# ON CERTAIN SUBCLASSES OF UNIVALENT FUNCTIONS AND RADIUS PROPERTIES 

M. OBRADOVIĆ and S. PONNUSAMY

Let $\mathcal{S}$ denote the class of normalized univalent functions $f$ in the unit disk $\Delta$. One of the problems addressed in this paper is that of the $\mathcal{F}$-radius in $\mathcal{G}$ when $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{S}$, namely the maximum value of $r_{0}$ such that $r^{-1} f(r z) \in \mathcal{G}$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $0<r \leq r_{0}$. The investigations are concerned primarily with the classes $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{P}(2)$ consisting of univalent functions satisfying

$$
\left|f^{\prime}(z)\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{2}-1\right| \leq 1 \quad \text { and } \quad\left|\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\prime \prime}\right| \leq 2
$$

respectively, for all $|z|<1$. Similar radius properties are also obtained for a geometrically motivated subclass $\mathcal{S}_{p} \subset \mathcal{S}$. Several new sufficient conditions for $f$ to be in the class $\mathcal{U}$ are also presented.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

Denote by $\mathcal{A}$ the class of all functions $f$, normalized by $f(0)=f^{\prime}(0)-$ $1=0$, that are analytic in the unit disk $\Delta=\{z \in \mathbb{C}:|z|<1\}$, and by $\mathcal{S}$ the subclass of univalent functions in $\Delta$. Denote by $\mathcal{S}^{*}$ the subclass consisting of functions $f$ in $\mathcal{S}$ that are starlike (with respect to origin), i.e., $t w \in f(\Delta)$ whenever $t \in[0,1]$ and $w \in f(\Delta)$. Analytically, $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}$ if and only if $\operatorname{Re}\left(z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)\right)>0$ in $\Delta$. A function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is said to belong to the class $\mathcal{U}$ if

$$
\left|f^{\prime}(z)\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{2}-1\right| \leq 1, \quad z \in \Delta
$$

In [6], the authors introduced a subclass $\mathcal{P}(2)$ of $\mathcal{U}$, consisting of functions $f$ for which

$$
\left|\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\prime \prime}\right| \leq 2, \quad z \in \Delta
$$

We have the strict inclusion $\mathcal{P}(2) \subsetneq \mathcal{U} \subsetneq \mathcal{S}$ (see $[1,6,10]$ for a proof). An interesting fact is that each function in

$$
\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{Z}}=\left\{z, \frac{z}{(1 \pm z)^{2}}, \frac{z}{1 \pm z}, \frac{z}{1 \pm z^{2}}, \frac{z}{1 \pm z+z^{2}}\right\}
$$

belongs to $\mathcal{U}$. Also, it is well-known that these are the only functions in $\mathcal{S}$ having integral coefficients in the power series expansions of $f \in \mathcal{S}$ (see [2]). From the analytic characterization of starlike functions, it is a simple exercise to see that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{Z}} \subset \mathcal{S}^{*}$.

Further work on the classes $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{P}(2)$, including some interesting generalizations of these classes, may be found in $[7,9,11]$. A function $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}$ is said to be in $\mathcal{T}^{*}$ if it can be expressed as

$$
f(z)=z-\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_{k} z^{k},
$$

where $a_{k} \geq 0$ for $k=2,3, \ldots$. Functions of this form are discussed in detail by Silverman [13, 14]. The work of Silverman led to a large number of investigations for univalent functions of the above form.

In this paper we shall be mainly concerned with functions $f \in \mathcal{A}$ of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=\frac{z}{1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n}}, \quad z \in \Delta . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The class of functions $f$ of this form for which $b_{n} \geq 0$ is especially interesting and deserves a separate discussion. We remark that if $f \in \mathcal{S}$ then $z / f(z)$ is nonvanishing in the unit disk $\Delta$. Hence it can be represented as Taylor series of the form

$$
\frac{z}{f(z)}=1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n}, \quad z \in \Delta .
$$

