

THE SHARP GROWTH ESTIMATE FOR $\mathcal{U}(\lambda)$

Hiroshi Yanagihara

Department of Applied Science
Faculty of Engineering, Yamaguchi University
Tokiwadai, Ube 755-8611, Japan

ABSTRACT. For $0 < \lambda \leq 1$ let $\mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ be the class of analytic functions in the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$ with $f(0) = f'(0) - 1 = 0$ satisfying $|f'(z)(z/f(z))^2 - 1| < \lambda$ in $\mathbb{D}$. Then it is known that every $f \in \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ is univalent in $\mathbb{D}$. In the present article we shall prove the sharp estimates $|f''(0)| \leq 2(1+\lambda)$ and $|z|/\{(1+|z|)(1+\lambda|z|)\} \leq |f(z)| \leq |z|/\{(1-|z|)(1-\lambda|z|)\}$. As an application we shall also give the sharp covering theorems.

1. INTRODUCTION

We denote the complex plane by $\mathbb{C}$ and the extended complex plane by $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. For $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $r > 0$ let $\mathbb{D}(c, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - c| < r\}$ and $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}(0, 1)$. Similarly let $\Delta_r = \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}(0, r) = \{z \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}} : r < |z| \leq \infty\}$ and $\Delta = \Delta_1$.

Let $\mathcal{A}(\{\mathbb{D}\})$ denote the space of analytic functions in $\mathbb{D}$ and $\mathcal{A}_0(\{\mathbb{D}\}) = \{f \in \mathcal{A}(\{\mathbb{D}\}) : f(0) = f'(0) - 1 = 0\}$. Here we regard $\mathcal{A}(\{\mathbb{D}\})$ as a topological vector space endowed with the topology of uniform convergence over compact subsets of $\mathbb{D}$. A function f is said to be univalent in a domain D if it is one-to-one in D . Let S denote the class of univalent functions in $\mathcal{A}_0(\{\mathbb{D}\})$.

For $0 < \lambda \leq 1$ let $\mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ be the class of functions $f \in \mathcal{A}_0$ satisfying

$$(1.1) \quad \left| f'(z) \left(\frac{z}{f(z)} \right)^2 - 1 \right| < \lambda$$

in $\mathbb{D}$. The boundedness of $f'(z)(z/f(z))^2$ forces $f \in \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ that $f(z) \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$. Hence $f'(z) \neq 0$ holds in $\mathbb{D}$ and f is locally univalent in $\mathbb{D}$. Moreover it is known that $f \in \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ is univalent in $\mathbb{D}$, i.e., $\mathcal{U}(\lambda) \subset S$.

In the present article we shall prove the sharp inequalities

$$|a_2(f)| = 2^{-1}|f''(0)| \leq 1 + \lambda,$$

$$\frac{|z|}{(1 - \lambda|z|)(1 - |z|)} \leq |f(z)| \leq \frac{|z|}{(1 - \lambda|z|)(1 - |z|)}$$

for $f \in \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$. To this end we introduce three classes of meromorphic functions in Δ closely related to $\mathcal{U}(\lambda)$. For $0 < \lambda \leq 1$ let $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ be the class of meromorphic functions g in Δ which has a Laurent expansion of a form

$$(1.2) \quad g(w) = w + c_0 + \frac{c_1}{w} + \frac{c_2}{w^2} + \cdots, \quad 1 < |w| < \infty$$

and satisfying

$$|g'(w) - 1| < \lambda.$$

Now for $f \in \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ put

$$T(f)(w) = \frac{1}{f(\frac{1}{w})}, \quad w \in \Delta.$$

Then we have

$$\frac{d}{dw}T(f)(w) = \frac{f'(1/w)}{w^2 f^2(\frac{1}{w})} = f'(z) \left(\frac{z}{f(z)} \right)^2, \quad z = \frac{1}{w}$$

and hence $Tf \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$. Thus T is a transformation which maps $\mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ injectively into $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$. The image $T(\mathcal{U}(\lambda))$ is a proper subset of $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ and it is easy to see that

$$\mathcal{M}_0(\lambda) = \{g \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda) : g(w) \neq 0 \text{ in } \Delta\} = T(\mathcal{U}(\lambda)).$$

