# Certain sufficient conditions for close-to-convexity and starlikeness of multivalent functions 
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Abstract. By using Jack's lemma, we derive simple sufficient conditions for analytic functions to be multivalent close-to-convex and multivalent starlike.

## 1. Introduction

Denote by $\mathcal{A}(p)$, where $p \in \mathbb{N}:=\{1,2, \ldots\}$, the class of multivalent analytic functions in the open unit disk $\mathbb{U}:=\{z \in \mathbb{C}:|z|<1\}$ of the form

$$
f(z)=z^{p}+\sum_{k=p+1}^{\infty} a_{k} z^{k}, z \in \mathbb{U}
$$

and let $\mathcal{A}:=\mathcal{A}(1)$.
For $0 \leq \alpha<p$, we say that the function $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ belongs to the class of p-valently starlike functions of order $\alpha$, denoted by $\mathbb{S}_{p}^{*}(\alpha)$, if it satisfies the inequality (see Owa [7] and Aouf [1, 2])

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re} \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}>\alpha, z \in \mathbb{U} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Also, we say that the function $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ belongs to the class of of $p$-valently convex functions of order $\alpha$, denoted by $\mathbb{K}_{p}(\alpha)$, if (see Owa [7])

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\left[1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right]>\alpha, z \in \mathbb{U} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$
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For the special case $\alpha=0$, we denote $\mathbb{S}_{p}^{*}:=\mathbb{S}_{p}^{*}(0)$ and $\mathbb{K}_{p}:=\mathbb{K}_{p}(0)$, and from the formulas (1.1) and (1.2) we have

$$
f \in \mathbb{K}_{p}(\alpha) \Leftrightarrow \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{p} \in \mathbb{S}_{p}^{*}(\alpha) .
$$

Furthermore, a function $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ is said to be in the class of $p$-valently close-to-convex functions, denoted by $\mathbb{C}(p)$, if there exists a function $g \in$ $\mathbb{S}^{*}(p)$ such that (see Aouf [3] and Owa [8])

$$
\operatorname{Re} \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{g(z)}>0, z \in \mathbb{U}
$$

Since $g(z)=z^{p} \in \mathbb{S}^{*}(p)$, it follows that a function $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ satisfying

$$
\operatorname{Re} \frac{f^{\prime}(z)}{z^{p-1}}>0, z \in \mathbb{U},
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{f^{\prime}(z)}{z^{p-1}}-p\right|<p, z \in \mathbb{U}, \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

is a member of the class $\mathbb{C}(p)$.
In order to prove our results, we have to recall the following lemma of Jack [4] (generalized by Miller and Mocanu [5, 6]).

Lemma 1.1. Let $\omega$ be a non-constant analytic function in $\mathbb{U}$ with $\omega(0)=$ 0 . If $|\omega|$ attains its maximum value on the circle $|z|=r$ at a point $z_{0} \in \mathbb{U}$, then $z_{0} \omega^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=k \omega\left(z_{0}\right)$ where $k \geq 1$ is a real number.

## 2. Main results

Theorem 2.1. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$, and suppose that it satisfies, for $\gamma \geq 0$, the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{f^{\prime}(z)}{z^{p-1}}-p\right|^{1-\gamma}\left|\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{p z^{p-2}}-(p-1)\right|^{\gamma}<p, z \in \mathbb{U} . \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then (1.3) holds, i.e., $f$ belongs to $\mathbb{C}(p)$ and is a bounded function in $\mathbb{U}$.
Proof. For a function $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ satisfying the assumption (2.1), we define a function $\omega$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega(z):=\frac{1}{p}\left(\frac{f^{\prime}(z)}{z^{p-1}}-p\right), z \in \mathbb{U} . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then $\omega$ is analytic in $\mathbb{U}$ with $\omega(0)=0$. To prove our conclusion (1.3) we will show that $|\omega(z)|<1, z \in \mathbb{U}$.

