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#### Abstract

The sharp upper and lower bounds for the third-order Hermitian-Toeplitz determinant are investigated for the classes of Janowski type starlike and convex functions. The results presented in this paper generalize several recent works in this direction.
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## 1. Introduction

Investigating the sharp bound for the coefficient functionals of normalised analytic functions defined over the unit disk has gained much focus after the Bieberbach conjecture (1916) came into the picture. Even after the historical proof of the Bieberbach conjecture, in 1984, by L. de Branges, investigation of the bounds for coefficients of various classes of analytic functions did not stop as the bounds on coefficient also unfold many geometric properties of analytic functions. For example, the growth and distortion of an analytic function can be estimated using the bound on the second coefficient of an analytic univalent function [8]. The Hankel determinants have been among the most studied topics in Geometric Function Theory (GFT) in recent years; such studies can be back to the 1960 s (see [10,18]). In many of the recently-published works dealing extensively with the Hankel and Toeplitz determinants, use is made also of the basic (or $q$-) calculus (see, for example, [9, 17, 20, 22, 23]; see also a survey-cum-expository review article by Srivastava [21]).

In this line, using Hankel determinant of coefficients of analytic functions, Cantor [4] gave a criterion for rationality of such functions. The results of this kind

[^0]makes the estimation of coefficient functionals much interesting. The following few paragraphs give a short review of basic notations that we will be using in this paper.

From now on, let $\mathcal{A}$ be the class of normalised holomorphic functions defined on the open unit disk

$$
\mathbb{D}:=\{z: z \in \mathbb{C} \quad \text { and } \quad|z|<1\}
$$

Also a subclass of $\mathcal{A}$ consisting of functions which are also univalent in $\mathbb{D}$ shall be denoted by $\mathcal{S}$. Because of the normalisation $f(0)=0=f^{\prime}(0)-1$, the functions in the class $\mathcal{A}$ have the following form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=z+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the same for functions in the class $\mathcal{S}$ too. For $\alpha(0 \leqq \alpha<1)$, let

$$
p_{\alpha}(z):=\frac{1+(1-2 \alpha) z}{1-z}
$$

be an analytic function in the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$ which maps the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$ onto the right of the line $x=\alpha$ of the complex plane. Robertson [19], in 1936, considered the classes of starlike and convex functions of order $\alpha(0 \leqq \alpha<1)$ defined as follows:

$$
\mathcal{S}^{*}(\alpha):=\left\{f: f \in \mathcal{S} \quad \text { and } \quad \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \prec p_{\alpha}(z)\right\}
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{K}(\alpha):=\left\{f: f \in \mathcal{S} \quad \text { and } \quad 1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)} \prec p_{\alpha}(z)\right\} .
$$

Let $\mathcal{S}^{*}(0)=: S^{*}$ and $\mathcal{K}(0)=: \mathcal{K}$ be the classes of starlike and convex functions, respectively. Janowski [11] gave a generalisation to the classes of starlike and convex functions of order $\alpha$ by replacing the function $p_{\alpha}$ with

$$
p_{A, B}(z):=\frac{1+A z}{1+B z} \quad(-1 \leqq B<A \leqq 1)
$$

The classes of Janowski type starlike and Janowski type convex functions are defined, respectively, by

$$
\mathcal{S}^{*}[A, B]:=\left\{f: f \in \mathcal{S} \quad \text { and } \quad \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \prec p_{A, B}(z)\right\}
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{K}[A, B]:=\left\{f: f \in \mathcal{S} \quad \text { and } \quad 1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)} \prec p_{A, B}(z)\right\} .
$$

Janowski investigated growth and distortion rates for functions in the classes $S^{*}[A, B]$ and $\mathcal{K}[A, B]$. Several recent investigations involving Janowski type analytic and univalent functions include, for example, those published in [2, 24-26] (see also the aforementioned review article by Srivastava [21]), in each of which the basic (or $q$-) calculus is also used.

