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#### Abstract

The main aim of this paper is to use the method of differential subordination to obtain a number of sufficient conditions for a normalized analytic function to be univalent or starlike in the unit disc. In particular, we find a condition on $\beta$ so that each normalized analytic function $f$ satisfying the condition $$
\left|1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{2 f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right|<\beta, \quad z \in \Delta
$$ implies that $f$ is univalent or starlike in the unit disc.


1. Introduction. Throughout the text, $\Delta=\{z:|z|<1\}$ denotes the unit disc and $\mathcal{H}$ denotes the class of all analytic functions in $\Delta$. A function $f \in \mathcal{H}$ is said to be convex if $f(\Delta)$ is a convex domain. It is well known that $f$ is convex if and only if $f^{\prime}(0) \neq 0$ and $\operatorname{Re}\left(z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)+1\right)>0$ for $z \in \Delta$. A function $f \in \mathcal{H}$ is said to be starlike if $f$ is univalent and $f(\Delta)$ is a starlike domain, with respect to $z=0$. It is well known that $f$ is starlike if and only if $f(0)=0$, $f^{\prime}(0) \neq 0$ and $\operatorname{Re}\left(z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)\right)>0$ for $z \in \Delta$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the class of all functions $f \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $f(0)=f^{\prime}(0)-1=0$. The subclass of $\mathcal{A}$ consisting of univalent functions is denoted by $\mathcal{S}$. In the following, we denote by $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{S}^{*}$ the normalized subclasses of functions in $\mathcal{S}$ for which $f(\Delta)$ is convex and starlike, respectively. We denote by $\mathcal{S}^{*}(\beta)$, the class of all starlike functions $f$ of order $\beta, \beta<1$, if and only if $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\operatorname{Re}\left(z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)\right)>\beta$ for $z \in \Delta$. Similarly, $f$ is said to belong to $\mathcal{K}(\beta)$, the class of all convex functions of order $\beta$, if and only if $z f^{\prime}(z) \in \mathcal{S}^{*}(\beta)$. Note that $\mathcal{S}^{*}(0)=\mathcal{S}^{*}$, and $\mathcal{K}(0)=\mathcal{K}$. Define

$$
\mathcal{R}=\left\{f \in \mathcal{A}: \operatorname{Re} f^{\prime}(z)>0, z \in \Delta\right\}
$$

[^0]Finally, let us recall an important class that was studied recently in [5]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{U}(\lambda)=\left\{f \in \mathcal{A}:\left|f^{\prime}(z)\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{2}-1\right|<\lambda, z \in \Delta\right\} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \Delta \backslash\{0\}$. According to a result due to Ozaki and Nunokawa $[7]$, we have the inclusion $\mathcal{U}(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{S}$ for $0<\lambda \leq 1$. We see that the Koebe function $z /(1-z)^{2}$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}(1)$ but does not belong to the class of starlike functions of order $\alpha, \alpha>0$. Similarly, $z+z^{2} / 2 \in \mathcal{U}(1)$ but not in $\mathcal{S}^{*}(\alpha)$ with $\alpha>0$. In [5] Ponnusamy and Obradović obtained a condition on $\lambda$ so that $\mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ is in $\mathcal{S}^{*}$ or $\mathcal{R}$ (in fact in smaller subclasses) respectively. We recall [6]

Lemma 1.1. Let $f \in \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$. Then we have
(i) $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}$ for

$$
0<\lambda \leq \frac{-\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)\right|+\sqrt{8-\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)\right|^{2}}}{4}
$$

(ii) $f \in \mathcal{R}$ for

$$
0<\lambda \leq \frac{\sqrt{4\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)\right|+9}-\left(2\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)\right|+1\right)}{4}
$$

This lemma was proposed as conjectures by Obradovic and Ponnusamy [5] and has been proved in [6] in a more general form. In particular, if $f \in \mathcal{A}$ with $f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$, then from Lemma 1.1 one has the following implications:

$$
\mathcal{U}(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{S}^{*} \quad \text { for } 0<\lambda \leq 1 / \sqrt{2}
$$

