

NOTES ON CONVEX FUNCTIONS OF ORDER α

TOSHIYUKI SUGAWA AND LI-MEI WANG

ABSTRACT. Marx and Stroh acker showed around in 1933 that $f(z)/z$ is subordinate to $1/(1-z)$ for a normalized convex function f on the unit disk $|z| < 1$. Brickman, Hallenbeck, MacGregor and Wilken proved in 1973 further that $f(z)/z$ is subordinate to $k_\alpha(z)/z$ if f is convex of order α for $1/2 \leq \alpha < 1$ and conjectured that this is true also for $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. Here, k_α is the standard extremal function in the class of normalized convex functions of order α and $k_0(z) = z/(1-z)$. We prove the conjecture and study geometric properties of convex functions of order α . In particular, we prove that $(f+g)/2$ is starlike whenever f and g both are convex of order $3/5$.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

Let \mathcal{A} denote the set of analytic functions on the open unit disk $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$. Let \mathcal{A}_1 be the subclass of \mathcal{A} consisting of functions f normalized by $f(0) = f'(0) - 1 = 0$. Further let \mathcal{S} be the subset of \mathcal{A}_1 consisting of functions f univalent on \mathbb{D} . The present paper mainly deals with the subfamily of \mathcal{S} , denoted by $\mathcal{K}(\alpha)$, consisting of convex functions of order α introduced by Robertson [8]. Here, for a constant $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, a function f in \mathcal{A}_1 is called *convex of order α* if

$$\operatorname{Re} \left(1 + \frac{zf''(z)}{f'(z)} \right) > \alpha$$

for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Note that the class $\mathcal{K}(0) = \mathcal{K}$ is known to consist of convex functions in \mathcal{A}_1 . Here, a function f in \mathcal{A} is called *convex* if f maps \mathbb{D} univalently onto a convex domain. A function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is called *starlike* if f maps \mathbb{D} univalently onto a domain starlike with respect to $f(0)$. It is clear that every convex function is starlike. We denote by \mathcal{S}^* the set of starlike functions in \mathcal{A}_1 . By definition, it is obvious that for $0 \leq \alpha < \beta < 1$,

$$\mathcal{K}(\beta) \subset \mathcal{K}(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{S}^* \subset \mathcal{S}.$$

The Koebe function $z/(1-z)^2$ is often extremal in \mathcal{S}^* or even in \mathcal{S} and thus plays quite an important role in the theory of univalent functions. It is helpful in many respects to have such an extremal function for the class $\mathcal{K}(\alpha)$. Since the function $(1+(1-2\alpha)z)/(1-z)$ maps \mathbb{D} univalently onto the half-plane $\operatorname{Re} w > \alpha$, indeed, the function $k_\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(\alpha)$ characterized by the following relations serves as an extremal one:

$$1 + \frac{zk''_\alpha(z)}{k'_\alpha(z)} = \frac{1+(1-2\alpha)z}{1-z}, \quad \text{and} \quad k_\alpha(0) = 0, \quad k'_\alpha(0) = 1.$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 30C45; Secondary 30C75.

Key words and phrases. subordination, convex functions of order α , hypergeometric function.

The present research was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11326080) and JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) 22340025.

It is easy to find an explicit form of k_α as follows:

$$k_\alpha(z) = \begin{cases} (1 - 2\alpha)^{-1}[(1 - z)^{2\alpha-1} - 1], & \alpha \neq 1/2, \\ -\log(1 - z), & \alpha = 1/2. \end{cases}$$

We now recall the notion of subordination between two analytic functions f and g on \mathbb{D} . We say that f is subordinate to g and write $f \prec g$ or $f(z) \prec g(z)$ for it if there exists an analytic function ω on \mathbb{D} such that $\omega(0) = 0$, $|\omega(z)| < 1$ and $f(z) = g(\omega(z))$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. When g is univalent, f is subordinate to g precisely if $f(0) = g(0)$ and if $f(\mathbb{D}) \subset g(\mathbb{D})$.

In 1973, Brickman, Hallenbeck, MacGregor and Wilken proved in [2, Theorem 11] the following result for convex functions of order α .

Theorem A (Brickman *et al.*). *If $f \in \mathcal{K}(\alpha)$ for $1/2 \leq \alpha < 1$, then*

$$\frac{f(z)}{z} \prec \frac{k_\alpha(z)}{z} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{D}.$$

We note that $k_0(z)/z = 1/(1 - z)$ maps \mathbb{D} univalently onto the half-plane $\operatorname{Re} w > 1/2$. Thus the above relation also holds when $\alpha = 0$ by a theorem of Marx and Stroh acker (see [2, Theorem 10]). In [2], they conjectured that the assertion of Theorem A would hold for $0 < \alpha < 1/2$ as well. They also observed that the conjecture is confirmed if one could show that the function $k_\alpha(z)/z$ is convex. They prove the last theorem by showing it for $1/2 \leq \alpha < 1$ (cf. [2, Lemma 3]). We will show it for all α .

