned} N_2(r, 0; \Phi) &\leq N_2(r, 0; (\mathcal{F})^{(k)}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, (\mathcal{F})^{(k)}) - T(r, \mathcal{F}) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \Phi) - T(r, \mathcal{F}) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + S(r, f) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{That is } T(r, \mathcal{F}) \leq T(r, \Phi) - N_2(r, 0; \Phi) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + S(r, f) \quad (4.15)$$

Combining Lemma 3.12 and (4.15) we have

$$(n - 1)T(r, f) \leq T(r, \mathcal{F}) \leq T(r, \Phi) - N_2(r, 0; \Phi) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + S(r, f). \quad (4.16)$$

Subcase 1.1. While $l \geq 2$, in view of case (i) of Lemma 3.7, using (4.11), (4.12) and (4.16) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (n - 1)T(r, f) &\leq N_2(r, 0; \Psi) + N_2(r, \infty; \Phi) + N_2(r, \infty; \Psi) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq (km_2 + r_1 + 6)T(r, f) + ((m_2 + 2)k + r_1 + 6)T(r, g) + S(r, f) \\ &\quad + S(r, g). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$(n - 1)T(r, g) \leq (km_2 + r_1 + 6)T(r, g) + ((m_2 + 2)k + r_1 + 6)T(r, f) + S(r, f) + S(r, g).$$

Combining the above two equations, we have

$$(n - 1)\{T(r, f) + T(r, g)\} \leq (2km_2 + 2r_1 + 2k + 12)\{T(r, f) + T(r, g)\}S(r, f) + S(r, g).$$

which is a contradiction for $n > 2(m_2 + 1)k + 2r_1 + 13$.

Subcase 1.2. While $l = 1$, in view of Lemma 3.8, using (4.11),(4.12),(4.13),(4.14) and (4.16) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (n - 1)T(r, f) &\leq N_2(r, 0; \Psi) + N_2(r, \infty; \Phi) + N_2(r, \infty; \Psi) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}(r, 0; \Phi) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}(r, \infty; \Phi) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \\ &\leq [(m_2 + 2)k + r_1 + 2]T(r, g) + 4T(r, f) + 4T(r, g) \\ &\quad + [(m_1 + (k + 2)m_2 + 2)T(r, f) + \frac{1}{2}[(m_2 + 2)k + r_0 \\ &\quad + 2]T(r, f)] + \frac{1}{2}(2T(r, f)) \\ &\quad + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} (n - 1)T(r, g) &\leq [(m_2 + 2)k + r_1 + 2]T(r, f) + 4T(r, g) + 4T(r, f) \\ &\quad + [(m_1 + (k + 2)m_2 + 2)T(r, g) + \frac{1}{2}[(m_2 + 2)k + r_0 \\ &\quad + 2]T(r, g)] + \frac{1}{2}(2T(r, g)) \\ &\quad + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two equations, we have

$$(n - 1)[T(r, f) + T(r, g)] \leq \left[\left(\frac{5}{2}m_2 + 3 \right)k + 2r_1 + \frac{r_0}{2} + 14 \right] [T(r, f) + T(r, g)] + S(r, f) + S(r, g).$$

which is a contradiction for $n > \left(\frac{5}{2}m_2 + 3 \right)k + 2r_1 + \frac{r_0}{2} + 15$.

Subcase 1.3. While $l = 0$, in view of Lemma 3.9, using (4.11),(4.12),(4.13),(4.14) and (4.16) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (n - 1)T(r, f) &\leq N_2(r, 0; \Psi) + N_2(r, \infty; \Phi) + N_2(r, \infty; \Psi) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + 2\bar{N}(r, 0; \Phi) + \\ &\quad 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; \Phi) + \bar{N}(r, 0; \Psi) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Psi) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \\ &\leq [(m_2 + 2)k + r_1 + 2]T(r, g) + 4T(r, f) + 4T(r, g) + (m_1 + (k + \\ &\quad 2)m_2 + 2)T(r, f) + 2[(m_2 + 2)k + r_0 + 2]T(r, f) + 2[2T(r, f)] + \\ &\quad [(m_2 + 2)k + r_0 + 2]T(r, g) + 2T(r, g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} (n - 1)T(r, g) &\leq [(m_2 + 2)k + r_1 + 2]T(r, f) + 4T(r, g) + 4T(r, f) + (m_1 + (k + 2)m_2 + \\ &\quad 2)T(r, g) + 2[(m_2 + 2)k + r_0 + 2]T(r, g) + 2[2T(r, g)] + \\ &\quad [(m_2 + 2)k + r_0 + 2]T(r, f) + 2T(r, f) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two equations, we have

$$(n - 1)[T(r, f) + T(r, g)] \leq 5m_2k + 8k + 2r_1 + 3r_0 + 24.$$

which is a contradiction for $n > 5m_2k + 8k + 2r_1 + 3r_0 + 25$.