(see also [9]) and

$$
\mathcal{U}(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{R} \quad \text { for } 0<\lambda \leq 1 / 2
$$

Let $\psi: \mathbf{C}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ and let $h$ be univalent in $\Delta$. If $p \in \mathcal{H}$ and satisfies the first order differential subordination

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi\left(p(z), z p^{\prime}(z)\right) \prec h(z) \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $p$ is called a solution of the differential subordination. A univalent function $q$ is called a dominant of the solutions of the differential subordination, or more simply a dominant, if $p \prec q$ for all $p$ satisfying (1.2). A dominant $\tilde{q}$ that satisfies $\tilde{q} \prec q$ for all dominants $q$ of (1.2) is said to be the best dominant of (1.2). Note that the best dominant is unique up to rotation. For a detailed collection of works on differential subordination, we refer to the recent monograph due to Miller and Mocanu in [2]. For the proof of our results, we also need the following lemmas on differential subordination.

Lemma $1.2[\mathbf{2}$, Theorem 3.4h, p. 132]. Let $q$ be univalent in $\Delta, \theta$ and $\phi$ analytic in a domain $D$ containing $q(\Delta)$ with $\phi(w) \neq 0$ when $w \in q(\Delta)$. Set $Q(z)=z q^{\prime}(z) \phi(q(z)), h(z)=\theta(q(z))+Q(z)$ and suppose that
(i) $Q$ is starlike in $\Delta$
(ii)

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{Q(z)}\right)=\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\theta^{\prime}(q(z))}{\phi(q(z))}+\frac{z Q^{\prime}(z)}{Q(z)}\right)>0, \quad z \in \Delta .
$$

If $p(z)$ is analytic in $\Delta$ with $p(0)=q(0), p(\Delta) \subset D$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\theta(p(z))+z p^{\prime}(z) \phi(p(z)) \prec \theta(q(z))+z q^{\prime}(z) \phi(q(z))=h(z) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $p(z) \prec q(z)$. The function $q$ is the best dominant of (1.3).

Lemma $1.3[\mathbf{1}]$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbf{C}$. Suppose that $\psi: \mathbf{C}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ satisfies the condition $\psi(i x, y) \notin \Omega$ when $x$ is real and $y \leq-\left(1+x^{2}\right) / 2$. If $p$ is analytic in $\Delta$, with $p(0)=1$ and $\psi\left(p(z), z p^{\prime}(z)\right) \in \Omega$ for $z \in \Delta$, then $\operatorname{Re} p(z)>0$ in $\Delta$.

Lemma 1.3 is a special case of a result due to Miller and Mocanu in [1, Theorem 1].

## 2. Main results.

Theorem 2.1. Let $k>1$ and $\alpha>-1$. Suppose that $p$ is analytic in $\Delta, p(z) \neq 0$ in $\Delta, p(0)=1$ and satisfies the condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{p(z)}+\alpha p(z) \prec \frac{k \alpha-z}{k+z}, \quad z \in \Delta \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

or equivalently

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{p(z)}+\alpha(p(z)-1)-\frac{\alpha+1}{k^{2}-1}\right|<\frac{k(\alpha+1)}{k^{2}-1}, \quad z \in \Delta . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then

$$
p(z) \prec \frac{k}{k+z}, \quad \text { i.e. } \quad\left|p(z)-\frac{k^{2}}{k^{2}-1}\right|<\frac{k}{k^{2}-1}, \quad z \in \Delta,
$$

and $k /(k+z)$ is the best dominant of (2.1).

