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#### Abstract

The article discusses criteria for univalence of analytic functions in the unit disc. A unified method for creating new sets of conditions ensuring univalence is presented. Applying this method we are able to find several families of new sharp criteria for univalence.


## 1 Introduction

The Schwarzian derivative $S f=\left(f^{\prime \prime} / f^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}-\frac{1}{2}\left(f^{\prime \prime} / f^{\prime}\right)^{2}$ of an analytic locally univalent function plays an important role for finding sufficient conditions for univalence. Nehari [6] found conditions implying univalence expressed in terms of the Schwarzian derivative: if $|S f| \leq 2\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{-2}$, then $f$ is univalent in the unit disc $\Delta=\{z,|z|<1\}$. Also if $|S f| \leq \pi^{2} / 2$, the same conclusion follows. For deriving his outstanding results Nehari used a useful connection between the zeros of solutions of linear second order differential equations and univalence [6]. Later Pokornyi [9] stated without proof the condition $|S f| \leq 4\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{-1}$. Nehari then proved this condition [7]. In addition Nehari extended these results and proved a more general theorem [7,8] concerning criteria for univalence. In his theorem he also investigated the sharpness of his conditions. These pioneering works of Nehari opened a new line of research in geometric function theory.

[^0]Our aim in the following article is to present a unified method, simple but useful, for finding criteria ensuring the univalence of analytic functions in the unit disc. The paper contains two theorems. In Theorem 1 we present a new (sharp) univalence criteria depending on a parameter. The proof of Theorem 1 is short and easy while the proof of Theorem 2 is technically more involved. The method of the proof of Theorem 2 is of independent interest and led us to some interesting results in approximation of trigonometric functions near their poles. See [2].

## 2 Nehari's univalence criteria

Nehari's pioneering work appeared in [6]. This work opened a fundamental line of research. His idea was to use a connection between the number of zeros of solutions of second order linear differential equations in a given domain in the complex plane and univalence of the quotient of two independent solution of this equation: If $u(z), v(z)$ are two linearly independent functions (solutions of a linear, homogeneous second order differential equation) in a domain $D$ such that every linear combination $c_{1} u(z)+c_{2} v(z)$ has at most one zero in $D$, then their quotient $f(z)=v(z) / u(z)$ is univalent in $D$.

Quotients of solutions are naturally related to a differential equation through the well known Schwarzian derivative operator

$$
S f=\left(\frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}\right)^{\prime}-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}\right)^{2}=\frac{f^{\prime \prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}-\frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f^{\prime}}\right)^{2}
$$

due to the following property: suppose we are given the linear differential equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}+p(z) u=0 \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $p(z)$ is an analytic function in the unit disc $\Delta$ and $u(z), v(z)$ are any two linearly independent solutions of (2.1). Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(v / u)(z)=2 p(z) . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

We recall some other basic properties of the Schwarzian derivative. One of them is: given a Möbius map $T=(a z+b) /(c z+d), a d-b c \neq 0$, we have $S(T)(z)=0$. Another useful property is for a composition of two functions $g \circ f$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(g \circ f)(z)=(S(g) \circ f(z)) f^{\prime}(z)^{2}+S(f)(z) \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

If the above $f$ is in particular a Möbius map $T$ then by $S(T)=0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(g \circ T)(z)=(S(g) \circ T(z)) T^{\prime}(z)^{2} . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Nehari made use of the Schwarzian derivative and its above properties to arrive at his sufficient conditions for univalence.

Theorem A (Nehari [7]) Suppose that
(i) $p(x)$ is a positive and continuous even function for $-1<x<1$,
(ii) $p(x)\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2}$ is nonincreasing for $0<x<1$,
(iii) the real valued differential equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime}(x)+p(x) y(x)=0, \quad-1<x<1, \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

has a solution which does not vanish in $-1<x<1$.
Then any analytic function $f(z)$ in $\Delta$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
|S f(z)| \leq 2 p(|z|) \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

is univalent in the unit disc $\Delta$.
In what follows we use the term "Nehari's function" to denote a positive even function $p(x)$ such that $p(x)\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2}$ is nonincreasing for $0<x<1$. See [11].

