

A Study of Some Geometric Aspects of a Subclass of Analytic Functions

Syed Zakar Hussain Bukhari^{a*}, Huo Tang^b, Farah Manzoor^a

^aDepartment of Mathematics, Mirpur University of Science and Technology(MUST), Mirpur-10250(AJK), Pakistan

^bSchool of Mathematics and Computer Sciences, Chifeng University, Chifeng 024000, China

E-mail: fatmi@must.edu.pk

E-mail: thth2009@163.com

E-mail: fmhappiness@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT. We introduce a subclass $k-TUS^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$ of uniformly star-like functions f and study characterization theorem and coefficients estimates. We also define a neighbourhood of a function f under certain assumptions and study this neighborhood related results. We establish results relating to the partial sums of functions belonging to the class $k-TUS^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$. These functions are closely linked with the conformal mappings which lead to the growing applications in boundary and eigen-value problems in mathematics and various other fields of science and engineering. This research may also be related with the various known classes already found in the literature.

Keywords: Coefficients estimates, Neighborhood, Integral means, Partial sums.

2010 Mathematics subject classification: 30C45.

*Corresponding Author

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the subclass of analytic function with the representation given below

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ f : f(z) = z + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m z^m, \quad (z \in \mathbb{U}(0, 1)) \right\},$$

where $\mathbb{U}(0, 1) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ is the unit disk in the z -plane with center at the origin and radius 1. A function f is univalent in a domain $\mathbb{U}(0, 1)$, if it does not map the same point twice. A function f is univalent in $\mathbb{U}(0, 1)$ provided that its derivative never vanishes and we prove the univalence of f by using Rouché's theorem. The notation $\mathcal{S}$ represents the class or family of univalent functions. The class $\mathcal{S}$ and its subclasses are related with the class $\mathcal{P}$ of functions p with $\Re(p(z)) > 0$ and

$$p(z) = 1 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} p_m z^m \quad (z \in \mathbb{U}(0, 1)).$$

A large number of analytic functions classes are related with the class $\mathcal{P}$ and some of its generalizations. These include $\mathcal{S}^* \subset \mathcal{S}$, the class of starlike functions f satisfying the condition

$$\frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)} \in \mathcal{P}, \quad (z \in \mathbb{U}(0, 1)).$$

A function $f \in \mathcal{S}$ is convex in $\mathbb{U}(0, 1)$, if and only if $zf' \in \mathcal{S}^*$. For these classes with order and arguments, see [17, 22, 23, 27] and others. These classes are further extended in such a way that the function f maps on to the right half plane or some specific plane region Δ_k defined by

$$\Delta_k = \left\{ w = u + iu' : u^2 > k^2 \left((u-1)^2 + (u')^2 \right), k \geq 0 \right\},$$

under certain restriction on k , for detail see [8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 18]. The classes $k - \mathcal{US}^*(\alpha)$ and $k - \mathcal{UC}(\alpha)$ contain k -uniformly starlike and convex functions of order α respectively. We define these classes in the following.

Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $f \in k - \mathcal{US}^*(\alpha)$, if

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)} - \alpha \right\} > k \left| \frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)} - 1 \right| \quad (z \in \mathbb{U}(0, 1)), \quad (1.1)$$

where $-1 \leq \alpha < 1$ and $k \geq 0$. Also $f \in k - \mathcal{UC}(\alpha)$ if and only if $zf' \in k - \mathcal{US}^*(\alpha)$. For $\alpha = 0$ and $k = 1$, these classes were studied by Goodman [4, 5] and Rønning [24, 25]. These and related subclasses are nicely extended in various aspects in the literature of the subject. Importantly Kanas and Srivastava also determined conditions on the parameters for which a certain linear operator maps the classes of starlike and univalent functions onto the class $k - \mathcal{UC}$ of uniformly convex and the class $k - \mathcal{US}^*$ of uniformly starlike functions, for reference, see [9]. Uniformly univalent functions with respect to symmetric points were also discussed in [19, 37, 38]. Goodman [6] in 1957 and Ruscheweyh

