

## DIFFERENTIAL SUBORDINATIONS FOR FRACTIONAL- LINEAR TRANSFORMATIONS

YONG CHAN KIM, ADAM LECKO, JAE HO CHOI, and MEGUMI SAIGO

(Received 29 May 1998 and in revised form 29 June 1998)

**ABSTRACT.** We establish that the differential subordinations of the forms  $p(z) + \gamma zp'(z) < h(A_1, B_1; z)$  or  $p(z) + \gamma zp'(z)/p(z) < h(A_2, B_2; z)$  implies  $p(z) < h(A, B; z)$ , where  $\gamma \geq 0$  and  $h(A, B; z) = (1 + Az)/(1 + Bz)$  with  $-1 \leq B < A$ .

**Keywords and phrases.** Subordination, univalent functions, Carlson-Shaffer operator, Ruscheweyh derivative.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 30C45.

**1. Introduction.** For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathcal{A}(n)$  denote the class of functions  $f$  of the form

$$f(z) = z + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} a_k z^k \tag{1.1}$$

which are analytic in the open unit disk  $\mathcal{U} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ . We write  $\mathcal{A}$  instead of  $\mathcal{A}(1)$ . Also, let  $\mathcal{S}$  denote the class of all functions in  $\mathcal{A}$  which are univalent in  $\mathcal{U}$  (see Srivastava and Owa [9]).

For analytic functions  $g$  and  $h$  on  $\mathcal{U}$  with  $g(0) = h(0)$ ,  $g$  is said to be subordinate to  $h$  if there exists an analytic function  $\omega$  on  $\mathcal{U}$  such that  $\omega(0) = 0$ ,  $|\omega(z)| < 1$  and  $g(z) = h(\omega(z))$  for  $z \in \mathcal{U}$ . We denote this subordination relation by

$$g < h \quad \text{or} \quad g(z) < h(z) \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}). \tag{1.2}$$

For each  $A$  and  $B$  such that  $-1 \leq B < A$ , let us define the function

$$h(A, B; z) = \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz}, \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}). \tag{1.3}$$

It is well known that  $h(A, B; z)$ , for  $-1 \leq B \leq 1$ , is the conformal map of the unit disk onto the disk symmetrical with respect to the real axis having the center  $(1 - AB)/(1 - B^2)$  and the radius  $(A - B)/(1 - B^2)$ . The boundary circle cuts the real axis at the points  $(1 - A)/(1 - B)$  and  $(1 + A)/(1 + B)$ . A function  $f(z) \in \mathcal{A}$  is said to be in  $\mathcal{S}^*[A, B]$  if

$$\frac{zf'}{f} < h(A, B; z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}) \tag{1.4}$$

and in  $\mathcal{K}[A, B]$  if

$$1 + \frac{zf''}{f'} < h(A, B; z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}). \tag{1.5}$$

Note that  $f \in \mathcal{K}[A, B]$  if and only if  $zf' \in \mathcal{S}^*[A, B]$ .

In [3] Janowski introduced the class  $\mathcal{P}(A, B)$  for  $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$

$$\mathcal{P}(A, B) = \{p : p(z) < h(A, B; z), z \in \mathcal{U}\}. \tag{1.6}$$

For fixed  $n \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$  the subclass  $\mathcal{P}_n(A, B)$  of  $\mathcal{P}(A, B)$  containing functions  $p$  of the form  $p(z) = 1 + p_n z^n + \dots, z \in \mathcal{U}$ , was defined by Stankiewicz and Waniurski [10].

Further subclasses of  $\mathcal{P}(A, B)$  were considered by various authors. Janowski [3, 4], and Silverman and Silvia [8] studied the above-mentioned class  $\mathcal{P}^*[A, B]$ . The class  $R_n(A, B)$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  of functions  $f \in \mathcal{A}(n)$  such that  $f' \in \mathcal{P}_n(A, B)$  was examined by Stankiewicz and Waniurski [10]. For  $\gamma \geq 0$  the class

$$H(\gamma, A, B) = \{f \in \mathcal{A} : f' + \gamma z f'' \in \mathcal{P}(A, B)\} \tag{1.7}$$

was studied by Dinggong [11]. Notice that  $H(0, A, B) = R_1(A, B)$ .