As Nehari pointed out already in [6], the functions

$$
\begin{equation*}
p(x)=\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{-2}, \quad p(x)=\pi^{2} / 4 \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the corresponding solutions $y(x)=\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}, y(x)=\cos (\pi x / 2)$ of the respective equations (2.5) have all the needed properties to conclude the sufficient conditions for univalence in $\Delta$. Soon after that, Hille [5] made the remarkable observation that the condition $|S f| \leq 2\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{-2}$ is sharp.

Let us assume, in addition, that $p(z)$ is also analytic in the unit disc $\Delta$ and consider together with the real equation (2.5) also the analytic differential equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}(z)+p(z) u=0, \quad z \in \Delta . \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

In this case the following definition will be useful:
Definition 1 We shall say that a function $p(z)$, analytic in the open unit disc $\Delta$, is self majorant if $|p(z)| \leq p(|z|)$ for each $z \in \Delta$.

For example, if $p(z)=\sum A_{k} z^{k}$ in $\Delta$ and $A_{k} \geq 0$ for all $k$, then $p(z)$ is self majorant.

If, in addition to the assumptions of Theorem A, $p(z)$ is self majorant, then $f_{0}(z)=$ $v(z) / u(z)$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|S f_{0}(z)\right|=2|p(z)| \leq 2 p(|z|) \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $f_{0}(z)$ itself is univalent. Namely, equation (2.8) naturally generates a univalent function. If by reduction of order of the differential equation we take it's second solution as $v=u \int u^{-2}$, then we conclude that equation (2.8) generates a univalent function

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{0}(z)=\int_{0}^{z} \frac{d t}{u^{2}(t)} \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note, for example, Nehari's more general condition [8] for univalence in $\Delta$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
|S f(z)| \leq 2\left(1-\mu^{2}\right)\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{-2}+2 \mu(2+\mu)\left(1+|z|^{2}\right)^{-2}, \quad 0 \leq \mu \leq 1, \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

which which is generated by the function $y(x)=\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{(\mu+1) / 2}\left(1+x^{2}\right)^{-\mu / 2}$, corresponds to a function $p(z)$ which is not self majorant for $\mu$ close to 1 . On the other hand, Nehari's other condition in [8],

$$
\begin{equation*}
|S f(z)| \leq 2(1+\mu)\left(1-\mu|z|^{2}\right)\left(1-|z|^{2}\right)^{-2}, \quad 0 \leq \mu \leq 1 \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is generated by the function $y(x)=\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{(\mu+1) / 2}$, corresponds to a function $p(z)$ which is self majorant.

In the spirit of Steinmetz [11] we define
Definition 2 We shall say that the univalence criteria (2.6) is sharp if for an analytic function $g(z)$, the conditions $S g(x) \geq 2 p(x)$ for $-1<x<1, \operatorname{Sg}(z) \not \equiv 2 p(z)$ in $\Delta$ imply that $g(z)$ is not univalent in $\Delta$.

We claim that if the solution $y(x)$ of the real valued differential equation (2.5) in Nehari's Theorem A satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int^{1} \frac{d t}{y^{2}(t)}=\infty, \quad \int_{-1} \frac{d t}{y^{2}(t)}=\infty \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

then the corresponding univalence criterion (2.6) is sharp. For this purpose recall Theorem 1 from [1], where a singular Sturm comparison theorem is presented:

Let $P(x), p(x)$ be continuous functions on the open, finite or infinite interval $(a, b)$ (but not necessarily at its endpoints), and $P(x) \geq p(x), P(x) \not \equiv p(x)$ on $(a, b)$. If the differential equation

$$
u^{\prime \prime}+p(x) u=0, \quad a<x<b,
$$

has a solution $u(x)$ which satisfies the boundary conditions

$$
\int_{a} \frac{d x}{u^{2}(x)}=\infty, \quad \int^{b} \frac{d x}{u^{2}(x)}=\infty
$$

then every solution of the equation

$$
v^{\prime \prime}+P(x) v=0, \quad a<x<b,
$$

has a zero in $(a, b)$. In particular, there exists a solution $v(x)$ which has two zeros in ( $a, b$ ).

