

SOME FURTHER Q-SHIFT DIFFERENCE RESULTS ON HAYMAN CONJECTURE

GOUTAM HALDAR

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we investigate the zero distributions of q -shift difference-differential polynomials of meromorphic functions with zero-order that extends and generalizes the classical Hayman results of the zeros of differential polynomials to q -shift difference. We also investigate the uniqueness problem of q -shift difference-differential polynomials sharing a polynomial value with finite weight.

1. Introduction

A meromorphic function $f(z)$ in the complex plane \mathbb{C} means is a function that is analytic in \mathbb{C} except for the set of isolated points, which are poles of the function. If no poles occur, then $f(z)$ is called an entire function. Let f and g be two non-constant meromorphic functions defined in the open complex plane \mathbb{C} . If for some $a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, the zero of $f - a$ and $g - a$ have the same locations as well as multiplicities, we say that f and g share the value a CM (counting multiplicities). If we do not consider the multiplicities, then f and g are said a IM (ignoring multiplicities). We adopt the standard notations of the Nevanlinna theory of meromorphic functions explained in ([7]).

A meromorphic function $\alpha(z)$ is said to be small with respect to f if $T(r, \alpha) = S(r, f)$. i.e., $T(r, \alpha) = o(T(r, f))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, outside of a possible exceptional set of finite linear measure.

For a set $S \subset \mathbb{C}$, we define

$$E_f(S) = \bigcup_{a \in S} \{z | f(z) = a(z)\},$$

where each zero is counted according to its multiplicity and

$$\overline{E}_f(S) = \bigcup_{a \in S} \{z | f(z) = a(z)\}, \text{ where each zero is counted only once.}$$

If $E_f(S) = E_g(S)$, we say that f, g share the set S CM and if $\overline{E}_f(S) = \overline{E}_g(S)$, we say f, g share the set S IM.

In 2001, Lahiri ([9]) introduced a gradation of sharing of values or sets which is known as weighted sharing. Below we are recalling the notion.

Definition 1.1. ([9]) *Let k be a non-negative integer or infinity. For $a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ we denote by $E_k(a, f)$ the set of all a -points of f , where an a point of multiplicity*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 30D35.

Key words and phrases. Meromorphic function, q -shift operator, zero order, small function, value sharing.

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 .

We write f, g share (a, k) to mean that f, g share the value a with weight k . Clearly if f, g share (a, k) then f, g share (a, p) for any integer $p, 0 \leq p < k$. Also we note that f, g share a value a IM or CM if and only if f, g share $(a, 0)$ or (a, ∞) respectively.

Definition 1.2. [1] Let f and g be two non-constant meromorphic functions such that f and g share the value a IM. Let z_0 be a a -point of f with multiplicity p , a a -point of g with multiplicity q . We denote by $\overline{N}_L(r, a; f)$ the 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 $p = q = 1$ and by $\overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, a; f)$ the counting function of those a -points of f and g where $p = q \geq 2$, each point in these counting functions is counted only once. Similarly, one can define $\overline{N}_L(r, a; g)$, $N_E^1(r, a; g)$, $\overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, a; g)$.

Definition 1.3. [9, 10] Let f, g share a value a IM. We denote by $\overline{N}_*(r, a; f, g)$ the reduced counting function of those a -points of f whose multiplicities differ from the multiplicities of the corresponding a -points of g . Clearly $\overline{N}_*(r, a; f, g) \equiv \overline{N}_*(r, a; g, f)$ and $\overline{N}_*(r, a; f, g) = \overline{N}_L(r, a; f) + \overline{N}_L(r, a; g)$.

Definition 1.4. [12] Let p be a positive integer and $a \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$.

- (i) $N(r, a; f \mid \geq p)$ ($\overline{N}(r, a; f \mid \geq p)$) denotes the counting function (reduced counting function) of those a -points of f whose multiplicities are not less than p .
- (ii) $N(r, a; f \mid \leq p)$ ($\overline{N}(r, a; f \mid \leq p)$) denotes the counting function (reduced counting function) of those a -points of f whose multiplicities are not greater than p .

In recent times, many mathematicians are working on difference equations, the difference product and the q -difference analogues the value distribution theory of entire and meromorphic functions in the complex plane (see [4], [5], [6], [8], [14], [15], [16], [25]). In 2006, Halburd and Korhonen ([5]) established a difference analogue of the Logarithmic Derivative Lemma, and then applying it, a lot of results on meromorphic solutions of complex difference equations has been proved. After that Barnett, Halburd, Korhonen and Morgan ([3]) also established a q -difference analogue of the Logarithmic Derivative Lemma.

Let us first recall the notion of the q -shift and q -difference operator of a meromorphic function f .

Definition 1.5. For a meromorphic function f and $c, q (\neq 0) \in \mathbb{C}$, let us now denote its q -shift $E_q f$ and q -difference operators $\Delta_q f$ respectively by $E_q f(z) = f(qz + c)$ and $\Delta_q f(z) = f(qz + c) - f(z)$.

For further generalization of $\Delta_q f(z)$, we now define the q -difference operator of an entire (meromorphic) function f as $L(z, f) = b_1 f(qz + c) + b_0 f(z)$, where $b_1 (\neq 0)$ and b_0 are complex constants. For $s \in \mathbb{N}$, let us define

$$\chi_{b_0} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } b_0 \neq 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } b_0 = 0. \end{cases}$$

Let $P(z) = a_m z^m + a_{m-1} z^{m-1} + \dots + a_0$ be a nonzero polynomial of degree n , where $a_m (\neq 0), a_{m-1}, \dots, a_0$ are complex constants and m is a positive integer.

Let m_1 be the number of distinct simple zeros and m_2 be the number of distinct multiple zeros of $P(z)$. Let $\Gamma_0 = m_1 + 2m_2$ and $\Gamma_1 = m_1 + m_2$.

In 2010, Zhang and Korhonen ([26]) studied the value distribution of q -difference polynomials of meromorphic functions and obtained the following result.

Theorem A. [26] *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic (resp. entire) function of zero order and q non-zero complex constant. Then for $n \geq 6$ (resp. $n \geq 2$), $f(z)^n f(qz)$ assumes every non-zero value $a \in \mathbb{C}$ infinitely often.*

Recently, Liu and Qi [18] firstly investigated value distributions for a q -shift of the meromorphic function and obtained the following result.

Theorem B. [18] *Let f be a zero-order transcendental meromorphic function, $n \geq 6$; $q \in \mathbb{C} - \{0\}$, $\eta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $R(z)$ a rational function. Then $f(z)^n f(qz + \eta) - R(z)$ has infinitely many zeros.*

In 2011, Liu, Liu and Cao [17] investigated about the zeros of $f^n(f^m - 1)[f(qz + c) - f(z)] = a(z)$, where $a(z)$ is a small function of f and obtained the following result.

