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#### Abstract

In this paper, we obtain some sufficient conditions for a normalized analytic function to be $\phi$-like and starlike of order $\alpha$.
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## 1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the class of functions $f$ which are analytic in the unit disc $E=$ $\{z:|z|<1\}$ and are normalized by the conditions $f(0)=f^{\prime}(0)-1=0$. Denote by $S^{*}(\alpha)$ and $K(\alpha)$, the classes of starlike functions of order $\alpha$ and convex functions of order $\alpha$ respectively, which are analytically defined as follows

$$
S^{*}(\alpha)=\left\{f(z) \in \mathcal{A}: \Re \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}>\alpha, z \in E\right\}
$$

and

$$
K(\alpha)=\left\{f(z) \in \mathcal{A}: \Re\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right)>\alpha, z \in E\right\}
$$

[^0]where $\alpha$ is a real number such that $0 \leq \alpha<1$. We shall use $S^{*}$ and $K$ to denote $S^{*}(0)$ and $K(0)$, respectively which are the classes of univalent starlike (w.r.t. the origin) and univalent convex functions.
Let $f$ and $g$ be analytic in $E$. We say that $f$ is subordinate to $g$ in $E$, written as $f(z) \prec g(z)$ in $E$, if $g$ is univalent in $E, f(0)=g(0)$ and $f(E) \subset g(E)$. Denote by $S^{*}[A, B],-1 \leq B<A \leq 1$, the class of functions $f \in \mathcal{A}$ which satisfy
$$
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \prec \frac{1+A z}{1+B z}, z \in E .
$$

Note that $S^{*}[1-2 \alpha,-1]=S^{*}(\alpha), 0 \leq \alpha<1$ and $S^{*}[1,-1]=S^{*}$.
A function $f, f^{\prime}(0) \neq 0$, is said to be close-to-convex in $E$, if and only if, there is a starlike function $h$ (not necessarily normalized) such that

$$
\Re \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{h(z)}>0, z \in E .
$$

Let $\phi$ be analytic in a domain containing $f(E), \phi(0)=0$ and $\Re \phi^{\prime}(0)>0$, then, the function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is said to be $\phi$-like in $E$ if

$$
\Re \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{\phi(f(z))}>0, z \in E
$$

This concept was introduced by L. Brickman [1]. He proved that an analytic function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is univalent if and only if $f$ is $\phi$-like for some $\phi$. Later, Ruscheweyh [8] investigated the following general class of $\phi$-like functions: Let $\phi$ be analytic in a domain containing $f(E), \phi(0)=0, \phi^{\prime}(0)=1$ and $\phi(w) \neq 0$ for $w \in f(E)-\{0\}$, then the function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is called $\phi$-like with respect to a univalent function $q, q(0)=1$, if

$$
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{\phi(f(z))} \prec q(z), z \in E
$$

In the present note, we obtain some sufficient conditions for a normalized analytic function to be $\phi$-like. In [9], Silverman defined the class $G_{b}$ as

$$
G_{b}=\left\{f \in \mathcal{A}:\left|\frac{1+z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)}{z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)}-1\right|<b, z \in E\right\}
$$

and proved that the functions in the class $G_{b}$ are starlike in $E$. Later on, this class was studied extensively by Tuneski $[4,11,12,13,14,15]$. As particular cases, we obtain many interesting results for the class $G_{b}$. Most of the results proved by Tuneski follow as corollaries to our theorem.

## 2 Preliminaries

We shall need following definition and lemmas to prove our results.
Definition 2.1. A function $L(z, t), z \in E$ and $t \geq 0$ is said to be a subordination chain if $L(., t)$ is analytic and univalent in $E$ for all $t \geq 0, L(z,$. is continuously differentiable on $[0, \infty)$ for all $z \in E$ and $L\left(z, t_{1}\right) \prec L\left(z, t_{2}\right)$ for all $0 \leq t_{1} \leq t_{2}$.
Lemma 2.1 [5, page 159]. The function $L(z, t): E \times[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, ( $\mathbb{C}$ is the set of complex numbers), of the form $L(z, t)=a_{1}(t) z+\ldots$ with $a_{1}(t) \neq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, and $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\left|a_{1}(t)\right|=\infty$, is said to be a subordination chain if and only if $\operatorname{Re}\left[\frac{z \partial L / \partial z}{\partial L / \partial t}\right]>0$ for all $z \in E$ and $t \geq 0$.
Lemma 2.2 [3]. Let $F$ be analytic in $E$ and let $G$ be analytic and univalent in $\bar{E}$ except for points $\zeta_{0}$ such that $\lim _{z \rightarrow \zeta_{0}} F(z)=\infty$, with $F(0)=G(0)$. If $F \nprec G$ in $E$, then there is a point $z_{0} \in E$ and $\zeta_{0} \in \partial E$ (boundary of $E$ ) such that $F\left(|z|<\left|z_{0}\right|\right) \subset G(E), F\left(z_{0}\right)=G\left(\zeta_{0}\right)$ and $z_{0} F^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=m \zeta_{0} G^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)$ for some $m \geq 1$.

