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#### Abstract

In the present paper we introduce a new subclass of analytic functions. We prove a sharp upper bound to the second Hankel determinant associated with the $k^{t h}$ root transform $\left[f\left(z^{k}\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{k}}$ of the normalized analytic function $f(z)$, when it belongs to this class, using Toeplitz determinants.


## 1. Introduction

Let $A$ denote the class of all functions $f(z)$ of the form

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

in the open unit disc $E=\{z:|z|<1\}$. Let $S$ be the subclass of $A$ consisting of univalent functions. In 1985, Louis de Branges de Bourcia proved the Bieberbach conjecture, i.e.: for a univalent function its $n^{t h}$ coefficient is bounded
by $n$ (see [3]). The bounds for the coefficients give information about the geometric properties of these functions. In particular, the growth and distortion properties of a normalized univalent function are determined by the bound of its second coefficient. The Hankel determinant of $f$ for $q \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$ was defined by Pommerenke [14] as

$$
H_{q}(n)=\left|\begin{array}{cccc}
a_{n} & a_{n+1} & \cdots & a_{n+q-1} \\
a_{n+1} & a_{n+2} & \cdots & a_{n+q} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
a_{n+q-1} & a_{n+q} & \cdots & a_{n+2 q-2}
\end{array}\right|, \quad\left(a_{1}=1\right)
$$

This determinant has been considered by many authors in the literature. For example, Noor [12] determined the rate of growth of $H_{q}(n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for the functions in $S$ with bounded boundary. Ehrenborg [5] studied the Hankel determinant of exponential polynomials. The Hankel transform of an integer sequence and some of its properties were discussed by Layman [8]. In the recent years several authors have investigated bounds for the Hankel determinant of functions belonging to various subclasses of univalent and multivalent analytic functions in the literature. In particular for $q=2, n=1, a_{1}=1$ and $q=2$, $n=2, a_{1}=1$, the Hankel determinant simplifies respectively to

$$
\begin{gathered}
H_{2}(1)=\left|\begin{array}{ll}
a_{1} & a_{2} \\
a_{2} & a_{3}
\end{array}\right|=a_{3}-a_{2}^{2}, \\
\text { and } H_{2}(2)=\left|\begin{array}{ll}
a_{2} & a_{3} \\
a_{3} & a_{4}
\end{array}\right|=a_{2} a_{4}-a_{3}^{2} .
\end{gathered}
$$

We refer to $H_{2}(2)$ as the second Hankel determinant. A familiar result is that for the univalent function given in (1.1) the sharp inequality $H_{2}(1)=\left|a_{3}-a_{2}^{2}\right| \leq$ $\leq 1$ holds true [4]. For a family $\mathcal{T}$ of functions in $S$, the more general problem of finding sharp estimates for the functional $\left|a_{3}-\mu a_{2}^{2}\right|(\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ or $\mu \in \mathbb{C})$ in popularly known as the Fekete-Szegő problem for $\mathcal{T}$. Ali [2] found sharp bounds for the first four coefficients and sharp estimate for the Fekete-Szegő functional $\left|\gamma_{3}-t \gamma_{2}^{2}\right|$, where $t$ is real for the inverse function of $f$ defined as $f^{-1}(w)=w+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \gamma_{n} w^{n} \in \widetilde{S T}(\alpha)$, the class of strongly starlike functions of order $\alpha(0<\alpha \leq 1)$. Janteng, Halim and Darus [7] have considered the functional $\left|a_{2} a_{4}-a_{3}^{2}\right|$ and found sharp upper bound for the function $f$ in the subclass $R T$ of $S$, consisting of functions whose derivative have a positive real part (also called bounded turning functions) studied by Mac Gregor [10] and have shown that if $f \in R T$ then $\left|a_{2} a_{4}-a_{3}^{2}\right| \leq \frac{4}{9}$. R. M. Ali, S. K. Lee, V. Ravichandran and S. Supramaniam [1] obtained sharp bounds for the FeketeSzegő coefficient functional denoted by $\left|b_{2 k+1}-\mu b_{k+1}^{2}\right|$ associated with the $k^{t h}$ root transform $\left[f\left(z^{k}\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{k}}$ of the function given in (1.1), belonging to certain
subclasses of $S$. The $k^{\text {th }}$ root transform for the function $f$ given in (1.1) is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(z):=\left[f\left(z^{k}\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{k}}=z+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{k n+1} z^{k n+1} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Motivated by the results obtained by R. M. Ali, S. K. Lee, V. Ravichandran and S. Supramaniam [1], in the present paper, we introduce a new subclass denoted by $\widehat{R T}$ and obtain sharp upper bound to the functional $\mid b_{k+1} b_{3 k+1}-$ $-b_{2 k+1}^{2} \mid$ for the $k^{t h}$ root transform of the function $f$ when it belongs to this class, defined as follows.

