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## 1. Introduction

Let $\mathscr{A}_{p}(p \in \mathbb{N}=\{1,2,3, \ldots\})$ be the class of functions $f(z)$ of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=z^{p}+\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_{p+m} z^{p+m} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

which are analytic in the open unit disk $\Delta:=\{z:|z|<1\}$.
Let $D$ be the class of functions $p(z)$ of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
p(z)=1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} p_{n} z^{n} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

which are analytic in $\Delta$. If $p(z) \in P$ satisfies $\mathfrak{R p}(z)>0(z \in \Delta)$, then we say that $p(z)$ is a Carathéodory function.

With a view to recalling the principle of subordination between analytic functions, let the functions $f$ and $g$ be analytic in $\Delta$. Then we say that the function $f$ is subordinate to $g$ if there exists a Schwarz function $w(z)$, analytic in $\Delta$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
w(0)=0, \quad|w(z)|<1 \quad(z \in \Delta) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=g(w(z)) \quad(z \in \Delta) \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We denote this subordination by

$$
\begin{equation*}
f \prec g, \quad f(z) \prec g(z) \quad(z \in \Delta) \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, if the function $g$ is univalent in $\Delta$, the above subordination is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(0)=g(0) \quad \text { or } \quad f(\Delta) \subset g(\Delta) \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $-1 \leq b<a \leq 1$ and $0<\gamma \leq 1$, a function $f \in \mathcal{A}_{p}$ is said to be in the class $S_{p}^{*}(\gamma, a, b)$ if it satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \prec p\left(\frac{1+a z}{1+b z}\right)^{\gamma} \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Also, we write $S_{p}^{*}(\gamma, 1,-1)=S S_{p}^{*}(\gamma)$, the class of strongly starlike $p$-valent functions of order $\gamma$ in $\Delta . S_{p}^{*}(1, a, b)=S_{p}^{*}(a, b)$, the class of Janowski starlike $p$-valent function, $S_{p}^{*}(1,-1)=S_{p}^{*}$, the class of $p$-valent starlike function, and $S_{p}^{*}(1-2 \gamma, 1)=S_{p}^{*}(\gamma)(0 \leq \gamma<1)$, the class of $p$-valent starlike function of order $\gamma$.

For Carathéodory functions, Miller [1] obtained certain sufficient conditions applying the differential inequalities. Recently, Nunokawa et al. [2] have given some improvement of result by Miller [1]. Recently Ravichandran and Jayamala [3] studied some subordination results for Carathéodory functions. In this paper by extending the result of Ravichandran and Jayamala [3], we find sufficient conditions for the subordination $p(z) \prec q(z)$ to hold for given $q(z)$ and criteria for $p$-valent starlikeness. Our results include results obtained by Nunokawa et al. [2]. We also give some criteria for $p$-valently starlikeness and strong starlikeness.

To prove our result we need the following lemma due to Miller and Mocanu [4].
Lemma 1.1 (see [4, Theorem 3.4h, page 132]). Let $q(z)$ be analytic and univalent in the unit disk $\Delta$ and $\theta(\omega)$ and let $\phi(\omega)$ be analytic in a domain $D$ containing $q(\Delta)$ with $\phi(w) \neq 0$ when $w \in q(\Delta)$. Set

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q(z)=z q^{\prime}(z) \phi(q(z)), \quad h(z)=\theta(q(z))+Q(z) \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

## Suppose that

(i) $Q(z)$ is starlike univalent in $\Delta$,
(ii) $\mathfrak{R}\left\{z h^{\prime}(z) / Q(z)\right\}=\mathfrak{R}\left\{\theta^{\prime}(q(z)) / \phi(q(z))+z Q^{\prime}(z) / Q(z)\right\}>0$ for $z \in \Delta$.

