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#### Abstract

In this paper, we define a new subclass $k-Q(\alpha)$ of analytic functions, which generalizes the class of $k$-uniformly convex functions. Various interesting relationships between $k-Q(\alpha)$ and the class $\mathcal{B}(\delta)$ of functions with bounded turning are derived.
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## 1. Introduction

Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the class of functions $f$ which are analytic in the open unit disk $\Delta=\{z \in \mathbb{C}:|z|<1\}$, normalized by the conditions $f(0)=f^{\prime}(0)-1=0$. So each $f \in \mathcal{A}$ has series representation of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=z+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

For two analytic functions $f$ and $g, f$ is said to be subordinated to $g$ (written as $f<g$ ) if there exists an analytic function $\omega$ with $\omega(0)=0$ and $|\omega(z)|<1$ for $z \in \Delta$ such that $f(z)=(g \circ \omega)(z)$.

A function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is said to be in the class $\mathcal{S}$ if $f$ is univalent in $\Delta$. A function $f \in \mathcal{S}$ is in class $C$ of normalized convex functions if $f(\Delta)$ is a convex domain. For $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, Mocanu [23] introduced the
class $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}$ of functions $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\frac{f(z) f^{\prime}(z)}{z} \neq 0$ for all $z \in \Delta$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{R}\left((1-\alpha) \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}+\alpha \frac{\left(z f^{\prime}(z)\right)^{\prime}}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right)>0 \quad(z \in \Delta) . \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Geometrically, $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\alpha}$ maps the circle centred at origin onto $\alpha$-convex arcs which leads to the condition (1.2). The class $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}$ was studied extensively by several researchers, see [1, 10-12, 24-27] and the references cited therein.

A function $f \in \mathcal{S}$ is uniformly starlike if $f$ maps every circular arc $\Gamma$ contained in $\Delta$ with center at $\zeta \in \Delta$ onto a starlike arc with respect to $f(\zeta)$. A function $f \in C$ is uniformly convex if $f$ maps every circular arc $\Gamma$ contained in $\Delta$ with center $\zeta \in \Delta$ onto a convex arc. We denote the classes of uniformly starlike and uniformly convex functions by $\mathcal{U S T}$ and $\mathcal{U C V}$, respectively. For recent study on these function classes, one can refer to [7,9,13, 19, 20, 31].

In 1999, Kanas and Wisniowska [15] introduced the class $k-\mathcal{U C V}(k \geq 0)$ of $k$-uniformly convex functions. A function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is said to be in the class $k-\mathcal{U C V}$ if it satisfies the condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{R}\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right)>k\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right| \quad(z \in \Delta) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

In recent years, many researchers investigated interesting properties of this class and its generalizations. For more details, see [2-4, 14-18,30,32,35] and references cited therein.

In 2015, Sokół and Nunokawa [33] introduced the class $\mathcal{M N}$, a function $f \in \mathcal{M N}$ if it satisfies the condition

$$
\mathfrak{R}\left(1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right)>\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-1\right| \quad(z \in \Delta)
$$

In [28], it is proved that if $\mathfrak{R}\left(f^{\prime}\right)>0$ in $\Delta$, then $f$ is univalent in $\Delta$. In 1972, MacGregor [21] studied the class $\mathcal{B}$ of functions with bounded turning, a function $f \in \mathcal{B}$ if it satisfies the condition $\mathfrak{R}\left(f^{\prime}\right)>0$ for $z \in \Delta$. A natural generalization of the class $\mathcal{B}$ is $\mathcal{B}\left(\delta_{1}\right)\left(0 \leq \delta_{1}<1\right)$, a function $f \in \mathcal{B}\left(\delta_{1}\right)$ if it satisfies the condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{R}\left(f^{\prime}(z)\right)>\delta_{1} \quad\left(z \in \Delta ; 0 \leq \delta_{1}<1\right) \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for details associated with the class $\mathcal{B}\left(\delta_{1}\right)$ (see $[5,6,34]$ ).
Motivated essentially by the above work, we now introduce the following class $k-Q(\alpha)$ of analytic functions.