Janteng et al. [12] computed the sharp bound on the second Hankel determinant for the classes $\mathcal{S}^{*}$ and $\mathcal{K}$. Later, Babalola [3] investigated the non-sharp bounds for third Hankel determinant for these classes. In 2018, Kowalczyk et al. [13] obtained the sharp bound of third Hankel determinant to be $4 / 135$ for the class of convex functions. However, the best known estimate for starlike functions till date is 8/9 (see [14]). For more details, we refer the reader to [6, 15]. In line of the investigation on Hankel determinants in recent years, Ali et al. [1] investigated the sharp bound for the second and third order symmetric Toeplitz determinants. Cudna et al. [7] considered the $q^{\text {th }}$-order Hermitian-Toeplitz determinants with its entries as coefficients of the function $f(z)$ given by (1.1) as follows:

$$
T_{q, n}(f)=\left|\begin{array}{cccc}
a_{n} & a_{n+1} & \cdots & a_{n+q-1} \\
\bar{a}_{n+1} & a_{n} & \cdots & a_{n+q-2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\bar{a}_{n+q-1} & \bar{a}_{n+q-2} & \cdots & a_{n}
\end{array}\right|
$$

There it is reported that $T_{q, n}(f)$ is rotationally invariant and if $a_{n}$ 's are real, then $T_{q, n}(f)$ is Hermitian and, therefore, the determinant $T_{q, n}(f)$ is a real number. They obtained the sharp lower and upper bound for the third-order Hermitian-Toeplitz determinants for the classes of starlike and convex functions of order $\alpha(0 \leqq \alpha<1)$. Inspired by their work, Cho and Kumar [5] investigated the sharp lower and upper bounds of the third-order Hermitian-Toeplitz determinants for the class of analytic functions with bounded turning.

In this paper, the authors aim to generalise the work of Cudna et al. [7] for the class of Janowski type starlike and convex functions.

## 2. JANOWSKI TYPE STARLIKE FUNCTIONS

This section gives the estimation for lower and upper bounds of the third-order Hermitian-Toeplitz determinant $T_{3,1}(f)$ for Janowski type starlike functions. From the definition, it is easy to verify that $T_{2,1}(f)=1-\left|a_{2}\right|^{2}$ and

$$
T_{3,1}(f)=\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & a_{2} & a_{3} \\
\bar{a}_{2} & 1 & a_{2} \\
\bar{a}_{3} & \bar{a}_{2} & 1
\end{array}\right|=2 \Re\left(a_{2}^{2} \bar{a}_{3}\right)-2\left|a_{2}\right|^{2}-\left|a_{3}\right|^{2}+1
$$

Estimating the coefficient bounds in many cases, in our case too, depends on the comparison coefficients of functions under consideration with that of the functions with positive real part. For this reason, let $\mathcal{P}$ denotes the class of analytic functions $p: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with $p(0)=1$ and $\mathfrak{R} p(z)>0$.

To keep the proof brief and avoid repetitions, let us note that for any function $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}[A, B]$, there is a function with positive real part $p(z)=1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} p_{n} z^{n} \in \mathscr{P}$ such
that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}=\frac{(1+A) p(z)+1-A}{(1+B) p(z)+1-B} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

On expanding in the Taylors series and comparing the coefficients, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{2}=\frac{A-B}{2} p_{1}, \text { and } a_{3}=\frac{A-B}{8}\left[(A-2 B-1) p_{1}^{2}+2 p_{2}\right] . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Theorem 1. Let $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}[A, B]$. Then, the following sharp estimation holds

$$
1-(A-B)^{2} \leqq T_{2,1}(f) \leqq
$$

Proof. Since $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}[A, B]$, in view of the known fact $\left|p_{n}\right| \leqq 2$, we get $\left|a_{2}\right| \leqq A-B$ and thus $T_{2,1}(f)=1-\left|a_{2}\right|^{2} \geqq 1-(A-B)^{2}$ and $T_{2,1}(f)=1-\left|a_{2}\right|^{2} \leqq 1$. The extremal functions for lower and upper bounds are, respectively

$$
\tilde{h}_{0}(z)= \begin{cases}z(1+B z)^{\frac{A-B}{B}}, & B \neq 0  \tag{2.3}\\ z e^{A z}, & B=0\end{cases}
$$

and

$$
\tilde{h}_{1}(z)= \begin{cases}z\left(1+B z^{2}\right)^{\frac{A-B}{2 B}}, & B \neq 0  \tag{2.4}\\ z e^{A z^{2} / 2}, & B=0\end{cases}
$$

