



ISSN: 0067-2904

## Differential Subordination and Superordination for Multivalent Functions Associated with Generalized Fox-Wright Functions

Zainab H.Mahmood<sup>1\*</sup>, Kassim A. Jassim<sup>2</sup>, Buthyna N. Shihab<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physical, College of Science, University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics, College of Science, University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq

<sup>3</sup>Department of Mathematics, College of Education for Pure Science Ibn Al Haitham, University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq

Received: 18/2/2021

Accepted: 22/4/2021

### Abstract

In this paper, we derive some subordination and superordination results for certain subclasses of  $p$ -valent analytic functions that defined by generalized Fox-wright functions using the principle of differential subordination, -----producing best dominant univalent solutions. We have also derived inclusion relations and solved majorization problem.

**Keywords:** analytic function, Univalent function, Multivalent function, Differential subordination, Fox-wright functions.

### التابعة التفاضلية والتفاضلية العليا لدوال متعددة التكافؤ مرتبطة مع دوال Fox-Wright المعممة

زينب هادي محمود<sup>1\*</sup>, قاسم عبدالحميد جاسم<sup>2</sup>, بثينة نجاد شهاب<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>قسم الفيزياء, كلية العلوم, جامعة بغداد, بغداد, العراق

<sup>2</sup>قسم الرياضيات, كلية العلوم, جامعة بغداد, بغداد, العراق

<sup>3</sup>قسم الرياضيات, كلية التربية ابن الهيثم للعلوم الصرفة, جامعة بغداد, بغداد, العراق

### الخلاصة

في هذا البحث سوف نشق بعض نتائج التابعة والتفاضلية العليا لاصناف جزئية حديثة لدوال تحليلية متعددة التكافؤ من النمط  $p$  معرفة بواسطة دوال Fox-Wright المعممة باستخدام اساسيات التابعة التفاضلية ناتجة عن افضل الحلول المتكافئة المهيمنة. ايضا تم اشتقاق العلاقات الضمنية وحل مسالتها الخاصة.

### 1.Introduction

Let  $\Delta = \{\omega \in \mathbb{C} : |\omega| < 1\}$  be the open unit disk in the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$ , and  $\mu = \mu(\Delta)$  is the class of analytic functions defined in  $\Delta$ . For a positive integer  $n$  and  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ , let  $\mu[a, n] = \{f \in \mu : f(\omega) = a + a_n \omega^n + a_{n+1} \omega^{n+1} + \dots\}$ , with  $\mu_0 = \mu[0, 1]$ ,  $\mu = \mu[1, 1]$ .

Miller and Mocanu [1] assumed that  $f$  and  $g$  are functions of  $\mu$ . The function  $f$  is said to be subordinate to  $g$ , written  $f < g$  or  $f(\omega) < g(\omega)$ , if there exists a Schwarz function  $w(\omega)$

\*Email: kasimmathphd@gmail.com

analytic in  $\Delta$ , with  $w(0)=0$  and  $|w(\omega)| < 1$  such that  $f(\omega) = g(w(\omega))$ , ( $\omega \in \Delta$ ). In particular, if the function  $g$  is univalent in  $\Delta$ , then  $f \prec g$  if and only if  $f(0) = g(0)$  and  $f(\Delta) \subset g(\Delta)$ .

Let  $\psi : \mathbb{C}^3 \times \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , and  $h$  is univalent in  $\Delta$ . If  $f$  is analytic in  $\Delta$  and satisfies the (second-order) differential subordination

$$\psi(f(\omega), \omega f'(\omega), \omega^2 f''(\omega); \omega) \prec h(\omega) \tag{1.1}$$

then  $f$  is called a solution of the differential subordination. The univalent function  $q$  is called a dominant of the solutions of the differential subordination, or more simply dominant if  $f \prec q$  for all  $f$  satisfying (1.1). A dominant  $\hat{q}$  that satisfies  $\hat{q} \prec q$  for all dominants  $q$  of (1.1) is said to be the best dominant of (1.1).

**Definition 1.1:** For the parameters  $a_i, B_j \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $A_i, B_j \in \mathcal{R}$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, p; j = 1, 2, \dots, q$ ), with  $\frac{a_i}{A_i} \neq 0, -1, -2, \dots, (i = 1, 2, \dots, p)$  and  $\frac{b_j}{B_j} \neq 0, -1, -2, \dots, (j = 1, 2, \dots, q)$ , the generalized Fox-Wright function  ${}_p\Psi_q$  is defined by

$${}_p\Psi_q \left[ \begin{matrix} (a_i; A_i)_{1,p} \\ (B_j, B_j)_{1,q} \end{matrix}; \omega \right] := {}_p\Psi_q \left[ \begin{matrix} (a_1, A_1), \dots, (a_p, A_p) \\ (B_1, B_1), \dots, (B_q, B_q) \end{matrix}; \omega \right] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^p \Gamma(a_i + nA_i)}{\prod_{j=1}^q \Gamma(b_j + nB_j)(1)_n} \omega^n, \tag{1.2}$$

for suitable bounded values of  $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$ , where  $\Gamma$  is the Gamma function. For more details see [2-5].

