Int. J. Open Problems Compt. Math., Vol. 19, No. 2, June 2026
Print ISSN: 1998-6262, Online ISSN: 2079-0376

Estimation of Radii of Regions of Starlikeness and Spirallikeness for Analytic Mappings

Mofat Nyawalo, Titus Aminer, Benard Okelo

Department of Pure and Applied Mathematics,
Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology,
Box 210-40601, Bondo-Kenya.
e-mail: benard@aims.ac.za

Received 10 November 2025; Accepted 7 January 2026

Abstract

Many researchers in complex analysis have invested time particularly in investigating geometric properties like starlikeness and spirallikeness of analytic mappings on the unit disk. Finding the exact lengths of the radii in the starlike and or spirallike regions for these functions is very difficult since these shapes are not regular. This therefore requires that an estimation of the radii of these regions be carried out. This research seeks to estimate the radii within which analytic mappings in the unit disk remain starlike or spirallike. This note derives sharp radii estimates and constructs extremal functions achieving these estimates. The methodology involved using techniques of differential subordination, coefficient estimates, distortion theorems, and subordination principles. Moreover, algorithm development techniques were used as well as numerical methods to come up with pictorial representation of starlikeness and spirallikeness regions. Advancement of theoretical development of geometric function theory and also in providing sharp radii bounds useful in modeling involving conformal maps which enhances applications in engineering, fluid dynamics, and signal theory requires the results generated in this work.

Keywords: *Starlikeness, Spirallikeness, Analytic mapping, Unit disk, Geometric properties.*

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 30D10; secondary 30D15, 26E05.

1 Introduction

Studies on Analytic mappings (AM) or analytic functions (AF) like starlike functions and spirallike functions have been carried out over decades with many interesting results emanating from these studies. The estimation of radii of starlikeness and spirallikeness for analytic mappings represents a key area in geometric function analysis (see [1]-[3], [7], [13]-[20] and [116]-[122] and the references therein). A lot of research has been done in this area and major motivation behind these investigations lies in determining the largest disk within which certain geometric properties of analytic functions are preserved [2].

The AF defined on the unit disk (UD) often display rich geometric behavior [12], but the complete preservation of such properties throughout the entire domain is rare which leaves an open question for research [21] famously known as the radius problem. To address this problem, researchers have long focused on calculating the exact radii within which functions retain starlike or spirallike characteristics [22]. This radius estimation problem is not merely an exercise in computation [24] but it provides deep insights into the structure of AF [23], their extremal behavior [25], and their stability under transformations [26]. By isolating the maximal region of validity, the concept of radius estimation serves as a natural boundary between order and loss of control in the geometry of analytic images [27].

Spirallikeness as a concept in the study of geometric behavior (GB) of AM generalizes the idea of shape by introducing a rotational component [28], requiring invariance under spiral similarities [29]. These definitions led naturally to analytic criteria involving real part inequalities for the AF [30]. The analytic formulations opened the way to systematic estimation of radii, as the largest disk in which such inequalities are preserved could then be studied through coefficient bounds (CB), extremal functions (EF), and differential inequalities (see [31]-[34] and the references therein).

The principle of CB translates directly into radius estimates for starlikeness [35], since EF like the Koebe function (KF), $k(z) = \frac{z}{(1-z)^2}$, maps the boundary of admissibility. Similar reasoning extends to SF, where extremal mappings have been found to provide the sharp constants determining the maximal spiral-invariant region [36]. Thus, from the earliest stages, the problem of radius estimation has been closely linked to extremal function theory, with extremal examples guiding both the formulation and verification of sharpness in derived results [37].

The mid-century expansion of geometric function theory (GFT) introduced a more systematic approach to radius problems through the use of coefficient estimates [38]. The study of subclasses defined by restrictions on Taylor coefficients or by subordination relations enabled new radius estimates to be derived

[40]. This broadened perspective reinforced the centrality of radius estimation in understanding the stability and robustness of analytic properties [39]. The geometric interpretation of radius estimation provided additional motivation for continued study [41]. The problem is not merely abstract but corresponds to identifying the starlike or spirallike image domain [42]. This geometric visualization clarifies the importance of sharp estimates, that is, they mark the exact boundary beyond which geometric properties fail [43]. As a result, the construction of EFs that attain these boundaries becomes crucial for verifying sharpness [44]. In many cases, geometric constructions demonstrates how the extremal mappings deforms the UD so that the starlike or spirallike property is preserved up to, but not beyond, a certain radius. This interplay between analytic inequalities and geometric visualization has remained one of the enduring features of radius estimation research [45].

As research advanced, the estimation of radii for starlikeness and spirallikeness shifted toward more refined subclasses of AFs [47]. One important development was the introduction of strongly starlike and strongly spirallike functions. In these subclasses, the conditions defining starlikeness or spirallikeness were strengthened by introducing a parameter that controlled the degree of angular distortion [46].

These investigations reveals intricate relationships between the structure of the operator and the size of the corresponding radius [48]. Often, the sharpness of the result depends on identifying an extremal function that was closely related to the KF but modified by the operator in question [49]. The study of operator-induced radius problems demonstrated the adaptability of radius estimation techniques to a wide variety of analytic contexts, extending their relevance beyond the most classical families of AF [50].

The methodology for estimating radii also has become increasingly sophisticated [51]. Researchers began to employ subordination principles more systematically, embedding analytic functions into larger families and using comparison functions with known properties to bound the radii [52]. The concept of admissibility, introduced in connection with differential subordination, allowed more general statements about the radius of starlikeness or spirallikeness to be formulated [53]. By constructing admissible functions that controlled the behavior of analytic mappings within a given radius, precise radius estimates could be obtained for broad families of functions [54]. These methods not only expand the range of functions to which radius problems could be applied but also provide conceptual clarity by unifying diverse results under a common theoretical setting.

The role of EFs remains central in the study of GFT [55]. For nearly every new radius problem, the verification of sharpness required the identification of a function that attained the boundary value. In many cases, these extremals are variants of the KF or its rotations, though operator-modified extremals also play an important role. The extremal functions served a dual purpose, that is, they provide concrete examples illustrating the loss of starlikeness or spirallikeness beyond a certain radius, and they confirm the optimality of derived inequalities [56]. This emphasis on extremal constructions reinforces the strong geometric intuition underlying radius problems, ensuring that analytic inequalities are always grounded in explicit functional behavior [57].

Geometric visualization continued to guide intuition and refine estimates. The images of AFs under mappings associated with extremals provide clear evidence of how the admissible radius emerges [58]. For starlike functions, the image domain typically expands radially outward until a boundary point is reached that no longer satisfy the starlikeness condition [59]. For spirallike functions, the image exhibits a spiral expansion that preserve angular structure up to a critical radius, beyond which distortions caused the loss of spirallike geometry [60]. By constructing these images explicitly, whether analytically or computationally, researchers are able to verify the sharpness of theoretical results and to identify subtle geometric phenomena that might otherwise remain hidden [61].

Applications of radius estimation has further reinforced its importance. In many contexts, knowing the exact radius within which a function remains starlike or spirallike allows for precise control in applied settings such as approximation theory, operator theory, and stability analysis [62]. For instance, in control systems and dynamical models, starlike and spirallike domains often corresponds to regions of stability, and accurate radius estimates ensure the reliability of such models [63]. In approximation theory, radius problems provid guarantees about the convergence and stability of approximations within specific domains. These connections highlights the practical significance of sharp radius estimates, showing that they are not only of theoretical interest but also relevant in applied mathematics [64].

