An. Şt. Univ. Ovidius Constanţa Vol. 21(1), 2013, 5–18

Differential sandwich theorems of $p-$valent analytic functions involving a linear operator

M. K. Aouf and T. M. Seoudy

Abstract

In this paper we derive some subordination and superordination results for certain $p-$valent analytic functions in the open unit disc, which are acted upon by a class of a linear operator. Some of our results improve and generalize previously known results.

1 Introduction

Let $H(U)$ denotes the class of analytic functions in the open unit disc $U = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ and let $H[a, p]$ denotes the subclass of the functions $f \in H(U)$ of the form:

$$f(z) = a + a_p z^p + a_{p+1} z^{p+1} + ...(a \in \mathbb{C}; p \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, ..\}).$$

Also, let $\mathcal{A}(p)$ be the subclass of the functions $f \in H(U)$ of the form:

$$f(z) = z^p + \sum_{k=p+1}^{\infty} a_k z^k \qquad (p \in \mathbb{N}), \tag{1.1}$$

and set $\mathcal{A} \equiv \mathcal{A}(1)$. For functions $f(z) \in A(p)$, given by (1.1), and $g(z)$ given by

$$g(z) = z^p + \sum_{k=p+1}^{\infty} b_k z^k \qquad (p \in \mathbb{N}), \tag{1.2}$$

Key Words: Analytic function, Hadamard product, differential subordination, superordination, linear operator.
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 30C45.
Received: April, 2011.
Revised: April, 2011.
Accepted: February, 2012.

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

$$(f*g)(z) = z^p + \sum_{k=p+1}^{\infty} a_k b_k z^k = (g*f)(z). \tag{1.3}$$

For $f, g \in H(U)$, we say that the function f is subordinate to g, if there exists a Schwarz function w, i.e, $w \in H(U)$ with $w(0) = 0$ and $|w(z)| < 1$, $z \in U$, such that $f(z) = g(w(z))$ for all $z \in U$. This subordination is usually denoted by $f(z) \prec g(z)$. It is well-known that, if the function g is univalent in U, then $f(z) \prec g(z)$ is equivalent to $f(0) = g(0)$ and $f(U) \subset g(U)$ (see [5] and [9]).

Supposing that h and k are two analytic functions in U, let

$$\phi(r, s, t; z) : \mathbb{C}^3 \times U \to \mathbb{C}.$$

If h and $\varphi(h(z), zh^{'}(z), z^2h^{''}(z); z)$ are univalent functions in U and if h satisfies the second-order superordination

$$k(z) \prec \varphi(h(z), zh^{'}(z), z^2h^{''}(z); z), \tag{1.4}$$

then h is called to be a solution of the differential superordination (1.4). A function $q \in H(U)$ is called a subordinant of (1.4), if $q(z) \prec h(z)$ for all the functions h satisfying (1.4). A univalent subordinant $\widetilde{q}$ that satisfies $q(z) \prec \widetilde{q}(z)$ for all of the subordinants q of (1.4), is said to be the best subordinant.

Recently, Miller and Mocanu [10] obtained sufficient conditions on the functions k, q and φ for which the following implication holds:

$$k(z) \prec \varphi(h(z), zh^{'}(z), z^2h^{''}(z); z) \Rightarrow q(z) \prec h(z).$$

Using these results, Bulboaca [3] considered certain classes of first-order differential superordinations, as well as superordination-preserving integral operators [4]. Ali et al. [1], using the results from [3], obtained sufficient conditions for certain normalized analytic functions to satisfy

$$q_1(z) \prec \frac{zf^{'}(z)}{f(z)} \prec q_2(z),$$

where q_1 and q_2 are given univalent normalized functions in U.

