

On Differential Sandwich Theorems of Analytic Functions Defined by Generalized Integral Operator

Waggas Galib Atshan¹, Faiz Jawad Abdulkhadim²

Department of Mathematics, College of Computer Science and Mathematics, University of Al-Qadisiya, Diwaniya, Iraq

Abstract: In this paper, we obtain some applications of first order differential Subordination and super ordination results involving a generalized integral operator for certain normalized analytic functions.

Keywords: Analytic functions, p -valent, integral operator, subordination and sandwich

2014 Mathematics Subject Classification: 30C45

1. Introduction

Let $A(p)$ denote the class of functions of the form:

$$f(z) = z^p + \sum_{k=p+1}^{\infty} a_k z^k \quad (a_k \geq 0, p \in N = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}), \quad (1.1)$$

which are analytic and p -valent in the open unit disk $U = \{z: z \in \mathbb{C}, |z| < 1\}$. If f and g are analytic functions in U , we say that f is subordinate to g in U ,

written $f < g$ or $f(z) < g(z)$, if there exists a Schwarz function $w(z)$ analytic in U , with $w(0) = 0$ and $|w(z)| < 1$ such that

$$f(z) = g(w(z)), \quad (z \in U).$$

In particular, if the function g is univalent in U , then $f < g$ if

$$f(0) = g(0), \text{ and } f(U) \subset g(U) \quad ([4, 13]).$$

For the function f given by (1.1) and $g \in A(p)$ given by

$$g(z) = z^p + \sum_{k=p+1}^{\infty} b_k z^k.$$

the Hadamard product (or convolution) of f and g is defined by

$$(f * g)(z) = z^p + \sum_{k=p+1}^{\infty} a_k b_k z^k = (g * f)(z).$$

The set of all functions f that are analytic and injective on $\bar{U} \setminus E(f)$, Denote by Q where

$$E(f) = \left\{ \zeta \in \partial U : \lim_{z \rightarrow \zeta} f(z) = \infty \right\}.$$

and are such that $f(\zeta) \neq 0$ for $\zeta \in \partial U \setminus E(f)$ (see [14]).

Let $\psi: \mathbb{C}^3 \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and h is univalent in U with $q \in Q$. Miller and Mocanu [13] consider the problem of determining conditions on admissible functions ψ such that

$$\psi(p(z), zp(z), z^2 \dot{p}(z); z) < h(z) \quad (1.2)$$

implies $p(z) < q(z)$, for all functions $p(z) \in H[a, n]$ that satisfy the differential subordination (1.2), moreover, they found conditions so that q is the smallest function with this property, called the best dominant of the subordination (1.2).

Let $\phi: \mathbb{C}^3 \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and $h \in H$ with $q \in H[a, n]$. Recently Miller and Mocanu [14, 15] studied the dual problem and determined conditions on ϕ such that

$$h(z) < \phi(p(z), zp(z), z^2 \dot{p}(z); z) \quad (1.3)$$

implies $q(z) < p(z)$, for all functions $p \in Q$ that satisfy the above super ordination. They also found conditions so that the

function q is the largest function with this property, called the best subordinate of the super ordination (1.3).

In [5] Cataş extended the multiplier transformation and defined the operator $I_p^m(\lambda, \ell) f(z)$ on $A(p)$ by the following infinite series

$$I_p^m(\lambda, \ell) f(z) = z^p + \sum_{k=p+1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{p + \ell + \lambda(k-p)}{p + \ell} \right]^m a_k z^k, \quad (\lambda \geq 0; \ell \geq 0; p \in N, m \in N_0; z \in U), \quad (1.4)$$

we note that:

$$I_p^0(\lambda, \ell) f(z) = f(z), \text{ and } I_p^1(1, 0) f(z) = \frac{zf(z)}{p}.$$

By specializing the parameters m, λ, ℓ and p , we obtain the following operators studied by various authors:

- 1) $I_p^m(1, \ell) f(z) = I_p(m, \ell) f(z)$ (see [12, 21])
- 2) $I_p^m(1, 0) f(z) = D_p^m f(z)$ (see [2.11, 18]).
- 3) $I_1^m(1, \ell) f(z) = I_\ell^m f(z)$ (see [6, 7]).
- 4) $I_1^m(1, 0) f(z) = D^m f(z)$ ($m \in N_0$) (see [19]).
- 5) $I_1^m(\lambda, 0) f(z) = D_\lambda^m f(z)$ (see [1]).
- 6) $I_1^m(1, 1) f(z) = I^m f(z)$ (see [22]).
- 7) $I_p^m(\lambda, 0) f(z) = D_{\lambda, p}^m f(z)$, where $D_{\lambda, p}^m f(z)$ is defined by

$$D_{\lambda, p}^m f(z) = z^p + \sum_{k=p+1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{p + \lambda(k-p)}{p} \right]^m a_k z^k,$$