**Remark 1.1:**

1. According to [6]. If  $\sum_{j=1}^q B_j - \sum_{i=1}^p A_i > -1$ , then the power series of (1.2) converges absolutely on  $\mathbb{C}$  and the above defined function  ${}_p\Psi_q$  is an entire function. If  $\sum_{j=1}^q B_j - \sum_{i=1}^p A_i = -1$ , then the power series of (1.2) converges absolutely on the disk  $|\omega| < \frac{\prod_{j=1}^q |B_j|^{\beta_j}}{\prod_{i=1}^p |A_i|^{\alpha_i}}$ .

2. If  $A_i = 1 (i = 1, 2, \dots, p)$  and  $B_j = 1 (j = 1, 2, \dots, q)$ , one can find as the relationship [7]

$$\Omega \left( \begin{matrix} a_1, \dots, a_p \\ b_1, \dots, b_q \end{matrix} \right) \cdot {}_p\Psi_q \left[ \begin{matrix} (a_i, 1)_{1,p} \\ (b_j, 1)_{1,q} \end{matrix}; \omega \right] = {}_p\mathcal{F}_q \left( \begin{matrix} a_1, \dots, a_p \\ b_1, \dots, b_q \end{matrix}; \omega \right),$$

where  ${}_p\mathcal{F}_q \left( \begin{matrix} a_1, \dots, a_p \\ b_1, \dots, b_q \end{matrix}; \omega \right)$  is the generalized hypergeometric function [4], and

$$\Omega = \Omega \left( \begin{matrix} a_1, \dots, a_p \\ b_1, \dots, b_q \end{matrix} \right) := \frac{\prod_{j=1}^q \Gamma(b_j)}{\prod_{i=1}^p \Gamma(a_i)} \tag{1.3}$$

3. For  $p = 1, q = 1, A_1 = 1$  and  $B_1 = 1$ , the Fox-Wright defined function  ${}_p\Psi_q$  reduces to

$${}_1\Psi_1 \left[ \begin{matrix} (a, 1)_{1,1} \\ (b, 1)_{1,1} \end{matrix}; \omega \right] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(a + n)}{\Gamma(b + n)(1)_n} \omega^n, \omega \in \Delta.$$

4. With the parameters values  $a = 1$  and  $b = a > 0 (b \geq a)$ , the function  ${}_1\Psi_1$  represents the classical Mittag-Leffler function for example see [8]. Moreover  ${}_p\Psi_q$  is a special case of the Fox's  $\mathfrak{H}$ -function  $\mathcal{H}_{k,l}^{m,n}$  [3].

Use the generalized hypergeometric function, the authors [9] introduced a linear operator which was subsequently extended in [7] by using the Fox-Wright generalized hypergeometric

function. Let

$\theta \left[ \begin{matrix} (a_i, A_i)_{1,p} \\ (b_j, B_j)_{1,q} \end{matrix} \right]: \mathcal{D}_p \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_p$  be a linear operator which is defined by

$$\theta \left[ \begin{matrix} (a_i, A_i)_{1,p} \\ (b_j, B_j)_{1,q} \end{matrix} \right] f(\omega) := \omega_p \phi_q \left[ \begin{matrix} (a_i, A_i)_{1,p} \\ (b_j, B_j)_{1,q} \end{matrix}; \omega \right] * f(\omega).$$

Note that for  $f(\omega)$  of the form (1.1) and  $\omega_p \phi_q = \Omega_p \Psi_p$ , one can obtain that

$$\theta \left[ \begin{matrix} (a_i, A_i)_{1,p} \\ (b_j, B_j)_{1,q} \end{matrix} \right] f(\omega) := \omega + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \delta_n(a_1) a_n \omega^n, \tag{1.4}$$

where  $\delta_n(a_i)$  is given by

$$\delta_n(a_i) = \frac{\Omega \Gamma(a_1 + (n-1)A_1) \dots \Gamma(a_p + (n-1)A_p)}{\Gamma(b_1 + (n-1)B_1) \dots \Gamma(b_q + (n-1)B_q)}$$

and  $\Omega$  is given by (1.3).

