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1. Introduction. We shall consider restrictions on the derivative of a function $f \in H(\mathbf{B})$ (i.e., holomorphic in the unit disk $\mathbf{B}$ ) which imply that $f$ is univalent. Perhaps the best known result of this type, due to Wolff [13], Warschawski [12] and Noshiro [11], involves only the argument of $f^{\prime}$. It states that $f$ is one-to-one if $f^{\prime}(z) \neq 0$ and $\arg f^{\prime}(z)$ lies in an interval of length $\pi, z \in \mathbf{B}$. If the length of the interval is larger than $\pi$, then $f$ need not be univalent, and, in fact, the valence of $f$ need not be bounded [6].

On the other hand, there is a criterion for univalence due to John [7] which involves only the modulus of $f^{\prime}$. For non-constant $f \in H(\mathbf{B})$ let $M_{f}=\sup _{z \in \mathbf{B}}\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|, m_{f}=\inf _{z \in \mathbf{B}}\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|$ and $\mu_{f}=M_{f} / m_{f}$. The John constant $\gamma$ is defined by $\gamma=\sup \left\{t: \mu_{f} \leqq t\right.$ implies $f$ is univalent $\}$. If $\mu_{f} \leqq \gamma$, then $f$ is univalent.

The condition $\mu_{f}<\infty$ is equivalent to $f^{\prime}(\mathbf{B})$ lying in an annulus centered at zero. We may introduce symmetry relative to the unit circle by considering $g=f / \sqrt{m_{f} M_{f}}$. Then $M_{g}=\sqrt{M_{f} / m_{f}}=1 / m_{g}, \mu_{g}=\mu_{f}$, and, of course, $f$ is univalent if and only if $g$ is. It follows that

$$
\frac{1}{2} \log \gamma=\sup \left\{M: e^{-M} \leqq\left|f^{\prime}\right| \leqq e^{M} \Rightarrow f \text { is univalent }\right\} .
$$

The best known estimates for $\gamma$ are $e^{\pi / 2} \leqq \gamma \leqq e^{\pi}$; the lower and upper bounds being given by John [8] and Yamashita [14], respectively.

In the next section we consider the problem of determining which plane regions $\Omega$ have the property that $\log f^{\prime}(\mathbf{B}) \subset \Omega$ implies $f$ is univalent. The above two criteria correspond to the cases in which $\Omega$ is a horizontal or vertical strip, respectively. We obtain conditions on $\Omega$, involving the hyperbolic metric on $\Omega$, which insure that $f$ is one-one. Our results rely on the following theorem due to Becker [3].

Becker's Univalence Criterion. If $f \in H(\mathbf{B}), f^{\prime}(\mathbf{0}) \neq 0$, and

$$
\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)\left|\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right| \leqq 1, z \in \mathbf{B},
$$

[^0]then $f$ is univalent.
In $\S 4$ we consider the case in which $\Omega$ is a rectangle with horizontal and vertical sides. This gives a chain of univalence criteria with the Wolff-Warshawski-Noshiro result and the John criterion as limiting cases.

In §3 we establish some properties of the hyperbolic metric which may be of independent interest.
2. The hyperbolic metric. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbf{C}$ be a hyperbolic region, i.e., $\mathbf{C} \backslash \Omega$ contains at least two points. Let $\phi$ be an analytic universal covering projection of $\mathbf{B}$ onto $\Omega$. The hyperbolic metric, $\lambda_{\rho}(z)|d z|$, is defined as follows: if $z \in \Omega$ and $w \in \phi^{-1}(z)$, then

$$
\lambda_{\Omega}(z)=\frac{1}{\left|\phi^{\prime}(w)\right|\left(1-|w|^{2}\right)}
$$

The value of $\lambda_{\rho}(z)$ is independent of both the choice of $w \in \phi^{-1}(z)$ and of the selection of the covering $\phi$. The collection of analytic coverings of B onto $\Omega$ consists of the functions $\phi \circ T$, where $T$ is a conformal selfmapping of $\mathbf{B}$. Thus, for fixed $z \in \Omega$, there is a unique analytic covering $\phi$ for which $\phi(0)=z$ and $\phi^{\prime}(0)>0$. In this case, $\lambda_{\rho}(z)=1 / \phi^{\prime}(0)$. If $\Omega$ is simply-connected, then $\phi$ is just a conformal mapping of $\mathbf{B}$ onto $\Omega$. The function $\lambda_{Q}$ is real-analytic on $\Omega$.

