

LE MATEMATICHE

Vol. LXIX (2014) – Fasc. I, pp. 3–16

doi: 10.4418/2014.69.1.1

## SOME PROPERTIES OF TWO-FOLD SYMMETRIC ANALYTIC FUNCTIONS

A. MUHAMMAD - Q. SHAH - M. ISMAIL MOHAMAND

In this paper, we introduce a new class of two-fold symmetric functions analytic in the unit disc. We prove such results as subordination and superordination properties, convolution properties, distortion theorems, and inequality properties of this new class.

### 1. Introduction

Let  $\mathcal{A}(m)$  denote the class of functions  $f$ :

$$f(z) = z + \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} a_k z^k, \quad m \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}, \quad (1)$$

which are analytic in the open unit disc  $E = \{z : z \in \mathbb{C} \text{ and } |z| < 1\}$ . Also, let  $\mathcal{H}[a, m+1]$  be the class of analytic functions of the form

$$f(z) = a + a_{m+1}z^{m+1} + a_{m+2}z^{m+2} + \dots, \quad z \in E.$$

If  $f$  and  $g$  are analytic in  $E$ , we say that  $f$  is subordinate to  $g$ , written  $f \prec g$  or  $f(z) \prec g(z)$ , if there exists a Schwarz function  $w$  with  $w(0) = 0$  and  $|w(z)| < 1$

---

Entrato in redazione: 17 novembre 2012

AMS 2010 Subject Classification: 30C45, 30C50.

Keywords: Analytic functions, two-fold Symmetric functions, Differential, subordination and superordination.

in  $E$  such that  $f(z) = g(w(z))$ . Furthermore, if the function  $g(z)$  is univalent in  $E$ , then we have the following equivalence holds, see [4, 5]

$$f(z) \prec g(z) \quad (z \in E) \iff f(0) = g(0) \text{ and } f(E) \subset g(E).$$

For function  $f, g \in \mathcal{A}(m)$ , where  $f$  is given by (1) and  $g$  is defined by

$$g(z) = z + \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} b_k z^k, \quad m \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\},$$

then the Hadamard product (or convolution)  $f * g$  of the function  $f$  and  $g$  is defined by

$$(f * g)(z) = z + \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} a_k b_k z^k = (g * f)(z).$$

In [8], Sakaguchi defined the class of starlike functions with respect to symmetrical points as follows:

Let  $f \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then  $f$  is said to be starlike with respect to symmetrical points in  $E$  if, and only if,

$$\operatorname{Re} \frac{zf'(z)}{f(z) - f(-z)} > 0, \quad z \in E.$$

Obviously, it forms a subclass of close-to-convex functions and hence univalent. Moreover, this class includes the class of convex functions and odd starlike functions with respect to the origin, see [8].

**Definition 1.1.** A function  $f \in \mathcal{A}(m)$  is said to be in the class  $\mathcal{B}^{\lambda, \mu}(m, A, B)$ , if it satisfies the following subordination condition:

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \lambda) \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^{\mu} + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^{\mu} \\ \prec \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where and throughout this paper unless otherwise mention the parameters  $\lambda, \mu, A$  and  $B$  are constrained as follows:

$$\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(\mu) > 0 : -1 \leq B \leq 1, A \neq B, A \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } m \in \mathbb{N},$$

and all powers are understood as principal values.

In this paper, we prove such results as subordination and superordination properties, convolution properties, distortion theorems, and inequality properties of the class  $\mathcal{B}^{\lambda, \mu}(m, A, B)$ .

For interested readers see the work done by the authors [1, 2, 10–13].

## 2. Preliminary Results

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be the set of all functions  $f$  that are analytic and injective on  $\overline{E} \setminus U(f)$ , where

$$U(f) = \left\{ \zeta \in \partial E : \lim_{z \rightarrow \zeta} f(z) = \infty \right\},$$

and are such that  $f'(\zeta) \neq 0$  for  $\zeta \in \partial E \setminus U(f)$ .

To establish our main results we need the following Lemmas.