Theorem 1.1. *The function $h_\alpha(z) = k_\alpha(z)/z$ maps \mathbb{D} univalently onto a convex domain for each $0 \leq \alpha < 1$.*

We remark that, in the context of the hypergeometric function, this follows also from results of K stner in [5] (see the remark at the end of Section 2 for more details). Anyway, the conjecture has been confirmed:

Corollary 1.2. *Let $0 \leq \alpha < 1$. Then, for $f \in \mathcal{K}(\alpha)$, the following subordination holds:*

$$\frac{f(z)}{z} \prec \frac{k_\alpha(z)}{z} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{D}.$$

In view of the form, it is easy to see that k_α is bounded on \mathbb{D} if and only if $\alpha > 1/2$. By analyzing the shape of the image of \mathbb{D} under the mapping $h_\alpha(z) = k_\alpha(z)/z$, we obtain the following more refined result.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ and $f \in \mathcal{K}(\alpha)$. Then the following hold:*

- (i) $\frac{k_\alpha(-r)}{-r} \leq \operatorname{Re} \frac{f(z)}{z} \leq \frac{k_\alpha(r)}{r}$ for $|z| = r < 1$.
- (ii) When $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, the asymptotic lines of the boundary curve of $h_\alpha(\mathbb{D})$ are given by $v = \pm \cot(\pi\alpha)(u - \frac{1}{2\alpha-1})$. In particular, the values of $f(z)/z$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$ are contained in the sector $S = \{u + iv : |v| < \cot(\pi\alpha)(u - \frac{1}{2\alpha-1})\}$.
- (iii) When $1/2 \leq \alpha < 1$,

$$\left| \operatorname{Im} \frac{f(z)}{z} \right| < M(\alpha), \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

where

$$M(\alpha) = \max_{0 < \theta < \pi} \operatorname{Im} [e^{-i\theta} k_\alpha(e^{i\theta})] \leq M(\tfrac{1}{2}) = \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

The estimate is sharp.

We remark that the left-hand inequality in (i) was already proved by Brickman *et al.* [2, Theorem 10] and the right-hand one follows also from Robertson's theorem (see Lemma 3.1 below). A much simpler proof of (i) is now available thanks to Corollary 1.2. The proof of this theorem and more information about the constant $M(\alpha)$ will be given in Section 3. We also provide an application of our results to an extremal problem for $\mathcal{K}(\alpha)$ in Section 3.

Styer and Wright [10] studied (non-)univalence of a convex combination of two convex functions. Among other things, the following result is most relevant to the present study.

Theorem B (Styer and Wright). *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{K}$ be odd convex functions. If $|\operatorname{Im} [f(z)/z]| < \pi/4$ and $|\operatorname{Im} [g(z)/z]| < \pi/4$ on $|z| < 1$, then $(f + g)/2 \in \mathcal{S}^*$.*

Styer and Wright suspected that the assumption $|\operatorname{Im} [f(z)/z]| < \pi/4$ in the theorem was superfluous. They even stated the belief that

$$(1.1) \quad \frac{f(z)}{z} \prec H_2(z) := \frac{1}{2z} \log \frac{1+z}{1-z} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^{2n}}{2n+1}$$

if $f \in \mathcal{K}$ is odd; namely, $f(-z) = -f(z)$. Note that $|\operatorname{Im} H_2(z)| < \pi/4$ on $|z| < 1$. Indeed, Hallenbeck and Ruscheweyh [4] proved that

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{f(z)}{z} \prec H_1(z) := \frac{1}{2\sqrt{z}} \log \frac{1+\sqrt{z}}{1-\sqrt{z}} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^n}{2n+1}$$

for a function $f \in \mathcal{K}$ with $f''(0) = 0$, which implies that $|\operatorname{Im} [f(z)/z]| < \pi/4$. In this way, they strengthened the above theorem (see [4, Corollary 2]):

Theorem C (Hallenbeck and Ruscheweyh). *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfy $f''(0) = g''(0) = 0$. Then $(f + g)/2 \in \mathcal{S}^*$.*

We give another result of this type.

Theorem 1.4. *$(f + g)/2 \in \mathcal{S}^*$ for $f, g \in \mathcal{K}(0.6)$.*

The proof will be given in Section 4. Note that the constant $0.6 = 3/5$ is not best possible.

