# ON THE RADIUS OF $\beta$-CONVEXITY OF STARLIKE FUNCTIONS OF ORDER $\alpha$ 

HASSOON S. AL-AMIRI ${ }^{1}$

Abstract. A function $f(z)=z+a_{2} z^{2}+\cdots$ is called $\beta$-convex if $f(z) f^{\prime}(z) / z \neq 0$ in $D:|z|<1$ and if

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left\{(1-\beta) z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)+\beta\left(1+z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)\right)\right\}>0
$$

for some $\beta \geqq 0$ and all $z$ in $D$. Recently M. O. Reade and P. T. Mocanu have announced a sharp result about the radius of $\beta$-convexity for starlike functions. The author generalizes this result to starlike functions of order $\alpha$.

1. Introduction. Let $f(z)=z+a_{2} z^{2}+\cdots$ be analytic in the unit disc $D:|z|<1$. We say that $f(z)$ is starlike of order $\alpha, 0 \leqq \alpha<1$, if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\left\{z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)\right\}>\alpha \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $z$ in $D$. We denote such a class of functions by $S_{\alpha}^{*}$. We say that $f(z)$ is convex of order $\alpha, 0 \leqq \alpha<1$, if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\left\{1+z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)\right\}>\alpha \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $z$ in $D$. We denote such a class of functions by $C_{\alpha}$. For $\alpha=0, S_{0}^{*}, C_{0}$ are simply called starlike and convex, respectively.

We consider now a class of functions which is formed by a linear combination of the conditions stated in (1) and (2).

Definition. Let $f(z)=z+a_{2} z^{2}+\cdots$ be analytic in $D$ with $f(z) f^{\prime}(z) / z \neq$ 0 in D. Let

$$
L(\beta ; f)=(1-\beta) z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)+\beta\left(1+z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)\right)
$$

If

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Re}\{L(\beta ; f)\}>0 \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$
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for some $\beta, \beta \geqq 0, z \in D$, then $f(z)$ is called a $\beta$-convex function. We denote this class by $C(\beta)$.

Mocanu [2] was the first to introduce the class of $\beta$-convex functions under the restrictions $0 \leqq \beta \leqq 1$ and that $f(z)$ must be univalent in $D$. Recently, however, Mocanu and Reade [3] have shown that each function in $C(\beta)$ is univalent (starlike) for $\beta \geqq 0$. In particular each $f(z) \in C(\beta)$ is convex if $\beta \geqq 1$. It is natural now to raise the following question: What is the largest $r_{\alpha, \beta}, 0<r_{\alpha, \beta} \leqq 1$ such that each $f(z) \in S_{\alpha}^{*}$ is a function in $C(\beta)$ for $|z|<r_{\alpha, \beta}$ ? Again, Reade and Mocanu [4] have announced a sharp result for the general class $S_{0}^{*}$.

Theorem A (Reade and Mocanu). If $f(z) \in S_{0}^{*}$, then $f(z) \in C(\beta)$ for $|z|<r_{\beta}=\left(1+\beta+\left((1+\beta)^{2}-1\right)^{-1}\right)^{1 / 2}, \beta \geqq 0$. This result is sharp for $f(z)=$ $z /(1-z)^{2}$.

We call $r_{\alpha, \beta}$ the radius of $\beta$-convexity of the class $S_{\alpha}^{*}$. Here $r_{0, \beta}=r_{\beta}$.
The object of this note is to extend Theorem A to the class $S_{\alpha}^{*}$; in short to find $r_{\alpha, \beta}$. In $\S 2$ a rough estimate of $r_{\alpha, \beta}$ is given, Theorem 1. In $\S 3$, the number $r_{\alpha, \beta}$ is completely determined, Theorem 2. The method used in $\S 3$ is that of V. A. Zmorovič [7]. We also adopt his notations and thus we refer the reader to [7] for a deeper and perhaps a better understanding of $\S 3$.
2. Some estimate for $r_{\alpha, \beta}$. Let $P$ be the class of analytic functions in $D$ such that if $p(z) \in P, p(0)=1$, and $\operatorname{Re}\{p(z)\}>0$ for all $z \in D$. Let $q(z)=$ $z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)$, where $f(z) \in S_{\alpha}^{*}$. Then there exists $p(z) \in P$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
q(z)=\alpha+(1-\alpha) p(z)=(p(z)+h) /(1+h) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $h=\alpha /(1-\alpha)$.
Using (3), (4) and the fact that

