

## On Sandwich Theorems for Certain Univalent Functions Defined by a New operator

WaggasGalibAtshan<sup>1</sup>Elaf Ibrahim Badawi<sup>2</sup>

Department of Mathematics, College of Computer Science and Information Technology

University of Al-Qadisiyah, Diwaniyah\_Iraq

[waggas.galib@qu.edu.iq](mailto:waggas.galib@qu.edu.iq)[waggashnd@gmail.com](mailto:waggashnd@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>[eilafibraheem911994@gmail.com](mailto:eilafibraheem911994@gmail.com)<sup>2</sup>

Received : 20\3\2019 Revised : 27 \3 \ 2019

Accepted : 1\4\2019

Available online : 30 /4/2019

### Abstract:

In this paper, we study some differential subordination and superordination results for certain univalent functions in the open unit disc  $U$  by using a new operator  $f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}$ . Also, we derive some sandwich theorems.

**Keywords:** Analytic function, Differential Subordination, Hadamard Product, Univalent function.

**Mathematics Subject Classification:** 30C45

### 1 . Introduction

Denote by  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(U)$  the class of analytic functions in the open unit disk  $U = \{z: z \in \mathbb{C} \text{ and } |z| < 1\}$ . For  $n$  a positive integer and  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ , let  $\mathcal{H}[a, n]$  be the subclass of the function  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  of the form:

$$f(z) = a + a_n z^n + a_{n+1} z^{n+1} + \dots \quad (a \in \mathbb{C}, n \in \mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}). \tag{1.1}$$

Also, Let  $T$  be the subclass of  $\mathcal{H}$  consisting of functions of the form:

$$f(z) = z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_n z^n \tag{1.2}$$

If  $f \in T$  is given by (1.2) and  $g \in T$  given by

$$g(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} b_k z^k.$$

The Hadamard product (or the convolution) of  $f$  and  $g$  is defined by

$$(f * g)(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k b_k z^k = (g * f)(z).$$

If  $f$  and  $g$  are analytic functions in  $U$ , We say that  $f$  is subordination to  $g$ .

Let  $l, h \in \mathcal{H}$ , and  $\phi(r, s, t; z): \mathbb{C}^3 \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ .

If  $l$  and  $\phi(l(z), z l'(z), z^2 l''(z); z)$  are univalent functions in  $U$  and if  $l$  satisfies the second- order superordination:

$$h(z) < \phi(l(z), z l'(z), z^2 l''(z); z), (z \in U)$$

then  $l$  is called a solution of the differential superordination(1.2), (if  $f$  subordinate to  $g$ , then  $g$  is superordinate to  $f$ ).

An analytic function  $q$  is called subordinate of the differential superordination if  $q < k$  for all  $l$  satisfying (1.3). A univalent subordinate  $\tilde{q}$  that satisfies  $q < \tilde{q}$  for all subordinats  $q$  of (1.3) is said to be the best subordinat. Recently, Miller and Mocanu [9] obtained sufficient conditions on the functions  $(h, k)$  and  $\phi$  for which the following implication holds:

$$h(z) < \phi(l(z), z l'(z), z^2 l''(z); z) \implies q(z) < l(z), (z \in U). \tag{1.4}$$

Using the results, Bulboacă [5] considered certain classes of first order differential subordinations as well as superordinationpreserving integral operator [6]. Ali et al. [1], have used the results of Bulboacă[5] to obtain sufficient conditions for normalized analytic functions to satisfy:

$$q_1(z) < \frac{z f'(z)}{f(z)} < q_2(z),$$

where  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  are given univalent functions in  $U$  with  $q_1(0) = q_2(0) = 1$ . Also, Tuneski [13] obtained a sufficient conditions for starlikeness of  $f$  in terms of the quantity

$$\frac{f''(z)f(z)}{(f'(z))^2}.$$

Recently, Shanmugam et al. [11,12] and Goyal et al. [7], Atshan and Hiress[2], Atshan and Kazim[4], Atshan and Jawad [3], Wanas and Majeed [14], also obtained sandwich results for certain classes of analytic functions.

