

DIFFERENTIAL SANDWICH THEOREMS USING A MULTIPLIER
TRANSFORMATION AND RUSCHEWEYH DERIVATIVE

ALB LUPAŞ ALINA

*Presented at the 11th International Symposium
GEOMETRIC FUNCTION THEORY AND APPLICATIONS
24-27 August 2015, Ohrid, Republic of Macedonia*

ABSTRACT. In this work we define a new operator using the multiplier transformation and Ruscheweyh derivative. Denote by $IR_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}$ the Hadamard product of the multiplier transformation $I(m, \lambda, l)$ and Ruscheweyh derivative R^n , given by $IR_{\lambda,l}^{m,n} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, $IR_{\lambda,l}^{m,n} f(z) = (I(m, \lambda, l) * R^n) f(z)$ and $\mathcal{A}_n = \{f \in \mathcal{H}(U) : f(z) = z + a_{n+1}z^{n+1} + \dots, z \in U\}$ is the class of normalized analytic functions with $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}$. The purpose of this paper is to derive certain subordination and superordination results involving the operator $IR_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}$ and we establish differential sandwich-type theorems.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\mathcal{H}(U)$ be the class of analytic function in the open unit disc of the complex plane $U = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$. Let $\mathcal{H}(a, n)$ be the subclass of $\mathcal{H}(U)$ consisting of functions of the form $f(z) = a + a_n z^n + a_{n+1} z^{n+1} + \dots$.

Let $\mathcal{A}_n = \{f \in \mathcal{H}(U) : f(z) = z + a_{n+1} z^{n+1} + \dots, z \in U\}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1$.

Let the functions f and g be analytic in U . We say that the function f is subordinate to g , written $f \prec g$, if there exists a Schwarz function w , analytic in U , with $w(0) = 0$ and $|w(z)| < 1$, for all $z \in U$, such that $f(z) = g(w(z))$, for all $z \in U$. In particular, if the function g is univalent in U , the above subordination is equivalent to $f(0) = g(0)$ and $f(U) \subset g(U)$.

Let $\psi : \mathbb{C}^3 \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and h be an univalent function in U . If p is analytic in U and satisfies the second order differential subordination

$$(1.1) \quad \psi(p(z), zp'(z), z^2 p''(z); z) \prec h(z), \quad \text{for } z \in U,$$

then p is called a solution of the differential subordination. The univalent function q is called a dominant of the solutions of the differential subordination, or more simply a dominant, if $p \prec q$ for all p satisfying (1.1). A dominant \tilde{q} that satisfies $\tilde{q} \prec q$ for all

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 30C45.

Key words and phrases. analytic functions, differential operator, differential subordination, differential superordination.

dominants q of (1.1) is said to be the best dominant of (1.1). The best dominant is unique up to a rotation of U .

Let $\psi : \mathbb{C}^2 \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and h analytic in U . If p and $\psi(p(z), zp'(z), z^2p''(z); z)$ are univalent and if p satisfies the second order differential superordination

$$(1.2) \quad h(z) \prec \psi(p(z), zp'(z), z^2p''(z); z), \quad z \in U,$$

then p is a solution of the differential superordination (1.2) (if f is subordinate to F , then F is called to be superordinate to f). An analytic function q is called a subordinant if $q \prec p$ for all p satisfying (1.2). An univalent subordinant \tilde{q} that satisfies $q \prec \tilde{q}$ for all subordinants q of (1.2) is said to be the best subordinant.

Miller and Mocanu [8] obtained conditions h , q and ψ for which the following implication holds

$$h(z) \prec \psi(p(z), zp'(z), z^2p''(z); z) \Rightarrow q(z) \prec p(z).$$

For two functions $f(z) = z + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} a_j z^j$ and $g(z) = z + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} b_j z^j$ analytic in the open unit disc U , the Hadamard product (or convolution) of $f(z)$ and $g(z)$, written as $(f * g)(z)$ is defined by

$$f(z) * g(z) = (f * g)(z) = z + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} a_j b_j z^j.$$

Definition 1.1. [6] For $f \in \mathcal{A}$, $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, $\lambda, l \geq 0$, the multiplier transformation $I(m, \lambda, l)f(z)$ is defined by the following infinite series

$$I(m, \lambda, l)f(z) := z + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1 + \lambda(j-1) + l}{1+l} \right)^m a_j z^j.$$

Remark 1.1. We have

$$(l+1)I(m+1, \lambda, l)f(z) = (l+1-\lambda)I(m, \lambda, l)f(z) + \lambda z(I(m, \lambda, l)f(z))', \quad z \in U.$$

Remark 1.2. For $l=0$, $\lambda \geq 0$, the operator $D_{\lambda}^m = I(m, \lambda, 0)$ was introduced and studied by Al-Oboudi ([3]), which reduced to the Sălăgean differential operator $S^m = I(m, 1, 0)$ ([11]) for $\lambda=1$.

