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#### Abstract

In the present paper, we study certain differential inequalities involving Ruscheweyh operator. As particular cases to our main result, we derive certain results for starlike and convex functions.


## 1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote the class of functions $f$, analytic in the open unit disk $\mathbb{E}=\{z \in \mathbb{C}:|z|<1\}$ in the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the subclass of $\mathcal{H}$, consisting of functions $f$, analytic in the open unit disk $\mathbb{E}$ and normalized by the conditions $f^{\prime}(0)=0=f^{\prime}(0)-1$. A function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is said to be starlike of order $\alpha$ if and only if

$$
\Re\left(\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right)>\alpha, 0 \leq \alpha<1, z \in \mathbb{E}
$$

The class of such functions is denoted by $\mathcal{S}^{*}(\alpha)$. A function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is said to be convex of order $\alpha$ in $\mathbb{E}$, if and only if

$$
\Re\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right)>\alpha, 0 \leq \alpha<1, z \in \mathbb{E}
$$

Let $\mathcal{K}(\alpha)$ denote the class of all those functions $f \in \mathcal{A}$ that are convex of order $\alpha$ in $\mathbb{E}$. Let $f$ and $g$ be two analytic functions in open unit disk $\mathbb{E}$. Then we say $f$ is subordinate to $g$ in $\mathbb{E}$ written as $f \prec g$ if there exists a Schwarz function $w$, analytic in $\mathbb{E}$ with $w(0)=0$ and $|w(z)|<1, z \in \mathbb{E}$ such that $f(z)=g(w(z)), z \in \mathbb{E}$. In case the function $g$ is univalent, the above subordination is equivalent to $f(0)=g(0)$ and $f(\mathbb{E}) \subset g(\mathbb{E})$.
The Taylor's series expansions of $f, g \in \mathcal{A}$ are given as

$$
f(z)=z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_{k} z^{k} \text { and } g(z)=z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} b_{k} z^{k} .
$$

Then the convolution/Hadamard product of $f$ and $g$ is denoted by $f * g$, and defined as

$$
(f * g)(z)=z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_{k} b_{k} z^{k}
$$

Ruscheweyh [5] introduced a differential operator $R^{\lambda}$, (Known as Ruscheweyh differential operator) for $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is defined as follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
R^{\lambda} f(z)=\frac{z}{(1-z)^{\lambda+1}} * f(z), \lambda \geq-1, z \in \mathbb{E} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $\lambda=n \in \mathbb{N}_{0}=\mathbb{N} \cup\{0\}$

$$
R^{n} f(z)=\frac{z\left(z^{n-1} f(z)\right)^{(n)}}{n!}, z \in \mathbb{E}
$$

Lecko et al. [3] observed that for $\lambda \geq-1$, the expression given in (1.1) becomes

$$
R^{\lambda} f(z)=z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{(\lambda+1)(\lambda+2) \ldots(\lambda+k-1)}{(k-1)!} a_{k} z^{k}, z \in \mathbb{E}
$$

and for every $\lambda>-1$

$$
\begin{aligned}
R^{1} R^{\lambda} f(z) & =z\left(R^{\lambda} f\right)^{\prime}(z)=z\left(\frac{z}{(1-z)^{\lambda+1}} * f(z)\right)^{\prime} \\
& =\frac{z}{(1-z)^{\lambda+1}} *\left(z f^{\prime}(z)\right)=R^{\lambda}\left(z f^{\prime}(z)\right)=R^{\lambda} R^{1} f(z), z \in \mathbb{E}
\end{aligned}
$$

We notice that

$$
R^{-1} f(z)=z, R^{0} f(z)=f(z), R^{1} f(z)=z f^{\prime}(z) \text { and } R^{2} f(z)=z f^{\prime}(z)+\frac{z^{2}}{2} f^{\prime \prime}(z)
$$

and so on. For $\lambda \geq-1$ and for $z \in \mathbb{E}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
z\left(R^{\lambda} f\right)^{\prime}(z)=(\lambda+1) R^{\lambda+1} f(z)-\lambda R^{\lambda} f(z) \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Ruscheweyh [5] introduced the class $K_{\lambda}$ defined as

$$
K_{\lambda}=\left\{f \in \mathcal{A}: \Re\left(\frac{R^{\lambda+1} f(z)}{R^{\lambda} f(z)}\right)>\frac{1}{2}, \lambda \in \mathbb{N}_{0}, z \in \mathbb{E}\right\}
$$