Komatu [8] introduced and investigated a family of integral operator

$$\mathfrak{I}_{\mu}^{\lambda}: T \rightarrow T$$

that is obtain as follows:

$$\mathfrak{I}_{\mu}^{\lambda} f(z) = z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu + n - 1}\right)^n a_n z^n,$$

$$(z \in U^*, \mu > 1, \lambda \geq 0). \tag{1.5}$$

The Hurwitz - Lerch zeta function

$$\Phi(z, s, a) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{(1+a)^s}, r \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z}_0^-, s \in \mathbb{C} \quad \text{when } 0 < |z| < 1.$$

In terms of (Hadamard) product (or convolution) where  $G_{s,a}(z)$  is given by

$$G_{s,a}(z) = (1 + a)^s [\Phi(z, s, a) - a^{-s}], (z \in U).$$

**Definition (2.1.1):** Let  $f \in T, z \in U^*, a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z}_0^-, s \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\lambda > 1$ , we define a new operator  $\mathfrak{I}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda} f(z): T \rightarrow T$ , where

$$\mathfrak{I}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda} f(z) = G_{s,a}(z) * \mathfrak{I}_{\mu}^{\lambda} f(z)$$

$$= z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1+a}{k+a}\right)^s \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu+n-1}\right)^\lambda a_n z^n \quad (1.6)$$

We note from (1.6) that

$$z \left( \bar{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) \right)' = \mu \bar{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z) - (\mu - 1) \bar{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) \quad (1.7)$$

The specific aim of this document is to find sufficient-conditions for certain normalized analytic functions  $f$  to satisfy:

$$q_1(z) < \left( \frac{\rho \bar{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \bar{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} < q_2(z),$$

and

$$q_1(z) < \left( \frac{\bar{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z)}{z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} < q_2(z),$$

where  $q_1(z)$  and  $q_2(z)$  are given univalent functions in  $U$  with  $q_1(0) = q_2(0) = 1$ .

## 2 . Preliminaries

In order to establish our subordination and superordination results, that require the following lemmas and definitions.

**Definition (2.1)[6]:** Denote by  $Q$  the class of all functions  $q$  that are analytic and injective on  $\bar{U} \setminus E(q)$ , where  $\bar{U} = U \cup \{z \in \partial U\}$ , and  $E(q) = \{\zeta \in \partial U: \lim_{z \rightarrow \zeta} f(z) = \infty\}$  and are such that  $q'(\zeta) \neq 0$  for  $\zeta \in \partial U \setminus E(q)$ . Further, let the subclass of  $Q$  for which  $q(0) = a$  be denoted by  $Q(a)$ ,  $Q(0) = Q_0$  and  $Q(1) = Q_1 = \{q \in Q: q(0) = 1\}$ .

**Lemma (2.1)[1]:** Let  $q(z)$  be convex univalent function in  $U$ , let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}, \beta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and suppose that

$$\operatorname{Re} \left\{ 1 + \frac{zq''(z)}{q'(z)} \right\} > \max \left\{ 0, -\operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \right) \right\}.$$

If  $l(z)$  is analytic in  $U$  and

$$\alpha l(z) + \beta z l'(z) < \alpha q(z) + \beta z q'(z),$$

then  $l(z) < q(z)$  and  $q$  is the best dominant.

**Lemma (2.2)[3]:** Let  $q$  be univalent in  $U$  and let  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  be analytic in the domain  $D$  containing  $q(U)$  with  $\theta(w) \neq 0$ , when  $w \in q(U)$ . Set

$$Q(z) = zq'(z)\theta(q(z)) \text{ and } h(z) = \theta(q(z)) + Q(z),$$

suppose that

1)  $Q$  is starlike univalent in  $U$ ,

$$2) \operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{zh'(z)}{Q(z)} \right) > 0, z \in U.$$

If  $l$  is analytic in  $U$  with  $l(0) = q(0)$ ,  $l(U) \subseteq D$  and

$$\theta(l(z)) + zl'(z)\theta(l(z)) < \theta(q(z)) + zq'(z)\theta(q(z)),$$

then  $l(z) < q(z)$ , and  $q$  is the best dominant.

