Zinelâabidine Latreuch · Benharrat Belaïdi

On Picard value problem of some difference polynomials

Received: 24 April 2017 / Accepted: 24 October 2017 / Published online: 16 November 2017
© The Author(s) 2017. This article is an open access publication

Abstract In this paper, we study the value distribution of zeros of certain nonlinear difference polynomials of entire functions of finite order.

Mathematics Subject Classification 30D35 · 39A05

المخلص

في هذا البحث، ندرس توزيع القيم لأصفار بعض كثيرات الحدود اللاخطية ذات الفروق لدوال شاملة ذات رتب منتهية.

1 Introduction and results

Throughout this paper, we assume that the reader is familiar with the fundamental results and the standard notations of the Nevanlinna's value distribution theory [10, 13]. In addition, we will use $\rho(f)$ to denote the order of growth of f , we say that a meromorphic function $a(z)$ is a small function of $f(z)$ if $T(r, a) = S(r, f)$, where $S(r, f) = o(T(r, f))$, as $r \rightarrow +\infty$ outside of a possible exceptional set of finite logarithmic measure, we use $S(f)$ to denote the family of all small functions with respect to $f(z)$. For a meromorphic function $f(z)$, we define its shift by $f_c(z) = f(z + c)$.

In 1959, Hayman proved in [11] that if f is a transcendental entire function, then $f^n f'$ assume every nonzero complex number infinitely many times, provided that $n \geq 3$. Later, Hayman [12] conjectured that this result remains to be valid when $n = 1$ and $n = 2$. Then Mues [18] confirmed the case when $n = 2$ and Bergweiler-Eremenko [2] and Chen-Fang [3] confirmed the case when $n = 1$, independently. Since then, there are many research publications (see [17]) regarding this type of Picard value problem. In 1997, Bergweiler obtained the following result.

Theorem 1.1 [1] *If f is a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order and q is a not identically zero polynomial, then $ff' - q$ has infinitely many zeros.*

In 2007, Laine and Yang studied the difference analogue of Hayman's theorem and proved the following result.

Theorem 1.2 [14] *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental entire function of finite order, and c be a nonzero complex constant. Then for $n \geq 2$, $f^n(z) f(z + c)$ assume every nonzero value $a \in \mathbb{C}$ infinitely often.*

Z. Latreuch · B. Belaïdi (✉)
Laboratory of Pure and Applied Mathematics, Department of Mathematics, University of Mostaganem (UMAB), B. P. 227,
Mostaganem, Algeria
E-mail: benharrat.belaidi@univ-mosta.dz

Z. Latreuch
E-mail: z.latreuch@gmail.com

In the same paper, Laine and Yang showed that Theorem 1.2 does not remain valid for the case $n = 1$. Indeed, take $f(z) = e^z + 1$. Then

$$f(z)f(z + \pi i) - 1 = (1 + e^z)(1 - e^z) - 1 = -e^{2z}.$$

After their, a stream of studies on the value distribution of nonlinear difference polynomials in f has been launched and many related results have been obtained, see, e.g. [5, 14–16]. For example, Liu and Yang improved the previous result and obtained the following.

Theorem 1.3 [15] *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental entire function of finite order, and c be a nonzero complex constant. Then for $n \geq 2$, $f^n(z)f(z+c) - p(z)$ has infinitely many zeros, where $p(z) \not\equiv 0$ is a polynomial in z .*

Hence, it is natural to ask: *What can be said about the value distribution of $f(z)f(z+c) - q(z)$; when f is a transcendental meromorphic function and q be a not identically zero small function of f ?* In this paper, as an attempt in resolving this question, we obtain the following results.

Theorem 1.4 *Let f be a transcendental entire function of finite order, let c_1, c_2 be two nonzero complex numbers such that $f(z+c_1) \not\equiv f(z+c_2)$ and q be not identically zero polynomial. Then $f(z)f(z+c_1) - q(z)$ and $f(z)f(z+c_2) - q(z)$ at least one of them has infinitely many zeros.*

The following corollary arises directly from Theorems 1.4 and 1.3.

Corollary 1.5 *Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer and let c_1, c_2 ($c_1c_2 \neq 0$) be two distinct complex numbers. Let α, β, p_1, p_2 and q ($\neq 0$) be nonconstant polynomials. If f is a finite order transcendental entire solution of*

$$\begin{cases} f^n(z)f(z+c_1) - q(z) = p_1(z)e^{\alpha(z)} \\ f^n(z)f(z+c_2) - q(z) = p_2(z)e^{\beta(z)} \end{cases},$$

then $n = 1$ and f must be a periodic function of period $c_1 - c_2$.