Let the functions  $f_j(z)$  be defined by

$$f_j(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{j,n+1} z^{n+1}, \quad (j = 1, 2). \tag{1.8}$$

We denote by  $(f_1 * f_2)(z)$  the Hadamard product or convolution of two functions  $f_1(z)$  and  $f_2(z)$ , that is,

$$(f_1 * f_2)(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{1,n+1} a_{2,n+1} z^{n+1}. \tag{1.9}$$

Also, let the function  $\phi(a, c; z)$  be defined by

$$\phi(a, c; z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a)_n}{(c)_n} z^{n+1}, \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}), \tag{1.10}$$

where  $c \neq 0, -1, -2, \dots$ , and  $(\lambda)_n$  is the Pochhammer symbol defined by

$$(\lambda)_n = \begin{cases} 1, & (n = 0), \\ \lambda(\lambda + 1) \cdots (\lambda + n - 1), & (n \in \mathbb{N}). \end{cases} \tag{1.11}$$

Corresponding to the function  $\phi(a, c; z)$ , Carlson and Shaffer [2] defined a linear operator on  $\mathcal{A}$  by

$$\mathcal{L}(a, c)f(z) = \phi(a, c; z) * f(z) \quad \text{for } f(z) \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{1.12}$$

Then  $\mathcal{L}(a, c)$  maps  $\mathcal{A}$  onto itself. Furthermore, if  $a \neq 0, -1, -2, \dots$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(c, a)$  is an inverse of  $\mathcal{L}(a, c)$ . (See also Owa and Srivastava [6].)

Ruscheweyh [7] introduced an operator  $\mathcal{D}^\lambda : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  defined by the convolution

$$\mathcal{D}^\lambda f(z) = \frac{z}{(1-z)^{\lambda+1}} * f(z), \quad (\lambda \geq -1; z \in \mathcal{U}) \tag{1.13}$$

which implies that

$$\mathcal{D}^n f(z) = \frac{z(z^{n-1} f(z))^{(n)}}{n!}, \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}). \tag{1.14}$$

We also note that

$$\mathcal{D}^\lambda f(z) = \mathcal{L}(\lambda + 1, 1)f(z), \tag{1.15}$$

$$z(\mathcal{D}^\lambda f)'(z) = (\lambda + 1)\mathcal{D}^{\lambda+1} f(z) - \lambda \mathcal{D}^\lambda f(z). \tag{1.16}$$

For a function  $f(z)$  belonging to the class  $\mathcal{A}$ , Bernardi [1] defined the integral operator  $\mathcal{F}_c$ ,

$$(\mathcal{F}_c f)(z) = \frac{c+1}{z^c} \int_0^z t^{c-1} f(t) dt, \quad (c > -1; z \in \mathcal{U}). \tag{1.17}$$

By the series expansion of the function  $(\mathcal{F}_c f)(z)$ , it is easily seen that

$$(\mathcal{F}_c f)(z) = \mathcal{L}(c+1, c+2)f(z) \quad \text{for } f \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{1.18}$$

In this paper, we consider some geometric properties of certain differential subordinations associated with the function  $h(A, B; z)$ . We also apply the Carlson-Shaffer operator and the Ruscheweyh derivative to such subordinations.

**2. Main results.** The following lemma proved by Miller and Mocanu [5] is required in our investigation.

**LEMMA 1.** *Let  $q$  be an analytic function on  $\bar{\mathcal{U}}$  except for at most one pole on  $\partial\mathcal{U}$ , and univalent on  $\bar{\mathcal{U}}$ , and let  $p$  be an analytic function in  $\mathcal{U}$  with  $p(0) = q(0)$  and  $p(z) \neq p(0)$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{U}$ . If  $p$  is not subordinate to  $q$ , then there exist points  $z_0 \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $\xi_0 \in \partial\mathcal{U}$  and a number  $m \geq 1$  for which*

- (a)  $p(\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < |z_0|\}) \subset q(\mathcal{U})$ ,
- (b)  $p(z_0) = q(\xi_0)$ ,
- (c)  $z_0 p'(z_0) = m \xi_0 q'(\xi_0)$ .