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
\theta(p(z))+z p^{\prime}(z) \phi(p(z))<\theta(q(z))+z q^{\prime}(z) \phi(q(z)) \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

## 2. Application of Differential Subordination

By making use of Lemma 1.1, we first prove the following theorem.
Theorem 2.1. Let $0 \neq \alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\lambda$ be a positive real number. Let $q(z)$ be convex univalent in $\Delta$ and $\mathfrak{R}\left((1-\alpha) \backslash \alpha+m(q(z))^{m-1}\right)>0, m \in \mathbb{N} \backslash\{1\}$. If $p \in D$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
(1-\alpha) p(z)+\alpha(p(z))^{m}+\alpha \lambda z p^{\prime}(z)<h(z) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(z)=(1-\alpha) q(z)+\alpha(q(z))^{m}+\alpha \lambda z q^{\prime}(z) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
p(z) \prec q(z) \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $q(z)$ is the best dominant of (2.1).
Proof. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\theta(w)=(1-\alpha) w+\alpha w^{m}, \quad \phi(w)=\alpha \lambda \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then clearly $\theta(w)$ and $\phi(w)$ are analytic in $\mathbb{C}$ and $\phi(w) \neq 0$. Also let

$$
\begin{align*}
Q(z) & =z q^{\prime}(z) \phi(q(z))=\alpha \lambda z q^{\prime}(z) \\
h(z) & =\theta(q(z))+Q(z)  \tag{2.5}\\
& =(1-\alpha) q(z)+\alpha(q(z))^{m}+\alpha \lambda z q^{\prime}(z)
\end{align*}
$$

Since $q(z)$ is convex univalent, $z q^{\prime}(z)$ is starlike univalent. Therefore $Q(z)$ is starlike univalent in $\Delta$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Re\left(\frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{Q(z)}\right)=\frac{1}{\ell} \Re\left\{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}+m(q(z))^{m-1}+\lambda\left(1+\frac{z q^{\prime \prime}(z)}{q^{\prime}(z)}\right)\right\}>0 \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $z \in \Delta$.
From (2.1)-(2.6) we see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\theta(p(z))+z p^{\prime}(z) \phi(p(z))<\theta(q(z))+z q^{\prime}(z) \phi(q(z))=h(z) \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, by applying Lemma 1.1, we conclude that $p(z)<q(z)$ and $q(z)$ is the best dominant of (2.1). The proof of the theorem is complete.

By taking $\alpha$ as real and $q(z)=((1+a z) /(1+b z))^{\gamma}$ in Theorem 2.1, we get the following corollary.

Corollary 2.2. Let $-1 \leq b<a \leq 1, m \in \mathbb{N} \backslash\{1\}, 0<\gamma \leq 1 /(m-1)$, $\lambda$ be real number such that $\lambda>0$ and $0<\alpha \leq 1$. If $p \in D$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
(1-\alpha) p(z)+\alpha(p(z))^{m}+\alpha \lambda z p^{\prime}(z)<h(z) \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(z)=(1-\alpha)\left(\frac{1+a z}{1+b z}\right)^{\gamma}+\alpha\left(\frac{1+a z}{1+b z}\right)^{m \gamma}+\frac{\alpha \lambda \gamma(a-b) z}{(1+a z)^{1-\gamma}(1+b z)^{1+\gamma}} \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
p(z)<\left(\frac{1+a z}{1+b z}\right)^{\gamma}, \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $((1+a z) /(1+b z))^{\gamma}$ is the best dominant of (2.8).
Corollary 2.3. Let $-1 \leq b<a \leq 1, \lambda>0$. If $f \in \mathcal{A}_{p}$ satisfies $f(z) \neq 0$ in $0<|z|<1$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{p f(z)}\left[1-\alpha+\frac{\alpha}{p}(1-\lambda p) \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}+\alpha \lambda\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right)\right] \prec h(z) \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(z)=(1-\alpha)\left(\frac{1+a z}{1+b z}\right)^{\gamma}+\alpha\left(\frac{1+a z}{1+b z}\right)^{2 \gamma}+\frac{\alpha \lambda \gamma(a-b) z}{(1+a z)^{1-\gamma}(1+b z)^{1+\gamma}} \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{p f(z)}<\left(\frac{1+a z}{1+b z}\right)^{\gamma} \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $p(z)=z f^{\prime}(z) / p f(z)$, then $p \in D$ and (2.11) can be written as

$$
\begin{align*}
& (1-\alpha) p(z)+\alpha p^{2}(z)+\alpha \lambda z p^{\prime}(z) \\
& \quad<(1-\alpha)\left(\frac{1+a z}{1+b z}\right)^{\gamma}+\alpha\left(\frac{1+a z}{1+b z}\right)^{2 \gamma}+\frac{\alpha \lambda \gamma(a-b) z}{(1+a z)^{1-\gamma}(1+b z)^{1+\gamma}} \tag{2.14}
\end{align*}
$$

Taking $m=2$ in Corollary 2.2 and using (2.14), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{p f(z)}<\left(\frac{1+a z}{1+b z}\right)^{\gamma} . \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

By taking $p=\lambda=\gamma=a=1$ and $b=-1$ in Corollary 2.3, we get the following result of Padmanabhan [5].