**Lemma 2.2** (Miller and Mocanu [4, 5]). *Let the function  $h(z)$  be analytic and convex (univalent) in  $E$  with  $h(0) = 1$ . Suppose also that the function  $\Phi(z)$  given by*

$$\Phi(z) = 1 + c_{m+1}z^{m+1} + c_{m+2}z^{m+2} + \dots$$

is analytic in  $E$ ,

$$\Phi(z) + \frac{z\Phi'(z)}{\gamma} \prec h(z) \quad (z \in E; \operatorname{Re} \gamma \geq 0; \gamma \neq 0), \quad (3)$$

then

$$\Phi(z) \prec \Psi(z) = \frac{\gamma}{(m+1)z^{\frac{\gamma}{m+1}}} \int_0^z t^{\frac{\gamma}{m+1}-1} h(t) dt \prec h(z) \quad (z \in E),$$

and  $\Psi(z)$  is the best dominant of (3).

**Lemma 2.3** (Shanmugam et al. [9]). *Let  $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^* = \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and let  $q$  be a convex univalent function in  $E$  with*

$$\operatorname{Re} \left( 1 + \frac{zq''(z)}{q'(z)} \right) > \max \left\{ 0; -\operatorname{Re} \frac{\sigma}{\eta} \right\}, \quad z \in E.$$

If  $p$  is analytic in  $E$  and

$$\sigma p(z) + \eta zp'(z) \prec \sigma q(z) + \eta zq'(z), \quad (4)$$

then  $p(z) \prec q(z)$ , and  $q$  is the best dominant of (4).

**Lemma 2.4** ([5]). *Let  $q(z)$  be convex univalent in  $E$  and  $k \in \mathbb{C}$ . Further assume that  $\operatorname{Re} k > 0$ . If*

$$g(z) \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q},$$

and

$$g(z) + kzq'(z) \prec g(z) + kzg'(z),$$

implies  $q(z) \prec g(z)$  and  $q(z)$  is the best subdominant.

**Lemma 2.5** ([3]). *Let  $F$  be analytic and convex in  $E$ . If  $f, g \in \mathcal{A}(1)$  and  $f, g \prec F$ , then*

$$\lambda f + (1 - \lambda)g \prec F \quad (0 \leq \lambda \leq 1).$$

**Lemma 2.6** ([7]). *Let*

$$f(z) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k z^k$$

*be analytic in  $E$  and*

$$g(z) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k z^k$$

*be analytic and convex in  $E$ . If  $f(z) \prec g(z)$ , then*

$$|a_k| < |b_k|, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

### 3. Main Results

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $f(z) \in \mathcal{B}^{\lambda, \mu}(m, A, B)$  with  $\operatorname{Re} \lambda > 0$ . Then*

$$\left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^{\mu} \prec \psi(z) = \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \frac{1 + Azu}{1 + Bzu} u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} - 1} du \prec \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz}, \quad (5)$$

*and  $\psi(z)$  is the best dominant.*

*Proof.* Set

$$\left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^{\mu} = h(z), \quad z \in E. \quad (6)$$

Then  $h(z)$  is analytic in  $E$  with  $h(0) = 1$ .

Logarithmic differentiation of (5) and simple computations yield

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \lambda) \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^{\mu} + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^{\mu} \\ = h(z) + \frac{\lambda}{\mu} z h'(z) \prec \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Applying Lemma 2.2 to (7) with  $\gamma = \frac{\mu}{\lambda}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^{\mu} \prec \psi(z) &= \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} z^{-\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)}} \int_0^z \frac{1 + At}{1 + Bt} t^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} - 1} dt \\ &= \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \frac{1 + Azu}{1 + Bzu} u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} - 1} du \prec \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and  $\psi(z)$  is the best dominant. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.2.** Let  $q(z)$  be univalent in  $E$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$ . Suppose also that  $q(z)$  satisfies the following inequality:

$$\operatorname{Re} \left( 1 + \frac{zq''(z)}{q'(z)} \right) > \max \left\{ 0; -\operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \right) \right\}. \quad (9)$$

If  $f \in \mathcal{A}(m)$  satisfies the following subordination:

$$(1-\lambda) \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \prec q(z) + \frac{\lambda}{\mu} zq'(z), \quad (10)$$

then

$$\left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \prec q(z),$$

and  $q(z)$  is the best dominant.

