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#### Abstract

Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the class of all analytic functions $f$ in the open unit disc $\mathbb{D}$ in the complex plane satisfying $f(0)=0, f^{\prime}(0)=1$. Let $U(\lambda)(0<\lambda \leq 1)$ denote the class of functions $f \in \mathcal{A}$ for which $$
\left|\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{2} f^{\prime}(z)-1\right|<\lambda \quad \text { for } z \in \mathbb{D} \text {. }
$$

The behaviour of functions in this class has been extensively studied in the literature. In this paper, we shall prove that no member of $U_{0}(\lambda)=\left\{f \in U(\lambda): f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0\right\}$ is convex in $\mathbb{D}$ for any $\lambda$ and obtain a lower bound for the radius of convexity for the family $U_{0}(\lambda)$. These results settle a conjecture proposed in the literature negatively. We also improve the existing lower bound for the radius of convexity of the family $U_{0}(\lambda)$.


1. Introduction. Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the class of all analytic functions $f$ in the open unit disc $\mathbb{D}$ in the complex plane satisfying $f(0)=0$ and $f^{\prime}(0)=1$. Let $U(\lambda)(0<\lambda \leq 1)$ denote the class of functions $f \in \mathcal{A}$ for which

$$
\left|\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{2} f^{\prime}(z)-1\right|<\lambda \quad \text { for } z \in \mathbb{D}
$$

and let $U_{0}(\lambda)$ be the class of $f \in U(\lambda)$ with $f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$. The properties of functions in $U(\lambda)$ and $U_{0}(\lambda)$ have been studied in detail in the literature (see [2]-[5]). Recently, Ponnusamy and Vasundhra [5] proposed the conjecture that $f \in U_{0}(\lambda)$ is convex at least when $0<\lambda \leq 3-2 \sqrt{2}$. In [6], Vasundhra also obtained a lower bound for the radius of convexity of the families $U(\lambda)$ and $U_{0}(\lambda)$.

The aim of the present paper is to show that the above conjecture is not valid. We shall also improve the lower bound for the radius of convexity of $U_{0}(\lambda)$. Further we shall obtain a lower bound for $\operatorname{Re}\left(z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)\right)$ on each $|z|=r<1$, thereby giving an alternative proof for the order of starlikeness of the family $U_{0}(\lambda)$.
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## 2. Main results

Theorem 2.1. If $f \in U_{0}(\lambda)$ then $|z| \leq r<1$ we have

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right) \geq \begin{cases}\frac{1-\lambda r^{2}}{1+\lambda r^{2}} & \text { if } r^{2} \leq 1 / 2 \lambda \\ \frac{1-2 \lambda^{2} r^{4}}{2\left(1-\lambda^{2} r^{4}\right)} & \text { if } r^{2} \geq 1 / 2 \lambda\end{cases}
$$

Proof. From [6, p. 22] (replacing $w$ by $-w$ ) we have

$$
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}=\frac{1-\lambda w}{1+\lambda w_{1}}
$$

where $w(z)$ is analytic in $|z|<1$ with $|w(z)| \leq|z|^{2}<1$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
w_{1}(z)=\int_{0}^{1} \frac{w(t z)}{t^{2}} d t \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

By a simple computation we have

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right) \geq \frac{(1-\lambda a)\left(1+\lambda a_{1}\right)-\lambda^{2} b b_{1}}{1+\lambda^{2}\left(a_{1}^{2}+b_{1}^{2}\right)+2 \lambda a_{1}}
$$

with $w(z)=a+i b$ and $w_{1}(z)=a_{1}+i b_{1}$ (so that $a^{2}+b^{2} \leq r^{4}$ and $a_{1}^{2}+b_{1}^{2} \leq r^{4}$ ).
Put $\lambda|a|=y, \lambda a_{1}=x$ so that $0 \leq y \leq \lambda r^{2}$ and $-\lambda r^{2} \leq x \leq \lambda r^{2}$. Using

$$
a \leq|a|, \quad \lambda|b| \leq \sqrt{\lambda^{2} r^{4}-y^{2}}, \quad \lambda\left|b_{1}\right| \leq \sqrt{\lambda^{2} r^{4}-x^{2}}
$$

we get

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right) \geq \frac{(1-y)(1+x)-\sqrt{\lambda^{2} r^{4}-x^{2}} \sqrt{\lambda^{2} r^{4}-y^{2}}}{1+\lambda^{2} r^{4}+2 x}
$$

