

LOGARITHMIC COEFFICIENTS OF CLOSE-TO-CONVEX FUNCTIONS

MD FIROZ ALI, D. K. THOMAS, AND A. VASUDEVARAO

ABSTRACT. For an analytic and univalent function f in the unit disk $\mathbb{D} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ with the normalization $f(0) = 0 = f'(0) - 1$, the logarithmic coefficients γ_n are defined by $\log \frac{f(z)}{z} = 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \gamma_n z^n$. In the present paper, we consider the class of close-to-convex functions (with argument 0), and determine the sharp upper bound of $|\gamma_3|$ for such functions f , which proves a recent conjecture of the first and third authors.

1. INTRODUCTION

Denote by $\mathcal{A}$ the class of functions f analytic in the unit disk $\mathbb{D} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ with Taylor series

$$(1.1) \quad f(z) = z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_n z^n.$$

The subclass $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{A}$, consisting of univalent (one-to-one) functions has attracted much interest for over a century, and is a central area of research in the theory of complex analysis. Although the class $\mathcal{S}$ is the main attraction, various geometric subclasses (e.g. starlike, convex and close-to-convex) have been extensively studied, some of which appear naturally in different areas in the theory of quasiconformal mappings. A function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is called starlike (respectively convex), if $f(\mathbb{D})$ is starlike with respect to the origin (respectively convex). Let $\mathcal{S}^*$ and $\mathcal{C}$ denote the class of starlike and convex functions in $\mathcal{S}$, respectively. It is well-known that a function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}^*$ if, and only, if $\operatorname{Re} (zf'(z)/f(z)) > 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Similarly, a function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}$ if, and only if, $\operatorname{Re} (1 + (zf''(z)/f'(z))) > 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. From the above it is easy to see that $f \in \mathcal{C}$ if, and only if, $zf' \in \mathcal{S}^*$.

Given $\alpha \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ and $g \in \mathcal{S}^*$, a function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ is said to be close-to-convex with respect to g with argument α , provided

$$(1.2) \quad \operatorname{Re} \left(e^{i\alpha} \frac{zf'(z)}{g(z)} \right) > 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Denote by $\mathcal{K}_\alpha(g)$ the class of all such functions, and let

$$\mathcal{K}(g) := \bigcup_{\alpha \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)} \mathcal{K}_\alpha(g), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K}_\alpha := \bigcup_{g \in \mathcal{S}^*} \mathcal{K}_\alpha(g)$$

be the classes of functions close-to-convex functions with respect to g , and close-to-convex functions with argument α , respectively. The class

$$\mathcal{K} := \bigcup_{\alpha \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)} \mathcal{K}_\alpha = \bigcup_{g \in \mathcal{S}^*} \mathcal{K}(g)$$

is the class of all close-to-convex functions. It is well-known that every close-to-convex function is univalent in $\mathbb{D}$ [3, 7]. Geometrically, $f \in \mathcal{K}$ means that the complement of the image-domain $f(\mathbb{D})$ is the union of non-intersecting half-lines [9].

File: log_coeff_complete_3.tex, printed: 2016-8-29, 0.21

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 30C45, 30C55.

Key words and phrases. Univalent, starlike, convex, close-to-convex functions, logarithmic coefficient.

The logarithmic coefficients γ_n of $f \in \mathcal{S}$ are defined by

$$(1.3) \quad \log \frac{f(z)}{z} = 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \gamma_n z^n,$$

and play a central role in the theory of univalent functions. The significance of the logarithmic coefficients in the context of the Bieberbach conjecture was pointed out by I.M. Milin, who conjectured that for $f \in \mathcal{S}$ and $n \geq 2$,

$$\sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^m \left(k |\gamma_k|^2 - \frac{1}{k} \right) \leq 0,$$

which De Branges established in his celebrated proof the Bieberbach conjecture [2].

