

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

## **SUBORDINATION THEOREMS FOR SOME CLASSES OF STARLIKE FUNCTIONS**

ROGER W. BARNARD AND JOHN LAWSON LEWIS

# SUBORDINATION THEOREMS FOR SOME CLASSES OF STARLIKE FUNCTIONS

ROGER BARNARD AND JOHN L. LEWIS

Let  $K_r = \{z: |z| < r\}$ ,  $r > 0$ . For given  $\alpha$ ,  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ ,  $d$ ,  $0 \leq d < 1$ , and  $M$ ,  $1 < M \leq \infty$ , let  $S(\alpha, d, M)$  denote the class of univalent and normalized  $\alpha$  starlike functions  $f$  in  $K_1$  with  $K_d \subset f(K_1) \subset K_M$ . The authors show the existence of a function  $F \in S(\alpha, d, M)$  with the properties: (a)  $\log F(z)/z$ ,  $z \in K_1$ , is univalent, (b) if  $f \in S(\alpha, d, M)$ , then  $\log f(z)/z$ ,  $z \in K_1$ , is subordinate to  $\log F(z)/z$ ,  $z \in K_1$ . Letting  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$  they obtain a similar subordination result for normalized starlike univalent functions. They then point out that these subordination results solve and give uniqueness for a number of extremal problem in the above classes.

**1. Introduction.** Given  $\alpha$ ,  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ , let  $S(\alpha)$  denote the class of normalized  $\alpha$  starlike functions  $f$  in  $K = \{z: |z| < 1\}$ . That is,  $f \in S(\alpha)$  if and only if  $f(0) = 0$ ,  $f'(0) = 1$ ,  $z^{-1}f(z)f'(z) \neq 0$  ( $z \in K$ ), and

$$(1.1) \quad \alpha \operatorname{Re} \left\{ 1 + \frac{zf''(z)}{f'(z)} \right\} + (1 - \alpha) \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)} \right\} \geq 0, \quad z \in K.$$

The class  $S(\alpha)$  was first considered by Mocanu [12]. The following facts about  $S(\alpha)$  are known (see Miller [11]),

- (1.2a) Each  $f \in S(\alpha)$  is starlike univalent,
- (1.2b)  $S(\alpha_2) \subset S(\alpha_1)$  whenever  $0 < \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 < \infty$ ,
- (1.2c) If  $f \in S(\alpha)$  and bounded, then  $f'$  is in the Hardy class  $H^1$ ,
- (1.2d) For given  $f \in S(\alpha)$ , there exists a starlike univalent function  $g$  satisfying  $g(0) = 0$ ,  $g'(0) = 1$ , and

$$(f(z)/z)^{1/\alpha-1}f'(z) = (g(z)/z)^{1/\alpha}, \quad z \in K.$$

Here the  $1/\alpha$  powers of the above functions in  $K$  are defined to be 1 at  $z = 0$ . We note that  $S(1)$  is the class of normalized convex functions.

For given  $d$ ,  $0 \leq d < 1$ ,  $M$ ,  $1 < M \leq \infty$ , and  $\alpha$ ,  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ , let  $S(\alpha, d, M)$  denote the subclass of functions  $f \in S(\alpha)$  that satisfy:

$$(1.3) \quad d \leq |f(z)/z| \leq M, \quad z \in K.$$

We observe that  $S(\alpha, d, M)$  is compact, as follows easily from (1.1) and (1.3). Then in this paper we shall prove the following theorem:

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $\alpha, d$ , and  $M$  be fixed nonnegative numbers satisfying  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ ,  $0 \leq d < 1$ , and  $1 < M \leq \infty$ . Then there exists a function  $F = F(\cdot, \alpha, d, M) \in S(\alpha, d, M)$  with the following properties:*

(A) *The function  $g(z) = \log F(z)/z$ ,  $z \in K$ , ( $g(0) = 0$ ) is univalent and convex in the direction of the imaginary axis,*

(B) *If  $f \in S(\alpha, d, M)$ , then  $\log f(z)/z$ ,  $z \in K$ , is subordinate to  $g$ .*

In order to describe  $F$  we first make the following definition.

**DEFINITION 1.** Let  $\alpha$  be given,  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ . Then  $\gamma$  is said to be an  $\alpha$  curve in the  $w$  plane, if there exists a line in the  $\zeta$  plane, not containing  $\zeta = 0$ , which is mapped onto  $\gamma$  by a continuous  $\alpha$  power of  $\zeta$ .

Second, we let  $\partial E$  denote the boundary of a set  $E$ , and  $K_r = \{z: |z| < r\}$ ,  $0 < r < \infty$ ,  $r \neq 1$ . Third, we let  $\delta(M, \alpha)$  denote the radius of the largest disk with center at the origin contained in  $f(K)$  for all  $f \in S(\alpha, 0, M)$ . Here  $\alpha$  and  $M$  are fixed numbers satisfying  $0 < \alpha < \infty$  and  $1 < M \leq \infty$ . It is easily seen that  $S(\alpha, d, M) = S(\alpha, \delta(M, \alpha), M)$  for  $0 \leq d \leq \delta(M, \alpha)$ . Hence in describing  $F$  we assume for given  $\alpha$  and  $M$  as above that  $\delta(M, \alpha) \leq d < 1$ . For such values of  $\alpha, d$ , and  $M$  we now describe  $\partial F(K)$ . If  $d = \delta(M, \alpha)$ , then  $\partial F(K)$  contains

(i) An arc with endpoints  $C, \bar{C}$ , of the  $\alpha$  curve tangent to  $\partial K_d$  at  $-d$ .

If  $\delta(M, \alpha) < d < 1$ , then  $\partial F(K)$  contains

(ii) An arc of  $\partial K_d$  through  $-d$  with endpoints  $A, \bar{A}$ ,

(iii) Two arcs with endpoints  $A, C$ , and  $\bar{A}, \bar{C}$ , of the two  $\alpha$  curves tangent to  $\partial K_d$  at  $A$  and  $\bar{A}$  respectively.

Either (a)  $0 < C = \bar{C} \leq M$  or (b)  $C \neq \bar{C}$ ,  $M < \infty$ , and  $|C| = M$ . If (a) occurs, then  $\partial F(K)$  is the arc in (i) for  $d = \delta(M, \alpha)$ , and the union of the arcs in (ii) and (iii) for  $\delta(M, \alpha) < d < 1$ . If (b) occurs, then  $\partial F(K)$  contains

(iv) The arc of  $\partial K_M$  through  $M$  with endpoints  $C, \bar{C}$ .

$\partial F(K)$  is now the union of the arcs in (i) and (iv) for  $d = \delta(M, \alpha)$ , and the union of the arcs in (ii)-(iv) for  $\delta(M, \alpha) < d < 1$ . This completes the description of  $\partial F(K)$ .

The function  $F$  is uniquely determined by the above description of  $\partial F(K)$  and the requirement that  $F \in S(\alpha, d, M)$ , as we show in §3.

We remark that Theorem 1 is well known in the simple case  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $M = \infty$ ,  $d = \frac{1}{2}$ . In this case it is a simple consequence of the fact that a normalized convex function is starlike of order  $\frac{1}{2}$  (see Suffridge [15] for a proof of this fact). However, in all other cases Theorem 1 is new. The subordination result in (B) implies the following corollary (see for example Golusin [4, Ch.8, §8]).

COROLLARY 1. *Let  $\alpha, d, M$ , and  $F$  be as in Theorem 1. Let  $\Phi$  be a given nonconstant entire function. If  $f \in S(\alpha, d, M)$ , then*

(A) *For given  $z \in K - \{0\}$*

$$\operatorname{Re} \left\{ \Phi \left[ \log \frac{f(z)}{z} \right] \right\} \leq \max_{0 < \theta \leq 2\pi} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \Phi \left[ \log \frac{F(e^{i\theta} z)}{e^{i\theta} z} \right] \right\},$$

(B) *For given  $r, 0 < r < 1$ , and  $\lambda > 0$ ,*

$$\int_0^{2\pi} |f(re^{i\theta})|^\lambda d\theta \leq \int_0^{2\pi} |F(re^{i\theta})|^\lambda d\theta,$$

(C) *For a given positive integer  $N \geq 2$ ,*

$$\sum_{k=2}^N |a_k|^2 \leq \sum_{k=2}^N |A_k|^2,$$

where  $f(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^k$  and  $F(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} A_k z^k$ ,  $z \in K$ .

*Equality holds in any one of (A), (B), or (C) only if for some real  $\theta$ ,  $f(z) = e^{-i\theta} F(e^{i\theta} z)$ ,  $z \in K$ .*

We note that with the appropriate choice of  $\Phi$  in Corollary 1, some of the classical extremal problems follow for  $S(\alpha, d, M)$ . For example, the quantities  $|f(z)/z|$ ,  $|\operatorname{Arg} f(z)/z|$ ,  $\operatorname{Re} \{[f(z)/z]^p\}$ , where  $|z| = r$ ,  $0 < r < 1$ ,  $f \in S(\alpha, d, M)$ , and  $p > 0$ , are all maximized or minimized on  $\partial K$ , by  $F$ . We remark that Krzyz [10] proved (A) of Corollary 1 for  $S(1, 0, M)$ , and Barnard [1] proved (A) of Corollary 1 for  $S(1, d, M)$ . However, they did not show the  $F$  in their respective classes was the unique function with property (A). Also Miller [11] proved (A) of Corollary 1 for  $S(\alpha, 0, \infty)$ ,  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ , and  $\Phi(w) = \pm w$ .

Next for fixed  $d$ ,  $0 \leq d < 1$ , and  $M$ ,  $1 < M \leq \infty$ , let  $S^*(d, M)$  denote the class of normalized starlike univalent functions  $f$  in  $K$  which satisfy (1.3). We observe for given  $r$ ,  $0 < r < 1$ , and  $f \in S^*(d, M)$  that  $f(rz)/r$ ,  $z \in K$ , is in  $S(\alpha, d, M)$  for  $\alpha > 0$  small enough. Moreover if  $f, g \in S^*(d, M)$  and  $0 < r < 1$ , then the function  $z[f(z)/z]^\tau [g(z)/z]^{1-\tau}$ ,  $z \in K$ , is in  $S^*(d, M)$ . Using these observations and Theorem 1, we easily obtain in §9, the following theorem.

(A) *The function  $g(z) = \log F^*(z)/z$ ,  $z \in K$ , ( $g(0) = 0$ ) is convex univalent,*

(B) *If  $f \in S^*(d, M)$ , then  $\log f(z)/z$ ,  $z \in K$ , is subordinate to  $g$ .*

Theorem 2 implies, as in the discussion after Theorem 1, the following corollary.

**COROLLARY 2.** *Let  $d$  and  $M$  be as in Corollary 1. Replace  $F$  by  $F^*$  and  $S(\alpha, d, M)$  by  $S^*(d, M)$  in Corollary 1. Then Corollary 1 is valid for  $F^*$ .*

We remark that Theorem 2 and Corollary 2 are well known in the simple case  $d = \frac{1}{4}$ ,  $M = \infty$  (see Goluzin [4, Thm. 1, p. 531]). Moreover, Suffridge [16] proved (C) of Corollary 2 for  $S^*(d, \infty)$  and  $N = 2$ . Barnard [2] proved (A) of Corollary 2 for  $S^*(d, M)$  and  $\Phi(w) = \pm w$ . With these exceptions, Theorem 2 and Corollary 2 are new results for starlike functions.

For given  $M$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $d$ , as in Theorem 1, let  $f$  be in  $S(\alpha, d, M)$  and put  $D = f(K)$ . Then the proof of Theorem 1 is based upon a geometric description of  $\partial D$  and a use of the Julia variational formula similar to Krzyz [10] and Barnard [1]. This geometric description of  $\partial D$  is obtained in Lemmas 1–3 of §2. In §3 we use Lemmas 1–3 to determine  $\delta(M, \alpha)$  and show  $F \in S(\alpha, d, M)$  is uniquely defined by (i)–(iv).

In §4 we define our variations of  $D$  when  $\partial D$  contains an arc of an  $\alpha$  curve. In §5 we show that the Hadamard variational formula holds for the Greens functions of our varied domains. In §6 we deduce the Julia variational formula from the Hadamard variational formula, and show how it can be used to solve an extremal problem. In §7 we prove Lemmas 4–7. We use these lemmas in §8 to prove Theorem 1. In §9 we deduce Theorem 2 from Theorem 1 and describe  $\partial F^*(K, d, M)$ .

As motivation for the proof of Theorem 1, we first remark that it turns out (A) of Corollary 1 implies Theorem 1. Second, we remark that our geometric description implies  $\partial D$  is made up of a finite number of arcs with the following property: each arc is the image, under  $\zeta^\alpha$ , of an arc contained in the boundary of a convex domain. Since the Julia variation is a local boundary variation, it follows that the solution to (A) of Corollary 1 in  $S(\alpha, d, M)$  should be obtainable from a local use of conformal mapping and arguments similar to those of Krzyz [10] and Barnard [1]. Furthermore, a general description of  $\partial F(K, \alpha, d, M)$  should follow from considering local  $\alpha$  powers of  $\zeta$  on  $\partial F(K, 1, d, M)$ . This is indeed the case, as we see from (i)–(iv). We emphasize, though, that the extremal functions in Theorem 1, corresponding to different values of  $\alpha$ , do not bear such a simple relationship. Even though the bounds on  $F(K, \alpha, d, M)$  make it quite difficult to obtain an explicit representation formula for  $F$ , this function is completely described by its geometric properties. Since the Julia variational method allows to preserve both bounds and the class, it seems the most natural way to prove Theorem 1.

Finally the authors would like to thank Professor Frank Keogh for some helpful comments concerning the geometric description of  $S(\alpha)$ .

**2. A geometric description of the image domains of  $\alpha$  starlike functions.** Given  $w \neq 0$ , let  $\text{Arg } w$ ,  $-\pi \leq \text{Arg } w \leq \pi$ , denote the principal argument of  $w$ . Let  $\gamma$  be an  $\alpha$  curve as in Definition 1. Since  $\gamma$  is the image of a line, not containing  $\zeta = 0$ , under a continuous  $\alpha$  power of  $\zeta$ , it follows for  $0 < \alpha \leq 2$ , that  $\gamma$  divides the  $w$  plane into two disjoint domains. Moreover the domain containing  $w = 0$  is starlike. However for  $\alpha > 2$ ,  $\gamma$  intersects itself, and consequently there exist rays through  $w = 0$  which intersect  $\gamma$  more than once. Since we shall be studying starlike domains in which part of the boundary is an arc of  $\gamma$ , it is necessary to make the following definition for fixed  $\alpha$ ,  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ .

**DEFINITION 2.** Let  $\beta$  denote a closed arc of an  $\alpha$  curve  $\gamma$ . Then we shall call  $\beta$  an  $\alpha$  arc of  $\gamma$ , if each ray through  $w = 0$  intersects  $\beta$  in at most one point.

We shall determine the number of  $\alpha$  arcs with endpoints  $A, B (A \neq B)$  in the  $w$  plane. Clearly the number is zero if either  $\text{Arg}(\bar{A}B) = 0$ , or one of  $A$  and  $B$  is zero. Hence we assume  $A \neq 0$ ,  $B \neq 0$ , and  $\text{Arg}(\bar{A}B) \neq 0$ . Next we draw the rays from  $w = 0$  through  $A$  and  $B$ . These rays divide the  $w$  plane into two sectors,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , with angular openings  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  respectively. We may suppose that  $0 < \theta_1 \leq \theta_2 < 2\pi$ , since otherwise we renumber. We observe that if  $\beta$  is an  $\alpha$  arc with endpoints  $A$  and  $B$ , then either  $\beta \subset T_1 \cup \{A, B\}$ , or  $\beta \subset T_2 \cup \{A, B\}$ , as follows from Definition 2. We claim for fixed  $\alpha$ ,  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ , that

(2.1a) Let  $i$  be fixed,  $i = 1$  or  $2$ . Then if  $0 < \theta_i < \pi\alpha$ , there exists exactly one  $\alpha$  arc  $\beta$  with endpoints  $A$  and  $B$  for which  $\beta \subset T_i \cup \{A, B\}$ . If  $\pi\alpha \leq \theta_i$ , there does not exist an  $\alpha$  arc  $\beta$  with endpoints  $A$  and  $B$  for which  $\beta \subset T_i \cup \{A, B\}$ .