Differentiating (2.2), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{z^{p-2}}-p(p-1)=p(p-1) \omega(z)+p z \omega^{\prime}(z), z \in \mathbb{U} . \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (2.2) and (2.3) we obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\frac{f^{\prime}(z)}{z^{p-1}}-p\right|^{1-\gamma}\left|\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{z^{p-2}}-p(p-1)\right|^{\gamma} \\
& =|p \omega(z)|^{1-\gamma}\left|p(p-1) \omega(z)+p z \omega^{\prime}(z)\right|^{\gamma}  \tag{2.4}\\
& =p|\omega(z)|\left|p-1+\frac{z \omega^{\prime}(z)}{\omega(z)}\right|^{\gamma}, z \in \mathbb{U} .
\end{align*}
$$

Supposing that there exists a point $z_{0} \in \mathbb{U}$ such that $\max _{|z| \leq\left|z_{0}\right|}|\omega(z)|=$ $\left|\omega\left(z_{0}\right)\right|=1$, from Lemma 1.1 we obtain that $z_{0} \omega^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=k \omega\left(z_{0}\right)$ where $k \geq 1$. Hence, from (2.4) we have

$$
\left|\frac{f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{z_{0}^{p-1}}-p\right|^{1-\gamma}\left|\frac{f^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{z_{0}^{p-2}}-p(p-1)\right|^{\gamma}=p|p-1+k|^{\gamma} \geq p^{\gamma+1}
$$

which contradicts (2.1). Therefore, $|\omega(z)|<1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{U}$, and the conclusion (1.3) has been proved.

Finally, from (1.3) it follows that $\left|f^{\prime}(z)\right| \leq 2 p|z|^{p-1}<2 p, z \in \mathbb{U}$, hence

$$
\begin{gathered}
|f(z)|=\left|\int_{0}^{z} f^{\prime}(\zeta) d \zeta\right| \leq \int_{0}^{r}\left|f^{\prime}\left(\rho e^{i \theta}\right)\right| d \rho \leq 2 p r<2 p \\
z=r e^{i \theta} \in \mathbb{U}, \theta \in[0,2 \pi)
\end{gathered}
$$

Consequently, $f$ is bounded in $\mathbb{U}$.
For the special case $\gamma=1$, Theorem 2.1 reduces to the next result.
Corollary 2.1. If $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ satisfies

$$
\left|\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{p z^{p-2}}-(p-1)\right|<p, z \in \mathbb{U}
$$

then the inequality (1.3) holds, i.e., $f \in \mathbb{C}(p)$ and it is a bounded function in $\mathbb{U}$.

Theorem 2.2. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$, and suppose that $f$ satisfies, for $\gamma \geq 0$, the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{f^{\prime}(z)}{p z^{p-1}}-1\right|^{1-\gamma}\left|1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-p\right|^{\gamma}<\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\gamma}, z \in \mathbb{U} . \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then the inequality (1.3) holds, i.e., $f \in \mathbb{C}(p)$ and it is a bounded function in $\mathbb{U}$.

Proof. For a function $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ satisfying the assumption (2.5), we define a function $\omega$ by (2.2). Then, $\omega$ is analytic in $\mathbb{U}$ with $\omega(0)=0$, and
differentiating (2.2), we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-p=\frac{z \omega^{\prime}(z)}{1+\omega(z)}, z \in \mathbb{U} . \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the assumption (2.5), it follows that the left-hand side of (2.6) is an analytic function in $\mathbb{U}$, hence $\omega(z) \neq-1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{U}$. From (2.2) and (2.6) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{f^{\prime}(z)}{p z^{p-1}}-1\right|^{1-\gamma}\left|1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-p\right|^{\gamma}=|\omega(z)|^{1-\gamma}\left|\frac{z \omega^{\prime}(z)}{1+\omega(z)}\right|^{\gamma}, z \in \mathbb{U} . \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we suppose that there exists a point $z_{0} \in \mathbb{U}$ such that $\max _{|z| \leq\left|z_{0}\right|}|\omega(z)|=$ $\left|\omega\left(z_{0}\right)\right|=1$, from Lemma 1.1 we obtain that $z_{0} \omega^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=k \omega\left(z_{0}\right)$ with $k \geq 1$. Hence, from (2.7) we obtain

