

On the Classes of Analytic Functions Defined by Using Al - Oboudi Operator *

Hesam Mahzoon[†]

Manasagangotri University of Mysore Mysore-570 006 India

and

S. Latha[‡]

*Department of Mathematics Yuvaraja's College
University of Mysore Mysore - 570 005 India*

Received March 31, 2009, Accepted May 12, 2009.

Abstract

In this note, we define the new subclasses $\mathcal{N}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)$ of analytic functions using the Al - Oboudi operator. For functions belonging to these classes we determine coefficient inequalities, extreme points and integral means inequalities.

Keywords and Phrases: *Analytic functions, Al - Oboudi operator, Coefficient inequalities, Extreme points and Integral means.*

*2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 30C45.

[†]E-mail: mahzoon_hesam@yahoo.com

[‡]Corresponding author. E-mail: drlatha@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Let \mathcal{A} be the class of functions f of the form

$$f(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^k, \quad (1.1)$$

which are analytic in the open unit disc $\mathcal{U} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$.

Definition 1.1. [1] Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda \geq 0$, the Al - Oboudi operator $D_\lambda^n : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, is defined as $D_\lambda^0 f(z) = f(z)$, $D_\lambda^1 f(z) = (1-\lambda)f(z) + zf'(z) = D_\lambda f(z)$ and $D_\lambda^n f(z) = D_\lambda(D_\lambda^{n-1}f(z))$.

Further, if $f(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^k$, then we have,

$$D_\lambda^n f(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} [1 + (k-1)\lambda]^n a_k z^k, \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}_0). \quad (1.2)$$

Remark 1.2. It is easy to observe that for $\lambda = 1$, we get the Sălăgean operator [8].

Definition 1.3. A function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is said to be in the class $\mathcal{N}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)$ if

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{D_\lambda^m f(z)}{D_\lambda^n f(z)} \right\} > \beta \left| \frac{D_\lambda^m f(z)}{D_\lambda^n f(z)} - 1 \right| + \alpha, \quad (1.3)$$

for some $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, $\beta \geq 0$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\lambda \geq 0$ and $z \in \mathcal{U}$.

The following are the special cases of the class $\mathcal{N}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)$:

- i. $\mathcal{N}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, 1) \equiv \mathcal{N}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta)$, the class introduced by Eker and Owa [3].
- ii. $\mathcal{N}_{1,0}(\alpha, \beta, 1) \equiv \mathcal{SD}(\alpha, \beta)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{2,1}(\alpha, \beta, 1) \equiv \mathcal{KD}(\alpha, \beta)$, the classes studied by Shams, Kulkarni and Jahangiri [9].
- iii. $\mathcal{N}_{m,n}(\alpha, 0, 1) \equiv \mathcal{K}_{m,n}(\alpha)$, the class studied by Eker and Owa [4].
- iv. $\mathcal{N}_{1,0}(\alpha, 0, 1) \equiv \mathcal{S}^*(\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{2,1}(\alpha, 0, 1) \equiv \mathcal{K}(\alpha)$, the classes introduced by Robertson [7].

2. Coefficient Inequalities for the Class $\mathcal{N}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)$

Theorem 2.1. *If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies,*

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta) |a_k| \leq 2(1 - \alpha) \quad (2.1)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta) = & |(1 + \alpha) [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n - [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m| \\ & + ((1 - \alpha) [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n + [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m) \\ & + 2\beta |[1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m - [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n| \end{aligned}$$

for some α ($0 \leq \alpha < 1$), $\beta \geq 0$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\lambda \geq 0$, then $f \in \mathcal{N}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)$.

Proof. Let, the expression (2.1) be true for $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, $\beta \geq 0$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\lambda \geq 0$. Hence it suffices to show that,

$$|(1 - \alpha)D_{\lambda}^n f(z) + D_{\lambda}^m f(z) - \beta e^{i\theta} |D_{\lambda}^m f(z) - D_{\lambda}^n f(z)||$$

$$- |(1 + \alpha)D_{\lambda}^n f(z) - D_{\lambda}^m f(z) + \beta e^{i\theta} |D_{\lambda}^m f(z) - D_{\lambda}^n f(z)|| > 0.$$

So, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(1 - \alpha)D_\lambda^n f(z) + D_\lambda^m f(z) - \beta e^{i\theta} |D_\lambda^m f(z) - D_\lambda^n f(z)|| \\
& - |(1 + \alpha)D_\lambda^n f(z) - D_\lambda^m f(z) + \beta e^{i\theta} |D_\lambda^m f(z) - D_\lambda^n f(z)|| \\
& = \left| (2 - \alpha)z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \{(1 - \alpha)[1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n + [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m\} a_k z^k \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \beta e^{i\theta} \left| \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \{[1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m - [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n\} a_k z^k \right| \right| \\
& \quad - \left| \alpha z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \{(1 + \alpha)[1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n - [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m\} a_k z^k \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \beta e^{i\theta} \left| \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \{[1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m - [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n\} a_k z^k \right| \right| \\
& \geq (2 - \alpha)|z| - \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} |(1 - \alpha)[1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n + [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m| |a_k| |z|^k \\
& \quad - \beta |e^{i\theta}| \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} |[1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m - [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n| |a_k| |z|^k \\
& \quad - \alpha |z| - \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} |(1 + \alpha)[1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n - [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m| |a_k| |z|^k \\
& \quad - \beta |e^{i\theta}| \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} |[1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m - [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n| |a_k| |z|^k \\
& \geq 2(1 - \alpha) - \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \{|(1 + \alpha)[1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n - [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m| \\
& \quad + ((1 - \alpha)[1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n + [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m) \\
& \quad + 2\beta |[1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m - [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n|\} |a_k| \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

3. Relation for $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)$

By Theorem 2.1, we introduce the class $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)$ as the subclass of $\mathcal{N}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)$ consisting of f satisfying

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta) |a_k| \leq 2(1 - \alpha) \quad (3.1)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta) &= |(1 + \alpha) [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n - [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m| \\ &\quad + ((1 - \alpha) [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n + [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m) \\ &\quad + 2\beta |[1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^m - [1 + (k - 1)\lambda]^n| \end{aligned}$$

for some α ($0 \leq \alpha < 1$), $\beta \geq 0$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\lambda \geq 0$.

Theorem 3.1. *If $f \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta_2, \lambda) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta_1, \lambda)$ for some β_1 and β_2 , such that $0 \leq \beta_1 \leq \beta_2$.*

Proof. For $0 \leq \beta_1 \leq \beta_2$, we have

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta_1) |a_k| \leq \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta_2) |a_k|.$$

Therefore, if $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta_2, \lambda)$, then $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta_1, \lambda)$.

4. Extreme Points

The determination of the extreme points of a family \mathcal{F} of univalent functions enables us to solve many external problems for \mathcal{F} .

Theorem 4.1. *Let $f_1(z) = z$ and*

$$f_k(z) = z + \frac{2(1 - \alpha)\varepsilon_k}{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)} z^k, \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots; |\varepsilon_k| = 1).$$

Then, $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)$ if and only if it can be expressed in the form

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k f_k(z),$$

where, $\lambda_k \geq 0$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k = 1$.

Proof. Let $f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k f_k(z)$, $\lambda_k \geq 0$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, with $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k = 1$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k f_k(z) &= \lambda_1 z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \lambda_k \left(z + \frac{2(1-\alpha)\varepsilon_k}{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)} z^k \right) \\ &= z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \lambda_k \frac{2(1-\alpha)\varepsilon_k}{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)} z^k. \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta) \left| \frac{2(1-\alpha)\varepsilon_k}{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)} \lambda_k \right| &= \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} 2(1-\alpha)\lambda_k \\ &= 2(1-\alpha)(1-\lambda_1) \leq 2(1-\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

which is the condition (3.1) for $f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k f_k(z)$. Thus, $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)$.

Conversely, let $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)$. Since

$$|a_k| \leq \frac{2(1-\alpha)}{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)}, \quad (k = 2, 3, \dots)$$

we put

$$\lambda_k = \frac{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)}{2(1-\alpha)\varepsilon_k} a_k, \quad (|\varepsilon_k| = 1)$$

and

$$\lambda_1 = 1 - \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \lambda_k.$$

Then,

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k f_k(z).$$

Corollary 4.2. *The extreme points of $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)$ are the functions $f_1(z) = z$ and*

$$f_k(z) = z + \frac{2(1-\alpha)\varepsilon_k}{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)} z^k, \quad (k = 2, 3, \dots; |\varepsilon_k| = 1).$$

5. Integral Means Inequalities

For any two functions f and g analytic in \mathcal{U} , f is said to be subordinate to g in \mathcal{U} , denoted by $f \prec g$ if there exists an analytic function ω defined \mathcal{U} satisfying $\omega(0) = 0$ and $|\omega(z)| < 1$ such that $f(z) = g(\omega(z))$, $z \in \mathcal{U}$.