Theorem C. [17] *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic (resp. entire) function with zero-order. If $n \geq 7$ (resp. $n \geq 3$), then $f(z)^n(f(z)^m - a)[f(qz + c) - f(z)] - \alpha(z)$ has infinitely many zeros, where $\alpha(z)$ is a non-zero small function with respect to f .*

Later on Xu, Liu and Cao [20] started investigation about the zeros of $P(f)f(qz + \eta) = a(z)$ and $P(f)[f(qz + \eta) - f(z)] = a(z)$ and obtained the following two results.

Theorem D. [20] *Let f be a zero-order transcendental meromorphic (resp. entire) function, $q (\neq 0), \eta$ are complex constants. Then for $n > m + 4$ (resp. $n > m$), $P(f)f(qz + \eta) = a(z)$ has infinitely many solutions, where $a(z)$ is a non-zero small functions in f .*

Theorem E. [20] *Let f be a zero-order transcendental meromorphic (resp. entire) function, $q (\neq 0), \eta$ are complex constants. Then for $n > m + 6$ (resp. $n > m + 2$), $P(f)\{f(qz + \eta) - f(z)\} = a(z)$ has infinitely many solutions, where $a(z)$ is a non-zero small functions in f .*

For the uniqueness of difference and q -difference of meromorphic functions Zhang and Korhonen [26] obtained the following results.

Theorem F. [26] *Let f and g be two transcendental meromorphic (resp. entire) functions of zero order. Suppose that q is a non-zero complex constant and n is an integer satisfying $n \geq 8$ (resp. $n \geq 4$). If $f(z)^n f(qz)$ and $g(z)^n g(qz)$ share $1, \infty$ CM, then $f(z) \equiv tg(z)$ for $t^{n+1} = 1$.*

Theorem G. [26] *Let f and g be two transcendental entire functions of zero order. Suppose that q is a non-zero complex constant and n is an integer satisfying $n \geq 6$. If $f(z)^n(f(z) - 1)f(qz)$ and $g(z)^n(g(z) - 1)g(qz)$ share 1 CM, then $f(z) \equiv g(z)$.*

To generalize the above result, Liu, Liu and Cao [17], obtained the following result.

Theorem H. [17] *Let $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ be transcendental entire functions with zero order. If $n \geq m + 5$, $f(z)^n(f(z)^m - a)f(qz + c)$ and $g(z)^n(g(z)^m - a)g(qz + c)$ share a nonzero polynomial $p(z)$ CM, then $f(z) \equiv tg(z)$, where $t^{n+1} = t^m = 1$.*

In 2015, Xu, Liu and Cao [20] also investigated the uniqueness problems of q -shift of entire functions and obtained the following results.

Theorem I. [20] *Let f and g be transcendental entire functions of finite order, c a nonzero complex constant and let $n > 2\Gamma_0 + 1$ be an integer. If $P(f)f(qz + c)$ and $P(g)g(qz + c)$ share 1 CM, then one of the following results holds:*

- (i). $f \equiv tg$ for a constant t such that $t^d = 1$, where $d = \text{GCD}\{\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m\}$ and

$$\lambda_i = \begin{cases} i + 1, & \text{if } a_i \neq 0 \\ n + 1, & \text{if } a_0 = 0. \end{cases}, i = 0, 1, \dots, m;$$

- (ii). f and g satisfy the algebraic equation $R(f; g) = 0$, where $R(w_1; w_2) = P(w_1)w_1(z + c) - P(w_2)w_2(z + c)$;

- (iii). $fg \equiv \mu$, where μ is a complex constant satisfying $a_n^2 \mu^{n+1} \equiv 1$.

Theorem J. [20] *Let f and g be two transcendental entire functions of zero order, and let $q \in \mathbb{C} - \{0\}$, $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Suppose $E_l(1; P(f)f(qz + c)) = E_l(1; P(g)g(qz + c))$ and l, m, n are integers satisfying one of the following conditions :*

- (i). $l \geq 3, n > 2\Gamma_0 + 1$;
(ii). $l = 2, n > 2\Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1 + 2 - \lambda$;
(iii). $l = 1, n > 2\Gamma_0 + 2\Gamma_1 + 3 - 2\lambda$;
(iv). $l = 0, n > 2\Gamma_0 + 3\Gamma_1 + 4 - 3\lambda$. Then the conclusions of Theorem I hold, where $\lambda = \min\{\Theta(0; f); \Theta(0; g)\}$.

Question 1.1. *Can we unify Theorems A–E into a single result that improves, extends, and generalizes all the results to a large extent?*

Question 1.2. *Can we further generalize Theroem H by replacing $(f(z)^m - a)$ ($(g(z)^m - a)$) in place of $P(f)$ ($P(g)$) and $L(z, f)$ ($L(z, g)$) in place of $f(qz + c)$ ($g(qz + c)$) under relax sharing hypothesis?*

Question 1.3. *What can be said about uniqueness if we replace the difference polynomial $P(f)f(qz + c)$ with more general settings differential-difference polynomial $(P(z)L(z, f))^k$ in Theorems I and J?*

The purpose of the paper is to find out all the possible answers to the above questions. Section 2 includes our main results.

2. Main Results

Theorem 2.1. *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic (resp., entire) function of zero order, and k be a non-negative integer. If $m > \Gamma_1 + km_2 + 2s + (1 + s)\chi_{b_0} + 2$ (resp., $n > \Gamma_1 + km_2$), then $(P(f)L(z, f)^s)^{(k)} - \alpha(z)$ has infinitely many zeros, where $\alpha(z) \in S(f) - \{0\}$.*

Theorem 2.2. *Let $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ be two transcendental entire functions of zero order and n be a positive integer such that $n \geq m + 5$. Let $f^n P(f)L(z, f) - p(z)$ and $g^n P(g)L(z, g) - p(z)$ share $(0, 2)$, where $p(z)$ be a nonzero polynomial such that $\deg(p) < (n - 1)/2$ and $g(z), g(qz + c)$ share 0 CM. Then one of the following conclusions can be realized:*

- (i). $f \equiv tg$, where t is a constant satisfying $t^d = 1$, where $d = \text{GCD}(n + m + 1, n + m, \dots, n + 1)$ and $a_{q-j} \neq 0$ for some $j = 0, 1, \dots, m$.