Very few exact upper bounds for $|\gamma_n|$ seem have been established, with more attention being given to results of an average sense [3, 4, 11]. For the Koebe function $k(z) = z/(1-z)^2$, the logarithmic coefficients are $\gamma_n = 1/n$. Since the Koebe function plays the role of the extremal function for many problems in the class $\mathcal{S}$, it could expected that $|\gamma_n| \leq \frac{1}{n}$ holds for $n \geq 1$, when $f \in \mathcal{S}$. This however is not true, even in order of magnitude. Indeed, there exists a bounded function $f \in \mathcal{S}$ with logarithmic coefficients $\gamma_n \neq O(n^{-0.83})$ [3, Theorem 8.4].

Next note that differentiating (1.3), and equating coefficients gives

$$(1.4) \quad \gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2}a_2,$$

$$(1.5) \quad \gamma_2 = \frac{1}{2}(a_3 - \frac{1}{2}a_2^2),$$

$$(1.6) \quad \gamma_3 = \frac{1}{2}(a_4 - a_2a_3 + \frac{1}{3}a_2^3),$$

so that if $f \in \mathcal{S}$ then $|\gamma_1| \leq 1$ follows at once from (1.4), and using the Fekete-Szegő inequality [3, Theorem 3.8] in (1.5), gives the sharp inequality

$$|\gamma_2| \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + 2e^{-2}) = 0.635 \dots$$

For $n \geq 3$, the problem seems much harder, and no significant upper bounds for $|\gamma_n|$ appear to be known.

When $\mathcal{S}^*$, the inequality $|\gamma_n| \leq \frac{1}{n}$, for $n \geq 1$ is a trivial consequence of the representation of f in terms of functions of positive real part. It was claimed in [5] that this inequality extended to functions in $\mathcal{K}_0$, but this was later shown not to be the case [6]. It was pointed out in [12] that when $f \in \mathcal{K}_0$, $|\gamma_1| \leq 1$, and that the sharp inequality $|\gamma_2| \leq \frac{11}{18}$ follows from the Fekete-Szegő inequality for $f \in \mathcal{K}_0$ [8]. It was also shown in [12], that $|\gamma_3| \leq \frac{7}{12}$, with the added restriction that the second coefficient of the associated starlike function g is real. However, it was shown in [1] that the bound $\frac{7}{12}$ could be improved, and without the added restriction. It is the purpose of this paper to establish the sharp upper bound for $|\gamma_3|$ for functions in $\mathcal{K}_0$ conjectured in [1].

2. MAIN RESULTS

Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the class of analytic functions p with positive real part on $\mathbb{D}$ and expansion

$$(2.1) \quad p(z) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n z^n.$$

Functions in $\mathcal{P}$ are sometimes called Carathéodory function. To prove our main results, we need some preliminary lemmas.

Lemma 2.1. [3, p. 41] *For a function $p \in \mathcal{P}$ of the form (2.1), the sharp inequality $|c_n| \leq 2$ holds for each $n \geq 1$. Equality holds for the function $p(z) = (1+z)/(1-z)$.*

Lemma 2.2. [10] *Let $p \in \mathcal{P}$ be of the form (2.1). Then there exist $x, t \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|x| \leq 1$ and $|t| \leq 1$, such that*

$$2c_2 = c_1^2 + x(4 - c_1^2),$$

and

$$4c_3 = c_1^3 + 2(4 - c_1^2)c_1x - c_1(4 - c_1^2)x^2 + 2(4 - c_1^2)(1 - |x|^2)t.$$

Lemma 2.3. [8, Lemma 3] *Let $g \in \mathcal{S}^*$ and be given by $g(z) = z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} b_n z^n$. Then for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$,*

$$|b_3 - \lambda b_2^2| \leq \max\{1, |3 - 4\lambda|\}.$$

The inequality is sharp when $g(z) = k(z)$ if $|3 - 4\lambda| \geq 1$, and when $g(z) = (k(z^2))^{1/2}$ if $|3 - 4\lambda| < 1$.

We now present our results, beginning with

Theorem 2.1. *If $f \in \mathcal{K}_0$ is of the form (1.1), then*

$$\operatorname{Re} \gamma_3 \leq \frac{1}{243}(28 + 19\sqrt{19}).$$

The inequality is sharp.