The above representation is convenient for our investigation.
Now, we introduce a subclass $\mathcal{S}_{p}$ of starlike functions, namely,

$$
\mathcal{S}_{p}=\left\{f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}:\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-1\right| \leq \operatorname{Re} \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}, z \in \Delta\right\}
$$

Geometrically, $f \in \mathcal{S}_{p}$ if and only if the domain values of $z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z), z \in \Delta$, is the parabolic region $(\operatorname{Im} w)^{2} \leq 2 \operatorname{Re} w-1$. It is well-known [12, Theorem 2] that $f(z)=z+a_{n} z^{n}$ is in $\mathcal{S}_{p}$ if and only if $(2 n-1)\left|a_{n}\right| \leq 1$.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be two subclasses of $\mathcal{A}$. If for every $f \in \mathcal{F}, r^{-1} f(r z) \in \mathcal{G}$ for $r \leq r_{0}$, and $r_{0}$ is the maximum value for which this holds, then we say that
$r_{0}$ is the $\mathcal{G}$-radius in $\mathcal{F}$. There are many results of this type in the theory of univalent functions. For example, the $\mathcal{S}_{p}$-radius in $\mathcal{S}^{*}$ was found by Rønning in [12] to be $1 / 3$. Moreover, the class $\mathcal{S}_{p}$ and its associated class of uniformly convex functions, introduced by Goodman [4, 5], have been investigated in [12]. We recall here the following result.

Theorem A [12, Theorem 4]. If $f \in \mathcal{S}$ then $\frac{1}{r} f(r z) \in \mathcal{S}_{p}$ for $0<r \leq$ 0.33217....

The paper is organized as follows. We investigate the $\mathcal{P}(2)$-radius in $\mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{F}$ is the subclasses of $\mathcal{U}$ consisting of functions $f \in \mathcal{U}$ of the form (1) that satisfies either the condition $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(n-1)\left|b_{n}\right| \leq 1$ (see Theorem 1) or $b_{n} \geq 0$ (see Corollary 1). In Theorem 2 we obtain a necessary coefficient condition for a function $f$ of the form (1) with $b_{n} \geq 0$ to be in $\mathcal{S}_{p}$, while in Theorem 3 we obtain a sufficient coefficient condition for a nonvanishing analytic function $z / f(z)$ of the form (1) (where $\left.b_{n} \in \mathbb{C}\right)$ to be in $\mathcal{S}_{p}$. In Theorem 4 we derive the value of the $\mathcal{S}$-radius in $\mathcal{S}_{p}$. In Theorems 5 and 6 we establish new necessary and sufficient conditions for a function to belong to the class $\mathcal{U}$. Finally, in Corollary 2 we show that $\mathcal{T}^{*} \subset \mathcal{U}$, which is somewhat surprising.

## 2. LEMMAS

For the proof of our results we need the following result (see [3, Theorem 11 on p. 193 of Vol. 2]) which reveals the importance of the area theorem in the theory of univalent functions.

Lemma 1. Let $\mu>0$ and $f \in \mathcal{S}$ be of the form $(z / f(z))^{\mu}=1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n}$. Then we have $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(n-\mu)\left|b_{n}\right|^{2} \leq \mu$.

We also have
Lemma 2 ([9]). Let $\phi(z)=1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n}$ be a non-vanishing analytic function in $\Delta$ and $f(z)=z / \phi(z)$. Then
(a) $f \in \mathcal{U}$ if $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(n-1)\left|b_{n}\right| \leq 1$;
(b) $f \in \mathcal{P}(2)$ if $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n(n-1)\left|b_{n}\right| \leq 2$.

## 3. MAIN RESULTS

It is easy to see that the rational function $f(z)=z /\left(1+A z^{3}\right)$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$ if and only if $|A| \leq 1 / 2$. Further, for $|A|=1 / 2$ we have

$$
\left|(z / f(z))^{\prime \prime}\right|=|6 A z| \leq 3|z| \leq 2
$$

provided $|z| \leq 2 / 3$. It seems reasonable to expect that the $\mathcal{P}(2)$-radius in $\mathcal{U}$ is at least $2 / 3$, and we formulate our first result.

