Differential Subordination and Superordination For Analytic Functions Defined Using A Family Of Generalized Differential Operators

Amnah Shammaky*

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Jazan University, Jazan, Saudi Arabia

E-mail: a-e-sh27@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

By making use of the generalized differential operator, the authors derive the subordination and superordination results for certain normalized analytic functions in the open unit disk. Many of the well-known and new results are shown to follow as special cases of our results.

Key Words: Analytic functions, Differential Operators, Differential Subordination, Differential Superordination.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 30C 45.

---

1. INTRODUCTION:

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the class of functions analytic in the open unit disc $\mathcal{U} = \{z : |z| < 1\}$. Let $\mathcal{H}(a,n)$ be the subclass of $\mathcal{H}$ consisting of functions of the form $f(z) = a + a_n z^n + a_{n+1} z^{n+1} + \cdots$.

Let

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \{f \in \mathcal{H}, f(z) = z + a_{n+1} z^{n+1} + a_{n+2} z^{n+2} + \cdots\}$$

and let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1$. Let the functions f and g be analytic in $\mathcal{U}$. We say that the function f is subordinate to g if there exists a Schwarz function w, analytic in $\mathcal{U}$ with $w(0) = 0$ and $|w(z)| < 1$ such that $f(z) = g(w(z))$ for $z \in \mathcal{U}$. We denote it by $f(z) \prec g(z)$. In particular, if the function g is univalent in $\mathcal{U}$, the above subordination is equivalent to $f(0) = g(0)$ and $f(\mathcal{U}) \subset g(\mathcal{U})$. Let $p, h \in \mathcal{H}$ and let $\phi(r, s, t; z) : \mathbb{C}^3 \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. If p and $\phi(p(z), zp'(z), z^2 p''(z); z)$ are univalent and if p satisfies the second order superordination

$$h(z) \prec \phi(p(z), zp'(z), z^2 p''(z); z), \tag{1.1}$$

then p is a solution of the differential superordination (1.1). (If f is subordinate to F, then F is called to be superordinate to f) An analytic function q is called a subordinant if $q \prec p$ for all p satisfying (1.1). An univalent subordinant $\hat{q}$ that satisfies $p \prec \hat{q}$ for all subordinants q of (1.1) is said to be the best subordinant. Recently Miller and Mocanu [6] obtained conditions h, q and ϕ for which the following implication holds:

$$h(z) \prec \phi(p(z), zp'(z), z^2 p''(z); z) \quad \Rightarrow \quad q(z) \prec p(z).$$

With the results of Miller and Mocanu [7], Bulboaca [3] investigated certain classes of first order differential superordinations as well as superordination- preserving integral operators [4]. Ali et al.[2] used the results obtained by Bulboaca [4] and gave the sufficient conditions for certain normalized analytic functions f to satisfy

---

*Corresponding author: *Amnah Shammaky*,*E-mail:* a-e-sh27@hotmail.com

$$q_1(z) \prec \frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)} \prec q_2(z)$$

where q_1 and q_2 are given univalent functions in U with $q_1(0) = 1$ and $q_2(0) = 1$. Shanmugam et al. [10] obtained sufficient conditions for a normalized analytic functions f to satisfy

$$q_1(z) \prec \frac{f(z)}{zf'(z)} \prec q_2(z)$$

and

$$q_1(z) \prec \frac{z^2 f'(z)}{(f(z))^2} \prec q_2(z)$$

where q_1 and q_2 are given univalent functions in U with $q_1(0) = 1$ and $q_2(0) = 1$.