Proof. Choose

$$
q(z)=\frac{k}{k+z} \quad \text { and } \quad \phi(w)=\frac{1}{w}
$$

Then $q$ is a convex univalent function with $q(0)=1$. Further

$$
q(\Delta)=\left\{w \in \mathbf{C}:\left|w-\frac{k^{2}}{k^{2}-1}\right|<\frac{k}{k^{2}-1}\right\}
$$

$\phi$ is analytic in $\mathbf{C} \backslash\{0\} \supset q(\Delta)$ and $\phi(w) \neq 0$ when $w \in q(\Delta)$. Furthermore

$$
Q(z)=z q^{\prime}(z) \phi(q(z))=\frac{z q^{\prime}(z)}{q(z)}=-\frac{z}{k+z}
$$

which is convex and in particular, $Q$ is starlike in $\Delta$. Define

$$
\theta(w)=\alpha w, \quad h(z)=\theta(q(z))+Q(z)=\frac{k \alpha-z}{k+z}
$$

It is easy to see that $h$ is convex univalent in $\Delta$, and

$$
\frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{Q(z)}=(1+\alpha) \frac{k}{k+z}
$$

so that

$$
\operatorname{Re} \frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{Q(z)}>(1+\alpha) \frac{k}{k-1}>0, \quad z \in \Delta
$$

By Lemma 1.2, (2.1) implies that $p(z) \prec k /(k+z)$. Moreover, since

$$
\left(\frac{k \alpha-z}{k+z}-\alpha\right)-\frac{\alpha+1}{k^{2}-1}=-\frac{k(1+\alpha)}{k^{2}-1}\left(\frac{1+k z}{k+z}\right)
$$

and since, for $k>1$,

$$
\left|\frac{1+k z}{k+z}\right|<1, \quad z \in \Delta
$$

we observe that (2.1) and (2.2) are equivalent.

Corollary 2.2. Let $k>1, \alpha>-1$ and $f \in \mathcal{A}$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\lvert\, 1-\alpha+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}+(\alpha-1) \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right. & -\frac{\alpha+1}{k^{2}-1} \left\lvert\,<\frac{k(\alpha+1)}{k^{2}-1}\right. \\
\Longrightarrow & \left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-\frac{k^{2}}{k^{2}-1}\right|<\frac{k}{k^{2}-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. We choose $p(z)=z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)$ in Theorem 2.1.

In the case $\alpha=-1,(2.1)$ is equivalent to

$$
\frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{p(z)}-p(z)=-1
$$

which gives $p(z) \equiv 1$. The following result extends this case with a different conclusion.

Theorem 2.3. Let $p$ be analytic in $\Delta, p(z) \neq 0$ in $\Delta, p(0)=1$, $\alpha>-1 / 2$ and

$$
\left|\frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{p(z)}+\alpha(p(z)-1)\right|<\alpha+1
$$

Then $\operatorname{Re} p(z)>0$ in $\Delta$.

Proof. Define $\psi(r, s)=s r^{-1}+\alpha(r-1)$. By Lemma 1.3, it suffices to show that

$$
|\psi(i x, y)| \geq \alpha+1
$$

whenever $x$ and $y$ are real and $y \leq-\left(1+x^{2}\right) / 2$. It follows that

$$
|\psi(i x, y)|^{2}=\left|\frac{y}{i x}+\alpha(i x-1)\right|^{2}=\alpha^{2}+\frac{1}{x^{2}}\left(\alpha x^{2}-y\right)^{2}
$$

Since

$$
\alpha x^{2}-y \geq \alpha x^{2}+\frac{1+x^{2}}{2}=\frac{1+(1+2 \alpha) x^{2}}{2}
$$

we see that for $\alpha \geq-1 / 2$
$|\psi(i x, y)|^{2} \geq \alpha^{2}+\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1}{x}+(1+2 \alpha) x\right)^{2} \geq \alpha^{2}+\frac{1}{4}[4(1+2 \alpha)]=(\alpha+1)^{2}$
which shows that $|\psi(i x, y)| \geq \alpha+1$ for real $x, y$ with $y \leq-\left(1+x^{2}\right) / 2$. The desired conclusion follows from Lemma 1.3.

For $p(z)=z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)$, Theorem 2.3 gives the following result.

