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## 1. Introduction

Let $\mathbb{D}$ be the unit disk in $\mathbb{C}$, and let $\mathbb{T}=\partial \mathbb{D}$. A domain $G$ on the Riemann sphere $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ is called spherically convex if, for any pair $w_{1}, w_{2} \in G$, the smaller arc of the greatest circle (spherical geodesic) between $w_{1}$ and $w_{2}$ also lies in $G$.

An analytic univalent function $g$ in $\mathbb{D}$ is called convex if $g(\mathbb{D})$ is a convex domain in $\mathbb{C}$. A meromorphic univalent function $f$ in $\mathbb{D}$ is called spherically convex (s-convex) if $f(\mathbb{D})$ is a spherically convex domain in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$.

Let $\operatorname{Rot}(\hat{\mathbb{C}})$ denote the group of rotations of the Riemann sphere $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ that consists of the Möbius transformations

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi(z)=e^{i \vartheta}(z-a) /(1+\bar{a} z), \quad a \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \vartheta \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

together with $\varphi(z)=e^{i \vartheta} / z$. Let $\operatorname{Möb}(\mathbb{D})$ denote the group of Möbius transformations of $\mathbb{D}$ onto itself. If $f$ is s-convex, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{*}=\varphi \circ f \circ \psi, \quad \varphi \in \operatorname{Rot}(\hat{\mathbb{C}}), \psi \in \operatorname{Möb}(\mathbb{D}) \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

is again s-convex and we have $f^{*}(\mathbb{D})=\varphi(f(\mathbb{D}))$.
The spherical and Schwarzian derivatives

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\#}=\frac{\left|f^{\prime}\right|}{1+|f|^{2}}, \quad S_{f}=\left(\frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}\right)^{\prime}-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}\right)^{2} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

are unchanged if we replace $f$ by $\varphi \circ f$, with $\varphi \in \operatorname{Rot}(\hat{\mathbb{C}})$. We introduce

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma(f)=\max _{z \in \mathbb{D}}\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) f^{\#}(z) \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is clear that $\sigma(\varphi \circ f \circ \psi)=\sigma(f)$ for $\varphi \in \operatorname{Rot}(\hat{\mathbb{C}})$ and $\psi \in \operatorname{Möb}(\mathbb{D})$. The quantity $\sigma(f)$ measures the thickness of $f(\mathbb{D})$ and corresponds to the Bloch norm in the Euclidean case (see e.g. [ACP] and [BMY]).

Replacing $f$ by $\varphi \circ f$ with $a=f(0)$ and suitable $\vartheta$ in (1.1), we may often assume that our s-convex function $f$ is normalized:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=\alpha z+a_{2} z^{2}+a_{3} z^{3}+\cdots, \quad 0<\alpha \leq 1 \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]see Theorem 3. We will show in Theorem 4 that, replacing $f$ by $\varphi \circ f \circ \psi$, we can attain that $f$ is centrally normalized:
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=\alpha z+a_{3} z^{3}+a_{4} z^{4}+\cdots, \quad \alpha=\sigma(f) \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

If $f$ is s-convex then $f(\mathbb{D})$ contains no pair $(w,-1 / \bar{w})$ of antipodal points. Univalent functions with this property were studied, for example, by Kühnau [K] and Jenkins [J, p. 125]. Under the normalization (1.5), Kühnau proved that $\alpha \leq 1$ and $\left|a_{2}\right| \leq 0.58 \ldots$.