(ii). f and g satisfy the algebraic equation $\mathcal{A}(x, y) = 0$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(w_1, w_2) &= w_1^n (a_m w_1^m + \cdots + a_1 w_1 + a_0) L(z, w_1) \\ &\quad - w_2^n (a_m w_2^m + \cdots + a_1 w_2 + a_0) L(z, w_2). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.3. *Let f, g be two transcendental entire functions of zero order. If $E_l(1; (P(f)L(z, f))^{(k)}) = E_l(1; (P(g)L(z, g))^{(k)})$ and l, m, n are integers satisfying one of the following conditions:*

- (i). $l \geq 2, m > 2\Gamma_0 + 2km_2 + 1$
- (ii). $l = 1, m > \frac{1}{2}(\Gamma_1 + 4\Gamma_0 + 5km_2 + 3)$
- (iii). $l = 0, m > (3\Gamma_1 + 2\Gamma_0 + 5km_2 + 4)$,

then one of the following results holds:

- (i). $f \equiv tg$ for a constant t such that $t^d = 1$, where $d = \text{GCD}(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$
- (ii). f and g satisfy the algebraic equation $\mathcal{A}(w_1, w_2) = 0$, where

$$\mathcal{A}(w_1, w_2) = P(w_1)L(z, w_1) - P(w_2)L(z, w_2).$$

Remark 2.1. *Let $P(z) = z^n$, where n is a positive integer. Suppose $f(z) = e^{-z}$, $q = -n, c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\alpha(z) = e^{-c}$. Then $P(f(z))[f(qz+c) - f(z)] - \alpha(z) = -e^{-(n+1)z}$ have no zeros. This shows that zero order growth restriction in Theorem 2.1 can not be extended to finite order.*

Remark 2.2. (i). *Theorem 2.1 is a more general result than Theorems A–E.*
 (ii). *Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 answer the answer of questions 1.2 and 1.3, respectively.*

3. Some Lemmas

We now prove several lemmas which will play key roles in proving the main results of the paper. Let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} be two non-constant meromorphic functions. Henceforth we shall denote by \mathcal{H} 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 $c, q (\neq 0) \in \mathbb{C}$. Then*

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

Lemma 3.2. [20] *Let f be a zero-order meromorphic function, and $c, q \in \mathbb{C}$. Then*

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

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

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

$$\overline{N}(r, \infty; f(qz+c)) = \overline{N}(r, \infty; f(z)) + S(r, f),$$

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

on a set of logarithmic density 1.

Lemma 3.3. [13] *If $N(r, 0; f^{(k)} \mid f \neq 0)$ denotes the counting function of those zeros of $f^{(k)}$ which are not the zeros of f , where a zero of $f^{(k)}$ is counted according to its multiplicity then*

$$N\left(r, 0; f^{(k)} \mid f \neq 0\right) \leq k\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + N(r, 0; f \mid < k) + k\overline{N}(r, 0; f \mid \geq k) + S(r, f).$$

Lemma 3.4. [19] *Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function and let*

$$\mathcal{R}(f) = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^n a_i f^i}{\sum_{j=0}^m b_j f^j}$$

be an irreducible rational function in f with constant coefficients $\{a_i\}$ and $\{b_j\}$ where $a_n \neq 0$ and $b_m \neq 0$. Then

$$T(r, \mathcal{R}(f)) = d T(r, f) + S(r, f),$$

where $d = \max\{n, m\}$.

Lemma 3.5. [10] *Let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} be two non-constant meromorphic functions satisfying $E_{\mathcal{F}}(1, m) = E_{\mathcal{G}}(1, m)$, $0 \leq m < \infty$ with $\mathcal{H} \neq 0$, then*

$$N_E^1(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) \leq N(r, \infty; \mathcal{H}) + S(r, \mathcal{F}) + S(r, \mathcal{G}).$$

Similar inequality holds for \mathcal{G} also.

Lemma 3.6. [23] *Let $\mathcal{H} \equiv 0$ and \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} share $(\infty, 0)$, then \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} share $(1, \infty)$, (∞, ∞) .*

Lemma 3.7. [11] *Suppose \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} share $(1, 0)$, $(\infty, 0)$. If $\mathcal{H} \neq 0$, then,*

$$N(r, \infty; \mathcal{H}) \leq N(r, 0; \mathcal{F} \mid \geq 2) + N(r, 0; \mathcal{G} \mid \geq 2) + \overline{N}_*(r, 1; \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_*(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \\ + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + S(r, \mathcal{F}) + S(r, \mathcal{G}),$$

where $\overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}')$ is the reduced counting function of those zeros of \mathcal{F}' which are not the zeros of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{F} - 1)$ and $\overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}')$ is similarly defined.

Lemma 3.8. [10] *If two non-constant meromorphic functions \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} share $(1, 2)$, then*

$$\overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{G} \mid \geq 2) + \overline{N}_*(r, 1; \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \leq \overline{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + S(r, \mathcal{G}),$$

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

Lemma 3.9. [22] *Let f and g be two non-constant meromorphic functions. Then*

$$N\left(r, \infty; \frac{f}{g}\right) - N\left(r, \infty; \frac{g}{f}\right) = N(r, \infty; f) + N(r, 0; g) - N(r, \infty; g) - N(r, 0; f).$$

Lemma 3.10. *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental entire function of zero-order, $q \in \mathbb{C} - \{0\}$ and $n, s \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\Phi(z) = f^n P(f) L(z, f)^s$, then*

$$(n + m)T(r, f) \leq T(r, \Phi) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)^s) + S(r, f).$$

Proof. Using the first fundamental theorem of Nevalinna and Lemmas 3.1 and 3.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (n+m+s)T(r, f) &= m(r, f^{n+s}P(f)) = m\left(r, \frac{\Phi(z)f(z)^s}{L(z, f)^s}\right) \\
 &\leq m(r, \Phi(z)) + m\left(r, \frac{f(z)^s}{L(z, f)^s}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq m(r, \Phi(z)) + T\left(r, \frac{f(z)^s}{L(z, f)^s}\right) - N\left(r, \infty; \frac{f(z)^s}{L(z, f)^s}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq m(r, \Phi(z)) + T\left(r, \frac{L(z, f)^s}{f(z)^s}\right) - N\left(r, \infty; \frac{f(z)^s}{L(z, f)^s}\right) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq m(r, \Phi(z)) + N(r, 0; f(z)^s) + N(r, 0; L(z, f)^s) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq m(r, \Phi(z)) + sT(r, f) + N(r, 0; L(z, f)^s) + S(r, f).
 \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$(n+m)T(r, f) \leq T(r, \Phi) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)^s) + S(r, f).$$