[26] in 1981, introduced and extended the concept of the neighbourhood of an analytic function f defined below:

$$\mathcal{N}_\tau(f) = \left\{ h \in \mathcal{T} : h(z) = z - \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} b_m z^m, \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} m |a_m - b_m| \leq \tau \right\}.$$

Remark 1.1. For $I(z) = z$, we write

$$\mathcal{N}_\tau(I) = \left\{ h \in \mathcal{T} : h = z - \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} b_m z^m, \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} m |b_m| \leq \tau \right\}. \quad (1.2)$$

Definition 1.2. Let $f, F \in \mathcal{A}$. Then f is subordinate to F ($f \prec F$), if for a "Schwarz function" w , $f(z) = F(w(z))$.

For $F \in \mathcal{S}$, $f \prec F \Leftrightarrow f(0) = F(0)$ and $f(\mathbb{U}(0,1)) \subset F(\mathbb{U}(0,1))$. Let

$$\{f_n(z)\} = \left\{ z - \sum_{m=2}^n a_m z^m, \quad (z \in \mathbb{U}(0,1)) \right\}$$

be a sequence of the partial sums of f . We choose the coefficients of f sufficiently small so that we can easily find the ratio of a function f to its sequence $f_n(z) = z - \sum_{m=2}^n a_m z^m$ and $f_1(z) = z$. We also determine the sharp lower bounds for these ratios. For this purpose, we have the following

$$\Re \left(\frac{1 - \omega(z)}{1 + \omega(z)} \right) > 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \omega(z) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} d_m z^m \quad \text{with} \quad |\omega(z)| \leq |z|.$$

A function $f \in \mathcal{T}$ can be written as

$$f(z) = z - \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m z^m, \quad (a_m \geq 0). \quad (1.3)$$

Silverman [32] introduced some subclasses of $\mathcal{T}$. These and related classes were further investigated in [13, 14, 20, 21, 33, 39] and others. We now introduce the following:

Definition 1.3. A function $f \in k - \mathcal{US}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$, if

$$\Re \left(\vartheta \frac{z^2 f''(z)}{f(z)} + (1 + ke^{i\theta}) \frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)} - ke^{i\theta} \right) > \alpha, \quad (1.4)$$

for $z \in \mathbb{U}(0,1)$, $\vartheta \geq 0$, $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, $0 < k < 1$.

To define the subclass $k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$ of analytic functions with non-negative coefficients, we take

$$k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta) = k - \mathcal{US}^*(\alpha, \vartheta) \cap \mathcal{T}. \quad (1.5)$$

The classes of functions related with these classes are studied in [1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 18, 25, 36] and others.

2. SOME BASIC LEMMAS

From [28], we have the following two lemmas.

Lemma 2.1. *If $w \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}$, then we have*

$$\Re(w(z)) \geq \vartheta \Leftrightarrow |w(z) + (1 - \vartheta)| - |w(z) - (1 - \vartheta)| \geq 0.$$

The above lemma relates the functions with positive real part to the functions defined by using the absolute values

Lemma 2.2. *For $w \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}$, we can write*

$$\Re(w(z)) \geq k \mid \vartheta + w(z) - 1 \mid \iff \Re\{w(z)(1 + ke^{i\theta}) - ke^{i\theta}\} \geq \vartheta, \quad -\pi \leq \theta \leq \pi.$$

This lemma also relates the functions having some plane curves as image domains to the functions defined by using the positive real part. The concept of $\prec$ leads to the following lemma:

Lemma 2.3. *If $f, h \in \mathcal{A}$ with $f \prec h$, then*

$$\int_0^{2\pi} |f(re^{i\theta})|^\tau d\theta \leq \int_0^{2\pi} |h(re^{i\theta})|^\tau d\theta, \quad (2.1)$$

where $z = re^{i\theta}$, $0 < r < 1$ and $\tau > 0$.

For the reference of the above result, see [15].

