

Quasiconformal Extension and Univalence Criteria

DELIN TAN

1. Introduction and Main Results

Following Ahlfors [A2] and Anderson and Hinkkanen [AH], Harmelin [H] recently obtained a univalence criterion for analytic functions $f(z)$ in the upper half-plane U . It says:

Suppose that $f(z)$ is analytic and $f'(z) \neq 0$ in U and satisfies the

$$(1) \quad \left| 2y \frac{f''(z)}{f'(z)} - c \right| \leq k \quad \text{for } y = \text{Im } z > 0,$$

where c is some given complex number with $|c| \leq k$. If $k < 1$, then $f(z)$ is univalent in U and has a k -quasiconformal extension to the whole plane. If $k = 1$ and $|c| < 1$, then (1) implies that $f(z)$ is univalent in U .

By a k -quasiconformal mapping, where $0 \leq k < 1$, we mean a quasiconformal homeomorphism whose maximal dilatation does not exceed $(1+k)/(1-k)$, or, equivalently, whose complex dilatation μ satisfies $\|\mu\|_\infty \leq k$.

Our initial observation is the following: Simply by applying Lehto's standard argument to Harmelin's criterion, the condition $|c| \leq k$ can be dropped from (1). Later we find that the above constant c can be replaced by some analytic functions related to $f(z)$. So it is natural to ask the following question: *Do there exist analytic functions $a(z)$ and $c(z)$ related to $f(z)$ such that the inequality*

$$(2) \quad |(\bar{z} - z)a(z) + c(z)| \leq k < 1 \quad \text{for } \text{Im } z > 0$$

implies that $f(z)$ is univalent in U and has a k -quasiconformal extension to the whole plane?

In this paper, we will give a positive answer. In fact, with the help of singular integrals we have obtained the following results.

THEOREM. *Let $f(z)$ and $a(z)$ be analytic functions in U or $B = \{z: |z| < 1\}$ with $f'(z) \neq 0$ for all z in U or B , and let c be a nonzero complex constant. Suppose that*

Received March 23, 1990. Final revision received July 17, 1991.
Michigan Math. J. 39 (1992).

$$(3) \quad |(\bar{z}-z)a(z) + cf'(z)e^{-\int a(z) dz} - 1| \leq k \quad \text{for all } z \in U$$

or that

$$(4) \quad |z(1-|z|^2)a(z) + (cf'(z)e^{-\int a(z) dz} - 1)|z|^2| \leq k \quad \text{for all } z \in B,$$

as appropriate. If $k < 1$, then $f(z)$ is univalent in its domain of definition and has a k -quasiconformal extension to the whole plane. If $k = 1$, then $f(z)$ is univalent in its domain.

Choosing some specific $a(z)$ will lead to interesting univalence criteria. For example, from (3) we have ($\text{Im } z > 0$)

1. $|f'(z) - 1| \leq k$ when $a(z) = 0$ and $c = 1$;
2. $\left| 2y \frac{f''(z)}{f'(z)} + c - i \right| \leq k$ when $a(z) = \frac{f''(z)}{f'(z)}$.

From (4), we have ($|z| < 1$)

3. $|f'(z) - 1| \leq \frac{k}{|z|^2}$ when $a(z) = 0$ and $c = 1$;
4. $\left| z(1-|z|^2) \frac{f''(z)}{f'(z)} + (c-1)|z|^2 \right| \leq k$ when $a(z) = \frac{f''(z)}{f'(z)}$.

REMARK 1. Criterion 1 is a refinement of the Noshiro-Warschawski univalence criterion for analytic functions in convex domains [D, p. 47]. We know that the function $f(z) = z + \gamma e^{iz}$ ($|\gamma| > 1$) is not univalent in U . However $|f'(z) - 1| = |\gamma|e^{-y}$. So the constant k in criterion 1 cannot be replaced by any number bigger than 1.

REMARK 2. Criterion 3 was obtained by Krzyz under the additional assumption $f'(0) = 1$ in [K]. The function $f(z) = z/(z^2 - \gamma)$, where $|\gamma| > 1$, which is not univalent in B , shows that in criterion 3, applied to $1/f$ instead of f , we cannot allow k to be larger than 1 if we wish to deduce that f is univalent.