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left|\frac{f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{p z_{0}^{p-1}}-1\right|^{1-\gamma}\left|1+\frac{z_{0} f_{0}^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f_{0}^{\prime}(z)}-p\right|^{\gamma}=\left|\omega\left(z_{0}\right)\right|^{1-\gamma}\left|\frac{z \omega^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{1+\omega\left(z_{0}\right)}\right|^{\gamma} \\
=\left|\omega\left(z_{0}\right)\right|\left|\frac{k}{1+\omega\left(z_{0}\right)}\right|^{\gamma} \geq\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\gamma}
\end{gathered}
$$

which contradicts (2.5). Therefore, $|\omega(z)|<1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{U}$, and our conclusion has been proved.

Since under the assumption (2.5) the inequality (1.3) holds, as in the proof of the previous theorem it follows that $f$ is bounded in $\mathbb{U}$.

Putting $\gamma=1$ in Theorem 2.2, we obtain the next special case.
Corollary 2.2. If $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ satisfies

$$
\left|1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-p\right|<\frac{1}{2}, z \in \mathbb{U},
$$

then the inequality (1.3) holds, i.e., $f \in \mathbb{C}(p)$ and it is a bounded function in $\mathbb{U}$.

Remark 2.1. For the special case $p=1$, the above corollary gives us the following criteria for close-to-convexity. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$, then

$$
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right|<\frac{1}{2}, z \in \mathbb{U} \Rightarrow\left|f^{\prime}(z)-1\right|<1, z \in \mathbb{U}
$$

i.e., $f$ lies in $\mathbb{C}(1)$ and is a bounded function in $\mathbb{U}$.

Theorem 2.3. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$, and suppose that it satisfies, for $\gamma \geq 0$, the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-p\right|^{1-\gamma}\left|1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-p\right|^{\gamma}<(p-\alpha)\left(1+\frac{1}{p+|p-2 \alpha|}\right)^{\gamma}, z \in \mathbb{U} . \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, for $\gamma=1$, assume that $f(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \dot{\mathbb{U}}$. Then $f \in \mathbb{S}_{p}^{*}(\alpha)$.
Proof. We have to prove that the assumption (2.8) implies the inequality (1.1). For a function $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ satisfying the assumption (2.8), we define a function $\omega$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}=\frac{p+(p-2 \alpha) \omega(z)}{1-\omega(z)}, z \in \mathbb{U} \quad(0 \leq \alpha<p) \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

We have that $\omega$ is analytic in $\mathbb{U}$ with $\omega(0)=0$, and from the assumption $(2.8)$ it follows that the left-hand side of $(2.9)$ is an analytic function in $\mathbb{U}$, hence $\omega(z) \neq 1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{U}$.

Differentiating (2.9), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-p=\frac{2(p-\alpha) \omega(z)}{1-\omega(z)}\left[1+\frac{\frac{z \omega^{\prime}(z)}{\omega(z)}}{p+(p-2 \alpha) \omega(z)}\right], z \in \mathbb{U} \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then from (2.9) and (2.10) we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-p\right|^{1-\gamma}\left|1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-p\right|^{\gamma} \\
& =2(p-\alpha)\left|\frac{\omega(z)}{1-\omega(z)}\right|\left|1+\frac{\frac{z \omega^{\prime}(z)}{\omega(z)}}{p+(p-2 \alpha) \omega(z)}\right|^{\gamma}, z \in \mathbb{U} \tag{2.11}
\end{align*}
$$