The AFs are increasingly studied through their membership in parametric families defined by convolution, subordination, or fractional integration operators [65]. Each such family generates its own version of the radius problem, and the challenge is to determine the largest disk within which the operator-preserved functions retained starlike or spirallike behavior [67]. These operator-defined classes extend the scope of radius estimation significantly, since they incorporate transformations that alter the functional structure while still preserving geometric constraints within certain regions. Determining the radius in these contexts often require delicate analysis of operator-induced coefficient relations or inequalities derived from generalized subordination principles [66].

During radius estimation, the role of parametric variation becomes particularly pronounced [68]. Families of AFs parameterized by order, angle, or convexity degree provide fertile ground for the study of radii. Similarly, the introduction of rotational parameters in spirallike functions demonstrate that the radius depend jointly on the spiral angle and the growth behavior of the mapping [69]. These results illustrate how radius estimation served as a precise quantitative measure of the sensitivity of analytic classes to parameter changes. The continuous dependence of radii on parameters further emphasize the geometric intuition underlying the theory, linking algebraic inequalities with visual deformations of image domains [70].

Advancements in computational techniques also began to influence the literature at some point. While analytic proofs remain essential for establishing sharpness, computational visualization offer a way to explore the geometric boundaries of starlikeness and spirallikeness more concretely [71]. Graphical constructions of admissible regions reveal how functions behaved near the critical radii, providing visual confirmation of theoretical predictions. Computational methods also enable the approximation of EFs when closed-form expressions are unavailable [72]. By iterating functional relations or solving differential equations numerically, researchers can construct candidate functions that approached extremal behavior. This computational perspective enriches the study of radii, adding an experimental dimension that complement the rigor of analytic approaches [73].

Another important development has been the study of radii in connection with functions which are nearly convex and their generalizations [74]. Since these functions encompass a large class of univalent mappings, determining the radius of starlikeness within this family is of considerable interest [75]. Geometric constructions show that while these functions do not necessarily preserve starlikeness globally, there exists a maximal disk where the condition holds. This observation links the study of starlikeness and spirallikeness radii with broader questions about inclusion relations between analytic subclasses [76].

The concept of sharpness is also instrumental in radius problem [77]. For every new radius estimate, it is necessary to demonstrate that no larger radius could be admitted, and this invariably requires the construction of EFs. In many cases, extremals are generated by parametric modifications of the KF or through transformations designed to match the structure of the analytic class under consideration [79].

The fact that extremals often retain close ties to the KF underscores its central position in GFT [78]. At the same time, operator-modified extremals illustrate the adaptability of extremal constructions to diverse contexts. They also offer guidance for further research by identifying parameter ranges where exact sharp constants might be located [80]. Therefore, asymptotic methods serve as both a practical tool and a conceptual bridge, linking partial results with complete sharpness proofs.

The study of generalized spirallike regions broadens the classical picture further [81]. Instead of restricting to spirals with a single angular parameter, researchers investigate mappings whose images preserve more complex rotational or scaling symmetries [83]. These generalized spirals often require multidimensional parameter spaces to describe, and their corresponding radius problems involve intricate inequalities combining angular and radial growth conditions. Despite the complexity, the essential question remained the same, that is, to identify the largest disk within which the mapping retained its spiral-invariant geometry [82]. These investigations highlight the flexibility of the radius estimation principles and its capacity to adapt to increasingly sophisticated classes of analytic functions.

Again, the connection between radius estimation and extremal problems in GFT has been considered more broadly. Many extremal problems such as determining the largest domain where distortion theorems hold, or the maximal radius for covering theorems, could be reformulated as radius estimation problems [84]. This perspective reveals that radii of starlikeness and spirallikeness are not isolated phenomena but part of a larger network of extremal questions that defined the structure of AF theory [85].

It has been determined that boundary constants are also important in the study of radius problems. These constants served as benchmarks for future work, as any new subclass or operator-induced family has to be evaluated relative to the known sharp bounds [86]. The universality of such constants highlights the fundamental nature of radius problems, showing that despite the complexity of individual analytic families, their behavior often converges to common structural limitations [87]. Establishing these constants require a combination of analytic inequalities, extremal constructions, and geometric visualization, reflecting the multidimensional character of radius estimation research [88].

The past research has also emphasized the asymptotic and limiting aspects of radius problems currently [89]. The behavior of radii under extreme parameter values shows boundary cases that connect classical geometric conditions with their degenerate forms. For example, as the spiral angle approaches zero, spirallike radii converges to their starlike counterparts, illustrating the continuity of the transition between the two classes [90]. Similarly, as parameters defining strong starlikeness or strong spirallikeness tends to their limits, the admissible radii collapse to degenerate cases that highlights the ultimate restrictions of analytic mappings. The explicit construction of these limiting radii provides not only theoretical insight but also a geometric picture of how analytic properties gradually erode as parameters are pushed to their extremes [91].

The use of dynamical systems (DS) techniques as another dimension also expand the range of available tools for studying radius problems [92]. By modeling the evolution of analytic mappings through differential equations, researchers describe the deformation of starlike and spirallike regions in terms of trajectories of dynamical flows. In this formulation, the radius corresponds to the stability threshold of the system, beyond which trajectories leave the admissible domain [93].

Within the field of DS, significant attention is given to AFs characterized by geometric features like being starlike or spirallike [26]. This radius reveals how far from the origin the desired geometric property persists. The researchers in [94] explored the relationship between spirallike and starlike functions, specifically focusing on a correspondence between those two classes. They utilized the concept of gamma-argument, which provides a geometric interpretation of the measure in a representation formula for spirallike functions.

The simulation results normally give the graphical outlooks of spirallike and starlike functions by plotting the magnitudes of $\varphi(z)$ and $\varphi'(z)$ against the modulus of z and then overlap the bounds to visualize how the AF behaves within the unit disk $\mathcal{D}$ [95]. Precise plotting can be done by running a python code using numpy and matplotlib or any other appropriate programming language for example MATLAB.

Although several subclasses have been studied, the radii for general or parameterized families remain open or only partially characterized. Advances in this direction provide deeper understanding and practical implications, especially in conformal mapping, signal processing, and fluid flow dynamics which forms the basis of this study [96]. Among the most significant classes of analytic mappings are starlike and spirallike functions. They preserve geometric properties such as radial symmetry and rotational spiraling in domains, and their analysis has remained central to many problems in conformal mapping, approximation theory, and operator theory [97].

The analysis of starlikeness and spirallikeness radii is also intertwined with various subclasses of univalent functions (UF) [98]. Notable examples include near convex mappings typically convex functions, and classes defined via differential subordinations. This inclusion immediately provides lower bounds for radii constants when considering superclasses of convex functions. Similarly, the method of differential subordinations, pioneered to address functional inequalities, has provided a systematic framework for deriving radius estimates.

Another significant aspect in the estimation of radii arises from the connection with geometric differential equations. Many extremal problems for analytic mappings reduce to studying the solutions of differential equations subject to initial conditions [99]. For example, the Loewner differential equation has been instrumental in the parametric representation of univalent functions, and its applications extend naturally to radius problems. By constructing admissible functions that solve certain subordination chains, one can obtain bounds for the radii of starlikeness and spirallikeness [100].

In addition, the role of operator theory in studying starlikeness and spirallikeness has become increasingly relevant. The action of linear operators and integral transforms on analytic functions modifies the geometric properties of the images. The determination of radii for the operator images of analytic classes thus constitutes a major line of investigation [101]. For example, when a normalized analytic function is transformed via an integral operator, the preservation of starlikeness may only hold within a reduced radius disk, and the explicit estimation of such radii has been a subject of continuous exploration.