Case 2. Let $\mathcal{H} \equiv 0$. By integration, we get

$$\frac{1}{\phi - 1} \equiv \frac{b\Psi + a - b}{\Psi - 1} \quad (4.17)$$

where $a \neq 0, b$ are constants. From (4.17) it is clear that Φ and Ψ share $(1, \infty)$. Now we consider the following cases.

Subcase 2.1. Let $b \neq 0$ and $a \neq b$. If $b = -1$, then from (4.17) we have

$$\Phi \equiv \frac{-a}{\Psi^{-a-1}}.$$

From Lemma 3.2 and (4.14) it is clear that

$$\bar{N}(r, a+1; \Psi) = \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Phi) \leq 2\bar{N}(r, \infty; \Psi).$$

Now using second fundamental theorem we get

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, \Psi) &\leq \bar{N}(r, 0; \Psi) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Psi) + \bar{N}(r, a+1; \Psi) + S(r, \mathfrak{g}) \\ &\leq \bar{N}(r, 0; \Psi) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Psi) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Phi) + S(r, \mathfrak{f}) + S(r, \mathfrak{g}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.10, we see that

$$\bar{N}(r, 0; \Psi) \leq T(r, \Psi) - T(r, \mathfrak{G}) + N_{k+1}(r, 0; \mathfrak{G}) + S(r, \mathfrak{g}).$$

These two inequalities imply

$$T(r, \mathfrak{G}) \leq \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Psi) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Phi) + N_{k+1}(r, 0; \mathfrak{G}) + S(r, \mathfrak{f}) + S(r, \mathfrak{g}).$$

From the above equation, using (4.14) and Lemmas 3.2, 3.12 we have

$$\begin{aligned} (n-1)T(r, \mathfrak{g}) &\leq \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Psi) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Phi) + N_{k+1}(r, 0; \mathfrak{G}) + S(r, \mathfrak{f}) + S(r, \mathfrak{g}) \\ &\leq 2T(r, \mathfrak{f}) + 2T(r, \mathfrak{g}) + (m_1 + (k+1)m_2 + 2)T(r, \mathfrak{g}) + S(r, \mathfrak{f}) + S(r, \mathfrak{g}) \\ &\leq 2T(r, \mathfrak{f}) + (r_1 + km_2 + 4)T(r, \mathfrak{g}) + S(r, \mathfrak{f}) + S(r, \mathfrak{g}). \end{aligned}$$

As Φ and Ψ are interchangeable, in a similar manner we can get

$$(n-1)T(r, \mathfrak{f}) \leq 2T(r, \mathfrak{g}) + (r_1 + km_2 + 4)T(r, \mathfrak{f}) + S(r, \mathfrak{f}) + S(r, \mathfrak{g}).$$

Combining above two, we can get

$$(n-1)\{T(r, \mathfrak{f}) + T(r, \mathfrak{g})\} \leq (r_1 + km_2 + 6)\{T(r, \mathfrak{f}) + T(r, \mathfrak{g})\} + S(r, \mathfrak{f}) + S(r, \mathfrak{g}),$$

a contradiction for $n > 2(m_2 + 1)k + 2r_1 + 13$.

If $b \neq -1$, from (4.17) we obtain that

$$\Phi - \left(1 + \frac{1}{b}\right) \equiv \frac{-a}{b^2 \left[\Psi + \frac{a-b}{b}\right]}.$$

So ,
$$\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{b-a}{b}; \Psi\right) \equiv \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Phi).$$

Using Lemmas 3.2, 3.10 and 3.12 with the same argument as used in the case for $b = -1$, we can get a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2. Let $b \neq 0$ and $a = b$. If $b = -1$, then from (4.17) we have

$$\Phi\Psi \equiv 1,$$

That is $[P(\mathfrak{f})(z)\{\mathfrak{f}(qz+c) - \mathfrak{f}(z)\}]^{(k)} [P(\mathfrak{g})(z)\{\mathfrak{g}(qz+c) - \mathfrak{g}(z)\}]^{(k)} \equiv 1$.