Furthermore we define the integral operator $I_p^m(\lambda, \alpha, \delta) f(z)$, $f(z) \in A(p)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} I_p^0(\lambda, \alpha, \delta) f(z) &= f(z) \\ I_p^1(\lambda, \alpha, \delta) f(z) &= I_p(\lambda, \alpha, \delta) f(z) \\ &= \left(\frac{p + \alpha\delta}{\lambda} \right) z^{p - \left(\frac{p + \alpha\delta}{\lambda} \right)} \int_0^z t^{\left(\frac{p + \alpha\delta}{\lambda} \right) - (p+1)} f(t) dt \\ I_p^2(\lambda, \alpha, \delta) f(z) &= \left(\frac{p + \alpha\delta}{\lambda} \right) z^{p - \left(\frac{p + \alpha\delta}{\lambda} \right)} \int_0^z t^{\left(\frac{p + \alpha\delta}{\lambda} \right) - (p+1)} I_p^1(\lambda, \alpha, \delta) f(t) dt \\ &\text{and, in general} \\ I_p^m(\lambda, \alpha, \delta) f(z) &= \left(\frac{p + \alpha\delta}{\lambda} \right) z^{p - \left(\frac{p + \alpha\delta}{\lambda} \right)} \int_0^z t^{\left(\frac{p + \alpha\delta}{\lambda} \right) - (p+1)} I_p^{m-1}(\lambda, \alpha, \delta) f(t) dt \\ &\quad (f(z) \in A(p); m \in N_0; z \in U) \quad (1.5) \end{aligned}$$

We see that for $f(z) \in A(p)$, we have that

$$I_p^m(\lambda, \alpha, \delta)f(z) = z^p + \sum_{k=p+1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{p + \alpha\delta}{p + \alpha\delta + \lambda(k-p)} \right)^m a_k z^k, (m \in N_0). \quad (1.6)$$

From (1.6), it easy to verify that

$$\lambda z(I_p^{m+2}f(z))' = (\alpha\delta + p)(I_p^{m+1}f(z))' - (\alpha\delta + p(1-\lambda))(I_p^{m+2}f(z)). \quad (1.7)$$

We note that:

- 1) $I_p^m(\lambda, 0, 0)f(z) = I_{\lambda}^{-m}f(z)$ (see [18])
- 2) $I_1^{\alpha}(1, 1, 1)f(z) = I^{\alpha}f(z)$ (see [10]).
- 3) $I_p^m(1, 1, 1)f(z) = I_p^m f(z)$ (see [20]).
- 4) $I_1^m(1, 1, 1)f(z) = D^m f(z)$ (see [17]).
- 5) $I_1^m(1, 1, 1)f(z) = I^m f(z)$ (see [9]).
- 6) $I_1^m(1, 0, 0)f(z) = I^m f(z)$ (see [19]).

Also we note that :

- 1- $I_p^m(1, 0, 0)f(z) = J_p^m f(z)$
 $= \left\{ f(z) : J_p^m f(z) = z^p + \sum_{k=n+p}^{\infty} \left(\frac{p}{k} \right)^m a_k z^k, m \in N_0, z \in U \right\}.$
- 2- $I_p^m(1, l, 1)f(z) = J_p^m(l)f(z)$
 $= \left\{ f(z) : J_p^m(l)f(z) = z^p + \sum_{k=n+p}^{\infty} \left(\frac{p+l}{k+l} \right)^m a_k z^k, m \in N_0, l > 0, z \in U \right\}.$
- 3- $I_p^m(\lambda, 0, 0)f(z) = J_{p,\lambda}^m f(z)$
 $= \left\{ f(z) : J_{p,\lambda}^m f(z) = z^p + \sum_{k=n+p}^{\infty} \left(\frac{p}{k + \lambda(k-p)} \right)^m a_k z^k, m \in N_0, \lambda \geq 0, z \in U \right\}.$

In this paper, we shall determine some properties on the admissible functions defined with operator $I_p^m(\lambda, \alpha, \delta)$.

2. Preliminaries

In order to prove our results, we shall make use of the following known results.

Lemma (2.1)[8]: Let q be univalent in U , $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^* \setminus \{0\}$ and suppose that

$$Re \left\{ 1 + \frac{z\dot{q}(z)}{\dot{q}(z)} \right\} > \max \left\{ 0, -Re \left(\frac{1}{\zeta} \right) \right\}. \quad (2.1)$$

If $p(z)$ is analytic in U , with $p(0) = q(0)$ and

$$p(z) + \zeta z\dot{p}(z) < q(z) + \zeta z\dot{q}(z), \quad (2.2)$$

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

Lemma (2.2)[13]: Let the function $q(z)$ be univalent in the unit disk, and let θ, φ be analytic in domain D containing $q(U)$ with $\varphi(w) \neq 0$ when $w \in q(U)$. Set

$Q(z) = z\dot{q}(z)\varphi(q(z))$ and $h(z) = \theta(q(z)) + Q(z)$. Suppose that

1- Q is star like univalent in U .