*Proof.* Let the function  $h(z)$  be defined by (6). We know that the first part of (7) holds true. Combining (7) and (10), we have

$$h(z) + \frac{\lambda}{\mu} zh'(z) \prec q(z) + \frac{\lambda}{\mu} zq'(z). \quad (11)$$

By using Lemma 2.3 and (11), we easily get the assertion of Theorem 3.2.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.3.** Let  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$  and  $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$ . Suppose also that

$$\operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{1 - Bz}{1 + Bz} \right) > \max \left\{ 0, -\operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \right) \right\}.$$

If  $f \in \mathcal{A}(m)$  satisfies the following subordination:

$$\begin{aligned} & (1-\lambda) \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \\ & \prec \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz} + \lambda \frac{(A-B)z}{(1 + Bz)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \prec \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz},$$

and  $\frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$  is the best dominant.

If  $f$  is subordinate to  $F$ , then  $F$  is superordinate to  $f$ . We now derive the following superordination result for the class  $\mathcal{B}^{\lambda, \mu}(m, A, B)$ .

**Theorem 3.4.** Let  $q$  be convex univalent in  $E$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $\operatorname{Re} \lambda > 0$ . Also let

$$\left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q}$$

and

$$(1 - \lambda) \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu$$

be univalent in  $E$ . If

$$q(z) + \frac{\lambda}{\mu} zq'(z) \prec (1 - \lambda) \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu,$$

then

$$q(z) \prec \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu,$$

and  $q$  is the best subordinator.

*Proof.* Let the function  $h(z)$  be defined by (6). Then

$$\begin{aligned} & q(z) + \frac{\lambda}{\mu} zq'(z) \\ & \prec (1 - \lambda) \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \\ & = h(z) + \frac{\lambda}{\mu} zh'(z). \end{aligned}$$

An application of Lemma 2.4 yields the assertion of Theorem 3.4.  $\square$

Taking  $q(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$  in Theorem 3.4, we obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.5.** Let  $q(z)$  be convex univalent in  $E$  and  $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $\operatorname{Re} \lambda > 0$ . Also let

$$0 \neq \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q},$$

and

$$(1 - \lambda) \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu$$

be univalent in  $E$ . If

$$\frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz} + \lambda \frac{(A - B)z}{(1 + Bz)^2} \prec (1 - \lambda) \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu,$$

then

$$\frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz} \prec \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu,$$

and  $\frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$  is the best subordinant.

Combining the above results of subordination and superordination, we easily get the following "sandwich-type result".

**Corollary 3.6.** *Let  $q_1$  be convex univalent and let  $q_2$  be univalent in  $E$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $\operatorname{Re} \lambda > 0$ . Let  $q_2$  satisfy (9). If*

$$0 \neq \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q},$$

and

$$(1 - \lambda) \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu$$

is univalent in  $E$ , also

$$\begin{aligned} & q_1(z) + \frac{\lambda z q_1'(z)}{\mu} \\ & \prec (1 - \lambda) \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \\ & \prec q_2(z) + \frac{\lambda z q_2'(z)}{\mu}, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$q_1(z) \prec \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \prec q_2(z),$$

and  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  are, respectively, the best subordinant and dominant.

**Theorem 3.7.** *If  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mu > 0$  and  $f(z) \in \mathcal{B}^{0,\mu}(m, 1 - 2\rho, -1)$  ( $0 \leq \rho < 1$ ), then  $f(z) \in \mathcal{B}^{\lambda,\mu}(m, 1 - 2\rho, -1)$  for  $|z| < R$ ,*

where

$$R = \left( \left( \sqrt{\left( \frac{|\lambda|(m+1)}{\mu} \right)^2 + 1} \right) - \frac{|\lambda|(m+1)}{\mu} \right)^{\frac{1}{m+1}}. \quad (12)$$

The bound  $R$  is best possible.

*Proof.* Set

$$\left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu = (1 - \rho)h(z) + \rho, \quad z \in E, \quad 0 \leq \rho < 1. \quad (13)$$

Then, clearly the function  $h(z)$  is analytic in  $E$  with  $h(0) = 1$ . Proceeding as an Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1-\rho} \left\{ (1-\lambda) \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \right. \\ \left. + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu - \rho \right\} \\ = h(z) + \frac{\lambda zh'(z)}{\mu}. \quad (14) \end{aligned}$$

Using the following well-known estimate, see [6]

$$|zh'(z)| \leq \frac{2(m+1)r^{m+1} \operatorname{Re}(h(z))}{(1-r^{2(m+1)})} \quad (|z| = r < 1)$$

in (14), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} \frac{1}{1-\rho} \left\{ (1-\lambda) \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \right. \\ \left. + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu - \rho \right\} \\ \geq \operatorname{Re} h(z) \left\{ 1 - \frac{2|\lambda|(m+1)r^{m+1}}{\mu(1-r^{2(m+1)})} \right\}. \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

Right hand side of (15) is positive, provided that  $r < R$ , where  $R$  is given by (12).

