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#### Abstract

In this investigation, we obtain some applications of first order differential subordination and superordination results involving an extended multiplier transformation and other linear operators for certain normalized analytic functions. Some of our results improve previous results.
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## 1. Introduction

Let $H(U)$ be the class of functions analytic in the open unit disk $U=\{z:|z|<1\}$. Let $H[a, k]$ be the subclass of $H(U)$ consisting of functions of the form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=a+a_{n} z^{n}+a_{n+1} 1^{n+1}+\cdots(a \in c) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

For simplicity, let $H[a]=H[a, 1]$. Also, let $A$ be the subclass of $H(U)$ consisting of functions of the form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=z+a_{2} z^{2}+\cdots \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $f, g \in H(U)$, we say that $f$ is subordinate to $g$ written $f(z) \prec g(z)$ if there exists Schwarz function $w(z)$, which (by definition) is analytic in $U$ with $w(0)=0$ and $|w(z)|<1$ for all $z \in U$, such that $f(z)=g(w(z)), z \in U$. Furthermore, if the function $g(z)$ is univalent in $U$, then we have the following equivalence , (cf., e.g. [1,2]; see also [3]):
We denote this subordination by

$$
f(z) \prec g(z)(z \in U) \Leftrightarrow f(0)=g(0)
$$

and $f(U) \subset g(U)$.
Let $p, h \in H(U)$ and let $\phi(r, s, t ; z): C^{3} \times U \rightarrow C$. If $p$ and $\phi\left(p(z), z p^{\prime}(z), z^{2} p^{\prime \prime}(z) ; z\right)$ are univalent and if $p$ satisfies the second-order superordination

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(z) \prec \phi\left(p(z), z p^{\prime}(z), z^{2} p^{\prime \prime}(z) ; z\right), \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $p$ is a solution of the differential superordination (1.3). Note that if $f$ is subordinate to $g$, then $g$ is superordinate to $f$. An analytic function $q$ is called a subordinant if $q(z) \prec p(z)$ for all $p$ satisfying (1.3). A univalent subordinant $\tilde{q}$ that satisfies $q \prec \tilde{q}$ for all
subordinants of (1.3) is called the best subordinant. Recently Miller and Mocanu [4] obtained conditions on the functions $h, q$ and $\phi$ for which the following implication holds:

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(z) \prec \varphi\left(p(z), z p^{\prime}(z), z^{2} p^{\prime \prime}(z) ; z\right) \Rightarrow q(z) \prec p(z) . \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the results of Miller and Mocanu [4], Bulboaca [5] considered certain classes of first-order differential superordinations as well as superordination-preserving integral operators [6]. Ali et al. [7] have used the results of Bulboaca [5] and obtained sufficient conditions for normalized analytic functions $f$ to satisfy:

$$
q_{1}(z) \prec \frac{z f^{\prime}(z)}{f(z)} \prec q_{2}(z),
$$

where $q_{1}$ and $q_{2}$ are given univalent functions in $U$. Also, Tuneski [8] obtained a sufficient condition for starlikeness of $f$ in terms of the quantity $\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(z) f(z)}{\left\{f^{\prime}(z)\right\}^{2}}$. Recently Shanmugam et al. [9] obtained sufficient conditions for a normalized analytic functions $f$ to satisfy

$$
q_{1}(z) \prec \frac{f(z)}{z f^{\prime}(z)} \prec q_{2}(z)
$$

and

$$
q_{1}(z) \prec \frac{z^{2} f^{\prime}(z)}{\{f(z)\}^{2}} \prec q_{2}(z)
$$

Many essentially equivalent definitions of multiplier transformation have been given in literature (see [10-12].

In [13] Catas defined the operator $I^{m}(\lambda, \ell)$ as follows:
Definition 1.1. [13] Let the function $f(z) \in A$. For $m \in N_{0}=N \cup\{0\}$, where $N=\{1,2, \cdots\}, \lambda \geq 0, \ell \geq 0$. The extended multiplier transformation $I^{m}(\lambda, \ell)$ on $A$ is defined by the following infinite series:

$$
\begin{equation*}
I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)=z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left[\frac{1+\lambda(k-1)+\ell}{1+\ell}\right]^{m} a_{k} z^{k} \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows form (1.5) that $I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)=f(z)$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \lambda z\left(I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right)^{\prime} \\
& =(1+\ell) I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)  \tag{1.6}\\
& \quad-(1-\lambda+\ell) I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)(\lambda>0)
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& I^{m_{1}}(\lambda, \ell)\left(I^{m_{2}}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right) \\
& =I^{m_{1}+m_{2}}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)  \tag{1.7}\\
& =I^{m_{2}}(\lambda, \ell)\left(I^{m_{1}}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

for all integers $m_{1}$ and $m_{2}$. We note that:

