

MAJORIZATION PROPERTIES FOR CERTAIN CLASS OF ANALYTIC FUNCTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE GENERALIZED DERIVATIVE OPERATOR

GARIMA AGARWAL

ABSTRACT: Invoking generalize derivative operator $D_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m}$, we investigate the Majorization properties for analytic functions.

1. Introduction

Let f and g be Holomorphic in the open unit disc

$$\Delta = \{z: z \in \mathbb{C}, |z| < 1\} \tag{1.1}$$

We say that f is majorized by g in Δ (see[7]) and write

$$f(z) \ll g(z) \quad (z \in \Delta), \tag{1.2}$$

If there exist a function φ , analytic in Δ s.t.

$$|\varphi(z)| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad f(z) = \varphi(z)g(z) \quad (z \in \Delta), \tag{1.3}$$

It may be noted that (1.2) is closely related to the concept of quasi-subordination between holomorphic functions

Let A denote the class of holomorphic function of the form

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^k, \tag{1.4}$$

where, a_k is the complex number, which is holomorphic in the open unit disc $\Delta = \{Z \in \mathbb{C}: |Z| < 1\}$. An holomorphic function $f(z)$ is subordinate to the holomorphic function $g(z)$, written $f(z) \prec g(z)$, if there exist an holomorphic function w in Δ , such that $w(0) = 0$, $|w(z)| < 1$ and $f(z) = g(w(z))$. In particular, if $g(z)$ is univalent in Δ , then $f(z) \prec g(z)$ is equivalent to $f(0) = g(0)$ and $f(\Delta) \subset g(\Delta)$.

Now E.El.Yagubi and M.Darus [1] define the generalized derivative operator $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m}$ is defined as follows:

Definition 1. For $f(z) \in A$, the operator $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m}$ is defined by $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m}: A \rightarrow A$

$$\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z) = \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^m f(z) \times \mathcal{R}^n f(z), \quad z \in U \tag{1.5}$$

where, $n, m, b \in \mathcal{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$, $\lambda_2 \geq \lambda_1 \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{R}^n f(z)$ denotes the Ruscheweyh derivative operator, given by

$$\mathcal{R}^n f(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} c(n, k) a_k z^k \tag{1.6}$$

$$\text{where, } c(n, k) = \frac{(n+1)_{k-1}}{(1)_{k-1}} \tag{1.7}$$

Keyword. Holomorphic functions, generalize derivative operator, Majorization properties, Subordination.

and
$$\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^m f(z) = z + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{1 + (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)(k-1) + b}{1 + (\lambda_2)(k-1) + b} \right]^m z^k \quad (1.8)$$

where, $m, b \in \mathcal{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ and $\lambda_2 \geq \lambda_1 \geq 0$.

If $f(z)$ is given by (1.4), then by (1.6) we can write

$$\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \left[\frac{1 + (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)(k-1) + b}{1 + (\lambda_2)(k-1) + b} \right]^m c(n, k) a_k z^k \quad (1.9)$$

where, $c(n, k)$ is given by (1.8).

In view of (1.9), it is clear that $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, 0}$ is the Ruscheweyh Derivative operator (see [6]) and $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, 0, 0}^{n, 1} = \mathcal{D}_n^{\lambda_1}$ the generalized Ruscheweyh derivative operator (see[4]). $\mathcal{D}_{1, 0, 0}^{0, m} = s^n$ the Salageon derivative operator (see [2]). $\mathcal{D}_{1, 0, b}^{0, m} = \mathcal{D}_b^m$ the Cho and Srivastava derivative operator (see[5]).

Definition 2. A function $f(z)$ is said to be in the class $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m}$ if and only if

$$\frac{z[\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z)]'}{\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z)} \prec \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz} \quad (1.10)$$

where, $1 \geq A > B \geq -1$

For detail one can see [1].

Lemma 1. $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z)$ Satisfies the following:

$$z[\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z)]' = \frac{(1+b)}{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)} \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m+1} f(z) - \frac{\{1 - (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)(k-1) + b\}}{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)} \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z) \quad (1.11)$$

it is three term recurrence relation.