Definition 1. Let $k \geq 0$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. A function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is said to be in the class $k-Q(\alpha)$ if it satisfies the condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{R}\left(\frac{\left(z f^{\prime}(z)\right)^{\prime}}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right)>k\left|(1-\alpha) f^{\prime}(z)+\alpha \frac{\left(z f^{\prime}(z)\right)^{\prime}}{f^{\prime}(z)}-1\right| \quad(z \in \Delta) \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is worth mentioning that, for special values of parameters, one can obtain a number of well-known function classes, some of them are listed below:

1. $k-Q(1)=k-\mathcal{U C V}$;
2. $0-Q(\alpha)=C$.

In what follows, we give an example for the class $k-Q(\alpha)$.

Example 1. The function $f(z)=\frac{z}{1-A z}(A \neq 0)$ is in the class $k-Q(\alpha)$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
k \leq \frac{1-b^{2}}{b \sqrt{b(1+\alpha)[b(1+\alpha)+2]+4}} \quad(b=|A|) . \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

The main purpose of this paper is to establish several interesting relationships between $k-Q(\alpha)$ and the class $\mathcal{B}(\delta)$ of functions with bounded turning.

## 2. Preliminaries

To prove our main results, we need the following lemmas.
Lemma 1. ([8] ) Let h be analytic in $\Delta$ with $h(0)=1, \beta>0$ and $0 \leq \gamma_{1}<1$. If

$$
h(z)+\beta \frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{h(z)}<\frac{1+\left(1-2 \gamma_{1}\right) z}{1-z},
$$

then

$$
h(z)<\frac{1+(1-2 \delta) z}{1-z},
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta=\frac{\left(2 \gamma_{1}-\beta\right)+\sqrt{\left(2 \gamma_{1}-\beta\right)^{2}+8 \beta}}{4} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 2. Let h be analytic in $\Delta$ and of the form

$$
h(z)=1+\sum_{n=m}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n} \quad\left(b_{m} \neq 0\right)
$$

with $h(z) \neq 0$ in $\Delta$. If there exists a point $z_{0}\left(\left|z_{0}\right|<1\right)$ such that $|\arg h(z)|<\frac{\pi \rho}{2}\left(|z|<\left|z_{0}\right|\right)$ and $\left|\arg h\left(z_{0}\right)\right|=$ $\frac{\pi \rho}{2}$ for some $\rho>0$, then $\frac{z_{0} h^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{h\left(z_{0}\right)}=i \ell \rho$, where

$$
\ell:\left\{\begin{aligned}
\ell \geq \frac{n}{2}\left(c+\frac{1}{c}\right) & \left(\arg h\left(z_{0}\right)=\frac{\pi \rho}{2}\right), \\
\ell \leq-\frac{n}{2}\left(c+\frac{1}{c}\right) & \left(\arg h\left(z_{0}\right)=-\frac{\pi \rho}{2}\right),
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

and $\left(h\left(z_{0}\right)\right)^{1 / \rho}= \pm i c(c>0)$.
This result is a generalization of the Nunokawa's lemma [29].
Lemma 3. ( [37] ) Let $\varepsilon$ be a positive measure on $[0,1]$. Let $F$ be a complex-valued function defined on $\Delta \times[0,1]$ such that $F(., t)$ is analytic in $\Delta$ for each $t \in[0,1]$ and $F(z,$.$) is \varepsilon$-integrable on $[0,1]$ for all $z \in \Delta$. In addition, suppose that $\mathfrak{R}(F(z, t))>0, F(-r, t)$ is real and $\mathfrak{R}(1 / F(z, t)) \geq 1 / F(-r, t)$ for $|z| \leq r<1$ and $t \in[0,1]$. If $F(z)=\int_{0}^{1} F(z, t) d \varepsilon(t)$, then $\mathfrak{R}(1 / F(z)) \geq 1 / F(-r)$.