Definition 1.1. A function $f(z) \in A$ is said to be function whose reciprocal derivative has a positive real part (also called reciprocal of bounded turning function), denoted by $f \in \widehat{R T}$, if and only if

$$
\operatorname{Re} \frac{1}{f^{\prime}(z)}>0, \quad \forall z \in E
$$

## 2. Preliminary results

Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the class of functions consisting of $p$, such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
p(z)=1+c_{1} z+c_{2} z^{2}+c_{3} z^{3}+\ldots=1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_{n} z^{n} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

which are regular in the open unit disc $E$ and satisfy $\operatorname{Re} p(z)>0$ for any $z \in E$. Here $p(z)$ is called the Carathéodory function [4].

Lemma 2.1. ([13], [15]) If $p \in \mathcal{P}$, then $\left|c_{k}\right| \leq 2$, for each $k \geq 1$ and the inequality is sharp for the function $\frac{1+z}{1-z}$.

Lemma 2.2. ([6]) The power series for $p(z)=1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_{n} z^{n}$ given in (2.1) converges in the open unit disc $E$ to a function in $\mathcal{P}$ if and only if the Toeplitz determinants

$$
D_{n}=\left|\begin{array}{ccccc}
2 & c_{1} & c_{2} & \cdots & c_{n} \\
c_{-1} & 2 & c_{1} & \cdots & c_{n-1} \\
c_{-2} & c_{-1} & 2 & \cdots & c_{n-2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
c_{-n} & c_{-n+1} & c_{-n+2} & \cdots & 2
\end{array}\right|, \quad n=1,2,3, \ldots
$$

and $c_{-k}=\bar{c}_{k}$, are all non-negative. They are strictly positive except for $p(z)=$ $=\sum_{k=1}^{m} \rho_{k} p_{0}\left(e^{i t_{k}} z\right), \rho_{k}>0, t_{k}$ real and $t_{k} \neq t_{j}$, for $k \neq j$, where $p_{0}(z)=\frac{1+z}{1-z}$; in this case $D_{n}>0$ for $n<(m-1)$ and $D_{n} \doteq 0$ for $n \geq m$.

This necessary and sufficient condition found in [6] is due to Carathéodory and Toeplitz. We may assume without restriction that $c_{1}>0$. On using Lemma 2.2, for $n=2$, we have

$$
D_{2}=\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
2 & c_{1} & c_{2} \\
\bar{c}_{1} & 2 & c_{1} \\
\bar{c}_{2} & \bar{c}_{1} & 2
\end{array}\right|=\left[8+2 \operatorname{Re}\left\{c_{1}^{2} c_{2}\right\}-2\left|c_{2}\right|^{2}-4\left|c_{1}\right|^{2}\right] \geq 0
$$

which is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 c_{2}=c_{1}^{2}+x\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right), \text { for some } x,|x| \leq 1 \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $n=3$,