We now fix $x$ with $|x| \leq \lambda r^{2}$. We observe that the function

$$
F(y)=(1-y)(1+x)-\sqrt{\lambda^{2} r^{4}-x^{2}} \sqrt{\lambda^{2} r^{4}-y^{2}}
$$

for $0 \leq y \leq \lambda r^{2}$ attains its absolute minimum at

$$
y=\frac{\lambda r^{2}(1+x)}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^{2} r^{4}+2 x}}=y_{0} \quad \text { with } \quad F\left(y_{0}\right)=(1+x)-\lambda r^{2} \sqrt{1+\lambda^{2} r^{4}+2 x}
$$

Hence

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right) \geq H(x)=\frac{1+x}{1+\lambda^{2} r^{4}+2 x}-\frac{\lambda r^{2}}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^{2} r^{4}+2 x}}
$$

We now observe that

$$
H^{\prime}(x)=-\frac{1-\lambda^{2} r^{4}}{\left(1+\lambda^{2} r^{4}+2 x\right)^{2}}+\frac{\lambda r^{2}}{\left(1+\lambda^{2} r^{4}+2 x\right)^{3 / 2}}
$$

so that

$$
H^{\prime}(x)<0 \quad \text { for } x<x_{0}=\frac{1-3 \lambda^{2} r^{4}}{2 \lambda^{2} r^{4}}
$$

$H^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)=0$ and $H^{\prime}(x) \geq 0$ for $x \geq x_{0}$. However, $x_{0}$ is an admissible value for $x$ if and only if

$$
-\lambda r^{2} \leq x_{0} \leq \lambda r^{2}
$$

We can verify that $-\lambda r^{2} \leq x_{0}$ holds trivially and that $x_{0} \leq \lambda r^{2}$ if and only if $\left(1+\lambda r^{2}\right)\left(2 \lambda^{2} r^{4}+\lambda r^{2}-1\right) \geq 0$, that is, $r^{2} \geq 1 / 2 \lambda$.

Thus $H(x) \geq H\left(x_{0}\right)$ for $r^{2} \geq 1 / 2 \lambda$. On the other hand, if $0<r^{2} \leq 1 / 2 \lambda$ then $-\lambda r^{2} \leq x \leq \lambda r^{2}<x_{0}$ and hence $H(x)$ is a decreasing function of $x$. Thus in this case $H(x) \geq H\left(\lambda r^{2}\right)$. By a simple computation we have

$$
H\left(\lambda r^{2}\right)=\frac{1-\lambda r^{2}}{1+\lambda r^{2}} \quad \text { and } \quad H\left(x_{0}\right)=\frac{1-2 \lambda^{2} r^{4}}{2\left(1-\lambda^{2} r^{4}\right)}
$$

This completes the proof of our theorem.
Corollary 2.2. Let $f \in U_{0}(\lambda)$ for $0<\lambda \leq 1$. Then $f(z)$ is starlike of order $\delta$ with $0<\delta<1$ where $\delta=\delta(\lambda)$ is given by

$$
\delta(\lambda)= \begin{cases}\frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} & \text { if } \lambda \leq 1 / 2 \\ \frac{1-2 \lambda^{2}}{2\left(1-\lambda^{2}\right)} & \text { if } \lambda \geq 1 / 2\end{cases}
$$

In particular $f$ is starlike of order 0 for $0<\lambda \leq 1 / \sqrt{2}$, and of order $1 / 2$ for $0<\lambda \leq 1 / 3$.