Examples. (i) $\lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(z)=1 /\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)$.
(ii) If $H=\{z: \operatorname{Re} z>0\}$, then $\lambda_{H}(z)=1 /(2 \operatorname{Re} z)$.
(iii) If $S(b)=\{z:|\operatorname{Re} z|<b\}$, then $\lambda_{S(b)}(z)=\pi / 4 b \cos (\pi \operatorname{Re} z / 2 b)$.

For a general discussion of the hyperbolic metric we refer the reader to [1], [5], and [10]. We shall need the following basic properties, which are stated without proof.

Assume $\Omega$ and $\Delta$ are hyperbolic plane regions.
CONFORMAL INVARIANCE. If $f$ is a conformal mapping of $\Omega$ onto $\Delta$, then

$$
\lambda_{\Delta}(f(z))\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|=\lambda_{\Omega}(z)
$$

Principle of Hyperbolic Metric. If $f \in H(\Omega)$ and $f(\Omega) \subset \Delta$, then

$$
\lambda_{\Delta}(f(z))\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \leqq \lambda_{\Omega}(z)
$$

Equality occurs at some point if and only if $f$ is an anlaytic covering of $\Omega$ onto $\Delta$.

Monotonicity. If $\Omega \subset \Delta$, then for $z \in \Omega, \lambda_{\Delta}(z) \leqq \lambda_{0}(z)$. If equality holds at a single point, then $\Omega=\Delta$.

We may now prove the following distortion theorem, which, together with Becker's result, gives a criterion for univalence.

THEOREM 1. Let $\Omega$ be a hyperbolic plane region and let $\Lambda(\Omega)=\inf \left\{\lambda_{\rho}(z)\right.$ : $z \in \Omega\}$. If $f \in H(\mathbf{B}), f^{\prime}(z) \neq 0, z \in \mathbf{B}$, and $\log f^{\prime}(\mathbf{B}) \subset \Omega$, then

$$
\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)\left|\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right| \leqq \frac{1}{\Lambda(\Omega)}, \quad z \in \mathbf{B}
$$

If $\Lambda(\Omega)>0$, then equality occurs at a single point if and only if $\log f^{\prime}$ is a universal analytic covering of $\mathbf{B}$ onto $\Omega$.

Proof. Applying the Principle of Hyperbolic Metric to $\log f^{\prime}$, we have

$$
\lambda_{\Omega}\left(\log f^{\prime}(z)\right)\left|\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right| \leqq \lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(z)=\frac{1}{1-|z|^{2}}, z \in \mathbf{B}
$$

and the result follows.
Corollary. Under the hypotheses of Theorem $1, f$ is univalent if $\Lambda(\Omega)$ $\geqq 1$.

Remark. From Example (iii) we see that $\Lambda(S(b))=\pi / 4 b$. Thus, if $b \leqq \pi / 4$ and $\log f^{\prime}(\mathbf{B}) \subset S(b)$, then $f$ is univalent. This gives $\gamma \geqq e^{\pi / 2}$.
3. Evaluating $\Lambda(\Omega)$. Throughout this section $\Omega$ denotes a hyperbolic plane region.

Proposition 1. If a is a finite boundary point of $\Omega$, then $\lim _{z \rightarrow a} \lambda_{\Omega}(z)=$ $\infty$.

