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1. Introduction and Definitions

Before getting into the key findings, some prior information on function theory fundamentals is required. In this case, the symbols \( A \) and \( S \) indicate the families of normalised holomorphic and univalent functions, respectively. These families are specified in the set-builder form:

\[
A = \left\{ g \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{U}_d) : g(0) = g'(0) - 1 = 0 \ (z \in \mathbb{U}_d) \right\},
\]

\[
S = \left\{ g \in A : g \text{ is univalent in } \mathbb{U}_d \right\},
\]

where \( \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{U}_d) \) stands for the set of analytic (holomorphic) functions in the disc \( \mathbb{U}_d = \{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1 \} \). Thus, if \( g \in A \), then it can be stated in the series expansion form by

\[
g(z) = z + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k z^k (z \in \mathbb{U}_d).\]

For the given functions \( G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{U}_d) \), the function \( G_1 \) is subordinated by \( G_2 \) (stated mathematically by \( G_1 \prec G_2 \)) if there exists a holomorphic function \( v \) in \( \mathbb{U}_d \) with the restrictions \( v(0) = 0 \) and \( |v(z)| < 1 \) such that \( G_1(z) = G_2(v(z)) \). Moreover, if \( G_2 \) is univalent in \( \mathbb{U}_d \), then

\[
G_1(z) \prec G_2(z), (z \in \mathbb{U}_d) \Leftrightarrow G_1(0) = G_2(0) \text{ and } G_1(\mathbb{U}_d) \subset G_2(\mathbb{U}_d).
\]

Although the function theory was created in 1851, Bieberbach [1] presented the coefficient hypothesis in 1916, and it made the topic a hit as a promising new research field. D. Branges [2] proved this conjecture in 1985. From 1916 to 1985, many of the world’s most distinguished scholars sought to prove or disprove this claim. As a result, they investigated a number of subfamilies of the class \( S \) of univalent functions that are associated with various image domains [3–5]. The most fundamental and significant
subclasses of the set \( \mathcal{S} \) are the families of starlike and convex functions, represented by \( \mathcal{S}^* \) and \( \mathcal{K} \), respectively. Ma and Minda [6] defined the unified form of the family in 1992 as

\[
\mathcal{S}^*(\phi) := \left\{ g \in \mathcal{A} : \frac{zg'(z)}{g(z)} < \phi(z) \ (z \in \mathcal{U}_d) \right\},
\]

where \( \phi \) indicates the analytic function with \( \phi'(0) > 0 \) and \( \Re \phi > 0 \). Also, the region \( \phi(\mathcal{U}_d) \) is star-shaped about \( \phi(0) = 1 \) and is symmetric along the real axis. They examined some interesting aspects of this class. Some significant sub-families of the collection \( \mathcal{A} \) have recently been investigated as unique instances of the class \( \mathcal{S}^*(\phi) \). In particular;

(i) The class \( \mathcal{S}^*[L, M] = \mathcal{S}^*(1 + Lz/1 + Mz) \), \(-1 \leq M < L \leq 1\), is obtained by selecting \( \phi(z) = 1 + Lz/1 + Mz \) and was established in [7]. Moreover, \( \mathcal{S}^*(\xi) = \mathcal{S}^*[1 - 2\xi, -1] \) displays the well-known order \( \xi \) \((0 \leq \xi < 1)\) starlike function class

(ii) The class \( \mathcal{S}^*_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{S}^*(\phi(z)) \) with \( \phi(z) = \sqrt{1 + z} \) was designed by the researchers Sokól and Stankiewicz in [8]. Also, they showed that the image of the function \( \phi(z) = \sqrt{1 + z} \) is bounded by \(|z^2 - 1| < 1\).