2- $Re \left\{ \frac{zh(z)}{Q(z)} \right\} > 0$ for $z \in U$.

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

$$\theta(p(z)) + z\dot{p}(z)\varphi(p(z)) < \theta(q(z)) + z\dot{q}(z)\varphi(q(z)), \quad (2.3)$$

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

Lemma (2.3)[3]: Let $q(z)$ be convex in U , $q(0) = a$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$, $Re(\zeta) > 0$.

If $p \in H[a, 1]$ and $p(z) + \gamma z\dot{q}(z)$ is univalent in U then

$$q(z) + \zeta z\dot{q}(z) < p(z) + \zeta z\dot{p}(z), \quad (2.4)$$

implies $q(z) < p(z)$, and $q(z)$ is the best subdominant.

Lemma (2.4)[4]: Let $q(z)$ be convex univalent in the unit disk U and let θ, φ be analytic in a domain D containing $q(U)$. Suppose that

$$1 - Re \left\{ \frac{\theta(q(z))}{\varphi(q(z))} \right\} > 0, \text{ for } z \in U.$$

2- $z\dot{q}(z)\varphi(q(z))$ is star like univalent in U .

If $p(z) \in H[q(0), 1] \cap Q$, with $p(U) \subseteq D$, and $\theta(p(z)) + z\dot{p}(z)\varphi(p(z))$ is univalent in U , and

$$\theta(q(z)) + z\dot{q}(z)\varphi(q(z)) < \theta(p(z)) + z\dot{p}(z)\varphi(p(z)), \quad (2.5)$$

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

3. Main Results

Unless otherwise mentioned, we shall assume in the reminder of this paper that $\lambda > 0, \alpha, \delta \geq 0; p \in N, m \in N_0 = N \cup \{0\}; z \in U$ and the powers are understood as principle values.

Theorem (3.1): Let $q(z)$ be univalent in U with $q(0) = 1, \beta \in \mathbb{C}^*, \gamma > 0$ and suppose that

$$Re \left\{ 1 + \frac{z\dot{q}(z)}{\dot{q}(z)} \right\} > \max \left\{ 0, -Re \left(\frac{\gamma(\alpha\delta + p)}{\beta\lambda} \right) \right\}, \quad (3.1)$$

If $f \in A(p)$ satisfies the subordination

$$(1 - \beta) \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p} \right)^{\sigma} + \beta \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p} \right)^{\sigma} \frac{I_p^{m+1}f(z)}{I_p^{m+2}f(z)} < q(z) + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\gamma(\alpha\delta + p)} z\dot{q}(z), \quad (3.2)$$

then

$$\left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p} \right)^{\sigma} < q(z)$$

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

Proof : If we consider the analytic function

$$\left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p} \right)^{\sigma}, \sigma > 0, z \in U \quad (3.3)$$

Differentiating (3.3) logarithmically with respect to z and using the identity (1.7) in the resulting equation, we have

$$\frac{z\dot{p}(z)}{p(z)} = \frac{\sigma(\delta\alpha + p)}{\lambda} \left(\frac{I_p^{m+1}f(z)}{I_p^{m+2}f(z)} - 1 \right), \quad (3.4)$$

that is

$$\frac{\lambda}{\sigma(\delta\alpha + p)} z\dot{p}(z) = \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p} \right)^{\sigma} \left(\frac{I_p^{m+1}f(z)}{I_p^{m+2}f(z)} - 1 \right)$$

Thus, the subordination (3.2) is equivalent to

$$p(z) + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\sigma(\delta\alpha + p)} z\dot{p}(z) < q(z) + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\sigma(\delta\alpha + p)} z\dot{q}(z). \quad (3.5)$$

Applying lemma (2.1), with $\zeta = \frac{\beta\lambda}{\sigma(\delta\alpha + p)}$, the proof of Theorem (1.1) is completed.

Taking the convex function $(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$, in the Theorem (1.1), we have the following corollary.

Corollary (3.1): Let $A, B \in \mathbb{C}, A \neq B, |B| < 1, Re(\beta) > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$. If $f(z) \in A(p)$ satisfies the subordination

$$(1 - \beta) \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p} \right)^{\sigma} + \beta \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p} \right)^{\sigma} \frac{I_p^{m+1}f(z)}{I_p^{m+2}f(z)} < \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz} + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\sigma(1 + p)(1 + Bz)^2}$$

Then

$$\left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p}\right)^\sigma < \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$$

and $\frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$ is the best dominant.

