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#### Abstract

We consider the family $\mathcal{P}(1, b), b>0$, consisting of functions $p$ analytic in the open unit disc $U$ with the normalization $p(0)=1$ which have the disc formulation $|p-1|<b$ in $U$. Applying the subordination properties to certain choices of $p$ using the functions $f_{n}(z)=$ $z+\sum_{k=1+n}^{\infty} a_{k} z^{k}, n=1,2, \ldots$, we obtain inclusion relations, sufficient starlikeness and convexity conditions, and coefficient bounds for functions in these classes. In some cases our results improve the corresponding results appeared in print.
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## 1. Introduction

Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the class of functions that are analytic in the open unit disc $U=\{z \in \mathcal{C}:|z|<$ $1\}$ and let $\mathcal{A}_{n}$ be the subclass of $\mathcal{A}$ consisting of functions $f_{n}$ of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{n}(z)=z+\sum_{k=1+n}^{\infty} a_{k} z^{k}, \quad n=1,2,3, \ldots \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The function $p \in \mathcal{A}$ and normalized by $p(0)=1$ is said to be in $\mathcal{P}(1, b)$ if

$$
\begin{equation*}
|p(z)-1|<b, \quad b>0, \quad z \in U . \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The class $\mathcal{P}(1, b)$ which is defined using the disc formulation (1.2) was studied by Janowski [6] and has an alternative characterization in terms of subordination (see [5] or [14]), that is, for
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$z \in U$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
p \in \mathcal{P}(1, b) \Longleftrightarrow p(z) \prec 1+b z . \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the functions $\phi$ and $\psi$ in $\mathcal{A}$, we say that the $\phi$ is subordinate to $\psi$ in $U$, denoted by $\phi \prec \psi$, if there exists a function $w(z)$ in $\mathcal{A}$ with $w(0)=0$ and $|w(z)|<1$, such that $\phi(z)=\psi(w(z))$ in $U$. For further references see Duren [3].

The family $\mathcal{P}(1, b)$ contains many interesting classes of functions which have close interrelations with different well-known classes of analytic univalent functions. For example, for $f_{n} \in \mathcal{A}_{n}$ if

$$
\left(\frac{z f_{n}^{\prime}}{f_{n}}\right) \in \mathcal{P}(1,1-\alpha), \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1
$$

then $f_{n}$ is starlike of order $\alpha$ in $U$ and if

$$
\left(1+\frac{z f_{n}^{\prime \prime}}{f_{n}^{\prime}}\right) \in \mathcal{P}(1,1-\alpha), \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1
$$

then $f_{n}$ is convex of order $\alpha$ in $U$.
For $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ we let $\mathcal{S}^{*}(\alpha)$ be the class of functions $f_{n} \in \mathcal{A}_{n}$ which are starlike of order $\alpha$ in $U$, that is,

$$
\mathcal{S}^{*}(\alpha) \equiv\left\{f_{n} \in \mathcal{A}_{n}: \Re\left(\frac{z f_{n}^{\prime}}{f_{n}}\right) \geq \alpha, \quad|z|<1\right\}
$$

and let $\mathcal{K}(\alpha)$ be the class of functions $f_{n} \in \mathcal{A}_{n}$ which are convex of order $\alpha$ in $U$, that is,

$$
\mathcal{K}(\alpha) \equiv\left\{f_{n} \in \mathcal{A}_{n}: \Re\left(1+\frac{z f_{n}^{\prime \prime}}{f_{n}^{\prime}}\right) \geq \alpha, \quad|z|<1\right\}
$$

Alexander [1] showed that $f_{n}$ is convex in $U$ if and only if $z f_{n}^{\prime}$ is starlike in $U$.
In this paper we investigate inclusion relations, starlikeness, convexity, and coefficient conditions on $f_{n}$ and its related classes for two choices of $p\left(f_{n}\right)$ in $\mathcal{P}(1, b)$. In some cases, we improve the related known results appeared in the literature.

