



# On $q$ -Calculus and Starlike Functions

Krzysztof Piejko<sup>1</sup> · Janusz Sokół<sup>2</sup> · Katarzyna Trąbka-Więclaw<sup>3</sup>

Received: 15 October 2018 / Accepted: 12 August 2019 / Published online: 5 September 2019  
© The Author(s) 2019

## Abstract

We consider the class  $\mathcal{S}^*(\zeta, \alpha)$ ,  $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ , of normalized analytic functions  $f$  such that

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{z d_{\zeta} f(z)}{f(z)} \right\} > \alpha, \quad |z| < 1,$$

where  $d_{\zeta} f$  is the convolution operator

$$d_{\zeta} f(z) = \frac{1}{z} \left\{ f(z) * \frac{z}{(1 - \zeta z)(1 - z)} \right\},$$

where  $\zeta$  is complex,  $|\zeta| \leq 1$ . For  $\zeta = 1$  the operator becomes the derivative  $f'$ , while for real  $\zeta = q$ ,  $0 < q < 1$ , we obtain the Jackson  $q$ -derivative  $d_q f$ .

**Keywords** Analytic functions · Convex functions · Starlike functions ·  $q$ -Calculus ·  $q$ -Derivative operator · Convolution operator

**Mathematics Subject Classification** 30C45

## 1 Introduction

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  denote the class of analytic functions in the unit disc  $\mathbb{D} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the subclass of  $\mathcal{H}$  consisting of functions normalized by  $f(0) = 0, f'(0) = 1$ , i.e.

$$f(z) = z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_n z^n, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}, \quad (1)$$

and let  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{A}$  be the class of functions which are univalent in  $\mathbb{D}$ . Moreover, we shall use the following notations:

$$J_{ST}(f; z) := \frac{z f'(z)}{f(z)}, \quad J_{CV}(f; z) := 1 + \frac{z f''(z)}{f'(z)}. \quad (2)$$

Let a function  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  be univalent in  $\mathbb{D}$  with the normalization  $f(0) = 0$ . Then  $f$  maps  $\mathbb{D}$  onto a starlike domain with respect to the origin, if and only if

$$\Re \{ J_{ST}(f; z) \} > 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}, \quad (3)$$

and such function  $f$  is said to be starlike in  $\mathbb{D}$  with respect to the origin (or briefly starlike). Furthermore, a function  $f$  maps  $\mathbb{D}$  onto a convex domain  $E$ , if and only if

$$\Re \{ J_{CV}(f; z) \} > 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}, \quad (4)$$

and such function  $f$  is said to be convex in  $\mathbb{D}$  (or briefly convex). Recall that a set  $E \subset \mathbb{C}$  is said to be starlike with respect to a point  $w_0 \in E$ , if and only if the linear segment joining  $w_0$  to any other point  $w \in E$  lies entirely in  $E$ , while a set  $E$  is said to be convex, if and only if it is starlike with

✉ Katarzyna Trąbka-Więclaw  
k.trabka@pollub.pl

Krzysztof Piejko  
piejko@prz.edu.pl

Janusz Sokół  
jsokol@ur.edu.pl

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Mathematics and Applied Physics, Rzeszów University of Technology, Al. Powstańców Warszawy 12, 35-959 Rzeszów, Poland

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, University of Rzeszów, ul. Prof. Pignonia 1, 35-310 Rzeszów, Poland

<sup>3</sup> Mechanical Engineering Faculty, Lublin University of Technology, ul. Nadbystrzycka 36, 20-618 Lublin, Poland

respect to each of its points, that is, if and only if the linear segment joining any two points of  $E$  lies entirely in  $E$ . It is well known that if an analytic function  $f$  satisfies condition (3) and  $f(0) = 0, f'(0) \neq 0$ , then  $f$  is univalent and starlike in  $\mathbb{D}$ . By  $\mathcal{S}^*$  and  $\mathcal{K}$ , we denote the subclasses of  $\mathcal{A}$  which consist of starlike univalent functions and convex univalent functions in  $\mathbb{D}$ , respectively. It is known that for  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  condition (4) is sufficient for starlikeness of  $f$ . The following condition

$$|J_{CV}(f; z) - 1| < 2, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}$$

is also sufficient for starlikeness of  $f$ .