For convenience propose the contracted notation  $\theta(a_i)f(\omega)$  can be represented as follows:

$$\theta(a_i)f(\omega) = \theta \left[ \begin{matrix} (a_1, A_1), \dots, (a_p, A_p) \\ (b_1, B_1), \dots, (b_q, B_q) \end{matrix} \right] f(\omega) \tag{1.5}$$

From the equation (1.4) one can get the recursive relation that involves the operator  $\theta(a_i)f(\omega)$

$$A_i \omega (\theta(a_i)f(\omega))' = a_i \theta(a_i + 1)f(\omega) - (a_i - A_i) \theta(a_i)f(\omega) \tag{1.6}$$

Note that there are several interesting operators that are special cases of the linear operator (1.4). They have been extensively studied by researchers in [10-15], Hohlov operator and others. For more details see [16-18].

In order to prove the main results, we need the following definitions and theorem.

**Definition 1.7.**[19] The set of all function  $q$  hat, which is denoted by  $Q$ , are analytic and injective on  $\bar{\Delta} \setminus E(q)$ , where

$$E(q) = \{ \xi \in \partial \Delta : \lim_{\omega \rightarrow \xi} q(\omega) = \infty \}, \tag{1.7}$$

such that  $q'(\xi) \neq 0$  for  $\xi \in \partial \Delta \setminus E(q)$ , Furthermore let  $(a)$ ,  $Q(0) \equiv Q_0$  and  $Q(1) = Q_1$  such that  $q(0) = a$ .

**Definition 1.8**[19]. Let  $\Omega$  be a subset of  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $q \in Q$  and  $n$  is a positive integer. The class of admissible functions  $\psi[\Omega, q]$  consists function  $\psi: \mathbb{C}^3 \times \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  that satisfies the admissibility condition:

$$\psi(r, S, v; \omega, \xi) \notin \Omega,$$

whenever

$$\begin{aligned} r &= q(\xi), S = k \xi q'(\xi), \text{ and} \\ \Re \left\{ \frac{t}{s} + 1 \right\} &\geq k \Re \left\{ \frac{\xi q''(\xi)}{q'(\xi)} + 1 \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

where  $\omega \in \Delta$ ,  $\xi \in \partial \Delta \setminus E(q)$  and  $k \geq n$ . We write  $\psi_1[\Omega, q] = \psi[\Omega, q]$ . In addition if  $\omega \in \Delta$ ,  $\xi \in \partial \Delta$  and  $b \geq n \geq 1$ , then in particular we write  $\psi_1'[\Omega, q] = \psi'[\Omega, q]$ .

**Theorem 1.1**[19]. Let  $\Psi \in \psi_n[\Omega, q]$ , with  $(0) = a$ . If the analytic function  $F \in \mu[a, n]$  satisfies  $\Psi(g(\omega), \omega g'(\omega), \omega^2 g''(\omega); \omega) \in \Omega$ , then  $F(\omega) < q(\omega)$ .

### 1. Main Results

**Definition 2.1:** Let  $\Omega$  be a subset of  $\mathbb{C}$  with  $q \in Q_0 \cap \mathcal{H}_0$ . The class of admissible functions  $\Phi_k[\Omega, q]$  consists of those functions  $\emptyset: \mathbb{C}^3 \times \Delta \times \bar{\Delta} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  which satisfies the admissibility condition:

$$\emptyset(u, v, w; \omega, \xi) \notin \Omega, \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$u = q(\xi), \quad v = \frac{kA_i \xi q'(\xi) - (A_i - a_i)q(\xi)}{a_i}, \quad (a_i \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z}_0^-, a_i \neq 0),$$

and

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{\omega a_i (a_i + 1) - a_i (2a_i - 2A_i + 1)v + (A_i - a_i)^2 u}{A_i (a_i v + (A_i - a_i)u)} \right\} \geq k \Re \left\{ \frac{\xi q''(\xi)}{q'(\xi)} + 1 \right\}, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\omega \in \Delta, \zeta \in \partial \Delta \setminus E(q), \xi \in \bar{\Delta} \text{ and } k \geq 1.$$

**Theorem 2.1:** Let  $\emptyset \in \Phi_k[\Omega, q]$ . If  $f \in \mathcal{D}_p$  satisfies

$$\left\{ \phi(\theta(a_i)f(\omega)), \theta(a_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(a_i + 2)f(\omega); \omega \in \Delta \right\} \subset \Omega \tag{2.3}$$

$$\theta(a_i)f(\omega) < q(\omega).$$

**Proof:** From equation (1.6) we have

$$A_i \omega (\theta(a_i)f(\omega))' = a_i \theta(a_i + 1)f(\omega) - (a_i - A_i)\theta(a_i)f(\omega)$$