Define $\mathcal{F}(1, b)$ be the subclass of $\mathcal{P}(1, b)$ consisting of functions $p\left(f_{1}\right)$ so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
p\left(f_{1}(z)\right)=\frac{z f_{1}^{\prime}(z)}{f_{1}(z)}\left(1+\frac{z f_{1}^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f_{1}^{\prime}(z)}\right) \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f_{1} \in \mathcal{A}_{1}$ is given by (1.1).
For fixed $v>-1, n \geq 1$, and for $\lambda \geq 0$, define $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$ be the subclass of $\mathcal{P}(1, b)$ consisting of functions $p\left(f_{n}\right)$ so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
p\left(f_{n}(z)\right)=(1-\lambda) \frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}+\lambda\left(D^{v} f_{n}(z)\right)^{\prime} \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f_{n} \in \mathcal{A}_{n}$ and $D^{v} f$ is the $v$-th order Ruscheweyh derivative [10].
The $v$-th order Ruscheweyh derivative $D^{v}$ of a function $f_{n}$ in $\mathcal{A}_{n}$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
D^{v} f_{n}(z)=\frac{z}{(1-z)^{1+v}} * f_{n}(z)=z+\sum_{k=1+n}^{\infty} B_{k}(v) a_{k} z^{k} \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
B_{k}(v)=\frac{(1+v)(2+v) \cdots(v+k-1)}{(k-1)!}
$$

and the operator "*" stands for the convolution or Hadamard product of two power series

$$
f(z)=\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{i} z^{i} \text { and } g(z)=\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_{i} z^{i}
$$

defined by

$$
(f * g)(z)=f(z) * g(z)=\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{i} b_{i} z^{i}
$$

## 2. The Family $\mathcal{F}(1, b)$

The class $\mathcal{F}(1, b)$ for certain values of $b$ yields a sufficient starlikeness condition for the functions $f_{1} \in \mathcal{A}_{1}$.
Theorem 2.1. If $0<b \leq \frac{9}{4}$ and $p\left(f_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{F}(1, b)$ then

$$
\frac{z f_{1}^{\prime}}{f_{1}} \in \mathcal{P}\left(1, \frac{3-\sqrt{9-4 b}}{2}\right)
$$

We need the following lemma, which is due to Jack [4].
Lemma 2.2. Let $w(z)$ be analytic in $U$ with $w(0)=0$. If $|w|$ attains its maximum value on the circle $|z|=r$ at a points $z_{0}$, we can write $z_{0} w^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=k w\left(z_{0}\right)$ for some real $k, k \geq 1$.
Proof of Theorem 2.1. For $b_{1}=\frac{3-\sqrt{9-4 b}}{2}$ write $\frac{z f_{1}^{\prime}(z)}{f_{1}(z)}=1+b_{1} w(z)$. Obviously, $w$ is analytic in $U$ and $w(0)=0$. The proof is complete if we can show that $|w|<1$ in $U$. On the contrary, suppose that there exists $z_{0} \in U$ such that $\left|w\left(z_{0}\right)\right|=1$. Then, by Lemma 2.2, we must have $z_{0} w^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=k w\left(z_{0}\right)$ for some real $k, k \geq 1$ which yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\frac{z_{0} f_{1}^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{f_{1}\left(z_{0}\right)}\left(1+\frac{z_{0} f_{1}^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{f_{1}^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}\right)-1\right| & =\left|\left(1+b_{1} w\left(z_{0}\right)\right)^{2}+b_{1} z_{0} w^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)-1\right| \\
& =\left|b_{k}+2 b_{1}+b_{1}^{2} w\left(z_{0}\right)\right| \\
& \geq 3 b_{1}-b_{1}^{2}=b .
\end{aligned}
$$

This contradicts the hypothesis, and so the proof is complete.
Corollary 2.3. For $0<b \leq 2$ let $p\left(f_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{F}(1, b)$. Then $f_{1} \in \mathcal{S}^{*}\left(\frac{-1+\sqrt{9-4 b}}{2}\right)$.
Corollary 2.4. If $p\left(f_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{F}(1, b)$ and $0<b \leq 2$, then

$$
\left|\arg \frac{z f_{1}^{\prime}(z)}{f_{1}(z)}\right|<\arcsin \left(\frac{3-\sqrt{9-4 b}}{2}\right) .
$$

It is not known if the above corollaries can be extended to the case when $b>2$.
Corollary 2.5. If $\Re\left(\frac{f_{1}(z)}{z f_{1}^{\prime}(z)+z^{2} f_{1}^{\prime \prime}(z)}\right)>\frac{1}{2}$ then $f_{1} \in \mathcal{S}^{*}\left(\frac{-1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)$.
Remark 2.6. For $0<b<2$, Theorem 2.1 is an improvement to Theorem 1 obtained by Obradović, Joshi, and Jovanović [8].

Corollary 2.7. If $p\left(f_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{F}(1, b)$ then $f_{1}$ is convex in $U$ for $0<b \leq 0.935449$.
Proof. For $p\left(f_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{F}(1, b)$ we can write $\left|\arg p\left(f_{1}\right)\right|<\arcsin b$. Therefore,

$$
\left|\arg \left(1+\frac{z f_{1}^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f_{1}^{\prime}(z)}\right)\right|<\arcsin b+\arcsin \left(\frac{3-\sqrt{9-4 b}}{2}\right) .
$$

Now the proof is complete upon noting that the right hand side of the above inequality is less than $\frac{\pi}{2}$ for $b=0.935449$.

