Canad. J. Math. Vol. 73 (5), 2021 pp. 1347–1389
http://dx.doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541
© Canadian Mathematical Society 2020

Variation of constants formula and exponential dichotomy for nonautonomous non-densely defined Cauchy problems

Pierre Magal and Ousmane Seydi

Abstract. In this paper, we extend to the non-Hille–Yosida case a variation of constants formula for a nonautonomous and nonhomogeneous Cauchy problems first obtained by Gühring and Räbiger. By using this variation of constants formula, we derive a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of an exponential dichotomy for the evolution family generated by the associated nonautonomous homogeneous problem. We also prove a persistence result of the exponential dichotomy for small perturbations. Finally, we illustrate our results by considering two examples. The first example is a parabolic equation with nonlocal and nonautonomous boundary conditions, and the second example is an age-structured model that is a hyperbolic equation.

1 Introduction

In this article, we consider the following nonhomogeneous nonautonomous problem

$$\frac{du(t)}{dt} = (A + B(t))u(t) + f(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_0, \quad \text{and } u(t_0) = x \in \overline{D(A)}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $A : D(A) \subset X \to X$ is a linear operator (possibly with non-dense domain that is $\overline{D(A)} \subsetneq X$) on a Banach space $(X, \|\cdot\|)$, $\{B(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \subset \mathcal{L}(\overline{D(A)}, X)$ is a locally bounded and strongly continuous family of bounded linear operators, and $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, X)$.

Recall that the linear operator A is said to be a Hille–Yosida operator if there exist two constants $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and $M \geq 1$, such that the resolvent set of A contains $(\omega, +\infty)$ and the resolvent operator satisfies the usual condition

$$\left\|(\lambda I - A)^{-k}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \leq M(\lambda - \omega)^{-k}, \quad \forall \lambda > \omega, \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

In the following, we will not assume that A is a Hille–Yosida operator, since in Assumption 1.1(i) the operator norm is taken into $\overline{D(A)}$ instead of X.

Received by the editors March 28, 2019; revised April 4, 2020.
Published online on Cambridge Core June 29, 2020.
AMS subject classification: **37B55, 47D62, 34D09.**
Keywords: Nonautonomous Cauchy problem, non-densely defined Cauchy problem, exponential dichotomy.

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Assumption 1.1

(i) There exist two constants $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and $M \geq 1$, such that $(\omega, +\infty) \subset \rho(A)$ and

$$\left\|(\lambda I - A)^{-k}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}(\overline{D(A)})} \leq M\left(\lambda - \omega\right)^{-k}, \quad \forall \lambda > \omega,\ k \geq 1.$$

(ii) $\lim_{\lambda \to +\infty} (\lambda I - A)^{-1} x = 0,\ \forall x \in X.$

Set $X_0 := \overline{D(A)}$ and denote by A_0 the part of A on X_0 that is

$$A_0 x = Ax, \quad \forall x \in D(A_0) \quad \text{and} \quad D(A_0) := \{x \in D(A) : Ax \in X_0\}.$$

Then it is known that Assumption 1.1 is equivalent to $\rho(A) \neq \emptyset$, and A_0 is a densely defined Hille–Yosida linear operator on X_0 (see [9, Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2]). Therefore, A_0 generates a strongly continuous semigroup $\left\{T_{A_0}(t)\right\}_{t \geq 0} \subset \mathcal{L}(X_0)$.

An important and useful approach to investigating such a non-densely defined Cauchy problem (1.1) is to use the integrated semigroup theory. This notion was introduced first by Arendt [1, 2]. The integrated semigroup generated by A, namely $\left\{S_A(t)\right\}_{t \geq 0}$, is a strongly continuous family of bounded linear operators on X that is uniquely defined for each $t \geq 0$ and each $x \in X$ by

$$S_A(t)x = (\mu I - A_0) \int_0^t T_{A_0}(t)(\mu I - A)^{-1} x dt,$$

when $\mu > \omega$.

In order to assure the existence of mild solutions of (1.1), we need the following additional assumption.

Assumption 1.2 For each $\tau > 0$ and each $f \in C\left([0, \tau], X\right)$, we assume that there exists $u_f \in C\left([0, \tau], X_0\right)$, an integrated (or mild) solution of

$$\frac{du_f}{dt} = Au_f(t) + f(t), \quad \text{for } t \geq 0 \text{ and } u_f(0) = 0. \tag{1.2}$$

Moreover, we assume that there exists a nondecreasing map $\delta : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ such that

$$\|u_f(t)\| \leq \delta(t) \sup_{s \in [0,t]} \|f(s)\|,\ \forall t \geq 0, \tag{1.3}$$

with

$$\delta(t) \longrightarrow 0 as t \longrightarrow 0^+.$$

Let $f \in C([0, +\infty), X)$ be fixed. The existence of mild solutions in Assumption 1.2 is equivalent to the continuous time differentiability of the map $t \to (S_A * f)(t)$ from $[0, +\infty)$ into X. Moreover, by the uniqueness of the mild solutions of (1.2) (see Thieme [22]) , we have

$$u_f(t) = \frac{d}{dt}(S_A * f)(t), \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

when it exists. Define

$$(S_A \diamond f)(t) := \frac{d}{dt}(S_A * f)(t), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

The foregoing Assumption 1.2 needs justification. In fact, if A is a Hille–Yosida operator, then Assumption 1.2 holds true as long as $t \to f(t)$ is continuous (see Kellermann and Hieber [14]), and we have the estimate

$$\|(S_A \diamond f)(t)\| \leq M \int_0^t e^{\omega(t-s)} \|f(s)\| ds,$$

and Assumption 1.2 is clearly satisfied. As presented in Magal and Ruan [18], it is possible to obtain some necessary and sufficient conditions on the resolvent operator of A to obtain an L^p (for $p \in [1, +\infty)$) estimation on $\|(S_A \diamond f)(t)\|$. Such a result was also investigated by using the notion of bounded semi-p-variation (for $p \in [1, +\infty)$); see Thieme [23, Theorem 4.3]. Such a condition was also investigated by Ducrot, Magal, and Prevost [5] in the almost sectorial case.

The following assumption will be required in order to deal with the existence of integrated solutions for the nonhomogeneous equation (1.1).