Notice that $a_2(f) = -c_0(T(f))$ hold for $f \in \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$. Moreover let

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda) = \{g \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda) : c_0(g) = 0\}.$$

In the next section we shall show that every $g \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda)$ satisfies $g(w) \neq 0$ in Δ . Thus the relation

$$T(\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}(\lambda)) = \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda) \subset T(\mathcal{U}(\lambda)) = \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$$

holds.

In Section 2 we shall derive an integral representation of $g \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ and prove existence of the boundary limit $g(\eta) = \lim_{\Delta \ni w \rightarrow \eta} g(w)$ for each $\eta \in \partial\Delta$. Further we shall precisely study the boundary values of $g \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda)$ and obtain the sharp estimate $|g(\eta)| \leq 1 + \lambda$ for $g \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda)$ and $\eta \in \partial\Delta$, which is equivalent to the sharp upper bound $|a_2(f)| \leq 1 + \lambda$ for $f \in \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$.

In Section 3 for each fixed $w_0 \in \Delta \setminus \{\infty\}$ we shall treat the sharp estimate on $|g(w_0)|$ for $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$. The result has an immediate counterpart in $\mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ and we shall derive the sharp growth estimate and the sharp covering theorem for $\mathcal{U}(\lambda)$.

2. INTEGRAL REPRESENTATION

For $g \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ let

$$(2.1) \quad b_g(w) = \frac{w^2}{\lambda} (1 - g'(w)), \quad w \in \Delta,$$

$$(2.2) \quad \beta_g(z) = b_g(1/z), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Note that $g'(w) - 1 = O(w^{-2})$ as $w \rightarrow \infty$ and that $g'(1/z)$ is analytic in $\mathbb{D}$. Applying the maximum modulus principle to $g'(1/z) - 1$ we have

$$|g'(w) - 1| \leq \frac{\lambda}{|w|^2}, \quad 1 < |w| < \infty.$$

Hence $\beta_g \in H_1^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ and for any $w, w_0 \in \Delta \setminus \{\infty\}$ by integrating $g'(w) - 1 = -\lambda b_g(w)w^{-2}$ we obtain

$$g(w) - w = g(w_0) - w_0 - \lambda \int_{w_0}^w \frac{b_g(\zeta)}{\zeta^2} d\zeta.$$

Since $\lim_{w_0 \rightarrow \infty} (g(w_0) - w_0) = c_0$, we have

$$g(w) = w + c_0 - \lambda \int_{\infty}^w \frac{b_g(\zeta)}{\zeta^2} d\zeta = w + c_0 + \lambda \int_0^{1/w} \beta_g(\zeta) d\zeta.$$

Converse is also true and we have the following.

Theorem 2.1. *For a meromorphic function g in Δ , $g \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ if and only if there exist $\beta \in H_1^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ and $c \in \mathbb{C}$ such that*

$$g(w) = w + c + \lambda \int_0^{1/w} \beta(\zeta) d\zeta.$$

Corollary 2.2. *Each $g \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ is Lipschitz continuous and satisfies*

$$(2.3) \quad \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{|w_0 w_1|}\right) |w_1 - w_0| \leq |g(w_1) - g(w_0)| \leq \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{|w_0 w_1|}\right) |w_1 - w_0|$$

for $w_0, w_1 \in \Delta$. Particularly

- (i) The limit $g(\eta) = \lim_{\Delta \ni w \rightarrow \eta} g(w)$ exists for every $\eta \in \partial\Delta$.
- (ii) g is univalent in Δ . Furthermore if $0 < \lambda < 1$, then g is univalent on $\overline{\Delta}$.