$$
D_{3}=\left|\begin{array}{cccc}
2 & c_{1} & c_{2} & c_{3} \\
\bar{c}_{1} & 2 & c_{1} & c_{2} \\
\bar{c}_{2} & \bar{c}_{1} & 2 & c_{1} \\
\bar{c}_{3} & \bar{c}_{2} & \bar{c}_{1} & 2
\end{array}\right| \geq 0
$$

and is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\left(4 c_{3}-4 c_{1} c_{2}+c_{1}^{3}\right)\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right)+c_{1}\left(2 c_{2}-c_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}\right| \leq 2\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}-2\left|\left(2 c_{2}-c_{1}^{2}\right)\right|^{2} . \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Simplifying the expressions (2.2) and (2.3), we get

$$
\begin{align*}
4 c_{3}=\{ & c_{1}^{3}+2 c_{1}\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right) x-c_{1}\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right) x^{2}+ \\
& \left.+2\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right)\left(1-|x|^{2}\right) z\right\}, \quad \text { with }|z| \leq 1 \tag{2.4}
\end{align*}
$$

To obtain our result, we refer to the classical method initiated by Libera and Zlotkiewicz [9] and used by several authors in the literature.

## 3. Main result

Theorem 3.1. If $f(z) \in \widehat{R T}$, then $\left|b_{k+1} b_{k+3}-b_{k+2}^{2}\right| \leq \frac{4}{9 k^{2}}$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}=$ $=\{1,2,3, \ldots\}$ and the inequality is sharp.
Proof. For $f(z)=z+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n} \in \widehat{R T}$, by virtue of Definition 1.1, there exists an analytic function $p \in \mathcal{P}$ in the open unit disc $E$ with $p(0)=1$ and $\operatorname{Re} p(z)>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{f^{\prime}(z)}=p(z) \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad 1=f^{\prime}(z) p(z) \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Replacing $f^{\prime}(z)$ and $p(z)$ with their equivalent series expressions in (3.1), we have

$$
1=\left\{1+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n a_{n} z^{n-1}\right\}\left\{1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_{n} z^{n}\right\}
$$

Upon simplification, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
1= & 1+\left(c_{1}+2 a_{2}\right) z+\left(c_{2}+2 a_{2} c_{1}+3 a_{3}\right) z^{2}+ \\
& +\left(c_{3}+2 a_{2} c_{2}+3 a_{3} c_{1}+4 a_{4}\right) z^{3}+\cdots . \tag{3.2}
\end{align*}
$$

Equating the coefficients of like powers of $z, z^{2}$ and $z^{3}$ respectively on both sides of (3.2), after simplifying, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{2}=\frac{-c_{1}}{2} ; \quad a_{3}=\frac{1}{3}\left(c_{1}^{2}-c_{2}\right) ; \quad a_{4}=-\frac{1}{4}\left(c_{3}-2 c_{1} c_{2}+c_{1}^{3}\right) . \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

For a function $f$ given by (1.1), a computation shows that

$$
\begin{align*}
{\left[f\left(z^{k}\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{k}}=} & {\left[z^{k}+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n k}\right]^{\frac{1}{k}}=}  \tag{3.4}\\
= & {\left[z+\frac{1}{k} a_{2} z^{k+1}+\left\{\frac{1}{k} a_{3}+\frac{1-k}{2 k^{2}} a_{2}^{2}\right\} z^{2 k+1}+\right.} \\
& \left.+\left\{\frac{1}{k} a_{4}+\frac{1-k}{k^{2}} a_{2} a_{3}+\frac{(1-k)(1-2 k)}{6 k^{3}} a_{2}^{3}\right\} z^{3 k+1}+\cdots\right]
\end{align*}
$$

The equations (1.2) and (3.4) yield;

$$
\begin{gather*}
b_{k+1}=\frac{1}{k} a_{2} ; \quad b_{2 k+1}=\frac{1}{k} a_{3}+\frac{1-k}{2 k^{2}} a_{2}^{2} ;  \tag{3.5}\\
b_{3 k+1}=\frac{1}{k} a_{4}+\frac{1-k}{k^{2}} a_{2} a_{3}+\frac{(1-k)(1-2 k)}{6 k^{3}} a_{2}^{3} .
\end{gather*}
$$