Definition 1.2. (Ruscheweyh [10]) For $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the Ruscheweyh derivative R^n is defined by $R^n : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned} R^0 f(z) &= f(z) \\ R^1 f(z) &= z f'(z) \\ &\dots \\ (n+1) R^{n+1} f(z) &= z (R^n f(z))' + n R^n f(z), \quad z \in U. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1.3. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$, $f(z) = z + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} a_j z^j$, then $R^n f(z) = z + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \frac{(n+j-1)!}{n!(j-1)!} a_j z^j$ for $z \in U$.

The purpose of this paper is to derive the several subordination and superordination results involving a differential operator. Furthermore, we studied the results of Selvaraj and Karthikeyan [12], Shanmugam, Ramachandran, Darus and Sivasubramanian [13] and Srivastava and Lashin [14].

In order to prove our subordination and superordination results, we make use of the following known results.

Definition 1.3. [9] Denote by \mathcal{Q} the set of all functions f that are analytic and injective on $\bar{U} \setminus E(f)$, where $E(f) = \{\zeta \in \partial U : \lim_{z \rightarrow \zeta} f(z) = \infty\}$, and are such that $f'(\zeta) \neq 0$ for $\zeta \in \partial U \setminus E(f)$.

Lemma 1.1. [9] Let the function q be univalent in the unit disc U and θ and ϕ be analytic in a domain D containing $q(U)$ with $\phi(w) \neq 0$ when $w \in q(U)$. Set $Q(z) = zq'(z)\phi(q(z))$ and $h(z) = \theta(q(z)) + Q(z)$. Suppose that

1. Q is starlike univalent in U and
2. $\operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{zh'(z)}{Q(z)} \right) > 0$ for $z \in U$.

If p is analytic with $p(0) = q(0)$, $p(U) \subseteq D$ and

$$\theta(p(z)) + zp'(z)\phi(p(z)) \prec \theta(q(z)) + zq'(z)\phi(q(z)),$$

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

Lemma 1.2. [5] Let the function q be convex univalent in the open unit disc U and ν and ϕ be analytic in a domain D containing $q(U)$. Suppose that

1. $\operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{\nu'(q(z))}{\phi(q(z))} \right) > 0$ for $z \in U$ and
2. $\psi(z) = zq'(z)\phi(q(z))$ is starlike univalent in U .

If $p(z) \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q}$, with $p(U) \subseteq D$ and $\nu(p(z)) + zp'(z)\phi(p(z))$ is univalent in U and

$$\nu(q(z)) + zq'(z)\phi(q(z)) \prec \nu(p(z)) + zp'(z)\phi(p(z)),$$

then $q(z) \prec p(z)$ and q is the best subdominant.

2. MAIN RESULTS

Definition 2.1. Let $\lambda, l \geq 0$ and $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote by $IR_{\lambda, l}^{m, n} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ the operator given by the Hadamard product of the multiplier transformation $I(m, \lambda, l)$ and the Ruscheweyh derivative R^n ,

$$IR_{\lambda, l}^{m, n} f(z) = (I(m, \lambda, l) * R^n) f(z),$$

for any $z \in U$ and each nonnegative integers m, n .

Remark 2.1. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and $f(z) = z + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} a_j z^j$, then

$$IR_{\lambda, l}^{m, n} f(z) = z + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1+\lambda(j-1)+l}{l+1} \right)^m \frac{(n+j-1)!}{n!(j-1)!} a_j^2 z^j, \quad z \in U.$$

Remark 2.2. For $l = 0$, $\lambda \geq 0$, we obtain the Hadamard product $IR_{\lambda, 0}^{m, n} f(z) = DR_{\lambda}^{m, n} f(z)$, which was introduced in [4].

For $l = 0$ and $\lambda = 1$ we obtain the operator $IR_{1, 0}^{m, n} f(z) = SR^{m, n} f(z)$, which was introduced in [7].

For $m = n$, we obtain the Hadamard product $IR_{\lambda, l}^m$, which was studied in [1], [2].

Using simple computation one obtains the next result.