In particular, if the function g is univalent in \mathcal{U} , the above subordination is equivalent to $f(0) = g(0)$ and $f(\mathcal{U}) \subset g(\mathcal{U})$. In 1925, Littlewood [6] proved the following Subordination Theorem.

Theorem 5.1. [6] : *If f and g are any two functions, analytic in \mathcal{U} , with $f \prec g$, then for $\mu > 0$ and $z = re^{i\theta}$, ($0 < r < 1$),*

$$\int_0^{2\pi} |f(z)|^\mu d\theta \leq \int_0^{2\pi} |g(z)|^\mu d\theta.$$

Theorem 5.2. *Let $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{m,n}(\alpha, \beta, \lambda)$ and f_k be defined by*

$$f_k(z) = z + \frac{2(1-\alpha)\varepsilon_k}{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)} z^k, \quad (k = 2, 3, \dots; |\varepsilon_k| = 1).$$

If there exists an analytic function $\omega(z)$ given by

$$[\omega(z)]^{k-1} = \frac{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)}{2(1-\alpha)\varepsilon_k} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^{k-1},$$

then for $z = re^{i\theta}$ and $0 < r < 1$,

$$\int_0^{2\pi} |f(re^{i\theta})|^\mu d\theta \leq \int_0^{2\pi} |f_k(re^{i\theta})|^\mu d\theta, \quad (\mu > 0).$$

Proof. We have to prove that

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \left| 1 + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^{k-1} \right|^\mu d\theta \leq \int_0^{2\pi} \left| 1 + \frac{2(1-\alpha)\varepsilon_k}{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)} z^{k-1} \right|^\mu d\theta.$$

By Theorem 5.1, it suffices to show that

$$1 + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^{k-1} \prec 1 + \frac{2|b|(1-\alpha)\varepsilon_k}{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)} z^{k-1}.$$

By taking

$$1 + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^{k-1} = 1 + \frac{2(1-\alpha)\varepsilon_k}{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)} [\omega(z)]^{k-1}$$

we get

$$[\omega(z)]^{k-1} = \frac{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)}{2(1-\alpha)\varepsilon_k} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^{k-1}.$$

Clearly, $\omega(0) = 0$. By (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |[\omega(z)]|^{k-1} &= \left| \frac{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)}{2(1-\alpha)\varepsilon_k} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^{k-1} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\psi(\lambda, m, n, k, \alpha, \beta)}{2(1-\alpha)|\varepsilon_k|} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} |a_k| |z|^{k-1} \\ &\leq |z| < 1. \end{aligned}$$

References

- [1] F. M. AL - Oboudi, On univalent functions defined by a generalized Sălăgean operator, *Ind. J. Math. Math. Sci.*, no.25-28 (2004), 1429-1436.
- [2] P. L. Duren, *Univalent functions*, Springer-Verlag, 1983.
- [3] S. S. Eker and S. Owa, Certian classes of analytic functions involving Sălăgean operator, *J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.*, (in course of publication).
- [4] S. S. Eker and S. Owa, New applications of classes of analytic functions involving Sălăgean operator, *International Symposium on Complex Function Theory and Applications, Brasov, Romania*, 1 - 5 (2006).
- [5] S. S. Eker and B. Seker, On a class of multivalent functions defined by Sălăgean operator, *General Mathematics*, **15** Nr.2-3 (2007), 154 - 163.
- [6] J. E. Littlewood, On inequalities in the theory of functions, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, **23**(1925), 481-519.
- [7] M. S. Robertson, On the theory of univalent functons, *Annals of Math.*, **37**(1936), 374-406.
- [8] G. S. Sălăgean, *On some classes of univalent functions*, Seminar of Geometric function theory, Cluj - Napoca, 1983.
- [9] S. Shams, S. R. Kulkarni, and J. M. Jahangiri, Classes of uniformly starlike and convex functions, *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Science*, **55**(2004), 2959-2961.