This ends the proof.
Before we proceed further in this section, let $\Omega_{1}$ be the set of points $(A, B)$ such that

$$
\left(-1 \leqq B \leqq-\frac{1}{2} \text { and } 0<A \leqq \frac{4 B+2 \sqrt{B^{2}+6}}{3}\right) \text { or }\left(-\frac{1}{2}<B \leqq 0 \text { and } 0<A \leqq 1\right)
$$

Further, let $\Omega_{2}, \Omega_{3}$ and $\tau$ be the set of points $(A, B)$ satisfying

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Omega_{2}:=\left\{-1 \leqq B \leqq-\frac{1}{2} \text { and } \frac{4 B+2 \sqrt{B^{2}+6}}{3}<A \leqq 1\right\} \\
\Omega_{3}:=\left\{-1 \leqq B<0 \text { and } \delta_{1}:=\frac{\sqrt{16 B^{2}-16 B+49}+8 B-1}{6}<A \leqq 1\right\}
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\tau:=\frac{\left(3 A^{2}-5 A B+2 B^{2}-2\right)\left(A^{2}-3 A B+2 B^{2}-2\right)}{4}
$$

Theorem 2. Let $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}[A, B]$. Then, the following best possible estimations hold:

$$
T_{3,1}(f) \leqq \begin{cases}\tau, & (A, B) \in \Omega_{1} \\ 1, & (A, B) \in \Omega_{2} \text { or }-1 \leqq B<A \leqq 0\end{cases}
$$

and

$$
T_{3,1}(f) \geqq \begin{cases}-\frac{\left(A^{2}-2 A B+A+B^{2}-1\right)^{2}}{(A-2 B+1)(3 A-2 B-1)}, & (A, B) \in \Omega_{3} ; \\ \tau, & -1 \leqq B \leqq 0<A \leqq \delta_{1} \text { or }-1 \leqq B<A \leqq 0\end{cases}
$$

We owe to Libera and Zlotkiewicz for a result related to the class $\mathcal{P}$ :
Lemma 1 ([16, Lemma 3, p. 254]). Let $p(z)=1+p_{1} z+p_{2} z^{2}+p_{3} z^{3}+\cdots \in \mathscr{P}$. Then $2 p_{2}=p_{1}^{2}+\left(4-p_{1}^{2}\right) \zeta$ for some $\zeta \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

Proof of Theorem 2. The well-known fact about the class of functions with positive real part is that it is rotationally invariant and for this reason, we shall limit ourselves to a consideration of non-negative value of $p_{1}$ and since $\left|p_{1}\right| \leqq 2$, we can let $0 \leqq p_{1} \leqq 2$ and hereafter we use $x:=p_{1}^{2} \in[0,4]$ and $y:=|\zeta| \in[0,1]$. Keeping these in mind from (2.2), a computation gives

$$
\begin{align*}
T_{3,1}(f)= & 1+\frac{1}{64}(A-2 B)(3 A-2 B)(A-B)^{2} p_{1}^{4}-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{2} p_{1}^{2} \\
& -\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{64}\left(4-p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}|\zeta|^{2}+\frac{1}{32} A(A-B)^{2}\left(4-p_{1}^{2}\right) p_{1}^{2} \Re \zeta  \tag{2.5}\\
= & \Psi\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|, \Re \zeta\right) . \tag{2.6}
\end{align*}
$$

We proceed in the proof in various cases.
Case I. If $-1 \leqq B<A=0$, then from (2.5), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{3,1}(f) & =\frac{1}{16}\left(4-B^{2} p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}-\frac{B^{2}}{64}\left(4-p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}|\zeta|^{2} \\
& \leqq \frac{1}{16}\left(4-B^{2} p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2} \\
& \leqq 1
\end{aligned}
$$

and the minimum is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{3,1}(f) & \geqq \frac{1}{16}\left(4-B^{2} p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}-\frac{B^{2}}{64}\left(4-p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2} \\
& \geqq \frac{4-B^{2}}{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

