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We use the Baernstein star-function to investigate several questions about the integral means of the convolution of two analytic functions in the unit disc. The theory of univalent functions plays a basic role in our work.

## 1. Introduction

Let $\mathbb{D}=\{z \in \mathbb{C}:|z|<1\}$ and $\mathbb{T}=\{z \in \mathbb{C}:|z|=1\}$ denote the open unit disc and the unit circle in the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$. We let also $\mathscr{H}$ ol( $\mathbb{D})$ be the space of all analytic functions in $\mathbb{D}$ endowed with the topology of uniform convergence in compact subsets.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { If } 0 \leq r<1 \text { and } f \in \mathscr{H} o l(\mathbb{D}) \text {, we set } \\
& M_{p}(r, f)=\left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left|f\left(r e^{i t}\right)\right|^{p} \frac{d t}{2 \pi}\right)^{1 / p}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { if } 0<p<\infty \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
M_{\infty}(r, f)=\sup _{|z|=r}|f(z)|
$$

For $0<p \leq \infty$, the Hardy space $H^{p}$ consists of those $f \in \mathscr{H o l}(\mathbb{D})$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|f\|_{H^{p}} \stackrel{\text { def }}{=} \sup _{0 \leq r<1} M_{p}(r, f)<\infty . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

We refer to [1] for the theory of $H^{p}$-spaces.

If $f, g \in \mathscr{H} \circ l(\mathbb{D})$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& f(z)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n} \\
& g(z)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_{n} z^{n} \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
(z \in \mathbb{D})
$$

the (Hadamard) convolution $(f \star g)$ of $f$ and $g$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
(f \star g)(z)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n} b_{n} z^{n}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We have the following integral representation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
(f * g)(z)=\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \int_{|\xi|=r} f\left(\frac{z}{\xi}\right) g(\xi) \frac{d \xi}{\xi}, \quad|z|<r<1 \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

(see [2, p. 11]). The convolution operation $\star$ makes $\mathscr{H}$ ol( $\mathbb{D}$ ) into a commutative complex algebra with an identity

$$
\begin{equation*}
I(z)=\frac{1}{1-z}=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^{n}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

We refer to [2] for the theory of the convolution of analytic functions and its connections with geometric function theory.

Following [3], we shall say that a function $F \in \mathscr{H}$ ol( $\mathbb{D})$ is bound preserving if for every $f \in H^{\infty}$ we have that $f \star F \in$ $H^{\infty}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|f \star F\|_{H^{\infty}} \leq\|f\|_{H^{\infty}} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Sheil-Small [3, Theorem 1.3] (see also [2, p. 123]) proved that a function $F \in \mathscr{H}$ ol( $\mathbb{D})$ is bound preserving if and only if there exists a complex Borel measure $\mu$ on $\mathbb{T}$ with $\|\mu\| \leq 1$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(z)=\int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{d \mu(\xi)}{1-z \xi}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D} . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

The measure $\mu$ is a probability measure if and only if $F$ is convexity preserving; that is, for any $f \in \mathscr{H}$ ol $(\mathbb{D})$ the range of $f \star F$ is contained in the closed convex hull of the range of $f[2, \mathrm{pp} .123,124]$.

It turns out that if $F$ is bound preserving and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, then for every $f \in H^{p}$ we have that $f \star F \in H^{p}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|f \star F\|_{H^{p}} \leq\|f\|_{H^{p}} . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Actually, the following stronger result holds.
Theorem 1. Suppose that $f, F \in \mathscr{H}$ ol( $\mathbb{D})$ with $F$ being bound preserving. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{p}(r, f \star F) \leq M_{p}(r, f), \quad 0<r<1 \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

whenever $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.
Proof. Since $F$ is bound preserving, there exists a complex Borel measure $\mu$ on $\mathbb{T}$ with $\|\mu\| \leq 1$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(z)=\int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{d \mu(\xi)}{1-z \xi}=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \xi^{n} d \mu(\xi)\right) z^{n}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D} . \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $f(z)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n} z^{n}(z \in \mathbb{D})$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
(f \star F)(z) & =\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n}\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \xi^{n} d \mu(\xi)\right) z^{n} \\
& =\int_{\mathbb{T}}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n} \xi^{n} z^{n}\right) d \mu(\xi)  \tag{12}\\
& =\int_{\mathbb{T}} f(\xi z) d \mu(\xi), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}
\end{align*}
$$