We remark that the claim (1.1) for an odd convex function f is not necessarily true. An example will be given in Section 5.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We now show that the function $h_\alpha(z) = k_\alpha(z)/z$ is convex (univalent) on \mathbb{D} for each $0 \leq \alpha < 1$. To this end, we only need to see that $1 + zh''_\alpha(z)/h'_\alpha(z)$ has positive real

part. Since the case $\alpha = 0$ is trivial, we assume that $\alpha > 0$. Put $\beta = 2 - 2\alpha \in (0, 2)$ for convenience. We assume $\alpha \neq 1/2$ so that $\beta \neq 1$ for a while. A simple calculation yields

$$h'_\alpha(z) = \frac{(1 - \beta z)(1 - z)^{-\beta} - 1}{(1 - \beta)z^2}$$

and

$$(2.1) \quad 1 + \frac{zh''_\alpha(z)}{h'_\alpha(z)} = -1 - \frac{\beta(1 - \beta)z^2}{((1 - z)^\beta - 1 + \beta z)(1 - z)}.$$

With the Pochhammer symbol $(a)_n = a(a + 1) \cdots (a + n - 1)$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - z)^\beta - 1 + \beta z &= \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(-\beta)_n}{(1)_n} z^n \\ &= \frac{-\beta(1 - \beta)z^2}{2} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(2 - \beta)_{n-2}}{(3)_{n-2}} z^{n-2} \\ &= -\frac{\beta(1 - \beta)z^2}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2 - \beta)_n}{(3)_n} z^n. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $b_n = (2 - \beta)_n / (3)_n$ for $n \geq 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{((1 - z)^\beta - 1 + \beta z)(1 - z)}{\beta(1 - \beta)z^2} &= \frac{1 - z}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n z^n \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (b_n - b_{n-1}) z^n \right) \\ &= \frac{1 + \omega(z)}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\omega(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (b_n - b_{n-1}) z^n.$$

Hence, we have the expression

$$1 + \frac{zh''_\alpha(z)}{h'_\alpha(z)} = -1 + \frac{2}{1 + \omega(z)} = \frac{1 - \omega(z)}{1 + \omega(z)}.$$

Note that this is valid also for $\alpha = 1/2$ as is confirmed directly or by taking limit as $\alpha \rightarrow 1/2$.

In order to show $\operatorname{Re}(1 + zh''_\alpha(z)/h'_\alpha(z)) > 0$, it suffices to check $|\omega(z)| < 1$. Since

$$\frac{b_n}{b_{n-1}} = \frac{n + 1 - \beta}{n + 2} = 1 - \frac{1 + \beta}{n + 2} < 1,$$

we see that $\{b_n\}$ is a decreasing sequence of positive numbers. Therefore,

$$|\omega(z)| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (b_{n-1} - b_n) |z|^n < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (b_{n-1} - b_n) = b_0 - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n \leq b_0 = 1$$

for $z \in \mathbb{D}$ as required. (Indeed, we can easily show that $b_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.) \square

We remark that the function k_α can be expressed in terms of the Gauss hypergeometric function

$${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a)_n (b)_n}{(c)_n} \cdot \frac{z^n}{n!}.$$

Indeed, by integrating both sides of

$$k'_\alpha(z) = (1-z)^{-\beta} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\beta)_n \frac{z^n}{n!}$$

with $\beta = 2 - 2\alpha$, we obtain

$$k_\alpha(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\beta)_n}{n+1} \cdot \frac{z^{n+1}}{n!} = z \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\beta)_n (1)_n}{(2)_n} \cdot \frac{z^n}{n!},$$

and hence

$$h_\alpha(z) = \frac{k_\alpha(z)}{z} = {}_2F_1(\beta, 1; 2; z).$$

We extract the following result from Küstner's theorems in [5] (Theorem 1.1 with $r = 1$ and Remark 2.3, see also Corollary 6 (a) in [6]).

Lemma 2.1 (Küstner). *For non-zero real numbers a, b, c with $-1 < a \leq b < c$, let $F(z) = {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$. Then*

$$\inf_{z \in \mathbb{D}} \left(1 + \frac{zF''(z)}{F'(z)} \right) = 1 + \frac{-F''(-1)}{F'(-1)} \geq 1 - \frac{(a+1)(b+1)}{b+c+2}$$

Since ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = {}_2F_1(b, a; c; z)$, we can apply the above lemma to our function $h_\alpha(z) = {}_2F_1(\beta, 1; 2; z)$ for $0 < \alpha < 1$; equivalently, for $0 < \beta < 2$. Hence, by (2.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{z \in \mathbb{D}} \left(1 + \frac{zh''_\alpha(z)}{h'_\alpha(z)} \right) &= 1 - \frac{h''_\alpha(-1)}{h'_\alpha(-1)} = \frac{2^{\beta+1} - 2 - \beta - \beta^2}{2(1 + \beta - 2^\beta)} \\ &\geq \begin{cases} \frac{4\alpha - 1}{5}, & 1/2 \leq \alpha < 1, \\ \frac{\alpha}{3 - \alpha}, & 0 < \alpha \leq 1/2. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

In this way, we have obtained another proof of convexity of h_α .

3. MAPPING PROPERTIES OF FUNCTIONS IN $\mathcal{K}(\alpha)$

The present section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.3. Before the proof, we note basic results due to Robertson [8] (see also Pinchuk [7]).

Lemma 3.1 (Robertson). *Let $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ and $f \in \mathcal{K}(\alpha)$. Then,*

$$-k_\alpha(-r) \leq |f(z)| \leq k_\alpha(r) \quad \text{for } |z| = r < 1.$$

In particular, the image domain $f(\mathbb{D})$ contains the disk $|w| < -k_\alpha(-1)$.