Spherically convex functions have been studied, for example, by Wirths, Kühnau, Minda, Ma, and Mejía. Let $f$ be s-convex and normalized as in (1.5). We write $\beta=\sqrt{1-\alpha^{2}}$. Then

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{\alpha|z|}{1+\beta|z|} \leq|f(z)| \leq \frac{\alpha|z|}{1-\beta|z|} \quad \text { for } z \in \mathbb{D}  \tag{1.7}\\
\frac{\alpha}{(1+\beta|z|)^{2}} \leq\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \quad \text { for } z \in \mathbb{D} \tag{1.8}
\end{gather*}
$$

(see [K, p. 16; MMM, p. 53]). These estimates are sharp, as shown by the example

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=\frac{\alpha z}{1-\beta z}=\alpha z+\alpha \beta z^{2}+\alpha \beta^{2} z^{3}+\cdots, \quad \beta=\sqrt{1-\alpha^{2}} \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

This function maps $\mathbb{D}$ conformally onto a hemisphere.
Wirths [W1] proved the remarkable estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
3\left|\frac{a_{3}}{\alpha}-\frac{a_{2}^{2}}{\alpha^{2}}\right|+\frac{\left|a_{2}\right|^{2}}{\alpha^{2}}+\alpha^{2} \leq 1 \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies $\left|a_{2}\right| \leq \alpha \beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\left|a_{3}\right| \leq \alpha \beta^{2}=\alpha\left(1-\alpha^{2}\right) \leq \frac{2 \sqrt{3}}{9}$; see [MM1, p. 158]. A more geometric proof of $\left|a_{2}\right| \leq \alpha \beta$ was given in [M2, p. 104].

We shall give a short proof of the Wirths inequality and derive the sharp bound

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{2}\left|S_{f}(z)\right| \leq 2\left(1-\sigma(f)^{2}\right) \quad(z \in \mathbb{D}) \tag{1.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\sigma(f)$ is defined by (1.4). Using results about the Nehari class [CO, p. 290], we obtain the sharp bounds of $|f(z)|$ for centrally normalized s-convex functions that give another proof of the recent result of Ma and Minda (personal communication) that $f(\mathbb{D}) \subset \mathbb{D}$.

The hyperbolically convex (h-convex) functions map $\mathbb{D}$ onto a h-convex subdomain of $\mathbb{D}$. They were studied in [MM2; MP1; MP2]. If 0 lies in the image domain, then

$$
\text { spherical convexity } \Rightarrow \text { (classical) convexity } \Rightarrow \text { hyperbolic convexity. }
$$

This indicates that the present case of s-convexity is easier to handle than hconvexity. The methods and results are rather different.

We want to thank David Minda and Mario Bonk very much for our discussions and messages, which helped us a great deal in understanding spherically convex functions. We are also grateful to William Ma, Martin Chuaqui, and the referee for several helpful suggestions.

## 2. Reduction to Euclidean Convexity

We shall further develop an idea of Ma, Mejía, and Minda [MMM] on how to reduce the study of s-convex functions to that of (classically) convex functions.

Lemma. If the domain $G$ is s-convex and if $0 \in G$, then $G$ is convex.
Proof. Let $a, b \in G \backslash\{0\}$ and let $C$ be the smaller arc of the greatest circle between $a$ and $b$. Then the line segments $[0, a]$ and $[0, b]$ are arcs of a greatest circle (through 0 and $\infty$ ). Thus $[0, a],[0, b]$ and $C$ form a spherical triangle. Its closed interior lies in $G$ because $G$ is s-convex, and its angle sum is greater than $\pi$. The Euclidean triangle formed by $[0, a],[0, b]$, and $[a, b]$ has angle sum $\pi$. Hence, $[a, b]$ lies in the closed interior of the spherical triangle and thus in $G$.

Theorem 1. Let $f$ be univalent in $\mathbb{D}$ and let $f(0)=0$. Then $f$ is $s$-convex if and only if the functions

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{w}(z)=\frac{f(z)}{1+\bar{w} f(z)} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

are convex for every $w \in \overline{f(\mathbb{D})}$.
The fact that $g_{w}$ is convex was used in [MMM] for special values of $w$. All our results will be based on Theorem 1.

