

## SUBORDINATION BY CONVEX FUNCTIONS

D. J. HALLENBECK<sup>1</sup> AND STEPHAN RUSCHEWEYH

**ABSTRACT.** The following theorem is proven: Let  $F(z)$  be convex and univalent in  $\Delta = \{z: |z| < 1\}$ ,  $F(0) = 1$ . Let  $f(z)$  be analytic in  $\Delta$ ,  $f(0) = 1$ ,  $f'(0) = \dots = f^{(n-1)}(0) = 0$ , and let  $f(z) \prec F(z)$  in  $\Delta$ . Then for all  $\gamma \neq 0$ ,  $\operatorname{Re} \gamma \geq 0$ ,

$$\gamma z^{-\gamma} \int_0^z \tau^{\gamma-1} f(\tau) d\tau < \gamma z^{-\gamma/n} \int_0^z \tau^{1/n} \tau^{\gamma-1} F(\tau^n) d\tau.$$

This theorem, in combination with a method of D. Styer and D. Wright, leads to the following

**Corollary.** Let  $f(z)$ ,  $g(z)$  be convex univalent in  $\Delta$ ,  $f(0) = f''(0) = g(0) = g''(0) = 0$ . Then  $f(z) + g(z)$  is starlike univalent in  $\Delta$ .

Other applications of the theorem are concerned with the subordination of  $f(z)/z$  where  $f(z)$  belongs to certain classes of convex univalent functions.

**Introduction.** In this paper we are concerned with subordination results for special classes of convex univalent functions. Let  $\Delta_r = \{z: |z| < r\}$  and  $\Delta_1 = \Delta$ . We recall the definition of subordination between two functions, say  $f$  and  $F$ , analytic in  $\Delta$ . This means that  $f(0) = F(0)$  and there is an analytic function  $\phi(z)$  so that  $\phi(0) = 0$ ,  $|\phi(z)| < 1$  and  $f(z) = F(\phi(z))$ . This relation shall be denoted by  $f \prec F$ . If  $F$  is univalent in  $\Delta$  the subordination is equivalent to  $f(0) = F(0)$  and  $\operatorname{range} f(z) \subset \operatorname{range} F(z)$ .

One of our main tools is the following result of I. S. Jack, which, in fact, is a modification of Julia's theorem [2, p. 28].

**Lemma 1.** Let  $w(z)$  be analytic in  $\Delta_R$ ,  $w^{(k)}(0) = 0$ ,  $0 \leq k \leq n$ . Then if  $|w(z)|$  attains its maximum value on the circle  $|z| = r < R$  at  $z_0$ , we have

$$\rho = z_0 w'(z_0) / w(z_0) \geq n + 1.$$

Another main tool is the convolution theorem of T. Sheil-Small and the second author. We recall that the Hadamard convolution of two functions  $f(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n z^n$  and  $g(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n z^n$  is denoted by  $f * g(z)$  and defined by  $f * g(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n b_n z^n$ . In [6] the authors prove that the convolution of two convex univalent functions is convex and univalent. A function  $f(z)$  analytic in  $\Delta$  with  $f(0) = 0$ ,  $f'(0) = 1$ , is said to be convex of order  $\alpha$ ,  $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ ,

Received by the editors August 19, 1974.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 30A32, 30A40.

Key words and phrases. Subordination, convolution, convex.

<sup>1</sup>The research of the first author was, in part, supported by a University of Delaware Faculty Research Summer Grant.

if  $\operatorname{Re}(1 + zf''(z)/f'(z)) > \alpha$  for  $z$  in  $\Delta$ . We denote this class by  $K(\alpha)$ . For any set of complex numbers  $A$ , we let  $\bar{A}$  denote the closure and  $\partial A$  denote the boundary.

**Subordination theorems.**

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $F(z)$  be convex univalent in  $\Delta$ ,  $F(0) = 1$ . Let  $f(z)$  be analytic in  $\Delta$ ,  $f(0) = 1$ , and suppose  $f(z) \prec F(z)$  in  $\Delta$ . Then for all  $\gamma \neq 0$  with  $\operatorname{Re} \gamma \geq 0$ , we have  $g(z) \prec F(z)$  where*

$$g(z) = \gamma z^{-\gamma} \int_0^z \tau^{\gamma-1} f(\tau) d\tau.$$

**Proof.** We have  $g(z) = f * h(z)$  where

$$(1) \quad h(z) = \gamma z^{-\gamma} \int_0^z \frac{\tau^{\gamma-1}}{1-\tau} d\tau.$$

We prove, by Lemma 1, that  $\operatorname{Re} h(z) > \frac{1}{2}$  in  $\Delta$ .

