

# Difference “abc” theorem for entire functions and Difference analogue of truncated version of Nevanlinna second main theorem

Rui-Chun Chen and Zhi-Tao Wen<sup>\*†</sup>

## Abstract

In this paper, we focus on the difference analogue of Stothers-Mason theorem for entire functions of order less than 1, which can be seen as difference  $abc$  theorem for entire functions with slow growth. We also obtain the difference analogue of truncated version of Nevanlinna second main theorem which reveals that meromorphic functions which are of hyper order less than 1 except periodic functions with period one cannot have too many points with long height in the complex plane. Both theorems depend on new definitions of height of shifting poles and shifting zeros of a given meromorphic function in a domain.

**Keyword:** shifting pole, shifting zero, Stothers–Mason theorem, Nevanlinna second main theorem.

**2020MSC:** 30D35, 30D20

## 1 Introduction

Let  $a, b, c$  be nonzero relatively prime integers such that  $a + b = c$ , and let  $\text{rad}(abc)$  be the product of distinct prime numbers dividing  $abc$ . Oesterlé posed the question whether the numbers

$$L = L(a, b, c) = \frac{\log \max(|a|, |b|, |c|)}{\log \text{rad}(abc)}$$

are bounded. This question was refined by Masser who conjectured that for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a positive constant  $K(\varepsilon)$  such that

$$\max(|a|, |b|, |c|) \leq K(\varepsilon) \text{rad}(abc)^{1+\varepsilon}.$$

This is the well-known  $abc$ -conjecture. Lang in [7, Page 196] said that

*One of the most fruitful analogies in mathematics is that between the integers  $\mathbb{Z}$  and the ring of polynomials  $F[t]$  over a field  $F$ .*

---

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author

<sup>†</sup>Wen was supported by LKSF STU-GTIT Joint-research Grant (No. 2024LKSF06)

The Stothers–Mason theorem is the polynomial analogue of *abc*-conjecture. Let  $P$  be a polynomial. The radical  $\text{rad}(P)$  is the product of distinct linear factors of  $P$ . Let  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  be relatively prime polynomials such that not all of them are identically zero. The Stothers–Mason theorem [8], [18], see also e.g., [17] states that if they satisfy  $a + b = c$ , then

$$\max\{\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c)\} \leq \deg(\text{rad}(abc)) - 1.$$

A difference analogue of Stothers-Mason theorem or difference *abc* theorem for polynomials was given by Ishizaki et al. in [9, Theorem 3.1]. Let  $a, b$  and  $c$  be relatively prime polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[z]$  such that  $a + b = c$  and such that  $a, b$  and  $c$  are not all constants. Then,

$$\max\{\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c)\} \leq \tilde{n}_\kappa(a) + \tilde{n}_\kappa(b) + \tilde{n}_\kappa(c) - 1,$$

where  $\kappa \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ , and

$$\tilde{n}_\kappa(p) = \sum_{w \in \mathbb{C}} (\text{ord}_w(p) - \min\{\text{ord}_w(p), \text{ord}_{w+\kappa}(p)\})$$

for a polynomial  $p$  by  $\text{ord}_w(p)$  denoting the order of zeros of  $p$  at  $z = w$ .

Another difference analogue of Stothers-Mason theorem was given by Ishizaki and Wen in [11, Theorem 3.5]. Let  $a, b$  and  $c$  be relatively shifting prime polynomials, see [11, pages 736-737], such that  $a + b = c$  and such that  $a, b$  and  $c$  are not all constants. Then

$$\max\{\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c)\} \leq \deg(\text{rad}_\Delta(abc)) - 1, \tag{1.1}$$

where  $\text{rad}_\Delta(abc)$  is difference radical of  $abc$  defined in [11, Section 3].

The purpose of this paper is to generalize the inequality (1.1) for entire functions of order less than 1. In Section 2, we introduce a new definition on height of shifting poles of a given meromorphic function in a domain. We state the difference analogue of Stothers-Mason theorem for entire functions of order less than 1 in Section 3, which can be seen as difference “abc” theorem for entire functions, while we also generalize the result for  $m + 1$  entire functions of order less than 1. In Section 4, we give the difference analogue of truncated version of Nevanlinna second main theorem. The theorem reveals that meromorphic functions which are of hyper order less than 1 except periodic functions with period one cannot have too many points with long height.

## 2 Shifting pole

For a function  $f$ , we denote by  $\Delta f(z) = f(z + 1) - f(z)$  the difference operator. Let  $n$  be a nonnegative integer. Define  $\Delta^n f(z) = \Delta(\Delta^{n-1} f(z))$  for  $n \geq 1$ , and write  $\Delta^0 f = f$ . Define  $z^{\underline{0}} = 1$  and

$$z^{\underline{n}} = z(z - 1) \cdots (z - n + 1) = n! \binom{z}{n}, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots,$$

which is called a *falling factorial*, see [13, Page 25] or [10, Subsection 2.1]. Consider the formal series of the form

$$Y_1(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{a}_n z^{\underline{n}}, \quad \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{C}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

which is called the *binomial series* or the *factorial series*. More information on convergence of binomial series in connection with the order of growth of entire function can be found in [10]. Following the view of Boole [1, Page 7], we adopt the notation

$$z^{-n} = \frac{1}{z(z+1)\cdots(z+n-1)}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

It yields that

$$\Delta z^{-n} = (z+1)^{-n} - z^{-n} = -nz^{-(n+1)},$$

which is an analogue of derivative of inverse power series  $(z^{-n})' = -nz^{-(n+1)}$ , see e.g., [15, Page 5]. We add that  $z^{\overline{n}} = z(z+1)\cdots(z+n-1)$  is called a *raising factorial*, which coincides with the Pochhammer symbol [16, Page 171] denoted by  $(z)_n$  in this paper, see e.g., [12, Page 143], [19], and note that  $z^{-n}$  is characterized by  $z^{-n} = 1/z^{\overline{n}} = 1/(z)_n = \Gamma(z)/\Gamma(z+n)$

Let  $f$  be meromorphic in a domain  $G \subset \mathbb{C}$  and let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Suppose that  $z_0, z_0-1, \dots, z_0-n \in G$ . The point  $z_0$  is called a *shifting pole of  $f(z)$  with height  $n$  in  $G$*  provided  $z_0 - k$  are poles of  $f(z)$  for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $0 \leq k < n$ , but  $z_0 - n$  is not the pole of  $f(z)$ . In particular, if  $z_0$  is a shifting pole of  $f$  with height 1, then we also call  $z_0$  a shifting pole of  $f$  with simple height. Note that shifting pole with long height is a difference analogue of a pole with high multiplicity.

**Example 2.1** The function  $f(z) = 2^z = e^{z \ln 2}$  has no pole, which has no shifting pole. Let  $g$  be defined as  $g(z) = 1/(z^2(z+1)(z+2))2^z$ , which can be written

$$g(z) = z^{-3} \cdot z^{-1}2^z = (z+1)^{-2} \cdot (z^{-1})^2 2^z.$$

Then  $z = 0$  is a shifting pole of  $g$  with height 3 in  $\mathbb{C}$ . In addition,  $z = 1$  and  $z = 2$  are the shifting poles of  $g$  with height 2 and 1 in  $\mathbb{C}$ , respectively.

