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#### Abstract

This paper is devoted to studying the sharing value problem for the derivative of a meromorphic function with its shift and $q$-difference. The results in the paper improve and generalize the recent result due to Qi, Li and Yang [28].
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## 1. Introduction and main results

By a meromorphic function we shall always mean a meromorphic function in the complex plane. Let $k$ be a positive integer or infinity and $a \in C \cup\{\infty\}$. Set $E(a, f)=\{z: f(z)-a=0\}$, where a zero point with multiplicity $k$ is counted $k$ times in the set. If these zeros points are only counted once, then we denote the set by $\bar{E}(a, f)$. Let $f$ and $g$ be two nonconstant meromorphic functions. If $E(a, f)=E(a, g)$, then we say that $f$ and $g$ share the value $a$ CM; if $\bar{E}(a, f)=\bar{E}(a, g)$, then we say that $f$ and $g$ share the value $a \mathrm{IM}$. We denote by $E_{k)}(a, f)$ the set of all $a$-points of $f$ with multiplicities not exceeding $k$, where an $a$-point is counted according to its multiplicity. Also we denote by $\bar{E}_{k)}(a, f)$ the set of distinct $a$-points of $f$ with multiplicities not greater than $k$. We denote by $N_{k)}(r, 1 /(f-a))$ the counting function for zeros of $f-a$ with multiplicity less than or equal to $k$, and by $\bar{N}_{k)}(r, 1 /(f-a))$ the corresponding one for which multiplicity is not counted. Let $N_{(k}(r, 1 /(f-a))$ be the counting function for zeros of $f-a$ with multiplicity at least $k$ and $\bar{N}_{k}(r, 1 /(f-a))$ the corresponding one for which multiplicity is not counted. It is assumed that the reader is familiar with the notations of Nevanlinna theory such as $T(r, f)$, $m(r, f), N(r, f), \bar{N}(r, f), S(r, f)$ and so on, that can be found, for instance, in

[^0][14][36].
Around 2001, I Lahiri introduced the notion of weighted sharing, which measures how close a shared value is to being shared CM or to being shared IM. The definition is as follows.
Definition 1.1. [16] For a complex number $a \in C \cup\{\infty\}$, we denote by $E_{k}(a, f)$ the set of all a-points of $f$ where an $a$-point with mutiplicity $m$ is counted $m$ times if $m \leq k$ and $k+1$ times if $m>k$. For a complex number $a \in C \cup\{\infty\}$, such that $E_{k}(a, f)=E_{k}(a, g)$, then we say that $f$ and $g$ share the value $a$ with weight $k$.

The definition implies that if $f, g$ share a value $a$ with weight $k$, then $z_{0}$ is a zero of $f-a$ with multiplicity $m(\leq k)$ if and only if it is a zero of $g-a$ with multiplicity $m(\leq k)$ and $z_{0}$ is a zero of $f-a$ with multiplicity $m(>k)$ if and only if it is a zero of $g-a$ with multiplicity $n(>k)$, where $m$ is not necessarily equal to $n$. We write $f, g$ share $(a, k)$ to mean that $f, g$ share the value $a$ with weight $k$. Clearly if $f, g$ share $(a, k)$ then $f, g$ share $(a, p)$ for all integer $p, 0 \leq p<k$. Also we note that $f, g$ share a value $a$ IM or CM if and only if $f, g$ share $(a, 0)$ or $(a, \infty)$ respectively.

Mermorphic functions sharing values with their derivatives has become a subject of great interest in uniqueness theory. The paper by Rubel and Yang is the starting point of this topic, along with the following.
Theorem 1.2. [30] Let $f$ be a nonconstant entire function. If $f$ and $f^{\prime}$ share two distinct finite values $C M$, then $f=f^{\prime}$.

Now one may ask the following question: Can we change the number 2 of shared values to 1 in the Theorem 1.1? The following counterexample from shows the answer is negative. Let $f=e^{e^{z}} \int_{0}^{z} e^{-e^{t}}\left(1-e^{t}\right) d t$. Clearly, $f$ and $f^{\prime}$ share 1 CM but $f \neq f^{\prime}$. In a special case, we recall a well-known conjecture by Brück [4]: Let $f$ be a nonconstant entire function such that hype order $\sigma_{2}(f)<\infty$ and $\sigma_{2}(f)$ isn't positive integer. If $f$ and $f^{\prime}$ share the finite value $a \mathrm{CM}$, then $\frac{f^{\prime}-a}{f-a}=c$, where $c$ is nonzero constant. The conjecture has been verified in the special cases when $a=0$ [4], or when $f$ is of finite order [12], or when $\sigma_{2}(f)<\frac{1}{2}[7]$. Many results have been obtained for this and related topics(See [1], [5],[11],,[17],[18],,[23]-[27],[31],[32], [34],[35],,[37],[39],[41]-[44] and the references therein).