To prove (2.1a), let  $h_i$  denote an analytic  $1/\alpha$  power of  $w$  in  $T_i (i = 1$  or  $2)$  which is continuous on  $\partial T_i$ . Then the line segment with endpoints  $h_i(A)$  and  $h_i(B)$  is contained in  $h_i(T_i) \cup \{h_i(A), h_i(B)\}$ , if and only if  $0 < \theta_i < \pi\alpha$ . Using this fact and considering the inverse mapping to  $h_i$ , we get (2.1a).

From (2.1a) we see for  $0 < \alpha \leq 1$  that if  $0 < |\text{Arg}(\bar{A}B)| < \pi\alpha$ , then there exists exactly one  $\alpha$  arc with endpoints  $A, B$ . For  $1 < \alpha < \infty$ , it follows from (2.1a) that there is at least one  $\alpha$  arc with endpoints  $A, B (\text{Arg}(\bar{A}B) \neq 0)$ . Also for  $2 < \alpha < \infty$ , there are exactly two  $\alpha$  arcs with endpoints  $A, B (\text{Arg} \bar{A}B \neq 0)$ .

Next we determine a geometric criterion for a bounded domain to be a magnification of the image domain of an  $\alpha$  starlike function. This criterion is given by Lemma 1. In Lemma 1,  $\beta$  denotes the  $\alpha$  arc with endpoints  $A, B$ , satisfying  $\beta \subset T_1 \cup \{A, B\}$ .

LEMMA 1. *Let  $D$  be a bounded domain containing  $w = 0$  with the property that each ray through  $w = 0$  intersects  $\partial D$  in exactly one point. Let  $\alpha$  be a fixed positive number and suppose there exists a sufficiently small  $\eta > 0$  such that whenever  $A, B \in \partial D$  and  $0 < |\text{Arg}(\bar{A}B)| < \eta < \pi\alpha$ , then either  $\beta \subset D \cup \{A, B\}$  or  $\beta \subset \partial D$ . Then there is a function  $g \in S(\alpha)$  and a number  $t > 0$  such that  $tg(K) = D$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A, B$ , be any two points of  $\partial D$  with  $0 < |\text{Arg}(\bar{A}B)| < \eta \leq \pi\alpha$ . Define  $T_1$  and  $\beta \subset T_1 \cup \{A, B\}$  relative to  $A$  and  $B$  as in (2.1a). Let  $h_1$  be an analytic  $1/\alpha$  power of  $w$  on  $T_1$  which is continuous on  $\partial T_1$ . Put  $D_1 = D \cap T_1$ ,  $\lambda = \partial D \cap T_1$ , and suppose that  $E, F, E \neq F$ , are any two points of  $\lambda$ . Then from the hypotheses of Lemma 1 (with  $E, F$ , replacing  $A, B$ ), either the line segment connecting  $h_1(E)$  to  $h_1(F)$  is contained in  $h_1(\lambda)$  or it is contained in  $h_1(D_1) \cup \{h_1(A), h_1(B)\}$ . Since  $\partial h_1(D_1)$  consists of  $h_1(\lambda)$  and segments of two rays from  $w = 0$  forming an angle less than  $\pi$ , it follows that  $h_1(D_1)$  is convex. Hence  $h_1(\lambda)$  may be approximated by a polygonal arc  $\tau$ , made up of chords connecting points on  $h_1(\lambda)$ , with endpoints  $h_1(A), h_1(B)$ . If  $n$  a positive integer is given, then  $\tau$  can be chosen such that each point of  $\tau$  lies within  $1/n$  distance of a point of  $h(\lambda)$ . Also,  $\tau$  can be chosen in such a way that a piecewise continuous argument of the tangent to  $\tau$  does not decrease as  $\tau$  is described in the counterclockwise direction with respect to  $w = 0$ .

Taking the preimage of  $\tau$  under  $h_1$ , we find that  $\lambda$  may be approximated by an arc  $\sigma_1 \subset D_1 \cup \lambda \cup \{A, B\}$ , made up of  $\alpha$  arcs, with endpoints  $A, B$ . Moreover each point of  $\sigma_1$  is within  $C/n$  of a point of  $\lambda$ , where  $C$  is a positive constant which depends only on  $\alpha$  and  $D$ . Also the tangent to  $\sigma_1$  rotates counterclockwise as we pass from one  $\alpha$  arc to another in the counterclockwise direction. Since  $\partial D$  may be written as a finite union of sets of the form  $\lambda$ , we see that  $\partial D$  may be approximated by a Jordan curve  $\sigma$  with the same properties as  $\sigma_1$ . The bounded domain  $D(n)$ , with  $\partial D(n) = \sigma$ , is clearly starlike with respect to  $w = 0$ . Let  $g_n$  denote the Riemann mapping function satisfying  $g_n(0) = 0$ ,  $g'_n(0) > 0$ , and  $g_n(K) = D(n)$ . Then  $g_n$  is continuous in  $K \cup \partial K$  and a continuous  $1/\alpha$  power of  $g_n$  maps  $\partial K - \{1\}$  onto a polygonal arc. Moreover, as  $\partial K - \{1\}$  is described in the counterclockwise direction, a piecewise continuous argument of the tangent to this polygonal arc does not decrease. Using this fact and a Schwarz-Christophel type argument we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha \operatorname{Re} \{1 + zg''_n(z)/g'_n(z)\} + (1 - \alpha) \operatorname{Re} \{zg'_n(z)/g_n(z)\} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^m b_k \operatorname{Re} \left( \frac{1 + e^{-i\theta_k} z}{1 - e^{-i\theta_k} z} \right), \quad z \in K, \end{aligned}$$

where  $b_k$  and  $\theta_k$  are positive, and  $m$  is a positive integer. Hence

$$(2.2) \quad g_n/g'_n(0) \in S(\alpha).$$

The sequence  $(g_n)_1^\infty$  is a uniformly bounded sequence of univalent functions in  $K$ . Moreover from the construction of  $D(n)$ , we see that  $g_n(K) = D(n) \rightarrow D$  in the sense of kernel convergence. Using these facts and applying a theorem of Carathéodory (see Goluzin [4, Thm. 1, p. 55]), we deduce that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n = \hat{g}$ ,  $\hat{g}'(0) > 0$ , and  $\hat{g}(K) = D$ . Using the compactness of  $S(\alpha)$  and (2.2), we further deduce that  $\hat{g}/\hat{g}'(0) = g \in S(\alpha)$ . Hence Lemma 1 is true.

To continue our geometric description of the image domains of  $\alpha$  starlike functions we prove

LEMMA 2. *Let  $f \in S(\alpha, 0, M)$  for some  $M < \infty$  and put  $D = f(K)$ . Then each ray through  $w = 0$  intersects  $\partial D$  in exactly one point. If  $A, B, A \neq B$ , are in  $\partial D$  and if  $\beta$  is an  $\alpha$  arc with endpoints  $A$  and  $B$ , then*

(a) *either  $\beta \subset \partial D$  or  $\beta \subset D \cup \{A, B\}$ ,*

(b) *if  $\Omega$  denotes the component of  $D - \beta$  containing  $w = 0$ , then there exists a  $g \in S(\alpha)$  and  $t > 0$  such that  $tg(K) = \Omega$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $g_r(z) = f(rz)$  for  $z \in K$  and  $0 < r < 1$ . Put  $D_r = g_r(K)$ , and  $\Gamma_r(\theta) = g_r(e^{i\theta})$ ,  $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$ . Then from (1.1) we see that

$$\alpha \operatorname{Re} \{1 + zg''_r(z)/g'_r(z)\} + (1 - \alpha) \operatorname{Re} \{zg'_r(z)/g_r(z)\} \geq 0, \quad z \in K \cup \partial K.$$

Let  $\log \Gamma_r$  and  $\log \Gamma'_r$  be continuous logarithms of  $\Gamma_r$  and  $\Gamma'_r(\Gamma'_r(\theta) = d/d\theta \Gamma_r(\theta))$ . Then the above inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \operatorname{Im} \frac{d}{d\theta} \log [\Gamma_r^{1/\alpha-1}(\theta) \Gamma'_r(\theta)] &= \alpha \operatorname{Im} \frac{d}{d\theta} \log \Gamma'_r(\theta) \\ &+ (1 - \alpha) \operatorname{Im} \frac{d}{d\theta} \log \Gamma_r(\theta) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Geometrically this inequality means

(2.3a) The argument of the tangent to  $\Gamma_r^{1/\alpha}$  does not decrease as  $\theta$  increases for a continuous  $1/\alpha$  power of  $\Gamma_r$ .

Using (2.3a) we now prove Lemma 2. Let  $A, B$ , and  $\beta$  be as in Lemma 2. Choose a sector  $V$  containing  $\beta$  in its interior and of angle opening  $\phi$ ,  $0 < \phi < \pi\alpha$ . This choice is possible by (2.1a). Let  $p$  be an analytic  $1/\alpha$  power of  $w$  on  $V$ . Then (2.3a) implies that  $p(V \cap D_r)$  is



convex, as is easily seen. Since  $D = \bigcup_{0 < r < 1} D_r$  and  $D_s \subset D_r$ ,  $s < r$ , it follows that

$$(2.3b) \quad p(V \cap D) \text{ is convex.}$$

Hence the line segment  $l$  with end points  $p(A)$ ,  $p(B)$ , is either contained in  $p(V \cap D) \cup \{p(A), p(B)\}$  or in  $p(\partial D \cap V)$ . Using this fact and the inverse mapping to  $p$ , we deduce that (a) of Lemma 2 is true. Also since each ray through the origin intersects  $p(V \cap \partial D)$  in exactly one point, we see that  $V \cap \partial D$  likewise has this property. Hence each ray through  $w = 0$  intersects  $\partial D$  in exactly one point. To prove (b) of Lemma 2 we observe that  $p(V \cap \Omega)$  is equal to the component of  $p(V \cap D) - l$  containing zero in its boundary. Hence  $p(V \cap \Omega)$  is convex. Using the inverse of  $p$ , it follows that the boundary points of  $\Omega$  in a sufficiently small neighborhood of  $A$  satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 1. A similar statement holds for the boundary points in a small neighborhood of  $B$ . Since  $\eta > 0$  may be arbitrarily small in Lemma 1, and since  $\partial \Omega$  consists of a part of  $\partial D$  and  $\beta$ , we find from the above discussion and (a) of Lemma 2 that  $\partial \Omega$  satisfies the conditions of Lemma 1. Applying this lemma we deduce that (b) is valid. This proves Lemma 2.

Again suppose that  $f \in S(\alpha, 0, M)$  for some  $M < \infty$ . Then  $f' \in H^1$  (see (1.2c)) and hence  $\Gamma(\theta) = f(e^{i\theta})$ ,  $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$  is a bounded rectifiable curve in the  $w$  plane. (see for example Goluzin [4, Thm. 1, p. 409]). Let  $w \in \Gamma$  and suppose that  $\Gamma$  has unique left and right hand tangents at  $w$ . If  $\gamma$  is an  $\alpha$  curve through  $w$ , then we shall say  $\gamma$  is tangent to  $\Gamma$  from the right (left) at  $w$ , provided the tangent to  $\gamma$  coincides with the right hand (left hand) tangent of  $\Gamma$  at  $w$ . With this understanding we prove

**LEMMA 3.** *Let  $f$  and  $D$  be as in Lemma 2 and put  $\Gamma = \partial D$ . Then  $\Gamma$  has a unique right (left) hand tangent at each  $w \in \Gamma$ . Consequently, there exists exactly one  $\alpha$  curve  $\gamma$  which is tangent to  $\Gamma$  at  $w$  from the right (left). If  $\beta \subset \gamma$  is an  $\alpha$  arc with one endpoint  $w$ , then  $\beta \cap D = \{\phi\}$ .*

*Proof.* Lemma 3 follows easily from (2.3b) and geometric properties of convex domains. We omit the details.

**3. Applications of Lemmas 1–3.** We now determine  $\delta(M, \alpha)$  (see §1) for fixed  $M$  and  $\alpha$  satisfying  $1 < M < \infty$  and  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ . To do this we let  $f$ ,  $D$ , and  $\Gamma$  be as in Lemma 3 and put  $d(f) = \min\{|w| : w \in \Gamma\}$ . We shall use the following remark which also will be used in §4 and §8.

REMARK 1. If  $w_0 \in \Gamma$  is such that  $|w_0| = d(f)$ , then there is exactly one  $\alpha$  curve  $\gamma$  tangent to  $\Gamma$  at  $w_0$  from either the left or right. Furthermore,  $\gamma$  is tangent to  $\partial K_{d(f)}$  at  $w_0$ .

Remark 1 follows easily from Lemma 3 by way of contradiction. Let  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$ , be the  $\alpha$  curves tangent to  $\Gamma$  at  $w_0$  from the right and left, respectively. If  $\gamma_1$  were not tangent to  $\partial K_{d(f)}$  at  $w_0$ , then  $\gamma_1$  would contain points of  $K_{d(f)}$  arbitrarily near  $w_0$ . Hence there would exist an  $\alpha$  arc  $\beta \subset \gamma_1$  with endpoint  $w_0$  and  $\beta \cap D \neq \{\phi\}$ . This inequality contradicts Lemma 3. Therefore  $\gamma_1$  is tangent to  $\partial K_{d(f)}$  at  $w_0$ . Repeating the argument we see that  $\gamma_2$  is tangent to  $\partial K_{d(f)}$  at  $w_0$ . Since the definition of an  $\alpha$  curve implies there is exactly one  $\alpha$  curve tangent to  $\partial K_{d(f)}$  at  $w_0$ , we must have  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ .

To continue the determination of  $\delta(M, \alpha)$ , we need some notation. First, given a simply connected domain  $G$  containing  $w = 0$ , we shall let m.r.  $G$  denote the mapping radius of  $G$  (see Hayman [5, p. 78] for a definition). Also, we shall say  $G$  is  $\alpha$  starlike, if there exists  $h \in S(\alpha)$  and  $t > 0$  such that  $th(K) = G$ . Second, for given  $M$  and  $\alpha$  as above, and given  $s, 0 < s < M$ , we draw the  $\alpha$  curve  $\gamma$  tangent to  $\partial K_s$  at  $-s$ . From the definition of  $\gamma$  we see that either  $\gamma$  intersects itself at a point  $t = t(s)$ ,  $0 < t \leq M$ , or  $\gamma$  does not intersect itself in  $K_M \cup \partial K_M$ , and  $\gamma$  intersects  $\partial K_M$  at  $Me^{i\phi}, Me^{-i\phi}$ , for some  $\phi = \phi(s)$ ,  $0 < \phi < \pi$ . In the first case we let  $\Omega(s)$  denote the bounded domain containing  $w = 0$  whose boundary is the two  $\alpha$  arcs of  $\gamma$  with endpoints  $-s, t$ . In the second case we let  $\Omega(s)$  denote the bounded domain containing  $w = 0$  whose boundary consists of the  $\alpha$  arc of  $\gamma$  with endpoints  $Me^{i\phi}, Me^{-i\phi}$ , and the arc of  $\partial K_M$  with endpoints  $Me^{i\phi}, Me^{-i\phi}$ , which contains  $M$ . We claim that  $\Omega(s)$  is  $\alpha$  starlike. Indeed, it is obvious that  $\partial\Omega(s)$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 1 except possibly in a small disk about  $t$  in the first case or in small neighborhoods of  $Me^{i\phi}, Me^{-i\phi}$ , in the second case considered above. Using (2.3b) with  $A$  and  $B$  properly defined, it is easily checked that  $\partial\Omega(s)$  also satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 1 at these boundary points. Hence  $\Omega(s)$  is  $\alpha$  starlike for  $0 < s < M$ . Next we observe that  $\Omega(s_1) \subset \Omega(s_2) \subset K_M$  for  $0 < s_1 < s_2 < M$ , as can be seen by examining  $\partial\Omega(s_i)$  ( $i = 1$  or  $2$ ). Using elementary properties of subordination, it follows that

$$0 = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \text{m.r. } \Omega(s_1) < \text{m.r. } \Omega(s_2) < \lim_{s \rightarrow M} \text{m.r. } \Omega(s) = M,$$

for  $0 < s_1 < s_2 < M$ . From the above inequality we see there exists a unique  $s_0, 0 < s_0 < M$ , for which

$$(3.1) \quad \text{m.r. } \Omega(s_0) = 1.$$

Finally we determine  $\delta(M, \alpha)$ . Let  $f, \Gamma, D$ , and  $d(f)$  be as previously defined in §3. We may assume  $-d(f) \in \Gamma$ , since otherwise we rotate  $D$ . Then from Remark 1 and Lemma 3, we deduce that  $\Omega[d(f)] \supset D$  and thereupon, m.r.,  $\Omega[d(f)] \geq \text{m.r. } D = 1$ . Hence,  $\Omega(s_0) \subset \Omega[d(f)]$ , and so,  $s_0 \leq d(f)$ . Since  $\Omega(s_0)$  is the image domain of a function  $F \in S(\alpha, 0, M)$ , we conclude that  $\delta(M, \alpha) = s_0$ .

