# THE $H^{p}$ CLASSES FOR $\alpha$-CONVEX FUNCTIONS 
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## Abstract. Given $\alpha>0$, we determine the $H^{p}$ class to which an $\alpha$-convex function belongs.

Introduction. In this paper we continue the study ([4], [5], [6], [7]) of $\mathscr{M}_{\alpha}$, the class of $\alpha$-convex functions. Our purpose is to obtain the $H^{p}$ class to which a given $\alpha$-convex function belongs.
Definition. Let $f(z)=z+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n}$ be analytic in the unit disc $D$, with $(f(z) / z) f^{\prime}(z) \neq 0$ there, and let $\alpha$ be a real number. Then $f(z)$ is said to be $\alpha$-convex in $D$ if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\left[(1-\alpha) \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}+\alpha\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right)\right]>0 . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is known [5] that if $f(z)$ is $\alpha$-convex then $f(z)$ is starlike and univalent in $D$. Moreover, if $\alpha \geqq 1$ then $f(z)$ is convex in $D$. In our investigation we shall employ the $H^{p}$ results concerning starlike and convex functions [3]. We shall also make use of the following subclasses, first introduced by Reade [11], of the class of close-to-convex functions.

Definition. Let $K_{\beta}$ denote the class of functions $f(z)$, analytic in $D$, for which there exists a convex function $h(z)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\arg \left(f^{\prime}(z) / h^{\prime}(z)\right)\right| \leqq \beta \pi / 2 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following theorem can be found in [7].
Theorem 1. If $f(z) \in \mathscr{M}_{\alpha}(0 \leqq \alpha \leqq 1)$, then $f(z) \in K_{1-\alpha}$.
Proof. Since $f(z) \in \mathscr{M}_{\alpha}$ one easily checks that $f(z)\left(z f^{\prime}(z) \mid f(z)\right)^{\alpha}$ is starlike, so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(z) \equiv \int_{0}^{z} \frac{f(w)}{w}\left(\frac{w f^{\prime}(w)}{f(w)}\right)^{x} d w \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]is convex. The result then follows from the identity
$$
f^{\prime}(z) / h^{\prime}(z)=\left(z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)\right)^{1-\alpha}
$$
and the fact that $f(z)$ is starlike.
We now make the following two observations.
(a) If $f(z) \in \mathscr{M}_{\alpha}(\alpha>0)$, then $f(z)$ is continuous in $\bar{D}$ (if $\infty$ is allowed as a value) and assumes no finite value more than once.
(b) If $f(z) \in \mathscr{M}_{\alpha}(\alpha>0)$, and $L(r)$ denotes the length of $\{w=f(z):|z|=r\}$, then $L(r)=O(M(r))$ as $r \rightarrow 1$.

Pommerenke [10] obtained the results in (a) and (b) for $f(z) \in K_{\beta}$, $\beta<1$, and consequently by Theorem 1 they follow for $f(z) \in \mathscr{M}_{\alpha}, 0<\alpha<1$. In case $\alpha \geqq 1, f(z)$ is convex and the results (a) and (b) are well known.

We further observe from (a) that none of the classes of starlike functions of a positive order (less than unity) is contained in $\mathscr{M}_{\alpha}$ for some positive $\alpha$. This follows from the existence of bounded functions, starlike of any given order (less than unity), which do not extend continuously to $\bar{D}$ [2]. The question of the order of starlikeness for the class $\mathscr{M}_{\alpha}$ remains open.

Theorem 2. If $f(z) \in K_{\beta}$ and there exists a convex function $h(z)$, not of the form $h(z)=a+b z\left(1+z e^{i \tau}\right)^{-1}$, such that $\left|\arg \left(f^{\prime}(z) / h^{\prime}(z)\right)\right| \leqq \beta \pi / 2$, then there exists $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(f)>0$ such that

$$
f(z) \in H^{1 /(1+\beta)+\varepsilon} \quad \text { and } \quad f^{\prime}(z) \in H^{1 /(2+\beta)+\varepsilon} .
$$