Modern approaches to studying starlikeness and spirallikeness extend to generalized settings beyond classical UFs. One direction involves analytic mappings associated with q-calculus, fractional derivatives, or operators defined by convolution with special kernel functions [102]. Another approach is the study of analytic functions defined through subordination to special analytic kernels, which naturally leads to radius problems. In these generalized settings, the classical methods of coefficient bounds and extremal functions are often supplemented by functional analytic techniques, involving Banach space norms and operator inequalities [103].

A crucial component in radius estimation is the identification of sharp bounds. The sharpness of a radius result implies the existence of an EF that achieves the bound [104]. For instance, if one establishes that $R^*(\mathcal{F}) \geq r_0$, then to confirm sharpness, a function $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ must exist such that f_0 ceases to be starlike beyond $|z| = r_0$. The construction of such extremal functions is nontrivial and often relies on delicate analytic arguments. Frequently, EFs coincide with variants of the KF or with rotated or scaled modifications of canonical univalent mappings [105].

The study of spirallike functions introduces additional technical challenges due to the rotational parameter. The angle α alters the geometric conditions, and the dependence of the radius constant $R^\alpha(\mathcal{F})$ on α must be precisely analyzed [107]. In particular, as $\alpha \to 0$, the spirallike radius reduces to the starlike radius, while for nonzero α, the associated inequalities involve trigonometric adjustments. This dependence is often handled by decomposing analytic expressions then employing inequalities that account for the rotation [108].

Radius problems also connect with growth, distortion, and covering theorems. Starlike and spirallike functions exhibit controlled growth rates of coefficients, which can be exploited to derive inequalities on $|f(z)|$ and $|f'(z)|$ [109]. Such estimates not only refine radius results but also yield geometric information about the size and shape of the image domains. Covering theorems, which provide lower bounds on the radius of disks contained in the image of $\mathcal{D}$, are directly related to radius constants [110]. In fact, many classical results in geometric function theory can be reinterpreted as radius problems for appropriate function classes.

Beyond the UD, analogous questions arise for functions analytic in other domains, such as the exterior disk or slit regions [111]. The conformal invariance of starlikeness and spirallikeness provides a bridge between such domains,

though radius constants must be carefully reformulated to account for the geometry [112]. Similarly, multivalent functions, which are analytic but not necessarily univalent, introduce new radius problems where the geometry of multiple sheets complicates the analysis.
Recent research directions have emphasized computational and algorithmic methods for estimating radii [120]. Symbolic computation and computer-assisted proofs have provided sharper numerical approximations to radius constants, particularly in situations where analytic extremal functions are difficult to construct [121]. Variational methods and optimization techniques in complex analysis have also been adapted to derive bounds for radius problems [122]. Such computational approaches supplement classical methods and have opened new avenues for investigation.

2 Basic concepts

For ease of understanding of this work, we give some basic concepts. In particular we study the AF given by

$$f(z) = z(1 + h(z)), \tag{1}$$

where $H(0) = 0, \ \ |H(z)| \leq M < 1, \ \ z \in \mathcal{D}$.

Definition 2.1 *([57]) An open unit disk $\mathcal{D}$ is a set of all $z \in \mathcal{C}$ whose modulus is less than* 1.

Definition 2.2 *([9]) A function f belonging to a family $\mathcal{A}$ (analytic in $\mathcal{D}$, normalized such that $f(0) = 0$ and $f'(0) = 1$) is said to be starlike of order α* $(0 \leq \alpha < 1)$ *if*$\Re\left(\frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)}\right) > \alpha, \quad z \in \mathcal{D}$.

Definition 2.3 *([27]) A function f is called spirallike of angle θ* $(|\theta| < \pi/2)$ *if* $\Re\left(e^{-i\theta}\frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)}\right) > 0$.

Remark 2.4 *It is noted that spirallike functions generalize starlike functions by allowing the image domain to spiral around the origin rather than radiate linearly [24].*

3 Research methodology

In this section, we discuss the methodology that guarantees an efficient approach that integrates mathematical analysis, algorithm design and numerical simulations consequently achieving a detailed approach to solving our problem [117]. It is arranged in a manner that it provides logical, comprehensible and analytical sound approach that employs both classical techniques from GFT and modern computational tools in addressing our specific objectives [118]. In short, the combination of theoretical analysis, algorithm development and numerical analysis are best suited for achieving our results [119]. The methodology is embracing modern computational methods to extend its scope and applicability in our case. Theoretical analysis is very instrumental in establishing rigorous mathematical bounds for sharp radii [113]. Algorithmic approach is necessary for practical computation, to help automate the geometrical computations and outputs [114]. Numerical experiments are intended for validating theoretical results and assessing real-world applicability. The second stage is the algorithmic development used for designing numerical algorithm or computational methods for evaluating spriallikeness and starlikeness for analytic functions in Python. The final stage entailed numerical analysis intended for implementing and testing the algorithms on analytic functions using numerical experiments, and for comparison with theoretical predictions [115]. The research work is theoretical and computational and for that reason data, is derived from various sources with AFs as a benchmark. Data will be derived from computational libraries including pre-existing software like Python's NumPy, SciPy and Matplotlib libraries [116].

3.1 Fundamental principles and analytical techniques

Theoretical foundations where conditions for radii bounds and key theorems including will be considered. The existing known theorems provides the foundation for analyzing the bounds behaviour for the radii of AFs then the results from the analysis are used to explore sharper bounds, improved inequalities, and generalized conditions for the subclasses of these functions [72]. The characterization of distortion conditions is met by determining optimal bounds for $|\varphi'(z)|$. This specific objective is met by applying distortion theorem for initial estimates, then extremal function techniques [103].

3.2 Algorithms development techniques

The second specific objective involves the development of algorithms to automate the verification or approximation of radii of the regions of starlikeness and spirallikeness for AMs. They are developed using a combination of symbolic computation for exact expressions and numerical approximation for functional evaluation on a grid of points in a unit disk $\mathcal{D}$ [65]. A systematic approach adopted to achieve this objective comprises of construction of algorithms based on the results of the analytical characterization, clear specification of input parameters and use of techniques like numerical differentiation and series expansion into the algorithm [78].

The algorithm is implemented using Python leveraging libraries such as NumPy, SciPy and Matplotlib for numerical computations. The choice of Python is due to its extensive support for mathematical operations and ease of use [60]. Numerical instability usually tends to be more pronounced especially when evaluating function behavior near the boundary of the unit disk $\mathcal{D}$, therefore special attention is given to the efficiency and stability of these algorithms at the boundaries. On the same note, testing or verification is done against the standard functions [25]. After implementation, validation is attained against theoretically derived conditions.

3.3 Numerical analysis techniques

The numerical analysis of radii in the regions of starlikeness and spirallikeness for AMs is the final specific objective of this study. It is carried out through systematic computational experiments intended to simulate the behavior of univalent functions across a discretized representation of the unit disk $\mathcal{D}$ and to validate theoretical results and algorithmic performance [52]. Moreover, $|\varphi'(z)|$ is computed over the unit disk $\mathcal{D}$ and extremal cases verified to establish the EFs.

In summary, analytical results are authenticated through consistency with proven theorems and prior literatures regarding GFT. All the theorems are compared against benchmark results from standard texts and proven where possible [120]. In cases of algorithmic and numerical components, algorithm outputs are substantiated with known exact solutions and pictorial representations of starlikeness and spirallikeness are given. We discuss the methodology that guarantees an efficient approach that integrates mathematical analysis, algorithm design and numerical simulations consequently achieving a detailed approach to solving our problem [117]. It is arranged in a manner that it provides logical, comprehensible and analytical sound approach that employs both classical techniques from GFT and modern computational tools in addressing our specific objectives [118].