Next in §3 we show for fixed  $\alpha, M$ , and  $d$  satisfying  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ ,  $1 < M < \infty$ , and  $\delta(M, \alpha) \leq d < 1$ , that  $F(\cdot, \alpha, d, M) \in S(\alpha, d, M)$  is uniquely defined by (i)-(iv) of §1. To do this for given  $\theta$ ,  $0 < \theta < \pi$ , draw the  $\alpha$  curves  $\gamma, \bar{\gamma}$ , tangent to  $\partial K_d$  at  $de^{i\theta}, de^{-i\theta}$ , respectively. Then either  $\gamma$  intersects  $\bar{\gamma}$  at a point  $u = u(\theta)$ ,  $0 < u \leq M$ , or  $\gamma$  and  $\bar{\gamma}$  intersect  $\partial K_M$  at points  $P = P(\theta), \bar{P} = \bar{P}(\theta)$ , respectively with  $P \neq \bar{P}$ . In the first case we let  $\Lambda(d, \theta)$  denote the bounded domain containing  $w = 0$  whose boundary consists of

(+) the arc of  $\partial K_d$  with endpoints  $de^{i\theta}, de^{-i\theta}$ , containing  $-d$ , and  $\alpha$  arcs of  $\gamma$  and  $\bar{\gamma}$  with end points  $de^{i\theta}, u$ , and  $de^{-i\theta}, u$ , respectively.

In the second case we let  $\Lambda(d, \theta)$  denote the bounded domain containing  $w = 0$  whose boundary consists of the arc of  $\partial K_d$  in (+), the  $\alpha$  arcs of  $\gamma$  and  $\bar{\gamma}$  with end points  $de^{i\theta}, P$ , and  $de^{-i\theta}, \bar{P}$ , respectively, and the arc of  $\partial K_M$  with end points  $P, \bar{P}$ , containing  $M$ . We also put  $\Lambda(d, \pi) = \Omega(d)$ , where  $\Omega(d)$  is as defined previously in §3.

Again using (2.3b) and Lemma 1, we see that  $\Lambda(d, \theta)$  is  $\alpha$  starlike for  $0 < \theta \leq \pi$ . Furthermore  $\Lambda(d, \theta_1) \subsetneq \Lambda(d, \theta_2)$  for  $0 < \theta_1 < \theta_2 \leq \pi$ . Hence,

$$(3.2) \quad d = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \text{m.r. } \Lambda(d, \theta) < \text{m.r. } \Lambda(d, \theta_1) < \text{m.r. } \Lambda(d, \theta_2) < \text{m.r. } \Lambda(d, \pi),$$

for  $0 < \theta_1 < \theta_2 < \pi$ .

Now suppose that  $F \in S(\alpha, d, M)$  is a function for which  $\partial F(K)$  satisfies (i)-(iv) of §1. If  $d = \delta(M, \alpha)$ , then from (3.1) we see that  $F(K) = \Lambda(d, \pi) = \Omega(s_0)$ . If  $\delta(M, \alpha) < d < 1$ , then from (3.1), (3.2), and the fact that  $\Lambda[\delta(M, \alpha), \pi] \subsetneq \Lambda(d, \pi)$ , we see there exists exactly one  $\theta_0 = \theta_0(d)$  satisfying  $0 < \theta_0 < \pi$  and for which  $F(K) = \Lambda(d, \theta_0)$ . We conclude for a fixed  $\alpha, 0 < \alpha < \infty, M, 1 < M < \infty$ , and  $d, \delta(M, \alpha) \leq d < 1$ , that  $F \in S(\alpha, d, M)$  is uniquely defined by (i)-(iv) of §1. The situation  $M = \infty, 0 < \alpha < \infty, \delta(\infty, \alpha) \leq d < 1$ , can be handled by treating it as a limiting case, as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , of the previous cases considered. We omit the details.

**4. Boundary variations.** Again we assume that  $M, \alpha, d$ , are fixed numbers satisfying  $1 < M < \infty$ ,  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ , and  $\delta(M, \infty) \leq d < 1$ . If  $f \in S(\alpha, d, M)$ , we also put  $D = f(K)$ ,  $\Gamma = \partial D$ . Let  $A, B (A \neq B)$  and  $E, F (E \neq F)$  be in  $\Gamma$ . We suppose that  $\Gamma$  contains an  $\alpha$  arc  $\beta$  with end points  $A, B$ , and an  $\alpha$  arc  $\mu$  with endpoints  $E, F$ . We further suppose that  $\mu$  and  $\beta$  are disjoint, except possibly  $B = F$  or  $A = E$ . Let  $V$  and  $N$  be sectors drawn from  $w = 0$  which contain  $\beta$  and  $\mu$  in their interiors, respectively. Thanks to (2.1a), we may choose  $V$  and  $N$  to each have angle opening less than  $\pi\alpha$ . We let  $p$  and  $\phi$  be analytic  $1/\alpha$  powers of  $w$  on  $V$  and  $N$  respectively. Then we shall define the following variations on  $\Gamma$  (see Barnard [1] for similar variations in the convex case).

I. An inward variation whenever  $\mu$  is not tangent to  $\partial K_d$ , and the right and left hand tangents to  $\Gamma$  at  $F$  do not coincide.

II. An outward variation whenever the right and left hand tangents to  $\Gamma$  at  $A$  do not coincide, and  $B$  satisfies either (a) or (b):

(a)  $|B| = M$ ,

(b)  $|B| < M$ , and the left and right hand tangents to  $\Gamma$  at  $B$  do not coincide.

III. An outward sliding of  $\beta$  when  $\Gamma \cap \partial K_d$  contains a set of distinct points,  $\{Q_n\}_1^\infty$ , with  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_n = A$ , and  $B$  satisfies either (a) or (b) of II.

Variation I will be defined in terms of a parameter  $\delta$  for  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$  ( $\delta_0$  small) in such a way that if  $\Gamma_1(\delta)$  denotes the variation of  $\Gamma$ , then  $\Gamma_1(\delta)$  is the boundary of an  $\alpha$  starlike domain  $D_1(\delta)$ , and

$$(4.1) \quad \Gamma_1(\delta) \subset \{z: d \leq |z| \leq M\} = L(d, M).$$

Furthermore,

$$(4.2) \quad D_1(\delta_2) \subset D_1(\delta_1), \quad \text{whenever} \quad 0 < \delta_1 < \delta_2 \leq \delta_0,$$

$$(4.3) \quad \bigcup_{0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0} D_1(\delta) = D.$$

To define I let  $F_0$  be a point on  $(\Gamma - \mu) \cap N$  which is near  $F$ . Draw the  $\alpha$  arc  $\mu_0$  whose endpoints are  $E$  and  $F_0$  contained in  $N$ . It is possible to draw such an arc for  $F_0$  near  $F$  by (2.1a). Since  $F$  is as in I it follows from (a) of Lemma 2 that  $\mu_0 \subset D \cup \{E, F_0\}$ . Hence the smallest angle between the tangents to  $\mu$  and  $\mu_0$  at  $E$  is positive. Let  $\delta_0 > 0$  denote this angle.

Now suppose that  $F_1, F_2$  ( $F_1 \neq F_2$ ) are points on the arc of  $\Gamma \cap N$  with endpoints  $F_0, F$ . Also we suppose that  $F_1 \neq F, F_2 \neq F$ . Draw the  $\alpha$  arcs  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  with endpoints  $E, F_1$ , and  $E, F_2$ , respectively. Let  $\delta_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , denote the smallest angle between  $\mu_i$  and  $\mu$  at  $E$ . As above we observe that  $\mu_i \subset D \cup \{E, F_i\}$  and thereupon that  $\delta_i > 0$ . Also since  $\mu_1 \subset D \cup \{E, F_1\}$ , we must have  $\mu_1 \cap (\mu_2 - \{E\}) = \{\phi\}$ . Hence  $\delta_1 \neq \delta_2$ . Let  $D_1(\delta_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , denote the component of  $D - \mu_i$  containing  $w = 0$ . From Lemma 2 we see that  $D_1(\delta_i)$  is an  $\alpha$  starlike domain and  $D_1(\delta_i) \subsetneq D$ . Furthermore if  $0 < \delta_1 < \delta_2 \leq \delta_0$ , then  $D_1(\delta_2) \subsetneq D_1(\delta_1)$ . To see this observe that  $\mu_2$  is an  $\alpha$  arc connecting two boundary points of  $D_1(\delta_1)$ . Furthermore since  $\delta_1 \neq \delta_2$ ,  $\mu_2 \subset D_1(\delta_1) \cup \{E, F_2\}$ . Since  $D_1(\delta_2)$  is the bounded component of  $D_1(\delta_1) - \mu_2$  containing  $w = 0$ , it follows that (4.2) is true.

We put  $\delta = \delta_1$  and let  $F_1$  vary subject to the above restrictions. For each  $\delta$ ,  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ , we obtain an  $\alpha$  starlike domain  $D_1(\delta) \subsetneq D$  with boundary  $\Gamma_1(\delta)$ . Moreover, from the definition of  $D_1(\delta)$  it is clear that (4.3) holds. To prove (4.1) it suffices to show that  $K_d \subset D_1(\delta_0)$  since  $D_1(\delta_0) \subset D(\delta) \subset D$  for  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ . To do this recall that by assumption  $\mu$  is not tangent to  $\partial K_d$ . Then by Remark 1,  $\mu$  has a positive distance from  $\partial K_d$ . Hence for  $\delta_0 > 0$  small enough  $\mu_0$  also has a positive distance from  $\partial K_d$  and so,  $K_d \subset D_1(\delta_0)$ .

Variation II will be defined in terms of a parameter  $\epsilon$  for  $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ , while variation III will be defined for  $\epsilon > 0$  in a sequence,  $z = (\epsilon_j)$ , with  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_j = 0$ . The variations will be defined in such a way that if  $\Gamma_2(\epsilon)$  denotes the variation of  $\Gamma$ , then  $\Gamma_2(\epsilon)$  is the boundary of an  $\alpha$  starlike domain  $D_2(\epsilon)$ , and

$$(4.4) \quad \Gamma_2(\epsilon) \subset L(d, M),$$

$$(4.5) \quad D_2(\epsilon_1) \subsetneq D_2(\epsilon_2), \quad \text{whenever} \quad 0 < \epsilon_1 < \epsilon_2,$$

$$(4.6) \quad \bigcap D_2(\epsilon) = D.$$

We remark for later use that if the right and left hand tangents at  $A$  coincide, then our method of variation in II will still produce a starlike domain  $D_2(\epsilon)$  satisfying (4.4)–(4.6).

To define II(a), choose a point  $B_0 \in (\partial K_M - \partial D) \cap V$  near  $B$  with the property that the ray from the origin to  $B_0$  intersects  $\beta$ . Draw the  $\alpha$  arc  $\beta_0$  whose endpoints are  $A$  and  $B_0$  which is contained in  $V$ . Again it is possible to draw such an arc for  $B_0$  near  $B$  by (2.1a). Let  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  denote the smallest angle between  $\beta$  and  $\beta_0$  at  $A$ .

Now suppose that  $B_1, B_2 (B_1 \neq B_2)$  are points on the arc of  $\partial K_M \cap V$  with endpoints  $B, B_0$ . Also we suppose that  $B_1 \neq B, B_2 \neq B$ . Draw the  $\alpha$  arcs  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  with endpoints  $A, B_1$ , and  $A, B_2$ , respectively. Let  $\epsilon_i (i = 1, 2)$  denote the smallest angle between  $\beta_i$  and  $\beta$  at  $A$ . Clearly  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$  and  $\epsilon_1 \neq \epsilon_2$ . Let  $D_2(\epsilon_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , denote the domain whose boundary is the union of the arcs:  $\beta_i, \Gamma - \beta$ , and the arc of  $\partial K_M$  with endpoints  $B, B_i$ , contained in  $V$ .

We claim that  $D_2(\epsilon_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , is  $\alpha$  starlike when  $B_0$  is near  $B$ . To see this note from (2.3b) that  $p(V \cap D)$  is convex. Also  $\partial p(V \cap D)$  contains the line segment  $l$  with endpoints  $p(A), p(B)$ . Since  $A$  is as in II(a), we see that the left and right hand tangents to  $\partial p(V \cap D)$  at  $p(A)$  do not coincide. Using these observations and well known geometric properties of convex domains we deduce for given  $i = 1$  or  $2$  that the bounded domain with boundary,

- (i) the line segment with endpoints  $p(A), p(B_i)$ ,
- (ii) the arc of  $p(K_M \cap V)$  with endpoints  $p(B), p(B_i)$ ,
- (iii)  $\partial p(V \cap D) - l$ ,

is convex. Also the boundary of this domain is contained in  $p[K_M \cap V]$ . Since this domain is also equal to  $p[D_2(\epsilon_i) \cap V]$ , it follows, upon taking the inverse of  $p$ , that  $D_2(\epsilon_i)$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 1 and that  $\partial D_2(\epsilon_i) \subset L(d, M)$ . Hence  $D_2(\epsilon_i)$  is  $\alpha$  starlike and  $\Gamma_2(\epsilon_i) = \partial D_2(\epsilon_i)$  satisfies (4.4).

Next we prove (4.5). If  $0 < \epsilon_1 < \epsilon_2 \leq \epsilon_0$ , then from Lemma 1 we see that  $\beta_1 \subset D_2(\epsilon_2) \cup \{A, B_1\}$ . It follows that  $D_2(\epsilon_1)$  is the bounded component of  $D_2(\epsilon_2) - \beta_1$  containing  $w = 0$ . Hence (4.5) is valid. Put  $\epsilon = \epsilon_1$  and let  $B_1$  vary subject to the previous restrictions. For each  $\epsilon$ ,  $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ , we obtain an  $\alpha$  starlike domain  $D_2(\epsilon)$  which satisfies (4.4)–(4.5). From the definition of  $D_2(\epsilon)$  and (4.5) we also see that (4.6) holds.