Proof. Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{K}_0$, and is given by (1.1). Then there exists a starlike function g of the form $g(z) = z + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} b_n z^n$, and a function $p \in \mathcal{P}$ of the form (2.1), such that

$$(2.2) \quad z f'(z) = g(z)p(z).$$

Comparing the coefficients on both the sides of (2.2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} 2a_2 &= b_2 + c_1, \\ 3a_3 &= b_3 + b_2c_1 + c_2, \\ 4a_4 &= b_4 + b_3c_1 + b_2c_2 + c_3. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the above expressions for a_2, a_3 and a_4 into (1.6), and simplifying gives

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} 2\gamma_3 &= a_4 - a_2a_3 + \frac{1}{3}a_2^3 \\ &= \frac{1}{24} \left((6b_4 - 4b_2b_3 + b_2^3) + 2c_1 \left(b_3 - \frac{1}{2}b_2^2 \right) + b_2(2c_2 - c_1^2) + c_1^3 - 4c_1c_2 + 6c_3 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.2, we now write c_2 and c_3 in terms of c_1 to obtain

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} 48\gamma_3 &= (6b_4 - 4b_2b_3 + b_2^3) + 2c_1 \left(b_3 - \frac{1}{2}b_2^2 \right) + b_2x(4 - c_1^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}c_1^3 + c_1x(4 - c_1^2) - \frac{3}{2}c_1x^2(4 - c_1^2) + 3(4 - c_1^2)(1 - |x|^2)t, \end{aligned}$$

where $|x| \leq 1$ and $|t| \leq 1$. Let $\gamma_3(g)$ denote the third logarithmic coefficient of $g \in \mathcal{S}^*$, then, as was pointed out above, $|\gamma_3(g)| = \frac{1}{2}|b_4 - b_2b_3 + \frac{1}{3}b_2^3| \leq \frac{1}{3}$. Since $g \in \mathcal{S}^*$, this inequality and Lemma 2.3 gives

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} (6b_4 - 4b_2b_3 + b_2^3) &\leq 6|b_4 - b_2b_3 + \frac{1}{3}b_2^3| + 2|b_2b_3 - \frac{1}{2}b_2^3| \\ &= 12|\gamma_3(g)| + 2|b_2||b_3 - \frac{1}{2}b_2^2| \\ &\leq 8. \end{aligned}$$

Since the class $\mathcal{K}_0$ is invariant under rotation, without loss of generality we can assume that $c_1 = c$, where $0 \leq c \leq 2$. Taking real parts on both the sides of (2.4), and using the inequality (2.5) and Lemma 2.3, it follows that

$$48 \operatorname{Re} \gamma_3 \leq 8 + 2c + \frac{1}{2}c^3 + 3(4 - c^2)(1 - |x|^2) + (4 - c^2) \operatorname{Re} \left(cx - \frac{3}{2}cx^2 + b_2x \right),$$

where we have also used the fact $\operatorname{Re} t \leq 1$.

Now write $x = re^{i\theta}$, where $0 \leq r \leq 1$, and $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$, and let $b_2 = be^{i\phi}$ where $0 \leq b \leq 2$ and $0 \leq \phi \leq 2\pi$. Then

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} 48 \operatorname{Re} \gamma_3 &\leq 8 + 2c + \frac{1}{2}c^3 + 3(4 - c^2)(1 - r^2) \\ &\quad + (4 - c^2) \left(cr \cos \theta - \frac{3}{2}cr^2 \cos 2\theta + br \cos(\theta + \phi) \right) \\ &:= F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we need to find the maximum value of $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ over the hyper-rectangle $R := [0, 2] \times [0, 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 2\pi] \times [0, 2\pi]$.

We first prove that $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ has no maximum at any interior point of R . Suppose that $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ has a maximum at an interior point of R . Then at such point $\frac{\partial}{\partial b}F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi) = 0$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial c}F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi) = 0$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial r}F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi) = 0$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi) = 0$. Clearly, the pair of equations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial b}F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi) &= (4 - c^2) r \cos(\theta + \phi) = 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi) &= b(c^2 - 4) r \sin(\theta + \phi) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

has no solution in the interior of R . Hence, $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ has no maximum at any interior point of R .