Assumption 1.3 Let $\{B(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \subset \mathcal{L}(X_0, X)$ be a family of bounded linear operators. We assume that $t \to B(t)$ is strongly continuous from $\mathbb{R}$ into $\mathcal{L}(X_0, X)$; that is, for each $x \in X_0$, the map $t \to B(t)x$ is continuous from $\mathbb{R}$ into X. We assume that for each integer $n \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{t\in[-n,n]} \|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} < +\infty.$$

The foregoing assumptions will allow us to obtain the existence of an *evolution family* (see Definition 1.1) for the homogeneous Cauchy problem (1.4). Before proceeding, let us introduce the notation

$$\Delta := \{(t, s) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : t \geq s\}$$

and recall the notion of an evolution family.

Definition 1.1. Let $(Z, \|\cdot\|)$ be a Banach space. A two parameters family of bounded linear operators on Z, $\{U(t, s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$, is an *evolution family* if

(i) for each $t, r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ with $t \geq r \geq s$,

$$U(t, t) = I_{\mathcal{L}(Z)} \quad \text{and} \quad U(t, r)U(r, s) = U(t, s);$$

(ii) for each $x \in Z$, the map $(t, s) \to U(t, s)x$ is continuous from Δ into Z.

If in addition there exist two constants $\widehat{M} \geq 1$ and $\widehat{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|U(t, s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(Z)} \leq \widehat{M} e^{\widehat{\omega}(t-s)}, \quad \forall (t, s) \in \Delta,$$

we say that $\{U(t, s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$ is an exponentially bounded evolution family.

Consider the following homogeneous equation for each $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\frac{du(t)}{dt} = (A + B(t))u(t), \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0 \text{ and } u(t_0) = x \in X_0. \tag{1.4}$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

By using [18, Theorem 5.2] and [19, Proposition 4.1], we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 1.4 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 be satisfied. Then the Cauchy problem (1.4) generates a unique evolution family* $\{U_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta} \subset \mathcal{L}(X_0)$. *Moreover,* $U_B(\cdot,t_0)x_0 \in C([t_0,+\infty),X_0)$ *is the unique solution of the fixed point problem*

(1.5)
$$U_B(t,t_0)x_0 = T_{A_0}(t-t_0)x_0 + \frac{d}{dt}\int_{t_0}^{t} S_A(t-s)B(s)U_B(s,t_0)x_0 ds, \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

If we assume in addition that

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} < +\infty,$$

then the evolution family $\{U_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$ *is exponentially bounded.*

The following theorem provides an approximation formula of the solutions of equation (1.1). This is the first main result.

Theorem 1.5 (Variation of constants formula) *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 be satisfied. Then for each* $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, *each* $x_0 \in X_0$, *and each* $f \in C([t_0,+\infty],X)$, *the unique integrated solution* $u_f \in C([t_0,+\infty],X_0)$ *of (1.1) is given by*

$$u_f(t) = U_B(t,t_0)x_0 + \lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\int_{t_0}^{t} U_B(t,s)\lambda(\lambda-A)^{-1}f(s)ds, \quad \forall t \geq t_0, \tag{1.6}$$

where the limit exists in X_0. *Moreover, the convergence in (1.6) is uniform with respect to* $t, t_0 \in I$ *for each compact interval* $I \subset \mathbb{R}$.

This variation of constant formula has been proved by Gühring and Räbiger [11] when A is a Hille–Yosida operator by using extrapolated semigroups. Some extensions of this result have been proved in [4, 5] for nonautonomous Hille–Yosida operators $A(t)$.

The arguments used in [11] strongly use the fact that A is a Hille–Yosida operator. Actually, the estimation used is

$$\|\lambda(\lambda I - A)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \leq M\frac{\lambda}{\lambda-\omega}, \quad \forall \lambda > \max(0,\omega).$$

As a consequence when $\lambda \to +\infty$, we obtain

$$\limsup_{\lambda\to+\infty} \|\lambda(\lambda I - A)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} < +\infty.$$

In the context of non-Hille–Yosida operators, this last estimation is no longer true. Therefore, we need to find another approach to prove our result. In Sections 6 and 7, we will consider some examples of parabolic and hyperbolic equations that lead us to the non-Hille–Yosida case. For example, the linear operator A in Sections 6, which comes from a parabolic equation in L^p space, satisfies the following estimates (see

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lemma 6.3):

$$0 < \liminf_{\lambda\left(\in\mathbb{R}\right)\to+\infty} \lambda^{\frac{2p}{1+p}}\left\|\left(\lambda I - A\right)^{-1}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \leq \limsup_{\lambda\left(\in\mathbb{R}\right)\to+\infty} \lambda^{\frac{2p}{1+p}}\left\|\left(\lambda I - A\right)^{-1}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} < +\infty,$$

where $p \in [1, +\infty)$. It follows that when $p > 1$,

$$\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty} \lambda\left\|(\lambda I - A)^{-1}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} = +\infty.$$

Therefore, proving our results will not consist in adapting arguments from the Hille–Yosida case but require several intermediate technical lemmas in order to obtain the limit

$$\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty} \int_{t_0}^{t} U_B(t,s)\lambda\left(\lambda I - A\right)^{-1} f(s)ds, \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Our second main result deals with a necessary and sufficient condition for the evolution family (generated by the homogeneous problem associated with system (1.1)) to have an exponential dichotomy. To be more precise, let us first recall some definitions and state our result.

Definition 1.2. Let $(Z, \|\cdot\|_Z)$ be a Banach space. We say that $\{\Pi(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \subset \mathcal{L}(Z)$ is a strongly continuous family of projectors on Z if

$$\Pi(t)\Pi(t) = \Pi(t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R},$$

and for each $x \in Z$, $t \to \Pi(t)x$ is continuous from $\mathbb{R}$ into Z.

The following notion of exponential dichotomy will be used in this paper. We refer the reader to [7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 17] and the references therein.

Definition 1.3. Let $(Z, \|\cdot\|_Z)$ be a Banach space. We say that an evolution family $\{U(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta} \subset \mathcal{L}(Z)$ has an exponential dichotomy with constant $\kappa \geq 1$ and exponent $\beta > 0$ if and only if the following properties are satisfied.

(i) There exist two strongly continuous families of projectors $\{\Pi^+(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ and $\{\Pi^-(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ on Z such that

$$\Pi^+(t) + \Pi^-(t) = I_{\mathcal{L}(Z)}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then we define for all $t \geq s$,

$$U^+(t,s) := U(t,s)\Pi^+(s) \quad \text{and} \quad U^-(t,s) := U(t,s)\Pi^-(s).$$

(ii) For all $(t,s) \in \Delta$, we have $\Pi^+(t)U(t,s) = U(t,s)\Pi^+(s)$ and then $\Pi^-(t)U(t,s) = U(t,s)\Pi^-(s)$.