**Lemma (2.3)[6]:** Let  $q(z)$  be convex univalent in the unit disk  $U$  and let  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  be analytic in a domain  $D$  containing  $q(U)$ . Suppose that

$$1) \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \frac{\theta'(q(z))}{\phi(q(z))} \right\} > 0 \text{ for } z \in U,$$

2)  $Q(z) = zq'(z)\phi(q(z))$  is starlike univalent in  $z \in U$ .

If  $l \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap Q$ , with  $l(U) \subseteq D$ , and  $\theta(l(z)) + zl'(z)\phi(l(z))$  is univalent in  $U$ , and

$$\theta(q(z)) + zq'(z)\phi(q(z)) < \theta(l(z)) + zl'(z)\phi(l(z)),$$

then  $q(z) < l(z)$ , and  $q$  is the best subdominant.

**Lemma (2.4)[6]:** Let  $q(z)$  be convex univalent in  $U$  and  $q(0) = 1$ . Let  $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ , that  $\operatorname{Re}\{\beta\} > 0$ . If  $l(z) \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap Q$  and  $l(z) + \beta zl'(z)$  is univalent in  $U$ , then

$$q(z) + \beta zq'(z) < l(z) + \beta zl'(z),$$

which implies that  $q(z) < l(z)$  and  $q(z)$  is the best subdominant.

## 3 . Subordination Results

**Theorem(3.1):** Let  $q(z)$  be convex univalent in  $U$  with  $q(0) = 1, 0 < \delta < 1, \eta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Suppose that

$$\operatorname{Re} \left\{ 1 + \frac{z q''(z)}{q'(z)} \right\} > \max \left\{ 0, -\operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{1}{\delta \eta} \right) \right\}. \quad (3.1)$$

If  $f \in T$  is satisfies the subordination

$$l(z) < q(z) + \delta \eta z q'(z), \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$l(z) = \left( \frac{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} \times \left( 1 + \eta \left( \frac{\rho [\mu f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z) - (\mu - 1) f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z)] + \xi [\mu f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda-1}(z) - (\mu - 1) f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)]}{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)} \right) \right) \operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{1 - Bz}{1 + Bz} \right) > \max \left\{ 0, -\operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{1}{\delta \eta} \right) \right\}. \quad (3.3)$$

then

$$\left( \frac{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} < q(z), \quad (3.4)$$

and  $q(z)$  is the best dominant.

**Proof** :consider a function  $l(z)$  by

$$l(z) = \left( \frac{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} \times \left( 1 + \eta \left( \frac{\rho [\mu f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z) - (\mu - 1) f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z)] + \xi [\mu f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda-1}(z) - (\mu - 1) f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)]}{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)} \right) \right) \operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{1+z}{1-z} \right) > \max \{0, -\operatorname{Re}(\delta \eta)\}. \quad (3.5)$$

then the function  $q(z)$  is analytic in  $U$  and  $q(0)=1$ , therefore, differentiating (3.5) logarithmically with respect to  $z$  and using the identity (1.7) in the resulting equation,

$$l(z) = \left( \frac{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} \times \left( 1 + \eta \left( \frac{\rho [\mu f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z) - (\mu - 1) f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z)] + \xi [\mu f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda-1}(z) - (\mu - 1) f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)]}{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)} \right) \right) \operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{1+z}{1-z} \right) > \max \{0, -\operatorname{Re}(\delta \eta)\}. \quad (3.5)$$

Thus the subordination (3.2) is equivalent to

$$l(z) + \delta \eta z l'(z) < q(z) + \delta \eta z q'(z)$$

An application of Lemma (2.1) with  $\beta = \delta \eta$  and  $\alpha = 1$ , we obtain (3.4).

Taking  $q(z) = \frac{1+Bz}{1+Bz}$  ( $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$ ), in Theorem (3.1), we obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary (3.2)**: Let  $0 < \delta < 1$ ,  $\eta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$ . Suppose that

If  $f \in T$  is satisfy the following subordination condition:

$$l(z) < \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz} + \delta \eta \frac{(A - B)z}{(1 + Bz)^2},$$

where  $l(z)$  given by (3.3), then

$$\left( \frac{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} < \frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz},$$

and  $\frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$  is best dominant.