Taking $m = 0$ in Theorem (3.1), we obtain the following result:

Corollary (3.2): Let $q(z)$ be univalent in U , with $q(0) = 1, \beta \in \mathbb{C}^*, \sigma > 0$, and suppose that (3.1) holds. If $f(z) \in A(p)$ satisfies the subordination

$$(1-\beta)\left(\frac{I_p^2f(z)}{z^p}\right)^\sigma + \beta\left(\frac{I_p^2f(z)}{z^p}\right)^\gamma \frac{I_p^1f(z)}{I_p^2f(z)} < q(z) + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\sigma(\alpha\delta+p)}z\dot{q}(z),$$

then

$$\left(\frac{I_p^2f(z)}{z^p}\right)^\sigma < q(z).$$

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

Taking $\alpha = \lambda = 1$ in the Theorem (3.1), we have the following result.

Corollary (3.3) : Let $q(z)$ be univalent in U , with $q(0) = 1, \beta \in \mathbb{C}^*, \sigma > 0$, and suppose that (3.1) holds. If $f(z) \in A(p)$ satisfies the subordination

$$(1-\beta)\left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p}\right)^\sigma + \beta\left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p}\right)^\sigma \frac{I_p^{m+1}f(z)}{I_p^2f(z)} < q(z) + \frac{\beta}{\sigma(\delta+p)}z\dot{q}(z),$$

then

$$\left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p}\right)^\sigma < q(z).$$

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

Theorem (3.2) : Let $q(z)$ be univalent in U , with $q(0) = 1$ and $q(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in U$, let $\lambda, \sigma \in \mathbb{C}^*, f \in A(p)$ and suppose that f and q satisfy the next conditions:

$$\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p} \neq 0, (3.6)$$

and

$$Re\left\{1 + \frac{z\dot{q}(z)}{\dot{q}(z)} - \frac{z\dot{q}(z)}{q(z)}\right\} > 0, (z \in U) (3.7)$$

If

$$\frac{I_p^{m+1}f(z)}{I_p^{m+2}f(z)} < 1 + \frac{\lambda z q'(z)}{\sigma(\alpha\delta+p)q(z)}, (3.8)$$

then

$$\left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p}\right)^\sigma < q(z)$$

and $q(z)$ is the best dominant of (3.6).

Proof: Let

$$p(z) = \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p}\right)^\sigma, z \in U (3.9)$$

According to (3.4) the function $p(z)$ is analytic in U , and differentiating (3.9) logarithmically with respect to z , we obtain

$$\frac{z\dot{p}(z)}{p(z)} = \frac{\sigma(\delta\alpha+p)}{\lambda} \left(\frac{I_p^{m+1}f(z)}{I_p^{m+2}f(z)} - 1\right), (3.10)$$

In order to prove our result we will use Lemma (2.2). In this lemma consider

$$\theta(w) = 1 \text{ and } \varphi(w) = \frac{\lambda}{\sigma(\alpha\delta+p)w}$$

then θ is analytic in \mathbb{C} and $\varphi(w) \neq 0$ is analytic in \mathbb{C}^* . Also if we let

$$Q(z) = z\dot{q}(z)\varphi(q(z)) = \frac{\lambda z\dot{q}(z)}{\sigma(\alpha\delta+p)q(z)}$$

and

$$h(z) = \theta(q(z)) + Q(z) = 1 + \frac{\lambda z\dot{q}(z)}{\gamma\sigma(\alpha\delta+p)q(z)}$$

from (3.7), we see that $Q(z)$ is a starlike function in U . We also have

$$Re\left\{\frac{zh(z)}{Q(z)}\right\} = Re\left\{1 + \frac{z\dot{q}(z)}{\dot{q}(z)} - \frac{z\dot{q}(z)}{q(z)}\right\} > 0, (z \in U)$$

and then, by using Lemma (2.2) we deduce that the subordination (3.6) implies

$$p(z) < q(z)$$

and the function $q(z)$ is the best dominant of (3.8).

$$\text{Taking } q(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} \quad (-1 \leq B < A \leq 1) \quad \text{in}$$

Theorem (3.2), it is easy to check that the assumption (3.5) holds, hence we obtain the next result.

Corollary (3.4) : Let $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}^*$. Let $f(z) \in A(p)$ and suppose that

$$\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p} \neq 0, (z \in U).$$

If

$$\frac{I_p^{m+1}f(z)}{I_p^{m+2}f(z)} < 1 + \frac{\lambda z(A-B)}{\sigma(\alpha\delta+p)(1+Az)(1+Bz)}$$

then

$$\left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p}\right)^\sigma < \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$$

and $q(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$ is the best dominant.

Taking $q(z) = \frac{1+z}{1-z}$ in Theorem (3.2), it is easy to check that the assumption (3.5) holds, hence we obtain the next result.