The height of a shifting pole of a meromorphic function in a domain  $G$  can be infinite. For example, we consider the Euler Gamma function  $\Gamma(z)$ . It is known that  $\Gamma(z)$  is a transcendental meromorphic function that has simple poles at  $0, -1, -2, \dots$ . It gives that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $z = -n$  is a shifting pole of  $\Gamma(z)$  with infinite height in  $\mathbb{C}$ , see e.g., [20, Page 236].

**Proposition 2.1** *If  $z_0$  is a shifting pole of a meromorphic function with infinite height in  $\mathbb{C}$ , then the order of growth of  $f$  is  $\rho(f) \geq 1$ .*

*Proof.* We define counting function  $n(r, f)$  denoting the number of poles of  $f$  in the disk  $|z| \leq r$ . Since  $z_0$  is a shifting pole of  $f$  with infinite height, there exists an  $R > |z_0|$  such that  $n(r, f) \geq r + O(1)$  for  $r > R$ . Then

$$N(r, f) = \int_0^r \frac{n(t, f)}{t} dt \geq \int_{r/2}^r \frac{n(t, f)}{t} dt \geq n(r/2, f) \log 2$$

for  $r \geq 2R$ . Therefore,

$$\rho(f) = \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T(r, f)}{\log r} \geq \overline{\lim}_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log N(r, f)}{\log r} \geq 1.$$

□

It is well known that  $z = z_0$  is a pole of a meromorphic function  $f$  with multiplicity  $n$  if and only if  $f$  is of the form  $f = (z - z_0)^{-n}g(z)$ , where  $g(z)$  is analytic at  $z = z_0$  and  $g(z_0) \neq 0$ . The difference analogue of this result is given as follows.

**Theorem 2.1** *Let  $f$  be meromorphic in the domain  $G \subset \mathbb{C}$  and let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Suppose that  $z_0, z_0 - 1, \dots, z_0 - n \in G$ . The point  $z_0$  is a shifting pole of  $f(z)$  with height  $n$  in  $G$  if and only if there exists a meromorphic function  $g(z)$  in  $G$  such that*

$$f(z) = (z - z_0)^{-n}g(z),$$

where  $g(z)$  is analytic at  $z = z_0 - n$  and  $g(z_0 - j) \neq 0$  for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$ .

*Proof.* From the definition of height of shifting poles, we get our assertion.  $\square$

Let  $f$  be meromorphic in the domain  $G \subset \mathbb{C}$  and let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Suppose that  $z_0, z_0 - 1, \dots, z_0 - m \in G$ . We note that if  $z = z_0$  is a shifting pole of  $f$  with height  $m$  in  $G$ ,  $z = z_0$  is not a shifting pole of  $\Delta f$  with height  $m + 1$ . In order to illustrate it, we give the following examples.

**Example 2.2** Let  $f = z^{-2}(2z + 1)$ . It is clear that  $f$  has a shifting pole at  $z = 0$  with height 2, but  $z = 0$  is a simple shifting pole of  $\Delta f = -2/(z^2 + 2z)$ . Let  $g = 1/(z^2 + 2z)$ . It shows that  $g$  has a shifting pole at  $z = 0$  with simple height. However,  $z = 0$  is a shifting pole of  $\Delta g = z^{-4}(2z + 3)$  with height 4.

### 3 Difference Analogue of Stothers-Mason theorem for entire functions

Let  $P$  be a polynomial. The radical  $\text{rad}(P)$  is the product of distinct linear factors of  $P$ . Let  $a, b$  and  $c$  be relatively prime polynomials such that not all of them are identically zero. The Stothers–Mason theorem [8], [18], see also e.g., [17] states that if they satisfy  $a + b = c$ , then

$$\max\{\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c)\} \leq \deg(\text{rad}(abc)) - 1.$$

In order to state a difference analogue of Stothers-Mason theorem, let us recall the definition of shifting zero, see [11, Section 2]. Let  $f$  be analytic in a domain  $G \subset \mathbb{C}$  and let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Suppose that  $z_0, z_0 + 1, \dots, z_0 + n \in G$ . The point  $z_0$  is called a *shifting zero of  $f(z)$  with height  $n$  in  $G$*  provided  $f(z_0)$  and all difference  $\Delta^k f(z_0)$  vanish for every  $0 \leq k < n$ , but  $\Delta^n f(z_0) \neq 0$ . In general, the point  $z_0$  is called a *shifting  $a$ -point of  $f(z)$  with height  $n$  in  $G$*  provided  $f(z_0) - a$  and all difference  $\Delta^k f(z_0)$  vanish for every  $0 \leq k < n$ , but  $\Delta^n f(z_0) \neq 0$ . In particular, if  $z_0$  is a shifting  $a$ -point of  $f$  with height 1, then we also call  $z_0$  is a shifting  $a$ -point of  $f$  with *simple height*.

Let  $P$  be a polynomial with degree  $p$ , and  $z_1$  be a shifting zero of  $P$  with height  $n_1$  and  $P(z_1 - 1) \neq 0$ . Theorem [11, Theorem 2.4] states that there exists a polynomial  $P_1$  with degree  $p - n_1$  such that  $P(z) = (z - z_1)^{n_1}P_1(z)$ . Let  $z_2$  be a shifting zero of  $P_1$  with height  $n_2$  and  $P_1(z_2 - 1) \neq 0$ . Then there exists a polynomial  $P_2$  with degree  $p - n_1 - n_2$  such that  $P_1(z) = (z - z_2)^{n_2}P_2(z)$ . Repeating this argument for finitely many times, we see that  $P(z)$  can be written uniquely as

$$P(z) = A \prod_{j=1}^N (z - z_j)^{n_j}, \tag{3.1}$$

where  $A$  is a nonzero constant, and  $p = n_1 + \cdots + n_N$ . Note that it is possible that  $z_j = z_k$  even though  $j \neq k$  in (3.1). We define the *difference radical*  $\text{rad}_\Delta(P)$  by product of these linear factors, i.e.,

$$\text{rad}_\Delta(P) = \prod_{j=1}^N (z - z_j). \quad (3.2)$$

We denote the closed disc of radius  $r > 0$  centred at  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$  by  $\overline{D}(z_0, r) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - z_0| \leq r\}$ . Suppose that  $f$  is a meromorphic function in  $\mathbb{C}$ , and  $z = z_1 \in \overline{D}(0, r)$  is a shifting  $a$ -point of  $f$  with height  $n_1$ , while  $z = z_1 - 1$  is not an  $a$ -point of  $f$  in  $\overline{D}(0, r)$  or  $z_1 - 1 \notin \overline{D}(0, r)$ . Then by Theorem [11, Theorem 2.4], there exists a meromorphic function  $f_1$  such that

$$f(z) - a = (z - z_1)^{n_1} f_1(z),$$

where  $f_1(z_1 + n_1) \neq 0$  or  $z_1 + n_1 \notin \overline{D}(0, r)$ , and  $f_1(z)$  is analytic at  $z = z_1 + j$  for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, n_1 - 1$ . Suppose that  $z = z_2 \in \overline{D}(0, r)$  is a shifting zero of  $f_1$  with height  $n_2$  and  $f_1(z_2 - 1) \neq 0$  in  $\overline{D}(0, r)$  or  $z_2 - 1 \notin \overline{D}(0, r)$ . Then there exists a meromorphic function  $f_2$  such that

$$f_1(z) = (z - z_2)^{n_2} f_2(z),$$

where  $f_2(z_2 + n_2) \neq 0$  or  $z_2 + n_2 \notin \overline{D}(0, r)$ , and  $f_2(z)$  is analytic at  $z = z_2 + j$  for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, n_2 - 1$ . Repeating this argument for countable many times, we have there exists a meromorphic function  $F$  such that