Remark 2.8. It is not known if the above Corollary 2.7 is sharp but it is an improvement to Corollary 2 obtained by Obradovic, Joshi, and Jovanovic [8].

Corollary 2.9. If $p\left(f_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{F}(1, b)$ then $f_{1}$ is convex in the disc $|z|<\frac{0.935449}{b}$ for $0.935449 \leq$ $b \leq 1$.

Proof. We write $p\left(f_{1}\right)=1+b w(z)$ where $w$ is a Schwarz function. Let $|z| \leq \rho$. Then $|w(z)| \leq \rho$ and so $\left|p\left(f_{1}\right)-1\right|<b \rho$ for $|z| \leq \rho$. Upon choosing $b \rho=0.935449$ it follows from the above Corollary 2.7 that $\left|\arg \left(1+z f_{1}^{\prime \prime} / f_{1}^{\prime}\right)\right|<\pi / 2$ for $|z| \leq \rho=0.935449 / b$. Therefore the proof is complete.

In the following example we show that there exist functions $f$ which are not necessarily starlike or univalent in $U$ for $p\left(f_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{F}(1, b)$ if $b$ is sufficiently large.
Example 2.1. For the spirallike function $g(z)=z /(1-z)^{1+i}$ we have

$$
\Re\left(e^{-\frac{\pi}{4} i} \frac{z g^{\prime}(z)}{g(z)}\right)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1-|z|^{2}}{|1-z|^{2}}\right)>0, \quad z \in U
$$

Since $\frac{z g^{\prime}(z)}{g(z)}=\frac{1+i z}{1-z}$, we obtain

$$
\Re\left(\frac{z g^{\prime}(z)}{g(z)}\right)=\frac{1-r(\cos \theta+\sin \theta)}{1-2 r \cos \theta+r^{2}}
$$

for $z=r e^{i \theta}$. Thus $g(z)$ is not starlike for $|z|<t, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}<t<1$. This means that $f(z)=\frac{g(r z)}{r}$ is not starlike in $U$. Now set

$$
h(z)=\int_{0}^{z} \frac{g(\zeta)}{\zeta} d \zeta=i\left((1-z)^{-i}-1\right)
$$

and let $z_{0}=\frac{e^{2 \pi}-1}{e^{2 \pi}+1} \approx 0.996$. Therefore, $h\left(z_{0}\right)=h\left(-z_{0}\right)$ and so $h$ is not univalent in $U$. Consequently, $f(z)=\frac{h\left(z_{0} z\right)}{z_{0}}$ is not univalent in $U$ for sufficiently large values of $b$. On the other hand, $p(g) \in \mathcal{F}(1, b)$ for sufficiemtly large $b$, since,

$$
|p(g(z))-1|=\left|\frac{1+3 i z}{(1-z)^{2}}+\frac{z}{1-z}-1\right|<b
$$

for sufficiemtly large $b$.
The following theorem is the converse of Theorem 2.1 for a special case.
Theorem 2.10. If $\frac{z f_{1}^{\prime}}{f_{1}} \in \mathcal{P}\left(1, \frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)$ then $p\left(f_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{F}(1,1)$ for $|z|<r_{0}=0.7851$.
To prove our theorem, we need the following lemma due to Dieudonné [2].
Corollary 2.11. Let $z_{0}$ and $w_{0}$ be given points in $U$, with $z_{0} \neq 0$. Then for all functions $f$ analytic and satisfying $|f(z)|<1$ in $U$, with $f(0)=0$ and $f\left(z_{0}\right)=w_{0}$, the region of values of $f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)$ is the closed disc

$$
\left|w-\frac{w_{0}}{z_{0}}\right| \leq \frac{\left|z_{0}\right|^{2}-\left|w_{0}\right|^{2}}{\left|z_{0}\right|\left(1-\left|z_{0}\right|^{2}\right)} .
$$

Proof of Theorem 2.10. Write

$$
q(z)=\frac{z f_{1}^{\prime}(z)}{f_{1}(z)}=1+\left(\frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}\right) w(z)
$$

where $w$ is a Schwarz function. We need to find the largest disc $|z|<\rho$ for which