Thus we need to find the maximum value of $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ on the boundary of R . The boundary of R includes 32 vertices (i.e. 0-face), 80 edges (i.e. 1-face), 80 faces of dimension two (i.e. 2-face), 40 faces of dimension three (i.e. 3-face) and 10 faces of dimension four (i.e. 4-face). Clearly finding the maximum value of $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ on the boundary of R involves many tedious exercises in elementary calculus, and therefore, for the sake of brevity, we omit many of the simple ones. We will use the notation R_{mn} to represent an m -dimensional face of R , where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes a particular case in which the maximization is performed.

By simple calculation it is easy to see that $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi) \leq 20$ on all the 32 vertices. Finding the maximum values of $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ on each of the 80 edges involves easy exercises in elementary calculus. Indeed, in most of the cases the function to be maximized is constant, and in a few cases $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ results in the same function, for example, $F(0, c, 0, 0, 0) = F(0, c, 0, 0, 2\pi) = F(2, c, 0, 0, 0)$. The resulting analysis shows that $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi) \leq \frac{64}{3}$ on all 80 edges. Again, finding the maximum values of $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ on each of the 80 faces of dimension two, (where in many cases, $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ results in the same function as in the case of edges), involves simple exercises in elementary calculus. Therefore, for the sake of brevity, we omit almost all of them, but for convenience, include the following case.

On the face $b = 2, \theta = 0, \phi = 0$, we have

$$F(2, c, r, 0, 0) = 8 + 2c + \frac{1}{2}c^3 + 3(4 - c^2)(1 - r^2) + (4 - c^2) \left(cr - \frac{3}{2}cr^2 + 2r \right),$$

where $(c, r) \in R_{21} := [0, 2] \times [0, 1]$. Thus we only need check whether $F(2, c, r, 0, 0)$ has maxima in the interior of R_{21} . Suppose that $F(2, c, r, 0, 0)$ has a maximum at an interior point of R_{21} . Then at such a point

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial c}F(2, c, r, 0, 0) &= \frac{1}{2}(9c^2r^2 - 6c^2r + 3c^2 + 12cr^2 - 8cr - 12c - 12r^2 + 8r + 4) = 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial r}F(2, c, r, 0, 0) &= (c - 2)(c + 2)^2(3r - 1) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Solving this pair of equations for interior points of R_{21} yields $c = \frac{1}{3}(10 + 2\sqrt{19})$ and $r = \frac{1}{3}$. Thus,

$$\max_{(c,r) \in \text{int } R_{21}} F(2, c, r, 0, 0) = F\left(2, \frac{1}{3}(10 + 2\sqrt{19}), \frac{1}{3}, 0, 0\right) = \frac{16}{81}(28 + 19\sqrt{19}) = 21.8902.$$

Following the same method, it is possible to verify that $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi) \leq \frac{16}{81}(28 + 19\sqrt{19})$ on all the 80 faces of dimension two.

Next, we find the maximum values of $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ on each of the 40 faces of dimension three, finding that many cases, as before, are identical. We therefore only need to check whether the function $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ has maxima in the interior of the face considered. As in most of the cases the computation is simple, we again omit these for the sake of brevity. We illustrate the analysis for the following cases.

On the face $r = 1, \phi = 0$,

$$F(b, c, 1, \theta, 0) = 8 + 2c + \frac{1}{2}c^3 + (4 - c^2) \left(c \cos \theta - \frac{3}{2}c \cos 2\theta + b \cos \theta \right),$$

where $(b, c, \theta) \in R_{31} := [0, 2] \times [0, 2] \times [0, 2\pi]$. Suppose that $F(b, c, 1, \theta, 0)$ has a maximum at an interior point of R_{31} . Then at such point

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial b}F(b, c, 1, \theta, 0) &= (4 - c^2) \cos \theta = 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}F(b, c, 1, \theta, 0) &= (4 - c^2) \sin \theta (6c \cos \theta - (b + c)) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Since these two pair of equations has no solution in the interior of R_{31} , it follows that $F(b, c, 1, \theta, 0)$ has no maximum at an interior point of R_{31} .