Proof. Let $b \in \mathbf{C} \backslash \Omega, b \neq a$, and let $\lambda_{a, b}=\lambda_{\mathbf{C} \backslash a, b\rangle}$. Since $\Omega \subset \mathbf{C} \backslash\{a, b\}$ and $w=(z-a) /(b-a)$ is a conformal mapping of $\mathbf{C} \backslash\{a, b\}$ onto $\mathbf{C} \backslash\{0,1\}$, we see from Conformal Invariance and Monotonicity that

$$
\lambda_{\Omega}(z) \geqq \lambda_{a, b}(z)=|b-a|^{-1} \lambda_{0,1}\left(\frac{z-a}{z-b}\right)
$$

It is known [1, p. 18], that

$$
\log \lambda_{0,1}(z)=-\log |z|-\log \log \left(\frac{1}{|z|}\right)+O(1)
$$

as $z \rightarrow 0$. Thus,

$$
\lim _{z \rightarrow a} \lambda_{\rho}(z) \geqq|b-a|^{-1} \lim _{z \rightarrow 0} \lambda_{0,1}(z)=\infty
$$

It is necessary that $a$ be finite, as seen by Example (ii). Here, we have $\lim \sup _{z \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{H}(z)=\infty$ and $\lim \inf _{z \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{H}(z)=0$. If $\Omega$ is bounded, then $\lim _{z \rightarrow a} \lambda_{\Omega}(z)=\infty$ for all $a \in \partial \Omega$, so $\lambda_{\Omega}$ necessarily has a minimum in $\Omega$.

Proposition 2. If $\Omega$ is symmetric about the straight line $L$, then $\lambda_{\Omega}$ is symmetric about L.

Proof. There exist complex numbers $a, b,|a|=1$, such that $f(z)=$ $a z+b$ maps $L$ onto the real axis $\mathbf{R}$. If $z$ and $z^{*}$ are symmetric about $L$, then $f\left(z^{*}\right)=\overline{f(z)}$. By Conformal Invariance, $\lambda_{\rho}(z)=\lambda_{f(\Omega)}(f(z))\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right|=$ $\lambda_{f(O)}(f(z))$. Thus, it suffices to consider the case $L=\mathbf{R}$. Let $z \in \Omega$ and let $\phi$ be the analytic covering of $\mathbf{B}$ onto $\Omega$ with $\phi(0)=z, \phi^{\prime}(0)>0$. Since $\Omega$ is symmetric about $\mathbf{R}, \psi(\zeta)=\overline{\phi(\bar{\zeta})}$ is also an analytic covering of $\mathbf{B}$ onto $\Omega$, and $\psi(0)=\bar{z}, \psi^{\prime}(0)=\phi^{\prime}(0)$. Thus $\lambda_{\Omega}(\bar{z})=1 / \psi^{\prime}(0)=1 / \psi^{\prime}(0)=$ $\lambda_{\rho}(z)$.

Theorem 2. If $\Omega$ is convex, $L$ is a straight line, and $\Omega \cap L \neq \varnothing$, then $1 / \lambda_{\Omega}$ is concave on $\Omega \cap L$.

Proof. Consider distinct points $z_{0}, z_{1} \in \Omega \cap L$ and let $z_{t}=(1-t) z_{0}+$ $t z_{1}, t \in[0,1]$. Let $\phi_{t}$ be the conformal mapping of $\mathbf{B}$ onto $\Omega$ with $\phi_{t}(0)=z_{t}$, $\phi_{t}^{\prime}(0)>0$, and let $f_{t}=(1-t) \phi_{0}+t \phi_{1}$. Then $f_{t} \in H(\mathbf{B}), f_{t}(0)=z_{t}$ and, since $\Omega$ is convex, $f_{t}(\mathbf{B}) \subset \Omega$. By the Principle of Hyperbolic Metric,

$$
\lambda_{\Omega}\left(f_{t}(0)\right)\left|f_{t}^{\prime}(0)\right| \leqq \lambda_{\mathrm{B}}(0)=1
$$

or equivalently,

$$
\frac{1}{\lambda_{\varrho}\left(z_{t}\right)} \geqq(1-t) \phi_{0}^{\prime}(0)+t \phi_{1}^{\prime}(0)=\frac{1-t}{\lambda_{\Omega}\left(z_{0}\right)}+\frac{t}{\lambda_{\Omega}\left(z_{1}\right)}
$$