Which is equivalent to

$$\theta(a_i + 1)f(\omega) = \frac{A_i \omega (\theta(a_i)f(\omega))' + (a_i - A_i)\theta(a_i)f(\omega)}{a_i}. \tag{2.4}$$

Now assume that  $F(\omega) = \theta(a_i)f(\omega)$ , then

$$\theta(a_i + 1)f(\omega) = \frac{A_i \omega F'(\omega) + (a_i - A_i)F(\omega)}{a_i}.$$

Therefore,

$$\theta(a_i + 2)f(\omega) = \frac{A_i^2 \omega^2 F''(\omega) + A_i(2a_i - A_i + 1)\omega F'(\omega) + (a_i - A_i)(a_i - A_i - 1)F(\omega)}{a_i(a_i + 1)} \tag{2.5}$$

and from equation (2.4), we have

$$(\theta(a_i + 1)f(\omega))' = \frac{A_i \omega F''(\omega) + a_i F'(\omega)}{a_i} \tag{2.6}$$

So that

$$\begin{aligned} &\theta(a_i + 2)f(\omega) \\ &= \frac{1}{a_i} \left[ \frac{A_i \omega (A_i \omega F''(\omega) + a_i F'(\omega))}{(a_i + 1)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (a_i + 1 - A_i) \left( \frac{A_i \omega F'(\omega) + (a_i - A_i)F(\omega)}{(a_i + 1)} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{A_i^2 \omega^2 F''(\omega) + A_i(2a_i + 1 - A_i)\omega F'(\omega) + (A_i - a_i)(A_i - a_i - 1)F(\omega)}{a_i(a_i + 1)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Let } u = r, \quad v = \frac{A_i \mathcal{S} - (A_i - a_i)r}{a_i}, \quad w = \frac{A_i^2 t + A_i(2a_i + 1 - A_i)\mathcal{S} + (A_i - a_i)(A_i - a_i - 1)r}{a_i(a_i + 1)} \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$\text{let } \psi(r, \mathcal{S}, t; \omega, \xi) = \emptyset(u, v, w; \omega, \xi) = \emptyset \left( r, \frac{A_i \mathcal{S} - (A_i - a_i)r}{a_i}, \frac{A_i^2 t + A_i(2a_i + 1 - A_i)\mathcal{S} + (A_i - a_i)(A_i - a_i - 1)r}{a_i(a_i + 1)}; \omega \right). \tag{2.8}$$

So that by equation (2.4) and (2.5), we obtain

$$\psi(F(\omega), \omega F'(\omega), \omega^2 F''(\omega); \omega, \xi) = \emptyset \left( (\theta(a_i)f(\omega)), \theta(a_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(a_i + 2)f(\omega); \omega \right). \tag{2.9}$$

by using equation (2.3), we get

$$\psi(F(\omega), \omega F'(\omega), \omega^2 F''(\omega); \omega, \xi) \in \Omega. \tag{2.10}$$

We also use the following equation

$$w = \frac{A_i^2 \omega^2 F''(\omega) + A_i(2a_i + 1 - A_i)\omega F'(\omega) + (A_i - a_i)(A_i - a_i - 1)F(\omega)}{a_i(a_i + 1)},$$

and by simple calculations we get

$$\frac{\omega a_i(a_i + 1) - a_i(2a_i - 2A_i + 1)v + (A_i - a_i)^2 u}{A_i(a_i v + (A_i - a_i)u)} = \frac{t}{S} + 1. \tag{2.11}$$

We note that the admissibility condition for  $\emptyset \in \Phi_k[\Omega, q]$  is equivalent to the admissibility condition for  $\psi$ , then  $F(\omega) \prec q(\omega)$ .

**Example 2.1.** Let the class of  $\Phi_{kv}[\Omega, q]$  consists of those functions  $\emptyset: \mathbb{C}^3 \times \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  that satisfies the admissibility condition:

$$v = \frac{A_i k \xi q'(\xi) + (A_i - a_i)q(\xi)}{a_i} \notin \Omega$$

$\omega \in \Delta, \zeta \in \partial \Delta \setminus E_q$ , and  $m \geq p, I \in \mathcal{D}_p$  satisfies  $S_{0,\omega}^{\lambda,\mu,\eta} f(\omega) \subset \Omega$ , then

$$(\theta(a_i)f(\omega)) \prec q(\omega)$$

We consider the special situation when  $\Omega \neq \mathbb{C}$  is a simply connected domain. Now if we assume that  $\Omega \neq \mathbb{C}$  be a simply connected, so that  $\Omega = h(\Delta)$  for some conformal mapping  $h$  of  $\Delta$  onto  $\Omega$ . The next result is an abrupt outcome of Theorem 2.1.