In order to show that the bound  $R$  is best possible, we consider the function  $f(z) \in \mathcal{A}(m)$  defined by

$$\left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu = (1 - \rho) \frac{1 + z^{m+1}}{1 - z^{m+1}} + \rho, \quad z \in E, \quad 0 \leq \rho < 1.$$



We note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{1-\rho} \left\{ (1-\lambda) \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z)+f'(-z))}{f(z)-f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu - \rho \right\} \\ & = \frac{1+z^{m+1}}{1-z^{m+1}} + \frac{2|\lambda|(m+1)z^{m+1}}{\mu(1-z^{m+1})^2} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

for  $|z| = R$ , we conclude that the bound is the best possible and this proves the theorem.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$  and  $-1 \leq B_1 \leq B_2 < A_2 \leq A_1 \leq 1$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{B}^{\lambda_2, \mu}(m, A_2, B_2) \subset \mathcal{B}^{\lambda_1, \mu}(m, A_1, B_1). \quad (16)$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $f \in \mathcal{B}^{\lambda_2, \mu}(m, A_2, B_2)$ . We know that

$$\left\{ (1-\lambda_2) \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu + \lambda_2 \frac{z(f'(z)+f'(-z))}{f(z)-f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \right\} \prec \frac{1+A_2z}{1+B_2z}.$$

Since  $-1 \leq B_1 \leq B_2 < A_2 \leq A_1 \leq 1$ , we easily find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ (1-\lambda_2) \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu + \lambda_2 \frac{z(f'(z)+f'(-z))}{f(z)-f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \right\} \\ & \prec \frac{1+A_2z}{1+B_2z} \prec \frac{1+A_1z}{1+B_1z}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

that is  $f \in \mathcal{B}^{\lambda_2, \mu}(m, A_1, B_1)$ .

Thus the assertion (16) holds true for  $0 \leq \lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ . If  $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1 \geq 0$ , by Theorem 3.1 and (17), we know that  $f \in \mathcal{B}^{0, \mu}(m, A_2, B_2)$ , that is,

$$\left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \prec \frac{1+A_1z}{1+B_1z}. \quad (18)$$

At the same time, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ (1-\lambda_1) \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu + \lambda_1 \frac{z(f'(z)+f'(-z))}{f(z)-f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \right\} \\ & = \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \left[ (1-\lambda_2) \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu + \lambda_2 \frac{z(f'(z)+f'(-z))}{f(z)-f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \right] + \\ & \left( 1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \right) \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Moreover,

$$0 \leq \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} < 1,$$

and the function  $\frac{1+A_1z}{1+B_1z}$ ,  $-1 \leq B_1 < A_1 \leq 1$ ,  $z \in E$  is analytic and convex in  $E$ . Combining (17-19) and Lemma 2.5, we find that

$$\left\{ (1-\lambda_1) \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu + \lambda_1 \frac{z(f'(z)+f'(-z))}{f(z)-f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu \right\} \prec \frac{1+A_1z}{1+B_1z},$$

that is  $f \in \mathcal{B}^{\lambda_1, \mu}(m, A_1, B_1)$ , which implies that the assertion (16) of Theorem 3.8 holds and this completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.9.** Let  $f \in \mathcal{B}^{\lambda, \mu}(m, A, B)$  with  $\lambda > 0$  and  $-1 \leq B_1 < A_1 \leq 1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \frac{1-Au}{1-Bu} u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)}-1} du \\ & < \operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu < \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \frac{1+Au}{1+Bu} u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)}-1} du. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The extremal function of (20) is defined by

$$F_{\lambda, \mu, m, A, B}(z) = 2z \left( \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \frac{1+Az u}{1+Bz u} u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)}-1} du \right)^{\frac{1}{\mu}}. \quad (21)$$