Robertson introduced in Robertson (1936) the classes  $\mathcal{S}^*(\alpha)$  and  $\mathcal{K}(\alpha)$  of starlike and convex functions of order  $\alpha, \alpha < 1$ , which are defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^*(\alpha) &:= \{f \in \mathcal{A} : \Re\{J_{ST}(f; z)\} > \alpha, z \in \mathbb{D}\}, \\ \mathcal{K}(\alpha) &:= \{f \in \mathcal{A} : \Re\{J_{CV}(f; z)\} > \alpha, z \in \mathbb{D}\} \\ &= \{f \in \mathcal{A} : z f'(z) \in \mathcal{S}^*(\alpha), z \in \mathbb{D}\}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ , then a function in either of these sets is univalent; if  $\alpha < 0$ , it may fail to be univalent. In particular, we have  $\mathcal{S}^*(0) = \mathcal{S}^*$  and  $\mathcal{K}(0) = \mathcal{K}$ . It is known as the old Stroh acker result (Stroh acker 1933) that  $\mathcal{K}(0) \subset \mathcal{S}^*(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{S}^*(0)$ . Furthermore, note that if  $f \in \mathcal{K}(\alpha)$ , then  $f \in \mathcal{S}^*(\delta(\alpha))$ , see Wilken and Feng (1980), where

$$\delta(\alpha) = \begin{cases} (1 - 2\alpha)/(2^{2-2\alpha} - 2) & \text{for } \alpha \neq 1/2, \\ 1/\log 4 & \text{for } \alpha = 1/2. \end{cases}$$

Robertson (1985) proved that if  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $f(z)/z \neq 0, z \in \mathbb{D}$ , and if there exists  $k, 0 < k \leq 2$ , such that

$$|J_{CV}(f; z) - 1| \leq k|J_{ST}(f; z)|, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

then  $f \in \mathcal{S}^*(2/(2+k))$ . In Mocanu (1986), it was proved that if  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $f(z)f'(z)/z \neq 0$  and

$$|J_{CV}(f; z)| \leq \sqrt{2}|J_{ST}(f; z) + 1|, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

then  $f \in \mathcal{S}^*$ . Several more complicated sufficient conditions for starlikeness and convexity are collected in Chapter 5 of Miller and Mocanu (2000).

Jackson (1908, 1910) introduced and studied the  $q$ -derivative,  $0 < q < 1$ , as

$$d_q f(z) = \frac{f(qz) - f(z)}{(q-1)z}, \quad z \neq 0 \tag{5}$$

and  $d_q f(0) = f'(0)$ . Thus, from (5) for a function  $f$  given by (1) we have

$$z d_q f(z) = z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} [n]_q a_n z^n, \tag{6}$$

where

$$[n]_q = \frac{1 - q^n}{1 - q}, \quad n = 2, 3, \dots$$

Let us recall also the definition of the convolution. The convolution, or the Hadamard product, of two power series

$$f_1(z) = z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_n z^n \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(z) = z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} b_n z^n$$

convergent in  $\mathbb{D}$  is the function  $f_3 = f_1 * f_2$  with power series

$$f_3(z) = z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_n b_n z^n, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

## 2 $\zeta$ -Derivative Operator

The function  $h_\zeta$  of the form

$$h_\zeta(z) = \frac{z}{(1 - \zeta z)(1 - z)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - \zeta^n}{1 - \zeta} z^n, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}$$

is starlike for all complex  $\zeta, |\zeta| < 1$ . It is easy to check that if  $\zeta \rightarrow 1^-$ , then the function  $h_\zeta$  becomes the well-known Koebe function

$$h_1(z) = \frac{z}{(1 - z)^2} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n z^n, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

For each  $f \in \mathcal{A}$ , we can express its derivative in terms of the Koebe function as

$$f'(z) = \frac{1}{z} \{f(z) * h_1(z)\} = \frac{1}{z} \left\{ f(z) * \frac{z}{(1 - z)^2} \right\}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}, \tag{7}$$

where  $*$  denotes the Hadamard product, or convolution, of power series. It is natural to consider the following generalization of (7) for  $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}, |\zeta| \leq 1$

$$d_\zeta f(z) = \frac{1}{z} \{f(z) * h_\zeta(z)\} = \frac{1}{z} \left\{ f(z) * \frac{z}{(1 - \zeta z)(1 - z)} \right\}. \tag{8}$$