Corollary 2.4. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\alpha>-1 / 2$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|1-\alpha+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-(1-\alpha) \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right|<\alpha+1 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad f \in \mathcal{S}^{*} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

(i) For $\alpha=0$, Corollary 2.4 , shows that

$$
f \in \mathcal{A} \quad \text { and } \quad\left|1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right|<1 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}
$$

This implication can also be obtained as a special case of the following subordination result if we choose $p(z)=z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)$ :

$$
\frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{p(z)} \prec \frac{z}{(1-z)^{2}} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad p(z) \prec \frac{1+z}{1-z}
$$

We refer to Theorem 2.7 for an extension of this result.
(ii) For $\alpha=1$, (2.3) gives

$$
f \in \mathcal{A} \quad \text { and } \quad\left|\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right|<2 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}
$$

(iii) For $\alpha \neq 1$, Corollary 2.4 is equivalent to
$f \in \mathcal{A} \quad$ and $\quad\left|1+\frac{1}{1-\alpha} \frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right|<\frac{\alpha+1}{|1-\alpha|} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}$
so that this holds for $\alpha \in[-1 / 2, \infty) \backslash\{1\}$. If we let $\alpha^{\prime}=1 /(1-\alpha)$, then by a simple calculation we deduce the following: For $\alpha^{\prime} \in$ $(-\infty, 0] \cup[2 / 3, \infty)$, we have

$$
\left|1+\alpha^{\prime} \frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right|<\beta \quad \Longrightarrow \quad f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}
$$

where $\beta=\left(2-\left(1 / \alpha^{\prime}\right)\right)\left|\alpha^{\prime}\right|$.
Thus, it is interesting to raise the following:

Problem 2.5. For a given $\alpha^{\prime} \in(0,2 / 3)$, does there exist a best value of $\beta>0$ such that the condition

$$
\left|1+\alpha^{\prime} \frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right|<\beta
$$

implies that $f$ is starlike or univalent in $\Delta$ ?

In our next result we provide an affirmative answer when $\alpha^{\prime}=1 / 2$. However, the counterpart of Theorem 2.6 in the sense of Problem 2.5 for $\alpha^{\prime} \in(0,2 / 3) \backslash\{1 / 2\}$ remains open.

Theorem 2.6. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy the condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{2 f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right|<\beta, \quad z \in \Delta \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

(i) If $\beta \approx 0.426 \ldots$ is the solution of the equation $\beta e^{2 \beta}=1$, then $f$ is univalent in $\Delta$.
(ii) If $\beta$ is the solution of the equation $4 \beta e^{2 \beta}=-\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)\right|+$ $\sqrt{8-\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)\right|^{2}}$, then $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}$. In particular, if $f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$ and if $\beta \approx 0.3507 \ldots$ is the solution of the equation $2 \beta e^{2 \beta}=\sqrt{2}$, then $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}$.

Proof. Let

$$
p(z)=\frac{z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)}{f^{2}(z)}=\frac{z}{f(z)}-z\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\prime}
$$

Then a simple calculation shows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
z p^{\prime}(z) & =z\left(\frac{z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)}{f^{2}(z)}\right)^{\prime}=-z^{2}\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\prime \prime} \\
& =2 \frac{z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)}{f^{2}(z)}\left[1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{2 f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

and therefore, by (2.4), we have

$$
\frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{p(z)}=2\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{2 f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right) \prec 2 \beta z
$$

Because

$$
\frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{p(z)} \prec 2 \beta z \quad \Longrightarrow \quad p(z) \prec e^{2 \beta z}
$$

we deduce that $|p(z)| \leq e^{2 \beta R e z}<e^{2 \beta}$ for $z \in \Delta$. The above subordination relation is a consequence of Lemma 1.2, if we choose $q(z)=e^{2 \beta z}, \phi(z)=1 / z$ and $\theta(z)=0$. Therefore, by the hypothesis and the last subordination implication, it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|-z^{2}\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\prime \prime}\right|=|p(z)|\left|\frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{p(z)}\right|=\left|z p^{\prime}(z)\right|<2 \beta e^{2 \beta}=2 \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (2.5) and the Schwarz lemma, we get

$$
\left|-z^{2}\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\prime \prime}\right| \leq 2|z|^{2}
$$

which implies that

$$
\left|\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\prime \prime}\right| \leq 2, \quad z \in \Delta
$$

and in particular, $f$ is univalent, see [5]. Part (i) follows. Part (ii) is a consequence of [5, Example 1.11] and so we omit the details.