Let $g(z)$ be an analytic function such that $S g(x) \geq 2 p(x)$ for $-1<x<1, S g(z) \not \equiv$ $2 p(z)$ in $\Delta$. Consider the differential equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
v^{\prime \prime}+\frac{1}{2} S g(z) v=0, \quad z \in \Delta \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Due to (2.13) and the singular Sturm comparison theorem, the corresponding real differential equation

$$
v^{\prime \prime}+\frac{1}{2} S g(x) v=0
$$

has a solution $v(x)$ with (at least) two zeros in $(-1,1)$. These are, of course, also zeros of the analytic solution $v(z)$ of (2.14). Hence any quotient $v(z) / u(z)$ of two linearly independent solutions of (2.14) has two zeros in $\Delta$ and is not univalent there. Our $g(z)$ is also a quotient of two certain solutions of (2.14) and is related to $v(z) / u(z)$ by a Möbius map, so it follows that also $g(z)$ is not univalent in $\Delta$, as claimed.

It is worth noting that we may use a different approach to prove sharpness. One can use [4, Thm. 3], which is based on the "relative convexity lemma". Also in [11], Corollary 5, it is proved that (2.13) implies sharpness for a more restricted case, namely for "Nehari's functions".

We now outline our method of finding families of conditions for univalence. The classical Theorem A of Nehari is the main tool in what follows. Our main idea is to consider a family of differential equations depending on parameters. Let $\Lambda=$ $\left(\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}\right)$ be a vector of $n$ free real parameters. Let $u=u(z, \Lambda)$ be a family of analytic functions in $\Delta$ depending on these $n$ free parameters. We now generate for each vector $\Lambda$, through

$$
\begin{equation*}
p=p(z, \Lambda)=-u^{\prime \prime}(z, \Lambda) / u(z, \Lambda) \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

a differential equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime \prime}+p(z, \Lambda) u=0, \quad z \in \Delta \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

In addition we assume that the restriction of $u$ to the real axis, $u(x, \Lambda)$, is the solution of the real valued differential equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime}(x)+p(x, \Lambda) y(x)=0, \quad-1<x<1, \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

which does not vanish in $-1<x<1$.
Suppose we can find a range for $\Lambda$ such that $p(x, \Lambda)\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2}$ is non increasing for $-1<x<1$. If this is done-we may apply Theorem A in order to find a family of univalence criteria depending on the vector $\Lambda$.

Since we are mainly interested in sharp conditions for univalence, it will be useful, due to the previous claim, to deal only with cases where $u=u(z, \Lambda)$ vanish at $z= \pm 1$.

In the next two sections we suggest two univalence criteria, the first with one parameter and the other with two parameters.

## 3 Univalence criteria depending on one parameter

We have
Theorem 1 Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
p(x, \lambda)=\frac{2(1+\lambda)-12 \lambda x^{2}}{\left(1-x^{2}\right)\left(1-\lambda x^{2}\right)} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $f(z)$ is an analytic function in $\Delta$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
|S f(z)| \leq 2 p(|z|), \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq \lambda \leq 1 / 5, \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $f(z)$ is univalent in $\Delta$. Moreover the theorem is sharp. Also

$$
f(z)=\int_{0}^{z} \frac{d t}{\left(1-t^{2}\right)^{2}\left(1-\lambda t^{2}\right)^{2}}
$$

is an odd univalent function in $\Delta$ for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1 / 5$.
Proof Consider the following family of functions depending on the real parameter $\lambda$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=u(x, \lambda)=\left(1-x^{2}\right)\left(1-\lambda x^{2}\right) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