Let  $h(z) = 1/(1 - w(z))$ , where  $w(0) = 0$ . Clearly  $w(z)$  is meromorphic in all of  $\Delta$  and analytic in  $\Delta_R$  where  $R = \min\{|z_k| : h(z_k) = 0\}$ . Let  $z^*$  denote a point on  $|z| = R$  with  $h(z^*) = 0$ .  $z^*$  is a pole of  $w(z)$  and so there is a neighborhood of  $z^*$  in which  $|w(z)| > 1$  holds. This implies that there is a point  $z_0$ ,  $|z_0| < R$ , with  $|w(z_0)| = 1$  and  $|w(z)| \leq 1$  for  $|z| \leq |z_0|$ . Then differentiating (1), we find

$$-\gamma h(z)/z + \gamma/z(1 - z) = w'(z)/(1 - w(z))^2,$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{1}{1 - z} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \frac{zw'(z)}{w(z)} \frac{w(z)}{(1 - w(z))^2} + \frac{1}{1 - w(z)}.$$

This implies for  $z = z_0$  that  $\operatorname{Re}(1 - z_0)^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , since  $z_0 w'(z_0)/w(z_0) = \rho \geq 1$  by Lemma 1 and  $w(z_0)/(1 - w(z_0))^2$  is a real number less than  $-\frac{1}{4}$ . Hence this implies that  $R \geq 1$  and  $\operatorname{Re} h(z) > \frac{1}{2}$  in  $\Delta$ . Consequently, by the Herglotz formula, there exists a probability measure  $\mu(\theta)$  such that

$$h(z) = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{du(\theta)}{1 - ze^{-i\theta}} \quad \text{and} \quad g(z) = \int_0^{2\pi} f(ze^{-i\theta}) d\mu(\theta),$$

which implies the result.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $F(z)$  be convex univalent in  $\Delta$ ,  $F(0) = 1$ . Let  $f(z)$  be analytic in  $\Delta$ ,  $f(0) = 1$ ,  $f'(0) = \dots = f^{(n-1)}(0) = 0$ , and let  $f(z) \prec F(z)$  in  $\Delta$ . Then for all  $\gamma \neq 0$ ,  $\operatorname{Re} \gamma \geq 0$ ,*

$$(2) \quad g(z) \equiv \gamma z^{-\gamma} \int_0^z \tau^{\gamma-1} f(\tau) d\tau \prec \gamma z^{-\gamma/n} \int_0^{z^{1/n}} \tau^{\gamma-1} F(\tau^n) d\tau \equiv G(z).$$

**Proof.** We have  $G(z) = F(z) * \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \gamma z^j / (nj + \gamma)$ . It follows from a result of the second author [5] that the second factor is convex univalent in  $\Delta$ . In fact, any function  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} z^j / (j + \gamma)$  where  $\operatorname{Re} \gamma \geq 0$  has this property. The

convolution theorem [6] implies that  $G(z)$  is convex univalent in the same circle as  $F(z)$ . We remark that  $\rho(z) \prec q(z)$  in  $\Delta$ ,  $q$  univalent, if and only if  $\rho(rz) \prec q(rz)$ ,  $0 < r < 1$ . This implies, that for the proof of the theorem we can assume that  $F(z)$  and, hence,  $G(z)$  are convex univalent in  $\Delta_{r_0}$ ,  $r_0 > 1$ .

Let  $\phi(z) = G^{-1}(g(z))$ . We see that  $\phi(0) = 0$  and  $\phi(z)$  is analytic in  $\Delta_{r_1}$  where

$$r_1 = \min\{1, \sup\{r: g(\Delta_r) \cap \partial G(\Delta) = \emptyset\}\}.$$

Also  $|\phi(z)| \leq 1$  in  $\Delta_{r_1}$ . If  $r_1 = 1$ , the theorem is proven. Therefore let us assume  $r_1 < 1$ .  $G(z)$  is univalent in  $\Delta_{r_0}$  and  $g(z)$  analytic in  $\Delta$  so we can conclude that  $\phi(z)$  is analytic in  $\Delta_{r_1}$ , and there exists a  $z_0$ ,  $|z_0| = r_1$ , with  $|\phi(z_0)| = 1$ .

