# On $H_{3}(1)$ Hankel determinant for certain subclass of analytic functions 

D. Vamshee Krishna ${ }^{1, \varrho}$, D. Shalini ${ }^{2}$<br>${ }^{1}$ Department of Mathematics, GIS, GITAM University Visakhapatnam- 530 045, A.P., India<br>${ }^{2}$ Department of Mathematics, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar University Srikakulam- 532 410, A.P., India<br>vamsheekrishna1972@gmail.com, shaliniraj1005@gmail.com

Received February 21, 2019
Presented by Manuel Maestre
Accepted September 3, 2019
Abstract: The objective of this paper is to obtain an upper bound to Hankel determinant of third order for any function $f$, when it belongs to certain subclass of analytic functions, defined on the open unit disc in the complex plane.
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## 1. Introduction

Let $A$ denotes the class of analytic functions $f$ 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 also called as Coefficient conjecture, which states that for a univalent function its $n^{t h}$ - Taylor's coefficient is bounded by $n$ (see [4]). The bounds for the coefficients of these functions give information about their geometric properties. For example, the $n^{t h}$-coefficient gives information about the area where as the second coefficient of functions in the family $S$ yields the growth and distortion properties of the function. A typical problem in geometric function theory is to study a functional made up of combinations of the coefficients of the original function. The Hankel determinant of $f$ for
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$q \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$ was defined by Pommerenke [20], which has been investigated by many authors, as follows.
\[

H_{q}(n)=\left|$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
a_{n} & a_{n+1} & \cdots & a_{n+q-1}  \tag{1.2}\\
a_{n+1} & a_{n+2} & \cdots & a_{n+q} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
a_{n+q-1} & a_{n+q} & \cdots & a_{n+2 q-2}
\end{array}
$$\right|
\]

It is worth of citing some of them. Ehrenborg [7] studied the Hankel determinant of exponential polynomials. Noor [18] determined the rate of growth of $H_{q}(n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for the functions in $S$ with bounded boundary rotation. The Hankel transform of an integer sequence and some of its properties were discussed by Layman (see [13]). It is observed that $H_{2}(1)$, the FeketeSzegö functional is the classical problem settled by Fekete-Szegö [8] is to find for each $\lambda \in[0,1]$, the maximum value of the coefficient functional, defined by $\phi_{\lambda}(f):=\left|a_{3}-\lambda a_{2}^{2}\right|$ over the class $S$ and was proved by using Loewner method. Ali [1 found sharp bounds on the first four coefficients and sharp estimate for the Fekete-Szegö functional $\left|\gamma_{3}-t \gamma_{2}^{2}\right|$, where $t$ is real, for the inverse function of $f$ defined as $f^{-1}(w)=w+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \gamma_{n} w^{n}$ when $f^{-1} \in \widetilde{S T}(\alpha)$, the class of strongly starlike functions of order $\alpha(0<\alpha \leq 1)$. In recent years, the research on Hankel determinants has focused on the estimation of $\left|H_{2}(2)\right|$, where

$$
H_{2}(2)=\left|\begin{array}{ll}
a_{2} & a_{3} \\
a_{3} & a_{4}
\end{array}\right|=a_{2} a_{4}-a_{3}^{2}
$$

known as the second Hankel determinant obtained for $q=2$ and $n=2$ in (1.2). Many authors obtained an upper bound to the functional $\left|a_{2} a_{4}-a_{3}^{2}\right|$ for various subclasses of univalent and multivalent analytic functions. It is worth citing a few of them. The exact (sharp) estimates of $\left|H_{2}(2)\right|$ for the subclasses of $S$ namely, bounded turning, starlike and convex functions denoted by $\mathcal{R}$, $S^{*}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ respectively in the open unit disc $E$, that is, functions satisfying the conditions $\operatorname{Re} f^{\prime}(z)>0, \operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)}\right\}>0$ and $\operatorname{Re}\left\{1+\frac{z f^{\prime \prime}(z)}{f^{\prime}(z)}\right\}>0$ were proved by Janteng et al. [11, [10] and determined the bounds as 4/9, 1 and $1 / 8$ respectively. For the class $S^{*}(\psi)$ of Ma-Minda starlike functions, the exact bound of the second Hankel determinant was obtained by Lee et al. [15]. Choosing $q=2$ and $n=p+1$ in (1.2), we obtain the second Hankel determinant for the $p$-valent function (see [24]), as follows.