Proof. Inequality (2.3) easily follows from Theorem 2.1 and

$$\left| \int_{1/w_0}^{1/w_1} \beta(\zeta) d\zeta \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{w_1} - \frac{1}{w_0} \right| = \frac{|w_1 - w_0|}{|w_0 w_1|}.$$

By (2.3) the function g is Lipschitz continuous in Δ and from this the boundary limit $g(\eta) = \lim_{\Delta \ni w \rightarrow \eta} g(w)$ exists for each $\eta \in \partial\Delta$. Inequality (2.3) also shows that g is univalent in Δ . Since (2.3) still holds on $\bar{\Delta}$ by continuity, g is univalent on $\bar{\Delta}$, when $0 < \lambda < 1$. $\square$

Each $f \in \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ is univalent in $\mathbb{D}$, since Tf is univalent in Δ by Corollary 2.2.

Corollary 2.3. *For each $0 < \lambda \leq 1$ the inclusion relation $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ holds.*

Proof. For $g \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda) (\subset \mathcal{M}(\lambda))$ we have by Theorem 2.1

$$|g(w)| = \left| w + \lambda \int_0^{1/w} \beta(\zeta) d\zeta \right| \geq |w| - \frac{\lambda}{|w|} > 0, \quad |w| > 1.$$

Thus g has no zeros in Δ and hence $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$. $\square$

For $g \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ let $E(g)$ be the omitted set of g , i.e.,

$$E(g) = \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus g(\Delta).$$

For $R > 1$ the image $g(\partial\Delta_R)$ is an analytic Jordan curve and $g(\Delta_R)$ is the domain outside $g(\partial\Delta_R)$. Let D_R be the domain bounded by $g(\partial\Delta_R)$. Then $\{D_R : 1 < R\}$ is a 1-parameter family of increasing domains in $\mathbb{C}$ and

$$E(g) = \bigcap_{R>1} D_R.$$

In particular when $0 < \lambda < 1$, by Corollary 2.2 $E(g)$ is a closed Jordan domain bounded by $g(\partial\Delta)$. Notice that for any $g \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ with $0 < \lambda \leq 1$ and $a \in \partial E(g)$ there exists $\eta \in \partial\Delta$ such that $a = g(\eta)$.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $g \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ and $g(w) = w + c_0 + \int_0^{1/w} \beta(\zeta) d\zeta$ with $\beta \in H_1^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ and $c_0 \in \mathbb{C}$. Then $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ if and only if*

$$(2.4) \quad -c_0 \in E(\widetilde{g}),$$

where

$$\widetilde{g}(w) = w + \int_0^{1/w} \beta(\zeta) d\zeta \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda).$$

Proof. For $g \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$, by definition, $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ if and only if $g(w) = \tilde{g}(w) + c_0 \neq 0$ for all $w \in \Delta$. This is equivalent to (2.4). $\square$

For $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ the coefficient $c_0 = c_0(g)$ in the expansion (1.2) is called the conformal center of the set $E(g)$. For more details on conformal center we refer to [8].

Notice that $g + c \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ holds for any $g \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ and $c \in \mathbb{C}$. This implies that there are no upper bound on $|c_0(g)|$ for $g \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$. However concerning with the class $\mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$, it is not difficult to get the sharp estimate.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\lambda \in (0, 1]$. Then,*

- (a) *For $g \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda)$ the sharp estimate $1 - \lambda \leq |g(\eta)| \leq 1 + \lambda$ holds on $\partial\Delta$. Furthermore equality $|g(\eta)| = 1 - \lambda$ at some $\eta \in \partial\Delta$ if and only if $g(w) \equiv w - \lambda\eta^2/w$, and $|g(\eta)| = 1 + \lambda$ if and only if $g(w) \equiv w + \lambda\eta^2/w$.*
- (b) *Inequality $|c_0(g)| \leq 1 + \lambda$ holds for $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ with equality if and only if*

$$g(w) = w \left(1 + \frac{\lambda e^{i\theta}}{w}\right) \left(1 + \frac{e^{i\theta}}{w}\right), \quad w \in \Delta.$$

for some real θ .