Taking  $A = 1$  and  $B = -1$  in corollary (3.2), we get following result.

**Corollary (3.3)**: Let  $0 < \delta < 1$ ,  $\eta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and suppose that  $\operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{1+z}{1-z} \right) > \max \{0, -\operatorname{Re}(\delta \eta)\}$ .

If  $f \in T$  is satisfy the following subordination

$$l(z) < \frac{1 + z}{1 - z} + \delta \eta \frac{2z}{(1 - z)^2},$$

where  $l(z)$  given by (3.3), then

$$\left( \frac{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} < \frac{1 + z}{1 - z},$$

and  $\frac{1+z}{1-z}$  is best dominant.

**Theorem (3.4)**: Let  $q(z)$  be convex univalent in unit disk  $U$  with  $q(0) = 1$ , let  $0 < \delta < 1$ ,  $\eta \in$

$\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $u, v, \varepsilon, \alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $f \in T$  and suppose that  $f$  and  $q$  satisfy the following conditions

$$\operatorname{Re} \left\{ \frac{v}{\eta} q(z) + \frac{2\varepsilon}{\eta} [q(z)]^2 + 1 + \frac{3\alpha}{\eta} [q(z)]^3 + z \frac{q''(z)}{q'(z)} - z \frac{q'(z)}{q(z)} \right\} > 0, \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$\left( \frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} \neq 0. \quad (3.7)$$

If

$$r(z) < u + vq(z) + \varepsilon[q(z)]^2 + \alpha[q(z)]^3 + \eta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}, \quad (3.8)$$

where

$$r(z) = u + v \left( \frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} + \varepsilon \left( \frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\delta}} + \alpha \left( \frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{3\delta}} + \frac{1}{\eta \delta} \left[ \frac{\rho (\tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z))' + \xi (\tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z))'}{\rho \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)} - 1 \right] \quad (3.9)$$

then

$$\left( \frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} < q(z), \quad \text{and } q(z) \text{ is best dominant.}$$

**Proof** :consider a function  $l(z)$  by

$$l(z) = \left( \frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}}. \quad (3.10)$$

Then the function  $p$  is analytic in  $U$  and  $l(0) = 1$ , differentiating (3.10) logarithmically with respect to  $z$ , we get

$$\frac{zl'(z)}{l(z)} = \frac{1}{\delta} \left[ \frac{\rho (\tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z))' + \xi (\tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z))'}{\rho \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{S,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)} - 1 \right]. \quad (3.11)$$

By setting  $\theta(w) = u + vw + \varepsilon w^2 + \alpha w^3$  and  $\phi(w) = \frac{\eta}{w}$ , it can be easily observed that  $\theta(w)$  is analytic in  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\phi(w)$  is analytic in  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and that  $\phi(w) \neq 0$ ,  $w \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ . Also, we get

$$Q(z) = zq'(z)\phi(q(z)) = \eta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$$

and

$$h(z) = \theta(q(z)) + Q(z)$$

$$= u + vq(z) + \varepsilon[q(z)]^2 + \alpha[q(z)]^3 + \eta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)},$$

It is observe that  $Q(z)$  is starlike univalent in  $U$ , we have

$$\operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{zh'(z)}{Q(z)} \right) = \operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{v}{\eta} q(z) + \frac{2\varepsilon}{\eta} [q(z)]^2 + \frac{3\alpha}{\eta} [q(z)]^3 + 1 + \frac{zq''(z)}{q'(z)} - \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)} \right) > 0.$$

By Making use of (2.2),we obtain

$$vl(z) + \varepsilon [l(z)]^2 + \alpha[l(z)]^3 <$$

$$vq(z) + \varepsilon[q(z)]^2 + \alpha[q(z)]^3 + \eta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$$

and by using Lemma (2.2), we deduce that subordination (3.8) implies that

$l(z) < q(z)$  and the function  $q(z)$  is the best dominant.