Proof. (a) Let $f$ be s-convex and $w \in f(\mathbb{D})$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{w}=(f-w) /(1+\bar{w} f) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

is s-convex; see (1.1). Furthermore, $0 \in f_{w}(\mathbb{D})$ so that $f_{w}(\mathbb{D})$ is convex by the lemma. Hence $g_{w}=\left(f_{w}+w\right) /\left(1+|w|^{2}\right)$ is convex in $\mathbb{D}$ for $w \in f(\mathbb{D})$ and hence, by normality, for $w \in \overline{f(\mathbb{D})}$.
(b) Let $g_{w}$ be convex for all $w \in f(\mathbb{D})$. Then $f_{w}=\left(1+|w|^{2}\right) g_{w}-w$ is also convex; see (2.2). If $w^{\prime} \in f(\mathbb{D})$, then 0 and $w^{*}=\left(w^{\prime}-w\right) /\left(1+\bar{w} w^{\prime}\right)$ and thus also $\left[0, w^{*}\right]$ lie in the convex domain $f_{w}(\mathbb{D})$. The Euclidean segment $\left[0, w^{*}\right]$ lies on a greatest circle. Hence the arc of the greatest circle between $w$ and $w^{\prime}$ lies in the domain $f(\mathbb{D})$, which is obtained from $f_{w}(\mathbb{D})$ by a rotation of the sphere.

A different analytic characterization was given by Ma and Minda [MM1]—namely,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\left[1+z \frac{f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{2 z f^{\prime}(z) \overline{f(z)}}{1+|f(z)|^{2}}\right] \geq 0 \quad \text { for } z \in \mathbb{D} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $g$ is convex, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\left[\frac{\zeta+z}{\zeta-z}-\frac{2 z g^{\prime}(z)}{g(\zeta)-g(z)}\right] \geq 0 \quad \text { for } z, \zeta \in \mathbb{D} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

as Sheil-Small [SS] and Suffridge [S] have shown; see [P, p. 45] for a proof.
Theorem 2. If $f$ is $s$-convex with $f(0)=0$ and if $w \in \overline{f(\mathbb{D})}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\left[\frac{\zeta+z}{\zeta-z}-\frac{2 z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(\zeta)-f(z)} \frac{1+\bar{w} f(\zeta)}{1+\bar{w} f(z)}\right] \geq 0 \quad \text { for } z, \zeta \in \mathbb{D} \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

This is an immediate consequence of (2.4) applied to the convex function $g_{w}$ of Theorem 1. We remark that, as a function of $w$, the left-hand side assumes its minimum for $w \in f(\mathbb{T})$. Hence (2.5) is not sharp for $w \in f(\mathbb{D})$.

Theorem 3. Let $f(z)=\alpha z+a_{2} z^{2}+\cdots$ be s-convex, and let $\alpha>0$. Then $\alpha \leq$ 1 and, with $\beta=\sqrt{1-\alpha^{2}}$,

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left|\frac{\alpha z}{f(z)}-1\right| \leq \beta|z|<\beta \quad \text { for } z \in \mathbb{D}  \tag{2.6}\\
\operatorname{Re}\left[z \frac{f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right] \geq \frac{1}{1+\beta|z|}>\frac{1}{1+\beta} \quad \text { for } z \in \mathbb{D} \tag{2.7}
\end{gather*}
$$

If $f(z)=\alpha z /(1-\beta z)$ (see (1.9)), then equality holds in (2.6) for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and in (2.7) for $z<0$. The inequalities (1.7) follow at once from (2.6), and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\left[\frac{f(z)}{\alpha z}\right] \geq \frac{1}{1+\beta|z|} \quad \text { for } z \in \mathbb{D} \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (2.7) and (1.7) we deduce that

$$
\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \geq \frac{|f(z) / z|}{1+\beta|z|} \geq \frac{\alpha}{(1+\beta|z|)^{2}}
$$

which is (1.8). Of course, our proof is in essence the same as that in [MMM].
Proof. (a) If $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$ is fixed, then