This immediately yields (10) for $p=\infty$. Now, if $1 \leq p<\infty$, using Minkowski's integral inequality we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M_{p}(r, f \star F) \\
& \quad=\left[\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left|\int_{\mathbb{T}} f\left(r \xi e^{i \theta}\right) d \mu(\xi)\right|^{p} d \theta\right]^{1 / p} \\
& \quad \leq\left[\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}}\left|f\left(r \xi e^{i \theta}\right)\right| d|\mu|(\xi)\right)^{p} d \theta\right]^{1 / p}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \leq \int_{\mathbb{T}}\left(\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left|f\left(r \xi e^{i \theta}\right)\right|^{p} d \theta\right)^{1 / p} d|\mu|(\xi) \\
& =\int_{\mathbb{T}} M_{p}(r, f) d|\mu|(\xi) \leq M_{p}(r, f) . \tag{13}
\end{align*}
$$

## 2. Star-Type Inequalities

The main purpose of this article is studying the possibility of extending Theorem 1 to cover other integral means, at least for some special classes of functions. In order to do so, we shall use the method of the star-function introduced by A. Baernstein [4, 5].

If $u$ is a subharmonic function in $\mathbb{D} \backslash\{0\}$, the function $u^{*}$ is defined by

$$
\begin{align*}
u^{*}\left(r e^{i \theta}\right)=\sup _{|E|=2 \theta} \int_{E} u\left(r e^{i t}\right) d t, &  \tag{14}\\
& 0<r<1,0 \leq \theta \leq \pi
\end{align*}
$$

where $|E|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of the set $E$. The basic properties of the star-function which make it useful to solve extremal problems are the following [5].
(i) If $u$ is a subharmonic function in $\mathbb{D} \backslash\{0\}$, then the function $u^{*}$ is subharmonic in $\mathbb{D}^{+}=\left\{z=r e^{i \theta}: 0<\right.$ $r<1,0<\theta<\pi\}$ and continuous in $\left\{z=r e^{i \theta}: 0<\right.$ $r<1,0 \leq \theta \leq \pi\}$.
(ii) If $v$ is harmonic in $\mathbb{D} \backslash\{0\}$, and it is a symmetric decreasing function on each of the circles $\{|z|=r\}$ ( $0<r<1$ ), then $v^{*}$ is harmonic in $\mathbb{D}^{+}$and; in fact, $v^{*}\left(r e^{i \theta}\right)=\int_{-\theta}^{\theta} v\left(r e^{i t}\right) d t$.
The relevance of the star-function to obtain integral means estimates comes from the following result.

Proposition A (see [5]). Let $u$ and $v$ be two subharmonic functions in $\mathbb{D}$. Then the following two conditions are equivalent:
(i) $u^{*} \leq v^{*}$ in $\mathbb{D}^{+}$.
(ii) For every convex and increasing function $\Phi: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \Phi\left(u\left(r e^{i \theta}\right)\right) d \theta \leq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \Phi\left(v\left(r e^{i \theta}\right)\right) d \theta \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
0<r<1
$$

Proposition A yields the following result about analytic functions.

Proposition B. Let $f$ and $g$ be two nonidentically zero analytic functions in $\mathbb{D}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:
(i) $(\log |f|)^{*} \leq(\log |g|)^{*}$ in $\mathbb{D}^{+}$.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { (ii) For every convex and increasing function } \Phi: \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \text {, } \\
& \text { we have that } \\
& \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \Phi\left(\log \left|f\left(r e^{i \theta}\right)\right|\right) d \theta \leq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \Phi\left(\log \left|g\left(r e^{i \theta}\right)\right|\right) d \theta  \tag{16}\\
& \quad 0<r<1
\end{align*}
$$