(iii) The set \( \mathcal{S}^*_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{S}^*(\phi(z)) \) with \( \phi(z) = 1 + 4/3z + 2/3z^2 \) has been deduced by Sharma and his coauthors [9] in which they located the image domain of \( \phi(z) = 1 + 4/3z + 2/3z^2 \), which is bounded by the below cardioid

\[
(9x^2 + 9y^2 - 18x + 5)^2 - 16(9x^2 + 9y^2 - 6x + 1) = 0.
\]

(iv) By selecting \( \phi(z) = 1 + \sin z \), we get the class \( \mathcal{S}^*(\phi(z)) = \mathcal{S}^*_{\mathcal{K}}, \) which was defined in [10] while \( \mathcal{S}^*_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{S}^*(e^z) \) was contributed by the authors [11] and, subsequently, explored some more properties of it in [12]. This class was recently generalized by Srivastava et al. [13] in which the authors determined upper bound of Hankel determinant of order three

(v) The family \( \mathcal{S}^*_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{S}^*(\cos(z)) \) and \( \mathcal{S}^*_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{S}^*(\cosh(z)) \) were offered, respectively, by Raza and Bano [14] and Alothai et al. [15]. In both the papers, the authors studied some good properties of these families

(vi) By choosing \( \phi(z) = 1 + \sinh^{-1} z \), we obtain the recently studied class \( \mathcal{S}^*_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{S}^*(1 + \sinh^{-1} z) \) created by Al-Sawalha [16]. Barukab and his coauthors [17] studied the sharp Hankel determinant of third-order for the following class in 2021

\[
\mathcal{D}_s = \left\{ g \in \mathcal{A} : g'(z) < 1 + \sinh^{-1} z, z \in \mathcal{U}_d \right\}.
\]

In [18, 19], Pommerenke provided the following Hankel determinant \( \mathcal{D}_{q,n}(g) \) containing coefficients of a function \( g \in \mathcal{S} \)

\[
\mathcal{D}_{q,n}(g) := \begin{vmatrix}
    a_n & a_{n+1} & \cdots & a_{n+q} \\
    a_{n+1} & a_{n+2} & \cdots & a_{n+q+1} \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    a_{n+q-1} & a_{n+q} & \cdots & a_{n+2q-2}
\end{vmatrix},
\]

with \( q, n \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \cdots\} \). By varying the parameters \( q \) and \( n \), we get the determinants listed below:

\[
\mathcal{D}_{2,1}(g) = \begin{vmatrix}
    1 & a_2 \\
    a_2 & a_3
\end{vmatrix} = a_3 - a_2^2,
\]

\[
\mathcal{D}_{2,2}(g) = \begin{vmatrix}
    a_2 & a_3 \\
    a_3 & a_4
\end{vmatrix} = a_4a_4 - a_3^2,
\]

\[
\mathcal{D}_{3,1}(g) = \begin{vmatrix}
    1 & a_2 & a_3 \\
    a_2 & a_3 & a_4 \\
    a_3 & a_4 & a_5
\end{vmatrix} = a_3(a_4a_4 - a_3^2) - a_4(a_4 - a_2a_3) + a_5(a_3 - a_2^2),
\]

that referred as first-, second-, and third-order Hankel determinants, respectively. The Hankel determinant for functions belonging to the general family \( \mathcal{S} \) has just a few references in the literature. The best established sharp inequality for the function \( g \in \mathcal{S} \) is \( |\mathcal{D}_{2,n}(g)| \leq \lambda \sqrt{n} \), where \( \lambda \) is a constant, and it is because of Hayman [20]. Additionally, it was determined in [21] for the class \( \mathcal{S} \) that

\[
|\mathcal{D}_{2,2}(g)| \leq \lambda, \text{ for } 1 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{11}{3},
\]

\[
|\mathcal{D}_{3,1}(g)| \leq \mu, \text{ for } \frac{4}{9} \leq \mu \leq \frac{32 + \sqrt{285}}{15}.
\]

Several mathematicians were drawn to the problem of finding the sharp bounds of Hankel determinants in a given family of functions. In this context, Janteng et al. [22, 23] estimated the sharp bounds of \( |\mathcal{D}_{2,2}(g)| \), for three basic subfamilies of the set \( \mathcal{S} \). These families are \( \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{S}^*, \) and \( \mathcal{R} \) (functions of a bounded turning class), and these bounds are stated as

\[
|\mathcal{D}_{2,2}(g)| \leq \begin{cases}
    1, & \text{for } g \in \mathcal{K}, \\
    \frac{4}{9}, & \text{for } g \in \mathcal{S}^*, \\
    \frac{1}{8}, & \text{for } g \in \mathcal{R}.
\end{cases}
\]
The determinant’s exact bound for the unified collection $\delta^*(\phi)$ was determined in [24] and subsequently investigated in [25]. In [26–28], this problem was also solved for various families of univalent functions.