$$
\frac{\zeta+z}{\zeta-z}-\frac{2 z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(\zeta)-f(z)} \frac{1+\bar{w} f(\zeta)}{1+\bar{w} f(z)}=1+2\left(\frac{1}{\zeta}-\frac{\alpha}{f(\zeta)}-\alpha \bar{w}\right) z+\cdots
$$

as $z \rightarrow 0$. Hence it follows [P, p. 41] from (2.4) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{1}{\zeta}-\frac{\alpha}{f(\zeta)}-\alpha \bar{w}\right| \leq 1 \quad \text { for } \zeta \in \mathbb{D}, w \in \overline{f(\mathbb{D})} \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $b=\min \{|f(z)|: z \in \mathbb{T}\}$. Choosing $w \in \overline{f(\mathbb{D})}$ suitably with $|w|=b$, we deduce that

$$
\left|\frac{\alpha}{f(\zeta)}-\frac{1}{\zeta}\right| \leq 1-\alpha b \quad \text { for } \zeta \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}
$$

For $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $|f(\zeta)|=b$ we obtain that $\alpha / b-1 \leq 1-\alpha b$, which implies that $\alpha \leq 1$ and $b \geq(1-\beta) / \alpha$ and thus $1-\alpha b \leq \beta$. This, of course, also follows from (1.7).
(b) We obtain from (2.5) for $\zeta=0$ that

$$
\operatorname{Re} \frac{2 z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)(1+\bar{w} f(z))} \geq 1 \quad \text { for } z \in \mathbb{D}, w \in \overline{f(\mathbb{D})}
$$

Choosing $w=b f(z) /|f(z)|$, we conclude that $2 \operatorname{Re}\left[z f^{\prime} / f\right] \geq 1+b|f|$. Hence, it follows from the minimum principle for harmonic functions that

$$
2 \inf _{z \in \mathbb{D}} \operatorname{Re}\left[z \frac{f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right] \geq \min _{z \in \mathbb{T}}(1+b|f(z)|)=1+b^{2} \geq \frac{2}{1+\beta}
$$

## 3. The Central Normalization

Now we show that every s-convex domain has a unique "conformal center". For related ideas, see [MW; MO; COP].

Theorem 4. Let $f$ be s-convex. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma(f)=\max _{z \in \mathbb{D}}\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) f^{\#}(z) \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

is attained at a unique point $z_{0} \in \mathbb{D}$. The function

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(z)=\frac{f(\psi(z))-f\left(z_{0}\right)}{1+\overline{f\left(z_{0}\right)} f(\psi(z))} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\psi(z)=\left(z+z_{0}\right) /\left(1+\bar{z}_{0} z\right)$, is s-convex and satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(0)=0, \quad\left|h^{\prime}(0)\right|=\sigma(f), \quad h^{\prime \prime}(0)=0 . \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $h(\mathbb{D})=\varphi(f(\mathbb{D}))$ with $\varphi \in \operatorname{Rot}(\hat{\mathbb{C}})$, we can attain that $f$ is centrally normalized, that is,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=\alpha z+a_{3} z^{3}+\cdots \quad(z \in \mathbb{D}) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\alpha=\sigma(f)$. The important additional assumption is that $f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$. This normalization plays a great role for functions with given bounds for the Schwarzian derivative (see e.g. [CO; COP]). We have $0<\sigma(f) \leq 1$ by Theorem 3 .