Heittokangas et al. considered analogues of Brück's conjecture for meromorphic functions concerning their shifts, and proved the following theorem.
Theorem 1.3. [15] Let $f$ be a meromorphic function of order $\sigma(f)<2$ and let $c \in C$. If $f(z)$ and $f(z+c)$ share the values $a \in C$ and $\infty C M$, then

$$
\frac{f(z+c)-a}{f(z)-a}=\tau
$$

for some constant $\tau$.
Since then, many mathematicians considered this topic (See [6],[8],[10],[19][22],[29],[38] and the references therein). In 2018, Qi, Li and Yang considered the value sharing problem related to $f^{\prime}(z)$ and $f(z+c)$, where $c$ is a complex number. They obtained the following result.
Theorem 1.4. [28] Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant meromorphic function of finite order, $n \geq 9$ be an integer. If $\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$ and $f^{n}(z+c)$ share $a(\neq 0)$ and $\infty C M$, then $f^{\prime}(z)=t f(z+c)$, for a constant $t$ that satisfies $t^{n}=1$.

It is natural to ask whether the nature of sharing values can be reduced in Theorem 1.4. Considering this question, we prove the following results.
Theorem 1.5. Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant meromorphic function of finite order, $n \geq 10$ be an integer. If $\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$ and $f^{n}(z+c)$ share $(1,2)$ and $(\infty, 0)$, then $f^{\prime}(z)=t f(z+c)$, for a constant that satisfies $t^{n}=1$.
Theorem 1.6. Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant meromorphic function of finite order, $n \geq 9$ be an integer. If $\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$ and $f^{n}(z+c)$ share $(1,2)$ and $(\infty, \infty)$, then $f^{\prime}(z)=t f(z+c)$, for a constant $t$ that satisfies $t^{n}=1$.
Theorem 1.7. Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant meromorphic function of finite order, $n \geq 17$ be an integer. If $\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$ and $f^{n}(z+c)$ share $(1,0)$ and $(\infty, 0)$, then $f^{\prime}(z)=t f(z+c)$, for a constant that satisfies $t^{n}=1$.

Corollary 1.8. Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant entire function of finite order, $n \geq 5$ be an integer. If $\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$ and $f^{n}(z+c)$ share $(1,2)$, then $f^{\prime}(z)=t f(z+c)$, for a constant $t$ that satisfies $t^{n}=1$.
Remark 1.1. It's obvious that the condition that $\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$ and $f^{n}(z+c)$ share $(1,2)$ and $(\infty, \infty)$ in Theorem 1.6 is weaker than the condition $\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$ and $f^{n}(z+c)$ share $a(\neq 0)$ and $\infty \mathrm{CM}$ in Theorem 1.4.

If the shifts $f(z+c)$ in Theorem 1.5 and 1.6 are replaced by $q$-difference $f(q z)$, we obtain

Theorem 1.9. Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant meromorphic function of zero order, $n \geq 10$ be an integer. If $\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$ and $f^{n}(q z)$ share $(1,2)$ and $(\infty, 0)$, then $f^{\prime}(z)=$ $t f(q z)$, for a constant that satisfies $t^{n}=1$.
Theorem 1.10. Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant meromorphic function of zero order, $n \geq 9$ be an integer. If $\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$ and $f^{n}(q z)$ share $(1,2)$ and $(\infty, \infty)$, then $f^{\prime}(z)=$ $t f(q z)$, for a constant $t$ that satisfies $t^{n}=1$.
Theorem 1.11. Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant meromorphic function of zero order, $n \geq 17$ be an integer. If $\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$ and $f^{n}(q z)$ share $(1,0)$ and $(\infty, 0)$, then $f^{\prime}(z)=$ $t f(q z)$, for a constant $t$ that satisfies $t^{n}=1$.
Corollary 1.12. Let $f(z)$ be a non-constant entire function of zero order, $n \geq 5$ be an integer. If $\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$ and $f^{n}(q z)$ share $(1,2)$, then $f^{\prime}(z)=t f(q z)$, for a constant $t$ that satisfies $t^{n}=1$.