Proposition 2.1. For $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda \geq 0$ we have

$$(2.1) \quad IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z) = \frac{1+l-\lambda}{l+1} IR_{\lambda,l}^{m,n} f(z) + \frac{\lambda}{l+1} z (IR_{\lambda,l}^{m,n} f(z))'$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z) &= z + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1+\lambda(j-1)+l}{l+1} \right)^{m+1} \frac{(n+j-1)!}{n!(j-1)!} a_j^2 z^j \\ &= z + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \frac{1+\lambda(j-1)+l}{l+1} \left(\frac{1+\lambda(j-1)+l}{l+1} \right)^m \frac{(n+j-1)!}{n!(j-1)!} a_j^2 z^j \\ &= z + \frac{1+l-\lambda}{l+1} \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1+\lambda(j-1)+l}{l+1} \right)^m \frac{(n+j-1)!}{n!(j-1)!} a_j^2 z^j \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{l+1} \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1+\lambda(j-1)+l}{l+1} \right)^m \frac{(n+j-1)!}{n!(j-1)!} j a_j^2 z^j \\ &= \frac{1+l-\lambda}{l+1} \left[z + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1+\lambda(j-1)+l}{l+1} \right)^m \frac{(n+j-1)!}{n!(j-1)!} a_j^2 z^j \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{l+1} z \left[1 + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1+\lambda(j-1)+l}{l+1} \right)^m \frac{(n+j-1)!}{n!(j-1)!} j a_j^2 z^{j-1} \right] \\ &= \frac{1+l-\lambda}{l+1} IR_{\lambda,l}^{m,n} f(z) + \frac{\lambda}{l+1} z (IR_{\lambda,l}^{m,n} f(z))'. \end{aligned}$$

□

We begin with the following

Theorem 2.2. Let $\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \in \mathcal{H}(U)$ and let the function $q(z)$ be analytic and univalent in U such that $q(z) \neq 0$, for all $z \in U$. Suppose that $\frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$ is starlike univalent in U . Let

$$(2.2) \quad \operatorname{Re} \left(1 + \frac{\xi}{\beta} q(z) + \frac{2\mu}{\beta} (q(z))^2 - \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)} + \frac{zq''(z)}{q'(z)} \right) > 0,$$

for $\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\beta \neq 0$, $z \in U$ and

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta; z) &:= \alpha + \xi \left[\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right]^\delta + \\ &\quad \mu \left[\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right]^{2\delta} + \frac{\beta\delta(l+1)}{\lambda} \left[\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+2,n} f(z)}{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)} - 1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

If q satisfies the following subordination

$$(2.4) \quad \psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta; z) \prec \alpha + \xi q(z) + \mu (q(z))^2 + \beta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)},$$

for $\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta \in \mathbb{C}, \beta, \delta \neq 0$, then

$$\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z}\right)^\delta \prec q(z), \quad \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

and q is the best dominant.

Proof. Let the function p be defined by $p(z) := \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z}\right)^\delta, z \in U, z \neq 0, f \in \mathcal{A}$. We have $p'(z) = \delta \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z}\right)^{\delta-1} \cdot \frac{z(IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z))' - IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z^2}$. Then $\frac{zp'(z)}{p(z)} = \delta \left[\frac{z(IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z))'}{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)} - 1\right]$.

By using the identity (2.1), we obtain

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{zp'(z)}{p(z)} = \frac{\delta(l+1)}{\lambda} \left[\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+2,n} f(z)}{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)} - 1\right].$$

By setting $\theta(w) := \alpha + \xi w + \mu w^2$ and $Q(w) := \frac{\beta}{w}$, it can be easily verified that θ is analytic in \mathbb{C}, ϕ is analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and that $\phi(w) \neq 0, w \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

Also, by letting $Q(z) = zq'(z)\phi(q(z)) = \beta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$ and $h(z) = \theta(q(z)) + Q(z) = \alpha + \xi q(z) + \mu(q(z))^2 + \beta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$, we find that $Q(z)$ is starlike univalent in U .

We have $h'(z) = \xi + q'(z) + 2\mu q(z)q'(z) + \beta \frac{(q'(z) + zq''(z))q(z) - z(q'(z))^2}{(q(z))^2}$ and $\frac{zh'(z)}{Q(z)} = \frac{zh'(z)}{\beta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}} = 1 + \frac{\xi}{\beta} q(z) + \frac{2\mu}{\beta} (q(z))^2 - \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)} + \frac{zq''(z)}{q'(z)}$.

We deduce that $Re\left(\frac{zh'(z)}{Q(z)}\right) = Re\left(1 + \frac{\xi}{\beta} q(z) + \frac{2\mu}{\beta} (q(z))^2 - \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)} + \frac{zq''(z)}{q'(z)}\right) > 0$.