For complex parameters

$$\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_q \text{ and } \beta_1, ..., \beta_s \ \left(\beta_j \notin \mathbb{Z}_0^- = \{0, -1, -2, ...\}; j = 1, 2, ..., s\right),$$

we now define the generalized hypergeometric function ${}_qF_s(\alpha_1,..., \alpha_q; \beta_1, ..., \beta_s; z)$ by (see, for example, [15, p.19])

$${}_qF_s(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_q; \beta_1, ..., \beta_s; z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\alpha_1)_k ... (\alpha_q)_k}{(\beta_1)_k ... (\beta_s)_k} . \frac{z^k}{k!} \tag{1.5}$$

$$(q \leq s+1; q, s \in \mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}; z \in U),$$

where $(\theta)_\nu$ is the Pochhammer symbol defined, in terms of the Gamma function Γ, by

$$(\theta)_\nu = \frac{\Gamma(\theta+\nu)}{\Gamma(\theta)} = \begin{cases} 1 & (\nu = 0; \theta \in \mathbb{C}^* = \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}), \\ \theta(\theta+1)....(\theta+\nu-1) & (\nu \in \mathbb{N}; \theta \in \mathbb{C}). \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} h(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_q; \beta_1, ..., \beta_s; z) &= z^p {}_qF_s(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_q; \beta_1, ..., \beta_s; z) \\ &= z^p + \sum_{k=p+1}^{\infty} \Gamma_{p,q,s}(\alpha_1) z^k, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Gamma_{p,q,s}(\alpha_1) = \frac{(\alpha_1)_{k-p}...(\alpha_q)_{k-p}}{(\beta_1)_{k-p}...(\beta_s)_{k-p}(1)_{k-p}}, \tag{1.7}$$

and using the Hadamard product, El-Ashwah and Aouf [7] defined the following operator

$$I_{p,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_q; \beta_1, ..., \beta_s) : A(p) \to A(p)$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} I_{p,\lambda}^{0,\ell}(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_q; \beta_1, ..., \beta_s)f(z) &= f(z) * h(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_q; \beta_1, ..., \beta_s; z); \\ I_{p,\lambda}^{1,\ell}(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_q; \beta_1, ..., \beta_s)f(z) &= (1-\lambda)(f(z) * h(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_q; \beta_1, ..., \beta_s; z)) \end{aligned}$$

$$+\frac{\lambda}{(p+\ell)z^{\ell-1}}(z^\ell f(z) * h(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_q; \beta_1, ..., \beta_s; z))';$$

and

$$I_{p,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_q; \beta_1, ..., \beta_s)f(z) = I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{1,\ell}(I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m-1,\ell}(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_q; \beta_1, ..., \beta_s)f(z)). \tag{1.8}$$

If $f \in A(p)$, then from (1.1) and (1.8), we can easily see that

$$I_{p,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_q; \beta_1, ..., \beta_s)f(z) = z^p + \sum_{k=p+1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{p+\ell+\lambda(k-p)}{p+\ell}\right]^m \Gamma_{p,q,s}(\alpha_1) a_k z^k, \tag{1.9}$$

$$(p \in \mathbb{N}; m \in \mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}; \ell \geq 0; \lambda \geq 0; z \in U)$$

It can be easily verified from the definition (1.9) that:

$$z(I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1)f(z))' = \alpha_1 I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1+1)f(z) - (\alpha_1 - p)I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1)f(z), \tag{1.10}$$

where

$$I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1)f(z)=I_{p,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1,...,\alpha_q;\beta_1,...,\beta_s)f(z).$$

It should be remarked that the linear operator $I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1)$ is a generalization of many other linear operators considered earlier. In particular, we have

$$I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{0,\ell}(\alpha_1)f(z)=H_{p,q,s}(\alpha_1)f(z),$$

where the linear operator $H_{p,q,s}(\alpha_1)$ was investigated by Dziok and Srivastava [8], and also we have

$$I_{p,2,1,\lambda}^{0,\ell}(a,1;c)f(z)=L_p(a,c)f(z)(a\in\mathbb{R};c\in\mathbb{R}\backslash\mathbb{Z}_0^-),$$

where the linear operator $L_p(a,c)$ was studied by Saitoh [13] which yields the operator $L(a,c)f(z)$ introduced by Carlson and Shaffer [6] for $p=1$.

2 Preliminaries

In order to prove our subordination and superordination results, we make use of the following known definition and results.