## 2. Some Lemmas

In this section, we present some lemmas which will be needed in the sequel. We will denote by $H$ the following function:

$$
H=\left(\frac{F^{\prime \prime}}{F^{\prime}}-\frac{2 F^{\prime}}{F-1}\right)-\left(\frac{G^{\prime \prime}}{G^{\prime}}-\frac{2 G^{\prime}}{G-1}\right)
$$

Lemma 2.1. [2] Let $F, G$ be two non-constant meromorphic functions. If $F$, $G$ share $(1,2)$ and $(\infty, k)$, where $0 \leq k \leq \infty$, and $H \not \equiv 0$, then

$$
\begin{array}{r}
T(r, F) \leq N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)+\bar{N}(r, F)+\bar{N}(r, G) \\
+\bar{N}_{*}(r, \infty ; F, G)+S(r, F)+S(r, G)
\end{array}
$$

where $\bar{N}_{*}(r, \infty ; F, G)$ denotes the reduced counting function of those poles of $F$ whose multiplicities differ from the multiplicities of the corresponding poles of $G$.

Lemma 2.2. [33] Let $f$ be a non-constant meromorphic function, and let $a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{n}$ be finite complex numbers, $a_{n} \neq 0$. Then

$$
T\left(r, a_{n} f^{n}+\cdots+a_{2} f^{2}+a_{1} f+a_{0}\right)=n T(r, f)+S(r, f)
$$

Lemma 2.3. [9] Let $f(z)$ be a finite order meromorphic function, and let $c$ be a nonzero constant. Then

$$
T(r, f(z+c))=T(r, f(z))+O\left(r^{\sigma-1+\epsilon}\right)+O(\log r)
$$

Lemma 2.4. [44] Let $f$ be a nonconstant meromorphic function, $k$ be a positive integer, then

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

where $N_{p}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{(k)}}\right)$ denotes the counting function of the zeros of $f^{(k)}$ where a zero of multiplicity $m$ is counted $m$ times if $m \leq p$ and $p$ times if $m>p$. Clearly $\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{(k)}}\right)=N_{1}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{(k)}}\right)$.
Lemma 2.5. [13] Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of finite order, and let $c \in C$ and $\delta \in(0,1)$. Then

$$
m\left(r, \frac{f(z+c)}{f(z)}\right)+m\left(r, \frac{f(z)}{f(z+c)}\right)=o\left(\frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\delta}}\right)=S(r, f)
$$

Lemma 2.6. [39] Suppose that two nonconstant meromorphic functions $F$ and $G$ share 1 and $\infty I M$. Let $H$ be given as above. If $H \not \equiv 0$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& T(r, F)+T(r, G) \leq 3 \bar{N}(r, F)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)+N_{E}^{1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) \\
&+ 2 N_{E}^{(2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right)+3 N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right)+3 N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right)+S(r, F)+S(r, G)
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 2.7. [40] Let $f(z)$ be a zero-order meromorphic function, and $q \in$ $C \backslash\{0\}$. Then

$$
T(r, f(q z))=(1+o(1)) T(r, f(z))
$$

and

$$
N(r, f(q z))=(1+o(1)) N(r, f(z))
$$

on a set of lower logarithmic density 1.
Lemma 2.8. [3] Let $f$ be a zero-order meromorphic function, and $q \in C \backslash\{0\}$. Then

$$
m\left(r, \frac{f(q z)}{f(z)}\right)=S(r, f)
$$

on a set of logarithmic density 1.

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1.5

Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
F=f^{n}(z+c), \quad G=\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then it is easy to verify $F$ and $G$ share $(1,2)$ and $(\infty, 0)$. Let $H$ be defined as above. Suppose that $H \not \equiv 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
T(r, F) \leq N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)+\bar{N}(r, F)+\bar{N}(r, G) \\
+\bar{N}_{*}(r, \infty ; F, G)+S(r, F)+S(r, G) \tag{2}
\end{array}
$$

According to Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
T(r, F)=n T(r, f(z+c))+S(r, f)=n T(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