$$f(z) - a = \prod_{z_j \in \overline{D}(0, r)} (z - z_j)^{n_j} F(z), \quad (3.3)$$

where  $F(z)$  is zero free in  $\overline{D}(0, r)$  and  $F(z)$  is analytic at each  $z = z_j$  in (3.3). Note that it is possible that  $z_j = z_k$  even though  $j \neq k$  in (3.3). We denote the number of such points  $z_j$  in the disc  $\overline{D}(0, r)$  in (3.3) by  $\overline{n}_\Delta(r, 1/(f - a))$ . We call such points  $z_j$  are *initial shifting  $a$ -points* of  $f$  in  $\overline{D}(0, r)$ . For example, let

$$f(z) = z^2(z - 1)^3(z - 2)^4 e^z = z^3 z^3 (z - 1)^2 (z - 2) e^z,$$

we see that  $\overline{n}_\Delta(r, 1/f) = 4$  when  $r \geq 4$ , and the initial shifting zeros of  $f$  are  $0, 0, 1, 2$  in  $\overline{D}(0, 4)$ . If  $g(z) = \sin \pi z$ , then  $\overline{n}_\Delta(r, 1/g) = 1$  for  $r \geq 1$ , and the initial shifting zero of  $g$  is  $-[r]$ , where  $[r]$  denotes the integer part of  $r$ . It is obvious that if  $f$  is not a periodic function with period one, then for  $a_1, \dots, a_q \in \mathbb{C}$ , we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^q n \left( r, \frac{1}{f - a_j} \right) \leq n \left( r, \frac{1}{\Delta f} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^q \overline{n}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f - a_j} \right) \quad (3.4)$$

by [11, Corollary 2.6]. In particular, if  $f$  is a polynomial, then

$$\overline{n}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f} \right) = \deg \text{rad}_\Delta(f)$$

for large  $r$ , where  $\text{rad}_\Delta(f)$  is the difference radical of the polynomial  $f$  defined in (3.2), see [11, Section 3]. The corresponding integrated counting function is defined in the usual way as

$$\overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f - a} \right) := \int_0^r \frac{\overline{n}_\Delta \left( t, \frac{1}{f - a} \right) - \overline{n}_\Delta \left( 0, \frac{1}{f - a} \right)}{t} dt + \overline{n}_\Delta \left( 0, \frac{1}{f - a} \right) \log r.$$

**Remark 3.1** We note here that our definition on  $\bar{n}_\Delta(r, 1/f)$  is not equivalent to  $\tilde{n}_\kappa^{[q]}(r, 1/f)$  in [9, (5.5)] even when  $q = 1$  and  $\kappa = 1$  defined by

$$\tilde{n}_1^{[1]} \left( r, \frac{1}{f} \right) = \sum_{w \in \overline{D}(0, r)} (\text{ord}_w(f) - \min\{\text{ord}_w(f), \text{ord}_{w+1}(f)\}),$$

where  $\text{ord}_w(f)$  is the multiplicity of zeros of  $f$  at  $z = w$ . For example, let  $f = \sin \pi z$ . It is known that all zeros of  $f$  are integers. While  $\bar{n}_\Delta(r, 1/f) = 1$  and  $\tilde{n}_1^{[1]}(r, 1/f) = 0$  for any  $r > 0$ . In fact, according to [11, Theorem 2.4] and idea in [9]

$$\bar{n}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f} \right) = \sum_{w \in \overline{D}(0, r)} \left( \text{ord}_w(f) - \min\{\text{ord}_w(f), \text{Ord}_{w+1 \in \overline{D}(0, r)}(f)\} \right), \quad (3.5)$$

where  $\text{Ord}_{w+1 \in \overline{D}(0, r)}(f)$  denotes the multiplicity of zeros of  $f$  at  $z = w + 1$  and  $w + 1$  are in the closed disc  $\overline{D}(0, r)$ , and  $\text{Ord}_{w+1 \in \overline{D}(0, r)}(f) = 0$  if  $w + 1 \notin \overline{D}(0, r)$ .

Similarly, we define  $\bar{n}_\Delta(r, f)$  as follows. Suppose that  $f$  is a meromorphic function in  $\mathbb{C}$ , and  $z = z_1 \in \overline{D}(0, r)$  is a shifting pole of  $f$  with height  $n_1$ , while  $z = z_1 + 1$  is not a pole of  $f$  in  $\overline{D}(0, r)$  or  $z_1 + 1 \notin \overline{D}(0, r)$ . Then by Theorem 2.1 there exists a meromorphic function  $f_1$  such that

$$f(z) - a = (z - z_1)^{-n_1} f_1(z),$$

where  $z = z_1 - n_1$  is not the pole of  $f_1$  in  $\overline{D}(0, r)$  or  $z_1 - n_1 \notin \overline{D}(0, r)$ , and  $f_1(z)$  does not vanish at  $z = z_1 - j$  for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, n_1 - 1$ . Suppose that  $z = z_2 \in \overline{D}(0, r)$  is a shifting pole of  $f_1$  with height  $n_2$  and  $z_2 + 1$  is not a pole of  $f_1(z)$  in  $\overline{D}(0, r)$  or  $z_2 + 1 \notin \overline{D}(0, r)$ . Then there exists a meromorphic function  $f_2$  such that

$$f_1(z) = (z - z_2)^{-n_2} f_2(z),$$

where  $z = z_2 - n_2$  is not the pole of  $f_2$  in  $\overline{D}(0, r)$  or  $z_2 - n_2 \notin \overline{D}(0, r)$ , and  $f_2(z)$  does not vanish at  $z = z_2 - j$  for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, n_2 - 1$ . Repeating this argument for countable many times, we have there exists a meromorphic function  $F$  such that

$$f(z) = \prod_{z_j \in \overline{D}(0, r)} (z - z_j)^{-n_j} F(z), \quad (3.6)$$

where  $F$  is analytic in  $\overline{D}(0, r)$  and  $F$  does not vanish at  $z = z_j$  in (3.6). Note that it is possible that  $z_j = z_k$  even though  $j \neq k$  in (3.6). We denote the number of such points  $z_j$  in the disc  $\overline{D}(0, r)$  in (3.6) by  $\bar{n}_\Delta(r, f)$ . We call such points  $z_j$  *initial shifting poles* of  $f$  in  $\overline{D}(0, r)$ . For example, let

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

We see that  $\bar{n}_\Delta(r, f) = 4$  for  $r > 3$ . The initial shifting poles of  $f$  are  $z = 0, 0, -1, -1$  in  $\overline{D}(0, r)$  for  $r > 3$ . If  $g = \Gamma(z)$ , then  $\bar{n}_\Delta(r, g) = 1$  for  $r > 0$ . It is clear that the initial shifting pole of  $g$  is  $z = 0$  in  $\overline{D}(0, r)$  for any  $r > 0$ . Obviously, from the idea in [9], we obtain that

$$\bar{n}_\Delta(r, f) = \sum_{w \in \overline{D}(0, r)} \left( \text{ord}_w^-(f) - \min\{\text{ord}_w^-(f), \text{Ord}_{w-1 \in \overline{D}(0, r)}^-(f)\} \right), \quad (3.7)$$

where  $\text{ord}_w^-(0, r)(f)$  denotes the multiplicity of poles of  $f$  at  $z = w$ , and  $\text{Ord}_{w-1 \in \overline{D}(0, r)}^-(f)$  denotes the multiplicity of poles of  $f$  at  $z = w - 1$  when  $w - 1 \in \overline{D}(0, r)$ , if  $w - 1 \notin \overline{D}(0, r)$  then  $\text{Ord}_{w-1 \in \overline{D}(0, r)}^-(f) = 0$ . The corresponding integrated counting function is defined as

$$\overline{N}_\Delta(r, f) := \int_0^r \frac{\overline{n}_\Delta(t, f) - \overline{n}_\Delta(0, f)}{t} dt + \overline{n}_\Delta(0, f) \log r.$$