He gave coefficient estimates and determined some special elements of $K_{\lambda}$. In 1980, Al-Amiri [1] introduced and studied the class $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(\alpha, \beta), \lambda \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$ defined as :

$$
\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(\alpha, \beta)=\left\{f \in \mathcal{A}: \Re P_{\lambda}(f(z) ; \alpha, \beta)>0, \lambda \in \mathbb{N}_{0}, z \in \mathbb{E}\right\}
$$

where

$$
P_{\lambda}(f(z) ; \alpha, \beta)=\left(\frac{R^{\lambda+1} f(z)}{R^{\lambda} f(z)}-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\alpha}\left(\frac{R^{\lambda+2} f(z)}{R^{\lambda+1} f(z)}-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\beta}
$$

and $\alpha, \beta$ are real numbers. He observed that for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}_{0}, \mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(\alpha, \beta)$ contains many interesting classes of univalent functions; $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(1,0)=K_{\lambda}, \mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(0,1)=K_{\lambda+1}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{0}(\alpha, 0)$ is contained in strongly starlike class when $|\alpha| \geq 1$. Owa et al. [4] introduced and studied the following classes:

$$
\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{*}=\left\{f \in \mathcal{A}: R^{\lambda} f(z) \in \mathcal{S}^{*}, \lambda \geq-1\right\}
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{K}_{\lambda}=\left\{f \in \mathcal{A}: R^{\lambda} f(z) \in \mathcal{K}, \lambda \geq-1\right\}
$$

They established several interesting properties of $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{*}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda}$.
The results of above nature motivated us for the work of present paper. We, here, study the following differential inequality

$$
\left|\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda} f(z)}-1\right|^{\alpha}\left|\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda+1} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda+1} f(z)}-1\right|^{\beta}<M(\alpha, \beta, \mu, \lambda), z \in \mathbb{E}
$$

where $\alpha \geq 0, \beta \geq 0,0 \leq \mu<1$ and $\lambda \geq 0$ and obtain certain results for starlike and convex functions as special cases of our main result.

## 2 Preliminary

To prove our main result, we shall make use of the following lemma due to Jack [2].
Lemma 2.1. Suppose $w(z)$ be a non-constant analytic function in $\mathbb{E}$, with $w(0)=0$. If $|w(z)|$ attains its maximum value at a point $z_{0} \in \mathbb{E}$ on the circle $|z|=r<1$, then $z_{0} w^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=k w\left(z_{0}\right)$, where $k \geq 1$, is some real number.

## 3 Main Results

Theorem 3.1. Let $\alpha, \beta$ and $\mu$ be real numbers such that $\alpha \geq 0, \beta \geq 0,0 \leq \mu<1$. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda} f(z)}-1\right|^{\alpha}\left|\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda+1} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda+1} f(z)}-1\right|^{\beta}<M(\alpha, \beta, \mu, \lambda), z \in \mathbb{E} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
M(\alpha, \beta, \mu, \lambda)= \begin{cases}(1-\mu)^{\alpha+\beta}\left(1+\frac{1}{2(1+\lambda-\mu)}\right)^{\beta}, & 0 \leq \mu \leq 1 / 2 \\ (1-\mu)^{\alpha+\beta}\left(1+\frac{\mu}{\mu+\lambda}\right)^{\beta}, & 1 / 2 \leq \mu<1 .\end{cases}
$$

then

$$
\Re\left(\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda} f(z)}\right)>\mu, \lambda \geq 0, z \in \mathbb{E}
$$

Proof. Case(i) Let $0 \leq \mu \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Define

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda} f(z)}=\frac{1+(1-2 \mu) w(z)}{1-w(z)}, z \in \mathbb{E} . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $w(z)$ is analytic in $\mathbb{E}, w(0)=0$ and $w(z) \neq 1$ in $\mathbb{E}$. Using (1.2), we get

$$
\frac{R^{\lambda+1} f(z)}{R^{\lambda} f(z)}=\frac{(1+\lambda)+(1-2 \mu-\lambda) w(z)}{(1+\lambda)(1-w(z))}
$$

On differentiating above equation logarithmically, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda+1} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda+1} f(z)}-\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda} f(z)}=\frac{2(1-\mu) z w^{\prime}(z)}{[(1+\lambda)+(1-2 \mu-\lambda) w(z)][1-w(z)]} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

By making use of (3.2), the above equation reduces to

$$
\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda+1} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda+1} f(z)}=\frac{1+(1-2 \mu) w(z)}{1-w(z)}+\frac{2(1-\mu) z w^{\prime}(z)}{[(1+\lambda)+(1-2 \mu-\lambda) w(z)][1-w(z)]} .
$$