$$
H_{2}(p+1)=\left|\begin{array}{cc}
a_{p+1} & a_{p+2} \\
a_{p+2} & a_{p+3}
\end{array}\right|=a_{p+1} a_{p+3}-a_{p+2}^{2}
$$

The case $q=3$ appears to be much more difficult than the case $q=2$. Very few papers have been devoted to the third order Hankel determinant denoted by $H_{3}(1)$, obtained for $q=3$ and $n=1$ in (1.2), also called as Hankel determinant of third kind, namely

$$
H_{3}(1)=\left|\begin{array}{lll}
a_{1} & a_{2} & a_{3} \\
a_{2} & a_{3} & a_{4} \\
a_{3} & a_{4} & a_{5}
\end{array}\right|\left(a_{1}=1\right)
$$

Expanding the determinant, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{3}(1)=a_{1}\left(a_{3} a_{5}-a_{4}^{2}\right)+a_{2}\left(a_{3} a_{4}-a_{2} a_{5}\right)+a_{3}\left(a_{2} a_{4}-a_{3}^{2}\right) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

equivalently

$$
H_{3}(1)=H_{2}(3)+a_{2} J_{2}+a_{3} H_{2}(2)
$$

where $J_{2}=\left(a_{3} a_{4}-a_{2} a_{5}\right)$ and $H_{2}(3)=\left(a_{3} a_{5}-a_{4}^{2}\right)$.
Babalola [2] is the first one, who tried to estimate an upper bound for $\left|H_{3}(1)\right|$ for the classes $\mathcal{R}, S^{*}$ and $\mathcal{K}$. As a result of this paper, Raza and Malik [22] obtained an upper bound to the third Hankel determinant for a class of analytic functions related with lemniscate of Bernoulli. Sudharsan et al. [23] derived an upper bound to the third kind Hankel determinant for a subclass of analytic functions. Bansal et al. [3] improved the upper bound for $\left|H_{3}(1)\right|$ for some of the classes estimated by Babalola [2] to some extent. Recently, Zaprawa [25] improved all the results obtained by Babalola [2]. Further, Orhan and Zaprawa [19] obtained an upper bound to the third kind Hankel determinant for the classes $S^{*}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ functions of order alpha. Very recently, Kowalczyk et al. [12] calculated sharp upper bound to $\left|H_{3}(1)\right|$ for the class of convex functions $\mathcal{K}$ and showed as $\left|H_{3}(1)\right| \leq \frac{4}{135}$, which is far better than the bound obtained by Zaprawa [25]. Lecko et al. [14] determined sharp bound to the third order Hankel determinant for starlike functions of order $1 / 2$. Motivated by the results obtained by different authors mentioned above and who are working in this direction (see [5]), in this paper, we are making an attempt to obtain an upper bound to the functional $\left|H_{3}(1)\right|$ for the function $f$ belonging to the class, defined as follows.

Definition 1.1. A function $f(z) \in A$ is said to be in the class $Q(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ with $\alpha, \beta>0$ and $0 \leq \gamma<\alpha+\beta \leq 1$, if it satisfies the condition that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\left\{\alpha \frac{f(z)}{z}+\beta f^{\prime}(z)\right\} \geq \gamma, \quad z \in E \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

This class was considered and studied by Zhi- Gang Wang et al. [26].
In obtaining our results, we require a few sharp estimates in the form of lemmas valid for functions with positive real part.

Let $\mathscr{P}$ denotes the class of functions consisting of $g$, such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(z)=1+c_{1} z+c_{2} z^{2}+c_{3} z^{3}+\cdots=1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_{n} z^{n} \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

which are analytic in $E$ and $\operatorname{Re} g(z)>0$ for $z \in E$. Here $g$ is called the Caratheodòry function [6].

Lemma 1.2. ([9]) If $g \in \mathscr{P}$, then the sharp estimate $\left|c_{k}-\mu c_{k} c_{n-k}\right| \leq 2$, holds for $n, k \in \mathbb{N}=\{1,2,3, \ldots\}$, with $n>k$ and $\mu \in[0,1]$.

Lemma 1.3. ([17]) If $g \in \mathscr{P}$, then the sharp estimate $\left|c_{k}-c_{k} c_{n-k}\right| \leq 2$, holds for $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$, with $n>k$.