**Lemma 3.2** *Suppose that  $f$  is a meromorphic function of order  $\rho(f) < 1$ . Then*

$$N\left(r, \frac{\Delta f}{f}\right) = \overline{N}_\Delta(r, f) + \overline{N}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + O(1).$$

*Proof.* Since  $\Delta f/f = f(z+1)/f(z) - 1$ , from (3.5) and (3.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned} n\left(r, \frac{\Delta f}{f}\right) &= \sum_{w \in \overline{D}(0, r)} (\text{ord}_w(f) - \min\{\text{ord}_w(f), \text{ord}_{w+1}(f)\}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{w \in \overline{D}(0, r)} (\text{ord}_{w+1}^-(f) - \min\{\text{ord}_w^-(f), \text{ord}_{w+1}^-(f)\}) \\ &= \overline{n}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) - \sum_{\substack{|w| \leq r \\ |w+1| > r}} \min\{\text{ord}_w(f), \text{ord}_{w+1}(f)\} + \overline{n}_\Delta(r, f) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{|w| \leq r \\ |w+1| > r}} (\text{ord}_{w+1}^-(f) - \min\{\text{ord}_w^-(f), \text{ord}_{w+1}^-(f)\}) - \sum_{\substack{|w| \leq r \\ |w-1| > r}} \text{ord}_w^-(f). \end{aligned}$$

By Riemann-Stieltjes integral, it follows that

$$N\left(r, \frac{\Delta f}{f}\right) = \overline{N}_\Delta(r, f) + \overline{N}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + O\left(\sum_{\substack{|a_j| \leq r \\ |a_j+1| > r}} \log \frac{r}{|a_j|} - \sum_{\substack{|b_j| \leq r \\ |b_j+1| > r}} \log \frac{r}{|b_j+1|} + \sum_{\substack{|b_j| \leq r \\ |b_j-1| > r}} \log \frac{r}{|b_j|}\right),$$

where  $\{a_j\}$  are the sequence of zeros of  $f$  and  $\{b_j\}$  are the sequence of poles of  $f$ , with due to count of multiplicity. In addition, by using the inequality  $\log(1+x) \leq x$  and  $\rho(f) < 1$ ,

$$\sum_{\substack{|a_j| \leq r \\ |a_j+1| > r}} \log \frac{r}{|a_j|} = \sum_{\substack{|a_j| \leq r \\ |a_j+1| > r}} \log \left( \frac{r - |a_j|}{|a_j|} + 1 \right) \leq \sum_{\substack{|a_j| \leq r \\ |a_j+1| > r}} \frac{r - |a_j|}{|a_j|} \leq \sum_{\substack{|a_j| \leq r \\ |a_j+1| > r}} \frac{1}{|a_j|} < \infty.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{|b_j| \leq r \\ |b_j+1| > r}} \log \frac{|b_j+1|}{r} \leq \sum_{\substack{|b_j| \leq r \\ |b_j+1| > r}} \frac{|b_j+1| - r}{r} \leq \sum_{\substack{|b_j| \leq r \\ |b_j+1| > r}} \frac{1}{|b_j|} < \infty.$$

In addition, it yields that

$$\sum_{\substack{|b_j| \leq r \\ |b_j-1| > r}} \log \frac{r}{|b_j|} \leq \sum_{\substack{|b_j| \leq r \\ |b_j-1| > r}} \log \left( 1 + \frac{1}{|b_j|} \right) \leq \sum_{\substack{|b_j| \leq r \\ |b_j-1| > r}} \frac{1}{|b_j|} < \infty$$



Therefore, we prove our assertion.  $\square$

Suppose that  $f$  and  $g$  are entire functions, and suppose that  $z_1 \in \mathbb{C}$  is a shifting zero of  $f$  with height  $m$  and  $z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$  is a shifting zero of  $g$  with height  $n$ . Then from Theorem [11, Theorem 2.1], there exist entire functions  $F$  and  $G$  such that  $f(z) = (z - z_1)^{m_1}F(z)$  and  $g(z) = (z - z_2)^{n_1}G(z)$ , where  $1 \leq m_1 \leq m$  and  $1 \leq n_1 \leq n$ . If for some  $m_1, n_1$ ,

$$f(z)g(z) = (z - z_0)^{m_1+n_1}F(z)G(z),$$

where  $z_0$  is  $z_1$  or  $z_2$ , then  $z - z_0$  is called the *common shifting divisor* of  $f$  and  $g$ , which is the analogue of classical common divisor. If  $f$  and  $g$  do not have any nonconstant shifting common divisors, then  $f$  and  $g$  are called *relatively shifting prime*. Obviously, if  $f$  and  $g$  are shifting prime, then

$$\overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{fg} \right) = \overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f} \right) + \overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{g} \right).$$

**Remark 3.3** *Suppose that  $z = z_0$  is a simple shifting zero of an entire function  $f$ . If entire functions  $f$  and  $g$  do not have shifting common divisor  $z - z_0$ , then  $z = z_0$  is a simple shifting zero of  $f$  or  $z = z_0$  is not the zero of  $g$ .*

**Remark 3.4** *Suppose that  $z = z_0$  is a shifting zero of an entire function  $f$  with height  $m \geq 2$ , and a shifting zero of an entire function  $g$  with height  $n \geq 2$ . Then  $z - z_0$  is a shifting common divisor of  $f$  and  $g$ .*

**Remark 3.5** *From Remarks 3.3 and 3.4, we have if entire functions  $f$  and  $g$  are relatively shifting prime, then there exists  $h$  such that  $f/h$  and  $g/h$  are relatively prime entire functions, where all the shifting zeros of  $h$  are at most simple.*

Now it is possible for us to rewrite the difference analogue of the Stothers-Mason theorem [11, Theorem 3.4] as follows.

**Difference analogue of the Stothers-Mason theorem.** *Let  $a, b$  and  $c$  be relatively shifting prime polynomials such that  $a + b = c$  and such that  $a, b$  and  $c$  are not all constants. Then there exists  $R > 0$  such that for  $r > R$*

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c)\} &\leq \overline{n}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{abc} \right) - 1 \\ &= \overline{n}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{a} \right) + \overline{n}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{b} \right) + \overline{n}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{c} \right) - 1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

In the following, we proceed to generalize difference analogue of the Stothers-Mason theorem to entire functions of order  $< 1$ . Let us recall the useful notation.

