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#### Abstract

In 1947, R. Robinson conjectured that if $f$ is in $S$, i.e. a normalized univalent function on the unit disk, then the radius of univalence of $[z f(z)]^{\prime} / 2$ is at least $\frac{1}{2}$. He proved in that paper that it was at least .38. The conjecture has been shown to be true for most of the known subclasses of $S$. This author shows through use of the Grunski inequalities, that the minimum lower bound over the class $S$ lies between .49 and .5 .


Introduction. Let $\mathbb{Q}$ denote the class of analytic functions on the unit disk $U=\{z:|z|<1\}$. Let $S$ denote the univalent functions $f$ in $\mathbb{Q}$ normalized by $f(0)=1-f^{\prime}(0)=0$. Denote by $K, S^{*}, C$, and Sp the standard subclasses of $S$ consisting of functions that are convex starlike, close to convex and spirallike respectively. For a subclass $X$ (possibly a singleton) of $\mathbb{Q}$ let $r_{S}(X)$ denote the minimum radius of univalence over all functions $f$ in $X$. We use corresponding notation for the other subclasses of $S$. For example $r_{S^{*}}(X)$ denotes the minimum radius of starlikeness over all functions $f$ in $X$.

For a function $f$ in $S$ define the operator $\Gamma: S \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ by $\Gamma f=(z f) \frac{1}{2}$. In 1947 R. Robinson [10] considered the problem of determining $r_{s}[\Gamma(S)]$. Robinson observed that for each $f$ in $S,[\Gamma(f)]^{\prime} \neq 0$ for $|z|<\frac{1}{2}$. He also noted that for the Koebe function $k, k(z)=z(1-z)^{-2}, r_{S}(k)=r_{S^{*}}(k)=\frac{1}{2}$, which implies $r_{S}[\Gamma(S)] \leqslant \frac{1}{2}$. He in fact conjectured that $r_{s}[\Gamma(S)]=\frac{1}{2}$. He was able to show that $r_{S^{*}}[\Gamma(S)]>.38$.

There have been a number of papers (e.g. [2], [3], [6], [7], [8]) on the connection between the operator $\Gamma$ and various subclasses of $S$. In these papers it has been shown that

$$
r_{K}[\Gamma(K)]=r_{S^{*}}\left[\Gamma\left(S^{*}\right)\right]=r_{C}[\Gamma(C)]=r_{\mathrm{Sp}}[\Gamma(\mathrm{Sp})]=\frac{1}{2}
$$

and that $\Gamma$ preserves Rogosinski's class of typically real functions (not necessarily univalent) up to $|z|<\frac{1}{2}$. It was observed in [2] that with the exception of the result $r_{\mathrm{Sp}}[\Gamma(\mathrm{Sp})]=\frac{1}{2}$ these results follow directly from the S . Ruscheweyh-T. Sheil-Small theory [11]. They proved that, except for Sp, convolution by convex functions preserves the above subclasses of $S$. In order to obtain the related results in [2] one need only observe that for $f(z)=$ $\sum a_{n} z^{n}$,

$$
\Gamma[f(z)]=h * f(z)=\sum[(n+1) / 2] z^{n} * f(z)=\sum[(n+1) / 2] a_{n} z^{n}
$$
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and that $h(z)=\left(z-z^{2} / 2\right)(1-z)^{-2}$ is convex for $|z|<\frac{1}{2}$. As was shown in [2] most of the results that had been obtained on generalizations of the operator $\Gamma$ on subclasses of $S$ can also be obtained in a similar manner by the appropriate modifications of $h$. However, for the entire class $S$, if we let $r_{0}=r_{C}(S) \approx .80$ from [5], it appears that the easily obtained lower bound for $r_{S}[\Gamma(S)]$ of $r_{0} / 2 \approx .41$ is the most that can be obtained from the convolution operator method. It does show that $41<r_{S}[\Gamma(S)] \leqslant \frac{1}{2}$. In the present note the author, through use of the Grunsky inequalities, is able to prove that $.49<r_{S}[\Gamma(S)] \leqslant \frac{1}{2}$.

