

**UNIQUENESS OF MEROMORPHIC FUNCTION SHARING
THREE SMALL FUNCTIONS CM WITH ITS n - EXACT
DIFFERENCE**

XIAOHUANG HUANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study the uniqueness of the difference of meromorphic functions. We prove the following result: Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function of hyper-order less than 1, let η be a non-zero complex number, $n \geq 1$, an integer, and let $a, b, c \in \hat{S}(f)$ be three distinct small functions and two of them be periodic small functions with period η . If f and $\Delta_\eta^n f$ share a, b, c CM, then $f \equiv \Delta_\eta^n f$.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

In this paper, we use the standard denotations in the Nevanlinna value distribution theory, see([8, 17, 18]). Throughout this paper, $f(z)$ is a meromorphic function on the whole complex plane.

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

Define

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(f) &= \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log^+ T(r, f)}{\log r}, \\ \rho(f) &= \underline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log^+ T(r, f)}{\log r}, \\ \rho_2(f) &= \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log^+ \log^+ T(r, f)}{\log r}\end{aligned}$$

by the order and the hyper-order of f , respectively.

Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function, and a finite complex number η , we define its difference operators by

$$\Delta_\eta f(z) = f(z + \eta) - f(z), \quad \Delta_\eta^n f(z) = \Delta_\eta^{n-1}(\Delta_\eta f(z)).$$

A meromorphic function a satisfying $T(r, a) = S(r, f)$ is called a small function of f . We say that two nonconstant meromorphic functions f and g share small

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 30D35.

Key words and phrases. Uniqueness, meromorphic functions, share small functions, differences.

function a CM(IM) if $f - a$ and $g - a$ have the same zeros counting multiplicities (ignoring multiplicities). And we that $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ share a CM almost if

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

In 1977, Rubel and Yang [15] considered the uniqueness of an entire function and its derivative. They proved.

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

In recent years, there has been tremendous interests in developing the value distribution of meromorphic functions with respect to difference analogue, see [2-8, 10-14, 19]. Heittokangas et al [10] proved a similar result analogue of Theorem A concerning shift.

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

Recently, Chen-Yi [4], Zhang-Liao [19], and Liu-Yang-Fang [13] proved

Theorem C Let f be a transcendental entire function of finite order, let η be a non-zero complex number, n be a positive integer, and let a, b be two distinct small functions of f . If f and $\Delta_\eta^n f$ share a, b CM, then $f \equiv \Delta_\eta^n f$.

In 2014, Halburd-Korhonen-Tohge [8] investigated the relationship of characteristic functions between $f(z)$ and $f(z + \eta)$ in $\rho_2(f) < 1$. They obtain the following Lemma 2.1. Immediately, Theorem B and Theorem C are still true when finite order is replaced by $\rho_2(f) < 1$.

Li-Yi-Kang [14], Lü-Lü [12], Gao, et.al [5] improved Theorem C to meromorphic function. They proved.

Theorem D Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function of hyper-order less than 1, let η be a non-zero complex number, $n \geq 1$, an integer, and let a, b, c be three distinct periodic small functions f with period η . If f and $\Delta_\eta^n f$ share a, b, c CM, then $f \equiv \Delta_\eta^n f$.

In this paper, we prove.

Theorem 1 Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function of hyper-order less than 1, let η be a non-zero complex number, $n \geq 1$, an integer, and let $a, b, c \in \hat{S}(f)$ be three distinct small functions and two of them be periodic small functions with period η . If f and $\Delta_\eta^n f$ share a, b, c CM, then $f \equiv \Delta_\eta^n f$.

2. SOME LEMMAS

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

$$m(r, \frac{f(z + \eta)}{f(z)}) = S(r, f),$$

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

Lemma 2.2. [6, 7] *Let f be a non-constant meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$, and let $\eta \neq 0$ be a finite complex number. Then*

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

Lemma 2.3. [16] *Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$, and let a, b, c , be three distinct small functions of f . Then*

$$T(r, f) \leq \bar{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + \bar{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + \bar{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) + S(r, f).$$

Lemma 2.4. *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$, n a positive integer, let η be a nonzero finite number, and let $a(z) \not\equiv \infty, b(z) \not\equiv \infty$ and $c(z)$ be three distinct small meromorphic functions of $f(z)$. Suppose*

$$L(f) = \begin{vmatrix} a-b & f-a \\ a'-b' & f'-a' \end{vmatrix}$$

then $L(f) \not\equiv 0$.

Proof. Suppose that $L(f) \equiv 0$, then we can get $\frac{f'-a'}{f-a} \equiv \frac{a'-b'}{a-b}$. Integrating both side of above we can obtain $f-a = C_1(a-b)$, where C_1 is a nonzero constant. So we have $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. Hence $L(f) \not\equiv 0$. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic function of $\rho_2(f) < 1$, n a positive integer, let η be a nonzero finite number, and let $a(z) \not\equiv \infty, b(z) \not\equiv \infty$ and $c(z)$ be three distinct small meromorphic functions of $f(z)$. Then*

$$m(r, \frac{L(f)}{f-a}) = S(r, f), \quad m(r, \frac{L(f)}{f-b}) = S(r, f).$$

And

$$m(r, \frac{L(f)f}{(f-a)(f-b)}) = S(r, f),$$

where $L(f)$ is defined as in Lemma 2.4.