$$
1+z f^{\prime \prime}(z) / f^{\prime}(z)=q(z)+z q^{\prime}(z) / q(z)
$$

the radius of $\beta$-convexity of the class $S_{\alpha}^{*}, r_{\alpha, \beta}$ becomes the smallest positive root of $Q_{\alpha, \beta}(r)=0$, where

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{\alpha, \beta}(r)=\min _{p \in P} \min _{|z|=r<1} \operatorname{Re}\left\{(1-\alpha)(p(z)+h)+\beta z p^{\prime}(z) /(p(z)+h)\right\} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus our problem is now reduced to finding the quantity

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q(r)=\min _{p \in P} \min _{|z|=r<1} \operatorname{Re}\left\{\Psi\left(p(z), z p^{\prime}(z)\right)\right\}, \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Psi(w, W)$ is an analytic function of the variables $w$ and $W$ in the $W$-plane and in the half plane $\operatorname{Re}\{w\}>0$. It is known [5] that the minimum
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in (6) is realized for functions of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
p(z)=\lambda_{1} \frac{1+z e^{-i \theta_{1}}}{1-z e^{-i \theta_{1}}}+\lambda_{2} \frac{1+z e^{-i \theta_{2}}}{1-z e^{-i \theta_{2}}}, \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\theta_{1}, \theta_{2} \in[0,2 \pi], \lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2} \geqq 0$, and $\lambda_{1}+\lambda_{2}=1$.
Before determining $Q(r)$, an elementary method yields a rough estimate for $r_{\alpha, \beta}$. We need the following lemmas.

Lemma 1. If $\phi(z)$ is analytic and $|\phi(z)| \leqq 1$ in $D$, then

$$
\left|\phi^{\prime}(z)\right| \leqq\left(1-|\phi(z)|^{2}\right) /\left(1-r^{2}\right)
$$

for $|z|=r<1$.
Lemma 1 may be found in Carathéodory [1, p. 18].
Lemma 2. If $q(z)=1+b_{1} z+\cdots, \operatorname{Re}\{q(z)\}>\alpha$, then

$$
\operatorname{Re}\{q(z)\} \geqq(1-(1-2 \alpha) r) /(1+r)
$$

valid for $|z|=r<1$.
This estimate readily follows from the fact that

$$
q(z)=(1-(1-2 \alpha) z \phi(z)) /(1+z \phi(z))
$$

where $\phi(z)$ is as in Lemma 1.
Lemma 3. If $q(z)$ is as in Lemma 2, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|z q^{\prime}(z) / q(z)\right| \leqq 2(1-\alpha) r /(1-r)(1+(1-2 \alpha) r) \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $|z|=r<1$.
Proof. From

$$
q(z)=(1-(1-2 \alpha) z \phi(z)) /(1+z \phi(z))
$$

it follows that

$$
z q^{\prime}(z) / q(z)=\frac{-2(1-\alpha)\left(z^{2} \phi^{\prime}(z)+z \phi(z)\right)}{(1+z \phi(z))(1-(1-2 \alpha) z \phi(z))}
$$

The above may be written in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
z q^{\prime}(z) / q(z)=-2(1-\alpha) I_{1}(z) I_{2}(z) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I_{1}(z)=\left(z^{2} \phi^{\prime}(z)+z \phi(z)\right) /\left(1-z^{2} \phi^{2}(z)\right) \\
& I_{2}(z)=(1-z \phi(z)) /(1-(1-2 \alpha) z \phi(z))
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the triangular inequality, the monotonicity of the right-hand side of $\left|I_{1}(z)\right|$ with respect to $\left|\phi^{\prime}(z)\right|$ and on applying Lemma 1 , we get

$$
\left|I_{1}(z)\right| \leqq \frac{2}{1-r^{2}}\left(\frac{r^{2}\left(1-|\phi(z)|^{2}\right)+r|\phi(z)|\left(1-r^{2}\right)}{1-r^{2}|\phi(z)|^{2}}\right)
$$