1) $I^{m}(\lambda, 0) f(z)=D_{\lambda}^{m} f(z) \quad$ (see [14]);
2) $I^{m}(1,0) f(z)=D^{m} f(z)$ (see [15]);
3) $I^{m}(1, \ell) f(z)=I^{m}(\ell) f(z)$ (see $\left.[10,11]\right)$;
4) $I^{m}(1,1) f(z)=I^{m} f(z)$ (see [12]).

Also if $f(z) \in A$, then we can write

$$
I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)=\left(f * \varphi_{\lambda, \ell}^{m}\right)(z)
$$

where

$$
\varphi_{\lambda, \ell}^{m}(z)=z+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left[\frac{1+\lambda(k-1)+\ell}{1+\ell}\right]^{m} z^{k}
$$

In this paper, we obtain sufficient conditions for the normalized analytic function $f$ defined by using an extended multiplier transformation $I^{m}(\lambda, \ell)$ to satisfy:

$$
q_{1}(z) \prec \frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \prec q_{2}(z)
$$

and

$$
q_{1}(z) \prec \frac{z I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \prec q_{2}(z)
$$

and $q_{1}$ and $q_{2}$ are given univalent functions in $U$.

## 2. Definitions and Preliminaries

In order to prove our results, we shall make use of the following known results.

Definition 2.1. [4]

Denote by $Q$ the set of all functions $f$ that are analytic and injective on $\bar{U}-E(f)$ where

$$
E(f)=\left\{\xi \in \partial U: \lim _{z \rightarrow \xi} f(z)=\infty\right\}
$$

and are such that $f^{\prime}(\varsigma) \neq 0$ for $\xi \in \partial U-E(f)$.

## Lemma 2.1. [4]

Let the function $q$ be univalent in the open unit disc $U$ and $\theta$ and $\phi$ be analytic in a domain $D$ containing $q(U)$ with $\phi(w) \neq 0$ when $w \in q(U)$. Set

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi(z)=z q^{\prime}(z) \phi(q(z)), h(z)=\theta(q(z))+\psi(z) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose that

1) $\psi(z)$ is starlike univalent in $U$,
2) $\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{z h^{\prime}(z)}{\psi(z)}\right)>0$ for $z \in U$.

If $p$ is analytic with $p(0)=q(0), \quad p(U) \subseteq D$ and $\theta(p(z))+z p^{\prime}(z) \phi(p(z)) \prec \theta(q(z))+z q^{\prime}(z) \phi(p(z))$,
then $p \prec q$ and $q$ is the best dominant. Taking
$\theta(w)=\alpha w$ and $\varphi(w)=\gamma$ in lemma 1, Shanmugam et al. [9] obtained the following lemma.

## Lemma 2.2. [2]

Let $q$ be univalent in $U$ with $q(0)=1$. Let $\alpha \in C ; \gamma \in C^{*}=C \backslash\{0\}$, further assume that

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left\{1+\frac{z q^{\prime \prime}(z)}{q^{\prime}(z)}\right\}>\max \{0,-\operatorname{Re}(\alpha / \gamma)\}
$$

If $p$ is analytic in $U$, and

$$
\alpha p(z)+\gamma z p^{\prime}(z) \prec \alpha q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z),
$$

then $p \prec q$ and $q$ is the best dominant.
Lemma 2.3. [5]
Let the function $q$ be univalent in the open unit disc $U$ and $\vartheta$ and $\phi$ be analytic in a domain $D$ containing $q(U)$ Suppose that

