

## SUBORDINATION RESULTS FOR SUBCLASSES OF ANALYTIC FUNCTIONS DEFINED BY CONVOLUTION

M. K. AOUF, A. A. SHAMANDY, A. O. MOSTAFA AND A. K. WAGDY

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper, we drive several interesting subordination results for subclasses of analytic functions defined by convolution. Also number of interesting applications of the subordination results are considered.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification:* 30C45.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $A$  denote the class of functions of the form:

$$f(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^k, \quad (1.1)$$

which are analytic in the open unit disc  $\mathbb{U} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ . Let  $\phi \in A$  be given by

$$\phi(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} c_k z^k. \quad (1.2)$$

**Definition 1** (*Hadamard product or convolution*). Given two functions  $f$  and  $\phi$  in the class  $A$ , where  $f(z)$  is given by (1.1) and  $\phi(z)$  is given by (1.2), the Hadamard product (or convolution)  $f * \phi$  of  $f$  and  $\phi$  is defined (as usual) by

$$(f * \phi)(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k c_k z^k = (\phi * f)(z). \quad (it1.3)$$

We also denote by  $K$  the class of functions  $f(z) \in A$  that are convex in  $\mathbb{U}$ .

Following Goodman ([10] and [11]), Ronning ([18] and [19]) introduced and studied the following subclasses:

(i) A function  $f(z)$  of the form (1.1) is said to be in the class  $S_p(\alpha, \beta)$  of  $\beta$ -uniformly starlike functions if it satisfies the condition:

$$Re \left\{ \frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)} - \alpha \right\} > \beta \left| \frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)} - 1 \right| \quad (z \in \mathbb{U}), \quad (1.4)$$

where  $-1 \leq \alpha < 1$  and  $\beta \geq 0$ .

(ii) A function  $f(z)$  of the form (1.1) is said to be in the class  $UCV(\alpha, \beta)$  of  $\beta$ -uniformly convex functions if it satisfies the condition:

$$Re \left\{ 1 + \frac{zf''(z)}{f'(z)} - \alpha \right\} > \beta \left| \frac{zf''(z)}{f'(z)} \right| \quad (z \in \mathbb{U}), \quad (1.5)$$

where  $-1 \leq \alpha < 1$  and  $\beta \geq 0$ .

It follows from (1.4) and (1.5) that

$$f(z) \in UCV(\alpha, \beta) \Leftrightarrow zf'(z) \in S_p(\alpha, \beta). \quad (it1.6)$$

For  $-1 \leq \alpha < 1$ ,  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$  and  $\beta \geq 0$ , let  $S(g, \lambda; \alpha, \beta)$  be the subclass of  $A$  consisting of functions  $f(z)$  of the form (1.1), functions  $g(z)$  given by

$$g(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} b_k z^k \quad (b_k > 0), \quad (1.7)$$

and satisfying the analytic criterion:

$$Re \left\{ \frac{z(f*g)'(z)}{(1-\lambda)(f*g)(z) + \lambda z(f*g)'(z)} - \alpha \right\} > \beta \left| \frac{z(f*g)'(z)}{(1-\lambda)(f*g)(z) + \lambda z(f*g)'(z)} - 1 \right|. \quad (1.8)$$

We note that:

- (i)  $S(\frac{z}{(1-z)}, 0; \alpha, 0) = S^*(\alpha)$  and  $S(\frac{z}{(1-z)^2}, 0; \alpha, 0) = C(\alpha)$  (see Robertson [17]);
- (ii)  $S(\frac{z}{(1-z)}, 0; \alpha, 1) = S_p(\alpha)$  and  $S(\frac{z}{(1-z)^2}, 0; \alpha, 1) = UCV(\alpha)$  (see Bharati et al. [4]);
- (iii)  $S(\frac{z}{(1-z)}, 0; \alpha, \beta) = S_p(\alpha, \beta)$  and  $S(\frac{z}{(1-z)^2}, 0; \alpha, \beta) = UCV(\alpha, \beta)$  (see Goodman [10], [11] and Ronning [18], [19]);
- (iv)  $S(\frac{z}{(1-z)}, \lambda; \alpha, \beta) = S_p(\lambda, \alpha, \beta)$  and  $S(\frac{z}{(1-z)^2}, \lambda; \alpha, \beta) = UCV(\lambda, \alpha, \beta)$  (see Murugusundaramoorthy and Magesh [16]);
- (v)  $S(z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{(a)_{k-1}}{(c)_{k-1}} z^k, 0; \alpha, \beta) = S(\alpha, \beta)$  ( $c \neq 0, -1, -2, \dots$ ) (see Murugusundaramoorthy and Magesh [14] and [15]);