Simplifying the equations (3.3) and (3.5), we get

$$
\begin{gather*}
b_{k+1}=\frac{-c_{1}}{2 k} ; \quad b_{2 k+1}=\frac{1}{24 k^{2}}\left[(5 k+3) c_{1}^{2}-8 k c_{2}\right]  \tag{3.6}\\
b_{3 k+1}=-\frac{1}{48 k^{3}}\left[12 k^{2} c_{3}-8 k(1+2 k) c_{1} c_{2}+(1+2 k)(1+3 k) c_{1}^{3}\right]
\end{gather*}
$$

Substituting the values of $b_{k+1}, b_{2 k+1}$ and $b_{3 k+1}$ from (3.6) in the second Hankel determinant $\left|b_{k+1} b_{3 k+1}-b_{2 k+1}^{2}\right|$ for the $k^{t h}$ transform of the function $f \in \widehat{R T}$, which simplifies to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|b_{k+1} b_{3 k+1}-b_{2 k+1}^{2}\right|=\frac{1}{576 k^{4}}\left|72 k^{2} c_{1} c_{3}-16 k^{2} c_{1}^{2} c_{2}-64 k^{2} c_{2}^{2}+\left(11 k^{2}-3\right) c_{1}^{4}\right| . \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting the values of $c_{2}$ and $c_{3}$ from (2.2) and (2.4) respectively from Lemma 2.2 on the right-hand side of (3.7), we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { 8) } \begin{array}{l}
\left|72 k^{2} c_{1} c_{3}-16 k^{2} c_{1}^{2} c_{2}-64 k^{2} c_{2}^{2}+\left(11 k^{2}-3\right) c_{1}^{4}\right|= \\
=\left\lvert\, 72 k^{2} c_{1} \times \frac{1}{4}\left\{c_{1}^{3}+2 c_{1}\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right) x-c_{1}\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right) x^{2}+2\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right)\left(1-|x|^{2}\right) z\right\}-\right. \\
-16 k^{2} c_{1}^{2} \times \frac{1}{2}\left\{c_{1}^{2}+x\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right)\right\}-64 k^{2} \times \frac{1}{4}\left\{c_{1}^{2}+x\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right)\right\}^{2}+ \\
+\left(11 k^{2}-3\right) c_{1}^{4} \mid
\end{array} \tag{3.8}
\end{align*}
$$

Using the triangle inequality and the fact $|z|<1$, upon simplification, we get

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left|72 k^{2} c_{1} c_{3}-16 k^{2} c_{1}^{2} c_{2}-64 k^{2} c_{2}^{2}+\left(11 k^{2}-3\right) c_{1}^{4}\right| \leq \\
\leq\left|\left(5 k^{2}-3\right) c_{1}^{4}+36 k^{2} c_{1}\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right)+4 k^{2} c_{1}^{2}\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right)\right| x \mid+  \tag{3.9}\\
+2 k^{2}\left(c_{1}+2\right)\left(c_{1}+16\right)\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right)|x|^{2} \mid
\end{gather*}
$$

Since $c_{1} \in[0,2]$, noting that $\left(c_{1}+a\right)\left(c_{1}+b\right) \geq\left(c_{1}-a\right)\left(c_{1}-b\right)$, where $a, b \geq 0$ on the right hand side of (3.9), we have

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left|72 k^{2} c_{1} c_{3}-16 k^{2} c_{1}^{2} c_{2}-64 k^{2} c_{2}^{2}+\left(11 k^{2}-3\right) c_{1}^{4}\right| \leq \\
\leq\left|\left(5 k^{2}-3\right) c_{1}^{4}+36 k^{2} c_{1}\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right)+4 k^{2} c_{1}^{2}\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right)\right| x \mid+  \tag{3.10}\\
+2 k^{2}\left(c_{1}-2\right)\left(c_{1}-16\right)\left(4-c_{1}^{2}\right)|x|^{2} \mid
\end{gather*}
$$