We will use also the following simple fact.

Lemma 3.2. *Let Ω be an unbounded convex domain in \mathbb{C} whose boundary is parametrized positively by a Jordan curve $w(t) = u(t) + iv(t)$, $0 < t < 1$, with $w(0^+) = w(1^-) = \infty$. Suppose that $u(0^+) = +\infty$ and that $v(t)$ has a finite limit as $t \rightarrow 0^+$. Then $v(t) \leq v(0^+)$ for $0 < t < 1$.*

Proof. Let $0 \leq t^* \leq 1$ be the number such that $u(t^*) = \inf_{0 < t < 1} u(t)$ and that $u(t) > u(t^*)$ for $0 < t < t^*$. (We interpret $u(0) = u(0^+)$ or $u(1) = u(1^-)$ when $t^* = 0$ or 1 , respectively.) By the assumption $u(0^+) = +\infty$, we have $t^* > 0$. Note that $u(t)$ is strictly decreasing in $0 < t < t^*$. By convexity and orientation, the part $w((t^*, 1))$ of the boundary lies below the part $w((0, t^*))$. Thus, it is enough to show that $v(t)$ is non-increasing in $0 < t < t^*$. Let $0 < t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < t^*$ and set $w(t_j) = u_j + iv_j$ for $j = 0, 1, 2$. By convexity, the part $w((t_0, t_2))$ of the boundary lies above the line which passes through the points $w(t_0)$ and $w(t_2)$; equivalently,

$$v(t) \geq v_2 + \frac{v_0 - v_2}{u_0 - u_2}(u(t) - u_2), \quad t_0 < t < t_2.$$

We now put $t = t_1$ and let $t_0 \rightarrow 0^+$ to obtain $v_1 = v(t_1) \geq v_2 = v(t_2)$. Thus we have shown that $v(t)$ is non-increasing as required. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Since $h_\alpha(z) = k_\alpha(z)/z$ is convex and symmetric in \mathbb{R} , we easily see that $h_\alpha(-r) \leq \operatorname{Re} h_\alpha(z) \leq h_\alpha(r)$ for $|z| = r < 1$. Therefore, assertion (i) immediately follows from Corollary 1.2.

To prove (ii) and (iii), we study mapping properties of the function $h_\alpha(z)$. We remark that h_α analytically extends to $\partial\mathbb{D} \setminus \{1\}$ by its form. Let us investigate the shape of the boundary of $h_\alpha(\mathbb{D})$. In the rest of this section, it is convenient to put $\gamma = 2\alpha - 1 \in [-1, 1)$. Note that $\gamma < 0$ if and only if $\alpha < 1/2$. We write $h_\alpha(e^{i\theta}) = u_\gamma(\theta) + iv_\gamma(\theta)$ for $0 < \theta < 2\pi$. We remark that the symmetry $h_\alpha(\bar{z}) = \overline{h_\alpha(z)}$ leads to the relations $u_\gamma(2\pi - \theta) = u_\gamma(\theta)$ and $v_\gamma(2\pi - \theta) = -v_\gamma(\theta)$. Thus, we may restrict our attention to the range $0 < \theta \leq \pi$. It is easy to obtain the following expressions for $\gamma \neq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} u_\gamma(\theta) &= \frac{-1}{\gamma} \left(\left(2 \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^\gamma \cos \left(-\theta + \frac{\theta - \pi}{2} \gamma \right) - \cos \theta \right), \\ v_\gamma(\theta) &= \frac{-1}{\gamma} \left(\left(2 \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^\gamma \sin \left(-\theta + \frac{\theta - \pi}{2} \gamma \right) + \sin \theta \right). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that for $-1 < \gamma < 0$, both $u_\gamma(\theta)$ and $v_\gamma(\theta)$ tend to $+\infty$ as $\theta \rightarrow 0^+$. A simple calculation yields

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{v_\gamma(\theta)}{u_\gamma(\theta)} = \tan \frac{-\pi\gamma}{2} = -\tan \frac{\pi\gamma}{2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} \left(v_\gamma(\theta) + u_\gamma(\theta) \tan \frac{\pi\gamma}{2} \right) &= \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} \left[\frac{-(2 \sin \frac{\theta}{2})^\gamma \sin(\frac{\gamma}{2} - 1)\theta}{\gamma \cos(\pi\gamma/2)} - \frac{1}{\gamma} \tan \frac{\pi\gamma}{2} \cos \theta \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{\gamma} \tan \frac{\pi\gamma}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} v &= -\tan \frac{\pi\gamma}{2} \left(u - \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) \\ &= \cot(\alpha\pi) \left(u - \frac{1}{2\alpha - 1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

is an asymptotic line of the boundary curve $\partial h_\alpha(\mathbb{D})$. Since $h_\alpha(\mathbb{D})$ is a convex domain symmetric in the real axis, we conclude assertion (ii).