Suppose that  $f$  is a nonconstant meromorphic function in the complex plane. Write  $f = a/b$  as the quotient of two entire functions  $a$  and  $b$  without common zeros. It is well known that Cartan characteristic function of  $f$  differs from its Nevanlinna characteristic function by a bounded term. The Cartan characteristic function, see [14, Section 2.5.2], is denoted by

$$T_{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n}(r) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log u(re^{i\theta}) d\theta - \log u(0), \quad u(re^{i\theta}) = \max\{|f_1(re^{i\theta})|, \dots, |f_n(re^{i\theta})|\},$$



where  $f_1, \dots, f_n$  are entire functions without common zeros. In order to study the relation on entire functions with common zeros in the section, we analogize the Cartan characteristic function and define

$$\tilde{T}_{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n}(r) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log u(re^{i\theta}) d\theta - \log u(0), \quad u(re^{i\theta}) = \max\{|a_1(re^{i\theta})|, \dots, |a_n(re^{i\theta})|\},$$

where  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  are entire functions such that  $u(0) \neq 0$ . Suppose that  $u(0) = 0$ , let the Laurent expansion of  $a_j(z)$  at origin be

$$a_j(z) = c_{\lambda_j} z^{\lambda_j} + c_{\lambda_j+1} z^{\lambda_j+1} + \dots, \quad c_{\lambda_j} \neq 0,$$

where  $\lambda_j = n(0, 1/a_j)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . Hence, we define

$$\tilde{T}_{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n}(r) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log u(re^{i\theta}) d\theta - \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \log |c_{\lambda_j}|.$$

**Lemma 3.6** *Suppose that  $a$  and  $b$  are entire functions, and  $n_{a,b}(r)$  denotes the number of common zeros of  $a$  and  $b$  counting multiplicity in the closed disc  $\overline{D}(0, r)$ . Then*

$$\tilde{T}_{a,b}(r) = T\left(r, \frac{a}{b}\right) + R_{a,b}(r) + O(1),$$

where  $R_{a,b}(r)$  is the integrated counting function of  $n_{a,b}(r)$  defined by

$$R_{a,b}(r) := \int_0^r \frac{n_{a,b}(t) - n_{a,b}(0)}{t} dt + n_{a,b}(0) \log r.$$

*Proof.* By Jensen formula and Nevanlinna main theory, it yields that

$$\begin{aligned} T\left(r, \frac{a}{b}\right) &= m\left(r, \frac{a}{b}\right) + N\left(r, \frac{a}{b}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ \left| \frac{a(re^{i\theta})}{b(re^{i\theta})} \right| d\theta + N\left(r, \frac{1}{b}\right) - R_{a,b}(r) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ \left| \frac{a(re^{i\theta})}{b(re^{i\theta})} \right| d\theta + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log |b(re^{i\theta})| d\theta - R_{a,b}(r) + O(1) \\ &= \tilde{T}_{a,b}(r) - R_{a,b}(r) + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

□

Now by using Lemma 3.6, it is easy to see that (3.8) is written as

$$\tilde{T}_{a,b,c}(r) \leq \overline{N}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{abc}\right) - \log r + O(1)$$

for large  $r$ . This inequality inspires us to generalize Stothers-Mason theorem for transcendental entire functions. Now let us state our result as follows.

**Theorem 3.7** *Let  $a, b$  and  $c$  be relatively shifting prime entire functions of order less than 1 such that*

$$a + b = c$$

and such that  $a, b$  and  $c$  are not all constants. Then there exists  $R > 0$  such that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{T}_{a,b,c}(r) &\leq \bar{N}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{abc}\right) - (1 - \delta - \varepsilon) \log r \\ &= \bar{N}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{a}\right) + \bar{N}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{b}\right) + \bar{N}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{c}\right) - (1 - \delta - \varepsilon) \log r\end{aligned}$$

holds for  $r > R$  outside an exceptional set on  $r$  with finite logarithmic measure, where  $\delta = \max\{\rho(a), \rho(b), \rho(c)\}$ .

*Proof.* We denote a set of common zeros of  $a$  and  $b$  by  $\{S_n\}$ . Since the common zeros of  $a$  and  $b$  are zeros of  $c$ , all the elements in  $\{S_n\}$  are zeros of  $c$ . We divided the set of zeros counting multiplicity of  $a$  (or  $b, c$ ) into two subsets, which are denoted by  $\{A_n\}$  (or  $\{B_n\}, \{C_n\}$ ) and  $\{S_n\}$ , respectively. For example,  $z_0$  is a zero of  $a$  with multiplicity 3 and a zero of  $b$  with multiplicity 2,  $z_0$  belongs to both sets  $\{S_n\}$  and  $\{A_n\}$ , while  $z_0 \notin \{B_n\}$ . Note here that the set  $\{S_n\}$  may be empty. Obviously, we see that there is no common elements in each two sets of  $\{A_n\}, \{B_n\}, \{C_n\}$ . From Remark 3.3, we know that if  $\{S_n\}$  is not empty, all the points in the set  $\{S_n\}$  are the simple shifting zeros of  $a$  or  $b, c$ , and it is impossible that there exists an element  $z \in \{A_n\} \cup \{B_n\} \cup \{C_n\}$  such that  $z \pm 1 \in \{S_n\}$ .

For any  $z' \in \{A_n\} \cup \{B_n\} \cup \{C_n - 1\}$ , it is known that  $z'$  is a zero of  $a(z)b(z)c(z+1)$  denoted by  $ab\bar{c}$ . We construct a canonical product  $h_1$  whose zeros are from  $z \in \{A_n\} \cup \{B_n\} \cup \{C_n - 1\}$  with multiplicity  $\text{ord}_z(ab\bar{c}) - \min\{\text{ord}_z(ab\bar{c}), \text{ord}_{z-1}(ab\bar{c})\}$ . That is,

$$h_1(z) = \prod_{w \in \{A_n\} \cup \{B_n\} \cup \{C_n - 1\}} \left(1 - \frac{z}{w}\right)^{\text{ord}_w(ab\bar{c}) - \min\{\text{ord}_w(ab\bar{c}), \text{ord}_{w-1}(ab\bar{c})\}}.$$

In addition, we construct  $h_2$  as

$$h_2 = \prod_{w \in \{S_n\}} \left(1 - \frac{z}{w}\right).$$

Now let us define an entire function  $h = h_1 h_2$ . It is clear that  $\rho(h) < 1$  and

$$N\left(r, \frac{1}{h}\right) \leq \bar{N}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{ab\bar{c}}\right) \leq \bar{N}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{a}\right) + \bar{N}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{b}\right) + \bar{N}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{c}\right). \quad (3.9)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{n}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{c}\right) &= \bar{n}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{c}\right) + \sum_{\substack{|w| \leq r \\ |w+1| > r}} (\text{ord}_{w+1}(c) - \min\{\text{ord}_w(c), \text{ord}_{w+1}(c)\}) \\ &\quad - \sum_{\substack{|w| \leq r \\ |w-1| > r}} (\text{ord}_w(c) - \min\{\text{ord}_w(c), \text{ord}_{w+1}(c)\}),\end{aligned}$$

it follows by Riemann-Stieltjes integral that

$$\bar{N}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{c}\right) = \bar{N}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{c}\right) + O\left(\sum_{\substack{|\alpha_j| \leq r \\ |\alpha_j+1| > r}} \log \frac{|\alpha_j+1|}{r} + \sum_{\substack{|\alpha_j| \leq r \\ |\alpha_j-1| > r}} \log \frac{r}{|\alpha_j|}\right),$$

where  $\{\alpha_j\}$  are zeros of  $c$  counting multiplicity. It gives us that

$$\sum_{\substack{|\alpha_j| \leq r \\ |\alpha_j+1| > r}} \log \frac{|\alpha_j+1|}{r} \leq \sum_{\substack{|\alpha_j| \leq r \\ |\alpha_j+1| > r}} \log \left( 1 + \frac{|\alpha_j|+1-r}{r} \right) \leq \sum_{\substack{|\alpha_j| \leq r \\ |\alpha_j+1| > r}} \frac{1}{|\alpha_j|} < \infty$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{|\alpha_j| \leq r \\ |\alpha_j-1| > r}} \log \frac{r}{|\alpha_j|} \leq \sum_{\substack{|\alpha_j| \leq r \\ |\alpha_j-1| > r}} \log \left( 1 + \frac{1}{|\alpha_j|} \right) \leq \sum_{\substack{|\alpha_j| \leq r \\ |\alpha_j-1| > r}} \frac{1}{|\alpha_j|} < \infty.$$

Therefore, it implies that

$$\bar{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{\bar{c}} \right) = \bar{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{c} \right) + O(1) \quad (3.10)$$

for entire function  $c$  of order  $\rho(c) < 1$ .