□

In a similar way as done in the proof of Lemma 3.10, we can prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental entire function of zero-order, $q \in \mathbb{C} - \{0\}$ and $n, s \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\Phi(z) = P(f)L(z, f)^s$, then*

$$mT(r, f) \leq T(r, \Phi) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)^s) + S(r, f).$$

Lemma 3.12. [25] *Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function and $p, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$N_p(r, 0; f^{(k)}) \leq T(r, f^{(k)}) - T(r, f) + N_{p+k}(r, 0; f) + S(r, f),$$

$$N_p(r, 0; f^{(k)}) \leq k\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + N_{p+k}(r, 0; f) + S(r, f).$$

Lemma 3.13. [1] *If \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} be two non-constant meromorphic functions such that they share $(1, 1)$. Then*

$$2\overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + 2\overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) - \overline{N}_{\mathcal{F}>2}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) \leq N(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) - \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}).$$

Lemma 3.14. [2] *If two non-constant meromorphic functions \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} share $(1, 1)$, then*

$$\overline{N}_{\mathcal{F}>2}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) - N_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}')) + S(r, \mathcal{F}),$$

where $N_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}')$ is the counting function of those zeros of \mathcal{F}' which are not the zeros of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{F} - 1)$.

Lemma 3.15. [2] *Let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} be two non-constant meromorphic functions sharing $(1, 0)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + 2\overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) - \overline{N}_{\mathcal{F}>1}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) - \overline{N}_{\mathcal{G}>1}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) \\
 &\leq N(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) - \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.16. [2] *If \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} share $(1, 0)$, then*

$$\overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) \leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) + S(r, \mathcal{F})$$

$$\overline{N}_{\mathcal{F}>1}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) \leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) - N_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + S(r, \mathcal{F}).$$

Similar inequalities holds for \mathcal{G} also.

4. Proofs of the theorems

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Suppose $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1^{(k)}$, where $\mathcal{F}_1 = P(f)L(z, f)^s$. Let us first suppose that f is a transcendental entire function of zero order. On the contrary, we assume that $\mathcal{F} - \alpha(z)$ has only finitely many zeros. In view of Lemmas 3.1, 3.11, 3.12 and by the Second Theorem for small functions (see [21]), we get

$$\begin{aligned} mT(r, f) &\leq T(r, P(f)L(z, f)^s) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)^s) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \mathcal{F}) + N_{k+1}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)^s) - \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) \\ &\quad - N(r, 0; L(z, f)^s) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, \alpha; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) + N(r, 0; L(z, f)^s) \\ &\quad + N_{k+1}(r, 0; P(f)) - \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)^s) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq N_{k+1}(r, 0; P(f)) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq (\Gamma_1 + km_2)T(r, f) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

which is not possible since $n \geq \Gamma_1 + km_2$.

Suppose f is a transcendental meromorphic function of zero order. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} (m+s)T(r, f) &= T(r, f^s P(f)) = T\left(r, \frac{\mathcal{F}_1 f^s}{L(z, f)^s}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \mathcal{F}_1) + T\left(r, \frac{f^s}{L(z, f)^s}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \mathcal{F}_1) + T\left(r, \frac{L(z, f)^s}{f^s}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \mathcal{F}_1) + sN\left(r, \infty; \frac{L(z, f)}{f}\right) + sm\left(r, \frac{L(z, f)}{f}\right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \mathcal{F}_1) + 2sT(r, f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} (m-s)T(r, f) &\leq T(r, \mathcal{F}_1) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, \mathcal{F}) + N_{k+1}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)^s) - \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, \alpha; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) + N_{k+1}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)^s) \\ &\quad - \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, \infty; P(f)L(z, f)^s) + N_{k+1}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)^s) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq (2 + \chi_{b_0})\overline{N}(r, \infty; f) + (\Gamma_1 + km_2)\overline{N}(r, 0; f) + (1 + \chi_{b_0})sT(r, f) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq (\Gamma_1 + km_2 + 2 + \chi_{b_0} + s(1 + \chi_{b_0}))T(r, f) + S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$mT(r, f) \leq (\Gamma_1 + km_2 + 2s + (1+s)\chi_{b_0} + 2)T(r, f) + S(r, f),$$

which is not possible since $m > \Gamma_1 + km_2 + 2s + (1+s)\chi_{b_0} + 2$ and hence the theorem is proved. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let $\mathcal{F} = \frac{f^n P(f)L(z, f)}{p(z)}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \frac{g^n P(g)L(z, g)}{p(z)}$. From the given condition it follows that \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} share (1, 2) except for the zeros of $p(z)$.

Case 1: Let $\mathcal{H} \neq 0$. From 3.1, we obtain

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

If z_0 be a simple zero of $\mathcal{F} - 1$ such that $p(z_0) \neq 0$, then z_0 is also a simple zero of $\mathcal{G} - 1$ and hence a zero of \mathcal{H} . So

$$N(r, 1\mathcal{F} \mid = 1) \leq N(r, 0; \mathcal{H}) \leq N(r, \infty; \mathcal{H}) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \quad (4.2)$$

Using (4.1) and (4.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) &= N(r, 1; \mathcal{F} \mid = 1) + \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F} \mid \geq 2) \\ &\leq N(r, \infty; \mathcal{H}) + \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F} \mid \geq 2) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} \mid \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G} \mid \geq 2) + \overline{N}_*(r, 1; \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') \\ &\quad + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F} \mid \geq 2) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Now, by Lemma 3.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F} \mid \geq 2) + \overline{N}_*(r, 1; \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \\ &\leq N(r, 0; \mathcal{G}' \mid \mathcal{G} \neq 0) \leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + S(r, g). \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Since $g(z)$ and $g(qz + c)$ share 0 CM, we must have $N\left(r, \infty; \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) = 0$. Hence using (4.3), (4.4) and Lemmas 3.10, 3.12, we get from the Second Fundamental Theorem of Nevalinna, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(n+m)T(r, f) \leq T(r, \mathcal{F}) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) - \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq N_2(r, 0; f^n P(f)L(z, f)) + N_2(r, 0; g^n P(g)L(z, g)) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) \\ &\quad + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq N_2(r, 0; f^n P(f)) + N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + N_2(r, 0; P(g)) + N_2\left(r, 0; g^{n+1} \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) \\ &\quad - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq 2\overline{N}(r, 0; f) + N(r, 0; P(f)) + N(r, 0; P(g)) + 2\overline{N}(r, 0; g) + N\left(r, 0; \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) \\ &\quad + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq (m+2)T(r, f) + (m+2)T(r, g) + T\left(r, \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq (m+2)T(r, f) + (m+2)T(r, g) + N\left(r, \infty; \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) \\ &\quad + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq (m+2)T(r, f) + (m+2)T(r, g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$nT(r, f) \leq 2T(r, f) + (m+2)T(r, g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \quad (4.5)$$