After simple calculations, we have the following lemma.

**LEMMA 2.** *If  $-1 < B < A$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} |h'(A, B; e^{i\theta})| &= \frac{A-B}{1+2B\cos\theta+B^2}, \\ \frac{A-B}{(1+|B|)^2} &\leq |h'(A, B; e^{i\theta})| \leq \frac{A-B}{(1-|B|)^2}, \quad (\theta \in \mathbb{R}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Now, we prove the following theorem.

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $y \geq 0$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  be such that  $-1 < B < A \leq 1$ . Let  $A_1(y)$  and  $B_1(y)$  be defined by the system of equations*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1-A_1(y)}{1-B_1(y)} &= \frac{1-A}{1-B} - y \frac{A-B}{(1+|B|)^2}, \\ \frac{1+A_1(y)}{1+B_1(y)} &= \frac{1+A}{1+B} + y \frac{A-B}{(1+|B|)^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

*If  $p$  is an analytic function in  $\mathcal{U}$  with  $p(0) = 1$  and*

$$p(z) + y z p'(z) < h(A_1(y), B_1(y); z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}), \tag{2.3}$$

*then*

$$p(z) < h(A, B; z) \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}). \tag{2.4}$$

**PROOF.** First, notice that  $B_1(y) = (2 - a_1 - b_1)/(b_1 - a_1)$  for  $y \geq 0$ , where

$$a_1 = \frac{1-A}{1-B} - \gamma \frac{A-B}{(1+|B|)^2} \quad \text{and} \quad b_1 = \frac{1+A}{1+B} + \gamma \frac{A-B}{(1+|B|)^2}. \tag{2.5}$$

Then  $b_1 > a_1$ ,  $a_1 < 1$ ,  $b_1 > 0$ , and  $-1 < B_1(\gamma) < 1$  for each  $\gamma \geq 0$ . Hence, the function  $h(A_1(\gamma), B_1(\gamma); z)$  is analytic and univalent in  $\mathcal{U}$ , so that (2.3) is well defined.

To prove (2.4), we suppose that  $p$  is not subordinate to  $h(A, B; z)$  ( $z \in \mathcal{U}$ ). Then, by Lemma 1, there exist points  $z_0 \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $\xi_0 = e^{i\theta}$  ( $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ ), and  $m \geq 1$  such that

$$p(z_0) = h(A, B; \xi_0), \quad z_0 p'(z_0) = m e^{i\theta} h'(A, B; e^{i\theta}). \tag{2.6}$$

By Lemma 2 and by the fact that  $m \geq 1$ , we have

$$|z_0 p'(z_0)| \geq |h'(A, B; e^{i\theta})| = \frac{A-B}{1+2B \cos \theta + B^2} \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$\min_{\theta \in [0, 2\pi]} |h'(A, B; e^{i\theta})| = \frac{A-B}{(1+|B|)^2}, \tag{2.8}$$

the minimum is achieved for  $\theta = 0$  if  $B \geq 0$  and for  $\theta = \pi$  if  $B < 0$ .

From (2.2) it follows at once that the disk  $h(A, B; \mathcal{U})$  is contained in the disk  $h(A_1(\gamma), B_1(\gamma); \mathcal{U})$  and they have the same center. Also, the distance between the circle  $\partial h(A_1(\gamma), B_1(\gamma); \mathcal{U})$  and the circle  $\partial h(A, B; \mathcal{U})$  is a constant and equal to  $\gamma(A-B)/(1+|B|)^2$ .