Proof. Obviously, we have

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

As $\frac{L(f)f}{(f-a)(f-b)} = \frac{C_1 L(f)}{f-a} + \frac{C_2 L(f)}{f-b}$, where $C_i (i = 1, 2)$ are small functions of f . Thus

$$m(r, \frac{L(f)f}{(f-a)(f-b)}) \leq m(r, \frac{C_1 L(f)}{f-a}) + m(r, \frac{C_2 L(f)}{f-b}) = S(r, f).$$

\square

Lemma 2.6. [17] *Let f and g be two non-constant meromorphic functions. If f and g share $0, 1, \infty$ CM, then*

$$N_{(2)}(r, f) + N_{(2)}(r, \frac{1}{f}) + N_{(2)}(r, \frac{1}{f-1}) = S(r, f).$$

Lemma 2.7. [17] *Let f and g be two non-constant meromorphic functions. If f and g share $0, 1, \infty$ CM, and f is not a Möbius transformation of g , then*

(i) $T(r, f) = N(r, \frac{1}{g}) + N_0(r) + S(r, f), T(r, g) = N(r, \frac{1}{f}) + N_0(r) + S(r, f)$, where $N_0(r)$ denotes the zeros of $f-g$, but not the zeros of $f, f-1$, and $\frac{1}{f}$.

- (ii) $T(r, f) + T(r, g) = N(r, f) + N(r, \frac{1}{f}) + N(r, \frac{1}{f-1}) + N_0(r) + S(r, f);$
 (iii) $T(r, f) = N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + S(r, f)$, where $a \neq 0, 1, \infty$.

Lemma 2.8. [17] *Let f and g be two non-constant meromorphic functions. If f and g share $0, 1, \infty$ CM with finite lower order, then $T(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f)$.*

Lemma 2.9. [17] *Let f and g be two non-constant meromorphic functions. If f and g share $0, 1, \infty$ CM, and*

$$N(r, f) \neq T(r, f) + S(r, f),$$

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) \neq T(r, f) + S(r, f),$$

where $a \neq 0, 1, \infty$. Then a, ∞ are the Picard exceptional values of f , and $1-a, \infty$ are the Picard exceptional values of g .

Lemma 2.10. [1] *Let f and g be two nonconstant meromorphic functions. If f and g share $0, 1, \infty$ CM, and f is a Möbius transformation of g , then f and g assume one of the following six relations: (i) $fg = 1$; (ii) $(f-1)(g-1) = 1$; (iii) $f+g = 1$; (iv) $f = cg$; (v) $f-1 = c(g-1)$; (vi) $[(c-1)f+1][(c-1)g-c] = -c$, where $c \neq 0, 1$ is a complex number.*

Lemma 2.11. *Let f and g be two non-constant meromorphic functions satisfying*

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

If $f^s g^t \equiv 1$ for all integers s and t ($|s| + |t| > 0$), then for any positive number ε , we have

$$N_0(r, 1; f; g) \leq \varepsilon(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + S(r),$$

where $N_0(r, 1; f; g)$ denotes the reduced counting function of f and g related to the common 1-points and $S(r) = o(T(r, f) + T(r, g))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty, r \notin E_3$

3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Let $g = \Delta_\eta^n f$. Suppose $f \not\equiv g$. Without lose of generality, we discuss two cases, i.e. $c \equiv \infty$ and $c \neq \infty$.

Case 1 $c \equiv \infty$. Since f is a non-constant meromorphic function satisfying $\rho_2(f) < 1$, and f and g share a, b, ∞ CM, we know that there are two entire functions p_1 and p_2 such that

$$\frac{g-a}{f-a} = e^{p_1}, \quad \frac{g-b}{f-b} = e^{p_2}. \quad (3.1)$$

Set

$$\varphi = \frac{L(f)(f-g)}{(f-a)(f-b)}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $L(f) \not\equiv 0$ is defined as in Lemma 2.4. Since $f \not\equiv g$, then $\varphi \not\equiv 0$.

Set $F = \frac{f-a}{b-a}$ and $G = \frac{g-a}{b-a}$, and thus F and G share $0, 1, \infty$ CM, as f and g share a, b, ∞ CM. Then by Lemma 2.6, we have

$$N(r, f) = N_1(r, f), N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) = N_1(r, \frac{1}{f-a}), N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) = N_1(r, \frac{1}{f-b}). \quad (3.3)$$

Since f is a non-constant meromorphic function satisfying $\rho_2(f) < 1$, by Lemma 2.8, we have

$$T(r, f) = T(r, F) + S(r, f) = T(r, G) + S(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f). \quad (3.4)$$

We claim that

$$T(r, f) = N(r, f) + S(r, f). \quad (3.5)$$

Otherwise, by Lemma 2.9, we know $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$, and hence **Remark 1** implies $f \equiv g$, a contradiction. We also claim that F is not a Möbius transformation of G . Otherwise, by Lemma 2.10, if (i) occurs, we can see that

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) = N(r, \frac{1}{g-a}) = S(r, f), N(r, f) = N(r, g) = S(r, f). \quad (3.6)$$

Then by Theorem C, we can obtain a contradiction.

If (ii) occurs, we can see that

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) = N(r, \frac{1}{g-b}) = S(r, f), N(r, f) = N(r, g) = S(r, f). \quad (3.7)$$

Then by **Remark 1**, we can obtain a contradiction.