It's obvious that

$$
\begin{gather*}
N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)=2 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f(z+c)}\right) \leq 2 T(r, f(z+c))=2 T(r, f)+S(r, f)  \tag{4}\\
\bar{N}(r, F)=\bar{N}(r, f(z+c)) \leq T(r, f(z+c))=T(r, f)+S(r, f)  \tag{5}\\
\bar{N}(r, G)=\bar{N}(r, f) \leq T(r, f)  \tag{6}\\
\bar{N}_{*}(r, \infty ; F, G) \leq \bar{N}(r, F) \leq T(r, f(z+c))=T(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{7}
\end{gather*}
$$

Lemma 2.4 gives

$$
\begin{align*}
N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)=2 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right) \leq 2 N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) & +2 \bar{N}(r, f)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq 4 T(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7) and (8), we deduce

$$
\begin{equation*}
(n-9) T(r, f) \leq S(r, f) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

which contradicts with $n \geq 10$. Therefore $H \equiv 0$. By integration, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{F-1}=\frac{A}{G-1}+B \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A \neq 0$ and $B$ are constants. From (10) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
G=\frac{(B-A) F+(A-B-1)}{B F-(B+1)} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

We discuss the following three cases.
Case I. Suppose that $B \neq 0,-1$. From (11), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-\frac{B+1}{B}}\right)=\bar{N}(r, G) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the second fundamental theorem and Lemma 2.3, we have

$$
\begin{array}{r}
n T(r, f)=T(r, F)+S(r, f) \leq \bar{N}(r, F)+\bar{N}\left(r \cdot \frac{1}{F}\right) \\
+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-\frac{B+1}{B}}\right)+S(r, f) \\
\leq \bar{N}(r, f(z+c))+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f(z+c)}\right)+\bar{N}(r, f)+S(r, f), \tag{13}
\end{array}
$$

which contradicts with $n \geq 10$.
Case II. Suppose that $B=0$. From (11), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
G=A F-(A-1) . \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $A \neq 1$, from (14) we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-\frac{A-1}{A}}\right)=\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) . \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the second fundamental theorem and Lemma 2.4, we have

$$
\begin{array}{r}
n T(r, f)=T(r, F)+S(r, f) \leq \bar{N}(r, F)+\bar{N}\left(r \cdot \frac{1}{F}\right) \\
+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-\frac{A-1}{A}}\right)+S(r, f) \\
\leq \bar{N}(r, f(z+c))+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f(z+c)}\right)+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right) \\
\leq \bar{N}(r, f(z+c))+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f(z+c)}\right) \\
+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right)+\bar{N}(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{16}
\end{array}
$$

which contradicts with $n \geq 10$. Thus $A=1$. From (14) we have $F=G$, that is $f^{n}(z+c)=\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$. Hence $f^{\prime}(z)=t f(z+c)$, for a constant $t$ with $t^{n}=1$.

Case III. Suppose that $B=-1$. From (11) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
G=\frac{(A+1) F-A}{F} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $A \neq-1$, we obtain from (17) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-\frac{A}{A+1}}\right)=\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) . \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the same reasoning discussed in Case II, we obtain a contradiction. Hence $A=-1$. From (17), we get $F G=1$, that is

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{n}(z+c)\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}=1 \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$ and $f^{n}(z+c)$ share $(\infty, 0)$, from (19) we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
N\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)=0, \quad T\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)=T(r, f(z+c))+S(r, f), \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{2 n}=\frac{\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}}{f^{n}(z+c)}=\frac{\frac{\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}}{f^{n}(z)}}{\frac{f^{n}(z+c)}{f^{n}(z)}} \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

From Lemma 2.5 and the logarithmic derivative lemma, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
m\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)=S(r, f) \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (20) and (22), we know that

$$
\begin{equation*}
T(r, f(z+c))=T\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)=S(r, f) \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is a contradiction with Lemma 2.3. The proof of Theorem 1.5 is completed.

## 4. Proof of Theorem 1.6

Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
F=f^{n}(z+c), \quad G=\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n} \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then it is easy to verify $F$ and $G$ share $(1,2)$ and $(\infty, \infty)$. Let $H$ be defined as above. Suppose that $H \not \equiv 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
T(r, F) \leq N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)+\bar{N}(r, F)+\bar{N}(r, G) \\
+\bar{N}_{*}(r, \infty ; F, G)+S(r, F)+S(r, G) \tag{25}
\end{array}
$$

According to Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
T(r, F)=n T(r, f(z+c))+S(r, f)=n T(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