Definition [10]. *Denote by Q the set of all functions $f(z)$ that are analytic and injective on $\overline{U}\backslash E(f)$, where*

$$E(f)=\left\{\zeta:\zeta\in\partial \text{ and } \lim_{z\to\zeta}f(z)=\infty\right\} \tag{2.1}$$

and are such that $f^{'}(\zeta)\neq 0$ for $\zeta\in\partial U\backslash E(f)$.

Lemma 1 [9]. *Let the function $q(z)$ be univalent in the unit disc U and let θ and φ be analytic in a domain D containing $q(U)$ with $\varphi(w)\neq 0$ when $w\in q(U)$. Set $Q(z)=zq^{'}(z)\varphi(q(z))$ and $h(z)=\theta(q(z))+Q(z)$. Suppose that*

(i) *$Q(z)$ is starlike univalent in U,*

(ii) $\Re\left(\dfrac{zh^{'}(z)}{Q(z)}\right)>0$ *for $z\in U$.*

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

$$\theta(p(z))+zp^{'}(z)\varphi(p(z))\prec\theta(q(z))+zq^{'}(z)\varphi(q(z)), \tag{2.2}$$

then $p(z)\prec q(z)$ and $q(z)$ is the best dominant.

Lemma 2 [5]. *Let $q(z)$ be convex univalent in the unit disc U and let θ and φ be analytic in a domain D containing $q(U)$. Suppose that*

(i) $\Re\left\{\dfrac{\theta^{'}(q(z))}{\varphi(q(z))}\right\}>0$ *for $z\in U$;*

(ii) $zq^{'}(z)\varphi(q(z))$ *is starlike univalent in* U.
If $p(z) \in H[q(0),1]\cap Q$, *with* $p(U) \subseteq D$, *and* $\theta(p(z)) + zp^{'}(z)\varphi(p(z))$ *is univalent in* U, *and*

$$\theta(q(z)) + zq^{'}(z)\varphi(q(z)) \prec \theta(p(z)) + zp^{'}(z)\varphi(p(z)), \tag{2.4}$$

then $q(z) \prec p(z)$ *and* $q(z)$ *is the best subordinant*

The following lemma gives us a necessary and sufficient condition for the univalence of a special function which will be used in some particular case.
Lemma 3 [12]. *The function* $q(z) = (1-z)^{-2ab}$ $(a, b \in \mathbb{C}^*)$ *is univalent in the unit disc* U *if and only if* $|2ab-1| \leq 1$ or $|2ab+1| \leq 1$.

3 Main Results

Unless otherwise mentioned, we assume throughout this paper that $p \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{N}_0, \ell \geq 0; \lambda \geq 0$ and the power understood as principal values.
Theorem 1. *Let* $q(z)$ *be univalent in* U *such that* $q(0) = 1$, $q(z) \neq 0$ *and* $\frac{zq^{'}(z)}{q(z)}$ *is starlike in U. Let* $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ *and suppose that* f *and* q *satisfy the next conditions:*

$$\left[\frac{I^{m,\ell}_{p,q,s,\lambda}(\alpha_1)f(z)}{z^p}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z^p}{I^{m,\ell}_{p,q,s,\lambda}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}\right]^{\eta} \neq 0 \ (\mu \in \mathbb{C}^*; \eta \in \mathbb{C}; z \in U), \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\Re\left\{1 + \frac{\zeta}{\gamma}q(z) + \frac{2\delta}{\gamma}[q(z)]^2 - \frac{zq^{'}(z)}{q(z)} + \frac{zq^{''}(z)}{q^{'}(z)}\right\} > 0 \ \ (\zeta, \delta \in \mathbb{C}; \gamma \in \mathbb{C}^*; z \in U). \tag{3.2}$$