For  $\zeta = 1$ , convolution operator (8) becomes the derivative  $f'$ , while for real  $\zeta = q, 0 < q < 1$ , we obtain the Jackson  $q$ -derivative of  $f$ , namely  $d_q f(z)$ , which is defined in (5). Therefore, for  $f$  given by (1) we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_{\zeta}f(z) &= \frac{1}{z} \left\{ f(z) * \frac{z}{(1-\zeta z)(1-z)} \right\} \\
 &= \frac{1}{z} \left\{ \left( z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_n z^n \right) * \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1-\zeta^n}{1-\zeta} z^n \right) \right\} \\
 &= \frac{1}{z} \left\{ z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1-\zeta^n}{1-\zeta} a_n z^n \right\} \\
 &= \frac{1}{z} \left\{ z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} [n]_{\zeta} a_n z^n \right\},
 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where

$$[n]_{\zeta} = \frac{1-\zeta^n}{1-\zeta}, \quad n = 2, 3, \dots$$

For these reasons, we can also look at Jackson’s  $q$ -derivative  $d_q f$  from (5), as a special case of convolution operator (8).

**Definition 1** [11] Let  $f \in \mathcal{A}$ . For given  $\zeta, |\zeta| \leq 1$ , we say that  $f$  is in the class  $\mathcal{S}^*(\zeta, \alpha)$  of  $\zeta$ -starlike functions of order  $\alpha, 0 \leq \alpha < 1$ , if

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{z d_{\zeta} f(z)}{f(z)} \right\} > \alpha, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}, \tag{10}$$

where the operator  $d_{\zeta}$  is defined in (8).

**Remark 1** For  $\zeta = 1$ , condition (10) becomes

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{z f'(z)}{f(z)} \right\} > \alpha, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}, \tag{11}$$

and the class  $\mathcal{S}^*(1, \alpha)$  becomes the well-known class  $\mathcal{S}^*(\alpha)$  of starlike functions of order  $\alpha$ , while for  $\zeta = 0$  we have  $\mathcal{S}^*(0, \alpha) = \mathcal{A}$ . For  $\zeta \neq 1$ , condition (10) becomes

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{f(\zeta z) - f(z)}{(\zeta - 1)z} \frac{z}{f(z)} \right\} > \alpha, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}. \tag{12}$$

**Remark 2** It is known that condition (11) follows the univalence of  $f$ , whenever  $f \in \mathcal{A}$ . If  $\zeta \neq 1$ , then condition (10) does not follow that  $f$  is univalent in  $\mathbb{D}$ . For example, it is known that  $f(z) = z + (2/3)z^2$  is not univalent in  $\mathbb{D}$ , while  $f \in \mathcal{S}^*(1/2, 0)$  because for this function  $f$  we have

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{z d_{\zeta} f(z)}{f(z)} \right\} = \Re \left\{ \frac{1+z}{1+(2/3)z} \right\} > 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

**Theorem 1** The function  $g(z) = z + az^2$  is in the class  $\mathcal{S}^*(\zeta, \alpha)$ , if and only if

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{1 - |a|^2(\zeta + 1) - |a||\zeta|}{1 - |a|^2} \right\} > \alpha. \tag{13}$$

**Proof** We have

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{z d_{\zeta} g(z)}{g(z)} \right\} = \Re \left\{ \frac{1 + a(\zeta + 1)z}{1 + az} \right\}.$$

The function

$$z \mapsto \frac{1 + a(\zeta + 1)z}{1 + az}$$

maps  $\mathbb{D}$  onto a disc at  $S$  with radius  $R$ , where

$$S = \frac{1 - |a|^2(\zeta + 1)}{1 - |a|^2}, \quad R = \frac{|a||\zeta|}{1 - |a|^2}.$$

Therefore,  $g \in \mathcal{S}^*(\zeta, \alpha)$ , if and only if  $\Re(S - R) > \alpha$ , which gives (13).  $\square$

**Lemma 1** Ruscheweyh and Sheil-Small (1973) If  $f \in \mathcal{S}^*(1/2)$  and  $g \in \mathcal{S}^*(1/2)$  [or if  $f \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $g \in \mathcal{S}^*$ ], then

$$\frac{f(z) * g(z) F(z)}{f(z) * g(z)} \in \overline{\text{co}}\{F(\mathbb{D})\}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}, \tag{14}$$

where  $F \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $\overline{\text{co}}\{F(\mathbb{D})\}$  denotes the closed convex hull of  $F(\mathbb{D})$ .

**Theorem 2** If  $f$  is in the class  $\mathcal{S}^*(1/2)$  of starlike functions of order  $1/2$ , then for all  $\zeta, |\zeta| \leq 1$ ,  $f$  is in the class  $\mathcal{S}^*(\zeta, 1/(1 + |\zeta|))$  of  $\zeta$ -starlike functions of order  $1/(1 + |\zeta|)$ .