To define II (b), let  $\gamma$  be the  $\alpha$  curve tangent to  $\Gamma$  at  $B$  which does not contain  $\beta$ . Let  $B_0, |B_0| < M$ , be a point on  $\gamma$  near  $B$  with the property that the ray from the origin through  $B_0$  intersects  $\beta$ . Let  $\beta_0$  denote the  $\alpha$  arc with endpoints  $A$  and  $B_0$  which is contained in  $V$ . Let  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  be the smallest angle between  $\beta$  and  $\beta_0$  at  $A$ . Now let  $B_1 \neq B$  be a point on the arc of  $\gamma \cap V$  with endpoints  $B_0, B$ . Draw the  $\alpha$  arc  $\beta_1$  with endpoints  $A, B_1$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$  denote the smallest angle between  $\beta$  and  $\beta_1$  at  $A$ . Let  $D_2(\epsilon)$  denote the domain whose boundary is  $\beta_1, \Gamma - \beta$ , and the  $\alpha$  arc of  $\gamma$  with endpoints  $B, B_1$ , which is contained in  $V$ . Then  $D_2(\epsilon)$  is an  $\alpha$  starlike domain with boundary  $\Gamma_2(\epsilon)$  for  $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ . Furthermore, (4.4)–(4.6) are true. The proof of these facts is similar to the proof used in II (a). We omit the details.

To define III when  $B$  satisfies II (a), we first note from Remark 1 that  $\beta$  is tangent to  $\partial K_d$  at  $A$ . Let  $A_0 \in \partial K_d \cap \Gamma \cap V$  be near

$A(A_0 \neq A)$ . Let  $\gamma$  be the  $\alpha$  curve containing  $\beta$ , and let  $\gamma_0$  be the  $\alpha$  curve tangent to  $\partial K_d \cap \Gamma$  at  $A_0$ . Let  $P_0$  be the point of intersection in  $V$  of  $\gamma$  and  $\gamma_0$  which is nearest  $A$ . Let  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  denote the smallest angle between the tangents to  $\gamma$  and  $\gamma_0$  at  $P_0$ .

Now suppose that  $A_1 \neq A$  is a point on the arc of  $\partial K_d \cap V \cap \Gamma$  with endpoints  $A_0, A$ . Draw the  $\alpha$  curve  $\gamma_1$  tangent to  $\partial K_d \cap \Gamma$  at  $A_1$ . Let  $P_1$  denote the point of intersection of  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma$  in  $V$  which is nearest  $A$ . Let  $\epsilon, 0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ , be the smallest angle between  $\gamma$  and  $\gamma_1$  at  $P_1$ . The bounds on  $\epsilon$  may be established using the function  $p$  and elementary geometry. Let  $B_1$  be the point of  $\partial K_M \cap \gamma_1$  which is nearest  $B$ . We claim for  $\epsilon_0$  small enough that there exists an  $\alpha$  arc  $\beta_1$  of  $\gamma_1 \cap V$  with endpoints  $A_1, B_1$ . Again this is easily seen using (2.3b) and the function  $p$ . Let  $\sigma_1$  be the arc of  $\Gamma$  with endpoints  $A, A_1$ , which is contained in  $V$ . Finally let  $D_2(\epsilon)$  be the domain whose boundary is the union of the arcs,  $\beta_1, \Gamma - \{\beta \cup \sigma_1\}$ , and the arc of  $\partial K_M$  with endpoints  $B, B_1$ , which is contained in  $V$ . Put  $\Gamma_2(\epsilon) = \partial D_2(\epsilon)$ . Next we let  $\epsilon$  vary subject to the above restrictions. Since  $\{Q_n\}_1^\infty \subset \partial K_d \cap \Gamma$ , we obtain a sequence,  $\langle D_2(\epsilon) \rangle_{\epsilon \in z}$ , of domains with boundaries,  $\Gamma_2(\epsilon)$ ,  $\epsilon \in z$ . We assert that  $D_2(\epsilon)$ ,  $\epsilon \in z$ , is  $\alpha$  starlike and (4.4)–(4.6) are true. The assertion that  $D_2(\epsilon)$  is  $\alpha$  starlike may be proved using (2.3b) and Lemma 1. (4.4) follows from the definition of  $\Gamma_2(\epsilon)$ . (4.5) is a consequence of Lemma 3 and the fact that the  $\gamma_1$  corresponding to  $\epsilon_2$  is tangent to  $\Gamma_2(\epsilon_1)$  for  $0 < \epsilon_1 < \epsilon_2 \leq \epsilon_0$ . (4.6) then follows from (4.5), the definition of  $D_2(\epsilon)$ , and the fact that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_n = A$  (see III).

To define III when  $B$  satisfies II (b) we choose a point  $A_0 \in \Gamma \cap \partial K_d$  near  $A$ ,  $A_0 \neq A$ , and let  $A_1$  be a point on the arc of  $\partial K_d \cap \Gamma$  with endpoints  $A_0, A$ . With this notation  $\gamma, \gamma_0$ , and  $\gamma_1$  are defined as in III (a). Let  $\gamma^*$  be the  $\alpha$  curve tangent to  $\Gamma$  at  $B$  which does not contain  $\beta$ . Let  $B_1$  be the point nearest  $B$  in  $V$  where  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma^*$  intersect. With this notation we define  $\beta_1$  relative to  $A_1, B_1$ , and  $\sigma_1$  relative to  $A, A_1$ , as in III (a).  $P_1$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  are also as in III (a). Let  $D_2(\epsilon)$  be the domain whose boundary is the union of the arcs  $\beta_1, \Gamma - \{\beta \cup \sigma_1\}$ , and the  $\alpha$  arc of  $\gamma^* \cap V$  with end points  $B, B_1$ . Then  $D_2(\epsilon)$  is  $\alpha$  starlike and (4.4)–(4.6) are true, as follows from an argument similar to our previous arguments. We omit the details.

We now consider the effect on  $D$  of applying an outward variation of  $\Gamma$ , as in II or III, followed by an inward variation of the form I. To simplify our notation we put  $Y = (0, \epsilon_0]$ , if  $D$  is varied as in II, and  $Y = z$  if  $D$  is varied as in III. First applying variation II or III we obtain for each  $\epsilon, \epsilon \in Y$ , an  $\alpha$  starlike domain  $D_2(\epsilon)$  with boundary  $\Gamma_2(\epsilon)$ . Also,  $\Gamma_2(\epsilon)$  contains an  $\alpha$  arc  $\mu(\epsilon)$  with one endpoint  $E$ , and  $\mu \subset \mu(\epsilon)$  ( $\mu = \mu(\epsilon)$  unless  $B = F$ ). Next we apply variation I with  $\mu(\epsilon), \Gamma_2(\epsilon)$ , replacing  $\mu, \Gamma$ , in I. This is permissible if  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  is small

enough. Applying variation I, we obtain for each  $\delta$ ,  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0(\epsilon)$ , an  $\alpha$  starlike domain  $D(\epsilon, \delta)$  with boundary  $\Gamma(\epsilon, \delta)$ . We claim that  $\delta_0(\epsilon)$  does not depend on  $\epsilon$ . This claim is clearly true if  $B \neq F$ , since in this case the inward and outward variations are independent for small  $\epsilon_0 > 0$ . If  $B = F$ , then it is easily checked that  $D(\epsilon, \delta)$  is well defined for  $\epsilon \in Y$  and  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0(\epsilon_0)$ , when  $\epsilon_0 \in Y$  is small. Hence our claim is true and we may take  $\delta_0(\epsilon) = \delta_0(\epsilon_0)$ .

Finally in this section we consider the equation

$$(4.7) \quad \text{m.r. } D(\epsilon, \delta) = 1$$

for  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0(\epsilon_0)$  and  $\epsilon \in Y$ . Here m.r.  $D(\epsilon, \delta)$ , as previously defined, denotes the mapping radius of  $D(\epsilon, \delta)$ . We claim that the ordered pairs  $(\epsilon, \delta)$  satisfying (4.7) define a decreasing function  $\delta = \delta(\epsilon)$  for  $\epsilon \in Y \cap (0, \epsilon_1]$ ,  $0 < \epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_0$ . Also  $\delta(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  in  $Y$ . This claim is verified using (4.1)–(4.6), and the monotonicity of the mapping radius. We omit the details.

We put  $D(\epsilon) = D[\epsilon, \delta(\epsilon)]$ ,  $\epsilon \in Y \cap (0, \epsilon_1]$ ,  $\Gamma(\epsilon) = \partial D[\epsilon, \delta(\epsilon)]$ ,  $\epsilon \in Y \cap (0, \epsilon_1]$ . We also put  $D(0) = D$ ,  $\Gamma(0) = \Gamma$ . Then  $D(\epsilon)$  is  $\alpha$  starlike and from (4.1), (4.4), (4.7), we have

$$(4.8) \quad \Gamma(\epsilon) \subset L(d, M), \epsilon \in Y_1 = [Y \cup \{0\}] \cap [0, \epsilon_1],$$

$$(4.9) \quad \text{m.r. } D(\epsilon) = 1, \epsilon \in Y_1.$$

**5. The Hadamard variational formula.** From the definition of  $\Gamma(\epsilon)$  for  $\epsilon \in Y \cap (0, \epsilon_1]$  we see that  $\Gamma(\epsilon)$  contains an  $\alpha$  arc  $\beta_1 = \beta_1(\epsilon)$  with  $\epsilon$  the smallest angle between  $\beta_1$  and the  $\alpha$  arc containing  $\beta$  at  $A$  or  $P_1$ . Also  $\Gamma(\epsilon)$  contains an  $\alpha$  arc  $\mu_1 = \mu_1(\epsilon)$  with  $\delta(\epsilon)$  the smallest angle between  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu$  at  $E$ . This observation will be used throughout §5. In the sequel the symbols,  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0}$ , apply only to  $\epsilon \in Y_1$ .

Given  $\epsilon, \epsilon \in Y_1$ , let  $g_\epsilon(\cdot, w_1)$  denote Green's function for  $D(\epsilon)$  with pole at  $w_1 \in D(\epsilon)$ . If  $w_1 \in D(0)$  is fixed, then

$$(5.1) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} [g_\epsilon(\cdot, w_1) - g_0(\cdot, w_1)] = 0$$

uniformly on compact subsets of  $D(0)$ . This inequality follows from the fact that  $D(\epsilon) \rightarrow D(0)$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  in the sense of kernel convergence. We remark for fixed  $w_1 \in D(\epsilon)$  that the outer normal derivative of  $g_\epsilon(\cdot, w_1)$  exists at each  $s \in \mu_1 \cup \beta_1$ , except possibly at the endpoints of these arcs. We denote this derivative by  $\partial g_\epsilon / \partial n(s, w_1)$ . We wish to show for fixed  $w_1 \in D(0)$  that



$$\begin{aligned}
(5.2) \quad g_0(w_1, 0) - g_\epsilon(w_1, 0) &= \frac{q\epsilon}{2\pi} \int_\mu \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, 0) \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, w_1) \frac{|\phi(s) - \phi(E)|}{|\phi'(s)|} |ds| \\
&\quad - \frac{\epsilon}{2\pi} \int_\beta \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, 0) \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, w_1) \frac{|p(s) - p(A)|}{|p'(s)|} |ds| \\
&\quad + o(\epsilon)
\end{aligned}$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Here  $p$  and  $\phi$  are analytic  $1/\alpha$  powers of  $w$  in  $V$  and  $N$  respectively (see §4). Also,  $q = I_2/I_1$ , where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \int_\mu \left[ \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, 0) \right]^2 \frac{|\phi(s) - \phi(E)|}{|\phi'(s)|} |ds|, \\
I_2 &= \int_\beta \left[ \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, 0) \right]^2 \frac{|p(s) - p(A)|}{|p'(s)|} |ds|.
\end{aligned}$$

For  $w_1 = 0$  the lefthand side of (5.2) is to be interpreted as the value of the harmonic function  $g_0(w, 0) - g_\epsilon(w, 0)$ ,  $w \in D(0) \cap D(\epsilon)$ , at  $w = 0$ . The term  $o(\epsilon)$  in (5.2) is independent of  $w_1$  when  $w_1$  lies in a compact subset of  $D(0)$ . Formula (5.2) is essentially just the Hadamard variational formula (see Bergman [3, Ch.8]). However since our variations are not strictly normal and since  $\Gamma$  need not be twice continuously differentiable, we shall give the proof of (5.2).

Let  $w_1$  be given in  $\cup_{\epsilon \in Y_1} D(\epsilon)$ , and let  $\Delta, \Delta(w_1)$ , denote disks about  $w = 0, w = w_1$ , of radius  $r > 0$  respectively, which are contained in each  $D(\epsilon)$  for  $\epsilon \in Y_1$ . Let  $\rho(w, \epsilon)$  denote the distance of  $w \in D(\epsilon)$  from  $\Gamma(\epsilon)$  for  $\epsilon \in Y_1$ . We also let  $C$  denote a positive constant, not necessarily the same at each occurrence, which may depend on  $\alpha, r, D(0)$ , and  $\epsilon_1$  (see (4.8)), but not on  $\epsilon$  or  $w \in D_\epsilon - \{\Delta \cup \Delta(w_1)\}$ . Then as a first step in proving (5.2) we show

$$(5.3) \quad \max \{g_\epsilon(w, w_1), g_\epsilon(w, 0)\} \leq C\rho(w, \epsilon)$$

for  $w \in D(\epsilon) - \{\Delta \cup \Delta(w_1)\}$  and  $\epsilon \in Y_1$ .

To prove (5.3), let  $f_\epsilon, \epsilon \in Y_1$ , be the function in  $S(\alpha, d, M)$  for which  $f_\epsilon(K) = D(\epsilon)$ . The existence of  $f_\epsilon$  is guaranteed by (4.8) and (4.9). Let  $k_\epsilon$  denote the inverse of  $f_\epsilon$  and note that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.4) \quad g_\epsilon(w, 0) &= -\log |k_\epsilon(w)|, \\
g_\epsilon(w, w_1) &= -\log \left| \frac{k_\epsilon(w) - k_\epsilon(w_1)}{1 - \bar{k}_\epsilon(w_1)k_\epsilon(w)} \right|
\end{aligned}$$

for  $w \in D(\epsilon) - \{\Delta \cup \Delta(w_1)\}$ . We assert that

$$(5.5) \quad |f_\epsilon(a) - f_\epsilon(b)| \geq C_1 |b - a|$$

whenever  $a, b \in K$  and  $\{f_\epsilon(b), f_\epsilon(a)\} \subset D(\epsilon) - \{\Delta \cup \Delta(w_1)\}$ . Here  $C_1$  is a positive constant which has the same dependence as  $C$  defined previously. (5.3) is then an easy consequence of (5.4) and (5.5).