If we suppose that there exists a point $z_{0} \in \mathbb{U}$ such that $\max _{|z|<\left|z_{0}\right|}|\omega(z)|=$ $\left|\omega\left(z_{0}\right)\right|=1$, from Lemma 1.1 we obtain that $z_{0} \omega^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=k \omega\left(z_{0}\right)$ with $k \geq 1$. Therefore, from (2.11) we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\frac{z_{0} f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{f\left(z_{0}\right)}-p\right|^{1-\gamma}\left|1+\frac{z_{0} f^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}-p\right|^{\gamma} \\
& =2(p-\alpha)\left|\frac{\omega\left(z_{0}\right)}{1-\omega\left(z_{0}\right)}\right|\left|1+\frac{\frac{z_{0} \omega^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{\omega\left(z_{0}\right)}}{p+(p-2 \alpha) \omega\left(z_{0}\right)}\right|^{\gamma}  \tag{2.12}\\
& \geq(p-\alpha)\left|1+\frac{k}{p} \frac{1}{1+\left(1-\frac{2 \alpha}{p}\right) w\left(z_{0}\right)}\right|^{\gamma}
\end{align*}
$$

Considering the function $\varphi$ defined by

$$
\varphi(z):=\frac{1}{1+\left(1-\frac{2 \alpha}{p}\right) z}, z \in \mathbb{U}
$$

it is easy to check that $|\varphi(z)|>\frac{p}{p+|p-2 \alpha|}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{U}$. Hence, using the fact that $\gamma \geq 0$, from (2.12) we obtain

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left|\frac{z_{0} f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{f\left(z_{0}\right)}-p\right|^{1-\gamma}\left|1+\frac{z_{0} f^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}-p\right|^{\gamma} \geq(p-\alpha)\left(1+\frac{k}{p} \frac{p}{p+|p-2 \alpha|}\right)^{\gamma} \\
\geq(p-\alpha)\left(1+\frac{1}{p+|p-2 \alpha|}\right)^{\gamma}
\end{gathered}
$$

which contradicts (2.8). This proves that $|\omega(z)|<1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{U}$, and hence $f \in \mathbb{S}_{p}^{*}(\alpha)$.

If we take $\alpha=0$ in Theorem 2.3, then we obtain the next corollary.
Corollary 2.3. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$, and suppose that $f$ satisfies, for $\gamma \geq 0$, the inequality

$$
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-p\right|^{1-\gamma}\left|1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-p\right|^{\gamma}<p\left(\frac{2 p+1}{2 p}\right)^{\gamma}, z \in \mathbb{U} .
$$

Moreover, for $\gamma=1$ assume that $f(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \dot{\mathbb{U}}:=\mathbb{U} \backslash\{0\}$. Then $f \in \mathbb{S}_{p}^{*}$.

For $\gamma=1$, Corollary 2.3 reduces to the next result.
Corollary 2.4. If $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ satisfies the inequality

$$
\left|1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-p\right|<p+\frac{1}{2}, z \in \mathbb{U},
$$

and $f(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{U}$, then $f \in \mathbb{S}_{p}^{*}$.
Taking $p=1$ in Corollaries 2.3 and 2.4, we get the results obtained by Singh and Singh [11, Theorem 3 and Corollary 3].

Putting $p=1$ in Theorem 2.3, we have the following corollary.
Corollary 2.5. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies, for some $\gamma \geq 0$, the inequality

$$
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-1\right|^{1-\gamma}\left|\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right|^{\gamma}<(1-\alpha)\left(1+\frac{1}{1+|1-2 \alpha|}\right)^{\gamma}, z \in \mathbb{U},
$$

and, for $\gamma=1$ we have $f(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \dot{\mathbb{U}}$, then $f \in \mathbb{S}^{*}(\alpha)$.
The above corollary is an improvement of the result obtained by Owa and Srivastava [10, Lemma 3].