Next we assume $\alpha \geq 1/2$ to show (iii). Since $f(z)/z \prec k_\alpha(z)/z \prec k_{1/2}(z)/z$ for $f \in \mathcal{K}(\alpha)$, the assertion is clear except for $M(1/2) = \pi/2$. A simple computation gives us the expression

$$v_{1/2}(\theta) = \frac{\pi - \theta}{2} \cos \theta + \sin \theta \log \left(2 \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \right)$$

for $0 < \theta < \pi$. We easily get $v_{1/2}(0^+) = \pi/2$. Thus we conclude that $M(1/2) = \pi/2$ by Lemma 3.2. We have thus proved assertion (iii). \square

We indicate how to compute the value of $M(\alpha)$ for $1/2 < \alpha < 1$. Set $c = \gamma/2 = \alpha - 1/2 \in (0, 1/2)$. Since $h_\alpha(\mathbb{D})$ is a bounded convex domain symmetric in \mathbb{R} , it is easy to see that $v_\gamma(\theta)$ has a unique critical point, say, θ_α at which v_γ attains its maximum so that $M(\alpha) = v_\gamma(\theta_\alpha)$. Here, $\theta = \theta_\alpha$ is a unique solution of the equation

$$(3.1) \quad \left[c \cot \frac{\theta}{2} + (1 - c) \cot(c\pi + (1 - c)\theta) \right] \left(2 \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^{2c} \sin(c\pi + (1 - c)\theta) - \cos \theta = 0$$

in $0 < \theta < \pi$, where $c = \alpha - 1/2$. By using this equation, we can express $M(\alpha)$ in a different way:

$$(3.2) \quad M(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2c} \left[\frac{\cos \theta_\alpha}{c \cot(\theta_\alpha/2) + (1 - c) \cot(c\pi + (1 - c)\theta_\alpha)} - \sin \theta_\alpha \right].$$

This expression will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Assertion (ii) of Theorem 1.3 can be applied to an extremal problem for $\mathcal{K}(\alpha)$. For $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we consider the quantity

$$Q_\alpha(t) = \inf_{f \in \mathcal{K}(\alpha), z \in \mathbb{D}} \operatorname{Re} \left[e^{it} \frac{f(z)}{z} \right].$$

The quantity $M(\alpha)$ in Theorem 1.3 is a particular case of this quantity. Indeed, we have $Q_\alpha(\pi/2) = -M(\alpha)$ for $1/2 \leq \alpha < 1$. We have the obvious monotonicity $Q_\alpha(t) \leq Q_\beta(t)$ for $0 \leq \alpha < \beta < 1$ and the symmetry $Q_\alpha(-t) = Q_\alpha(t)$. It is thus enough to consider the case when $0 \leq t \leq \pi$.

Theorem 3.3. *For $0 < \alpha < 1$, the function $\varphi_\alpha(\theta) = \theta + \arg h'_\alpha(e^{i\theta})$ maps the interval $(0, \pi]$ onto $(\pi(1 - \alpha), \pi]$ homeomorphically. Furthermore, the following hold.*

- (i) *Suppose $\alpha = 0$. Then, $Q_0(0) = 1/2$ and $Q_0(t) = -\infty$ for $0 < t \leq \pi$.*

(ii) Suppose $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. Then

$$Q_\alpha(t) = \begin{cases} \operatorname{Re} [e^{i(t-\theta_0)} k_\alpha(e^{i\theta_0})], & 0 \leq t < \alpha\pi, \theta_0 = \varphi_\alpha^{-1}(\pi - t), \\ (2\alpha - 1)^{-1} \cos(\alpha\pi), & t = \alpha\pi, \\ -\infty, & \alpha\pi < t \leq \pi. \end{cases}$$

(iii) Suppose $\alpha = 1/2$. Then

$$Q_{1/2}(t) = \begin{cases} \operatorname{Re} [e^{i(t-\theta_0)} k_{1/2}(e^{i\theta_0})], & 0 \leq t < \pi/2, \theta_0 = \varphi_{1/2}^{-1}(\pi - t), \\ -\pi/2, & t = \pi/2, \\ -\infty, & \pi/2 < t \leq \pi. \end{cases}$$

(iv) Suppose $1/2 < \alpha < 1$. Then

$$Q_\alpha(t) = \begin{cases} \operatorname{Re} [e^{i(t-\theta_0)} k_\alpha(e^{i\theta_0})], & 0 \leq t < \alpha\pi, \theta_0 = \varphi_\alpha^{-1}(\pi - t), \\ (2\alpha - 1)^{-1} \cos t, & \alpha\pi \leq t \leq \pi. \end{cases}$$

Proof. When $t = 0$ or π , the assertions are clear. Assume therefore that $0 < t < \pi$. Let $D_\alpha = h_\alpha(\mathbb{D})$. By Corollary 1.2, we have

$$Q_\alpha(t) = \inf_{u+iv \in D_\alpha} \operatorname{Re} [e^{it}(u+iv)] = \inf_{u+iv \in D_\alpha} [u \cos t - v \sin t].$$

