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#### Abstract

Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ and $0 \in D$. A set $D$ is circularly symmetric if, for each $\varrho \in \mathbb{R}^{+}$, a set $D \cap\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}:|\zeta|=\varrho\}$ is one of three forms: an empty set, a whole circle, a curve symmetric with respect to the real axis containing $\varrho$. A function $f$ analytic in the unit disk $\Delta \equiv\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}:|\zeta|<1\}$ and satisfying the normalization condition $f(0)=f^{\prime}(0)-1=0$ is circularly symmetric, if $f(\Delta)$ is a circularly symmetric set. The class of all such functions is denoted by $X$. In this paper, we focus on the subclass $X^{\prime}$ consisting of functions in $X$ which are locally univalent. We obtain the results concerned with omitted values of $f \in X^{\prime}$ and some covering and distortion theorems. For functions in $X^{\prime}$ we also find the upper estimate of the $n$-th coefficient, as well as the region of variability of the second and the third coefficients. Furthermore, we derive the radii of starlikeness, convexity and univalence for $X^{\prime}$.
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## 1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the class of all functions analytic in the unit disk $\Delta \equiv\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}:|\zeta|<1\}$ which satify the condition $f(0)=f^{\prime}(0)-1=0$. A function $f$ is said to be typically real if the inequality $(\operatorname{Im} z)(\operatorname{Im} f(z)) \geq 0$ holds for all $z \in \Delta$. The class of functions which are typically real is denoted by $\tilde{T}$ and the class of typically real functions which belong to $\mathcal{A}$ is denoted by $T$. For a typically real function $f, z \in \Delta^{+} \Leftrightarrow f(z) \in \mathbb{C}^{+}$ and $z \in \Delta^{-} \Leftrightarrow f(z) \in \mathbb{C}^{-}$. The symbols $\Delta^{+}, \Delta^{-}, \mathbb{C}^{+}, \mathbb{C}^{-}$stand for the following sets: the upper and the lower halves of the disk $\Delta$, the upper halfplane and the lower halfplane, respectively.

Jenkins [3] established the following definitions.
Definition 1 Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}, 0 \in D$. A set $D$ is circularly symmetric if, for each $\varrho \in \mathbb{R}^{+}$, a set $D \cap\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}:|\zeta|=\varrho\}$ is one of three forms: an empty set, a whole circle, a curve symmetric with respect to the real axis containing $\varrho$.

Definition 2 A function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is circularly symmetric if $f(\Delta)$ is a circularly symmetric set. The class of all such functions is denoted by $X$.

In fact Jenkins considered only those circularly symmetric functions which are univalent. This assumption is rather restrictive. A number of interesting problems appear while discussing non-univalent circularly symmetric functions. For these reasons, we decided to define a circularly symmetric function as in Definition 2. In this paper, we focus on the set $X^{\prime}$ consisting of locally univalent circularly symmetric functions.

According to Jenkins (see, [3]), if $f \in X$ is univalent then $\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}$ is a typically real function. Additionally, he observed that the property $\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \in \tilde{T}$ does not guarantee the univalence of $f$. In fact, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
f \in X \Leftrightarrow \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \in \tilde{T} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Jenkins also gave a nice geometric property of $f$ in $X$. He proved that $f \in X$ if and only if, for a fixed $r \in(0,1)$, a function $\left|f\left(r e^{i \varphi}\right)\right|$ is nonincreasing for $\varphi \in(0, \pi)$ and nondecreasing for $\varphi \in(\pi, 2 \pi)$. From (1), all coefficients of the Taylor series expansion of $f \in X$ are real.

In [9] the following relation between $X^{\prime}$ and $T$ was proved:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f \in X^{\prime} \Leftrightarrow \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}=(1+z)^{2} \frac{h(z)}{z}, \quad h \in T . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is known that each function of the class $T$ can be represented by the formula

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(z)=\int_{-1}^{1} \frac{z}{1-2 t z+z^{2}} d \mu(t) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mu$ is a probability measure on $[-1,1]$ (see, [7]). Applying (3) in (2) and integrating it, one can write a function $f \in X^{\prime}$ in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=z \exp \left(\int_{0}^{z} \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{2(1+t)}{1-2 t \zeta+\zeta^{2}} d \mu(t) d \zeta\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Putting $\cos \psi$ instead of $t$ in (4) and integrating it with respect to $\zeta$, we get the integral representation of a function in $X^{\prime}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
f \in X^{\prime} \Leftrightarrow f(z)=z \exp \left(\int_{0}^{\pi} i \cot \frac{\psi}{2} \log \frac{1-z e^{i \psi}}{1-z e^{-i \psi}} d \mu(\psi)\right), \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mu$ is a probability measure on $[0, \pi]$.
Applying the well-known equivalence

$$
\begin{equation*}
f \in T \Leftrightarrow \frac{1-z^{2}}{z} f(z) \in P_{\mathbb{R}} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

we obtain the relation between $X^{\prime}$ and the set $P_{\mathbb{R}}$ of functions with positive real part which have real coefficients:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f \in X^{\prime} \Leftrightarrow \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}=\frac{1+z}{1-z} p(z), \quad p \in P_{\mathbb{R}} . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is known (Robertson, [6]) that the set of extreme points for $T$ has the form $\left\{\frac{z}{1-2 z t+z^{2}}: t \in[-1,1]\right\}$. Putting these functions into formula (2) as $h$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}=\frac{(1+z)^{2}}{1-2 z t+z^{2}} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easy to check that the functions $f$, which satisfy (8), are of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{t}(z)=z \exp \left(i \cot \frac{\psi}{2} \log \frac{1-z e^{i \psi}}{1-z e^{-i \psi}}\right), \quad t \in[-1,1) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $t=\cos \psi$. Obviously, $t \in[-1,1) \Leftrightarrow \psi \in(0, \pi]$. Furthermore,

$$
\lim _{\psi \rightarrow 0^{+}}\left(i \cot \frac{\psi}{2} \log \frac{1-z e^{i \psi}}{1-z e^{-i \psi}}\right)=\frac{4 z}{1-z}
$$

so we can write

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{1}(z)=z \exp \left(\frac{4 z}{1-z}\right) \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Besides $f_{t}$, we need another family of functions belonging to $X^{\prime}$. Since the set $T$ is convex, every linear combination of any two functions from $T$ also belongs to $T$. Hence, taking $\frac{1+t}{2} \frac{z}{(1-z)^{2}}+\frac{1-t}{2} \frac{z}{(1+z)^{2}}, t \in[-1,1]$ as $h$ in (2), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}=\frac{1+2 z t+z^{2}}{(1-z)^{2}} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us denote by $g_{t}$ the solutions of Eq. (11). From this equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{t}(z)=z \exp \left(\frac{2(1+t) z}{1-z}\right), \quad t \in[-1,1] . \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, we have

$$
g_{-1}(z)=f_{-1}(z)=z \quad \text { and } \quad g_{1}(z)=f_{1}(z)=z \exp \left(\frac{4 z}{1-z}\right)
$$

## 2 Properties of $f_{t}$ and $g_{t}$

Firstly, we shall describe the sets $f_{t}(\Delta)$ and $g_{t}(\Delta)$, where $f_{t}, g_{t}$ are defined by (9) and (12), respectively.