REMARK 3. If we choose $a(z) = f''(z)/f'(z)$ and $c(z) = -1$ in the proof of Proposition 1 below, then (16) and (17) in Section 4 below read $h_z = a(h+1)$ and $F''(z)/F'(z) = a(z)$, respectively. Thus criterion 2 remains valid even if $c = 0$. The same is true for criterion 4, which was obtained by Ahlfors [A2] with the condition that $|c-1| < 1$.

REMARK 4. In order to generalize the criterion of Anderson and Hinkkanen [AH], one would need to consider the following problem which remains open: *Find a relation between analytic functions $a(z)$, $c(z)$, and $f(z)$ such that the inequality*

$$(5) \quad |(\bar{z} - z)^2 a(z) + c(z)| \leq k < 1 \quad \text{for } \text{Im } z > 0$$

implies that $f(z)$ is univalent in U and has a k -quasiconformal extension to the whole plane.

2. Proof of Theorem

The proof is based on the following propositions.

PROPOSITION 1. Suppose that $a(z)$ and $c(z)$ are analytic in U and satisfy

$$(6) \quad |(\bar{z} - z) a(z) + c(z)| \leq k < 1, \quad z \in U.$$

Set

$$(7) \quad \mu(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } z \in U, \\ (z - \bar{z}) a(\bar{z}) + c(\bar{z}) & \text{for } z \in L = \{z : \text{Im } z < 0\}. \end{cases}$$

Let $F(z)$ be any k -quasiconformal homeomorphism of \mathbb{C} with dilatation $\mu(z)$. Then

$$(8) \quad \frac{F''(z)}{F'(z)} = a(z) + \frac{c'(z)}{c(z) + 1} \quad \text{for } z \in U.$$

PROPOSITION 2. Suppose that $a(z)$ and $c(z)$ are analytic in B and satisfy

$$|z(1 - |z|^2) a(z) + c(z)| |z|^2 \leq k < 1, \quad z \in B.$$

Set

$$\mu(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } z \in B, \\ -\frac{1}{\bar{z}^2} \left[\left(z - \frac{1}{\bar{z}} \right) a\left(\frac{1}{\bar{z}} \right) + c\left(\frac{1}{\bar{z}} \right) \right] & \text{for } z \in \Delta = \{z : |z| > 1\}. \end{cases}$$

Let $F(z)$ be any k -quasiconformal homeomorphism of \mathbb{C} with dilatation $\mu(z)$. Then

$$\frac{F''(z)}{F'(z)} = a(z) + \frac{c'(z)}{c(z) + 1} \quad \text{for } z \in B.$$

We postpone the proof of the propositions.

Now suppose that $f(z)$ satisfies (3). Set

$$c(z) = c f'(z) e^{-\int a(z) dz} - 1.$$

First we assume $k < 1$. Then $a(z)$ and $c(z)$ satisfy (6). Let $F(z)$ be a k -quasiconformal homeomorphism of \mathbb{C} with dilatation of form (7). Then, from Proposition 1,

$$\frac{F''(z)}{F'(z)} = a(z) + \frac{c'(z)}{c(z) + 1} = \frac{f''(z)}{f'(z)} \quad \text{for } z \in U.$$

So there exist some complex constants α, β with $\alpha \neq 0$ such that

$$(9) \quad f(z) = \alpha F(z) + \beta \quad \text{for } z \in U.$$

It is clear that (9) is a quasiconformal extension formula for $f(z)$.

Next we consider the case $k=1$. For $n=1, 2, 3, \dots$, define

$$\mu_n(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } z \in U, \\ n/(n+1)\{(z-\bar{z})a(\bar{z})+c(\bar{z})\} & \text{for } z \in L; \end{cases}$$

then $|\mu_n(z)| < n/(n+1)$. Let $F_n(z)$ be a k -quasiconformal homeomorphism of \mathbb{C} with dilatation $\mu_n(z)$ that agrees with $f(z)$ at three points of U , where $f(z)$ attains distinct values. Then $\{F_n(z)\}$ is a normal family in U . We may choose a subsequence $\{F_{n_k}(z)\}$ locally uniformly converging to an analytic univalent function $F(z)$ in U . So

$$\frac{F''(z)}{F'(z)} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F_{n_k}''(z)}{F_{n_k}'(z)} \quad \text{for } z \in U.$$

But

$$\frac{F_n''(z)}{F_n'(z)} = \frac{n}{n+1}a(z) + \frac{\frac{n}{n+1}c'(z)}{\frac{n}{n+1}c(z)+1} \rightarrow a(z) + \frac{c'(z)}{c(z)+1} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{for } z \in U.$$

Again, we obtain (9) which implies that $f(z)$ is univalent in U .