The formulae provided in (11) make it abundantly evident that the computation of $|\mathcal{D}_{3,1}(g)|$ is much more difficult than determining the bound of $|\mathcal{D}_{3,2}(g)|$. Babalola [29] was the first mathematician who studied third-order Hankel determinant for the $\mathcal{K}, \delta^*$, and $R$ families in 2010. Following that, several academics [30–34] used the same method to publish papers regarding $|\mathcal{D}_{3,1}(g)|$ for specific subclasses of univalent functions. However, Zaprawa’s work [35] caught the researcher’s attention, in which he improved Babalola’s results by utilizing a revolutionary method to show that

$$|\mathcal{D}_{3,1}(g)| \leq \begin{cases} 
\frac{49}{540}, & \text{for } g \in \mathcal{K}, \\
\frac{1}{9}, & \text{for } g \in \delta^*, \\
\frac{41}{60}, & \text{for } g \in R.
\end{cases}$$

(15)

He also pointed out that these bounds are not sharp. In 2018, Kwon et al. [36] achieved a more acceptable finding for $g \in \delta^*$ and demonstrated that $|\mathcal{D}_{3,1}(g)| \leq 8/9$, and this limit was further enhanced by Zaprawa and his coauthors [37] in 2021. They got $|\mathcal{D}_{3,1}(g)| \leq 5/9$ for $g \in \delta^*$. In recent years, Kowalczyk et al. [38] and Lecko et al. [39] got a sharp bound of third Hankel determinant given by

$$|\mathcal{D}_{3,1}(g)| \leq \begin{cases} 
\frac{4}{135}, & \text{for } g \in \mathcal{K}, \\
\frac{1}{3}, & \text{for } g \in \delta^* \left(\frac{1}{2}\right),
\end{cases}$$

(16)

where $\delta^*(1/2)$ is the starlike functions family of order 1/2. In [40], the authors obtained the sharp bounds of third Hankel determinant for the subclass of $\delta^*_m$, and Mahmood et al. [41] calculated the third Hankel determinant for starlike functions in $q$-analogue. For some new literature on sharp third-order Hankel determinant, see [42–45].

In [46], Gandhi introduced a family of bounded turning function connected with a four-leaf function defined by

$$\delta^*_{4\gamma} = \left\{ g \in \mathcal{S} : \frac{zg'(z)}{g(z)} < 1 + \frac{5}{6}z + \frac{1}{6}\delta^*, (z \in \mathcal{U}_d) \right\},$$

(17)

and characterized it with some important properties. Similar to the definition of $\delta^*_{4\gamma}$, we now define a new subfamily of bounded turning functions by the following set builder notation:

$$\mathcal{BT}_{4\gamma} = \left\{ g \in \mathcal{S} : g'(z) < 1 + \frac{5}{6}z + \frac{1}{6}\delta^*, (z \in \mathcal{U}_d) \right\}.$$  

(18)

The aim of the current manuscript is to determine the exact bounds of the coefficient inequalities, Fekete-Szegö type problem, Kruskal inequality, and Hankel determinant of order two for functions of bounded turning class linked with four-leaf domain.

2. A Set of Lemmas

We say a function $p \in \mathcal{P}$ if and only if it has the series expansion

$$p(z) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n z^n (z \in \mathcal{U}_d),$$

(19)

along with the $\Re p(z) \geq 0 (z \in \mathcal{U}_d)$.