(iii) For all $(t,s) \in \Delta$, the restricted linear operator $U(t,s)\Pi^-(s)$ is invertible from $\Pi^-(s)(Z)$ into $\Pi^-(t)(Z)$ with inverse denoted by $\tilde{U}^-(s,t)$, and we set

$$U^-(s,t) := \tilde{U}^-(s,t)\Pi^-(t).$$

(iv) For all $(t,s) \in \Delta$,

$$\|U^+(t,s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(Z)} \leq \kappa e^{-\beta(t-s)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|U^-(s,t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(Z)} \leq \kappa e^{-\beta(t-s)}.$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the foregoing Definition 1.3, + and − are used to refer to the *forward time* and the *backward time*, respectively.

Definition 1.4. Let $f \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, X)$ be fixed. A function $u \in C(\mathbb{R}, X_0)$ is an integrated solution (or a weak solution) of (1.1) if and only if for each $t \geq t_0$,

$$\int_{t_0}^{t} u(r)dr \in D(A)$$

and

$$u(t) = u(t_0) + A\int_{t_0}^{t} u(r)dr + \int_{t_0}^{t} \big[B(r)u(r) + f(r)\big]dr.$$

We will say that u is a mild solution of (1.1) if

$$u(t) = T_{A_0}(t - t_0)u(t_0) + \frac{d}{dt}\int_{t_0}^{t} S_A(t - s)\big[B(s)u(s) + f(s)\big]ds, \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

Actually, weak and mild notions of solutions are equivalent (see [18, Corollary 2.12.]). Then our second main result splits into the following two theorems.

Theorem 1.6 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 be satisfied. Assume, in addition, that*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} < +\infty.$$

Then the following assertions are equivalent.

(i) *The evolution family* $\{U_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$ *has an exponential dichotomy.*
(ii) *For each bounded function* $f \in C(\mathbb{R}, X)$*, there exists a unique bounded integrated solution* $u \in C(\mathbb{R}, X_0)$ *of* (1.1).

Theorem 1.7 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 be satisfied. Assume, in addition, that*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} < +\infty.$$

If U_B *has an exponential dichotomy with exponent* $\beta > 0$*, then for each* $\eta \in [0, \beta)$ *and each* $f \in BC^{\eta}(\mathbb{R}, X)$ *with*

$$BC^{\eta}(\mathbb{R}, X) := \Big\{ f \in C(\mathbb{R}, X) : \|f\|_{\eta} := \sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} e^{-\eta|t|}\|f(t)\| < +\infty \Big\},$$

there exists a unique integrated solution $u \in BC^{\eta}(\mathbb{R}, X_0)$ *of* (1.1) *that is given for each* $t \in \mathbb{R}$ *by*

(1.7)
$$u_f(t) = \lim_{\lambda\to+\infty} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{t} U_B^{+}(t,s)\lambda(\lambda - A)^{-1}f(s)ds - \int_{t}^{+\infty} U_B^{-}(t,s)\lambda(\lambda - A)^{-1}f(s)ds \right].$$

Moreover, the following properties hold true.

(i) *The limit* (1.7) *exists uniformly on compact subsets of* $\mathbb{R}$.
(ii) *If* f *is bounded and uniformly continuous with relatively compact range, then the limit* (1.7) *is uniform on* $\mathbb{R}$.

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(iii) *For each* $v \in (-\beta, 0)$, *there exists* $C(v, \kappa, \beta) > 0$ *such that*

$$\|u_f\|_\eta \le C(v, \kappa, \beta)\|f\|_\eta, \quad \forall \eta \in [0, -v].$$

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some results concerning integrated semigroups and define the notion of integrated solutions for system (1.1). Section 3 is devoted to a the proof of Theorem 1.5 concerning the variation of constants formula. In Section 4, we prove some uniform convergence results. Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 are proved in Section 5. Finally, in Sections 6 and 7, we present two examples to illustrate our results.

2 Preliminaries

In the following lemma, we summarize some results proved in Magal and Ruan [20, Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2].

Lemma 2.1 *Let Assumption 1.1 be satisfied. Then we have*

$$\rho(A) = \rho(A_0).$$

Moreover, we have the following properties.

(i) *For each* $\lambda > \omega$,

$$D(A_0) = (\lambda I - A)^{-1}X_0 \quad \text{and} \quad (\lambda I - A)^{-1}_{|X_0} = (\lambda I - A_0)^{-1}.$$

(ii) $\overline{D(A_0)} = X_0$.

(iii) $\lim_{\lambda \to +\infty} \lambda(\lambda I - A)^{-1}x = x, \ \forall x \in X_0$.

Remark 2.2. It can be easily proved that $\lim_{\lambda \to +\infty} \lambda(\lambda I - A)^{-1}x = x$ uniformly for x in a relatively compact subset of X_0. This property will be used often in this paper.

Note that if $(A, D(A))$ satisfies Assumption 1.1, then by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\left\|(\lambda I - A_0)^{-k}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0)} \le M(\lambda - \omega)^{-k}, \quad \forall \lambda > \omega, \ k \ge 1 \text{ and } \overline{D(A_0)} = X_0.$$

Therefore, $(A_0, D(A_0))$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup $\{T_{A_0}(t)\}_{t \ge 0} \subset \mathcal{L}(X_0)$ with

$$\|T_{A_0}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0)} \le Me^{\omega t}, \quad \forall t \ge 0.$$

The characterization of an integrated semigroup is summarized in the following definition.

Definition 2.1. Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a Banach space. A family of bounded linear operators $\{S(t)\}_{t \ge 0}$ on X is called an integrated semigroup if

(i) $S(0)x = 0, \forall x \in X$;

(ii) $t \to S(t)x$ is continuous on $[0, +\infty)$ for each $x \in X$;

(iii) for each $t \ge 0$, $S(t)$ satisfies

$$S(s)S(t) = \int_0^s [S(r + t) - S(r)]dr, \quad \forall s \ge 0.$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The integrated semigroup $\{S(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ is said to be non-degenerate if

$$S(t)x = 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0 \Longrightarrow x = 0.$$

Moreover, we will say that $(A, D(A))$ generates an integrated semigroup $\{S_A(t)\}_{t\geq 0} \subset \mathcal{L}(X, X_0)$ that is

$$x \in D(A) \quad \text{and} \quad y = Ax \Longleftrightarrow S_A(t)x = tx + \int_0^t S(s)y ds, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

The following result is well known in the context of integrated semigroups.