- (c) *Inequality $|a_2(f)| \leq 1 + \lambda$ holds for $f \in \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ with equality if and only if*

$$f(z) = \frac{z}{(1 + \lambda e^{i\theta} z)(1 + e^{i\theta} z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}$$

for some real θ .

Proof. Let $g \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda)$ and put $\beta \in H_1^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ as in (2.2). Then

$$(2.5) \quad g(w) = w + \lambda \int_0^{1/w} \beta(\zeta) d\zeta.$$

For $\eta \in \partial\Delta$ we consider $\int_0^{1/\eta} \beta(\zeta) d\zeta$ as the Lebesgue integral along a C^1 -path connecting 0 to $1/\eta$ and contained in $\mathbb{D}$ except for the end point $1/\eta$. Then the integral does not depend on choice of path. Thus (2.5) still holds for $\eta \in \partial\Delta$ and we have

$$|g(\eta)| \leq |\eta| + \lambda \left| \int_0^{1/\eta} \beta(\zeta) d\zeta \right| \leq 1 + \lambda \int_{[0, 1/\eta]} |\beta(\zeta)| |d\zeta| \leq 1 + \lambda,$$

where $[0, 1/\eta]$ is the radial line segment connecting 0 and $1/\eta$. If $|g(\eta_0)| = 1 + \lambda$ at some $\eta_0 \in \partial\Delta$, then by the maximum modulus theorem $\beta = \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ and

$$\frac{\lambda \int_0^{1/\eta} \beta(\zeta) d\zeta}{\eta} = \frac{\lambda\varepsilon}{\eta^2} > 0.$$

Therefore $\varepsilon = \eta^2$ and $g(w) \equiv w + \lambda\eta^2/w$. Similarly

$$|g(\eta)| \geq |\eta| - \lambda \left| \int_0^{1/\eta} \beta(\zeta) d\zeta \right| \geq 1 - \lambda \int_{[0, 1/\eta]} |\beta(\zeta)| |d\zeta| \geq 1 - \lambda$$

with equality if and only if $\beta = \varepsilon \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ and $\lambda\varepsilon/\eta^2 < 0$, i.e., $\varepsilon = -\eta^2$ and therefore $g(w) \equiv w - \lambda\eta^2/w$. This completes the proof of (a).

To show (b) let $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$. Then g can be expressed as $g = \tilde{g} + c_0$ with $\tilde{g} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda)$ and $-c_0 \in E(\tilde{g})$. By (a) and $E(\tilde{g}) = \cap_{R>1} D(R)$, where $D(R)$ is a domain bounded by the Jordan curve $\tilde{g}(\partial\Delta_R)$. Hence we have $E(\tilde{g}) \subset \overline{\mathbb{D}}(0, 1 + \lambda)$ and $|c_0(g)| \leq 1 + \lambda$.

Suppose now that $|c_0(g)| = 1 + \lambda$. Combining $-c_0(g) \in E(\tilde{g}) \cap \partial\mathbb{D}(0, 1 + \lambda)$ and $E(\tilde{g}) \subset \overline{\mathbb{D}}(0, 1 + \lambda)$, we have $-c_0(g) \in \partial E(\tilde{g})$. By Lipschitz continuity of $\tilde{g}$ there exists $\eta \in \partial\Delta$ with $-c_0(g) = \tilde{g}(\eta)$. Since $|\tilde{g}(\eta)| = |-c_0(g)| = 1 + \lambda$, it follows from (a) that $\tilde{g}(w) = w + \lambda\eta^2/w$ and hence

$$g(w) = \tilde{g}(w) + c_0 = \tilde{g}(w) - \tilde{g}(\eta) = w \left(1 + \frac{\lambda\eta}{w} \right) \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{w} \right).$$

By letting $e^{i\theta} = -\eta$ we obtain (b).