Proof. We first observe that if $\beta=0$ or $\beta=1$, these results are known [3]. Writing $f^{\prime}(z)=h^{\prime}(z) P(z)$ where $|\arg P(z)| \leqq \beta \pi / 2$, it follows that $P(z) \in H^{\lambda}, \forall \lambda, \lambda<1 / \beta$. Also, from Theorem 3 of [3], $h^{\prime}(z) \in H^{1 / 2+\delta}$ for some $\delta=\delta(h)>0$. Application of Hölder's inequality with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p=\left(\frac{1}{2}+\delta\right)(\beta+2-\delta) \\
& q=\left(\frac{1}{2}+\delta\right)(\beta+2-\delta)\left(\beta / 2+\delta \beta+3 \delta / 2-\delta^{2}\right)^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

yields

$$
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|^{(\beta+2-\delta)^{-1}} d \theta \leqq\left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left|h^{\prime}(z)\right|^{p /(\beta+2-\delta)} d \theta\right)^{1 / p}\left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}|P(z)|^{q /(\beta+2-\delta)} d \theta\right)^{1 / q}
$$

If $\delta$ is sufficiently small, each of the integrals on the right remains bounded as $r$ tends to 1 . Hence there exists $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(f)>0$ such that $f^{\prime}(z) \in H^{1 /(\beta+2)+\varepsilon}$. By a well-known theorem of Hardy-Littlewood [1, p. 88], $f(z) \in H^{1 /(\beta+1)+\varepsilon}$ for a possibly different value of $\varepsilon$.

We require the following integral representation [6] for functions in $\mathscr{M}_{\alpha}, \alpha>0$ : the function $f(z)$ is in $\mathscr{M}_{\alpha}, \alpha>0$, if and only if there exists a
starlike function $s(z)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=\left[\frac{1}{\alpha} \int_{0}^{z}[s(\zeta)]^{1 / \alpha \zeta-1} d \zeta\right]^{\alpha} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $\alpha>2, f(z)$ is bounded [4] and $f^{\prime}(z) \in H^{1}$ (since $f(z)$ is convex).
Let us denote by $f_{\alpha}(z)$, the function obtained in (4) by letting $s(z)$ be the Koebe function, $k(z)=z(1-z)^{-2}$. It follows from (3) that $h(z)$ is of the form $z\left(1-z e^{i \tau}\right)^{-1}$ if and only if $f(z)=e^{-i \tau} f_{\alpha}\left(z e^{i \tau}\right)$. Theorems 1 and 2 then yield the following.

Theorem 3. If $f(z) \in \mathscr{M}_{\alpha}(0 \leqq \alpha \leqq 1)$ and is not a rotation of $f_{\alpha}(z)$, then there exists $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(f)>0$ such that

$$
f(z) \in H^{1 /(2-\alpha)+\varepsilon} \quad \text { and } \quad f^{\prime}(z) \in H^{1 /(3-\alpha)+\varepsilon}
$$

We remark that for $0 \leqq \alpha \leqq 2, f_{\alpha}(z) \notin H^{1 /(2-\alpha)}\left(H^{\infty}\right.$ if $\left.\alpha=2\right)$, although $f_{\alpha}(z) \in H^{\lambda}, \forall \lambda, \lambda<1 /(2-\alpha)$.

We now wish to establish Theorem 3 for $1<\alpha \leqq 2$. In this case $f(z)$ is both convex and starlike. These geometric properties give rise to the usual Herglotz formulas, which in turn yield probability measures $\mu_{1}$ and $\mu_{2}$, respectively. We can suppose these measures to be normalized so that

$$
\frac{1}{2}\left[\mu_{i}(t+0)+\mu_{i}(t-0)\right]=\mu_{i}(t), \quad \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \mu_{i}(t) d t=0 \quad(i=1,2)
$$

The normalization determines $\mu_{1}$ and $\mu_{2}$ uniquely; we shall call them the convex and starlike measures associated with $f(z)$, respectively.

Lemma 4. Let $f(z)$ be an unbounded convex function and let $\mu_{1}$ be the convex measure associated with $f(z)$. If the maximum jump of $\mu_{1}(t)$ is $\gamma$, then $f(z) \in H^{\lambda}, \forall \lambda, \lambda<1 /(2 \gamma-1)$, and $f^{\prime}(z) \in H^{\lambda}, \forall \lambda, \lambda<1 / 2 \gamma$.

Proof. We first observe that since $f(z)$ is unbounded, $\gamma \geqq \frac{1}{2}$ [8, pp. 67-72]. The proof of Lemma 4 then follows from [3, p. 345].