It's obvious that

$$
\begin{gather*}
N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)=2 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f(z+c)}\right) \leq 2 T(r, f(z+c))=2 T(r, f)+S(r, f)  \tag{27}\\
\bar{N}(r, F)=\bar{N}(r, f(z+c)) \leq T(r, f(z+c))=T(r, f)+S(r, f)  \tag{28}\\
\bar{N}(r, G)=\bar{N}(r, f) \leq T(r, f)  \tag{29}\\
\bar{N}_{*}(r, \infty ; F, G)=0 \tag{30}
\end{gather*}
$$

Lemma 2.4 gives

$$
\begin{align*}
N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)=2 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right) \leq 2 N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) & +2 \bar{N}(r, f)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq 4 T(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{31}
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (25), (26), (27), (28), (29), (30) and (31), we deduce

$$
\begin{equation*}
(n-8) T(r, f) \leq S(r, f) \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

which contradicts with $n \geq 9$. Therefore $H \equiv 0$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 1.5 , we can get the conclusion of Theorem 1.6.

## 5. Proof of Theorem 1.7

Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
F=f^{n}(z+c), \quad G=\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n} \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then it is easy to verify $F$ and $G$ share $(1,0)$ and $(\infty, 0)$. Let $H$ be defined as above. Suppose that $H \not \equiv 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.6 that

$$
\begin{align*}
& T(r, F)+T(r, G) \leq 3 \bar{N}(r, F)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)+N_{E}^{1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) \\
&+2 N_{E}^{(2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right)+3 N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right)+3 N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) \\
&+S(r, F)+S(r, G) \tag{34}
\end{align*}
$$

Since

$$
\begin{align*}
N_{E}^{1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right)+2 N_{E}^{(2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right)+ & N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right)+2 N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) \\
& \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) \leq T(r, G)+O(1) \tag{35}
\end{align*}
$$

we get from (34) and (35) that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
T(r, F) \leq 3 \bar{N}(r, F)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)+2 N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) \\
+N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right)+S(r, F)+S(r, G) \tag{36}
\end{array}
$$

According to Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
T(r, F)=n T(r, f(z+c))+S(r, f)=n T(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

It's obvious that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\bar{N}(r, F)=\bar{N}(r, f(z+c)) \leq T(r, f(z+c))=T(r, f)+S(r, f)  \tag{38}\\
N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)=2 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f(z+c)}\right) \leq 2 T(r, f(z+c))=2 T(r, f)+S(r, f)  \tag{39}\\
N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{F}{F^{\prime}}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{F^{\prime}}{F}\right)+S(r, f) \\
\leq \bar{N}(r, F)+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)+S(r, f) \\
\leq \bar{N}(r, f(z+c))+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f(z+c)}\right)+S(r, f) \\
\leq 2 T(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{40}
\end{gather*}
$$

Lemma 2.4 gives

$$
\begin{align*}
& N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)=2 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right) \leq 2 N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right)+2 \bar{N}(r, f)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq 4 T(r, f)+S(r, f)  \tag{41}\\
& N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{G}{G^{\prime}}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{G^{\prime}}{G}\right)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq \bar{N}(r, G)+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq \bar{N}(r, f)+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq \bar{N}(r, f)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right)+\bar{N}(r, f)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq 3 T(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{42}
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (36), (37), (38), (39), (40), (41) and (42), we deduce

$$
\begin{equation*}
(n-16) T(r, f) \leq S(r, f) \tag{43}
\end{equation*}
$$

which contradicts with $n \geq 17$. Therefore $H \equiv 0$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 1.5, we can get the conclusion of Theorem 1.7.

## 6. Proof of Theorem 1.9

Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
F=f^{n}(q z), \quad G=\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n} \tag{44}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then it is easy to verify $F$ and $G$ share $(1,2)$ and $(\infty, 0)$. Let $H$ be defined as above. Suppose that $H \not \equiv 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
T(r, F) \leq N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)+\bar{N}(r, F)+\bar{N}(r, G) \\
+\bar{N}_{*}(r, \infty ; F, G)+S(r, F)+S(r, G) \tag{45}
\end{array}
$$

According to Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.7, we have

$$
\begin{gather*}
T(r, F)=n T(r, f(q z))+S(r, f)=n T(r, f)+S(r, f)  \tag{46}\\
\bar{N}(r, F)=\bar{N}(r, f(q z))=\bar{N}(r, f(z))+S(r, f) \leq T(r, f)+S(r, f),  \tag{47}\\
N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)=2 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f(q z)}\right) \leq 2 T(r, f(q z))=2 T(r, f)+S(r, f) . \tag{48}
\end{gather*}
$$