If $b \neq -1$, from (4.17) we have

$$\frac{1}{\Phi} \equiv \frac{b\Psi}{(1+b)\Psi-1}.$$

Therefore,
$$\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{1+b}; \Psi\right) = \bar{N}(r, 0; \Phi).$$

So using the second fundamental theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
T(r, \Psi) &\leq \bar{N}(r, 0; \Psi) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Psi) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{1+b}; \Psi\right) + S(r, g) \\
&\leq \bar{N}(r, 0; \Psi) + \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Psi) + \bar{N}(r, 0; \Phi) + S(r, f) + S(r, g).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.10, we see

$$\bar{N}(r, 0; \Psi) \leq T(r, \Psi) - T(r, \mathcal{G}) + N_{k+1}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + S(r, g).$$

These two inequalities imply

$$T(r, \mathcal{G}) \leq \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Psi) + \bar{N}(r, 0; \Phi) + N_{k+1}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + S(r, f) + S(r, g).$$

From the above equation, using (4.13), (4.14) and Lemmas 3.2, 3.12, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(n-1)T(r, g) &\leq \bar{N}(r, \infty; \Psi) + \bar{N}(r, 0; \Phi) + N_{k+1}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
&\leq [(m_2 + 2)k + r_0 + 2]T(r, f) + 2T(r, g) + (m_1 + (k + 1)m_2 + 2)T(r, g) \\
&\quad + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
&\leq [(m_2 + 2)k + r_0 + 2]T(r, f) + [km_2 + r_1 + 4]T(r, g) + S(r, f) \\
&\quad + S(r, g).
\end{aligned}$$

As Φ and Ψ are symmetric, in a similar manner, we can get

$$(n-1)T(r, f) \leq [(m_2 + 2)k + r_0 + 2]T(r, g) + [km_2 + r_1 + 4]T(r, f) + S(r, f) + S(r, g)$$

Combining above two, we get

$$(n-1)\{T(r, f) + T(r, g)\} \leq [2(m_2 + 1)k + r_1 + r_0 + 6]\{T(r, f) + T(r, g)\} + S(r, f) + S(r, g),$$

a contradiction for $n > 2(m_2 + 1)k + 2r_1 + 13$.

Subcase 2.3. Let $b = 0$. From (4.17), we obtain

$$\Phi \equiv \frac{\Psi - a - 1}{a}. \quad (4.18)$$

$$\bar{N}(r, 1 - a; \Psi) = \bar{N}(r, 0; \Phi).$$

So using the same argument as done in Case 2, for $b \neq -1$, we can similarly deduce a contradiction. Therefore $a = 1$ and from (4.18) we obtain $\Phi = \Psi$,

$$\text{That is } [P(f)(z)\{f(qz + c) - f(z)\}]^{(k)} \equiv [P(g)(z)\{g(qz + c) - g(z)\}]^{(k)}.$$

$$\text{Integrating we have } P(f)(z)\{f(qz + c) - f(z)\} \equiv P(g)(z)\{g(qz + c) - g(z)\} + p(z)$$

where $p(z)$ is a polynomial of degree at most $k - 1$. If $p(z) \not\equiv 0$, then from the second main theorem for the small function and Lemma 3.12 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(n-1)T(r, f) &\leq T(r, \mathcal{F}) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq \bar{N}(r, \mathcal{F}) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{\mathcal{F}}\right) + \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{\mathcal{G}}\right) + S(r, f)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq (r_0 + 4)T(r, f) + (r_0 + 2)T(r, g) + S(r, f).$$

Similarly $(n-1)T(r, g) \leq (r_0 + 4)T(r, g) + (r_0 + 2)T(r, f) + S(r, g)$. Therefore, $(n-1)[T(r, f) + T(r, g)] \leq (2r_0 + 6)[T(r, f) + T(r, g)] + S(r, f) + S(r, g)$, which by $n > 2(m_2 + 1)k + 2r_1 + 13$ gives a contradiction. Thus $p(z) \equiv 0$ which implies

$$P(f)(z)\{f(qz + c) - f(z)\} = P(g)(z)\{g(qz + c) - g(z)\}. \quad (4.19)$$

That is $(a_n f^n + a_{n-1} f^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 f + a_0)(f(qz + c) - f(z)) = (a_n g^n + a_{n-1} g^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 g + a_0)(g(qz + c) - g(z))$, which implies

$$(a_n f^n + a_{n-1} f^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 f + a_0)(f(qz + c)) - (a_n f^n + a_{n-1} f^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 f + a_0)f(z) =$$