In [8, Remark 4.4.3], the following result was obtained as a special case (see also [4]) of a general result: if $F$ is analytic in $|z|<1$, $F(z) F^{\prime}(z) / z \neq 0$ in $|z|<1$, then for $\operatorname{Re} \alpha>0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|(\alpha-1) \frac{z F^{\prime}(z)}{F(z)}+\frac{z F^{\prime \prime}(z)}{F^{\prime}(z)}\right|<1 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad F \in \mathcal{S}^{*} \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we put $p(z)=z F^{\prime}(z) / F(z)$ in (2.6), then the last implication takes the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{p(z)}+\alpha p(z)-1\right|<1 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \operatorname{Re} p(z)>0 \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $\alpha$ real, we extend this result in the following form.

Theorem 2.7. Let $p(z)$ be analytic in $\Delta, p(z) \neq 0$ in $\Delta, p(0)=1$ and $\alpha \geq-1 / 2$. Then

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{p(z)}+\alpha p(z) \prec \alpha \frac{1+z}{1-z}+\frac{2 z}{1-z^{2}} &  \tag{2.8}\\
& \Longrightarrow \quad p(z) \prec \frac{1+z}{1-z}, \quad z \in \Delta
\end{align*}
$$

and $(1+z) /(1-z)$ is the best dominant.

Proof. Let $q(z)=(1+z) /(1-z)$. Then $q$ is convex univalent in $\Delta$ and $q(\Delta)=\{w: \operatorname{Re} w>0\}$. Let $\theta(w)=\alpha w$ and $\phi(w)=1 / w$. Then
$\theta(w)$ and $\phi(w)$ are analytic in $\mathbf{C} \backslash\{0\} \supset q(\Delta)$ and $\phi(w) \neq 0$ when $w \in q(\Delta)$. Now

$$
Q(z)=z q^{\prime}(z) \phi(q(z))=\frac{z q^{\prime}(z)}{q(z)}=\frac{2 z}{1-z^{2}}
$$

is starlike in $\Delta$. Further,

$$
\begin{aligned}
h(z) & =\theta(q(z))+Q(z)=\alpha q(z)+\frac{z q^{\prime}(z)}{q(z)} \\
& =\alpha \frac{1+z}{1-z}+\frac{2 z}{1-z^{2}}=\frac{1+2 \alpha}{1-z}-\frac{1}{1+z}-\alpha
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
z h^{\prime}(z)=\frac{z}{(1+z)^{2}}+(1+2 \alpha) \frac{z}{(1-z)^{2}}
$$

so that

$$
\frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{Q(z)}=\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1-z}{1+z}\right)+\frac{1+2 \alpha}{2}\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)
$$

Therefore, for $1+2 \alpha \geq 0$, we have $\operatorname{Re}\left(z h^{\prime}(z) / Q(z)\right)>0$ and thus all the conditions of Lemma 1.2 are satisfied and the theorem is proved.

For $\alpha \geq-1 / 2$, the function $h$ defined by

$$
h(z)=\alpha \frac{1+z}{1-z}+\frac{2 z}{1-z^{2}}
$$

maps the unit disc $\Delta$ conformally onto the complex plane with slits along the half-lines $\operatorname{Re} w=0,|\operatorname{Im} w| \geq \sqrt{1+2 \alpha}$. Suppose that $\alpha \in[-1 / 2, \infty) \backslash\{1\}$. Then (2.8) is equivalent to

$$
\frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{|1-\alpha| p(z)}+\frac{\alpha(p(z)-1)}{|1-\alpha|} \prec \frac{h(z)-\alpha}{|1-\alpha|}=H(z) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad p(z) \prec \frac{1+z}{1-z}
$$

where

$$
H(\Delta)=\mathbf{C} \backslash\left\{w \in \mathbf{C}: \operatorname{Re} w=-\frac{\alpha}{|1-\alpha|},|\operatorname{Im} w| \geq \frac{\sqrt{1+2 \alpha}}{|1-\alpha|}\right\}
$$

Now, let $\alpha^{\prime}=1 /(1-\alpha)$. Then a simple calculation gives the following.