Case II. If $-1 \leqq B \leqq 0<A \leqq 1$, then with the settings $p_{1}^{2}=: x \in[0,4]$ and $|\zeta|=: y \in$ $[0,1]$, we have

$$
T_{3,1}(f)=\Psi\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|, \Re \zeta\right) \leqq \Psi\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|,|\zeta|\right)=\Psi\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|\right)=G(x, y)
$$

Note that $G$ is a continuously differentiable function of two variables $x$ and $y$ defined over the rectangular region $[0,4] \times[0,1]$ and is given by

$$
G(x, y):=1+\frac{1}{64}(A-2 B)(3 A-2 B)(A-B)^{2} x^{2}-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{2} x
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{64}\left(4-p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2} y^{2}+\frac{1}{32} A(A-B)^{2}(4-x) x y . \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the boundary lines of the rectangular region $[0,4] \times[0,1]$, we see that

$$
\begin{gathered}
G(0, y)=1-\frac{1}{4} y^{2}(A-B)^{2} \leqq 1 \\
G(4, y)=\frac{1}{4}\left(3 A^{2}-5 A B+2 B^{2}-2\right)\left(A^{2}-3 A B+2 B^{2}-2\right)=: \tau
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
G(x, 0)=1-\frac{1}{2} x(A-B)^{2}+\frac{1}{64} x^{2}(A-2 B)(3 A-2 B)(A-B)^{2}=: f_{1}(x) \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now the positivity of the second derivative $f_{1}^{\prime \prime}(x)>0$ assures that there is no maxima of $f_{1}$ for $0<x<4$. Therefore, the possibilities left are the end points and we have

$$
f_{1}(x) \leqq \max \left\{f_{1}(0), f_{1}(4)\right\}=f_{1}(4)=\tau
$$

Thus, for $-1 \leqq B \leqq 0<A \leqq 1$, we have

$$
G(x, y)=\max \{1, \tau\}= \begin{cases}1, & (A, B) \in \Omega_{1} \\ \tau, & (A, B) \in \Omega_{2}\end{cases}
$$

To find the lower bound, we write

$$
T_{3,1}(f)=\Psi\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|, \Re \zeta\right) \geqq F\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|,-|\zeta|\right) \geqq F\left(p_{1}^{2}, 1,-1\right)=f_{2}(x)
$$

where the function $f_{2}:[0,4] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$
\begin{align*}
& f_{2}(x):=1-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{4}-\frac{(A+3)(A-B)^{2}}{8} x \\
&+\frac{(A-2 B+1)(3 A-2 B-1)(A-B)^{2}}{64} x^{2} \tag{2.9}
\end{align*}
$$

At the end points, we see that

$$
f_{2}(0)=1-\frac{1}{4}(A-B)^{2}
$$

and

$$
f_{2}(4)=\frac{1}{4}\left(3 A^{2}-5 A B+2 B^{2}-2\right)\left(A^{2}-3 A B+2 B^{2}-2\right)=\tau
$$

Now $f_{2}^{\prime \prime}(x)>0$ holds for

$$
\left(-1 \leqq B \leqq-\frac{1}{2} \text { and } 0<A \leqq 1\right) \text { or }\left(-\frac{1}{2}<B \leqq 0 \text { and } \frac{1}{3}(2 B+1)<A \leqq 1\right)
$$

and the only critical point of $f_{2}$ is

$$
x=x^{*}=\frac{4(A+3)}{(A-2 B+1)(3 A-2 B-1)}
$$

A computation shows that $x^{*} \in(0,4)$ if and only if $(A, B) \in \Omega_{3}$. But, since

$$
2(2 B+1) \leqq \sqrt{16 B^{2}-16 B+49}+8 B-1
$$

holds for all $-1 \leqq B \leqq 0<A \leqq 1$, it follows that the minimum of $f_{2}$ attains at $x^{*}$ for $(A, B) \in \Omega_{3}$ and

$$
f_{2}\left(x^{*}\right)=-\frac{\left(A^{2}-2 A B+A+B^{2}-1\right)^{2}}{(A-2 B+1)(3 A-2 B-1)}
$$