Proposition 2.3 *Let Assumption 1.1 be satisfied. Then $(A, D(A))$ generates a uniquely determined non-degenerate exponentially bounded integrated semigroup with*

$$\|S_A(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \leq \widehat{M} e^{\hat{\omega} t},$$

where $\widehat{M} > 0$, $\widehat{\omega} > 0$, and $(\widehat{\omega}, +\infty) \in \rho(A)$. Moreover, the following properties hold.

(i) *For each $x \in X$, each $t \geq 0$, and each $\mu > \omega$, $S_A(t)x$ is given by*

$$S_A(t)x = (\mu I - A_0) \int_0^t T_{A_0}(s) ds (\mu I - A)^{-1},$$

or equivalently

$$S_A(t)x = \mu \int_0^t T_{A_0}(s)(\mu I - A)^{-1} x ds + [I - T_{A_0}(t)](\mu I - A)^{-1} x.$$

(ii) *The map $t \to S_A(t)x$ is continuously differentiable if and only if $x \in X_0$ and*

$$\frac{dS_A(t)x}{dt} = T_{A_0}(t)x, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in X_0.$$

Next we give the notion of integrated solutions for system (1.1).

Definition 2.2. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}((t_0, +\infty), X)$ be fixed. A function $u \in C([t_0, +\infty), X_0)$ is an integrated (or mild) solution of (1.1) if and only if for each $t \geq t_0$,

$$\int_{t_0}^t u(r) dr \in D(A)$$

and

$$u(t) = x + A \int_{t_0}^t u(r) dr + \int_{t_0}^t [B(r)u(r) + f(r)] dr.$$

The following result is a direct consequence of [19, Theorem 2.10].

Theorem 2.4 *Let Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 be satisfied. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ be fixed. Then for all $f \in C([t_0, +\infty), X)$, the map $t \to (S_A * f(t_0 + \cdot))(t - t_0)$ is continuously differentiable from $[t_0, +\infty)$ into X and satisfies the following properties.*

(i) $(S_A * f(t_0 + \cdot))(t - t_0) \in D(A)$, $\forall t \geq t_0$.

(ii) *If we set*

$$u(t) := (S_A \diamond f(t_0 + \cdot))(t - t_0), \quad \forall t \geq t_0,$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

then the following hold:

$$u(t) = A\int_{t_0}^{t} u(s)ds + \int_{t_0}^{t} f(s)ds, \qquad \forall t \geq t_0,$$
$$\|u(t)\| \leq \delta(t-t_0)\sup_{s\in[t_0,t]}\|f(s)\|, \qquad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

(iii) *For all* $\lambda \in (\omega, +\infty)$, *we have for each* $t \geq t_0$,

$$(\lambda I - A)^{-1}\frac{d}{dt}(S_A * f(t_0+\cdot))(t-t_0) = \int_{t_0}^{t} T_{A_0}(t-s)(\lambda I - A)^{-1}f(s)ds.$$

As a consequence of Theorem 2.4(iii), we obtain the following approximation formula:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{t_0}^{t} S_A(t-s)f(s)ds = \lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\int_{t_0}^{t} T_{A_0}(t-s)\lambda(\lambda I - A)^{-1}f(s)ds, \quad \forall t \geq t_0. \tag{2.1}$$

It also follows that for each $t, h \geq 0$,

$$(S_A \diamond f)(t+h) = T_{A_0}(h)(S_A \diamond f)(t) + (S_A \diamond f(t+\cdot))(h). \tag{2.2}$$

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.4, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5 *Let Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 be satisfied. Let* $f \in C(\mathbb{R}, X)$. *Then the map* $(t, t_0) \to (S_A \diamond f(t_0+\cdot))(t-t_0)$ *is continuous from* Δ *into* X.

Proof Let $(t, t_0), (s, s_0) \in \Delta$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} I &:= \big(S_A \diamond f(t_0+\cdot)\big)(t-t_0) - \big(S_A \diamond f(s_0+\cdot)\big)(s-s_0) \\ &= \big(S_A \diamond \big[f(t_0+\cdot) - f(s_0+\cdot)\big]\big)(t-t_0) \\ &\quad + (S_A \diamond f(s_0+\cdot))(t-t_0) - (S_A \diamond f(s_0+\cdot))(s-s_0); \end{aligned}$$

hence, by using (2.2),

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \big(S_A \diamond \big[f(t_0+\cdot) - f(s_0+\cdot)\big]\big)(t-t_0) \\ &\quad + \big[T_{A_0}\big((t-t_0)-(s-s_0)\big) - I\big]\big(S_A \diamond f(s_0+\cdot)\big)(s-s_0) \\ &\quad + (S_A \diamond f(s_0+(s-s_0)+\cdot))\big((t-t_0)-(s-s_0)\big) \end{aligned}$$

whenever $t - t_0 \geq s - s_0$. The result follows by using the uniform continuity of f on bounded intervals. ∎

By using [19, Proposition 4.1], we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 2.6 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 be satisfied. Let* $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ *be fixed. Then for each* $x_0 \in X_0$ *and* $f \in C([t_0, +\infty), X)$, *there exists a unique integrated solution* $u_f \in C([t_0, +\infty), X_0)$ *of (1.1) given by*

$$u_f(t) = T_{A_0}(t-t_0)x_0 + \frac{d}{dt}\big(S_A * \big((Bu_f)(t_0+\cdot) + f(t_0+\cdot)\big)(t-t_0), \quad \forall t \geq t_0,$$

or equivalently

$$u_f(t) = T_{A_0}(t-t_0)x_0 + (S_A \diamond ((Bu_f)(t_0+\cdot) + f(t_0+\cdot))(t-t_0), \quad \forall t \geq t_0,$$

where we have used the notation $(Bu_f)(t) := B(t)u_f(t)$ *for every* $t \geq t_0$.

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The next result is due to Magal and Ruan [19, Proposition 2.14] and is one of the main tools in studying integrated solutions for non-Hille–Yosida operators.

