

COMPOSITIO MATHEMATICA

MAXWELL O. READE

ELIGIUSZ ZLOTKIEWICZ

**On values omitted by univalent functions with
two pre-assigned values**

Compositio Mathematica, tome 24, n° 3 (1972), p. 355-358

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM_1972__24_3_355_0

© Foundation Compositio Mathematica, 1972, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Compositio Mathematica » (<http://www.compositio.nl/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/legal.php>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

<http://www.numdam.org/>

ON VALUES OMITTED BY UNIVALENT FUNCTIONS WITH TWO PRE-ASSIGNED VALUES

by

Maxwell O. Reade¹ and Eligiusz Złotkiewicz²

1. Introduction

Let \mathfrak{M} denote the set of all functions $f(Z)$ which are analytic and univalent in the unit disc Δ and which are normalized by the conditions $f(0) = 0$ and $f(Z_0) = Z_0$; here Z_0 is a fixed point in Δ , $Z_0 \neq 0$. For the class \mathfrak{M} , the following result was established recently.

LEMMA. *If $f \in \mathfrak{M}$, then the image domain $f(\Delta)$ contains the disc $[W| |W| < \frac{1}{4}(1 - |Z_0|)^2]$. The constant $\frac{1}{4}(1 - |Z_0|)^2 \equiv R_0$ is the best possible one [2,3].*

Let C_R denote the circle $[W| |W| = R]$, let $f \in \mathfrak{M}$. and let $m(R, f) \equiv m[C_R \setminus f(\Delta) \cap C_R]$ be the Lebesgue measure of the set of values on C_R not taken on by $f(z)$. It follows from the Lemma that $m(R, f) = 0$ for $0 \leq R < R_0$ and $m(R, f) = 2\pi R$ for $R > 1$.

In this note we shall evaluate the expression

$$(1) \quad m(R) \equiv \sup [m(R, f) | f \in \mathfrak{M}]$$

for R fixed, $R_0 \leq R < 1$. The result we obtain is analogous to one obtained by Jenkins [1]: he considered the class S of univalent functions $f(z)$ subject to the usual normalization $f(0) = 0$ and $f'(0) = 1$. Our result reduces to that of Jenkins if we allow $Z_0 \rightarrow 0$.

2. The principal result

If Ω is a simply-connected domain in the complex domain S^2 , and if a and b are two points in Ω , then $\rho(a, b, \Omega)$ will denote the hyperbolic distance between the points a and b with respect to Ω .

If Ω is a simply-connected domain in the complex domain, and if Ω contains the points a and b , then Ω^* denotes the domain obtained from

¹ The first author acknowledges support received under National Science Foundation Grant GP-11158.

² The second author acknowledges support received from I.R.E.X.

Ω by circular symmetrization with respect to the half-line $[a, b, \infty]$, which has its finite end-point at a and passes through the point b .

The symbol $J(R, t)$ denotes the ‘fork-domain’ defined by

$$J(R, t) \equiv S^2 \setminus [[-\infty, -R) \cup \{w | w = Re^{i\varphi}, t \leq \varphi \leq 2\pi - t\}].$$

Here R is fixed, $R_0 \leq R < 1$, and t is fixed, $0 \leq t < \pi$.

Our principal result is the following one.

THEOREM. *The bound in (1) is given by the formula*

$$(2) \quad m(R) = 2R \arccos(1 - 2D^2),$$

where

$$(3) \quad D = \frac{2(1-d)(R-d) + 8d\sqrt{R}}{(1+d)^2\sqrt{R}} - 1, \quad d \equiv |z_0|,$$

for R fixed, $\frac{1}{4}(|-1Z_0|)^2 \equiv R_0 \leq R < 1$. The extremal function for this problem maps Δ onto a suitably-chosen fork-domain.

PROOF. Compactness considerations yield the result that there exists at least one extremal function; later considerations will show that there is only one extremal function.