It's obvious that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\bar{N}(r, G)=\bar{N}(r, f) \leq T(r, f)  \tag{49}\\
\bar{N}_{*}(r, \infty ; F, G) \leq \bar{N}(r, G)=\bar{N}(r, f) \leq T(r, f) \tag{50}
\end{gather*}
$$

Lemma 2.4 gives

$$
\begin{align*}
N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)=2 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right) \leq 2 N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) & +2 \bar{N}(r, f)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq 4 T(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{51}
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (45), (46), (47), (48), (49), (50) and (51), we deduce

$$
\begin{equation*}
(n-9) T(r, f) \leq S(r, f) \tag{52}
\end{equation*}
$$

which contradicts with $n \geq 10$. Therefore $H \equiv 0$. By integration, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{F-1}=\frac{A}{G-1}+B \tag{53}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A \neq 0$ and $B$ are constants. From (53) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
G=\frac{(B-A) F+(A-B-1)}{B F-(B+1)} . \tag{54}
\end{equation*}
$$

We discuss the following three cases.
Case I. Suppose that $B \neq 0,-1$. From (54), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-\frac{B+1}{B}}\right)=\bar{N}(r, G) . \tag{55}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the second fundamental theorem and Lemma 2.7, we have

$$
\begin{array}{r}
n T(r, f)=T(r, F)+S(r, f) \leq \bar{N}(r, F)+\bar{N}\left(r \cdot \frac{1}{F}\right) \\
+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-\frac{B+1}{B}}\right)+S(r, f) \\
\leq \bar{N}(r, f(q z))+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f(q z)}\right)+\bar{N}(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{56}
\end{array}
$$

which contradicts with $n \geq 10$.

Case II. Suppose that $B=0$. From (54), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
G=A F-(A-1) . \tag{57}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $A \neq 1$, from (57) we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-\frac{A-1}{A}}\right)=\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) . \tag{58}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the second fundamental theorem and Lemma 2.4, we have

$$
\begin{array}{r}
n T(r, f)=T(r, F)+S(r, f) \leq \bar{N}(r, F)+\bar{N}\left(r \cdot \frac{1}{F}\right) \\
+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-\frac{A-1}{A}}\right)+S(r, f) \\
\leq \bar{N}(r, f(q z))+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f(q z)}\right)+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right) \\
\leq \bar{N}(r, f(q z))+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f(q z)}\right)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) \\
+\bar{N}(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{59}
\end{array}
$$

which contradicts with $n \geq 10$. Thus $A=1$. From (57) we have $F=G$, that is $f^{n}(q z)=\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$. Hence $f^{\prime}(z)=t f(q z)$, for a constant $t$ with $t^{n}=1$.

Case III. Suppose that $B=-1$. From (54) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
G=\frac{(A+1) F-A}{F} \tag{60}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $A \neq-1$, we obtain from (60) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-\frac{A}{A+1}}\right)=\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right) . \tag{61}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the same reasoning discussed in Case II, we obtain a contradiction. Hence $A=-1$. From (60), we get $F G=1$, that is

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{n}(q z)\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}=1 \tag{62}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}$ and $f^{n}(q z)$ share $(\infty, 0)$, from (62) we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
N\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)=0, \quad T\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)=T(r, f(q z))+S(r, f) \tag{63}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{2 n}=\frac{\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}}{f^{n}(q z)}=\frac{\frac{\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n}}{f^{n}(z)}}{\frac{f^{n}(q z)}{f^{n}(z)}} \tag{64}
\end{equation*}
$$

From Lemma 2.8 and the logarithmic derivative lemma, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
m\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)=S(r, f) \tag{65}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (63) and (65), we know that

$$
\begin{equation*}
T(r, f(q z))=T\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)=S(r, f) \tag{66}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is a contradiction with Lemma 2.7. The proof of Theorem 1.9 is completed.

