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Abstract. The main object of the present paper is to derive subordination property of the class which was very recently $\mathcal{P} \mathcal{T}_{g}(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ introduced by Murugusundaramoorthy and Joshi (J. Math. Ineq., 3(1)(2009), pp. 293-303).
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## 1. Introduction and Preliminaries

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_{k} z^{k} \quad(z \in \Delta:=\{z \in C| | z \mid<1\}) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

which are analytic and univalent in the open unit disk. If $\mathcal{U}=\{z \in C:|z|<1\}$ is given by (1.1) and $g \in \mathcal{A}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(z)=z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} b_{k} z^{k} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

the Hadamard product (or convolution ) $(f * g)$ of f and g is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
(f * g)(z)=z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_{k} b_{k} z^{k}, z \in \mathcal{U} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Very recently, by using Hadamard product (or convolution) Murugusundaramoorthy and Joshi [5], introduced the subclass $\mathcal{P}_{g}(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ of $\mathcal{A}$ consisting the functions of the form (1.1) and satisfying the following inequality,

$$
\left.\left|\frac{J_{g, \lambda}(z)-1}{2 \gamma\left(J_{g, \lambda}(z)-\alpha\right)-\left(J_{g, \lambda}(z)-1\right)}\right|<\beta, \lambda \geq 0,0 \leq \alpha<1,0<\beta \leq 1, z \in C\right)
$$

where $J_{g, \lambda}(z)=\frac{(1-\lambda)(f * g)(z)+\lambda z(f * g)^{\prime}}{z} \quad 0<\gamma \leq 1$, and $(f * g)(z)$ is given by (1.3) and g is fixed function for all $z \in \mathcal{U}$. We further assume that $\mathcal{P} \mathcal{T}_{g}(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)=$ $P_{g}(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \gamma) \cap T$, where

$$
\begin{equation*}
T:=\left\{f \in A: f(z)=z-\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left|a_{k}\right| z^{k}, z \in U\right\} \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

is a subclass of $\mathcal{A}$ introduced and studied by Silverman [6].
We observe that several known operators are deducible from the convolution. That is, for various choices of $g$ in (1.3), we obtain some interesting operators studied by many authors. For examples, we illustrate the following two operators.

At first, for complex parameters $\alpha_{1}, \ldots \alpha_{l}$ and $\beta_{1}, \ldots \beta_{q},\left(\beta_{j} \in C \backslash Z_{0}^{-} ; Z_{0}^{-}=\{0,-1,-2, \ldots \ldots ..\} ; j=1,2,3 \ldots \ldots\right)$ consider the function $g$ defined by

$$
\begin{align*}
& g(z)=z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\alpha_{1}\right)_{k-1} \cdots\left(\alpha_{l}\right)_{k-1}}{\left(\beta_{1}\right)_{k-1} \cdots\left(\beta_{q}\right)_{k-1}} \frac{z^{k}}{(k-1)!},  \tag{1.5}\\
& \quad\left(l \leq q+1 ; q, s \in N_{0}:=N \cup\{0\} ; z \in \mathcal{U}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

where $(\nu)_{k}$ is the well known Pochhammer symbol.
Then for functions $f \in \mathcal{A}$, the convolution (1.3) with the function g defined by (1.5) gives the operator studied by Dziok and Srivastava ([2], see also [ 3,4]).
Next, if we define the function g by

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(z)=z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left(\frac{k+l}{1+l}\right)^{m} z^{k}(m \geq 0, l \in Z) . \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then for functions $f \in \mathcal{A}$, the convolution (1.3) with the function g defined by (1.6) reduces to the multiplier transformation studied by Cho and Srivastava [1]. In the present paper, we will obtain subordination property for the subclass $\mathcal{P} \mathcal{T}_{g}(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$. To prove it, we need following definitions and lemma which are given below.
Definition 1.1 (Subordination Principle).For the two functions $f$ and $g$ analytic in $U$, we say that the function $f(z)$ is subordinate to $g(z)$ in $\mathcal{U}$ and denoted by $f(z) \prec g(z) \quad z \in \mathcal{U}$, if there exists a Schwarz function $w(z)$ analytic in $\mathcal{U}$ with
$w(0)=0$, and $|w(z)|<1$ such that $f(z)=g(w(z)) z \in \mathcal{U}$. In particular, if the function $g(z)$ is univalent in $\mathcal{U}$, the above subordination is equivalent to $f(0)=g(0)$ and $f(\mathcal{U}) \subseteq g(\mathcal{U})$.

Definition 1.2 (Subordinating factor sequence, see [7]). A sequence $\left\{b_{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of complex number is called a subordinating factor sequence if, whenever $f(z)=$ $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{K} z^{K}\left(\mathrm{a}_{1}=1\right)$ is analytic, univalent and convex in $\mathcal{U}$, we have the subordination given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{k} b_{k} z^{k} \prec f(z) \quad(z \in \mathcal{U}) \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 1.1 (see [7]). The sequence $\left\{b_{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is a subordinating factor sequence if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\left\{1+2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_{k} z^{k}\right\}>0 \quad(z \in \mathcal{U}) \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

To prove our main result, we shall required the following lemma due to Murusundaramoorthy and Joshi.
Lemma 1.2 (see [5]). Let the function $f$ be defined by (1.4) then $\mathcal{P} \mathcal{T}_{g}(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}(1+\lambda(k-1))[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] a_{k} b_{k} \leq 2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha) \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 2. Subordination theorem