On the face $b = 0, \phi = 0$,

$$F(0, c, r, \theta, 0) = 8 + 2c + \frac{1}{2}c^3 + 3(4 - c^2)(1 - r^2) + (4 - c^2) \left(cr \cos \theta - \frac{3}{2}cr^2 \cos 2\theta \right),$$

where $(c, r, \theta) \in R_{32} := [0, 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 2\pi]$. Suppose that $F(0, c, r, \theta, 0)$ has a maximum at an interior point of R_{32} . Then at such point

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial r}F(0, c, r, \theta, 0) = (4 - c^2)(c \cos \theta - 3cr \cos 2\theta - 6r) = 0,$$

$$(2.8) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}F(0, c, r, \theta, 0) = cr(4 - c^2) \sin \theta (6r \cos \theta - 1) = 0.$$

From (2.8) either $\sin \theta = 0$, or $\cos \theta = 1/6r$. If $\sin \theta = 0$, then $\theta = \pi$, and so (2.7) becomes $(4 - c^2)(c + 3cr + 6r) = 0$, which has no solution in the interior of R_{32} . If $\cos \theta = 1/6r$, then (2.7) becomes $3(4 - c^2)(c - 2)r = 0$, which has no solution in the interior of R_{32} . It therefore follows that $F(0, c, r, \theta, 0)$ has no maximum at an interior point of R_{32} .

On the face $b = 2, \theta = 0$,

$$F(2, c, r, 0, \phi) = 8 + 2c + \frac{1}{2}c^3 + 3(4 - c^2)(1 - r^2) + (4 - c^2) \left(cr - \frac{3}{2}cr^2 + 2r \cos \phi \right),$$

where $(c, r, \phi) \in R_{33} := [0, 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 2\pi]$. Suppose that $F(2, c, r, 0, \phi)$ attains a maximum at an interior point of R_{33} , then at such a point

$$(2.9) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial r} F(2, c, r, 0, \phi) = (4 - c^2)(c - 3cr + 2 \cos \phi - 6r) = 0,$$

$$(2.10) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} F(2, c, r, 0, \phi) = 2(c^2 - 4)r \sin \phi = 0.$$

From (2.10), we see that $\phi = \pi$, and so (2.9) becomes $(4 - c^2)(3r(c + 2) + (2 - c)) = 0$, which has no solution in the interior of R_{33} . It therefore follows that $F(2, c, r, 0, \phi)$ has no maximum at an interior point of R_{33} .

On the face $b = 2, r = 1$,

$$F(2, c, 1, \theta, \phi) = 8 + 2c + \frac{1}{2}c^3 + (4 - c^2) \left(c \cos \theta - \frac{3}{2}c \cos 2\theta + 2 \cos(\theta + \phi) \right),$$

where $(c, \theta, \phi) \in R_{34} := [0, 2] \times [0, 2\pi] \times [0, 2\pi]$. Suppose that $F(2, c, 1, \theta, \phi)$ has a maximum at an interior point of R_{34} . Then at such point

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial c} F(2, c, 1, \theta, \phi) = 2 + \frac{3c^2}{2} + (4 - 3c^2) \cos \theta + \left(\frac{9c^2}{2} - 6 \right) \cos 2\theta - 4c \cos(\theta + \phi) = 0,$$

$$(2.12) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} F(2, c, 1, \theta, \phi) = -(4 - c^2)(c \sin \theta - 3c \sin 2\theta + 2 \sin(\theta + \phi)) = 0,$$

$$(2.13) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} F(2, c, 1, \theta, \phi) = -2(4 - c^2) \sin(\theta + \phi) = 0.$$

From (2.13), we see that $\theta + \phi = \pi$, and then from (2.12), we have $\cos \theta = 1/6$. Substituting these values in (2.11) yields $-39c^2 + 48c + 100 = 0$, which has no solution in the interior of R_{34} . It therefore follows that $F(2, c, 1, \theta, \phi)$ has no maximum at an interior point of R_{34} .

Following the same method we can show that $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi) \leq \frac{16}{81}(28 + 19\sqrt{19})$ on all the 40 faces of dimension three.