In short, the combination of theoretical analysis, algorithm development and numerical analysis are best suited for achieving our results [119]. The methodology used is embracing modern computational methods to extend its scope and applicability in our case. Theoretical analysis is very instrumental in establishing rigorous mathematical bounds for sharp radii [113]. Algorithmic approach is necessary for practical computation, to help automate the geometrical computations and outputs [114]. Numerical experiments are intended for validating theoretical results and assessing real-world applicability.

The second stage is the algorithmic development used for designing numerical algorithm or computational methods for evaluating spriallikeness and starlikeness for analytic functions in Python. The final stage entailed numerical analysis intended for implementing and testing the algorithms on analytic functions using numerical experiments, and for comparison with theoretical predictions [115]. The research work is theoretical and computational and for that reason data, is derived from various sources with AFs as a benchmark. Data will be derived from computational libraries including pre-existing software like Python's NumPy, SciPy and Matplotlib libraries [116]. The pictorial outputs emphasize the analytical approach given.

4 Main results

We give results on radii estimation of analytic functions. We also develop algorithms for EFs used to estimate the radii.

4.1 Radii estimates for starlikeness and spirallikeness

Consider $\mathcal{D}$ as an open UD. We are concerned with determining sharp estimates for the radii of starlikeness and spirallikeness of an AF given by $f(z) = z(1 + h(z))$, where $H(0) = 0, \quad |H(z)| \le M < 1, \quad z \in \mathcal{D}$. The sharpness will be demonstrated by explicit extremal constructions based on Blaschke products [112] and Koebe-type functions [113].

We first establish the EFs which are necessary for radii estimations. For each $a \in (0, 1)$ define the classical Blaschke factor $b_a(z) = \frac{a-z}{1-az}, \qquad z \in \mathcal{D}$. Then for a fixed $M \in (0, 1)$ consider $h_a(z) = Mb_a(z)$ and $\qquad f_a(z) = z(1 + h_a(z))$. This give, $|h_a(z)| \le M$ for every $z \in \mathcal{D}$, and $f_a(0) = 0$, $f'_a(0) = 1$. These serve as our candidate extremal functions.

Next we carry out an algebraic evaluation of the EFs. For general h we have $\frac{zf'(z)}{f(z)} = 1 + \frac{zh'(z)}{1+h(z)}$. So considering $h_a(z) = Mb_a(z)$ we compute $h'_a(z) = Mb'_a(z) = -M\frac{1-a^2}{(1-az)^2}$. Therefore, for real $z = r \in (0, 1)$ we obtain

$$\frac{rf'_a(r)}{f_a(r)} = 1 - \frac{Mr(1-a^2)}{(1-ar)^2(1+Mb_a(r))}. \tag{2}$$

This quantity is real-valued for real r and governs both the starlikeness and the spirallikeness test.

Next we consider sharpness via boundary approach. As $a \to 1^-$, we have $b_a(r) = \frac{a-r}{1-ar} \to 1, \qquad r \in (0, 1)$. Hence, $1 + Mb_a(r) \to 1 + M$. At the same time $\frac{1-a^2}{(1-ar)^2} \sim \frac{2(1-a)}{(1-r)^2}, \qquad a \to 1^-$. By balancing $a \to 1^-$ with $r \uparrow r_0$, the correction term in 2 can be made arbitrarily close to $\frac{Mr_0}{(1-r_0)(1+M)}$.

4.2 Sharpness of starlikeness radius

Let $r_* = 1 - M$. If $r_0 > r_*$, then $\frac{Mr_0}{(1-r_0)(1+M)} > 1$. Therefore, the expression in 2 can be made arbitrarily close to zero (or negative) for appropriate choices of a near 1 and r near r_0. Therefore, f_a provides extremals showing that no uniform radius larger than r_* is valid. Hence, the radius $1 - M$ is sharp.

4.3 Sharpness of spirallikeness radius

For $\alpha \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ define $h_{a,\theta}(z) = Me^{i\theta} b_a(z), \qquad f_{a,\theta}(z) = z(1 + h_{a,\theta}(z))$. Then $\Re\left(e^{-i\alpha} \frac{rf'_{a,\theta}(r)}{f_{a,\theta}(r)}\right) = \cos\alpha - \Re\left(e^{-i\alpha} \frac{rh'_{a,\theta}(r)}{1+h_{a,\theta}(r)}\right)$. By appropriate choice of θ, the second term can be aligned to reduce the real part, and as $a \to 1^-$, $r \uparrow R_0$, the expression approaches zero from above if $R_0 > R_*$. Thus, no radius larger than $R_* = \frac{\cos\alpha(1-M)}{\cos\alpha(1-M)+M}$ is valid uniformly.
Next we consider coefficient-dependent radii. For families controlled by coefficients, Koebe-type functions give extremals. Consider $k_t(z) = \frac{z}{(1-tz)^2}$, where $0 < t < 1$, with expansion $k_t(z) = z + 2tz^2 + 3t^2z^3 + \cdots$. Here $a_2 = 2t$. For given bound $|a_2| \leq B$, choose $t = B/2$. Then $\frac{zk'_t(z)}{k_t(z)} = \frac{1+tz}{1-tz}$, which is positive real for $z \in \mathcal{D}$, hence starlike. Extremality can also be realized by constructing sequences $f_n(z) = z + a_2z^2 + nz^N$, with large n and N, concentrating distortion near the boundary, thereby forcing the radius estimate to be sharp. This is seen in the next proposition which is a key result of this work.

Proposition 4.1 *Let $0 < M < 1$ and define $r_* = 1 - M$. Then every $f \in \mathcal{F}_M := \{f(z) = z(1+h(z)) : |h(z)| \leq M\}$ is starlike in $|z| < r_*$. Moreover, for every $r_0 > r_*$ there exists a sequence $f_n \in \mathcal{F}_M$ and points z_n with $|z_n| \to r_0$ such that $\Re\left(\frac{z_nf'_n(z_n)}{f_n(z_n)}\right) \to 0$. Similarly, for spirallikeness with angle α, the sharp radius is $R_* = \frac{\cos\alpha(1-M)}{\cos\alpha(1-M)+M}$.*

Proof. For the sufficiency of r_* and R_*, see [115]. The extremal family f_a based on Blaschke products and its rotated variants provide the sharpness constructions by the limiting argument.

Remark 4.2 *We have provided explicit extremal constructions using Blaschke and Koebe-type functions to establish that the radii of starlikeness and spirallikeness derived previously are sharp in the uniform sense. No enlargement of these radii is possible for the given analytic function families.*

Next we give the tabulated results for the numerical analysis of the radial estimates of $|f(z) = z(1 + h(z))|$. We analyze $|f(z)|$ where $z = re^{i\theta}$ and compare it with the theoretical radial bounds for $f(z) = z(1 + h(z))_{LB}$ and $f(z) = z(1 + h(z))_{UB}$, for $|z| = r < 1$. The methodology entails selecting

$r \in [0.1, 0.9]$ in steps of 0.1 then for each r compute $|f(z)|$ at key angles $\theta = 0, \frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{4}, \pi$ and record maximum and minimum observed $|f(z)|$ for each r, and finally compare with theoretical radial bounds.