- (vi)  $S(z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k^n z^k, 0; \alpha, \beta) = S(n, \alpha, \beta)$  ( $n \in \mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , where  $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ ) (see Rosy and Murugusundaramoorthy [20]);
- (vii)  $S(z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} [1 + \delta(k-1)]^n z^k, 0; \alpha, \beta) = S_{\delta}(n, \alpha, \beta)$  ( $\delta \geq 0, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ) (see Aouf and Mostafa [2]).

Also we note that:

(i)  $S(g, \lambda; \alpha, 0) = S(g, \lambda, \alpha)$

$$= \left\{ f \in A : Re \left\{ \frac{z(f*g)'(z)}{(1-\lambda)(f*g)(z) + \lambda z(f*g)'(z)} \right\} > \alpha \quad (-1 \leq \alpha < 1, 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1, z \in \mathbb{U}) \right\};$$

(ii)  $S(z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \Gamma_k(\alpha_1) z^k, \lambda; \alpha, \beta) = S_{q,s}(\alpha_i, \beta_j; \lambda, \alpha, \beta)$

$$= \left\{ f \in A : Re \left\{ \frac{z(H_{q,s}(\alpha_1, \beta_1)f(z))'}{(1-\lambda)H_{q,s}(\alpha_1, \beta_1)f(z) + \lambda z(H_{q,s}(\alpha_1, \beta_1)f(z))'} - \alpha \right\} > \beta \left| \frac{z(H_{q,s}(\alpha_1, \beta_1)f(z))'}{(1-\lambda)H_{q,s}(\alpha_1, \beta_1)f(z) + \lambda z(H_{q,s}(\alpha_1, \beta_1)f(z))'} - 1 \right| \right\},$$

where  $\Gamma_k(\alpha_1)$  is defined by

$$\Gamma_k(\alpha_1) = \frac{(\alpha_1)_{k-1} \dots (\alpha_q)_{k-1}}{(\beta_1)_{k-1} \dots (\beta_s)_{k-1} (1)_{k-1}} \tag{1.9}$$

( $\alpha_i > 0, i = 1, \dots, q; \beta_j > 0, j = 1, \dots, s; q \leq s + 1, q, s \in \mathbb{N}_0, \mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ ),

and the operator  $H_{q,s}(\alpha_1, \beta_1)$  was introduced and studied by Dziok and Srivastava ( see [7] and [8]), and contains many other operators;

(iii)  $S(z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{\ell+1+\mu(k-1)}{\ell+1} \right]^m z^k, \lambda; \alpha, \beta) = S(m, \mu, \ell; \alpha, \beta)$

$$= \left\{ f \in A : Re \left\{ \frac{z(I^m(\mu, \ell)f(z))'}{(1-\lambda)I^m(\mu, \ell)f(z) + \lambda z(I^m(\mu, \ell)f(z))'} - \alpha \right\} > \beta \left| \frac{z(I^m(\mu, \ell)f(z))'}{(1-\lambda)I^m(\mu, \ell)f(z) + \lambda z(I^m(\mu, \ell)f(z))'} - 1 \right| \right\},$$

where  $m \in \mathbb{N}_0, \mu, \ell \geq 0, z \in \mathbb{U}$  and the operator  $I^m(\mu, \ell)$  was defined by Cătaş et al. ( see [6] ), and contains many other operators;

(iv)  $S(z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} C_k(b, \mu) z^k, \lambda; \alpha, \beta) = S_b^{\mu}(\lambda; \alpha, \beta)$

$$= \left\{ f \in A : \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \frac{z(J_b^\mu f(z))'}{(1-\lambda)J_b^\mu f(z) + \lambda z(J_b^\mu f(z))'} - \alpha \right\} > \beta \left| \frac{z(J_b^\mu f(z))'}{(1-\lambda)J_b^\mu f(z) + \lambda z(J_b^\mu f(z))'} - 1 \right| \right\},$$

where  $C_k(b, \mu)$  is defined by

$$C_k(b, \mu) = \left( \frac{1+b}{k+b} \right)^\mu \quad (\mu \in \mathbb{C}, b \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{\mathbb{Z}_0^-\}; \mathbb{Z}_0^- = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{N}), \quad (1.10)$$

and the operator  $J_b^\mu$  was introduced by Srivastava and Attiya [23], and contains many other operators.