Since $a_2(f) = -c_0(T(f))$ holds for $f \in \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$, (c) follows directly from (b). $\square$

3. GROWTH ESTIMATES

Let $0 < \lambda \leq 1$ and $1 < |w_0| < \infty$. Combining Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.5 (b) it is easily seen that if $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ then

$$\begin{aligned} (3.1) \quad |g(w_0)| &\leq |w_0| + \lambda \int_{[0, 1/w_0]} |\beta(\zeta)| |d\zeta| + |c_0| \\ &\leq |w_0| + \frac{\lambda}{|w_0|} + 1 + \lambda = |w_0| \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{|w_0|} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{|w_0|} \right) \end{aligned}$$

with equality at $w_0 = Re^{i\theta}$ if and only if $g(w) \equiv w(1 + \lambda e^{i\theta} w^{-1})(1 + e^{i\theta} w^{-1})$. Similarly the lower estimate

$$|g(w_0)| \geq |w_0| - \frac{\lambda}{|w_0|} - (1 + \lambda)$$

holds for $g \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$. Clearly it is not sharp, since the right hand side is negative for all r sufficiently close to 1.

In this section we deal with the region of variability $V_\lambda(w_0)$ of $g(w_0)$, when g varies on $\mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$, i.e.,

$$V_\lambda(w_0) = \{g(w_0) : g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)\}.$$

We shall show that $V_\lambda(w_0)$ is a closed Jordan domain bounded by a simple closed curve and give a parameterization of the boundary curve. Using these ideas we will obtain the sharp lower estimate on $|g(w_0)|$ when $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$.

First we notice that $V_\lambda(w_0)$ is a compact subset of $\mathbb{C}$. Indeed by (3.1) it is clear that $\mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ is a family of analytic functions in $\Delta \setminus \{\infty\}$ which is locally uniformly bounded and hence normal. Moreover if a sequence $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $\mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ converge to g locally uniformly in $\Delta \setminus \{\infty\}$, then it is not difficult to see that $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$. Thus $\mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ is a compact family with respect to the topology of locally uniform convergence. Since $V_\lambda(w_0)$ is the image of $\mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ with respect to the continuous mapping $\mathcal{M}_0(\lambda) \ni g \mapsto g(w_0) \in \mathbb{C}$, $V_\lambda(w_0)$ is also an compact subset of $\mathbb{C}$.

Next for $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ let $g_\theta(w) = e^{-i\theta} g(e^{i\theta} w)$. Then $g_\theta \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. From this it follows that

$$V_\lambda(Re^{i\theta}) = e^{i\theta} V_\lambda(R)$$

and it suffices to determine $V_\lambda(R)$ for $1 < R < \infty$. Similarly for $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ let $\bar{g}(w) = \overline{g(\bar{w})}$. Then $\bar{g} \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ and hence $V_\lambda(R)$ is symmetric with respect to $\mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $0 < \lambda \leq 1$. Then*

(i) *For $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$*

$$|w| \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{|w|}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{|w|}\right) \leq |g(w)| \leq |w| \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{|w|}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{|w|}\right),$$

for $1 < |w| < \infty$ with equality $w_0 = R_0 e^{i\theta_0}$ if and only if

$$g(w) = w \left(1 - \frac{\lambda e^{i\theta_0}}{w}\right) \left(1 - \frac{e^{i\theta_0}}{w}\right) \text{ or } g(w) = w \left(1 + \frac{\lambda e^{i\theta_0}}{w}\right) \left(1 + \frac{e^{i\theta_0}}{w}\right),$$

respectively.

(ii) For $f \in \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$

$$\frac{|z|}{(1+|z|)(1+\lambda|z|)} \leq |f(z)| \leq \frac{|z|}{(1-|z|)(1-\lambda|z|)}, \quad 0 < |z| < 1$$

with equality at $z = r_0 e^{i\theta_0}$ if and only if

$$f(z) = \frac{z}{(1+\lambda e^{i\theta_0} z)(1+e^{i\theta_0} z)} \quad \text{or} \quad f(z) = \frac{z}{(1-\lambda e^{i\theta_0} z)(1-e^{i\theta_0} z)}$$

respectively.