THEOREM 1. If $f \in \mathcal{U}$ is of the form (1) such that $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(n-1)\left|b_{n}\right| \leq 1$, then $\frac{1}{r} f(r z) \in \mathcal{P}(2)$ for $0<r \leq 2 / 3$; and $2 / 3$ is the largest number with this property, especially in the class for which $b_{1}=b_{2}=0$.

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{U}$ be of the form (1). We need to show that $\frac{1}{r} f(r z) \in \mathcal{P}(2)$ for $0<r \leq 2 / 3$. Using (1), for $0<r \leq 1$ we can write

$$
\frac{z}{\frac{1}{r} f(r z)}=1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(b_{n} r^{n}\right) z^{n}
$$

According to Lemma 2(b), it suffices to show that

$$
\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n(n-1)\left|b_{n}\right| r^{n} \leq 2
$$

for $0<r \leq 2 / 3$. It is easy to see by induction that $n r^{n} \leq 3 r$ for all $0<$ $r \leq 2 / 3$ and for $n \geq 2$. In view of this observation, and the assumption that $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(n-1)\left|b_{n}\right| \leq 1$, we obtain

$$
\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n(n-1)\left|b_{n}\right| r^{n} \leq 3 r \leq 2 \quad \text { for } r \leq 2 / 3
$$

Hence, by Lemma 2(b), $\frac{1}{r} f(r z) \in \mathcal{P}(2)$ for $0<r \leq 2 / 3$.
To prove the sharpness, we consider $f_{\theta}(z)=z /\left(1+\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta} z^{3} / 2\right)$. Then we observe that $f_{\theta} \in \mathcal{U}$, but it does not belongs to $\mathcal{P}(2)$. We see that $\frac{1}{r} f_{\theta}(r z) \in$ $\mathcal{P}(2)$ for $0<r \leq 2 / 3$ and $r=2 / 3$ is the largest value with the desired property.

An interesting consequence of Theorem 1 is stated later in Corollary 1.
THEOREM 2. If a function $f$ of the form (1) with $b_{n} \geq 0$ is in $\mathcal{S}_{p}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(2 n-1) b_{n} \leq 1 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{S}_{p}$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
z\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\prime}=\frac{z}{f(z)}-\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{2} f^{\prime}(z) . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, as $f \in \mathcal{S}_{p}$ is of the form (1), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-1\right| & \leq \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right) \Leftrightarrow\left|\frac{-z\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\prime}}{\frac{z}{f(z)}}\right| \leq \operatorname{Re} \frac{\frac{z}{f(z)}-z\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\prime}}{\frac{z}{f(z)}} \\
& \Leftrightarrow\left|\frac{-\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n b_{n} z^{n}}{1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n}}\right| \leq \operatorname{Re}\left(1-\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n b_{n} z^{n}}{1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n}}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

If $z \in \Delta$ is real and tends to $1^{-}$through reals, then from the last inequality we have

$$
\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n b_{n}}{1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n}} \leq \operatorname{Re}\left(1-\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n b_{n}}{1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n}}\right),
$$

from which we obtain the desired inequality $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(2 n-1) b_{n} \leq 1$.
Remark 1. Condition (2) for functions of the form (1) with nonnegative coefficients $b_{n}$ is not sufficient for the corresponding $f$ to be in the class $\mathcal{S}_{p}$. As an example, consider the function $f(z)=z /(1+z)$. It is easy to see that the condition for the class $\mathcal{S}_{p}$, namely,

$$
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-1\right| \leq \operatorname{Re} \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)},
$$

does not hold for all $z \in \Delta$, for example at the boundary point $z=(-1+\mathrm{i}) / \sqrt{2}$, hence at some points in $\Delta$.