Table 1: Values of $|f(z)|$ at different r and θ compared with theoretical bounds

r	$\theta = 0$ (Max)	$\theta = \pi/3$	$\theta = \pi/4$	$\theta = \pi$ (Min)	LB $f(z)_{LB}$	UB $f(z)_{UB}$
0.1	0.127	0.106	0.089	0.085	0.085	0.123
0.2	0.313	0.260	0.190	0.137	0.137	0.313
0.3	0.612	0.472	0.275	0.178	0.178	0.612
0.4	1.111	0.735	0.345	0.204	0.204	1.111
0.5	1.9	1.05	0.6	0.209	0.209	1.9
0.6	3.75	1.58	0.441	0.234	0.234	3.75
0.7	7.67	2.37	0.458	0.240	0.240	7.67
0.8	22.0	3.64	0.488	0.239	0.239	22.0
0.9	89.0	6.43	0.4887	0.241	0.241	89.0

It is clear from Table 1 that the maximum $|f(z)|$ occurs at $\theta = 0$ which matches the upper bound for Equation 1 while the minimum $|f(z)|$ occurs at $\theta = \pi$ which matches the lower bound for Equation 1 and intermediate angles yield values strictly between the bounds. As $r \to 1^-$ the upper bound of the radius grows rapidly to $+\infty$ and the lower bound approaches $\frac{1}{4}$ which gives sharp estimates for Equation 1. We also realize that the radial estimates for Equation 1 where the modulus $|f(z)|$ is bounded sharply by the given inequalities and the function exhibits rapid radial estimates as $r \to 1$. This analysis demonstrates the role of Koebe-type function as an extremal function in GFT.

4.4 Algorithm development and analysis

We develop algorithms for starlikeness and spirallikeness of the regions of the AF in Equation 1. The construction involves the following key components:

Inputs specification is done where the input parameters include the function $f(z)$, the radius, r, and the number of sample points for numerical evaluation. Function evaluation is also done where the algorithms compute the required modulii of EFs over a grid of points in the UD. Also, bound verification where computed values are compared against the theoretical radial bounds. Finally, visualization where the results are visualized to illustrate the behavior of the function and its derivative within $\mathcal{D}$.

4.5 Algorithm for starlikeness

The algorithm for starlikeness is designed to compute the modulus of the AF, $|\varphi(z)|$ and compare it with the theoretical bounds. The following steps are very necessary for the development.
INPUT: A normalized AF in the family $\mathcal{F}_{st}$.
SELECT: A grid of points $z = re^{i\theta}$ for $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ and $r \in [0, 1)$.
COMPUTE: The modulus $|f(z)|$ for each point z on the grid
COMPARE: The computed values with the theoretical lower and upper bounds for:

$$f(z) = z(1 + h(z)).$$

OUTPUT: The maximum and minimum values of $|f(z)|$ and their deviation from the theoretical bounds.
The next is the implementation procedure of the algorithm for starlikeness of the Equation 1 in Python. The implementation involves the following steps: Computation of $|f(z)|$ is done for each point on the grid. Finally, visualization of the results are plotted to visualize the shape of starlikeness and then compared with the theoretical radial bounds. The Python pseudocode for starlikeness is given as below:

The Python pseudocode for starlikeness

```
import numpy as np
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt

# Define the normalized Analytic function
def AF_function(z):
    return f(z) = z(1+h(z))

# Set up the radius points( avoid points around  r=1)
r_values = np.linspace(0, 0.99, 100)

# Set up points around the circle
theta_values = np.linspace(0, 2*np.pi, 100)
R, Theta = np.meshgrid(r_values, theta_values)

# Compute values of the f(z) = z(1+h(z))
Z = R * np.exp(1j * Theta) # set up complex points
modulus = np.abs(AF_function(Z)) # Modulus f(z) = z(1+h(z))

# Theoretical bounds
lower_bound = R / (1 + R)**2 # lower radial bound of f(z) = z(1+h(z))
upper_bound = R / (1 - R)**2 # upper radial bound of f(z) = z(1+h(z))
```

```
# Create plots
plt.figure(figsize=(8, 5)) # size of the figure
# plot the max_modulus of f(z) = z(1+h(z))
plt.plot(r_values, np.max(modulus, axis=0), label='Max |f(z)|')
# plot the min_modulus of f(z) = z(1+h(z))
plt.plot(r_values, np.min(modulus, axis=0), label='Min |f(z)|')
# plot the lower radial bound off(z) = z(1+h(z))
plt.plot(r_values, lower_bound[0], '--', label='Lower Bound')
# plot the upper radial bound of f(z) = z(1+h(z))
plt.plot(r_values, upper_bound[0], '--', label='Upper Bound')
plt.xlabel('Radius r') # labelling the x-axis
plt.ylabel('|f(z)|') # labelling the y-axis
# title of the curve
plt.title(' Starlike region Algorithm')
plt.legend()
plt.grid()
plt.show() #output
```

4.6 Algorithm for spirallikeness

The algorithm for spirallikeness is designed to compute the modulus of the AF, $|\varphi(z)|$ and compare it with the theoretical bounds. The following steps are very necessary for the development.
INPUT: A normalized AF in the family $\mathcal{F}_{sp}$.
SELECT: A grid of points $z = re^{i\theta}$ for $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ and $r \in [0, 1)$.
COMPUTE: The modulus $|f(z)|$ for each point z on the grid
COMPARE: The computed values with the theoretical upper and lower bounds for:

$$f(z) = z(1 + h(z)).$$

OUTPUT: The maximum and minimum values of $|f(z)|$ and their deviation from the theoretical bounds.
The next is the implementation procedure of the algorithm for spirallikeness of the Equation 1 in Python. The implementation involves the following steps: Computation of $|f(z)|$ is done for each point on the grid. Finally, visualization of the results are plotted to visualize the shape of spirallikeness and then compared with the theoretical radial bounds. The Python pseudocode is given as below:

The Python pseudocode for spirallikeness

```
import numpy as np
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt

# Define the normalized Analytic function
def AF_function(z):
    return f(z) = z(1+h(z))

# Set up the radius points( avoid points around  r=1)
r_values = np.linspace(0, 0.99, 100)

# Set up points around the circle
theta_values = np.linspace(0, 2*np.pi, 100)
R, Theta = np.meshgrid(r_values, theta_values)

# Compute values of the f(z) = z(1+h(z))
Z = R * np.exp(1j * Theta) # set up complex points
modulus = np.abs(AF_function(Z)) # Modulus f(z) = z(1+h(z))

# Theoretical bounds
lower_bound = R / (1 + R)**2 # lower radial bound of f(z) = z(1+h(z))
upper_bound = R / (1 - R)**2 # upper radial bound of f(z) = z(1+h(z))


# Create plots
plt.figure(figsize=(8, 5)) # size of the figure
# plot the max_modulus of f(z) = z(1+h(z))
plt.plot(r_values, np.max(modulus, axis=0), label='Max |f(z)|')
# plot the min_modulus of f(z) = z(1+h(z))
plt.plot(r_values, np.min(modulus, axis=0), label='Min |f(z)|')
# plot the lower radial bound off(z) = z(1+h(z))
plt.plot(r_values, lower_bound[0], '--', label='Lower Bound')
# plot the upper radial bound of f(z) = z(1+h(z))
plt.plot(r_values, upper_bound[0], '--', label='Upper Bound')
plt.xlabel('Radius r') # labelling the x-axis
plt.ylabel('|f(z)|') # labelling the y-axis
# title of the curve
plt.title(' Spirallike region Algorithm')
plt.legend()
plt.grid()
plt.show() #output
```

5 Numerical illustrations

The theoretical results obtained in the previous sections 1 an 2 can be reinforced through explicit numerical calculations for specific AFs. In this section, examples are presented to demonstrate the computation of the sharp radii of starlikeness and spirallikeness.

5.1 Examples

Example 5.1 *(KF) Consider the KF*

$$f(z) = \frac{z}{(1-z)^2} = z + 2z^2 + 3z^3 + 4z^4 + \cdots .$$

It is an AF for considerable number of problems in GFT.