ThEOREM 5. Let $f(z)$ be an unbounded convex function. If the maximum jump of $\mu_{1}(t)$ is $\gamma$ then the maximum jump in $\mu_{2}(t)$ is $\gamma-\frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. Since $f(z)$ is convex, either (a) $f(z)$ is continuous on $\bar{D}$ with the exception of one point, say $z_{0}$, and at this point, $f(z) \rightarrow \infty$ as $z \rightarrow z_{0}$ with $|z| \leqq 1,\left|z_{0}\right|=1$, or (b) $f(D)$ is a domain whose boundary is two parallel lines [8]. In case (b), the result of Theorem 5 is obvious; hence, we assume case (a). We also assume that the maximum jump, $\gamma$, in $\mu_{1}(t)$ occurs at $t=0$. It follows by the continuity remark in (a) that the maximum jump in $\mu_{2}(t)$, call it $\beta$, also occurs at $t=0$.

First, suppose $\gamma-\frac{1}{2}<\beta$. It is well known (see e.g. [12]) that $f(D)$ contains a sector of vertex angle $2 \pi \beta$. Hence, for some constant $C$,

$$
C((1+z) /(1-z))^{2 \beta}<f(z), \quad z \in D
$$

Thus, $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}|f(z)|^{1 / 2 \beta} d \theta$ becomes unbounded as $r$ tends to 1 , contradicting Lemma 4 (since $2 \gamma-1<2 \beta$ ).

We now suppose $\beta<\gamma-\frac{1}{2}$. Choosing $\delta$ such that $\beta<\delta<\gamma-\frac{1}{2}$, a result of Pommerenke [9] gives

$$
M(r, f)=O\left((1-r)^{-2 \delta}\right)
$$

The Cauchy formula yields

$$
M\left(r, f^{\prime}\right)=O\left((1-r)^{-2 \delta-1}\right)
$$

On the other hand, since $z f^{\prime}(z)$ is starlike

$$
\left|z f^{\prime}(z)\right| \geqq K|z| /|1-z|^{2 \gamma}
$$

where $K$ is a constant [9]. But this contradicts the fact that $2 \delta+1<2 \gamma$. The result follows.

Theorem 6. If $f(z) \in \mathscr{M}_{\alpha}(0 \leqq \alpha<2)$ and is not a rotation of $f_{\alpha}(z)$, then there exists $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(f)>0$ such that

$$
f(z) \in H^{1 /(2-\alpha)+\varepsilon} \quad \text { and } \quad f^{\prime}(z) \in H^{1 /(3-\alpha)+\varepsilon} .
$$

If $f(z) \in \mathscr{M}_{2}$ is unbounded, then $f(z)$ is a rotation of $f_{2}(z)$.
Proof. By Theorem 3, we may assume $\alpha>1$. We also take $f(z)$ unbounded. Let $\mu_{1}$ and $\mu_{2}$ be as in Theorem 5. Since $f(z) \in \mathscr{M}_{\alpha}, \mu=$ $(1-\alpha) \mu_{2}+\alpha \mu_{1}$ is a measure on $[-\pi, \pi]$. If $\gamma$ denotes the maximum jump in $\mu_{1}$, then the maximum jump in $\mu_{2}$ occurs at the same point and equals $\gamma-\frac{1}{2}$. Thus, the maximum jump in $\mu$ is $\gamma+\frac{1}{2}(\alpha-1)$. The rotations of $f_{\alpha}(z)$ are given by equating this number with unity; i.e., by setting $\gamma=\frac{1}{2}(3-\alpha)$.

Thus, let us assume $\frac{1}{2} \leqq \gamma<\frac{1}{2}(3-\alpha)$. We observe that if $\alpha=2$ then $\gamma=\frac{1}{2}$, and consequently there is only one unbounded function in $\mathscr{M}_{2}$ (up to rotations). ${ }^{2}$

By Lemma 4, $f^{\prime}(z) \in H^{\lambda}(\lambda<1 / 2 \gamma)$. Since $1 / 2 \gamma>1 /(3-\alpha)$ we may choose $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(f)>0$ so that $1 / 2 \gamma>1 /(3-\alpha)+\varepsilon$. Hence, $f^{\prime}(z) \in H^{1 /(3-\alpha)+\varepsilon}$, and, for perhaps a different $\varepsilon, f(z) \in H^{1 /(2-\alpha)+\varepsilon}$.
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