2. Majorization Problem for the Class $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m}$

Theorem (1). Let the function $f(z) \in A$ and suppose that $g(z) \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m}(A, B)$. If

$$\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z) \ll \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} g(z) \quad (2.1)$$

$$\text{Then, } \left| \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m+1} f(z) \right| \leq \left| \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m+1} g(z) \right| \text{ for } |z| \leq r_0 \quad (2.2)$$

$$r^3 \left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right) [\{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)(A - B) + B(1+b)\}] - r^2 \left[\left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right) \{ (1+b) + 2B(1+b) \} \right] \\ - r \left[2(1+b) + \left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right) \{ (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)(A - B) + B(1+b) \} \right] + \left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right) (1+b) = 0$$

$$k, \eta \in \mathbb{C}, p(0) = 1, \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_1 \geq 0, n, m, b \in \mathcal{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$$

$$|1+b| \geq |(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)(A - B) + B(1+b)|, 1 \geq A > B \geq -1$$

Proof. Since $f(z) \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m}$, we find from (1.11) that

$$\frac{z(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z))}{\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z)} = \frac{1 + A|z|}{1 + B|z|} \quad (2.3)$$

where, $\omega(z) = c_1 z + c_2 z^2 + \dots$, $\omega \in \mathcal{P}$, \mathcal{P} denotes the well known class of the bounded analytic functions in \mathbb{U} and satisfies the condition $\omega(0) = 0$, and $|\omega(z)| \leq |z|$ ($z \in \mathbb{U}$)

$$\left| \frac{z(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z))'}{\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z)} \right| \leq |p(z)| + \frac{|z||p'(z)|}{k|p(z)| + \eta} \quad (2.4)$$

By using (1.11) in (2.4)

$$\left| \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z) \right| \leq \frac{(1+b)(1+B|z|)}{(1+b) - |z| \left\{ [(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)(A-B) + B(1+b)] \right\}} \left| \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m+1} f(z) \right| \quad (2.5)$$

Since $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z)$ is majorized by $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} g(z)$ in the unit disk \mathbb{U} , from (1.3) we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z) = \varphi(z) \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} g(z) \quad (2.6)$$

where, $\varphi(z) \leq 1$. Differentiating (2.6) w.r. to z and multiplying by z , we get

$$z(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z))' = z\varphi(z)'(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} g(z)) + z\varphi(z)(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} g(z))' \quad (2.7)$$

Which on using (1.11), gives

$$\left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right) \left| \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m+1} f(z) \right| = |z| |\varphi(z)'| \left| \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} g(z) \right| + |\varphi(z)| \left| \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m+1} g(z) \right| \left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right) \quad (2.8)$$

Noting that $\varphi(z) \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfying the inequality (see[8])

$$|\varphi(z)'| \leq \frac{1 - |\varphi(z)|^2}{1 - |z|^2} \quad (2.9)$$

Now making use of (2.5) and (2.9) in (2.8)

$$\left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right) \left| \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m+1} f(z) \right| \leq \left[|\varphi(z)| \left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right) + \left(\frac{1 - |\varphi(z)|^2}{1 - |z|^2} \right) |z| \right] \left\{ \frac{(1+b)(1+B|z|)}{(1+b) - |z| \left\{ [(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)(A-B) + B(1+b)] \right\}} \right\} \left| \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m+1} g(z) \right| \quad (2.11)$$

Which upon setting $|z| = r$, $|\varphi(z)| = \rho$ ($0 \leq \rho \leq 1$)

Leads us to the inequality

$$\left| \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m+1} f(z) \right| \leq \frac{\vartheta(\rho) \left| \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m+1} g(z) \right|}{(1-r^2) \left[(1+b) + r \left\{ [(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)(A-B) + B(1+b)] \right\} \right] \left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right)} \quad (2.12)$$

where, $\vartheta(\rho) = \rho \left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right) (1-r^2) [(1+b) - r \{ (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)(A-B) + B(1+b) \}]$
 $+ r(1+b)(1+|B|r)(1-\rho^2)$