Theorem 3.2. Let $f \in \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ with $0 < \lambda \leq 1$. Then

$$\mathbb{D} \left(0, \frac{1}{2(1+\lambda)} \right) \subset f(\mathbb{D}).$$

Furthermore $\frac{e^{i\theta_0}}{2(1+\lambda)} \notin f(\mathbb{D})$ holds if and only if

$$f(z) = \frac{z}{(1+\lambda e^{-i\theta_0} z)(1+e^{-i\theta_0} z)}.$$

Now we define auxiliary functions. For $\varepsilon \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ let

$$\tilde{G}_{\lambda, \varepsilon}(w) = w + \frac{\lambda \varepsilon}{w}$$

and

$$E_\lambda = \begin{cases} \{u + iv : (u/(1+\lambda))^2 + (v/(1-\lambda))^2 \leq 1\}, & 0 < \lambda < 1 \\ [-2, 2], & \lambda = 1. \end{cases}$$

Notice that $E(\tilde{G}_{\lambda, e^{i\theta}}) = e^{i\theta/2} E_\lambda$ for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proposition 3.3. Let $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$. If $g(R) \in \partial V_\lambda(R)$, then there exists ε, η with $|\varepsilon| = |\eta| = 1$, such that $g = \tilde{G}_{\lambda, \varepsilon} - \tilde{G}_{\lambda, \varepsilon}(\eta)$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.4 g can be decomposed as $g = \tilde{g} + c_0$, where $\tilde{g}(w) = w + \lambda \int_0^{1/w} \beta_g(\zeta) d\zeta \in \widetilde{M}(\lambda)$ and $-c_0 \in E(\tilde{g})$. Again by Theorem 2.4

$$g(R) = \tilde{g}(R) + c_0 \in \tilde{g}(R) - E(\tilde{g}) \subset V_\lambda(R).$$

Thus $-c_0$ cannot be an interior point of $E(\tilde{g})$, otherwise $g(R)$ is an interior point of $V_\lambda(R)$. Hence $-c_0 \in \partial E(\tilde{g})$. By Lipschitz continuity of $\tilde{g}$ there exists $\eta \in \partial \Delta$ such that $-c_0 = \tilde{g}(\eta)$. Therefore

$$g(R) = \tilde{g}(R) - \tilde{g}(\eta) = R - \eta + \lambda \int_{1/\eta}^{1/R} \beta_g(\zeta) d\zeta.$$

Notice that $R \neq \eta$, since $g(R) \neq 0$. Then we have

$$\left| \int_{1/\eta}^{1/R} \beta_g(\zeta) d\zeta \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{R} - \frac{1}{\eta} \right|$$

with equality if and only if $\beta_g = \varepsilon$ for some ε with $|\varepsilon| = 1$.

Suppose that

$$\left| \int_{1/\eta}^{1/R} \beta_g(\zeta) d\zeta \right| < \left| \frac{1}{R} - \frac{1}{\eta} \right| = \left| \frac{\eta - R}{R\eta} \right|.$$