Proof. By the Koebe one-quarter theorem, the spherical distance satisfies

$$
\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) f^{\#}(z) \leq 4 \operatorname{dist}^{\#}(f(z), f(\mathbb{T})) \rightarrow 0 \text { as }|z| \rightarrow 1
$$

Hence, the maximum in (3.1) is attained for some $z_{0} \in \mathbb{D}$. It follows from (3.2) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) h^{\#}(z)=\left(1-|\psi(z)|^{2}\right) f^{\#}(\psi(z)) \leq\left(1-\left|z_{0}\right|^{2}\right) f^{\#}\left(z_{0}\right)=h^{\#}(0) \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. We have

$$
\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) \frac{h^{\#}(z)}{h^{\#}(0)}=1+\operatorname{Re}\left[\frac{z h^{\prime \prime}(0)}{h^{\prime}(0)}\right]+O\left(|z|^{2}\right)
$$

as $z \rightarrow 0$, so we may deduce that $h^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$.
Now $h$ is convex by the lemma. Hence

$$
p(z)=1+\frac{z h^{\prime \prime}(z)}{h^{\prime}(z)}=1+O\left(z^{2}\right) \quad(z \in \mathbb{D})
$$

has positive real part. Consequently, the function $(p-1) /(p+1)$ has a double zero at 0 and is bounded by 1 and thus by $|z|^{2}$. It follows that, for $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ and $0 \leq$ $r<1$,

$$
r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \log \left[\left(1-r^{2}\right)\left|h^{\prime}(r \zeta)\right|\right]=\operatorname{Re} p(r \zeta)-\frac{1+r^{2}}{1-r^{2}} \leq 0
$$

Hence $\left(1-r^{2}\right)\left|h^{\prime}(r \zeta)\right| \leq\left|h^{\prime}(0)\right|$, which implies

$$
\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) h^{\#}(z)<h^{\#}(0) \text { for } 0<|z|<1
$$

It follows that the maximum $z_{0}$ of (3.1) is unique; see (3.5).
An important example is the s-convex function

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{\alpha}(z)=\frac{(1+z)^{\alpha}-(1-z)^{\alpha}}{(1+z)^{\alpha}+(1-z)^{\alpha}}=\alpha z+\frac{\alpha}{3}\left(1-\alpha^{2}\right) z^{3}+\cdots, \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

which maps $\mathbb{D}$ onto the symmetric lens-shaped domain between the two circular arcs that meet at $\pm 1$ under the angle $\pi \alpha$. This function satisfies

$$
\begin{gather*}
\sigma\left(h_{\alpha}\right)=\alpha, \quad S_{h_{\alpha}}(z)=2\left(1-\alpha^{2}\right)\left(1-z^{2}\right)^{-2} \quad(z \in \mathbb{D})  \tag{3.7}\\
h_{\alpha}(i y)=i \tan (\alpha \arctan y), \quad h_{\alpha}^{\#}(i y)=\alpha /\left(1+y^{2}\right) \tag{3.8}
\end{gather*}
$$

for $y>0$. In particular, $h_{\alpha}(i)=i \tan (\pi \alpha / 4)$. See [M1, p. 133] for a detailed study of this example.

Theorem 5. Let the s-convex function be centrally normalized; see (3.4). Then, for $|z|=r<1$,

$$
\begin{gather*}
\tan (\alpha \arctan r) \leq|f(z)| \leq \frac{(1+r)^{\alpha}-(1-r)^{\alpha}}{(1+r)^{\alpha}+(1-r)^{\alpha}}<1  \tag{3.9}\\
\frac{\alpha}{1+r^{2}} \leq f^{\#}(z)  \tag{3.10}\\
\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \leq \frac{4 \alpha\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{\alpha-1}}{\left[(1+r)^{\alpha}+(1-r)^{\alpha}\right]^{2}}<\alpha 2^{1-\alpha}(1-r)^{\alpha-1} \tag{3.11}
\end{gather*}
$$