Then, geometrically, we can say that $-Q_\alpha(t)/\sin t$ is the supremum of y -intercepts of those lines $y = x \cot t + C$ which intersect with D_α . Since D_α does not intersect the y -axis, such a line must intersect with ∂D_α . Therefore, in the above characterization of $Q_\alpha(t)$, D_α may be replaced by ∂D_α . Hence, noting also the symmetry of D_α in \mathbb{R} , we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\alpha(t) &= \inf_{u+iv \in \partial D_\alpha} [u \cos t - v \sin t] \\ &= \inf_{u+iv \in \partial D_\alpha, v \geq 0} [u \cos t - v \sin t] \\ &= \inf_{0 < \theta < \pi} F(\theta), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F(\theta) = u_\gamma(\theta) \cos t - v_\gamma(\theta) \sin t.$$

and u_γ, v_γ are the functions given by $h_\alpha(e^{i\theta}) = u_\gamma(\theta) + iv_\gamma(\theta)$ with $\gamma = 2\alpha - 1$, as before.

When $\alpha = 0$, the function $h_0(z) = 1/(1+z)$ maps the unit disk onto the half-plane $\operatorname{Re} w > 1/2$ so that assertion (i) is obvious. We thus assume that $0 < \alpha < 1$ in the rest of the proof.

First we analyze the case when $Q_\alpha(t) = -\infty$. Recall that $u_\gamma(\theta) \rightarrow +\infty$ and $v_\gamma(\theta) = u_\gamma(\theta) \cot(\alpha\pi) + O(1)$ as $\theta \rightarrow 0^+$ for $0 < \alpha < 1/2$ by (ii) of Theorem 1.3. This is valid also for $\alpha = 1/2$. Hence,

$$\sin(\alpha\pi) [u_\gamma(\theta) \cos t - v_\gamma(\theta) \sin t] = u_\gamma(\theta) \sin(\alpha\pi - t) + O(1) \rightarrow -\infty \quad (\theta \rightarrow 0^+),$$

whenever $\sin(\alpha\pi - t) < 0$, which confirms the assertion for $\alpha\pi < t < \pi$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1/2$.

We now show the first assertion of the theorem. Let $\psi_\alpha(\theta) = \arg [u'_\gamma(\theta) + iv'_\gamma(\theta)] \in (\pi/2, 3\pi/2]$ for $0 < \theta \leq \pi$. The strict convexity of D_α implies that ψ_α is strictly increasing. Note that $\psi_\alpha(\theta) = \arg h'_\alpha(e^{i\theta}) + \theta + \pi/2 = \varphi_\alpha(\theta) + \pi/2$. Then we consider the case $0 \leq$

$t < \alpha\pi$. From the proof of assertion (ii) of Theorem 1.3, we see that $\psi_\alpha(0^+) = 3\pi/2 - \alpha\pi$ for $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. This is valid also for $1/2 \leq \alpha < 1$. Indeed, it follows from

$$\tan \psi_\alpha(0^+) = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{v_\gamma(\theta)}{u_\gamma(\theta) - u_\gamma(0^+)} = -\tan \frac{\pi\gamma}{2} = \cot(\alpha\pi)$$

for $1/2 < \alpha < 1$. We can also see that $\psi_{1/2}(0^+) = \pi$ directly. Hence, we conclude that the range of $\psi_\alpha(\theta)$ on $0 < \theta \leq \pi$ is precisely $(\frac{3\pi}{2} - \alpha\pi, \frac{3\pi}{2}]$, which proves the required assertion.

We now consider the case when $0 \leq t < \alpha\pi$. Then $F'(\theta)$ vanishes precisely when $\tan \psi_\alpha(\theta) = v'_\gamma(\theta)/u'_\gamma(\theta) = \cot t = \tan(3\pi/2 - t)$, namely, $\varphi_\alpha(\theta) = \pi - t$. Thus we see that $F(\theta)$ takes its minimum at $\theta_0 = \varphi_\alpha^{-1}(\pi - t)$ and the corresponding assertions hold.

Our next task is to consider the borderline case $t = \alpha\pi$. When $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, Theorem 1.3 (ii) implies that the supremum of the y -intercepts of the lines $y = x \cot(\alpha\pi) + k$ intersecting with D_α is $\cot(\alpha\pi)/(1 - 2\alpha)$. This case has been confirmed to be true. When $\alpha = 1/2$, the assertion is contained in Theorem 1.3 (iii). When $\alpha > 1/2$, this case can be included in the final case below.