From the above analysis, we conclude that

$$
T_{3,1}(f) \geqq \begin{cases}-\frac{\left(A^{2}-2 A B+A+B^{2}-1\right)^{2}}{(A-2 B+1)(3 A-2 B-1)}, & (A, B) \in \Omega_{3} \\ \tau, & -1 \leqq B \leqq 0 \text { and } 0<A \leqq \delta_{1}\end{cases}
$$

Case III. Let $-1 \leqq B<A<0$. Then, using (2.5) and the notations $p_{1}^{2}=: x \in[0,4]$ and $|\zeta|=: y \in[0,1]$, we can write

$$
T_{3,1}(f)=F\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|, \Re \zeta\right) \leqq F\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|,-|\zeta|\right)=H(x, y)
$$

where $H:[0,4] \times[0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$
\begin{align*}
H(x, y):=1 & +\frac{1}{64}(A-2 B)(3 A-2 B)(A-B)^{2} x^{2}-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{2} x \\
& -\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{64}\left(4-p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2} y^{2}-\frac{1}{32} A(A-B)^{2}(4-x) x y \tag{2.10}
\end{align*}
$$

Now, at the boundary lines, we see that

$$
\begin{gathered}
H(0, y)=1-\frac{1}{4}(A-B)^{2} y^{2} \leqq 1, H(4, y)=\tau \\
H(x, 0)=1-\frac{1}{2}(A-B)^{2} x+\frac{1}{64}(A-2 B)(3 A-2 B)(A-B)^{2} x^{2}=f_{3}(x)
\end{gathered}
$$

and $H(x, 1)=f_{2}(x)$, where $f_{2}$ is as defined in (2.9). The first derivative of $f_{3}$ vanishes for $x=x_{2}=16 /(A-2 B)(3 A-2 B)$ and since $(A-2 B)(3 A-2 B)<4$ for $-1 \leqq B<$ $A<0$, it follows that $x_{2} \notin(0,4)$ and therefore it is sufficient to consider the values of $f_{3}$ at the end points of the interval $(0,4)$. Further, as previous, we see that $f_{2}^{\prime}(x)=0$ holds for $x=x_{1}$ and further, for $-1 \leqq B<A<0$, it can be verified that $x_{1} \notin(0,4)$. Thus the above discussion make us to write

$$
T_{3,1}(f) \leqq \max \{1, \tau\}=1
$$

Now it remains to look for the claimed lower bound in the case $-1 \leqq B<A<0$. For this purpose, we write

$$
T_{3,1}(f)=F\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|, \Re \zeta\right) \geqq F\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|,|\zeta|\right) \geqq F\left(p_{1}^{2}, 1,1\right)=f_{1}(x)
$$

where $f_{1}$ is defined by (2.8). As before, we see at the end points of $[0,4]$ that

$$
f_{1}(0)=1-\frac{1}{4}(A-B)^{2} \text { and } f_{1}(4)=\tau
$$

Also $f_{1}$ has no critical points inside the interval $(0,4)$ and therefore,

$$
T_{3,1}(f) \geqq \min \left\{1-\frac{1}{4}(A-B)^{2}, \tau\right\}=\tau
$$

Case IV. In this case, we consider the situation when $-1 \leqq B<A=0$. Upon setting $A=0$ in (2.5), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{3,1}(f) & =\frac{\left(4-B p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}}{16}-\frac{B^{2}\left(4-p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}}{64}|\zeta|^{2} \\
& \leqq \frac{\left(4-B p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}}{16} \\
& \leqq 1
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{3,1}(f) & =\frac{\left(4-B p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}}{16}-\frac{B^{2}\left(4-p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}}{64}|\zeta|^{2} \\
& \geqq \frac{\left(4-B p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}}{16}-\frac{B^{2}\left(4-p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}}{64} \\
& \geqq \frac{(4-B)^{2}}{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