It follows from (3.6) and (3.8) that all four bounds are sharp for every value of $z \in$ $\mathbb{D}$. The estimate $|f(z)|<1$ is due to Ma and Minda (personal communication). Also, it follows from (3.9) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\{|w|<\tan (\pi \alpha / 4)\} \subset f(\mathbb{D}) \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

this disk has the spherical radius $\pi \alpha / 4$.
Now let $f$ be any s-convex function. We use the transformation (3.2) of Theorem 4 to obtain a centrally normalized function to which Theorem 5 can be applied. We list three consequences.
(i) Minda [M1, p. 137] proved that $f(\mathbb{D})$ always contains a disk of spherical radius $\pi \sigma(f) / 4$. This also follows from (3.12).
(ii) It follows either from (3.12) by a geometrical argument or from (3.11) by an analytical argument that all corners of $f(\mathbb{T})$ have interior angles $\geq \pi \sigma(f)$; we have equality for the function $h_{\alpha}$ in (3.6).
(iii) We deduce from (3.11) that, if $f$ is bounded, then

$$
f^{\prime}(z)=O\left((1-|z|)^{\sigma(f)-1}\right) \text { as }|z| \rightarrow 1,
$$

where the exponent is best possible. Under the normalization (1.5), it is known [MMM, p. 53] that

$$
\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \leq \alpha(1-\beta|z|)^{-2} \quad \text { for }|z|<2 /(1+\sqrt{5-4 \beta}), \quad \beta=\sqrt{1-\alpha^{2}} .
$$

Proof of Theorem 5. (a) First we prove the lower estimates. Let $w \in f(\mathbb{D})$ and let $g_{w}$ be the convex function of Theorem 1. Then

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left[1+z \frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}-\frac{2 z f^{\prime} \bar{w}}{1+f \bar{w}}\right]=\operatorname{Re}\left[1+z \frac{g^{\prime \prime}}{g^{\prime}}\right]>0
$$

For given $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, we choose $w=f\left(\zeta^{2} \bar{z}\right)$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
p_{\zeta}(z) \equiv 1+z \frac{f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{2 z f^{\prime}(z) \overline{f\left(\zeta^{2} \bar{z}\right)}}{1+f(z) \overline{f\left(\zeta^{2} \bar{z}\right)}} \quad(z \in \mathbb{D}) \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

is analytic and satisfies

$$
\operatorname{Re} p_{\zeta}(z)>0 \quad(z \in \mathbb{D}), \quad p_{\zeta}(0)=1, \quad p_{\zeta}^{\prime}(0)=0
$$

by our normalization (3.4). We easily deduce that $\left|\left(p_{\zeta}(z)-1\right) /\left(p_{\zeta}(z)+1\right)\right| \leq|z|^{2}$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. It follows that $\operatorname{Re} p_{\zeta}(z) \geq\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) /\left(1+|z|^{2}\right)$. We conclude that, with $z=r \zeta \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\left[1+z \frac{f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{2 z f^{\prime}(z) \overline{f(z)}}{1+|f(z)|^{2}}\right]=\operatorname{Re} p_{\zeta}(r \zeta) \geq \frac{1-|z|^{2}}{1+|z|^{2}} \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence we have

$$
r \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left[\log \frac{\left(1+r^{2}\right)\left|f^{\prime}(r \zeta)\right|}{1+|f(r \zeta)|^{2}}\right]=\operatorname{Re} p_{\zeta}(r \zeta)-\frac{1-r^{2}}{1+r^{2}} \geq 0
$$

which, by (1.3), implies (3.10) because $[\ldots]=\log \alpha$ for $r=0$. Finally, if $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and $C=f^{-1}([0, f(z)])$, then by (3.10) we have

$$
\arctan |f(z)|=\int_{C} \frac{\left|f^{\prime}(s)\right||d s|}{1+|f(s)|^{2}} \geq \int_{C} \frac{\alpha|d s|}{1+|s|^{2}} \geq \alpha \arctan |z|
$$

(b) The upper estimates are an immediate consequence of Theorem 7 (see Section 4) and the following result of Chuaqui and Osgood [CO, p. 290].