Lemma 1. Let $p \in \mathcal{P}$ be represented by (19). Then

$$|c_n| \leq 2n \geq 1.$$  

(20)

$$|c_{n+1} - \mu c_n| \leq 2 \max \{1, |2\mu - 1|\} = \begin{cases} 
2 & \text{for } 0 \leq \mu \leq 1; \\
|2\mu - 1| & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}$$

(21)

Also, If $B \in [0, 1]$ with $B(2B - 1) \leq D \leq B$, we have

$$|c_3 - 2Bc_1c_2 + Dc_1| \leq 2.$$  

(22)

These inequalities (20), (21), and (22) are taken from [47, 48].

Lemma 2. Let $p \in \mathcal{P}$ and be given by (19). Then, for $x, \delta, \rho \in \mathcal{U}_d$, we have

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

(23)

$$4c_3 = c_1^2 + 2(4 - c_1^2)c_1x - c_1(4 - c_1^2)x^2 + 2(4 - c_1^2)(1 - |x|^2)\delta,$$

(24)

For the formula $c_2$, see [48]. The formula $c_3$ was due to Zlotkiewicz and Libera [49] while the formula for $c_4$ was proved in [50].

Lemma 3 [51]. Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, a, \rho, \alpha, \alpha, \alpha \in (0, 1)$ and

$$8a(1 - a)(\alpha^2 - 2\rho)^2 + (\alpha(a + a - \beta)^2) + a(1 - a)(\beta - 2\rho)^2 \leq 4aa^2(1 - a)^2(1 - a).$$

(25)

If $p \in \mathcal{P}$ and be given by (19), then

$$|\gamma c_1^4 + ac_1^3 + 2ac_1c_3 - \frac{3}{2}\beta c_2c_1 - c_4| \leq 2.$$  

(26)

3. Coefficient Inequalities for the Class $\mathcal{BT}_{4\gamma}$

We begin this section by finding the absolute values of the first four initial coefficients for the function $\mathcal{BT}_{4\gamma}$. 
Theorem 4. If \( g \in \mathcal{B}_T \), and has the series representation (3), then

\[
|a_2| \leq \frac{5}{12}, \quad (27)
\]

\[
|a_3| \leq \frac{5}{18}, \quad (28)
\]

\[
|a_4| \leq \frac{5}{24}, \quad (29)
\]

\[
|a_5| \leq \frac{1}{6}. \quad (30)
\]

These bounds are best possible.

Proof. Let \( g \in \mathcal{B}_T \). Then, (18) can be written in the form of Schwarz function as

\[
g'(z) = 1 + \frac{5}{6} w(z) + \frac{1}{6} (w(z))^5, \quad (z \in \mathcal{U}_d). \quad (31)
\]

If \( p \in \mathcal{D} \), and it may be written in terms of Schwarz function \( w(z) \) as

\[
p(z) = \frac{1 + w(z)}{1 - w(z)} = 1 + c_1 z + c_2 z^2 + c_3 z^3 + \cdots. \quad (32)
\]

Equivalently, we have

\[
|a_2| \leq \frac{5}{12}
\]

By comparing (35) and (36), we obtain

\[
a_2 = \frac{5}{24} c_1, \quad (37)
\]

\[
a_3 = \frac{1}{3} \left( -\frac{5}{24} c_1^2 + \frac{5}{12} c_2 \right), \quad (38)
\]

\[
a_4 = \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{5}{12} c_1^2 + \frac{5}{16} c_2^2 - \frac{5}{96} c_3^2 - \frac{5}{24} c_2^2 - \frac{5}{18} c_3 c_4 \right). \quad (39)
\]

For \( a_2 \), implementing (20), in (37), we get

\[
|a_2| \leq \frac{5}{12}. \quad (41)
\]

For \( a_3 \), (38) can be written as

\[
a_3 = \frac{5}{36} \left( c_2 - \frac{1}{2} c_1^2 \right). \quad (42)
\]

Using (21), we get

\[
|a_3| \leq \frac{5}{18}. \quad (43)
\]

For \( a_4 \), we can write (39) as

\[
|a_4| = \frac{5}{48} \left( c_3 - \frac{1}{2} c_1 c_2 - \frac{1}{4} c_3^2 \right). \quad (44)
\]