2 Some lemmas

The following lemma is an extension of the difference analogue of the Clunie lemma obtained by Halburd and Korhonen [8].

Lemma 2.1 [4] *Let $f(z)$ be a nonconstant, finite order meromorphic solution of*

$$f^n P(z, f) = Q(z, f),$$

where $P(z, f), Q(z, f)$ are the difference polynomials in $f(z)$ with meromorphic coefficients $a_j(z)$ ($j = 1, \dots, s$), and let $\delta < 1$. If the degree of $Q(z, f)$ as a polynomial in $f(z)$ and its shifts is at most n , then

$$m(r, P(z, f)) = o\left(\frac{T(r + |c|, f)}{r^\delta}\right) + o(T(r, f)) + O\left(\sum_{j=1}^s m(r, a_j)\right),$$

for all r outside an exceptional set of finite logarithmic measure.

Lemma 2.2 [6] *Let $f(z)$ be a nonconstant, finite order meromorphic function and let $c \neq 0$ be an arbitrary complex number. Then*

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

Lemma 2.3 [7] *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic function of finite order ρ , and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a given constant. Then, there exists a set $E_0 \subset (1, +\infty)$ that has finite logarithmic measure, such that for all z satisfying $|z| \notin E_0 \cup [0, 1]$, and for all $k, j, 0 \leq j < k$, we have*

$$\left| \frac{f^{(k)}(z)}{f^{(j)}(z)} \right| \leq |z|^{(k-j)(\rho-1+\varepsilon)}.$$

The following lemma is the lemma of the logarithmic derivative.

Lemma 2.4 [10] *Let f be a meromorphic function and let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

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

where $S(r, f) = O(\log T(r, f) + \log r)$, possibly outside a set $E_1 \subset [0, +\infty)$ of a finite linear measure. If f is of finite order of growth, then

$$m\left(r, \frac{f^{(k)}}{f}\right) = O(\log r).$$

The following lemma is a difference analogue of the lemma of the logarithmic derivative for finite order meromorphic functions.

Lemma 2.5 [6,8,9] *Let η_1, η_2 be two arbitrary complex numbers such that $\eta_1 \neq \eta_2$ and let $f(z)$ be a finite order meromorphic function. Let σ be the order of $f(z)$. Then for each $\varepsilon > 0$, we have*

$$m\left(r, \frac{f(z + \eta_1)}{f(z + \eta_2)}\right) = O(r^{\sigma-1+\varepsilon}).$$

Lemma 2.6 *Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental meromorphic solution of the system*

$$\begin{cases} f(z) f(z + c_1) - q(z) = p_1(z) e^{\alpha(z)}, \\ f(z) f(z + c_2) - q(z) = p_2(z) e^{\beta(z)}, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where α, β are polynomials and p_1, p_2, q are not identically zero rational functions. If $N(r, f) = S(r, f)$, then

$$\deg \alpha = \deg \beta = \deg(\alpha + \beta) = \rho(f) > 0.$$

Proof First, we prove that $\deg \alpha = \rho(f)$ and by the same we can deduce that $\deg \beta = \rho(f)$. It is clear from (2.1) that $\deg \alpha \leq \rho(f)$. Suppose that $\deg \alpha < \rho(f)$, this means that

$$f(z) f(z + c_1) := F = q(z) + p_1(z) e^{\alpha(z)} \in S(f). \quad (2.2)$$

Applying Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 into (2.2), we obtain $T(r, f_c) = T(r, f) = S(r, f)$ which is a contradiction. Assume now that $\deg(\alpha + \beta) < \rho(f)$, this leads to $p_1 p_2 e^{\alpha+\beta} \in S(f)$. From this and (2.1), we have

$$f^2 P(z, f) = p_1 p_2 e^{\alpha+\beta} + q^2,$$

where

$$P(z, f) = a(z) f^2 - b(z)$$

and

$$a = \frac{f_{c_1}}{f} \frac{f_{c_2}}{f}, \quad b = q \left(\frac{f_{c_1}}{f} + \frac{f_{c_2}}{f} \right).$$