The functional $T_{3,1}(f)$ equals $\tau$ in case of the function $\tilde{h_{0}}$ defined in (2.3). Further $T_{3,1}(f)$ equals $\tau$ for the function

$$
\tilde{h}_{2}(z)= \begin{cases}z\left(1+B z^{3}\right)^{\frac{A-B}{3 B}}, & B \neq 0  \tag{2.11}\\ z e^{A z^{3} / 3}, & B=0\end{cases}
$$

For $(A, B) \in \Omega_{3}$, the extremal function $\tilde{h}_{3}$ satisfying (2.1) with the function $p$ is replace by $\tilde{p}$ defined as

$$
\tilde{p}(z)=\frac{1-z^{2}}{1-2 \sqrt{t} z+z^{2}}, \quad t:=x^{*} / 4
$$

The Taylor series of $\tilde{h}_{3}$ is given by

$$
\tilde{h}_{3}(z)=z+\sqrt{t}(A-B) z^{2}+\frac{(A-B)((A-2 B+1) t-1)}{2} z^{3}+\cdots
$$

and thus we have

$$
T_{3,1}(f)=1+2 a_{2}^{2} a_{3}-\left|a_{2}\right|^{2}-\left|a_{3}\right|^{2}=-\frac{\left(A^{2}-2 A B+A+B^{2}-1\right)^{2}}{(A-2 B+1)(3 A-2 B-1)}
$$

Cases I to IV, together, bring the proof to an end.
Remark 1. For $A=1-2 \alpha$ and $B=-1$, Theorems 1 and 2 reduce to the results [7, Theorem 2] and [7, Theorem 3], respectively.

## 3. JANOWSKI TYPE CONVEX FUNCTIONS

In this section, the sharp bounds for the Hermitian-Toeplitz determinant of the third order for the classes of Janowski type convex functions are investigated.

For any function $f \in \mathcal{K}[A, B]$, there is a function with positive real part $p(z)=$ $1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} p_{n} z^{n} \in \mathscr{P}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}=\frac{(1+A) p(z)+1-A}{(1+B) p(z)+1-B} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Expanding both sides of the above in Taylor series and comparing the coefficients of similar terms, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{2}=\frac{A-B}{4} p_{1} \text { and } a_{3}=\frac{A-B}{4}\left[(A-2 B-1) p_{1}^{2}+2 p_{2}\right] \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Clearly, since $\left|a_{2}\right| \leqq(A-B) / 2$, it follows that $\left(4-(A-B)^{2}\right) / 4 \leqq T_{3,1}(f) \leqq 1$. These lower bound is sharp in case of the function $k_{0}$ satisfying (3.1) with $p(z)=(1+$ $z) /(1-z)$ and that the upper bound is sharp in case of the function $k_{1}$ satisfying (3.1) with $\left.p(z)=\left(1+z^{2}\right) /\left(1-z^{2}\right)\right)$. Thus, we have the following:

Theorem 3. Let $f \in \mathcal{K}[A, B]$. Then, the following best possible estimations hold:

$$
\frac{4-(A-B)^{2}}{4} \leqq T_{2,1}(f) \leqq 1
$$

Theorem 4. Let $f \in \mathcal{K}[A, B]$. Then, the following best possible estimations hold:

$$
\sigma \leqq\left|T_{3,1}(f)\right| \leqq 1
$$

where

$$
\sigma:=\frac{1}{36}\left(2 A^{2}-3 A B+B^{2}-6\right)\left(A^{2}-3 A B+2 B^{2}-6\right)
$$

Proof. Using (3.2) computations give

$$
\begin{array}{r}
T_{3,1}(f)=1+\frac{(A-B)^{2}(A-2 B)(2 A-B)}{576} p_{1}^{4}-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{8} p_{1}^{2}-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{576}\left(4-p_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}|\zeta|^{2} \\
+\frac{(A-B)^{2}(A+B)}{576}\left(4-p_{1}^{2}\right) p_{1}^{2} \Re \zeta=: \Upsilon\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|, \Re \zeta\right) \tag{3.3}
\end{array}
$$