Taking the function  $q(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$  ( $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$ ), in Theorem (3.4) for every  $\eta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  the condition(3.6) becomes

$$\operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{v}{\eta} \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} + \frac{2\varepsilon}{\eta} \left( \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} \right)^2 + \frac{2\alpha}{\eta} \left( \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} \right)^3 + 1 + \frac{(A-B)z}{(1+Bz)(1+Az)} - \frac{2Bz}{1+Bz} \right) > 0, \quad (3.12)$$

hence, we have the following corollary.

**Corollary(3.5)**:Let  $(-1 \leq B < A \leq 1)$ ,  $0 < \delta < 1$ ,  $\eta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $u, v, \varepsilon, \alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ .

Assume that (3.12) holds.

If  $f \in T$  and

$$r(z) < u + v \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} + \varepsilon \left( \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} \right)^2 + \alpha \left( \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} \right)^3 + \eta \frac{(A-B)z}{(1+Bz)(1+Az)},$$

where  $r(z)$  is defined in (3.9), then

$$\left(\frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z)}{z}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} < \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}, \text{ and } \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} \text{ is best dominant.}$$

Taking the function  $q(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^\rho$

( $0 < \rho \leq 1$ ), in Theorem(3.4), the condition

(2.12)becomes

$$\text{Re} \left\{ \frac{v}{\eta} \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^\rho + \frac{2\varepsilon}{\eta} \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{2\rho} + \frac{\alpha}{\eta} \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{3\rho} + \frac{2z^2}{1-z^2} \right\} > 0 \quad (\eta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}), \quad (3.13)$$

hence, we have the following corollary.

**Corollary (3.6):** Let  $0 < \rho \leq 1, 0 < \delta < 1, \eta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}, u, v, \varepsilon, \alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ . Assume that (3.13) holds. If  $f \in T$  and

$$r(z) < u + v \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^\rho + \varepsilon \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{2\rho} + \alpha \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{3\rho} + \eta \frac{2\rho z}{1-z^2}, r(z) =$$

where  $r(z)$  is defined in (3.9), then

$$\left(\frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z)}{z}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} < \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^\rho, \text{ and } \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^\rho \text{ is best dominant.}$$

#### 4. Superordination Results

**Theorem (4.1):** Let  $q(z)$  be convex univalent in  $U$  with  $q(z) = 1, 0 < \delta < 1, \eta \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $\text{Re}(\eta) > 0$ , if  $f \in T$ , such that

$$\left(\frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^\lambda(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} \neq 0$$

and suppose that  $f$  satisfies the condition:

$$\left(\frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^\lambda(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap Q. \quad (4.1)$$

If the function  $l(z)$  given by (3.3) is univalent and the following superordination condition:

$$q(z) + \delta \eta z q'(z) < l(z), (4.2)$$

holds, then

$$q(z) < \left(\frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^\lambda(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} \quad (4.3)$$

and  $q(z)$  is the best subordination.

**Proof :** Consider the analytic function  $l(z)$  by

$$l(z) = \left(\frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^\lambda(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}}. \quad (4.4)$$

Differentiate Equation(4.4) with the respect to  $z$  logarithmically, we get

$$\frac{z l'(z)}{l(z)} = \frac{1}{\delta} \left( \frac{\rho z (\tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z))' + \xi z (\tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^\lambda(z))'}{\rho \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^\lambda(z)} \right) \quad (4.5)$$

A simple computation and using (1.6), from (4.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} l(z) &= \left(\frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^\lambda(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} \\ &\times \left( 1 + \eta \left( \frac{\rho [\mu \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) - (\mu - 1) \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^\lambda(z)] + \xi [\mu \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^\lambda(z) - (\mu - 1) \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda-1}(z)]}{\rho \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^\lambda(z)} \right) \right) \\ &= l(z) + \delta \eta z l'(z), \end{aligned}$$

now, by using Lemma (2.4), we get the desired result.

Taking  $q(z) = \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$  ( $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$ ), in Theorem (4.1), we get the following corollary.