It is clear that $P(z, f) \not\equiv 0$, and using Lemma 2.1, we get

$$m(r, P(z, f)) = S(r, f)$$

which leads to

$$2T(r, f) = m\left(r, \frac{b(z) + P(z, f)}{a(z)}\right) = S(r, f)$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $\deg(\alpha + \beta) = \deg \alpha = \deg \beta$. Finally, using Lemma 2.1, it is easy to see that both of α and β are nonconstant polynomials. $\square$

3 Proof of Theorem 1.4

We shall prove this theorem by contradiction. Suppose contrary to our assertion that both of $f(z)f(z+c_1)-q(z)$ and $f(z)f(z+c_2)-q(z)$ have finitely many zeros. Then, there exist four polynomials α, β, p_1 and p_2 such that

$$f(z)f(z+c_1)-q(z)=p_1(z)e^{\alpha(z)} \quad (3.1)$$

and

$$f(z)f(z+c_2)-q(z)=p_2(z)e^{\beta(z)}. \quad (3.2)$$

By differentiating (3.1) and eliminating e^α , we get

$$A_1 f f_{c_1} - f' f_{c_1} - f f'_{c_1} = B_1, \quad (3.3)$$

where $A_1 = \frac{p'_1}{p_1} + \alpha'$, $B_1 = \left(\frac{p'_1}{p_1} + \alpha'\right)q - q'$. By Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\deg \alpha = \deg \beta = \deg(\alpha + \beta) = \rho(f) > 0.$$

Now, we prove that $A_1 \neq 0$. To show this, we suppose the contrary. Then, there exists a constant A such that $A = p_1(z)e^\alpha$, which implies the contradiction $\deg \alpha = \rho(f) = 0$. By the same, we can prove that $B_1 \neq 0$. By the same arguments as above, (3.2) gives

$$A_2 f f_{c_2} - f' f_{c_2} - f f'_{c_2} = B_2, \quad (3.4)$$

where $A_2 = \frac{p'_2}{p_2} + \beta'$ and $B_2 = \left(\frac{p'_2}{p_2} + \beta'\right)q - q'$. Obviously, $A_2 \neq 0$ and $B_2 \neq 0$. Dividing both sides of (3.3) and (3.4) by f^2 , we get for each $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} 2m\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) &\leq m\left(r, \frac{f_{c_1}}{f}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{f' f_{c_1}}{f}\right) + m\left(r, \frac{f'_{c_1} f_{c_1}}{f}\right) + O(\log r) \\ &= O(r^{\rho-1+\varepsilon}) + O(\log r) = S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

So, by the first fundamental theorem, we deduce that

$$T(r, f) = N\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + O(r^{\rho-1+\varepsilon}) + O(\log r). \quad (3.5)$$

It is clear from (3.3) and (3.4) that any multiple zero of f is a zero of B_i ($i = 1, 2$). Hence,

$$N_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{B_i}\right) = O(\log r),$$

where $N_{(2)}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right)$ denotes the counting function of zeros of f whose multiplicities are not less than 2. It follows by this and (3.5) that

$$T(r, f) = N_{(1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) + O(r^{\rho-1+\varepsilon}) + O(\log r), \quad (3.6)$$

where $N_{(1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right)$ is the counting function of zeros, where only the simple zeros are considered. From (3.3) and (3.4), for every zero z_0 such that $f'(z_0) \neq 0$ which is not zero or pole of B_1 and B_2 , we have

$$(f' f_{c_1} + B_1)(z_0) = 0 \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$(f' f_{c_2} + B_2)(z_0) = 0. \quad (3.8)$$

By (3.7) and (3.8), we obtain

$$(B_2 f_{c_1} - B_1 f_{c_2})(z_0) = 0, \quad (3.9)$$

which means that the function $\frac{B_2 f_{c_1} - B_1 f_{c_2}}{f}$ has at most a finite number of simple poles. We consider two cases:

Case 1. $B_2 f_{c_1} - B_1 f_{c_2} \not\equiv 0$. Set

$$h(z) = \frac{B_2 f_{c_1} - B_1 f_{c_2}}{f(z)}. \quad (3.10)$$

Then, from the lemma of logarithmic differences, we have $m(r, h) = O(r^{\rho-1+\varepsilon}) + O(\log r)$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} N(r, h) &= N\left(r, \frac{B_2 f_{c_1} - B_1 f_{c_2}}{f}\right) = N_1\left(r, \frac{B_2 f_{c_1} - B_1 f_{c_2}}{f}\right) \\ &\quad + O(r^{\rho-1+\varepsilon}) + O(\log r) = S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $T(r, h) = O(r^{\rho-1+\varepsilon}) + O(\log r) = S(r, f)$. From the Eq. (3.10), we have

$$f_{c_1}(z) = \frac{B_1}{B_2} f_{c_2}(z) + \frac{h}{B_2} f(z). \quad (3.11)$$

By differentiating (3.11), we get

$$f'_{c_1}(z) = \left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)' f(z) + \frac{h}{B_2} f'(z) + \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)' f_{c_2}(z) + \frac{B_1}{B_2} f'_{c_2}(z). \quad (3.12)$$