Proposition 2.7 *Let Assumption 1.1 be satisfied. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given and fixed. Then, for each $\tau_\varepsilon > 0$ satisfying $M\delta(\tau_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$, we have*

$$\left\| \frac{d}{dt}(S_A * f)(t) \right\| \leq C(\varepsilon, \gamma) \sup_{s\in[0,t]} e^{\gamma(t-s)} \|f(s)\|, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

whenever $\gamma \in (\omega, +\infty)$, $f \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$ with

$$C(\varepsilon, \gamma) := \frac{2\varepsilon \max(1, e^{-\gamma\tau_\varepsilon})}{1 - e^{(\omega-\gamma)\tau_\varepsilon}}.$$

3 A Variation of Constants Formula

In this section, we will prove the first main result of this paper. It deals with the representation of the integrated solution of (1.1) in term of the evolution family $\{U_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$. This result generalizes [11, Theorem 2.2] to the context of non-Hille–Yosida operators. The proof will be given by using several technical lemmas. Note that a direct consequence of Theorem 1.5 is the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 be satisfied. Then for each $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, each $x_0 \in X_0$, and each $f \in C([t_0, +\infty), X_0)$, the unique integrated solution $u_f \in C([t_0, +\infty), X_0)$ of (1.1) is given by*

$$u_f(t) = U_B(t, t_0)x_0 + \int_{t_0}^{t} U_B(t,s)f(s)ds, \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

Next we prove some technical lemmas that will be crucial for the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Lemma 3.2 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 be satisfied. Then for each $h \in C(\Delta, X)$, the following equality holds:*

$$\int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{d}{dt}\left[\int_s^t S_A(t-r)h(r,s)dr \right] ds = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{t_0}^{t} S_A(t-r)\left[\int_{t_0}^{r} h(r,s)ds \right] dr$$

for all $(t, t_0) \in \Delta$.

For convenience, we will use the following notation:

$$R_\lambda(A) := (\lambda I - A)^{-1}, \quad \forall \lambda \in \rho(A).$$

Proof Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ be fixed. Let $s \geq t_0$ be given. Then observing that $h(\cdot, s) \in C([s, +\infty), X)$, one can apply Theorem 2.4 to obtain for all $t \geq s$ and $\lambda > \omega$ that

$$\int_s^t T_{A_0}(t-r)\lambda R_\lambda(A)h(r,s)dr = \lambda R_\lambda(A) \frac{d}{dt} \int_s^t S_A(t-r)h(r,s)dr. \tag{3.1}$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thus, integrating both sides of (3.1) and using Fubini's theorem, we obtain for each $t \geq t_0$ and $\lambda > \omega$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda R_\lambda(A)\int_{t_0}^{t}\left[\frac{d}{dt}\int_s^t S_A(t-r)h(r,s)dr\right]ds &= \int_{t_0}^{t}\left[\int_s^t T_{A_0}(t-r)\lambda R_\lambda(A)h(r,s)dr\right]ds\\ &= \int_{t_0}^{t}\left[\int_{t_0}^{r} T_{A_0}(t-r)\lambda R_\lambda(A)h(r,s)ds\right]dr\\ &= \int_{t_0}^{t} T_{A_0}(t-r)\lambda R_\lambda(A)\left[\int_{t_0}^{r} h(r,s)ds\right]dr.\end{aligned}$$

Now, observing that

$$\int_{t_0}^{t}\left[\frac{d}{dt}\int_s^t S_A(t-r)h(r,s)dr\right]ds \in X_0, \quad \forall t \geq t_0,$$

the result follows, since we have

$$\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\lambda R_\lambda(A)\int_{t_0}^{t}\left[\frac{d}{dt}\int_s^t S_A(t-r)h(r,s)dr\right]ds = \int_{t_0}^{t}\left[\frac{d}{dt}\int_s^t S_A(t-r)h(r,s)dr\right]ds$$

for all $t \geq t_0$ and (see equality (2.1))

$$\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\int_{t_0}^{t} T_{A_0}(t-r)\lambda R_\lambda(A)\left[\int_{t_0}^{r} h(r,s)ds\right]dr = \frac{d}{dt}\int_{t_0}^{t} S_A(t-r)\left[\int_{t_0}^{r} h(r,s)ds\right]dr$$

for all $t \geq t_0$. ∎

Using Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 2.7, we can prove the following technical lemma.

Lemma 3.3 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 be satisfied. Let $f \in C(\mathbb{R}, X)$. Define for each $\lambda > \omega$ and $(t, t_0) \in \Delta$,*

$$\begin{aligned}v_\lambda(t,t_0) &:= \int_{t_0}^{t} U_B(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds,\\ w(t,t_0) &:= \frac{d}{dt}\int_{t_0}^{t} S_A(t-s)f(s)ds = \big(S_A \diamond f(t_0+\cdot)\big)(t-t_0).\end{aligned}$$

Then we have the following properties.

(i) *For each $\lambda > \omega$ and $(t, t_0) \in \Delta$,*

$$v_\lambda(t,t_0) = \frac{d}{dt}\int_{t_0}^{t} S_A(t-r)B(r)v_\lambda(r,t_0)dr + \lambda R_\lambda(A)w(t,t_0), \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

(ii) *If, in addition, $\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} < +\infty$, then there exists a constant $\gamma > \max(0,\omega)$ such that for each $\lambda > \omega$ and $(t, t_0) \in \Delta$,*

$$\sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{-\gamma s}\|v_\lambda(s,t_0)\| \leq 2 \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{-\gamma s}\|\lambda R_\lambda(A)w(s,t_0)\|,$$

and since $w(s, t_0) \in X_0$, we have

$$\|\lambda R_\lambda(A)w(s,t_0)\| \leq \frac{M|\lambda|}{\lambda-\omega}\|w(s,t_0)\|, \quad \forall s \in [t_0,t].$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof (i) By using formula (1.5) , we obtain for each $\lambda > \omega$ and $t \geq t_0$ that

$$v_\lambda(t,t_0) = \int_{t_0}^{t} T_{A_0}(t-s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds + \int_{t_0}^{t}\left[\frac{d}{dt}\int_s^t S_A(t-r)B(r)U_B(r,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)dr\right]ds.$$

Now note that from Theorem 2.4, we have for each $\lambda > \omega$,

$$\int_{t_0}^{t} T_{A_0}(t-s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds = \lambda R_\lambda(A)\frac{d}{dt}\int_{t_0}^{t} S_A(t-s)f(s)ds, \quad \forall t \geq t_0, \tag{3.2}$$

and from Lemma 3.2 with $h(r,s) = B(r)U_B(r,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)$

$$\int_{t_0}^{t}\left[\frac{d}{dt}\int_s^t S_A(t-r)h(r,s)dr\right]ds = \frac{d}{dt}\int_{t_0}^{t} S_A(t-r)v_\lambda(r,t_0)dr, \quad \forall t \geq t_0. \tag{3.3}$$

Then (i) follows by combining (3.2) and (3.3).