For $f_{t}, t \in(-1,1)$ (i.e. for $\psi \in(0, \pi)$ ), from (9) we obtain

$$
\left|f_{t}\left(e^{i \varphi}\right)\right|=\exp \left(\cot \frac{\psi}{2} \arg \frac{1-e^{i(\varphi-\psi)}}{1-e^{i(\varphi+\psi)}}\right)
$$

We shall derive the argument which appears in the above expression. To do this, we need the following identity:

$$
\arg \left(1+e^{i \alpha}\right)=\frac{\alpha}{2}-\pi \cdot\left\lfloor\frac{\alpha+\pi}{2 \pi}\right\rfloor \text { for } \alpha \neq(1+2 k) \pi, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z} .
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|f_{t}\left(e^{i \varphi}\right)\right|=\exp \left(-\psi \cot \frac{\psi}{2}\right) \quad \text { for } \varphi \in(\psi, 2 \pi-\psi) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|f_{t}\left(e^{i \varphi}\right)\right|=\exp \left((\pi-\psi) \cot \frac{\psi}{2}\right) \quad \text { for } \varphi \in[0, \psi) \cup(2 \pi-\psi, 2 \pi] \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the above expressions, it follows that a function $\left|f_{t}\left(e^{i \varphi}\right)\right|$, with fixed $t \in$ $(-1,1)$, does not depend on the variable $\varphi$. Moreover, $\left|f_{t}\left(e^{i \varphi}\right)\right|$ in (13) is less than 1 and $\left|f_{t}\left(e^{i \varphi}\right)\right|$ in (14) is greater than 1. Additionally,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\arg \left(f_{t}\left(e^{i \varphi}\right)\right)=\varphi+\cot \frac{\psi}{2} \log \left|\frac{\sin \frac{\varphi+\psi}{2}}{\sin \frac{\varphi-\psi}{2}}\right|, \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

which means that the curves $\left\{f_{t}\left(e^{i \varphi}\right), \varphi \in[0, \phi)\right\}$ and $\left\{f_{t}\left(e^{i \varphi}\right), \varphi \in(\phi, \pi]\right\}$ wind around circles given by (13) and (14) infinitely many times. Hence, for $t \in(-1,1)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{t}(\Delta) \subset\left\{w \in \mathbb{C}:|w|<\exp \left((\pi-\psi) \cot \frac{\psi}{2}\right)\right\} . \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easily seen that $f_{-1}(\Delta)=\Delta$.
Now, we shall show that $f_{1}$ omits only one point on the real axis.
Theorem 1 The condition $f_{1}(z) \neq-e^{-2}$ holds for all $z \in \Delta$.
Proof On the contrary, suppose that there exists $z \in \Delta$ such that $f_{1}(z)=-e^{-2}$. In fact, we can assume that $\arg z \in[0, \pi]$ because the coefficients of $f_{1}$ are real. For this reason,

$$
\begin{equation*}
z \exp \left(\frac{2(1+z)}{1-z}\right)=-1 \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

or equivalently,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1+z}{1-z}=\frac{1}{2}\left(-\log |z|+i \arg \frac{-1}{z}\right) \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $z=r e^{i \varphi}, \varphi \in[0, \pi]$. Comparing the arguments of both sides of this equality, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{2 r \sin \varphi}{1-r^{2}}=\frac{\pi-\varphi}{-\log r} \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

For a fixed $r \in(0,1)$, let us consider a function

$$
h(\varphi)=\frac{2 r}{1-r^{2}} \sin \varphi+\frac{1}{\log r}(\pi-\varphi), \quad \varphi \in[0, \pi] .
$$

For $\varphi \in[0, \pi]$ the function $h^{\prime}(\varphi)$ decreases and

$$
\begin{equation*}
h^{\prime}(\varphi) \geq-\frac{2 r}{\left(1-r^{2}\right) \log r} \cdot g(r) \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
g(r)=\log r+\frac{1-r^{2}}{2 r}
$$

Since $g^{\prime}(r)=-(1-r)^{2} / 2 r^{2}$, the function $g(r)$ decreases for $r \in(0,1)$ and

$$
g(r) \geq g(1)=0
$$

Both factors on the right-hand side of (20) are positive. Consequently, $h(\varphi)$ increases for $\varphi \in(0, \pi)$, so $h(\varphi) \leq h(\pi)=0$.

Taking into account the last inequality, we can see that $\varphi=\pi$ is the only solution of (19). It means that Eq. (18) is satisfied only for $z=r e^{i \pi}=-r$; so

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1-r}{1+r}+\frac{1}{2} \log r=0 \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us denote the left-hand side of (21) by $k(r)$. Since $k$ is increasing for $r \in(0,1)$,

$$
\sup \{k(r): r \in(0,1)\}=k(1)=0 .
$$

Therefore, (21) has no solutions in the open set $(0,1)$, which contradicts (18), and, consequently we obtain the desired result.

Applying a similar argument, one can prove the following more general theorem.
Theorem 2 For $g_{t}, t \in(-1,1]$ given by (12),
(i) $g_{t}(z) \neq-e^{-1-t}$ for $z \in \Delta$,
(ii) the equation $g_{t}(z)=-\varrho e^{-1-t}$ has a solution for any $\varrho>1$,
(iii) the equation $g_{t}(z)=-e^{-1-t} e^{i \theta}$ has a solution for any $\theta \in(-\pi, \pi)$.

Proof ad (i) Suppose that there exists $z \in \Delta$ such that $g_{t}(z)=-e^{-1-t}$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
z \exp \left((1+t) \frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)=-1 \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

and putting $z=r e^{i \varphi}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1+r e^{i \varphi}}{1-r e^{i \varphi}}=\frac{1}{1+t}(-\log r+i(\pi-\varphi)) \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Comparing the arguments on both sides, we obtain the same function $h$ as in the proof for Theorem 4; consequently $h(\varphi) \leq 0$. Therefore, Eq. (23) holds only if $z=-r$, but in this case

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1-r}{1+r}+\frac{1}{1+t} \log r=0 \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let the left-hand side of (24) be denoted by $k(r)$, which is an increasing and nonpositive function of $r \in(0,1)$. It yields that (24) has no solutions in the open set $(0,1)$, which contradicts the assumption.
ad (ii) Consider an equation $g_{t}(z)=-\varrho e^{-1-t}$ with fixed $\varrho>1$. It takes the following form

$$
\begin{equation*}
z \exp \left((1+t) \frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)=-\varrho . \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Putting $z=r e^{i \varphi}$ into (25), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1+r e^{i \varphi}}{1-r e^{i \varphi}}=\frac{1}{1+t}\left(\log \frac{\varrho}{r}+i(\pi-\varphi)\right) \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{2 r \sin \varphi}{1-r^{2}}-\frac{\pi-\varphi}{\log \frac{\varrho}{r}}=0 \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $h(\varphi)$ denote the left-hand side of this equality. The function $h^{\prime}(\varphi)$ is decreasing; $h^{\prime}(0)=\frac{2 r}{1-r^{2}}+\frac{1}{\log \frac{\varrho}{r}}>0$ and $h^{\prime}(\pi)=\frac{-2 r}{1-r^{2}}+\frac{1}{\log \frac{\rho}{r}}$. One can easily prove that there exists only one number $r_{0} \in(0,1)$ such that $h^{\prime}(\pi)>0$ for $r \in\left(0, r_{0}\right)$ and $h^{\prime}(\pi)<0$ for $r \in\left(r_{0}, 1\right)$.