From (22), we have

\[
0 \leq B = \frac{1}{2} \leq 1, \quad B = \frac{1}{2} \geq D = \frac{1}{4}. \quad (45)
\]

\[
B(2B - 1) = 0 \leq D = \frac{1}{4}. \quad (46)
\]

Application of triangle inequality plus (22) leads us to

\[
|a_4| \leq \frac{5}{24}. \quad (47)
\]
For $a_3$, we may write (40) as

$$|a_3| = \left| -\frac{1}{96} c_1^4 - \frac{1}{24} c_2^2 - \frac{1}{12} c_1 c_3 + \frac{1}{16} c_1^2 c_2 + \frac{1}{12} c_4 \right|. \quad (48)$$

After simplifying, we have

$$|a_3| = \frac{1}{12} \left| \frac{1}{8} c_1^4 + \frac{1}{2} c_2^2 + 2 \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) c_1 c_3 - \frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) c_1^2 c_2 - c_4 \right|. \quad (49)$$

Comparing the right side of (49) with

$$\left| \gamma c_1^4 + a c_2^2 + 2ac_1 c_3 - \frac{3}{2} \beta c_1^2 c_2 - c_4 \right|,$$

we get

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{8}, \quad a = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \alpha = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \beta = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (51)$$

It follows that

$$8a(1-a)((\alpha \beta - 2\gamma)^2 + (\alpha(\alpha + \alpha) - \beta)^2) + a(1-a)(\beta - 2\alpha a)^2 = 0,$$

$$4\alpha^2(1-a)^2(1-a) = \frac{1}{16}. \quad (53)$$

From (26), we deduce that

$$|a_3| \leq \frac{1}{6}. \quad (54)$$

These bounds are best possible and can be determined by the following extremal functions:

$$g_0(z) = \int_0^z \left( 1 + \frac{5}{6} (t^2) + \frac{1}{6} (t^6) \right) dt = z + \frac{5}{12} z^3 + \frac{1}{36} z^6 + \cdots. \quad (55)$$

$$g_1(z) = \int_0^z \left( 1 + \frac{5}{6} (t^2) + \frac{1}{6} (t^{10}) \right) dt = z + \frac{5}{18} z^3 + \frac{1}{66} z^{11} + \cdots. \quad (56)$$

$$g_2(z) = \int_0^z \left( 1 + \frac{5}{6} (t^3) + \frac{1}{6} (t^{15}) \right) dt = z + \frac{5}{24} z^4 + \frac{1}{96} z^{16} + \cdots. \quad (57)$$

$$g_3(z) = \int_0^z \left( 1 + \frac{5}{6} (t^4) + \frac{1}{6} (t^{20}) \right) dt = z + \frac{1}{6} z^5 + \frac{1}{126} z^{21} + \cdots. \quad (58)$$

**Theorem 5.** If $g$ is of the form (3) belongs to $\mathcal{B}_4^{2,2}$, then

$$|a_3 - \gamma a_2^2| \leq \max \left\{ \frac{5}{18}, \frac{25|\gamma|}{144} \right\}, \quad \text{for} \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (59)$$

This inequality is sharp.

**Proof.** By using (37) and (38), we may have

$$|a_3 - \gamma a_2^2| = \frac{5}{36} c_2 - \frac{5}{72} c_1^2 - \frac{25}{576} \gamma c_1. \quad (60)$$

By rearranging, it yields

$$|a_3 - \gamma a_2^2| = \frac{5}{36} \left| c_2 - \left( \frac{5\gamma + 8}{16} \right) c_1 \right|. \quad (61)$$

Application of (21) leads us to

$$|a_3 - \gamma a_2^2| \leq \frac{10}{36} \max \left\{ 1, \left| \frac{5\gamma + 8}{8} - 1 \right| \right\}. \quad (62)$$

After the simplification, we get

$$|a_3 - \gamma a_2^2| \leq \max \left\{ \frac{5}{18}, \frac{25|\gamma|}{144} \right\}. \quad (63)$$

This required result is sharp and is determined by

$$g_1(z) = \int_0^z \left( 1 + \frac{5}{6} (t^2) + \frac{1}{6} (t^{10}) \right) dt = z + \frac{5}{18} z^3 + \frac{1}{66} z^{11} + \cdots. \quad (64)$$

**Theorem 6.** If $g$ has the form (3) belongs to $\mathcal{B}_4^{2,2}$, then

$$|a_2 a_3 - a_4| \leq \frac{5}{24}. \quad (65)$$

This inequality is best possible.