Let  $f = a/c$  and  $g = b/c$ . It is obvious that  $f + g = 1$  and  $\Delta f + \Delta g = 0$ . Hence

$$\frac{a}{b} = \frac{f}{g} = -\frac{\Delta g/g}{\Delta f/f} = -\frac{h\Delta g/g}{h\Delta f/f},$$

Then  $(\Delta g/g)h$  and  $(\Delta f/f)h$  are entire, and

$$k = -\frac{\Delta g h}{g a} = \frac{\Delta f h}{f b}$$

is also entire. Therefore, by Jensen formula, [4, Theorem 5.1], (3.9)-(3.10) and  $a, b, c$  are relatively shifting prime, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{a,b}(r) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log \max\{|a(re^{i\theta})|, |b(re^{i\theta})|\} d\theta + O(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log \max\{|ka|, |kb|\} d\theta - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log |k| d\theta + O(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log \max \left\{ \left| \frac{\Delta f}{f} \right|, \left| \frac{\Delta g}{g} \right| \right\} d\theta + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log |h| d\theta - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log |k| d\theta + O(1) \\ &\leq N \left( r, \frac{1}{h} \right) - (1 - \delta - \varepsilon) \log r - N \left( r, \frac{1}{k} \right) \\ &\leq \bar{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{a} \right) + \bar{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{b} \right) + \bar{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{c} \right) - (1 - \delta - \varepsilon) \log r \\ &= \bar{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{abc} \right) - (1 - \delta - \varepsilon) \log r \end{aligned}$$

for all  $r \notin E$ , where  $E$  has finite logarithmic measure and  $\delta = \max\{\rho(a), \rho(b), \rho(c)\}$ . In addition, since

$$\max\{|a|, |b|\} \leq \max\{|a|, |b|, |c|\} \leq 2 \max\{|a|, |b|\},$$

we have

$$\tilde{T}_{a,b,c}(r) = \tilde{T}_{a,b}(r) + O(1).$$

Therefore, it yields our assertion.  $\square$

**Remark 3.8** *The condition “order less than 1” in Theorem 3.7 is necessary. For example, let  $a = \sin \pi z$ ,  $b = \sin \pi(z - 1/2)$ , and  $c = \sqrt{2} \sin \pi(z - 1/4)$ . It is obvious that*

$$\tilde{T}_{a,b,c}(r) = r + O(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{abc} \right) = O(\log r).$$

*It shows that the inequality in Theorem 3.7 does not hold.*

The following theorem extends Theorem 3.7 for  $m + 1$  entire functions of order less than 1, see [11, Theorem 4.1] for the polynomial case.

**Theorem 3.9** *Let  $m$  be an integer such that  $m > 2$ . Suppose that  $f_1, \dots, f_{m+1}$  are pairwise relatively shifting prime entire functions of order  $< 1$  and  $f_1, \dots, f_m$  are linearly independent over periodic field with period one satisfying*

$$f_1 + f_2 + \dots + f_m = f_{m+1}.$$

*Then there exists  $R > 0$  such that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{f_1, \dots, f_{m+1}}(r) &\leq (m-1) \bar{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f_1 \dots f_{m+1}} \right) - \frac{m(m-1)}{2} (1 - \delta - \varepsilon) \log r \\ &= (m-1) \sum_{j=1}^{m+1} \bar{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f_j} \right) - \frac{m(m-1)}{2} (1 - \delta - \varepsilon) \log r \end{aligned}$$

*holds for  $r > R$  outside an exceptional set on  $r$  with finite logarithmic measure, where  $\delta = \max_{1 \leq j \leq m+1} \{\rho(f_j)\}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that entire functions  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{m+1}$  have no common zeros. Since  $f_1, \dots, f_{m+1}$  are linearly independent over periodic field with period one, it is obvious that  $f_1, \dots, f_{m+1}$  are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{C}$ . For each  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , we arrange the moduli of the function values  $|f_j(z)|$  in weakly decreasing order, that is,

$$|f_{l_1}(z)| \leq |f_{l_2}(z)| \leq \dots \leq |f_{l_{m+1}}(z)|,$$

where the integers  $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{m+1}$  depend on  $z$ . According to [2] or [5, Lemma 8.2], there exists a positive constant  $A$  that does not depend on  $z$ , such that

$$|f_j(z)| \leq A |f_{l_{m+1}}(z)| \quad \text{whenever} \quad 1 \leq j \leq m+1,$$

and  $f_{l_{m+1}}$  does not vanish at  $z$ . Using the fact that  $f_1 + f_2 + \dots + f_m = f_{m+1}$ , we have

$$\tilde{T}_{f_1, \dots, f_{m+1}}(r) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log |f_{l_{m+1}}(re^{i\theta})| d\theta + O(1), \quad (3.11)$$

where  $l_{m+1}$  depends on  $z$ . Moreover,  $f_{l_1}, \dots, f_{l_{m+1}}$  are linear combinations of  $f_1, \dots, f_m$ . Then there exists a constant  $K$  that depends on  $z$  with upper bound  $M$ , such that

$$\mathcal{C}(f_1, \dots, f_m) = K \mathcal{C}(f_{l_1}, \dots, f_{l_m}),$$

where  $\mathcal{C}(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m)(z)$  is Casorati determinant, see e.g., [13, Pages 354–357], [15, Pages 276–281], defined by

$$\mathcal{C}(z) = \mathcal{C}(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m)(z) = \begin{vmatrix} f_1(z) & f_2(z) & \cdots & f_m(z) \\ f_1(z+1) & f_2(z+1) & \cdots & f_m(z+1) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ f_1(z+m-1) & f_2(z+m-1) & \cdots & f_m(z+m-1) \end{vmatrix}.$$

Denote a non-constant meromorphic function by

$$G = \frac{\mathcal{C}(f_1, \dots, f_m)}{f_1 \cdots f_{m+1}}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$G = \frac{K\mathcal{C}(f_{l_1}, \dots, f_{l_m})}{f_{l_1} \cdots f_{l_{m+1}}} = \frac{K}{f_{l_{m+1}}} \begin{vmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \frac{f_{l_1}(z+1)}{f_{l_1}(z)} & \frac{f_{l_2}(z+1)}{f_{l_2}(z)} & \cdots & \frac{f_{l_m}(z+1)}{f_{l_m}(z)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{f_{l_1}(z+m-1)}{f_{l_1}(z)} & \frac{f_{l_2}(z+m-1)}{f_{l_2}(z)} & \cdots & \frac{f_{l_m}(z+m-1)}{f_{l_m}(z)} \end{vmatrix}. \quad (3.12)$$