Hence, for suitably taken $r$, the function $h$ first increases and then decreases. Furthermore, $h(0)=-\pi / \log \frac{\varrho}{r}<0$ and $h(\pi)=0$. Consequently, there exists $\varphi_{0} \in(0, \pi)$
such that $h\left(\varphi_{0}\right)=0$. It means that (26) is satisfied by $z_{0}=r e^{i \varphi_{0}}$; so (25) holds for $z=z_{0}$.
ad (iii) The proof of this part is similar to the proof of (ii).
Corollary $1 g_{t}(\Delta)=\mathbb{C} \backslash\left\{-e^{-1-t}\right\}$ for all $t \in(-1,1]$.
Proof Let $t \in(-1,1]$ be fixed. For $r \in(0,1)$, we have $g_{t}(-r)=-r \exp (-2(1+$ $t) r /(1+r))$. Observe that $\left|g_{t}(-r)\right|$ is a continuous and increasing function of $r \in$ $[0,1)$. For this reason, $g_{t}(-r)$ achieves all values in $\left(-e^{-1-t}, 0\right]$. From the definition of circularly symmetric function it follows that if $c$ belongs to the negative real axis and $c \in g_{t}(\Delta)$, then the whole circle with radius $|c|$ centered at the origin is also contained in this set. Hence, for each $\varrho$ in $[0,1)$ we have $\left\{w \in \mathbb{C}:|w|=\varrho e^{-1-t}\right\} \subset g_{t}(\Delta)$.

By Theorem 2, part (ii), $\left(-\infty,-e^{-1-t}\right)$ is contained in $g_{t}(\Delta)$. Let $-\varrho e^{-1-t}, \varrho>1$ be an arbitrary point of this ray. Applying the same argument as above, we conclude that for any $\varrho>1,\left\{w \in \mathbb{C}:|w|=\varrho e^{-1-t}\right\} \subset g_{t}(\Delta)$.

Combining these facts with points (i) and (iii) of Theorem 2 completes the proof.

Let us consider a function $b(\varphi)=\arg g_{t}\left(r e^{i \varphi}\right), \varphi \in(0, \pi)$ where $t \in[-1,1]$ and $r \in(0,1)$ are fixed. Analyzing the derivative of this function it can be observed that if $t-3+4 \sigma^{2} \leq 0$, where $\sigma=\frac{2 r}{1+r^{2}}$, then $b(\varphi)$ increases in $(0, \pi)$. On the other hand, if $t-3+4 \sigma^{2}>0$ then, for $\varphi \in(0, \pi)$, the function $b(\varphi)$ increases at the beginning, then it decreases, only to increase again at the end. From this observation we conclude that for small $r$, a set $g_{t}(\{z \in \mathbb{C}:|z|<r, \operatorname{Im} z \geq 0\})$ is contained in the upper halfplane. If $r$ is greater than $r_{t}=\frac{\sqrt{3-t}}{2+\sqrt{1+t}}$, then this set is not contained in the upper halfplane; its boundary is wound around the origin.

If $r=1$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{t}\left(e^{i \varphi}\right)=\exp \left(-1-t+i\left(\varphi+(1+t) \cot \frac{\varphi}{2}\right)\right) \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|g_{t}\left(e^{i \varphi}\right)\right|=\exp (-1-t) \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\arg \left(g_{t}\left(e^{i \varphi}\right)\right)=\varphi+(1+t) \cot \frac{\varphi}{2} . \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, $g_{t}(\Delta)$ is wound around the origin infinitely many times, or, more precisely, it is wound around the circle with radius $e^{-1-t}$.

## 3 Coefficients of Functions in $X^{\prime}$

To start with, let us look into the coefficients of $f_{1}$ given by (10). Although it is complicated to find an explicit formula for the $n$-th coefficient of this function, the formula of the logarithmic coefficients $\gamma_{n}$ of $f_{1}$ can be easily derived. Indeed,

$$
\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{f_{1}(z)}{z}=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2 z^{k}
$$

thus

$$
\gamma_{n}=2 \quad \text { for all } n \in \mathbb{N}
$$

The Taylor series expansion of $f_{1}$ is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{1}(z) & =z+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{4^{k}}{k!} z^{k+1}(1-z)^{-k}=z+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{4^{k}}{k!} z^{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\binom{j+k-1}{k-1} z^{j} \\
& =z+\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_{j, k} z^{k+j+1}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
b_{j, k}=\frac{4^{k}}{k!}\binom{j+k-1}{k-1}, \quad k \geq 1, \quad j \geq 0
$$

Denoting the $n$-th coefficient of $f_{1}$ by $A_{n}$, we can write

$$
A_{n}=\sum_{s=0}^{n-2} b_{s, n-1-s}=\sum_{s=0}^{n-2} \frac{4^{n-1-s}}{(n-1-s)!}\binom{n-2}{n-2-s}
$$

and consequently,

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{n}=\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{4^{j}}{j!}\binom{n-2}{j-1} . \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

The first four values of $A_{n}$ are

$$
A_{2}=4, \quad A_{3}=12, \quad A_{4}=\frac{92}{3}, \quad A_{5}=\frac{212}{3} .
$$

On the other hand, for $A_{n}$ the formula

$$
\begin{equation*}
n A_{n+1}=(2 n+2) A_{n}-(n-2) A_{n-1} \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds for $n \geq 2$. Indeed, expanding both sides of the equality

$$
z f_{1}^{\prime}(z)=f_{1}(z)\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{2}
$$

we get

$$
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n A_{n} z^{n}=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A_{n} z^{n} \cdot\left(1+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2 z^{k}\right)^{2}
$$

Comparing the coefficients at $z^{n}$, we obtain (32).
We shall now prove that the upper bound of $n$-th coefficient of a function $f \in X^{\prime}$ is achieved when $f$ is equal to $f_{1}$. To do this, we apply the relation (7).