**Corollary (4.2):** Let  $\text{Re}(\eta) > 0, 0 < \delta < 1$  and  $-1 \leq B < A \leq 1$ , such that

$$\left(\frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^\lambda(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap Q.$$

If the function  $l(z)$  given by (3.3) is univalent in  $U$  and  $f \in T$  satisfies the following superordination condition:

$$\frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} + \delta \eta \frac{(A-B)z}{(1+Bz)^2} < l(z), \text{ then}$$

$$\frac{1 + Az}{1 + Bz} < \left( \frac{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}},$$

and the function  $\frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}$  is the bestsubordinant.

**Theorem (4.3):**Let  $q(z)$  be convex univalent in unit disk  $U$ , let  $\eta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $0 < \delta < 1$ ,  $u, v, \varepsilon \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $q(z) \neq 0$ , and  $f \in T$ . Suppose that

$$\operatorname{Re} \left\{ (v + 2\varepsilon q(z) + 3\alpha q(z)) \frac{q(z)q'(z)}{\eta} \right\} > 0,$$

Let  $f(z) \in T$  and suppose that satisfies the next condition:

$$\left( \frac{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap Q, (4.6)$$

and

$$\frac{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \neq 0.$$

If the function  $r(z)$  is given by (3.9) is univalent in  $U$ , and

$$u + vq(z) + \varepsilon[q(z)]^2 + \alpha[q(z)]^3 + \eta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)} < r(z), (4.7)$$

implies

$$q(z) < \left( \frac{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}}$$

and  $q(z)$  is the best subordinant.

**Proof :** Let the function  $A(z)$  defined on  $U$  by (3.14). Then a computation show that

$$\frac{zl'(z)}{l(z)} = \frac{1}{\delta} \left[ \frac{\rho (f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z))' + \xi (f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z))'}{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)} - 1 \right] (4.8)$$

By setting  $\theta(w) = u + vw + \varepsilon w^2 + \alpha w^3$  and  $\phi(w) = \frac{\eta}{w}$ , it can be easily observed that  $\theta(w)$  is analytic in  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\phi(w)$  is analytic in  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and that  $\phi(w) \neq 0$  ( $w \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ ). Also, we get  $Q(z) = zq'(z)\phi(q(z)) = \eta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$ , it observed that  $Q(z)$  is starlike univalent in  $U$ .

Since  $q(z)$  is convex, it follows that

$$\operatorname{Re} \left\{ \frac{\theta'(q(z))}{\phi(q(z))} \right\} = \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \frac{q(z)}{\eta} (2\varepsilon q(z) + 3\alpha[q(z)]^2 + v) \right\} q'(z) > 0.$$

By making use of (4.8) the hypothesis (4.7) can be equivalently written as

$$\theta(q(z) + zq'(z)\phi(q(z))) = \theta(l(z) + zl'(z)\phi(A(z))),$$

thus, by applying Lemma (2.3), the proof is completed.

## 5. Sandwich Results

Combining Theorem (3.1) with Theorem (4.1), we obtain the following sandwich Theorem :

**Theorem (5.1):**Let  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  be convex univalent in  $U$  with  $q_1(0) = q_2(0) = 1$  and  $q_2$  satisfies (3.1). Suppose that  $\operatorname{Re}\{\eta\} > 0$ ,  $0 < \delta < 1$ ,  $\eta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ .

If  $f \in T$ , such that

$$\left( \frac{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} \in \mathcal{H}[q(0), 1] \cap Q,$$

and the function  $l(z)$  defined by (3.3) is univalent and satisfies

$$q_1(z) + \delta \eta z q_1'(z) < l(z) < q_2(z) + \delta \eta z q_2'(z), (5.1)$$

implies that

$$q_1(z) < \left( \frac{\rho f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi f_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} < q_2(z),$$

where  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  are, respectively, the best subordinant and the best dominant of (5.1).

Combining Theorem (3.4) with Theorem (4.3), we obtain the following sandwich Theorem.

**Theorem (5.2):**Let  $q_i$  be two convex univalent functions in  $U$ , such that  $q_i(0) = 1$ ,  $q_i(0) \neq 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). Suppose that  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  satisfies (4.8) and (3.8), respectively.