**Remark 1.** By taking  $\lambda = 0$  in the class  $S_b^\mu(\lambda; \alpha, \beta)$ , we get the class  $S_b^\mu(\alpha, \beta)$ , which was defined by Murugusundaramoorthy [13].

**Definition 2 (Subordination Principle).** For two functions  $f$  and  $\phi$ , analytic in  $\mathbb{U}$ , we say that the function  $f(z)$  is subordinate to  $\phi(z)$  in  $\mathbb{U}$ , written  $f(z) \prec \phi(z)$ , if there exists a Schwarz function  $w(z)$ , which (by definition) is analytic in  $\mathbb{U}$  with  $w(0) = 0$  and  $|w(z)| < 1$ , such that  $f(z) = \phi(w(z))$ . Indeed it is known that

$$f(z) \prec \phi(z) \Rightarrow f(0) = \phi(0) \text{ and } f(\mathbb{U}) \subset \phi(\mathbb{U}).$$

Furthermore, if the function  $\phi$  is univalent in  $\mathbb{U}$ , then we have the following equivalence ( see [5] and [12]):

$$f(z) \prec \phi(z) \Leftrightarrow f(0) = \phi(0) \text{ and } f(\mathbb{U}) \subset g(\mathbb{U}). \quad (\text{it1.11})$$

**Definition 3 (Subordinating Factor Sequence)** [24]. A sequence  $\{c_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  of complex numbers is said to be a subordinating factor sequence if, whenever  $f$  of the form (1.1) is analytic, univalent and convex in  $\mathbb{U}$ , we have

$$\sum_{k=2}^\infty c_k a_k z^k \prec f(z) \quad (a_1 = 1; z \in \mathbb{U}). \quad (\text{it1.12})$$

## 2. MAIN RESULTS

Unless otherwise mentioned, we shall assume in the reminder of this paper that,  $-1 \leq \alpha < 1$ ,  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ ,  $\beta \geq 0$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{U}$  and  $g(z)$  is given by (1.7) with  $b_{k+1} \geq b_k > 0$  ( $k \geq 2$ ).

To prove our main result we need the following lemmas.

**Lemma 1** [24]. *The sequence  $\{c_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  is a subordinating factor sequence if and only if*

$$Re \left\{ 1 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} d_k z^k \right\} > 0. \tag{it2.1}$$

Now, we prove the following lemma which gives a sufficient condition for functions belonging to the class  $S(g, \lambda; \alpha, \beta)$ .

**Lemma 2.** *A function  $f(z)$  of the form (1.1) is said to be in the class  $S(g, \lambda; \alpha, \beta)$  if*

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \{k(1 + \beta) - (\alpha + \beta) [1 + \lambda(k - 1)]\} b_k |a_k| \leq 1 - \alpha. \tag{it2.2}$$

**Proof.** Assume that, the inequality (2.2) holds true. Then it suffices to show that

$$\beta \left| \frac{z (f * g)'(z)}{(1-\lambda)(f * g)(z) + \lambda z (f * g)'(z)} - 1 \right| - Re \left\{ \frac{z (f * g)'(z)}{(1-\lambda)(f * g)(z) + \lambda z (f * g)'(z)} - 1 \right\} \leq 1 - \alpha. \tag{2.3}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta \left| \frac{z (f * g)'(z)}{(1-\lambda)(f * g)(z) + \lambda z (f * g)'(z)} - 1 \right| - Re \left\{ \frac{z (f * g)'(z)}{(1-\lambda)(f * g)(z) + \lambda z (f * g)'(z)} - 1 \right\} \\ & \leq (1 + \beta) \left| \frac{z (f * g)'(z)}{(1 - \lambda) (f * g)(z) + \lambda z (f * g)'(z)} - 1 \right| \\ & \leq \frac{(1 + \beta) \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} (1 - \lambda) (k - 1) b_k |a_k|}{1 - \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} [1 + \lambda(k - 1)] b_k |a_k|} \leq 1 - \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.