If

$$\Psi(z) \prec \chi + \zeta q(z) + \delta[q(z)]^2 + \gamma\frac{zq^{'}(z)}{q(z)}, \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(z) \quad = \quad & \chi + \zeta\left[\frac{I^{m,\ell}_{p,q,s,\lambda}(\alpha_1)f(z)}{z^p}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z^p}{I^{m,\ell}_{p,q,s,\lambda}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}\right]^{\eta} \\ & +\delta\left[\frac{I^{m,\ell}_{p,q,s,\lambda}(\alpha_1)f(z)}{z^p}\right]^{2\mu}\left[\frac{z^p}{I^{m,\ell}_{p,q,s,\lambda}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}\right]^{2\eta} \\ & +\gamma\mu\alpha_1\left[\frac{I^{m,\ell}_{p,q,s,\lambda}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}{I^{m,\ell}_{p,q,s,\lambda}(\alpha_1)f(z)} - 1\right]\end{aligned}$$

$$+\gamma\eta\left(\alpha_1+1\right)\left[1-\frac{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1+2)f(z)}{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}\right], \tag{3.4}$$

then

$$\left[\frac{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1)f(z)}{z^p}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z^p}{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}\right]^{\eta}\prec q\left(z\right),$$

and q is the best dominant of (3.3).

Proof. Let

$$h(z)=\left[\frac{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1)f(z)}{z^p}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z^p}{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}\right]^{\eta}\ (z\in U). \tag{3.5}$$

According to (3.1) the function $h(z)$ is analytic in U, and differentiating (3.5) logarithmically with respect to z, we obtain

$$\frac{zh^{'}(z)}{h(z)}=\mu\left[\frac{z(I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1)f(z))^{'}}{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1)f(z)}-p\right]+\eta\left[p-\frac{z(I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1+1)f(z))^{'}}{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}\right].$$

By using the identity (1.10), we obtain

$$\frac{zh^{'}(z)}{h(z)}=\mu\alpha_1\left[\frac{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1)f(z)}-1\right]+\eta\left(\alpha_1+1\right)\left[1-\frac{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1+2)f(z)}{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}\right].$$

In order to prove our result we will use Lemma 1. In this lemma consider

$$\theta(w)=\chi+\zeta w+\delta w^2 \quad \textit{and} \quad \varphi(w)=\frac{\gamma}{w},$$

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

$$Q(z)=zq^{'}(z)\varphi(q(z))=\gamma\frac{zq^{'}(z)}{q(z)},$$

and

$$g(z)=\theta(q(z))+Q(z)=\chi+\zeta q\left(z\right)+\delta\left[q\left(z\right)\right]^2+\gamma\frac{zq^{'}(z)}{q(z)}.$$

We see that $Q(z)$ is starlike function in U. From (3.2), we also have

$$\Re\left\{\frac{zg^{'}(z)}{Q(z)}\right\}=\Re\left\{1+\frac{\zeta}{\gamma}q\left(z\right)+\frac{2\delta}{\gamma}\left[q\left(z\right)\right]^2-\frac{zq^{'}(z)}{q(z)}+\frac{zq^{''}(z)}{q^{'}(z)}\right\}>0\quad(z\in U),$$

and then, by using Lemma 1 we deduce that the subordination (3.3) implies $h(z) \prec q(z)$, and the function q is the best dominant of (3.3).

Putting $q = 2, s = p = 1, m = 0, \alpha_1 = a\,(a \in \mathbb{C}), \alpha_2 = 1$ and $\beta_1 = c$ $(c \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{Z}_0^-)$ in Theorem 1, we obtain the following result which improves the corresponding work of Shammugam et al. [14,Theorem 3.1].

Corollary 1. *Let $q(z)$ be univalent in U such that $q(0) = 1$, $q(z) \neq 0$ and $\frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$ is starlike in U. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that*

$$\left[\frac{L(a,c)\,f(z)}{z}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z}{L(a+1,c)\,f(z)}\right]^{\eta} \neq 0 \quad (\mu \in \mathbb{C}^*; z \in U), \tag{3.6}$$