**Theorem 2.2 :** Let  $\emptyset \in \Phi_k[h, q]$ . If  $f \in \mathcal{D}_p$  satisfies

$$\emptyset \left( (\theta(a_i)f(\omega)), \theta(a_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(a_i + 2); \omega \in \Delta \right) \prec h(\omega), \tag{2.12}$$

Then

$$\theta(a_i)f(\omega) \prec q(\omega).$$

The next result is an extension of Theorem (2.1) to the case where the behavior of  $q$  on  $\Delta$  is not known.

**Corollary 2.1.** Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ ,  $q$  be univalent in  $\Delta$  and  $q(0)=0$ . Let  $\emptyset \in \Phi_k[\Omega, q_\rho]$  for some  $\rho \in (0,1)$ , where  $q_\rho(\omega) = q(\rho\omega)$ . If  $f \in \mathcal{D}_p$  satisfies

$$\emptyset \left( (\theta(a_i)f(\omega)), \theta(a_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(a_i + 2); \omega \in \Delta \right) \in \Omega, \tag{2.13}$$

Then

$$(\theta(a_i)f(\omega)) \prec q(\omega).$$

**Proof.** From Theorem 2.1, we have  $(\theta(a_i)f(\omega)) \prec q_p(\omega)$ .

**Theorem 2.3.** Let  $h$  and  $q$  are univalent. Also,  $q(0)=0, q_\rho(\omega) = q(\rho\omega)$  and  $h_\rho(\omega) = h(\rho\omega)$ .

Let  $\emptyset: \mathbb{C}^3 \times \Delta \times \bar{\Delta} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  satisfies one of the following conditions:

- (1)  $\emptyset \in \Phi_k[\Omega, q_\rho]$  for some  $\rho \in (0,1)$  or
- (2) There exists  $\rho_0 \in (0,1)$  such that  $\emptyset \in \Phi_k[h_\rho, q_\rho]$  for all  $\rho \in (\rho_0, 1)$ .

If  $f \in \mathcal{D}_p$  satisfies (2.12), then

$$(\theta(a_i)f(\omega)) \prec q(\omega).$$

**Proof: Case (1):** By using Theorem (2.1), we get  $(\theta(a_i)f(\omega)) \prec q_\rho(\omega)$ . Since  $q_\rho(\omega) \prec q(\omega)$ , we deduce

$$(\theta(a_i)f(\omega)) \prec q(\omega).$$

**Case (2):** Assume that  $F(\omega) = (\theta(a_i)f(\omega))$ , and  $F_\rho(\omega) = F(\rho\omega)$ . So that

$$\emptyset(F_\rho(\omega), \omega F'_\rho(\omega), \omega^2 F''_\rho(\omega); \rho\omega) = \emptyset(F(\rho\omega), \rho\omega F'(\rho\omega), \rho^2 \omega^2 F''(\rho\omega); \rho\omega) \in h_\rho(\Delta).$$

By using Theorem 2.1 with associated

$\emptyset(F(\omega), \omega F'(\omega), \omega^2 F''(\omega); w(\omega)) \in \Omega$ , where  $w$  is any function mapping from

$\Delta$  onto  $\Delta$ , with  $w(\omega) = \rho\omega$ , we obtain  $F_\rho(\omega) < q_\rho(\omega)$  for  $\rho \in (\rho_0, 1)$ . By letting  $\rho \rightarrow 1^-$ , we get  $F(\omega) < q(\omega)$ .

Therefore

$$(\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)) < q(\omega)$$

The next theorem gives the best dominant of the differential subordination (2.12).

**Theorem 2.4.** Let  $h$  be univalent in  $\Delta$  and let  $\phi: \mathbb{C}^3 \times \Delta \times \bar{\Delta} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . Suppose that the differential equation

$$\phi\left(q(\omega), \frac{A_i \omega q'(\omega) + (A_i - \alpha_i)q(\omega)}{\alpha_i}, \frac{A_i^2 \omega^2 q''(\omega) + A_i(2\alpha_i + 1 - A_i)\omega q'(\omega) + (A_i - \alpha_i)(A_i - \alpha_i - 1)q(\omega)}{\alpha_i(\alpha_i + 1)}; \omega\right) = h(\omega), \tag{2.14}$$

has a solution  $q$  with  $q(0) = 0$  and satisfies one of the following conditions:

- (1)  $q \in Q_0$  and  $\phi \in \Phi_k[h, q]$ .
- (2)  $q$  is univalent in  $\Delta$  and  $\phi \in \Phi_k[h, q_\rho]$  for some  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ , or
- (3)  $q$  is univalent in  $\Delta$  and there exists  $\rho_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\phi \in \Phi_k[h_\rho, q_\rho]$ , for all  $\rho_0 \in (0, 1)$ . If  $f \in \mathcal{D}_\rho$  satisfies (2.12), then  $(\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)) < q(\omega)$  and  $q$  is the best dominant.