Corollary (3.5) : Let $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}^*, f(z) \in A(p)$ and suppose that

$$\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p} \neq 0, (z \in U).$$

If

$$\frac{I_p^{m+1}f(z)}{I_p^{m+2}f(z)} < 1 + \frac{2\lambda z}{\sigma(\alpha\delta+p)(1-z)(1+z)}$$

then

$$\left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p}\right)^\sigma < \frac{1+z}{1-z}$$

and $q(z) = \frac{1+z}{1-z}$ is the best dominant.

Theorem (3.3): Let $q(z)$ be univalent in U , with $q(0) = 1$, let $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}^*$, and let $\psi, \nu, \eta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\nu + \eta \neq 0$. Let $f \in A(p)$ and suppose that f and q satisfy the next conditions:

$$\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1}f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{(\nu + \eta)z^p} \neq 0, (z \in U) (3.11)$$

and

$$Re\left\{1 + \frac{z\dot{q}(z)}{\dot{q}(z)}\right\} > \max\{0, -Re(\psi)\}, (z \in U) (3.12)$$

If

$$\Psi(z) = \psi \left[\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{(\nu + \eta) z^p} \right]^\sigma + \sigma \left[\left(\frac{\nu z (I_p^{m+1} f(z))' + \nu z (I_p^{m+2} f(z))'}{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)} - p \right) \right] - p \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$\Psi(z) < \psi q(z) + \frac{z \dot{q}(z)}{q(z)}, \quad (3.14)$$

then

$$\left[\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{(\nu + \eta) z^p} \right]^\sigma < q(z)$$

and $q(z)$ is the best dominant of (3.11).

Proof : Let

$$p(z) = \left[\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{(\nu + \eta) z^p} \right]^\sigma, \quad z \in U \quad (3.15)$$

According to (3.8) the function $p(z)$ is analytic in U , and differentiating (3.15) logarithmically with respect to z , we obtain

$$\frac{z \dot{p}(z)}{p(z)} = \sigma \left[\frac{\nu z (I_p^{m+1} f(z))' + \nu z (I_p^{m+2} f(z))'}{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)} - p \right], \quad (3.16)$$

and hence

$$z \dot{p}(z) = \sigma \left[\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{(\nu + \eta) z^p} \right]^\sigma \left[\frac{\nu z (I_p^{m+1} f(z))' + \nu z (I_p^{m+2} f(z))'}{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)} - p \right] - p$$

In order to prove our result, we will use Lemma (2.2). In this lemma consider

$$\theta(w) = \psi w \text{ and } \varphi(w) = \frac{1}{w}$$

then θ is analytic in \mathbb{C} and $\varphi(w) \neq 0$ is analytic in \mathbb{C}^* . Also if we let

$$Q(z) = z \dot{q}(z) \varphi(q(z)) = \sigma \left[\frac{\nu z (I_p^{m+1} f(z))' + \nu z (I_p^{m+2} f(z))'}{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)} - p \right]$$

and

$$h(z) = \theta(q(z)) + Q(z)$$

$$= \psi \left[\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{(\nu + \eta) z^p} \right]^\sigma + \sigma \left[\left(\frac{\nu z (I_p^{m+1} f(z))' + \nu z (I_p^{m+2} f(z))'}{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)} - p \right) \right]$$

from (3.11), we see that $Q(z)$ is a starlike function in U . We also have

$$\operatorname{Re} \left\{ \frac{z \dot{h}(z)}{Q(z)} \right\} = \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \psi + 1 + \frac{z \dot{q}(z)}{q(z)} \right\} > 0, \quad (z \in U)$$

and then, by using Lemma (2.2) we deduce that the subordination (3.14) implies

$$p(z) < q(z).$$

Taking $q(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$ ($-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$) in Theorem (3.3) and according to (3.4), the condition (3.12) becomes

$$\max\{0, -\operatorname{Re}(\psi)\} \leq \frac{1 - |B|}{1 + |B|}.$$

Hence, for the special case $\nu = 1$ and $\eta = 0$, we obtain the following result.

Corollary (3.6) : Let $\psi \in \mathbb{C}$ with

$$\max\{0, -\operatorname{Re}(\psi)\} \leq \frac{1 - |B|}{1 + |B|}.$$

Let $f(z) \in A(p)$ and suppose that

$$\frac{I_p^{m+1} f(z)}{z^p} \neq 0, \quad (z \in U).$$

If

$$\psi \left[\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z)}{z^p} \right]^\sigma + \sigma \left[\left(\frac{z (I_p^{m+1} f(z))'}{I_p^{m+1} f(z)} - p \right) \right] < \psi \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz} + \frac{(A - B)z}{(1 + Az)(1 + Bz)}$$

then

$$\left(\frac{I_p^{m+1} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\gamma < \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz}$$

and $q(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$ is the best dominant.

Taking $p = \nu = m = 1, \eta = 0$ and $q(z) = \frac{1+z}{1-z}$ in

Theorem (3.3), we obtain the next result.