Choosing $c_{1}=c \in[0,2]$, applying triangle inequality and replacing $|x|$ by $\mu$ on the right-hand side of the above inequality, we have

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left|72 k^{2} c_{1} c_{3}-16 k^{2} c_{1}^{2} c_{2}-64 k^{2} c_{2}^{2}+\left(11 k^{2}-3\right) c_{1}^{4}\right| \leq \\
\leq\left[\left(5 k^{2}-3\right) c^{4}+2 k^{2}\left\{18 c+2 c^{2} \mu+(c-2)(c-16) \mu^{2}\right\} \times\left(4-c^{2}\right)\right]=  \tag{3.11}\\
=F(c, \mu), \quad \text { for } 0 \leq \mu=|x| \leq 1
\end{gather*}
$$

We next maximize the function $F(c, \mu)$ on the closed region $[0,2] \times[0,1]$. Differentiating $F(c, \mu)$ partially with respect to $\mu$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial F}{\partial \mu}=4 k^{2}\left[c^{2}+(c-2)(c-16) \mu\right] \times\left(4-c^{2}\right) \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $0<\mu<1$, for fixed $c$ with $0<c<2$ and for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, from (3.12), we observe that $\frac{\partial F}{\partial \mu}>0$. Therefore, $F(c, \mu)$ is an increasing function of $\mu$ and hence it cannot have maximum value at any point in the interior of the closed region $[0,2] \times[0,1]$. Moreover, for fixed $c \in[0,2]$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max _{0 \leq \mu \leq 1} F(c, \mu)=F(c, 1)=G(c) \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, replacing $\mu$ by 1 in $F(c, \mu)$, upon simplification, we obtain

$$
\begin{gather*}
G(c)=-\left(k^{2}+3\right) c^{4}-40 k^{2} c^{2}+256 k^{2}  \tag{3.14}\\
G^{\prime}(c)=-4\left(k^{2}+3\right) c^{3}-80 k^{2} c . \tag{3.15}
\end{gather*}
$$

From (3.15), we observe that $G^{\prime}(c) \leq 0$, for every $c \in[0,2]$ and for every $k$. Therefore, $G(c)$ becomes a decreasing function of $c$ in the interval [ 0,2 ], whose maximum value occurs at $c=0$ only. From (3.14), the maximum value of $G(c)$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{\max }=G(0)=256 k^{2} \tag{3.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the relations (3.11) and (3.16), we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|72 k^{2} c_{1} c_{3}-16 k^{2} c_{1}^{2} c_{2}-64 k^{2} c_{2}^{2}+\left(11 k^{2}-3\right) c_{1}^{4}\right| \leq 256 k^{2} . \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Simplifying the expressions (3.7) and (3.17), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|b_{k+1} b_{3 k+1}-b_{2 k+1}^{2}\right| \leq \frac{4}{9 k^{2}} . \tag{3.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

By setting $c_{1}=c=0$ and selecting $x=1$ in the expressions (2.2) and (2.4), we find that $c_{2}=2$ and $c_{3}=0$ respectively. Using these values in (3.17), we observe that equality is attained, which shows that our result is sharp. For these values, we derive the extremal function, given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{f^{\prime}(z)}=1+2 z^{2}+2 z^{4}+\ldots=\frac{1+z^{2}}{1-z^{2}} \tag{3.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

This completes the proof of our Theorem.
Remark 3.1. Choosing $k=1$ in (3.18), the result coincides with that of Janteng, Halim and Darus [7]. From this, we conclude that the upper bound to the second Hankel determinant of a function whose derivative has a positive real part and a function whose reciprocal derivative has a positive real part is the same.
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