which are positive on $(-1,1)$ for $\lambda \leq 1$. For the sake of simlicity we restrict ourself to values of $\lambda \geq 0$. By a straight forward calculation this $u$ is a solution of the differential equation $u^{\prime \prime}+p(x, \lambda) u=0$, where $p=-u^{\prime \prime} / u$ is given by (3.1). In order to apply Theorem A, we have to show that

$$
p(x)\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2}=\frac{\left(2(1+\lambda)-12 \lambda x^{2}\right)\left(1-x^{2}\right)}{1-\lambda x^{2}}
$$

is positive and non increasing for $0 \leq x \leq 1$. With $y=x^{2}$ we have to verify that

$$
G(y)=\frac{(2(1+\lambda)-12 \lambda y)(1-y)}{1-\lambda y}
$$

is non increasing, i.e., that

$$
(1-\lambda y)^{2} G^{\prime}(y)=-12 \lambda^{2} y^{2}+24 \lambda y+2\left(\lambda^{2}-6 \lambda-1\right) \leq 0
$$

for $0 \leq y \leq 1$. A simple calculation shows that this condition holds if $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1 / 5$.
By another elementary computation we have that all Taylor coefficients appearing in the expansion of $p(z)$ around zero are nonegative for $\lambda$ satisfying (3.3). Indeed, with $y=x^{2}$,
$p(x, \lambda)=\frac{2(1+\lambda)-12 \lambda x^{2}}{\left(1-x^{2}\right)\left(1-\lambda x^{2}\right)}=\frac{2(1+\lambda)-12 \lambda y}{(1-y)(1-\lambda y)}=\frac{2(1+\lambda)}{1-\lambda y}+\frac{2(1-5 \lambda) y}{(1-y)(1-\lambda y)}$
and all Taylor coefficients are positive for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1 / 5$. As a corollary of the Taylor coefficients being nonnegative, we conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|p(z)| \leq p(|z|) \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

i.e., $p(z)$ is self majorant. Consequently, by (2.10), the function

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z, \Lambda)=\int^{z} \frac{d z}{\left(1-z^{2}\right)^{2}\left(1-\lambda z^{2}\right)^{2}} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

is univalent in $\Delta$ for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1 / 5$.
The sharpness of (3.2) follows from the divergence of $\int u^{-2}$ at $x= \pm 1$.

## 4 Univalence criteria depending on two parameters

Now we consider the two-parametric family of functions $u(x)=\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{\lambda} \cos ^{\mu}(\pi x / 2)$ and $p(x)=-u^{\prime \prime} / u$ which it generates. By our general method we have

Theorem 2 Let

$$
\begin{align*}
p(x)= & 4 \lambda(1-\lambda) x^{2}\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{-2}+2 \lambda\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{-1}+\mu \pi^{2} / 4 \\
& +\mu(1-\mu) \pi^{2} \tan ^{2}(\pi x / 2) / 4-2 \mu \lambda \pi x \tan (\pi x / 2)\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{-1} \tag{4.1}
\end{align*}
$$

and let $\lambda, \mu$ satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda \geq 0, \quad \mu \geq 0, \quad 1 / 2 \leq \lambda+\mu \leq 1, \quad 2 \lambda+\mu \geq 1 . \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then if $f(z)$ is an analytic function in $\Delta$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
|S f(z)| \leq 2 p(|z|), \quad z \in \Delta \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

it follows that $f(z)$ is univalent in $\Delta$.
Also

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(z)=\int_{0}^{z} \frac{d t}{u^{2}(t)}=\int_{0}^{z} \frac{d t}{\left(1-t^{2}\right)^{2 \lambda} \cos ^{2 \mu}(\pi t / 2)} \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

is an odd univalent function in $\Delta$. Moreover the condition (4.3) is sharp.
Proof of Theorem 2 We first note that for the special case $\lambda+\mu=1, \lambda>0, \mu>0$, the corresponding $p(x)$ was mentioned by Beesack in [3, p. 217] in a different connection.