(ii) To do this we will make use of Proposition 2.7. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given such that

$$2\varepsilon \sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} < \frac{1}{4}. \tag{3.4}$$

Let $\tau_\varepsilon > 0$ be given with $M\delta(\tau_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$. By combining Proposition 2.7 with (i) , we obtain for each $\lambda > \omega$ and $t \geq t_0$ that

$$\|v_\lambda(t,t_0)\| \leq C(\varepsilon,\gamma) \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]}\left[e^{\gamma(t-s)}\|B(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)}\|v_\lambda(s,t_0)\|\right] + \|\lambda R_\lambda(A)w(t,t_0)\|,$$

whenever $\gamma \in (\omega, +\infty)$ with

$$C(\varepsilon,\gamma) := \frac{2\varepsilon \max(1, e^{-\gamma\tau_\varepsilon})}{1-e^{(\omega-\gamma)\tau_\varepsilon}}, \tag{3.5}$$

so that

$$\sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{-\gamma s}\|v_\lambda(s,t_0)\| \leq C(\varepsilon,\gamma)\sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}}\|B(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{-\gamma s}\|v_\lambda(s,t_0)\| + \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]}\|\lambda R_\lambda(A)w(s,t_0)\|.$$

By using (3.5) and (3.4), it is easily seen that one can choose $\gamma > \max(0,\omega)$ large enough such that

$$0 \leq C(\varepsilon,\gamma)\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} < \frac{1}{2},$$

and (ii) follows. ∎

The following lemma will be needed in the sequel.

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lemma 3.4 *Let Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 be satisfied. Then for each $a, c \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a < c$ and each $x \in X$, the map $t \to (S_A * x\mathbb{1}_{[a,c)}(\cdot))(t)$ is differentiable on $[0, +\infty)$ and*

$$\frac{d}{dt}(S_A * x\mathbb{1}_{[a,c)}(\cdot))(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } c \le 0 \text{ or } t \le a, \\ S_A(t - a^+)x & \text{if } c > 0 \text{ and } t \in [a, c), \\ T_{A_0}(t - c)S_A(c - a^+)x & \text{if } c > 0 \text{ and } t \ge c, \end{cases}$$

with $a^+ := \max(0, a)$.

Proof The proof is straightforward. ∎

Now we have all the materials to prove Theorem 1.5.

Proof Since the proof is trivial when $f(t) = 0$, it is sufficient to prove our theorem for $x_0 = 0$. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ be fixed. Recalling for each $\lambda > \omega$,

$$v_\lambda(t, t_0) = \int_{t_0}^{t} U_B(t, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds, \quad \forall t \ge t_0,$$

we will show that the limit

$$\tilde{v}(t, t_0) := \lim_{\lambda \to +\infty} v_\lambda(t, t_0), \quad \forall t \ge t_0, \tag{3.6}$$

is well defined and is an integrated solution of

$$\frac{dv(t)}{dt} = [A + B(t)]v(t) + f(t), \quad t \ge t_0 \quad \text{and} \quad v(t_0) = 0. \tag{3.7}$$

First of all, note that by Lemma 2.6, problem (3.7) admits a unique integrated solution $v(\cdot, t_0) \in C([t_0, +\infty), X_0)$ satisfying

$$v(t, t_0) = \Big(S_A \diamond (Bv(\cdot, t_0))(t_0 + \cdot)\Big)(t - t_0) + (S_A \diamond f(t_0 + \cdot))(t - t_0), \quad \forall t \ge t_0, \tag{3.8}$$

where we used the notation $(Bv(\cdot, t_0))(t) = B(t)v(t, t_0)$ for every $t \ge t_0$. Furthermore, by Lemma 3.3, we also have for each $\lambda > \omega$ and each $t \ge t_0$,

$$v_\lambda(t, t_0) = \frac{d}{dt}\int_{t_0}^{t} S_A(t - r)B(r)v_\lambda(r, t_0)dr + \lambda R_\lambda(A)w(t, t_0), \quad \forall t \ge t_0, \tag{3.9}$$

with

$$w(t, t_0) = \frac{d}{dt}\int_{t_0}^{t} S_A(t - s)f(s)ds = \Big(S_A \diamond f(t_0 + \cdot)\Big)(t - t_0), \quad \forall t \ge t_0. \tag{3.10}$$

Then (3.8) and (3.9) can be rewritten, for each $\lambda > \omega$, as the following system:

$$\begin{cases} v_\lambda(t, t_0) = \Big(S_A \diamond \big(Bv_\lambda(\cdot, t_0)\big)(t_0 + \cdot)\Big)(t - t_0) + \lambda R_\lambda(A)w(t, t_0), & t \ge t_0, \\ v(t, t_0) = \Big(S_A \diamond \big(Bv(\cdot, t_0)\big)(t_0 + \cdot)\Big)(t - t_0) + w(t, t_0), & t \ge t_0, \end{cases} \tag{3.11}$$

where we used the notation $(Bv_\lambda(\cdot, t_0))(t) = B(t)v_\lambda(t, t_0)$ for every $t \ge t_0$.

Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$. To show that (3.6) exists uniformly for $t \ge t_0$ in I, we will make use of Proposition 2.7. We have from (3.11) that for each $\lambda > \omega$ and

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

each $t \geq t_0$

$$\begin{aligned} v_\lambda(t,t_0) - v(t,t_0) &= \Big(S_A \diamond \big(B\big(v_\lambda(\cdot,t_0) - v(\cdot,t_0)\big)\big)(t_0+\cdot)\Big)(t-t_0) \\ &\quad + \big[\lambda R_\lambda(A) - I\big]w(t,t_0), \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

with the notation

$$\Big(B\big(v_\lambda(\cdot,t_0) - v(\cdot,t_0)\big)\Big)(t) := B(t)\big(v_\lambda(t,t_0) - v(t,t_0)\big), \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given such that

$$2\varepsilon \sup_{t\in I} \|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} < \frac{1}{4}. \tag{3.13}$$

Let $\tau_\varepsilon > 0$ be given with $M\delta(\tau_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$. Then by using (3.12) and Proposition 2.7, we obtain for each $\lambda > \omega$ and each $t \geq t_0$ with $t, t_0 \in I$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_\lambda(t,t_0) - v(t,t_0)\| &\leq C(\varepsilon,\gamma) \sup_{\substack{s\geq t_0 \\ s,t_0\in I}} \left[e^{\gamma(t-s)} \|B(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} \|v_\lambda(s,t_0) - v(s,t_0)\|\right] \\ &\quad + \big\|[\lambda R_\lambda(A) - I]w(t,t_0)\big\|, \end{aligned}$$

whenever $\gamma \in (\omega, +\infty)$ with

$$C(\varepsilon,\gamma) := \frac{2\varepsilon \max(1, e^{-\gamma\tau_\varepsilon})}{1 - e^{(\omega-\gamma)\tau_\varepsilon}},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\substack{s\geq t_0 \\ s,t_0\in I}} e^{-\gamma s}\big\|v_\lambda(s,t_0) - v(s,t_0)\big\| &\leq C(\varepsilon,\gamma) \sup_{s\in I} \big\|B(s)\big\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} \\ &\quad \times \sup_{\substack{s\geq t_0 \\ s,t_0\in I}} e^{-\gamma s}\big\|v_\lambda(s,t_0) - v(s,t_0)\big\| + \sup_{\substack{s\geq t_0 \\ s,t_0\in I}} \big\|[\lambda R_\lambda(A) - I]w(s,t_0)\big\|. \end{aligned}$$

By using (3.13), one can choose $\gamma > 0$ large enough such that

$$0 \leq C(\varepsilon,\gamma) \sup_{t\in I} \|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} < \frac{1}{2},$$

providing for all $\lambda > \omega$, that

$$\sup_{\substack{s\geq t_0 \\ s,t_0\in I}} e^{-\gamma s}\|v_\lambda(s,t_0) - v(s,t_0)\| \leq 2 \sup_{\substack{s\geq t_0 \\ s,t_0\in I}} e^{-\gamma s}\big\|[\lambda R_\lambda(A) - I]w(s,t_0)\big\|.$$

Hence, recalling that the limit $\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty} \lambda R_\lambda(A)y = y$ is uniform on relatively compact sets of X_0 and by observing that $w(\cdot,\cdot)$ maps $I \times I$ into a relatively compact set of X_0, we obtain

$$\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty} \sup_{\substack{s\geq t_0 \\ s,t_0\in I}} e^{-\gamma s}\big\|[\lambda R_\lambda(A) - I]w(s,t_0)\big\| = 0,$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that is

$$\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\sup_{\substack{s\geq t_0\\ s,t_0\in I}} e^{-\gamma s}\left\|v_\lambda(s,t_0)-v(s,t_0)\right\|=0.$$

Since I is bounded, this implies

$$\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\sup_{\substack{s\geq t_0\\ s,t_0\in I}} \left\|v_\lambda(s,t_0)-v(s,t_0)\right\|=0.$$

The proof is complete. ∎

4 A Uniform Convergence Result

Let $BUC(\mathbb{R},X)$ be the space of all bounded and uniformly continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}$. The next proposition gives a uniform convergence result subject to f belonging to an appropriate subspace of $BUC(\mathbb{R},X)$.

Proposition 4.1 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 be satisfied. Assume in addition that*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)}<+\infty.$$

Let $f\in BUC(\mathbb{R},X)$ with relatively compact range. Then, for any fixed $t_0>0$, the limit

$$\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\int_{t-t_0}^{t}U_B(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds,$$

exists uniformly for $t\in\mathbb{R}$.

Proof Let $t_0>0$ be fixed. Recall that for each $\lambda>\omega$, we have

$$v_\lambda(t,t-t_0)=\int_{t-t_0}^{t}U_B(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds,\quad\forall t\in\mathbb{R}.$$

Thus, by using similar arguments in the proof of Lemma 3.3(ii), we have for each $t\in\mathbb{R}$, each $\lambda>\omega$, and $\mu>\omega$ that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{s\in[t-t_0,t]}e^{-\gamma s}\|v_\lambda(s,s-t_0)-v_\mu(s,s-t_0)\|\\&\quad\leq 2\sup_{s\in[t-t_0,t]}e^{-\gamma s}\|[\lambda R_\lambda(A)-\mu R_\mu(A)]w(s,s-t_0)\|,\end{aligned}$$

with $\gamma>\max(0,\omega)$ (large enough) and

$$w(t_1,t_2)=\big(S_A\diamond f(t_2+\cdot)\big)(t_1-t_2),\quad\forall(t_1,t_2)\in\Delta.$$

Hence, for each $t\in\mathbb{R}$, each $\lambda>\omega$, and $\mu>\omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|v_\lambda(t,t-t_0)-v_\mu(t,t-t_0)\|&\leq 2\sup_{s\in[t-t_0,t]}e^{\gamma(t-s)}\|[\lambda R_\lambda(A)-\mu R_\mu(A)]w(s,s-t_0)\|\\&\leq 2\,e^{\gamma t_0}\sup_{s\in[t-t_0,t]}\|[\lambda R_\lambda(A)-\mu R_\mu(A)]w(s,s-t_0)\|.\end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Then to prove our proposition, it is sufficient to show that

$$\lim_{\lambda,\mu\to+\infty}\sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}}\left\|[\lambda R_\lambda(A)-\mu R_\mu(A)]w(s,s-t_0)\right\|=0.$$

This can be achieved by proving that $w(\cdot,\cdot-t_0)$ maps $\mathbb{R}$ into a relatively compact subset of X_0. To do so we will prove that for any $\varepsilon>0$, there exists a relatively compact set K such that

$$w(t,t-t_0)\in K+c\varepsilon B_{X_0}(0,1),\quad \forall t\in\mathbb{R},$$

for some constant $c>0$ and $B_{X_0}(0,1)$ the closed unit ball of X_0.