2. DEFINITIONS AND PRELIMINARIES:

For two analytic functions

$$f(z) = z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_n z^n$$

and

$$g(z) = z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} b_n z^n$$

The Hadamard product or convolution of $f(z)$ and $g(z)$, written as $(f * g)(z)$ is defined by

$$(f * g)(z) = z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_n b_n z^n.$$

For complex parameters $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_q$ and $\beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots, \beta_s$ ($\beta_j \in \mathbb{C} \backslash \mathbf{Z}_\circ^-$, $\mathbf{Z}_\circ^- = 0, -1, -2, \cdots, j = 1, \cdots, s$)

we define the generalized hypergeometric function $_q F_s(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_q, \beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots, \beta_s; z)$ by

$$_q F_s(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_q, \beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots, \beta_s; z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\alpha_1)_n, \cdots, (\alpha_q)_n}{(\beta_1)_n, \cdots, (\beta_s)_n} \frac{z^n}{n!},$$

$(q \le s + 1, q, s \in N_\circ = N \cup \{0\}, z \in \mathcal{U})$,

where $(x)_n$ is the Pochhammer symbol defined, in terms of the Gamma function Γ, by

$$(x)_n = \frac{\Gamma(x + n)}{\Gamma(x)} \begin{cases} 1 & if \quad n = 0 \\ x(x+1)(x+2)\cdots(x+n-1) & if \quad n \in N = \{1, 2, \cdots\}. \end{cases}$$

Corresponding to the function $h_{q,s}(\alpha_1; z)$ defined by

$$h_{q,s}(\alpha_1) = z \, _q F_s(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_q, \beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots, \beta_s; z)$$

we now define the following operator $D_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1) f : A_1 \to A_1$ by

$$D_{\lambda,q,s}^0(\alpha_1) f(z) = f(z) * h_{q,s}(\alpha_1; z)$$

$$D_{\lambda,q,s}^1(\alpha_1) f(z) = (1 - \lambda)(f(z) * h_{q,s}(\alpha_1; z)) + \lambda z(f(z) * h_{q,s}(\alpha_1; z)) \tag{2.1}$$

$$D_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1) f(z) = D_{\lambda,q,s}^1(D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m-1}(\alpha_1) f(z)). \tag{2.2}$$

If $f \in \mathcal{A}_1$, then from (2.1) and (2.2) we may easily deduce that

$$D_{\lambda,q,s}^m (\alpha_1) f(z) = z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} [1+(n-1)\lambda]^m \Gamma_n (\alpha_1) a_n z^n, \tag{2.3}$$

Where $m \in \mathcal{N}_0 = \mathcal{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\Gamma_n(\alpha_1) = \dfrac{(\alpha_1)_{n-1}, \cdots, (\alpha_q)_{n-1}}{(\beta_1)_{n-1}, \cdots, (\beta_s)_{n-1} (n-1)!}$

We remark that, for the choice of the parameter $m = 0$, the operator $D_{\lambda,q,s}^0 (\alpha_1) f(z)$ reduces to the well-known Dziok-Srivastava operator [6], for $q = 2$, $s = 1$, $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$, $\alpha_2 = 1$, we get the operator introduced by Al-oboudi [1], and for $q = 2$, $s = 1$, $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$, $\alpha_2 = 1$ and $\lambda = 1$, we get the operator introduced by Salagean [8], and for the choice of the parameter $m = 0$, $\alpha_1 = a > 0$, $\beta_1 = c > 0$, $\alpha_2 = 1$, $q = 2$, $s = 1$, we get the operator introduced by Carlson-Shaffer [5]. Also many (well known and new) integral and differential operators can be obtained specializing the parameters.

It can be easily verified from the definition of (2.3) that

$$z(D_{\lambda,q,s}^m (\alpha_1) f(z))' = \alpha_1 D_{\lambda,q,s}^m (\alpha_1 + 1) f(z) - (\alpha_1 - 1) D_{\lambda,q,s}^m (\alpha_1) f(z) \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$\lambda z(D_{\lambda,q,s}^m (\alpha_1) f(z))' = D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m+1} (\alpha_1) f(z) - (1-\lambda) D_{\lambda,q,s}^m (\alpha_1) f(z). \tag{2.5}$$

In order to prove our subordination and superordination results, we make use of the following known results.