**Proof.** By employing (37), (38), and (39), we have

$$|a_2 a_3 - a_4| = \frac{5}{48} c_3 - 2 \left( \frac{23}{36} \right) c_1 c_2 + \frac{7}{18} c_1^2. \quad (66)$$

From (22), we have

$$0 \leq B = \frac{23}{36} \leq 1, \quad B = \frac{23}{36} \geq D = \frac{7}{18}, \quad (67)$$

$$B(2B - 1) = \frac{115}{648} \leq D = \frac{7}{18}. \quad (68)$$
Using (22), we obtain

\[ |a_2a_3 - a_4| \leq \frac{5}{24}. \]  

(69)

This inequality is best possible and can be obtained by

\[ g_3(z) = \int_0^z \left(1 + \frac{5}{6} (t^4) + \frac{1}{6} (t^{15})\right) dt = z + \frac{5}{24} z^4 + \frac{1}{96} z^{16} + \ldots. \]

(70)

Theorem 7. If \( g \) belongs to \( \mathcal{B}T_{4, \alpha} \), and be of the form (3). Then

\[ |a_5 - a_2a_4| \leq \frac{1}{6}. \]  

(71)

This result is sharp.

Proof. From (37), (39), and (40), we obtain

\[ |a_5 - a_2a_4| = \left| -\frac{73}{4608} c_1^4 + \frac{1}{24} c_1^2 - \frac{121}{1152} c_1 c_3 + \frac{97}{1152} c_1^2 c_2 + \frac{1}{12} c_4 \right|. \]

(72)

After simplifying, we have

\[ |a_5 - a_2a_4| = \left| \frac{73}{12} \left( c_1^4 + \frac{1}{2} c_1^2 + 2 \left( \frac{121}{192} c_1 c_3 - \frac{3}{2} \frac{97}{144} c_1^2 c_2 - c_4 \right) \right) \right|. \]

(73)

Comparing the right side of (73) with

\[ yc_1^4 + ac_1^2 + 2ac_1c_3 - \frac{3}{2} \beta c_1^2 c_2 - c_4, \]  

we get

\[ y = \frac{73}{384}, a = \frac{1}{2}, a = \frac{121}{192}, \beta = \frac{97}{144}. \]

(74)

It follows that

\[ 8a(1-a)((\alpha \beta - 2\gamma)^2 + (\alpha(a + \alpha) - \beta)^2) + \alpha(1-a)(\beta - 2aa)^2 = 0.00735, \]

(75)

and

\[ 4aa^2(1-a)^2(1-a) = 0.05431. \]

(76)

From (26), we deduce that

\[ |a_5 - a_2a_4| \leq \frac{1}{6}. \]  

(77)

The required result is sharp and can be determined by

\[ g_3(z) = \int_0^z \left(1 + \frac{5}{6} (t^4) + \frac{1}{6} (t^{20})\right) dt = z + \frac{1}{6} z^5 + \frac{1}{126} z^{21} + \ldots. \]

(78)

Theorem 8. If \( g \in \mathcal{B}T_{4, \alpha} \), and be of the form (3). Then

\[ |a_5 - a_3^2| \leq \frac{1}{6}. \]  

(79)

This inequality is best possible.