and suppose that q satisfies (3.2).If

$$\Lambda(z) \prec \chi + \zeta q(z) + \delta\left[q(z)\right]^2 + \gamma\frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}, \tag{3.7}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda(z) \;=\; & \chi + \zeta\left[\frac{L(a,c)\,f(z)}{z}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z}{L(a+1,c)\,f(z)}\right]^{\eta} \\ & +\delta\left[\frac{L(a,c)\,f(z)}{z}\right]^{2\mu}\left[\frac{z}{L(a+1,c)\,f(z)}\right]^{2\eta} \\ & +\gamma\mu a\left[\frac{L(a+1,c)\,f(z)}{L(a,c)\,f(z)} - 1\right] \\ & +\gamma\eta(a+1)\left[1 - \frac{L(a+2,c)\,f(z)}{L(a+1,c)\,f(z)}\right],\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

then

$$\left[\frac{L(a,c)\,f(z)}{z}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z}{L(a+1,c)\,f(z)}\right]^{\eta} \prec q(z),$$

and q is the best dominant of (3.7).

Putting $q(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}\,(-1 \leq B < A \leq 1)$ in Corollary 1, we obtain the following result which improves the corresponding work of Shammugam et al. [14, Corollary 3.2].

Corollary 2. *Assume that*

$$\Re\left\{\frac{1-ABz^2}{(1+Az)(1+Bz)} + \frac{\zeta}{\gamma}\left[\frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}\right] + \frac{2\delta}{\gamma}\left[\frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}\right]^2\right\} > 0$$

$$(\zeta, \delta \in \mathbb{C}; \gamma \in \mathbb{C}^*; z \in U)$$

holds. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ *such that* (3.6) *holds. If*

$$\Lambda(z) \prec \chi + \zeta \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} + \delta \left[\frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}\right]^2 + \frac{\gamma(A-B)z}{(1+Az)(1+Bz)}, \tag{3.9}$$

where $\Lambda(z)$ *is given by* (3.8), *then*

$$\left[\frac{L(a,c)f(z)}{z}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z}{L(a+1,c)f(z)}\right]^{\eta} \prec \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz},$$

and $\frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$ *is the best dominant of* (3.9).

Putting $q(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\vartheta}$ $(0 < \vartheta \leq 1)$ in Corollary 1, we obtain the following result which improves the corresponding work of Shammugam et al. [14, Corollary 3.3].

Corollary 3. *Assume that*

$$\Re\left\{\frac{1-3z^2}{1-z^2} + \frac{\zeta}{\gamma}\left[\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right]^{\vartheta} + \frac{2\delta}{\gamma}\left[\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right]^{2\vartheta}\right\} > 0 \quad (\zeta, \delta \in \mathbb{C}; \gamma \in \mathbb{C}^*; z \in U)$$

holds. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ *such that (3.6) holds. If*

$$\Lambda(z) \prec \chi + \zeta\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\vartheta} + \delta\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{2\vartheta} + \frac{2\gamma\vartheta z}{(1-z^2)} \ (0 < \vartheta \leq 1), \tag{3.10}$$

where $\Lambda(z)$ *is given by* (3.8), *then*

$$\left[\frac{L(a,c)f(z)}{z}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z}{L(a+1,c)f(z)}\right]^{\eta} \prec \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\vartheta},$$

and $\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\vartheta}$ *is the best dominant of* (3.10).

Putting $q(z) = e^{\mu Az}$ $(|\mu A| < \pi)$ in Corollary 1, we obtain the following result which improves the corresponding work of Shammugam et al. [14, Corollary 3.4].

Corollary 4. *Assume that*

$$\Re\left\{1 + \frac{\zeta}{\gamma}e^{\mu Az}q(z) + \frac{2\delta}{\gamma}e^{2\mu Az}\right\} > 0 \quad (\zeta, \delta \in \mathbb{C}; \gamma \in \mathbb{C}^*; z \in U)$$

holds and let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ *such that (3.6) holds. If*

$$\Lambda(z) \prec \chi + \zeta e^{\mu Az} + \delta e^{2\mu Az} + \gamma A\mu z \qquad (|\mu A| < \pi), \tag{3.11}$$

where $\Lambda(z)$ *is given by* (3.8), *then*

$$\left[\frac{L(a,c)\,f(z)}{z}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z}{L(a+1,c)\,f(z)}\right]^{\eta}\prec e^{\mu Az},$$

and $e^{\mu Az}$ *is the best dominant of* (3.11).