Suppose that functions $f \in X^{\prime}$ and $p \in P_{\mathbb{R}}$ are of the form $f(z)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n}$ and $p(z)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{n} z^{n}$ with $a_{1}=1, p_{0}=1$. Equation (7) yields

$$
z+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n a_{n} z^{n}=\left(z+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n}\right) \cdot\left(1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_{n} z^{n}\right)
$$

where

$$
c_{n}=p_{n}+2 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} p_{k}
$$

Comparing the coefficients at $z^{n}, n \geq 2$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
(n-1) a_{n}=\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} a_{j} c_{n-j}=\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} a_{j}\left(p_{n-j}+2 \sum_{k=0}^{n-j-1} p_{k}\right) . \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

Taking into account (33) and the coefficient estimates of a function in $P_{\mathbb{R}}$, we conclude

$$
\begin{equation*}
(n-1) a_{n} \leq 4 \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\left|a_{j}\right|(n-j), \quad n \geq 2 \tag{34}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equality in (34) holds only if all $p_{i}$ in (33) are equal to 2, which means that $p(z)=\frac{1+z}{1-z}$.
From (34), when $n=2$, there is $a_{2} \leq 4\left|a_{1}\right|=4$. Equality in this estimate holds for $f_{1}$ only. Now, it is sufficient to apply mathematical induction in order to prove that successive coefficients $a_{n}$ of any $f \in X^{\prime}$ are bounded by corresponding coefficients $A_{n}$ of $f_{1}$. Hence

Theorem 3 Let $f \in X^{\prime}$ have the form $f(z)=z+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n}$ and let $A_{n}$ be given by (31). Then, for $n \geq 2$,

$$
a_{n} \leq A_{n} .
$$

Our next problem is to find the set of variability of $\left(a_{2}, a_{3}\right)$ for a function in $X^{\prime}$. For a given class of analytic functions $A$, let $A_{i, j}(A)$ denote a set $\left\{\left(a_{i}(f), a_{j}(f)\right): f \in A\right\}$.

For the class $P_{\mathbb{R}}$ of functions with positive real part and having real coefficients, the following result is known:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{1,2}\left(P_{\mathbb{R}}\right)=\left\{(x, y):-2 \leq x \leq 2, x^{2}-2 \leq y \leq 2\right\} \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

Based on this result, we can prove

## Theorem 4

$$
A_{2,3}\left(X^{\prime}\right)=\left\{(x, y): 0 \leq x \leq 4, x^{2}-x \leq y \leq \frac{1}{2} x^{2}+x\right\}
$$

and
Corollary 2 Let $f \in X^{\prime}$ have the form $f(z)=z+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n}$. Then $a_{3} \geq-\frac{1}{4}$.
Proof of Theorem 4 Let $f(z)=z+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n} \in X^{\prime}$ and $p(z)=1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} p_{n} z^{n} \in$ $P_{\mathbb{R}}$. It follows from (33) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
a_{2} & =p_{1}+2 \\
2 a_{3} & =p_{2}+2 p_{1}+2+a_{2}\left(p_{1}+2\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

or equivalently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p_{1}=a_{2}-2 \\
& p_{2}=2 a_{3}-a_{2}^{2}-2 a_{2}+2
\end{aligned}
$$

Combining these relations with the estimates given in (35) completes the proof.
The points of intersection of two parabolas described in Theorem 4, i.e.: (0, 0) and $(4,12)$ correspond to the functions $f_{-1}(z)=z$ and $f_{1}(z)=z \exp \left(\frac{4 z}{1-z}\right)=$ $z+4 z^{2}+12 z^{3}+\cdots$, respectively.

Observe that the class $X^{\prime}$ is not convex. Indeed, if $X^{\prime}$ is a convex set, then, for every fixed $\alpha \in(0,1)$, a function $\alpha f_{1}(z)+(1-\alpha) f_{-1}(z)=\alpha z \exp \left(\frac{4 z}{1-z}\right)+(1-\alpha) z=$ $z+4 \alpha z^{2}+12 \alpha z^{3}+\cdots$, would be in $X^{\prime}$. This will imply that $(4 \alpha, 12 \alpha) \in A_{2,3}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$, a contradiction with Theorem 4.

## 4 Distortion Theorems

Directly from the definition of a circularly symmetric function, it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|f(-r)| \leq\left|f\left(r e^{i \varphi}\right)\right| \leq|f(r)| \tag{36}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every function $f \in X^{\prime}$ and for all $\varphi \in[0,2 \pi]$ and $r \in(0,1)$.
From (4), for any function $f \in X^{\prime}$ and any number $r \in(0,1)$,

$$
\begin{align*}
f(r) & =r \exp \left(\int_{0}^{r} \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{2(1+t)}{1-2 t x+x^{2}} \mathrm{~d} \mu(t) \mathrm{d} x\right) \\
& \leq r \exp \left(\int_{0}^{r} \frac{4}{(1-x)^{2}} \mathrm{~d} x\right)=r \exp \left(\frac{4 r}{1-r}\right)=f_{1}(r) \tag{37}
\end{align*}
$$

Similarly,

$$
\begin{align*}
|f(-r)| & =r \exp \left(\int_{0}^{-r} \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{2(1+t)}{1-2 t x+x^{2}} \mathrm{~d} \mu(t) \mathrm{d} x\right) \\
& =r \exp \left(-\int_{0}^{r} \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{2(1+t)}{1+2 t y+y^{2}} \mathrm{~d} \mu(t) \mathrm{d} y\right) \\
& \geq r \exp \left(-\int_{0}^{r} \frac{4}{(1+y)^{2}} \mathrm{~d} y\right)=r \exp \left(\frac{-4 r}{1+r}\right)=\left|f_{1}(-r)\right| . \tag{38}
\end{align*}
$$

Equalities in the above estimates hold only if $\mu$ is a measure concentrated in point 1 ; it means that $h(z)=\frac{z}{(1-z)^{2}}$. We have proved

Theorem 5 For any $f \in X^{\prime}$ and $r=|z| \in(0,1)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
r \exp \left(\frac{-4 r}{1+r}\right) \leq|f(z)| \leq r \exp \left(\frac{4 r}{1-r}\right) \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equalities in the above estimates hold only for $f_{1}$ and points $z=-r$ and $z=r$.
Corollary 3 For any $f \in X^{\prime}$, we have $f(\Delta) \supset \Delta_{e^{-2}}$.
The estimates of $\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|$ for $f \in X^{\prime}$ can be obtained from (2) and Theorem 5.
Theorem 6 For any $f \in X^{\prime}$ and $|z|=r \in(0,1)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{1-r}{1+r}\right)^{2} \exp \left(\frac{-4 r}{1+r}\right) \leq\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \leq\left(\frac{1-r}{1+r}\right)^{2} \exp \left(\frac{4 r}{1-r}\right) \tag{40}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equalities in the above estimates hold only for $f_{1}$ and points $z=-r$ and $z=r$.
Proof Let $f \in X^{\prime}$. From (2),

$$
f^{\prime}(z)=(1+z)^{2} \frac{h(z)}{z} \frac{f(z)}{z}
$$

where $h \in T$. Therefore, if $|z|=r \in(0,1)$ then

$$
\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \leq(1+r)^{2} \frac{1}{(1-r)^{2}} \frac{f_{1}(r)}{r}
$$

and

$$
\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \geq(1-r)^{2} \frac{1}{(1+r)^{2}} \frac{\left|f_{1}(-r)\right|}{r}
$$

which is equivalent to (40). Moreover, equalities in both estimates appear when $h$ is equal to $\frac{z}{(1-z)^{2}}$ and $z$ is equal to $r$ and $-r$, respectively. It means that $f_{1}$ is the extremal function for (40).