Since $N\left(r, \infty; \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) = 0$, keeping in view of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (n+m+1)T(r, g) &= T(r, g^{n+1}P(g)) = m\left(r, \frac{g^{n+1}P(g)}{\mathcal{G}}\right) + m(r, \mathcal{G}) \\ &\leq m\left(r, \frac{g}{L(z, g)}\right) + m(r, \mathcal{G}) + O(\log r) \\ &\leq T\left(r, \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) + T(r, \mathcal{G}) + O(\log r) \\ &\leq m\left(r, \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) + T(r, \mathcal{G}) + O(\log r) \\ &\leq T(r, \mathcal{G}) + O(\log r). \end{aligned}$$

In a similar manner, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (n+m+1)T(r, g) &\leq T(r, \mathcal{G}) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) - \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + S(r, g) \\ &\leq N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + N_2(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq N_2(r, 0; f^n P(f)L(z, f)) + N_2(r, 0; g^n P(g)L(z, g)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq 2\overline{N}(r, 0; f) + N(r, 0; P(f)) + N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + N(r, 0; P(g)) \\ &\quad + N_2\left(r, 0; g^{n+1} \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq (m+2)T(r, f) + T(r, L(z, f)) + (m+2)T(r, g) + N\left(r, 0; \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) \\ &\quad + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq (m+2)T(r, f) + m\left(r, \frac{L(z, f)}{f}\right) + m(r, f) + T\left(r, \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) \\ &\quad + (m+2)T(r, g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq (m+2)T(r, f) + m\left(r, \frac{L(z, f)}{f}\right) + m(r, f) + N\left(r, \infty; \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) \\ &\quad + m\left(r, \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) + (m+2)T(r, g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq (m+3)T(r, f) + (m+2)T(r, g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$nT(r, g) \leq (m+3)T(r, f) + T(r, g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \quad (4.6)$$

Combining (4.5) and (4.6), we obtain

$$(n-m-5)T(r, f) + (n-m-3)T(r, g) \leq S(r, f) + S(r, g),$$

which contradicts to the fact that $n \geq m+5$.

Case 2: Suppose $H \equiv 0$. Then by integration, we get

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{F}-1} = \frac{A}{\mathcal{G}-1} + B, \quad (4.7)$$

where A, B are constant with $A \neq 0$. From (4.7), it can be easily seen that \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} share $(1, \infty)$. We now consider the following three sub-cases.

Subcase 2.1: Let $B \neq 0$ and $A \neq B$. If $B = -1$, then from (4.7), we have $\mathcal{F} = \frac{-A}{\mathcal{G} - A - 1}$. Therefore, $\overline{N}(r, A + 1; \mathcal{G}) = \overline{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) = N(r, 0; p) = S(r, g)$. So, in view of Lemma 3.10 and the second fundamental theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (n + m)T(r, g) &\leq T(r, g^n P(g)L(z, g)) - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq T(r, \mathcal{G}) - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}(r, A + 1; \mathcal{G}) - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq (m + 1)T(r, g) + S(r, g), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction since $n \geq m + 5$.

If $B \neq -1$, then from (4.7), we get $\mathcal{F} - \left(1 + \frac{1}{B}\right) = -\frac{A}{B^2 \left(\mathcal{G} + \frac{A - B}{B}\right)}$. Therefore, $\overline{N}\left(r, \frac{B - A}{B}; \mathcal{G}\right) = N(r, 0; p(g)) = O(\log r) = S(r, g)$. Using Lemmas 3.12, 3.10 and the same argument as used in the case when $B = -1$ we get a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2: Let $B \neq 0$ and $A = B$. If $B = -1$, then from (4.7), we have $\mathcal{F}\mathcal{G} \equiv 1$. i.e.,

$$f^n P(f)L(z, f)g^n P(g)L(z, g) \equiv p^2(z). \quad (4.8)$$

Keeping in view of (4.8) and $\deg(p) < (n - 1)/2$, we can say that f and g have zeros. Since f and g are of zero orders, f and g both must be constants which contradicts to our assumption. Therefore, (4.8) is not possible.

If $B \neq -1$, from (4.7), we have $\frac{1}{\mathcal{F}} = \frac{A\mathcal{G}}{(1 + A)\mathcal{G} - 1}$. Hence,

$$\overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{1 + A}; \mathcal{G}\right) = \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + S(r, f).$$

So in view of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.10 and the second fundamental theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (n + m)T(r, g) &\leq T(r, g^n P(g)L(z, g)) - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq T(r, \mathcal{G}) - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{1 + A}; \mathcal{G}\right) - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}(r, 0; P(g)) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq (m + 1)T(r, g) + (m + 2 + \chi_{b_0})T(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$nT(r, g) \leq (m + 3 + \chi_{b_0})T(r, g) + S(r, g),$$

which is a contradiction since $n \geq m + 5$.

Subcase 2.3: Let $B = 0$. Then from (4.7), we get

$$\mathcal{F} = \frac{\mathcal{G} + A - 1}{A}. \quad (4.9)$$

If $A \neq 1$, we obtain $\overline{N}(r, 1 - A; \mathcal{G}) = \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F})$. Therefore, we can similarly get a contradiction as in Subcase 2.2. Hence $A = 1$ and from (4.9), we get

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

i.e.,

$$f^n P(f)L(z, f) \equiv g^n P(g)L(z, g). \quad (4.10)$$

Let $h = f/g$. If h is constant, then (4.10) reduces to

$$h^n g^n P(hg)L(z, hg) \equiv g^n P(g)L(z, g).$$

After simple calculation, we obtain

$$[a_m g^{n+m}(h^{n+m+1} - 1) + a_{m-1} g^{n+m}(h^{n+m} - 1) + \dots + a_0 g^n(h^{n+1} - 1)]L(z, g) \equiv 0.$$

Since g is non-constant, we must have $h^d = 1$, where $d = \text{CGD}(n + m + 1, n + m, \dots, n + m + 1 - i, \dots, n + 1)$ and $a_{m-i} \neq 0$ for some $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$. Hence $f(z) = tg$ for a constant t such that $t^d = 1$, where d is mentioned above. If h is not constant, then $f(z), g(z)$ satisfy the algebraic difference equation $\mathcal{A}(w_1, w_2) \equiv 0$, where

$$\mathcal{A}(w_1, w_2) = w_1^n P(w_1)L(z, w_1) - w_2^n P(w_2)L(z, w_2).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Let $\mathcal{F}(z) = (P(f)L(z, f))^{(k)}$ and $\mathcal{G}(z) = (P(g)L(z, g))^{(k)}$. It follows that \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} share $(1, l)$.

