CERTAIN CLASS OF ANALYTIC FUNCTIONS WITH VARYING ARGUMENTS DEFINED BY SĂLĂGEAN AND RUSCHEWEYH DERIVATIVE

ÁGNES ORSOLYA PÁLL-SZABÓ

Abstract. In this paper we derive some results for a certain new class of analytic functions with varying arguments defined by using Sălăgean and Ruscheweyh derivative.

MSC 2010. 30C45.

Key words. Analytic function, Sălăgean operator, Ruscheweyh operator, Bernardi operator.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathcal{A} denote the class of functions of the form

(1)
$$f(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^k,$$

which are analytic in the open unit disk $U = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}.$

DEFINITION 1.1 ([2]). For $f \in \mathcal{A}, \lambda \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the operator $\mathscr{D}_{\lambda}^{n} \colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{D}^{n}_{\lambda}f(z) = f(z),$$

$$\mathcal{D}^{1}_{\lambda}f(z) = (1-\lambda)f(z) + \lambda z f'(z) = \mathcal{D}_{\lambda}f(z), \dots,$$

$$\mathcal{D}^{n+1}_{\lambda}f(z) = (1-\lambda)\mathcal{D}^{n}_{\lambda}f(z) + \lambda z \left(\mathcal{D}^{n}_{\lambda}f(z)\right)' = \mathcal{D}_{\lambda}\left(\mathcal{D}^{n}_{\lambda}f(z)\right), z \in U.$$

REMARK 1.2 ([7]). For $\lambda = 1$ in the above definition we obtain the Sălăgean differential operator.

DEFINITION 1.3 ([6]). For $f \in \mathcal{A}, n \in \mathbb{N}$, the operator $\mathscr{R}^n : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ is defined by

$$\mathscr{R}^{0}f(z) = f(z), \dots,$$

$$(n+1)\mathscr{R}^{n+1}f(z) = z \left(\mathscr{R}^{n}f(z)\right)' + n\mathscr{R}^{n}f(z), \ z \in U.$$

DEFINITION 1.4. Let $\gamma, \lambda \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathscr{L}^n : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ be the operator given by

$$\mathscr{L}^{n}f(z) = (1 - \gamma)\mathscr{R}^{n}f(z) + \gamma \mathscr{D}_{\lambda}^{n}f(z), \ z \in U.$$

REMARK 1.5. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and $f(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^k$, then

$$\mathscr{L}^{n}f(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \left\{ \gamma \left[1 + (k-1)\lambda \right]^{n} + (1-\gamma) \frac{(n+k-1)!}{n!(k-1)!} \right\} a_{k} z^{k}, \ z \in U.$$

DEFINITION 1.6 ([4]). Let f and g be analytic functions in U. We say that the function f is *subordinate* to the function g, if there exists an analytic function w on U with w(0) = 0 and |w(z)| < 1, $z \in U$, such that f(z) = g(w(z)), for all $z \in U$. We denote by \prec the subordination relation.

DEFINITION 1.7. For $\tilde{\lambda} \geq 0$, $-1 \leq A < B \leq 1$, $0 < B \leq 1$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $L(n, \tilde{\lambda}, A, B)$ denote the subclass of \mathcal{A} which contains the functions f = f(z) of the form (1) that satisfy

(2)
$$(1 - \widetilde{\lambda})(\mathscr{L}^n f(z))' + \widetilde{\lambda}(\mathscr{L}^{n+1} f(z))' \prec \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz}.$$

Attiya and Aouf defined in [3] the class $\mathscr{R}(n, \lambda, A, B)$, using a condition similar to (2), where, instead of the operator \mathscr{L}^n , they used the Ruscheweyh operator.

DEFINITION 1.8 ([9]). A function f = f(z) of the form (1) is said to be in the class $V(\theta_k)$ if $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\arg(a_k) = \theta_k$, for all $k \ge 2$. If there exists $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\theta_k + (k-1)\delta \equiv \pi \pmod{2\pi}$, for all $k \ge 2$, then f is said to be in the class $V(\theta_k, \delta)$. The union of $V(\theta_k, \delta)$, taken over all possible sequences $\{\theta_k\}$ and all possible real numbers δ , is denoted by V.

Let $VL(n, \lambda, A, B)$ denote the subclass of V consisting of functions $f \in L(n, \tilde{\lambda}, A, B)$.