We finally consider the case when $1/2 < \alpha < 1$ and $\alpha\pi \leq t < \pi$. In this case the function $F(\theta)$ has no critical point in $0 < \theta < \pi$. Since $F'(\pi) = -v'_\gamma(\pi) \sin t > 0$, we see that $F(\theta)$ is increasing in $0 < \theta < \pi$ so that $Q_\alpha(t) = F(0^+) = (2\alpha - 1)^{-1} \cos t$. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

We denote by \mathbb{D}_r the disk $|z| < r$. Throughout this section, we define f_a for $f \in \mathcal{A}_1$ and $a \in \mathbb{D}$ by $f_a(z) = f(az)/a$. Here, we set $f_0(z) = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} f_a(z) = z$. We begin with the following simple observation.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $f \in \mathcal{S}$. Suppose that $f(\mathbb{D})$ contains the disk \mathbb{D}_ρ for some $\rho > 0$. Then $\mathbb{D}_\rho \subset f_a(\mathbb{D})$ for $a \in \mathbb{D}$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that $\mathbb{D}_{\rho r} \subset f(\mathbb{D}_r)$ for $0 < r < 1$. By assumption, $g(w) = f^{-1}(\rho w)$ is a univalent analytic function on \mathbb{D} with $|g(w)| < 1$ and $g(0) = 0$. Then the Schwarz lemma implies that $g(\mathbb{D}_r) \subset \mathbb{D}_r$, which in turn gives us $\mathbb{D}_{\rho r} \subset f(\mathbb{D}_r)$ as required. \square

By making use of the idea due to Styer and Wright [10], the following result can now be shown. For convenience of the reader, we reproduce the proof here in a somewhat simplified form.

Lemma 4.2. *Let ρ be a positive constant. Suppose that two functions $f, g \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfy the following two conditions:*

- (1) $f(\mathbb{D})$ and $g(\mathbb{D})$ both contain the disk \mathbb{D}_ρ , and
- (2) $|\operatorname{Im}[f(z)/z]| < \rho$ and $|\operatorname{Im}[g(z)/z]| < \rho$ on \mathbb{D} .

Then $(f + g)/2 \in \mathcal{S}^$.*

Proof. Put $h = f + g$. For starlikeness, we need to show that $\operatorname{Re}[zh'(z)/h(z)] > 0$ on \mathbb{D} . We will show that $\operatorname{Re}[zf'(z)/h(z)] > 0$. Since we can do the same for g , it will finish the proof.

Let $a \in \mathbb{D}$ with $a \neq 0$. Since $f'_a(1)/h_a(1) = af'(a)/h(a)$, it is enough to show the inequality $\operatorname{Re}[f'_a(1)/h_a(1)] \geq 0$. Denote by W the set $\{w : |w| \geq \rho, |\operatorname{Im} w| < \rho\}$. Then W consists of the two connected components W_+ and W_- , where $W_{\pm} = \{w \in W : \pm \operatorname{Re} w > 0\}$. By Lemma 4.1 and the relation $f_a(z)/z = f(az)/(az)$, the assumptions imply $f_a(1) \in W$. Since the (continuous) curve $t \mapsto f_{ta}(1)$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$, connects $f_a(1)$ with $f_0(1) = 1$, we see that $f_a(1) \in W_+$. Since we have $g_a(1) \in W_+$ in the same way and thus $-g_a(1) \in W_-$, the segment $[-g_a(1), f_a(1)]$ intersects the disk \mathbb{D}_ρ . Choose a point $w_0 \in [-g_a(1), f_a(1)] \cap \mathbb{D}_\rho$. Then the vector $f_a(1) - w_0$ is directed at the point $f_a(1)$ outward from the convex domain $f_a(\mathbb{D})$. Since the tangent vector of the curve $f_a(e^{i\theta})$ at $\theta = 0$ is given by $if'_a(1)$, we have

$$\arg[if'_a(1)] - \pi \leq \arg[f_a(1) - w_0] = \arg[f_a(1) + g_a(1)] \leq \arg[if'_a(1)],$$

which is equivalent to $|\arg[f'_a(1)/h_a(1)]| \leq \pi/2$. Thus we have shown the desired inequality $\operatorname{Re}[f'_a(1)/h_a(1)] \geq 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{K}(3/5)$. We will apply the last lemma to these two functions. Let $\rho = -k_{3/5}(-1) = 5(2^{1/5} - 1) = 0.743491\dots$. By Theorem 1.3, we have only to show that $M(3/5) \leq \rho$. We denote by $F(\theta)$ the function in the left-hand side in (3.1) for $c = \frac{3}{5} - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{10}$. A numerical computation gives us $F(0.11) = 0.0050\dots > 0$ and $F(0.114) = -0.0010\dots < 0$. Thus we have $0.11 < \theta_{3/5} < 0.114$. By (3.2), we have the expression $M(3/5) = 5G(\theta_{3/5})$, where

$$G(\theta) = \frac{\cos \theta}{c \cot(\theta/2) + (1-c) \cot(c\pi + (1-c)\theta)} - \sin \theta = \frac{\cos \theta}{H(\theta)} - \sin \theta.$$

We observe that $H(\theta)$ is positive and decreasing in $0 < \theta < \frac{1/2-c}{1-c}\pi = 4\pi/9$, because

$$H'(\theta) = -\frac{c}{2 \sin^2(\theta/2)} - \frac{(1-c)^2}{\sin^2(c\pi + (1-c)\theta)} < 0.$$