Corollary 2.4. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}+\alpha \frac{z^{2} f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)} \prec \frac{2 \alpha\left(z^{2}+2 z\right)+1-z^{2}}{(1-z)^{2}} \quad(0<\alpha \leq 1) \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{R}\left(\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right)>0 \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Theorem 2.5. Let $\alpha, \beta, \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\eta \neq 0$. Let $q(z)$ be convex univalent in $\Delta$ and satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{R}\left[\frac{1}{\eta}(\beta+2 \xi q(z))\right]>0 \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $p \in D$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha+\beta p(z)+\xi p^{2}(z)+\eta z p^{\prime}(z)<\alpha+\beta q(z)+\xi q^{2}(z)+\eta z q^{\prime}(z)=h(z) \tag{2.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
p(z) \prec q(z), \tag{2.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $q(z)$ is the best dominant of (2.19)
Proof. By setting $\theta(w):=\alpha+\beta w+\xi w^{2}$ and $\phi(w):=\eta$ it can be easily observed that $\theta(w)$ and $\phi(w)$ are analytic in $\mathbb{C}$ and that $\phi(w) \neq 0(w \in \mathbb{C} \backslash\{0\})$.

Also, by letting

$$
\begin{align*}
Q(z) & =z q^{\prime}(z) \phi(q(z))=\eta z q^{\prime}(z), \\
h(z) & =\theta(q(z))+Q(z)  \tag{2.21}\\
& =\alpha+\beta q(z)+\xi q^{2}(z)+\eta z q^{\prime}(z),
\end{align*}
$$

we find that $Q(z)$ is starlike univalent in $\Delta$ and that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Re\left(\frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{Q(z)}\right)=\Re\left[\frac{1}{\eta}(\beta+2 \xi q(z))+\left(1+\frac{z q^{\prime \prime}(z)}{q^{\prime}(z)}\right)\right]>0 . \tag{2.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

The differential subordination

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha+\beta p(z)+\xi p^{2}(z)+\eta z p^{\prime}(z)<\alpha+\beta q(z)+\xi q^{2}(z)+\eta z q^{\prime}(z) \tag{2.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\theta(p(z))+z p^{\prime}(z) \phi(p(z))<\theta(q(z))+z q^{\prime}(z) \phi(q(z)) \tag{2.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, the result follows as an application of Lemma 1.1.
Theorem 2.6. Let $\alpha, \beta, \xi, \eta$, and $\delta$ be complex numbers, $\delta \neq 0$. Let $0 \neq q(z)$ be univalent in $\Delta$ and satisfy the following conditions for $z \in \Delta$ :
(1) let $Q(z)=\delta z q^{\prime}(z) / q(z)$ be starlike,
(2) $\Re\left\{(\beta / \delta) q(z)+(2 \xi / \delta) q^{2}(z)-(\eta / \delta q(z))+z Q^{\prime}(z) / Q(z)\right\}>0$.

If $p \in D$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha+\beta p(z)+\xi(p(z))^{2}+\frac{\eta}{p(z)}+\delta \frac{z p^{\prime}(z)}{p(z)}<\alpha+\beta q(z)+\xi(q(z))^{2}+\frac{\eta}{q(z)}+\delta \frac{z q^{\prime}(z)}{q(z)} \tag{2.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
p(z)<q(z), \tag{2.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $q(z)$ is the best dominant.
Proof. The proof of this theorem is much akin to the proof of Theorem 2.5 and hence can be omitted.

Remark 2.7. By taking $\alpha=\beta=0, \xi=(\lambda / \mu) \mu>0, \lambda>-\mu / 2, \eta=1$, and $q(z)=(1+z) /(1-z)$ in Theorem 2.5 we get the result of Nunokawa et al. [2] which was proved by a different method.