In order to use Theorem A we proceed to find restrictions on $\lambda, \mu$ that will ensure that for $p(x)$ in (4.1) the function $\varphi(x)=p(x)\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2}$ is positive and nonincreasing for $0<x<1$. It will be convenient to denote

$$
\begin{equation*}
G(x)=\left(1-x^{2}\right) \tan (\pi x / 2) . \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

With this notation,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi(x)=4 \lambda(1-\lambda) x^{2}+2 \lambda\left(1-x^{2}\right)+\mu \pi^{2}\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2} / 4+\mu(1-\mu) \pi^{2} G^{2}(x) / 4-2 \mu \lambda \pi x G(x) \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
\varphi^{\prime}(x)= & 8 \lambda(1-\lambda) x-4 \lambda x-\mu \pi^{2} x\left(1-x^{2}\right) \\
& +\mu(1-\mu)\left(\pi^{2} / 4\right) 2 G(x) G^{\prime}(x)-2 \mu \lambda \pi\left(x G^{\prime}(x)+G(x)\right) \tag{4.7}
\end{align*}
$$

We start with some elementary considerations. To ensure that $\varphi(x)$ is positive and nonincreasing for $0<x<1$, we must have in particular that $\varphi(1) \geq 0$ and $\varphi^{\prime}(1) \leq 0$. By direct calculation,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.G\right|_{x=1^{-}}=4 / \pi,\left.\quad G^{\prime}\right|_{x=1^{-}}=2 / \pi \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

After some more calculations we require that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi(1)=4(\lambda+\mu)(1-\lambda-\mu) \geq 0 \tag{4.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi^{\prime}(1)=4(\lambda+\mu)(1-2 \lambda-\mu) \leq 0 . \tag{4.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (4.9) it follows that $0 \leq \lambda+\mu \leq 1$. If $\lambda+\mu=0$, then $u=\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{\lambda} \cos ^{\mu}(\pi x / 2)$ does not vanish at $x= \pm 1$, contradicting our assumptions. Hence let $0<\lambda+\mu \leq 1$. Summing up, we get from (4.9) and (4.10) the conditions

$$
\begin{equation*}
1-\lambda-\mu \geq 0, \quad 1-2 \lambda-\mu \leq 0 \tag{4.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consequently $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\mu \leq 1$ are necessary for $\varphi(x)$ to be nonincreasing.
From now and on we assume for sake of simplicity that $\mu \geq 0$. From (4.11) it follows that $\lambda \geq(1-\mu) / 2$ which implies $\lambda+\mu \geq(1+\mu) / 2$. Since we assume that $\mu \geq 0$, it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
1 / 2 \leq \lambda+\mu \leq 1 \tag{4.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

We start to show that under the restrictions above, $p(z)$ is self majorant. It will be enough to verify that all coefficients in the expansion of $p$ around zero are non negative. For this purpose we rewrite $p$ of (4.1) as

$$
\begin{aligned}
p(x)= & \frac{4 \lambda(1-\lambda-\mu)}{1-\mu} \frac{x^{2}}{\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2}}+\frac{2 \lambda}{1-x^{2}}+\frac{\mu \pi^{2}}{4} \\
& +\mu(1-\mu)\left(\frac{\pi}{2} \tan \left(\frac{\pi x}{2}\right)-\frac{2 \lambda}{1-\mu} \frac{x}{1-x^{2}}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $4 \lambda(1-\lambda-\mu) /(1-\mu), 2 \lambda, \mu \pi^{2} / 4$ and $\mu(1-\mu)$ are all non negative, it is sufficient to prove that the Taylor coefficients of $\frac{\pi}{2} \tan \left(\frac{\pi x}{2}\right)-\frac{2 \lambda}{1-\mu} \frac{x}{1-x^{2}}$ are non negative. For this aim we recall the formula [10, Section 3.14]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\tan \pi x / 2}{\pi x / 2}=\frac{8}{\pi^{2}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda(2 k+2) x^{2 k}, \quad \lambda(p)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2 n+1)^{p}} . \tag{4.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