## 3 Main Result

Lemma 3.1. Let $\gamma, \Re \gamma \geq 0$, be a complex number. Let $q$ be univalent function such that either $\frac{z q^{\prime}(z)}{q^{2}(z)}$ is starlike in $E$ or $\frac{1}{q(z)}$ is convex in $E$. If an analytic function $p$, satisfies the differential subordination

$$
\begin{equation*}
1-\frac{\gamma}{p(z)}+\frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{p^{2}(z)} \prec 1-\frac{\gamma}{q(z)}+\frac{z q^{\prime}(z)}{q^{2}(z)}, p(0)=q(0)=1, z \in E \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $p(z) \prec q(z)$ and $q(z)$ is the best dominant.
Proof. Let us define a function

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(z)=1-\frac{\gamma}{q(z)}+\frac{z q^{\prime}(z)}{q^{2}(z)}, z \in E . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Firstly, we will prove that $h(z)$ is univalent in $E$ so that the subordination (3.1) is well-defined in $E$. Differentiating (3.2) and simplifying a little, we get

$$
\frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{Q(z)}=\gamma+\frac{z Q^{\prime}(z)}{Q(z)}, z \in E
$$

where $Q(z)=\frac{z q^{\prime}(z)}{q^{2}(z)}$. In view of the given conditions, we obtain

$$
\Re \frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{Q(z)}>0, z \in E .
$$

Thus, $h(z)$ is close-to-convex and hence univalent in $E$. We need to show that that $p \prec q$. Suppose to the contrary that $p \nprec q$ in $E$. Then by Lemma 2.2 , there exist points $z_{0} \in E$ and $\zeta_{0} \in \partial E$ such that $p\left(z_{0}\right)=q\left(\zeta_{0}\right)$ and $z_{0} p^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=m \zeta q^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right), m \geq 1$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
1-\frac{\gamma}{p\left(z_{0}\right)}+\frac{z_{0} p^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{p^{2}\left(z_{0}\right)}=1-\frac{\gamma}{q\left(\zeta_{0}\right)}+\frac{m \zeta_{0} q^{\prime}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)}{q^{2}\left(\zeta_{0}\right)}, z \in E \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consider a function

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(z, t)=1-\frac{\gamma}{q(z)}+(1+t) \frac{z q^{\prime}(z)}{q^{2}(z)}, z \in E . \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The function $L(z, t)$ is analytic in $E$ for all $t \geq 0$ and is continuously differentiable on $[0, \infty)$ for all $z \in E$. Now,

$$
a_{1}(t)=\left(\frac{\partial L(z, t)}{\partial z}\right)_{(0, t)}=q^{\prime}(0)(\gamma+1+t)
$$

In view of the condition that $\Re \gamma \geq 0$, we get $|\arg (\gamma+1+t)| \leq \pi / 2$. Also, as $q$ is univalent in $E$, so, $q^{\prime}(0) \neq 0$. Therefore, it follows that $a_{1}(t) \neq 0$ and
$\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\left|a_{1}(t)\right|=\infty$. A simple calculation yields

$$
z \frac{\partial L / \partial z}{\partial L / \partial t}=\gamma+(1+t) \frac{z Q^{\prime}(z)}{Q(z)}, z \in E .
$$

Clearly

$$
\Re z \frac{\partial L / \partial z}{\partial L / \partial t}>0, z \in E
$$

in view of given conditions. Hence, $L(z, t)$ is a subordination chain. Therefore, $L\left(z, t_{1}\right) \prec L\left(z, t_{2}\right)$ for $0 \leq t_{1} \leq t_{2}$. From (3.4), we have $L(z, 0)=h(z)$, thus we deduce that $L\left(\zeta_{0}, t\right) \notin h(E)$ for $\left|\zeta_{0}\right|=1$ and $t \geq 0$. In view of (3.3) and (3.4), we can write

$$
1-\frac{\gamma}{p\left(z_{0}\right)}+\frac{z_{0} p^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{p^{2}\left(z_{0}\right)}=L\left(\zeta_{0}, m-1\right) \notin h(E)
$$

where $z_{0} \in E,\left|\zeta_{0}\right|=1$ and $m \geq 1$ which is a contradiction to (3.1). Hence, $p \prec q$. This completes the proof of the Lemma.