Since for any $p>0$ the function $\Phi$ defined by $\Phi(x)=$ $\exp (p x)(x \in \mathbb{R})$ is convex and increasing, we deduce that if $f$ and $g$ are as in Proposition B and $(\log |f|)^{*} \leq(\log |g|)^{*}$ in $\mathbb{D}^{+}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{p}(r, f) \leq M_{p}(r, g), \quad 0<r<1, \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $p>0$.
The main achievement in the use of the star-function by A. Baernstein in [5] was the proof that the Koebe function $k(z)=z /(1-z)^{2}(z \in \mathbb{D})$ is extremal for the integral means of functions in the class $S$ of univalent functions (see $[1,6]$ for the notation and results regarding univalent functions). Namely, Baernstein proved that if $f \in S$ then

$$
\begin{equation*}
( \pm \log |f|)^{*} \leq( \pm \log |k|)^{*} \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

and, hence,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left|f\left(r e^{i \theta}\right)\right|^{p} d \theta \leq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left|k\left(r e^{i \theta}\right)\right|^{p} d \theta, \quad 0<r<1 \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $p \in \mathbb{R}$. In particular, we have that if $f \in S$ and $0<p \leq$ $\infty$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{p}(r, f) \leq M_{p}(r, k), \quad 0<r<1 \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Subsequently the star-function has been used in a good number of papers to obtain bounds on the integral means of distinct classes of analytic functions (see, e.g., [7-12]).

Coming back to convolution, the following questions arise in a natural way.

Question 1. Let $f, g, F, G$ be analytic functions in $\mathbb{D}$ with $|F|$ and $|G|$ being symmetric decreasing on each of the circles $\{|z|=r\}$ and suppose that

$$
\begin{align*}
(\log |f|)^{*} & \leq(\log |F|)^{*} \\
\text { and }(\log |g|)^{*} & \leq(\log |G|)^{*} \tag{21}
\end{align*}
$$

Does it follow that $(\log |f \star g|)^{*} \leq(\log |F \star G|)^{*}$ ?
Question 2. Let $F$ and $f$ be two analytic functions in $\mathbb{D}$ and suppose that $F$ is bound preserving. Can we assert that $(\log |f \star F|)^{*} \leq(\log |f|)^{*}$ ?

We shall show that the answer to these two questions is negative. Regarding Question 1 we have the following result.

Theorem 3. There exist two functions $F_{1}, F_{2} \in \mathscr{H}$ ol( $\left.\mathbb{D}\right)$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\log \left|F_{j}\right|\right)^{*} \leq(\log |I|)^{*}, \quad \text { for } j=1,2 \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

and such that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { the inequality }\left(\log \left|F_{1} \star F_{2}\right|\right)^{*} \\
& \qquad \leq(\log |I \star I|)^{*} \text { does not hold. } \tag{23}
\end{align*}
$$

Here, I is the identity element of the convolution defined in (6); that is, $I(z)=1 /(1-z)(z \in \mathbb{D})$. Hence $I \star I=I$.

Proof. Let $h$ be an odd function in the class $S$ with Taylor expansion

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(z)=z+a_{3} z^{3}+a_{5} z^{5}+\ldots \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\left|a_{5}\right|>1$. The existence of such $h$ was proved by Fekete and Szegö (see [13, p. 104]). Set also

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{1}(z)=\frac{h(z)}{z}=1+a_{3} z^{2}+a_{5} z^{4}+\ldots, \quad z \in \mathbb{D} \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is well known that there exists a function $H \in S$ such that $h(z)=\sqrt{H\left(z^{2}\right)}\left(\right.$ see [13, p. 64]). Set $k_{2}(z)=\sqrt{k\left(z^{2}\right)}=z /(1-$ $\left.z^{2}\right)$ and $J(z)=k_{2}(z) / z=1 /\left(1-z^{2}\right)(z \in \mathbb{D})$. By Baernstein's theorem we have $(\log |H|)^{*} \leq(\log |k|)^{*}$, a fact which easily implies that $\left(\log \left|h_{1}\right|\right)^{*} \leq(\log |J|)^{*}$. Now, it is clear that $J$ is subordinate to $I$ and then, using [8, Lemma 2], we see that $(\log |J|)^{*} \leq(\log |I|)^{*}$. Thus it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\log \left|h_{1}\right|\right)^{*} \leq(\log |I|)^{*} \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $n=1,2,3, \ldots$, we define $f_{n}$ inductively as follows:

$$
f_{1}=h_{1}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { and } f_{n}=f_{n-1} \star f_{1}, \quad \text { for } n \geq 2 \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