Corollary. Suppose $\Omega$ is convex.
(i) If $\Omega$ is symmetric about a line $L$ and $L^{\prime}$ is a line perpendicular to $L$, then the restriction of $\lambda_{0}$ to $\Omega \cap L^{\prime}$ attains a minimum value at $L \cap L^{\prime}$.
(ii) If $\Omega$ is symmetric about two intersecting lines $L$ and $L^{\prime}$, then $\lambda_{\Omega}$ attains a minimum at $L \cap L^{\prime}$.

Proof. (i) By Proposition 2 and Theorem 2, the restriction of $1 / \lambda_{\Omega}$ to $\Omega \cap L^{\prime}$ is both concave and symmetric about $L \cap L^{\prime}$, thus attaining a maximum at $L \cap L^{\prime}$. Part (ii) follows from (i).

The proof of the following lemma is elementary and therefore omitted.
Lemma. Suppose fand gare real-analytic functions on an open set $U \subset \mathbf{C}$, and let $/$ be an open line segment contained in $U$. Iff and $g$ agree on a subset of $\ell$ which has a limit point in $\ell$, then $f$ and $g$ agree on $\ell$.

Theorem 3. Assume $\Omega$ is convex, $L$ is a line, and $\Omega \cap L \neq \phi$. If the restriction of $\lambda_{\rho}$ to $\Omega \cap L$ attains a minimum at two distinct points, then $\Omega$ is either a strip or a half-plane.

Proof. Suppose the restriction of $\lambda_{Q}$ to $\Omega \cap L$ attains a minimum at distinct points $z_{1}$ and $z_{2}$. Since $1 / \lambda_{\Omega}$ is concave on $\Omega \cap L, \lambda_{\Omega}$ is constant on the segment $\left[z_{1}, z_{2}\right]$. By the lemma, $\lambda_{\Omega}$ is necessarily constant on $\Omega \cap L$,
say with value $c$. If $L$ meets $\partial \Omega$ at a point $a \in \mathbf{C}$, then $\lambda_{D}(z) \rightarrow e$ as $z \rightarrow a$ along $L$, contrary to Proposition 1 . Thus $\Omega$ contains $L$. Being covex, $\Omega$ must be either a strip or a half-plane.

We have observed that $\lambda_{0}$ does not have a minimum when $\Omega$ is a halfplane. In the case of the strip $S(b)$, the minimum exists and occurs at each point of the center line of the strip.

Corollary. If $\Omega$ is convex and $\lambda_{\Omega}$ has a minimum, then either $\Omega$ is a strip or the minimum occurs at a unique point of $\Omega$.
4. The case of a rectangle. For $M, A \in(0, \infty]$, let $R(M, A)=\{z:|\operatorname{Re} z|<$ $M,|\operatorname{Im} z|<A\}$ and let $\mathscr{F}(M, A)=\left\{f \in H(\mathbf{B}): \log f^{\prime}(\mathbf{B}) \subset R(M, A)\right\}$. We wish to determine $\tau(A)=\sup \{M: f \in \mathscr{F}(M, A)$ implies $f$ is univalent $\}$. Since $\mathscr{F}(M, A)$ increases with $A, \tau$ is a decreasing function on $(0, \infty]$. By the Wolff-Warschawski-Noshiro result, $\tau(A)=\infty$ for $0<A \leqq \pi / 2$. The John criterion gives $\tau(\infty)=(1 / 2) \log \gamma$.