On the other hand,  $\xi_0 h'(A, B; \xi_0)$  is an outward normal to the circle  $\partial h(A, B; \mathcal{U})$  at the point  $h(A, B; \xi_0)$  of the length not less than  $(A-B)/(1+|B|)^2$  as a consequence of (2.8). But  $m \geq 1$  and the point  $h(A, B; \xi_0) + \gamma m \xi_0 h'(A, B; \xi_0)$  is outside of the disk  $h(A_1(\gamma), B_1(\gamma); \mathcal{U})$ . Using Lemma 1, we finally obtain

$$p(z_0) + \gamma z_0 p'(z_0) = h(A, B; \xi_0) + \gamma m \xi_0 h'(A, B; \xi_0) \notin h(A_1(\gamma), B_1(\gamma); \mathcal{U}). \tag{2.9}$$

This is a contradiction to the assumption. □

In the following corollaries, we assume the conditions of Theorem 1 on constants  $\gamma, A, B, A_1(\gamma)$ , and  $B_1(\gamma)$ .

By setting  $p(z) = f(z)/z$  for  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  in Theorem 1, we obtain the following.

**COROLLARY 1.1.** *If  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  and*

$$(1-\gamma) \frac{f(z)}{z} + \gamma f'(z) \prec h(A_1(\gamma), B_1(\gamma); z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}), \tag{2.10}$$

then

$$\frac{f(z)}{z} \prec h(A, B; z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}). \tag{2.11}$$

Especially for  $\gamma = 1$ , we have the following.

**COROLLARY 1.2.** *If  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  and*

$$f'(z) \prec h(A_1(1), B_1(1); z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}), \tag{2.12}$$

then

$$\frac{f(z)}{z} < h(A, B; z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}). \quad (2.13)$$

Setting  $p(z) = f'(z)$  for  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  in Theorem 1, we have the next corollary.

**COROLLARY 1.3.** *If  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  and*

$$f'(z) + \gamma z f''(z) < h(A_1(\gamma), B_1(\gamma); z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}), \quad (2.14)$$

then

$$f'(z) < h(A, B; z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}). \quad (2.15)$$

Taking  $p(z) = zf'(z)/f(z)$  for  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  in Theorem 1, we have the following corollary.

**COROLLARY 1.4.** *If  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  and*

$$\frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)} \left[ 1 + \gamma + \frac{zf''(z)}{f'(z)} - \gamma \frac{zf''(z)}{f(z)} \right] < h(A_1(\gamma), B_1(\gamma); z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}), \quad (2.16)$$

then

$$\frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)} < h(A, B; z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}). \quad (2.17)$$

By putting  $p(z) = \mathcal{D}^\lambda f(z)/z$  and  $\gamma = 1/(\lambda + 1)$  for  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  in Theorem 1, the relation (1.16) yields the following.

**COROLLARY 1.5.** *Let  $\lambda > -1$ . If  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  and*

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}^{\lambda+1} f(z)}{z} < h\left(A_1\left(\frac{1}{\lambda+1}\right), B_1\left(\frac{1}{\lambda+1}\right); z\right), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}), \quad (2.18)$$

then

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}^\lambda f(z)}{z} < h(A, B; z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}). \quad (2.19)$$

**REMARK 1.** As was observed in the proof of Theorem 1, there holds the inclusion property

$$h(A, B; \mathcal{U}) \subset h(A_1(\gamma), B_1(\gamma); \mathcal{U}) \quad \text{for every } \gamma \geq 0. \quad (2.20)$$

Consequently, Theorem 1 and its corollaries can be improved results concerning inclusion relations between classes of analytic functions. For example, from Corollary 1.3 it follows that  $H(\gamma, A, B) \subset H(0, A, B)$  for every  $\gamma > 0$  in terms of the class  $H(\gamma, A, B)$  in (1.7), which was proved in [11].

For  $\gamma \geq 0$  such that  $A_1(\gamma) \leq 1$  and  $B_1(\gamma) \leq 1$ , the statement of Corollary 1.3 can be written as  $H(\gamma, A_1(\gamma), B_1(\gamma)) \subset H(0, A, B)$ .