If  $|\operatorname{Arg}[\overline{f_\epsilon(b)}f_\epsilon(a)]| \geq \pi\alpha/2$  and  $f_\epsilon(a), f_\epsilon(b)$ , are in  $D(\epsilon) - [\Delta \cup \Delta(w_1)]$ , then clearly

$$|f_\epsilon(b) - f_\epsilon(a)| \geq C \geq \frac{C}{2} |b - a|.$$

Hence we assume  $0 \leq |\operatorname{Arg}[\overline{f_\epsilon(a)}f_\epsilon(b)]| < \pi\alpha/2$ . Let  $R$  be a sector drawn from  $w = 0$  which contains  $f_\epsilon(a), f_\epsilon(b)$ , in its interior. We also choose  $R$  to be of angle opening less than  $\pi\alpha/2$ . Let  $h$  be an analytic  $1/\alpha$  power of  $w$  on  $R$ . Let  $\lambda_\epsilon$  be the  $\alpha$  arc contained in  $R$  with endpoints  $f_\epsilon(a), f_\epsilon(b)$ . Then since  $h[R \cap D(\epsilon)]$  is convex, the line segment  $\sigma_\epsilon$ , with endpoints  $h[f_\epsilon(a)], h[f_\epsilon(b)]$ , is contained in  $h[R \cap D(\epsilon)]$ . Since  $|\operatorname{Arg}[h(f_\epsilon(a))\overline{h(f_\epsilon(b))}]| < \pi/2$  and  $\min(|f_\epsilon(a)|, |f_\epsilon(b)|) \geq r$ , it follows from elementary geometry that

$$\min_{\zeta \in \sigma_\epsilon} |\zeta| \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} r^{1/\alpha}.$$

Moreover since  $h$  maps  $\lambda_\epsilon$  onto  $\sigma_\epsilon$ , we deduce that

$$(5.6) \quad \min_{w \in \lambda_\epsilon} |w| \geq \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\right)^\alpha r.$$

If  $\tau_\epsilon$  denotes the preimage in  $K$  of  $\sigma_\epsilon$  under  $h \circ f_\epsilon$ , then  $\tau_\epsilon$  has endpoints  $a, b$ , and

$$(5.7) \quad |h[f_\epsilon(b)] - h[f_\epsilon(a)]| = \int_{\tau_\epsilon} \left| \frac{d}{dz} h \circ f_\epsilon(z) \right| |dz|.$$

Since  $f_\epsilon \in S(\alpha, d, M)$ , and we have (1.2d), we may write for  $z \in K - \{0\}$  that

$$(5.8) \quad \left| \frac{d}{dz} h \circ f_\epsilon(z) \right| = \frac{1}{\alpha} |f_\epsilon(z)|^{\frac{1}{\alpha}-1} |f'_\epsilon(z)| = \frac{1}{\alpha} |\psi_\epsilon(z)/z|^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \cdot |z|^{\frac{1}{\alpha}-1},$$

where  $\psi_\epsilon$  is starlike univalent and  $\psi_\epsilon(0) = 0, \psi'_\epsilon(0) = 1$ . It is well known that  $|\psi_\epsilon(z)/z| \geq \frac{1}{4}$ . It also follows from well known estimates for

normalized univalent functions and (5.6) that  $|z| \geq C$ ,  $z \in \tau_\epsilon$  (see Goluzin [4, p. 52, (10)] for these estimates). Using (5.8) and the above facts we get,

$$\left| \frac{d}{dz} h \circ f_\epsilon(z) \right| \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \left( \frac{1}{4} \right)^{1/\alpha} C^{1/\alpha-1} = C$$

for  $z \in \tau_\epsilon$ . From this inequality and (5.7) we deduce  $|h(f_\epsilon(b)) - h(f_\epsilon(a))| \geq C|b - a|$ . Since clearly  $|h(f_\epsilon(b)) - h(f_\epsilon(a))| \leq C|f_\epsilon(b) - f_\epsilon(a)|$  whenever  $\{f_\epsilon(a), f_\epsilon(b)\} \subset D(\epsilon) - [\Delta \cup \Delta(w_1)]$  and  $\text{Arg}[f_\epsilon(a)f_\epsilon(b)] < \pi\alpha/2$ , it follows that (5.5) is true.

We now prove (5.3). We first note that

$$(5.9) \quad \max \{g_\epsilon(w, w_1), g_\epsilon(w, 0)\} \leq C,$$

when  $\epsilon \in Y_1$  and  $w \in D(\epsilon) - [\Delta \cup \Delta(w_1)]$ , as follows from the maximum principle for harmonic functions. Consider the case when  $\rho(w, \epsilon) \geq \frac{C_1}{16}(1 - |k_\epsilon(w_1)|)$ , [ $C_1$  as in (5.5)]. Then from (5.9) we have

$$\max \{g_\epsilon(w, w_1), g_\epsilon(w, 0)\} \leq \frac{16 C \rho(w, \epsilon)}{C_1(1 - |k_\epsilon(w_1)|)} = C \rho(w, \epsilon).$$

Here we have used the fact that  $\sup_{\epsilon \in Y_1} |k_\epsilon(w_1)| < 1$ . Next consider the case when  $\rho(w, \epsilon) < \frac{(1 - |k_\epsilon(w_1)|)C_1}{16}$ . In this case let  $w_0 = w_0(\epsilon)$  in  $\Gamma(\epsilon)$  be such that  $|w - w_0| = \rho(w, \epsilon)$ . Choose  $w^* = w^*(\epsilon) \in D(\epsilon)$  near enough  $w_0$  such that

$$(5.10) \quad \min \{ |k_\epsilon(w^*)|, \left| \frac{k_\epsilon(w^*) - k_\epsilon(w_1)}{1 - \overline{k_\epsilon(w^*)}k_\epsilon(w_1)} \right| \} \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

and such that

$$(5.11) \quad |w - w^*| \leq 2\rho(w, \epsilon).$$

Then from (5.5) with  $a = k_\epsilon(w)$ ,  $b = k_\epsilon(w^*)$ , and (5.11) we deduce

$$(5.12) \quad |k_\epsilon(w) - k_\epsilon(w^*)| \leq C_1^{-1}|w - w^*| \leq 2C_1^{-1}\rho(w, \epsilon).$$

Using (5.12) and (5.10) it follows for

$$u = \frac{k_\epsilon(w) - k_\epsilon(w_1)}{1 - \overline{k_\epsilon(w_1)}k_\epsilon(w)}, \quad v = \frac{k_\epsilon(w^*) - k_\epsilon(w_1)}{1 - \overline{k_\epsilon(w_1)}k_\epsilon(w^*)},$$

that

$$|v|^{-1}|u-v| \leq 2|v|^{-1} \frac{|k_\epsilon(w) - k_\epsilon(w^*)|}{1 - |k_\epsilon(w_1)|} \leq \frac{8C_1^{-1}\rho(w, \epsilon)}{1 - |k_\epsilon(w_1)|} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Using this inequality, (5.4), and the fact that  $-\log(1-x) \leq 2x$  for  $0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} g_\epsilon(w, w_1) &= -\log|u| = -\log\left|\frac{u-v}{v} + 1\right| - \log|v| \leq 2\left|\frac{u-v}{v}\right| \\ &\quad - \log|v| \leq \frac{16C_1^{-1}\rho(w, \epsilon)}{1 - |k_\epsilon(w_1)|} - \log|v| = C\rho(w, \epsilon) - \log|v|. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $w^* \rightarrow w_0$ , we obtain since  $\log|v| \rightarrow 0$  that  $g_\epsilon(w, w_1) \leq C\rho(w, \epsilon)$ ,  $w \in D(\epsilon) - \{\Delta \cup \Delta(w_1)\}$ . Similarly from (5.10) and (5.12), we get  $g_\epsilon(w, 0) \leq C\rho(w, \epsilon)$  for  $w \in D(\epsilon) - \{\Delta \cup \Delta(w_1)\}$ . We conclude that (5.3) is true.

Next we use (5.3) to prove (5.2). We first claim for given  $\epsilon$ ,  $\epsilon \in Y_1$ , that

$$(5.13) \quad g_0(w_1, 0) - g_\epsilon(w_1, 0) = J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + o(\epsilon)$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  where

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\beta \cap D(\epsilon)} g_\epsilon(s, 0) \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, w_1) |ds|, \\ J_2 &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mu_1 \cap D(0)} g_0(s, w_1) \frac{\partial g_\epsilon}{\partial n}(s, 0) |ds|, \\ J_3 &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mu_1 \cap D(0)} \left[ g_0(s, w_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial n} g_0(s, 0) - g_0(s, 0) \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, w_1) \right] |ds|. \end{aligned}$$

To verify this claim we consider two cases. First suppose that  $\beta$  is as in variation III. In this case we let  $D^*(\epsilon) \subset D(\epsilon) \cap D(0)$ , be the domain whose boundary is the union of the arcs:  $\partial D(\epsilon) \cap \partial D(0)$ ,  $\beta \cap D(\epsilon)$ ,  $\mu_1 \cap D(0)$ , and the arc of  $\partial K_d$  with endpoints  $A_1, A$ , which is contained in  $V$ . Here  $A_1$  is as in variation III. Let  $v$  denote the above arc of  $\partial K_d$ . We observe that  $D^*(\epsilon)$  is  $\alpha$  starlike. This observation is verified using (2.3b) and Lemma 1.

From the above observation and Lemma 2, it now follows that  $D^*(\epsilon)$  can be approximated by a sequence of  $\alpha$  starlike domains  $\langle \Omega(n) \rangle_1^\infty$  with the property that

(i) the sets  $\beta \cap D(\epsilon)$ ,  $\mu_1 \cap D(0)$ , and  $v$ , are contained in  $\partial \Omega(n)$ ,

- (ii)  $\Omega(n) \subset D^*(\epsilon)$ ,
- (iii) Each point of  $\partial\Omega(n)$  is within  $1/n$  distance of a point of  $\partial D^*(\epsilon)$ ,
- (iv)  $\partial\Omega(n)$  consists of a finite number of  $\alpha$  arcs and  $v$ .

Since  $D^*(\epsilon) \subset D \cap D(\epsilon)$  we clearly may apply Green's second identity in  $\Omega(n) - \{w : |w - w_1| \leq \eta\}$ ,  $\eta$  small, to the functions:  $g_0(w, w_1)$ ,  $g_0(w, 0) - g_\epsilon(w, 0)$ ,  $w \in D(\epsilon) \cap D$  (see Nehari [13, p. 9] for this identity). Doing this, letting  $\eta \rightarrow 0$ , using (iii) and (5.3), we get

$$g_0(w_1, 0) - g_\epsilon(w_1, 0) = J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4 + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right),$$

where

$$J_4 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_v [g_\epsilon(s, 0) - g_0(s, 0)] \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, w_1) |ds| \\ - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_v g_0(s, w_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial n} [g_\epsilon(s, 0) - g_0(s, 0)] |ds|.$$

We note that each point of  $v$  is  $O(\epsilon)$  distance from  $A$ . Furthermore the arc length of  $v$  is  $O(\epsilon)$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Hence from (5.3),  $J_4 = O(\epsilon^2)$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Using this fact and letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in the above equality, we get (5.13) when  $\beta$  is as in variation III. The proof of (5.13) when  $\beta$  is as in variation II is similar. We omit the details.

To continue the proof of (5.2) we show

$$(5.14) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{J_1}{\epsilon} = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_\beta \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, 0) \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, w_1) \frac{|p(s) - p(A)|}{|p'(s)|} |ds|,$$

$$(5.15) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{J_2}{\delta} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_\mu \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, 0) \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, w_1) \frac{|\phi(s) - \phi(E)|}{|\phi'(s)|} |ds|$$

$$(5.16) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{J_3}{\delta} = 0.$$

To prove (5.14) let  $V \supset \beta$  be the domain of definition of  $p$ , as defined at the beginning of §4. Let  $l_\epsilon$ ,  $\epsilon \in Y_1 - \{0\}$ , and  $l_0$ , denote the line segments which are images of  $\beta_1 = \beta_1(\epsilon)$  and  $\beta$  under  $p$  respectively. We also put  $H_\epsilon(\zeta) = g_\epsilon(w, 0)$  when  $p(w) = \zeta$ ,  $w \in V \cap D(\epsilon)$ ,  $\epsilon \in Y_1$ . Then  $H_\epsilon$  is harmonic in  $p(V \cap D(\epsilon))$ , vanishes on  $l_\epsilon$ , and from (5.3), (5.1), it follows that

$$(5.17) \quad H_\epsilon(\zeta) \leq C, \quad \zeta \in p(V \cap [D(\epsilon) - \Delta]),$$

$$(5.18) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} H_\epsilon(\zeta) = H_0(\zeta), \quad \zeta \in p[V \cap D(0)].$$

Now suppose that  $s$  is a fixed number in  $\beta - \{A, B\}$  and  $t = p(s)$ . Then if  $\epsilon_2 > 0$  is small enough, we have  $s \in D(\epsilon) \cap \beta$  for  $\epsilon \in Y \cap (0, \epsilon_2]$ ,  $0 < \epsilon_2 \leq \epsilon_1$ , as follows from the definition of  $D(\epsilon)$ . Let  $R = R(\epsilon)$  denote the point of intersection of  $\beta_1$  and the  $\alpha$  arc containing  $\beta$  in  $V$  (Either  $R = A$  or  $R = P_1$ ). Then we may write  $t = p(R) + xe^{i\theta}$ , where  $x = x(\epsilon) > 0$  and  $e^{i\theta}$  denotes the direction of  $l_0$ . Since the angle between  $l_\epsilon$  and the line containing  $l_0$  at  $p(R)$  is  $\epsilon$ , either the point  $u(\epsilon) = p(R) + xe^{i(\theta+\epsilon)}$  or the point  $t(\epsilon) = p(R) + xe^{i(\theta-\epsilon)}$ , is in  $l_\epsilon$  for  $\epsilon_2 > 0$  small,  $\epsilon \in Y_1 \cap [0, \epsilon_2]$ . We first assume that  $t(\epsilon)$  is in  $l(\epsilon)$ . Then if  $\epsilon_2$  is small enough there exists  $\rho > 0$  and a semicircular disk,  $Q(\epsilon)$ , of radius  $\rho$ , center  $t(\epsilon)$ , and whose diameter is a line segment of  $l_\epsilon$ , which is contained in  $p[V \cap D(\epsilon)]$  for  $\epsilon \in Y_1 \cap [0, \epsilon_2]$ . Since  $H_\epsilon$  vanishes on the diameter of  $Q(\epsilon)$ , it follows from the reflection principle, that

$$(5.19) \quad H_\epsilon(\zeta) = \text{Im} \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n(\epsilon) e^{in(\epsilon-\theta)} [\zeta - t(\epsilon)]^n \right\},$$

$\zeta \in Q(\epsilon)$ , where  $a_n(\epsilon)$  is real,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , and

$$(5.20) \quad |a_n(\epsilon)| \leq C\rho^{-n}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots,$$

$$(5.21) \quad a_1(\epsilon) = \frac{2}{\pi\rho} \int_{\theta-\epsilon}^{\theta-\epsilon+\pi} H_\epsilon[t(\epsilon) + \rho e^{i\phi}] \sin(\phi - \theta + \epsilon) d\phi.$$

From (5.19) and (5.20) it follows with  $\zeta = t(0) = t$  that

$$(5.22) \quad \left| \frac{H_\epsilon(t) - a_1(\epsilon) \text{Im}[e^{i(\epsilon-\theta)}(t - t(\epsilon))]}{\epsilon} \right| \leq C\epsilon.$$

Furthermore from (5.18), (5.21), the bounded convergence theorem and the fact that  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} R(\epsilon) = A$  we deduce,  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} a_1(\epsilon) = a_1(0)$ . Hence,

$$(5.23) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} g_\epsilon(s, 0)/\epsilon = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} H_\epsilon(t)/\epsilon = a_1(0) |p(A) - t| = -\frac{\partial H_0}{\partial n} |p(A) - t|.$$

Here  $\partial H_0/\partial n$  denotes the outer normal derivative of  $H_0$  on  $l_0$ . If  $u(\epsilon)$  is in  $l_\epsilon$  for  $\epsilon_2$  small, then the above equality also holds, as is easily seen. We observe that,  $\partial g/\partial n(s, 0) = \partial H_0/\partial n(t) |p'(s)|$ . Using this

observation, (5.3), (5.23), and the bounded convergence theorem we deduce that (5.14) is true.

The proof of (5.15) is similar to the proof of (5.14). Let  $N$  be the domain of definition of  $\phi$ , as defined at the beginning of §4. Let  $y_\delta$ , and  $y_0$ , denote the line segments which are images of  $\mu_1 \cap D(0)$ , and  $\mu_1 - \{E, F\}$  under  $\phi$  respectively. We also put  $\Psi(\zeta) = g_0(w, w_1)$ ,  $H_\epsilon(\zeta) = g_\epsilon(w, 0)$  when  $\zeta = \phi(w)$ ,  $w \in N \cap D(\epsilon)$ , and  $\epsilon \in Y_1$ . Since the angle between  $y_\delta$  and  $y_0$  at  $\phi(E)$  is  $\delta$ , we may assume that

$$y_\delta = \{\phi(E) + xe^{i(\theta-\delta)} : 0 < x < x_1(\delta)\},$$

where  $e^{i\theta}$  is the direction of  $y_0$  and  $\delta = \delta(\epsilon)$ ,  $\epsilon \in Y_1$ . From the definition of  $D(\epsilon)$  and the fact that  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta(\epsilon) = 0$ , we see that  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} x_1(\delta) = x_1(0)$ .