Let  $S^*(g, \lambda; \alpha, \beta)$  denote the class of  $f(z) \in A$  whose coefficients satisfy the condition (2.2). We note that  $S^*(g, \lambda; \alpha, \beta) \subseteq S(g, \lambda; \alpha, \beta)$ .

Employing the technique used earlier by Attiya [3] and Srivastava and Attiya [22], we prove:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $f(z) \in S^*(g, \lambda; \alpha, \beta)$ . Then*

$$\frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{2 \{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}} (f * h)(z) \prec h(z), \quad (\text{it2.4})$$

for every function  $h \in K$ , and

$$\operatorname{Re} \{f(z)\} > -\frac{\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}}{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}. \quad (\text{it2.5})$$

The constant factor  $\frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{2 \{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}}$  in the subordination result (2.4) can not be replaced by a larger one.

**Proof.** Let  $f(z) \in S^*(g, \lambda; \alpha, \beta)$  and suppose that  $h(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} c_k z^k$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{2 \{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}} (f * h)(z) \\ &= \frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{2 \{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}} \left( z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} c_k a_k z^k \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Thus, by using Definition 3, the subordination result holds true if

$$\left\{ \frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{2 \{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}} a_k \right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$$

is a subordinating factor sequence, with  $a_1 = 1$ . In view of Lemma 1, this is equivalent to the following inequality:

$$\operatorname{Re} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}} a_n z^n \right\} > 0. \quad (2.7)$$

Now, since

$$\Psi(k) = \{k(1 + \beta) - (\alpha + \beta)[1 + \lambda(k - 1)]\} b_k$$

is an increasing function of  $k$  ( $k \geq 2$ ), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Re} \left\{ 1 + \frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k z^k \right\} \\ &= \operatorname{Re} \left\{ 1 + \frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}} z + \frac{\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_k a_k z^k}{\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\geq 1 - \frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}^\infty} r \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}_{k=2}^\infty} [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_k |a_k| r^k \\
 &\geq 1 - \frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}^\infty} r \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}_{k=2}^\infty} \{k(1 + \beta) - (\alpha + \beta)[1 + \lambda(k - 1)]\} b_k |a_k| r^k \\
 &\geq 1 - \frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}^\infty} r - \frac{1 - \alpha}{\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}^\infty} r \\
 &\geq 1 - \frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}^\infty} - \frac{1 - \alpha}{\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}^\infty} \\
 &> 0 \quad (|z| = r < 1),
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have also made use of assertion (2.2) of Lemma 2. Thus (2.7) holds true in  $\mathbb{U}$ . This proves the inequality (2.4). The inequality (2.5) follows from (2.4) by taking the convex function

$$h(z) = \frac{z}{1 - z} = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} z^k \in K. \tag{2.8}$$

To prove the sharpness of the constant

$$\frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{2 \{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}},$$

we consider the function  $f_0(z) \in \mathcal{S}^*(g, \lambda; \alpha, \beta)$  given by

$$f_0(z) = z - \frac{1 - \alpha}{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2} z^2.$$

Thus from (2.4), we have

$$\frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{2 \{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}} f_0(z) \prec \frac{z}{1 - z}.$$

It is easily verified that

$$\min_{|z| \leq r} \left\{ \operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{2 \{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}} f_0(z) \right) \right\} = -\frac{1}{2}. \quad (2.9)$$

This shows that the constant  $\frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2}{2 \{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] b_2\}}$  is the best possible. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

**Remark 2.** (i) Taking  $\lambda = 0$  and  $g(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{(a)_{k-1}}{(c)_{k-1}} z^k$  ( $c \neq 0, -1, -2, \dots$ ) in Theorem 1, we obtain the result obtained by Frasin [9, Theorem 2.1];

(ii) Taking  $g(z) = \frac{z}{(1-z)}$  and  $g(z) = \frac{z}{(1-z)^2}$ , respectively, in Theorem 1, we obtain the results obtained by Murugusundaramoorthy and Magesh [16, Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3, respectively];

(iii) Taking  $\lambda = 0$ ,  $g(z) = \frac{z}{(1-z)}$  and  $g(z) = \frac{z}{(1-z)^2}$ , respectively, in Theorem 1, we obtain the results obtained by Frasin [9, Corollary 2.2 and Corollary 2.5, respectively];

