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#### Abstract

Denote by $A$ the class of functions $f(z)$ analytic in the unit disk $D$ and normalised so that $f(0)=f^{\prime}(0)-1=0$. For $f(z) \in A$, let $F(z)=\int_{0}^{z}[f(t) / t] d t$ for $z \in D$. We find estimate on $\beta$ so that $\operatorname{Re} f^{\prime}(z)>-\beta$ will ensure the starlikeness of $F(z)$. Our conclusion improves the well-known results.


1. Introduction. Denote by $A$ the class of functions $f(z)$ which are analytic in the unit disc $D=\{z:|z|<1\}$ and normalised so that $f(0)$ $=f^{\prime}(0)-1=0$. Let $R_{\alpha}$ be the subclass of $A$ satisfying $\operatorname{Re} f^{\prime}(z)>\alpha$ for $z \in D$ and $S^{*}$ be the subset of starlike functions, i. e.

$$
S^{*}=\left\{f(z) \in A: \operatorname{Re}\left[z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)\right]>0 \text { for } z \in D\right\}
$$

For $f(z) \in A$, let

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(z)=\int_{0}^{z}[f(t) / t] d t \quad z \in D \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

This integral operator was first introduced by J. W. Alexander. In paper [1], R. Singh and S . Singh showed that if $f(z) \in R_{0}$, then $\operatorname{Re}[F(z) / z]>1 / 2$ $(z \in D)$, and if $\operatorname{Re} f^{\prime}(z)>-1 / 4$, then $F(z) \in S^{*}$. Recently M. Nunokawa and D. K. Thomas [2] improved the second result by showing that if $\operatorname{Re} f^{\prime}(z)>-0.262$, then $F(z) \in S^{*}$.

In this paper we will improve both two conclusions.
2. Results and proofs. In proving our results, we need the following lemmas.

Lemma 1 ([3]). Let $f(z)$ be analytic and $g(z)$ convex in $D$ (that is, in $D, g(z)$ satisfies $\left.\operatorname{Re}\left[1+z g^{\prime \prime}(z) / g^{\prime}(z)\right]>0\right)$. If $f(z) \prec g(z)(z \in D)$, then we have

$$
z^{-1} \int_{0}^{z} f(t) d t \prec z^{-1} \int_{0}^{z} g(t) d t
$$

where " $<$ " denotes the subordination.
Lemma $2([4])$. If $g(z) \in K$ - the normalised class of convex functions, then

$$
G(z)=\frac{2}{z} \int_{0}^{z} g(t) d t \in K
$$

Lemma 3 ([5]). Let $w(z)$ be a non-constant regular function in $D, w(0)=0$. If $|w(z)|$ attains its maximum value on the circle $|z|=$ $r<1$ at $z_{0}$, then we have $z_{0} w^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=k w\left(z_{0}\right)$, where $k$ is a real number,
$k \geqslant 1$.
Theorem 1. Let $f(z) \in R_{\alpha}$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1. Let } f(z) \in R_{\alpha} \text {, then } \\
& \operatorname{Re}[F(z) / z]>2 \alpha-1+(1-\alpha) \frac{\pi^{2}}{6} \quad(z \in D),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $F(z)$ is defined by (1).
Proof. From the definition of $F(z)$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
F^{\prime}(z)+z F^{\prime \prime}(z)=f^{\prime}(z) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $f(z) \in R_{\alpha}$, we have

$$
F^{\prime}(z)+z F^{\prime \prime}(z)=f^{\prime}(z)<\frac{1+(1-2 \alpha) z}{1-z}=p_{\alpha}(z) \quad(z \in D)
$$

It is easy to know $p_{\alpha}(z)$ is convex in $D$, so using Lemma 1 , we get
that is,

$$
z^{-1} \int_{0}^{z}\left[F^{\prime}(t)+t F^{\prime \prime}(t)\right] d t \prec z^{-1} \int_{0}^{z} p_{\alpha}(t) d t
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
F^{\prime}(z) \prec 2 \alpha-1-\frac{2(1-\alpha)}{z} \log (1-z)=\varphi_{1}(z) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easy to know that if $f(z) \prec g(z)$, then $a f+b \prec a g+b(a, b$ are constants and $a \neq 0$ ) too, and if $f$ is convex in $D$, then $a f+b$ ( $a, b$ are constants and $a \neq 0$ ) is convex in $D$ too. So from Lemma 2, we know that $\varphi_{1}(z)$ is convex in $D$. Applying Lemma 1 to (3), we obtain

So we have

$$
F(z) / z \prec z^{-1} \int_{0}^{z} \varphi_{1}(t) d t=\varphi_{2}(z)
$$

$$
\operatorname{Re}[F(z) / z]>\min \operatorname{Re}\left[\varphi_{2}(z)\right] \quad(|z| \leqslant r)
$$ As indicated above, $\varphi_{2}(z)$ is convex in $D$, and it is easy to check that $\varphi_{2}(\bar{z})$

$=\overline{\varphi_{2}(z)}$, so $\varphi_{2}(z)$ maps $|z| \leqslant r$ onto a convex region which is symmetric with respect to the real axis. Comparing $\varphi_{2}(r)$ and $\varphi_{2}(-r)$ we know

$$
\min _{|z| \leqslant r} \operatorname{Re}\left[\varphi_{2}(z)\right]=\varphi_{2}(-r)=\frac{1}{r} \int_{0}^{r}\left[2 \alpha-1+\frac{2(1-\alpha)}{t} \log (1+t)\right] d t
$$