Now the proof will be completed in a few cases.
Case I. Let $A+B>0$. Then, since the coefficient of $\mathfrak{R} \zeta$ is positive or equal to zero, it follows that

$$
\Upsilon\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|, \Re \zeta\right) \leqq \Upsilon\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|,|\zeta|\right)=G(x, y)
$$

where $x=p_{1}^{2}, y=|\zeta|$ and the function $G:[0,4] \times[0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$
G(x, y):=1-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{8} x+\frac{(2 A-B)(A-2 B)(A-B)^{2}}{576} x^{2}
$$

$$
+\frac{(A+B)(A-B)^{2}}{576}(4-x) x y-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{576}(4-x)^{2} y^{2}
$$

Now on the boundary lines of the rectangular region $[0,4] \times[0,1]$, we see that

$$
\begin{gather*}
G(0, y)=1-\frac{1}{36} y^{2}(A-B)^{2} \\
G(4, y)=\frac{1}{36}\left(2 A^{2}-3 A B+B^{2}-6\right)\left(A^{2}-3 A B+2 B^{2}-6\right)=: \sigma \\
G(x, 0)=1-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{8} x+\frac{(2 A-B)(A-2 B)(A-B)^{2}}{576} x^{2}=: g_{1}(x) \tag{3.4}
\end{gather*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
G(x, 1)=1-\frac{1}{36}(A-B)^{2} & +\frac{1}{144}(A+B-16)(A-B)^{2} x \\
& +\frac{1}{576}(2 A-B+1)(A-2 B-1)(A-B)^{2} x^{2}=: g_{2}(x) \tag{3.5}
\end{align*}
$$

Consider the functions $g_{1}$ and $g_{2}$. The first derivative of these functions, namely $g_{1}^{\prime}(x)$ and $g_{2}^{\prime}(x)$ vanish for $x=x_{3}=36 /(A-2 B)(2 A-B)$ and $x=x_{4}=-2(A+$ $B-16) /(A-2 B-1)(2 A-B+1)$, respectively. Since $(A-2 B)(2 A-B)<9$ and $-(A-2 B-1)(2 A-B+1)<9$, it folows that none of the $x_{3}$ and $x_{4}$ lie inside the interval $(0,4)$. At the end points, we have $g_{1}(0)=1, g_{1}(4)=\sigma=g_{2}(4)$ and $g_{2}(0)=$ $1-(A-B)^{2} / 36$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$
T_{3,1}(f) \leqq \max \left\{1, \sigma, 1-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{36}\right\}=1
$$

Next we find the minimum for $T_{3,1}(f)$. For $A+B>0$, with the setting $p_{1}^{2}=x$, we can write

$$
\Upsilon\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|, \Re \zeta\right) \geqq \Upsilon\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|,-|\zeta|\right) \geqq \Upsilon\left(p_{1}^{2}, 1,-1\right)=g_{3}(x)
$$

where the function $g_{2}:[0,4] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$
\begin{align*}
& g_{3}(x):=1-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{36}-\frac{(A+B+16)(A-B)^{2}}{144} x \\
&+\frac{(2 A-B-1)(A-2 B+1)(A-B)^{2}}{576} x^{2} \tag{3.6}
\end{align*}
$$

The first derivative of $g_{3}$ vanishes for $x=x_{5}=2(A+B+16) /(A-2 B+1)(2 A-B-$ $1)$. But since $2(A+B+16)>32$ and $(A-2 B+1)(2 A-B-1)<8$, we conclude that $x_{5} \notin(0,4)$ and therefore, it is suffices to consider the values of $g_{3}$ at the end points of the interval $[0,4]$, and we get

$$
g_{3}(0)=1-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{36} \text { and } g_{3}(4)=\sigma
$$

From the above discussion, we conclude that

$$
T_{3,1}(f) \geqq \min \left\{\sigma, 1-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{36}\right\}=\sigma
$$