Finally, we shall prove two lemmas which will be useful in our research on the convexity of functions in $X^{\prime}$.

Lemma 1 For a fixed point $z \in \Delta^{+}$, the set $\Omega(z)$ of variability of the expression $\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}$, while $f$ varies in $X^{\prime}$, is of the form

$$
\Omega(z)=\operatorname{conv} \gamma(z),
$$

where $\gamma(z)$ is an upper halfplane located arc of a circle containing three nonlinear points: $z_{0}=0, z_{1}=1, z_{2}=\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{2}$, with endpoints $z_{1}$ and $z_{2}$.

Lemma 2 For any $f \in X^{\prime}$ and $z \in \Delta$,

$$
\operatorname{Re} \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \geq \begin{cases}\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{2} & \text { for } \quad \operatorname{Re}(z+1 / z) \leq 2  \tag{41}\\ 1 & \text { for } \quad \operatorname{Re}(z+1 / z) \geq 2\end{cases}
$$

Proof of Lemma 1 Let $z \in \Delta^{+}$. Applying (2) and the representation formula for a function in $T$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}=\int_{-1}^{1} \frac{(1+z)^{2}}{1-2 z t+z^{2}} d \mu(t) \tag{42}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mu$ is a probability measure on $[-1,1]$.
With a fixed $z \in \Delta$, we denote by $q_{z}(t)$ an integrand in (42). The image set $\left\{q_{z}(t)\right.$ : $t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ coincides with a circle going through the origin. Furthermore, $q_{z}(-1)=1$ and $q_{z}(1)=\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{2}$.

For $z$ such that $\operatorname{Im} z>0$,

$$
\operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{2}=\operatorname{Im}\left(1+\frac{4}{w-2}\right)=\frac{-4 \operatorname{Im} w}{|w-2|^{2}}=\frac{4\left(1 /|z|^{2}-1\right) \operatorname{Im} z}{|w-2|^{2}}>0
$$

where $w=z+1 / z$.
Hence, the set $\left\{q_{z}(t): t \in[-1,1]\right\}$ is an arc of the circle with endpoints $q_{z}(-1)$ and $q_{z}(1)$, which does not contain the origin. For this reason, this set coincides with $\gamma(z)$ and one endpoint of this arc is always 1 , independent of $z$. Finally, $\Omega(z)$ is a section of the disk bounded by $\gamma(z)$ and the line segment with endpoints $q_{z}(-1)$ and $q_{z}(1)$.

Proof of Lemma 2 Every function $f$ in $X^{\prime}$ has real coefficients, so $f(\Delta)$ is symmetric with respect to the real axis. Hence, it is sufficient to prove (41) only for $z \in \Delta^{+}$. But Lemma 1 leads to

$$
\inf \left\{\operatorname{Re} \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}: f \in X^{\prime}\right\}= \begin{cases}\operatorname{Re} q_{z}(1) & \text { for } \quad \operatorname{Re}(z+1 / z) \leq 2  \tag{43}\\ \operatorname{Re} q_{z}(-1) & \text { for } \quad \operatorname{Re}(z+1 / z) \geq 2\end{cases}
$$

It is easy to check that for $z \in \Delta$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{2} \leq 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \operatorname{Re}(z+1 / z) \leq 2 \tag{44}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consequently, (41) can be written as follows:

$$
\operatorname{Re} \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \geq \min \left\{\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{2}, 1\right\}
$$

## 5 Starlikeness and Convexity

The relation (2) and the estimates of the argument for typically real functions imply that for $z \in \Delta^{+}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\arg \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}=2 \arg (1+z)+\arg \frac{g(z)}{z} \leq 2 \arg (1+z)+\arg \frac{1}{(1-z)^{2}}=2 \arg \frac{1+z}{1-z} . \tag{45}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\arg \frac{1+z}{1-z}\right| \leq \arctan \frac{2 r}{1-r^{2}} \tag{46}
\end{equation*}
$$

The condition for starlikeness $\left|\arg \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ and the bounds given above result in

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{S^{*}}\left(X^{\prime}\right)=\sqrt{2}-1 \tag{47}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equality in (45) holds for $g(z)=\frac{z}{(1-z)^{2}}$, and, consequently, for $f=f_{1}$. This result will be generalized in two ways.

First, we estimate $\operatorname{Re} \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}$ for $z$ in $H=\left\{z \in \Delta:\left|1+z^{2}\right|>2|z|\right\}$. This set appears in the research on typically real functions. It is the domain of univalence and local univalence in $T$ (see, [2]). The set $H$, called the Golusin lens, is the common part of two disks with radii $\sqrt{2}$ which have the centers in points $i$ and $-i$. Moreover,

$$
H=\left\{z \in \mathbb{C}: \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{2}>0\right\}
$$

From Lemma 2, we obtain
Theorem 7 For each $f \in X^{\prime}$ and $z \in H$,

$$
\operatorname{Re} \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \geq 0
$$

It is worth noticing that this theorem is still true even if $X^{\prime}$ is replaced by $T$. This property is very interesting because the classes $X^{\prime}$ and $T$ have a non-empty intersection, but one is not included in the other.

As a corollary, from Theorem 7 we obtain (47).
Another generalization of (47) refers to the radius of starlikeness of order $\alpha$ and the radius of strong starlikeness of order $\alpha$ (for definitions and other details the reader is referred to $[1,5,8]$ ).