Remark 2. Let $0<\lambda<1$ and $f(z)=z-\lambda z^{m}$, where $m \geq 2$. Then

$$
\frac{z}{f(z)}=\frac{1}{1-\lambda z^{m-1}}=1+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{k} z^{k(m-1)}
$$

which is nonvanishing in the unit disk. It follows from the previous theorem that if $f \in \mathcal{S}_{p}$, the coefficient must satisfy the condition

$$
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}[2 k(m-1)-1] \lambda^{k} \leq 1,
$$

which simplifies to $\lambda(2 m-1) \leq 1$. Thus, a necessary condition for $f$ to belong to $\mathcal{S}_{p}$ is $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1 /(2 m-1)$. It is a simple exercise to see that this condition also is a sufficient condition for $f \in \mathcal{S}_{p}$ (see also [12, Theorem 2]). Thus, the upper bound for $\lambda$ cannot be improved. This observation shows that the constant 1 on the right hand side of inequality (2) cannot be replaced by a larger constant. In this sense, condition (2) is sharp.

Theorem 3. Let $f(z)$ be a nonvanishing analytic function in $0<|z|<1$ of the form (1). Then the condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(2 n+1)\left|b_{n}\right| \leq 1 \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

is sufficient for $f$ to belong to the class $\mathcal{S}_{p}$.
Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 2, we notice that

$$
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-1\right| \leq \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right) \Leftrightarrow\left|-\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n b_{n} z^{n}}{1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n}}\right| \leq \operatorname{Re}\left(1-\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n b_{n} z^{n}}{1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n}}\right)
$$

Thus, to show that $f$ is in $\mathcal{S}_{p}$, it suffices to show that the quotient

$$
-\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n b_{n} z^{n}}{1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n}}
$$

lies in the parabolic region $(\operatorname{Im} w)^{2} \leq 1+2 \operatorname{Re} w$. Geometric considerations show that this condition holds if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n b_{n} z^{n}}{1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad z \in \Delta . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

From condition (4) we obtain that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(2 n+1)\left|b_{n}\right||z|^{n} \leq 1$ and so

$$
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n\left|b_{n}\right||z|^{n} \leq \frac{1}{2}\left(1-\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left|b_{n}\right||z|^{n}\right) .
$$

Finally, we find that

$$
\left|\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n b_{n} z^{n}}{1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1-\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left|b_{n}\right||z|^{n}}{1-\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left|b_{n}\right||z|^{n}}=\frac{1}{2} .
$$

This means that inequality (5) holds and, therefore, $f \in \mathcal{S}_{p}$.
Theorem 4. If $f \in \mathcal{S}$ is given by (1), then $\frac{1}{r} f(r z) \in \mathcal{S}_{p}$ for $0<r \leq$ $r_{0}$, where $r_{0}$, which depends on the second coefficient of $f$, is the root of the equation
(6) $\frac{4}{\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2}}+\frac{4}{1-r^{2}}-\left(8+12 r^{2}\right)-9 r^{2} \ln \left(1-r^{2}\right)=\left(1-(3 / 2)\left|f^{\prime \prime}(0)\right| r\right)^{2}$.

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{S}$ be given by (1). Then $z / f(z)$ is nonvanishing and for $0<r \leq 1$ we have

$$
\frac{z}{\frac{1}{r} f(r z)}=1+\left(b_{1} r\right) z+\left(b_{2} r^{2}\right) z^{2}+\cdots \quad\left(b_{1}=-f^{\prime \prime}(0) / 2\right)
$$

and if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(2 n+1)\left|b_{n}\right| r^{n} \leq 1 \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $r$, then $\frac{1}{r} f(r z) \in \mathcal{S}_{p}$ by Theorem 3. By Lemma 1 with $\mu=1$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(n-1)\left|b_{n}\right|^{2} \leq 1 \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (8),

$$
\begin{gathered}
\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(2 n+1)\left|b_{n}\right| r^{n}=\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sqrt{n-1}\left|b_{n}\right| \frac{2 n+1}{\sqrt{n-1}} r^{n} \\
\leq\left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(n-1)\left|b_{n}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(2 n+1)^{2}}{n-1} r^{2 n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\leq\left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(2 n+1)^{2}}{n-1} r^{2 n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}=\left(\frac{16 r^{4}-12 r^{6}}{\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2}}-9 r^{2} \ln \left(1-r^{2}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} .
\end{gathered}
$$

In particular, for $0<r \leq r_{0}$, the last expression is less than or equal to $1-3\left|b_{1}\right| r$. Therefore, (7) holds, concluding the proof.