If (iii) occurs, then by (3.1), we can get $f + g = a + b$, that is

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) = N(r, \frac{1}{g-a}) = S(r, f), N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) = N(r, \frac{1}{g-b}) = S(r, f), \quad (3.8)$$

and with a similar method of proving **Case 2 (i)**, we can obtain a contradiction since one of a and b is a periodic small function.

If (iv) occurs, that is $F = jG$, where $j \neq 0, 1$ is a finite constant. And hence $e^{p_1} = j$. So by Lemma 2.1 and (3.1), we have

$$T(r, f) = m(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f) = T(r, e^{p_2}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.9)$$

It follows from above that

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

that is

$$N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta b}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.10)$$

We claim that $\Delta_\eta b \neq b$. Otherwise, by Lemma 2.1 and (3.1), we can obtain

$$T(r, e^{p_2}) = m(r, e^{p_2}) = m(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta b}{f-b}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.11)$$

Then by (3.9) and (3.11), we have $T(r, f) = T(r, F) + S(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

Rewrite $F = jG$ as $f - (a + j(b - a)) = j(g - b)$ and $f - (a + j(\Delta_\eta^n b - a)) = j(g - \Delta_\eta^n b)$. So

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f - a - j(b - a)}) = S(r, f), \quad N(r, \frac{1}{f - a - j(\Delta_\eta^n b - a)}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.12)$$

Since $j \neq 0, 1$ and $\Delta_\eta^n b \not\equiv b$, we know $a + j(b - a) \not\equiv b$ and $a + j(b - a) \not\equiv a + j(\Delta_\eta^n b - a)$. On the other hand, if $a + j(\Delta_\eta^n b - a) \not\equiv b$. Then it follows from Lemma 2.3, and (3.12) we can get

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) &\leq N(r, \frac{1}{f - b}) + N(r, \frac{1}{f - a - j(b - a)}) \\ &\quad + N(r, \frac{1}{f - a - j(\Delta_\eta^n b - a)}) \leq +S(r, f) = S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

It is impossible. Hence $a + j(\Delta_\eta^n b - a) \equiv b$. Set $d = a + j(b - a)$, and we define

$$\begin{aligned} E &= (f - d)(\Delta_\eta^n(d - b)) - (g - \Delta_\eta^n d)(d - b) \\ &= (f - b)(\Delta_\eta^n(d - b)) - (g - \Delta_\eta^n b)(d - b). \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

If $E \not\equiv 0$, then by (3.5), (3.12), (3.14) and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2T(r, f) &= m(r, \frac{1}{f - b}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f - d}) + S(r, f) \\ &= m(r, \frac{1}{f - b} + \frac{1}{f - d}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{E}{f - b} + \frac{E}{f - d}) + m(r, \frac{1}{E}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, (f - d)(\Delta_\eta^n(d - b)) - (g - \Delta_\eta^n d)(d - b)) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, f) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

which is $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. Therefore $E \equiv 0$, i.e.

$$(f - d)(\Delta_\eta^n(d - b)) \equiv (g - \Delta_\eta^n d)(d - b). \quad (3.15)$$

Easy to see from (3.12) and (3.15) that

$$N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n d}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.16)$$

If $\Delta_\eta^n d \equiv b$, since $c = \infty$, then one of a, b is a periodic functions, we discuss two cases.

Case 1.1 b is periodic. Then from the fact that $f - d = j(g - b)$ and also $d - b = (a - b)(1 - j)$, we can know from (3.15) that

$$b = \Delta_\eta^n d = (1 - j)(a - b), \quad (3.17)$$

and

$$b = \Delta_\eta^n d = (1 - j)\Delta_\eta^n a. \quad (3.18)$$

$a + j(\Delta_\eta^n b - a) \equiv b$ can deduce

$$b = \Delta_\eta^n d = (1 - j)a, \quad (3.19)$$

it follows from (3.18) that a is also periodic and $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv a$. So we have $a = b = 0$, a contradiction.

Case 1.2 a is periodic. Then from the fact that $f - d = j(g - b)$ and also $d - b = (a - b)(1 - j)$, we can know from (3.15) that

$$b = \Delta_\eta^n d = j \Delta_\eta^n b. \quad (3.20)$$

and

$$j(b - \Delta_\eta^n b) = (1 - j)(a - b). \quad (3.21)$$

(3.20) and (3.21) imply

$$a = (1 + j)b, \quad (3.22)$$

and hence we can obtain from (3.20) and (3.22) that $a = b = 0$, a contradiction.

If $\Delta_\eta^n d \equiv \Delta_\eta^n b$, then we can obtain from (3.13) and $j \neq 0, 1$ that $T(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f) = T(r, \Delta_\eta^n d) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

By Lemma 2.3 and (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) &= T(r, g) + S(r, f) \leq N(r, \frac{1}{g - b}) + N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) \\ &\quad + N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n d}) + S(r, f) = S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

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

If (v) occurs, that is $F - 1 = i(G - 1)$, where $i \neq 0, 1$ is a finite constant. And with a similar method of proving (iv), we can obtain a contradiction.

If (vi) occurs, $[(k - 1)F + 1][(k - 1)G - k] = -k$, where $k \neq 0, 1$ is a complex number. We can see that

$$N(r, F) = N(r, f) = N(r, g) = N(r, G) = S(r, f). \quad (3.23)$$

Then by **Remark 1**, we can obtain a contradiction.