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $\gamma \geq 0$ . For  $-1 < B < A \leq 1$ , let*

$$\Phi(A, B) = \frac{(A - B)(1 + B)}{(1 + A)(1 + |B|)^2} \quad (2.21)$$

and let

$$\Psi(A, B) = \frac{\sqrt{(1 - A^2)(1 - B^2)}}{1 - AB}. \quad (2.22)$$

Let  $A_2(\gamma)$  and  $B_2(\gamma)$  be defined by the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 - A_2(\gamma)}{1 - B_2(\gamma)} &= \frac{1 - A}{1 - B} - \gamma\Phi(A, B)\Phi(A, B), \\ \frac{1 + A_2(\gamma)}{1 + B_2(\gamma)} &= \frac{1 + A}{1 + B} + \gamma\Phi(A, B)\Psi(A, B). \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

If  $p$  is an analytic function in  $\mathcal{U}$  with  $p(0) = 1$  and

$$p(z) + \gamma \frac{z p'(z)}{p(z)} < h(A_2(\gamma), B_2(\gamma); z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}), \tag{2.24}$$

then

$$p(z) < h(A, B; z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}). \tag{2.25}$$

**PROOF.** By the same way as in the proof of Theorem 1, it is easily seen that the function  $h(A_2(\gamma), B_2(\gamma); z)$  for  $\gamma \geq 0$  is analytic and univalent in  $\mathcal{U}$ . Since for  $\gamma = 0$  the statement of the theorem is trivial, we can assume, for further considerations, that  $\gamma > 0$ .

Let us assume that  $p$  is not subordinate to  $h(A, B; z)$  ( $z \in \mathcal{U}$ ). Then, by Lemma 1, there exist points  $z_0 \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $\xi_0 \in \partial\mathcal{U}$ , and  $m \geq 1$  such that  $p(z_0) = h(A, B; \xi_0)$ ,  $z_0 p'(z_0) = m \xi_0 h'(A, B; \xi_0)$ . From Lemma 2, we also have

$$|m \xi_0 h'(A, B; \xi_0)| \geq \frac{A - B}{(1 + |B|)^2}. \tag{2.26}$$

Since  $|z| = 1$  is mapped by  $h(A, B; z)$  onto a circle centered at  $c = (1 - AB)/(1 - B^2)$  with radius  $r = (A - B)/(1 - B^2)$ , we see that

$$|h(A, B; z)| < \frac{1 + A}{1 + B}, \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}). \tag{2.27}$$

If we put  $\psi = \tan^{-1} \{(A - B)/\sqrt{(1 - A^2)(1 - B^2)}\}$ , then we also have

$$|\arg h(A, B; z)| \leq \tan^{-1} \frac{r}{\sqrt{c^2 - r^2}} = \psi, \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}). \tag{2.28}$$

By using (2.26) and (2.27), it is obvious that

$$\left| \frac{z_0 p'(z_0)}{p(z_0)} \right| = \left| \frac{m \xi_0 h'(A, B; \xi_0)}{h(A, B; \xi_0)} \right| \geq \Phi(A, B), \tag{2.29}$$

where  $\Phi(A, B)$  is given by (2.21).

From (2.23) it follows that the disk  $h(A, B; \mathcal{U})$  and  $h(A_2(\gamma), B_2(\gamma); \mathcal{U})$  are concentric and  $h(A, B; \mathcal{U}) \subset h(A_2(\gamma), B_2(\gamma); \mathcal{U})$ . Thus the distance between an arbitrary point of the circle  $\partial h(A_2(\gamma), B_2(\gamma); \mathcal{U})$  and the circle  $\partial h(A, B; \mathcal{U})$  is a constant and equal to  $\gamma\Phi(A, B)\Psi(A, B)$ .