2. MAIN RESULTS

2.1. Coefficient estimates

THEOREM 2.1. Let the function f = f(z) given by (1) be in V. Then $f = f(z) \in VL(n, \lambda, A, B)$ if and only if

(3)
$$T(f) = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} kC_k (1+B) |a_k| \le B - A,$$

where

$$C_{k} = \gamma \left[1 + (k-1)\lambda \right]^{n} \left[1 + \tilde{\lambda}\lambda(k-1) \right] + \frac{(n+k-1)!}{n!(k-1)!} (1-\gamma) \left[1 + \tilde{\lambda}\frac{k-1}{n+1} \right].$$

Moreover, the extremal functions for (3) are

$$f(z) = z + \frac{B - A}{kC_k (1 + B)} e^{i\theta_k} z^k, \ k \ge 2.$$

Proof. Our arguments are based on the technique used in [5]. Suppose that $f = f(z) \in VL(n, \lambda, A, B)$. Then

(4)
$$h(z) = (1 - \widetilde{\lambda})(\mathscr{L}^n f(z))' + \widetilde{\lambda}(\mathscr{L}^{n+1} f(z))' = \frac{1 + Aw(z)}{1 + Bw(z)},$$

where $w \in H = \{w \text{ analytic}, w(0) = 0 \text{ and } |w(z)| < 1, z \in U\}$. From this we have $w(z) = \frac{1-h(z)}{Bh(z)-A}$. Therefore

$$h(z) = 1 + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \left\{ \gamma \left[1 + (k-1)\lambda \right]^n \left[1 + \widetilde{\lambda}(1-k) \right] + \frac{(n+k-1)!}{n! (k-1)!} (1-\gamma) \left[1 + \widetilde{\lambda} \frac{k-1}{n+1} \right] \right\} k a_k z^{k-1}.$$

Hence $h(z) = 1 + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} C_k k a_k z^{k-1}$ and thus |w(z)| < 1 implies

(5)
$$\left| \frac{\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} C_k k a_k z^{k-1}}{(B-A) + B \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} C_k k a_k z^{k-1}} \right| < 1.$$

Since $f = f(z) \in V$, f = f(z) lies in $V(\theta_k, \delta)$ for some sequence $\{\theta_k\}$ and a real number δ with $\theta_k + (k-1)\delta \equiv \pi \pmod{2\pi}$, for all $k \geq 2$. Set $z = re^{i\delta}$ in (5). Then $a_k z^{k-1} = |a_k| r^{k-1}$ and

(6)
$$\left| \frac{\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} C_k k |a_k| r^{k-1}}{(B-A) - B \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} C_k k |a_k| r^{k-1}} \right| < 1.$$

Since $\operatorname{Re} \{w(z)\} < |w(z)| < 1$, we have

(7)
$$\operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} C_k k |a_k| r^{k-1}}{(B-A) - B \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} C_k k |a_k| r^{k-1}}\right\} < 1.$$

 So

(8)
$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} kC_k (1+B) |a_k| r^{k-1} \le B - A.$$

Letting $r \to 1$, we get $\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} kC_k (1+B) |a_k| \leq B - A$. Conversely, assume that $f = f(z) \in V$ satisfies (3). Since $r^{k-1} < 1$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k |a_k| z^{k-1} C_k \right| \le \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k |a_k| r^{k-1} C_k$$
$$\le (B-A) - B \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k |a_k| r^{k-1} C_k$$
$$\le \left| (B-A) + B \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k a_k z^{k-1} C_k \right|,$$

which gives (5) and hence it follows that

$$(1 - \widetilde{\lambda})(\mathscr{L}^n f(z))' + \widetilde{\lambda}(\mathscr{L}^{n+1} f(z))' = \frac{1 + Aw(z)}{1 + Bw(z)}$$

that is $f = f(z) \in VL(n, \lambda, A, B).$

COROLLARY 2.2. Let the function f = f(z) given by (1) be in the class $VL(n, \tilde{\lambda}, A, B)$. Then

$$|a_k| \le \frac{B-A}{kC_k \left(1+B\right)}, \ k \ge 2.$$

The result given by (3) is sharp for the functions

$$f(z) = z + \frac{B - A}{kC_k (1 + B)} e^{i\theta_k} z^k, \ k \ge 2.$$

2.2. DISTORTION THEOREMS

THEOREM 2.3. Let the function f = f(z) given by (1) be in the class $VL(n, \tilde{\lambda}, A, B)$. Then