## 7. Proof of Theorem 1.10

Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
F=f^{n}(q z), \quad G=\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n} \tag{67}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then it is easy to verify $F$ and $G$ share $(1,2)$ and $(\infty, \infty)$. Let $H$ be defined as above. Suppose that $H \not \equiv 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
T(r, F) \leq N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)+\bar{N}(r, F)+\bar{N}(r, G) \\
+\bar{N}_{*}(r, \infty ; F, G)+S(r, F)+S(r, G) \tag{68}
\end{array}
$$

According to Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.7, we have

$$
\begin{gather*}
T(r, F)=n T(r, f(q z))+S(r, f)=n T(r, f)+S(r, f)  \tag{69}\\
\bar{N}(r, F)=\bar{N}(r, f(q z))=\bar{N}(r, f(z))+S(r, f) \leq T(r, f)+S(r, f)  \tag{70}\\
N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)=2 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f(q z)}\right) \leq 2 T(r, f(q z))=2 T(r, f)+S(r, f) . \tag{71}
\end{gather*}
$$

It's obvious that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\bar{N}(r, G)=\bar{N}(r, f) \leq T(r, f)  \tag{72}\\
\bar{N}_{*}(r, \infty ; F, G)=0 \tag{73}
\end{gather*}
$$

Lemma 2.4 gives

$$
\begin{align*}
N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)=2 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right) \leq 2 N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right) & +2 \bar{N}(r, f)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq 4 T(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{74}
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (68), (69), (70), (71), (72), (73) and (74), we deduce

$$
\begin{equation*}
(n-8) T(r, f) \leq S(r, f) \tag{75}
\end{equation*}
$$

which contradicts with $n \geq 9$. Therefore $H \equiv 0$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 1.9, we can get the conclusion of Theorem 1.10.

## 8. Proof of Theorem 1.11

Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
F=f^{n}(q z), \quad G=\left[f^{\prime}(z)\right]^{n} \tag{76}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then it is easy to verify $F$ and $G$ share $(1,0)$ and $(\infty, 0)$. Let $H$ be defined as above. Suppose that $H \not \equiv 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.6 that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
T(r, F)+T(r, G) \leq 3 \bar{N}(r, F)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)+N_{E}^{1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) \\
+2 N_{E}^{(2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right)+3 N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right)+3 N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) \\
+S(r, F)+S(r, G) . \tag{77}
\end{array}
$$

Since

$$
\begin{align*}
N_{E}^{1)}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right)+2 N_{E}^{(2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right)+ & N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right)+2 N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) \\
& \leq N\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) \leq T(r, G)+O(1) \tag{78}
\end{align*}
$$

we get from (77) and (78) that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
T(r, F) \leq 3 \bar{N}(r, F)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)+2 N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) \\
+N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right)+S(r, F)+S(r, G) \tag{79}
\end{array}
$$

According to Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.7, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
T(r, F)=n T(r, f(q z))+S(r, f)=n T(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{80}
\end{equation*}
$$

It's obvious that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\bar{N}(r, F)=\bar{N}(r, f(q z)) \leq T(r, f(q z))=T(r, f)+S(r, f)  \tag{81}\\
N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)=2 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f(q z)}\right) \leq 2 T(r, f(q z))=2 T(r, f)+S(r, f),  \tag{82}\\
N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{F-1}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{F}{F^{\prime}}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{F^{\prime}}{F}\right)+S(r, f) \\
\leq \bar{N}(r, F)+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{F}\right)+S(r, f)
\end{gather*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
\leq \bar{N}(r, f(q z))+\bar{N} & \left(r, \frac{1}{f(q z)}\right)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq 2 T(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{83}
\end{align*}
$$

Lemma 2.4 gives

$$
\begin{align*}
& N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)=2 \bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right) \leq 2 N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right)+2 \bar{N}(r, f)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq 4 T(r, f)+S(r, f)  \tag{84}\\
& N_{L}\left(r, \frac{1}{G-1}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{G}{G^{\prime}}\right) \leq N\left(r, \frac{G^{\prime}}{G}\right)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq \bar{N}(r, G)+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{G}\right)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq \bar{N}(r, f)+\bar{N}\left(r, \frac{1}{f^{\prime}}\right)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq \bar{N}(r, f)+N_{2}\left(r, \frac{1}{f}\right)+\bar{N}(r, f)+S(r, f) \\
& \leq 3 T(r, f)+S(r, f) \tag{85}
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (79), (80), (81), (82), (83), (84) and (85), we deduce

$$
\begin{equation*}
(n-16) T(r, f) \leq S(r, f) \tag{86}
\end{equation*}
$$

which contradicts with $n \geq 17$. Therefore $H \equiv 0$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 1.9, we can get the conclusion of Theorem 1.11.
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