Theorem 2.3. For each fixed $\lambda$ with $0<\lambda \leq 1$ we have

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow 1-} \operatorname{Re}\left(1+\frac{r f_{r}^{\prime \prime}(r)}{f_{r}^{\prime}(r)}\right)=-\infty
$$

where for each $\alpha$ in $\mathbb{D}, f_{\alpha} \in U_{0}(\lambda)$ is defined by

$$
\frac{z f_{\alpha}^{\prime}(z)}{f_{\alpha}(z)}=\frac{1+\lambda w_{\alpha}(z)}{1-\lambda w_{\alpha 1}(z)}
$$

with $w_{\alpha}(z)=-z^{2} g_{\alpha}(z)=-z^{2} \frac{z-\alpha}{1-z \bar{\alpha}}$ and $w_{\alpha 1}=\left(w_{\alpha}\right)_{1}$ (see (1)).
Proof. From [6, p. 22] we have, for $f \in U_{0}(\lambda)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}=\frac{1+\lambda w}{1-\lambda w_{1}} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $w(z)$ is analytic in $|z|<1$ with $|w(z)| \leq|z|^{2}<1$ and $w_{1}$ is given by (1).

Note that, conversely, all functions $f$ defined by (2) are members of $U_{0}(\lambda)$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the subfamily of $U_{0}(\lambda)$ consisting of functions $f_{\alpha}$ with

$$
\frac{z f_{\alpha}^{\prime}(z)}{f_{\alpha}(z)}=\frac{1+\lambda w_{\alpha}(z)}{1-\lambda w_{\alpha 1}(z)}
$$

for $w_{\alpha}(z)$ and $w_{\alpha 1}(z)$ as in the statement.

Using (2) we have, for each $f \in U_{0}(\lambda)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)} & =2 \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-1+\frac{\lambda z w^{\prime}(z)}{1+\lambda w(z)} \\
& =2 \frac{1+\lambda w}{1-\lambda w_{1}}-1+\frac{\lambda z w^{\prime}(z)}{1+\lambda w(z)}
\end{aligned}
$$

For $f_{r} \in \mathcal{F}$ and $z=r$ we also have

$$
1+\frac{r f_{r}^{\prime \prime}(r)}{f_{r}^{\prime}(r)}=2 \frac{1+\lambda w_{r}(r)}{1-\lambda w_{r 1}(r)}-1+\frac{\lambda r w_{r}^{\prime}(r)}{1+\lambda w_{r}(r)}
$$

with $w_{r 1}(r)=r+\frac{1-r^{2}}{r} \log \left(1-r^{2}\right)$. Now

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2 \frac{1+\lambda w_{r}(r)}{1-\lambda w_{r 1}(r)}-1+\frac{\lambda r w_{r}^{\prime}(r)}{1+\lambda w_{r}(r)} \\
& =\frac{2}{1-\lambda\left[r+\frac{1-r^{2}}{r} \log \left(1-r^{2}\right)\right]}-1-\frac{\lambda r^{3}}{1-r^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim _{r \rightarrow 1} \operatorname{Re}\left(1+\frac{r f_{r}^{\prime \prime}(r)}{f_{r}^{\prime}(r)}\right) & =\lim _{r \rightarrow 1} \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{2}{1-\lambda\left[r+\frac{1-r^{2}}{r} \log \left(1-r^{2}\right)\right]}-1-\frac{\lambda r^{3}}{1-r^{2}}\right) \\
& =-\infty
\end{aligned}
$$

proving the theorem.
Theorem 2.4. Let $f \in U_{0}(\lambda)$. Then

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right) \geq 0 \quad \text { for }|z| \leq R
$$

where

$$
R^{2}= \begin{cases}\frac{1}{7 \lambda}, & \frac{8}{35} \leq \lambda \leq 1 \\ \frac{5+\lambda-\sqrt{(1-\lambda)(25-\lambda)}}{6 \lambda}, & 0<\lambda \leq \frac{8}{35}\end{cases}
$$

Proof. Taking logarithmic derivatives in (2) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}=\frac{\lambda z w^{\prime}(z)}{1+\lambda w(z)}+\frac{\lambda z w_{1}^{\prime}(z)+1+\lambda w(z)}{1-\lambda w_{1}(z)} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