Let $0 \leqq|\phi(z)|=t \leqq 1$. The above inequality becomes

$$
\left|I_{1}(z)\right| \leqq g(t, r)=\frac{2}{1-r^{2}}\left(\frac{r^{2}\left(1-t^{2}\right)+r t\left(1-r^{2}\right)}{1-r^{2} t^{2}}\right)
$$

For fixed $r$,

$$
\partial g / \partial t=2 r(1-r t)^{2} /\left(1-r^{2} t^{2}\right)^{2} \geqq 0
$$

Therefore,

$$
\left|I_{1}(z)\right| \leqq \max _{0 \leqq t \leqq 1} g(t, r)=g(1, r)=2 \dot{r} /\left(1-r^{2}\right)
$$

It is also clear that

$$
\left|I_{2}(z)\right| \leqq(1+r) /(1+(1-2 \alpha) r)
$$

Using these estimates in (9) one gets (8).
Theorem 1. Let $f(z)=z+a_{2} z^{2}+\cdots$ be a function in $S_{\alpha}^{*}$. Then $f(z)$ is $\beta$-convex in $|z|<R_{\alpha, \beta}$, where $R_{\alpha, \beta}$ is the smallest positive root of

$$
\begin{align*}
(1-2 \alpha)^{2} r^{3} & -\left((1-2 \alpha)^{2}+2 \beta(1-\alpha)\right) r^{2} \\
& -(1+2 \beta(1-\alpha)) r+1=0 \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. Let $q(z)=z f^{\prime}(z) / f(z)$. From (4),

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Re}\{(1-\alpha)(p+h) & \left.+\beta z p^{\prime}(z) /(p(z)+h)\right\} \\
= & \operatorname{Re}\left\{q(z)+\beta z q^{\prime}(z) / q(z)\right\} \leqq \operatorname{Re}\{q(z)\}-\beta\left|z q^{\prime}(z) / q(z)\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

where $h=\alpha /(1-\alpha), 0 \leqq \alpha<1$.
Applying Lemmas 2 and 3,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Re}\left\{(1-\alpha)(p(z)+h)+\beta z p^{\prime}(z) /(p(z)+h)\right\} \\
& \begin{aligned}
& \leqq\left[(1-2 \alpha)^{2} r^{3}-\left((1-2 \alpha)^{2}+2 \beta(1-\alpha)\right) r^{2}-(1+2 \beta(1-\alpha)) r+1\right] \\
& \div\left(1-r^{2}\right)(1+(1-2 \alpha) r)
\end{aligned}
\end{aligned}
$$

From (5) and the above inequality each starlike function of order $\alpha$ in $D$ is $\beta$-convex in $|z|<R_{\alpha, \beta}$, where $R_{\alpha, \beta}$ is given by (10). Note that $r_{\alpha, \beta} \geqq R_{\alpha, \beta}$ and if $\alpha=0, r_{0, \beta}=R_{0, \beta}=r_{\beta}$ as given in Theorem A. Theorem 1, however, is not sharp since the estimates of Lemmas 2, 3 are sharp for

$$
q_{\alpha}(z)=(1-(1-2 \alpha) z) /(1+z)
$$

but not at the same point. Indeed, $q_{\alpha}(z)$ realizes the estimate of Lemma 2
at $z=r$, while realizing the estimate of Lemma 3 at $z=-r$. This is precisely the source of difficulties in such extremal problems.
3. The main theorem for $r_{\alpha, \beta}$. In this section we obtain $r_{\alpha, \beta}$ through an application of a theorem and technique due to V. A. Zmorovič [7] which is stated next.