Lemma 4. ([22]) If $-1 \leq D<C \leq 1, \lambda_{1}>0$ and $\mathfrak{R}\left(\gamma_{2}\right) \geq-\lambda_{1}(1-C) /(1-D)$, then the differential equation

$$
s(z)+\frac{z s^{\prime}(z)}{\lambda_{1} s(z)+\gamma_{2}}=\frac{1+C z}{1+D z} \quad(z \in \Delta)
$$

has a univalent solution in $\Delta$ given by

If $r(z)=1+c_{1} z+c_{2} z^{2}+\cdots$ satisfies the condition

$$
r(z)+\frac{z r^{\prime}(z)}{\lambda_{1} r(z)+\gamma_{2}}<\frac{1+C z}{1+D z} \quad(z \in \Delta)
$$

then

$$
r(z)<s(z)<\frac{1+C z}{1+D z}
$$

and $s(z)$ is the best dominant.
Lemma 5. ( [36, Chapter 14]) Let $w, x$ and $y \neq 0,-1,-2, \ldots$ be complex numbers. Then, for $\mathfrak{R}(y)>$ $\mathfrak{R}(x)>0$, one has

1. ${ }_{2} G_{1}(w, x, y ; z)=\frac{\Gamma(y)}{\Gamma(y-x) \Gamma(x)} \int_{0}^{1} s^{x-1}(1-s)^{y-x-1}(1-s z)^{-w} d s$;
2. ${ }_{2} G_{1}(w, x, y ; z)={ }_{2} G_{1}(x, w, y ; z)$;
3. ${ }_{2} G_{1}(w, x, y ; z)=(1-z)^{-w}{ }_{2} G_{1}\left(w, y-x, y ; \frac{z}{z-1}\right)$.

## 3. Main results

Firstly, we derive the following result.
Theorem 1. Let $0 \leq \alpha<1$ and $k \geq \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$. If $f \in k-Q(\alpha)$, then $f \in \mathcal{B}(\delta)$, where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta=\frac{(2 \mu-\lambda)+\sqrt{(2 \mu-\lambda)^{2}+8 \lambda}}{4} \quad\left(\lambda=\frac{1+\alpha k}{k(1-\alpha)} ; \mu=\frac{k-\alpha k-1}{k(1-\alpha)}\right) . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $f^{\prime}=\hbar$, where $\hbar$ is analytic in $\Delta$ with $\hbar(0)=1$. From inequality (1.5) which takes the form

$$
\mathfrak{R}\left(1+\frac{z \hbar^{\prime}(z)}{\hbar(z)}\right)>k\left|(1-\alpha) \hbar(z)+\alpha\left(1+\frac{z \hbar^{\prime}(z)}{\hbar(z)}\right)-1\right|=k\left|1-\alpha-\hbar(z)+\alpha \hbar(z)-\alpha \frac{z \hbar^{\prime}(z)}{\hbar(z)}\right|,
$$

we find that

$$
\mathfrak{R}\left(\hbar(z)+\frac{1+\alpha k}{k(1-\alpha)} \frac{z \hbar(z)}{\hbar(z)}\right)>\frac{k-\alpha k-1}{k(1-\alpha)},
$$

which can be rewritten as

$$
\mathfrak{R}\left(\hbar(z)+\lambda \frac{z \hbar(z)}{\hbar(z)}\right)>\mu \quad\left(\lambda=\frac{1+\alpha k}{k(1-\alpha)} ; \mu=\frac{k-\alpha k-1}{k(1-\alpha)}\right) .
$$

The above relationship can be written as the following Briot-Bouquet differential subordination

$$
\hbar(z)+\lambda \frac{z \hbar^{\prime}(z)}{\hbar(z)}<\frac{1+(1-2 \mu) z}{1-z}
$$

Thus, by Lemma 1, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hbar<\frac{1+(1-2 \delta) z}{1-z}, \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\delta$ is given by (3.1). The relationship (3.2) implies that $f \in \mathcal{B}(\delta)$. We thus complete the proof of Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. Let $0<\alpha \leq 1,0<\beta<1, c>0, k \geq 1, n \geq m+1(m \in \mathbb{N}),|\ell| \geq \frac{n}{2}\left(c+\frac{1}{c}\right)$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\alpha \beta \ell \pm(1-\alpha) c^{\beta} \sin \frac{\beta \pi}{2}\right| \geq 1 . \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

If

$$
f(z)=z+\sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n} \quad\left(a_{m+1} \neq 0\right)
$$

and $f \in k-Q(\alpha)$, then $f \in \mathcal{B}\left(\beta_{0}\right)$, where

$$
\beta_{0}=\min \{\beta: \beta \in(0,1)\}
$$

such that (3.3) holds.
Proof. By the assumption, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime}(z)=\hbar(z)=1+\sum_{n=m}^{\infty} c_{n} z^{n} \quad\left(c_{m} \neq 0\right) . \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