**Proof.** By using Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3, we get that  $q$  is a dominant of (2.12). Since  $q$  satisfies (2.14), it is also a solution of (2.12) and therefore  $q$  will be dominant by all dominants of (2.12). Hence  $q$  is the best dominant of (2.12).

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $\Omega$  be a set in  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $M > 0$ . The class of admissible functions  $\Phi_k[\Omega, q]$  consists of functions  $\phi: \mathbb{C}^3 \times \Delta \times \bar{\Delta} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$\phi\left(Me^{i\theta}, \frac{(A_i k - (A_i - \alpha_i))Me^{i\theta}}{\alpha_i}, \frac{A_i^2 L + [A_i k(2\alpha_i - A_i + 1) + (A_i - \alpha_i)(A_i - \alpha_i - 1)]Me^{i\theta}}{\alpha_i(\alpha_i + 1)}; \omega\right) \notin \Omega, \tag{2.15}$$

Where  $\lambda > 0, \theta \in \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}(Le^{i\theta}) \geq k(k - 1)M$  for all real  $\theta, k \geq 1, \omega \in \Delta$ .

**Corollary 2.2:** Let  $\phi \in \Phi_k[\Omega, M]$ . If  $f \in \mathcal{D}_\rho$  satisfies that

$$\phi\left((\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)), \theta(\alpha_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(\alpha_i + 2); \omega\right) \in \Omega, \text{ then } \theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega) < M\omega.$$

**Corollary 2.3:** Let  $\phi \in \Phi_k[\Omega, M]$ . If  $f \in \mathcal{D}_\rho$  satisfies that

$$|(\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)), \theta(\alpha_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(\alpha_i + 2); \omega| < M, \text{ then } |\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)| < M$$

**Corollary 2.4:** Let  $M > 0, \alpha_i \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z}_0^-, \mathcal{R}(\alpha_i) \geq 0$  and  $f \in \mathcal{D}_\rho$  satisfies the following inequality

$$|\theta(\alpha_i + 1)f(\omega)| < M, \text{ then } |\theta(\alpha_i + 1)f(\omega)| < M, \omega \in \Delta.$$

**Proof.** From Corollary (2.2) one can take  $\phi(u, v, w, \omega) = v = \frac{(A_i k - (A_i - \alpha_i))Me^{i\theta}}{\alpha_i}$

**Corollary 2.5.** If  $M > 0, \alpha_i \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z}_0^-$ , If  $f \in \mathcal{D}_\rho$  satisfies the following inequality

$$\left| \theta(\alpha_i + 1)f(\omega) - \left(\frac{A_i}{\alpha_i} - 1\right) \theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega) \right| < \frac{MA_i}{\alpha_i}$$

then  $|\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)| < M, \omega \in \Delta$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\phi(u, v, w, \omega) = v + \left(\frac{A_i}{\alpha_i} - 1\right)u$  and  $\Omega = h(\Delta)$  where  $h(\omega) = \frac{MA_i}{\alpha_i}\omega, M > 0$ .

From the corollary (1.3), it is enough to show that  $\phi \in \Phi_k[\Omega, q]$ , that means the admissibility condition (1.6) is satisfied. Hence,

$$\left| \phi\left(Me^{i\theta}, \frac{(A_i k - (A_i - \alpha_i))Me^{i\theta}}{\alpha_i}, \frac{A_i^2 L + [A_i k(2\alpha_i - A_i + 1) + (A_i - \alpha_i)(A_i - \alpha_i - 1)]Me^{i\theta}}{\alpha_i(\alpha_i + 1)}; \omega\right) \right| \geq \left| \frac{A_i Me^{i\theta}}{\alpha_i} \right| \geq \frac{MA_i}{|\alpha_i|}$$

Whenever  $\omega \in \Delta, \theta \in \mathcal{R}, \alpha_i \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z}_0^-, \alpha_i \neq -1$  and  $k \geq 1$ .