3. MAIN RESULTS

In 1957, Goodman in [15] studied certain coefficient conditions for the convexity and starlikeness of some subclasses of analytic functions. These results were further extended in the prospective of various other related subclasses of analytic, harmonic and meromorphic functions. In the following, we study the characterizations of functions in the class $k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$ under certain restrictions on the parameters involved.

Theorem 3.1. *A function $f \in k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$ iff*

$$\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} [(m-1)(k+1)(\vartheta m+1) + (1-\alpha)] a_m \leq 1 - \alpha. \quad (3.1)$$

The above inequality is sharp.

Proof. Suppose (3.1) holds. Then, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} |F(z) - 1| &= \left| \frac{(\vartheta z^2 f''(z) + z f'(z))(1 + ke^{i\theta}) - ke^{i\theta} f(z)}{f(z)} - 1 \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} [\vartheta ke^{i\theta} m(m-1) + \vartheta m(m-1) + m + ke^{i\theta} m - ke^{i\theta} - 1] a_m z^{m-1}}{1 - \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m z^{m-1}} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} [(m-1)(k+1)(\vartheta m+1)] a_m}{1 - \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m} \right| \leq 1 - \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $|F(z) - 1| \leq 1 - \alpha$, that is

$$\frac{(\vartheta z^2 f''(z) + z f'(z))(1 + ke^{i\theta}) - ke^{i\theta} f(z)}{f(z)}$$

lies in the disk centered at 1 and radius $1 - \alpha$. Thus, $f \in k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$.

Conversely, suppose that $f \in k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$. Then from (1.4), we have

$$\Re \left(\frac{1 - \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} [\vartheta m(m-1) + m + \vartheta ke^{i\theta} m(m-1) + ke^{i\theta} m - ke^{i\theta} f(z)] a_m z^{m-1}}{1 - \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m z^{m-1}} \right) > \alpha.$$

For real values we take $z \rightarrow 1^-$ and write

$$\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} [(m-1)(k+1)(\vartheta m+1) + 1 - \alpha] a_m \leq 1 - \alpha$$

as required. The following function

$$f(z) = z - \frac{1 - \alpha}{(m-1)(k+1)(\vartheta m+1) + 1 - \alpha} z^m, \quad (m \geq 2) \quad (3.2)$$

provides the sharpness for the assertion (3.1). $\square$

Corollary 3.2. Let $f \in k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$. Then for $m \geq 2$, we have

$$a_m \leq \frac{1 - \alpha}{(1+k)(1+\vartheta m)(m-1) + 1 - \alpha}. \quad (3.3)$$

The following Theorem deals with the inclusion for $\vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2$.

Theorem 3.3. Let $0 \leq \alpha < 1, 0 \leq \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2$ and $0 < k < 1$. Then $k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta_2) \subset k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta_1)$.

Proof. For $f \in k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta_2)$, we write

$$\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} [(m-1)(k+1)(1+m\vartheta_1) + (1-\alpha)] a_m < \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} [(m-1)(k+1)(m\vartheta_2+1) + (1-\alpha)] a_m \leq 1 - \alpha.$$

Hence $f \in k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta_1)$. $\square$

From the above theorem, we deduce that $f \in k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$ is k -uniformly starlike and starlike of order α .

Following the results of Goodman [6] and Ruscheweyh [26], we find the neighbourhood of $f \in k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$.

Theorem 3.4. Let $0 \leq \alpha < 1, 0 \leq \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2$ and $0 < k < 1$. Then $k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_\tau(I)$, where $I(z) = z$ and

$$\tau = \frac{2(1-\alpha)}{(2\vartheta+1)(k+1) + (1-\alpha)}.$$

Proof. For $f \in k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$ and by Theorem 3.1, we have

$$[(2\vartheta+1)(k+1) + (1-\alpha)] \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m \leq \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} [(1+\vartheta m)(1+k)(m-1) + (1-\alpha)] a_m \leq 1 - \alpha,$$

which yields

$$\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m \leq \frac{1-\alpha}{(k+1)(2\vartheta+1)+(1-\alpha)}. \quad (3.4)$$

Also, we have

$$(2\vartheta+1)(k+1) \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} m a_m \leq (1-\alpha) - [(1-\alpha) - (2\vartheta+1)(k+1)] \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m.$$