Theorem 2.4. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ be such that $f(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \dot{\mathbb{U}}$, and suppose that, for $0 \leq \alpha<p$, the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-p\right|<\frac{(p-\alpha)(2 p+1-\alpha)}{2 p-\alpha}, z \in \mathbb{U} \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

is satisfied. Then,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-p\right|<p-\alpha, z \in \mathbb{U} \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

i.e., $f \in \mathbb{S}_{p}^{*}(\alpha)$.

Proof. Assume that $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$, with $f(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \dot{\mathbb{U}}$, satisfies the inequality (2.13). Define a function $\omega$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}=p+(p-\alpha) \omega(z), z \in \mathbb{U} \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows that $\omega$ is analytic in $\mathbb{U}$ with $\omega(0)=0$. Differentiating (2.15), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-p=(p-\alpha)\left[\omega(z)+\frac{z \omega^{\prime}(z)}{p+(p-\alpha) \omega(z)}\right], z \in \mathbb{U} \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose that there exists a point $z_{0} \in \mathbb{U}$ such that $\max _{|z| \leq\left|z_{0}\right|}|\omega(z)|=\left|\omega\left(z_{0}\right)\right|=$

1. From Lemma 1.1 we obtain that $z_{0} \omega^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=k \omega\left(z_{0}\right)$ with $k \geq 1$, and from (2.16) we obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|1+\frac{z_{0} f^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}-p\right| & =(p-\alpha)\left|\omega\left(z_{0}\right)\right|\left|1+\frac{k}{p+(p-\alpha) \omega\left(z_{0}\right)}\right| \\
& =(p-\alpha)\left|1+\frac{k}{p} \frac{1}{1+\left(1-\frac{\alpha}{p}\right) \omega\left(z_{0}\right)}\right| \tag{2.17}
\end{align*}
$$

If we define a function $\psi$ by

$$
\psi(z):=\frac{1}{1+\left(1-\frac{\alpha}{p}\right) z}, z \in \mathbb{U}
$$

it is easy to check that $|\psi(z)|>\frac{p}{2 p-\alpha}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{U}$. Hence, from (2.17) we obtain that

$$
\left|1+\frac{z_{0} f^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{f^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}-p\right| \geq(p-\alpha)\left|1+\frac{k}{p} \frac{p}{2 p-\alpha}\right| \geq \frac{(p-\alpha)(2 p+1-\alpha)}{2 p-\alpha}
$$

which contradicts (2.13). Thus, we conclude that $|\omega(z)|<1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{U}$, which proves that (2.14) holds.

Remarks 2.1. (i) For the special case $\gamma=1$, Theorem 2.3 reduces to the next implication. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ be such that $f(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \dot{\mathbb{U}}$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}-p\right|<(p-\alpha)\left(1+\frac{1}{p+|p-2 \alpha|}\right), z \in \mathbb{U} \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

implies (1.1).
(ii) Comparing this result with Theorem 2.4, since $\alpha \in[0, p)$, and using the fact that

$$
\frac{(p-\alpha)(2 p+1-\alpha)}{2 p-\alpha} \geq(p-\alpha)\left(1+\frac{1}{p+|p-2 \alpha|}\right) \Leftrightarrow \alpha \in\left[\frac{2 p}{3}, p\right)
$$

we deduce that Theorem 2.4 gives, for the case $\alpha \in[2 p / 3, p)$, a better result than the implication (i).