Remark 2.8. For the choices of $\alpha=\beta=0$ in Theorem 2.5, we get the result of [3, Theorem 1, page 192] and for $\alpha=\xi=\eta=0$ in Theorem 2.6 we get the result of [3, Theorem 2, page 194].

Corollary 2.9. Let $-1 \leq b<a \leq 1,0<\gamma \leq 1$ and $\lambda>0$. If $f \in \mathcal{A}_{p}$ satisfies $f(z) f^{\prime}(z) \neq 0$ in $0<|z|<1$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
(1-\lambda) \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}+\lambda\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right) \prec p\left(\frac{1+a z}{1+b z}\right)^{\gamma}+\frac{\lambda \gamma(a-b) z}{(1+a z)(1+b z)} \tag{2.27}
\end{equation*}
$$

implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
f \in S_{p}^{*}(\gamma, a, b) \tag{2.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

Also,

$$
\begin{equation*}
1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \prec \frac{r(a-b) z}{(1+a z)(1+b z)} \tag{2.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
f \in S_{p}^{*}(\gamma, a, b) \tag{2.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. By taking $\alpha=\xi=\eta=0, \beta=p / \lambda, \delta=1, p(z)=z f^{\prime}(z) / p f(z)$, and $q(z)=$ $((1+a z) /(1+b z))^{\gamma}$ in Theorem 2.6, we get the first part.

Proof of the second part follows, by setting $\alpha=\beta=\xi=\eta=0, \delta=1, p(z)=$ $z f^{\prime}(z) / p f(z)$, and $q(z)=((1+a z) /(1+b z))^{\gamma}$.

For $\alpha=\xi=0, \beta=1, p(z)=z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)$, and $q(z)=(1+a z) /(1-z),-1<a \leq 1$ in Theorem 2.5, we have the following result.

Corollary 2.10. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies $f(z) \neq 0, z \in \Delta$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\left[\left(1-\eta \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right)+\eta\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right)\right] \prec h(z) \tag{2.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(z)=\frac{1+a z}{1-z}+\eta \frac{(1+a) z}{(1-z)^{2}} \tag{2.32}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \prec \frac{1+a z}{1-z} \tag{2.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

One notes that if $h(z)=u+i v$, then $h(\Delta)$ is the exterior of the parabola given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
v^{2}=-\frac{(1+a)}{\eta}\left[u-\frac{2-2 a-\eta(1+a)}{4}\right] \tag{2.34}
\end{equation*}
$$

with its vertex as $((2-2 a-\eta(1+a) / 4), 0)$ (see $[5,6])$.
By taking $\eta=a=1$ in Corollary 2.10, we obtain the following.
Corollary 2.11. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies $f(z) \neq 0, z \in \Delta$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\left[2-\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right] \prec \frac{1+2 z-z^{2}}{(1-z)^{2}} \tag{2.35}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}<\frac{1+z}{1-z} \tag{2.36}
\end{equation*}
$$

Region $h(\Delta)$ has been shown shaded in Figure 1.


$$
(\eta=A=1)
$$

Figure 1: $\eta=a=1$.

Letting $\alpha=\beta=0, \xi=\eta=1, p(z)=z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)$, and $q(z)=(1+(1-2 \gamma) z) /(1-z)$ in Theorem 2.5, we get the following.

Corollary 2.12. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies $f(z) \neq 0,0<|z|<1$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right) \prec h(z) \tag{2.37}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(z)=\frac{(1-2 \gamma)^{2} z^{2}+2(2-3 \gamma) z+1}{(1-z)^{2}} \tag{2.38}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $\gamma(0 \leq \gamma<1)$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Re\left(\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right)>\gamma \tag{2.39}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the univalent function $h(z)$ given by (2.38), One now finds the image $h(\Delta)$ of the unit disk $\Delta$.