Using our new notation and changing variables in the integral defining  $J_2$  we find that

$$(5.24) \quad \frac{J_2}{\delta} = \int_0^{x_1(\delta)} \frac{\Psi[\phi(E) + xe^{i(\theta-\delta)}]}{-2\pi\delta} \frac{\partial H_\epsilon}{\partial n} [\phi(E) + xe^{i(\theta-\delta)}] dx.$$

Here  $\partial H_\epsilon / \partial n$  denotes the outer normal derivative of  $H_\epsilon$  to  $y_\delta$ . From (5.3) we note that  $\delta^{-1} \Psi[\phi(E) + xe^{i(\theta-\delta)}]$  is bounded for  $\delta = \delta(\epsilon)$ ,  $\epsilon \in Y_1 - \{0\}$ , and  $0 < x < x_1(\delta)$ . Moreover,

$$(5.25) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Psi[\phi(E) + xe^{i(\theta-\delta)}]}{\delta} = -\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial n} [\phi(E) + xe^{i\theta}] \cdot x$$

when  $\phi(E) + xe^{i\theta} \in y_0$ . Also, as in (5.23) we find that

$$(5.26) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial H_\epsilon}{\partial n} [\phi(E) + xe^{i(\theta-\delta)}] = \frac{\partial H_0}{\partial n} [\phi(E) + xe^{i\theta}],$$

when  $\phi(E) + xe^{i\theta} \in y_0$ . Using (5.24)–(5.26), (5.3), the bounded convergence theorem, and changing back to our original variables, we conclude that (5.15) is true.

The proof of (5.16) is essentially the same as the proof of (5.15). We omit the details. Hence (5.14)–(5.16) are true.

Finally we show that

$$(5.27) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta(\epsilon)/\epsilon = q$$

where  $q$  is as in (5.2). (5.2) is then an obvious consequence of (5.13)–(5.16) and (5.27). To prove (5.27) we put  $w_1 = 0$  in (5.13). We obtain from (4.9) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.28) \quad \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\beta \cap D(\epsilon)} g_\epsilon(s, 0) \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, 0) |ds| &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mu_1 \cap D(0)} g_0(s, 0) \frac{\partial g_\epsilon}{\partial n}(s, 0) |ds| \\
 &+ o(\epsilon), \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

From (5.14)–(5.15) with  $w_1 = 0$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
 - \int_{\beta \cap D(\epsilon)} g_\epsilon(s, 0) \frac{\partial g_0}{\partial n}(s, 0) |ds| &= [1 + o(1)]\epsilon I_2, \\
 - \int_{\mu_1 \cap D(0)} g_0(s, 0) \frac{\partial g_\epsilon}{\partial n}(s, 0) |ds| &= [1 + o(1)]\delta I_1.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using these equalities and (5.28), we find that (5.27) is true.

We have now shown that (5.2) holds with a  $o(\epsilon)$  term that depends on  $w_1$ . To complete the proof of (5.2), we show this term does not depend on  $w_1$  when  $w_1$  lies in a compact subset,  $X$ , of  $D(0)$ . Clearly, it suffices to prove the above for given  $w_0 \in D(0)$  and  $X = \{w_2: |w_2 - w_0| \leq r/2\}$ ,  $r$  small. Moreover, since a pointwise limit of uniformly bounded harmonic functions is uniform, it suffices to show that  $\epsilon^{-1}[g_0(w_1, 0) - g_\epsilon(w_1, 0)]$  is uniformly bounded for  $\epsilon \in Y_1 - \{0\}$  and  $w_1 \in \{w_2: |w_2 - w_0| \leq r/2\}$ . From (5.13), its subsequent proof, and (5.27), we see that this statement will be true if we can show the constant in (5.3) does not depend on  $w_1$  when  $w_1 \in \{w_2: |w_2 - w_0| \leq r/2\}$ .

To argue the last statement we first assert that  $[g_\epsilon(w, w_0)]^{-1}g_\epsilon(w, w_1)$  is uniformly bounded whenever  $w_1 \in \{w_2: |w_2 - w_0| \leq r/2\}$ ,  $w \in \{w_2: |w_2 - w_0| = r\}$ , and  $\epsilon \in Y_1$ . Indeed, since  $D(\epsilon) \rightarrow D(0)$  in the sense of kernel convergence, we have  $k_\epsilon \rightarrow k_0$  uniformly on  $\{w_2: |w_2 - w_0| \leq r\}$ . Using this and (5.4), it follows that our assertion is true. If  $c$  denotes the uniform bound in our assertion, then from the maximum principle for harmonic functions we have,  $g_\epsilon(w, w_1) \leq c g_\epsilon(w, w_0)$  when  $w \in D(\epsilon) - \{w_2: |w_2 - w_0| < r\}$ ,  $w_1 \in \{w_2: |w_2 - w_0| \leq r/2\}$  and  $\epsilon \in Y_1$ . Using (5.3) with  $w_1 = w_0$ , we conclude that

$$g_\epsilon(w, w_1) \leq c g_\epsilon(w, w_0) \leq c C \rho(w, \epsilon),$$

when  $w$ ,  $w_1$ , and  $\epsilon$  are in the above sets. Hence the constant in (5.3) does not depend on  $w_1 \in \{w_2: |w_2 - w_0| \leq r/2\}$ . This completes the proof of (5.2).

**6. The Julia variational formula.** In this section we show how the Julia variational formula for the mapping functions  $f_\epsilon$ , corresponding to  $D(\epsilon)$ , can be derived from the Hadamard variational



formula for  $g_\epsilon$  [see (5.2)]. We then show in a general way how the Julia variational formula can be used to solve some extremal problems. We use the same notation as in §5.

First note that  $\Gamma(0)$  is a Jordan curve. Hence from the strong form of the Riemann mapping theorem (see Goluzin [4, Thm. 4, p. 44]),  $f_0$  is a homeomorphism of  $K \cup \partial K$  onto  $D(0) \cup \Gamma(0)$ . Consequently there exist arcs  $\lambda, \tau$ , of  $\partial K$ , disjoint, except possibly for endpoints, such that  $f_0(\lambda) = \mu$ , and  $f_0(\tau) = \beta$ . Also from the reflection principle we see that  $f_0$  can be extended analytically to a larger domain containing all of  $\lambda \cup \tau$ , except possibly the endpoints of these arcs. We denote this extension again by  $f_0$ .

Put  $s = f_0(\zeta)$ ,  $\zeta \in \lambda \cup \tau$ , and choose  $z \in K$  such that  $w_1 = f_0(z)$ . Furthermore, let  $h(\zeta) = -q|\phi(s) - \phi(E)|/|\phi'(s)|$ , when  $s = f_0(\zeta) \in \mu$ , and  $h(\zeta) = |p(s) - p(A)|/|p'(s)|$  when  $s = f_0(\zeta) \in \beta$ . Here  $q$  is as in (5.2). Using (5.4), changing variables in (5.2), and arguing as in Julia [7], we get

$$(6.1) \quad f_\epsilon(z) = f_0(z) + \frac{\epsilon z f'_0(z)}{2\pi} \int_{\lambda \cup \tau} \left( \frac{\zeta + z}{\zeta - z} \right) \frac{h(\zeta)}{|f'(\zeta)|} |d\zeta| + o(\epsilon)$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Now let  $d\Lambda(\zeta) = \frac{h(\zeta)|d\zeta|}{2\pi|f'(\zeta)|}$ , when  $\zeta \in \lambda \cup \tau$ . Then from (6.1) we obtain

$$\log [f_\epsilon(z)/z] = \log [f_0(z)/z] + \epsilon \int_{\lambda \cup \tau} \frac{z f'_0(z)}{f_0(z)} \left( \frac{\zeta + z}{\zeta - z} \right) d\Lambda(\zeta) + o(\epsilon)$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . If  $\Phi$  is a given nonconstant entire function, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi \left[ \log \frac{f_\epsilon(z)}{z} \right] &= \Phi \left[ \log \frac{f_0(z)}{z} \right] + \epsilon \int_{\lambda \cup \tau} \Phi' \left[ \log \frac{f_0(z)}{z} \right] \frac{z f'_0(z)}{f_0(z)} \left( \frac{\zeta + z}{\zeta - z} \right) d\Lambda(\zeta) \\ &\quad + o(\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Hence

$$(6.2) \quad \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \Phi \left[ \log \frac{f_0(z)}{z} \right] \right\} - \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \Phi \left[ \log \frac{f_0(z)}{z} \right] \right\} = \epsilon \int_{\lambda \cup \tau} \sigma(\zeta) d\Lambda(\zeta) + o(\epsilon)$$

where,

$$(6.3) \quad \sigma(\zeta) = \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \Phi' \left[ \log \frac{f_0(z)}{z} \right] \frac{z f'_0(z)}{f_0(z)} \left( \frac{\zeta + z}{\zeta - z} \right) \right\}, \quad \zeta \in \partial K.$$

Next let  $\alpha, d$ , and  $M$  be fixed positive numbers satisfying  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ ,  $0 \leq d < 1$ , and  $1 < M < \infty$ . Let  $C$  denote a given compact subclass of

$S(\alpha, d, M)$ . Let  $\Phi$  be a given nonconstant entire function. Consider the following extremal problem:

*Problem 1.* Find  $\max_{f \in C} \operatorname{Re} \{\Phi[\log f(z)/z]\}$  for given  $z \in K - \{0\}$ .

Assume that  $f_\epsilon$  is in  $C$  for  $\epsilon \in Y_1$ . Then we shall outline the method in which (6.2) can be used to obtain information about an extremal function which solves Problem 1 in  $C$ . First observe that if  $\Phi'[\log f_0(z)/z] \neq 0$ , then  $\sigma$  defined by (6.3) is the real part of an analytic function which maps  $\partial K$  onto a circle. Hence  $\partial K$  can be divided into two arcs, disjoint except for endpoints, such that  $\sigma$  is increasing on one arc, and decreasing on the other. It follows from this monotonic property of  $\sigma$  that if we are given any three arcs of  $\partial K$  (disjoint except possibly for endpoints), then we can choose two of the arcs, say  $\lambda$  and  $\tau$ , such that

$$(6.4) \quad \min_{\zeta \in \tau} \sigma(\zeta) \geq \max_{\zeta \in \lambda} \sigma(\zeta).$$

If (6.4) holds, we claim that either  $f_0$  is not an extremal function for Problem 1 or  $\Phi'[\log f_0(z)/z] = 0$ . To verify this claim observe that  $d\Lambda(\zeta) < 0$ ,  $\zeta \in \lambda$ , and  $d\Lambda(\zeta) > 0$ ,  $\zeta \in \tau$ , except possibly at endpoints of these arcs. Also,  $\int_{\lambda \cup \tau} d\Lambda(\zeta) = 0$ . Using these facts and (6.4), we obtain from (6.2) that either

$$(6.5) \quad \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \Phi \left[ \log \frac{f_\epsilon(z)}{z} \right] \right\} > \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \Phi \left[ \log \frac{f_0(z)}{z} \right] \right\}$$

for  $\epsilon > 0$  small or

$$(6.6) \quad \Phi' \left[ \log \frac{f_0(z)}{z} \right] = 0.$$

If (6.5) occurs clearly  $f_0$  is not an extremal function for Problem 1. Hence our claim is true.

**7. Preliminary lemmas.** Let  $\alpha, d$ , and  $M$  be fixed positive numbers satisfying  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ ,  $1 < M < \infty$ , and  $0 \leq d < 1$ . Then in this section we first consider Problem 1 in some subclasses of  $S(\alpha, d, M)$ . Using this information, we then consider Problem 1 in  $S(\alpha, d, M)$ . Our goal is to show that a rotation of  $F$  defined by (i)-(iv) of §1 solves Problem 1 in  $S(\alpha, d, M)$  (Lemma 8). We use the method of §6. To begin, let  $\mathcal{A}$  denote the class of  $\alpha$  starlike domains  $\Omega$  with  $\Omega$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  if and only if  $f(K) = \Omega$  for some  $f \in S(\alpha, d, M)$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}_n$  denote the

subclass of  $\mathcal{A}$  consisting of all domains  $\Omega$  whose boundary is the union of a finite number of  $\alpha$  arcs with at most  $n$  nondegenerate vertices. By a vertex we mean of course the intersection point of two  $\alpha$  arcs. The vertex is nondegenerate if the smallest angle  $\theta$  between the two  $\alpha$  arcs at this vertex satisfies  $0 < \theta < \pi$ . If  $\beta$  is an  $\alpha$  arc connecting two nondegenerate vertices of  $\Omega$ , then we shall call  $\beta$  an  $\alpha$  side of  $\Omega$ . If the vertices of an  $\alpha$  side  $\beta$  lie on  $\partial K_M$ , then we shall call  $\beta$  an  $\alpha$  chord of  $\partial K_M$ . The following lemma shows that  $\bigcup_{1 \leq n \leq \infty} \mathcal{A}_n$  is dense in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

LEMMA 4. *If  $\Omega \in \mathcal{A}$ , then there exists a sequence of domains  $\{\Omega_n\}$  with  $\Omega_n \in \mathcal{A}_n$  such that  $\Omega_n \rightarrow \Omega$  in the sense of kernel convergence.*

*Proof.* It obviously suffices to show that for each  $\eta > 0$  there exists an integer  $n$  and  $\Omega_n \in \mathcal{A}_n$  such that  $\partial\Omega_n$  is contained in an  $\eta$  neighborhood of  $\partial\Omega$ . Let  $f \in S(\alpha, d, M)$  be such that  $f(K) = \Omega$ . For given  $r$ ,  $0 < r < 1$ , we consider the function  $f_r(z) = f(rz)/r$ ,  $z \in K$ . From (1.1) we see that  $f_r$  is an  $\alpha$  starlike function. Moreover the maximum and minimum modulus principle guarantee the existence of a  $d_1$  and  $M_1$  such that

$$(7.1) \quad d < d_1 < |f_r(z)/z| < M_1 < M, \quad z \in K.$$

We put  $\Omega^* = f_r(K)$ . Then since  $f$  is continuous on  $K \cup \partial K$ , we may choose  $r$  near enough 1, such that each point of  $\partial\Omega^*$  is contained in an  $\eta/2$  neighborhood of  $\partial\Omega$ . From Lemma 2 we see that  $\Omega^*$  may be approximated by an  $\alpha$  starlike domain  $G$  with the following properties:

- (i)  $G \subset \Omega^*$ ,
- (ii)  $\partial G \subset L(d_1, M_1) = \{z: d_1 \leq |z| \leq M_1\}$ ,
- (iii)  $\partial G$  is the union of a finite number of  $\alpha$  arcs,
- (iv)  $\partial G$  is contained in an  $\eta/4$  neighborhood of  $\partial\Omega^*$ ,
- (v) if  $\rho = \text{m.r. } G < 1$ , then  $\frac{1}{\rho} \leq \min \left\{ M/M_1, 1 + \frac{\eta}{4M} \right\}$ .

From (ii), (iii), and (v) we see that  $1/\rho G \in \mathcal{A}_n$  for some  $n$ . Also, (iv) and (v) imply that  $\partial(1/\rho G)$  is contained in an  $\eta/2$  neighborhood of  $\Omega^*$ . Hence if  $\Omega_n = 1/\rho G$ , then  $\partial\Omega_n$  is contained in an  $\eta$  neighborhood of  $\Omega$ . This completes the proof of Lemma 4.

Lemma 4 and A Theorem of Carathéodory imply that if  $f(K) = \Omega$ ,  $f_n(K) = \Omega_n$ , where  $f, f_n \in S(\alpha, d, M)$ , then

$$(7.2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = f$$

uniformly on compact subsets of  $K$ .