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\left[1+\left(\frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}\right) w(z)\right]^{2}+\left(\frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}\right) z w^{\prime}(z)-1\right| \\
& =\left|\left(\frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^{2} w^{2}(z)+(3-\sqrt{5}) w(z)+\left(\frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}\right) z w^{\prime}(z)\right|<1
\end{aligned}
$$

For fixed $r=|z|$ and $R=|w(z)|$ we have $R \leq r$. Therefore, by Lemma 2.11, we obtain

$$
\left|w^{\prime}(z)\right| \leq \frac{R}{r}+\frac{r^{2}-R^{2}}{r\left(1-r^{2}\right)}
$$

and so

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|p\left(f_{1}\right)-1\right| & =\left|\frac{z f_{1}^{\prime}(z)}{f_{1}(z)}\left(1+\frac{z f_{1}^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f_{1}^{\prime}(z)}\right)-1\right| \\
& =\left|\left(\frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^{2} w^{2}(z)+(3-\sqrt{5}) w(z)+\left(\frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}\right) z w^{\prime}(z)\right| \\
& \leq t^{2} R^{2}+3 t R+t \frac{r^{2}-R^{2}}{1-r^{2}} \\
& =\frac{t}{1-r^{2}} \psi(R)
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\psi(R)=R^{2}\left(t-t r^{2}-1\right)+3 R\left(1-r^{2}\right)+r^{2} \text { and } t=\frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}
$$

We note that $\psi(R)$ attains its maximum at $R_{0}=\frac{3\left(1-r^{2}\right)}{2\left(1+t r^{2}-t\right)}$. So the theorem follows for $r_{0} \approx 0.7851$ which is the root of the equation $\frac{t}{1-r^{2}} \psi\left(R_{0}\right)=1$.

Letting $z_{0}$ and $w_{0}$ in Lemma 2.11 be so that $\left|z_{0}\right|=r_{0}$ and $\left|w_{0}\right|=\frac{3\left(1-r_{0}^{2}\right)}{2\left(1+t r_{0}^{2}-t\right)}$ we conclude that the bound given by Theorem 2.10 is sharp.
3. The Family $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$

We begin with stating and proving some properties of the family $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$.
Theorem 3.1. If $p\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$ then

$$
\frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z} \in \mathcal{P}\left(1, \frac{b}{1+\lambda n}\right) .
$$

We need the following lemma, which is due to Miller and Mocanu [7].
Lemma 3.2. Let $q(z)=1+q_{n} z^{n}+\cdots(n \geq 1)$ be analytic in $U$ and let $h(z)$ be convex univalent in $U$ with $h(0)=1$. If $q(z)+\frac{1}{c} z q^{\prime}(z) \prec h(z)$ for $c>0$, then

$$
q(z) \prec \frac{c}{n} z^{-c / n} \int_{0}^{z} h(t) t^{\frac{c}{n}-1} d t .
$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1] For $p\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$ set $q(z)=\frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}$. Then we can write $q(z)+$ $\lambda z q^{\prime}(z) \prec 1+b z$. Now, applying Lemma 3.2, we obtain

$$
q(z) \prec+1+\frac{b}{1+\lambda n} z .
$$

Substituting back for $q(z)$ and choosing $w(z)$ to be analytic in $U$ with $|w(z)| \leq|z|^{n}$, by the definition of subordination we have

$$
\frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}=1+\frac{b}{(1+\lambda n)} w(z) .
$$

Now the theorem follows using the necessary and sufficient condition (1.3). The estimates in Theorem 3.1 are sharp for $p\left(f_{n}\right)$ where $f_{n}$ is given by

$$
\frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}=1+\frac{b}{(1+\lambda n)} z^{n}
$$

Corollary 3.3. If $p\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$ then

$$
\left|\frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}\right| \leq 1+\frac{b}{1+\lambda n}|z|^{n}
$$

Corollary 3.4. If $\left|f_{n}^{\prime}(z)+\lambda z f_{n}^{\prime \prime}(z)-1\right|<b$ then

$$
f_{n}^{\prime}(z) \prec 1+\frac{b}{1+\lambda n} z .
$$

Corollary 3.5. If $\left|(1-\lambda) \frac{f_{n}(z)}{z}+\lambda f_{n}^{\prime}(z)-1\right|<b$ then

$$
\frac{f_{n}(z)}{z} \prec 1+\frac{b}{1+\lambda n} z .
$$

In the next two theorems we investigate the inclusion relations for classes of $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}$.
Theorem 3.6. For $0 \leq \lambda_{1}<\lambda$ and $v \geq 0$, let $b_{1}=\frac{1+\lambda_{1} n}{1+n \lambda} b$. Then

$$
\mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b) \subset \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_{1}}^{v}\left(1, b_{1}\right)
$$