(iv) Taking  $\beta = \lambda = 0$ ,  $g(z) = \frac{z}{(1-z)}$  and  $g(z) = \frac{z}{(1-z)^2}$ , respectively, in Theorem 1, we obtain the results obtained by Frasin [9, Corollary 2.3 and Corollary 2.6, respectively];

(v) Taking  $\alpha = \beta = \lambda = 0$  and  $g(z) = \frac{z}{(1-z)}$  in Theorem 1, we obtain the result obtained by Singh [21, Corollary 2.2];

(vi) Taking  $\alpha = \beta = \lambda = 0$  and  $g(z) = \frac{z}{(1-z)^2}$  in Theorem 1, we obtain the result obtained by Frasin [9, Corollary 2.7];

(vii) Taking  $\lambda = 0$ ,  $\beta = 1$ ,  $g(z) = \frac{z}{(1-z)}$  and  $g(z) = \frac{z}{(1-z)^2}$ , respectively, in Theorem 1, we obtain the results obtained by Aouf et al. [1, Corollary 1 and Corollary 2, respectively];

(viii) Taking  $\lambda = 0$ ,  $g(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k^n z^k$  ( $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ) and  $g(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} [1 + \delta(k-1)]^n z^k$  ( $\delta \geq 0$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ), respectively, in Theorem 1, we obtain the results obtained by Aouf et al. [1, Corollary 4 and Corollary 6, respectively];

Also, we establish subordination results for the associated subclasses,  $S^*(g, \lambda, \alpha)$ ,  $S_{q,s}^*(\alpha_i, \beta_j; \lambda, \alpha, \beta)$ ,  $S^*(m, \mu, \ell; \alpha, \beta)$ ,  $S_b^{*\mu}(\lambda; \alpha, \beta)$  and  $S_b^{*\mu}(\alpha, \beta)$ , whose coefficients satisfy the condition (2.2) in the special cases as mentioned in the introduction.

By taking  $\beta = 0$  in Lemma 2 and Theorem 1, we obtain the following corollary:

**Corollary 1.** Let the function  $f(z)$  defined by (1.1) be in the class  $S^*(g, \lambda, \alpha)$  and



satisfy the condition

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \{k - \alpha [1 + \lambda(k - 1)]\} b_k |a_k| \leq 1 - \alpha. \quad (\text{it2.10})$$

Then for every function  $h \in K$ , we have

$$\frac{(2 - \alpha - \lambda\alpha)b_2}{2[1 - \alpha + (2 - \alpha - \lambda\alpha)b_2]} (f * h)(z) \prec h(z), \quad (\text{it2.11})$$

and

$$\operatorname{Re} \{f(z)\} > -\frac{[1 - \alpha + (2 - \alpha - \lambda\alpha)b_2]}{(2 - \alpha - \lambda\alpha)b_2}. \quad (\text{it2.12})$$

The constant factor  $\frac{(2 - \alpha - \lambda\alpha)b_2}{2[1 - \alpha + (2 - \alpha - \lambda\alpha)b_2]}$  in the subordination result (2.11) can not be replaced by a larger one.

By taking  $b_k = \Gamma_k(\alpha_1)$ , where  $\Gamma_k(\alpha_1)$  is defined by (1.9), in Lemma 2 and Theorem 1, we obtain the following corollary:

**Corollary 2.** Let the function  $f(z)$  defined by (1.1) be in the class  $S_{q,s}^*(\alpha_i, \beta_j; \lambda, \alpha, \beta)$  and satisfy the condition

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \{k(1 + \beta) - (\alpha + \beta)[1 + \lambda(k - 1)]\} \Gamma_k(\alpha_1) |a_k| \leq 1 - \alpha. \quad (\text{it2.13})$$

Then for every function  $h \in K$ , we have

$$\frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] \Gamma_2(\alpha_1)}{2\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] \Gamma_2(\alpha_1)\}} (f * h)(z) \prec h(z), \quad (\text{it2.14})$$

and

$$\operatorname{Re} \{f(z)\} > -\frac{\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] \Gamma_2(\alpha_1)\}}{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] \Gamma_2(\alpha_1)}. \quad (\text{it2.15})$$

The constant factor  $\frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] \Gamma_2(\alpha_1)}{2\{1 - \alpha + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] \Gamma_2(\alpha_1)\}}$  in the subordination result (2.14) can not be replaced by a larger one.