In view of (1.5) and (3.4), we get

$$
\mathfrak{R}\left(1+\frac{z \hbar^{\prime}(z)}{\hbar(z)}\right)>k\left|(1-\alpha) \hbar(z)+\alpha\left(1+\frac{z \hbar^{\prime}(z)}{\hbar(z)}\right)-1\right| .
$$

If there exists a point $z_{0} \in \Delta$ such that

$$
|\arg \hbar(z)|<\frac{\beta \pi}{2} \quad\left(|z|<\left|z_{0}\right| ; 0<\beta<1\right)
$$

and

$$
\left|\arg \hbar\left(z_{0}\right)\right|=\frac{\beta \pi}{2} \quad(0<\beta<1)
$$

then from Lemma 2, we know that

$$
\frac{z_{0} \hbar^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{\hbar\left(z_{0}\right)}=i \ell \beta,
$$

where

$$
\left(\hbar\left(z_{0}\right)\right)^{1 / \beta}= \pm i c \quad(c>0)
$$

and

$$
\ell:\left\{\begin{aligned}
\ell \geq \frac{n}{2}\left(c+\frac{1}{c}\right) & \left(\arg \hbar\left(z_{0}\right)=\frac{\beta \pi}{2}\right), \\
\ell \leq-\frac{n}{2}\left(c+\frac{1}{c}\right) & \left(\arg \hbar\left(z_{0}\right)=-\frac{\beta \pi}{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

For the case

$$
\arg \hbar\left(z_{0}\right)=\frac{\beta \pi}{2}
$$

we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{R}\left(1+\frac{z_{0} \hbar^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{\hbar\left(z_{0}\right)}\right)=\mathfrak{R}(1+i \ell \beta)=1 \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, we find from (3.3) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& k\left|(1-\alpha) \hbar\left(z_{0}\right)+\alpha\left(1+\frac{z_{0} \hbar^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{\hbar\left(z_{0}\right)}\right)-1\right| \\
= & k\left|(1-\alpha)\left(\hbar\left(z_{0}\right)-1\right)+\alpha \frac{z_{0} \hbar^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{\hbar\left(z_{0}\right)}\right| \\
= & k\left|(1-\alpha)\left[( \pm i c)^{\beta}-1\right]+i \alpha \beta \ell\right| \\
= & k \sqrt{(1-\alpha)^{2}\left(c^{\beta} \cos \frac{\beta \pi}{2}-1\right)^{2}+\left[\alpha \beta \ell \pm(1-\alpha) c^{\beta} \sin \frac{\beta \pi}{2}\right]^{2}} \\
\geq & 1 .
\end{aligned}
$$

By virtue of (3.5) and (3.6), we have

$$
\mathfrak{R}\left(1+\frac{z \hbar^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{\hbar\left(z_{0}\right)}\right) \leq k\left|(1-\alpha) \hbar\left(z_{0}\right)+\alpha\left(1+\frac{z_{0} \hbar\left(z_{0}\right)}{\hbar\left(z_{0}\right)}\right)-1\right|,
$$

which is a contradiction to the definition of $k-Q(\alpha)$. Since $\beta_{0}=\min \{\beta: \beta \in(0,1)\}$ such that (3.3) holds, we can deduce that $f \in \mathcal{B}\left(\beta_{0}\right)$.

By using the similar method as given above, we can prove the case

$$
\arg \hbar\left(z_{0}\right)=-\frac{\beta \pi}{2}
$$

is true. The proof of Theorem 2 is thus completed.
Theorem 3. If $0<\beta<1$ and $0 \leq v<1$. If $f \in k-Q(\alpha)$, then

$$
\mathfrak{R}\left(f^{\prime}\right)>\left[{ }_{2} G_{1}\left(\frac{2}{\beta}(1-v), 1 ; \frac{1}{\beta}+1 ; \frac{1}{2}\right)\right]^{-1},
$$

or equivalently, $k-Q(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{B}\left(v_{0}\right)$, where

$$
v_{0}=\left[{ }_{2} G_{1}\left(\frac{2}{\beta}(1-\mu), 1 ; \frac{1}{\beta}+1 ; \frac{1}{2}\right)\right]^{-1}
$$