Proof. By using (38) and (40), we have

\[ |a_5 - a_3^2| = \left| -\frac{79}{5184} c_1^4 - \frac{79}{1296} c_1^2 - \frac{1}{12} c_1 c_3 + \frac{53}{648} c_1^2 c_2 + \frac{1}{12} c_4 \right|. \]

(80)

After simplifying, we have

\[ |a_5 - a_3^2| = \left| \frac{79}{432} c_1^4 + \frac{79}{168} c_1^2 + 2 \left( \frac{1}{2} c_1 c_3 - \frac{3}{2} \frac{53}{81} c_1^2 c_2 - c_4 \right) \right|. \]

(81)

Comparing the right side of (82) with

\[ yc_1^4 + ac_1^2 + 2ac_1c_3 - \frac{3}{2} \beta c_1^2 c_2 - c_4, \]

we get

\[ y = \frac{79}{432}, a = \frac{79}{168}, a = \frac{1}{2}, \beta = \frac{53}{81}. \]

(82)

It follows that

\[ 8a(1-a)((\alpha \beta - 2\gamma)^2 + (\alpha(a + \alpha) - \beta)^2) + \alpha(1-a)(\beta - 2aa)^2 = 0.00616, \]

(83)

and

\[ 4aa^2(1-a)^2(1-a) = 0.04910. \]

(84)

From (26), we deduce that

\[ |a_5 - a_3^2| \leq \frac{1}{6}. \]  

(85)

This inequality is best possible and can be achieved by

\[ g_3(z) = \int_0^z \left(1 + \frac{5}{6} (t^4) + \frac{1}{6} (t^{20})\right) dt = z + \frac{1}{6} z^5 + \frac{1}{126} z^{21} + \ldots. \]

(86)
4. Kruskal Inequality for the Class $\mathcal{B} \mathcal{T}_{4,2}$

In this section, we will give a direct proof of the inequality

$$|a_4 - a_2^3| \leq \frac{5}{24},$$

(89)

over the class $\mathcal{B} \mathcal{T}_{4,2}$ for the choice of $n = 4, q = 1$, and for $n = 5, q = 1$. Kruskal introduced and proved this inequality for the whole class of univalent functions in [52].

**Theorem 9.** If $g$ belongs to $\mathcal{B} \mathcal{T}_{4,2}$, and be of the form (3). Then

$$|a_4 - a_2^3| \leq \frac{5}{24}.$$  (90)

This result is sharp.

**Proof.** From (37) and (39), we obtain

$$|a_4 - a_2^3| = \frac{5}{48} c_2 - 2 \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) c_1 c_2 + \frac{47}{288} c_1^3.$$  (91)

From (22), we have

$$0 \leq B = \frac{1}{2} \leq 1, \quad B(2B - 1) = 0 \leq D = \frac{47}{288}. \quad (92)$$

$$B(2B - 1) = 0 \leq D = \frac{47}{288}. \quad (93)$$

Using (22), we obtain

$$|a_4 - a_2^3| \leq \frac{5}{24}.$$  (94)

This result is sharp and can be obtained by

$$g_5(z) = \int_0^z \left( 1 + \frac{5}{6} z^4 + \frac{1}{6} z^{15} \right) \, dt = z + \frac{5}{24} z^4 + \frac{1}{96} z^{16} + \cdots.$$  (95)

After simplifying, we have

$$|a_5 - a_2^4| = \frac{1}{12} \left[ \frac{4081}{331776} c_4^4 - \frac{1}{24} c_2^2 - \frac{1}{12} c_1 c_3 + \frac{1}{16} c_1^2 c_2 + \frac{1}{12} c_4 \right].$$  (97)

Comparing the right side of (98) with

$$\gamma c_1^4 + a_2^4 + 2a c_1 c_3 - \frac{3}{2} \beta c_1 c_2 - c_4,$$

(99)

we get

$$\gamma = \frac{4081}{27648}, \quad a = \frac{1}{2}, \quad c = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \beta = \frac{1}{2}.$$  (100)

It follows that

$$8a(1 - a) \left( (a \beta - 2) \gamma + (\alpha(a + \alpha) - \beta) \right)$$

$$+ \alpha(1 - a)(\beta - 2aa) = 0.00408,$$

(101)

$$4aa^2(1 - a)^2(1 - a) = \frac{1}{16}.$$  (102)