By taking  $b_k = \left[\frac{\ell + 1 + \mu(k - 1)}{\ell + 1}\right]^m$  ( $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $\mu, \ell \geq 0$ ) in Lemma 2 and Theorem 1, we obtain the following corollary:

**Corollary 3.** Let the function  $f(z)$  defined by (1.1) be in the class  $S^*(m, \mu, \ell; \alpha, \beta)$  and satisfy the condition

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \{k(1 + \beta) - (\alpha + \beta)[1 + \lambda(k - 1)]\} \left[\frac{\ell + 1 + \mu(k - 1)}{\ell + 1}\right]^m |a_k| \leq 1 - \alpha. \quad (\text{it2.16})$$

Then for every function  $h \in K$ , we have

$$\frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)](\ell + 1 + \mu)^m}{2\{(\ell + 1)^m(1 - \alpha) + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)](\ell + 1 + \mu)^m\}} (f * h)(z) \prec h(z), \tag{it2.17}$$

and

$$\operatorname{Re}\{f(z)\} > -\frac{\{(\ell + 1)^m(1 - \alpha) + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)](\ell + 1 + \mu)^m\}}{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)](\ell + 1 + \mu)^m}. \tag{it2.18}$$

The constant factor  $\frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)](\ell + 1 + \mu)^m}{2\{(\ell + 1)^m(1 - \alpha) + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)](\ell + 1 + \mu)^m\}}$  in the subordination result (2.17) can not be replaced by a larger one.

By taking  $b_k = C_k(b, \mu)$ , where  $C_k(b, \mu)$  is defined by (1.10), in Lemma 2 and Theorem 1, we obtain the following corollary:

**Corollary 4.** Let the function  $f(z)$  defined by (1.1) be in the class  $S_b^{*\mu}(\lambda; \alpha, \beta)$  and satisfy the condition

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \{k(1 + \beta) - (\alpha + \beta)[1 + \lambda(k - 1)]\} |C_k(b, \mu)| |a_k| \leq 1 - \alpha. \tag{it2.19}$$

Then for every function  $h \in K$ , we have

$$\frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] |C_2(b, \mu)|}{2\{(1 - \alpha) + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] |C_2(b, \mu)|\}} (f * h)(z) \prec h(z), \tag{it2.20}$$

and

$$\operatorname{Re}\{f(z)\} > -\frac{\{(1 - \alpha) + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] |C_2(b, \mu)|\}}{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] |C_2(b, \mu)|}. \tag{it2.21}$$

The constant factor  $\frac{[2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] |C_2(b, \mu)|}{2\{(1 - \alpha) + [2 + \beta - \alpha - \lambda(\alpha + \beta)] |C_2(b, \mu)|\}}$  in the subordination result (2.20) can not be replaced by a larger one.

By taking  $\lambda = 0$  in Corollary 4, we obtain the following corollary:

**Corollary 5.** Let the function  $f(z)$  defined by (1.1) be in the class  $S_b^{*\mu}(\alpha, \beta)$  and satisfy the condition

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} [k(1 + \beta) - (\alpha + \beta)] |C_k(b, \mu)| |a_k| \leq 1 - \alpha. \tag{it2.22}$$

Then for every function  $h \in K$ , we have

$$\frac{(2 + \beta - \alpha) |C_2(b, \mu)|}{2[1 - \alpha + (2 + \beta - \alpha) |C_2(b, \mu)|]} (f * h)(z) \prec h(z), \tag{it2.23}$$

and

$$\operatorname{Re}\{f(z)\} > -\frac{[1 - \alpha + (2 + \beta - \alpha)|C_2(b, \mu)]}{(2 + \beta - \alpha)|C_2(b, \mu)|}. \quad (\text{it2.24})$$

The constant factor  $\frac{(2+\beta-\alpha)|C_2(b,\mu)|}{2[1-\alpha+(2+\beta-\alpha)|C_2(b,\mu)]}$  in the subordination result (2.23) can not be replaced by a larger one.