Takes the maximum value at $\rho = 1$, with $r_0 = r_0(n, m, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, b)$. Where r_0 is the smallest positive root of equation (2.2). Furthermore if $0 \leq \sigma \leq r_0$, then the function $\phi(\rho)$ defined by

$$\phi(\rho) = \rho \left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right) (1-\sigma^2) [(1+b) - \sigma \{ (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)(A-B) + B(1+b) \}]$$

$$+ \sigma(1+b)(1+|B|\sigma)(1-\rho^2)$$

Is an increasing function on the interval $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$, so that

$$\phi(\rho) = \phi(1) = \left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right) (1-\sigma^2) [(1+b) - \sigma \{ (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)(A-B) + B(1+b) \}]$$

$$(0 \leq \rho \leq 1, 0 \leq \sigma \leq r_0) \quad (2.11)$$

Hence upon setting $\rho = 1$, in (2.14), we conclude that (2.1) of Theorem (1) holds true for $|z| \leq r_0$.

Where, $r_0 = r_0(A, B, n, m, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, b)$ is the smallest positive root of equation (2.2). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

Setting $A = 1, B = -1$ in Theorem (1), we have

Corollary (1): Let the function $f(z) \in A$ and suppose that $g(z) \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m}$. If

$$\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} f(z) \ll \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m} g(z)$$

Then, $\left| \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m+1} f(z) \right| \leq \left| \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m+1} g(z) \right|$ for $|z| \leq r_1$

$$\text{where, } r_1(n, m, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, b) = \frac{\delta \pm \sqrt{\delta^2 - 4(1+b) \left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right)^2 |2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) - (1+b)|}}{2 \left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right) |2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) - (1+b)|}$$

$$\text{where, } \delta = \left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right) \{ |2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) - (1+b)| + (1+b) \} + 2(1+b)$$

Setting $\xi = \left(\frac{1+b}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right)$ in Corollary (1), we have

Corollary (2): Let the function $f(z) \in A$ and suppose that $g(z) \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, b}^{n, m}$. If

$$\left(\mathcal{S}_{0, z}^{\lambda, \mu, \eta} f(z) \right)^j \ll \left(\mathcal{S}_{0, z}^{\lambda, \mu, \eta} g(z) \right)^j$$

Then, $\left| \left(\mathcal{S}_{0, z}^{\lambda+1, \mu, \eta} f(z) \right)^j \right| \leq \left| \left(\mathcal{S}_{0, z}^{\lambda+1, \mu, \eta} g(z) \right)^j \right|$ for $|z| \leq r_2(n, m, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, b)$

$$\text{where, } r_2(j, \lambda, \mu, \eta) = \frac{[|2 - \xi| + (2 + \xi)] \pm \sqrt{[|2 - \xi| + (2 + \xi)]^2 - 4|2 - \xi|\xi}}{2|2 - \xi|}$$

For detail one can see [3].

References

1. E. El-Yagubi and M. Darus, Subclasses of analytic functions defined by new generalized derivative operator, J. of Quality Measurement and Analysis, 9(1), 47-56(2013).
2. G.S. Salegean, Subclasses of univalent functions, Proceedings of the complex analysis 5th Romanian-Finnish seminar part-I, 1013, 362-372(1983).
3. J.K. Prajapat, M.K. Aouf, Majorization properties for certain class of p -valently analytic function defined by generalized fractional differintegral operator, J. Computers and Mathematics with Applications, 63, 42-47(2012).
4. K. Al-Shaqsi and M. Darus, On univalent functions with respect to k -symmetric points defined by a generalized Ruscheweyh derivative operators, J. of Analysis and Applications 7(1), 53-61(2009).
5. N.E. Cho and H.M. Srivastava, Argument estimate of certain analytic functions defined by a class of multiplier transformations, Mathematical and Computer Modelling 37(1-2), 39-49(2003).
6. S. Ruschweyh, New criteria for univalent functions, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 49(1975) 109-115.
7. T.H. MacGregor, Majorization by Univalent function, Duke Math. J. 34(1967) 95-102.
8. Z. Nehari, Conformal Mapping, McGraw-Hill, New York, Toronto, London, 1952.