1) $\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\vartheta^{\prime}(q(z))}{\phi(q(z))}\right)>0$ for $z \in U$ and
2) $\psi(z)=z q^{\prime}(z) \phi(q(z))$ is starlike univalent in $U$. If $p \in H[q(0), 1] \cap Q$, with $p(U) \subseteq D$,
$\vartheta(p(z))+z p^{\prime}(z) \phi(p(z))$, is univalent in $U$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\vartheta(q(z))+z q^{\prime}(z) \phi(q(z)) \prec \vartheta(p(z))+z p^{\prime}(z) \phi(p(z)) \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $q \prec p$ and $q$ is the best subordinant.
Taking $\theta(w)=\alpha w$ and $\varphi(w)=\gamma$ in Lemma 2.3, Shanmugam et al. [9] obtained the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4. [2]
Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U, q(0)=1$. Let
$\alpha \in C, \gamma \in C^{*}=C \backslash\{0\}$, and $\operatorname{Re}\{\alpha / \gamma\}>0$. If $p \in H[q(0), 1] \cap Q, \quad \alpha p(z)+\gamma z p^{\prime}(z)$ is univalent in $U$ and $\alpha q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z) \prec \alpha p(z)+\gamma z p^{\prime}(z)$, then $q \prec p$ and $q$ is the best subordinant.

## 3. Applications to an Extended Multiplier Transformation and Sandwich Theorems

## Theorem 3.1.

Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U$ with $q(0)=1$, $\gamma \in C^{*}$. Further, assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\left\{1+\frac{z q^{\prime \prime}(z)}{q^{\prime}(z)}\right\}>\max \{0,-\operatorname{Re}(1 / \gamma)\} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $f \in A, \quad I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z) \neq 0$ for $0<|z|<1$, and

$$
\begin{align*}
& \gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right)+\frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \\
& -\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{I^{2(m+1)}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}  \tag{3.2}\\
& \prec q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z),
\end{align*}
$$

then

$$
\frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \prec q(z)
$$

and $q$ is the best dominant.
Proof. Define a function $p$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
p(z)=\frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \quad(z \in U) \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then the function $p$ is analytic in $U$ and $p(0)=1$. Therefore, differentiating (3.3) logarithmically with respect to $z$ and using the identity (1.6) in the resulting equation, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right)+\frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \\
& -\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{I^{2(m+1)}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \\
& =p(z)+\gamma z p^{\prime}(z)
\end{aligned}
$$

that is,

$$
p(z)+\gamma z p^{\prime}(z) \prec q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z)
$$

and therefore, the theorem follows by applying Lemma 2.2.

Putting

$$
q(z)=(1+A z) /(1+B z) \quad(-1 \leq B<A \leq 1)
$$

in Theorem 3.1, we have the following corollary.

## Corollary 3.1.

If $f(z) \in A$ and $\gamma \in C^{*}$ satisfy

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right)+\frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \\
& -\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{I^{2(m+1)}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \\
& \prec \gamma \frac{(A-B) z}{(1+B z)^{2}}+\frac{1+A z}{1+B z}
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
\frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \prec \frac{1+A z}{1+B z}
$$

Putting $A=1, B=-1$ and $q(z)=\frac{1+z}{1-z}$ in Corollary

## 3.1, we have

## Corollary 3.2.

If $f(z) \in A$ and $\gamma \in C^{*}$ satisfy

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right)+\frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \\
& -\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{I^{2(m+1)}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \\
& \prec \frac{2 \gamma z}{(1-z)^{2}}+\frac{1+z}{1-z},
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}\right\}>0
$$

Taking $\ell=0$, in Theorem 1, we have
Corollary 3.3.
Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U$ with $q(0)=1$, $\gamma \in C^{*}$. Further, assume that (3.1) holds. If $f \in A$, and

$$
\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}+\frac{D_{\lambda}^{m} f(z)}{D_{\lambda}^{m+1} f(z)}-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda} \frac{D_{\lambda}^{2(m+1)} f(z)}{\left\{D_{\lambda}^{m+1} f(z)\right\}^{2}} \prec q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z)
$$

then

$$
\frac{D_{\lambda}^{m} f(z)}{D_{\lambda}^{m+1} f(z)} \prec q(z)
$$

and $q$ is the best dominant.
Taking $\lambda=1, \ell=0$, in Theorem 3.1, we have