Proof. For

$$
w=\frac{2}{\beta}(1-v), x=\frac{1}{\beta}, y=\frac{1}{\beta}+1,
$$

we define

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(z)=(1+D z)^{w} \int_{0}^{1} t^{x-1}(1+D t z)^{-w} d t=\frac{\Gamma(x)}{\Gamma(y)}{ }_{2} G_{1}\left(1, w, y ; \frac{z}{z-1}\right) . \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

To prove $k-Q(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{B}\left(v_{0}\right)$, it suffices to prove that

$$
\inf _{\mid z<1}\{\mathfrak{R}(q(z))\}=q(-1),
$$

which need to show that

$$
\mathfrak{R}(1 / F(z)) \geq 1 / F(-1) .
$$

By Lemma 3 and (3.7), it follows that

$$
F(z)=\int_{0}^{1} F(z, t) d \varepsilon(t)
$$

where

$$
F(z, t)=\frac{1-z}{1-(1-t) z} \quad(0 \leq t \leq 1),
$$

and

$$
d \varepsilon(t)=\frac{\Gamma(x)}{\Gamma(w) \Gamma(y-w)} t^{w-1}(1-t)^{y-w-1} d t,
$$

which is a positive measure on $[0,1]$.
It is clear that $\mathfrak{R}(F(z, t))>0$ and $F(-r, t)$ is real for $|z| \leq r<1$ and $t \in[0,1]$. Also

$$
\mathfrak{R}\left(\frac{1}{F(z, t)}\right)=\mathfrak{R}\left(\frac{1-(1-t) z}{1-z}\right) \geq \frac{1+(1-t) r}{1+r}=\frac{1}{F(-r, t)}
$$

for $|z| \leq r<1$. Therefore, by Lemma 3, we get

$$
\mathfrak{R}(1 / F(z)) \geq 1 / F(-r) .
$$

If we let $r \rightarrow 1^{-}$, it follows that

$$
\mathfrak{R}(1 / F(z)) \geq 1 / F(-1) .
$$

Thus, we deduce that $k-Q(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{B}\left(v_{0}\right)$.
Theorem 4. Let $0 \leq \alpha<1$ and $k \geq \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$. If $f \in k-Q(\alpha)$, then

$$
f^{\prime}(z)<s(z)=\frac{1}{g(z)},
$$

where

$$
g(z)={ }_{2} G_{1}\left(\frac{2}{\lambda}, 1, \frac{1}{\lambda}+1 ; \frac{z}{z-1}\right) \quad\left(\lambda=\frac{1+\alpha k}{k(1-\alpha)}\right) .
$$

Proof. Suppose that $f^{\prime}=\hbar$. From the proof of Theorem 1, we see that

$$
\hbar(z)+\frac{z \hbar^{\prime}(z)}{\frac{1}{\lambda} \hbar(z)}<\frac{1+(1-2 \mu) z}{1-z}<\frac{1+z}{1-z} \quad\left(\lambda=\frac{1+\alpha k}{k(1-\alpha)} ; \mu=\frac{k-\alpha k-1}{k(1-\alpha)}\right) .
$$

If we set $\lambda_{1}=\frac{1}{\lambda}, \gamma_{2}=0, C=1$ and $D=-1$ in Lemma 4, then

$$
\hbar(z)<s(z)=\frac{1}{g(z)}=\frac{z^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(1-z)^{-\frac{2}{\lambda}}}{1 / \lambda \int_{0}^{z} t^{(1 / \lambda)-1}(1-t)^{-2 / \lambda} d t} .
$$

By putting $t=u z$, and using Lemma 5, we obtain

$$
\hbar(z)<s(z)=\frac{1}{g(z)}=\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\lambda}(1-z)^{\frac{2}{\lambda}} \int_{0}^{1} u^{(1 / \lambda)-1}(1-u z)^{-2 / \lambda} d u}=\left[{ }_{2} G_{1}\left(\frac{2}{\lambda}, 1, \frac{1}{\lambda}+1 ; \frac{z}{z-1}\right)\right]^{-1}
$$

which is the desired result of Theorem 4.
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