Proposition. Let $f$ be meromorphic and locally univalent in $\mathbb{D}$. If $f(z)=$ $a_{1} z+a_{3} z^{3}+\cdots$ near 0 and if

$$
\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{2}\left|S_{f}(z)\right| \leq 2\left(1-\alpha^{2}\right) \quad(z \in \mathbb{D})
$$

with $0<\alpha \leq 1$, then

$$
|f(z)| \leq \frac{\left|a_{1}\right|}{\alpha} h_{\alpha}(|z|), \quad\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \leq \frac{\left|a_{1}\right|}{\alpha} h_{\alpha}^{\prime}(|z|)
$$

for $z \in \mathbb{D}$, where $h_{\alpha}$ is defined by (3.6).

## 4. The Schwarzian Derivative

Wirths [W1, p. 49] proved an important inequality, which we present in its invariant form [MM1, p. 158] (cf. [W2]). We shall give a much simpler proof.

Theorem 6. If $f$ is s-convex, then

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{2}}{2}\left|S_{f}(z)\right| & +\left|\bar{z}-\frac{1-|z|^{2}}{2} \frac{f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}+\left(1-|z|^{2}\right) \frac{f^{\prime}(z) \overline{f(z)}}{1+|f(z)|^{2}}\right|^{2} \\
& +\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{2} f^{\#}(z)^{2} \leq 1 \tag{4.1}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. All three terms in (4.1) remain essentially unchanged if we replace $f$ by $\varphi \circ f \circ \psi$, with $\varphi \in \operatorname{Rot}(\hat{\mathbb{C}})$ and $\psi \in \operatorname{Möb}(\mathbb{D})$; see [MM1, p. 154]. Hence, it is sufficient to prove (4.1) for $z=0, f(0)=0$, and $f^{\prime}(0)=\alpha>0$, that is, to prove (1.10).

Let $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, and define $p_{\zeta}$ again by (3.13). We have

$$
p_{\zeta}(z)=1+2 p_{1} z+2 p_{2} z^{2}+\cdots
$$

where

$$
p_{1}=\frac{a_{2}}{\alpha}, \quad p_{2}=\frac{3 a_{3}}{\alpha}-\frac{2 a_{2}^{2}}{\alpha^{2}}-\alpha^{2} \bar{\zeta}^{2} .
$$

Since $\operatorname{Re} p_{\zeta}(z)>0$, the analytic function

$$
q(z)=\frac{1}{z} \frac{p(z)-1}{p(z)+1}=p_{1}+\left(p_{2}-p_{1}^{2}\right) z+\cdots
$$

satisfies $|q(z)| \leq 1$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Hence $\left|p_{2}-p_{1}^{2}\right|+\left|p_{1}\right|^{2} \leq 1$, so that

$$
\left|\frac{3 a_{3}}{\alpha}-\frac{3 a_{2}^{2}}{\alpha^{2}}-\alpha^{2} \bar{\zeta}^{2}\right|+\frac{\left|a_{2}\right|^{2}}{\alpha^{2}} \leq 1
$$

(1.10) follows if we choose $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ suitably.

We deduce the sharp bound for the Schwarzian derivative in terms of the quantity $\sigma(f)$ defined in (1.4). We remark that, for $h$-convex functions, the sharp bound of the Schwarzian derivative remains unknown.

Theorem 7. If $f$ is s-convex, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{2}\left|S_{f}(z)\right| \leq 2\left(1-\sigma(f)^{2}\right) \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and equality is possible for every value of $z \in \mathbb{D}$.
Proof. (a) Let $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ be fixed. First we prove that

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{\zeta}(r)=r-\frac{1-r^{2}}{2} \operatorname{Re} \frac{\zeta f^{\prime \prime}(r \zeta)}{f^{\prime}(r \zeta)}+\left(1-r^{2}\right) \operatorname{Re} \frac{\zeta f^{\prime}(r \zeta) \overline{f(r \zeta)}}{1+|f(r \zeta)|^{2}} \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{\zeta}^{\prime}(r) \geq 2\left(1-r^{2}\right) f^{\#}(r \zeta)^{2} \quad \text { for } 0 \leq r<1 \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