Using (3.4), we can write

$$(1+k)(2\vartheta+1) \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} m a_m \leq 1-\alpha - \frac{(1-\alpha)[1-\alpha-(1+k)(2\vartheta+1)]}{(2\vartheta+1)(k+1)+(1-\alpha)}.$$

On simplifying the above inequality, we see that

$$\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} m a_m \leq \frac{2(1-\alpha)}{(2\vartheta+1)(k+1)+(1-\alpha)} = \tau,$$

which, in view of (1.2), leads the proof. $\square$

Letting $\vartheta = 0$, we have $k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_\tau(e)$, where $\tau = \frac{2(1-\alpha)}{k-\alpha+2}$ and $k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha)$ is a subclass of k -uniformly starlike analytic functions with non-negative coefficient of order α . Also, if we take $\vartheta = k = 0$, then we obtain that $\mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_\tau(e)$, where $\tau = \frac{2(1-\alpha)}{\alpha+2}$ and $\mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha)$ is a subclass of starlike analytic functions with non-negative coefficient of order α . Silverman [32] found that $f_1(z) = z - \frac{z^2}{2}$ is an extremal for $\mathcal{T}$. He used it to solve the integral inequality conjectured in [29] and finally settled in [30], that is

$$\int_0^{2\pi} |f(z)|^\eta d\theta \leq \int_0^{2\pi} |f_1(z)|^\eta d\theta, \quad f_1 \in \mathcal{T}, \quad 0 < r < 1.$$

We solve the conjecture for $k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$. We use the concept of subordination already defined above and a known result of Littlewood seen in [15].

Theorem 3.5. *If $f \in k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$ and $z = re^{i\theta}$, $r < 1$ with $\tau > 0$, then*

$$\int_0^{2\pi} |f(re^{i\theta})|^\tau d\theta \leq \int_0^{2\pi} |f_1(re^{i\theta})|^\tau d\theta,$$

where

$$f_1(z) = z - \frac{(1-\alpha)z^2}{2\vartheta k + 2\vartheta + k + 2 - \alpha}. \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. Let f and f_1 be given by equations (1.3) and (3.5) respectively. Then, we write

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \left| 1 - \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m z^{m-1} \right|^\tau d\theta \leq \int_0^{2\pi} \left| 1 - \frac{1-\alpha}{2\vartheta k + 2\vartheta + k + 2 - \alpha} z \right|^\tau d\theta.$$

By using Lemma 2.2, we have

$$1 - \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m z^{m-1} \prec 1 - \frac{1-\alpha}{2\vartheta k + 2\vartheta + k + 2 - \alpha} z,$$

or we can write

$$1 - \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m z^{m-1} = 1 - \frac{1-\alpha}{2\vartheta k + 2\vartheta + k + 2 - \alpha} \omega(z). \quad (3.6)$$

From (3.1) and (3.6), we obtain

$$|\omega(z)| \leq |z| \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{[(m-1)(k+1)(\vartheta m+1) + 1 - \alpha]}{1 - \alpha} a_m \leq |z|.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

For $f \in k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha)$ with $\tau > 0$, we have

$$\int_0^{2\pi} |f(re^{i\theta})|^\tau d\theta \leq \int_0^{2\pi} |f_1(re^{i\theta})|^\tau d\theta,$$

where $f_1(z) = z - \frac{(1-\alpha)}{k+2-\alpha} z^2$. Also for $f \in \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha)$ with $\tau > 0$, we deduce

$$\int_0^{2\pi} |f(re^{i\theta})|^\tau d\theta \leq \int_0^{2\pi} |f_1(re^{i\theta})|^\tau d\theta,$$

where $f_1(z) = z - \frac{1-\alpha}{2-\alpha} z^2$.