Definition: 2-1[7] Denote by Q the set of all functions f that are analytic and injective on $\overline{\mathcal{U}} - E(f)$ where

$$E(f) = \{\varsigma \in \partial \mathcal{U} : \lim_{z \to \varsigma} f(z) = \infty\}, \text{ And are such that } f'(\varsigma) \neq 0 \text{ for } \varsigma \in \partial \mathcal{U}\text{-}E(f).$$

Lemma: 2-1 [7] Let the function q be univalent in the open unit disc $\mathcal{U}$ and θ and ϕ be analytic in a domain D containing $q(\mathcal{U})$ with $\phi(w) \neq 0$ when $w \in q(\mathcal{U})$. set $Q(z) = zq'(z)\phi(q(z))$, $h(z) = \theta(q(z)) + Q(z)$. Suppose that

(1) Q is starlike univalent in $\mathcal{U}$ and

(2) $\text{Re}\left(\dfrac{zh'(z)}{Q(z)}\right) > 0$ for $z \in \mathcal{U}$.

If

$\theta(p(z)) + zp'(z)\phi(p(z)) \prec \theta(q(z)) + zq'(z)\phi(p(z))$, then $p(z) \prec q(z)$ and q is the best dominant.

Lemma: 2-2 [4] Let the function q be univalent in the open unit disc $\mathcal{U}$ and ϑ and ϕ be analytic in a domain D containing $q(\mathcal{U})$ suppose that

(1) $\text{Re}\left(\dfrac{\vartheta'(q(z))}{\phi q(z))}\right) > 0$ for $z \in \mathcal{U}$ and

(2) $zq'(z)\phi(q(z))$ is starlike univalent in $\mathcal{U}$.

If $p \in \mathcal{H}[q(0),1] \cap Q$, with $p(\mathcal{U}) \subseteq D$, $\vartheta(p(z)) + zp'(z)\phi(p(z))$ is univalent in $\mathcal{U}$ and $\vartheta(q(z)) + zq'(z)\phi(q(z)) \prec \vartheta(p(z)) + zp'(z)\phi(p(z))$, then $q(z) \prec p(z)$ and q is the best subordinant.

3. SUBORDINATION AND SUPERORDINATION FOR ANALYTIC FUNCTIONS:

We begin with the following

Theorem: 3.1 Let $\left(\dfrac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu} \in H$ and let the function $q(z)$ be analytic and univalent in U such that

$q(z) \neq 0, (z \in , U)$. Suppose that $\dfrac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$ is starlike univalent in U . Let

$$\text{Re}\left\{1+\frac{\xi}{\beta}q(z)+\frac{2\delta}{\beta}(q(z))^2-\frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}+\frac{zq''(z)}{q'(z)}\right\} > 0 \tag{3.1}$$

$(\alpha,\delta,\xi,\beta \in \mathbb{C};\ \beta \neq 0)$
and

$$\Psi_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1,\mu,\xi,\beta,\delta,f)(z) := \alpha + \xi\left(\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu}$$

$$+\delta\left(\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}{z}\right)^{2\mu}+\beta\mu(\alpha_1+1)\left[\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1+2)f(z)}{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}-1\right].$$

$$\tag{3.2}$$

If q satisfies the following subordination:

$$\Psi_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1,\mu,\xi,\beta,\delta,f)(z) \prec \alpha+\xi q(z)+\delta(q(z))^2+\beta\frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}, \ (\alpha,\delta,\xi,\mu,\beta \in \mathbb{C}\ ;\ \beta,\mu \neq 0),$$

then

$$\left(\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu} \prec q(z) \quad \left(\mu \in C; \mu \neq 0\right) \text{ and } q \text{ is the best dominant.} \tag{3.3}$$

Proof: Let the function p be defined by

$$p(z) := \left(\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu} \quad (z \in \mathcal{U};\ z \neq 0;\ f \in \mathcal{A})$$

By a straightforward computation, we have

$$\frac{zp'(z)}{p(z)} := \mu\left(\frac{z(D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1+1)f(z))'}{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}-1\right).$$