Corollary 2.8. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\alpha^{\prime} \in(-\infty, 0) \cup[2 / 3, \infty)$. Then we have

$$
1+\alpha^{\prime} \frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \prec G(z) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}
$$

where $G$ is the conformal mapping of the unit disc $\Delta$ with $G(0)=1$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
G(\Delta)=\mathbf{C} \backslash\{w \in \mathbf{C}: & \operatorname{Re} w=\frac{\left(1-\alpha^{\prime}\right)\left|\alpha^{\prime}\right|}{\alpha^{\prime}} \\
& \left.|\operatorname{Im} w| \geq\left|\alpha^{\prime}\right| \sqrt{3-2 / \alpha^{\prime}}=\sqrt{3 \alpha^{\prime 2}-2 \alpha^{\prime}}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Problem 2.9. Find the counterpart of Corollary 2.8 (as in Problem 2.5) if $\alpha \in(0,2 / 3)$.

For example if $\alpha^{\prime} \in[2 / 3,1)$, then Corollary 2.8 gives

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(G_{\alpha^{\prime}}(f)\right)<1-\alpha^{\prime} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}
$$

where

$$
G_{\alpha^{\prime}} f(z)=1+\alpha^{\prime} \frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} .
$$

In particular, if we suppose $\alpha^{\prime}=1 / 2$, then this condition becomes

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(1+\frac{1}{2} \frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right)<\beta, \quad z \in \Delta
$$

where $\beta=1 / 2$. In Corollary 2.11 we show that if $\beta=1 / 4$, then the function satisfying the last inequality implies that $f$ is univalent in $\Delta$. On the other hand, it can be shown that a function $f$ satisfying this condition does not necessarily imply that $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}$. For instance, consider the function $f_{n}$ defined by

$$
f_{n}(z)=\frac{z}{1+(s-t / n) e^{i \theta} z+(t / n) e^{-i \lambda} z^{n+1}}
$$

where $t \in(0,1), 0<\varepsilon<t, s=\sqrt{1-(t-\varepsilon)^{2}}, \theta=\arccos (-s)$, $\lambda=\arccos t$ and $n$ is a positive integer such that $n s-t>0$. As
shown in [3], $f_{n} \notin \mathcal{S}^{*}$ for sufficiently large $n$. Let $N$ be one such large value of $n$ with the property that $f_{N} \notin \mathcal{S}^{*}$. Then

$$
\frac{z^{2} f_{N}^{\prime}(z)}{f_{N}^{2}(z)}-1=-z^{2}\left(\frac{1}{f_{N}^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{1}{z}\right)^{\prime}=-t e^{-i \lambda} z^{N+1}
$$

showing that $f_{N} \in \mathcal{S}$ because $\mathcal{U}(t) \subset \mathcal{U}(1) \subset \mathcal{S}$ for $0<t<1$. Further, we find that

$$
\begin{equation*}
1+\frac{1}{2} \frac{z f_{N}^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f_{N}^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f_{N}^{\prime}(z)}{f_{N}(z)}=\frac{N+1}{2}\left[1-\frac{1}{1-t e^{-i \lambda} z^{N+1}}\right] \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and therefore, for $0<t \leq 1 / N$, we have

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left\{1+\frac{1}{2} \frac{z f_{N}^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f_{N}^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f_{N}^{\prime}(z)}{f_{N}(z)}\right\}<\frac{N+1}{2}\left[1-\frac{1}{t+1}\right]=\frac{(N+1) t}{2(1+t)} \leq \frac{1}{2}
$$

Furthermore, from (2.9), it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|1+\frac{1}{2} \frac{z f_{N}^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f_{N}^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f_{N}^{\prime}(z)}{f_{N}(z)}\right| & =\frac{N+1}{2}\left|\frac{t e^{-i \lambda} z^{N+1}}{1-t e^{-i \lambda} z^{N+1}}\right|<\frac{(N+1)}{2} \frac{t}{1-t} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text { if } \quad 0<t \leq \frac{1}{N+3}
\end{aligned}
$$

This observation shows that there exists a function $f_{N} \in \mathcal{S} \backslash \mathcal{S}^{*}$ such that

$$
\left|1+\frac{1}{2} \frac{z f_{N}^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f_{N}^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f_{N}^{\prime}(z)}{f_{N}(z)}\right|<\frac{1}{2}, \quad z \in \Delta
$$

This observation also motivates Problem 2.5.