Proof. The case for $\lambda_{1}=0$ is trivial. For $\lambda_{1} \neq 0$ suppose that $p\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$. Therefore, we can write

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(1-\lambda_{1}\right) \frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}+ & \lambda_{1}\left(D^{v} f_{n}(z)\right)^{\prime} \\
& =\frac{\lambda_{1}}{\lambda}\left[(1-\lambda) \frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}+\lambda\left(D^{v} f_{n}(z)\right)^{\prime}\right]+\left(1-\frac{\lambda_{1}}{\lambda}\right)\left(\frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, by definition, $p\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_{1}}^{v}\left(1, b_{1}\right)$ and so the proof is complete.
Theorem 3.7. Let $v \geq 0$ and $b_{1}=\frac{b(1+v)}{n+1+v}$. Then

$$
\mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v+1}(1, b) \subset \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}\left(1, b_{1}\right)
$$

Proof. For $f_{n} \in \mathcal{A}_{n}$ suppose that $p_{1}\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v+1}(1, b)$ where

$$
p_{1}\left(f_{n}(z)\right)=(1-\lambda) \frac{D^{1+v} f_{n}(z)}{z}+\lambda\left(D^{v+1} f_{n}(z)\right)^{\prime}
$$

Set

$$
p_{2}\left(f_{n}(z)\right)=(1-\lambda) \frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}+\lambda\left(D^{v} f_{n}(z)\right)^{\prime}
$$

An elementary differentiation yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{1}\left(f_{n}(z)\right) & =(1-\lambda) \frac{D^{1+v} f_{n}(z)}{z}+\lambda\left(D^{v+1} f_{n}(z)\right)^{\prime} \\
& =p_{2}\left(f_{n}(z)\right)+\frac{1}{1+v} z p_{2}^{\prime}\left(f_{n}(z)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

From this and Lemma 3.2, we conclude that $p_{1}\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}\left(1, b_{1}\right)$.

## Corollary 3.8.

$$
f_{n}^{\prime}(z)+\lambda z f_{n}^{\prime \prime}(z) \in \mathcal{P}(1, b) \Longrightarrow(1-\lambda) \frac{f_{n}(z)}{z}+\lambda f_{n}^{\prime}(z) \in \mathcal{P}\left(1, \frac{b}{1+n}\right) .
$$

Theorem 3.9. For $v \geq 0$ and $\lambda>0$ let $b<1+\lambda n$. If $p\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$ then

$$
\left|\frac{z\left(D^{v} f_{n}(z)\right)^{\prime}}{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}-1\right|<\frac{b(2+\lambda n)}{\lambda[(1+\lambda n)-b]} .
$$

Proof. First note that, we can write

$$
\left|(1-\lambda) \frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}+\lambda\left(D^{v} f_{n}(z)\right)^{\prime}-1\right|<b ; \quad\left|\frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}-1\right|<\frac{b}{1+\lambda n} .
$$

For $b_{1}=\frac{b(2+\lambda n)}{\lambda[(1+\lambda n)-b]}$ we define $w(z)$ by

$$
1+b_{1} w(z)=\frac{\left[z\left(D^{v} f_{n}(z)\right)^{\prime}\right]}{\left[D^{v} f_{n}(z)\right]} .
$$

One can easily verify that $w(z)$ is analytic in $U$ and $w(0)=0$. To conclude the proof, it suffices to show that $|w(z)|<1$ in $U$. If this is not the case, then by Lemma 2.2, there exists a point $z_{0} \in U$ such that $\left|w\left(z_{0}\right)\right|=1$ and $z_{0} w^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=k w\left(z_{0}\right)$. Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|p\left(f_{n}\left(z_{0}\right)\right)-1\right| & =\left|(1-\lambda) \frac{D^{v} f\left(z_{0}\right)}{z_{0}}+\lambda\left(D^{v} f\left(z_{0}\right)\right)^{\prime}-1\right| \\
& =\left|\frac{D^{v} f_{n}\left(z_{0}\right)}{z_{0}}\left[(1-\lambda)+\lambda \frac{z_{0}\left(D^{v} f_{n}\left(z_{0}\right)\right)^{\prime}}{D^{v} f_{n}\left(z_{0}\right)}\right]-1\right| \\
& =\left|\lambda\left(\frac{z_{0}\left(D^{v} f_{n}\left(z_{0}\right)\right)^{\prime}}{D^{v} f_{n}\left(z_{0}\right)}-1\right) \frac{D^{v} f_{n}\left(z_{0}\right)}{z_{0}}+\left(\frac{D^{v} f_{n}\left(z_{0}\right)}{z_{0}}-1\right)\right| \\
& \geq \lambda b_{1}\left(1-\frac{b}{1+n \lambda}\right)-\frac{b}{1+n \lambda}=b .
\end{aligned}
$$