For a given positive integer  $n$ , let  $C_n$  denote the class of functions  $f \in S(\alpha, d, M)$  with  $f(K) \in \mathcal{A}_n$ . As in the proof of Lemma 1, we see that if  $f \in C_n$ , then  $f$  may be written in the form

$$\alpha \operatorname{Re} \left\{ 1 + \frac{zf''(z)}{f'(z)} \right\} + (1 - \alpha) \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)} \right\} = \sum_{k=1}^m a_k \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \frac{1 + e^{i\theta_k} z}{1 - e^{i\theta_k} z} \right\},$$

where  $m \leq n$ ,  $a_k > 0$  ( $1 \leq k \leq m$ ), and  $\sum_{k=1}^m a_k = 1$ . From this formula it is easily seen that  $C_n$  is compact. Hence if  $C_n \neq \{\phi\}$ , then there exists an extremal function  $F_n$  for Problem 1 with  $C = C_n$ . Choose a subsequence  $(n_j)_1^\infty$  of  $(n)_1^\infty$  such that if  $H_j = F_{n_j}$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ , then  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} H_j = H \in S(\alpha, d, M)$  uniformly on compact subsets of  $K$ . Then from (7.2) we see that  $H$  is an extremal function for Problem 1 with  $C = S(\alpha, d, M)$ .

We note for given  $f \in S(\alpha, d, M)$  and  $t \in K$  that the function  $f(tz)/t$ ,  $z \in K$ , is also in  $S(\alpha, d, M)$ . It follows from this fact and a result of Kirwan [9] that

$$(7.3) \quad \Phi' \left[ \log \frac{H(z)}{z} \right] \neq 0.$$

Here  $\Phi$  and  $z$  are as in Problem 1, and  $H = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} H_j$  is as above. Hence we may choose  $n_0$  large enough such that

$$(7.4) \quad \Phi'[\log (H_j(z)/z)] \neq 0, j \geq n_0.$$

We use (7.4) to obtain a partial description of  $\Omega_j = H_j(K)$ ,  $j \geq n_0$ . Indeed, we have

**LEMMA 5.** *Let  $H_j$  and  $\Omega_j = H_j(K)$  be as above for  $j \geq n_0$ . Then all but at most two of the  $\alpha$  sides of  $\partial\Omega_j$  are either  $\alpha$  chords of  $\partial K_M$  or are tangent to  $\partial K_d$ .*

*Proof.* Assume for some  $j \geq n_0$  that Lemma 5 is false. Put  $D(0) = \Omega_j$ ,  $\Gamma(0) = \partial\Omega_j$ , and  $f_0 = H_j$ . Then  $\Gamma(0)$  has at least three  $\alpha$  sides which are not  $\alpha$  chords of  $\partial K_M$  and which are not tangent to  $\partial K_d$ . The preimage of these sides consists of three arcs of  $\partial K$ , disjoint except possibly for endpoints. As in §6 we choose two of these arcs,  $\lambda$  and  $\tau$  such that (6.4) holds. Let  $f_0(\lambda) = \mu$ ,  $f_0(\tau) = \beta$ . Then  $\mu$  can be rotated inward as in variation I, and  $\beta$  can be rotated outward as in variation II (b) in such a way that we obtain  $D(\epsilon)$  (see §4) for  $\epsilon \in Y_1$ . Also if  $\epsilon_1 > 0$  is small enough, then  $D(\epsilon)$  has the same number of vertices as  $D(0)$ . Hence  $D(\epsilon) \in \mathcal{A}_{n_j}$  for  $\epsilon \in Y_1$ . It follows that the functions  $f_\epsilon$ , corresponding to  $D(\epsilon)$  are in  $C_{n_j}$ . Using this fact, (6.4), (7.4), and

arguing in §6, we find that  $f_0$  is not extremal for Problem 1 in  $C_n$ . Since  $f_0 = H_j$ , we have reached a contradiction. We conclude from this contradiction that Lemma 5 is true.

We recall that our goal is to show that a rotation of  $F$  defined by (i)-(iv) of §1 solves Problem 1. We shall need the following lemma.

**LEMMA 6.** *Let  $d_1$  and  $M_1$  be fixed positive numbers satisfying  $d < d_1 < M_1 < M$ . Let  $\Omega_j$  be as in Lemma 5 for  $j \geq n_0$ . Then there exists, independently of  $j$ , a maximum number  $N$  of  $\alpha$  sides of  $\partial\Omega_j$  that intersect the closed annulus  $L(d_1, M_1)$ .*

*Proof.* We first consider those  $\alpha$  sides of  $\partial\Omega_j$  ( $j$  fixed) that have their endpoints on  $\partial K_M$ . If an  $\alpha$  chord of  $\partial K_M$  intersects  $L(d, M)$ , this chord subtends a minor arc of  $\partial K_M$  of arc length at least  $t_1$ .  $t_1$  may be taken to be the arc length of the minor arc subtended by an  $\alpha$  chord of  $\partial K_M$  which is tangent to  $\partial K_{M_1}$ . Again this statement is proved using (2.3b) and properties of convex domains. Choose an integer  $l_1$  such that  $l_1 t_1 > 2\pi M$ . Then, independently of  $j$ , no more than  $l_1$  sides of  $\partial\Omega_j$  which are  $\alpha$  chords of  $\partial K_M$ , can intersect  $L(d_1, M_1)$ .

Suppose next that  $\beta$  is an  $\alpha$  side tangent to  $\partial K_d$  which intersects  $L(d_1, M_1)$ . Let  $P$  be a point of  $\beta \cap L(d_1, M_1)$  and let  $P_1$  be the radial projection of  $P$  on  $\partial K_d$ . Let  $P_2$  be the point where  $\beta$  is tangent to  $\partial K_d$ . Then the length of the minor arc of  $\partial K_d$  with endpoints  $P_1, P_2$ , has length at least  $t_2$ , where  $t_2$  depends only on  $d, d_1$ , and  $\alpha$ . Since  $\Omega_j$  is starlike, two arcs of  $\partial K_d$ , obtained from two different  $\alpha$  sides tangent to  $\partial K_d$  in the above way, cannot overlap. Hence if  $l_2$  is a positive integer satisfying  $l_2 t_2 \geq 2\pi d$ , then  $\partial\Omega_j$  has at most  $l_2$ ,  $\alpha$  sides intersecting  $L(d_1, M_1)$  which are tangent to  $\partial K_d$ . Using Lemma 5 we conclude that  $\partial\Omega_j$  has at most  $N = l_1 + l_2 + 2$  sides which intersect  $L(d_1, M_1)$ .

Next we use Lemma 6 to characterize  $\Omega = H(K)$ . We shall need some notation. Given  $\theta$ ,  $0 < \theta \leq 2\pi$ , and  $j \geq n_0$ , let  $w_j(\theta)$  denote the unique point of intersection of  $\partial\Omega_j$  with the ray from  $w = 0$  which has direction  $e^{i\theta}$ . The uniqueness of  $w_j(\theta)$  is guaranteed by Lemma 2.  $w(\theta)$  is defined relative to  $\partial\Omega$  in a similar way. For given  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\theta$ ,  $0 < \theta \leq 2\pi$ , we claim there exists a positive integer  $n_1 = n_1(\epsilon, \theta) \geq n_0$  such that

$$(7.5) \quad |w_j(\theta) - w(\theta)| < \epsilon \quad \text{for } j \geq n_1.$$

This claim is a direct consequence of the fact that  $\Omega_j \rightarrow \Omega$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  in the sense of kernel convergence. We use (7.5) and Lemma 6 to prove.

**LEMMA 7.** *Let  $d_1$  and  $M_1$  be as in Lemma 6. Let  $\Omega = H(K)$ . Then  $\partial\Omega \cap \{w : d_1 < |w| < M_1\}$  consists of a finite number of  $\alpha$  arcs.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $x_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N+2$ , are  $N+2$  points of  $\partial\Omega$  with  $0 \leq \text{Arg}(x_i \bar{x}_1) < \text{Arg}(x_{i+1} \bar{x}_1) < \pi\alpha$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N+1$ , and  $d_1 < |x_i| < M_1$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N+2$ . Let  $V$  be a sector, whose boundary consists of two rays drawn from  $w=0$ , which contains each  $x_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N+2$ , in its interior. We may assume  $V$  has angle opening less than  $\pi\alpha$ . Draw the  $\alpha$  arcs  $\beta_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N+1$ , which are contained in  $V$ , and have endpoints  $x_i, x_{i+1}$ . Let  $\phi_i$  denote the smallest angle between the tangents of  $\beta_i$  and  $\beta_{i+1}$  at  $x_{i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ . Then if Lemma 7 is false we clearly can choose  $x_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N+2$ , as above, and such that

$$(7.6) \quad 0 < \phi_i < \pi, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N.$$

Furthermore, from (7.5) we can choose, for arbitrarily small  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $j$  large enough,  $N+2$  points of  $\partial\Omega_j$ , say  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{N+2}$ , so that

$$|x_i - y_i| < \epsilon, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N+2.$$

However if  $\epsilon$  is small enough this inequality and (7.6) imply that  $\partial\Omega_j$  has  $N+1$ ,  $\alpha$  sides which intersect  $L(d_1, M_1)$ . We have reached a contradiction to Lemma 6. Hence Lemma 7 is true.

## 8. Proof of Theorem 1. Finally we prove.

LEMMA 8. For some real  $\theta$ ,  $\Omega = e^{i\theta}F(K)$ , where  $F = F(\cdot, \alpha, d, M)$  is as in (i)-(iv).

*Proof.* First we extend the definition of an  $\alpha$  side. Let  $\gamma$  be an  $\alpha$  curve and suppose that  $\beta = \gamma \cap \partial\Omega$  is a set consisting of more than one point. Then we shall call  $\beta$  an  $\alpha$  side of  $\partial\Omega$ . From Lemma 2 we see that  $\beta$  is a closed  $\alpha$  arc. Hence if  $\partial\Omega \neq \beta$ , then  $\beta$  has endpoints  $A, B$ , with  $A \neq B$ . In this case we assume, as we may, that  $d \leq |A| \leq |B| \leq M$ . We assert that

(a) the left and righthand tangents to  $\partial\Omega$  at  $B$  do not coincide.

If  $|B| < M$ , then (a) is a consequence of Lemma 7. If  $|B| = M$ , then (a) is easily proved using (2.3b) and geometric properties of convex domains. Hence our assertion is true.

Next, we assert that one of (b), (c), or (d) is valid for  $A$ ,

(b) The left and right hand tangents to  $\partial\Omega$  at  $A$  do not coincide and  $d < |A|$ ,

(c)  $|A| = d$  and there exists a set  $\{Q_n\}_1^\infty$  of distinct points in  $\partial K_d \cap \partial\Omega$  with  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_n = A$ ,

(d)  $|A| = d$  and there exists set  $\{\rho_n\}_1^\infty$  of distinct  $\alpha$  sides  $\subset \partial\Omega$ , with endpoints  $A_n, B_n$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , for which  $d < |A_n| \leq |B_n| \leq M$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} B_n = A$ .

The proof of (b) is the same as the proof of (a). If  $|A| = d$ , then from Remark 1 we see that  $\gamma$  is the unique  $\alpha$  curve tangent to  $\partial K_d \cap \partial \Omega$  at  $A$ . Using this fact, Lemma 3, and Lemma 7, it follows that either (c) or (d) is true.

We now use (a)-(d) to show that  $\partial \Omega$  contains at most two  $\alpha$  sides. Suppose to the contrary that there are at least three distinct  $\alpha$  sides in  $\partial \Omega$ . To obtain a contradiction we consider two possibilities. First assume that one of the statements (a), (b), or (c) is valid for each endpoint of the  $\alpha$  sides. Then the preimage of these sides consists of three arcs, disjoint, except possibly for endpoints. As in §6 we can choose two of the arcs  $\lambda$  and  $\tau$  such that (6.4) holds with  $f_0 = H$ . Let  $\lambda_1$  be a subarc of  $\lambda$  with the property that

- (†)  $\lambda_1$  has an endpoint in common with  $\lambda$ ,
- (††)  $H(\lambda_1) \cap \partial K_d = \{\phi\}$ .

Clearly there exists such an arc  $\lambda_1$ . We put  $H(\lambda_1) = \mu$ ,  $H(\tau) = \beta$ . We also put  $\Omega = D(0)$  and  $f_0 = H$ . Then  $\mu$  satisfies the conditions of variation I, and  $\beta$  satisfies the conditions of either variation II or III. Hence we can perform these variations on  $D(0)$  in such a way that we obtain  $D(\epsilon)$  (see §4) for  $\epsilon \in Y_1$ . From the construction of  $D(\epsilon)$ , we have  $D(\epsilon) \in \mathcal{A}$ . Hence if  $f_\epsilon$  is the function corresponding to  $D(\epsilon)$ , then  $f_\epsilon \in S(\alpha, d, M)$ . Using this fact, (6.4), (7.3), and arguing as in §6, we find that  $f_0 = H$  is not extremal for Problem 1 in  $S(\alpha, d, M)$ . We have reached a contradiction. Thus if the above possibility occurs, then  $\partial \Omega$  contains at most two  $\alpha$  sides.

Next consider the possibility that all of the statements (a), (b), and (c) are false for an endpoint of one of the above  $\alpha$  sides. Then from (d) we see that  $\partial \Omega \cap \{z: d < |z| < M\}$  contains three other  $\alpha$  sides. Furthermore, either statement (a) or statement (b) is valid for each endpoint of these  $\alpha$  sides. Hence we may apply the argument of the first case to these  $\alpha$  sides. Again we obtain a contradiction. We conclude from this contradiction that  $\partial \Omega$  contains at most two  $\alpha$  sides.

Since  $\Omega$  is  $\alpha$  starlike and we have Lemma 7, it follows from the above that  $\partial \Omega$  consists of at most two  $\alpha$  sides, at most two arcs of  $\partial K_M$ , and possibly one or two points or a proper arc of  $\partial K_d$ . Consider first the case when  $\partial \Omega$  contains exactly one  $\alpha$  side. Then from the discussion in §3 for  $d = \delta(M, \alpha)$  we see that Lemma 8 is true. Second consider the case when  $\partial \Omega$  contains two  $\alpha$  sides. In this case we shall show that one endpoint of each  $\alpha$  side must be on  $\partial K_d$ . It then follows from Remark 1 that these  $\alpha$  sides are tangent to  $\partial K_d$  and there upon from the discussion in §3 that Lemma 8 is true.

The proof is again by contradiction. Assume that  $\partial \Omega$  contains two  $\alpha$  sides with at least one of the sides having both its endpoints off of

$\partial K_d$ . Observe from Lemma 1 that the other side then must also have both its endpoints off of  $\partial K_d$ . Let  $\xi_1$  and  $\xi_2$  denote these two  $\alpha$  sides. Let  $\psi_1, \psi_2, \subset \partial K$  be such that  $H(\psi_1) = \xi_1, H(\psi_2) = \xi_2$ . Put  $f_0 = H$  and suppose that  $\sigma$  defined by (6.3) obtains its minimum at  $\zeta_0 \in \partial K$ . We first assume that  $\zeta_0$  is an interior point of either  $\psi_1$  or  $\psi_2$ . We may assume that  $\zeta_0$  is in the interior of  $\psi_1$  since otherwise we renumber. Then by the monotonic property of  $\sigma$  (see §6), there is a subarc  $\psi_3 \subset \psi_1$  possessing an endpoint in common with  $\psi_1$  and satisfying  $\max_{\zeta \in \psi_1} \sigma(\zeta) \leq \min_{\zeta \in \psi_2} \sigma(\zeta)$ . Choose a subarc  $\lambda$  of  $\psi_3$  possessing a common endpoint with  $\psi_1$  and for which  $H(\lambda) \cap \partial K_d = \{\phi\}$ . This choice is possible since  $\xi_1$  has both endpoints off of  $\partial K_d$ . We note that  $\lambda$  and  $\tau = \psi_2$  satisfy (6.4). Also if  $H(\lambda) = \mu, H(\tau) = \beta, f_0 = H, \Omega = D(0)$ , then  $\mu$  and  $\beta$  satisfy the requirements of variations I and II respectively. Using this fact and arguing as previously in §8, we obtain a contradiction to the fact that  $H$  is extremal for Problem 1 in  $S(\alpha, d, M)$ . Hence  $\zeta_0$  is not an interior point of either  $\psi_1$  or  $\psi_2$ .