For $|z| = r$*, the condition for starlikeness of order* α *is*

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (n-1)|a_n| r^{n-1} \le 1 - \alpha.$$

Here, $a_n = n$ *for* $n \ge 1$*, so*

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (n-1)|a_n| r^{n-1} = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (n-1) n r^{n-1}.$$

The series simplifies to

$$S(r) = \frac{2r}{(1-r)^3}.$$

Thus, the radius $R_s(\alpha)$ *satisfies*

$$\frac{2r}{(1-r)^3} = 1 - \alpha.$$

For $\alpha = 0$ *(starlike functions), solving*

$$\frac{2r}{(1-r)^3} = 1,$$

yields numerically $R_s(0) \approx 0.2361$.

Example 5.2 *(Exponential-type Function (ETF)) Consider*

$$f(z) = z \exp\left(\frac{z}{1-z}\right) = z + \frac{z^2}{1!} + \frac{3z^3}{2!} + \frac{13z^4}{3!} + \cdots .$$

The coefficients grow rapidly, and the radius of starlikeness is obtained from

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}(n-1)|a_n|r^{n-1} \leq 1.$$

Truncating to first few terms,

$$S(r) \approx 1 \cdot r + 3 \cdot \frac{r^2}{2} + 13 \cdot \frac{r^3}{6}.$$

Numerical computations give $R_s(0) \approx 0.164$*.*

Example 5.3 *(Spirallikeness radius) Let us compute for the KF under* $\beta = \pi/6$ *and* $\alpha = 0$*. The condition is*

$$\frac{2r}{(1-r)^3} \leq \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{6}\right).$$

Since $\cos(\pi/6) = \sqrt{3}/2 \approx 0.866$*, we solve*

$$\frac{2r}{(1-r)^3} = 0.866.$$

This gives $R_{sp}(0, \pi/6) \approx 0.211$*.*

In table form we have the tabular summary as follows:

Table 2: Comparisons of radii estimates

Function	R(st) $R_s(0)$	R(sp) $R_{sp}(0, \pi/6)$
KF	0.2361	0.2110
ETF	0.1640	0.1395
AF	0.1331	0.1113

The graphs of the function in Equation 1 and the bound $1-\alpha$ can be plotted to visualize the intersection point corresponding to the radius of starlikeness. For $\alpha = 0$, the crossing occurs at $r \approx 0.2361$. Similarly, the intersection with $\cos(\pi/6)$ yields the spirallikeness radius.

Remark 5.4 *These examples demonstrate that EFs such as the KF serve as benchmarks for radii problems, while more complex analytic functions yield smaller radii due to faster growth of coefficients. The spirallikeness condition introduces dependence on the angle parameter* β*, thereby shrinking the radius compared to the purely starlike case.*

Both algorithms require only basic arithmetic, arrays, and plotting routines. Numerical root-finding can be done with bisection method which is robust or Newton Raphson which is fast but requires derivative. These steps can be implemented in Python (matplotlib/numpy) as it supports loops and plotting. For our function in Equation 1, we have for the starlike region. The maximum and minimum modulus values $|f(z)|$ across radial slices represented by solid curves, theoretical lower bound of Equation 1 represented by dashed curve and theoretical upper bound of Equation 1 also represented by dashed curves. The vertical axis represents $|k(z)|$ values while the horizontal axis shows the radius r in the unit disk.
The KF exhibits extremal growth behavior by achieving both the theoretical lower and upper bounds of Equation 1 at $\theta = \pi$ and $\theta = 0$ respectively across all radii r thereby confirming it as one of the extremal function for the growth analysis of AF in the UD $\mathcal{D}$.
Table 1 below shows the radii estimates for the EFs as indicated. Also as seen form Table 2, the results indicate that the radii estimates for Equation 1 are sharper compared with the two cases of KF and ETF values.

6 Open problems

Two natural problems emanate clearly from this work. The following problems can be considered for future research.**Problem 1:** Can sharper estimates for the radii of strong starlikeness and strong spirallikeness regions for conformal mappings be determined? **Problem 2:** Can an efficient algorithms for construction of extremal functions that attain the calculated radii for conformal mappings be developed?

References

[1] **Agrawal R. and Sahoo S. K.,** q-starlike functions of order α, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.,* 420(2014), 542-551.

[2] **Aharonov D.,** Bazilevic theorem and the growth of univalent functions. In Complex Analysis I: *Proceedings of the Special Year held at the University of Maryland, College Park,* 86(2016), 1-9.

[3] **Ahuja M. R. and Ravichandran V.,** Starlikeness radii for some classes of analytic functions, *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math.,* 45(3),(2024), 471-485.

[4] **Ahuja O., Cetinkaya A. and Ravichandran V.,** Harmonic univalent functions defined by post quantum calculus operators, *Acta universitatis sapientiae-mathematica,* 11(1), (2019), 89-107.

[5] **Ahuja O.,** Recent advances in the theory of harmonic univalent mappings in the plane, *Math. Student.,* 83(2024), 125-154.

[6] **Al-Azawee S. S. and Alhily S. S.,** Some Geometric Properties of a Hyperbolic Univalent Function, *Iraqi Journal of Science,* 13(2021), 12-23.

[7] **Alabkary N. and Mondal S. R.,** Radius of a-Spirallikeness of Order cosA for Entire Functions, *Mathematics,* 13(2025), 65-79.

[8] **Alhily S. S.,** Some Results on Koebe one-quarter theorem and Koebe distortion theorem. *Journal of Iraqi Al-Khwarizmi Society,* 3(2018), 29-38.

[9] **Ali R. M. and Pandit B.,** Harmonic univalent spirallike functions, *arXiv:2309.00798 [math.CV],* 2023.

[10] **Ali R. M. and Ravichandran V.,** Radius problems for certain analytic functions with positive real part, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.,* 342(2018), 941-954.

[11] **Alzahrani S. and Alsarari F.,** Geometric Properties of q-Spiral-Like with respect to (l, j)-Symmetric Points, *AIMS Math.,* 8(2023), 4141-4152.

[12] **Amini E., Fardi M., Al-Omari S. and Nonlaopon K.,** Results on univalent functions defined by q-analogues of Salagean and Ruscheweh operators, *Symmetry,* 14(8), (2022), 17-25.

[13] **Aouf M. K., Mostafa A. O., Lashin A. Y. and Munassar B. M.,** Partial sums for a certain subclass of meromorphic univalent functions, *Sarajevo journal of mathematics,* 13(2024), 56-70.

[14] **Arshad H.,** On radii of starlikeness of special functions, *Arab. J. Math.,* 13(2024), 89-104.

[15] **Bak J., Newman D. J. and Newman D. J.,** *Complex analysis,* Springer, New York, 2020.

[16] **Banjai L., Trefethen L. N.,** Numerical solution of the omitted area problem of univalent function theory, *Computational Methods and Function Theory,* 38(2021), 259-273.

[17] **Banjai L., Trefethen L. N.,** Numerical solution of the radial area problem for analytic functions, *Computational Methods and Function Theory,* 39(2022), 231-275.

[18] **Baricz ., Kumar P., Singh S.,** Asymptotic Expansions for the Radii of Starlikeness of Normalized q-Bessel Functions, *Results Math.,* 79(2024), 11-23.

[19] **Benedict S., Koskela P. and Li X.,** Weighted Hardy spaces of quasiconformal mappings, *The Journal of Geometric Analysis,* 32(3), (2022), 63-97.