Substituting (3.11) and (3.12) into (3.3)

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[\frac{A_1 h}{B_2} - \left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)'\right] f^2 + \left[-\frac{2h}{B_2}\right] f f' \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{A_1 B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'\right] f f_{c_2} - \frac{B_1}{B_2} f' f_{c_2} - \frac{B_1}{B_2} f f'_{c_2} = B_1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Equation (3.4), can be rewritten as

$$-\frac{B_1 A_2}{B_2} f f_{c_2} + \frac{B_1}{B_2} f' f_{c_2} + \frac{B_1}{B_2} f f'_{c_2} = -B_1.$$

By adding this to (3.13), we get

$$\left[\frac{A_1 h}{B_2} - \left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)'\right] f + \left[-\frac{2h}{B_2}\right] f' + \left[\frac{A_1 B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)' - \frac{B_1 A_2}{B_2}\right] f_{c_2} = 0. \quad (3.14)$$

Its clear that $-\frac{2h}{B_2} \not\equiv 0$. To complete the proof of our theorem, we need to prove

$$\frac{A_1 h}{B_2} - \left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)' \not\equiv 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{A_1 B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)' - \frac{B_1 A_2}{B_2} \not\equiv 0.$$

Suppose contrary to our assertion that $\frac{A_1 h}{B_2} - \left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)' \equiv 0$. Then, by the definition of A_1 and by simple integration, we get

$$p_1 e^\alpha = C_1 \frac{h}{B_2},$$

where C_1 is a nonzero constant. This implies that $\deg \alpha = \rho(f) - 1$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $\frac{A_1 h}{B_2} - \left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)' \not\equiv 0$. Next, we shall prove $\frac{A_1 B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)' - \frac{B_1 A_2}{B_2} \not\equiv 0$. Suppose that $\frac{A_1 B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)' - \frac{B_1 A_2}{B_2} \equiv 0$. Then, we obtain

$$\frac{p_1}{p_2} e^{\alpha-\beta} = C_2 \frac{B_1}{B_2} := \gamma,$$

where C_2 is a nonzero constant and γ is a small function of f . From (3.1) and (3.2), we get

$$f(f_{c_1} - \gamma f_{c_2}) = (1 - \gamma)q. \quad (3.15)$$

If $\gamma \neq 1$, then by applying Clunie's lemma to (3.15), we obtain

$$m(r, f_{c_1} - \gamma f_{c_2}) = T(r, f_{c_1} - \gamma f_{c_2}) = S(r, f).$$

By this and (3.15), we have

$$T(r, f) = T\left(r, \frac{(1-\gamma)q}{f_{c_1} - \gamma f_{c_2}}\right) = S(r, f)$$

which is a contradiction. If $\gamma \equiv 1$, then we obtain the contradiction $f_{c_1}(z) \equiv f_{c_2}(z)$. Thus, $\frac{A_1 B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)' - \frac{B_1 A_2}{B_2} \neq 0$. From the above discussion and (3.14), we have

$$f_{c_2}(z) = M(z) f(z) + N(z) f'(z) \quad (3.16)$$

and

$$f_{c_1}(z) = \varphi(z) f(z) + \psi(z) f'(z), \quad (3.17)$$

where

$$M = \frac{\left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)' - A_1 \frac{h}{B_2}}{(A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'}, \quad N = \frac{\frac{2h}{B_2}}{(A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2}\right)'}$$

and

$$\varphi(z) = \frac{B_1}{B_2} M + \frac{h}{B_2}, \quad \psi = \frac{B_1}{B_2} N.$$

Differentiation of (3.16) gives

$$f'_{c_2} = M' f + (M + N') f' + N f''. \quad (3.18)$$

Substituting (3.16) and (3.18) into (3.4), we get

$$[M' - A_2 M] f^2 + [N' - A_2 N + 2M] f' f + N \left((f')^2 + f f'' \right) = -B_2. \quad (3.19)$$