Case 1: Suppose $\mathcal{H} \neq 0$.

(i). Let $l \geq 2$. Using Lemmas 3.5, 3.7 and 3.8, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) = N(r, 1; \mathcal{F} | = 1) + \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F} | \geq 2) \\ & \leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} | \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G} | \geq 2) + \overline{N}_*(r, 1; \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F} | \geq 2) \\ & \quad \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ & \leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} | \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G} | \geq 2) + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) \\ & \quad S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Hence, using (4.11), Lemmas 3.1, 3.11, 3.12, we get from the second fundamental theorem

$$\begin{aligned}
 mT(r, f) &\leq T(r, P(f)L(z, f)) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq T(r, \mathcal{F}) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) - N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) - N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) - \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') \\
 &\quad - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(g)L(z, g)) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) \\
 &\quad + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(f)) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(g)) + N(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq (m_1 + 2m_2 + km_2)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + T(r, L(z, g)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq (m_1 + 2m_2 + km_2)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + m \left(r, \frac{L(z, g)}{g} \right) + m(r, g) \\
 &\quad S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq (m_1 + 2m_2 + km_2)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + T(r, g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \tag{4.12}
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
 mT(r, g) &\leq (m_1 + 2m_2 + km_2)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + T(r, f) + S(r, f) \\
 &\quad + S(r, g). \tag{4.13}
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.12) and (4.13), we have

$$m(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) \leq (2\Gamma_0 + 2km_2 + 1)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g),$$

which is a contradiction since $m > 2\Gamma_0 + 2km_2 + 1$.

(ii). Let $l = 1$, using Lemmas 3.3, 3.5, 3.7, 3.13, 3.14, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) &\leq N(r, 1; \mathcal{F} | = 1) + \overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) \\
 &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} | \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G} | \geq 2) + \overline{N}_*(r, 1; \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) \\
 &\quad + \overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') \\
 &\quad + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} | \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G} | \geq 2) + 2\overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + 2\overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) \\
 &\quad + \overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} | \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G} | \geq 2) + \overline{N}_{\mathcal{F}>2}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) + N(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) \\
 &\quad - \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} | \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G} | \geq 2) + \frac{1}{2}\overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + N(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) \\
 &\quad - \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} | \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G} | \geq 2) + \frac{1}{2}\overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') \\
 &\quad N(r, 0; \mathcal{G}' | \mathcal{G} \neq 0) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} | \geq 2) + \frac{1}{2}\overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') \\
 &\quad + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \tag{4.14}
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence using (4.14), Lemmas 3.1, 3.11, 3.12 and the second fundamental theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
mT(r, f) &\leq T(r, P(f)L(z, f)) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq T(r, \mathcal{F}) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) - N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) - \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') \\
&\quad - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) - N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) \\
&\quad - \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
&\leq N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) + \frac{1}{2}\overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) \\
&\quad + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
&\leq N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(g)L(z, g)) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}N_{k+1}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
&\leq (m_1 + 2m_2 + km_2)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + \frac{1}{2}(m_1 + m_2 + km_2)T(r, f) \\
&\quad + T(r, g) + \frac{1}{2}T(r, f) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \tag{4.15}
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar manner, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
mT(r, g) &\leq (m_1 + 2m_2 + km_2)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + \frac{1}{2}(m_1 + m_2 + km_2)T(r, g) \\
&\quad + T(r, f) + \frac{1}{2}T(r, g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \tag{4.16}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.15) and (4.16), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&m(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) \\
&\leq \left(2(m_1 + 2m_2 + km_2) + \frac{1}{2}(m_1 + m_2 + km_2) + \frac{3}{2} \right) (T(r, f) + T(r, g)) \\
&\quad S(r, f) + S(r, g).
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
&m(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}(4\Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1 + 5km_2 + 3)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g),
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction since $m > \frac{1}{2}(4\Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1 + 5km_2 + 3)$.

(iii). Let $l = 0$. Using Lemmas 3.3, 3.5, 3.7, 3.15, 3.16, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) &\leq N_E^1(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) \\
 &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} \mid \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G} \mid \geq 2) + \overline{N}_*(r, 1; \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) \\
 &\quad + \overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') \\
 &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} \mid \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G} \mid \geq 2) + 2\overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + 2\overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) \\
 &\quad + \overline{N}_E^{(2)}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} \mid \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G} \mid \geq 2) + \overline{N}_L(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}_{\mathcal{F}>1}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) \\
 &\quad + \overline{N}_{\mathcal{G}>1}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + N(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) - \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') \\
 &\quad + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F} \mid \geq 2) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G} \mid \geq 2) + 2\overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) \\
 &\quad + N(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) - \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + \overline{N}_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') \\
 &\leq N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + N(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) - \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{G}) \\
 &\quad + N_0(r, 0; \mathcal{G}') + N_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + N(r, 0; \mathcal{G}' \mid \mathcal{G} \neq 0) \\
 &\quad + N_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) \\
 &\quad + N_0(r, 0; \mathcal{F}') + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \tag{4.17}
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence using (4.17), Lemmas 3.1, 3.11, 3.12 and the second fundamental theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 mT(r, f) &\leq T(r, P(f)L(z, f)) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq T(r, \mathcal{F}) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) - N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) \\
 &\quad + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + \overline{N}(r, 1; \mathcal{F}) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) - N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) \\
 &\quad - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) \\
 &\leq N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) + 2\overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) \\
 &\quad - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) + 2N_{k+1}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) \\
 &\quad + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(g)L(z, g)) + N_{k+1}(r, 0; P(g)L(z, g)) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) \\
 &\quad + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(f)) + 2N_{k+1}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(g)L(z, g)) \\
 &\quad + N_{k+1}(r, 0; P(g)L(z, g)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
 &\leq (m_1 + 2m_2 + km_2 + 2)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + 2(m_1 + m_2 + km_2)T(r, f) \\
 &\quad + (m_1 + m_2 + km_2)T(r, g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \tag{4.18}
 \end{aligned}$$

In a similar manner we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 mT(r, g) &\leq (m_1 + 2m_2 + km_2 + 2)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + 2(m_1 + m_2 + km_2)T(r, g) \\
 &\quad + (m_1 + m_2 + km_2)T(r, f) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \tag{4.19}
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.18) and (4.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& m(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) \\
\leq & (m_1 + 2m_2 + km_2 + 2 + 2(m_1 + m_2 + km_2) + (m_1 + m_2 + km_2))(T(r, f) \\
& + T(r, g)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
= & (2\Gamma_0 + 3\Gamma_1 + 5km_2 + 4)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g),
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction since $m > 2\Gamma_0 + 3\Gamma_1 + 5km_2 + 4$.