Next, we find the maximum values of $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ on each of the 10 faces of dimension four, and as before find identical cases. Thus we only need check if the function $F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ has a maxima in the interior of the following faces.

On the face $\phi = 0$ (or, $\phi = 2\pi$),

$$F(b, c, r, \theta, 0) = 8 + 2c + \frac{1}{2}c^3 + 3(4 - c^2)(1 - r^2) + (4 - c^2) \left(cr \cos \theta - \frac{3}{2}cr^2 \cos 2\theta + br \cos \theta \right),$$

where $(b, c, r, \theta) \in R_{41} := [0, 2] \times [0, 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 2\pi]$. Suppose that $F(b, c, r, \theta, 0)$ has a maximum at an interior point of R_{41} . Then at such point

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial b} F(b, c, r, \theta, 0) &= (4 - c^2)r \cos \theta = 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} F(b, c, r, \theta, 0) &= (4 - c^2)r \sin \theta (6cr \cos \theta - (b + c)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since these two pair of equations has no solution in the interior of R_{41} , it follows that $F(b, c, r, \theta, 0)$ has no maximum at an interior point of R_{41} .

On the face $\theta = 0$ (or, $\theta = 2\pi$),

$$F(b, c, r, 0, \phi) = 8 + 2c + \frac{1}{2}c^3 + 3(4 - c^2)(1 - r^2) + (4 - c^2) \left(cr - \frac{3}{2}cr^2 + br \cos \phi \right),$$

where $(b, c, r, \phi) \in R_{42} := [0, 2] \times [0, 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 2\pi]$. Suppose that $F(b, c, r, 0, \phi)$ has a maximum at an interior point of R_{42} . Then at such a point

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial b}F(b, c, r, 0, \phi) &= (4 - c^2)r \cos \phi = 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}F(b, c, r, 0, \phi) &= -br(4 - c^2) \sin \phi = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Clearly these two pair of equations has no solution in the interior of R_{42} , and therefore, $F(b, c, r, 0, \phi)$ has no maximum at an interior point of R_{42} .

On the face $r = 0$,

$$F(b, c, 0, \theta, \phi) = 8 + 2c + \frac{1}{2}c^3 + 3(4 - c^2),$$

where $(b, c, \theta, \phi) \in R_{43} := [0, 2] \times [0, 2] \times [0, 2\pi] \times [0, 2\pi]$, and by elementary calculus it can be shown that

$$\max_{(b, c, \theta, \phi) \in \text{int } R_{43}} F(b, c, 0, \theta, \phi) = F\left(b, \frac{2}{3}(3 - \sqrt{6}), 0, \theta, \phi\right) = \frac{16}{9}(9 + \sqrt{6}) = 20.3546.$$

On the face $r = 1$,

$$F(b, c, 1, \theta, \phi) = 8 + 2c + \frac{1}{2}c^3 + (4 - c^2) \left(c \cos \theta - \frac{3}{2}c \cos 2\theta + b \cos(\theta + \phi) \right),$$

where $(b, c, \theta, \phi) \in R_{43}$. Suppose that $F(b, c, r, 0, \phi)$ has a maximum at an interior point of R_{43} . Then at such a point

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial b}F(b, c, 1, \theta, \phi) &= (4 - c^2) \cos(\theta + \phi) = 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}F(b, c, 1, \theta, \phi) &= -b(4 - c^2) \sin(\theta + \phi) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

As these two pair of equations has no solution in the interior of R_{43} , it follows that $F(b, c, 1, \theta, \phi)$ has no maximum at an interior point of R_{43} .

On the face $c = 0$,

$$F(b, 0, r, \theta, \phi) = 8 + 12(1 - r^2) + 4br \cos(\theta + \phi),$$

where $(b, r, \theta, \phi) \in R_{44} := [0, 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 2\pi] \times [0, 2\pi]$. Suppose that $F(b, 0, r, \theta, \phi)$ has a maximum at an interior point of R_{44} . Then at such a point

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial b}F(b, 0, r, \theta, \phi) &= 4r \cos(\theta + \phi) = 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}F(b, 0, r, \theta, \phi) &= -4br \sin(\theta + \phi) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Since these two pair of equations has no solution in the interior of R_{44} , it follows that $F(b, 0, r, \theta, \phi)$ has no maximum at an interior point of R_{44} .