**Proof** The case  $|\zeta| = 1$  is trivial. Assume that  $|\zeta| < 1$ . Note that

$$g(z) = \frac{z}{1-z} \in \mathcal{S}^*(1/2), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Therefore, Lemma 1 gives

$$\frac{f(z) * \frac{z}{1-z} \frac{1-\zeta}{1-\zeta} \frac{1-\zeta}{1-\zeta}}{f(z) * \frac{z}{1-z}} \in \overline{\text{co}}\{F(\mathbb{D})\}, \tag{15}$$

where

$$F(z) = \frac{\frac{z}{(1-\zeta z)(1-z)}}{\frac{z}{1-z}} = \frac{1}{1-\zeta z}, \quad \Re \left\{ \frac{1}{1-\zeta z} \right\} > \frac{1}{1+|\zeta|}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

for all  $\zeta, |\zeta| \leq 1$ . Hence, (15) becomes

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{f(z) * \frac{z}{(1-\zeta z)(1-z)}}{f(z) * \frac{z}{1-z}} \right\} > \frac{1}{1+|\zeta|}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

or equivalently

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{z d_{\zeta} f(z)}{f(z)} \right\} > \frac{1}{1+|\zeta|}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

in view of (10), this means that  $f$  is  $\zeta$ -starlike functions of order  $1/(1 + |\zeta|)$ .  $\square$

Since  $1/2 \leq 1/(1 + |\zeta|)$ , for all  $\zeta, |\zeta| \leq 1$ , Theorem 2 implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 1** *If  $f$  is in the class  $\mathcal{S}^*(1/2)$  of starlike functions of order  $1/2$ , then for all  $\zeta, |\zeta| \leq 1$ ,  $f$  is in the class  $\mathcal{S}^*(\zeta, 1/2)$  of  $\zeta$ -starlike functions of order  $1/2$ .*

Corollary 1 provides some examples of  $\zeta$ -starlike functions of order  $1/2$ , for example

$$g \in \mathcal{S}^*(1/2) \Rightarrow g \in \mathcal{S}^*(\zeta, 1/2), \quad \text{for all } \zeta, |\zeta| \leq 1.$$

It is known that  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{S}^*(1/2)$ ; therefore, Corollary 1 leads to the following result.

**Corollary 2** *If  $f$  is in the class  $\mathcal{K}$  of convex univalent functions, then for all  $\zeta, |\zeta| \leq 1$ ,  $f$  is in the class  $\mathcal{S}^*(\zeta, 1/2)$  of  $\zeta$ -starlike functions of order  $1/2$ .*

We can look for the smallest  $\alpha$  such that for all  $\zeta, |\zeta| \leq 1$ , we have  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{S}^*(\zeta, \alpha)$ . From Corollary 2, we have  $0 < \alpha \leq 1/2$  and it is known that for  $\zeta = 1$  the order of  $\alpha$ -starlikeness in the class of convex functions is  $1/2$ , so  $1/2$  is the solution of this problem. However, we may consider this problem for a given  $\zeta$ .

*Open problem.* For given  $\zeta, |\zeta| \leq 1$ , find the smallest  $\alpha$  such that

$$\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{S}^*(\zeta, \alpha).$$

Recall here another definition of  $q$ -starlike functions of order  $\alpha$ . Namely, making use of  $q$ -derivative (6), Agrawal and Sahoo in Agrawal and Sahoo (2017) introduced the class  $\mathcal{S}_q^*(\alpha)$ . A function  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  belongs to the class  $\mathcal{S}_q^*(\alpha)$ ,  $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ , if

$$\left| \frac{z d_q f(z)}{f(z)} - \frac{1 - \alpha q}{1 - q} \right| \leq \frac{1 - \alpha}{1 - q}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}. \tag{16}$$

If  $q \rightarrow 1^-$  the class  $\mathcal{S}_q^*(\alpha)$  reduces to the class  $\mathcal{S}^*(\alpha)$ . If  $\alpha = 0$ , the class  $\mathcal{S}_q^*(\alpha)$  coincides with the class  $\mathcal{S}_q^*(0) = \mathcal{S}_q^*$ , which was first introduced by Ismail et al. (1990) and was considered in Abu-Risha et al. (2007), Agrawal and Sahoo (2014), Annaby and Mansour (2012), Aouf and Seoudy (2019), Raghavendar and Swaminathan (2012), Rønning (1994), Sahoo and Sharma (2015), Seoudy and Aouf (2014, 2016). Moreover, only for  $\alpha = 0$  the classes  $\mathcal{S}_q^*(\alpha)$  and  $\mathcal{S}^*(q, \alpha)$  are equal one to another. In other cases, i.e. for  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , condition (16) follows