By a simple computation we see that $z w_{1}^{\prime}(z)=w(z)+w_{1}(z)$. By using this, we deduce from (3) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)} & =\frac{\lambda z w^{\prime}(z)}{1+\lambda w(z)}+\frac{\lambda\left(w(z)+w_{1}(z)\right)+1+\lambda w(z)}{1-\lambda w_{1}(z)} \\
& =2 \frac{1+\lambda w(z)}{1-\lambda w_{1}(z)}-1+\frac{\lambda z w^{\prime}(z)}{1+\lambda w(z)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)} & =2\left(\frac{1+\lambda w(z)}{1-\lambda w_{1}(z)}-1\right)+\frac{\lambda z w^{\prime}(z)}{1+\lambda w(z)}  \tag{4}\\
& =2 \frac{\lambda\left(w(z)+w_{1}(z)\right)}{1-\lambda w_{1}(z)}+\frac{\lambda z w^{\prime}(z)}{1+\lambda w(z)}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $w_{2}(z)=w(z) / z$ is a Schwarz function,

$$
\left|w_{2}^{\prime}(z)\right| \leq \frac{1-\left|w_{2}(z)\right|^{2}}{1-|z|^{2}}
$$

(see [1, p. 136]), which is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|z w^{\prime}(z)-w(z)\right| \leq \frac{|z|^{2}-|w(z)|^{2}}{1-|z|^{2}} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (4) and (5) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right| \leq & \frac{2 \lambda\left(|w(z)|+r^{2}\right)}{1-\lambda r^{2}}+\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda|w(z)|}|w(z)| \\
& +\frac{r^{2}-|w(z)|^{2}}{1-r^{2}} \frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda|w(z)|}
\end{aligned}
$$

If we let $|w(z)|=x$ (note that $0 \leq x \leq r^{2}$ ), the above inequality becomes

$$
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right| \leq \frac{2 \lambda\left(x+r^{2}\right)}{1-\lambda r^{2}}+\frac{\lambda x}{1-\lambda x}+\frac{r^{2}-x^{2}}{1-r^{2}} \frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda x}=\phi(x) \quad(\text { say })
$$

By some simple computations, we see that

$$
\phi(x) \leq \phi\left(r^{2}\right)=\frac{6 \lambda r^{2}}{1-\lambda r^{2}} \quad \text { if } \quad r^{2}<\frac{5+\lambda-\sqrt{(1-\lambda)(25-\lambda)}}{6 \lambda}=x_{0}
$$

Thus

$$
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right|<1 \quad \text { if } \quad r^{2}<\frac{1}{7 \lambda}
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right|<1, \quad \text { that is, } \quad f \text { is convex for }|z| \leq r \quad \text { if } \\
& \qquad r^{2} \leq \min \left\{\frac{1}{7 \lambda}, \frac{5+\lambda-\sqrt{(1-\lambda)(25-\lambda)}}{6 \lambda}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

However, we have

$$
\frac{1}{7 \lambda}<\frac{5+\lambda-\sqrt{(1-\lambda)(25-\lambda)}}{6 \lambda} \quad \text { for } \lambda \geq 8 / 35
$$

and

$$
\frac{5+\lambda-\sqrt{(1-\lambda)(25-\lambda)}}{6 \lambda}<\frac{1}{7 \lambda} \quad \text { for } \lambda \leq 8 / 35
$$

proving the theorem.

Note 2.5. Theorem 2.3 implies that the conjecture proposed in [5] is not true. Indeed, if it were, even for a single $\lambda$ with $0<\lambda \leq 1$, then for each fixed $r<1$ we would have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Re}\left(1+\frac{r f_{r}^{\prime \prime}(r)}{f_{r}^{\prime}(r)}\right) & \geq \inf _{\alpha \in \mathbb{D}} \operatorname{Re}\left(1+\frac{r f_{\alpha}^{\prime \prime}(r)}{f_{\alpha}^{\prime}(r)}\right) \\
& \geq \inf _{f \in U_{0}(\lambda)} \operatorname{Re}\left(1+\frac{r f^{\prime \prime}(r)}{f^{\prime}(r)}\right) \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

However, this implies that if $\lim _{r \rightarrow 1-} \operatorname{Re}\left(1+r f_{r}^{\prime \prime}(r) / f_{r}^{\prime}(r)\right)$ exists, it is greater than or equal to zero, contradicting Theorem 2.3.

Theorem 2.4 improves the lower bounds obtained in [6] for the radius of convexity of the family $U_{0}(\lambda)$. For example if $\lambda=1$ then $R=1 / \sqrt{7}=$ 0.377 whereas for the same value of $\lambda$ the lower bound in [6] is 0.3489 approximately.
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