By using the identity (2.4), we obtain

$$\frac{zp'(z)}{p(z)} := \mu\left((\alpha_1+1)\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1+2)f(z)}{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}-(\alpha_1+1)\right).$$

By setting

$$\theta(w) := \alpha+\xi w+\delta w^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(w) := \frac{\beta}{w},$$

it can be easily verified that θ is analytic in $\mathbb{C}$, ϕ is analytic in $\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$ and that $\phi(w) \neq 0\ (w \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\})$. Also, by letting

$$Q(z) = zq'(z)\phi(q(z)) = \beta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$$

and

$$h(z) = \theta(q(z)) + Q(z) = \alpha + \xi q(z) + \delta(q(z))^2 + \beta \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}.$$

We find that $Q(z)$ is starlike univalent in $\mathcal{U}$ and that

$$\text{Re}\left(\frac{zh'(z)}{Q(z)}\right) = \text{Re}\left\{1 + \frac{\xi}{\beta}q(z) + \frac{2\delta}{\beta}(q(z))^2 - \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)} + \frac{zq''(z)}{q'(z)}\right\} > 0.$$

The assertion (3.3) of Theorem3.1 now follows by an application of Lemma 2.2.

Using arguments similar to those detailed in the Theorem (3.1) with the equation (2.5), we have the following Theorem.

Theorem: 3.2 Let $\left(\dfrac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1)f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu} \in \mathcal{H}$ and let the function $q(z)$ be analytical and univalent in $\mathcal{U}$ such

that $q(z) \neq 0, (z \in , \mathcal{U})$. Suppose that $\dfrac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$ is starlike univalent in $\mathcal{U}$. Let

$$\text{Re}\left\{1 + \frac{\xi}{\beta}q(z) + \frac{2\delta}{\beta}(q(z))^2 - \frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)} + \frac{zq''(z)}{q'(z)}\right\} > 0 \qquad (\alpha, \delta, \xi, \beta \in \mathbb{C}; \beta \neq 0) \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$\Omega_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1, \mu, \xi, \beta, \delta, f)(z) := \alpha + \xi\left(\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m+1}(\alpha_1)f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu}$$

$$+ \delta\left(\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m+1}(\alpha_1)f(z)}{z}\right)^{2\mu} + \beta\frac{\mu}{\lambda}\left[\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m+2}(\alpha_1)f(z)}{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m+1}(\alpha_1)f(z)} - (2-\lambda)\right]. \tag{3.5}$$

If q satisfies the following subordination:

$$\Omega_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1, \mu, \xi, \beta, \delta, f)(z) \prec \alpha + \xi q(z) + \delta(q(z))^2 + \beta\frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)} \quad (\alpha, \delta, \xi, \mu, \beta \in \mathbb{C}; \beta, \mu \neq 0)$$

then

$$\left(\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^{m+1}(\alpha_1)f(z)}{z}\right)^{\mu} \prec q(z) \quad (\mu \in C; \mu \neq 0) \tag{3.6}$$

and q is the best dominant.

For the choices $q(z) = \dfrac{1+Az}{1+Bz}, \; -1 \leq B < A \leq 1$ and $q(z) = \left(\dfrac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^{\gamma}, \; 0 < \gamma \leq 1,$ in Theorem 3.1, we get the

following results.

Corollary: 3.3 Assume that (3.1) holds. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and

$$\Psi_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1, \mu, \xi, \beta, \delta, f)(z) \prec \alpha + \xi\frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} + \delta\left(\frac{1+Az}{1+Bz}\right)^2 + \beta\frac{(A-B)z}{(1+Az)(1+Bz)} \quad (\alpha, \delta, \xi, \mu, \beta \in \mathbb{C};$$

$\beta, \mu \neq 0$), where $\Psi_{\lambda,q,s}^{m}(\alpha_1, \mu, \xi, \beta, \delta, f)$ is as defined in (3.2), then

$$\left(\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}{z}\right)^\mu \prec \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} \quad (\mu \in C; \mu \neq 0) \text{ and } \frac{1+Az}{1+Bz} \text{ is the best dominant.}$$