Furthermore we have

$$g(z) = G(\phi(z)) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j \phi^j(z)$$

and the conditions  $b_1 \neq 0$ ,  $g'(0) = \dots = g^{(n-1)}(0) = 0$  imply that  $\phi'(0) = \dots = \phi^{(n-1)}(0) = 0$ . In  $\Delta_{r_1}$  we have  $g'(z) = G'(\phi(z))\phi'(z)$ , and for  $z = z_0$ ,  $\rho = z_0 \phi'(z_0)/\phi(z_0) \geq n$  by Lemma 1.

We now find  $g'(z)$  and  $G'(z)$  by differentiating (2). These expressions involving  $f(z)$  and  $F(z)$  yield, after substituting the expression for  $\rho$ , the equation

$$g(z_0)(1 - n/\rho) + (n/\rho)f(z_0) = F(\phi(z_0)).$$

Since  $\rho \geq n$ , the left-hand side is a convex combination of  $g(z_0)$  and  $f(z_0)$  which are both interior points of the convex domain  $F(\Delta)$  by Lemma 2 since  $|z_0| < 1$ . But  $F(\phi(z_0))$  belongs to  $\partial F(\Delta)$  and a contradiction follows.

**Remark 1.** In the notation of Theorem 1 we obviously have  $\text{range } g(z) \subset \text{range } G(z^n)$ , and if  $g(z) \neq 1$ ,  $0 < |z| < 1$ , it is easy to see that, in fact,  $g(z) \prec G(z^n)$ . In a private communication, D. Styer and D. Wright gave a counterexample to the latter formula if  $g(z) - 1$  is allowed to have additional zeros.

**Corollary 1.** Let  $f(z) = z + \sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} a_j z^j \in K(\alpha)$ ,  $1 - n/2 \leq \alpha < 1$ . Then

$$\frac{f(z)}{z} \prec \frac{1}{z^{1/n}} \int_0^{z^{1/n}} \frac{dr}{(1 - r^n)^{(2-2\alpha)/n}} = G(z).$$

**Proof.** A straightforward computation shows that  $g(z) = z(f'(z))^{1/(1-\alpha)}$  is starlike in  $\Delta$ . It is clear that  $g''(0) = \dots = g^{(n)}(0) = 0$ . Since  $g(z)$  is starlike univalent in  $\Delta$ , we may define an analytic function  $w(z)$  in  $\Delta$  by the equation

$$g(z)/z = 1/(1 - w(z))^{2/n}.$$

We now differentiate this equation and assume  $|w(z_0)| = 1$  where  $|z_0| < 1$ .

Applying Lemma 1 we find after simplification that  $\operatorname{Re}(zg'(z)/g(z)) = 1 - k/n \leq 0$  since  $k \geq n$ . This contradiction implies that  $|w(z)| < 1$  in  $\Delta$  and so  $g(z)/z < 1/(1 - z)^{2/n}$  or, equivalently,  $f'(z) < 1/(1 - z)^\beta$  where  $\beta = (2 - 2\alpha)/n$ . For  $\beta \leq 1$ ,  $1/(1 - z)^\beta$  is convex univalent, and by Theorem 1 with  $\gamma = 1$  the result follows.

**Remark 2.** If  $n = 1$ , Corollary 1 is exactly the subordination theorem on  $K(\alpha)$ ,  $1/2 \leq \alpha < 1$  in [1, p. 427].

**Corollary 2.** Let  $f(z), g(z) \in K(0)$ ,  $f''(0) = g''(0) = 0$ . Then  $f(z) + g(z)$  is starlike univalent in  $\Delta$ .

**Proof.** Recently D. Styer and D. Wright [8] developed a method to prove this result for any two functions  $f, g$  in  $K(0)$  which satisfy

(i)  $f(\Delta), g(\Delta)$  contain the circle  $\{w \mid |w| < \pi/4\}$ ,

(ii)  $f(\Delta) \subset h(\Delta), g(\Delta) \subset h(\Delta)$  where  $h(z) = (2z)^{-1} \log(1 + z)(1 - z)^{-1}$ .

Condition (i) follows from the well-known estimate  $\arctan |z| \leq |p(z)|$  for every  $p(z) \in K(0)$  with vanishing second coefficient. The second condition follows from Corollary 1 with  $\alpha = 0, n = 2$  and by Remark 1.