Also, we see that $-H'(\theta)$ is positive and decreasing in $0 < \theta < 4\pi/9$ by its form. Since

$$G'(\theta) = -\frac{\sin \theta}{H(\theta)} - \frac{H'(\theta) \cos \theta}{H(\theta)^2} - \cos \theta,$$

letting $\theta_0 = 0.11$ and $\theta_1 = 0.114$, we estimate on $\theta_0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_1$ in the form

$$G'(\theta) > -\frac{\sin \theta_1}{H(\theta_1)} - \frac{H'(\theta_1) \cos \theta_1}{H(\theta_0)^2} - \cos \theta_0 = 0.326\dots > 0.$$

Hence $G(\theta)$ is increasing in this interval so that

$$M(3/5) = 5G(\theta_{3/5}) < 5G(\theta_1) = 0.743487\dots < \rho.$$

The proof is now complete. \square

5. AN EXAMPLE

We conclude the present note by giving an example of an odd convex function $f \in \mathcal{K}$ such that

$$\frac{f(z)}{z} \not\prec H_2(z) = \frac{1}{2z} \log \frac{1+z}{1-z} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{D}.$$

The following result due to Alexander [1] (see also Goodman [3]) is useful for our aim here.

Lemma 5.1 (Alexander). *The function $f(z) = z + a_2z^2 + a_3z^3 + \dots$ is convex univalent on \mathbb{D} if*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 |a_n| \leq 1.$$

We also need the following auxiliary result which is a special case of Theorem 5 of Ruscheweyh [9] with $n = 1$.

Lemma 5.2 (Ruscheweyh). *The function*

$$q_\gamma(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma+j} z^j$$

belongs to \mathcal{K} for $\operatorname{Re} \gamma \geq 0$.

In particular, the function H_1 given in (1.2) is univalent because $H_1 = 1 + q_{1/2}/3$.

We now consider the function

$$f(z) = z + \frac{z^3}{100} + \frac{z^5}{50}.$$

Then, by Alexander's lemma, f is an odd convex function. Secondly, we observe that f has a non-zero fixed point z_0 in \mathbb{D} . Indeed, by solving the algebraic equation $f(z) = z$, we obtain $z_0 = \pm i/\sqrt{2}$.

We now show that $f(z)/z$ is not subordinate to $H_2(z)$ given in (1.1). Suppose, to the contrary, that

$$\frac{f(z)}{z} \prec H_2(z) = \frac{1}{2z} \log \frac{1+z}{1-z}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Then there exists an analytic function ω on \mathbb{D} with $\omega(0) = 0$ and $|\omega| < 1$ such that

$$\frac{f(z)}{z} = H_2(\omega(z)) = H_1(\omega(z)^2).$$

Thus

$$\frac{zf'(z) - f(z)}{z^2} = 2\omega(z)\omega'(z)H_1'(\omega(z)^2).$$

Since $f(z_0) = z_0$, we have $H_1(\omega(z_0)^2) = 1 = H_1(0)$. Univalence of H_1 enforces the relation $\omega(z_0) = 0$ to hold. Hence, $z_0 f'(z_0) - f(z_0) = 0$ which is equivalent to $f'(z_0) = 1$. By solving the equation $f'(z) = 1$, we obtain $z_0 = \pm i\sqrt{3/10}$. This is a contradiction. Therefore, $f(z)/z$ is not subordinate to $H_2(z)$.

REFERENCES

1. J. W. Alexander, *Functions which map the interior of the unit circle upon simple regions*, Ann. of Math. **17** (1915), 12–22.
2. L. Brickman, D. J. Hallenbeck, T. H. MacGregor, and D. R. Wilken, *Convex hulls and extreme points of families of starlike and convex mappings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **185** (1973), 413–428.
3. A. W. Goodman, *Univalent functions and nonanalytic curves*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **8** (1957), 598–601.
4. D. J. Hallenbeck and St. Ruscheweyh, *Subordination by convex functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **52** (1975), 191–195.
5. R. Küstner, *Mapping properties of hypergeometric functions and convolutions of starlike or convex functions of order α* , Comput. Methods Funct. Theory **2** (2002), 597–610.
6. R. Küstner, *On the order of starlikeness of the shifted Gauss hypergeometric function*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **334** (2007), 1363–1385.
7. B. Pinchuk, *On starlike and convex functions of order α* , Duke Math. J. **35** (1968), 721–734.
8. M. S. Robertson, *On the theory of univalent functions*, Ann. of Math. **37** (1936), 374–408.
9. St. Ruscheweyh, *New criteria for univalent functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **49** (1975), 109–115.
10. D. Styer and D. Wright, *On the valence of the sum of two convex functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **37** (1973), 511–516.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF INFORMATION SCIENCES, TOHOKU UNIVERSITY, AOBA-KU, SENDAI 980-8579, JAPAN

E-mail address: sugawa@math.is.tohoku.ac.jp

SCHOOL OF STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS, NO. 10, HUIXIN DONGJIE, CHAOYANG DISTRICT, BEIJING 100029, CHINA

E-mail address: wangmabel@163.com