By using (2.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha + \xi p(z) + \mu(p(z))^2 + \beta \frac{zp'(z)}{p(z)} &= \alpha + \xi \left[\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z}\right]^\delta + \mu \left[\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z}\right]^{2\delta} \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta\delta(l+1)}{\lambda} \left[\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+2,n} f(z)}{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)} - 1\right]. \end{aligned}$$

By using (2.4), we have $\alpha + \xi p(z) + \mu(p(z))^2 + \beta \frac{zp'(z)}{p(z)} \prec \alpha + \beta q(z) + \mu(q(z))^2 + \beta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$.

By an application of Lemma 1.1, we have $p(z) \prec q(z), z \in U$, i.e. $\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z}\right)^\delta \prec q(z), z \in U$ and q is the best dominant. □

Corollary 2.3. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}, \lambda, l \geq 0$. Assume that (2.2) holds. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and

$$\psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta; z) \prec \alpha + \xi \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz} + \mu \left(\frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz}\right)^2 + \beta \frac{(A - B)z}{(1 + Az)(1 + Bz)},$$

for $\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta \in \mathbb{C}, \beta, \delta \neq 0, -1 \leq B < A \leq 1$, where $\psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}$ is defined in (2.3), then

$$\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z}\right)^\delta \prec \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz}, \quad \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

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

Proof. For $q(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$, $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$ in Theorem 2.2 we get the corollary. \square

Corollary 2.4. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda, l \geq 0$. Assume that (2.2) holds. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and

$$\psi_{\lambda, l}^{m, n}(\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta; z) \prec \alpha + \xi \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^\gamma + \mu \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^{2\gamma} + \frac{2\beta\gamma z}{1-z^2},$$

for $\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, $\beta \neq 0$, where $\psi_{\lambda, l}^{m, n}$ is defined in (2.3), then

$$\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda, l}^{m+1, n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \prec \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^\gamma, \text{ for } \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

and $\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^\gamma$ is the best dominant.

Proof. Corollary follows by using Theorem 2.2 for $q(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^\gamma$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$. \square

Theorem 2.5. Let q be analytic and univalent in U such that $q(z) \neq 0$ and $\frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$ be starlike univalent in U . Assume that

$$(2.6) \quad \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{2\mu}{\beta} (q(z))^2 + \frac{\xi}{\beta} q(z) \right) > 0, \text{ for } \xi, \mu, \beta \in \mathbb{C}, \beta \neq 0.$$

If $f \in \mathcal{A}$, $\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda, l}^{m+1, n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q}$ and $\psi_{\lambda, l}^{m, n}(\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta; z)$ is univalent in U , where $\psi_{\lambda, l}^{m, n}(\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta; z)$ is as defined in (2.3), then

$$(2.7) \quad \alpha + \xi q(z) + \mu (q(z))^2 + \beta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)} \prec \psi_{\lambda, l}^{m, n}(\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta; z)$$

implies

$$q(z) \prec \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda, l}^{m+1, n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta, \quad \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0, z \in U,$$

and q is the best subdominant.

Proof. Let the function p be defined by $p(z) := \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda, l}^{m+1, n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta$, $z \in U$, $z \neq 0$, $f \in \mathcal{A}$.

By setting $\nu(w) := \alpha + \xi w + \mu w^2$ and $\phi(w) := \frac{\beta}{w}$ it can be easily verified that ν is analytic in \mathbb{C} , ϕ is analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and that $\phi(w) \neq 0$, $w \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

Since $\frac{\nu'(q(z))}{\phi(q(z))} = \frac{q'(z)[\xi + 2\mu q(z)]q(z)}{\beta}$, it follows that

$$\operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{\nu'(q(z))}{\phi(q(z))} \right) = \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{2\mu}{\beta} (q(z))^2 + \frac{\xi}{\beta} q(z) \right) > 0,$$

for $\mu, \xi, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\beta \neq 0$.