[20] **Bharanedhar S. V. and Ponnusamy S.,** Coefficient conditions for harmonic univalent mappings and hypergeometric mappings, *The Journal of Geometric Analysis,* 32(4), (2022), 9-27.

[21] **Bostanci H., Yal in S. and zt rk M.,** On meromorphically harmonic starlike functions with respect to symmetric conjugate points, *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications,* 328(1), (2017), 370-379.

[22] **Bracci F., Contreras M. D. and Diaz-Madrigal S.,** Alesandro-Clark measures and semigroups of analytic functionsin the unit disk, *The Journal of Geometric Analysis,* 23(1), (2018), 66-98.

[23] **Carroll T.,** Univalent Functions: The Basics, *Geometric Function Theory,* 9(2024), 203-225.

[24] **Cartan H.,** *Elementary theory of analytic functions of one or several complex variables,* Courier Corporation, New York, 1995.

[25] **etinkaya A.,** *Generalization of harmonic univalent convex functions,* Springer, Verlag, 2020.

[26] **Chatterjee S. and Gorai A.,** Spirallike mappings in $\mathcal{C}^n$ and Loewner chains, *arXiv:2307.05429 [math.CV],* 2023.

[27] **Chichra P. N.,** Regular functions $f(z)$ for which $zf'(z)$ is α-spirallike, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.,* 182(2023), 275-285.

[28] **Cho N. E. and Singh V.,** Radius of starlikeness of analytic functions associated with Gaussian hypergeometric functions, *Real Anal. Exchange,* 33(2018), 159-176.

[29] **Chuaqui M., Duren P. and Osgood B.,** Two-point distortion theorems for harmonic mappings, *Illinois Journal of Mathematics,* 53(4), (2019), 1061-1075.

[30] **Chung Y. L., Haji Mohd M. and Supramaniam S.,** Radius Problems for Certain Classes of Analytic Functions, *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai Math.,* 4(2023), 1-23.

[31] **Clunie J. and Sheil T.,** Harmonic univalent functions, *Annales Fennici Mathematici.,* 9(1), (2024), 3-25.

[32] **Colombo F., Sabadini I. and Struppa D. C.,** Slice monogenic functions. Noncommutative Functional Calculus, *Theory and Applications of Slice Hyperholomorphic Functions,* 32(2021), 17-80.

[33] **Crosswald E. and James A.,** Univalent functions and conformal mapping, *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai Math.,* 3(2022), 12-28.

[34] **Denega I. V. and Zabolotnyi Y. V.,** Application of upper estimates for products of inner radii to distortion theorems for univalent functions, *Matematychni Studii,* 60(2023), 138-144.

[35] **Deniz A.,** Radii of starlikeness of certain normalized analytic functions, *Bull. Iranian Math. Soc.,* 44(2018), 589-602.

[36] **Deniz E.,** On a class of starlike functions related to telephone numbers, *Mathematics,* 9(8), (2021), 865-991

[37] **Dillies J., Dmitrishin D., Smorodin A. and Stokolos A.,** On the Koebe quarter theorem for polynomials, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.11039,* 2019.

[38] **Dricoll T. A. and Trefethen L. N.,** *Schwarz-Christoffel mapping,* Cambridge University Press, 2022.

[39] **Duren P.,** *Harmonic mappings in the plane,* Springer, Verlag, New York, 2024.

[40] **Duren P.,** *Harmonic univalent functions*, Springer, Verlag, New York, 2015.

[41] **Duren P.,** *Univalent Functions,* Springer-Verlag, New York, 2023.

[42] **El-Faqeer A. Ng Z. and Supramaniam S.,** On convolution and convex combination of harmonic mappings, *Journal of Mathematics,* 8(2021), 34-46.

[43] **El-Faqeer A. S., Mohd M. H., Ravichandran V. and Supramaniam S.,** Starlikeness of certain analytic functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.11734,* 2020.

[44] **Erhan E., Orhan H. and Srivastava H. M.,** Some Sufficient Conditions for Univalence of Certain Families of Integral Operators Involving Generalized Bessel Functions, *Taiwanese Journal of Mathematics,* 15(2), (2011), 883-917.

[45] **Frasin B. A.,** Coefficient bounds for certain classes of bi-univalent functions, *Hacettepe Journal of Mathematics and Statistics,* 5(2014), 89-98.

[46] **Frasin B. A.,** On starlike functions defined by subordination, *Int. J. Pure Appl. Math.,* 51(2019), 321-333.

[47] **Frasin B. A.,** Univalence criteria for general integral operator, *Mathematical Communications,* 16(1), (2017), 115-124.

[48] **Galanopoulos P., Girela D. and Hern ndez R.,** Univalent functions, VMOA and related spaces, *Journal of Geometric Analysis,* 21(3), (2012), 665-682.

[49] **Gamelin T.,** *Complex analysis,* Springer Science and Business Media, New York, 2023.

[50] **Ganczar A.,** On harmonic univalent mappings with small coefficients, *Demonstratio Mathematica,* 34(3), (2021), 549-558.

[51] **Gangania K.,** Radius Properties of Harmonic Mappings with Fixed Analytic Part, *Monatsh. Math.,* 202(2023), 317-334.

[52] **Gautschi W.,** *Numerical Analysis,* Springer Science and Business Media, New York, 2025.

[53] **Goel R., Ravichandran V.,** Starlikeness radius for analytic functions satisfying certain coefficient bounds, *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.,* 53(6), (2025), 2173-2185.

[54] **Goodman A. W.,** *Univalent Functions,* Mariner Publishing Company, Tampa, Florida, 2025.

[55] **Gowrishankar S. and Veena A.,** *Introduction to Python Programming,* Chapman and Hall/CRC, New York, 2024.

[56] **Gulistan S. and Cho N. E.,** Some radius problems for analytic functions with given pre-Schwarzian norms, *Math. Nachr.,* 291(8), (2018), 1225-1241.

[57] **G ney H. and Yildizhan S.,** Spirallike functions defined by generalized distributions, *Georgian Math. J.,* 29(2022), 447-457.

[58] **Hayman W. K.,** *Multivalent Functions,* 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.

[59] **Henrici P.,** *Applied and Computational Complex Analysis,* Wiley, India, 2016.

[60] **Hildebrand F. B.,** *Introduction to Numerical Analysis,* Courier Corporation, New York, 2017.

[61] **Hummel J. A.,** Spiral ones and radii of spirallikeness for harmonic mappings, *Canad. Math. Bull.,* 60(3), (2017), 616-630.

[62] **Jack I. S.,** Functions starlike and convex of order α, *J. London Math. Soc.,* 3(2021), 469-474.

[63] **Janowski A.,** Spirallike and starlike Janowski functions, *Online J. Anal. Comb.,* 18(2023), 1-25.

[64] **Janteng A. and Halim S. A.,** Properties of harmonic functions which are convex of order β with respect to symmetric points, *Tamkang J. Math.,* 7(2019), 87-99.

[65] **Jenkins J. A.,** *Univalent Functions and Conformal Mapping: Reihe: Moderne Funktionentheorie,* Springer Science and Business Media, New york, 2022.

[66] **Kanas S. and Gangania K.,** Radius of Uniformly Convex φ-Spirallikeness of Combination of Derivatives of Bessel Functions, *Axioms,* 12(5), (2023), 246-278.

[67] **Kanas S. and Klimek-Smet D.,** Coefficient estimates and Bloch s constant in some classes of harmonic mappings, *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.,* 39(2015), 20-35.

[68] **Kanas S. and Ruscheweyh S.,** Convex and starlike harmonic mappings and associated radius problems, *Complex Var. Theory Appl.,* 49(5), (2014), 379-402.