Suppose $f \in \mathscr{F}(M, A)$ and $t>0$. Let

$$
f_{t}(z)=f(0)+\int_{0}^{z}\left[f^{\prime}(\zeta)\right]^{t} d \zeta
$$

where the branch of the power function is determined by the choice of $\log f^{\prime}$ satisfiyng $\log f^{\prime}(\mathbf{B}) \subset R(M, A)$. Then $f_{t} \in \mathscr{F}(t M, t A)$ and $f_{t} \rightarrow f$ locally uniformly as $t \rightarrow 1$. If $f \in \mathscr{F}(\tau(A), A)$ and $0<t<1$, then $f_{t} \in$ $\mathscr{F}(t \tau(A), t A) \subset \mathscr{F}(t \tau(A), A)$, implying $f_{t}$ is univalent. Thus, $f$ is one-toone, and $\mathscr{F}(\tau(A), A)$ consists entirely of univalent functions.

We shall now apply our work in the preceding sections to obtain a lower bound for $\tau(A)$. If both $M$ and $A$ are finite, then $R(M, A)$ is convex, bounded and symmetric about both axes. Thus, $\lambda_{R(M, A)}$ has a minimum value, say $\Lambda(M, A)$, which is attained only at the origin. If exactly one of $M$ and $A$ is finite, then the minimum value, $\Lambda(M, A)$, is attained at each point of the center line of the strip and, in particular, at $z=0 . \Lambda(M, A)$ has the following properties.

Proposition 3. Assume at least one of $M$ and $A$ is finite.
(i) $\Lambda(M, A)=\Lambda(A, M)$.
(ii) $\Lambda(t M, t A)=t^{-1} \Lambda(M, A), 0<t<\infty$.
(iii) $\Lambda(M, A)$ is strictly decreasing in each variable.
(iv) $1 / \Lambda(M, A)$ is concave.

Proof. Parts (i) and (ii) follow from Conformal Invariance and the observation that $w=i z$ and $w=t z \operatorname{map} R(M, A)$ onto $R(A, M)$ and $R(t M, t A)$, respectively. If $M_{1}<M_{2}$, then $R\left(M_{1}, A\right)$ is a proper subregion of $\left(M_{2}, A\right)$. By Monotonicity, $\Lambda\left(M_{1}, A\right)=\lambda_{R\left(M_{1}, A\right)}(0)>\lambda_{R\left(M_{2}, A\right)}(0)=$
$\Lambda\left(M_{2}, A\right)$. Similiarly, $\Lambda(M, A)$ is strictly decreasing as a function of $A$. As for (iv), consider distinct finite points $\left(M_{0}, A_{0}\right)$ and ( $M_{1}, A_{1}$ ). For $t \in[0,1]$, let $\left(M_{t}, A_{t}\right)=(1-t)\left(M_{0}, A_{0}\right)+t\left(M_{1}, A_{1}\right)$, and let $\phi_{t}$ be the conformal mapping of $\mathbf{B}$ onto $R\left(M_{t}, A_{t}\right)$ with $\phi_{t}(0)=0, \phi_{t}^{\prime}(0)>0$. Then

$$
\frac{1}{\Lambda\left(M_{t}, A_{t}\right)}=\frac{1}{\lambda_{R\left(M_{t}, A_{t}\right)}(0)}=\phi_{t}^{\prime}(0), 0 \leqq t \leqq 1
$$

Now, $\psi_{t}=(1-t) \phi_{0}+t \phi_{1} \in H(\mathbf{B}), \psi_{t}(0)=0$ and $\psi_{t}(\mathbf{B}) \subset R\left(M_{t}, A_{t}\right)$. By the Principle of Hyperbolic Metric,

$$
\lambda_{R\left(M_{t}, A_{t}\right)}\left(\psi_{t}(0)\right)\left|\psi_{t}^{\prime}(0)\right| \leqq \lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(0)=1,
$$

or equivalently, $(1-t) \phi_{0}^{\prime}(0)+t \phi_{1}^{\prime}(0) \leqq \phi_{t}^{\prime}(0)$. This is the desired inequality.

When both $M$ and $A$ are finite, we can obtain an expression for $\Lambda(M, A)$ using the Jacobian elliptic functions sn , cn , and dn, relative to the parameter $\tau=i A / M$. We refer the reader to [9, Chapter VI, §3] for many of the results quoted below. Let $k=\sqrt{\lambda(t)}$, where here $\lambda$ denotes the elliptic modular function. If

$$
K=\int_{0}^{1} \frac{d t}{\left[\left(1-t^{2}\right)\left(1-k^{2} t^{2}\right)\right]^{1 / 2}}
$$

and $K^{\prime}=K\left(\left(1-k^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right)$, then

$$
f(z)=\left(\frac{1-\operatorname{cn}(z)}{1+\operatorname{cn}(z)}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

maps the rectangle $R\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$ conformally onto $\mathbf{B}$ with $f(0)=0$ [9, pg. 297]. Moreover, $i A / M=\tau=i K^{\prime} / K$, so $R(M, A)$ is similar to $R\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)$. By Proposition 3(ii), $\Lambda(M, A)=(K / M) \Lambda\left(K, K^{\prime}\right)=(K / M)\left|f^{\prime}(0)\right|$. Various identities for the Jacobian ellitptic functions show that $f^{\prime}(z)=\operatorname{dn}(z) /$ $(1+\operatorname{cn}(z))$. Furthermore, $\operatorname{dn}(0)=\operatorname{cn}(0)=1$, so $f^{\prime}(0)=1 / 2$ and $\Lambda(M, A)$ $=K / 2 M$. Although $K$ is determined implicitly by $M$ and $A$, it is possible to express $\Lambda(M, A)$ more explicitly in terms of $M$ and $A$. If $q=e^{i \pi \tau}=e^{-2 \pi A / M}$ then [4, pgs. 385, 410]

$$
K=\frac{\pi}{2} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(1-q^{2 n}\right)^{2}\left(1+q^{2 n-1}\right)^{4}=\frac{\pi}{2}\left(1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q^{n^{2}}\right)^{2}
$$

and so

$$
\Lambda(M, A)=\frac{\pi}{4 M}\left(1+2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q^{n^{2}}\right)^{2}
$$

Although it is not obvious that the preceding formula for $\Lambda(M, A)$ is symmetric in $M$ and $A$, it can be established by means of identities for elliptic functions.

Proposition 4. Suppose $M, A \in(0, \infty)$.
(i) $\lim _{M \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(M, A)=\pi / 4 A=\Lambda(\infty, A)$.
(ii) $\lim _{A \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(M, A)=\pi / 4 M=\Lambda(M, \infty)$.
(iii) $\lim _{M \rightarrow 0} \Lambda(M, A)=\infty=\lim _{A \rightarrow 0} \Lambda(M, A)$.

Proof. As $A \rightarrow \infty, q \rightarrow 0$, so $\Lambda(M, A) \rightarrow \pi / 4 M$. That $\Lambda(M, \infty)=\pi / 4 M$ follows from Example (iii). Moreover, $M \rightarrow 0$ implies $q \rightarrow 0$ and, consequently, $\Lambda(M, A) \rightarrow \infty$. The other three conclusions follow from the symmetry of $\Lambda(M, A)$ (Proposition 3(i)).

We have shown that for fixed $A \in(0, \infty), \Lambda(M, A)$ is a strictly decreasing function of $M$ on $(0, \infty)$ with limits $\infty$ and $\pi / 4 A$ at the left and right end points, respectively. If $A \leqq \pi / 4$, then $\Lambda(M, A)>1$ for all $M \in$ $(0, \infty)$. For $A>\pi / 4$ there is a unique value of $M$, say $\gamma(A)$, such that $\Lambda(\gamma(A), A)=1$. If $0<A \leqq \pi / 4$, we set $\gamma(A)=\infty$.

Proposition 5. The function $\Upsilon$ has the following properties.
(i) $\Upsilon(A) \leqq \tau(A), 0<A \leqq \infty$,
(ii) $\Upsilon$ is a strictly decreasing, convex function on $(\pi / 4, \infty)$,
(iii) The graph of $M=\Upsilon(A)$ is symmetric about $M=A$,
(iv) $\Upsilon(A) \rightarrow \infty$ as $A$ decreases to $\pi / 4$.

Proof. (i) follows directly from the Corollary to Theorem 1. For (ii), consider $\pi / 4<A_{0}<A_{1}<\infty$ and let $\left(M_{t}, A_{t}\right)=t\left(\gamma\left(A_{1}\right), A_{1}\right)+(1-t)$ $\left(\Upsilon\left(A_{0}\right), A_{0}\right), 0 \leqq t \leqq 1$. By Proposition 3 (iii), $1=\Lambda\left(\Upsilon\left(A_{0}\right), A_{0}\right)>$ $\Lambda\left(\Upsilon\left(A_{0}\right), A_{1}\right)$, so $\Upsilon\left(A_{1}\right)<\Upsilon\left(A_{0}\right)$. Furthermore, by Proposition 3 (iv),

$$
\frac{1}{\Lambda\left(M_{t}, A_{t}\right)} \geqq \frac{t}{\Lambda\left(\Upsilon\left(A_{1}\right), A_{1}\right)}+\frac{1-t}{\Lambda\left(\Upsilon\left(A_{0}\right), A_{0}\right)}=1
$$

Thus, $\Lambda\left(M_{t}, A_{t}\right) \leqq 1=\Lambda\left(\Upsilon\left(A_{t}\right), A_{t}\right)$, which gives $\gamma\left(A_{t}\right) \leqq M_{t}=t \Upsilon\left(A_{1}\right)$ $+(1-t) \gamma\left(A_{0}\right), 0 \leqq t \leqq 1$. Part (ii) follows from Proposition 3(i). As to (iv), if $\gamma(A)$ had a finite limit, $L$, as $A$ decreases to $\pi / 4$, then $1=$ $\Lambda(\Upsilon(A), A) \rightarrow \Lambda(L, \pi / 4)$, contrary to the remarks preceding this proposition.

The following two examples provide an upper estimate for $\tau(A)$.
Example 1. Suppose $\pi / 2<A<\pi, 0<r<1$, and consider the function $f$ such that

$$
f^{\prime}(z)=(1+r z)^{A / a r c s i n} r, f^{\prime}(0)=1
$$

Then

$$
\frac{A \log (1-r)}{\operatorname{arscin} r}<\operatorname{Re}\left\{\log f^{\prime}(z)\right\}<\frac{A \log (1+r)}{\arcsin r}
$$

$\left|\arg f^{\prime}(z)\right|<A$, and $f \in \mathscr{F}(-A \log (1-r) / \arcsin r, A)$. Now the univalence of $f$ is determined by that of $\exp \{(1+A / \arcsin r) \log (1+r z)\}$.

The image of $\mathbf{B}$ under $w=\log (1+r z)$ is a convex region $D$, which lies in the strip $\{w:|\operatorname{Im} w|<\arcsin r\}$. The points $\log \left(1-r^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \pm i \arcsin r$ lie on the boundary of $D$. Thus, by the periodicity of $\exp (z), f$ will fail to be univalent if and only if $A+\arcsin r>\pi$. For $r>\sin A$, we have $\arcsin r>\pi-A$, so $f$ is not univalent, and $\tau(A) \leqq A \log (1-r) / \arcsin r$. Letting $r$ decrease to $\sin A$, we obtain

$$
\tau(A) \leqq \frac{-A \log (1-\sin A)}{\pi-A}, \quad \pi / 2<A<\pi
$$

The quantity on the right side has limit $\pi$ as $A \rightarrow \pi$.
Example 2. Suppose $\pi<A, 0<r<1$, and consider the function $f$ determined by