Remark 3. One can easily show that equation (6) has a unique solution for $0<r \leq 1$ and $\left|b_{1}\right| \leq 1 / 3$. Indeed, let

$$
G(r)=\frac{4}{\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{2}}+\frac{4}{1-r^{2}}-\left(8+12 r^{2}\right)-9 r^{2} \ln \left(1-r^{2}\right)-\left(1-3\left|b_{1}\right| r\right)^{2}
$$

and $1-r^{2}=x$. Now, for $0 \leq x<1$ we consider the new function

$$
H(x)=\frac{4}{x^{2}}+\frac{4}{x}+12 x-20-9(1-x) \ln x-\left(1-3\left|b_{1}\right| \sqrt{1-x}\right)^{2} .
$$

For this function, we see that $H(x) \rightarrow+\infty$ when $x \rightarrow 0+, H(1)=-1$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H^{\prime}(x)=-\frac{8}{x^{3}}-\frac{4}{x^{2}}+12-9\left(-\ln x+\frac{1-x}{x}\right)-\left(1-3\left|b_{1}\right| \sqrt{1-x}\right) \frac{6\left|b_{1}\right|}{\sqrt{1-x}} \\
& =-8\left(\frac{1-x^{3}}{x^{3}}\right)-4\left(\frac{1-x^{2}}{x^{2}}\right)+9 \ln x-9\left(\frac{1-x}{x}\right)-\left(1-3\left|b_{1}\right| \sqrt{1-x}\right) \frac{6\left|b_{1}\right|}{\sqrt{1-x}}
\end{aligned}
$$

which is negative for $0<x<1$ while $\left|b_{1}\right| \leq 1 / 3$, showing that equation (6) has a unique solution in the interval $(0,1)$.

Also, in Theorem 4, we have actually obtained $\mathcal{F}$-radius in $\mathcal{S}$, where $\mathcal{F}$ is the subclass of $\mathcal{S}_{p}$ consisting of functions $f$ given by (1) with coefficients satisfying the condition $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(2 n+1)\left|b_{n}\right| \leq 1$.

Remark 4. For $f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$ in Theorem 4, we have $r_{0}=0.30066 \ldots$, and the result is the best possible, the extremal function being of the form

$$
\frac{z}{f(z)}=1+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{2 n+1}{n-1} r_{0}^{n} z^{n} .
$$

To see this, for $|\zeta|<1$ we have

$$
\frac{r_{0} \zeta}{f\left(r_{0} \zeta\right)}=1+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} b_{n} \zeta^{n}
$$

where

$$
b_{n}=\frac{2 n+1}{n-1} r_{0}^{2 n}
$$

and

$$
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(2 n+1)\left|b_{n}\right|=\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(2 n+1)^{2}}{n-1} r_{0}^{2 n}=1,
$$

by the definition of $r_{0}$ from (6). This means that $\frac{1}{r} f(r z)$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{p}$ for $0<r \leq r_{0}$. Moreover, for $|z|=r>r_{0}$ we have $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(2 n+1)\left|b_{n}\right|>1$. Therefore,
$f$ is extremal for the class $\mathcal{F}$ of functions $f$ given by (1) with coefficients satisfying the condition $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(2 n+1)\left|b_{n}\right| \leq 1$. In this sense, the result is sharp.