Similarly, if $f(z)$ satisfies (4) we can apply Proposition 2 to prove the theorem.

3. Lemmas

To prove the propositions we need some lemmas.

For positive numbers r and ϵ , set

$$z_r = -i\sqrt{r^2+1}, \quad D(r) = \{z: |z-z_r| < r\}, \quad B(t, \epsilon) = \{z: |z-t| < \epsilon\}.$$

Note that when $z \in \partial D(r)$,

$$\bar{z} = \bar{z}_r + \frac{r^2}{z-z_r}, \quad d\bar{z} = -\frac{r^2}{(z-z_r)^2} dz.$$

Let $h(z)$ be a continuous function in L , and define

$$\iint_L \frac{h(z)}{(z-t)^2} dz \wedge d\bar{z} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty, \epsilon \rightarrow 0} \iint_{D(r) \setminus B(t, \epsilon)} \frac{h(z)}{(z-t)^2} dz \wedge d\bar{z}$$

and

$$\iint_L \frac{h(z)}{z-t} dz \wedge d\bar{z} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty, \epsilon \rightarrow 0} \iint_{D(r) \setminus B(t, \epsilon)} \frac{h(z)}{z-t} dz \wedge d\bar{z}.$$

LEMMA 1. *Let $a(z)$ be analytic in U . Then*

$$(10) \quad \frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_L \frac{a(\bar{z})}{(z-t)^2} dz \wedge d\bar{z} = \begin{cases} a(t) & \text{for } t \in U, \\ 0 & \text{for } t \in L. \end{cases}$$

Proof. When $t \in U$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_{D(r)} \frac{a(\bar{z})}{(z-t)^2} dz \wedge d\bar{z} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D(r)} \frac{a(\bar{z})}{z-t} d\bar{z} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D(r)} \frac{a(\bar{z}_r + r^2/(z-z_r))}{z-t} \cdot \frac{r^2}{(z-z_r)^2} dz \\ &= -a\left(\bar{z}_r + \frac{r^2}{t-z_r}\right) \cdot \frac{r^2}{(t-z_r)^2} \\ &= -a\left(\frac{it\sqrt{r^2+1}-1}{t+i\sqrt{r^2+1}}\right) \cdot \frac{r^2}{(t+i\sqrt{r^2+1})^2} \rightarrow a(t) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

When $t \in L$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_{D(r) \setminus B(t, \epsilon)} \frac{a(\bar{z})}{(z-t)^2} dz \wedge d\bar{z} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D(r)} \frac{a(\bar{z})}{z-t} d\bar{z} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z-t|=\epsilon} \frac{a(\bar{z})}{z-t} d\bar{z} = I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$I_1 = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D(r)} \frac{a\left(\bar{z}_r + \frac{r^2}{z-z_r}\right)}{z-t} \cdot \frac{r^2}{(z-z_r)^2} dz = 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \frac{a(\bar{t})}{2\pi i} \int_{|z-t|=\epsilon} \frac{d\bar{z}}{z-t} + \frac{a'(\bar{t})}{2\pi i} \int_{|z-t|=\epsilon} \frac{\bar{z}-t}{z-t} d\bar{z} \\ &+ o(|z-t|^2) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

In the proof of the next two lemmas, we will use the following fact, which is a consequence of Cauchy's integral theorem: *Let D be a Jordan domain containing ∞ . Suppose that $a(z)$ is analytic in \bar{D} and has a zero of at least second order at ∞ . Then, for $t \in D$,*

$$(11) \quad \int_{\partial D} a(z) \log(z-t) dz = 2\pi i \int_{\infty}^t a(z) dz,$$

where \int_{∞}^t means any simple path from ∞ to t and ∂D is negatively oriented with respect to D .