**Remark 3.** Corollary 5, corrects the result obtained by Murugusundaramoorthy [13, Theorem 2.1].

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. K. Aouf, R. M. El-Ashwah and S. M. El-Deeb, Subordination results for certain subclasses of uniformly starlike and convex functions defined by convolution, *European J. Pure Appl. Math.*, 3(2010), no. 5, 903-917.
- [2] M. K. Aouf and A. O. Mostafa, Some properties of a subclass of uniformly convex functions with negative coefficients, *Demonstration Math.*, 2(2008), 353-370.
- [3] A. A. Attiya, On some application of a subordination theorems, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 311(2005), 489-494.
- [4] R. Bharati, R. Parvatham and A. Swaminathan, On subclasses of uniformly convex functions and corresponding class of starlike functions, *Tamakang J. Math.*, 28(1997), 17-32.
- [5] T. Bulboaca, *Differential Subordinations and Superordinations, Recent Results*, House of Scientific Book Publ., Cluj-Napoca, 2005.
- [6] A. Cătaș, G. I. Oros and G. Oros, Differential subordinations associated with multiplier transformations, *Abstract Appl. Anal.*, (2008), ID845724, 1-11.
- [7] J. Dziok and H. M. Srivastava, Classes of analytic functions with the generalized hypergeometric function, *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 103 (1999), 1-13.
- [8] J. Dziok and H. M. Srivastava, Certain subclasses of analytic functions associated with the generalized hypergeometric function, *Integral Transform. Spec. Funct.*, 14 (2003), 7-18.
- [9] B. A. Frasin, Subordination results for a class of analytic functions defined by a linear operator, *J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.*, 7(2006), no. 4, Art. 134, 1-7.
- [10] A. W. Goodman, On uniformly convex functions, *Ann. Polon. Math.*, 56(1991), 87-92.
- [11] A. W. Goodman, On uniformly starlike functions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 155(1991), 364-370.
- [12] S. S. Miller and P. T. Mocanu, *Differential Subordinations Theory and Applications*, in: *Series on Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Appl. Math.*, 255, Marcel Dekker, Inc, New York, 2000.

- [13] G. Murugusundaramoorthy, Subordination results and integrals means inequalities for  $k$ -uniformly starlike functions defined by convolution involving the Hurwitz-Lerch Zeta function, *Mathematica* 2010, vol. 54.
- [14] G. Murugusundaramoorthy and N. Magesh, A new subclass of uniformly convex functions and corresponding subclass of starlike functions with fixed second coefficient, *J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.*, 5(2004), no. 4, Art. 85, 1-10.
- [15] G. Murugusundaramoorthy and N. Magesh, Linear operators associated with a subclass of uniformly convex functions, *Internat. J. Pure Appl. Math. Sci.*, 3(2006), no. 2, 113-125.
- [16] G. Murugusundaramoorthy and N. Magesh, On certain Subclasses of analytic functions associated with hypergeometric functions, *Appl. Math. Letters*, 24(2011), 494-500.
- [17] M. S. Robertson, On the theory of univalent functions, *Ann. Math.*, 37(1936), no. 2, 374-408.
- [18] F. Ronning, On starlike functions associated with parabolic regions, *Ann. Univ. Mariae-Curie-Sklodowska, Sect. A* 45(1991), 117-122.
- [19] F. Ronning, Uniformly convex functions and a corresponding class of starlike functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 118(1993), 189-196.
- [20] T. Rosy and G. Murugusundaramoorthy, Fractional calculus and their applications to certain subclass of uniformly convex functions, *Far East J. Math. Sci.*, 15(2004), no. 2, 231-242.
- [21] S. Singh, A subordination theorems for spirallike functions, *Internat J. Math. Math. Sci.*, 24 (2000), no. 7, 433-435.
- [22] H. M. Srivastava and A. A. Attiya, Some subordination results associated with certain subclass of analytic functions, *J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.*, 5(2004), no. 4, Art. 82, 1-6.
- [23] H. M. Srivastava and A. A. Attiya, An integral operator associated with the Hurwitz-Lerch Zeta function and differential subordination, *Integral Transform. Spec. Funct.*, 18(2007), 207-216.
- [24] Wilf, Subordinating factor sequence for convex maps of the unit circle, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 12 (1961), 689-693.

M. K. Aouf, A. A. Shamandy, A. O. Mostafa and A. K. Wagdy

Department of Mathematics

Faculty of Science

Mansoura University

Mansoura 35516, Egypt

email: [mkaouf127@yahoo.com](mailto:mkaouf127@yahoo.com), [aashamandy@hotmail.com](mailto:aashamandy@hotmail.com), [adelaeg254@yahoo.com](mailto:adelaeg254@yahoo.com), [awagdy-fos@yahoo.com](mailto:awagdy-fos@yahoo.com)