Proof of Main Result. To find a lower bound for $r_{S}[\Gamma(S)]$ we consider the nonvanishing of

$$
\frac{f(z)+z f^{\prime}(z)-f(\zeta)-\zeta f^{\prime}(\zeta)}{z-\zeta}
$$

By use of the minimum principle we may assume $|z|=|\zeta|<r$. Since $f$ is in $S$ we may divide through by $[f(z)-f(\zeta)] /(z-\zeta)$. Thus it suffices to find the largest $r$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
1+\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)-\zeta f^{\prime}(\zeta)}{f(z)-f(\zeta)} \neq 0, \quad|z|=|\zeta|<r \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consider for $f$ in $S$ the Grunsky coefficients defined by letting

$$
\begin{equation*}
\log \frac{f(z)-f(\zeta)}{z-\zeta}=\sum_{n, m=0}^{\infty} d_{n m} z^{n \zeta} \zeta^{m} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Putting $\zeta, z=0$ respectively, in (2) we obtain

$$
\log \frac{f(z)}{z}=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} d_{n 0} z^{n}, \quad \log \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta}=\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} d_{0 m} \zeta^{m}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\log \frac{f(z)-f(\zeta)}{z-\zeta}=\log \frac{f(z)}{z}+\log \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta}+\sum_{n, m=1}^{\infty} d_{n m} z^{n \zeta} \zeta^{m} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Although Grunsky's inequalities are usually stated in terms of the function $F$, on $|\xi|>1$ defined by $F(\xi)=1 / f(1 / \xi)$, it is more convenient for our purposes to express them directly in terms of $f$ in $S$. To do this, we observe, by letting $z^{\prime}=1 / z, \zeta^{\prime}=1 / \zeta$, that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \log \frac{f(z)-f(\zeta)}{z-\zeta}-\log \frac{f(z)}{z}-\log \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta} \\
& \quad=\log \frac{f\left(1 / z^{\prime}\right)-f\left(1 / \zeta^{\prime}\right)}{f\left(1 / z^{\prime}\right) f\left(1 / \zeta^{\prime}\right) z^{\prime} \zeta^{\prime}\left[\left(1 / z^{\prime}\right)-\left(1 / \zeta^{\prime}\right)\right]} \\
& \quad=\log \frac{1 / f\left(1 / z^{\prime}\right)-1 / f\left(1 / \zeta^{\prime}\right)}{z^{\prime}-\zeta^{\prime}}=\log \frac{F\left(z^{\prime}\right)-F\left(\zeta^{\prime}\right)}{z^{\prime}-\zeta^{\prime}} \\
& \quad=\sum_{n, m=1}^{\infty} d_{n m}\left(z^{\prime}\right)^{-n}\left(\zeta^{\prime}\right)^{-m}=\sum_{n, m=1}^{\infty} d_{n m} z^{n \zeta m} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we can use the following form of Grunsky's inequalities (see Pommerenke [9, p. 60]). For $f$ in $S$ and $d_{n m}$ defined by (2) we have for arbitrary complex $x_{n}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n\left|\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} d_{n m} x_{m}\right|^{2} \leqslant \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left|x_{n}\right|^{2}}{n} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

provided the last series converges. Now, differentiating (3) with respect to $z$ and $\zeta$ we see from the uniform convergence of the series in (3) for $|z|=|\zeta| \leqslant$ $r<1$ that

$$
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)-f(\zeta)}-\frac{z}{z-\zeta}=\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-1+\sum_{m, n=1}^{\infty} n d_{n m} z^{n \xi m},
$$

and

$$
\frac{-\zeta f^{\prime}(\zeta)}{f(z)-f(\zeta)}+\frac{\zeta}{z-\zeta}=\frac{\zeta f^{\prime}(\zeta)}{f(\zeta)}-1+\sum_{n, m=1}^{\infty} m d_{n m} z^{n \zeta} \zeta^{m}
$$