Now, from (3.1), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda} f(z)}-1\right|^{\alpha}\left|\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda+1} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda+1} f(z)}-1\right|^{\beta} \\
& =\left|\frac{2(1-\mu) w(z)}{1-w(z)}\right|^{\alpha}\left|\frac{2(1-\mu) w(z)}{1-w(z)}+\frac{2(1-\mu) z w^{\prime}(z)}{[(1+\lambda)+(1-2 \mu-\lambda) w(z)][1-w(z)]}\right|^{\beta} \\
& =\left|\frac{2(1-\mu) w(z)}{1-w(z)}\right|^{\alpha+\beta}\left|1+\frac{z w^{\prime}(z)}{w(z)[(1+\lambda)+(1-2 \mu-\lambda) w(z)]}\right|^{\beta}
\end{aligned}
$$

We need to prove $|w(z)|<1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{E}$. If $|w(z)| \nless 1$ then there exists a point $z_{0} \in \mathbb{E}$ such that $\max _{|z| \leq\left|z_{0}\right|}|w(z)|=\left|w\left(z_{0}\right)\right|=1$. Then by Lemma 2.1, we have $w\left(z_{0}\right)=e^{i \theta}, 0<\theta \leq 2 \pi$ and $z_{0} w^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=k w\left(z_{0}\right), k \geq 1$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\frac{z_{0}\left(R^{\lambda} f\left(z_{0}\right)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda} f\left(z_{0}\right)}-1\right| & \left|\frac{z_{0}\left(R^{\lambda+1} f\left(z_{0}\right)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda+1} f\left(z_{0}\right)}-1\right|^{\beta} \\
& =\left|\frac{2(1-\mu) w\left(z_{0}\right)}{1-w\left(z_{0}\right)}\right|^{\alpha+\beta}\left|1+\frac{z_{0} w^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{w\left(z_{0}\right)\left[(1+\lambda)+(1-2 \mu-\lambda) w\left(z_{0}\right)\right]}\right|^{\beta} \\
& =\frac{2^{\alpha+\beta}(1-\mu)^{\alpha+\beta}}{\left.\left|1-e^{i \theta}\right|\right|^{\beta+\alpha}}\left|1+\frac{k}{(1+\lambda)+(1-2 \mu-\lambda) e^{i \theta}}\right|^{\beta} \\
& \geq(1-\mu)^{\alpha+\beta}\left(1+\frac{k}{2(1+\lambda-\mu)}\right)^{\beta} \geq(1-\mu)^{\alpha+\beta}\left(1+\frac{1}{2(1+\lambda-\mu)}\right)^{\beta}
\end{aligned}
$$

which contradicts (3.1) for $0 \leq \mu \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Thus, we must have $|w(z)|<1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{E}$ and hence the result follows.

Case(ii) For $\frac{1}{2} \leq \mu<1$, define $w$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda} f(z)}=\frac{\mu}{\mu-(1-\mu) w(z)}, z \in \mathbb{E} \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $w(z) \neq \frac{\mu}{1-\mu}$ in $\mathbb{E}$. Then $w(z)$ is analytic in $\mathbb{E}$ and $w(0)=0$. In view of (1.2) and proceeding as in Case(i), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda} f(z)}-1\right|^{\alpha}\left|\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda+1} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda+1} f(z)}-1\right|^{\beta} \\
& \quad=\left|\frac{(1-\mu) w(z)}{\mu-(1-\mu) w(z)}\right|^{\alpha}\left|\frac{(1-\mu) w(z)}{\mu-(1-\mu) w(z)}+\frac{\mu(1-\mu) z w^{\prime}(z)}{[\mu(1+\lambda)-\lambda(1-\mu) w(z)][\mu-(1-\mu) w(z)]}\right|^{\beta} \\
& =\left|\frac{(1-\mu) w(z)}{\mu-(1-\mu) w(z)}\right|^{\alpha+\beta}\left|1+\frac{\mu z w^{\prime}(z)}{w(z)[\mu(1+\lambda)-\lambda(1-\mu) w(z)]}\right|^{\beta}
\end{aligned}
$$

We need to show that $|w(z)|<1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{E}$. On the contrary, suppose that there exists a point $z_{0} \in \mathbb{E}$ such that $\max _{|z| \leq\left|z_{0}\right|}|w(z)|=\left|w\left(z_{0}\right)\right|=1$. Then by Lemma 2.1, we have $w\left(z_{0}\right)=e^{i \theta}, 0<$ $\theta \leq 2 \pi$ and $z_{0} w^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=k w\left(z_{0}\right), k \geq 1$. Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left|\frac{z_{0}\left(R^{\lambda} f\left(z_{0}\right)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda} f\left(z_{0}\right)}-1\right|^{\alpha}\left|\frac{z_{0}\left(R^{\lambda+1} f\left(z_{0}\right)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda+1} f\left(z_{0}\right)}-1\right|^{\beta} \\
&=\left|\frac{(1-\mu) w\left(z_{0}\right)}{\mu-(1-\mu) w\left(z_{0}\right)}\right|^{\alpha+\beta}\left|1+\frac{\mu k w\left(z_{0}\right)}{w\left(z_{0}\right)\left[\mu(1+\lambda)-\lambda(1-\mu) w\left(z_{0}\right)\right]}\right|^{\beta} \\
& \geq(1-\mu)^{\alpha+\beta}\left(1+\frac{k \mu}{\mu+\lambda}\right)^{\beta} \\
& \geq(1-\mu)^{\alpha+\beta}\left(1+\frac{\mu}{\mu+\lambda}\right)^{\beta}
\end{aligned}
$$