Theorem B (V. A. Zmorovič). Let $\Psi(w, W)=M(w)+N(w) W$, where $M(w)$ and $N(w)$ are defined and are finite in the half plane $\operatorname{Re}\{w\}>0$. Set

$$
\begin{aligned}
w & =\lambda_{1} \frac{1+z_{1}^{m}}{1-z_{1}^{m}}+\lambda_{2} \frac{1+z_{2}^{m}}{1-z_{2}^{m}} \\
W & =\lambda_{1} \frac{2 m z_{1}^{m}}{\left(1-z_{1}^{m}\right)^{2}}+\lambda_{2} \frac{2 m z_{2}^{m}}{\left(1-z_{2}^{m}\right)^{2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $z_{1}$ and $z_{2}$ are any points on $|z|=r<1, \lambda_{1} \geqq 0, \lambda_{2} \geqq 0, \lambda_{1}+\lambda_{2}=1$. Then $\Psi(w, W)$ can be put in the form

$$
\Psi(w, W)=M(w)+\frac{m}{2}\left(w^{2}-1\right) N(w)+\frac{m}{2}\left(\rho^{2}-\rho_{0}^{2}\right) N(w) e^{2 i \psi}
$$

where

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left(1+z_{k}^{m}\right) /\left(1-z_{k}^{m}\right)=a+\rho e^{i \psi_{k}} \quad(k=1,2) \\
w=a+\rho_{0} e^{i \psi_{0}}, \quad 0 \leqq \rho_{0} \leqq \rho \\
a=\frac{1+r^{2 m}}{1-r^{2 m}}, \quad \rho=\frac{2 r^{m}}{1-r^{2 m}}, \quad e^{i \psi}=i e^{i\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2}
\end{gathered}
$$

Also

$$
\begin{align*}
& \min \operatorname{Re}\{\Psi(w, W)\} \equiv \Psi_{\rho}(w) \\
& \quad=\operatorname{Re}\left\{M(w)+\frac{m}{2}\left(w^{2}-1\right) N(w)\right\}-\frac{m}{2}|N(w)|\left(\rho^{2}-\rho_{0}^{2}\right) \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

This minimum is reached when

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp [i(2 \psi+\arg N(w))]=-1 \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

In our particular problem (5), $m=1$,

$$
M(w)=(1-\alpha)(w+h), \quad N(w)=\beta /(w+h)
$$

Thus from (6), (11) and the above relations,

$$
\begin{align*}
\min \operatorname{Re}\{\Psi(w, W)\} & \equiv \Psi_{\rho}(w) \\
& =\operatorname{Re}\left\{(1-\alpha)(w+h)+\frac{\beta}{2} \frac{w^{2}-1}{w+h}\right\}-\frac{\beta}{2} \frac{\rho^{2}-\rho_{0}^{2}}{|w+h|} \tag{13}
\end{align*}
$$

The following remarks will be used later.
Remark 1. For a fixed $w=a+\rho_{0} e^{i \psi_{0}}, \rho_{0}<\rho$, and a suitably defined $\psi_{1}$ and $\psi_{2}$, a choice of $\lambda_{1}$ and $\lambda_{2}$ may be made, namely,

$$
\lambda_{1} / \lambda_{2}=\left|\rho e^{i \psi_{2}}-\rho_{0} e^{i \psi_{0}} / /\left|\rho e^{i \psi_{1}}-\rho_{0} e^{i \psi_{0}}\right|\right.
$$

such that $\Psi=\left(\Psi_{1}+\Psi_{2}+\pi\right) / 2$ becomes the angle of inclination of the secant through $a+\rho_{e}^{i \psi_{0}}$ and intersects the circle $|w-a|=\rho$ at $a+\rho e^{i \psi_{k}}, k=1,2$. The choice of $\lambda_{1} / \lambda_{2}$ is to maintain the correct relations between $\rho_{0} e^{i \psi_{0}}, \rho e^{i \psi_{1}}$ and $\rho e^{i \psi_{2}}$ as required in the theorem. Thus $\psi$ may assume any value in $[0, \pi]$. Also as a consequence of formula (12), the minimum in (13) is reached when the point $w,|w-a|<\rho$ is fixed and the secant through it, as described above, is perpendicular to $e^{i \phi / 2}$, where $w+h=\operatorname{Re}^{i \phi}$.