Hence, F is not a Möbius transformation of G . If $ab \equiv 0$, and without lose of generality, we set $a \equiv 0$. Easy to see from (3.1), Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.5 that

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, \varphi) &= m(r, \frac{L(f)(f - g)}{(f - a)(f - b)}) + N(r, \varphi) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{L(f)f}{(f - a)(f - b)}) + m(r, 1 - \frac{g}{f}) + N(r, \varphi) \\ &\leq N_1(r, f) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$T(r, \varphi) \leq N_1(r, f) + S(r, f). \quad (3.24)$$

We also obtain

$$m(r, \frac{\varphi}{f}) \leq m(r, \frac{L(f)f}{(f - a)(f - b)}) + m(r, 1 - \frac{g}{f}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.25)$$

Then it follows from Lemma 2.7, (3.2)-(3.4), and (3.24)-(3.25) that

$$\begin{aligned}
m(r, \frac{1}{f}) &\leq m(r, \frac{\varphi}{f}) + m(r, \frac{1}{\varphi}) \\
&\leq T(r, \varphi) - N(r, \frac{1}{\varphi}) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq T(r, \varphi) - (N(r, \frac{1}{L(f)}) + N_0(r, \frac{1}{f-g})) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq N_1(r, f) - T(r, f) + S(r, f) = S(r, f),
\end{aligned}$$

which is

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

Here, $N_0(r, \frac{1}{f-g}) = N_0(r, \frac{1}{F-G}) + S(r, f)$. So

$$T(r, f) = N(r, \frac{1}{f}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.27)$$

Combing Lemma 2.7, (3.2)-(3.4) and (3.27), we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
&N(r, f) + N(r, \frac{1}{f}) + N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + N_0(r) \\
&= T(r, f) + T(r, g) + S(r, f) \\
&= N(r, \frac{1}{f}) + N(r, f) + S(r, f),
\end{aligned}$$

that is

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + N_0(r) = S(r, f), \quad (3.28)$$

and therefore by (3.28), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T(r, e^{p_1}) &= N(r, \frac{1}{e^{p_1} - 1}) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq N_0(r) + N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) = S(r, f)
\end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
T(r, f) &= m(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f) \\
&= m(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq T(r, g) - N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + S(r, f),
\end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

which implies

$$N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.31)$$

If $\Delta_\eta^n b = 0$, then (3.27) deduces $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. Hence $\Delta_\eta^n b = b$. Then by (3.1) and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$m(r, e^{p_2}) = m(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}{f-b}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.32)$$

Solving the equation (3.1), we can get

$$f = \frac{a - b + be^{p_2} - ae^{p_1}}{e^{p_2} - e^{p_1}}. \quad (3.33)$$

It follows from above, (3.29) and (3.32), we have $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. Hence, we know that neither $\Delta_\eta b = 0$ nor $\Delta_\eta b = b$ holds. Then by Lemma 2.1-Lemma 2.3 and (3.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) &= N(r, \frac{1}{\Delta_\eta^n f - b}) + S(r, f) \\ &= N(r, \frac{1}{\Delta_\eta^n f - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + S(r, f) = S(r, f), \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

and

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

Set

$$P_1 = \frac{\Delta_\eta^n f - b}{f - b}, \quad Q_1 = \frac{(f - b)\Delta_\eta^n b}{(\Delta_\eta^n f - \Delta_\eta^n b)b}.$$

We can see from above that

$$N(r, P_1) + N(r, Q_1) + N(r, \frac{1}{P_1}) + N(r, \frac{1}{Q_1}) = S(r, f).$$

If for all integers s and t satisfying $(|s| + |t| > 0)$ such that $P_1^s Q_1^t \equiv 1$, then by Lemma 2.12, we get

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) &= N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + S(r, f) \leq \varepsilon(T(r, P_1) + T(r, Q_1)) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon T(r, f) + S(r, f), \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

it follows from above and $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ that $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. Therefore, there exist two integer $s = 1$ and $t = 1$ such that $P_1 Q_1 \equiv 1$. That is

$$\frac{(\Delta_\eta^n f - b)\Delta_\eta^n b}{(\Delta_\eta^n f - \Delta_\eta^n b)b} \equiv 1.$$

Rewrite above as

$$\frac{\Delta_\eta^n b - b}{\Delta_\eta^n f - \Delta_\eta^n b} \equiv \frac{b}{\Delta_\eta^n b} - 1, \quad (3.37)$$

which follows from Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2 and (3.21) that

$$T(r, f) = m(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{\Delta_\eta^n f - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + S(r, f) = S(r, f), \quad (3.38)$$

but it is impossible.

So $ab \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.7 and (3.5) that

$$3T(r, f) + N_0(r) = 2T(r, f) + m(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f),$$

which follows from above inequality that

$$T(r, f) + N_0(r) = m(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq m(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}{f - a}) + m(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}{f - b}) + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) \\ &+ S(r, f) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

We discuss two case.

Case 1.1 $\Delta_\eta^n a \neq \Delta_\eta^n b$.

Case 1.1.1 $\Delta_\eta^n a \neq a, b$ and $\Delta_\eta^n b \neq a, b$. We discuss two case.

Case 1.1 $\Delta_\eta^n a \neq \Delta_\eta^n b$.

Case 1.1.1 $\Delta_\eta^n a \neq a, b$ and $\Delta_\eta^n b \neq a, b$. Let $F_1 = \frac{1}{F}$ and $G_1 = \frac{1}{G}$. We only need to discuss F_1 is not a Möbius transformation of G_1 . We discuss two subcases.