Theorem 3.1. Let $\gamma, \Re \gamma \geq 0$, be a complex number. Let $q, q(0)=1$, be a univalent function such that $\frac{z q^{\prime}(z)}{q^{2}(z)}$ is starlike in $E$ or, equivalently, $\frac{1}{q(z)}$ is convex in $E$. If an analytic function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies the differential subordination

$$
1+\frac{1-\gamma+z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)}{z f^{\prime}(z) / \phi(f(z))}-\frac{(\phi(f(z)))^{\prime}}{f^{\prime}(z)} \prec 1-\frac{\gamma}{q(z)}+\frac{z q^{\prime}(z)}{q^{2}(z)}, z \in E
$$

for some function $\phi$, analytic in a domain containing $f(E), \phi(0)=0, \phi^{\prime}(0)=$ 1 and $\phi(w) \neq 0$ for $w \in f(E)-\{0\}$, then $\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{\phi(f(z))} \prec q(z)$ and $q(z)$ is the best dominant.
Proof. The proof of the theorem follows by writing $p(z)=\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{\phi(f(z))}$ in Lemma 3.1.

In particular, for $\phi(w)=w$ and $q(z)=\frac{z g^{\prime}(z)}{g(z)}$ in Theorem 3.1, we obtain the following result.
Theorem 3.2. Let $\gamma, \Re \gamma \geq 0$, be a complex number. Let $g \in \mathcal{A}$ be such that $\frac{z g^{\prime}(z)}{g(z)}=q(z)$ is univalent in $E$. Assume that either $\frac{z q^{\prime}(z)}{q^{2}(z)}$ is starlike
in $E$ or $\frac{1}{q(z)}$ is convex in $E$. If an analytic function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies the differential subordination

$$
\frac{1-\gamma+z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)}{z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)} \prec \frac{1-\gamma+z g^{\prime \prime}(z) / g^{\prime}(z)}{z g^{\prime}(z) / g(z)}, z \in E,
$$

then $\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \prec \frac{z g^{\prime}(z)}{g(z)}$.

## 4 Applications to univalent functions

In this section, we obtain a criterion for a normalized analytic function to be $\phi$-like. As an application of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, we obtain some new conditions and also few existing conditions for a function to be in the class $S^{*}$ and $S^{*}(\alpha)$.
When the dominant is $q(z)=\frac{1+A z}{1+B z}$. We observe that $q$ is univalent in $E$ and $\frac{1}{q(z)}$ is convex in $E$ where $-1 \leq B<A \leq 1$. From Theorem 3.1, we deduce the following result.

Theorem 4.1. Let $\gamma, \Re \gamma \geq 0$, be a complex number and $A$ and $B$ be real numbers $-1 \leq B<A \leq 1$. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy the differential subordination $1+\frac{1-\gamma+z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)}{z f^{\prime}(z) / \phi(f(z))}-\frac{(\phi(f(z)))^{\prime}}{f^{\prime}(z)} \prec 1-\gamma \frac{1+B z}{1+A z}+\frac{(A-B) z}{(1+A z)^{2}}, z \in E$,
for some function $\phi$, analytic in a domain containing $f(E), \phi(0)=0, \phi^{\prime}(0)=$ 1 and $\phi(w) \neq 0$ for $w \in f(E)-\{0\}$, then $\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{\phi(f(z))} \prec \frac{1+A z}{1+B z}, z \in E$.

As an example, if we take $\gamma=i, A=0, B=-1$ in Theorem 4.1, we obtain the following result.
Example 4.1. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy

$$
\left|\frac{1-\gamma+z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)}{z f^{\prime}(z) / \phi(f(z))}-\frac{(\phi(f(z)))^{\prime}}{f^{\prime}(z)}+i\right|<\sqrt{2}, z \in E
$$

then $\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{\phi(f(z))} \prec \frac{1}{1-z}, z \in E$.

In particular, for $\gamma=0$ and $A=1, B=-1$, Theorem 4.1, reduces to the following result.
Corollary 4.1. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy the differential subordination

$$
\frac{1+z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)}{z f^{\prime}(z) / \phi(f(z))}-\frac{(\phi(f(z)))^{\prime}}{f^{\prime}(z)} \prec \frac{2 z}{(1+z)^{2}}, z \in E
$$

for some function $\phi$, analytic in a domain containing $f(E), \phi(0)=0, \phi^{\prime}(0)=$ 1 and $\phi(w) \neq 0$ for $w \in f(E)-\{0\}$, then $\operatorname{Re} \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{\phi(f(z))}>0, z \in E$.