In other words, $f_{n}=\overbrace{h_{1} \star \cdots \star h_{1}}^{(n)}$. Clearly, (25) yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{n}(z)=1+a_{3}^{n} z^{2}+a_{5}^{n} z^{4}+\ldots \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\left|a_{5}\right|>1$, it follows that $\left|a_{5}^{n}\right| \longrightarrow \infty$, as $n \longrightarrow \infty$. This is equivalent to saying that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|f_{n}^{(4)}(0)\right| \longrightarrow \infty, \quad \text { as } n \longrightarrow \infty \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then it follows that the family $\left\{f_{n}^{(4)}: n=1,2,3, \ldots\right\}$ is not a locally bounded family of holomorphic functions in $\mathbb{D}$. Using [14, Theorem 16, p. 225] we see that the same is true for the family $\left\{f_{n}: n=1,2,3, \ldots\right\}$. Take $p \in(0,1)$, then $I \in H^{p}$. Since a bounded subset of $H^{p}$ is a locally bounded family [1, p. 36], it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{n \geq 1}\left\|f_{n}\right\|_{H^{p}}=\infty \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, (30) implies that $\left\|f_{n}\right\|_{H^{p}}>\|I\|_{H^{p}}$ for some $n$. Using Proposition B, we see that this implies that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { the inequality }\left(\log \left|f_{n}\right|\right)^{*}  \tag{31}\\
& \qquad(\log |I|)^{*} \text { is not true for some } n .
\end{align*}
$$

Let $N$ be the smallest of all such $n$. Using (26) and the fact that $f_{1}=h_{1}$, it follows that $N>1$.

Then it is clear that (23) holds with $F_{1}=f_{1}, F_{2}=f_{N-1}$.

We have the following result regarding Question 2.
Theorem 4. There exist $f, F$ analytic and univalent in $\mathbb{D}$ such that $F$ is convexity preserving and with the property that the inequality $(\log |f \star F|)^{*} \leq(\log |f|)^{*}$ does not hold.

The following lemma will be used in the proof of Theorem 4.

Lemma 5. Let $f, F \in \mathscr{H}$ ol $((D)$ and suppose that $F(0)=1, F$ is convexity preserving, and $f$ and $f \star F$ are zero-free in $\mathbb{D}$ and satisfy the inequality $(\log |f \star F|)^{*} \leq(\log |f|)^{*}$. Then we also have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\log \left|\frac{1}{f \star F}\right|\right)^{*} \leq\left(\log \left|\frac{1}{f}\right|\right)^{*} \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Set $u=\log |f \star F|, v=\log |f|$. Then $u$ and $v$ are harmonic in $\mathbb{D}, u(0)=v(0)$, and $u^{*} \leq v^{*}$. Then it follows that, for $0<r<1$ and $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& (-u)^{*}\left(r e^{i \theta}\right)=\sup _{|E|=2 \theta} \int_{E}-u\left(r e^{i t}\right) d t \\
& \quad=\sup _{|E|=2 \theta}\left(-\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} u\left(r e^{i t}\right) d t+\int_{[-\pi, \pi] \backslash E} u\left(r e^{i t}\right) d t\right) \\
& \quad=-2 \pi u(0)+u^{*}\left(r e^{i(\pi-\theta)}\right)  \tag{33}\\
& \quad=-2 \pi v(0)+u^{*}\left(r e^{i(\pi-\theta)}\right) \\
& \quad \leq-2 \pi v(0)+v^{*}\left(r e^{i(\pi-\theta)}\right)=(-v)^{*}\left(r e^{i \theta}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

Hence, we have proved that $(-u)^{*} \leq(-v)^{*}$ which is equivalent to (32).