Corollary (3.7) : Let $f(z) \in A(p)$ and suppose that

$$\frac{I_p^2 f(z)}{z^p} \neq 0, \quad (z \in U).$$

and $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}^*$. If

$$\psi \left[\frac{I^2 f(z)}{z} \right]^\sigma + \sigma \left[\left(\frac{z (I^2 f(z))'}{I^2 f(z)} - 1 \right) \right] < \psi \frac{1 + z}{1 - z} + \frac{2z}{(1 + z)(1 - z)}$$

then

$$\left(\frac{I^2 f(z)}{z} \right)^\gamma < \frac{1 + z}{1 - z}$$

and $q(z) = \frac{1+z}{1-z}$ is the best dominant.

4. Superordination and Sandwich Results

Theorem (4.1): Let $q(z)$ be a convex in U with $q(0) = 1, \beta \in \mathbb{C}, \operatorname{Re}(\beta) > 0, \gamma > 0$. If

$f(z) \in A(p)$ such that $\left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma \in H[q(0), 1] \cap Q$ and

$(1 - \beta) \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma + \beta \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma \frac{I_p^{m+1} f(z)}{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}$ is univalent in U , and satisfies the superordination

$$q(z) + \frac{\beta \lambda}{\gamma(\alpha \delta + p)} z \dot{q}(z) < (1 - \beta) \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma + \beta \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma \frac{I_p^{m+1} f(z)}{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}, \quad (4.1)$$

then

$$q(z) < \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma$$

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

Proof : If we consider the analytic function

$$\left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma, \quad z \in U \quad (4.2)$$

Differentiating (4.2) logarithmically with respect to z and using the identity (1.7) in the resulting equation, we have

$$\frac{z \dot{p}(z)}{p(z)} = \frac{\sigma(\delta \alpha + p)}{\lambda} \left(\frac{I_p^{m+1} f(z)}{I_p^{m+2} f(z)} - 1 \right)$$

that is

$$\frac{\lambda}{\sigma(\delta\alpha + p)} z\dot{p}(z) = \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2}f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma \left(\frac{I_p^{m+1}f(z)}{I_p^{m+2}f(z)} - 1 \right)$$

Thus, the subordination (4.1) is equivalent to

$$q(z) + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\sigma(\delta\alpha + p)} z\dot{q}(z) < p(z) + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\sigma(\delta\alpha + p)} z\dot{p}(z).$$

Applying Lemma (2.3), with $\zeta = \frac{\beta\lambda}{\sigma(\delta\alpha + p)}$, the proof of Theorem (4.1) is completed.

Taking $m = 0$ in Theorem (4.1), we obtain the following result:

Corollary (4.1): Let $q(z)$ be convex in U , with $q(0) = 1, \beta \in \mathbb{C}, \operatorname{Re}(\beta) > 0, \sigma \in \mathbb{C}^*$, and suppose that (3.1) holds. If $f(z) \in A(p)$ such that $\left(\frac{I_p^2 f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma \in H[q(0), 1] \cap Q$ and

$$(1 - \beta) \left(\frac{I_p^2 f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma + \beta \left(\frac{I_p^2 f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma \frac{I_p f(z)}{I_p^2 f(z)}$$

Is univalent in U and satisfies the superordination

$$q(z) + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\sigma(\alpha\delta + p)} z\dot{q}(z) < (1 - \beta) \left(\frac{I_p^2 f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma + \beta \left(\frac{I_p^2 f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma \frac{I_p f(z)}{I_p^2 f(z)},$$

then

$$q(z) < \left(\frac{I_p^2 f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma.$$

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

Taking $\alpha = \lambda = 1$ in the Theorem (4.1), we have the following result.

Corollary (4.2): Let $q(z)$ be convex in U , with $q(0) = 1, \beta \in \mathbb{C}, \operatorname{Re}(\beta) > 0, \sigma \in \mathbb{C}^*$, and suppose that (3.1) holds. If $f(z) \in A(p)$ such that $\left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma \in H[q(0), 1] \cap Q$ and

$$(1 - \beta) \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma + \beta \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma \frac{I_p^{m+1} f(z)}{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}$$

Is univalent in U and satisfies the superordinant

$$q(z) + \frac{\beta}{\sigma(\delta + p)} z\dot{q}(z) < (1 - \beta) \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma + \beta \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma \frac{I_p^{m+1} f(z)}{I_p^{m+2} f(z)},$$

$$q(z) < \left(\frac{I_p^2 f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma.$$

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

Theorem (4.2) : Let $q(z)$ be convex in U , with $q(0) = 1$, let $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and let $\psi, \nu, \eta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\nu + \eta \neq 0$ and $\operatorname{Re}(\psi) > 0$. Let $f \in A(p)$ and suppose that f satisfies the next conditions:

$$\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{(\nu + \eta) z^p} \neq 0, (z \in U) \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{(\nu + \eta) z^p} \right)^\sigma \in H[q(0), 1] \cap Q, \quad (4.4)$$

If the function $\Psi(z)$ given by (3.13) is univalent in U and,

$$\psi q(z) + \frac{z\dot{q}(z)}{q(z)} < \Psi(z), \quad (4.5)$$

then

$$q(z) < \left(\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{(\nu + \eta) z^p} \right)^\sigma$$

and $q(z)$ is the best subordinate of (4.5).