Theorem 8 The radius of starlikeness of order $\alpha, \alpha \in[0,1)$, in $X^{\prime}$ is equal to

$$
r_{S^{*}(\alpha)}\left(X^{\prime}\right)= \begin{cases}\sqrt{\frac{2}{1-2 \alpha}}-\sqrt{\frac{1+2 \alpha}{1-2 \alpha}} & \text { for } \alpha \in[0,1 / 3] \\ \frac{1-\sqrt{\alpha}}{1+\sqrt{\alpha}} & \text { for } \alpha \in[1 / 3,1) .\end{cases}
$$

Corollary $4 r_{S^{*}(1 / 2)}\left(X^{\prime}\right)=(\sqrt{2}-1)^{2}=0.171 \ldots$.
Theorem 9 The radius of strong starlikeness of order $\alpha, \alpha \in(0,1]$, in $X^{\prime}$ is equal to

$$
r_{S S^{*}(\alpha)}\left(X^{\prime}\right)=\tan \left(\frac{\pi}{8} \alpha\right)
$$

Corollary $5 r_{S S^{*}(2 / 3)}\left(X^{\prime}\right)=2-\sqrt{3}$.
Proof of Theorem 8 By Lemma 2,

$$
\operatorname{Re} \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \geq \begin{cases}1+4 \operatorname{Re} \frac{z}{(1-z)^{2}} & \text { for } \operatorname{Re}(z+1 / z) \leq 2  \tag{48}\\ 1 & \text { for } \operatorname{Re}(z+1 / z) \geq 2\end{cases}
$$

Let $r=|z|$ be a fixed number, $0<r \leq 2-\sqrt{3}$. It is known that $h(z)=\frac{z}{(1-z)^{2}}$ is convex for $|z| \leq 2-\sqrt{3}$. Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re} \frac{z}{(1-z)^{2}} \geq \frac{-r}{(1+r)^{2}} \tag{49}
\end{equation*}
$$

with equality for $z=-r$.
From (48) and (49) it follows that

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

and so

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re} \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \geq\left(\frac{1-r}{1+r}\right)^{2} \tag{50}
\end{equation*}
$$

with equality for $z=-r$. For this $z$, the condition $\operatorname{Re}(z+1 / z) \leq 2$ is satisfied.

Now, suppose that $r \in(2-\sqrt{3}, 1)$. The real part of $\frac{z}{(1-z)^{2}}$ for $z=r e^{i \varphi}$ can be written as a function $h(\cos \varphi), \varphi \in[0,2 \pi]$, where $h(x)=\frac{r\left(1+r^{2}\right) x-2 r^{2}}{\left(1-2 r x+r^{2}\right)^{2}}$. If $r \in(2-\sqrt{3}, 1)$, one can check that

$$
\min \{h(x): x \in[-1,1]\}=h\left(x_{0}\right)=-\frac{\left(1+r^{2}\right)^{2}}{8\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2}}
$$

where

$$
x_{0}=-\frac{1-6 r^{2}+r^{4}}{2 r\left(1+r^{2}\right)}
$$

Thus

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

Consequently

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re} \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \geq \frac{1-6 r^{2}+r^{4}}{2\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2}} \tag{51}
\end{equation*}
$$

with equalities for points $z_{0}=r e^{i \varphi_{0}}$ and $\overline{z_{0}}$, where $\varphi_{0}=\arccos x_{0}$. Furthermore,

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(z_{0}+1 / z_{0}\right)-2=(1 / r+r) \cos \varphi_{0}-2=(1 / r+r) x_{0}-2=-\frac{\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2}}{2 r^{2}}
$$

The condition $\operatorname{Re}\left(z_{0}+1 / z_{0}\right) \leq 2$ is satisfied in this case also.
Combining (50) and (51), we get

$$
\operatorname{Re} \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \geq \begin{cases}\left(\frac{1-r}{1+r}\right)^{2} & \text { for } r \in(0,2-\sqrt{3}]  \tag{52}\\ \frac{1-6 r^{2}+r^{4}}{2\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2}} & \text { for } r \in[2-\sqrt{3}, 1)\end{cases}
$$

In the first case, substituting $\left(\frac{1-r}{1+r}\right)^{2}$ by $\alpha$, we obtain $r=\frac{1-\sqrt{\alpha}}{1+\sqrt{\alpha}}$. The condition $r \in(0,2-\sqrt{3}]$ is equivalent to $\alpha \in[1 / 3,1)$.

While discussing the second possibility in (52), we should remember that the radius of starlikeness in $X^{\prime}$ is equal to $\sqrt{2}-1$. For this reason, we substitute $\frac{1-6 r^{2}+r^{4}}{2\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2}}=\alpha$ only for $r \in[2-\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{2}-1]$. This results in $r=\sqrt{\frac{2}{1-2 \alpha}}-\sqrt{\frac{1+2 \alpha}{1-2 \alpha}}$ and $\alpha \in[0,1 / 3]$.

The bound in (52) is sharp; equality holds for $f$ satisfying $\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}=\frac{z}{(1-z)^{2}}$, so for $f_{1}$.

The proof of Theorem 9 is easier. In fact, we need the condition for strong starlikeness and inequality (46). Thus we obtain

$$
2 \arctan \frac{2 r}{1-r^{2}} \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \alpha
$$

and hence

$$
r^{2}+2 r \cot \left(\frac{\pi}{4} \alpha\right)-1 \leq 0
$$

Solving this inequality with respect to $r$, the assertion of Theorem 9 follows.
The next theorem is concerned with the problem of convexity of a function in $X^{\prime}$.
Theorem 10 The radius of convexity for $X^{\prime}$ is equal to $r_{C V}\left(X^{\prime}\right)=r_{0}$, where $r_{0}=$ $0.139 \ldots$ is the only solution of equation $1-7 r-r^{2}-r^{3}=0$. The extremal function is $f_{1}$.

In the proof of this theorem, we need the following result of Todorov for $h \in T$ (see [10]):

$$
\operatorname{Re} \frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{h(z)} \geq \begin{cases}\frac{1-r}{1+r}, & 0 \leq r \leq 2-\sqrt{3}  \tag{53}\\ \frac{1-6 r^{2}+r^{4}}{1-r^{4}}, & 2-\sqrt{3} \leq r<1\end{cases}
$$

Proof From (2), if $f \in X^{\prime}$ then $\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}=(1+z)^{2} \frac{h(z)}{z}$, where $h \in T$. Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}=\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}+\frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{h(z)}-\frac{1-z}{1+z} \tag{54}
\end{equation*}
$$

In further calculation, we shall apply Lemma 2.
Let $r \leq 2-\sqrt{3}$. For $z$ such that $\operatorname{Re}(z+1 / z) \geq 2$,

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right) \geq 1+\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{h(z)}-\frac{1-z}{1+z}\right)=\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{h(z)}+\frac{2 z}{1+z}\right)
$$

Estimate (53) and the inequality $\operatorname{Re} \frac{2 z}{1+z} \geq-\frac{2 r}{1-r}$ result in

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

This estimate is not sharp because equalities in the two previous inequalities appear only if $z=-r$, but in this case $\operatorname{Re}(z+1 / z)<2$. From the above, we conclude that if $\operatorname{Re}(z+1 / z) \geq 2$ and $r \in[0, \sqrt{5}-2)$ then $\operatorname{Re}\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right)>0$.