Now consider the case when  $\zeta_0$  is not an interior point of either  $\psi_1$  or  $\psi_2$ . In this case  $\sigma$  clearly varies in a strictly monotonic manner on one of the sides, say  $\psi_1$ . Let  $\zeta_1, \zeta_2$ , denote the endpoints of  $\psi_1$ . Let the labelling of these points be such that

$$(8.1) \quad \sigma(\zeta_1) < \sigma(\zeta_2).$$

Choose a subarc  $\nu \subset \psi_1$  with the property that  $\zeta_1 \in \nu$  and  $H(\nu) \cap \partial K_d = \{\phi\}$ .

Again we let  $H = f_0, D(0) = \Omega$ , and use the notation introduced in §4. Let  $\mu$  be a subarc of  $H(\nu)$ , with  $H(\zeta_1) \in \mu, \mu \cap \partial K_d = \{\phi\}$ , and such that if  $\beta = \xi_1 - \mu$ , then  $q$  defined as in (5.2) satisfies

$$(8.2) \quad q > 1.$$

This choice is possible since from (5.2) and (5.3) we have  $q \rightarrow \infty$  as the arc length of  $\mu \rightarrow 0$ . Let  $A = E$  denote the common endpoint of  $\beta$  and  $\mu$ . Then  $\mu$  satisfies the hypotheses of variation I, but  $\beta$  does not satisfy the hypotheses of either variation II or III. However from the remark after (4.6) we see that we still can apply variations I and II to obtain a starlike domain  $D(\epsilon)$  for  $\epsilon \in Y_1$  with m.r.  $D(\epsilon) = 1$  and  $\partial D(\epsilon) \subset L(d, M)$ . We assert that in fact  $D(\epsilon)$  is  $\alpha$  starlike for  $\epsilon \in Y_1 \cap [0, \epsilon_2]$  when  $\epsilon_2 > 0$  is small enough.

To prove this assertion we introduce a new domain  $\hat{D}(\epsilon), \epsilon \in Y_1$ . We obtain  $\hat{D}(\epsilon)$  by applying variations I and II to  $D(0)$ . More specifically, put  $\hat{D}(\epsilon) = D(\epsilon, \epsilon)$  (see §4 for the definition of  $D(\epsilon, \delta)$ ). Then  $\partial \hat{D}(\epsilon)$  contains  $\alpha$  arcs  $\hat{\mu}, \hat{\beta}$ , with  $\epsilon$  the smallest angle between  $\mu, \hat{\mu}$ , and  $\beta, \hat{\beta}$ , at  $E = A$ . Hence,  $\hat{\mu} \cup \hat{\beta}$  is an  $\alpha$  arc. Using this fact and Lemma 1, we find that  $\hat{D}(\epsilon)$  is  $\alpha$  starlike.



We claim that (5.3) is valid, where now  $g_\epsilon(\cdot, w_1)$  is Green's function for  $\hat{D}(\epsilon)$  with pole at  $w_1 \in \hat{D}(\epsilon)$ . Indeed, it is easily checked that (5.3) holds under the weaker assumption,  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{m.r. } \hat{D}(\epsilon) = 1$ . Using (5.3) we deduce that (5.13)–(5.16) still hold for  $g_\epsilon$  when  $\delta = \epsilon$ . It follows from these equalities with  $w_1 = 0$ ,  $\delta = \epsilon$ , and (8.2) that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1 - \text{m.r. } \hat{D}(\epsilon)}{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{2\pi} [I_1 - I_2] = \frac{I_1}{2\pi} [1 - q] < 0.$$

Hence,  $\text{m.r. } \hat{D}(\epsilon) > 1$  for  $\epsilon > 0$  and small.

Since  $\text{m.r. } \hat{D}(\epsilon) > 1$  for  $\epsilon > 0$  and small, we may now apply variation I (with  $\hat{D}(\epsilon)$ ,  $\hat{\mu}$ , replacing  $D(0)$ ,  $\mu$ , in I) to obtain an  $\alpha$  starlike domain  $\tilde{D}(\epsilon)$  with  $\text{m.r. } \tilde{D}(\epsilon) = 1$ . We note that  $\tilde{\beta} \subset \partial \tilde{D}(\epsilon) \cap \partial D(\epsilon)$ . Using this fact and the monotonicity of the mapping radius, we conclude that  $\tilde{D}(\epsilon) = D(\epsilon)$ . Hence our assertion is true.

Let  $\lambda \subset \nu$  and  $\tau = \psi_1 - \lambda$  be the preimages of  $\mu$ ,  $\beta$ , respectively under  $f_0$ . We observe that  $\zeta_1 \in \lambda$ . Using this observation, (8.1), and the monotonicity of  $\sigma$  on  $\psi_1$  we deduce that (6.4) holds for  $\lambda$  and  $\tau$ . Using (6.4), (7.3), and arguing as in §6, we find that  $H$  is not extremal for Problem 1 in  $S(\alpha, d, M)$ . We have reached a contradiction. Therefore  $\zeta_0$  must be an interior point of either  $\psi_1$  or  $\psi_2$ . However, we have already shown this case cannot occur. Hence the assumption that  $\xi_1$  does not have an endpoint on  $\partial K_d$  is false. We conclude that Lemma 8 is true.

Next we use Lemma 8 to prove Theorem 1. We note that  $F$  defined by (i)–(iv) of §1 is circularly symmetric. Using this fact and Theorem 2 of Jenkins [6] we see that

$$(8.3) \quad |F(re^{i\theta_1})| > |F(re^{i\theta_2})|, \quad 0 \leq \theta_1 < \theta_2 \leq \pi,$$

whenever  $0 < r < 1$ . From (8.3) and Theorem 3 of Kaplan [8], we deduce that the function  $g(z) = \log F(z)/z$ ,  $z \in K$ , is univalent and convex in the direction of the imaginary axis. Suppose now for some  $f \in S(\alpha, d, M)$  that the function  $h(z) = \log f(z)/z$ ,  $z \in K$ , is not subordinate to  $g(z)$ . Then for some  $z_0 \in K - \{0\}$  we would have  $w_0 = h(z_0) \notin g(K)$ . It would then follow from Runge's Theorem (see Rudin [14, Thm. 13.9]) that there exists a polynomial  $P$  with

- (i)  $|P(w)| \leq \frac{1}{4}$  for  $w \in g(K_{|z_0|})$ ,
- (ii)  $|P(w_0)| \geq \frac{1}{2}$ .

We choose  $\gamma$  such that  $\text{Re}\{e^{i\gamma}P(w_0)\} = |P(w_0)|$ . Then the function  $\Phi(w) = e^{i\gamma}P(w)$  is entire and from (i), (ii), we have

$$\max_{0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \Phi \left[ \log \frac{F(e^{i\theta} z_0)}{e^{i\theta} z_0} \right] \right\} \leq \frac{1}{4} < \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \Phi \left[ \log \frac{f(z_0)}{z_0} \right] \right\}.$$

This inequality contradicts Lemma 8. We conclude that Theorem 1 is true, for fixed  $\alpha$ ,  $d$ , and  $M$  satisfying  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ ,  $1 < M < \infty$ , and  $0 \leq d < 1$ .

The case  $0 < \alpha < \infty$ ,  $M = \infty$ ,  $0 \leq d < 1$ , can be handled by treating it as a limiting case as  $M \rightarrow \infty$  of the above cases. We omit the details.

**9. Proof of Theorem 2.** Let  $M$  and  $d$  be fixed numbers satisfying  $1 < M < \infty$ ,  $0 \leq d < 1$ . Let  $S^*(d, M)$  be as in §1. Given  $f \in S^*(d, M)$  and  $r$ ,  $0 < r < 1$ , let  $f_r(z) = f(rz)/r$ ,  $z \in K$ . From the maximum principle for harmonic functions and (1.1) we see that  $f_r \in S(\alpha, d, M)$  for  $0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0$ , provided  $\alpha_0$  is small enough. Hence from Theorem 1,  $\log f_r(z)/z$ ,  $z \in K$ , is subordinate, to the function  $\log [F(z, \alpha, d, M)/z]$ ,  $z \in K$ , for  $0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0$ . Using this fact and simple properties of subordination, it follows that if  $F^*(\cdot, d, M) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} F(\cdot, \alpha, d, M)$  exists, then  $\log f_r(z)/z$ ,  $z \in K$ , is subordinate to  $\log [F^*(z, d, M)/z]$ ,  $z \in K$ . Since  $F(K, \alpha, d, M)$  converges as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$  in the sense of kernel convergence, we see that the above limit exists. Furthermore,  $\partial F^*(K, d, M)$  consists of either

- (i) An arc of  $\partial K_d$ , passing through  $-d$ , with endpoints  $de^{i\theta}$ ,  $de^{-i\theta}$ ,  $0 < \theta < \pi$ ,
- (ii) The arc of  $\partial K_M$ , passing through  $M$ , with endpoints  $Me^{i\theta}$ ,  $Me^{-i\theta}$ ,
- (iii) The radial line segments connecting  $de^{i\theta}$ ,  $Me^{i\theta}$ , and  $de^{-i\theta}$ ,  $Me^{-i\theta}$ , respectively, or
- (iv) A line segment on the negative real axis with one endpoint  $-M$ , and  $\partial K_M$ .

Since  $f = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} f_r$  we conclude that (B) of Theorem 1 is valid.

Finally we show that  $g(z) = \log [F^*(z, d, M)/z]$ ,  $z \in K$ , is convex univalent. Since  $g$  is the limit of univalent functions, it is clearly univalent. Let  $z_1, z_2$ , be fixed points in  $K - \{0\}$  with  $z_1/|z_1| = e^{i\theta_1}$ ,  $z_2/|z_2| = e^{i\theta_2}$ , and  $r_1 = |z_1| \leq r_2 = |z_2|$ . Then for given  $t$ ,  $0 < t < 1$ , and  $r = r_1/r_2 \leq 1$ , the function

$$h(z) = z \left[ \frac{F^*(e^{i\theta_2} z, d, M)}{e^{i\theta_2} z} \right]^t \left[ \frac{F^*(re^{i\theta_1} z, d, M)}{re^{i\theta_1} z} \right]^{1-t},$$

$z \in K$ , is in  $S^*(d, M)$ . The above fact follows from a property of starlike functions stated in §1, and the maximum principle for harmonic functions. Since  $\log [h(z)/z]$ ,  $z \in K$ , is subordinate to  $g$ , we see that  $\log [h(r_2)/r_2] = tg(z_2) + (1-t)g(z_1)$  is in  $g(K)$ . Hence  $g$  is convex

univalent. The proof of Theorem 2 is now complete for  $1 < M < \infty$  and  $0 \leq d < 1$ . The case  $M = \infty$ ,  $0 \leq d < 1$ , can be handled by treating it as a limiting case as  $M \rightarrow \infty$  of the above cases. We omit the details.

## REFERENCES

1. R. Barnard, *Extremal problems for univalent functions whose range contain a fixed disk*, thesis, University of Maryland, 1971.
2. —, *Extremal problems for univalent functions whose range contain a fixed disk*, to appear.
3. S. Bergman, *The kernel function and conformal mapping*, Amer. Math. Soc., Mathematical surveys, V, 1970.
4. G. Goluzin, *Geometric theory of functions of a complex variable*, Transl. of Math. Mon. (Amer. Math. Soc.), 1969.
5. W. Hayman, *Multivalent functions*, Cambridge University press, 1967.
6. J. Jenkins, *On circularly symmetric functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **9** (1958), 82–87.
7. G. Julia, *Sur une équation aux dérivées fonctionnelles liée à la représentation conforme*, Ann. Scient. Ecole Norm. Sup., **39** (1922), 1–28.
8. W. Kaplan, *Close to convex schlicht functions*, Michigan Math. J., (1952), 169–185.
9. W. Kirwan, *A note on extremal problems for certain classes of analytic functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **17**, (1966), 1028–1030.
10. J. Krzyz, *Distortion theorems for bounded convex functions II*, Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Skłodowska Sect. A, **14** (1960), 7–18.
11. S. Miller, *On properties of Bazilevič functions*, thesis, University of Kentucky, 1971.
12. P. Mocanu, *Une propriété de convexité généralisée dans la représentation conforme*, Mathematica (Cluj) **1** (34), 1, (1969), 127–133.
13. Z. Nehari, *Conformal Mapping*, McGraw-Hill, 1952.
14. W. Rudin, *Real and complex analysis*, McGraw-Hill, 1966.
15. T. Suffridge, *Some remarks on convex maps of the unit disk*, Duke Math. J., **37** (1970), 775–777.
16. T. Suffridge, *A coefficient problem for a class of univalent function*, Michigan Math. J., **16** (1969), 33–42.

Received December 4, 1973.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

## EDITORS

RICHARD ARENS (Managing Editor)

University of California  
Los Angeles, California 90024

J. DUGUNDJI

Department of Mathematics  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, California 90007

R. A. BEAUMONT

University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington 98105

D. GILBARG AND J. MILGRAM

Stanford University  
Stanford, California 94305

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

## SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA  
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY  
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON  
OSAKA UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO  
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH  
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

\* \* \*

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

---

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its contents or policies.

---

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. Items of the bibliography should not be cited there unless absolutely necessary, in which case they must be identified by author and Journal, rather than by item number. Manuscripts, in duplicate, may be sent to any one of the four editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. 39. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

100 reprints are provided free for each article, only if page charges have been substantially paid. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

---

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: \$ 72.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: \$ 36.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley, California, 94708.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION  
Printed at Jerusalem Academic Press, POB 2390, Jerusalem, Israel.

Copyright © 1975 Pacific Journal of Mathematics  
All Rights Reserved

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 56, No. 2

December, 1975

Ralph Alexander, <i>Generalized sums of distances</i> . . . . .	297
Zvi Arad and George Isaac Glauberman, <i>A characteristic subgroup of a group of odd order</i> . . . . .	305
B. Aupetit, <i>Continuité du spectre dans les algèbres de Banach avec involution</i> . . . . .	321
Roger W. Barnard and John Lawson Lewis, <i>Coefficient bounds for some classes of starlike functions</i> . . . . .	325
Roger W. Barnard and John Lawson Lewis, <i>Subordination theorems for some classes of starlike functions</i> . . . . .	333
Ladislav Bican, <i>Preradicals and injectivity</i> . . . . .	367
James Donnell Buckholtz and Ken Shaw, <i>Series expansions of analytic functions. II</i> . . . . .	373
Richard D. Carmichael and E. O. Milton, <i>Distributional boundary values in the dual spaces of spaces of type <math>\mathcal{S}</math></i> . . . . .	385
Edwin Duda, <i>Weak-unicohherence</i> . . . . .	423
Albert Edrei, <i>The Padé table of functions having a finite number of essential singularities</i> . . . . .	429
Joel N. Franklin and Solomon Wolf Golomb, <i>A function-theoretic approach to the study of nonlinear recurring sequences</i> . . . . .	455
George Isaac Glauberman, <i>On Burnside's other <math>p^a q^b</math> theorem</i> . . . . .	469
Arthur D. Grainger, <i>Invariant subspaces of compact operators on topological vector spaces</i> . . . . .	477
Jon Craig Helton, <i>Mutual existence of sum and product integrals</i> . . . . .	495
Franklin Takashi Iha, <i>On boundary functionals and operators with finite-dimensional null spaces</i> . . . . .	517
Gerald J. Janusz, <i>Generators for the Schur group of local and global number fields</i> . . . . .	525
A. Katsaras and Dar-Biau Liu, <i>Integral representations of weakly compact operators</i> . . . . .	547
W. J. Kim, <i>On the first and the second conjugate points</i> . . . . .	557
Charles Philip Lanski, <i>Regularity and quotients in rings with involution</i> . . . .	565
Ewing L. Lusk, <i>An obstruction to extending isotopies of piecewise linear manifolds</i> . . . . .	575
Saburou Saitoh, <i>On some completenesses of the Bergman kernel and the Rudin kernel</i> . . . . .	581
Stephen Jeffrey Willson, <i>The converse to the Smith theorem for <math>Z_p</math>-homology spheres</i> . . . . .	597