**Corollary 3.** Suppose  $f(z) = z + a_2z^2 + \dots$  and  $F(z) = z + A_2z^2 + \dots$  are analytic in  $\Delta$ ,  $F'(z)$  is univalent and convex. If  $f'(z) \prec F'(z)$ , then  $f(z)/z \prec F(z)/z$ .

**Proof.** This follows immediately from Theorem 1 by choosing  $\gamma = 1$  and  $n = 1$ .

**Remark 3.** This completely generalizes a result of D. J. Hallenbeck [3] which corresponds to the choice  $F'(z) = (1 + (1 - 2\alpha)z)/(1 - z)$  where  $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ . An alternate proof of Corollary 3 follows from a general subordination result involving Hadamard convolutions in [6].

To conclude this paper we present a subordination theorem which is a simple but interesting corollary of the following lemma due to T. J. Suffridge [9].

**Lemma 3.** Suppose that  $f(z)$  is analytic in  $\Delta$ ,  $F(z)$  is starlike univalent in  $\Delta$ , and  $f(z) \prec F(z)$ . Then

$$h(z) = \int_0^z \frac{f(\tau)}{\tau} d\tau \prec \int_0^z \frac{F(\tau)}{\tau} d\tau = H(z).$$

**Theorem 2.** Suppose that  $f(z) = z^p + a_{p+1}z^{p+1} + \dots$  and  $F(z) = z^p + A_{p+1}z^{p+1} + \dots$  are analytic in  $\Delta$  and that  $g(z) = zf'(z)/f(z) \prec zF'(z)/F(z) = G(z)$ . If  $G(z)$  is univalent and starlike with respect to  $w = p$ , then  $f(z)/z^p \prec F(z)/z^p$  where  $p = 1, 2, \dots$ .

**Proof.** We know that  $f(z)/z^p = \exp h(z)$  and  $F(z)/z^p = \exp H(z)$  where  $h(z) = \int_0^z (g(\tau) - p)/\tau d\tau$  and  $H(z) = \int_0^z (G(\tau) - p)/\tau d\tau$ . The result now follows directly from Lemma 3.

**Remark 4.** This theorem generalizes the classical result of Stroh acker [7] dealing with the class of starlike univalent functions which is achieved by taking  $G(z) = (1+z)/(1-z)$ . We note that among the interesting choices for  $G(z)$  are the functions

$$p(1 + (1 - \alpha)z), \quad p\left(\frac{1 + \alpha z}{1 - \alpha z}\right), \quad p\left(\frac{1 + (1 - 2\alpha)z}{1 - z}\right)^\beta,$$

where  $p = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ ,  $0 \leq \alpha < 1$  and  $0 \leq \beta \leq 2$ , and  $(1 + cz)/(1 - z)$ , where  $|c| = 1$ . These choices correspond to various compact families of starlike and spirallike mappings and, in the case  $\beta > 1$  or  $p \geq 2$ , to nonunivalent mappings.

## REFERENCES

1. L. Brickman, D. J. Hallenbeck, T. H. MacGregor and D. R. Wilken, *Convex hulls and extreme points of families of starlike and convex mappings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 185 (1973), 413–428.
2. C. Carath odory, *Funktionentheorie*, Band 2, Birkh user, Basel, 1950; English transl., Chelsea, New York, 1954. MR 12, 248; 16, 346.
3. D. J. Hallenbeck, *Convex hulls and extreme points of some families of univalent functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 192 (1974), 285–292.
4. I. S. Jack, *Functions starlike and convex of order  $\alpha$* , J. London Math. Soc. (2) 3 (1971), 469–474. MR 43 #7611.
5. S. Ruscheweyh, *New criteria for univalent functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 49 (1975), 109–115.
6. S. Ruscheweyh and T. Sheil-Small, *Hadamard products of schlicht functions and the Polya-Schoenberg conjecture*, Comment. Math. Helv. 48 (1973), 119–135.
7. E. Stroh acker, *Beitr age zur Theorie der schlichten Funktionen*, Math. Z. 37 (1933), 356–380.
8. D. Stryer and D. J. Wright, *On the valence of the sum of two convex functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 37 (1973), 511–516. MR 47 #2049.
9. T. J. Suffridge, *Some remarks on convex maps of the unit disk*, Duke Math. J. 37 (1970), 775–777. MR 42 #4722.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE, NEWARK, DELAWARE, 19711

ABTEILUNG MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSIT T DORTMUND, D-46 DORTMUND-HOMBRUCK, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY