## UNIVALENCE CRITERIA AND THE HYPERBOLIC METRIC

## C. D. MINDA AND D. J. WRIGHT

1. Introduction. We shall consider restrictions on the derivative of a function  $f \in H(\mathbf{B})$  (i.e., holomorphic in the unit disk **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'. It states that f is one-to-one if  $f'(z) \neq 0$  and  $\arg f'(z)$  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'. For non-constant  $f \in H(\mathbf{B})$  let  $M_f = \sup_{z \in \mathbf{B}} |f'(z)|$ ,  $m_f = \inf_{z \in \mathbf{B}} |f'(z)|$  and  $\mu_f = M_f/m_f$ . The John constant  $\gamma$  is defined by  $\gamma = \sup\{t: \mu_f \leq t \text{ implies } f \text{ is univalent}\}$ . If  $\mu_f \leq \gamma$ , then f is univalent.

The condition  $\mu_f < \infty$  is equivalent to  $f'(\mathbf{B})$  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

$$\frac{1}{2}\log \gamma = \sup \{M \colon e^{-M} \le |f'| \le e^M \Rightarrow f \text{ is univalent}\}.$$

The best known estimates for  $\gamma$  are  $e^{\pi/2} \le \gamma \le e^{\pi}$ ; 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  $\log f'(\mathbf{B}) \subset \Omega$  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  $f \in H(\mathbf{B})$ ,  $f'(0) \neq 0$ , and

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

Received by the Editors on September 9, 1980, and in revised form on November 27, 1980.

then f is univalent.

In §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  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$  be a hyperbolic region, i.e.,  $\mathbb{C}\backslash\Omega$  contains at least two points. Let  $\phi$  be an analytic universal covering projection of **B** onto  $\Omega$ . The hyperbolic metric,  $\lambda_{\Omega}(z)|dz|$ , is defined as follows: if  $z \in \Omega$  and  $w \in \phi^{-1}(z)$ , then

$$\lambda_{Q}(z) = \frac{1}{|\phi'(w)|(1-|w|^2)}.$$

The value of  $\lambda_{\Omega}(z)$  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 self-mapping of **B**. Thus, for fixed  $z \in \Omega$ , there is a unique analytic covering  $\phi$  for which  $\phi(0) = z$  and  $\phi'(0) > 0$ . In this case,  $\lambda_{\Omega}(z) = 1/\phi'(0)$ . If  $\Omega$  is simply-connected, then  $\phi$  is just a conformal mapping of **B** onto  $\Omega$ . The function  $\lambda_{\Omega}$  is real-analytic on  $\Omega$ .

Examples. (i)  $\lambda_{\mathbf{R}}(z) = 1/(1 - |z|^2)$ .

- (ii) If  $H = \{z : \text{Re } z > 0\}$ , then  $\lambda_H(z) = 1/(2 \text{ Re } z)$ .
- (iii) If  $S(b) = \{z : |\text{Re } z| < b\}$ , then  $\lambda_{S(b)}(z) = \pi/4b \cos{(\pi \text{ Re } z/2b)}$ .

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

$$\lambda_{\Delta}(f(z))|f'(z)| = \lambda_{\Omega}(z).$$

PRINCIPLE OF HYPERBOLIC METRIC. If  $f \in H(\Omega)$  and  $f(\Omega) \subset \Delta$ , then

$$\lambda_{\Delta}(f(z))|f'(z)| \leq \lambda_{\Omega}(z).$$

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

MONOTONICITY. If  $\Omega \subset \Delta$ , then for  $z \in \Omega$ ,  $\lambda_{\Delta}(z) \leq \lambda_{\Omega}(z)$ . 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  $\Lambda(\Omega) = \inf \{ \lambda_{\Omega}(z) : z \in \Omega \}$ . If  $f \in H(\mathbf{B})$ ,  $f'(z) \neq 0$ ,  $z \in \mathbf{B}$ , and  $\log f'(\mathbf{B}) \subset \Omega$ , then

$$(1-|z|^2)\left|\frac{f''(z)}{f'(z)}\right| \leq \frac{1}{\Lambda(\Omega)}, \ z \in \mathbf{B}.$$

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

PROOF. Applying the Principle of Hyperbolic Metric to  $\log f'$ , we have

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{Q}}(\log f'(z))\left|\frac{f''(z)}{f'(z)}\right| \leq \lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(z) = \frac{1}{1-|z|^2}, z \in \mathbf{B},$$

and the result follows.

COROLLARY. Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1, f is univalent if  $\Lambda(\Omega) \ge 1$ .

REMARK. From Example (iii) we see that  $\Lambda(S(b)) = \pi/4b$ . Thus, if  $b \le \pi/4$  and  $\log f'(\mathbf{B}) \subset S(b)$ , then f is univalent. This gives  $\gamma \ge e^{\pi/2}$ .

3. Evaluating  $\Lambda(Q)$ . Throughout this section Q denotes a hyperbolic plane region.

**PROPOSITION** 1. If a is a finite boundary point of  $\Omega$ , then  $\lim_{z\to a} \lambda_{\Omega}(z) = \infty$ .

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

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{Q}}(z) \geq \lambda_{a,b}(z) = |b - a|^{-1} \lambda_{0,1} \left( \frac{z - a}{z - b} \right).$$

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

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

as  $z \to 0$ . Thus,

$$\lim_{z\to a} \lambda_{\Omega}(z) \geq |b-a|^{-1} \lim_{z\to 0} \lambda_{0,1}(z) = \infty.$$

It is necessary that a be finite, as seen by Example (ii). Here, we have  $\limsup_{z\to\infty} \lambda_H(z) = \infty$  and  $\liminf_{z\to\infty} \lambda_H(z) = 0$ . If  $\Omega$  is bounded, then  $\lim_{z\to a} \lambda_0(z) = \infty$  for all  $a \in \partial \Omega$ , so  $\lambda_0$  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) = az + b maps L onto the real axis  $\mathbf{R}$ . If z and  $z^*$  are symmetric about L, then  $f(z^*) = \overline{f(z)}$ . By Conformal Invariance,  $\lambda_{\Omega}(z) = \lambda_{f(\Omega)}(f(z))|f'(z)| = \lambda_{f(\Omega)}(f(z))$ . 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  $\phi(0) = z$ ,  $\phi'(0) > 0$ . Since  $\Omega$  is symmetric about  $\mathbf{R}$ ,  $\phi(\zeta) = \overline{\phi(\zeta)}$  is also an analytic covering of  $\mathbf{B}$  onto  $\Omega$ , and  $\phi(0) = \overline{z}$ ,  $\phi'(0) = \phi'(0)$ . Thus  $\lambda_{\Omega}(\overline{z}) = 1/\phi'(0) = 1/\phi'(0) = \lambda_{\Omega}(z)$ .

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

PROOF. Consider distinct points  $z_0$ ,  $z_1 \in \Omega \cap L$  and let  $z_t = (1 - t)z_0 + tz_1$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Let  $\phi_t$  be the conformal mapping of **B** onto  $\Omega$  with  $\phi_t(0) = z_t$ ,  $\phi_t'(0) > 0$ , 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,

$$\lambda_{\varrho}(f_t(0))|f_t'(0)| \leq \lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(0) = 1,$$

or equivalently,

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{\varrho}(z_{t})} \geq (1-t) \, \phi_{0}'(0) \, + \, t \, \phi_{1}'(0) = \frac{1-t}{\lambda_{\varrho}(z_{0})} + \frac{t}{\lambda_{\varrho}(z_{1})}.$$

COROLLARY. Suppose  $\Omega$  is convex.

- (i) If  $\Omega$  is symmetric about a line L and L' is a line perpendicular to L, then the restriction of  $\lambda_0$  to  $\Omega \cap L'$  attains a minimum value at  $L \cap L'$ .
- (ii) If  $\Omega$  is symmetric about two intersecting lines L and L', then  $\lambda_{\Omega}$  attains a minimum at  $L \cap L'$ .

**PROOF.** (i) By Proposition 2 and Theorem 2, the restriction of  $1/\lambda_Q$  to  $Q \cap L'$  is both concave and symmetric about  $L \cap L'$ , thus attaining a maximum at  $L \cap L'$ . Part (ii) follows from (i).

The proof of the following lemma is elementary and therefore omitted.

LEMMA. Suppose f and g are real-analytic functions on an open set  $U \subset \mathbb{C}$ , and let  $\ell$  be an open line segment contained in U. If f 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  $\lambda_0$  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  $1/\lambda_Q$  is concave on  $\Omega \cap L$ ,  $\lambda_Q$  is constant on the segment  $[z_1, z_2]$ . By the lemma,  $\lambda_Q$  is necessarily constant on  $\Omega \cap L$ ,

say with value c. If L meets  $\partial \Omega$  at a point  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ , then  $\lambda_{\Omega}(z) \to e$  as  $z \to a$  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  $\lambda_Q$  does not have a minimum when Q 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  $R(M, A) = \{z : | \text{Re } z| < M, | \text{Im } z| < A\}$  and let  $\mathscr{F}(M, A) = \{f \in H(\mathbf{B}) : \log f'(\mathbf{B}) \subset R(M, A)\}$ . We wish to determine  $\tau(A) = \sup \{M : f \in \mathscr{F}(M, A) \text{ implies } f \text{ is univalent}\}$ . 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  $0 < A \le \pi/2$ . The John criterion gives  $\tau(\infty) = (1/2) \log \gamma$ .

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

$$f_t(z) = f(0) + \int_0^z [f'(\zeta)]^t d\zeta,$$

where the branch of the power function is determined by the choice of  $\log f'$  satisfying  $\log f'(\mathbf{B}) \subset R(M, A)$ . Then  $f_t \in \mathcal{F}(tM, tA)$  and  $f_t \to f$  locally uniformly as  $t \to 1$ . If  $f \in \mathcal{F}(\tau(A), A)$  and 0 < t < 1, then  $f_t \in \mathcal{F}(t\tau(A), tA) \subset \mathcal{F}(t\tau(A), A)$ , implying  $f_t$  is univalent. Thus, f is one-to-one, and  $\mathcal{F}(\tau(A), A)$  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)  $\Lambda(tM, tA) = t^{-1}\Lambda(M, A), 0 < t < \infty$ .
- (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 = iz and w = tz map R(M, A) onto R(A, M) and R(tM, tA), respectively. If  $M_1 < M_2$ , then  $R(M_1, A)$  is a proper subregion of  $(M_2, A)$ . By Monotonicity,  $\Lambda(M_1, A) = \lambda_{R(M_1, A)}(0) > \lambda_{R(M_2, A)}(0) =$ 

 $\Lambda(M_2, A)$ . Similiarly,  $\Lambda(M, A)$  is strictly decreasing as a function of A. As for (iv), consider distinct finite points  $(M_0, A_0)$  and  $(M_1, A_1)$ . For  $t \in [0, 1]$ , let  $(M_t, A_t) = (1 - t) (M_0, A_0) + t(M_1, A_1)$ , and let  $\phi_t$  be the conformal mapping of **B** onto  $R(M_t, A_t)$  with  $\phi_t(0) = 0$ ,  $\phi_t'(0) > 0$ . Then

$$\frac{1}{\Lambda(M_t, A_t)} = \frac{1}{\lambda_{R(M_t, A_t)}(0)} = \phi'_t(0), \ 0 \le t \le 1.$$

Now,  $\psi_t = (1 - t) \phi_0 + t\phi_1 \in H(\mathbf{B}), \ \psi_t(0) = 0$  and  $\psi_t(\mathbf{B}) \subset R(M_t, A_t)$ . By the Principle of Hyperbolic Metric,

$$\lambda_{R(M_t, A_t)}(\phi_t(0)) |\phi_t'(0)| \leq \lambda_{\mathbf{B}}(0) = 1,$$

or equivalently,  $(1-t) \phi_0'(0) + t \phi_1'(0) \le \phi_t'(0)$ . 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  $\tau = iA/M$ . 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

$$K = \int_0^1 \frac{dt}{[(1-t^2)(1-k^2t^2)]^{1/2}}$$

and  $K' = K((1 - k^2)^{1/2})$ , then

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

maps the rectangle R(K, K') conformally onto **B** with f(0) = 0 [9, pg. 297]. Moreover,  $iA/M = \tau = iK'/K$ , so R(M, A) is similar to R(K, K'). By Proposition 3(ii),  $\Lambda(M, A) = (K/M)\Lambda(K, K') = (K/M)|f'(0)|$ . Various identities for the Jacobian ellitptic functions show that  $f'(z) = \operatorname{dn}(z)/(1 + \operatorname{cn}(z))$ . Furthermore,  $\operatorname{dn}(0) = \operatorname{cn}(0) = 1$ , so f'(0) = 1/2 and  $\Lambda(M, A) = K/2M$ . 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]

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

and so

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

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)  $\lim_{M\to\infty} \Lambda(M, A) = \pi/4A = \Lambda(\infty, A)$ .
- (ii)  $\lim_{A\to\infty} \Lambda(M, A) = \pi/4M = \Lambda(M, \infty)$ .
- (iii)  $\lim_{M\to 0} \Lambda(M, A) = \infty = \lim_{A\to 0} \Lambda(M, A)$ .

PROOF. As  $A \to \infty$ ,  $q \to 0$ , so  $\Lambda(M, A) \to \pi/4M$ . That  $\Lambda(M, \infty) = \pi/4M$  follows from Example (iii). Moreover,  $M \to 0$  implies  $q \to 0$  and, consequently,  $\Lambda(M, A) \to \infty$ . 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  $\pi/4A$  at the left and right end points, respectively. If  $A \le \pi/4$ , then  $\Lambda(M, A) > 1$  for all  $M \in (0, \infty)$ . For  $A > \pi/4$  there is a unique value of M, say  $\Upsilon(A)$ , such that  $\Lambda(\Upsilon(A), A) = 1$ . If  $0 < A \le \pi/4$ , we set  $\Upsilon(A) = \infty$ .

**PROPOSITION** 5. The function  $\Upsilon$  has the following properties.

- (i)  $\Upsilon(A) \leq \tau(A)$ ,  $0 < A \leq \infty$ ,
- (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)  $\Upsilon(A) \to \infty$  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  $(M_t, A_t) = t(\Upsilon(A_1), A_1) + (1 - t)$   $(\Upsilon(A_0), A_0), 0 \le t \le 1$ . By Proposition 3 (iii),  $1 = \Lambda(\Upsilon(A_0), A_0) > \Lambda(\Upsilon(A_0), A_1)$ , so  $\Upsilon(A_1) < \Upsilon(A_0)$ . Furthermore, by Proposition 3 (iv),

$$\frac{1}{\Lambda(M_t, A_t)} \ge \frac{t}{\Lambda(\Upsilon(A_1), A_1)} + \frac{1 - t}{\Lambda(\Upsilon(A_0), A_0)} = 1.$$

Thus,  $\Lambda(M_t, A_t) \leq 1 = \Lambda(\Upsilon(A_t), A_t)$ , which gives  $\Upsilon(A_t) \leq M_t = t \Upsilon(A_1) + (1 - t) \Upsilon(A_0)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ . Part (ii) follows from Proposition 3(i). As to (iv), if  $\Upsilon(A)$  had a finite limit, L, as A decreases to  $\pi/4$ , then  $1 = \Lambda(\Upsilon(A), A) \to \Lambda(L, \pi/4)$ , 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

$$f'(z) = (1 + rz)^{A/\arcsin r}, f'(0) = 1.$$

Then

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

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

The image of **B** under  $w = \log (1 + rz)$  is a convex region D, which lies in the strip  $\{w : |\text{Im } w| < \arcsin r\}$ . The points  $\log (1 - r^2)^{1/2} \pm i \arcsin r$  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  $\tau(A) \le A \log (1 - r) / \arcsin r$ . Letting r decrease to  $\sin A$ , we obtain

$$\tau(A) \le \frac{-A \log (1 - \sin A)}{\pi - A}, \qquad \pi/2 < A < \pi.$$

The quantity on the right side has limit  $\pi$  as  $A \to \pi$ .

EXAMPLE 2. Suppose  $\pi < A$ , 0 < r < 1, and consider the function f determined by

$$f'(z) = (1 + rz)^{-iA/\log(1-r)}, f'(0) = 1.$$

Estimates on the real and imaginary parts of  $\log f'$  show that  $f \in \mathcal{F}(-A \arcsin r/\log (1-r), A)$ . For the univalence of f we consider  $\exp \{(1-iA/\log(1-r)) \log (1+rz)\}$ . The region D in Example 1 is symmetric about both the real axis and the line  $\operatorname{Re} w = \log (1-r^2)^{1/2}$ . It can be shown that D contains the disk of radius  $\arcsin r$  centered at  $\log (1-r^2)^{1/2}$ , but we omit the details. Then, the image of  $\mathbf{B}$  under  $(1-iA/\log (1-r)) \log (1+rz)$  is a convex region containing a disk of radius  $\rho(r) = |1-iA/\log (1-r)|$  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

$$\tau(A) \leq \frac{-A \arcsin (r_0(A))}{\log (1 - r_0(A))}.$$

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  $(1-|z|^2)|f''(z)|f'(z)| \le k$  implies f is one-to-one. Of course  $c \ge 1$ . An example of Becker [2] shows that  $c \le 4/e$ . From Proposition 5 we obtain  $\tau(A) \ge \Upsilon(A) = \infty$ ,  $0 < A \le \pi/4$ , whereas the Wolff-Warschawski-Noshiro Theorem gives  $\tau(A) = \infty$  for  $0 < A \le \pi/2$ . 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 §4, of our main results.

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

$$|a| > |\phi'_{2\Upsilon(A/2),A}(0)| = 2|\phi'_{\Upsilon(A/2),A/2}(0)| = 2.$$

If

$$f(z) = \int_0^z \exp\{\phi_{M,A}(\zeta^n)\} d\zeta = z + \frac{a}{n+1} z^{n+1} + \dots,$$

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

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

## REFERENCES

- 1. L. V. Alfors, *Conformal invariants*, Topics in geometric function theory, McGraw-Hill. New York, 1973.
- 2. J. Becker, Über Subordinationskette und quasikonform fortsetzbare schlichte Funktionen, Thesis, Technische Universität Berlin, 1970.
- 3. ——, Löwnersche Differentialgleichung und quasikonform fortsetzbare schlichte Funktionen, J. Reine Angew. Math 225 (1972), 23-43.
- 4. E. T. Copson, An introduction to the theory of functions of a complex variable, Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1935.
- **5.** G. M. Goluzin, *Geometric theory of functions of a complex variable*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, vol. 26, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1969.
- 6. A. W. Goodman, A note on the Noshiro-Warschawski theorem, J. Analyse Math. 25 (1972), 401-408.
- 7. F. John, On quasi-isometric mappings II, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 22 (1969), 265-278.
- 8. ——, A criterion for univalency brought up to date, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 29 (1976), 293–295.
  - 9. Z. Nehari, Conformal mapping, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1952.
- 10. R. Nevanlinna, *Analytic functions*, Die Grundlehren der math. Wissenschaften, Band 162, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1970.
- 11. K. Noshiro, On the theory of schlicht functions, J Fac. Sci. Hokkaido Univ. Jap. (1), 2 (1934–1935), 129–155.
- 12. S. E. Warschawski, On the higher derivatives at the boundary in conformal mapping, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 38 (1935), 310-340.
- 13. J. Wolff, L'intégrale d'une fonction holomorphe et à partie réelle positive dans un demi plan est univalente, C. R. Acad. des Sci. (Paris) 198 (1934), 1209-1210.
  - 14. S. Yamashita, On the John constant, Math. Z. 161 (1978), 185-188.