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

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{F} - 1} = \frac{A}{\mathcal{G} - 1} + B, \quad (4.20)$$

where A, B are constant with $A \neq 0$. From (4.20), it can be easily seen that \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} share $(1, \infty)$. We now consider the following sub-cases.

Subcase 2.1: Let $B \neq 0$ and $A \neq B$. If $B = -1$, then from (4.20), we have $\mathcal{F} = \frac{-A}{\mathcal{G} - A - 1}$. Therefore, $\overline{N}(r, A + 1; \mathcal{G}) = \overline{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) = S(r, f)$. Therefore, using Lemma 3.11 and the second fundamental theorem of Nevalinna, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& mT(r, g) \leq T(r, P(g)L(z, g)) - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, g) \\
\leq & T(r, \mathcal{G}) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(g)L(z, g)) - N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, g) \\
\leq & \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}(r, A + 1; \mathcal{G}) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(g)L(z, g)) - N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) \\
& - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, g) \\
\leq & N_{k+1}(r, 0; P(g)L(z, g)) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(g)) + N(r, 0; L(z, g)) - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) \\
& + S(r, g) \\
\leq & (2m_1 + 3m_2 + 2km_2 + 1)T(r, g) + S(r, g) \\
= & (2\Gamma_0 + 2km_2 + 1 - m_2)T(r, g) + S(r, g),
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction since $m > 2\Gamma_0 + 2km_2 + 1$. If $B \neq -1$, then from (4.20), we have $\mathcal{F} = \frac{(B+1)\mathcal{G} - (B-A+1)}{B\mathcal{G} + (A-B)}$ and therefore, $\overline{N}\left(r, \frac{A-B}{B}; \mathcal{G}\right) = \overline{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) = S(r, f)$. Therefore, in a similar manner as done in the case $B = -1$, we arrive at a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2: Let $B \neq 0$ and $A = B$. If $B \neq -1$, then from (4.20), we have $\frac{1}{\mathcal{F}} = \frac{B\mathcal{G}}{(B+1)\mathcal{G} - 1}$, and therefore, $\overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) = \overline{N}(r, \infty; \mathcal{F}) = S(r, f)$ and

$\overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{B+1}; \mathcal{G}\right) = \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F})$. Therefore, using Lemma 3.11 and the second fundamental theorem of Nevalinna, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& mT(r, g) \leq T(r, P(g)L(z, g)) - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, g) \\
& \leq T(r, \mathcal{G}) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(g)L(z, g)) - N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, g) \\
& \leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{B+1}; \mathcal{G}\right) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(g)L(z, g)) - N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) \\
& \quad - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, g) \\
& \leq \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F}) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(g)L(z, g)) - N_2(r, 0; \mathcal{G}) - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, g) \\
& \leq N_{k+1}(r, 0; P(f)L(z, f)) + N_{k+2}(r, 0; P(g)) + N(r, 0; L(z, g)) - N(r, 0; L(z, g)) \\
& \quad + S(r, g) \\
& \leq (m_1 + 2m_2 + km_2)T(r, g) + (m_1 + m_2 + km_2 + 1)T(r, f) + S(r, f) + S(r, g).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& mT(r, f) \\
& \leq (m_1 + 2m_2 + km_2)T(r, f) + (m_1 + m_2 + km_2 + 1)T(r, g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& m(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) \\
& \leq (2\Gamma_0 + 2km_2 + 1 - m_2)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g),
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction since $m > 2\Gamma_0 + 2km_2 + 1$.

If $B = -1$, then (4.20) reduces to $\mathcal{F}\mathcal{G} \equiv 1$. This implies

$$(P(f)L(z, f))^{(k)}(P(g)L(z, g))^{(k)} \equiv 1. \quad (4.21)$$

Suppose that $P(z) = 0$ has t roots $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_t$ with multiplicities u_1, u_2, \dots, u_t , respectively. Then we must have $u_1 + u_2 + \dots + u_t = m$. Therefore (4.21) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
& (a_m(f - \alpha_1)^{u_1}) \dots (f - \alpha_t)^{u_t} L(z, f))^{(k)} (a_m(g - \alpha_1)^{u_1}) \dots (g - \alpha_t)^{u_t} L(z, g))^{(k)} \\
& \equiv 1.
\end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

Since f and g are entire functions, from (4.22), we can say that $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_t$ are Picard exceptional values of f and g . Since by Picard's theorem, an entire function can have at most one finite exceptional value, all α_j 's are equal for $1 \leq j \leq t$. Let $P(z) = a_m(z - \alpha)^m$. therefore, (4.22) reduces to

$$(a_m(f - \alpha)^m L(z, f))^{(k)} (a_m(g - \alpha)^m L(z, g))^{(k)} \equiv 1. \quad (4.23)$$

Equation (4.23) shows that α is an exceptional value of f and g . Since f is an entire function of zero order having an exceptional value α , f must be constant, which is not possible since f is assumed to be transcendental and therefore non constant.

Subcase 2.3: Let $B = 0$. Then (4.20) reduces to $\mathcal{F} = \frac{\mathcal{G} + A - 1}{A}$. If $A \neq 1$, then $\overline{N}(r, 1 - A; \mathcal{G}) = \overline{N}(r, 0; \mathcal{F})$. Proceeding in a similar manner as done in **subcase 2.2**, we get a contradiction. Hence $A = 1$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F} \equiv \mathcal{G}$. This implies that

$$(P(f)L(z, f))^{(k)} \equiv (P(g)L(z, g))^{(k)}. \quad (4.24)$$

Integrating (4.24) k times, we get

$$P(f)L(z, f) = P(g)L(z, g) + p_1(z), \quad (4.25)$$

where $p_1(z)$ is a polynomial in z of degree atmost $k - 1$. Suppose $p_1(z) \not\equiv 0$. Then (4.25) can be written as

$$\frac{P(f)L(z, f)}{p_1(z)} = \frac{P(g)L(z, g)}{p_1(z)} + 1. \quad (4.26)$$

Now in view of Lemmas 3.1, 3.11 and the second fundamental theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} mT(r, f) &\leq T(r, P(f)L(z, f)) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T\left(r, \frac{P(f)L(z, f)}{p_1(z)}\right) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}\left(r, 0; \frac{P(f)L(z, f)}{p_1(z)}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \infty; \frac{P(f)L(z, f)}{p_1(z)}\right) \\ &\quad + \overline{N}\left(r, 1; \frac{P(f)L(z, f)}{p_1(z)}\right) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}\left(r, 0; \frac{P(f)L(z, f)}{p_1(z)}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \infty; \frac{P(f)L(z, f)}{p_1(z)}\right) \\ &\quad + \overline{N}\left(r, 0; \frac{P(g)L(z, g)}{p_1(z)}\right) - N(r, 0; L(z, f)) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \overline{N}(r, 0; P(f)) + \overline{N}(r, 0; P(g)) + \overline{N}(r, 0; L(z, g)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq (m_1 + m_2)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + T(r, L(z, g)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\ &\leq (m_1 + m_2)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + m\left(r, \frac{L(z, g)}{g}\right) + m(r, g) + S(r, f) \\ &\quad + S(r, g) \\ &\leq (m_1 + m_2)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + T(r, g) + S(r, f) + S(r, g). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have

$$mT(r, g) \leq (m_1 + m_2)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + T(r, f) + S(r, f) + S(r, g).$$