Adding these two expressions and rearranging we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
1+\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)-\zeta f^{\prime}(\zeta)}{f(z)-f(\zeta)}=\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}+\frac{\zeta f^{\prime}(\zeta)}{f(\zeta)}+\sum_{n, m=1}^{\infty}(n+m) d_{n m} z^{n \zeta m} . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus from (1) we need to find the largest $r$ for which the right-hand side of (5), which we denote by $T(z, \zeta)$, does not vanish for $|z|=|\zeta|<r$. We have by the use of Schwarz's inequality and (4) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Re \mathrm{e}\{T(z, \zeta)\} \geqslant & \Re \mathrm{e}\left\{\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}+\frac{\zeta f^{\prime}(\zeta)}{f(\zeta)}\right\}-\left|\sum_{n, m=1}^{\infty}(n+m) d_{n m} z^{n} \zeta^{m}\right| \\
\geqslant & 2 \min _{|z|=r} \Re \mathrm{Re}\left\{\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right\}-\left(\left|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{n} z^{n} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{n} d_{n m} \zeta^{m}\right|\right. \\
& \left.+\left|\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{m} \zeta^{m} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{m} d_{m n} z^{n}\right|\right) \\
\geqslant & 2 \min _{|z|=r} \Re \mathrm{e}\left\{\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right\}-\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n r^{2 n}\right)^{1 / 2}\left[\left.\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n\left|\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} d_{n m} \zeta^{m}\right|^{2}\right|^{1 / 2}\right. \\
& -\left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m r^{2 m}\right)^{1 / 2}\left\{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m\left|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_{m n} z^{n}\right|^{2}\right]^{1 / 2} \\
\geqslant & 2 \min _{|z|=r} \Re \mathrm{e}\left\{\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right\}-\left[\frac{r^{2}}{\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2}}\right]^{1 / 2}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{r^{2 n}}{n}\right)^{1 / 2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& -\left[\frac{r^{2}}{\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2}}\right]^{1 / 2}\left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{r^{2 m}}{m}\right)^{1 / 2} \\
\geqslant & 2 \min _{|z|=r} \Re \mathrm{e}\left\{\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right\}-2\left(\frac{r}{1-r^{2}}\right)\left(\log \frac{1}{1-r^{2}}\right)^{1 / 2} . \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $f$ is in $S$ we have the well-known inequality

$$
\left|\log \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right| \leqslant \log \frac{1+r}{1-r},|z| \leqslant r,
$$

where, in fact, for each real $\alpha$, and $z,|z|=r<1$, there exists an $f$ in $S$ such that

$$
\log \left[z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)\right]=e^{i \alpha} \log [(1+r) /(1-r)]
$$

(see Jenkins [4, p. 110]). Thus, if we let $\log \left[z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)\right]=R e^{i \Phi}$, we can assume $R=\log [(1+r) /(1-r)]$. In order to find the minimum of (6) for all $f$ in $S$ we consider

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min _{f \in S} \min _{|z|=r} \Re \mathrm{e}\left\{\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right\} & =\min _{\Phi} \operatorname{Re}\left\{\exp \left(\operatorname{Re}^{i \Phi}\right)\right\} \\
& =\min _{\Phi}[\exp (R \cos \Phi)][\cos (R \sin \Phi)]
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, from (6), we need to find the largest $r$ for which

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{\Phi}[\exp (R \cos \Phi)][\cos (R \sin \Phi)] \geqslant \frac{r}{1-r^{2}}\left[-\log \left(1-r^{2}\right)\right]^{1 / 2} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easy to see that the left-hand side of (7), call it LS, is a decreasing function of $r$ while the right-hand side of (7), call it RS, is an increasing function of $r$. A computer checked calculation shows that for $r=.490$, $\mathrm{RS}<.3379$ while $\mathrm{LS}>.3393$ where the minimum value occurs when $\Phi$ is approximately 2.5 radians. We note that for $r=.491, \mathrm{RS}>.3398$. Thus, inequality (1) holds for all $f$ in $S$ and $r \leqslant .49$. It follows that $r_{S}[\Gamma(S)]>.49$.
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