Keeping in mind that  $f_1, \dots, f_{m+1}$  are relatively shifting prime entire functions of order less than 1, from Lemma 3.2 and proof of (3.10), we have

$$N(r, G) \leq (m-1) \sum_{j=1}^{m+1} \overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f_j} \right) + O(1) = (m-1) \overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f_1 \cdots f_{m+1}} \right) + O(1). \quad (3.13)$$

Hence, by Jensen formula, [4, Theorem 5.1], and (3.11)-(3.13), it yields that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{T}_{f_1, \dots, f_{m+1}}(r) &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log |f_{l_{m+1}}| d\theta + O(1) \\ &\leq N(r, G) - N \left( r, \frac{1}{G} \right) - \frac{m(m-1)}{2} (1 - \delta - \varepsilon) \log r \\ &\leq (m-1) \overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f_1 \cdots f_{m+1}} \right) - \frac{m(m-1)}{2} (1 - \delta - \varepsilon) \log r \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

holds for  $r > R$  outside an exceptional set on  $r$  with finite logarithmic measure, where  $\delta = \max_{1 \leq j \leq m+1} \{\rho(f_j)\}$ .

Suppose that entire functions  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{m+1}$  have common zeros. From Remark 3.5, there exists an entire function  $h$  of order  $\rho(h) < 1$  with simple shifting zeros such that  $g_j = f_j/h$  are entire without common zeros for  $j = 1, \dots, m+1$ . Substituting  $f_j$  to (3.14) and using Jensen's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{T}_{f_1, \dots, f_{m+1}}(r) &= \widetilde{T}_{g_1, \dots, g_{m+1}}(r) + \widetilde{T}_h(r) \\ &\leq (m-1) \overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{g_1 \cdots g_{m+1}} \right) - \frac{m(m-1)}{2} (1 - \delta' - \varepsilon) \log r + N \left( r, \frac{1}{h} \right) \\ &= (m-1) \overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{g_1 \cdots g_{m+1}} \right) - \frac{m(m-1)}{2} (1 - \delta' - \varepsilon) \log r + \overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{h} \right) \\ &\leq (m-1) \overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f_1 \cdots f_{m+1}} \right) - \frac{m(m-1)}{2} (1 - \delta - \varepsilon) \log r \end{aligned}$$

holds for  $r > R$  outside an exceptional set on  $r$  with finite logarithmic measure, where  $\delta' = \max_{1 \leq j \leq m+1} \{\rho(g_j)\} \leq \delta$ . Therefore, we prove the assertion.  $\square$

## 4 Difference analogue of truncated version of Nevanlinna second main theorem

Nevanlinna second main theorem which is a deep generalization of Picard's theorem implies that a non-constant meromorphic function cannot have too many points with high multiplicity. In this section, we proceed to show that a finite order meromorphic function which is not a periodic function with period one cannot have too many points with long height. The following theorems in this section heavily depend on the difference analogue of the lemma on the logarithmic derivative. The initial assumption is finite order meromorphic functions, see [3] and [6]. The best condition so far is for meromorphic functions  $f$  satisfying

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T(r, f)}{r} = 0, \quad (4.1)$$

see [21]. In order to make the paper readable, we state the following theorems in this section with the condition "finite order meromorphic functions". We note here that the best conditions for the theorems in this section are (4.1) instead of finite order meromorphic functions. Now let us state the difference analogue of truncated version of Nevanlinna second main theorem.

**Theorem 4.1** *Suppose that  $f$  is a meromorphic function of finite order such that  $\Delta f \not\equiv 0$ . Let  $q \geq 2$ , and let  $a_1, \dots, a_q$  be distinct constants. Then*

$$(q-1)T(r, f) \leq \overline{N}_\Delta(r, f) + \sum_{k=1}^q \overline{N}_\Delta\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_k}\right) + S(r, f), \quad (4.2)$$

where the exceptional set associated with  $S(r, f)$  is of at most finite logarithmic measure.

*Proof.* In order to prove Theorem 4.1, let us recall the difference analogue of Nevanlinna Second Main Theorem at first.

**Lemma 4.2** [6, Theorem 2.4] *Let  $c \in \mathbb{C}$ , and let  $f$  be a meromorphic function of finite order such that  $\Delta f \not\equiv 0$ . Let  $q \geq 2$ , and let  $a_1, \dots, a_q$  be distinct constants. Then*

$$m(r, f) + \sum_{k=1}^q m\left(r, \frac{1}{f-a_k}\right) \leq 2T(r, f) - N_{pair}(r, f) + S(r, f),$$

where

$$N_{pair}(r, f) := 2N(r, f) - N(r, \Delta f) + N\left(r, \frac{1}{\Delta f}\right)$$

and the exceptional set associated with  $S(r, f)$  is of at most finite logarithmic measure.

It is known that by Theorem 2.1

$$N(r, \Delta f) \leq N(r, f) + \overline{N}_\Delta(r, f)$$

Therefore, our result follows from Lemma 4.2 and (3.4).  $\square$

**Remark 4.3** *The difference analogue of Cartan's version of Nevanlinna second main theorem was given by Ishizaki et al. in [9, Theorem 5.7]. It is known that Nevanlinna second main theorem is a particular example of Cartan's version of Nevanlinna second main theorem, see [5, Page 447]. The authors cannot give any proof that Theorem 4.1 is a corollary of [9, Theorem 5.7].*

Suppose that  $z_n$  are initial shifting  $a$ -points of  $f$  with height  $m_n \geq 2$ . Then  $z = a$  is called *complete long value* of  $f$ . For example, let  $f = z^2$ , 0 is a complete long value of  $f$ , but for any  $z \neq 0$  is not. Therefore, we got the following result from Theorem 4.1.

**Theorem 4.4** *If  $f$  is a meromorphic function of finite order such that  $\Delta f \not\equiv 0$ , then  $f$  has at most four complete long values. In particular, if  $f$  is a finite order entire function such that  $\Delta f \not\equiv 0$ , then  $f$  has at most two complete long values.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $a_n$  are complete long values of  $f$ , where  $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ . It is known that

$$\overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f - a_n} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} N \left( r, \frac{1}{f - a_n} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} T(r, f) + O(1)$$

for  $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ . In addition, using Theorem 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (n-1)T(r, f) &\leq \overline{N}_\Delta(r, f) + \sum_{k=1}^n \overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f - a_k} \right) + S(r, f) \\ &\leq T(r, f) + \frac{n}{2}T(r, f) + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

where the exceptional set associated with  $S(r, f)$  is of at most finite logarithmic measure. Hence, we have  $n \leq 4$ . In addition, if  $f$  is a meromorphic function of finite order such that  $\Delta f \not\equiv 0$ , then

$$(n-1)T(r, f) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f - a_k} \right) + S(r, f) \leq \frac{n}{2}T(r, f) + S(r, f),$$

where the exceptional set associated with  $S(r, f)$  is of at most finite logarithmic measure. Hence, we have  $n \leq 2$ . We prove our assertion.  $\square$

Nevanlinna value distribution theory is concerned with the density of points where a meromorphic function takes a certain value in the complex plane, such as the quantity  $\theta(a, f)$  is the index of multiplicity of value  $a$ . A difference analogue of the index of multiplicity  $\theta(a, f)$  is called *index of height of value  $a$* , which is defined as

$$\theta_\Delta(a, f) := \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N \left( r, \frac{1}{f-a} \right) - \overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f-a} \right)}{T(r, f)},$$



where  $a \in \mathbb{C}$  or  $a = \infty$ . Obviously,  $\theta_{\Delta}(a, f)$  is positive only if there are relatively many shifting  $a$ -point of  $f$  with long height.