Case II. Let $A+B<0$. Then, since the coefficient of $\mathfrak{R} \zeta$ is negative or equal to zero, it follows that

$$
\Upsilon\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|, \Re \zeta\right) \leqq \Upsilon\left(p_{1}^{2},|\zeta|,-|\zeta|\right)=H(x, y)
$$

where $x=p_{1}^{2}, y=|\zeta|$ and the function $H:[0,4] \times[0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
H(x, y)=1-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{8} x+ & \frac{(2 A-B)(A-2 B)(A-B)^{2}}{576} x^{2} \\
& -\frac{(A+B)(A-B)^{2}}{576}(4-x) x y-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{576}(4-x)^{2} y^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now on the boundary of the rectangular region $[0,4] \times[0,1]$, we have

$$
H(0, y)=1-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{36} y^{2} \leqq 1, H(4, y)=\sigma, H(x, 0)=g_{1}(x) \text { and } H(x, 1)=g_{3}(x)
$$

where the functions $g_{1}$ and $g_{3}$ are defined by (3.4) and (3.6), respectively. Note that at the end point of $[0,4], g_{1}(0)=1=g_{3}(0), g_{1}(4)=\sigma=g_{3}(4)$ and $g_{1}^{\prime}(x)=0$ has no critical point inside the interval $(0,4)$ as $(A-2 B)(2 A-B)<9$ for all $-1 \leqq B<A \leqq 1$. Similarly, it can be proved that the function $g_{3}^{\prime}(x)=0$ has no root inside the interval $(0,4)$. From the above discussion, for $A+B<0$, we conclude that

$$
T_{3,1}(f) \leqq \max \left\{1, \sigma, 1-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{36}\right\}=1
$$

We now proceed to find the minimum of $T_{3,1}(f)$ for the case $-1 \leqq B<A<0$. For this, with the setting $x=p_{1}^{2}$, we can write

$$
\Upsilon\left(p^{2},|\zeta|, \zeta\right) \geqq \Upsilon\left(p^{2},|\zeta|,|\zeta|\right) \geqq \Upsilon\left(p^{2}, 1,1\right)=g_{2}(x)
$$

where the function $g_{3}$ is defined by (3.6). As in the Case II, it can be established that $g_{2}$ has no root in the interval $(0,4)$ and $g_{2}(0)=1-(A-B)^{2} / 36$ and $g_{2}(4)=\sigma$. Thus, for $-1 \leqq B<A<0$, we have

$$
\left|T_{3,1}(f)\right| \geqq \min \left\{1-\frac{(A-B)^{2}}{36}, \sigma\right\}=\sigma
$$

Case III. Let $A+B=0$. Then, from (3.3), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{3,1}(f) & =1-\frac{A^{2}}{2} x+\frac{A^{4}}{16} x^{2}-\frac{A^{2}}{144}(4-x)^{2} y^{2} \\
& \leqq \frac{1}{16}\left(A^{2} x-4\right)^{2} \\
& \leqq 1
\end{aligned}
$$

We also have

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{3,1}(f) & =1-\frac{A^{2}}{2} x+\frac{A^{4}}{16} x^{2}-\frac{A^{2}}{144}(4-x)^{2} y^{2} \\
& \geqq 1-\frac{A^{2}}{9}-\frac{4 A^{2}}{9} x+\frac{\left(9 A^{2}-1\right) A^{2}}{144} x^{2} \\
& =: h(x)
\end{aligned}
$$

The first derivative of $h$ vanishes only at $x=x_{5}=32 /\left(9 A^{2}-1\right)$ and $x_{5} \notin(0,4)$. At the end points of the interval $(0,4)$, we have $h(0)=1-A^{2} / 9$ and $h(4)=\left(A^{2}-1\right)^{2}$. Thus for $A+B=0$, we conclude that

$$
\left(A^{2}-1\right)^{2} \leqq\left|T_{3,1}(f)\right| \leqq 1, \text { or equivalently }\left(B^{2}-1\right)^{2} \leqq\left|T_{3,1}(f)\right| \leqq 1
$$

We put together the results discussed in the above three cases to conclude the assertion of the theorem. These lower bound is sharp in case of the function $k_{0}$ satisfying (3.1) with $p(z)=(1+z) /(1-z)$ and that the upper bound is sharp in case of the function $k_{1}$ satisfying (3.1) with $\left.p(z)=\left(1+z^{2}\right) /\left(1-z^{2}\right)\right)$. This ends the proof.

Remark 2. For $A=1-2 \alpha$ and $B=-1$, Theorems 3 and 4 reduce to the results [7, Theorem 4] and [7, Theorem 5], respectively.
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