LEMMA 2. *Let $a(z)$ be analytic in U . Then, for $t \in U$,*

$$(12) \quad \frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_L \frac{a(\bar{z})}{z-t} dz \wedge d\bar{z} = \int_{+\infty i}^t a(z) dz,$$

provided that the first integral exists.

Proof. If $\bar{t} \in D(r)$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_{D(r)} \frac{a(\bar{z})}{z-t} dz \wedge d\bar{z} &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D(r)} a(\bar{z}) \log(z-t) d\bar{z} \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D(r)} a\left(\bar{z}_r + \frac{r^2}{z-z_r}\right) \log(z-t) \cdot \frac{r^2}{(z-z_r)^2} dz \\
&= -\int_{\infty}^{\bar{t}} a\left(\bar{z}_r + \frac{r^2}{z-z_r}\right) \cdot \frac{r^2}{(z-z_r)^2} dz \\
&= \int_{\bar{z}_r}^{\bar{z}_r + r^2/(t-z_r)} a(\zeta) d\zeta \quad \left(\zeta = \bar{z}_r + \frac{r^2}{z-z_r}\right) \\
&\rightarrow \int_{+\infty i}^{\bar{t}} a(\zeta) d\zeta \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 3. Let $a(z)$ be analytic in U . Then, for $t \in L$,

$$(13) \quad \frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_L \frac{a(\bar{z})}{z-t} dz \wedge d\bar{z} = \int_{+\infty i}^{\bar{t}} a(z) dz,$$

provided that the first integral exists.

Proof. Assume that $B(t, \epsilon) \subset D(r)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_{D(r) \setminus B(t, \epsilon)} \frac{a(\bar{z})}{z-t} dz \wedge d\bar{z} &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D(r)} a(\bar{z}) \log|z-t|^2 d\bar{z} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z-t|=\epsilon} a(\bar{z}) \log|z-t|^2 d\bar{z} = I_1 - I_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Write $\tilde{t} = z_r + r^2/(\bar{t} - \bar{z}_r)$. Then for $z \in \partial D(r)$,

$$\log|z-t|^2 = \log \frac{z-t}{z-z_r} + \log(\bar{z}_r - \bar{t}) + \log(z - \tilde{t}).$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial D(r)} a\left(\bar{z}_r + \frac{r^2}{z-z_r}\right) \log(z-\tilde{t}) \cdot \frac{r^2}{(z-z_r)^2} dz \\
&= -\int_{\infty}^{\tilde{t}} a\left(\bar{z}_r + \frac{r^2}{z-z_r}\right) \cdot \frac{r^2}{(z-z_r)^2} dz \\
&= \int_{\bar{z}_r}^{\bar{z}_r + r^2/(\tilde{t}-z_r)} a(\zeta) d\zeta \quad \left(\zeta = \bar{z}_r + \frac{r^2}{z-z_r}\right) \\
&\rightarrow \int_{+\infty i}^{\tilde{t}} a(\zeta) d\zeta \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $I_2 \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. □

The same method will yield the following lemma.

LEMMA 4. *Let $a(z)$ be analytic in B . Then*

$$-\frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_{\Delta} \frac{a(1/\bar{z})}{\bar{z}^2(z-t)^2} dz \wedge d\bar{z} = \begin{cases} a(t) & \text{for } t \in B, \\ 0 & \text{for } t \in \Delta, \end{cases}$$

and

$$-\frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_{\Delta} \frac{a(1/\bar{z})}{\bar{z}^2(z-t)} dz \wedge d\bar{z} = \begin{cases} \int_0^t a(z) dz & \text{for } t \in B, \\ \int_0^{1/\bar{t}} a(z) dz & \text{for } t \in \Delta. \end{cases}$$

4. Proofs of the Propositions

To prove Proposition 1 we first assume that, for a suitable $p > 2$ to be specified below,

$$\mu(z) \in L^p(\mathbb{C}).$$

For $g(z) \in L^p(\mathbb{C})$, operators \mathbf{P} , \mathbf{T} and $\mathbf{T}\mu$ are defined in [A1]:

$$\mathbf{P}g(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_{\mathbb{C}} g(z) \left(\frac{1}{z-t} - \frac{1}{z} \right) dz \wedge d\bar{z},$$

$$\mathbf{T}g(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{g(z)}{(z-t)^2} dz \wedge d\bar{z}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathbf{T}\mu(g) = \mathbf{T}(\mu g).$$