The following corollary reveals that a finite order meromorphic function which is not a periodic function with period one cannot have too many  $a$ -points with long height.

**Corollary 4.5** *Let  $f$  be a meromorphic function of finite order such that  $\Delta f \not\equiv 0$ . Then  $\theta_{\Delta}(a, f) = 0$  except for at most countably many values.*

It is well known that any polynomial is determined by its zero except for a constant factor, but it is not true for transcendental entire or meromorphic functions. Nevanlinna's five value theorem which is an important application of Nevanlinna second main theorem, says that if two non-constant meromorphic functions share five values ignoring multiplicity then these functions must be identical. By considering periodic functions instead of constants, and by ignoring height instead of multiplicity, we obtain a difference analogue of the five value theorem as follows.

We say  $f$  and  $g$  *shifting share a point* in the closed disc  $\overline{D}(0, r)$ , if  $f$  and  $g$  have the same initial shifting  $a$ -point in the closed disc  $\overline{D}(0, r)$ . We note that it is possible that  $a = \infty$ . For example, let  $f = z^3 = z(z-1)(z-2)$  and  $g = z$ . Then  $f$  and  $g$  shifting share 0 in  $\overline{D}(0, r)$  for  $r > 3$ . While  $h_1 = z$  and  $h_2 = z^2$  do not shifting share 0 in any disc. Because the initial shifting zero of  $h_1$  is 0 with multiplicity 2 and of  $h_2$  with multiplicity 1. If  $f$  and  $g$  shifting share  $a$ -point in  $\overline{D}(0, r)$  for any  $r > 0$ , then we say  $f$  and  $g$  shifting share  $a$ -point in the complex plane.

**Theorem 4.6** *Let  $f$  and  $g$  be finite order meromorphic functions, which are not periodic functions with period one. If there are five distinct values  $a_k$  in the extended complex plane, such that  $f$  and  $g$  shifting share  $a_k$  in the complex plane, for  $k = 1, \dots, 5$ . Then  $f \equiv g$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $f \not\equiv g$ . Then by Theorem 4.1,

$$3T(r, f) \leq \sum_{k=1}^5 \overline{N}_{\Delta} \left( r, \frac{1}{f - a_k} \right) + S(r, f)$$

and

$$3T(r, g) \leq \sum_{k=1}^5 \overline{N}_{\Delta} \left( r, \frac{1}{g - a_k} \right) + S(r, g)$$

hold outside a set with finite logarithmic measure. Since  $f$  and  $g$  shifting share  $a_k$  in the complex plane for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ , it implies that

$$\overline{N}_{\Delta} \left( r, \frac{1}{f - a_k} \right) = \overline{N}_{\Delta} \left( r, \frac{1}{g - a_k} \right)$$

for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
3(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^5 \overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{f - a_k} \right) + \sum_{k=1}^5 \overline{N}_\Delta \left( r, \frac{1}{g - a_k} \right) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
&\leq 2N \left( r, \frac{1}{f - g} \right) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
&\leq 2T \left( r, \frac{1}{f - g} \right) + S(r, f) + S(r, g) \\
&\leq 2(T(r, f) + T(r, g)) + S(r, f) + S(r, g)
\end{aligned}$$

From inequalities above, we have

$$T(r, f) + T(r, g) \leq S(r, f) + S(r, g),$$

which is a contradiction. There  $f = g + \alpha$ , where  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ . Our assertion  $f \equiv g$  follows by  $f$  and  $g$  have at least one common initial shifting  $a_j$ -point for  $j = 1, \dots, 5$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.7** *The condition  $k = 5$  is sharp. For example,  $f = e^z$  and  $f = e^{-z}$  shifting share  $0, 1, -1, \infty$  in the complex plane. However,  $f \not\equiv g$ .*

## References

- [1] Boole, G., *A treatise on the calculus of finite differences*. Reprint of the 1860 original. Cambridge Library Collection. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009.
- [2] Cartan, H., *Sur les zeros des combinaisons linéaires de  $p$  fonctions holomorphes données*. *Mathematica Cluj* **7** (1933), 5–31.
- [3] Chiang, Y.-M., and S.-J. Feng, *On the Nevanlinna characteristic of  $f(z+\eta)$  and difference equations in the complex plane*. *Ramanujan J.* **16** (2008), no. 1, 105–129.
- [4] Chiang, Y.-M., and S.-J. Feng, *On the growth of logarithmic differences, difference quotients and logarithmic derivatives of meromorphic functions*. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **361** (2009), no.7, 3767–3791.
- [5] Gundersen, G. and W. Hayman, *The strength of Cartan’s version of Nevanlinna theory*. *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **36** (2004), 433–454.
- [6] Halburd, R. and R. Korhonen, *Nevanlinna theory for the difference operator*. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* **31** (2006), no. 2, 463–478.
- [7] Lang, S., *Algebra*. Revised 3rd edn (Springer, New York, 2002).
- [8] Mason, R., *Diophantine equations over function fields*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 96, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984.
- [9] Ishizaki, K., R. korhonen, N. Li and K. Toghe, *A Stothers-Mason theorem with a difference radical*. *Math. Z.* **298** (2021), no.1-2, 671–696.

- [10] Ishizaki, K. and Z.-T. Wen, *Binomial series and complex difference equations*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **497** (2021), no.1, Paper No. 124844.
- [11] Ishizaki, K. and Z.-T. Wen, *Difference radical in terms of shifting zero and applications to the Stothers-Mason theorem*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **150** (2022), no.2, 731–745.
- [12] Kohno, M., *Global analysis in linear differential equations*. Mathematics and its Applications, 471, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1999.
- [13] Milne-Thomson, L. M., *The Calculus of Finite Differences*. Macmillan, London, 1933.
- [14] Noguchi, J. and J. Winkelmann, *Nevanlinna theory in several complex variables and Diophantine approximation*. Springer, Tokyo, 2014.
- [15] Nörlund, N. E., *Vorlesungen Über Differenzenrechnung*. Springer Berlin, 1924.
- [16] Pochhammer, L., *Ueber eine Gattung von bestimmten Integralen*. Math. Ann. XLI (1893), 167–173.
- [17] Snyder, N., *An alternate proof of Mason’s theorem*. Elem. Math. **55** (2000), no. 3, 93–94.
- [18] Stothers, W., *Polynomial identities and Hauptmoduln*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **32** (1981), no. 127, 349–370.
- [19] Weniger, E., *Summation of divergent power series by means of factorial series*. Appl. Numer. Math. **60**(12) (2010), 1429–1441.
- [20] Whittaker, E. and G. Watson, *A course of modern analysis*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1927.
- [21] Zheng, J. and R. Korhonen, *Studies of differences from the point of view of Nevanlinna theory*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **373** (2020), no.6, 4285–4318.

*R.-C. Chen*

SHANTOU UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS,  
DAXUE ROAD No. 243, SHANTOU 515063, CHINA  
email:21rcchen@stu.edu.cn

*Z.-T. Wen*

SHANTOU UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS,  
DAXUE ROAD No. 243, SHANTOU 515063, CHINA  
e-mail:zhtwen@stu.edu.cn