On the face $c = 2$, we have $F(b, 2, r, \theta, \phi) = 16$, where $(b, r, \theta, \phi) \in R_{44}$.

On the face $b = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}F(0, c, r, \theta, \phi) &= 8 + 2c + \frac{1}{2}c^3 + 3(4 - c^2)(1 - r^2) + (4 - c^2) \left(cr \cos \theta - \frac{3}{2}cr^2 \cos 2\theta \right) \\ &= F(0, c, r, \theta, 0),\end{aligned}$$

where $(c, r, \theta, \phi) \in R_{45} := [0, 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 2\pi] \times [0, 2\pi]$. This case has been considered earlier (see the face $b = 0, \phi = 0$).

On the face $b = 2$,

$$F(2, c, r, \theta, \phi) = 8 + 2c + \frac{1}{2}c^3 + 3(4 - c^2)(1 - r^2) + (4 - c^2) \left(cr \cos \theta - \frac{3}{2}cr^2 \cos 2\theta + 2r \cos(\theta + \phi) \right),$$

where $(c, r, \theta, \phi) \in R_{45}$. Suppose that $F(2, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ has a maximum at an interior point of R_{45} . Then at such a point

$$(2.14) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial r} F(2, c, r, \theta, \phi) = (4 - c^2)(-6r + c \cos \theta - 3cr \cos 2\theta + 2 \cos(\theta + \phi)) = 0,$$

$$(2.15) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} F(2, c, r, \theta, \phi) = -(4 - c^2)r(c \sin \theta(1 - 6r \cos \theta) + 2 \sin(\theta + \phi)) = 0,$$

$$(2.16) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} F(2, c, r, \theta, \phi) = -2r(4 - c^2) \sin(\theta + \phi) = 0.$$

From (2.16), we find that $\theta + \phi = \pi$, and so from (2.15) we have $\cos \theta = 1/6r$. Substituting these values in (2.14), we obtain $-(4 - c^2)(2 + 3r(2 - c)) = 0$, which has no solution in the interior of R_{45} . It therefore follows that $F(2, c, r, \theta, \phi)$ has no maximum at an interior point of R_{45} .

Thus, combining all cases we find that

$$\max_{(b, c, r, \theta, \phi) \in R} F(b, c, r, \theta, \phi) = F\left(2, \frac{1}{3}(10 - 2\sqrt{19}), \frac{1}{3}, 0, 0\right) = \frac{16}{81}(28 + 19\sqrt{19}),$$

and so from (2.6) we obtain

$$(2.17) \quad \operatorname{Re} \gamma_3 \leq \frac{1}{243}(28 + 19\sqrt{19}) = 0.4560 \dots$$

which is the required inequality.

The sharpness of the inequality (2.17) was given in [1], but for the sake of completeness, we include it. A simple examination of the proof shows that equality holds in (2.17) if we choose $b_2 = b_3 = b_4 = 2$, $c_1 = c = \frac{1}{3}(10 - 2\sqrt{19})$, $x = 1/3$ and $t = 1$ in (2.4). For such values of c_1, x and t , Lemma 2.2 gives $c_2 = \frac{2}{27}(97 - 20\sqrt{19})$ and $c_3 = \frac{1}{243}(2050 - 362\sqrt{19})$. A function $p \in \mathcal{P}$ having the first three coefficients $c_1 = \frac{1}{3}(10 - 2\sqrt{19})$, $c_2 = \frac{2}{27}(97 - 20\sqrt{19})$ and $c_3 = \frac{1}{243}(2050 - 362\sqrt{19})$ is given by

$$(2.18) \quad p(z) = (1 - 2\lambda) \frac{1+z}{1-z} + \lambda \frac{1+uz}{1-uz} + \lambda \frac{1+\bar{u}z}{1-\bar{u}z} \\ = 1 + \frac{1}{3}(10 - 2\sqrt{19})z + \frac{2}{27}(97 - 20\sqrt{19})z^2 + \frac{1}{243}(2050 - 362\sqrt{19})z^3 + \dots,$$

where $\lambda = \frac{1}{18}(-13 + 4\sqrt{19})$ and $u = \alpha + i\sqrt{1 - \alpha^2}$ with $\alpha = -\frac{1}{9}(1 + \sqrt{19})$. Hence the inequality (2.17) is sharp for a function f defined by $(1 - z)^2 f'(z) = p(z)$, where $p(z)$ is given by (2.18). This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1. $\square$