$(a_n g^n + a_{n-1} g^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 g + a_0)(g(qz + c)) - (a_n g^n + a_{n-1} g^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 g + a_0)g(z)$. Let $h = \frac{f}{g}$, we consider the following cases.

Case 1. If $h(z)$ is a constant, then substituting $f = gh$ into (4.19), we have

$$(a_n h^n g^n + a_{n-1} h^{n-1} g^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 h g + a_0)hg((qz + c) - (a_n g^n + a_{n-1} g^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 g + a_0)g(qz + c) - ((a_n g^n h^n + a_{n-1} g^{n-1} h^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 g h + a_0)hg(z)) - (a_n g^n + a_{n-1} g^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 g + a_0)g(z)) = 0, \text{ which implies } a_n g^n g(qz + c)(h^{n+1} - 1) + a_{n-1} g^{n-1} g(qz + c)(h^n - 1) + \dots + a_1 g^1 g(qz + c)(h^2 - 1) + a_0 g(qz + c)(h - 1) - (a_n g^{n+1}(h^{n+1} - 1) + a_{n-1} g^n(h^n - 1) + \dots + a_1 g^2(h^2 - 1) + a_0 g((h - 1))) = 0.$$

Therefore $a_n g^n (g(qz + c) - g(z))(h^{n+1} - 1) + a_{n-1} g^{n-1} (g(qz + c) - g(z))(h^n - 1) + \dots + a_1 g (g(qz + c) - g(z))(h^2 - 1) + a_0 (g(qz + c) - g(z))(h - 1) = 0$. This implies $h^d = 1$, where $d = LCM\{\zeta_j : j = 0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and

$$\zeta_j = \begin{cases} j + 1 & \text{if } a_j \neq 0, \\ n + 1 & \text{if } a_j = 0. \end{cases}$$

Thus $f \equiv tg$, where t is a constant with $t^d = 1$, where $d = LCM\{\zeta_j : j = 0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and

$$\zeta_j = \begin{cases} j + 1 & \text{if } a_j \neq 0, \\ n + 1 & \text{if } a_j = 0. \end{cases}$$

Case 2. Suppose $h(z)$ is not a constant, then f and g satisfy the algebraic equation $R(f, g) = 0$, where $R(w_1, w_2) = P(w_1)(w_1(qz + c) - w_1(z)) - P(w_2)(w_2(qz + c) - w_2(z))$.

This completes the proof.

5. Conclusions

Using the Nevanlinna theory, we have studied the value distribution and uniqueness of difference operator for a transcendental meromorphic functions $P(f)(z)\{f(qz + c) - f(z)\}$ and $P(g)(z)\{g(qz + c) - g(z)\}$ having zero order. Our results extends and generalizes the Theorems C, D and E. Also by considering the concept of weighted sharing introduced by Indrajit Lahiri, we have obtained Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 which are the main results of this paper.

Also, we can pose the following open problems.

6. Open problems

1. Can the condition for the lower bound n in Theorems 2.1-2.2 be reduced any further?
2. What happens to Theorems 2.1-2.2, if we replace q -shift difference operator $f(qz + c) - f(z)$ by product of difference operator $\prod_{i=1}^n (\Delta_{\omega}^{\vartheta} f)^{\mu_i}$, where ϑ, μ_i are positive integers.

Scope of the Research.

Nevanlinna theory appeared to be a most powerful tool in investigating analytic solutions of complex differential equations in the complex plane and in the unit disk. In the theory of differential equations, in most of the cases it is difficult to find an explicit solution for a given differential equation. But Nevanlinna theory offers an efficient way for this problem, with the only requirement that the solution must be meromorphic either in the

whole complex plane or in small domain where the growth of the solution is sufficiently large near the boundary of the domain.