Putting $q=s+1, \alpha_i=1(i=1,..,s+1), \beta_j=1(j=1,..,s), m=\zeta=\delta=0, \chi=p=1, \gamma=\frac{1}{ab}(a,b\in\mathbb{C}^*), \mu=a, \eta=0$ and $q(z)=(1-z)^{-2ab}$ in Theorem 1, then combining this to gather with Lemma 3 we obtain the next result due to Obradovic et al. [11, Theorem 1].

Corollary 5 [11]. *Let* $a,b\in\mathbb{C}^*$ *such that* $|2ab-1|\leq 1$ *or* $|2ab+1|\leq 1$. *Let* $f\in\mathcal{A}$ *and suppose that* $\frac{f(z)}{z}\neq 0$ *for all* $z\in U$. *If*

$$1+\frac{1}{b}\left(\frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)}-1\right)\prec\frac{1+z}{1-z},$$

then

$$\left(\frac{f(z)}{z}\right)^{a}\prec(1-z)^{-2ab} \tag{3.12}$$

and $(1-z)^{-2ab}$ *is the best dominant of (3.12).*

Remark 1. For $a=1$, Corollary 5 reduces to the recent result of Srivastava and Lashin [16].

Putting $q=s+1, \alpha_i=1(i=1,..,s+1), \beta_j=1(j=1,..,s), m=\zeta=\delta=0, \chi=p=\gamma=1, \eta=0$ and $q(z)=(1+Bz)^{\frac{\mu(A-B)}{B}}$ in Theorem 2, and using Lemma 2 we obtain the next result.

Corollary 6. *Let* $-1\leq A<B\leq 1$ *with* $B\neq 0$, *and suppose that* $\left|\frac{\mu(A-B)}{B}-1\right|\leq 1$ *or* $\left|\frac{\mu(A-B)}{B}+1\right|\leq 1$. *Let* $f\in\mathcal{A}$ *such that* $\frac{f(z)}{z}\neq 0$ *for all* $z\in U$, *and let* $\mu\in\mathbb{C}^*$. *If*

$$1+\mu\left(\frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)}-1\right)\prec\frac{1+[B+\mu(A-B)]z}{1+Bz},$$

then

$$\left(\frac{f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu}\prec(1+Bz)^{\frac{\mu(A-B)}{B}}, \tag{3.13}$$

and $(1+Bz)^{\frac{\mu(A-B)}{B}}$ *is the best dominant of (3.13).*

Putting $q=s+1, \alpha_i=1(i=1,..,s+1), \beta_j=1(j=1,..,s), m=\zeta=\delta=0, \chi=p=1, \gamma=\frac{e^{i\tau}}{ab\cos\tau}(a,b\in\mathbb{C}^*;|\tau|<\frac{\pi}{2}), \mu=a, \eta=0$ and $q(z)=(1-z)^{-2ab\cos\tau e^{-i\tau}}$ in Theorem 1, we obtain the following result due to Aouf et al. [2, Theorem 1].

Corollary 7 [2]. *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^*, |\tau| < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and suppose that $\left|2ab\cos\tau e^{-i\tau}-1\right| \leq 1$ or $\left|2ab\cos\tau e^{-i\tau}+1\right| \leq 1$. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and suppose that $\frac{f(z)}{z} \neq 0$ for all $z \in U$. If*

$$1+\frac{e^{i\tau}}{b\cos\tau}\left(\frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)}-1\right) \prec \frac{1+z}{1-z},$$

then

$$\left(\frac{f(z)}{z}\right)^{a} \prec (1-z)^{-2ab\cos\tau e^{-i\tau}} \tag{3.14}$$

and $(1-z)^{-2ab\cos\tau e^{-i\tau}}$ is the best dominant of (3.14).