Theorem 3.6. *If $f \in k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$, then*

$$\Re \frac{f(z)}{f_n(z)} \geq \frac{d_{n+1} - 1}{d_{n+1}} \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$\Re \frac{f_n(z)}{f(z)} \geq \frac{d_{n+1}}{1 + d_{n+1}}, \quad (3.8)$$

where

$$d_m =: \frac{[(m-1)(k+1)(\vartheta m+1) + 1 - \alpha]}{1 - \alpha}.$$

These estimates in (3.7) and (3.8) are sharp.

Proof. Using the similar procedure as adopted by Silverman [31], we see that $f \in k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$ if and only if $\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} d_m a_m \leq 1$. Clearly, $d_{m+1} > d_m > 1$. So we can write

$$\sum_{m=2}^n a_m + d_{n+1} \sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} a_m \leq \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} d_m a_m \leq 1, \quad (3.9)$$

where $d_m =: \frac{[(m-1)(k+1)(\vartheta m+1)+1-\alpha]}{1-\alpha}$. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{[n(k+1)(\vartheta(n+1)+1)+1-\alpha]}{1-\alpha} \frac{f(z)}{f_n(z)} - \frac{n(k+1)(\vartheta(n+1)+1)+1-\alpha}{1-\alpha} + 1 \\ &= \frac{2-2\alpha - (1-\alpha) \sum_{m=2}^n a_m z^{m-1} - [n(k+1)(\vartheta n + \vartheta + 1) + 1 - \alpha] \sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} a_m z^{m-1}}{1 - \sum_{m=2}^k a_m z^{m-1}} \\ &= \frac{1+C(z)}{1+D(z)}. \end{aligned}$$

From the assertion $\frac{1+C(z)}{1+D(z)} = \frac{1-\omega(z)}{1+\omega(z)}$, we have $\omega(z) = \frac{D(z)-C(z)}{2+C(z)+D(z)}$. Thus

$$|\omega(z)| \leq \frac{\{n(k+1)(\vartheta n + \vartheta + 1) + (1-\alpha)\} \sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} a_m}{2-2\alpha - 2(1-\alpha) \sum_{m=2}^n a_m - \{n(k+1)(\vartheta n + \vartheta + 1) + 1 - \alpha\} \sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} a_m}.$$

Now $|\omega(z)| \leq 1$ if and only if

$$\sum_{m=2}^n a_m + \frac{[n(k+1)(\vartheta(n+1)+1)+1-\alpha]}{1-\alpha} \sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} a_m \leq 1, \quad (3.10)$$

which is true by (3.9) and we get the assertion (3.7). To check the sharpness, we consider

$$f(z) = z - \frac{(1-\alpha)z^{n+1}}{n(k+1)(\vartheta(n+1)+1)+1-\alpha}, \quad \frac{f(z)}{f_n(z)} = 1 - \frac{(1-\alpha)z^n}{n(k+1)(\vartheta(n+1)+1)+1-\alpha}, \quad (3.11)$$

and letting $z \rightarrow 1^-$, we write

$$\frac{f(z)}{f_n(z)} = 1 - \frac{1-\alpha}{[n(k+1)(\vartheta(n+1)+1)+1-\alpha]},$$

which shows that (3.7) is the best possible for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now consider that

$$\begin{aligned} (1+d_{n+1}) \frac{f_n(z)}{f(z)} - d_{n+1} &= \frac{1 - \sum_{m=2}^n a_m z^{m-1} + \frac{n(k+1)(\vartheta n + \vartheta + 1) + (1-\alpha)}{1-\alpha} \sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} a_m z^{m-1}}{1 - \sum_{m=2}^n a_m z^{m-1}} \\ &= \frac{1-\omega(z)}{1+\omega(z)}. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$d_{n+1} = \frac{[n(k+1)(\vartheta(n+1)+1)+1-\alpha]}{1-\alpha}.$$

Then we have

$$|\omega(z)| \leq \frac{\sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} \{2-2\alpha + n(k+1)(\vartheta n + \vartheta + 1)\} a_m}{2-2\alpha - 2(1-\alpha) \sum_{m=2}^n a_m + \sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} \{2-2\alpha - n(k+1)(\vartheta n + \vartheta + 1)\} a_m}.$$

Using (3.10), we obtain (3.8). These estimates in (3.7) and (3.8) are sharp for f in (3.11). $\square$

We note that $k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta) = k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha)$ and $0 - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, 0) = \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha)$. In the following, we find the ratios of the derivatives.