Theorem 2.2. *If $f \in \mathcal{K}_0$ is of the form (1.1), then*

$$|\gamma_3| \leq \frac{1}{243}(28 + 19\sqrt{19}) = 0.4560 \dots$$

The inequality is sharp.

Proof. If $f \in \mathcal{K}_0$ is of the form (1.1), then (1.6) shows that its third logarithmic coefficient is

$$\gamma_3(f) = \frac{1}{2}(a_4 - a_2 a_3 + \frac{1}{3}a_2^3).$$

Let $f_\alpha(z) = e^{-i\alpha} f(e^{i\alpha} z)$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ be a rotation of f . Then $f_\alpha \in \mathcal{K}_0$, and its third logarithmic coefficient is

$$\gamma_3(f_\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}(a_4 - a_2 a_3 + \frac{1}{3}a_2^3) e^{3i\alpha}.$$

Thus the functional $|\gamma_3|$ is rotationally invariant over the class $\mathcal{K}_0$. Therefore, to find the maximum value of $|\gamma_3|$ over $\mathcal{K}_0$, it suffices to find the maximum value of $\operatorname{Re} \gamma_3$ over the class of functions $\mathcal{K}_0$. Thus, the conclusion follows from Theorem 2.1. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] MD FIROZ ALI and A. VASUDEVARAO, On logarithmic coefficients of some close-to-convex functions, arXiv:1606.05162.
- [2] L. DE BRANGES, A proof of the Bieberbach conjecture. *Acta Math.* **154** (1985), no. 1-2, 137–152.
- [3] P. L. DUREN, *Univalent functions* (Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 259, New York, Berlin, Heidelberg, Tokyo), Springer-Verlag, 1983.
- [4] P. L. DUREN and Y. J. LEUNG, Logarithmic coefficients of univalent functions, *J. Analyse Math.* **36** (1979), 36–43.
- [5] M. M. ELHOSH, On the logarithmic coefficients of close-to-convex functions, *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A* **60** (1996), 1–6.
- [6] D. GIRELA, Logarithmic coefficients of univalent functions, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* **25** (2000), 337–350.
- [7] W. KAPLAN, Close-to-convex schlicht functions. *Michigan Math. J.* **1**(1952), 169–185.
- [8] W. KOEPF, On the Fekete-Szegő problem for close-to-convex functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **101** (1987), 89–95.
- [9] Z. LEWANDOWSKI, Sur l'identité de certaines classes de fonctions univalentes, I, *Ann. Univ. Mariae CurieSkłodowska Sect. A* **12** (1958), 131–146.
- [10] R.J. LIBERA and E.J. ZŁOTKIEWICZ, Early coefficients of the inverse of a regular convex function, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **85** (2) (1982) 225–230.
- [11] O. ROTH, A sharp inequality for the logarithmic coefficients of univalent functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **135**(7) (2007), 2051–2054.
- [12] D.K. THOMAS, On the logarithmic coefficients of close to convex functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **144** (2016), 1681–1687.

MD FIROZ ALI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KHARAGPUR, KHARAGPUR-721 302, WEST BENGAL, INDIA.
E-mail address: ali.firoz89@gmail.com

D. K. THOMAS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SWANSEA UNIVERSITY, SINGLETON PARK, SWANSEA, SA2 8PP, UNITED KINGDOM.
E-mail address: d.k.thomas@swansea.ac.uk

A. VASUDEVARAO, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KHARAGPUR, KHARAGPUR-721 302, WEST BENGAL, INDIA.
E-mail address: alluvasu@maths.iitkgp.ernet.in