## Corollary 3.4.

Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U$ with $q(0)=1$, $\gamma \in C^{*}$. Further, assume that (3.1) holds. If $f \in A$, and

$$
\gamma+\frac{D^{m} f(z)}{D^{m+1} f(z)}-\gamma \frac{D^{2(m+1)} f(z)}{\left\{D^{m+1} f(z)\right\}^{2}} \prec q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z)
$$

then

$$
\frac{D^{m} f(z)}{D^{m+1} f(z)} \prec q(z)
$$

and $q$ is the best dominant.
Taking $\lambda=1$, in Theorem 3.1, we have
Corollary 3.5.
Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U$ with $q(0)=1$, $\gamma \in C^{*}$. Further, assume that (3.1) holds. If $f \in A$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \gamma(1+\ell)+\frac{I^{m}(\ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\ell) f(z)} \\
& -\gamma(1+\ell) \frac{I^{2(m+1)}(\ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m+1}(\ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \\
& \prec q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z),
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
\frac{I^{m}(\ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\ell) f(z)} \prec q(z)
$$

and $q$ is the best dominant.
Taking $\lambda=1, \ell=1$, in Theorem 1, we have
Corollary 3.6.
Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U$ with $q(0)=1$, $\gamma \in C^{*}$. Further, assume that (3.1) holds. If $f \in A$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2 \gamma+\frac{I^{m} f(z)}{I^{m+1} f(z)}-2 \gamma \frac{I^{2(m+1)} f(z)}{\left\{I^{m+1} f(z)\right\}^{2}} \\
& \prec q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z),
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
\frac{I^{m} f(z)}{I^{m+1} f(z)} \prec q(z)
$$

and $q$ is the best dominant.
Now, by appealing to Lemma 2.4 it can be easily prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2.
Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U$. Let $\gamma \in C$ with $\operatorname{Re} \gamma>0$.

$$
\text { If } \begin{aligned}
f \in A, & \frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \in H[1,1] \cap Q \\
& \gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right)+\frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \\
& -\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{I^{2(m+1)}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

is univalent in $U$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z) \prec & \prec\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right)+\frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \\
& -\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{I^{2(m+1)}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
q(z) \prec \frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}
$$

and $q$ is the best subordinant.
Taking $\ell=0$, in Theorem 3.2, we have

## Corollary 3.7.

Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U$. Let $\gamma \in C$ with $\operatorname{Re} \gamma>0$.

$$
\text { If } f \in A, \frac{D_{\lambda}^{m} f(z)}{D_{\lambda}^{m+1} f(z)} \in H[1,1] \cap Q
$$

$$
\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}+\frac{D_{\lambda}^{m} f(z)}{D_{\lambda}^{m+1} f(z)}-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda} \frac{D_{\lambda}^{2(m+1)} f(z)}{\left\{D_{\lambda}^{m+1} f(z)\right\}^{2}}
$$

is univalent in $U$, and

$$
q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z) \prec \frac{\gamma}{\lambda}+\frac{D_{\lambda}^{m} f(z)}{D_{\lambda}^{m+1} f(z)}-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda} \frac{D_{\lambda}^{2(m+1)} f(z)}{\left\{D_{\lambda}^{m+1} f(z)\right\}^{2}}
$$

then

$$
q(z) \prec \frac{D_{\lambda}^{m} f(z)}{D_{\lambda}^{m+1} f(z)}
$$

and $q$ is the best subordinant.
Taking $\lambda=1, \ell=0$, in Theorem 3.2, we have

## Corollary 3.8.

Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U$. Let $\gamma \in C$ with $\operatorname{Re} \gamma>0$.
If $f \in A, \frac{D^{m} f(z)}{D^{m+1} f(z)} \in H[1,1] \cap Q$,

$$
\gamma+\frac{D^{m} f(z)}{D^{m+1} f(z)}-\gamma \frac{D^{2(m+1)} f(z)}{\left\{D^{m+1} f(z)\right\}^{2}}
$$

is univalent in $U$, and

$$
q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z) \prec \gamma+\frac{D^{m} f(z)}{D^{m+1} f(z)}-\gamma \frac{D^{2(m+1)} f(z)}{\left\{D^{m+1} f(z)\right\}^{2}}
$$

then

$$
q(z) \prec \frac{D^{m} f(z)}{D^{m+1} f(z)}
$$

and $q$ is the best subordinant.
Taking $\lambda=1$, in Theorem 3.2, we have

## Corollary 3.9.

Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U$. Let $\gamma \in C$ with $\operatorname{Re} \gamma>0$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { If } f \in A, \frac{I^{m}(\ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\ell) f(z)} \in H[1,1] \cap Q \\
& \gamma(1+\ell)+\frac{I^{m}(\ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\ell) f(z)}-\gamma(1+\ell) \frac{I^{2(m+1)}(\ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m+1}(\ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

is univalent in $U$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
q(z)+\gamma z q(z) & \prec \gamma(1+\ell)+\frac{I^{m}(\ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\ell) f(z)} \\
& -\gamma(1+\ell) \frac{I^{2(m+1)}(\ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m+1}(\ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
q(z) \prec \frac{I^{m}(\ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\ell) f(z)}
$$

and $q$ is the best subordinant.
Taking $\lambda=1, \ell=1$, in Theorem 3.2, we have