Combining the last two inequalities, we obtain

$$m(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) \leq (2m_1 + 2m_2 + 1)(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g),$$

which is a contradiction since $m > 2\Gamma_0 + 2km_2 + 1$. The same arguments also hold for the case $m > (\Gamma_1 + 4\Gamma_0 + 5km_2 + 3)/2$ and $m > 3\Gamma_1 + 2\Gamma_0 + 5km_2 + 4$. Hence $p_1(z) \equiv 0$ and therefore from (4.25), we have

$$P(f)L(z, f) = P(g)L(z, g). \quad (4.27)$$

Set $h = f/g$. If h is non-constant, from (4.27), we can get that f and g satisfy the algebraic equation $\mathcal{A}(f, g) = 0$, where $\mathcal{A}(w_1, w_2) = P(w_1)L(z, w_1) - P(w_2)L(z, w_2)$. If h is a constant, substituting $f = gh$ into (4.27), we can get

$$[a_m g^m (h^{m+1} - 1) + a_{m-1} g^{m-1} (h^m - 1) + \dots + a_0 (h - 1)]L(z, f) = 0.$$

Then in a similar argument as done in Case 2 in the proof of Theorem 11 in [20], we obtain $f = tg$ for a constant t such that $t^d = 1$; $d = \text{GCD}(\lambda_0; \lambda_1; \dots; \lambda_m)$. \square

Acknowledgments

There is no financial support from any agencies for this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alzahary, T.C., Yi, H.X.: Weighted value sharing and a question of I. Lahiri. *Complex Var. Theory Appl.* **49**(15), 1063–1078 (2004)
- [2] Banerjee, A.: Meromorphic functions sharing one value. *Int. J.Math.Math. Sci.* **22**, 3587–3598 (2005)
- [3] Barnett, D.C., Halburd R. G., Korhonen R.J., Morgan W.: Nevanlinna theory for the q -difference operator and meromorphic solutions of q -difference equations. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **137**(3), 457–474 (2007)
- [4] Chiang, Y.M., Feng, S.J.: On the Nevanlinna characteristic of $f(z + \eta)$ and difference equations in the complex plane. *Ramanujan J.* **16**, 105–129 (2008)
- [5] Halburd, R.G., Korhonen, R.J.: Difference analogue of the lemma on the logarithmic derivative with applications to difference equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **314**, 477–487 (2006)
- [6] Halburd, R.G., Korhonen, R.J.: Nevanlinna theory for the difference operator. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* **31**, 463–478 (2006)
- [7] Hayman, W.K.: *Meromorphic Functions*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford (1964)
- [8] Heittokangas, J., Korhonen, R.J., Laine, I., Rieppo, J.: Uniqueness of meromorphic functions sharing values with their shifts, *Complex Var. Elliptic Equ.* **56**, 81–92 (2011)
- [9] Lahiri, I.: Weighted sharing and uniqueness of meromorphic functions. *Nagoya Math. J.* **161**, 193–206 (2001)
- [10] Lahiri, I.: Weighted value sharing and uniqueness of meromorphic functions. *Complex Var. Theory Appl.* **46**, 241–253 (2001)
- [11] Lahiri, I., Banerjee, A.: Weighted sharing of two sets, *Kyungpook Math. J.* **46**, 79–87 (2006)
- [12] Lahiri, I., Sarkar, A.: Uniqueness of meromorphic function and its derivative. *J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.* **5** (1), Art.20 (2004). <http://jipam.vu.edu.au/>
- [13] Lahiri, I., Dewan, S.: Value distribution of the product of a meromorphic function and its derivative. *Kodai Math. J.* **26**, 95–100 (2003)
- [14] Laine, I., Yang, C.: Value distribution of difference polynomials. *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A* **83**, 148–151 (2007)
- [15] Liu, K.: Meromorphic functions sharing a set with applications to difference equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **359**, 384–393 (2009)
- [16] Liu, K., Yang, L.Z.: Value distribution of the difference operator. *Arch. Math.* **92**, 270–278 (2009)
- [17] Liu, K., Liu, X.L., Cao, T.B.: Uniqueness and zeros of q -shift difference polynomials. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci.* **121** (3), 301–310 (2011)
- [18] Liu, K., Qi, X.G.: Meromorphic solutions of q -shift difference equations. *Ann. Polon. Math.* **101**, 215–225 (2011)
- [19] Mohon'ko, A.Z.: On the Nevanlinna characteristics of some meromorphic functions. *Theory of Funct. Func. Anal. Appl.* **14**, 83–87 (1971)
- [20] Xu, H.Y., Liu, K., Cao, T.B.: Uniqueness and value distribution for q -shifts of meromorphic functions. *Math. Commun.* **20**, 97–112 (2015)
- [21] Yamanoi, K.: The second main theorem for small functions and related problems. *Acta Math.* **192**, 225–294 (2004)
- [22] Yang, L.: *Value Distribution Theory*. Springer and Science Press, Berlin (1993)
- [23] Yi, H.X.: Meromorphic functions that share one or two values II. *Kodai Math. J.* **22**, 264–272 (1999)
- [24] Zhang, J.L., Korhonen, R.: On the Nevanlinna characteristic of $f(qz)$ and its applications. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **369**(2), 537–544 (2010)
- [25] Zhang, Q.C.: Meromorphic function that shares one small function with its derivative. *J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.* **6** (4), Art.116 (2005). <http://jipam.vu.edu.au/>
- [26] Zhang, J.L., Korhonen, R.J.: On the Nevanlinna characteristic of $f(qz)$ and its applications. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **369**, 537–544 (2010)

G. HALDAR

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MALDA COLLEGE, WEST BENGAL 732101, INDIA.

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