Corollary: 3.4 Assume that (3.1) holds. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and

$$\Psi_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1,\mu,\xi,\beta,\delta,f)(z) \prec \alpha + \xi\left(\frac{1+z}{1+z}\right)^\gamma + \delta\left(\frac{1+z}{1+z}\right)^{2\gamma} + \beta\frac{2\gamma z}{(1+z^2)}$$

$(\alpha,\delta,\xi,\mu,\beta \in C; \beta,\mu \neq 0)$, where $\Psi_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1,\mu,\xi,\beta,\delta,f)$ is as defined in (3.2), then

$$\left(\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}{z}\right)^\mu \prec \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^\gamma \quad (\mu \in C; \mu \neq 0) \text{ and } \left(\frac{1+z}{1-z}\right)^\gamma \text{ is the best dominant.}$$

For special case when $q(z) = \frac{1}{(1-z)^{2b}}(b \in C\backslash\{0\}), \{0\}), m=0; \ \alpha_1 = a = 1, \ \beta_1 = c = 1,$

$\alpha_2 = 1, \ q = 2, \ s = 1, \delta = \xi = 0, \mu = \alpha = 1$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{b}$, Theorem 3.1 reduces at once to the following known result obtained by Srivastava and Lashin [11].

Corollary: 3.5 Let b be a non zero complex number. If $f \in \mathcal{A}$, and $1 + \frac{1}{b}\frac{zf''(z)}{f'(z)} \prec \frac{1+z}{1-z}$, then

$$f'(z) \prec \frac{1}{(1-z)^{2b}} \text{ and } \frac{1}{(1-z)^{2b}}, \text{ is the best dominant.}$$

Remark: 3.1 We remark that Theorem 3.2 can be restated, for different choices of the function q.

Next, by appealing to Lemma 2.2 of the preceding section, we prove the following:

Theorem: 3.6 Let q be analytic and univalent in $\mathcal{U}$ such that $q(z) \neq 0$ and $\frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)}$ be starlike univalent in $\mathcal{U}$. Further, let us assume that

$$\text{Re}\left[\frac{2\delta}{\beta}(q(z))^2 + \frac{\xi}{\beta}q(z)\right] > 0, \quad (\delta,\xi,\beta \in C; \beta \neq 0). \tag{3.7}$$

If $f \in \mathcal{A}$

$$0 \neq \left(\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}{z}\right)^\mu \in \mathcal{H}[q(0),1] \cap Q,$$

and $\Psi_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1,\mu,\xi,\beta,\delta,f)$ is univalent in $\mathcal{U}$, then

$$\alpha + \xi q(z) + \delta(q(z))^2 + \beta\frac{zq'(z)}{q(z)} \prec \Psi_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1,\mu,\xi,\beta,\delta,f)$$

implies

$$q(z) \prec \left(\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}{z}\right)^\mu \quad (\mu \in C; \mu \neq 0) \tag{3.8}$$

and q is the best subordinant where $\Psi_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1,\mu,\xi,\beta,\delta,f)$ is as defined in (3.2).

Proof: By setting

$$\vartheta(w) := \alpha + \xi w + \delta w^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(w) := \frac{\beta}{w},$$

it can be easily verified that ϑ is analytic in $\mathbb{C}$, ϕ is analytic in $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ and that $\phi(w) \neq 0$ $(w \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\})$. Since q is convex (univalent) function it follows that,

$$\text{Re}\left(\frac{\vartheta'(q(z))}{\varphi(q(z))}\right) = \text{Re}\left[\frac{2\delta}{\beta}(q(z))^2 + \frac{\xi}{\beta}q(z)\right] > 0, \quad (\delta, \xi, \beta \in \mathbb{C}; \ \beta \neq 0).$$

The assertion (3.8) of Theorem3.6 follows by an application of Lemma 2.2.