## Corollary 3.10.

Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U$. Let $\gamma \in C$ with $\operatorname{Re} \gamma>0$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { If } f \in A, \frac{I^{m} f(z)}{I^{m+1} f(z)} \in H[1,1] \cap Q \\
& \\
& \quad 2 \gamma+\frac{I^{m} f(z)}{I^{m+1} f(z)}-2 \gamma \frac{I^{2(m+1)} f(z)}{\left\{I^{m+1} f(z)\right\}^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

is univalent in $U$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z) \\
& \prec 2 \gamma+\frac{I^{m} f(z)}{I^{m+1} f(z)}-2 \gamma \frac{I^{2(m+1)} f(z)}{\left\{I^{m+1} f(z)\right\}^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
q(z) \prec \frac{I^{m} f(z)}{I^{m+1} f(z)}
$$

and $q$ is the best subordinant.
Combining Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 , we get the following sandwich theorem.

## Theorem 3.3.

Let $q_{1}$ be convex univalent in $U, \gamma \in C$ with $\operatorname{Re} \gamma>0, \quad q_{2}$ be univalent in $U, \quad q_{2}(0)=1$ and satisfies (3.1). If $f \in A$,

$$
\frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \in H[1,1] \cap Q
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right)+\frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \\
& -\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{I^{2(m+1)}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

is univalent in $U$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& q_{1}(z)+\gamma z q_{1}^{\prime}(z) \prec \gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right)+\frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \\
& -\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{I^{2(m+1)}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \prec q_{2}(z)+\gamma z q_{2}^{\prime}(z),
\end{aligned}
$$

Then

$$
q_{1}(z) \prec \frac{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)} \prec q_{2}(z)
$$

and $q_{1}$ and $q_{2}$ are respectively, the best subordinant and the best dominant.

## 4. Remarks

Combining: 1) Corollary 3.3 and Corollary 3.7; 2) Corollary 3.4 and Corollary 3.8 ; 3) Corollary 3.5 and Corollary 3.9 ; 4) Corollary 3.6 and Corollary 3.10 , we obtain similar sandwich theorems for the corresponding operators.

## Theorem 3.4.

Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U, \gamma \in C^{*}$. Further, assume that (3.1) holds.

If $f \in A$ satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[1+\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right)\right] \frac{z I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}} \\
& +\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{z I^{m+2}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \\
& -2 \gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{z\left\{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell)\right\}^{2}}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{3}} \\
& \prec q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z),
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
\frac{z I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \prec q(z)
$$

and $q$ is the best dominant.
Proof. Define the function $p(z)$ by

$$
p(z)=\frac{z I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}(z \in U) .
$$

Then, simple computations show that

$$
\begin{aligned}
p(z)+\gamma z p^{\prime}(z) & =\left[1+\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right)\right] \frac{z I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \\
& +\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{z I^{m+2}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \\
& -2 \gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{z\left\{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{3}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying Lemma 2, the theorem follows.
Taking $\ell=0$, in Theorem 3.4, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.11.
Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U, \gamma \in C^{*}$. Further, assume that (3.1) holds. If $f \in A$ satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[1+\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}\right] \frac{z D_{\lambda}^{m+1} f(z)}{\left\{D_{\lambda}^{m} f(z)\right\}^{2}}+\frac{\gamma}{\lambda} \frac{z D_{\lambda}^{m+2} f(z)}{\left\{D_{\lambda}^{m} f(z)\right\}^{2}}} \\
& -2 \frac{\gamma}{\lambda} \frac{z\left\{D_{\lambda}^{m+1} f(z)\right\}^{2}}{\left\{D_{\lambda}^{m} f(z)\right\}^{3}} \prec q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z),
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
\frac{z D_{\lambda}^{m+1} f(z)}{\left\{D_{\lambda}^{m} f(z)\right\}^{2}} \prec q(z)
$$