Theorem 2.10. Let $p$ be analytic in $\Delta, p(z) \neq 0$ in $\Delta, p(0)=1$, $\alpha>-1 / 4$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{p(z)}+\alpha(p(z)-1) \prec-\alpha z-\frac{z}{1-z}, \quad z \in \Delta \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then $p(z) \prec 1-z$ and this is the best dominant of (2.10).

Proof. Choose $q(z)=1-z$ so that $q(\Delta)=\{w:|w-1|<1\}$. With the same choices of $\theta(w)=\alpha w$ and $\phi(w)=1 / w$, we get

$$
Q(z)=-\frac{z}{1-z}=1-\frac{1}{1-z}
$$

We observe that $Q$ is convex univalent and $\operatorname{Re} Q(z)<1 / 2$ in $\Delta$. Now

$$
h(z)=\theta(q(z))+Q(z)=\alpha(1-z)+1-\frac{1}{1-z}
$$

and

$$
z h^{\prime}(z)=\alpha z-\frac{z}{(1-z)^{2}}
$$

so that

$$
\frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{Q(z)}=\alpha(1-z)+\frac{1}{1-z}
$$

Clearly, $\operatorname{Re}\left(z h^{\prime}(z) / Q(z)\right)>1 / 2$ if $\alpha>0$, and $\operatorname{Re}\left(z h^{\prime}(z) / Q(z)\right)>$ $2 \alpha+1 / 2$ if $\alpha<0$. The desired conclusion follows from Lemma 1.2.

Corollary 2.11. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies the condition

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{2 f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right)<\frac{1}{4}, \quad z \in \Delta
$$

then $f$ is univalent in $\Delta$.
Proof. Let $(z / f(z))^{2} f^{\prime}(z)=p(z)$. Then

$$
\frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{p(z)}=2\left(1-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right)+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}
$$

and therefore, by Theorem 2.10 with $\alpha=0$, it follows that

$$
\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{2 f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \prec-1-\frac{z}{2(1-z)} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{2} f^{\prime}(z) \prec 1-z
$$

Since $\operatorname{Re}(z /(1-z))>-1 / 2$, the above subordination relation is equivalent to

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{2 f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right)<-\frac{3}{4} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad f \in \mathcal{U}(1)
$$

and the desired conclusion follows as $\mathcal{U}(1) \subset \mathcal{S}$.

More generally, we can easily prove the following which we state without proof.

Corollary 2.12. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies the condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{2 f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \prec \frac{k z}{2(1+k z)}, \quad z \in \Delta \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $k \in(0,1]$, then we have

$$
\frac{z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)}{f^{2}(z)} \prec 1+k z, \quad z \in \Delta
$$

For $k \in(0,1),(2.11)$ is equivalent to

$$
\left|1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{2 f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-\frac{k^{2}}{2\left(1-k^{2}\right)}\right|<\frac{k}{2\left(1-k^{2}\right)}, \quad z \in \Delta
$$

and for $k=1$, this gives Corollary 2.11. If we apply Lemma 1.1, one can obtain a number of results for certain $k<1$ implying that $f$ is in $\mathcal{S}^{*}$ or $\mathcal{R}$, respectively. For example if $f \in \mathcal{A}$ with $f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$, then $f$ satisfying the subordination condition (2.11) implies that $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}$ whenever $0<k \leq 1 / \sqrt{2}$ and $f \in \mathcal{R}$ whenever $0<k \leq 1 / 2$.
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