*Proof.* Let  $f \in \mathcal{B}^{\lambda, \mu}(m, A, B)$  with  $\lambda > 0$ . From Theorem 3.1, we know that (5) holds, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{f(z)-f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu & < \sup_{z \in E} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \frac{1+Az u}{1+Bz u} u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)}-1} du \right\} \\ & \leq \left\{ \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \sup_{z \in E} \operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{1+Az u}{1+Bz u} \right) u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)}-1} du \right\} \\ & < \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \frac{1+Au}{1+Bu} u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)}-1} du, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^\mu &> \inf_{z \in E} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \frac{1 + Azu}{1 + Bzu} u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} - 1} du \right\} \\
 &\geq \left\{ \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \inf_{z \in E} \operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{1 + Azu}{1 + Bzu} \right) u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} - 1} du \right\} \\
 &> \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \frac{1 + Au}{1 + Bu} u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} - 1} du. \tag{23}
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (22) and (23), we obtain (20). Noting that the function  $F_{\lambda, \mu, m, A, B}(z)$  defined by (21) belongs to the class  $\mathcal{B}^{\lambda, \mu}(m, A, B)$ , we get that inequality (20) is sharp. This completes the proof.  $\square$

In view of Theorem 3.9, we have the following distortion theorems for the class  $\mathcal{B}^{\lambda, \mu}(m, A, B)$ .

**Corollary 3.10.** *Let  $f(z) \in \mathcal{B}^{\lambda, \mu}(m, A, B)$  with  $\lambda > 0$  and  $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$ . Then for  $|z| = r < 1$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
 &2r \left( \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \frac{1 - Aur}{1 - Bur} u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} - 1} du \right)^{\frac{1}{\mu}} \\
 &< |f(z) - f(-z)| < 2r \left( \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \frac{1 + Aur}{1 + Bur} u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} - 1} du \right)^{\frac{1}{\mu}}. \tag{24}
 \end{aligned}$$

The extremal function of (24) is defined by (21).

By noting that

$$(\operatorname{Re}(v))^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \operatorname{Re}(v^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq |v|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad v \in \mathbb{C}; \operatorname{Re} v \geq 0.$$

From Theorem 3.9, we can easily derive the following result.

**Corollary 3.11.** *Let  $f(z) \in \mathcal{B}^{\lambda, \mu}(m, A, B)$  with  $\lambda > 0$  and  $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\left( \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \frac{1 - Au}{1 - Bu} u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} - 1} du \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &< \operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^{\frac{\mu}{2}} < \left( \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \int_0^1 \frac{1 + Au}{1 + Bu} u^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} - 1} du \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 3.12.** *Let*

$$f(z) = z + \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} a_k z^k \in \mathcal{B}^{\lambda, \mu}(m, A, B), \quad m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (25)$$

*Then*

$$|a_{m+1}| \leq \left| \frac{2(A - B)}{\lambda(m + 1) + 2\mu} \right|. \quad (26)$$

*The inequality (26) is sharp, with the extremal function defined by (21).*

*Proof.* Combining (2) and (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \lambda) \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^{\mu} + \lambda \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} \left( \frac{f(z) - f(-z)}{2z} \right)^{\mu} \\ &= 1 + \left[ 1 + \frac{\lambda(m + 1)}{2\mu} \right] \mu a_{m+1} z^{m+1} + \dots < \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz} \\ &= 1 + (A - B)z + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

An application of Lemma 2.5 to (27) yields

$$\left| \left[ 1 + \frac{\lambda(m + 1)}{2\mu} \right] \mu a_{m+1} \right| \leq |A - B|. \quad (28)$$

Thus, from (28), we easily arrive at (26) asserted by Theorem 3.12. □

**Theorem 3.13.** *Let  $f(z) \in \mathcal{B}^{\lambda, \mu}(m, A, 0)$  with  $Re \lambda > 0, A > 0$  and  $|\lambda| \left( 1 + Re \frac{\mu}{\lambda(m+1)} \right) > A\mu$ . Then*

$$\left| \frac{z(f'(z) + f'(-z))}{f(z) - f(-z)} - 1 \right| < \frac{A \left[ |\lambda| \left( m + 1 + Re \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \right) + \mu \right]}{|\lambda| \left[ |\lambda| \left( m + 1 + Re \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \right) - A\mu \right]}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $h(z)$  be defined by (5). It follows from (6) that

$$h(z) + \frac{\lambda z h'(z)}{\mu} = 1 + Aw(z), \quad (29)$$

where

$$w(z) = \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} w_k z^k, \quad m \in \mathbb{N},$$

is analytic in  $E$  with  $|w(z)| < 1, z \in E$ . From (29), we can get

$$\begin{aligned} h(z) &= 1 + A \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \int_0^1 t^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda} - 1} w(tz) dt \\ &= 1 + A \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k + \frac{\mu}{\lambda}} w_k z^k. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