On the other hand, the function $f$ is univalent because it can be easily seen that $f \in \mathcal{U}$. Indeed, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(n-1)\left|b_{n}\right|-1 & =\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(2 n+1) r_{0}^{n}-1=\frac{2 r_{0}}{\left(1-r_{0}\right)^{2}}-2 r_{0}+\frac{r_{0}^{2}}{1-r_{0}}-1 \\
& =-\frac{\left(1-3 r_{0}\right)\left[r_{0}\left(1-r_{0}\right)+1\right]}{\left(1-r_{0}\right)^{2}}<0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

According to Lemma 2(a), $f \in \mathcal{U}$, hence $f$ is univalent. Finally, we only need to prove that the function

$$
\frac{z}{f(z)}=1+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{2 n+1}{n-1} r_{0}^{n} z^{n}=1+2 \frac{\left(r_{0} z\right)^{2}}{1-r_{0} z}-3 r_{0} z \log \left(1-r_{0} z\right)
$$

has no zeros in the unit disk. This is easy because

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)=1-\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{2 n+1}{n-1} r_{0}^{n} \geq 1-\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(2 n+1) r_{0}^{n}>0 .
$$

Thus, we have established that $r_{0}$ in Theorem 4 is the best possible radius when $f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$. In other words, if $\mathcal{F}$ is the subclass of functions $f \in \mathcal{S}$ of the form (1) such that $f^{\prime \prime}(0)=0$, then $\frac{1}{r} f(r z)$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{p}$ for $0<r \leq r_{0}$, where $r_{0}$ is the largest value with the desired property.

It is known that $\mathcal{U} \subsetneq \mathcal{S}$. In [8], the authors have shown that the $\mathcal{U}$-radius in the class $\mathcal{S}$ is $1 / \sqrt{2}$. Our next result is simple but is surprising as it identifies an important subclass of $\mathcal{S}$ which lies in $\mathcal{U}$. We remark that a function $f \in \mathcal{U}$ does not necessarily imply that $\operatorname{Re}\left(f^{\prime}(z)\right)>0$ throughout $|z|<1$, see [7].

Theorem 5. If $f$ is given by (1) with $b_{n} \geq 0$ and such that $\operatorname{Re}\left(f^{\prime}(z)\right)>0$ for $z \in \Delta$, then $f \in \mathcal{U}$.

Proof. Remark that if $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies $\operatorname{Re}\left(f^{\prime}(z)\right)>0$ for $z \in \Delta$, then $f$ must be univalent in $\Delta$ (see [3]). Also, notice that

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(f^{\prime}(z)\right)>0 \Leftrightarrow \operatorname{Re} \frac{\frac{z}{f(z)}-z\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\prime}}{\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{2}}>0 \Leftrightarrow \operatorname{Re} \frac{1-\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(n-1) b_{n} z^{n}}{\left(1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n}\right)^{2}}>0 .
$$

For $z \rightarrow 1^{-}$along the positive real axis, the last inequality above becomes

$$
\operatorname{Re} \frac{1-\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(n-1) b_{n}}{\left(1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{n}\right)^{2}} \geq 0
$$

which gives $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(n-1) b_{n} \leq 1$ and so $f \in \mathcal{U}$, by Lemma 2(a).
Theorem 6. A function $f$ of the form (1) with $b_{n} \geq 0$ and $z / f(z) \neq 0$ in $\Delta$, is in $\mathcal{U}$ if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(n-1) b_{n} \leq 1 \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. On account of Lemma 2(a), it suffices to prove the necessary part. To do this, we let $f \in \mathcal{U}$ of the form (1). This means that

$$
\left|\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{2} f^{\prime}(z)-1\right|=\left|\frac{z}{f(z)}-z\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\prime}-1\right|=\left|\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(n-1) b_{n} z^{n}\right|<1 .
$$

Choosing values of $z$ on the real axis and then letting $z \rightarrow 1^{-}$through real values, we obtain the coefficient condition (9).

For example, by (9), the functions

$$
\frac{z}{(1+z)^{2}}, \frac{z}{1+z}, \frac{z}{1+z^{2}} \text { and } \frac{z}{1+z+z^{2}}
$$

are in $\mathcal{U}$.
As an immediate consequence of Theorems 1 and 6 , we have the following result.

Corollary 1. If $f \in \mathcal{U}$ is of the form (1) such that $b_{n} \geq 0$, then $\frac{1}{r} f(r z) \in \mathcal{P}(2)$ for $0<r \leq 2 / 3$; and $2 / 3$ is the largest number with this property, at least when $b_{1}=0=b_{2}$.