By using (2.5) and (2.7) we obtain

$$\alpha + \xi q(z) + \mu (q(z))^2 + \beta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)} \prec \alpha + \xi p(z) + \mu (p(z))^2 + \beta \frac{zp'(z)}{p(z)}.$$

Using Lemma 1.2, we have

$$q(z) \prec p(z) = \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda, l}^{m+1, n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta, \quad z \in U, \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

and q is the best subordinant. □

Corollary 2.6. *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda, l \geq 0$. Assume that (2.6) holds. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$,*

$$\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q}$$

and

$$\alpha + \xi \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz} + \mu \left(\frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz} \right)^2 + \beta \frac{(A - B)z}{(1 + Az)(1 + Bz)} \prec \psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta; z),$$

for $\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\beta, \delta \neq 0$, $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$, where $\psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}$ is defined in (2.3), then

$$\frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz} \prec \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta, \quad \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

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

Proof. For $q(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$, $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$ in Theorem 2.5 we get the corollary. □

Corollary 2.7. *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda, l \geq 0$. Assume that (2.6) holds. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$,*

$$\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q}$$

and

$$\alpha + \xi \left(\frac{1 + z}{1 - z} \right)^\gamma + \mu \left(\frac{1 + z}{1 - z} \right)^{2\gamma} + \frac{2\beta\gamma z}{1 - z^2} \prec \psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta; z),$$

for $\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\beta, \delta \neq 0$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, where $\psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}$ is defined in (2.3), then

$$\left(\frac{1 + z}{1 - z} \right)^\gamma \prec \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta, \quad \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

and $\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^\gamma$ is the best subordinant.

Proof. For $q(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^\gamma$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ in Theorem 2.5 we get the corollary. □

Combining Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.5, we state the following sandwich theorem.

Theorem 2.8. *Let q_1 and q_2 be analytic and univalent in U such that $q_1(z) \neq 0$ and $q_2(z) \neq 0$, for all $z \in U$, with $\frac{zq_1'(z)}{q_1(z)}$ and $\frac{zq_2'(z)}{q_2(z)}$ being starlike univalent. Suppose that q_1 satisfies (2.2) and q_2 satisfies (2.6). If $f \in \mathcal{A}$, $\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q}$ and $\psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta; z)$ is as defined in (2.3) univalent in U , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha + \xi q_1(z) + \mu (q_1(z))^2 + \beta \frac{zq_1'(z)}{q_1(z)} &< \psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta; z) \\ &< \alpha + \xi q_2(z) + \mu (q_2(z))^2 + \beta \frac{zq_2'(z)}{q_2(z)}, \end{aligned}$$

for $\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\beta, \delta \neq 0$, implies

$$q_1(z) \prec \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \prec q_2(z), \quad \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

and q_1 and q_2 are respectively the best subdominant and the best dominant.

For $q_1(z) = \frac{1+A_1z}{1+B_1z}$, $q_2(z) = \frac{1+A_2z}{1+B_2z}$, where $-1 \leq B_2 < B_1 < A_1 < A_2 \leq 1$, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.9. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda, l \geq 0$. Assume that (2.2) and (2.6) hold. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$, $\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha + \xi \frac{1+A_1z}{1+B_1z} + \mu \left(\frac{1+A_1z}{1+B_1z} \right)^2 + \beta \frac{(A_1-B_1)z}{(1+A_1z)(1+B_1z)} &\prec \psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta; z) \\ &\prec \alpha + \xi \frac{1+A_2z}{1+B_2z} + \mu \left(\frac{1+A_2z}{1+B_2z} \right)^2 + \frac{(A_2-B_2)z}{(1+A_2z)(1+B_2z)}, \end{aligned}$$

for $\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\beta, \delta \neq 0$, $-1 \leq B_2 \leq B_1 < A_1 \leq A_2 \leq 1$, where $\psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}$ is defined in (2.3), then

$$\frac{1+A_1z}{1+B_1z} \prec \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \prec \frac{1+A_2z}{1+B_2z},$$

hence $\frac{1+A_1z}{1+B_1z}$ and $\frac{1+A_2z}{1+B_2z}$ are the best subdominant and the best dominant, respectively.

For $q_1(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^{\gamma_1}$, $q_2(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^{\gamma_2}$, where $0 < \gamma_1 < \gamma_2 \leq 1$, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.10. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda, l \geq 0$. Assume that (2.2) and (2.6) hold. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$, $\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha + \xi \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^{\gamma_1} + \mu \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^{2\gamma_1} + \frac{2\beta\gamma_1z}{1-z^2} &\prec \psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta; z) \\ &\prec \alpha + \xi \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^{\gamma_2} + \mu \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^{2\gamma_2} + \frac{2\beta\gamma_2z}{1-z^2}, \end{aligned}$$

for $\delta, \alpha, \xi, \mu, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\beta, \delta \neq 0$, $0 < \gamma_1 < \gamma_2 \leq 1$, where $\psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}$ is defined in (2.3), then

$$\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^{\gamma_1} \prec \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \prec \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^{\gamma_2},$$

hence $\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^{\gamma_1}$ and $\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^{\gamma_2}$ are the best subdominant and the best dominant, respectively.