Let $f(Z)$ be an extremal function for the bound (1). In view of the conformal invariance of the hyperbolic distance, we have

$$(4) \quad \operatorname{arctanh} |Z_0| = \rho(0, Z_0, \Delta) = \rho(0, Z_0, f(\Delta)).$$

If $f(\Delta)^*$ is the domain obtained from $f(\Delta)$ by circular symmetrization with respect to the half-line $[0, Z_0, \infty)$, then it is well-known that

$$(5) \quad \rho(0, Z_0, f(\Delta)) \geq \rho(0, Z_0, f(\Delta)^*)$$

holds. Now it is geometrically clear that $f(\Delta)^*$ is contained in a fork-domain $J(R, t)$ for some t , and for this $J(R, t)$ we have

$$(6) \quad \rho(0, Z_0, f(\Delta)^*) \geq \rho(0, Z_0, J(R, t)).$$

From (4), (5) and (6) we obtain the inequality

$$(7) \quad \rho(0, Z_0, \Delta) \leq \rho(0, Z_0, J(R, t)),$$

which is our fundamental one. Since $\rho(0, Z_0, J(R, t))$ is an increasing function of t , it follows from (7) that in order to determine $m(R)$ it is sufficient to determine t_0 so that

$$(8) \quad \operatorname{arc} \tanh |Z_0| = f(0, Z_0, \Delta) = \rho(0, Z_0, J(R, t_0))$$

holds. In order to do this, we shall find a function $f \in \mathfrak{M}$ that maps Δ onto the fork-domain $J(R, t_0)$. It is easy to show that the function is unique.

There is no loss in generality in taking $Z_0 = d > 0$. Now we obtain the function that maps Δ onto $J(R, t_0)$ as a composition $W(Z) = W(\zeta(Z))$, where $\zeta = \zeta(Z)$ and $W = W(\zeta)$ are determined by

$$(9) \quad \frac{(1+\zeta)^2}{\zeta} = \frac{(1+z)^2(1+D)^2}{4zD}$$

and

$$(10) \quad w = \frac{R\zeta(1-D\zeta)}{(D-\zeta)},$$

respectively. Here D is a real constant, $0 < D < 1$, to be determined by the condition

$$(11) \quad W(d) = W(\zeta(d)) = d.$$

The function $\zeta = \zeta(Z)$ in (9) maps Δ onto the slit-disc

$$\Delta^* = [\zeta|\zeta| < 1] \setminus [\zeta|D < \zeta < 1].$$

The function $W = W(\zeta)$ in (10) maps Δ^* onto the fork-domain $J(R, t_0)$ with $t_0 = 2D^2 - 1$. The requirement (11), with (9) and (10), now yields (2). This completes the proof.

COROLLARY. *If $f \in S$, then*

$$m(R) = 2R \arccos(8\sqrt{R} - 8R - 1), \quad \frac{1}{4} \leq R \leq 1.$$

PROOF. If we take $Z_0 = 0$ in the preceding theorem, then \mathfrak{M} becomes the well-known class S , while $R_0 = \frac{1}{4}$ and $D = 2\sqrt{R} - 1$. Thus we obtain the earlier result due to Jenkins, alluded to in a preceding paragraph, from the present one by a simple limiting process.

3. Final Remark

It is well-known that circular symmetrization preserves the starlikeness of a domain. Hence it is possible to try to obtain the analogue of our theorem for the class of starlike functions \mathfrak{M}^* , a subclass of \mathfrak{M} . However the calculations are so formidable, that we have not been able to complete them.

REFERENCES

J. A. JENKINS

- [1] "On Values Omitted by Univalent Functions", American Journal of Mathematics, 75, 1953, 406-408.

Z. LEWANDOWSKI

- [2] "Sur Certaines Classes de Fonctions Univalentes dans le Cercle Unité", Annales UMCS, 13, 1959, 115-126.

MAXWELL O. READE AND ELIGIUSZ ZŁOTKIEWICZ

- [3] “Koebe Sets for Univalent Functions with Two Preassigned Values”, *Bulletin AMS*, 77, 1971, 103–105.

(Oblatum 12–III–1971)

The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
U.S.A.

and

Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska
Lublin, Poland