Put

$$\varepsilon_0 = \frac{R\eta}{\eta - R} \int_{1/\eta}^{1/R} \beta_g(\zeta) d\zeta \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_{\lambda, \varepsilon_0}(R) - \tilde{G}_{\lambda, \varepsilon_0}(\eta) &= R - \eta + \lambda \varepsilon_0 \left(\frac{1}{R} - \frac{1}{\eta} \right) \\ &= R - \eta + \lambda \int_{1/\eta}^{1/R} \beta_g(\zeta) d\zeta = \tilde{g}(R) - \tilde{g}(\eta) = g(R). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand since $\tilde{G}_{\lambda, c} - \tilde{G}_{\lambda, c}(\eta) \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ for $c \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, we have $\tilde{G}_{\lambda, c}(R) - \tilde{G}_{\lambda, c}(\eta) \in V_\lambda(R)$ for $c \in \mathbb{D}$. The mapping $\mathbb{D} \ni c \mapsto \tilde{G}_{\lambda, c}(R) - \tilde{G}_{\lambda, c}(\eta) \in V_\lambda(R)$ is an analytic function of $c \in \mathbb{D}$. Since $R \neq \eta$, the mapping is not constant and hence it is an open mapping. Thus $g(R) = \tilde{G}_{\lambda, \varepsilon_0}(R) - \tilde{G}_{\lambda, \varepsilon_0}(\eta)$ is an interior point of $V_\lambda(R)$, which contradict the assumption that $g(R) \in \partial V_\lambda(R)$. Therefore $\beta_g = \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon \in \partial \mathbb{D}$ and $g = \tilde{G}_{\lambda, \varepsilon} - \tilde{G}_{\lambda, \varepsilon}(\eta)$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Since (ii) follows directly from (i), it suffices to show (i). From compactness of $\mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ it follows that there exist $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$ such that

$$|g_1(R)| = \min_{g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)} |g(R)| \quad \text{and} \quad |g_2(R)| = \max_{g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)} |g(R)|.$$

Then clearly $g_2(R) \in \partial V_\lambda(R)$. Also $g_1(R) \in \partial V_\lambda(R)$ follows from the fact that $0 \notin V_\lambda(R)$. Thus by Proposition 3.3 there exist ε_j, η_j with $|\varepsilon_j| = |\eta_j| = 1$ such that $g_j = \tilde{G}_{\lambda, \varepsilon_j} - \tilde{G}_{\lambda, \varepsilon_j}(\eta_j)$ for $j = 1, 2$. Since

$$g_j(R) = \tilde{G}_{\lambda, \varepsilon_j}(R) - \tilde{G}_{\lambda, \varepsilon_j}(\eta_j) = (R - \eta_j) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda \varepsilon_j}{R \eta_j} \right),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |g_1(R)| &= \min_{g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)} |g(R)| \leq \tilde{G}_{\lambda,1}(R) - \tilde{G}_{\lambda,1}(1) \\
 &= (R-1) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{R}\right) \\
 &\leq \left| (R - \eta_1) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda \varepsilon_1}{R \eta_1}\right) \right| = |g_1(R)|.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\eta_1 = \varepsilon_1 = 1$ and hence

$$g_1(w) \equiv \tilde{G}_{\lambda,1}(w) - \tilde{G}_{\lambda,1}(1) = w + \frac{\lambda}{w} - (1 + \lambda).$$

We have shown that for $g \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$

$$(R-1) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{R}\right) \leq |g(R)|$$

with equality if and only if $g(w) = w + \lambda w^{-1} - (1 + \lambda)$. Applying this to $g_\theta(w) = e^{-i\theta} g(e^{i\theta} w)$ we have for $w = Re^{i\theta}$ and $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(\lambda)$

$$(|w| - 1) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{|w|}\right) = (R-1) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{R}\right) \leq |g_\theta(R)| = |g(w)|$$

with equality $g_\theta(w) = w + \lambda w^{-1} - (1 + \lambda)$, i.e.,

$$g(w) = w + \lambda e^{2i\theta} w^{-1} - (1 + \lambda) e^{i\theta} = w \left(1 - \frac{\lambda e^{i\theta}}{w}\right) \left(1 - \frac{e^{i\theta}}{w}\right).$$

In the same manner we can treat the rest of the proof of (i). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.2. For $f \in \mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ the relation $\mathbb{D}(0, (2(1 + \lambda))^{-1}) \subset f(\mathbb{D})$ directly follows from 3.1 (ii).