Theorem 2.5. Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ satisfies, for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\alpha\left(\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-p\right)+(1-\alpha)\left(\frac{z^{2} f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f(z)}-p(p-1)\right)\right|<p[\alpha+(1-\alpha) p], z \in \mathbb{U} \tag{2.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then the inequality (1.3) holds, i.e., $f \in \mathbb{S}_{p}^{*}$.
Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ satisfy the inequality (2.19). Define a function $\omega$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}=p(1+\omega(z)), z \in \mathbb{U} \tag{2.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

The function $\omega$ is analytic in $\mathbb{U}$ with $\omega(0)=0$. Differentiating (2.20), we have

$$
\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}=\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-1+\frac{z \omega^{\prime}(z)}{1+\omega(z)}, z \in \mathbb{U}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z^{2} f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f(z)}-p(p-1)=2 p^{2} \omega(z)+p^{2} \omega^{2}(z)-p \omega(z)+p z \omega^{\prime}(z), z \in \mathbb{U} \tag{2.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (2.20) and (2.21) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \alpha\left(\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-p\right)+(1-\alpha)\left(\frac{z^{2} f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f(z)}-p(p-1)\right) \\
& =p \omega(z)\left\{\alpha+(1-\alpha)\left[2 p-1+\frac{z \omega^{\prime}(z)}{\omega(z)}+p \omega(z)\right]\right\}, z \in \mathbb{U}
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\alpha\left(\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}-p\right)+(1-\alpha)\left(\frac{z^{2} f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f(z)}-p(p-1)\right)\right|  \tag{2.22}\\
& =p|\omega(z)|\left|\alpha+(1-\alpha)\left[2 p-1+\frac{z \omega^{\prime}(z)}{\omega(z)}\right]+(1-\alpha) p \omega(z)\right|, z \in \mathbb{U} .
\end{align*}
$$

We will prove that that $|\omega(z)|<1, z \in \mathbb{U}$. If we suppose that there exists a point $z_{0} \in \mathbb{U}$ such that $\max _{|z| \leq\left|z_{0}\right|}|\omega(z)|=\left|\omega\left(z_{0}\right)\right|=1$, from Lemma 1.1 we get that $z_{0} \omega^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)=k \omega\left(z_{0}\right)$ with $k \geq 1$. Therefore, from (2.22) we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\alpha\left(\frac{z f_{0}^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{f\left(z_{0}\right)}-p\right)+(1-\alpha)\left(\frac{z_{0}^{2} f^{\prime \prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{f\left(z_{0}\right)}-p(p-1)\right)\right| \\
& =p\left|\omega\left(z_{0}\right)\right|\left|\alpha+(1-\alpha)\left[2 p-1+\frac{z_{0} \omega^{\prime}\left(z_{0}\right)}{\omega\left(z_{0}\right)}\right]+(1-\alpha) p \omega\left(z_{0}\right)\right| \\
& \geq p[\alpha+(1-\alpha)(2 p-1+k)-(1-\alpha) p] \geq p[\alpha+(1-\alpha) p],
\end{aligned}
$$

which contradicts (2.19). Concluding, we have $|\omega(z)|<1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{U}$, and hence (1.3) holds.

Putting $\alpha=0$ and $\alpha=1 / 2$ in Theorem 2.5, we obtain, respectively, the following results.

Corollary 2.6. If $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ satisfies

$$
\left|\frac{z^{2} f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f(z)}-p(p-1)\right|<p^{2}, z \in \mathbb{U}
$$

then (1.3) holds, i.e., $f \in \mathbb{S}_{p}^{*}$.
Corollary 2.7. If $f \in \mathcal{A}(p)$ satisfies

$$
\left|\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}+\frac{z^{2} f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f(z)}-p^{2}\right|<p(p+1), z \in \mathbb{U},
$$

then (1.3) holds, i.e., $f \in \mathbb{S}_{p}^{*}$.
Remarks 2.2. (i) Putting $p=1$ in Theorem 2.4, we obtain the result due to Owa [9, Theorem 1].
(ii) Putting $p=\gamma=1$ and $\alpha=0$ in Theorem 2.4, we obtain the result of Singh and Singh [11, Corollary 3].
(iii) Putting $p=1$ in Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.6, we get the results due to Singh and Singh [11, Theorem 4 and Corollary 4].
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