We have also

Theorem 2.11. Let $\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z}\right)^\delta \in \mathcal{H}(U)$, $f \in \mathcal{A}$, $z \in U$, $\delta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\delta \neq 0$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda, l \geq 0$ and let the function $q(z)$ be convex and univalent in U such that $q(0) = 1$, $z \in U$. Assume that

$$(2.8) \quad \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta}{\beta} + \frac{zq''(z)}{q'(z)} \right) > 0,$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\beta \neq 0$, $z \in U$, and

$$(2.9) \quad \psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \beta; z) := \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \left[\alpha + \frac{\beta\delta(l+1)}{\lambda} \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+2,n} f(z)}{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)} - 1 \right) \right]$$

If q satisfies the following subordination

$$(2.10) \quad \psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \beta; z) \prec \alpha q(z) + \beta zq'(z),$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\beta \neq 0$, $z \in U$, then

$$\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \prec q(z), \quad z \in U, \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

and q is the best dominant.

Proof. Let the function p be defined by $p(z) := \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta$, $z \in U$, $z \neq 0$, $f \in \mathcal{A}$.

The function p is analytic in U and $p(0) = 1$

$$\text{We have } zp'(z) = \delta \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \left[\frac{z(IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z))'}{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)} - 1 \right].$$

By using the identity (2.1), we obtain

$$(2.11) \quad zp'(z) = \frac{\delta(l+1)}{\lambda} \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+2,n} f(z)}{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)} - 1 \right).$$

By setting $\theta(w) := \alpha w$ and $\phi(w) := \beta$, it can be easily verified that θ is analytic in \mathbb{C} , ϕ is analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and that $\phi(w) \neq 0$, $w \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

Also, by letting $Q(z) = zq'(z)\phi(q(z)) = \beta zq'(z)$, we find that $Q(z)$ is starlike univalent in U .

$$\text{Let } h(z) = \theta(q(z)) + Q(z) = \alpha q(z) + \beta zq'(z).$$

$$\text{We have } \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{zh'(z)}{Q(z)} \right) = \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta}{\beta} + \frac{zq''(z)}{q'(z)} \right) > 0.$$

By using (2.11), we obtain

$$\alpha p(z) + \beta zp'(z) = \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \left[\alpha + \frac{\beta\delta(l+1)}{\lambda} \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+2,n} f(z)}{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)} - 1 \right) \right].$$

By using (2.10), we have $\alpha p(z) + \beta zp'(z) \prec \alpha q(z) + \beta zq'(z)$.

From Lemma 1.1, we have $p(z) \prec q(z)$, $z \in U$, i.e. $\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \prec q(z)$, $z \in U$, $\delta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\delta \neq 0$ and q is the best dominant. \square

Corollary 2.12. Let $q(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$, $z \in U$, $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda, l \geq 0$. Assume that (2.8) holds. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and

$$\psi_{\lambda, l}^{m, n}(\delta, \alpha, \beta; z) \prec \alpha \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} + \beta \frac{(A-B)z}{(1+Bz)^2},$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\beta \neq 0$, $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$, where $\psi_{\lambda, l}^{m, n}$ is defined in (2.9), then

$$\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda, l}^{m+1, n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \prec \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}, \quad \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

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

Proof. For $q(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$, $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$, in Theorem 2.11 we get the corollary. \square

Corollary 2.13. Let $q(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^\gamma$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda, l \geq 0$. Assume that (2.8) holds. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and

$$\psi_{\lambda, l}^{m, n}(\delta, \alpha, \beta; z) \prec \alpha \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^\gamma + \frac{2\beta\gamma z}{1-z^2} \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^\gamma,$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, $\beta \neq 0$, where $\psi_{\lambda, l}^{m, n}$ is defined in (2.9), then

$$\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda, l}^{m+1, n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \prec \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^\gamma, \quad \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

and $\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^\gamma$ is the best dominant.

Proof. Corollary follows by using Theorem 2.11 for $q(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^\gamma$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$. \square

Theorem 2.14. Let q be convex and univalent in U such that $q(0) = 1$. Assume that

$$(2.12) \quad \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta} q'(z) \right) > 0, \quad \text{for } \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}, \beta \neq 0.$$

If $f \in \mathcal{A}$, $\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda, l}^{m+1, n} f(z)}{z}\right)^\delta \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q}$ and $\psi_{\lambda, l}^{m, n}(\delta, \alpha, \beta; z)$ is univalent in U , where $\psi_{\lambda, l}^{m, n}(\delta, \alpha, \beta; z)$ is as defined in (2.9), then

$$(2.13) \quad \alpha q(z) + \beta z q'(z) \prec \psi_{\lambda, l}^{m, n}(\delta, \alpha, \beta; z)$$

implies

$$q(z) \prec \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda, l}^{m+1, n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta, \quad \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0, z \in U,$$

and q is the best subdominant.