Proof of Theorem 4. Set

$$
\begin{align*}
& f(z)=\frac{1}{(1-z)^{2}}=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(n+1) z^{n} \\
& F(z)=1-\frac{1}{2} z \tag{34}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
z \in \mathbb{D}
$$

Clearly, $f$ and $F$ are analytic, univalent, and zero-free in $\mathbb{D}$. Also

$$
\begin{equation*}
(f \star F)(z)=1-z, \quad z \in \mathbb{D} \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence $f \star F$ is also zero-free in $\mathbb{D}$. Notice that $1 /(f \star F) \notin H^{\infty}$ and $1 / f \in H^{\infty}$. Then it follows that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { the inequality }\left(\log \left|\frac{1}{f \star F}\right|\right)^{*} \\
& \leq\left(\log \left|\frac{1}{f}\right|\right)^{*} \text { does not hold. } \tag{36}
\end{align*}
$$

Now, it is a simple exercise to check that

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(z)=\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{1-\cos \theta}{1-e^{i \theta} z} d \theta \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

and then it follows that $F$ is convexity preserving. Then, using (36) and Lemma 5, it follows that the inequality $(\log \mid f \star$ $F \mid)^{*} \leq(\log |f|)^{*}$ does not hold, as desired.

We close the paper with a positive result, determining a class of univalent functions $\mathscr{Z}$ such that (10) is true for all $p>0$, whenever $f \in \mathscr{Z}$ and $F$ is convexity preserving.

A domain $D$ in $\mathbb{C}$ is said to be Steiner symmetric if its intersection with each vertical line is either empty, or is the whole line, or is a segment placed symmetrically with respect to the real axis. We let $\mathscr{Z}$ be the class of all functions $f$ which are analytic and univalent in $\mathbb{D}$ with $f(0)=0, f^{\prime}(0)>0$, and whose image is a Steiner symmetric domain. The elements of $\mathscr{Z}$ will be called Steiner symmetric functions. Using arguments similar to those used by Jenkins [15] for circularly symmetric functions, we see that a univalent function $f$ with $f(0)=0$ and $f^{\prime}(0)>0$ is Steiner symmetric if and only if it satisfies the following two conditions: (i) $f$ is typically real and (ii) $\operatorname{Re} f$ is a symmetric decreasing function on each of the circles $\{|z|=r\}(0<r<1)$. Then it follows that if $f \in \mathscr{Z}$, then for every $r \in(0,1)$, the domain $f(\{|z|<r\})$ is a Steiner symmetric domain and, hence, the function $f_{r}$ defined by $f_{r}(z)=$ $f(r z)(z \in \mathbb{D})$ belongs to $\mathscr{Z}$ and it extends to an analytic function in the closed unit disc $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Now we can state our last result.

Theorem 6. Suppose that $f \in \mathscr{F}$ and let $F$ be an analytic function in $\mathbb{D}$ which is convexity preserving. We have, for every $p>0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{p}(r, f \star F) \leq M_{p}(r, f), \quad 0<r<1 \tag{38}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. In view of Theorem 1 we only need to prove (38) for $0<p<1$. Let $\mu$ be the probability measure on $\mathbb{T}$ such that $F(z)=\int_{\mathbb{T}}(d \mu(\xi) /(1-z \xi))(z \in \mathbb{D})$. Then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
(f \star F)(z)=\int_{\mathbb{T}} f(\xi z) d \mu(\xi) . \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $F$ is convexity preserving, for $0<r<1$, we have that $\left(f_{r} \star F\right)(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ is contained in the closed convex hull of $f_{r}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. This easily yields

$$
\begin{gather*}
\min _{z \in \mathbb{D}} \operatorname{Re} f_{r}(z) \leq \min _{z \in \mathbb{D}} \operatorname{Re}\left(f_{r} \star F\right)(z), \\
\max _{z \in \mathbb{D}} \operatorname{Re}\left(f_{r} \star F\right)(z) \leq \max _{z \in \mathbb{D}} \operatorname{Re} f_{r}(z) . \tag{40}
\end{gather*}
$$

By the remarks in the previous paragraph, we find that, for all $r \in(0,1), f_{r}$ belongs to $\mathscr{Z}$ and extends to an analytic function in the closed unit disc $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Finally, we claim that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\operatorname{Re}\left(f_{r} \star F\right)\right)^{*} \leq\left(\operatorname{Re} f_{r}\right)^{*}, \quad 0<r<1 \tag{41}
\end{equation*}
$$

Once this is proved, using Proposition 6 of [10], we deduce that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
M_{p}(r, f \star F)=\left\|f_{r} \star F\right\|_{H^{p}} \leq\left\|f_{r}\right\|_{H^{p}}=M_{p}(r, f), \\
0<p \leq 2, \tag{42}
\end{array}
$$

finishing our proof.