Let $h=u+i v$, where $u$ and $v$ are real. One has

$$
\begin{gather*}
u=-\frac{(2-3 \gamma)+\left(1+2 \gamma^{2}-2 \gamma\right) \cos \theta}{(1-\cos \theta)}  \tag{2.40}\\
v=\frac{2 \gamma(1-\gamma) \sin \theta}{1-\cos \theta}
\end{gather*}
$$

Elimination of $\theta$ yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
v^{2}=-\frac{8 \gamma^{2}(1-\gamma)}{3-2 \gamma}\left[u-\frac{2 \gamma^{2}+\gamma-1}{2}\right] \tag{2.41}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, one concludes that

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(\Delta)=\left\{w=u+i v ; v^{2}>-\frac{8 \gamma^{2}(1-\gamma)}{3-2 \gamma}\left[u-\frac{2 \gamma^{2}+\gamma-1}{2}\right]\right\} \tag{2.42}
\end{equation*}
$$

which properly contains the half plane $\mathfrak{R w}>\left(2 \gamma^{2}+\gamma-1\right) / 2$.
Corollary 2.13. Let $-1 \leq b<a \leq 1$ and $\mathfrak{R} \beta \geq 0$. If $f \in \mathcal{A}_{p}$ satisfies $f^{\prime}(z) \neq 0$ in $0<|z|<1$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
(1-\beta) \frac{f(z)}{z f^{\prime}(z)}+\frac{f(z) f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{\left(f^{\prime}(z)\right)^{2}}<h(z) \tag{2.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(z)=\frac{b(p b-\beta a) z^{2}+((2 p+1-\beta) b-(1+\beta) a) z+p-\beta}{p(1+b z)^{2}}, \tag{2.44}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
f \in S_{p}^{*}(b, a) \tag{2.45}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. If we let $p(z)=p f(z) / z f^{\prime}(z)$, then $p \in P$ and (2.43) can be expressed as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta p(z)+z p^{\prime}(z)<\beta\left(\frac{1+a z}{1+b z}\right)+\frac{(a-b) z}{(1+b z)^{2}} \tag{2.46}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence, by taking $\alpha=\xi=0, \eta=1, q(z)=(1+a z) /(1+b z)$ and $\Re \beta \geq 0$ in Theorem 2.5, we have $p(z)<(1+a z) /(1+b z)$. So, $f(z) \in S_{p}^{*}(b, a)$.

Setting $p=1$ and $b=-1$ in Corollary 2.13, we get the following corollay.

Corollary 2.14. Let $-1<a \leq 1$ and $\mathfrak{R} \beta \geq 0$. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies $f^{\prime}(z) \neq 0$ in $0<|z|<1$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
(1-\beta) \frac{f(z)}{z f(z)}+\frac{f(z) f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{\left(f^{\prime}(z)\right)^{2}}<h(z) \tag{2.47}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(z)=\frac{(1+\beta a) z^{2}+((\beta-3)-(1+\beta) a) z+1-\beta}{(1-z)^{2}} \tag{2.48}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{f(z)}{z f^{\prime}(z)}<\frac{1+a z}{1-z} \tag{2.49}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 2.15. For the function $h(z)$ given by (2.48), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(\Delta)=\left\{w=u+i v ; v^{2}>a_{0}\left[u-b_{0}\right]\right\} \tag{2.50}
\end{equation*}
$$

which properly contains the half plane $\mathfrak{R z w}>b_{0}$, where

$$
\begin{gather*}
a_{0}=(1+a) \beta^{2} \\
b_{0}=\frac{5+a+2 \beta(a-1)}{4} . \tag{2.51}
\end{gather*}
$$

By putting $p=a=\beta=1$ and $b=-1$ in Corollary 2.13, we get the following result of Tuneski [7].

Corollary 2.16. If $f(z) \in \mathcal{A}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{f(z) f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{\left(f^{\prime}(z)\right)^{2}} \prec \frac{2 z(z-2)}{(1-z)^{2}} \tag{2.52}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{R}\left(\frac{f(z)}{z f^{\prime}(z)}\right)>0 \tag{2.53}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 2.17. By putting $0=b<a \leq 1, p=1$, and $\beta=0$ in Corollary 2.13, we get the result obtained by Singh [8], which refines the result of Silverman [9].