Differentiating (3.19), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & [M' - A_2 M]' f^2 + \left(2[M' - A_2 M] + [N' - A_2 N + 2M]' \right) f' f \\ & + (2N' - A_2 N + 2M) \left((f')^2 + f f'' \right) + N (3f' f'' + f f''') = -B_2'. \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

Suppose z_0 is a simple zero of f and not a zero or pole of B_2 . Then from (3.19) and (3.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(N f' + \frac{B_2}{f'} \right) (z_0) = 0, \\ & \left[(2N' - A_2 N + 2M) f' + 3N f'' + \frac{B_2'}{f'} \right] (z_0) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that z_0 is a zero of $[B_2 (2N' - A_2 N + 2M) - B_2' N] f' + 3B_2 N f''$. Therefore, the function

$$H = \frac{[2B_2 N' - B_2 A_2 N + 2B_2 M - B_2' N] f' + 3B_2 N f''}{f}$$

satisfies $T(r, H) = S(r, f)$ and

$$f'' = \frac{H}{3B_2 N} f + \frac{[-2B_2 N' + B_2 A_2 N - 2B_2 M + B_2' N]}{3B_2 N} f'. \quad (3.21)$$

Substituting (3.21) into (3.19), we get

$$q_1 f^2 + q_2 f' f + q_3 (f')^2 = -B_2, \quad (3.22)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} q_1 &= M' - A_2 M + \frac{H}{3B_2}, \\ q_2 &= \frac{1}{3}N' + \frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{B_2'}{B_2} - 2A_2\right)N + \frac{4}{3}M, \quad q_3 = N. \end{aligned}$$

We prove first $q_2 \neq 0$. Suppose the contrary. Then

$$\frac{q_2}{q_3} = \frac{2}{3}\frac{N'}{N} - \frac{1}{3}\frac{B_2'}{B_2} - \frac{2}{3}(A_1 + A_2) + \frac{2}{3}\frac{h'}{h} = 0$$

which leads to

$$\alpha' + \beta' = \frac{N'}{N} - 2\frac{B_2'}{B_2} + \frac{h'}{h} - \frac{p_1'}{p_1} - \frac{p_2'}{p_2}.$$

By simple integration of both sides of the above equation, we get

$$p_1 p_2 e^{\alpha+\beta} = c \frac{N}{B_2^2} h, \quad (3.23)$$

where c is a nonzero constant, this leads to the contradiction $\deg(\alpha + \beta) < \deg \alpha = \deg \beta$. Hence, $q_2 \neq 0$. Differentiating (3.22), we obtain

$$q_1' f^2 + (2q_1 + q_2') f' f + (q_2 + q_3') (f')^2 + q_2 f'' f + 2q_3 f' f'' = -B_2'. \quad (3.24)$$

Let z_0 be a simple zero of f which is not a zero or pole of B_2 . Then from (3.22) and (3.24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(q_3 f' + \frac{B_2}{f'}\right)(z_0) &= 0, \\ \left[(q_2 + q_3') f' + 2q_3 f'' + \frac{B_2'}{f'}\right](z_0) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, z_0 is a zero of $(B_2(q_2 + q_3') - B_2' q_3) f' + 2B_2 q_3 f''$. Hence, the function

$$R = \frac{(B_2(q_2 + q_3') - B_2' q_3) f' + 2B_2 q_3 f''}{f}$$

satisfies $T(r, R) = S(r, f)$ and

$$f'' = \frac{R}{2B_2 q_3} f + \frac{B_2' q_3 - B_2(q_2 + q_3')}{2B_2 q_3} f'. \quad (3.25)$$

Substituting (3.25) into (3.24)

$$\begin{aligned} \left[q_1' + \frac{q_2 R}{2B_2 q_3}\right] f^2 + \left[2q_1 + q_2' + \frac{1}{2}\frac{B_2'}{B_2} q_2 - \frac{1}{2}(q_2 + q_3') \frac{q_2}{q_3} + \frac{R}{B_2}\right] f' f \\ + \frac{B_2' q_3}{B_2} (f')^2 = -B_2'. \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

Combining (3.26) and (3.22), we obtain

$$\left[q_1' + \frac{q_2 R}{2B_2 q_3} - \frac{B_2'}{B_2} q_1\right] f + \left[2q_1 + q_2' - \frac{1}{2}\frac{B_2'}{B_2} q_2 - \frac{1}{2}(q_2 + q_3') \frac{q_2}{q_3} + \frac{R}{B_2}\right] f' = 0. \quad (3.27)$$