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{z d_q f(z)}{f(z)} \right\} > \alpha, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Therefore,

$$0 < q < 1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_q^*(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{S}^*(q, \alpha).$$

**Lemma 2** *If  $f$  is in the class  $\mathcal{K}$  of convex univalent functions, then we have*

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{(1 - \zeta) d_\zeta f(z)}{f'(z)} \right\} > 0, \quad z, \zeta \in \mathbb{D}, \tag{17}$$

**Proof** It is known that if  $f \in \mathcal{K}$ , then  $f(\mathbb{D})$  is starlike with respect to each of its points, so we have

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{z f'(z)}{f(z) - f(x)} \right\} > 0, \quad |x| < |z| < 1.$$

This implies

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{f(z) - f(\zeta z)}{z f'(z)} \right\} > 0, \quad z, \zeta \in \mathbb{D}. \tag{18}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(z) - f(\zeta z)}{z f'(z)} &= \frac{f(z) - f(\zeta z)(1 - \zeta)z}{(1 - \zeta)z z f'(z)} \\ &= \frac{(1 - \zeta) d_\zeta f(z)}{f'(z)}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Finally, from (18) and (19), we get (17). □

**Theorem 3** *If  $f$  and  $h$  are in the class  $\mathcal{K}$  of convex univalent functions, then we have*

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{h(z) * (1 - \zeta) z d_\zeta f(z)}{h(z) * z f'(z)} \right\} > 0, \quad z, \zeta \in \mathbb{D}. \tag{20}$$

**Proof** From the hypothesis, we have  $h \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $z f'(z) \in \mathcal{S}^*$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ , so by Lemma 1 we have

$$\frac{h(z) * (1 - \zeta) z d_\zeta f(z)}{h(z) * z f'(z)} = \frac{h(z) * z f'(z) \frac{(1 - \zeta) d_\zeta f(z)}{f'(z)}}{h(z) * z f'(z)} \in \overline{\text{co}}\{F(\mathbb{D})\},$$

where

$$F(z) = \frac{(1 - \zeta) d_\zeta f(z)}{f'(z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

By Lemma 2, we get  $\Re\{F(z)\} > 0$ , which implies (20). □

**Corollary 3** *If  $f$  is in the class  $\mathcal{K}$  of convex univalent functions, then we have*

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{(1 - \zeta) \int_0^z d_\zeta f(t) dt}{f(z)} \right\} > 0, \quad z, \zeta \in \mathbb{D}. \tag{21}$$

**Proof** It is known that the following function

$$H_1(z) := \log \left\{ \frac{1}{1 - z} \right\} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{z^n}{n}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

belongs to the class  $\mathcal{K}$ . Furthermore, for  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ , we have

$$H_1(z) * f(z) = \int_0^z \frac{f(t) - f(0)}{t} dt.$$

It is easy to check that

$$\frac{H_1(z) * (1 - \zeta) z d_\zeta f(z)}{H_1(z) * z f'(z)} = \frac{(1 - \zeta) \int_0^z d_\zeta f(t) dt}{f(z)}. \tag{22}$$

From (22) and Theorem 3, we immediately get (21). □

Some further applications of Theorem 3 can be obtained in the same way as in Corollary 3 by choosing some other convex functions. The following functions are in the class  $\mathcal{K}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} H_2(z) &:= \frac{z}{1-z}, & H_3(z) &:= \frac{-2(z + \log(1-z))}{z}, \\ H_4(z) &:= \frac{1}{1-\zeta} \log \frac{1-\zeta z}{1-z}, & z, \zeta &\in \mathbb{D}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The above functions  $H_i$ ,  $i = 2, 3, 4$ , generate the following corollaries.