This is a contradiction to the hypothesis and so $|w(z)|<1$ in $U$.
Corollary 3.10. i) If $f_{n}^{\prime}(z) \in \mathcal{P}\left(1, \frac{1+n}{3+n}\right)$ then $\frac{z f_{n}^{\prime}(z)}{f_{n}(z)} \in \mathcal{P}(1,1)$.
ii) If $f_{n}^{\prime}(z)+z f_{n}^{\prime \prime}(z) \in \mathcal{P}\left(1, \frac{1+n}{3+n}\right)$ then $\frac{z f_{n}^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f_{n}^{\prime}(z)} \in \mathcal{P}(1,1)$.

Theorem 3.11. Let $p\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$ for some $\lambda>0$. If

$$
b= \begin{cases}\frac{\lambda(1+\lambda n)}{2+\lambda(n-1)} ; & 0<\lambda \leq \frac{(n-3)+\sqrt{n^{2}+2 n+9}}{2 n} \\ (1+\lambda n) \sqrt{\frac{2 \lambda-1}{\lambda^{2} n^{2}+2 \lambda(1+n)}} ; & \frac{(n-3)+\sqrt{n^{2}+2 n+9}}{2 n} \leq \lambda \leq 1\end{cases}
$$

then

$$
\Re\left(\frac{D^{v+1} f_{n}(z)}{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}\right)>\frac{v}{1+v} .
$$

We need the following lemma, which is due to Ponnusamy and Singh [9].
Lemma 3.12. Let $0<\lambda_{1}<\lambda<1$ and let $Q$ be analytic in $U$ satisfying $Q(z) \prec 1+\lambda_{1} z$, and $Q(0)=1$. If $q(z)$ is analytic in $U, q(0)=1$ and satisfies

$$
Q(z)[c+(1-c) q(z)] \prec 1+\lambda z,
$$

where

$$
c= \begin{cases}\frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda_{1}}, & 0<\lambda+\lambda_{1} \leq 1 \\ \frac{1-\left(\lambda^{2}+\lambda_{1}^{2}\right)}{2\left(1-\lambda_{1}^{2}\right)}, & \lambda^{2}+\lambda_{1}^{2} \leq 1 \leq \lambda+\lambda_{1}\end{cases}
$$

then $\operatorname{Re}\{q(z)\}>0, z \in U$.
Proof of Theorem 3.11. From Theorem 3.1 and the fact $0<b<1<1+\lambda n$ we conclude that

$$
\frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z} \prec 1+b_{1} z, \quad 0<b_{1}=\frac{b}{1+n \lambda}<b<1 .
$$

On the other hand, we may write

$$
\frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}\left[(1-\lambda)+\lambda\left(\frac{z\left(D^{v} f_{n}(z)\right)^{\prime}}{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}\right)\right] \prec 1+b z
$$

Letting $Q(z)=\frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}, q(z)=\frac{z\left(D^{v} f_{n}(z)\right)^{\prime}}{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}$, and $c=1-\lambda$, we see that all conditions in Lemma 3.12 are satisfied. This implies that $\operatorname{Re} q(z)>0$ and so the proof is complete.

Corollary 3.13. Let $p\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$ for some $\lambda>0$. Then $D^{v} f_{n}$ is starlike in the disc

$$
|z| \leq \begin{cases}\frac{\lambda(1+n \lambda)}{(2+\lambda(n-1)) b} & \text { if } 0<\lambda<\lambda_{1} \text { and } b_{1} \leq b \leq 1 \\ \frac{(1+\lambda n)}{b} \sqrt{\frac{2 \lambda-1}{\lambda^{2} n^{2}+2 \lambda(1+n)}} & \text { if } \lambda_{1} \leq \lambda \leq 1 \text { and } b_{2} \leq b \leq 1\end{cases}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lambda_{1}=\frac{(n-3)+\sqrt{n^{2}+2 n+9}}{2 n}, b_{1}=\frac{\lambda(1+n \lambda)}{[2+\lambda(n-1)]}, \quad \text { and } \\
& b_{2}=\left(1+\lambda_{n}\right) \sqrt{\frac{2 \lambda-1}{\lambda^{2} n^{2}+2 \lambda(1+n)}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

i) If $f_{n}^{\prime} \in \mathcal{P}\left(1, \frac{(1+n)}{\sqrt{1+(1+n)^{2}}}\right)$ then $f_{n}$ is starlike in $U$.
ii) If $f_{n}^{\prime}+z f_{n}^{\prime \prime} \in \mathcal{P}\left(1, \frac{(1+n)}{\sqrt{1+(1+n)^{2}}}\right)$ then $f_{n}$ is convex in $U$.