Notice that  $\xi_0 h'(A, B; \xi_0)$  is an outward normal to the circle  $\partial h(A, B; \mathcal{U})$  at the point  $h(A, B; \xi_0)$ . Therefore,  $\xi_0 h'(A, B; \xi_0)/h(A, B; \xi_0)$  is the vector of the length not less than  $\Phi(A, B)$  by (2.29), rotated with respect to the normal vector  $\xi_0 h'(A, B; \xi_0)$  not more than the angle  $\psi$  in view of (2.28). Since  $\Psi(A, B) = \cos \psi$ , so an elementary geometric observation, and let us allow to assert that the point

$$h(A, B; \xi_0) + m\gamma \frac{\xi_0 h'(A, B; \xi_0)}{h(A, B; \xi_0)} \tag{2.30}$$

lies in the outside of the disk  $h(A_2(\gamma), B_2(\gamma); \mathcal{U})$ . Hence, we finally obtain

$$p(z_0) + \gamma \frac{z_0 p'(z_0)}{p(z_0)} = h(A, B; \xi_0) + m\gamma \frac{\xi_0 h'(A, B; \xi_0)}{h(A, B; \xi_0)} \notin h(A_2(\gamma), B_2(\gamma); \mathcal{U}). \quad (2.31)$$

This is a contradiction to the assumption. □

By taking  $p(z) = zf'(z)/f(z)$  for  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  in Theorem 2, we have the following.

**COROLLARY 2.1.** *Let  $\gamma \geq 0$ ,  $-1 < B < A \leq 1$ ,  $A_2(\gamma)$  and  $B_2(\gamma)$  are given by (2.23). If  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  satisfies*

$$(1 - \gamma) \frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)} + \gamma \left( 1 + \frac{zf''(z)}{f'(z)} \right) < h(A_2(\gamma), B_2(\gamma); z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}), \quad (2.32)$$

then  $f(z) \in \mathcal{G}^*[A, B]$ .

Next, we consider the case  $\gamma = 1$  in Corollary 2.1.

**COROLLARY 2.2.** *Let  $-1 < B < A \leq 1$  and  $A_2(1)$ ,  $B_2(1)$  are defined by (2.23). If  $f(z) \in \mathcal{K}[A_2(1), B_2(1)]$ , then  $f(z) \in \mathcal{G}^*[A, B]$ .*

By using the definition (1.12) and Theorem 2 we prove the following theorem.

**THEOREM 3.** *Let*

$$a > 0, \quad -1 < B < A \leq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad A_2\left(\frac{1}{a}\right), \quad B_2\left(\frac{1}{a}\right) \quad (2.33)$$

be defined by (2.23). If  $f \in \mathcal{A}$ , then

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}(a, c)f(z)}{z} + \frac{\mathcal{L}(a+1, c)f(z)}{\mathcal{L}(a, c)f(z)} - 1 < h\left(A_2\left(\frac{1}{a}\right), B_2\left(\frac{1}{a}\right); z\right), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}) \quad (2.34)$$

implies

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}(a, c)f(z)}{z} < h(A, B; z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}). \quad (2.35)$$

**PROOF.** The function

$$p(z) = \frac{\mathcal{L}(a, c)f(z)}{z}, \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}) \quad (2.36)$$

is analytic in  $\mathcal{U}$  with  $p(0) = 1$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} z(\mathcal{L}(a, c)f(z))' &= a\mathcal{L}(a+1, c)f(z) - (a-1)\mathcal{L}(a, c)f(z), \\ \frac{zp'(z)}{p(z)} &= \frac{a\mathcal{L}(a+1, c)f(z)}{\mathcal{L}(a, c)f(z)} - a. \end{aligned} \quad (2.37)$$

Therefore, the hypothesis (2.34) is equivalent to

$$p(z) + \frac{zp'(z)}{ap(z)} < h\left(A_2\left(\frac{1}{a}\right), B_2\left(\frac{1}{a}\right); z\right). \quad (2.38)$$

Hence, by Theorem 2 with  $\gamma = 1/a$ , the proof of Theorem 3 is completed. □

Setting  $a = \lambda + 1$  and  $c = 1$  in Theorem 3 and owing to the relation (1.15), we have the following.