Assume now that $\operatorname{Re}(z+1 / z) \leq 2$. In this case

$$
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{Re}\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right) & \geq \operatorname{Re}\left(\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{2}+\frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{h(z)}-\frac{1-z}{1+z}\right)  \tag{55}\\
& =\operatorname{Re} \frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{h(z)}+\operatorname{Re} \frac{2 z}{1+z}+\operatorname{Re} \frac{4 z}{(1-z)^{2}}
\end{align*}
$$

The first two components can be estimated as above. Based on (49), the third one is greater than or equal to $\frac{-4 r}{(1+r)^{2}}$. Since each estimate is sharp (with equality for $z=-r$ ), the estimate of the expression $\operatorname{Re}\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right)$ is also sharp. Consequently,

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right) \geq \frac{1-7 r-r^{2}-r^{3}}{(1+r)^{2}(1-r)} .
$$

The function in the numerator of the right-hand side of this inequality is decreasing for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For this reason, it has in $(0,1)$ the only solution $r_{0}$. We have proven that if $\operatorname{Re}(z+1 / z) \leq 2$ and $r \in\left[0, r_{0}\right]$ then $\operatorname{Re}\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right) \geq 0$. But $r_{0}<\sqrt{5}-2$.

Taking into account both parts of the proof, we obtain the assertion. Equality in (53) holds for $h(z)=\frac{z}{(1-z)^{2}}$ and $z=-r$. It means that (55) is sharp, with equality for $f_{1}$ and $z=-r$.

## 6 Univalence

The problems of the univalence of functions in $X^{\prime}$ are more complicated. Based on the already proved results, we know that the radius of univalence $r_{S}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ is greater than or equal to $\sqrt{2}-1$. On the other hand, one can easily find the upper estimate of $r_{S}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$. Namely, discuss a function $F(z)=\frac{1}{r_{*}} f_{1}\left(r_{*} z\right)$, where $f_{1}$ is given by (10) and $r_{*}$ is equal to $r_{S}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ which we want to derive. The function $F$ is univalent in $\Delta$ and it has normalization $F(0)=F^{\prime}(0)-1=0$. From (31) it follows that $F(z)=z+4 r_{*} z^{2}+\ldots$. The estimate of the second coefficient of functions in $S$ results in $r_{*} \leq 1 / 2$.

The main theorem of this section is as follows.
Theorem 11 The radius of univalence in $X^{\prime}$ is equal to $r_{S}\left(X^{\prime}\right)=r_{1}$, where $r_{1}=$ $0.454 \ldots$ is the only solution of equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\arcsin \frac{1-r^{2}}{2 r}+\frac{2\left(1-r^{2}\right)}{1+r^{2}-\sqrt{-1+6 r^{2}-r^{4}}}=\pi \tag{56}
\end{equation*}
$$

in $(\sqrt{2}-1,1)$. The extremal function is $f_{1}$.
In the proof of this theorem we need two lemmas.
Lemma 3 For each $f_{t}, t \in[-1,1]$ given by (9) and for each $r \in(0, \sqrt{3} / 3)$ and $\varphi \in[0, \pi]$ the following inequality is true:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\arg f_{t}\left(r e^{i \varphi}\right) \leq \arg f_{1}\left(r e^{i \varphi}\right) . \tag{57}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 4 The function $f_{1}$ is univalent in the disk $|z|<r_{1}$, where $r_{1}$ is the only solution of (56).

Proof of Lemma 3 Let $t \in[-1,1]$ and $r \in(0, \sqrt{3} / 3)$ be fixed. Let us denote by $g(\psi)$ the argument of $f_{t}\left(r e^{i \varphi}\right)$ with a fixed $\varphi \in[0, \pi]$, where $\psi$ and $t$ are connected by $t=\cos \psi$. Applying (9), $g$ can be written as

$$
g(\psi)=\varphi+\cot \frac{\psi}{2} k(\psi),
$$

where

$$
k(\psi)=\log \left|\frac{1-r e^{i(\varphi+\psi)}}{1-r e^{i(\varphi-\psi)}}\right|
$$

Since

$$
\left|\frac{1-r e^{i(\varphi+\psi)}}{1-r e^{i(\varphi-\psi)}}\right| \geq 1
$$

for $\varphi$ and $\psi$ in $[0, \pi]$, we conclude that $k(\psi) \geq 0$ for all $\psi \in[0, \pi]$.
Now, we shall show that $g(\psi)$ is a decreasing function of the variable $\psi$. We have

$$
g^{\prime}(\psi)=\frac{-1}{2 \sin ^{2} \frac{\psi}{2}} \cdot h(\psi)
$$

where

$$
h(\psi)=k(\psi)-k^{\prime}(\psi) \sin \psi .
$$

A long and tedious calculation shows that

$$
h^{\prime}(\psi)=\frac{\sin \varphi(1-\cos \psi)}{\left[(q \cos \psi-\cos \varphi)^{2}+\left(q^{2}-1\right) \sin ^{2} \psi\right]^{2}} \cdot W(\psi),
$$

with $q=\left(1+r^{2}\right) / 2 r, q>1$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
W(\psi)= & {\left[\left(1-2 q^{2}\right) \cos \varphi-q\right] \cos ^{2} \psi+2\left[q \cos ^{2} \varphi+\cos \varphi+q\left(q^{2}-1\right)\right] \cos \psi } \\
& -\cos ^{3} \varphi-q \cos ^{2} \varphi-\left(q^{2}-1\right) \cos \varphi+q\left(q^{2}-1\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence

$$
W(0)=(q-\cos \varphi)\left(3 q^{2}-4+\cos ^{2} \varphi\right) \quad \text { and } \quad W(\pi)=-(q+\cos \varphi)^{3} .
$$

It is obvious that $W(\pi)<0$. On the other hand, $W(0)>0$, providing that $r \in$ $(0, \sqrt{3} / 3)$, or equivalently, $q^{2}>4 / 3$. From these observations, taking into account that $W$ is a quadratic function of $\cos \psi$, we can see that $W(\psi)$ has exactly one solution in $[0, \pi]$; let us denote it by $\psi_{0}$. Hence, $h^{\prime}(\psi)$ has only one solution $\psi_{0}$ in $(0, \pi)$. Thus, $h^{\prime}(\psi)$ for $\psi \in\left(0, \psi_{0}\right)$ increases, and for $\psi \in\left(\psi_{0}, \pi\right)$ decreases. Combining it with $h(0)=h(\pi)=0$, we obtain $h(\psi) \geq 0$ for $\psi \in[0, \pi]$. This implies $g^{\prime}(\psi) \leq 0$ for $\psi \in(0, \pi)$; so $g(\psi)$ is decreasing in $(0, \pi)$.

Finally,

$$
g(\psi) \leq g\left(0^{+}\right) \text {for all } \psi \in[0, \pi]
$$

where

$$
g\left(0^{+}\right)=\lim _{\psi \rightarrow 0^{+}} g(\psi)=\varphi+\lim _{\psi \rightarrow 0^{+}} \frac{k(\psi)}{\tan \frac{\psi}{2}}=\varphi+2 k^{\prime}(0)=\varphi+\frac{2 \sin \varphi}{q-\cos \varphi}
$$

Moreover, if $\varphi=0$ then $g(\psi)=0$, and, if $\varphi=\pi$ then $g(\psi)=\pi$ for all $\psi \in[0, \pi]$. Consequently, (57) holds also for $\varphi=0$ and $\varphi=\pi$.