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $\Omega$  be a set in  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $q \in Q_0 \cap \mathcal{H}_0$ . The class of admissible functions  $\Phi_{k,1}[\Omega, q]$  consists of  $\phi: \mathbb{C}^3 \times \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  that satisfies

$$\emptyset(u, v, w, \omega, \xi) \notin \Omega,$$

whenever

$$u = q(\xi), v = \frac{1}{\alpha_i + 1} \left( \frac{kA\xi q'(\xi)}{q(\xi)} + \alpha_i q(\xi) + 1 \right), \alpha_i \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z}_0^-$$

and

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{v(\alpha_i + 1)((\alpha_i + 1)(w - v) + w - 1)}{A_i(v(\alpha_i + 1) - \alpha_i u - 1)} + \frac{(v(\alpha_i + 1) - \alpha_i u(A_i + 1) - 1)}{A_i} \right\} \geq k \Re \left\{ \frac{\xi q''(\xi)}{q'(\xi)} + 1 \right\},$$

$\omega \in \Delta, \zeta \in \partial \Delta \setminus E(q), k \geq 1$  and  $\alpha_i \neq -1$ .

**Theorem 2.5.** Let  $\emptyset \in \Phi'_k[h, q]$ . If  $f \in \mathcal{D}_\rho, \theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega) \in Q_0$  and

$$\emptyset \left( (\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)), \theta(\alpha_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(\alpha_i + 2); \omega \right)$$

is univalent in  $\Delta$ , then

$$\Omega \subset \left\{ \emptyset \left( (\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)), \theta(\alpha_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(\alpha_i + 2); \omega \in \Delta, \xi \in \bar{\Delta} \right) \right\} \text{ which implies that } q(z) < \theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega).$$

**Proof:** By (11) and  $\Omega \subset \left\{ \emptyset \left( (\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)), \theta(\alpha_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(\alpha_i + 2); \omega \in \Delta, \xi \in \bar{\Delta} \right) \right\}$ , we have  $\Omega \subset \left\{ \psi(F(\omega), \omega F'(\omega), \omega^2 F''(\omega); \omega, \xi); \omega \in \Delta, \xi \in \bar{\Delta} \right\}$ .  
from

$$u = r, v = \frac{A_i \mathcal{S} - (A_i - \alpha_i)r}{\alpha_i}, w = \frac{A_i^2 t + A_i(2\alpha_i + 1 - A_i)\mathcal{S} + (A_i - \alpha_i)(A_i - \alpha_i - 1)r}{\alpha_i(\alpha_i + 1)}$$

we see that the admissibility for  $\emptyset \in \Phi'_k[\Omega, q]$  is equivalent to admissibility condition for  $\psi$ . Hence,  $\psi \in \Psi'[\Omega, q]$  and so we have  $q(z) < \theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)$ .

The following Theorem is immediately consequence of Theorem(2.5).

**Theorem 2.6.** Let  $q \in \mu[0, p], h$  be analytic in  $\Delta$  and  $\emptyset \in \Phi'_k[h, q]$ . If  $f(\omega) \in \mathcal{D}_\rho, \theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega) \in Q_0$

and

$$\left\{ \emptyset \left( (\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)), \theta(\alpha_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(\alpha_i + 2); \omega \right) \right\}$$

It is univalent in  $\Delta$ , then

$$h(\omega) < \left\{ \emptyset \left( (\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)), \theta(\alpha_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(\alpha_i + 2); \omega \right) \right\}, \tag{2.18}$$

which implies that  $q(\omega) < \theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)$ .

**Theorem 2.7.** Let  $h$  be analytic in  $\Delta$  and  $\emptyset: \mathbb{C}^3 \times \Delta \times \bar{\Delta} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . Suppose that

$$\emptyset \left( q(\omega), \frac{A_i \omega q'(\omega) + (A_i - \alpha_i)q(\omega)}{\alpha_i}, \frac{A_i^2 \omega^2 q''(\omega) + A_i(2\alpha_i + 1 - A_i)\omega q'(\omega) + (A_i - \alpha_i)(A_i - \alpha_i - 1)q(\omega)}{\alpha_i(\alpha_i + 1)}; \omega \right) = h(\omega),$$

has a solution  $q \in Q_0$ . If  $\emptyset \in \Phi'_k[h, q], f \in \mathcal{D}_\rho, \theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega) \in Q_0$  and

$\left\{ \emptyset \left( (\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)), \theta(\alpha_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(\alpha_i + 2); \omega \right) \right\}$  is univalent in  $\Delta$ , then

$$h(z) < \left\{ \emptyset \left( (\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)), \theta(\alpha_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(\alpha_i + 2); \omega \right) \right\}, \tag{2.19}$$

implies that  $q(z) < \theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)$ , and  $q$  is the best dominant.

**Proof:**The proof of this Theorem is the same as the proof Theorem (2.4).

Theorem (2.2) and Theorem (2.6), we obtained the following Theorem.