From (3.27), we deduce that

$$q_1' + \frac{q_2 R}{2B_2 q_3} - \frac{B_2'}{B_2} q_1 = 0$$

and

$$2q_1 + q'_2 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{B'_2}{B_2} q_2 - \frac{1}{2} (q_2 + q'_3) \frac{q_2}{q_3} + \frac{R}{B_2} = 0.$$

By eliminating R from the above two equations, we obtain

$$q_3 (4q_1 q_3 - q_2^2) \frac{B'_2}{B_2} + q_2 (4q_1 q_3 - q_2^2) - q_3 (4q_1 q_3 - q_2^2)' + q'_3 (4q_1 q_3 - q_2^2) = 0. \quad (3.28)$$

Thus, Eq. (3.25) can be rewritten as

$$f'' = \left(\frac{B'_2}{B_2} \frac{q_1}{q_2} - \frac{q'_1}{q_2} \right) f + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{B'_2}{B_2} - \frac{q_2}{q_3} - \frac{N'}{N} \right) f'. \quad (3.29)$$

Subcase 1. If $4q_1 q_3 - q_2^2 \neq 0$, then from (3.28), we have

$$\frac{q_2}{q_3} = \frac{(4q_1 q_3 - q_2^2)'}{(4q_1 q_3 - q_2^2)} - \frac{B'_2}{B_2} - \frac{q'_3}{q_3}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\frac{q_2}{q_3} = \frac{1}{3} \frac{N'}{N} + \frac{1}{3} \frac{B'_2}{B_2} - \frac{2}{3} (A_1 + A_2) + \frac{2}{3} \frac{\left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)'}{\frac{h}{B_2}}.$$

Hence,

$$2(A_1 + A_2) = -3 \frac{(4q_1 q_3 - q_2^2)'}{(4q_1 q_3 - q_2^2)} + 4 \frac{N'}{N} + 4 \frac{B'_2}{B_2} + 2 \frac{\left(\frac{h}{B_2}\right)'}{\frac{h}{B_2}}.$$

By the definition of A_i ($i = 1, 2$) and simple integration, we deduce that

$$\deg(\alpha + \beta) < \deg \alpha = \deg \beta$$

which is a contradiction.

Subcase 2. If $4q_1 q_3 \equiv q_2^2$, then from (3.29) and (3.21), we have

$$\frac{B'_2}{B_2} \frac{q_1}{q_2} - \frac{q'_1}{q_2} = \frac{H}{3B_2 N}. \quad (3.30)$$

On the other hand,

$$\frac{q_1}{q_3} - \frac{M' - A_2 M}{N} = \frac{H}{3B_2 N}. \quad (3.31)$$

Combining (3.30) and (3.31), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{5 B_2'}{4 B_2} \frac{\left((A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' \right)'}{\left((A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' \right)'} \\ & + \frac{1}{6} \left(\frac{\left((A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' \right)'}{\left((A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' \right)'} \right)' - \left(\frac{1}{2} A_1 + A_2 \right) \frac{\left((A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' \right)'}{\left((A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' \right)'} \\ & - \frac{5 h'}{3 h} \frac{\left((A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' \right)'}{\left((A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' \right)'} - \frac{5}{6} (A_1 + A_2) \frac{h'}{h} + \frac{23 B_2' h'}{12 B_2 h} - \frac{5}{4} \left(\frac{h'}{h} \right)^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{9} (A_1 + A_2) \frac{\left((A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' \right)'}{\left((A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' \right)'} + \frac{1 B_2'}{9 B_2} \frac{\left((A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' \right)'}{\left((A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' \right)'} \\ & + \frac{2 B_2'}{9 B_2} (A_1 + A_2) - \frac{7}{9} \left(\frac{B_2'}{B_2} \right)^2 - \frac{19}{36} \left(\frac{\left((A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' \right)'}{\left((A_1 - A_2) \frac{B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' \right)'} \right)^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{6} \left(\frac{B_2'}{B_2} \right)' - \frac{1}{2} A_1' + \frac{1}{3} (A_1' + A_2') + \frac{1}{3} (A_1 + A_2) \frac{B_2'}{B_2} + \frac{1}{2} A_2 A_1 \\ & = \frac{1}{9} (A_1 + A_2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides of the above equation by $\frac{(A_1+A_2)^2}{2}$ and since $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R'(z)}{R(z)} = 0$ if R is a nonzero rational function, we obtain

$$\left| \frac{A_2 A_1}{(A_1 + A_2)^2} - \frac{2}{9} \right| \leq \frac{5}{3} \frac{\left| \frac{h'}{h} \right|}{|A_1 + A_2|} + \frac{23}{6} \left| \frac{B_2'}{B_2} \right| \frac{\left| \frac{h'}{h} \right|}{|A_1 + A_2|^2} + \frac{5}{2} \frac{\left| \frac{h'}{h} \right|^2}{|A_1 + A_2|^2} + o(1) \quad (3.32)$$