Proof of Lemma 4 Consider a level curve $f_{1}(\{z \in \mathbb{C}:|z|=r\})$ with a fixed $r \in(0,1)$. Since $f_{1}$ is a circularly symmetric function, $f_{1}\left(r e^{i \varphi}\right)$ decreases for $\varphi$ from 0 to $\pi$. Hence, $f_{1}$ is univalent when the level curves has no self-intersection points. It happens at small $r$, ie. when $r<\sqrt{2}-1$, because $f_{1}$ is starlike in this case. So it is enough to discuss for which $r \in[\sqrt{2}-1,1 / 2]$ the level curve $f_{1}(\{z \in \mathbb{C}:|z|=r\})$ is tangent to the real axis. Denoting the point of tangency by $w_{0}$, and denoting by $z_{0}=r e^{i \varphi_{0}}$ the corresponding point on circle $|z|=r$ for which $f\left(z_{0}\right)=w_{0}$, we obtain $\arg f\left(z_{0}\right)=\pi$.

The tangency of the level curve to the real axis in $w_{0}$ ensures that $\arg f_{1}\left(r e^{i \varphi}\right)$ is increasing for $\varphi \in\left(0, \varphi_{0}\right)$, decreasing for $\varphi \in\left(\varphi_{0}, \varphi_{1}\right)$, and once again increasing for $\varphi \in\left(\varphi_{1}, \pi\right)$, where $\varphi_{1}$ is a number from the interval $\left(\varphi_{0}, \pi\right)$. Hence, $\operatorname{Re} \frac{z_{0} f_{1}^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{f_{1}\left(z_{0}\right)}=0$.

For this reason, we need to solve the system

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\operatorname{Re} \frac{z_{0} f_{1}^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{f_{1}\left(z_{0}\right)}=0  \tag{58}\\
\arg f_{1}\left(z_{0}\right)=\pi
\end{array}\right.
$$

The first equation can be written, using (8), as $\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{1+z_{0}}{1-z_{0}}\right)^{2}=0$. Since $z_{0}=r e^{i \varphi}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{0}=\arcsin \frac{1-r^{2}}{2 r} \tag{59}
\end{equation*}
$$

But

$$
f_{1}\left(r e^{i \varphi_{0}}\right)=r e^{i \varphi_{0}} \exp \left(\frac{4 r e^{i \varphi_{0}}-4 r^{2}}{1-2 r \cos \varphi_{0}+r^{2}}\right),
$$

So

$$
\arg f_{1}\left(r e^{i \varphi_{0}}\right)=\varphi_{0}+\frac{4 r \sin \varphi_{0}}{1-2 r \cos \varphi_{0}+r^{2}}
$$

which, together with the second equation of (58), proves that $r$ is a solution of (56).
Finally, it can be observed that the right-hand side of the equality given above, let us denote it by $b(r)$, satisfies

$$
b^{\prime}(r)=\frac{\left(1+r^{2}\right)\left(-1+6 r^{2}-r^{4}\right)+8 r^{2} \sqrt{-1+6 r^{2}-r^{4}}+4 r^{2}\left(1+r^{2}\right)}{r\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2} \sqrt{-1+6 r^{2}-r^{4}}} .
$$

This means that $b(r)$ increases from $\pi / 2+\sqrt{2}$ to infinity, while $r \in(\sqrt{2}-1,1)$. For this reason, (56) has only one solution.

Proof of Theorem 11 Let $L=\left\{\log \frac{f(z)}{z}\right.$, $\left.f \in X^{\prime}\right\}$. In the paper [9], the authors showed that the extreme points of the class $L$ are as follows:

$$
l_{\psi}(z)=i \cot \frac{\psi}{2} \log \frac{1-z e^{i \psi}}{1-z e^{-i \psi}}, \quad \psi \in[0, \pi]
$$

A functional $L \ni l \rightarrow \operatorname{Im}(l(z))$ is linear, so for a fixed $z \in \Delta$, there is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max \{\operatorname{Im} l(z): l \in L\}=\max \left\{\operatorname{Im} l_{\psi}(z): \psi \in[0, \pi]\right\} \tag{60}
\end{equation*}
$$

But $\operatorname{Im} l(z)=\arg \frac{f(z)}{z}$ for $l \in L$. Therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max \left\{\arg \frac{f(z)}{z}: f \in X^{\prime}\right\}=\max \left\{\arg \frac{f_{t}(z)}{z}: t \in[-1,1]\right\}, \tag{61}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f_{t}$ is given by (9). Hence, for $z \in \Delta \backslash\{0\}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max \left\{\arg f(z): f \in X^{\prime}\right\}=\max \left\{\arg f_{t}(z): t \in[-1,1]\right\} \tag{62}
\end{equation*}
$$

Applying Lemma 3, we conclude that for every $f \in X^{\prime}, r \in(0, \sqrt{3} / 3)$ and $\varphi \in[0, \pi]$, the following inequality holds:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\arg f\left(r e^{i \varphi}\right) \leq \arg f_{1}\left(r e^{i \varphi}\right) \tag{63}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consequently, for every function $f \in X^{\prime}$, from $\left|\arg f_{1}\left(r e^{i \varphi}\right)\right| \leq \pi$, it yields that $\left|\arg f\left(r e^{i \varphi}\right)\right| \leq \pi$, which combined with Lemma 4 gives the assertion.

In the paper [4], the class $\mathcal{T}$ of semi-typically real functions was defined. Namely, $f \in \mathcal{T}$ if

$$
z \in(0,1) \text { if and only if } f(z)>0
$$

This equivalence means that the values of $f$ belonging to $\mathcal{T}$ are positive real numbers if and only if $z \in \Delta$ is positive and real. According to this definition, $T \subset \mathcal{T}$.

Based on the proof of Theorem 11, one can anticipate that functions $f \in X^{\prime}$ are semi-typically real at most in the disk with radius $r_{\mathcal{T}}$. The number $r_{\mathcal{T}}$ is chosen such that the level curves $f(\{z \in \mathbb{C}:|z|=r\})$ for $r<r_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $f \in X^{\prime}$ may wind around the origin, yet they do not touch the positive real halfaxis. Moreover, one can anticipate that the extremal function is still $f_{1}$.
Conjecture. The radius of semi-typical reality in $X^{\prime}$ is equal to $r_{\mathcal{T}}\left(X^{\prime}\right)=r_{2}$, where $r_{2}=0.718 \ldots$ is the only solution of equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\arcsin \frac{1-r^{2}}{2 r}+\frac{2\left(1-r^{2}\right)}{1+r^{2}-\sqrt{-1+6 r^{2}-r^{4}}}=2 \pi \tag{64}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is worth emphasizing that in the proof of Lemma 3 we did apply the assumption $r \in(0, \sqrt{3} / 3)$, which is equivalent to $q^{2}>4 / 3$. The number $\sqrt{3} / 3$ in this expression is not necesserily sharp. Hence, the argument given in the proof of Theorem 11 is not sufficient to prove this conjecture.
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