Subcases 1.1 $T(r, F_1) \neq N(r, F_1) + S(r, f) = N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + S(r, f)$. Then by Lemma 2.8, we have

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) = N(r, \frac{1}{\Delta_\eta^n f - a}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.40)$$

Lemma 2.1 implies that

$$N(r, \frac{1}{\Delta_\eta^n f - \Delta_\eta^n a}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.41)$$

If $a \equiv a_\eta$, then by Lemma 2.1 and (3.1), we get

$$m(r, e^p) = m(r, \frac{\Delta_\eta^n f - \Delta_\eta^n a}{f - a}) = S(r, f), \quad (3.42)$$

and then

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + N_0(r) \leq N(r, \frac{1}{e^p - 1}) + S(r, f) = S(r, f). \quad (3.43)$$

(3.31) and (3.33) deduce

$$\begin{aligned} m(r, e^q) &= N(r, \frac{1}{e^q - 1}) + S(r, f) \leq N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + N_0(r) \\ &+ S(r, f) = S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

Combining (3.23), (3.32) and (3.34), we have $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. That is to say $\Delta_\eta^n a \neq \infty$.

Set

$$P_2 = \frac{\Delta_\eta^n f - a}{f - a}, \quad Q_2 = \frac{(f - a)(b - \Delta_\eta^n a)}{(\Delta_\eta^n f - \Delta_\eta^n a)(b - a)}.$$

We can see from above that

$$N(r, P_1) + N(r, Q_1) + N(r, \frac{1}{P_1}) + N(r, \frac{1}{Q_1}) = S(r, f).$$

With a similar method, we can obtain $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

Subcases 1.2 $T(r, F_1) = N(r, F_1) + S(r, f) = N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + S(r, f)$. It follows from (3.29) that

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + N_0(r) = S(r, f). \quad (3.45)$$

Moreover, we have (3.24). As we set P_1 and Q_1 of above, we can also obtain $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

Case 1.1.2 $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv a$ and $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv b$. Then by Lemma 2.1 and (3.34), we can get $T(r, f) = T(r, F) + S(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

Case 1.1.3 $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv b$ and $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv a$. We can see from the fact one of a and b is a periodic small function that $a \equiv b = 0$, a contradiction.

Case 1.2 $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv \Delta_\eta^n b$. Then by (3.34) we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) + N_0(r) &= m(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-a} + \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}{f-a} + \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}{f-b}) + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) \\ &\quad + S(r, f) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, g) - N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) + S(r, f), \end{aligned} \quad (3.46)$$

it deduces that

$$N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) + N_0(r) = S(r, f). \quad (3.47)$$

It follows from Lemma 2.7 that $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv a$ or $\Delta_\eta^n a = b$. If $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv a$, then by Lemma 2.1 and (3.1) that

$$T(r, e^{p_1}) = m(r, e^{p_1}) = m(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}{f-a}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.48)$$

On the other hand, by Nevanlinna's Second Fundamental Theorem and (3.36), we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, e^{p_2}) &\leq N(r, \frac{1}{e^{p_2} - 1}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + N_0(r) = S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.49)$$

By (3.33), (3.37) and (3.38) that that $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction.

If $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv \Delta_\eta^n a \equiv b$, then using a similar proof of above, we can also obtain a contradiction.

Case 2 $c \neq \infty$. Without loss of generality, we suppose a and c to be two periodic small functions with period η . Since f and g share a, b, c CM, we set

$$F_2 = \frac{f-a}{f-b} \cdot \frac{c-b}{c-a}, G_2 = \frac{g-a}{g-b} \cdot \frac{c-b}{c-a},$$

and

$$\frac{(f-b)(g-a)}{(f-a)(g-b)} = e^{h_1}, \frac{(f-c)(g-a)}{(f-a)(g-c)} = e^{h_2}, \frac{(f-b)(g-c)}{(f-c)(g-b)} = e^{h_3}. \quad (3.50)$$

And we know that F_2 and G_2 share $0, 1, \infty$ CM almost. And we also have

$$\begin{aligned} N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) &= N_1(r, \frac{1}{f-a}), \\ N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) &= N_1(r, \frac{1}{f-b}), \end{aligned}$$

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) = N_1(r, \frac{1}{f-c}). \quad (3.51)$$

We claim that F_1 is not a Möbius transformation of G_1 . Otherwise, then by Lemma 2.10, if (i) occurs, we can see that

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) = N(r, \frac{1}{g-a}) = S(r, f), N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) = N(r, \frac{1}{g-b}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.52)$$

Then by Lemma 2.1 and (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2T(r, f) &= m(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f) \\ &= m(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}{f-a}) + m(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}{f-b}) + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) \\ &\quad + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + S(r, f) \leq 2T(r, g) \\ &\quad - N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) - N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + S(r, f), \end{aligned} \quad (3.53)$$

which implies

$$N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) + N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.54)$$