and $q$ is the best dominant.
Taking $\lambda=1, \ell=0$, in Theorem 3.4, we have
Corollary 3.12.
Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U, \gamma \in C^{*}$. Further, assume that (3.1) holds. If $f \in A$ satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {[1+\gamma] \frac{z D^{m+1} f(z)}{\left\{D^{m} f(z)\right\}^{2}}+\gamma \frac{z D^{m+2} f(z)}{\left\{D^{m} f(z)\right\}^{2}}-2 \gamma \frac{z\left\{D^{m+1} f(z)\right\}^{2}}{\left\{D^{m} f(z)\right\}^{3}}} \\
& \prec q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z),
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
\frac{z D^{m+1} f(z)}{\left\{D^{m} f(z)\right\}^{2}} \prec q(z)
$$

and $q$ is the best dominant.
Taking $\lambda=1$, in Theorem 3.4, we have
Corollary 3.13.
Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U, \gamma \in C^{*}$. Further, assume that (3.1) holds. If $f \in A$ satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {[1+\gamma(1+\ell)] \frac{z I^{m+1}(\ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}+\gamma(1+\ell) \frac{z I^{m+2}(\ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}} \\
& -2 \gamma(1+\ell) \frac{z\left\{I^{m+1}(\ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}{\left\{I^{m}(\ell) f(z)\right\}^{3}} \prec q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z)
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
\frac{z I^{m+1}(\ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \prec q(z)
$$

and $q$ is the best dominant.
Taking $\lambda=1, \ell=1$, in Theorem 3.4, we have

## Corollary 3.14.

Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U, \gamma \in C^{*}$. Further, assume that (3.1) holds. If $f \in A$ satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {[1+2 \gamma] \frac{z I^{m+1} f(z)}{\left\{I^{m} f(z)\right\}^{2}}+2 \gamma \frac{z I^{m+2} f(z)}{\left\{I^{m} f(z)\right\}^{2}}} \\
& -4 \gamma \frac{z\left\{I^{m+1} f(z)\right\}^{2}}{\left\{I^{m} f(z)\right\}^{3}} \prec q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z),
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
\frac{z I^{m+1} f(z)}{\left\{I^{m} f(z)\right\}^{2}} \prec q(z)
$$

and $q$ is the best dominant.
Theorem 3.5.
Let $q$ be convex univalent in $U$. Let $\gamma \in C$ with $\operatorname{Re} \gamma>0$.

$$
\text { If } \begin{aligned}
f \in & A, \frac{z I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \in H[1,1] \cap Q, \\
& {\left[1+\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right)\right] \frac{z I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} } \\
& +\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{z I^{m+2}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \\
& -2 \gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{z\left\{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{3}}
\end{aligned}
$$

is univalent in $U$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& q(z)+\gamma z q^{\prime}(z) \\
& \prec\left[1+\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right)\right] \frac{z I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \\
& \quad+\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{z I^{m+2}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}, \\
& \\
& -2 \gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{z\left\{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{3}},
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
q(z) \prec \frac{z I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}},
$$

and $q$ is the best subordinant.
Proof. The proof follows by applying Lemma 3.4.
Combining Theorems 3.4 and 3.5, we get the following sandwich theorem.

## Theorem 3.6.

Let $q_{1}$ be convex univalent in $U, \gamma \in C$ with $\operatorname{Re} \gamma>0, \quad q_{2}$ be univalent in $U, \quad q_{2}(0)=1$ and satis-

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { fies (3.1). If } f \in A, \frac{z I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \in H[1,1] \cap Q, \\
& \\
& {\left[1+\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right)\right] \frac{z I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}} \\
& \\
& +\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{z I^{m+2}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \\
& \\
& -2 \gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{z\left\{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{3}}
\end{aligned}
$$

is univalent in $U$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& q_{1}(z)+\gamma z q_{2}^{\prime}(z) \\
& \prec\left[1+\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right)\right] \frac{z I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \\
& +\gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{z I^{m+2}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \\
& -2 \gamma\left(\frac{1+\ell}{\lambda}\right) \frac{z\left\{I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{3}} \\
& \prec q_{2}(z)+\gamma z q_{2}^{\prime}(z),
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
q_{1}(z) \prec \frac{z I^{m+1}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)}{\left\{I^{m}(\lambda, \ell) f(z)\right\}^{2}} \prec q_{2}(z)
$$

and $q_{1}$ and $q_{2}$ are respectively the best subordinant and the best dominant.
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