If we set $w=a+\xi+i \eta, \rho_{0}^{2}=\xi^{2}+\eta^{2} \leqq \rho^{2}$, then (13) becomes

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Psi_{\rho}(w) \equiv \Psi_{\rho}(\xi, \eta)=\left(1+\frac{\beta}{2}-\alpha\right)(a+\xi+h)-\beta h \\
& \quad+\frac{\beta}{2}\left(h^{2}-1\right)(a+\xi+h) R^{-2}-\frac{\beta}{2}\left(\rho^{2}-\xi^{2}-\eta^{2}\right) R^{-1}, \tag{14}
\end{align*}
$$

where $R^{2}=(a+\xi+h)^{2}+\eta^{2}$.
One can show that $\partial \Psi_{\rho} / \partial \eta=(\beta / 2) \eta R^{-4} S(\xi, \eta)$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
S(\xi ; \eta)= & {\left[\xi^{2}+4(a+h) \xi+\rho^{2}+\eta^{2}+2\left(a+h^{2}\right)\right] R } \\
& -\left[\left(h^{2}-1\right)(\xi+a+h)\right] \\
\geqq & {\left[\xi^{2}+4(a+h) \xi+\rho^{2}+2(a+h)^{2}-2\left(h^{2}-1\right)\right](\xi+a+h) } \\
> & 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

which shows that the minimum of $\Psi_{\rho}(\xi, \eta)$ on every chord $\xi$-constant is reached when $\eta=0$. Therefore, the minimum of $\Psi_{\rho}(\xi, \eta)$ in the circle $\xi^{2}+\eta^{2} \leqq \rho^{2}$ is reached on the diameter $\eta=0$. Now set $\eta=0$ and $R=a+\xi+h$ in (1.4), we arrive at the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Psi_{\rho}(\xi, 0) \equiv & l(R)=\left(1+\frac{\beta}{2}-\alpha\right)(a+\xi+h)-\beta h \\
& +\frac{\beta}{2}\left(h^{2}-1\right)(a+\xi+h) R^{-2}-\frac{\beta}{2}\left(\rho^{2}-\xi^{2}\right) R^{-1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

From $\xi=R-(a+h), \rho^{2}=a^{2}-1$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
l(R)=(1+\beta-\alpha) R+\beta\left(h^{2}+a h\right) R^{-1}-\beta(a+2 h) \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus $Q(r)=\min l(R), R \in[a+h-\rho, a+h+\rho], Q(r)$ is given by (6). Simple
calculations show that the absolute minimum of $l(R)$ is realized at

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{0}=\left(\frac{\beta\left(h^{2}+a h\right)}{1+\beta-\alpha}\right)^{1 / 2} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since

$$
R_{0}^{2}=\frac{\beta\left(h^{2}+a h\right)}{1+\beta-\alpha}<h^{2}+a h<(a+h+\rho)^{2}
$$

$R_{0}<a+h+\rho$. However, $R_{0}$ may not be greater than $a+h-\rho$. Therefore, if $R_{0} \notin[a+h-\rho, a+h+\rho]$, then the minimum of $l(R)$ is obtained at

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{1}=a+h-\rho \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

The radius $r_{\alpha, \beta}$ is therefore determined either from

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q(r)=\min l(R)=l\left(R_{0}\right)=0 \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $R_{0}$ given by (16), or from

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q(r)=\min l(R)=l\left(R_{1}\right)=0 \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $R_{1}$ given by (17).
These two equations coincide for some $\alpha_{0}$ which will be determined later.
Equations (18) and (19) may be written in the form, respectively,

$$
\begin{gather*}
\beta a^{2}-4 \alpha a-4 \alpha h=0  \tag{20}\\
(1-3 \alpha+\alpha h) r^{2}-2(1+\beta-\alpha-\alpha h) r+1+\alpha+\alpha h=0 .
\end{gather*}
$$