(9)
$$|z| - \frac{B-A}{2C_2(1+B)} |z|^2 \le |f(z)| \le |z| + \frac{B-A}{2C_2(1+B)} |z|^2.$$

Proof. Our arguments are based on the technique used by Silverman [9]. Let

(10)
$$\Phi\left(k\right) = kC_k\left(1+B\right).$$

Then Φ is an increasing function with respect to $k \ (k \ge 2)$ and thus

$$\Phi(2)\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}|a_k| \le \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\Phi(k)|a_k| \le B - A,$$

or, equivalently,

(11)
$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} |a_k| \le \frac{B-A}{\Phi(2)} = \frac{B-A}{2C_2(1+B)}.$$

Hence, we have

$$|f(z)| \le |z| + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} |a_k| |z|^k \le |z| + |z|^2 \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} |a_k|$$

and thus

$$|f(z)| \le |z| + \frac{B-A}{2C_2(1+B)} |z|^2.$$

Also, we have

$$|f(z)| \ge |z| - \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} |a_k| |z|^k \ge |z| - |z|^2 \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} |a_k|.$$

Therefore

$$|f(z)| \ge |z| - \frac{B-A}{2C_2(1+B)} |z|^2.$$

The result is sharp for the function

$$f(z) = z + \frac{B - A}{2C_2(1 + B)} e^{i\theta_2} z^2,$$

at $z = \pm |z| e^{-i\theta_2}$.

COROLLARY 2.4. Let the function f = f(z) given by (1) be in the class $VL(n, \tilde{\lambda}, A, B)$. Then $f(z) \in U(0, r_1)$, where $r_1 = 1 + \frac{B-A}{2C_2(1+B)}$.

THEOREM 2.5. Let the function f = f(z) given by (1) be in the class $VL(n, \tilde{\lambda}, A, B)$. Then

(12)
$$1 - \frac{B-A}{C_2(1+B)}|z| \le |f'(z)| \le 1 + \frac{B-A}{C_2(1+B)}|z|$$

The result is sharp.

Proof. Let $\frac{\Phi(k)}{k} = C_k (1+B)$. This is an increasing function with respect to $k \ (k \ge 2)$. According to Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\frac{\Phi(2)}{2} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k |a_k| \le \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \Phi(k) |a_k| \le B - A,$$

or equivalently

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k |a_k| \le \frac{B-A}{\Phi(2)} = \frac{B-A}{C_2(1+B)}.$$

Hence, we have

$$|f'(z)| \le 1 + |z| \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k |a_k| \le 1 + \frac{B - A}{C_2 (1 + B)} |z|.$$

So

$$|f'(z)| \ge 1 - |z| \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k |a_k| \ge 1 - \frac{B - A}{C_2 (1 + B)} |z|.$$

COROLLARY 2.6. Let the function f = f(z) given by (1) be in the class $VL(n, \tilde{\lambda}, A, B)$. Then $f'(z) \in U(0, r_2)$, where $r_2 = 1 + \frac{B-A}{C_2(1+B)}$.

2.3. Extreme points

THEOREM 2.7. Let the function f = f(z) given by (1) be in the class $VL(n, \tilde{\lambda}, A, B)$, with $\arg(a_k) = \theta_k$, where $\theta_k + (k-1)\delta \equiv \pi \pmod{2\pi}$, for all $k \geq 2$. Define

$$f_1(z) = z$$

and

$$f_k(z) = z + \frac{B - A}{kC_k (1 + B)} e^{i\theta_k} z^k, \ k \ge 2, z \in U.$$

Then $f = f(z) \in VL(n, \tilde{\lambda}, A, B)$ if and only if f = f(z) can be expressed by $f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_k f_k(z)$, where $\mu_k \ge 0$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_k = 1$.

Proof. If
$$f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_k f_k(z), \ \mu_k \ge 0$$
, and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_k = 1$, then

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} kC_k (1+B) \frac{B-A}{kC_k (1+B)} \mu_k = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} (B-A)\mu_k$$

$$= (1-\mu_1)(B-A) \le B-A.$$

Hence $f = f(z) \in VL(n, \lambda, A, B)$. Conversely, let the function f = f(z) given by (1) be in the class $VL(n, \lambda, A, B)$ and define

$$\mu_{k} = \frac{kC_{k} \left(1+B\right)}{B-A} \left|a_{k}\right|, \ k \ge 2,$$

and

$$\mu_1 = 1 - \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \mu_k.$$

From Theorem 2.1, $\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \mu_k \leq 1$ and so $\mu_1 \geq 0$. Since $\mu_k f_k(z) = \mu_k z + a_k z^k$, for $k \geq 2$, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_k f_k(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^k = f(z).$$

REMARK. The operator I_c in the following theorem is the well-known Bernardi operator, see [8].