4. SANDWICH THEOREMS:

Combining Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.6, we get the following sandwich theorem.

Theorem: 4.1 Let q_1 and q_2 be univalent in U such that $q_1 \neq 0$ and $q_2 \neq 0$, $(z \in U)$ with $\dfrac{zq_1'(z)}{q_1(z)}$ and $\dfrac{zq_2'(z)}{q_2(z)}$ being starlike univalent. Suppose that q_1 satisfies (3.7) and q_2 satisfies (3.1). If $f \in A$,

$$\left(\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}{z}\right)^\mu \in H[q(0),1] \cap Q, \text{ and } \Psi_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1, \mu, \xi, \beta, \delta, f) \text{ is univalent in U, then}$$

$$\alpha + \xi q_1(z) + \delta(q_1(z))^2 + \beta\frac{zq_1'(z)}{q_1(z)} \prec \Psi_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1, \mu, \xi, \beta, \delta, f)(z)$$

$$\prec \alpha + \xi q_2(z) + \delta(q_2(z))^2 + \beta\frac{zq_2'(z)}{q_2(z)}$$

$(\alpha, \delta, \xi, \mu, \beta \in \mathbb{C}; \ \beta, \mu \neq 0)$ implies

$$q_1(z) \prec \left(\frac{D_{\lambda,q,s}^m(\alpha_1+1)f(z)}{z}\right)^\mu \prec q_2(z) \qquad (\mu \in C; \mu \neq 0)$$

and q_1 and q_2 are respectively the best subordinant and the dominant.

Remark: 4.1 By taking $m = 0$ and $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$ in Theorem 4.1, we have the result obtained by Shanmugam et al. [10].

Remark: putting $\alpha_1 = b > 0$, $\alpha_2 = 1$, $\beta_1 = c > 0$, $q = 2, s = 1$ in the above results we obtain the results obtained by Selvaraj and Karthikeyan [9].

REFERENCES:

[1]   F. M. Al-Oboudi, On univalent functions defined by a generalized Salagean operator, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci., 25-28(2004), 1429–1436.

[2]   R. M. Ali et al., Differential sandwich theorems for certain analytic functions, Far East J. Math. Sci., 15 (2004), no. 1, 87–94.

[3]   T. Bulboaca, Classes of first-order differential superordinations, Demonstratio Math., 35 (2002), no. 2, 287–292.

[4]   T. Bulboaca, A class of superordination-preserving integral operators, Indag. Math. (N.S.), 13 (2002), no. 3, 301–311.

[5]   B. C. Carlson and D. B. Shaffer, Starlike and prestarlike hypergeometric functions, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 15 (1984), no. 4, 737–745.

[6]   J. Dziok and H. M. Srivastava, Classes of analytic functions associated with the generalized hypergeometric function, Appl. Math.Comp. 103 (1999), 1-13.

[7]   S. S. Miller and P. T. Mocanu, Subordinants of differential superordina-tions, Complex Var. Theory Appl., 48 (2003), no. 10, 815–826. MR2014390 (2004i:30015).

[8]   G. S. Salagean, Subclasses of univalent functions, in Complex analysis—fifth Romanian-Finnish seminar, Part 1 (Bucharest, 1981), Lecture Notes in Math., 1013, Springer, Berlin, 362–372.

[9]   C. Selvaraj and K.R. Karthikeyan, Differential Subordination and Superordination for analytic functions defined using a family of generalized differential operators, An. St.Univ.Ovidius Constanta, 17(1) (2009), 201-201

[10]   T. N. Shanmugam, C. Ramachandran, M. Darus and S. Sivasubramanian, Differential sandwich theorems for some subclasses of analytic functions involving a linear operator, Acta Math. Univ. Comenianae, 16 (2007), no. 2, 287–294.

[11]   H. M. Srivastava and A. Y. Lashin, Some applications of the Briot-Bouquet differential subordination, JIPAM. J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math., 6 (2005), no. 2, Article 41, 7 pp. (electronic).

****