Corollary 2.18. Let $0 \neq \eta$ and $q(z)$ be convex univalent in $\Delta$ with $q(0)=1$ and satisfy (2.18). Let $f \in \mathcal{A}_{p}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi(z):=\alpha+\frac{\beta}{p}\left(\frac{f(z)}{z^{p}}\right)^{\mu}+\frac{\xi}{p^{2}}\left(\frac{f(z)}{z^{p}}\right)^{2 \mu}+\eta \mu\left(\frac{f(z)}{z^{p}}\right)^{\mu}\left[\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{p f(z)}-1\right] . \tag{2.54}
\end{equation*}
$$

If

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi(z)<\alpha+\beta q(z)+\xi q^{2}(z)+\eta z q^{\prime}(z) \tag{2.55}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{p}\left(\frac{f(z)}{z^{p}}\right)^{\mu} \prec q(z) \tag{2.56}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $q(z)$ is the best dominant.
Proof. By taking $p(z)=(1 / p)\left(f(z) / z^{p}\right)^{\mu}$ in Theorem 2.5, we have the above corollary.
Corollary 2.19. Let $0 \neq \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $q(z)$ be convex univalent in $\Delta$ with $q(0)=1$ and satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{R}\left(\frac{\mu}{\lambda}\right)>0 . \tag{2.57}
\end{equation*}
$$

(i) If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
(1-\lambda)\left(\frac{f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu}+\lambda f^{\prime}(z)\left(\frac{f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu-1}<q(z)+\frac{\lambda}{\mu} z q^{\prime}(z) \tag{2.58}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu} \prec q(z) \tag{2.59}
\end{equation*}
$$

(ii) If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime}(z)\left(\frac{f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu-1}-\left(\frac{f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu} \prec \frac{1}{\mu} z q^{\prime}(z) \tag{2.60}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu} \prec q(z) \tag{2.61}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

Proof. Proof of the first part follows from Corollary 2.18, by taking $\beta=p=1, \alpha=\xi=0$, and $\eta=\lambda / \mu$.

The proof of the second part follows from Corollary 2.18, by taking $\alpha=\beta=\xi=0, p=1$, and $\eta=1 / \mu$.

By taking $\lambda=\mu=n$ where $n$ is a positive integer and $q(z)=A+(1-A)[-1-(2 / z) \log (1-$ $z)]$ in the first part of Corollary 2.19, we get the following result of Ponnusamy [10].

Corollary 2.20. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$, then for a positive integer $n$, one has that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{R}\left\{(1-n)\left(\frac{f(z)}{z}\right)^{n}+n f^{\prime}(z)\left(\frac{f(z)}{z}\right)^{n-1}\right\}>\beta \tag{2.62}
\end{equation*}
$$

implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{f(z)}{z}\right)^{n} \prec A+(1-A)\left(-1-\frac{2}{z} \log (1-z)\right) \tag{2.63}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $A+(1-A)[-1-(2 / z) \log (1-z)]$ is the best dominant.
Remark 2.21. By taking $\mu=1$ and $q(z)=1+(A /(1+\delta)) z$ in Corollary 2.19 and $\mu=\lambda=1$ and $q(z)=A / B+(1-A / B)(\log (1+B z) / B z)$ we get the result of Ponnusamy and Juneja [11].

By taking $\beta=\xi=\eta=0, \alpha=p=1, \delta=1 / \mu, p(z)=(1 / p)\left(f(z) / z^{p}\right)^{\mu}$, and $q(z)=e^{\mu A z}$ in Theorem 2.5, we get the following result obtained by Owa and Obradović [12].

Corollary 2.22. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}<1+A z \tag{2.64}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu} \prec e^{\mu A z} \tag{2.65}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $e^{\mu A z}$ is the best dominant.
We remark here that $q(z)=e^{\mu A z}$ is univalent if and only if $|\mu A|<\pi$.
Remark 2.23. For a special case when $p(z)=(1 / p)\left(f(z) / z^{p}\right)^{\mu}, q(z)=1 /(1-z)^{2 b}$ where $b \in$ $\mathbb{C} \backslash\{0\}$ and $\beta=\xi=\eta=0, \alpha=\mu=p=1$, and $\delta=1 / b$ in Theorem 2.6, we have the result obtained by Srivastava and Lashin [13].

Corollary 2.24. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
(1+\lambda)\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\mu}-\lambda f^{\prime}(z)\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\mu+1}<q(z)+\frac{\lambda}{\mu} z q^{\prime}(z) \tag{2.66}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\mu} \prec q(z) \tag{2.67}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $q$ is the best dominant.
Proof. By taking $p(z)=(1 / p)\left(z^{p} / f(z)\right)^{\mu}$ and $\alpha=\xi=0, \beta=p=1$ and $\eta=\lambda / \mu$ in Theorem 2.5, we get the previous corollary.
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