Then we can know from Lemma 2.3, (3.41) and (3.43) that $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv a$ or $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv b$ and $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv a$ or $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv b$. If one of $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv \Delta_\eta^n b \equiv a$ and $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv \Delta_\eta^n b \equiv b$ occurs, then by Lemma 2.1 and (3.41), we know that

$$\begin{aligned} 2T(r, f) &= m(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f) \\ &= m(r, \frac{1}{f-a} + \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f) \\ &= m(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}{f-a} + \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}{f-b}) + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, g) + S(r, f), \end{aligned} \quad (3.55)$$

which implies $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. Hence $\Delta_\eta^n a \not\equiv \Delta_\eta^n b$. If $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv a$, and $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv b$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} D &= (f-a)(\Delta_\eta^n a - \Delta_\eta^n b) - (g - \Delta_\eta^n a)(a-b) \\ &= (f-b)(\Delta_\eta^n a - \Delta_\eta^n b) - (g - \Delta_\eta^n b)(a-b). \end{aligned} \quad (3.56)$$

We claim that $D \neq 0$. Otherwise, by the equalities $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv a$, $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv b$, and the definition of D , we can get $f \equiv g$, a contradiction. So $D \neq 0$. Then it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} 2T(r, f) &= m(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f) \\ &= m(r, \frac{1}{f-a} + \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= m\left(r, \frac{D}{f-a} + \frac{D}{f-b}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{1}{D}\right) \\
&\leq T(r, f-g) - N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-g}\right) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq 2T(r, f) - N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-g}\right) + S(r, f), \tag{3.57}
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-g}\right) = S(r, f). \tag{3.58}$$

Then by Lemma 2.3 and the fact that f and g share a, b, c CM, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T(r, f) &\leq \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-b}\right) + \overline{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f-c}\right) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-g}\right) + S(r, f) = S(r, f), \tag{3.59}
\end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Thus we know that it must occur that $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv b$ and $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv a$. We can see from the fact a , is a periodic small function that $a \equiv b = 0$, a contradiction.

If (ii) occurs, we can see that

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-b}\right) = N\left(r, \frac{1}{g-b}\right) = S(r, f), N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-c}\right) = N\left(r, \frac{1}{g-c}\right) = S(r, f). \tag{3.60}$$

And similar to the proof of (i), we can obtain a contradiction.

If (iii) occurs, we can see that

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a}\right) = N\left(r, \frac{1}{g-a}\right) = S(r, f), N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-c}\right) = N\left(r, \frac{1}{g-c}\right) = S(r, f). \tag{3.61}$$

And similar to the proof of (i), we can obtain a contradiction.

If (iv) occurs, that is $F_1 = dG_1$, and $F_1 - d = d(G_1 - 1)$, i.e.

$$\frac{f-a}{f-b} = d \frac{g-a}{g-b}, \tag{3.62}$$

where $d \neq 0, 1$ is a finite constant. It follows from above that

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-c}\right) = N\left(r, \frac{1}{g-c}\right) = S(r, f), N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-h}\right) = S(r, f), \tag{3.63}$$

where $h = \frac{(1-d)ab+c(bd-a)}{(1-d)c+da-b}$. If $(1-d)c + da - b \equiv 0$, we can obtain that $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$, and we can get a contradiction from **Remark 1**. So with a similar proof of proving (vi), and c is a periodic small function that we can obtain a contradiction.

If (v) occurs, we can obtain a contradiction with a similar proof of (vi).

If (vi) occurs, we can see that

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{f-b}\right) = N\left(r, \frac{1}{g-b}\right) = S(r, f), N\left(r, \frac{1}{f - \frac{a(d-1)q+b}{(d-1)q+1}}\right) = S(r, f), \tag{3.64}$$

where $q = \frac{c-b}{c-a}$, and $b \not\equiv \frac{a(d-1)q+b}{(d-1)q+1}$. Suppose $s = \frac{a(d-1)q+b}{(d-1)q+1}$, then we can obtain from above and Lemma 2.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
2T(r, f) &= m\left(r, \frac{1}{f-b}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{1}{f-s}\right) + S(r, f) \\
&= m\left(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}{f-b}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n s}{f-s}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n s}) + S(r, f) \\
& \leq m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n s}) + S(r, f) \leq 2T(r, g) \\
& - N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) - N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n s}) + S(r, f), \tag{3.65}
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n s}) = S(r, f). \tag{3.66}$$

Then we can know from Lemma 2.3, (3.53) and (3.55) that $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv b$ or $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv s$, and $\Delta_\eta^n s \equiv s$ or $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv s$. If $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv \Delta_\eta^n s$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
2T(r, f) & = m(r, \frac{1}{f - b}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f - s}) + S(r, f) \\
& = m(r, \frac{1}{f - b} + \frac{1}{f - s}) + S(r, f) \\
& = m(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}{f - b} + \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}{f - s}) + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + S(r, f) \\
& \leq m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, g) + S(r, f), \tag{3.67}
\end{aligned}$$

which implies $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. Therefore $\Delta_\eta^n b \not\equiv \Delta_\eta^n s$. If $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv b$ and $\Delta_\eta^n s \equiv s$, we set

$$\begin{aligned}
H & = (f - b)(\Delta_\eta^n b - \Delta_\eta^n s) - (g - b)(b - s) \\
& = (f - s)(\Delta_\eta^n b - \Delta_\eta^n s) - (g - s)(b - s). \tag{3.68}
\end{aligned}$$