Similarly $\varphi_{2}(z)$ maps $D$ onto a convex region which is symmetric with respect to the real axis, so we get

$$
\operatorname{Re}[F(z) / z]>\int_{0}^{1}\left[2 \alpha-1+\frac{2(1-\alpha)}{t} \log (1+t)\right] d t \quad(z \in D)
$$

Expanding the integrand into Taylor series about $t$ and integrating it, we can obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Re}[F(z) / z] & >2 \alpha-1+2(1-\alpha) \cdot \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(-1)^{n-1} \frac{1}{n^{2}} \\
& =2 \alpha-1+(1-\alpha) \cdot \frac{\pi^{2}}{6}
\end{aligned}
$$

The proof of the theorem is completed.
If we let $\alpha=0$, we have the following corollary.
Corollary 1. Let $f(z) \in R_{0}$, then

$$
\operatorname{Re}[F(z) / z]>\frac{\pi^{2}}{6}-1=0.6449 \cdots \quad(z \in D)
$$

The constant $\frac{\pi^{2}}{6}-1$ cannot be replaced by any larger one.

The second assertion can be seen from the function:

$$
f(z)=-z-2 \log (1-z) \in R_{0}
$$

Remark. This corollary improves and sharpens the corresponding result of R. Singh and S. Singh [1].

Theorem 2. Suppose that $f(z) \in A$ and $F(z)$ is given by (1). If $\operatorname{Re} f^{\prime}(z)$ $>-\beta=\frac{6-\pi^{2}}{24-\pi^{2}}=0.2738 \cdots(z \in D)$, then $F(z) \in S^{*}$.

Proof. First we prove that if $f(z)$ satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem, then we have $\operatorname{Re} F^{\prime}(z)>0(z \in D)$, thus $F(z)$ is univalent in $D$. In fact, from the condition and the definition of $F(z)$ we have

$$
\frac{F^{\prime}(z)+z F^{\prime \prime}(z)+\beta}{1+\beta}=\frac{f^{\prime}(z)+\beta}{1+\beta} \prec \frac{1+z}{1-z},
$$

using Lemma 1 we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
F^{\prime}(z) \prec(1+\beta)\left[-1-\frac{2}{z} \log (1-z)\right]-\beta \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

So

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Re} F^{\prime}(z) & >(1+\beta) \inf _{|z|<1} \operatorname{Re}\left[-1-\frac{2}{z} \log (1-z)\right]-\beta \\
& =(1+\beta)(-1+2 \log 2)-\beta>0 \quad(z \in D)
\end{aligned}
$$

Second we estimate the lower bound of $\operatorname{Re}[F(z) / z]$. Since the function on the right-hand side of (4) is convex, using Lemma 1 again we get

$$
F(z) / z \prec(1+\beta) \frac{1}{z} \int_{0}^{z}\left[-1-\frac{2}{t} \log (1-t)\right] d t-\beta,
$$

thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}[F(z) / z]>(1+\beta)\left(\frac{\pi^{2}}{6}-1\right)-\beta=2 \beta(z \in D) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we can prove $F(z) \in S^{*}$. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[z F^{\prime}(z)\right] / F(z)=[1+w(z)] /[1-w(z)] \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $F(z)$ is univalent in $D, w(z)$ defined in (6) is analytic in $D$ and $w(0)=0, w(z) \neq 1$. From (6) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
F^{\prime}(z)+z F^{\prime \prime}(z)=\frac{F(z)}{z}\left[\left(\frac{1+w(z)}{1-w(z)}\right)^{2}+\frac{2 z w^{\prime}(z)}{(1-w(z))^{2}}\right] \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

We can claim that $|w(z)|<1$ in $D$. In fact, if not, there exists a point $z_{0} \in D$ such that $\max _{|z| \leqslant\left|z_{0}\right|}|w(z)|=\left|w\left(z_{0}\right)\right|=1$, then from Lemma 3 we have $z_{0} w^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=k w\left(z_{0}\right)=k e^{i \theta}$ for $0<\theta<2 \pi$ where $k \geqslant 1$. With $z=z_{0}$, it follows from (7) that

$$
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{Re}\left[F^{\prime}(z)+z F^{\prime \prime}(z)\right] & =\operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{F\left(z_{0}\right)}{z_{0}}\left[\left(\frac{1+e^{i \theta}}{1-e^{i \theta}}\right)^{2}+\frac{2 k e^{i \theta}}{\left(1-e^{i \theta}\right)^{2}}\right]\right\}  \tag{8}\\
& =-\frac{1+\cos \theta+k}{1-\cos \theta} \operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{F\left(z_{0}\right)}{z_{0}}\right\} \\
& \leq-\beta
\end{align*}
$$

where we used the inequality (5). From the definition of $F(z)$ and (8) we have $\operatorname{Re} f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right) \leq-\beta$, which contradicts our hypothesis, so we have $|w(z)|$ $<1$ in $D$. Hence from (6) we know $\operatorname{Re}\left[z F^{\prime}(z) / F(z)\right]>0(z \in D)$, which
means $F(z) \in S^{*}$.
Remark. For $\beta=0.2738 \cdots>0.262>1 / 4$, so Theorem 2 is the improvement of the corresponding results obtained by [1] and [2].

Corollary 2. Let $g(z) \in A$ and $G(z)$ be defined by $z G^{\prime}(z)=\int_{0}^{z}[g(t)$ $/ t] d t$. If $\operatorname{Reg}^{\prime}(z)>-\beta,(z \in D)$, then $G(z) \in K$ where $\beta$ is defined in Theorem 2.
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