Proof. Let the function p be defined by $p(z) := \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda, l}^{m+1, n} f(z)}{z}\right)^\delta$, $z \in U$, $z \neq 0$, $\delta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\delta \neq 0$, $f \in \mathcal{A}$. The function p is analytic in U and $p(0) = 1$.

By setting $\nu(w) := \alpha w$ and $\phi(w) := \beta$ it can be easily verified that ν is analytic in \mathbb{C} , ϕ is analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and that $\phi(w) \neq 0$, $w \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

Since $\frac{\nu'(q(z))}{\phi(q(z))} = \frac{\alpha}{\beta} q'(z)$, it follows that $\operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{\nu'(q(z))}{\phi(q(z))} \right) = \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta} q'(z) \right) > 0$, for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\beta \neq 0$.

Now, by using (2.13) we obtain

$$\alpha q(z) + \beta z q'(z) \prec \alpha q(z) + \beta z q'(z), \quad z \in U.$$

From Lemma 1.2, we have

$$q(z) \prec p(z) = \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta, \quad z \in U, \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

and q is the best subdominant. \square

Corollary 2.15. Let $q(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$, $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$, $z \in U$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda, l \geq 0$. Assume that (2.12) holds. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$, $\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q}$, $\delta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\delta \neq 0$ and

$$\alpha \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} + \beta \frac{(A-B)z}{(1+Bz)^2} \prec \psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \beta; z),$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\beta \neq 0$, $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$, where $\psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}$ is defined in (2.9), then

$$\frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} \prec \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta, \quad \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

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

Proof. For $q(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$, $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$, in Theorem 2.14 we get the corollary. \square

Corollary 2.16. Let $q(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^\gamma$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda, l \geq 0$. Assume that (2.12) holds. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$, $\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q}$ and

$$\alpha \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^\gamma + \frac{2\beta\gamma z}{1-z^2} \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^\gamma \prec \psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \beta; z),$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, $\beta \neq 0$, where $\psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}$ is defined in (2.9), then

$$\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^\gamma \prec \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z} \right)^\delta, \quad \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

and $\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^\gamma$ is the best subdominant.

Proof. Corollary follows by using Theorem 2.14 for $q(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^\gamma$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$. \square

Combining Theorem 2.11 and Theorem 2.14, we state the following sandwich theorem.

Theorem 2.17. Let q_1 and q_2 be convex and univalent in U such that $q_1(z) \neq 0$ and $q_2(z) \neq 0$, for all $z \in U$. Suppose that q_1 satisfies (2.8) and q_2 satisfies (2.12).

If $f \in \mathcal{A}$, $\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z}\right)^\delta \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q}$, $\delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0$ and $\psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \beta; z)$ is as defined in (2.9) univalent in U , then

$$\alpha q_1(z) + \beta z q_1'(z) \prec \psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \beta; z) \prec \alpha q_2(z) + \beta z q_2'(z),$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}, \beta \neq 0$, implies

$$q_1(z) \prec \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z}\right)^\delta \prec q_2(z), \quad z \in U, \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

and q_1 and q_2 are respectively the best subordinate and the best dominant.

For $q_1(z) = \frac{1+A_1z}{1+B_1z}$, $q_2(z) = \frac{1+A_2z}{1+B_2z}$, where $-1 \leq B_2 < B_1 < A_1 < A_2 \leq 1$, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.18. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}, \lambda, l \geq 0$. Assume that (2.8) and (2.12) hold for $q_1(z) = \frac{1+A_1z}{1+B_1z}$ and $q_2(z) = \frac{1+A_2z}{1+B_2z}$, respectively. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$, $\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z}\right)^\delta \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \frac{1+A_1z}{1+B_1z} + \beta \frac{(A_1-B_1)z}{(1+B_1z)^2} &\prec \psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \beta; z) \\ &\prec \alpha \frac{1+A_2z}{1+B_2z} + \beta \frac{(A_2-B_2)z}{(1+B_2z)^2}, \quad z \in U, \end{aligned}$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}, \beta \neq 0, -1 \leq B_2 \leq B_1 < A_1 \leq A_2 \leq 1$, where $\psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}$ is defined in (2.3), then

$$\frac{1+A_1z}{1+B_1z} \prec \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z}\right)^\delta \prec \frac{1+A_2z}{1+B_2z}, \quad z \in U, \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

hence $\frac{1+A_1z}{1+B_1z}$ and $\frac{1+A_2z}{1+B_2z}$ are the best subordinate and the best dominant, respectively.