Let \mathbf{I} be the identity operator. As we know, $\|T\|_p \rightarrow 1$ as $p \rightarrow 2$. Let p satisfy $k\|T\|_p < 1$. Then $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{T}\mu)^{-1}$ exists. Let $h(z) = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{T}\mu)^{-1}\mathbf{T}\mu$. Since $\mu(h+1) \in L^p$, $F(z) = \mathbf{P}[\mu(h+1)] + z$ is well defined.

We claim that $F(z)$ is a k -quasiconformal homeomorphism of \mathbb{C} with dilatation $\mu(z)$. To see this, for $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ define

$$\mu_n(z) = \begin{cases} \mu(z) & \text{for } |z| \leq n, \\ 0 & \text{for } |z| > n; \end{cases}$$

$$h_n(z) = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{T}\mu_n)^{-1}\mathbf{T}\mu_n; \quad \text{and}$$

$$F_n(z) = \mathbf{P}[\mu_n(h_n+1)] + z.$$

From [A1], $F_n(z)$ is a k -quasiconformal homeomorphism of \mathbb{C} with dilatation $\mu_n(z)$ and satisfies $F_n(0) = 0$ and $F_n(z) = z + O(1)$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$. Note that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\|h_n - h\|_p \rightarrow 0$. Thus $F_n(z) \rightarrow F(z)$ in L^p . However $\{F_n(z)\}$ is a normal family in \mathbb{C} . We may choose a subsequence locally uniformly converging to a k -quasiconformal homeomorphism of \mathbb{C} with dilatation $\mu(z)$. Obviously the limit function must be $F(z)$.

Next we want to prove that $F(z)$ satisfies (8). From [A1] the distributional derivative

$$\begin{aligned} \{F(z)\}_z &= h(z) + 1 = 1 + \mathbf{T}\mu(z) + \mathbf{T}\mu\mathbf{T}\mu(z) + \mathbf{T}\mu\mathbf{T}\mu\mathbf{T}\mu(z) + \cdots \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{T}\mu)^n(z). \end{aligned}$$

For $z \in U$ and $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, we formally define

$$g_n(z) = \left(\int_{+\infty i}^z a(z_n) \int_{+\infty i}^{z_n} a(z_{n-1}) \int_{+\infty i}^{z_{n-1}} \cdots \int_{+\infty i}^{z_2} a(z_1) \right) dz_1 \cdots dz_{n-1} dz_n.$$

Then

$$g_n(t) = \int_{+\infty i}^t a(z) g_{n-1}(z) dz.$$

When $t \notin \mathbb{R}$, we conclude with the aid of Lemmas 1–3 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{T}\mu(t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_L \frac{(z - \bar{z})a(\bar{z}) + c(\bar{z})}{(z - t)^2} dz \wedge d\bar{z} \\ (14) \quad &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_L \frac{a(\bar{z})}{z - t} dz \wedge d\bar{z} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_L \frac{(t - \bar{z})a(\bar{z}) + c(\bar{z})}{(z - t)^2} dz \wedge d\bar{z} \\ &= \begin{cases} g_1(t) + c(t) & \text{for } t \in U, \\ g_1(\bar{t}) & \text{for } t \in L. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The first integral in (14) exists since $\mu \in L^p(\mathbb{C})$ so that $\mathbf{T}\mu \in L^p(\mathbb{C})$. The second integral on the second line in (14) exists by Lemma 1. Hence the first integral on the second line in (14) also exists, so that Lemmas 2 and 3 can be applied. This also shows that the integral used in the formal definition of $g_1(z)$ converges.