Proof : Let

$$p(z) = \left(\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{(\nu + \eta) z^p} \right)^\sigma, \quad z \in U \quad (4.6)$$

According to (4.3) the function $p(z)$ is analytic in U , and differentiating (4.6) logarithmically with respect to z , we obtain

$$\frac{z\dot{p}(z)}{p(z)} = \sigma \left[\frac{\nu z(I_p^{m+1} f(z))' + \nu z(I_p^{m+2} f(z))'}{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)} - p \right], \quad (4.7)$$

In order to prove our result we will use Lemma (2.4). In this lemma consider

$$\theta(w) = \psi w \text{ and } \varphi(w) = \frac{1}{w}$$

then θ is analytic in \mathbb{C} and $\varphi(w) \neq 0$ is analytic in \mathbb{C}^* .

We see that

$$Q(z) = z\dot{q}(z)\varphi(q(z)) = \sigma \left[\frac{\nu z(I_p^{m+1} f(z))' + \nu z(I_p^{m+2} f(z))'}{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)} - p \right]$$

and

$$h(z) = \theta(q(z)) + Q(z) = \psi \left[\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{(\nu + \eta) z^p} \right]^\sigma + \sigma \left[\frac{\nu z(I_p^{m+1} f(z))' + \nu z(I_p^{m+2} f(z))'}{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)} - p \right]$$

from (3.11), we see that $Q(z)$ is a starlike function in U .

From, we also have

$$\operatorname{Re} \left\{ \frac{z\dot{h}(z)}{h(z)} \right\} = \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \psi + 1 + \frac{z\dot{q}(z)}{q(z)} \right\} > 0, (z \in U)$$

and then, by using Lemma (2.4) we deduce that the subordination (4.5) implies

$$q(z) < p(z)$$

the proof of Theorem (4.2) is completed.

Combining Theorem (3.1) with Theorem (4.1) and Theorem (3.3) with Theorem (4.2), we obtain, respectively the following two sandwich results.

Theorem (4.3) : Let q_1, q_2 are two convex functions in U with $q_1(0) = q_2(0) = 1$ and q_2 satisfies (3.1), $\beta \in \mathbb{C}, \operatorname{Re}(\beta) > 0$ and $\operatorname{Re}(\sigma) > 0$. If $f(z) \in A(p)$ such that

$$\left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma \in H[q(0), 1] \cap Q,$$

and $\Phi(1 - \beta) \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma + \beta \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma \frac{I_p^{m+1} f(z)}{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}$ is univalent in U , and satisfies

$$q_1(z) + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\gamma(\alpha\delta + p)} z\dot{q}_1(z) < (1 - \beta) \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma + \beta \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma \frac{I_p^{m+1} f(z)}{I_p^{m+2} f(z)} < q_2(z) + \frac{\beta\lambda}{\gamma(\alpha\delta + p)} z\dot{q}_2(z), \quad (4.8)$$

then

$$q_1(z) < \left(\frac{I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{z^p} \right)^\sigma < q_2(z)$$

and q_1, q_2 are, respectively, the best subdominant and the best dominant of (4.8).

Theorem (4.4) : Let q_1, q_2 are two convex in U , with $q_1(0) = q_2(0) = 1$, let $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and $\psi, \nu, \eta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\nu + \eta \neq 0$ and $\operatorname{Re}(\psi) > 0$. Let $f \in A(p)$ and suppose that f satisfies the next conditions:

$$\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{(\nu + \eta) z^p} \neq 0, (z \in U)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{(\nu + \eta) z^p} \right)^\sigma \in H[q(0), 1] \cap Q,$$

If the function $\Psi(z)$ given by (3.13) is univalent in U and,

$$\psi q_1(z) + \frac{z \dot{q}_1(z)}{q_1(z)} < \Psi(z) < \psi q_2(z) + \frac{z \dot{q}_2(z)}{q_2(z)}, \quad (4.9)$$

then

$$q_1(z) < \left(\frac{\nu I_p^{m+1} f(z) + \eta I_p^{m+2} f(z)}{(\nu + \eta) z^p} \right)^\sigma < q_2(z)$$

and $q_1(z), q_2(z)$ are, respectively, the best subordinate and the best dominant of (4.9).