For $q_1(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\gamma_1}$, $q_2(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\gamma_2}$, where $0 < \gamma_1 < \gamma_2 \leq 1$, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.19. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}, \lambda, l \geq 0$. Assume that (2.8) and (2.12) hold for $q_1(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\gamma_1}$ and $q_2(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\gamma_2}$, respectively. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$, $\left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z}\right)^\delta \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap \mathcal{Q}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\gamma_1} + \frac{2\beta\gamma_1z}{1-z^2} \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\gamma_1} &\prec \psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}(\delta, \alpha, \beta; z) \\ &\prec \alpha \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\gamma_2} + \frac{2\beta\gamma_2z}{1-z^2} \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\gamma_2}, \quad z \in U, \end{aligned}$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}, \beta \neq 0, 0 < \gamma_1 < \gamma_2 \leq 1$, where $\psi_{\lambda,l}^{m,n}$ is defined in (2.3), then

$$\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\gamma_1} \prec \left(\frac{IR_{\lambda,l}^{m+1,n} f(z)}{z}\right)^\delta \prec \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\gamma_2}, \quad z \in U, \delta \in \mathbb{C}, \delta \neq 0,$$

hence $\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\gamma_1}$ and $\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\gamma_2}$ are the best subordinate and the best dominant, respectively.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. ALB LUPAS: *A note on a certain subclass of analytic functions defined by multiplier transformation*, Journal of Computational Analysis and Applications **12(1-B)**(2010), 369–373.
- [2] A. ALB LUPAS: *Certain differential subordinations using a multiplier transformation and Ruscheweyh derivative*, Buletinul Academiei de Ştiinţe a Republicii Moldova. Matematica, Numbers **2(72)-3(73)**(2013), 119–131.
- [3] F.M. AL-BOUDI: *On univalent functions defined by a generalized Sălăgean operator*, Ind. J. Math. Math. Sci. **27**(2004), 1429–1436.
- [4] L. ANDRÈI: *Differential Sandwich Theorems using a generalized Sălăgean operator and Ruscheweyh operator*, submitted (2014).
- [5] T. BULBOACĂ: *Classes of first order differential subordinations*, Demonstratio Math. **35(2)**(2002), 287–292.
- [6] A. CĂTAŞ: *On certain class of p -valent functions defined by new multiplier transformations*, Adriana Catas, Proceedings Book of the International Symposium on Geometric Function Theory and Applications, August 20-24, 2007, TC Istanbul Kultur University, Turkey, 241-250.
- [7] R. DIACONU: *On some differential sandwich theorems using Sălăgean operator and Ruscheweyh operator*, submitted, (2014).
- [8] S.S. MILLER, P.T. MOCANU: *Subordinants of Differential Superordinations*, Complex Variables **48(10)**(2003), 815–826, October, 2003.
- [9] S.S. MILLER, P.T. MOCANU: *Differential Subordinations: Theory and Applications*, Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 2000.
- [10] ST. RUSCHEWEYH: *New criteria for univalent functions*, Proc. Amet. Math. Soc. **49**(1975), 109–115.
- [11] G. ST. SĂLĂGEAN: *Subclasses of univalent functions*, Lecture Notes in Math., Springer Verlag, Berlin, **1013**(1983), 362–372.
- [12] C. SELVARAJ, K.T. KARTHIKEYAN: *Differential Subordination and Superordination for Analytic Functions Defined Using a Family of Generalized Differential Operators*, An. St. Univ. Ovidius Constanta **17(1)**(2009), 201-210.
- [13] T.N. SHANMUGAN, C. RAMACHANDRAN, M. DARUS, S. SIVASUBRAMANIAN: *Differential sandwich theorems for some subclasses of analytic functions involving a linear operator*, Acta Math. Univ. Comenianae **16(2)**(2007), 287–294.
- [14] H.M. SRIVASTAVA, A.Y. LASHIN: *Some applications of the Briot-Bouquet differential subordination*, J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math. **6(2)**(2005), Article 41, 7 pp. (electronic).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE
UNIVERSITY OF ORADEA
1 UNIVERSITATII STREET, 410087 ORADEA, ROMANIA
E-mail address: alblupas@gmail.com