According to (4.13),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) \tan \left(\frac{\pi x}{2}\right)-\frac{2 \lambda}{1-\mu} \frac{x}{1-x^{2}}=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left(2 \lambda(2 k+2)-\frac{2 \lambda}{1-\mu}\right) x^{2 k+1} \tag{4.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\lambda(p)>1$, the coefficients of the power series of (4.14) are

$$
2 \lambda(2 k+2)-\frac{2 \lambda}{1-\mu}>2-\frac{2 \lambda}{1-\mu}=\frac{2(1-\mu-\lambda)}{1-\mu} \geq 0
$$

Consequently $p(z)$ is self majorant.
The univalence criterion (4.3) will be proved when we show that $\varphi(x)=p(x)(1-$ $\left.x^{2}\right)^{2}$ is indeed positive and nonincreasing for $0 \leq x \leq 1$. With the notation

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(x)=(\pi / 2) \tan (\pi x / 2)-\frac{2 \lambda}{1-\mu} \frac{x}{1-x^{2}} . \tag{4.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi(x)= & p(x)\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2}=\frac{4 \lambda(1-\lambda-\mu)}{1-\mu} x^{2} \\
& +2 \lambda\left(1-x^{2}\right)+\left(\mu \pi^{2} / 4\right)\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2}+\mu(1-\mu)\left[\left(1-x^{2}\right) L(x)\right]^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi^{\prime}(x)= & \frac{2 \lambda(1-2 \lambda-\mu)}{1-\mu} 2 x-\mu \pi^{2} x\left(1-x^{2}\right) \\
& +2 \mu(1-\mu)\left[\left(1-x^{2}\right) L(x)\right]\left[\left(1-x^{2}\right) L(x)\right]^{\prime} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since we saw that $p(z)$ is self majorant, it is obvious by the same argument that $p(x) \geq 0$ and $\varphi(x) \geq 0$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$. So, it remains to establish $\varphi^{\prime}(x) \leq 0$. Since $1-2 \lambda-\mu \leq 0$ by (4.11), it is left to show only that

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 \mu(1-\mu)\left[\left(1-x^{2}\right) L(x)\right]\left[\left(1-x^{2}\right) L(x)\right]^{\prime} \leq \mu \pi^{2} x\left(1-x^{2}\right) \tag{4.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

We postpone the proof of (4.16) to a later stage (Lemma 1). Once (4.16) will be verified, the univalence criterion (4.3) will follow. The univalence of the function (4.4) follows from the self majorance of $p(z)$, as in Theorem 1.

Finally consider the issue of sharpness of (4.3). Note that the multiplicity of the zeros of $u(x)=\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{\lambda} \cos ^{\mu}(\pi x / 2)$ at $x=1,-1$ is $\lambda+\mu$ and by (4.12), $\lambda+\mu \geq 1 / 2$. Consequently,

$$
\int^{1} \frac{d x}{\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{2 \lambda} \cos ^{2 \mu}(\pi x / 2)}=\infty
$$

and the sharpness of (4.3) follows.
Thus the proof of the theorem is complete, except of inequality (4.16).
The next lemma provides some inequalities about the function $G(x)=(1-$ $\left.x^{2}\right) \tan (\pi x / 2)$ which are needed to prove (4.16). More upper and lower bounds for $\tan (\pi x / 2)$ which are very precise even at the poles at $x= \pm 1$ are discussed in [2].