Remark 1: Combining Corollaries (3.2), (4.1) and (3.3), (4.2), we obtain the corresponding Sandwich results for the operators I_p and I_p^{m+1} , respectively.

Remark 2: Taking $p = \lambda = 1$ and $l = 0$ in Theorems (3.1), (4.1) and (4.3), respectively, we obtain the results obtained by Cotirlă [8, Theorems (3.1), (3.4) and (3.7), respectively].

References

- [1] F.M. Al-Oboudi, On univalent functions defined by a generalized Salagean operator, *Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci.* 27 (2004) 1429–1436.
- [2] M.K. Aouf, A.O. Mostafa, On a subclass of n - p -valent prestarlike functions, *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 55 (2008), 851–861.
- [3] T. Bulboacă, Classes of first order differential superordinations, *Demonstratio Math.* 35 (2) (2002), 287–292.
- [4] T. Bulboacă, Differential Subordinations and Superordinations, Recent Results, House of Scientific Book Publ., Cluj-Napoca, 2005.
- [5] A. Catas, On certain classes of p -valent functions defined by multiplier transformations, in: *Proc. Book of the International Symposium on Geometric Function Theory and Applications*, Istanbul, Turkey, August 2007, pp. 241–250.
- [6] N. E. Cho and T.H. Kim, Multiplier transformations and strongly close-to-convex functions, *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.*, 40 (3) (2003), 399–410.
- [7] N.E. Cho, H.M. Srivastava, Argument estimates of certain analytic functions defined by a class of multiplier transformations, *Math. Comput. Modelling*, 37 (1–2) (2003), 39–49.
- [8] L. Cotirlă, A differential sandwich theorem for analytic functions defined by the integral operator, *Stud. Univ. Babeş-Bolyai Math.*, 54 (2) (2009), 13–21.
- [9] T.M. Flett, The dual of an inequality of Hardy and Littlewood and some related inequalities, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 38 (1972), 746–765.

- [10] T.B. Jung, Y. C. Kim and H.M. Srivastava, The Hardy space of analytic functions associated with certain one-parameter families of integral operator, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 176 (1993), 138–147.
- [11] M. Kamali and H. Orhan, On a subclass of certain starlike functions with negative coefficients, *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.* 41 (1) (2004) 53–71.
- [12] S.S. Kumar, H. C. Taneja and V. Ravichandran, Classes multivalent functions defined by Dziok–Srivastava linear operator and multiplier transformations, *Kyungpook Math. J.*, 46 (2006), 97–109.
- [13] S.S. Miller, P.T. Mocanu, *Differential Subordination: Theory and Applications*, in: *Series on Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 225, Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, Basel, 2000.
- [14] S.S. Miller, P.T. Mocanu, Subordinates of differential superordinations, *Complex Var.*, 48 (10) (2003), 815–826.
- [15] S.S. Miller and P. T. Mocanu, Briot–Bouquet differential superordinations and sandwich theorems, *J. Math., Anal. Appl.*, 329 (1) (2007), 327–335.
- [16] H. Orhan and H. Kiziltunc, A generalization on subfamily of p -valent functions with negative coefficients, *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 155 (2004), 521–530.
- [17] J. Patel, Inclusion relations and convolution properties of certain subclasses of analytic functions defined by a generalized Salagean operator, *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin*, 15 (2008), 33–47.
- [18] J. Patel and P. Sahoo, Certain subclasses of multivalent analytic functions, *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math.*, 34 (3) (2003) 487–500.
- [19] G.S. Sălăgean, Subclasses of univalent functions, in: *Lecture Notes in Math.*, vol. 1013, Springer-Verlag, 1983, pp. 362–372.
- [20] S. Shams, S.R. Kulkarni and J.M. Jahangiri, Subordination properties of p -valent functions defined by integral operators, *Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci.* (2006) 1–3. Art. ID 94572.
- [21] H.M. Srivastava, K. Suchithra, B. Adolf Stephen and S. Sivasubramanian, Inclusion and neighborhood properties of certain subclasses of multivalent functions of complex order, *J. Ineq. Pure Appl. Math.*, 7 (5) (2006), 1–8. Art. 191.
- [22] B. A. Uralegaddi, C. Somanatha and Certain classes of univalent functions, in: H.M. Srivastava, S. Owa (Eds.), *Current Topics in Analytic Function Theory*, World Scientific Publishing Company, Singapore, 1992, pp. 371–374.

Author Profile

Waggas Galib Atshan, Assist. Prof. Dr. in Mathematics (Complex Analysis), teacher at University of Al-Qadisiya, College of Computer Science & Mathematics, Department of Mathematics, he has 90 papers published in various journals in mathematics till now, he taught seventeen subjects in mathematics till now (undergraduate, graduate), he is supervisor of 20 students (Ph.D., M.Sc.) till now, he attended 23 international and national conferences.