If we let $\lambda=1$ and $v=0,1$ in Corollary 3.13, then we obtain
Corollary 3.14. Let $\frac{(1+n)}{\sqrt{1+(1+n)^{2}}} \leq b \leq 1$ and $f_{n} \in \mathcal{A}_{n}$.
i) If $f_{n}^{\prime} \in \mathcal{P}(1, b)$ then $f$ is starlike for $|z|<\frac{(1+n)}{b \sqrt{1+(1+n)^{2}}}$.
ii) If $f_{n}^{\prime}+z f_{n}^{\prime \prime} \in \mathcal{P}(1, b)$ then $f$ is convex for $|z|<\frac{1+n}{b \sqrt{1+(1+n)^{2}}}$.

## 4. Coefficient Bounds

Sufficient coefficient conditions for $\mathcal{F}(1, b)$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$ are given next.
Theorem 4.1. Let $p\left(f_{1}\right)$ be given by (1.4) for $f_{1}$ as in (1.1). If

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left(k^{2}+b-1\right)\left|a_{k}\right|<b, \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $p\left(f_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{F}(1, b)$.
Proof. We need to show that if (4.1) then $\left|p\left(f_{1}(z)\right)-1\right|<b$. For $p\left(f_{1}\right)$ we can write

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|p\left(f_{1}(z)\right)-1\right| & =\left|\frac{z f_{1}^{\prime}}{f_{1}}\left(1+\frac{z f_{1}^{\prime \prime}}{f_{1}^{\prime}}\right)-1\right| \\
& =\left|\frac{\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left(k^{2}-1\right) a_{k} z^{k}}{z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_{k} z^{k}}\right| \\
& \leq \frac{\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left(k^{2}-1\right)\left|a_{k}\right||z|^{k-1}}{1-\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left|a_{k}\right||z|^{k-1}} \\
& <\frac{\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left(k^{2}-1\right)\left|a_{k}\right|}{1-\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left|a_{k}\right|}
\end{aligned}
$$

The above right hand inequality is less than $b$ by (4.1) and so $p\left(f_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{F}(1, b)$.
Theorem 4.2. Let $p\left(f_{n}\right)$ be given by (1.5) for $f_{n}$ as in (1.1). If

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{k=1+n}^{\infty}(\lambda k-\lambda+1) B_{k}(v)\left|a_{k}\right|<b \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $p\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$.
Proof. Apply the Ruscheweyh derivative (1.6) to the function $f_{n}(z)$ and substitute in (1.5) to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|p\left(f_{n}(z)\right)-1\right| & =\left|(1-\lambda) \frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}+\lambda\left(D^{v} f_{n}(z)\right)^{\prime}-1\right| \\
& =\left|\sum_{k=1+n}^{\infty}(\lambda k-\lambda+1) B_{k}(v) a_{k} z^{k-1}\right| \\
& <\sum_{k=1+n}^{\infty}(\lambda k-\lambda+1) B_{k}(v)\left|a_{k}\right| .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now this latter inequality is less than $b$ by 4.2 and so $p\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$.
Next, by judiciously varying the arguments of the coefficients of the functions $f_{n}$ given by (1.1), we shall show that the sufficient coefficient conditions (4.1) and (4.2) are also necessary for their respective classes with varying arguments.

A function $f_{n}$ given by $\sqrt{1.1}$ is said to be in $\mathcal{V}\left(\theta_{k}\right)$ if $\arg \left(a_{k}\right)=\theta_{k}$ for all $k$. If, further, there exists a real number $\beta$ such that $\theta_{k}+(k-1) \beta \equiv \pi(\bmod 2 \pi)$ then $f_{n}$ is said to be in $\mathcal{V}\left(\theta_{k} ; \beta\right)$. The union of $\mathcal{V}\left(\theta_{k} ; \beta\right)$ taken over all possible $\left\{\theta_{k}\right\}$ and all possible real $\beta$ is denoted by $\mathcal{V}$. For more details see Silverman [13].