On the other hand, since $\rho(h) \leq \rho(f) - 1$ and by Lemma 2.3

$$\left| \frac{h'(z)}{h(z)} \right| \leq |z|^{\rho(f)-2+\varepsilon}, \quad (3.33)$$

for all z satisfying $|z| \notin E_0 \cup [0, 1]$, where $E_0 \subset (1, \infty)$ is a set of finite logarithmic measure. By combining (3.32) and (3.33), we deduce

$$\lim_{\substack{z \rightarrow \infty \\ |z| \notin E_0 \cup [0, 1]}} \frac{A_2 A_1}{(A_1 + A_2)^2} = \lim_{\substack{z \rightarrow \infty \\ |z| \notin E_0 \cup [0, 1]}} \frac{\alpha' \beta'}{(\alpha' + \beta')^2} = \frac{2}{9}.$$

By setting $\alpha(z) = a_m z^m + \cdots + a_0$ and $\beta(z) = b_m z^m + \cdots + b_0$, we deduce

$$\lim_{\substack{z \rightarrow \infty \\ |z| \notin E_0 \cup [0, 1]}} \frac{\alpha' \beta'}{(\alpha' + \beta')^2} = \frac{a_m b_m}{(a_m + b_m)^2} = \frac{2}{9}$$

which implies that $\frac{a_m}{b_m} = 2$ or $\frac{1}{2}$. We consider first the case $\frac{a_m}{b_m} = \frac{1}{2}$, we get from (3.1) and (3.17)

$$\varphi f^2 + \psi f' f - q = A e^{\frac{1}{2} b_m z^m} \quad (3.34)$$

and

$$Mf^2 + Nf'f - q = Be^{b_m z^m}, \quad (3.35)$$

where $A = p_1 e^{a_{m-1} z^{m-1} + \dots + a_0}$ and $B = p_2 e^{b_{m-1} z^{m-1} + \dots + b_0}$. From (3.34) and (3.35), we get

$$\varphi f^2 + \psi f'f = q + A \left(\frac{Mf^2 + Nf'f - q}{B} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence,

$$\varphi f + \psi f' = \frac{q}{f} + A \left(\frac{Mf^2 + Nf'f - q}{Bf^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} T(r, \varphi f + \psi f') &= m(r, \varphi f + \psi f') + S(r, f) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{E_1} \log^+ \left| \varphi(re^{i\theta}) f(re^{i\theta}) + \psi(re^{i\theta}) f'(re^{i\theta}) \right| d\theta \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{E_2} \log^+ \left| \varphi(re^{i\theta}) f(re^{i\theta}) + \psi(re^{i\theta}) f'(re^{i\theta}) \right| d\theta + S(r, f), \end{aligned}$$

where $E_1 = \{\theta : |f(re^{i\theta})| \leq 1\}$ and $E_2 = \{\theta : |f(re^{i\theta})| > 1\}$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{E_1} \log^+ \left| \varphi(re^{i\theta}) f(re^{i\theta}) + \psi(re^{i\theta}) f'(re^{i\theta}) \right| d\theta \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{E_1} \log^+ |f'(re^{i\theta})| d\theta + S(r, f) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{E_1} \log^+ \left| \frac{f'(re^{i\theta})}{f(re^{i\theta})} \right| d\theta + S(r, f) = S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{E_2} \log^+ \left| \varphi(re^{i\theta}) f(re^{i\theta}) + \psi(re^{i\theta}) f'(re^{i\theta}) \right| d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{E_2} \log^+ \left| \frac{q(re^{i\theta})}{f(re^{i\theta})} \right| d\theta \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{E_2} \log^+ \left| \frac{M(re^{i\theta})}{B(re^{i\theta})} + \frac{N(re^{i\theta}) f'(re^{i\theta})}{B(re^{i\theta}) f(re^{i\theta})} - \frac{q(re^{i\theta})}{f^2(re^{i\theta})} \right| d\theta + S(r, f) = S(r, f). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$T(r, f_{c_1}) = T(r, \varphi f + \psi f') = S(r, f)$$