**Corollary 4** If  $f$  is in the class  $\mathcal{K}$  of convex univalent functions, then we have

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{(1-\zeta) d_{\zeta} f(z)}{f'(z)} \right\} > 0, \quad z, \zeta \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (24)$$

**Proof** For  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ , we have

$$H_2(z) * f(z) = f(z), \quad (25)$$

where  $H_2$  is given by (23). Inequality (24) is obtained from (20) by putting  $h(z) = H_2(z)$  and using (25).  $\square$

**Corollary 5** If  $f$  is in the class  $\mathcal{K}$  of convex univalent functions, then we have

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{(1-\zeta) \int_0^{\zeta} t d_{\zeta} f(t) dt}{\int_0^{\zeta} t f'(t) dt} \right\} > 0, \quad z, \zeta \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (26)$$

**Proof** For  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ , we have

$$H_3(z) * f(z) = \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2z^n}{n+1} \right) * f(z) = \frac{2}{z} \int_0^z f(t) dt, \quad (27)$$

where  $H_3$  is given by (23). Inequality (26) is obtained from (20) by putting  $h(z) = H_3(z)$  and using (27).  $\square$

**Corollary 6** If  $f$  is in the class  $\mathcal{K}$  of convex univalent functions, then we have

$$\Re \left\{ \frac{(1-\zeta) \int_0^{\zeta} d_{\zeta} (t d_{\zeta} f(t)) dt}{\int_0^{\zeta} d_{\zeta} (t f'(t)) dt} \right\} > 0, \quad z, \zeta \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (28)$$

**Proof** For  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_4(z) * f(z) &= \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 + \zeta + \dots + \zeta^{n-1}}{n} z^n \right) * f(z) \\ &= \int_0^z d_{\zeta} f(t) dt, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where  $H_4$  is given by (23). Inequality (28) is obtained from (20) by putting  $h(z) = H_4(z)$  and using (29).  $\square$

**Open Access** This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.

## References

- Abu-Risha MH, Annaby MH, Ismail MEH, Mansour ZS (2007) Linear  $q$ -difference equations. *Z Anal Anwend* 26(4):481–494
- Agrawal S, Sahoo SK (2014) Geometric properties of basic hypergeometric functions. *J Differ Equ Appl* 20:1502–1522
- Agrawal S, Sahoo SK (2017) A generalization of starlike functions of order alpha. *Hokkaido Math J* 46:15–27
- Annaby MH, Mansour ZS (2012)  $q$ -Fractional calculus and equations. Springer, Berlin
- Aouf MK, Seoudy TM (2019) Convolution properties for classes of bounded analytic functions with complex order defined by  $q$ -derivative operator. *Rev R Acad Cienc Exactas Fis Nat Ser A Mat, RACSAM* 113:1279–1288
- Ismail MEH, Merkes E, Styer D (1990) A generalization of starlike functions. *Complex Var* 14:77–84
- Jackson FH (1908) On  $q$ -functions and certain difference operator. *Trans R Soc Edinb* 46:253–281
- Jackson FH (1910) On  $q$ -definite integrals. *Q J Pure Appl Math* 41:193–203
- Miller SS, Mocanu PT (2000) Differential subordinations theory and applications, series of monographs and textbooks in pure and applied mathematics, vol 225. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York
- Mocanu PT (1986) On a theorem of Robertson. *Babeş-Bolyai Univ Fac Math Res Sem Semin Geom Funct Theory* 5:77–82
- Piejko K, Sokół J On convolution and  $q$ -calculus, *Boletín de la Sociedad M. Mexicana. (in print)*
- Raghavender K, Swaminathan A (2012) Close-to-convexity of basic hypergeometric functions using their Taylor coefficients. *J Math Appl* 35:111–125
- Robertson MS (1936) On the theory of univalent functions. *Ann Math* 37:374–408
- Robertson MS (1985) Certain classes of starlike functions. *Mich Math J* 32:135–140
- Rønning F (1994) A Szegő quadrature formula arising from  $q$ -starlike functions. In: Clement Cooper S, Thron WJ (eds) *Continued fractions and orthogonal functions, theory and applications*. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, pp 345–352
- Ruscheweyh ST, Sheil-Small T (1973) Hadamard product of schlicht functions and the Poyla–Schoenberg conjecture. *Comment Math Helv* 48:119–135
- Sahoo SK, Sharma NL (2015) On a generalization of close-to-convex functions. *Ann Pol Math* 113:93–108
- Seoudy TM, Aouf MK (2014) Convolution properties for certain classes of analytic functions defined by  $q$ -derivative operator. *Abstr Appl Anal* vol 2014, Article ID 846719, pp 1–7
- Seoudy TM, Aouf MK (2016) Coefficient estimated of new classes of  $q$ -starlike and  $q$ -convex functions of complex order. *J Math Inequal* 10(1):135–145
- Strohhäcker E (1933) Beiträge zur theorie der schlichter functionen. *Math Z* 37:356–380
- Wilken DR, Feng J (1980) A remark on convex and starlike functions. *J Lond Math Soc* 21(2):287–290