If  $f \in T$  and suppose that  $f$  satisfies the next conditions:

$$\left( \frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} \neq 0$$

and

$$\left( \frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} \in \mathcal{H}[q(1), 1] \cap Q,$$

and  $r(z)$  is univalent in  $U$ , then

$$u + v q_1(z) + \varepsilon [q_1(z)]^2 + \alpha [q_1(z)]^3 + \eta \frac{z q_1'(z)}{q_1(z)} < r(z) < u + v q_2(z) + \alpha [q_2(z)]^3 + \eta \frac{z q_2'(z)}{q_2(z)} \quad (5.2)$$

implies

$$q_2(z) < \left( \frac{\rho \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda+1}(z) + \xi \tilde{f}_{s,a,\mu}^{\lambda}(z)}{(\rho + \xi)z} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} < q_2(z),$$

and  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  are the best subordinator and the best dominant respectively and  $r(z)$  is given by (3.9).

## 6. References:

[1] R. M. Ali, V. Ravichandran, M. H. Khan and K. G. Subramaniam, Differential sandwich theorems for certain analytic functions, Far East J. Math. Sci., 15(1) (2004), 87-94.

[2] W. G. Atshan, R. A. Hiress, On Differential Sandwich theorems of Meromorphic univalent functions, Journal of Al-Qadisiyah for Computer Science and Mathematics, Vol (10), no(3), (2018).

[3] W. G. Atshan, S. A. Jawad, On Differential Sandwich Results for analytic functions, Journal of Al-Qadisiyah for Computer Science and Mathematics, Vol.(11), No.(1), (2019), 96-101.

[4] W. G. Atshan, S. K. Kazim, On Differential sandwich Theorems of Multivalent Functions Defined a Linear Operator, Journal of Al-Qadisiyah for Computer Science and Mathematics, Vol.(10), No.(1), (2019), 117-123.

[5] T. Bulboacă, Classes of first-order differential superordinations, Demonstration Math., 35(2) (2002), 287–292.

[6] T. Bulboacă, Differential Subordinations and Superordinations, Recent Results, House of Scientific Book Publ., Cluj-Napoca, (2005).

[7] S. P. Goyal, P. Goswami and H. Silverman, Subordination and superordination results for a class of analytic multivalent functions, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. (2008), Article ID 561638, 1–12.

[8] Y. Komatu, On analytic prolongation of a family of integral operators, Mathematica (cluj), 32(55) (1990), 141-145.

[9] S. S. Miller and P. T. Mocanu, Differential subordinations: Theory and Applications, Series on Monographs and Text Books in Pure and Applied Mathematics, 225, Marcel Dekker, New York and Basel, (2000).

[10] S. S. Miller and P. T. Mocanu, Subordinations of differential inequalities superordinations, Complex Variables, 48(10), 815 – 826, (2003).

[11] T. N. Shanmugam, V. Ravichandran and S. Sivasubramanian, Differential sandwich theorems for subclasses of analytic functions, Aust. J. Math. Anal. Appl., 3 (2006), Article 8, 1–11

[12] T. N. Shanmugam, S. Shivasubramanian and H. Silverman, On sandwich theorems for some classes of analytic functions, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. (2006), Article ID 29684, 1 – 13.

[13] N. Tuneski, On certain sufficient conditions for starlikeness, Internat. J. Math. Sci. 23(8), (2000), 521–527.

[14] A. K. Wanas and A. H. Majeed, Differential sandwich theorems for multi valent analytic functions defined by convolution structure with generalized hypergeometric function, Analee Univ. Oradea Fasc. Math., XXV(2) (2018), 37-52.



حول مبرهنات الساندوج للدوال الاحادية التكافؤ الاكيدة والمعرفة بواسطة مؤثر جديد

إيلاف إبراهيم بديوي<sup>2</sup>

وقاص غالب عطشان<sup>1</sup>

قسم الرياضيات ،كلية علوم الحاسوب وتكنولوجيا المعلومات ،جامعة القادسية ، الديوانية- العراق

#### المستخلص:

في هذا البحث درسنا بعض نتائج التبعية التفاضلية العليا للدوال احادية التكافؤ الاكيدة في قرص الوحدة المفتوح باستخدام مؤثر جديد  $f_{S,a,\mu}^\lambda$  اشتقينا ايضا بعض مبرهنات الساندوج.