which is a contradiction. If $\frac{a_m}{b_m} = 2$, then by the same argument, we have

$$Mf^2 + Nf'f = q + B \left(\frac{\varphi f^2 + \psi f'f - q}{A} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

which implies the contradiction

$$T(r, f_{c_2}) = T(r, Mf + Nf') = S(r, f).$$

Case 2. $B_2 f_{c_1} - B_1 f_{c_2} \equiv 0$, using the same arguments as in the proof of (3.14), we obtain that

$$\frac{A_1 B_1}{B_2} - \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} \right)' - \frac{B_1 A_2}{B_2} \equiv 0$$

which leads to

$$\frac{p_1}{p_2} e^{\alpha-\beta} = k \frac{B_1}{B_2} = k \frac{f_{c_1}}{f_{c_2}}, \quad (3.36)$$

where k is a nonzero complex constant. By this (3.1) and (3.2), we have

$$(1 - c) f f_{c_1} f_{c_2} = q (f_{c_2} - k f_{c_1}). \quad (3.37)$$

If $k \neq 1$, then by applying Clunie lemma to (3.37), we deduce the contradiction $T(r, f_{c_i}) = S(r, f)$. Hence, $k = 1$ and from the equation (3.36), we conclude that $f_{c_1} \equiv f_{c_2}$ which exclude the hypothesis of our theorem. This shows that at least one of $f(z) f(z + c_1) - q(z)$ and $f(z) f(z + c_2) - q(z)$ has infinitely many zeros.

Acknowledgements The authors are grateful to the anonymous referee for his/her valuable comments and suggestions which lead to the improvement of this paper.

Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.

References

1. Bergweiler, W.: On the product of a meromorphic function and its derivative. *Bull. Hong Kong Math. Soc.* **1**, 97–101 (1997)
2. Bergweiler, W.; Eremenko, A.: On the singularities of the inverse to a meromorphic function of finite order. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* **11**(2), 355–373 (1995)
3. Chen, H.H.; Fang, M.L.: The value distribution of $f^n f'$. *Chin. Ser. A* **38**(7), 789–798 (1995)
4. Chen, Z.X.: *Complex Differences and Difference Equations*, vol. 29. Mathematics Monograph Series Science Press, Beijing (2014)
5. Chen, Z.X.: On value distribution of difference polynomials of meromorphic functions. *Abstr. Appl. Anal.* Art. ID 239853, pp. 9 (2011)
6. Chiang, Y.M.; Feng, S.J.: On the Nevanlinna characteristic of $f(z + \eta)$ and difference equations in the complex plane. *Ramanujan J.* **16**(1), 105–129 (2008)
7. Gundersen, G.G.: Estimates for the logarithmic derivative of a meromorphic function, plus similar estimates. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* (2) **37**(1), 88–104 (1988)
8. 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**(2), 477–487 (2006)
9. Halburd, R.G.; Korhonen, R.J.: Nevanlinna theory for the difference operator. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* **31**(2), 463–478 (2006)
10. Hayman, W.K.: *Meromorphic Functions*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Clarendon Press, Oxford (1964)
11. Hayman, W.K.: Picard values of meromorphic functions and their derivatives. *Ann. Math.* **2**(70), 9–42 (1959)
12. Hayman, W.K.: *Research Problems in Function Theory*. The Athlone Press University of London, London (1967)
13. Laine, I.: *Nevanlinna Theory and Complex Differential Equations*, de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, vol. 15. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin (1993)
14. Laine, I.; Yang, C.C.: Value distribution of difference polynomials. *Proc. Jpn. Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.* **83**(8), 148–151 (2007)
15. Liu, K.; Yang, L.Z.: Value distribution of the difference operator. *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **92**(3), 270–278 (2009)
16. Li, N.; Yang, L.: Value distribution of certain type of difference polynomials. *Abstr. Appl. Anal.* Art. ID 278786, pp. 6 (2014)
17. Lü, W.; Liu, N.; Yang, C.; Zhuo, C.: Notes on value distributions of $ff^{(k)} - b$. *Kodai Math. J.* **39**(3), 500–509 (2016)
18. Mues, E.: Über ein problem von Hayman. *Math. Z.* **164**(3), 239–259 (1979). (in German)

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.