Theorem 2.1.Let the function $f \in \mathcal{P} \mathcal{T}_{g}(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ satisfy the inequality (1.8), and $K$ denote the familiar class of univalent and convex functions in $\mathcal{U}$. Then for every $g \in K$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}}{\left[(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]}(f * \phi)(z) \prec \phi(z),  \tag{2.1}\\
& \quad\left(z \in U, b_{k} \geq b_{2}>0(k \geq 2) ; \gamma \in C \backslash\{0\} ; 0 \leq \alpha<1\right)
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\{f(z)\}>-\frac{\left[(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]}{2(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}} \quad(z \in \mathcal{U}) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following constant factor $\frac{(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}}{\left.2[1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]}$, in the subordination result (2.1) is the best dominant.
Proof. Let $f(z)$ satisfy the inequality and let $\phi(z)=z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} c_{k} z^{k} \in K$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}}{2\left[(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]}(f * \phi)(z) \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
=\frac{(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}}{2\left[(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]}\left(z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_{k} c_{k} z^{k}\right) .
$$

By invoking definition (2.2), the subordination (2.1) our theorem will hold true if the sequence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\{\frac{(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}}{2\left[(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]} a_{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

is a subordination factor sequence. By virtue of Lemma (1.1), this is equivalent to the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\left\{1+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}}{\left[(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]} a_{k} z^{k}\right\}>0 \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $b_{k} \geq b_{2}>0$ for $k \geq 2$, we have

$$
\begin{array}{rl} 
& \operatorname{Re}\left\{1+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}}{\left[(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]} a_{k} z^{k}\right\} \\
\geq 1 & 1-\frac{1+\lambda)(1+\beta(2-1)] b_{2}}{\left[(1+\lambda)\left[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1) b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]\right.} r \\
& \quad-\frac{1}{\left.(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2} a_{k} r^{k} \\
\geq 1- & \frac{(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}}{\left[(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]} r \\
& \quad-\frac{1}{\left.(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}(1+\lambda(k-1))[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{k} a_{k} r^{k} .
\end{array}
$$

By using Lemma 1.2, we can easily seen that

$$
\left.\geq 1-\frac{(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}}{\left[(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]} r\right) \quad r>0, \quad(|z|=r<1) .
$$

This establishes the inequality (2.5), and consequently the subordination relation (2.1) of Theorem 2.1 is proved. The inequality (2.2) follows from (2.1), upon setting

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi(z)=\frac{z}{1-z}=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} z^{n} \in K \quad(z \in \mathcal{U}), \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{0}(z)=z-\frac{2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)}{\left[(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]} z^{2} \quad(z \in \mathcal{U}), \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

which belongs to $\mathcal{P} \mathcal{I}_{g}(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$. Using (2.1), we infer that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}}{\left[(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]} f_{0}(z) \prec \frac{z}{1-z} \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

It can be easily verified for the function $f_{0}(z)$ defined by (2.7) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Min}_{|z|<1} \operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}}{\left[(1+\lambda)[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]} f_{0}(z)\right\}>-\frac{1}{2} \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

which completes the proof of theorem.
By substituting $\lambda=0$, in Theorem (2.1), we easily get
Corollary 2.2.Let the function $f(z) \in \mathcal{P}_{g}(0, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ satisfy the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] a_{k} b_{k} \leq 2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha) \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $K$ denote the familiar class of univalent and convex functions in $\mathcal{U}$. Then for every $\phi \in K$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}}{\left.[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]}(f * \phi)(z) \prec \phi(z)  \tag{2.11}\\
& \quad\left(z \in \mathcal{U}, b_{k} \geq b_{2}>0(k \geq 2) ; \gamma \in C /\{0\} ; 0 \leq \alpha<1\right)
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\{f(z)\}>-\frac{\left.[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)\right]}{2[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}} \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following constant factor $\frac{\left.[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}\right]}{2[1+\beta(2 \gamma-1)] b_{2}+2 \beta \gamma(1-\alpha)}$, in the subordination result (2.11) is the best dominant. By setting $\phi(z)=\frac{z}{1-z}, \beta=1$ and $\lambda=0$,

Corollary 2.3.Let the function $f(z) \in \mathcal{P}_{g}(0, \alpha, 1, \gamma)$ satisfy the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} 2 \gamma a_{k} \leq 2(1-\alpha) \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $K$ denote the familiar class of univalent and convex functions in $\mathcal{U}$. Then for every $\phi(z) \in K$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{1}{2-\alpha}(f * \phi)(z) \prec \phi(z)  \tag{2.14}\\
& \quad\left(z \in \mathcal{U}, b_{k} \geq b_{2}>0(k \geq 2) ; \gamma \in C /\{0\} ; 0 \leq \alpha<1\right)
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\{f(z)\}>\frac{\alpha-2}{2} \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following constant factor $\frac{2}{\alpha-2}$, in the subordination result (2.14) is the best dominant.

## 3. Further remarks and observation

Using Hadamard Product (or convolution) defined by (1.2) and using Wilf lemma, we obtained the subordination results for the subclass $\mathcal{P} \mathcal{T}_{g}(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ of $\mathcal{A}$. If we replace $\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{z})$ in Theorem 2.1 defined by the functions in (1.5) and (1.6), we get the corresponding results of the Theorem 2.1.
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