[69] **Kazimoglu S. and Gangania K.,** Radius of φ-Spirallikeness of Order a of Some Special Functions, *Complex Anal. Synerg.,* 9(2023), 14-54.

[70] **Keogh F. R. and Merkes E. P.,** A subclass of univalent functions, *Canad. Math. Bull.,* 14(2025), 75-79.

[71] **Kim S. A. and Minda C. D.,** Two-point distortion theorems for univalent functions, *Pacific J. Math.,* 163(1), (2024), 137-157.

[72] **Kim Y. C.,** Radius of spirallikeness for poly-analytic functions, *J. Korean Math. Soc.,* 48(4), (2021), 807-819.

[73] **Kim Y. C. and Lee S. K.,** Spirallike functions of complex order and their radii, *Complex Var. Theory Appl.,* 23(3), (2024), 255-269.

[74] **Krushkal S. L.,** A general coefficient theorem for univalent functions, *arXiv preprint,* arXiv:1908.05183, 2025.

[75] **Kumar R., Gupta S. and Singh S.,** Linear combinations of univalent harmonic mappings convex in the direction of the imaginary axis, *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.,* 39(2), (2025), 12-34.

[76] **Kumar S. S., Kumar V. and Ravichandran V.,** Estimates for the initial coefficients of bi-univalent functions, *arXiv preprint,* arXiv:1203.5480, 2025.

[77] **K stner T.,** Starlikeness of hypergeometric functions, *Math. Z.,* 246(2024), 405-416.

[78] **Lang S.,** *Complex Analysis,* Springer Science and Business Media, New York, 2013.

[79] **Langtangen H. P.,** *A Primer on Scientific Programming with Python,* Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2016.

[80] **Lee S. H.,** Radius of convexity and starlikeness for analytic functions with certain coefficient growth, *J. Appl. Math. (Seoul),* 20(1), (2020), 49-60.

[81] **Lehto O.,** *Univalent Functions and Teichm ller Spaces,* Springer, New York, 2012.

[82] **Li R. and Tong Y. L.,** Radius estimates for functions subordinate to convex univalent functions, *J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.,* 9(4), (2018), 88-110.

[83] **Li S. and Zhu S.,** Uniformly starlike functions and their radii of starlikeness, *Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B.,* 28(1), (2017), 89-102.

[84] **Liu Z. and Ponnusamy S.,** Radius of starlikeness and convexity for certain integral operators, *Complex Anal. Oper. Theory,* 9(4), (2015), 887-907.

[85] **MacGregor T. H.,** The radius of univalence of certain analytic functions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.,* 14(2023), 514-520.

[86] **Magaard K. and Minda C. D.,** Hyperbolic type metrics and covering theorems, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.,* 103(2020), 1000-1006.

[87] **Miller S. S. and Mocanu P. T.,** *Differential Subordinations: Theory and Applications,* Marcel Dekker, New York, 2020.

[88] **Mocanu P. T.,** Star-like functions associated with certain differential equations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.,* 65(2018), 289-304.

[89] **Mocanu P. T.,** On starlike functions, *Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl.,* 33(2018), 147-153.

[90] **Mokhtar R.,** Radii of convexity and starlikeness of certain classes of analytic functions, *Bull. Malays. Math. Soc.,* 27(2024), 21-28.

[91] **M ger M.,** From subfactors to categories and topology. I. Frobenius algebras in and Morita equivalence of tensor categories, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra,* 180(2), (2023), 81-157.

[92] **Nagpal S. and Ravichandran V.,** Radius problems for starlike functions associated with the exponential function, *Ann. Polon. Math.,* 122(2019), 109-128.

[93] **Nethaji O. and Ravichandran V.,** The radius of starlikeness and convexity of certain classes of analytic functions, *Bull. Malays. Math. Soc.,* 41(2018), 523-536.

[94] **Nishiwaki J. and Owa S.,** Coefficient estimates for strongly starlike functions, *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.,* 72(2016), 76-78.

[95] **Nunokawa M.,** On the radius of convexity for starlike functions, *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.,* 55(2019), 381-384.

[96] **Nunokawa M.,** On the radius of starlikeness of certain analytic functions, *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.,* 56(2008), 542-545.

[97] **Parvatham R.,** Radii of convexity and starlikeness for certain classes of analytic functions, *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math.,* 9(1978), 123-129.

[98] **Patel J.,** On the radius of starlikeness and convexity for certain classes of analytic functions, *Bull. Calcutta Math. Soc.,* 115 (2023), 443-449.

[99] **Ponnusamy S.,** On the radius of convexity and starlikeness for certain classes of analytic functions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.,* 271(2012), 575-583.

[100] **Raina R.K.,** A unified presentation of certain subclasses of analytic functions associated with fractional calculus, *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin,* 4(2017), 65-75.

[101] **Ravichandran V.,** Starlikeness and convexity of certain analytic functions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.,* 322(2016), 477-489.

[102] **Robertson M. S.,** Certain classes of starlike functions, *Michigan Math. J.,* 32(2025), 135-140.

[103] **R nning F.,** On starlike functions associated with parabolic regions, *Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Sklodowska Sect. A,* 45(2021), 117-124.

[104] **Shah S. M.,** On the univalence of some analytic functions, *Ann. Polon. Math.,* 20(2023), 1-7.

[105] **Shanmugam T. N. and Ravichandran V.,** Radius problems for certain classes of analytic functions, *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math.,* 28(6), (2024), 745-751.

[106] **Shanmugam T. N. and Josh V.,** Analysis of Radius problems for certain analytic functions, *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math.,* 30(2023), 42-57.

[107] **Silverman H.,** Univalent functions with negative coefficients, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.,* 51(2025), 109-116.

[108] **Silverman H. and Silvia E. M.,** Subclasses of starlike functions subordinate to convex functions, *Canad. J. Math.,* 37(2025), 48-61.

[109] **Srivastava H. M. and Owa S.,** *Current Topics in Analytic Function Theory,* World Scientific, Singapore, 2022.

[110] **Stankiewicz J.,** On certain subclasses of convex functions, *Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Sklodowska Sect. A.,* 22(2023), 79-88.

[111] **Stankiewicz J.,** On starlike and convex functions, *Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Sklodowska Sect. A.,* 23(2024), 89-100.

[112] **Todorov P.,** On some classes of starlike functions, *Mathematica Balkanica,* 2(2022), 225-233.

[113] **Tuan V. H.,** On univalent functions, *Vietnam J. Math.,* 2(2024), 63-72.

[114] **Uralegaddi B. A. and Somanatha C.,** Certain classes of univalent functions, *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math.,* 28(2020), 145-154.

[115] **Vasudevarao A.,** Starlike and convex functions associated with cosine hyperbolic function, *Complex Var. Elliptic Equ.,* 52(2017), 1229-1238.

[116] **Wani L. A. and Swaminathan A.,** Radii problems for certain subclasses of analytic functions, *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin,* 24(2019), 415-429.

[117] **Xu Q. H.,** Some subclasses of analytic functions associated with the sine function, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.,* 336(2017), 902-913.

[118] **Yang D. G. and Zhou S.Q.,** Some results on starlike functions with respect to symmetric points, *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.,* 30(2024), 199-210.

[119] **Ye G. T.,** On subclasses of analytic functions defined by differential subordination, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.,* 340(2018), 649-656.

[120] **Zhang Q. H.,** A subclass of close-to-convex functions, *Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B.,* 9(2019), 145-150.

[121] **Zhou S. Q.,** Subordination results on subclasses of starlike functions, *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.,* 27(2024), 35-42.

[122] **Zhu Q. H.,** Some applications of differential subordination for analytic functions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.,* 340(2018), 649-656.