**Theorem 2.8** Suppose that  $h_1$  and  $q_1$  are analytic functions in  $\Delta$ , and  $h_2$  is a univalent functions in  $\Delta$ ,  $q_2 \in Q_0$  with  $q_1(0) = q_2(0) = 0$  with  $\emptyset \in \Phi_k[h_2, q_2] \cap \Phi'_k[h_1, q_1]$ .

If  $f \in \mathcal{D}_p$ ,  $\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega) \in \mu[0, p] \cap Q_0$  and

$\{\emptyset((\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)), \theta(\alpha_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(\alpha_i + 2)); \omega\}$  is univalent in  $\Delta$ , then

$$h_1(\omega) < \emptyset((\theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega)), \theta(\alpha_i + 1)f(\omega), \theta(\alpha_i + 2)); \omega < h_2, \quad (2.20)$$

And this implies that  $q_1(\omega) < \theta(\alpha_i)f(\omega) < q_2(\omega)$ .

## Reference

- [1] Miller S.S., and Mocanu P.T. "Differential subordinations: Theory and Applications", *Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, Basel*, 2000.
- [2] Srivastava, H., and M. Owa, S. "Some characterization and distortion theorems involving fractional calculus, generalized hypergeometric functions, Hadamard products, linear operators and certain subclasses of analytic functions", *Nagoya Math. J.*, vol. 106, pp. 1–28, 1987.
- [3] Srivastava H. M., and Monacha, H. L. "A treatise on generating functions", *Ellis Horwood Series: Mathematics and its Applications, Horwood, Chichester*, 1984.
- [4] Srivastava H M., and Karlsson P. W. "Multiple Gaussian hypergeometric series", *Ellis Horwood Series: Mathematics and its Applications, Horwood, Chichester*, 1985.
- [5] Srivastava. H. M., and Attiya A. "An integral operator associated with the Hurwitz-Lerch zeta function and differential subordination", *Integral Transforms Spec. Funct.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 207–216, 2007.
- [6] Kilbas A. A., Saigo M., and Trujillo J. J. "On the generalized Wright function", *Fract. Calc. Appl. Anal.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 437–460, 2002.
- [7] Dziok J., and Raina. R. K. "Families of analytic functions associated with the Wright generalized hypergeometric function", *Demonstratio Math.*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 533–542, 2004.
- [8] Erdelyi A et al. "Higher transcendental functions", *McGraw-Hill, New York*, vol. 3, 1956.
- [9] Dziok J., and Srivastava H. M. "Classes of analytic functions associated with the generalized hypergeometric function", *Appl. Math. Comput.*, vol. 103, 1–13, 1999.
- [10] Dziok J., and Raina R. K. "Certain subclasses of analytic functions associated with the generalized hypergeometric function", *Integral Transforms Spec. Funct.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 7–18, 2003.
- [11] Carlson B. C., and Shaffer B. C. "Starlike and prestarlike hypergeometric functions", *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 737–745, 1984.
- [12] Ruscheweyh St. "New criteria for univalent functions", *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 49, pp. 109–115, 1975.
- [13] Cho N. E., and Kim J. A. "Multiplier transformations and strongly close-to-convex functions", *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 399–410, 2003.
- [14] Cho N. E., and Srivastava H. M. "Argument estimates of certain analytic functions defined by a class of multiplier transformations", *Math. Comput. Modelling*, vol. 37, no. 1-2, pp. 39–49, 2003.
- [15] Choi J. H., Saigo M., and Srivastava H. M. "Some inclusion properties of a certain family of integral operators", *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, vol. 276, no. 1, pp. 432–445, 2003.
- [16] Dziok J., Raina R. K., and Srivastava H. M. "Some classes of analytic functions associated with operators on Hilbert space involving Wright's generalized hypergeometric function", *Proc. Jangjeon Math. Soc.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 43–55, 2004.
- [17] Waggas Galib Atshan A. H. Majeed and Kassim A. Jassim. "On a new class of univalent functions with application of fractional calculus operators defined by hohlov operator", *Journal of Asian Scientific Research*, vol. 4,no.2, 99-111, 2014.
- [18] Rafid Habib Buti., and Kassim A. Jassim. "On A Class of W-Valent Functions With Two Fixed Points Involving Hypergeometric Function with Generalization Integral Operator", *Iraqi Journal of Science*, Vol. 60, no.8, pp.1753-1759, 2019.
- [19] S. S. Miller and P. T. Mocanu, "Differential subordinations and univalent functions", *Michigan Math. J.* vol. 28, 157-171, 1981.