References

- [1] A. Banerjee, Meromorphic functions sharing one value, *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, **22**,(2005),3587-3598.
- [2] A. Banerjee, Some uniqueness results on meromorphic functions sharing three sets, *Annales Polonici Mathematici*, **92**(3),(2007),261-274.
- [3] A. Banerjee, Uniqueness of meromorphic functions sharing two sets with finite weight II, *Tamkang Journal of Mathematics*, **41**(4), (2010),379-392.
- [4] A. Banerjee, Uniqueness of meromorphic functions sharing two sets with finite weight, *Portugaliae Mathematica*, **65**(1),(2008),81-93.
- [5] D.C. Barnett, R.G. Halburd, R.J. Korhonen, W. Morgan, Nevanlinna theory for the q-difference operator and meromorphic solutions of q-difference equations, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, **137**(3), (2007) 457-474.
- [6] Y.M. Chiang, and S.J. Feng, On the Nevanlinna characteristic of $f(z + c)$ and difference equations in the complex plane, *The Ramanujan Journal*, **16**(1),(2008),105-129.
- [7] R.G Halburd and R. J. Korhonen, Finite-order meromorphic solutions and the discrete Painlevé equations, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, **94**(2),(2007),443-474.
- [8] R.G Halburd and R. J Korhonen , Difference analogue of the lemma on the logarithmic derivative with applications to difference equations, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, **314**(2),(2006),477- 487.
- [9] W.K Hayman, *Meromorphic Functions*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs Clarendon Press.(1964).
- [10] J. Heittokangas, R. Korhonen, I. Laine, J. Rieppo and J. Zhang, Value sharing results for shifts of meromorphic functions and sufficient conditions for periodicity, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, **355**(1),(2009),352-363.
- [11] Z.B. Huang, Value distribution and uniqueness on q-differences of meromorphic functions, *Bulletin of the Korean Mathematical Society*, **50**(4),(2013),1157-1171.
- [12] I. Lahiri, Value distribution of certain differential polynomials, *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, **28**(2),(2001),83-91.
- [13] I. Lahiri, Weighted value sharing and uniqueness of meromorphic functions, *Complex Variables and Elliptic Equations*, **46**(3),(2001),241-253.
- [14] I. Lahiri, Weighted sharing and uniqueness of meromorphic functions, *Nagoya Math Journal*, **161**,(2001),193-206.
- [15] I. Laine, *Nevanlinna theory and complex differential equations*, De Gruyter, 1993.
- [16] W.lin and H.X. Yi, Uniqueness theorems for meromorphic functions, *Indian .J. Pure . Appl. Math*, **35**(2),(2004),121-132.

- [17] Y. Liu, Y. Cao, X. Qi and H. X. Yi, Value Sharing Results for-Shifts Difference Polynomials, *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society* (2013).
- [18] X. G. Qi and L. Z. Yang, Sets and value sharing of q -differences of meromorphic functions, *Bulletin of the Korean Mathematical Society*, **50(3)**, (2013), 731-745.
- [19] X. G. Qi, L. Z. Yang and Y. Liu, Meromorphic solutions of q -shift difference equations, *Mathematica Slovaca*, **66(3)**, (2016), 667-676.
- [20] P. Sahoo, Meromorphic functions that share fixed points with finite weights, *Bull. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **2(4)**, (2010), 106-118.
- [21] J. P. Wang, Liu. Yand F. H. Liu. "Some results on value distribution of the difference operator, "Bulletin of the Iranian Mathematical Society", **41(3)**, (2015), 603-611.
- [22] C. C. Yang and H. X. Yi, Uniqueness theory of meromorphic functions, ser, *Mathematics and its Applications*. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, **557**, (2003).
- [23] H. X. Yi, Meromorphic functions that share one or two values, *Complex Variables and Elliptic Equations*, **28(1)**, (1995), 1-11.
- [24] H. X. Yi and W. Lu, Meromorphic functions that share two sets, II, *Acta Mathematica Scientia*, **24(1)**, (2004), 83-90.
- [25] Q. Zhao and J. Zhang, Zeros and shared one value of q -shift difference polynomials, *Journal of Contemporary Mathematical Analysis*, **50**, (2015), 63-69.
- [26] X. Zhang and J. Xu, The zeros of q -shift difference polynomials of meromorphic functions. *Adv. Difference Equ.* (2012), Paper no 200, 10 pages.

UNDER PEER REVIEW