THEOREM 2.8. Let

$$F(z) = I_c f(z) = \frac{c+1}{z^c} \int_0^z f(t) t^{c-1} dt, \ c > -1.$$

If $f \in VL(n, \tilde{\lambda}, A, B)$, then $F \in VL(n, \tilde{\lambda}, A^*, B)$, where $A^* = \frac{B + A(c+1)}{c+2} > A$. The result is sharp.

Proof. Let $f \in VL(n, \lambda, A, B)$ and suppose it has the form (1). Then

$$F(z) = \frac{c+1}{z^c} \int_0^z \left(t + \sum_{k=2}^\infty a_k t^k \right) t^{c-1} dt$$

= $z + \sum_{k=2}^\infty \frac{c+1}{c+k} a_k z^k = z + \sum_{k=2}^\infty b_k z^k$

Since $f \in VL(n, \tilde{\lambda}, A, B)$, we have $\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} kC_k (1+B) |a_k| \leq B - A$ or, equivalently,

$$\frac{\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} kC_k \left(1+B\right) \left|a_k\right|}{B-A} \le 1.$$

We know, from Theorem 2.1, that $F \in VL(n, \lambda, A^*, B)$ if and only if

(13)
$$\frac{\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} kC_k \left(1+B\right) \frac{c+1}{c+k} |a_k|}{B-A^*} \le 1.$$

Next, we show that

7

(14)
$$\frac{kC_k \left(1+B\right)\frac{c+1}{c+k}|a_k|}{B-A^*} \le \frac{kC_k \left(1+B\right)|a_k|}{B-A}, \ k \ge 2,$$

and we note that (14) implies (13). The inequalities in (14) follow from

$$\frac{c+1}{(c+k)(B-A^*)} \le \frac{1}{B-A},$$
$$(c+1)(B-A) \le (c+k)(B-A^*), \ k \ge 2,$$
$$A^* \le \frac{B(k-1) + A(c+1)}{(c+k)}, \ k \ge 2.$$

Let us consider the function given by $E(x) = \frac{B(x-1)+A(c+1)}{x+c}$. Its derivative is $E'(x) = \frac{(B-A)(c+1)}{(x+c)^2} > 0$, hence E = E(x) is an increasing function. For our case, we need $A^* \leq E(k)$, for all $k \geq 2$. For this reason, we choose $A^* = E(2) = \frac{B+A(c+1)}{c+2}$. We note that $A^* > A$, because

$$B + A(c+1) > A(c+2) \Leftrightarrow B > A.$$

The result is sharp, because, if $f_2(z) = z + \frac{B-A}{2C_2(1+B)}e^{i\theta_2}z^2$, then $F_2 =$ $I_c f_2$ belongs to $VL(n, \lambda, A^*, B)$ and its coefficients satisfy the corresponding inequality in (3) with equality. Indeed, we have

$$F_2(z) = z + \frac{B - A}{2C_2(1 + B)} \frac{c + 1}{c + 2} e^{i\theta_2} z^2 = z + \frac{B - A^*}{2C_2(1 + B)} e^{i\theta_2} z^2$$

and

$$T(F_2) = 2C_2 (1+B) \frac{B-A^*}{2C_2 (1+B)} = B - A^*.$$

If $A = 2\alpha - 1$, $A^* = 2\beta - 1$, then, from Theorem 2.8, we get the following particular case.

COROLLARY 2.9. If $f \in VL(n, \tilde{\lambda}, 2\alpha - 1, B)$, then $F \in VL(n, \tilde{\lambda}, 2\beta - 1, B)$, where 10(11)

$$\beta = \beta(\alpha) = \frac{B+1+2\alpha(c+1)}{2(c+2)} \ge \alpha.$$

The result is sharp.

87

THEOREM 2.10. If $f \in VL(n, \tilde{\lambda}, A, B)$, then $F \in VL(n, \tilde{\lambda}, A, B^*)$, where

$$B^* = \frac{A(1+B)(c+2) + (B-A)(c+1)}{(1+B)(c+2) - (B-A)(c+1)} < B.$$

The result is sharp.