We next show that a certain class of functions in $\mathcal{S}^{*}$ is in $\mathcal{U}$, which is again a surprising simple result. Using this result, we can generate functions in $\mathcal{S}^{*}$ that are also in $\mathcal{U}$.

Theorem 7. If $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}$ is of the form (1) with $b_{n} \geq 0$, then the coefficient inequality (9) holds.

Proof. Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}$ is of the form (1) with $b_{n} \geq 0$. We have

$$
\begin{gathered}
\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right)>0 \Leftrightarrow\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-1\right|<\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}+1\right| \\
\Leftrightarrow\left|\frac{-z\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\prime}}{2 \frac{z}{f(z)}-z\left(\frac{z}{f(z)}\right)^{\prime}}\right|<1 \Leftrightarrow\left|\frac{-\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n b_{n} z^{n}}{2+b_{1} z-\sum_{n=3}^{\infty}(n-2) b_{n} z^{n}}\right|<1 .
\end{gathered}
$$

For $z \rightarrow 1^{-}$through real values, from the last inequality we obtain that

$$
\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n b_{n}}{2+b_{1}-\sum_{n=3}^{\infty}(n-2) b_{n}} \leq 1,
$$

which is equivalent to (9). Therefore, $f \in \mathcal{U}$.
Remark 5. Although condition (9) will be a useful necessary condition for a rational function $f$ of the form (1) (with $b_{n} \geq 0$ ) to be starlike, it is not a sufficient condition for the starlikeness for functions $f \in \mathcal{U}$. To prove this, we consider the function

$$
f_{1}(z)=\frac{z}{1+\frac{1}{2} z+\frac{1}{2} z^{3}} .
$$

By Theorem $6, f_{1} \in \mathcal{U}$. On the other hand, it is easy to see that

$$
\frac{z f_{1}^{\prime}(z)}{f_{1}(z)}=\frac{1-z^{3}}{1+\frac{1}{2} z+\frac{1}{2} z^{3}}
$$

and at the boundary point $z_{0}=(-1+\mathrm{i}) / \sqrt{2}$, we have

$$
\frac{z_{0} f_{1}^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{f_{1}\left(z_{0}\right)}=\frac{2-2 \sqrt{2}}{3}+\frac{1-2 \sqrt{2}}{3} \mathrm{i},
$$

which implies that $\operatorname{Re}\left\{z_{0} f_{1}^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right) / f_{1}\left(z_{0}\right)\right\}<0$. Consequently, there are points in the unit disk $|z|<1$ for which $\operatorname{Re}\left\{z f_{1}^{\prime}(z) / f_{1}(z)\right\}<0$, which shows that the function $f_{1}$ is not starlike in $\Delta$.

Corollary 2. If $f(z)=z-\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n}$ is in $\mathcal{S}^{*}$, where $a_{n} \geq 0$ for $n \geq 2$, then $f \in \mathcal{U}$.

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{S}^{*}$. Then $z / f(z)$ is nonvanishing in the unit disk. So, $z / f(z)$ can be expressed as

$$
\frac{z}{f(z)}=\frac{1}{1-a_{2} z-a_{3} z^{2}-\cdots}=1+b_{1} z+b_{2} z^{2}+\cdots,
$$

where $b_{n} \geq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, by Theorem 7, the inequality

$$
\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(n-1) b_{n} \leq 1
$$

holds. Hence, by Theorem $6, f \in \mathcal{U}$.
Corollary 2 is especially helpful in obtaining functions that are both starlike as well as in $\mathcal{U}$, as there are numerous results concerning starlike functions with negative coefficients. For example, $f_{m}(z)=z-z^{m} / m$ is in $\mathcal{S}^{*}$, hence in $\mathcal{U}$. Since $f(z)=z-\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}\left|a_{n}\right| z^{n}$ is in $\mathcal{S}^{*}$ if and only if $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n\left|a_{n}\right| \leq 1$ (see [13, Theorem 2]), this result can be used to generate functions $f \in \mathcal{U}$ that are not starlike.
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