Lemma 1.4. ([21]) If $g \in \mathscr{P}$ then $\left|c_{k}\right| \leq 2$, for each $k \geq 1$ and the inequality is sharp for the function $g(z)=\frac{1+z}{1-z}, z \in E$.

In order to obtain our result, we refer to the classical method devised by Libera and Zlotkiewicz [16], used by several authors.

## 2. MAIN RESULT

ThEOREM 2.1. If $f(z)=z+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n} \in Q(\alpha, \beta, \gamma),(\alpha, \beta>0$ and $0 \leq \gamma<\alpha+\beta \leq 1)$ then

$$
\left|H_{3}(1)\right| \leq 4 t_{1}^{2}\left[\frac{k_{1} \alpha^{6}+k_{2} \alpha^{5}+k_{3} \alpha^{4} \beta+k_{4} \alpha^{3} \beta^{2}+k_{5} \alpha^{2} \beta^{3}+k_{6} \alpha \beta^{4}+k_{7} \beta^{5}}{(\alpha+2 \beta)^{2}(\alpha+3 \beta)^{3}(\alpha+4 \beta)^{2}(\alpha+5 \beta)}\right]
$$

where $k_{1}=2, k_{2}=2(18 \beta+1), k_{3}=2(132 \beta+15), k_{4}=2(511 \beta+87)$, $k_{5}=(2179 \beta+490), k_{6}=12(203 \beta+56), k_{7}=12(93 \beta+30)$ and $t_{1}=(\alpha+\beta-\gamma)$.

Proof. Let $f(z)=z+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n} \in Q(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$. By virtue of Definition 1.1, there exists an analytic function $g \in \mathscr{P}$ in the open unit disc $E$ with $g(0)=1$ and $\operatorname{Re}\{g(z)\}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\alpha+\beta-\gamma}\left\{\alpha \frac{f(z)}{z}+\beta f^{\prime}(z)-\gamma\right\}=g(z) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the series representation for $f$ and $g$ in (2.1), upon simplification, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(\alpha+n \beta) a_{n} z^{n-2}=(\alpha+\beta-\gamma) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_{n} z^{n-1} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The coefficient of $z^{t-2}$, where $t$ is an integer with $t \geq 2$ in (2.2) is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{t}=\frac{(\alpha+\beta-\gamma) c_{t-1}}{(\alpha+t \beta)}, \text { with } t \geq 2 \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting the values of $a_{2}, a_{3}, a_{4}$ and $a_{5}$ from (2.3) in the functional given in (1.3), it simplifies to

$$
\begin{align*}
H_{3}(1)= & (\alpha+\beta-\gamma)^{2}\left[\frac{c_{2} c_{4}}{(\alpha+3 \beta)(\alpha+5 \beta)}-\frac{(\alpha+\beta-\gamma) c_{2}^{3}}{(\alpha+3 \beta)^{3}}-\frac{c_{3}^{2}}{(\alpha+4 \beta)^{2}}\right.  \tag{2.4}\\
& \left.-\frac{(\alpha+\beta-\gamma) c_{1}^{2} c_{4}}{(\alpha+2 \beta)^{2}(\alpha+5 \beta)}+\frac{2(\alpha+\beta-\gamma) c_{1} c_{2} c_{3}}{(\alpha+2 \beta)(\alpha+3 \beta)(\alpha+4 \beta)}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

On grouping the terms in the expression (2.4), in order to apply the lemmas, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
H_{3}(1)= & t_{1}^{2}\left[\frac{c_{4}\left(c_{2}-t_{1} c_{1}^{2}\right)}{(\alpha+2 \beta)^{2}(\alpha+5 \beta)}-\frac{c_{3}}{(\alpha+4 \beta)^{2}}\left\{c_{3}-\frac{t_{1}(\alpha+4 \beta) c_{1} c_{2}}{(\alpha+2 \beta)(\alpha+3 \beta)}\right\}\right.  \tag{2.5}\\
& +\frac{c_{2}\left(c_{4}-t_{1} c_{2}^{2}\right)}{(\alpha+3 \beta)^{3}}-\frac{c_{2}}{(\alpha+3 \beta)(\alpha+4 \beta)^{2}}\left\{c_{4}-\frac{t_{1}(\alpha+4 \beta) c_{1} c_{3}}{(\alpha+2 \beta)(\alpha+4 \beta)}\right\} \\
& \left.+\frac{\left(d_{1} \alpha^{6}+d_{2} \alpha^{5}+d_{3} \alpha^{4} \beta+d_{4} \alpha^{3} \beta^{2}+d_{5} \alpha^{2} \beta^{3}+d_{6} \alpha \beta^{4}+d_{7} \beta^{5}\right) c_{2} c_{4}}{(\alpha+2 \beta)^{2}(\alpha+3 \beta)^{3}(\alpha+4 \beta)^{2}(\alpha+5 \beta)}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