Suppose that $e^{i\theta_0} \{2(1 + \lambda)\}^{-1} \notin f(\mathbb{D})$. Then $2(1 + \lambda)e^{-i\theta_0} \in E(g) = E(\tilde{g}) + c_0(g)$, where $g = Tf = \tilde{g} + c_0(g)$ with $\tilde{g} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda)$. Since $2(1 + \lambda)e^{-i\theta_0} - c_0(g) \in E(\tilde{g}) \subset \overline{\mathbb{D}}(0, 1 + \lambda)$ and $|c_0(g)| \leq 1 + \lambda$ by Theorem 2.5, we have

$$1 + \lambda \leq 2(1 + \lambda) - |c_0(g)| \leq |2(1 + \lambda)e^{-i\theta_0} - c_0(g)| \leq 1 + \lambda.$$

Thus $c_0(g) = (1 + \lambda)e^{-i\theta_0}$. By Theorem 2.5 (b) $g(w) = w(1 + \lambda e^{i\theta} w^{-1})(1 + e^{i\theta} w^{-1}) = w + (1 + \lambda)e^{i\theta} + \lambda e^{2i\theta} w^{-1}$ for some $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore $e^{i\theta} = e^{-i\theta_0}$ and $g(w) = w(1 + \lambda e^{-i\theta_0} w^{-1})(1 + e^{-i\theta_0} w^{-1})$. This implies

$$f(z) = \frac{z}{(1 + \lambda e^{-i\theta_0} z)(1 + e^{-i\theta_0} z)}.$$

$\square$

Proposition 3.3 implies that $\partial\partial V_\lambda(R)$ is contained in

$$V_\lambda^*(R) = \left\{ (R - \eta) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda\varepsilon}{R\eta} \right) : |\varepsilon| = |\eta| = 1 \right\}.$$




FIGURE 1. $V_{0.5}^*(2)$ and $V_{0.9}^*(1.1)$

One can prove $\partial V_\lambda^*(R)$ consists of two Jordan curves $J_e(R)$ and $J_i(R)$ which are starlike with respect to R and $J_i(R)$ is contained inside of $J_e(R)$, and that $V_\lambda(R)$ is a closed Jordan domain surrounded by $J_e(R)$. For details see forthcoming paper [11].

REFERENCES

1. L.A. Aksent'ev, Sufficient condition for univalence of regular functions (Russian), *Izv. Vysš. Učebn. Zaved. Matematika* **1958**(4), 3–7.
2. F.G. Avhadiev and L.A. Aksent'ev, Fundamental results on sufficient condition for the univalence of analytic functions (Russian), *Uspehi Mat. Nauk* **30**(184)(1975), 3–60, English Translation in *Russian Math. Surveys* **30**(1975), 1–64.
3. P. Duren, *Univalent Functions*, Grundlehren Math. Wiss. **259**, Springer, New York 1983.
4. R. Fournier and S. Ponnusamy, A class of locally univalent functions defined by a differential inequality, *Complex Var. Elliptic Equ.* **52**(1)(2007), 1–8.
5. M. Obradović and S. Ponnusamy, New criteria and distortion theorems for univalent functions, *Complex Variables Theory Appl.* **44**(2001), 173–191.

6. M. Obradović and S. Ponnusamy, Univalence and starlikeness of certain integral transforms defined by convolution of analytic functions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **336**(2007), 758–767.
7. M. Obradović and S. Ponnusamy, Partial sums and the radius problem for some class of conformal mappings, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* **52**(2)(2011), 291–302.
8. Ch. Pommerenke, *Univalent functions*, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1975.
9. S. Ponnusamy and P. Vasundhara, Criteria for univalence, starlikeness and convexity, *Ann. Polon. Math.* **85**(2)(2005), 121–133.
10. S. Ozaki and M. Nunokawa, The Schwarzian derivative and univalent functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **33** (1972), 392–394.
11. A. Vasudevarao and H. Yanagihara, On the growth of analytic functions in class $\mathcal{U}(\lambda)$, in preparation.