Theorem 3.7. *If $f \in k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$, then*

$$\Re \left[\frac{f'(z)}{f'_n(z)} \right] \geq \frac{1}{d_{n+1}} (d_{n+1} - n - 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \Re \left[\frac{f'_n(z)}{f'(z)} \right] \geq d_{n+1} \left(\frac{1}{d_{n+1} + n + 1} \right),$$

where

$$d_m =: \frac{[(m-1)(k+1)(\vartheta m+1) + (1-\alpha)]}{1-\alpha}.$$

The lower bounds are sharp for f given by (3.11).

Following procedure of Theorem 3.6, we can easily prove this Theorem.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this research, we studied a subclass $k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$ of uniformly starlike functions including characterization theorem and coefficients estimates. Also we defined a neighbourhood of an analytic function f under certain assumptions and studied some neighborhood related results. We established results relating to the partial sums of functions in the class $k - \mathcal{TUS}^*(\alpha, \vartheta)$. This research can be related with the various known subclasses of analytic functions already seen in the literature and it may be kept updated with the emerging trends in geometric functions theory as found in [34, 35].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are thankful to the Editorial office of IJMSI and referees for their useful comments regarding improvement of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. S. Z. H. Bukhari, M. Nazir, M. Raza, Some Generalizations of Analytic Functions with Respect to $2k$ -Symmetric Conjugate Points, *Maejo Int. J. Sci. Technol.*, **10**(01), (2016), 1–12.
2. S. Z. H. Bukhari, M. Raza, M. Nazir, Some Generalizations of the Class of Analytic Functions with Respect to k -Symmetric Points, *Hacet. J. Math. Stat.*, **45**(1), (2016), 1–14.
3. S. Z. H. Bukhari, T. Bulboacă, M. S. Shabbir, Subordination and Superordination Results for Analytic Functions with Respect to Symmetrical Points, *Quaest. Math.*, **41**(1), (2018), 1–15.
4. A. W. Goodman, On Uniformly Convex Functions, *Ann. Polon. Math.*, **56**, (1991), 87–92.
5. A. W. Goodman, On Uniformly Starlike Functions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **155**, (1991), 364–370.
6. A. W. Goodman, *Univalent Functions, Vol. I*, Polygonal Publishing Washington, New Jersey, 1983.
7. A. W. Goodman, Univalent Functions and Analytic Curves, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **8**(3), (1957), 598–601.
8. S. Kanas, Coefficient Estimates in Subclasses of the Caratheodory Class Related to Conical Domains, *Acta Math. Univ. Comenian.*, **74**(2), (2005), 149–161.
9. S. Kanas, H. M. Srivastava, Linear Operators Associated with k -Uniformly Convex Functions, *Integral Transforms Spec. Funct.*, **9**(2), (2000), 121–132.
10. S. Kanas, A. Wiśniowska, Conic Domains and Starlike Functions, *Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl.*, **45**, (2000), 647–657.
11. S. Kanas and A. Wiśniowska, Conic Regions and k -Uniform Convexity, *J. Appl. Math.*, **105**, (1999), 327–336.