From (26), we deduce that

$$|a_5 - a_2^4| \leq \frac{1}{6}.$$  (103)

This inequality is best possible and can be achieved by

$$g_5(z) = \int_0^z \left( 1 + \frac{5}{6} z^4 + \frac{1}{6} z^{15} \right) \, dt = z + \frac{1}{2} z^4 + \frac{1}{12} z^{21} + \cdots.$$  (104)

Next, we will calculate the Hankel determinant of order two $\mathcal{D}_{2,2}(g)$ for the class $g \in \mathcal{B} \mathcal{T}_{4,2}$. \hfill $\Box$

**Theorem 11.** If $g$ belongs to $\mathcal{B} \mathcal{T}_{4,2}$, then

$$|\mathcal{D}_{2,2}(g)| \leq \frac{25}{324}.$$  (105)

This inequality is sharp.

**Proof.** The $\mathcal{D}_{2,2}(g)$ can be written as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}_{2,2}(g) = a_2 a_4 - a_3^2.$$  (106)

From (37), (38), and (39), we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{2,2}(g) = \frac{25}{1152} c_1 c_3 - \frac{25}{41472} c_1^2 c_2 + \frac{25}{10368} c_4^2 - \frac{25}{1296} c_2^2.$$  (107)

Using (23) and (24) to express $c_2$ and $c_4$ in terms of $c_1$ and, noting that without loss in generality we can write $c_1 = c$, with $0 \leq c \leq 2$, we obtain
\[
|\mathcal{D}_{2,2}(g)| = \left| -\frac{25}{4608} c^2 (4 - c^2) x^2 + \frac{25}{2304} c (4 - c^2) (1 - |x|^2) \delta - \frac{25}{5184} (4 - c^2)^2 x^2 \right|,
\]
with the aid of the triangle inequality and replacing \(|\delta| \leq 1, |x| = k\), where \(k \leq 1\) and taking \(c \in [0, 2]\). So,
\[
|\mathcal{D}_{2,2}(g)| \leq \frac{25}{4608} c^2 (4 - c^2) k^2 + \frac{25}{2304} c (4 - c^2) (1 - k^2) + \frac{25}{5184} (4 - c^2)^2 k^2 = \Xi(c, k).
\]

(108)

It is not hard to observe that \(\Xi'(c, k) \geq 0\) for \([0, 1]\), so we have \(\Xi(c, k) \leq \Xi(c, 1)\). Putting \(k = 1\) gives
\[
|\mathcal{D}_{2,2}(g)| \leq \frac{25}{4608} c^2 (4 - c^2) + \frac{25}{2304} (4 - c^2)^2 = \Xi(c, 1).
\]

(109)

It is clear that \(\Xi'(c, 1) < 0\), so \(\Xi(c, 1)\) is a decreasing function and attains its maximum value at \(c = 0\). Thus, we have
\[
|\mathcal{D}_{2,2}(g)| \leq \frac{25}{524}.
\]

(111)

The required second Hankel determinant is sharp and is obtained by
\[
g_1(z) = \int_0^z \left(1 + \frac{5}{6} (t^2) + \frac{1}{6} (t^0) \right) dt = z + \frac{5}{18} z^3 + \frac{1}{66} z^1 + \ldots.
\]

(112)

\[ \square \]

5. Conclusion

In our present investigation, we considered a subclass of bounded turning functions associated with a four-leaf-type domain. We obtained some useful results for such a class, such as the limits of the first four initial coefficients, as well as the Fekete-Szego type inequality, the Zalcman inequality, the Kruskal inequality, and the estimation of the second-order Hankel determinant. All of the obtained results have been proven to be sharp. This work has been used to obtain higher-order Hankel determinants, such as in the investigation of the bounds of fourth-order and fifth-order Hankel determinants. These two determinants have been studied in [45, 53–56], respectively. Also, one can easily use this new methodology to obtain sharp bounds of the third-order Hankel determinant for other subclasses of univalent functions.
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