Lemma 1 For the interval $(0,1)$ we have:
(i) The function $G(x)=\left(1-x^{2}\right) \tan (\pi x / 2)$ of (4.5) is convex.
(ii) The function $\frac{\left(1-x^{2}\right) \tan (\pi x / 2)}{\pi x / 2}$ decreases for $0 \leq x \leq 1$ and its maximal value at $x=0$ is 1 .
(iii)

$$
G(x) \leq \frac{2}{\pi}(1+x) .
$$

(iv)

$$
\frac{\pi}{2} G^{\prime}(x) \leq 1+\frac{\pi^{2}}{4}\left(1-x^{2}\right)
$$

Proof Convexity of $G(x)$ in the interval $(0,1)$ follows from (4.13). Indeed,

$$
\begin{equation*}
G(x)=\frac{\pi}{2} x-\frac{4}{\pi} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(\lambda(2 k)-\lambda(2 k+2)) x^{2 k+1} \tag{4.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $G^{\prime \prime}(x)<0$ due to monotonicity of $\lambda(p)$. This proves (i).
Since $\left(\frac{G(x)}{\pi x / 2}\right)^{\prime} \leq 0$ by (4.17), it follows that $\frac{G(x)}{\pi x / 2}$ is decreasing and thus its maximum is attained at $x=0$. This proves (ii).

For the proof of (iii) we recall that $G(1)=4 / \pi, G^{\prime}(1)=2 / \pi$ as calculated in (4.8). The equation of the tangent line through the point $(1,4 / \pi)$ is $y=\frac{4}{\pi}-\frac{2}{\pi}(1-x)=$ $\frac{2}{\pi}(1+x)$. Now (iii) follows using the convexity proved in (i).

In order to establish (iv) we use (iii) twice. Indeed,

$$
G^{\prime}(x)=-2 x \tan (\pi x / 2)+\frac{\pi}{2}\left(1-x^{2}\right)\left(1+\tan ^{2}(\pi x / 2)\right),
$$

hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
G^{\prime}(x)-\frac{\pi}{2}\left(1-x^{2}\right) & =-2 x \tan (\pi x / 2)+\tan (\pi x / 2) \frac{\pi}{2} G(x) \\
& \leq-2 x \tan (\pi x / 2)+(1+x) \tan (\pi x / 2) \\
& =\frac{1-x^{2}}{1+x} \tan (\pi x / 2)=\frac{G(x)}{1+x} \leq \frac{2}{\pi} .
\end{aligned}
$$

This ends the proof of (iv).
Now we are ready to complete the proof of (4.16). First recall that $L(x)=$ $(\pi / 2) \tan (\pi x / 2)-\frac{2 \lambda}{1-\mu} \frac{x}{1-x^{2}} \geq 0$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$. This follows from the fact that the coefficients of the power series for $L(x)$ in (4.14) are positive. Second, $\frac{-2 \lambda}{1-\mu} \leq-1$ by (4.11). In addition, by (ii) we have

$$
\frac{\pi}{2}\left(1-x^{2}\right) \tan \left(\frac{\pi x}{2}\right)=\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{2} \frac{\left(1-x^{2}\right) \tan (\pi x / 2)}{\pi x / 2} x \leq\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{2} x .
$$

Moreover, by (iv),

$$
\frac{\pi}{2}\left(\left(1-x^{2}\right) \tan \frac{\pi x}{2}\right)^{\prime}=\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) G^{\prime}(x) \leq 1+\frac{\pi^{2}}{4}\left(1-x^{2}\right) .
$$

Combining these facts together, we finally have

$$
\begin{aligned}
2 & {\left[\left(1-x^{2}\right) L(x)\right]\left[\left(1-x^{2}\right) L(x)\right]^{\prime} } \\
& \leq 2\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\left(1-x^{2}\right) \tan \left(\frac{\pi x}{2}\right)-\frac{2 \lambda}{1-\mu} x\right)\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\left(\left(1-x^{2}\right) \tan \left(\frac{\pi x}{2}\right)\right)^{\prime}-\frac{2 \lambda}{1-\mu}\right) \\
& \leq 2\left(\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{2} x-x\right)\left(1+\frac{\pi^{2}}{4}\left(1-x^{2}\right)-1\right) \\
& =2\left(\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{2}-1\right) \frac{\pi^{2}}{4} x\left(1-x^{2}\right) \leq \pi^{2} x\left(1-x^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $0<\mu \leq 1$, the last inequality implies (4.16).
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