So we proceed to prove (41). Fix $r \in(0,1)$ and set $u=$ $\operatorname{Re}\left(f_{r} \star F\right), v=\operatorname{Re} f_{r}$. Using (39), we have, for $0<R<1$ and $0<\theta<\pi$,

$$
\begin{align*}
u^{*}\left(\operatorname{Re}^{i \theta}\right) & =\sup _{|E|=2 \theta} \int_{E} u\left(\operatorname{Re}^{i t}\right) d t \\
& =\sup _{|E|=2 \theta} \int_{E} \int_{\mathbb{T}} v\left(\operatorname{Re}^{i t} \xi\right) d \mu(\xi) d t  \tag{43}\\
& =\sup _{|E|=2 \theta} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{E} v\left(\operatorname{Re}^{i t} \xi\right) d t d \mu(\xi) \\
& \leq \int_{\mathbb{T}} v^{*}\left(R e^{i \theta}\right) d \mu(\xi)=v^{*}\left(\operatorname{Re}^{i \theta}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

## Data Availability

No data were used to support this study.

## Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

## Acknowledgments

This research is supported by a grant from "El Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad", Spain (MTM2014-52865-P) and by a grant from la Junta de Andalucía (FQM-210). We wish also to dedicate this article to Fernando Pérez González on the occasion of his retirement.

## References

[1] P. L. Duren, Theory of $H^{p}$ Spaces, Academic Press, New YorkLondon, 1970, Reprint: Dover, Mineola-New York, 2000.
[2] S. Ruscheweyh, Convolutions in Geometric Function Theory, Séminaire de Mathématiques Supérieures [Seminar on Higher Mathematics], Fundamental Theories of Physics, Presses de l'Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada, 1982.
[3] T. Sheil-Small, "On the convolution of analytic functions," Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik, vol. 258, pp. 137-152, 1973.
[4] A. Baernstein, "Proof of Edrei's spread conjecture," Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 418-434, 1973.
[5] A. Baernstein, "Integral means, univalent functions and circular symmetrization," Acta Mathematica, vol. 133, pp. 139-169, 1974.
[6] C. Pommerenke, Univalent Functions, Vandenhoeck \& Ruprecht, Göttingen, Germany, 1975.
[7] A. Baernstein, "Some sharp inequalities for conjugate functions," Indiana University Mathematics Journal, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 833-852, 1978.
[8] Y. J. Leung, "Integral means of the derivatives of some univalent functions," Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 289-294, 1979.
[9] J. E. Brown, "Derivatives of close-to-convex functions, integral means and bounded mean oscillation," Mathematische Zeitschrift, vol. 178, no. 3, pp. 353-358, 1981.
[10] D. Girela, "Integral means and BMOA-norms of logarithms of univalent functions," Journal of The London Mathematical Society-Second Series, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 117-132, 1986.
[11] D. Girela, "Integral means, bounded mean oscillation, and Gel'fer functions," Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, vol. 113, no. 2, pp. 365-370, 1991.
[12] M. Nowak, "Some inequalities for BMOA functions," Complex Variables Theory and Application, vol. 16, no. 2-3, pp. 81-86, 1991.
[13] P. L. Duren, Univalent Functions, Springer-Verlag, New York, NY, USA, 1983.
[14] L. V. Ahlfors, Complex Analysis. An Introduction to the Theory of Analytic Functions of One Complex Variable, International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, NY, USA, 3rd edition, 1978.
[15] J. A. Jenkins, "On circularly symmetric functions," Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, vol. 6, pp. 620-624, 1955.


Advances in
Operations Research
$=$



Decision Sciences
Journal of
Applied Mathematics
$=$


The Scientific World Journal


Journal of
Probability and Statistics