If $H \equiv 0$, we have $f \equiv g$, a contradiction. Hence $H \not\equiv 0$. It is easy to see from (3.67) that

$$\begin{aligned}
2T(r, f) & = m(r, \frac{1}{f - b}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f - s}) + S(r, f) \\
& \leq 2m(r, \frac{1}{H}) + S(r, f) \leq 2T(r, f) - 2N(r, \frac{1}{H}) + S(r, f), \tag{3.69}
\end{aligned}$$

that is

$$N(r, \frac{1}{H}) = S(r, f). \tag{3.70}$$

Then by Lemma 2.3 and the fact that f and g share a, b, c CM, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T(r, f) & \leq \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f - a}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f - b}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f - c}) + S(r, f) \\
& \leq N(r, \frac{1}{f - g}) + S(r, f) = S(r, f), \tag{3.71}
\end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Hence $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv s$ and $\Delta_\eta^n s \equiv b$. On the other hand, Lemma 2.10 (vi) tells us that $N(r, \frac{1}{g - p}) = S(r, f)$, where $p = \frac{aq(d-1)-db}{q(d-1)-d}$. Obviously, $b \not\equiv p$, and $p \equiv s$, otherwise, by Lemma 2.3, we can obtain $a = b$ and $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. But $p \equiv s$ implies $d = -1$, and we take it into Lemma 2.10 (vi), we have

$$(2F_1 - 1)(2G_1 - 1) = 1,$$

and it follows from above that

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

And then we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2T(r, f) &= m(r, \frac{1}{f - b}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f - (2a - b)}) + S(r, f) \\ &= m(r, \frac{1}{f - b} + \frac{1}{f - (2a - b)}) + S(r, f) \\ &= m(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}{f - b} + \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}{f - (2a - b)}) + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + S(r, f) \leq T(r, g) + S(r, f), \end{aligned} \quad (3.72)$$

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

Therefore, F_1 is not a Möbius transformation of G_1 . We discuss two subcases.

Subcase 2.1 $T(r, f) \neq N(r, \frac{1}{f - b}) + S(r, f)$. Then by Lemma 2.9 we know that

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f - b}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.73)$$

Then by Lemma 2.7 and above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 3T(r, f) + N_0(r) &= 2T(r, f) + m(r, \frac{1}{f - a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f - b}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f - c}) + S(r, f) \\ &= 3T(r, f) + m(r, \frac{1}{f - a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f - c}) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$N_0(r) = m(r, \frac{1}{f - a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f - c}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.74)$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 2.1, we know

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) &= m(r, \frac{1}{f - b}) + S(r, f) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, g) - N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

it follows from Lemma 2.8 that

$$N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n b}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.75)$$

And by Lemma 2.8 and Lemma 2.9,

$$T(r, f) = N(r, f) + S(r, f) = T(r, g) + S(r, f) = N(r, g) + S(r, f). \quad (3.76)$$

We can know from (3.63)-(3.64) and Lemma 2.7 that either $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv a$ or $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv b$ or $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv c$. If $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv b$, then Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.11 and (3.39) deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
T(r, e^{h_1}) &= m(r, e^{h_1}) = m(r, e^{-h_1}) = m(r, \frac{(f-a)(g-b)}{(f-b)(g-a)}) \\
&\leq m(r, \frac{g-b}{f-b}) + m(r, \frac{f-a}{g-a}) \\
&\leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + N(r, \frac{g-a}{f-a}) - N(r, \frac{f-a}{g-a}) \\
&\leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + N(r, g) + N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) - N(r, f) \\
&\quad - N(r, \frac{1}{g-a}) + S(r, f) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + S(r, f),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$T(r, e^{h_1}) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.77)$$

We also have

$$T(r, e^{h_3}) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.78)$$

Applying Lemma 2.3 to e^{h_1} and e^{h_3} , we have

$$T(r, e^{h_1}) = \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{e^{h_1}-1}) + S(r, f), \quad (3.79)$$

and

$$T(r, e^{h_3}) = \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{e^{h_3}-1}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.80)$$

It follows from (3.39)-(3.40) and (3.65)-(3.69) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) + \overline{N}_0(r) &= \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{e^{h_1}-1}) + S(r, f) \\
&\leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + S(r, f),
\end{aligned}$$

which is

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) + \overline{N}_0(r) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.81)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + \overline{N}_0(r) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) + S(r, f). \quad (3.82)$$

From the fact that the zero of $f-g$ with multiplicity at least 2 are the zeros of $e^{h_1}-1$ with multiplicity at least 2, and hence we have

$$2\overline{N}_0(r) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) = N_0(r) + S(r, f),$$

that is

$$\overline{N}_0(r) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.83)$$

Then by Lemma 2.3, (3.71) and above, we can obtain $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. Therefore $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv a$ or $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv c$. If $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv a$, then by (3.69) and the fact that f and g share a CM, we have

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) = N(r, \frac{1}{g-a}) = S(r, f). \quad (3.84)$$

Then similar to the proof of the **Case 2-(i)**, we can obtain a contradiction. If $\Delta_\eta^n b \equiv c$, we can also get a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2 $T(r, f) = N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f)$. Then by Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 2.8 we know that

$$\begin{aligned} 2T(r, f) &= N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + N(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) + N_0(r) + S(r, f) \\ &= T(r, f) + N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + N(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) + N_0(r) + S(r, f) \\ &= N(r, \frac{1}{f-g}) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) &= N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + N(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) + N_0(r) + S(r, f), \\ 2T(r, f) &= N(r, \frac{1}{f-g}) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.85)$$

That is

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) + N_0(r) &= m(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}{f-a}) + m(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n c}{f-c}) + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n c}) \\ &\quad + S(r, f) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n c}) + S(r, f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.86)$$

We discuss two subcase.