Theorem 2. *Let q be convex in U such that $q(0)=1$ and $\frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$ is starlike in U. Further assume that*

$$\Re\left\{(\zeta+2\delta q(z))\frac{q(z)\,q'(z)}{\gamma}\right\} > 0 \quad (\zeta,\delta \in \mathbb{C};\gamma \in \mathbb{C}^*). \tag{3.15}$$

Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ such that

$$0 \neq \left[\frac{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1)f(z)}{z^p}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z^p}{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}\right]^{\eta} \in H[q(0),1]\cap Q. \tag{3.16}$$

If $\Psi(z)$ given by (3.4) is univalent in U and satisfies the following superordination condition

$$\chi+\zeta q(z)+\delta\left[q(z)\right]^2+\gamma\frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)} \prec \Psi(z), \tag{3.17}$$

then

$$q(z) \prec \left[\frac{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1)f(z)}{z^p}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z^p}{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}\right]^{\eta},$$

and q is the best subordinant of (3.17).

Putting $q=2, s=p=1, m=0, \alpha_1=a\,(a\in\mathbb{C}), \alpha_2=1$ and $\beta_1=c$ $(c\in\mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{Z}_0^-)$ in Theorem 2, we obtain the following result which improves the corresponding work of Shammugam et al. [14, Theorem 3.11].

Corollary 8. *Let q be convex in U such that $q(0)=1$ and $\frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$ is starlike in U. Further assume that (3.15) holds. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that*

$$0 \neq \left[\frac{L(a,c)\,f(z)}{z}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z}{L(a+1,c)\,f(z)}\right]^{\eta} \in H[q(0),1]\cap Q. \tag{3.18}$$

If $\Lambda(z)$ *given by* (3.8) *is univalent in* U *and satisfies the following superordination condition*

$$\chi+\zeta q(z)+\delta[q(z)]^2+\gamma\frac{zq^{'}(z)}{q(z)}\prec\Lambda(z), \tag{3.19}$$

then

$$q(z)\prec\left[\frac{L(a,c)f(z)}{z}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z}{L(a+1,c)f(z)}\right]^{\eta},$$

and q is the best subordinant of (3.19).

Combining Theorems 1 and 2, we obtain the following two sandwich results:

Theorem 3. *Let* q_i *be two convex functions in* U *such that* $q_i(0)=1$ *and* $\frac{zq_i^{'}(z)}{q_i(z)}$ $(i=1,2)$ *is starlike in* U*. Suppose that* $q_1(z)$ *satisfies* (3.15) *and* $q_2(z)$ *satisfies* (3.2)*. Let* $f\in\mathcal{A}(p)$ *and suppose that*

$$\left[\frac{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1)f(z)}{z^p}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z^p}{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}\right]^{\eta}\in H[q(0),1]\cap Q.$$

If $\Psi(z)$ *given by* (3.4) *is univalent in* U*, and*

$$\chi+\zeta q_1(z)+\delta[q_1(z)]^2+\gamma\frac{zq_1^{'}(z)}{q_1(z)}\prec\Psi(z)\prec\chi+\zeta q_2(z)+\delta[q_2(z)]^2+\gamma\frac{zq_2^{'}(z)}{q_2(z)}, \tag{3.20}$$

then

$$q_1(z)\prec\left[\frac{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1)f(z)}{z^p}\right]^{\mu}\left[\frac{z^p}{I_{p,q,s,\lambda}^{m,\ell}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}\right]^{\eta}\prec q_2(z),$$

and q_1 *and* q_2 *are, respectively, the best subordinant and the best dominant of* (3.20)*.*

Putting $q=2, s=p=1, m=0, \alpha_1=a\,(a\in\mathbb{C}), \alpha_2=1$ and $\beta_1=c$ $(c\in\mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{Z}_0^-)$ in Theorem 3, we obtain the following result which improves the corresponding work of Shammugam et al. [14, Theorem 3.12].