It follows from (30) that

$$\begin{aligned} (zh(z))' &= 1 + A \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{k+1}{k + \frac{\mu}{\lambda}} w_k z^k \\ &= 1 + A \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k + \frac{\mu}{\lambda}} w_k z^k \\ &\quad + A \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \left( w(z) - \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \int_0^1 t^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda}-1} w(tz) dt \right). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

We now find from (30) and (31) that

$$zh'(z) = A \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \left( w(z) - \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \int_0^1 t^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda}-1} w(tz) dt \right). \quad (32)$$

Combining (30) and (32), we can get

$$\left| \frac{zh'(z)}{h(z)} \right| < \frac{A\mu \left[ |\lambda| \left( m+1 + \operatorname{Re} \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \right) + \mu \right]}{|\lambda| \left[ |\lambda| \left( m+1 + \operatorname{Re} \frac{\mu}{\lambda} \right) - A\mu \right]}. \quad (33)$$

Thus, from (6) and (33), we easily arrive at the assertion of Theorem 3.13.  $\square$

### Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express their gratitude to the referees for his/her valuable advices and suggestions.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Ali Muhammad, *Some differential subordination and superordinations properties of symmetric functions*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino 69 (3) (2011), 247–259.
- [2] M. K. Aouf - T. M. Seoudy, *Some properties of a class of multivalent analytic functions involving the Liu-Owa operator*, J. Com. Math. App. 60 (2010), 1525–1535.
- [3] M. S. Liu, *On certain subclass of analytic functions*, J. South China Normal Univ. 4 (2002), 15–20 (in Chinese).

- [4] S. S. Miller - P. T. Mocanu, *Differential subordination Theory and Applications*, Series on Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 225, Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, Basel, 2000.
- [5] S. S. Miller - P. T. Mocanu, *Subordinations of differential superordinations*, Complex Variables 48 (10) (2003), 815–826.
- [6] T. H. Macgregor, *The radius of univalence of certain analytic functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 14 (1963), 514–520.
- [7] W. Rogosinski, *On the coefficient of subordinate functions*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. Ser.2 48 (1943), 48–82.
- [8] K. Sakaguchi, *On a certain univalent mapping*, J. Math. Soc. Japan 11 (1959), 72–75.
- [9] T. N. Shanmugam - V. Ravichandran - S. Sivasubbramanian, *Differential sandwich theorems for subclasses of analytic functions*, Aust. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 3 (2006), 1–11, Art. 8.
- [10] Zhi-Gang Wang - R. Aghalary - M. Darus - R. W. Ibrahim, *Some properties of certain multivalent analytic functions involving the Cho-Kwon-Srivastava operator*, J. Mathematics and Computer Modelling 49 (2009), 1969–1984.
- [11] J. Sokół, *Convolution and subordination in the convex hull of convex mappings*, Applied Math. Letters 19 (2006), 303–306.
- [12] J. Sokół, *On sufficient condition for starlikeness of certain integral of analytic function*, J. Math. Appl. 28 (2006), 127–130.
- [13] J. Sokół, *Starlikeness of Hadamard product of certain analytic functions*, Appl. Math. Comp. 190 (2007), 1157–1160.

ALI MUHAMMAD  
 Department of Basic Sciences,  
 University of Engineering and Technology,  
 Peshawar, Pakistan.  
 e-mail: ali7887@gmail.com

QAYYUM SHAH  
 Department of Basic Sciences,  
 University of Engineering and Technology,  
 Peshawar, Pakistan.  
 e-mail: qshah08@gmail.com

MUHAMMAD ISMAIL MOHAMAND  
 24 Westren Hill road sunderland, SR2 7PH. UK.  
 e-mail: bf89rp@student.sunderland.ac.uk