which contradicts (3.1) for $\frac{1}{2} \leq \mu<1$. Thus, we must have $|w(z)|<1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{E}$, hence we conclude in view of (3.4) that

$$
\Re\left(\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda} f(z)}\right)>\mu, z \in \mathbb{E}
$$

Setting $\lambda=0$ in Theorem 3.1, we obtain result of Singh et al. [6]:
Corollary 3.2. Let $\alpha, \beta$ and $\mu$ be real numbers such that $\alpha \geq 0, \beta \geq 0$, and $0 \leq \mu<1$, with $\beta+\alpha>0$. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies

$$
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-1\right|^{\alpha}\left|\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right|^{\beta}< \begin{cases}(1-\mu)^{\alpha}\left(\frac{3}{2}-\mu\right)^{\beta}, & 0 \leq \mu \leq 1 / 2 \\ (1-\mu)^{\alpha+\beta} 2^{\beta}, & 1 / 2 \leq \mu<1\end{cases}
$$

then

$$
\Re\left(\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right)>\mu, z \in \mathbb{E}
$$

Hence $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}(\mu)$.

Taking $\lambda=0$ and replacing $f(z)$ with $z f^{\prime}(z)$ in Theorem 3.1, we get the following result of Singh et al.[6]:

Corollary 3.3. Let $\alpha, \beta$ and $\mu$ be real numbers such that $\alpha \geq 0, \beta \geq 0,0 \leq \mu<1$ with $\beta+\alpha>0$. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies

$$
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right|^{\alpha}\left|\frac{2 z f^{\prime \prime}(z)+z^{2} f^{\prime \prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)+z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}\right|^{\beta}< \begin{cases}(1-\mu)^{\alpha}\left(\frac{3}{2}-\mu\right)^{\beta}, & 0 \leq \mu \leq 1 / 2 \\ (1-\mu)^{\alpha+\beta} 2^{\beta}, & 1 / 2 \leq \mu<1\end{cases}
$$

then

$$
\Re\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right)>\mu, z \in \mathbb{E}
$$

Hence $f \in \mathcal{K}(\mu)$.
Setting $\lambda=1$ in Theorem 3.1, we obtain:
Corollary 3.4. Let $\alpha, \beta$ and $\mu$ be real numbers such that $\alpha \geq 0, \beta \geq 0,0 \leq \mu<1$ with $\beta+\alpha>0$. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies

$$
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right|^{\alpha}\left|\frac{3 z f^{\prime \prime}(z)+z^{2} f^{\prime \prime \prime}(z)}{2 f^{\prime}(z)+z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}\right|^{\beta}< \begin{cases}(1-\mu)^{\alpha+\beta}\left(\frac{5-2 \mu}{4-2 \mu}\right)^{\beta}, & 0 \leq \mu \leq 1 / 2 \\ (1-\mu)^{\alpha+\beta}\left(\frac{2 \mu+1}{\mu+1}\right)^{\beta}, & 1 / 2 \leq \mu<1\end{cases}
$$

then

$$
\Re\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right)>\mu, z \in \mathbb{E}
$$

l.e. $f \in \mathcal{K}(\mu)$.

Selecting $\alpha=0$ and $\beta=1$ in Theorem 3.1, we have:
Corollary 3.5. Let $\mu$ be a real number such that $0 \leq \mu<1$. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies

$$
\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda+1} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda+1} f(z)} \prec \begin{cases}1+(1-\mu) z+\frac{(1-\mu) z}{2(1+\lambda-\mu)}, & 0 \leq \mu \leq 1 / 2 \\ 1+(1-\mu) z+\frac{\mu(1-\mu) z}{\mu+\lambda}, & 1 / 2 \leq \mu<1\end{cases}
$$

then

$$
\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda} f(z)} \prec \frac{1+(1-2 \mu) z}{1-z}, z \in \mathbb{E}
$$

hence

$$
\Re\left(\frac{z\left(R^{\lambda} f(z)\right)^{\prime}}{R^{\lambda} f(z)}\right)>\mu
$$
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