Some examples of functions in $\mathcal{V}$ are
i) $\mathcal{T} \equiv \mathcal{V}(\pi ; 0) \subset \mathcal{V}$ where $\mathcal{T}$ is the class of analytic univalent functions with negative coefficients studied by Schild [11] and Silverman [12].
ii) Univalent functions of the form $z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left|a_{k}\right| e^{i \theta_{k}} z^{k}$ are in $\mathcal{V}\left(\theta_{k} ; 2 \pi / k\right) \subset \mathcal{V}$ for $\theta_{k}=$ $\pi-2(k-1) \pi / k$.
Note that the family $\mathcal{V}$ is rotationally invariant since $f_{n} \in \mathcal{V}\left(\theta_{k} ; \beta\right)$ implies that

$$
e^{-i \gamma} f_{n}\left(z e^{i \gamma}\right) \in \mathcal{V}\left(\theta_{k}+(k-1) \gamma ; \beta-\gamma\right)
$$

Finally, we let

$$
\mathcal{V} \mathcal{F}(1, b) \equiv \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{F}(1, b) \quad \text { and } \mathcal{V} \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b) \equiv \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)
$$

## Theorem 4.3.

$$
p\left(f_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{V} \mathcal{F}(1, b) \Longleftrightarrow \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left(k^{2}+b-1\right)\left|a_{k}\right|<b
$$

Proof. In light of Theorem4.1, we only need to prove the "only if" part of the theorem. Suppose $p\left(f_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{V} \mathcal{F}(1, b)$, then

$$
\left|p\left(f_{1}\right)-1\right|=\left|\frac{\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left(k^{2}-1\right) a_{k} z^{k-1}}{1+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_{k} z^{k-1}}\right|<b
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left(k^{2}-1\right) a_{k} z^{k-1}\right|<b\left|1+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_{k} z^{k-1}\right| . \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The condition (4.3) must hold for all values of $z$ in $U$. Therefore, for $f_{1} \in \mathcal{V}\left(\theta_{k} ; \beta\right)$ we set $z=r e^{i \beta}$ in (4.3) and let $r \longrightarrow 1^{-}$. Upon clearing the inequality (4.3) we obtain the condition

$$
\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left(k^{2}-1\right)\left|a_{k}\right|<b\left(1-\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left|a_{k}\right|\right)
$$

as required.
Corollary 4.4. If $0<b \leq 1$ and $p\left(f_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{V} \mathcal{F}(1, b)$ then $f_{1}$ is convex in $U$.
Corollary 4.5. If $1<b \leq 3$ and $p\left(f_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{V} \mathcal{F}(1, b)$ then $f_{1}$ is starlike in $U$.
The above two corollaries can be justifed using Theorem 4.3 and the following lemma due to Silverman [12].
Lemma 4.6. For $f_{1}$ of the form (1.1) and univalent in $U$ we have
i) If $\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k^{2}\left|a_{k}\right| \leq 1$, then $f_{1}$ is convex in $U$.
ii) If $\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k\left|a_{k}\right| \leq 1$, then $f_{1}$ is starlike in $U$.

Next, we show that the above sufficient coefficient condition (4.2) is also necessary for functions in $\mathcal{V} \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$.

## Theorem 4.7.

$$
p\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{V M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b) \Longleftrightarrow \sum_{k=1+n}^{\infty}(\lambda k-\lambda+1) B_{k}(v)\left|a_{k}\right|<b
$$

Proof. Suppose that $p\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{V} \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$. Then, by (1.5), we have

$$
\left|p\left(f_{n}(z)\right)-1\right|=\left|(1-\lambda) \frac{D^{v} f_{n}(z)}{z}+\lambda\left(D^{v} f_{n}(z)\right)^{\prime}-1\right|<b .
$$

On the other hand, for $f_{n} \in \mathcal{V}\left(\theta_{k} ; \beta\right)$ we have

$$
f_{n}(z)=z+\sum_{k=1+n}^{\infty}\left|a_{k}\right| e^{i \theta_{k}} z^{k}
$$

The condition required for $p\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{V} \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$ must hold for all values of $z$ in $U$. Setting $z=r e^{i \beta}$ yields

$$
\sum_{k=1+n}^{\infty}(\lambda k-\lambda+1) B_{k}(v)\left|a_{k}\right| r^{k-1}<b
$$

The required coefficient condition follows upon letting $z \longrightarrow 1^{-}$.
From the above Theorem 4.7 and Lemma 4.6.ii, we obtain
Corollary 4.8. If $\lambda \geq 2 b-1$ and $p\left(f_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{V} \mathcal{M}_{\lambda}^{v}(1, b)$ then $f$ is starlike in $U$.
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