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{T}\mu\mathbf{T}\mu(t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_L \frac{a(\bar{z})g_1(\bar{z})}{z - t} dz \wedge d\bar{z} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \iint_L \frac{(t - \bar{z})a(\bar{z})g_1(\bar{z}) + c(\bar{z})g_1(\bar{z})}{(z - t)^2} dz \wedge d\bar{z} \\ &= \begin{cases} g_2(t) + c(t)g_1(t) & \text{for } t \in U, \\ g_2(\bar{t}) & \text{for } t \in L. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

By induction,

$$(15) \quad (\mathbf{T}\mu)^n(t) = \begin{cases} g_n(t) + c(t)g_{n-1}(t) & \text{for } t \in U, \\ g_n(\bar{t}) & \text{for } t \in L. \end{cases}$$

Clearly the existence of $g_n(z)$ is guaranteed by the condition $\mu \in L^p$. Define $g(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_n(z)$ for $z \in U$. Since $g(\bar{z}) = h(z) \in L^p(L)$, it follows that $g(z) \in L^p(U)$. Then the distributional derivative of g in U is

$$g_z = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g'_n(z) = a(z) \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} g_{n-1}(z) + a(z) = a(g+1).$$

Now, for $z \in U$, $h = g + gc + c$. So the distributional derivative of h in U is

$$(16) \quad h_z = g_z + g_z c + g c_z + c_z = (1+c)(1+g) \left(a + \frac{c_z}{1+c} \right) = (h+1) \left(a + \frac{c_z}{1+c} \right).$$

Note that the last expression is an analytic function in U . Therefore

$$(17) \quad \frac{F''(z)}{F'(z)} = \frac{h'(z)}{h(z)+1} = a(z) + \frac{c'(z)}{c(z)+1} \quad \text{for } z \in U.$$

Because any two k -quasiconformal homeomorphisms of \mathbb{C} with same dilatation only differ by an integral linear transformation, we have finished the proof in the case $\mu(z) \in L^p(\mathbb{C})$.

In general, for $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ set

$$\mu_n(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } z \in U, \\ \frac{n}{n + (-i\bar{z})^{1+\delta}} \{(z - \bar{z})a(\bar{z}) + c(\bar{z})\} & \text{for } z \in L, \end{cases}$$

where δ is a small positive number satisfying $k < \cos(\pi\delta/2)$. Then, for any $p > 2$,

$$\mu_n(z) \in L^p(\mathbb{C}) \quad \text{and} \quad |\mu_n(z)| \leq \frac{k}{\cos(\pi\delta/2)} < 1.$$

Let $F_n(z)$ be a quasiconformal homeomorphism of \mathbb{C} with dilatation $\mu_n(z)$ that fixes 0, 1, and ∞ . Again $\{F_n(z)\}$ is a normal family. Thus there exists a subsequence $\{F_{n_k}(z)\}$ locally uniformly converging to a k -quasiconformal homeomorphism $F(z)$ with dilatation $\mu(z)$. Denote $\rho_n(z) = n/(n + (-iz)^{1+\delta})$ for $z \in U$. Now, for $z \in U$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{F''(z)}{F'(z)} &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F''_{n_k}(z)}{F'_{n_k}(z)} \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \rho_{n_k}(z) a(z) + \frac{\rho'_{n_k}(z) c(z) + \rho_{n_k}(z) c'(z)}{\rho_{n_k}(z) c(z) + 1} \right\} = a(z) + \frac{c'(z)}{c(z)+1}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the Proposition 1.

It is not difficult to prove Proposition 2 with the aid of Lemma 4. Because every step of the proof is exactly the same as before, we omit the details.

References

- [A1] L. V. Ahlfors, *Lectures on quasiconformal mappings*, Van Nostrand Math. Studies, 10, Van Nostrand, New York, 1966.
- [A2] ———, *Sufficient condition for quasiconformal extension*, Ann. of Math. Stud., 79, pp. 23–29, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1974.
- [AH] J. M. Anderson and A. Hinkkanen, *A univalence criterion*, Michigan Math. J. 32 (1985), 33–40.
- [D] P. L. Duren, *Univalent functions*, Grundlehren Math. Wiss. 259, Springer, Berlin, 1983.

- [H] R. Harmelin, *A univalence criterion*, Complex Variables Theory Appl. 10 (1988), 327–331.
- [K] J. Krzyz, *Convolution and quasiconformal extension*, Comment. Math. Helv. 51 (1976), 99–104.

Mathematics Department
SUNY
Stony Brook, NY 11794

Current address:
Mathematics Department
Texas A&I University
Kingsville, TX 78363