$$
f^{\prime}(z)=(1+r z)^{-i A / \log (1-r)}, f^{\prime}(0)=1
$$

Estimates on the real and imaginary parts of $\log f^{\prime}$ show that $f \in$ $\mathscr{F}(-A \arcsin r / \log (1-r), A)$. For the univalence of $f$ we consider $\exp \{(1-i A / \log (1-r)) \log (1+r z)\}$. The region $D$ in Example 1 is symmetric about both the real axis and the line $\operatorname{Re} w=\log \left(1-r^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}$. It can be shown that $D$ contains the disk of radius $\arcsin r$ centered at $\log \left(1-r^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}$, but we omit the details. Then, the image of $\mathbf{B}$ under $(1-i A / \log (1-r)) \log (1+r z)$ is a convex region containing a disk of radius $\rho(r)=|1-i A / \log (1-r)| \arcsin r$, and by periodicity of $\exp (z), f$ fails to be univalent when $\rho(r)>\pi$. Now, $\rho(0)=A>\pi$ and $\rho(1)=\pi / 2$, so there is a smallest positive root, $r_{0}(A)$, of $\rho(r)=\pi$. This gives the implicit estimate

$$
\tau(A) \leqq \frac{-A \arcsin \left(r_{0}(A)\right)}{\log \left(1-r_{0}(A)\right)}
$$

This estimate cannot be sharp, since we lost some ground by considering the largest disk contained in $D$.
2. Comments. It is not known if the constant 1 in Becker's Theorem is sharp. It would be of considerable interest to determine the supremum, say $c$, of constants $k$ such that $\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)\left|f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)\right| \leqq k$ implies $f$ is one-to-one. Of course $c \geqq 1$. An example of Becker [2] shows that $c \leqq 4 / e$. From Proposition 5 we obtain $\tau(A) \geqq r(A)=\infty, 0<A \leqq \pi / 4$, whereas the Wolff-Warschawski-Noshiro Theorem gives $\tau(A)=\infty$ for $0<A \leqq$ $\pi / 2$. To obtain the latter conclusion from our method would require $c$ to be 2 . On the other hand, if one could demonstrate that $\gamma=e^{\pi / 2}$, then it would follow that $c=1$.

After the completion of this research, S. Yamashita brought to our attention the work of Avhadiev and Aksent'ev [Sufficient conditions for univalence of analytic functions, Soviet Math. Dok1, 12 (1971), 859-863]. Their paper overlaps with the application, in $\S 4$, of our main results.

We would like to thank J. Becker for several useful communications. In particular, he has shown that $\tau(A) \leqq 2 \gamma(A / 2)$. His proof, which he has permitted us to give here, goes as follows. Let $\phi_{M, A}$ denote a univalent mapping of $\mathbf{B}$ onto $R(M, A)$ sending zero to zero. For $A>\pi / 4, \gamma(A)$ is the unique value of $M$ for which $\Lambda(M, A)=1$, or equivalently for which $\left|\phi_{M, A}(0)\right|=1$. Now, suppose $M>2 \gamma(A / 2)$ and let $a=\phi_{M, A}(0)$. Then, for $A>\pi / 2$,

$$
|a|>\left|\phi_{2 r(A / 2), A}^{\prime}(0)\right|=2\left|\phi_{r(A / 2), A / 2}^{\prime}(0)\right|=2 .
$$

If

$$
f(z)=\int_{0}^{z} \exp \left\{\phi_{M, A}\left(\zeta^{n}\right)\right\} d \zeta=z+\frac{a}{n+1} z^{n+1}+\ldots
$$

then $f \in \mathscr{F}(M, A)$, but since $|a|>2, f$ is not univalent when $n$ is sufficiently large [5, page 494]. Thus $\tau(A)<M$ for each $M>2 r(A / 2)$. We note that $2 r(A / 2) \rightarrow \pi / 2$ as $A \rightarrow+\infty$.

Finally, Prokhorov, Szynal and Waniurski [New upper estimate of the John constant, Abstracts Amer. Math. Soc 1 (1980), 380] have announced the estimate $\gamma \leqq 19.93$.
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