Proof. Let $f \in VL(n, \lambda, A, B)$ and suppose it has the form (1). Since $f \in VL(n, \lambda, A, B)$, we have $\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} kC_k |a_k| \leq B - A$ or, equivalently,

$$\frac{\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} kC_k \left(1+B\right) \left|a_k\right|}{B-A} \le 1$$

We know, from Theorem 2.1, that $F\in VL(n,\widetilde{\lambda},A,B^*)$ if and only if

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} kC_k \left(1 + B^*\right) |b_k| \le B^* - A$$

or

(15)
$$\frac{\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} kC_k \left(1+B^*\right) \frac{c+1}{c+k} |a_k|}{B^* - A} \le 1.$$

We note that

(16)
$$\frac{kC_k \left(1+B^*\right) \frac{c+1}{c+k} |a_k|}{B^* - A} \le \frac{kC_k \left(1+B\right) |a_k|}{B - A}, \ k \ge 2$$

implies (15). The inequalities in (16) follow from

$$\frac{(c+1)(1+B^*)}{(c+k)(B^*-A)} \le \frac{1+B}{B-A},$$
$$\frac{A(1+B)(c+k) + (B-A)(c+1)}{(1+B)(c+k) - (B-A)(c+1)} \le B^*, \ k \ge 2.$$

Let

$$E(x) = \frac{A(1+B)(c+x) + (B-A)(c+1)}{(1+B)(c+x) - (B-A)(c+1)}.$$

Its derivative is

1

$$E'(x) = \frac{-(A+1)(c+1)(B-A)(1+B)}{\left[(1+B)(c+x) - (B-A)(c+1)\right]^2} < 0.$$

Hence E = E(x) is a decreasing function. For our case, we need $E(k) \leq B^*$. For this reason, we choose

$$B^* = E(2) = \frac{A(1+B)(c+2) + (B-A)(c+1)}{(1+B)(c+2) - (B-A)(c+1)}$$

and we note that

$$B^* < B \Leftrightarrow (B - A) (c + 1) (1 + B) < (1 + B) (c + 2) (B - A) \Leftrightarrow c + 1 < c + 2.$$

The result is sharp, because, if

$$f_2(z) = z + \frac{B - A}{2C_2(1+B)} e^{i\theta_2} z^2,$$

then $F_2 = I_c f_2$ belongs to $VL(n, \lambda, A, B^*)$ and its coefficients satisfy the corresponding inequality in (3) with equality. Indeed, we have

$$F_2(z) = z + \frac{B-A}{2C_2(1+B)} \frac{c+1}{c+2} e^{i\theta_2} z^2 = z + \frac{B^* - A}{2C_2(1+B^*)} e^{i\theta_2} z^2$$

and

$$T(F_2) = 2C_2 (1 + B^*) \frac{B^* - A}{2C_2 (1 + B^*)} = B^* - A.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] AL-AMIRI, H.S., On Ruscheweyh derivatives, Ann. Polon. Math., 38 (1980), 87–94.
- [2] AL-OBOUDI, F.M., On univalent functions defined by a generalized Sălăgean operator, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci., 27 (2004), 1429–1436.
- [3] ATTIYA, A.A. and AOUF, M.K., A study on certain class of analytic functions defined by Ruscheweyh derivative, Soochow J. Math., 33 (2007), 273–289.
- [4] MOCANU, P.T., BULBOACĂ, T. and SĂLĂGEAN, G.S., The Geometric Theory of Univalent Functions, Casa Cărții de Știință, Cluj-Napoca, 2006.
- [5] PÁLL-SZABÓ, Á.O. and ENGEL, O., Certain class of analytic functions with varying arguments defined by Salagean derivative, Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Theory and Applications of Mathematics and Informatics, Alba Iulia, Romania, 2015, 113–120.
- [6] RUSCHEWEYH, S., New criteria for univalent functions, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 49 (1975), 109–115.
- [7] SĂLĂGEAN, G.S., Subclasses of univalent functions, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 1013, 1983, 362–372.
- [8] SĂLĂGEAN, G.S., Integral properties of certain classes of analytic functions with negative coefficients, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci., 1 (2005), 125–131.
- [9] SILVERMAN, H., Univalent functions with varying arguments, Houston J. Math., 7 (1981), 283–287.

Received March 27, 2017 Accepted September 7, 2017 Babeş-Bolyai University Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science 1 M. Kogălniceanu St. 400084 Cluj-Napoca, Romania E-mail: pallszaboagnes@math.ubbcluj.ro