**COROLLARY 3.1.** *Let*

$$\lambda > -1, \quad -1 < B < A \leq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad A_2\left(\frac{1}{(\lambda+1)}\right), \quad B_2\left(\frac{1}{(\lambda+1)}\right) \quad (2.39)$$

be determined by (2.23). If  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  and

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}^\lambda f(z)}{z} + \frac{\mathcal{D}^{\lambda+1} f(z)}{\mathcal{D}^\lambda f(z)} - 1 < h\left(A_2\left(\frac{1}{\lambda+1}\right), B_2\left(\frac{1}{\lambda+1}\right); z\right), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}), \quad (2.40)$$

then

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}^\lambda f(z)}{z} < h(A, B; z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}). \quad (2.41)$$

From Theorem 3 and the relation (1.18), we obtain the next corollary

**COROLLARY 3.2.** *Let  $c > -1$ ,  $-1 < B < A \leq 1$ ,  $A_2(1/(c+1))$ , and  $B_2(1/(c+1))$  be determined by (2.23). If  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  and*

$$\frac{(\mathcal{J}_c f)(z)}{z} + \frac{f(z)}{(\mathcal{J}_c f)(z)} - 1 < h\left(A_2\left(\frac{1}{c+1}\right), B_2\left(\frac{1}{c+1}\right); z\right), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}), \quad (2.42)$$

then

$$\frac{(\mathcal{J}_c f)(z)}{z} < h(A, B; z), \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}), \quad (2.43)$$

where the integral operator  $\mathcal{J}_c$  is defined by (1.17).

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.** This work was partially supported by KOSEF, BSRI-98-1401 and TGRC-KOSEF.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] S. D. Bernardi, *Convex and starlike univalent functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **135** (1969), 429–446. MR 38#1243. Zbl 172.09703.
- [2] B. C. Carlson and D. B. Shaffer, *Starlike and prestarlike hypergeometric functions*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **15** (1984), no. 4, 737–745. MR 85j:30014. Zbl 567.30009.
- [3] W. Janowski, *Some extremal problems for certain families of analytic functions. I*, Ann. Polon. Math. **28** (1973), 297–326. MR 48 6401. Zbl 275.30009.
- [4] ———, *Some extremal problems for certain families of analytic functions. I*, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys. **21** (1973), 17–25. MR 47 3659. Zbl 252.30021.
- [5] S. S. Miller and P. T. Mocanu, *Differential subordinations and univalent functions*, Michigan Math. J. **28** (1981), no. 2, 157–171. MR 83c:30017. Zbl 456.30022.
- [6] S. Owa and H. M. Srivastava, *Univalent and starlike generalized hypergeometric functions*, Canad. J. Math. **39** (1987), no. 5, 1057–1077. MR 89f:30021. Zbl 611.33007.
- [7] S. Ruscheweyh, *New criteria for univalent functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **49** (1975), 109–115. MR 51 3418. Zbl 303.30006.
- [8] H. Silverman and E. M. Silvia, *Subclasses of starlike functions subordinate to convex functions*, Canad. J. Math. **37** (1985), no. 1, 48–61. MR 86j:30015. Zbl 574.30015.



- [9] H. M. Srivastava and S. Owa (eds.), *Current Topics in Analytic Function Theory*, World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1992. MR 94b:30001. Zbl 970.22308.
- [10] J. Stankiewicz and J. Waniurski, *Some classes of functions subordinate to linear transformation and their applications*, Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Skłodowska Sect. A **28** (1974), 85-94. MR 56 5858. Zbl 441.30031.
- [11] D. Yang, *Properties of a class of analytic functions*, Math. Japon. **41** (1995), no. 2, 371-381. MR 96h:30020. Zbl 833.30003.

KIM: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, YEUNGNAM UNIVERSITY, GYONGSAN 712-749, KOREA  
*E-mail address:* kimyc@ynucc.yeungnam.ac.kr

LECKO: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF RZESZÓW, RZESZÓW 35-959, POLAND

CHOI AND SAIGO: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FUKUOKA UNIVERSITY, FUKUOKA 814-0180, JAPAN