with $d_{1}=1, d_{2}=(18 \beta-1), d_{3}=(133 \beta-19), d_{4}=4(129 \beta-35), d_{5}=$ $2(554 \beta-249), d_{6}=8(156 \beta-107), d_{7}=4(144 \beta-143)$ and $t_{1}=(\alpha+\beta-\gamma)$. On applying the triangle inequality in (2.5), we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|H_{3}(1)\right| \leq t_{1}^{2}\left[\frac{\left|c_{4}\right|\left|\left(c_{2}-t_{1} c_{1}^{2}\right)\right|}{(\alpha+2 \beta)^{2}(\alpha+5 \beta)}+\frac{\left|c_{3}\right|}{(\alpha+4 \beta)^{2}}\left|c_{3}-\frac{t_{1}(\alpha+4 \beta) c_{1} c_{2}}{(\alpha+2 \beta)(\alpha+3 \beta)}\right|\right. \\
& \quad+\frac{\left|c_{2}\right|\left|\left(c_{4}-t_{1} c_{2}^{2}\right)\right|}{(\alpha+3 \beta)^{3}}+\frac{\left|c_{2}\right|}{(\alpha+3 \beta)(\alpha+4 \beta)^{2}}\left|c_{4}-\frac{t_{1}(\alpha+4 \beta) c_{1} c_{3}}{(\alpha+2 \beta)(\alpha+4 \beta)}\right| \quad(2.6  \tag{2.6}\\
& \left.\quad+\frac{\left|d_{1} \alpha^{6}+d_{2} \alpha^{5}+d_{3} \alpha^{4} \beta+d_{4} \alpha^{3} \beta^{2}+d_{5} \alpha^{2} \beta^{3}+d_{6} \alpha \beta^{4}+d_{7} \beta^{5} \| c_{2}\right|\left|c_{4}\right|}{(\alpha+2 \beta)^{2}(\alpha+3 \beta)^{3}(\alpha+4 \beta)^{2}(\alpha+5 \beta)}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

Upon using the lemmas given in (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4) in the inequality (2.6), it simplifies to

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|H_{3}(1)\right| \\
& \leq 4 t_{1}^{2}\left[\frac{k_{1} \alpha^{6}+k_{2} \alpha^{5}+k_{3} \alpha^{4} \beta+k_{4} \alpha^{3} \beta^{2}+k_{5} \alpha^{2} \beta^{3}+k_{6} \alpha \beta^{4}+k_{7} \beta^{5}}{(\alpha+2 \beta)^{2}(\alpha+3 \beta)^{3}(\alpha+4 \beta)^{2}(\alpha+5 \beta)}\right] \tag{2.7}
\end{align*}
$$

with $k_{1}=2, k_{2}=2(18 \beta+1), k_{3}=2(132 \beta+15), k_{4}=2(511 \beta+87), k_{5}=$ $(2179 \beta+490), k_{6}=12(203 \beta+56), k_{7}=12(93 \beta+30)$ and $t_{1}=(\alpha+\beta-\gamma)$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

Remark 2.2. For the values $\alpha=1-\sigma, \beta=\sigma, \gamma=0$, so that $(\alpha+\beta-\gamma)=1$ in (2.7), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|H_{3}(1)\right| \leq 4\left[\frac{63 \sigma^{6}+312 \sigma^{5}+411 \sigma^{4}+414 \sigma^{3}+188 \sigma^{2}+44 \sigma+4}{(1+\sigma)^{2}(1+2 \sigma)^{3}(1+3 \sigma)^{2}(1+4 \sigma)}\right] \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 2.3. Choosing $\sigma=1$ in the expression (2.8), it coincides with the result obtained by Zaprawa [25].
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