Subcase 2.2.1 $\Delta_\eta^n a \not\equiv \Delta_\eta^n c$.

Subase 2.2.1.1 $\Delta_\eta^n a \not\equiv a, c$ and $\Delta_\eta^n c \not\equiv a, c$. Set $F_3 = \frac{1}{F_2}$ and $G_3 = \frac{1}{G_2}$. With the same way to prove **Subcase 2.1**, we only need to discuss $T(r, f) = N(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + S(r, f)$. It follows from (3.79) that

$$N(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) + N_0(r) = S(r, f).$$

But in this case, we can also obtain a contradiction.

Subase 2.2.1.2 $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv a$ and $\Delta_\eta^n c \equiv c$. We can get $a \equiv c = 0$, a contradiction.

Subase 2.2.1.3 $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv c$ and $\Delta_\eta^n c \equiv a$. We can get $a \equiv c = 0$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2.2 $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv \Delta_\eta^n c$. Then by (3.74) we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, f) + N_0(r) &= m(r, \frac{1}{f-a}) + m(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-a} + \frac{1}{f-c}) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq m(r, \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}{f-a} + \frac{g - \Delta_\eta^n c}{f-c}) + m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + S(r, f) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) + S(r, f) \\
& \leq T(r, g) - N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) + S(r, f), \tag{3.87}
\end{aligned}$$

it deduces that

$$N(r, \frac{1}{g - \Delta_\eta^n a}) + N_0(r) = S(r, f). \tag{3.88}$$

It follows from Lemma 2.7 that $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv a$ or $\Delta_\eta^n a = c$. If $\Delta_\eta^n a \equiv a$, then with the same proof of (3.75), and by (3.39) and $T(r, f) = N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f)$, we can have

$$T(r, e^{h_2}) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-c}) + S(r, f) = S(r, f). \tag{3.89}$$

And thus,

$$\overline{N}_0(r) + \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) \leq m(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) + S(r, f), \tag{3.90}$$

which follows from (3.40) that $N(r, \frac{1}{f-b}) = S(r, f)$, and furthermore we get $T(r, f) = S(r, f)$, a contradiction. If $\Delta_\eta^n a = c$, then we can also obtain a contradiction with a same method of above.

Conflict of Interest The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Acknowledgements The author would like to thank to anonymous referees for their helpful comments.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. H. H. Al-khaladi.: Meromorphic functions that share three values with one share value for their derivatives, *J. Math. (Wuhan)* **20**, 156-160 (2000)
- [2] 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)
- [3] Chiang, Y.M., Feng, S.J.: On the growth of logarithmic differences, difference quotients and logarithmic derivatives of meromorphic functions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **361**, 3767-3791 (2009)
- [4] Chen, Z.X., Yi, H.X.: On Sharing Values of Meromorphic Functions and Their Differences. *Res. Math.* **63**, 557-565 (2013)
- [5] Gao, Z.S., Korhonen, R.J, Zhang, J., Zhang, Y.: Uniqueness of meromorphic functions sharing values with their nth order exact differences. *Anal. Math.* **45**, 321-334 (2019)
- [6] 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)
- [7] Halburd, R.G., Korhonen, R.J.: Nevanlinna theory for the difference operator. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* **31**, 463-478 (2006)
- [8] Halburd, R.G., Korhonen, R.J., Tohge, K.: Holomorphic curves with shift-invariant hyperplane preimages. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*]**366** , 4267-4298 (2014)
- [9] Hayman, W.K.: *Meromorphic Functions*. Clarendon Press, Oxford (1964)
- [10] Heittokangas, J., Korhonen, R., Laine, I., Rieppo, J.: Uniqueness of meromorphic functions sharing values with their shifts. *Complex Var. Elliptic Equ.* **56**, 81-92 (2011)
- [11] Li, S., Duan, M. Chen, B.Q.: Uniqueness of entire functions sharing two values with their difference operators. *Adv. Difference. Equ. Paper* 390, 9 pp (2017)
- [12] Lü, F, Lü, W.R., Meromorphic functions sharing three values with their difference operators. *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory* **17**, 395-403 (2017)
- [13] Liu, D., Yang ,D.G., Fang, M.L. Unicity of entire functions concerning shifts and difference operators. *Abstr. Appl. Anal.* 5 pp (2014)

- [14] Li, X.M., Yi, H.X., Kang, C.Y., Results on meromorphic functions sharing three values with their difference operators. Bull. Korean Math. Soc. **52**, 1401-1422(2015)
- [15] Rubel, L.A., Yang, C.C.: Values shared by an entire function and its derivative. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer, Berlin, **599**, 101-103 (1977)
- [16] K, Yamanoi, *The second main theorem for small functions and related problems*, Acta Math. **192**, 225-294 (2004)
- [17] Yang, C.C., Yi, H.X.: Uniqueness Theory of Meromorphic Functions. Science Press, Beijing, New York (2003)
- [18] Yang, L.: Value Distribution Theory. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1993)
- [19] Zhang, J. Liao, L.W.: Entire functions sharing some values with their difference operators. Sci. China Math. **57**, 2143-2152 (2014)

XIAOHUANG HUANG: CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHENZHEN UNIVERSITY, SHENZHEN 518055, CHINA

Email address: 1838394005@qq.com