By rotational invariance, we may assume that $\zeta=1$. We write

$$
\begin{equation*}
a=\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(r)}{f^{\prime}(r)}, \quad a^{\prime}=\left(\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(r)}{f^{\prime}(r)}\right)^{\prime}, \quad b=\frac{f^{\prime}(r) \overline{f(r)}}{1+|f(r)|^{2}} \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (1.3), the Wirths inequality (4.1) implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} a^{\prime}-\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Re}\left(a^{2}\right)\right) & +\left|r-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-r^{2}\right) a+\left(1-r^{2}\right) b\right|^{2} \\
& +\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2}|b / f|^{2} \leq 1 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Rearranging and dividing by the common factor $1-r^{2}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
0 \leq & -\frac{1}{2}\left(1-r^{2}\right) \operatorname{Re} a^{\prime}-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-r^{2}\right)(\operatorname{Im} a)^{2}+1+r \operatorname{Re} a-2 r \operatorname{Re} b \\
& +\left(1-r^{2}\right) \operatorname{Re}(a \bar{b})-\left(1-r^{2}\right)|b|^{2}-\left(1-r^{2}\right)|b / f|^{2} . \tag{4.6}
\end{align*}
$$

Differentiating (4.3), we see from (4.5) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
u_{1}^{\prime}= & 1+r \operatorname{Re} a-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-r^{2}\right) \operatorname{Re} a^{\prime}-2 r \operatorname{Re} b \\
& +\left(1-r^{2}\right) \operatorname{Re}(a b)+\left(1-r^{2}\right)|b / f|^{2}-\left(1-r^{2}\right) \operatorname{Re}\left(b^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, we deduce from (4.6) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
u_{1}^{\prime}-2\left(1-r^{2}\right)|b / f|^{2} & \geq\left(1-r^{2}\right)\left[\frac{1}{2}(\operatorname{Im} a)^{2}+|b|^{2}-\operatorname{Re}\left(b^{2}\right)-2 \operatorname{Im} a \operatorname{Im} b\right] \\
& =2\left(1-r^{2}\right)\left(\frac{\operatorname{Im} a}{2}-\operatorname{Im} b\right)^{2} \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

which is (4.4), by (4.5).
(b) Since both $\max \left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{2}\left|S_{f}(z)\right|$ and $\sigma(f)$ are unchanged under the transformation (1.2), we may assume that $f$ is centrally normalized. Thus $f(0)=$ $f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$ and so, by (4.3), $u_{\zeta}(0)=0$. Hence (4.4) shows that $u_{\zeta}(r) \geq 0$ for $0 \leq$ $r \leq 1$.

Using (4.3), it is easy to check that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d}{d r}\left[u_{\zeta}(r)^{2}+\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2} f^{\#}(r \zeta)^{2}\right]=2 u_{\zeta}\left(u_{\zeta}^{\prime}-2\left(1-r^{2}\right) f^{\# 2}\right) \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $u_{\zeta}(r) \geq 0$, this expression is $\geq 0$ by (4.4). Furthermore [...] $=f^{\#}(0)^{2}=$ $\sigma(f)^{2}$ for $r=0$. Using again (4.3), we therefore obtain from the Wirths inequality (4.1) that

$$
\frac{1}{2}\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2}\left|S_{f}(r \zeta)\right| \leq 1-u_{\zeta}(r)^{2}-\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2} f^{\#}(r \zeta)^{2} \leq 1-\sigma(f)^{2} .
$$

(c) For the function $h_{\alpha}$ defined in (3.6), we have equality in (4.2) if $z \in \mathbb{D} \cap \mathbb{R}$; see (3.7). Using $h_{\alpha}(\zeta z)$ with suitable $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, we deduce that equality in (4.2) is possible for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$.
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