It follows from (20) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{1}=r_{\alpha, \beta}=\left(\frac{2 \alpha-\beta+2\left(\alpha^{2}+\alpha h \beta\right)^{1 / 2}}{2 \alpha+\beta+2\left(\alpha^{2}+\alpha h \beta\right)^{1 / 2}}\right)^{1 / 2} \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

Also from (21) follows that

$$
\begin{align*}
r_{2}=r_{\alpha, \beta}=[(1-2 \alpha & +\beta(1-\alpha) \\
& \left.+\left((1-2 \alpha+\beta(1-\alpha))^{2}-(1-2 \alpha)^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right]^{-1} \tag{23}
\end{align*}
$$

However, formula (23) cannot be used to determine $r_{\alpha, \beta}$ if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha \geqq\left(-\beta+\left(\beta^{2}+8 \beta\right)^{1 / 2}\right) / 4 \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

since $r_{2}$ would become greater than 1 .
Also formula (22) cannot be used to determine $r_{\alpha, \beta}$ if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha \leqq \beta /(4+\beta) \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

since $r_{1}$ would become a nonreal number.

To find $\alpha_{0}$ that makes the transition from (23) to (22), we set

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{1}=r_{2} \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

and solve for $\alpha=\alpha_{0}$ where $\alpha_{0}$ is the smallest positive root of (26) which lies in

$$
\left(\frac{\beta}{4+\beta}, \frac{-\beta+\left(\beta^{2}+8 \beta\right)^{1 / 2}}{4}\right) .
$$

Thus we have our main theorem.
Theorem 2. Let $\alpha_{0}$ be the smallest positive root of (26) which lies in the interval

$$
\left(\frac{\beta}{4+\beta}, \frac{-\beta+\left(\beta^{2}+8 \beta\right)^{1 / 2}}{4}\right)
$$

Then the radius of $\beta$-convexity for the class $S_{\alpha}^{*}$ is determined from (22) when $\alpha_{0} \leqq \alpha<1$ and from (23) when $0 \leqq \alpha \leqq \alpha_{0}$.

Now we determine the extremal functions $f_{0}(z)$ for Theorem 2. Using Remark 1 and the fact that the minimum in case (22) is reached at a point on the diameter $\eta=0$ (not an endpoint) one gets $\psi_{1} \equiv-\psi_{2}(\bmod 2 \pi)$, and $\lambda_{1} / \lambda_{2}=1$. The extremal function given by (7) is therefore of the form

$$
p(z)=\frac{1}{2} \frac{1+z e^{-i \theta}}{1-z e^{-i \theta}}+\frac{1}{2} \frac{1+z e^{i \theta}}{1-z e^{i \theta}},
$$

where $\theta$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{0}=\operatorname{Re}\{h+w\}=h+\left(1-r_{1}^{2}\right)\left(1-2 r_{1} \cos \theta+r_{1}^{2}\right)^{-1} \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

$r_{1}$ is given by (22) and $R_{0}$ is given by (16). Hence the extremal function

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{0}(z)=z(1-2 z \cos \theta+z)^{-1+\alpha} \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

In case of (22), the minimum is realized at an end point of the diameter $\eta=0$, thus $\psi_{1} \equiv \psi_{2}(\bmod 2 \pi)$. The function $p(z)$ of (7) has the form

$$
p(z)=\left(1+z e^{-i \theta}\right) /\left(1-z e^{-i \theta}\right)
$$

or simply $p(z)=(1+z) /(1-z)$. Hence the extremal function

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{0}(z)=z(1-z)^{-2(1-\alpha)} \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

REMARK 2. (i) The case $\beta=1$ reduces $r_{\alpha, \beta}$ to be the radius of convexity of the class $S_{\alpha}^{*}$ which has been previously known for $\alpha=0, \alpha=\frac{1}{2}$. V. A. Zmorovič has provided the complete solution for such a case.
(ii) A. Schild [6] attempted to solve this problem $(\beta=1)$ and actually succeeded if a certain condition is to be true. In fact he obtained $r_{\alpha, 1}$ as
given by (22) and (23). Schild also calculated $\alpha_{0}=0.335 \cdots$ and found the extremal functions (28) and (29) (for the case $\beta=1$ ).
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