Note that several such results are available for different substitutions of constants $A, B$.
For the dominant $q(z)=\frac{1+A z}{1+B z}$, Theorem 3.2 gives us the following result.
Theorem 4.2. Let $\gamma, \Re \gamma \geq 0$, be a complex number and $A$ and $B$ be real numbers $-1 \leq B<A \leq 1$. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy the differential subordination

$$
\frac{1-\gamma+z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)}{z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)} \prec 1-\gamma \frac{1+B z}{1+A z}+\frac{(A-B) z}{(1+A z)^{2}}, \quad z \in E,
$$

then $f \in S^{*}[A, B]$.
Writing $\gamma=1$ in Theorem 4.2, we obtain the following result.
Corollary 4.2. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies the differential subordination

$$
\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(z) f(z)}{f^{\prime 2}(z)} \prec 1-\frac{1+B z}{1+A z}+\frac{(A-B) z}{(1+A z)^{2}}, \quad z \in E,-1 \leq B<A \leq 1
$$

then $f \in S^{*}[A, B]$.
Writing $A=0$ in Theorem 4.2, we obtain the following result.
Corollary 4.3. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy

$$
\left|\frac{1-\gamma+z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)}{z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)}-(1-\gamma)\right|<(1+\gamma) B, z \in E, \gamma \geq 0,0<B \leq 1
$$

then

$$
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \prec \frac{1}{1+B z}, z \in E .
$$

In particular, for $\gamma=1$, in Corollary 4.3, we obtain the following result. Corollary 4.4. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy

$$
\left|\frac{f(z) f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime 2}(z)}\right|<2 B, \quad z \in E, \quad 0<B \leq 1
$$

then

$$
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \prec \frac{1}{1+B z}, \quad z \in E .
$$

The selection of $B=0$ in Theorem 4.2 gives us the following result.
Corollary 4.5. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy
$\frac{1-\gamma+z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)}{z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)} \prec 1-\frac{\gamma}{1+A z}+\frac{A z}{(1+A z)^{2}}, z \in E, \gamma \geq 0,0<A \leq 1$, then

$$
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-1\right|<A, z \in E
$$

In particular, for $\gamma=0$ in Corollary 4.5, we obtain the following result.
Corollary 4.6. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy

$$
\frac{1+z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)}{z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)} \prec 1+\frac{A z}{(1+A z)^{2}}, \quad z \in E, 0<A \leq 1
$$

then

$$
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-1\right|<A, z \in E .
$$

Taking $\gamma=1$ in corollary 4.5, we obtain the following result.
Corollary 4.7. If

$$
\frac{f(z) f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime 2}(z)} \prec 1-\frac{1}{(1+A z)^{2}}, z \in E, 0<A \leq 1,
$$

then

$$
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-1\right|<A, z \in E
$$

Remark 4.1. (i) Writing $\gamma=0$ in Theorem 4.2, we obtain the Theorem 2.3 in [14].
(ii) Writing $A=-1, B=1$ in Theorem 4.2, we obtain Theorem 1 of [15].
(iii) Taking $A=1, B=-1, \gamma=0$ in Theorem 4.2, we obtain Theorem 3 in [4].
(iv) Taking $A=-1, B=1, \gamma=1$ in Theorem 4.2, we get Theorem 1 in [12].
(v) Taking $A=0, \gamma=0$ in Theorem 4.2, we obtain Theorem 1 in [4].
(vi) Writing $A=0, B=-1, \gamma=1$ in Theorem 4.2, we obtain the following result:
If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies, $\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(z) f(z)}{f^{\prime 2}(z)} \prec 2 z, z \in E$, then $f \in S^{*}(1 / 2)$.
This is an improvement of Corollary 2 proved in [12].
(vii) Taking $A=-(1-2 \alpha), B=1,0 \leq \alpha<1$ in Theorem 4.2, we get the Theorem 3 in [15].
(viii) Writing $A=-(1-2 \alpha), B=1,0 \leq \alpha<1$ and $\gamma=0$ in Theorem 4.2, we obtain Corollary 4(i) in [15].
(ix) Writing $A=-(1-2 \alpha), B=1,0 \leq \alpha<1$ and for $\gamma=1$ in Theorem 4.2, Corollary 4(ii) in [15] follows.
(x) For $B=\frac{1-\beta}{\beta}, 1 / 2 \leq \beta<1$ in Corollary 4.4, we obtain the result of Robertson [7].
(xi) Taking $q(z)=\frac{2 \alpha}{1+z}$ in Theorem 3.2, we obtain Theorem 2 in [15].
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