12. H. A. Al-Kharsani, A. Sofo, Subordination Results on Harmonic k -Uniformly Convex Mappings and Related Classes, *Comput. Math. Appl.*, **59**(12), (2010), 3718–3726.
13. A. Y. Lashin, On a Certain Subclass of Starlike Functions with Negative Coefficients, *J. Ineq. Pure Appl. Math.*, **110**(2), (2009), 1–18.
14. J. L. Li, S. Owa, Sufficient Conditions for Starlikeness, *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math.*, **33**, (2002), 313–318.
15. J. E. Littlewood, On Inequalities in the Theory of Functions, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, **23**, (1925), 481–519.
16. W. C. Ma, D. Minda, Uniformly Convex Functions, *Ann. Polon. Math.*, **57**, (1992), 165–175.
17. T. H. Macgregor, The Radius for Starlike Functions of Order $1/2$, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **14**, (1963), 71–76.
18. S. Mahmood, I. Khan, S. N. Malik, S. Z. H. Bukhari, On Subclass of Alpha-Quasi Convex Functions Associated with Conic Regions, *J. Inequa. special Funct.*, **7**(4), (2017), 1–10.
19. S. Mahmood, H. M. Srivastava, S. N. Malik, Some Subclasses of Uniformly Univalent Functions with Respect to Symmetric Points, *Symmetry* **11**, (2019), Article ID 287, 1–14
20. M. Obradovic, S. B. Joshi, On Certain Classes of Strongly Starlike Functions, *Taiwanese J. Math.*, **2**(3), (1998), 297–302.
21. K. S. Padmanabhan, On Sufficient Conditions for Starlikeness, *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math.*, **32**(4), (2001), 543–550.
22. B. Pinchuk, On Starlike and Convex Functions of Order α , *Duke Math. J.*, **35**, (1968), 89–103.
23. M. S. Robertson, On the Theory of Univalent Functions, *Ann. Math.*, **37**, (1936), 374–408.
24. F. Ronning, On Starlike Functions Associated with Parabolic Regions, *Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Sklodowska, Sect. A.*, **45**, (1991), 117–122.
25. F. Ronning, Uniformly Convex Functions and a Corresponding Class of Starlike Functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **118**, (1993), 189–196.
26. S. Ruscheweyh, Neighborhoods of Univalent Functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **81**(4), (1981), 521–527.
27. A. Schild, On Starlike Functions of Order α , *Amer. J. Math.*, **87**, (1965), 65–70.
28. C. Selvarag, A. Selvakumaran, New Classes of k -Uniformly Convex and Starlike Functions with Respect to Other Points, *Acta Math.*, **78**(1), (2009), 103–114.
29. H. Silverman, A Survey with Open Problems on Univalent Functions Whose Coefficients are Negative, *Rocky Mountain J. Math.*, **21**(3), (1991), 1099–1125.
30. H. Silverman, Integral Means for Univalent Functions with Negative Coefficients, *Houston J. Math.*, **23**(1), (1997), 169–174.
31. H. Silverman, Partial Sums of Starlike and Convex Functions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **209**, (1997), 221–227.
32. H. Silverman, Univalent Functions with Negative Coefficients, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **51**, (1975), 109–116.
33. S. Singh, S. Gupta, First Order Differential Subordinations and Starlikeness of Analytic Maps in the Unit Disc, *Kyungpook Math. J.*, **45**, (2005), 395–404.
34. H. M. Srivastava, Operators of Basic (or q -) Calculus and Fractional q -Calculus and Their Applications in Geometric Function Theory of Complex Analysis, *Iran J Sci Technol Trans Sci.*, **44**, (2020), 327–344.
35. H. M. Srivastava, Some Parametric and Argument Variations of the Operators of Fractional Calculus and Related Special Functions and Integral Transformations, *J. Nonlinear Convex Anal.*, **22**, (2021), 1501–1520.

36. H. M. Srivastava, S. Z. H. Bukhari, M. Nazir, A Subclass of α -Convex Functions with Respect to $(2j, k)$ -Symmetric Conjugate Points, *Bull. Iran. Math. Soc.*, **44**, (2018), 1227–1242.
37. H. M. Srivastava, G. Murugusundaramoorthy, T. Janani, Uniformly Starlike Functions and Uniformly Convex Functions Associated with the Struve Function, *Internat. J. Appl. Math. Engrg. Sci.*, **8**(2), (2014), 111-120.
38. H. M. Srivastava, S-H. Li, H. Tang, Certain Classes of k -Uniformly Close-to-Convex Functions and Other Related Functions Defined by Using the Dziok-Srivastava Operator, *Bull. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **1**(3), (2009), 49-63.
39. N. Xu, D. Yang, Some Criteria for Starlikeness and Strongly Starlikeness, *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.*, **42**(3), (2005), 579–590.