Corollary 9. *Let* q_i *be two convex functions in* U *such that* $q_i(0)=1$ *and* $\frac{zq_i^{'}(z)}{q_i(z)}$ $(i=1,2)$ *is starlike in* U*. Suppose that* $q_1(z)$ *satisfies* (3.15) *and* $q_2(z)$ *satisfies* (3.2)*. Let* $f\in\mathcal{A}$ *and suppose that* $\left[\frac{L(a+1,c)f(z)}{z}\right]^{\mu}\in H[q(0),1]\cap Q$*. If* $\Lambda(z)$ *given by* (3.8) *is univalent in* U*, and*

$$\chi+\zeta q_1(z)+\delta[q_1(z)]^2+\gamma\frac{zq_1^{'}(z)}{q_1(z)}\prec\Lambda(z)\prec\chi+\zeta q_2(z)+\delta[q_2(z)]^2+\gamma\frac{zq_2^{'}(z)}{q_2(z)}, \tag{3.21}$$

then

$$q_1(z) \prec \left[\frac{L(a+1,c)\,f(z)}{z}\right]^{\mu} \prec q_2(z),$$

and q_1 *and* q_2 *are, respectively, the best subordinant and the best dominant of* (3.21).

References

[1] R. M. Ali, V. Ravichandran, M. H. Khan and K. G. Subramanian, Differential Sandwich theorems for certain analytic functions, Far East J. Math. Sci. 15(2004), 87-94.

[2] M. K. Aouf, F. M. Al-Oboudi and M. M. Haidan, On some results for $\lambda-$spirallike and $\lambda-$Robertson functions of complex order, Publ. Instit. Math. Belgrade, 77(2005), no. 91, 93-98.

[3] T. Bulboaca, Classes of frist order differential superordinations, Demonstratio Math. 35(2002), no.2, 287-292.

[4] T. Bulboaca, A class of superordination-preserving integral operators, Indeg. Math. (N.S.) 13(2002), no.3, 301-311.

[5] T. Bulboaca, Differential Subordinations and Superordinations, Recent Results, House of Scientific Book Publ., Cluj-Napoca, 2005.

[6] B. C. Carlson and D. B. Shaffer, Starlike and prestarlike hypergeometric functions, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 15(1984), 737–745.

[7] R. M. El-Ashwah and M. K. Aouf, Differential subordination and superordination for certain subclasses of p-valent functions, Math. Comput. Modelling 51(2010), no. 5-6, 349-360.

[8] J. Dziok and H. M. Srivastava, Classes of analytic functions associated with the generalized hypergeometric function, Appl. Math. Comput., 103(1999), 1–13.

[9] S. S. Miller and P. T. Mocanu, Differential Subordinations : Theory and Applications, Series on Monographs and Texbooks in Pure and Appl. Math. No. 225 Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York, 2000.

[10] S. S. Miller and P. T. Mocanu, Subordinant of differential superordinations, Complex Variables 48 (2003), no. 10, 815-826.

[11] M. Obradovic, M. K. Aouf and S. Owa, On some results for starlike functions of complex order, Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) (N.S.) 46 (60), (1989), 79-85.

[12] W. C. Royster, On the univalence of a certain integral, Michigan Math. J. 12 (1965), 385-387.

[13] H. Saitoh, A linear operator and its applications of first order differential subordinations, Math. Japon., 44(1996), 31–38..

[14] T. N. Shanmugam, V. Ravichandran and S. Owa, On sandwich results for some subclasses of analytic functions involving certain linear operator, Integral Transforms and Spec. Functions, 21(2010), no.1, 1-11.

[15] H. M. Srivastava and P. W. Karlsson, Multiple Gaussion Hypergeometric Series, Halsted Press, Ellis Horwood Limited, Chichester, John Wiley and Sons, New York, Chichester, Brisbane, Toronto, 1985.

[16] H. M. Srivastava and A. Y. Lashin, Some applications of the Briot-Bouquet differential subordination, J. Inequal. Pure. Appl. Math. 6 (2005), no.2, Art. 41, 1-7.

M. K. Aouf,
Department of Mathematics,
Faculty of Science,
Mansoura University,
Mansoura 35516, Egypt.
Email: mkaouf127@yahoo.com

T. M. Seoudy,
Department of Mathematics,
Faculty of Science,
Fayoum University,
Fayoum 63514, Egypt.
Email: tms00@fayoum.edu.eg