Let $\varepsilon>0$ be given and fixed. Then since f has its range in a relatively compact subset of X, there exist $\eta=\frac{t_0}{n}>0$, with $n\in\mathbb{N}\backslash\{0\}$ and a function $g:\mathbb{R}\to X$ such that g is constant on each interval $[k\eta,(k+1)\eta)$, $k\in\mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, the range of g is contained in a finite set $K_0\subset X$ and

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\left\|f(t)-g(t)\right\|\le\varepsilon.$$

Note that g can be written as

$$g(t)=\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}x_k\mathbb{1}_{[k\eta,k\eta+\eta)}(t),\quad \forall t\in\mathbb{R},$$

with $x_k\in K_0$ for all $k\in\mathbb{Z}$. Then by Lemma 3.4, it is easy to see that $t\to(S_A*g)(t)$ is differentiable on $[0,+\infty)$, and we can write

$$w(t,t-t_0)=\big(S_A\diamond g(t-t_0+\cdot)\big)(t_0)+\big(S_A\diamond(f-g)(t-t_0+\cdot)\big)(t_0),\quad \forall t\in\mathbb{R}.$$

Let $t\in\mathbb{R}$ be fixed. Note that one can write

$$t=k_0\eta+r,\ \text{ with } r\in[0,\eta)\text{ and } k_0\in\mathbb{Z},$$

providing that (recalling $t_0=n\eta$)

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(S_A\diamond g(t-t_0+\cdot)\big)(t_0)&=\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^{t_0}S_A(t_0-s)g(t-t_0+s)ds\\
&=\frac{d}{dt}\int_{t-t_0}^{t}S_A(t-s)g(s)ds\\
&=\frac{d}{dt}\int_{(k_0-n)\eta+r}^{k_0\eta+r}S_A(t-s)g(s)ds\\
&=\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{(k_0-i-1)\eta+r}^{(k_0-i)\eta+r}S_A(k_0\eta+r-s)g(s)ds\\
&=\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\frac{d}{dt}\Bigg[\int_{(k_0-i-1)\eta+r}^{(k_0-i)\eta}S_A(k_0\eta+r-s)x_{k_0-i-1}ds\\
&\qquad+\int_{(k_0-i)\eta}^{(k_0-i)\eta+r}S_A(k_0\eta+r-s)x_{k_0-i}ds\Bigg],
\end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\big(S_A \diamond g(t-t_0+\cdot)\big)(t_0) &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\big[S_A(i\eta+\eta)-S_A(i\eta+r)\big]x_{k_0-i-1}\\ &\quad+\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\big[S_A(i\eta+r)-S_A(i\eta)\big]x_{k_0-i}\\ &=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\big[S_A(i\eta)-S_A(i\eta-\eta+r)\big]x_{k_0-i}\\ &\quad+\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\big[S_A(i\eta+r)-S_A(i\eta)\big]x_{k_0-i}\\ &=\big[S_A(n\eta)-S_A(n\eta-\eta+r)\big]x_{k_0-n}\\ &\quad+\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\big[S_A(i\eta+r)-S_A(i\eta-\eta+r)\big]x_{k_0-i}+S_A(r)x_{k_0}\\ &=T_{A_0}(n\eta-\eta+r)S_A(\eta-r)x_{k_0-n}\\ &\quad+\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}T_{A_0}(i\eta-\eta+r)S_A(\eta)x_{k_0-i}+S_A(r)x_{k_0},\end{aligned}$$

so that we can claim that $t\to(S_A\diamond g(t-t_0+\cdot))(t_0)$ has its range in

$$K=\left\{\sum_{k=0}^{n}T_{A_0}(s_k)S_A(l_k)x_k : 0\le s_k,l_k\le t_0 \text{ and } x_k\in K_0,\ k=0,\dots,n\right\}.$$

Then recalling that

$$(t,x)\in[0,+\infty)\times X\longrightarrow S(t)x \quad\text{and}\quad (t,x)\in[0,+\infty)\times X_0\longrightarrow T(t)x$$

are continuous, K is clearly compact.

To complete the proof, it remains to give an estimate of $z(\cdot,\cdot-t_0)$ with

$$z(t_1,t_2):=\big(S_A\diamond(f-g)(t_2+\cdot)\big)(t_1-t_2),\quad \forall(t_1,t_2)\in\Delta.$$

By using Proposition 2.7, one obtains

$$\|z(t_1,t_2)\|\le C(1,\gamma_0)\sup_{t\in[0,t_1-t_2]}e^{\gamma_0(t_1-t_2-t)}\|f(t_2+t)-g(t_2+t)\|,\quad\forall(t_1,t_2)\in\Delta,$$

with $\gamma_0>\max(0,\omega)$, $M\delta(\tau_1)\le 1$ and

$$C(1,\gamma_0):=\frac{2\max(1,e^{-\gamma_0\tau_1})}{1-e^{(\omega-\gamma_0)\tau_1}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{(t_1,t_2)\in\Delta}\|z(t_1,t_2)\| &\le C(1,\gamma_0)e^{\gamma_0(t_1-t_2)}\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\|f(t)-g(t)\|\\ &\le C(1,\gamma_0)e^{\gamma_0(t_1-t_2)}\varepsilon;\end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that is,

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|z(t,t-t_0)\| \leq C(1,\gamma_0)e^{\gamma_0 t_0}\varepsilon,$$

and the result follows. ∎

5 Exponential Dichotomy

In this section, we consider the complete orbits of the Cauchy problem (1.1). Namely, we consider a continuous map $u:(-\infty,+\infty)\to X_0$ as a mild solution of

$$\frac{du(t)}{dt} = \big(A+B(t)\big)u(t)+f(t), \quad \text{for } t\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{5.1}$$

This part is devoted to the proof of Theorems 1.6 and 1.7. We will give necessary and sufficient conditions for the evolution family $\{U_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}\subset\mathcal{L}(X_0)$ to have an exponential dichotomy. More precisely, we will prove that the existence of an exponential dichotomy for $\{U_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$ is equivalent to the existence of an integrated solution $u\in C(\mathbb{R},X_0)$ for all f in an appropriate subspace of $C(\mathbb{R},X)$.

In what follows, when $\{U(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}\subset\mathcal{L}(Z)$ has an exponential dichotomy, we define its associated Green's operator function by

$$\Gamma(t,s) := \begin{cases} U^+(t,s), & \text{if } t\geq s,\\ -U^-(s,t), & \text{if } t<s. \end{cases}$$

Remark 5.1. It is well known that when $\{U(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}\subset\mathcal{L}(Z)$ has an exponential dichotomy, for each $x\in Z$, the map $(t,s)\in\mathbb{R}^2\to U^-(t,s)x$ is continuous from $\mathbb{R}^2$ into Z (see [21, Lemma VI.9.15] or [10, Lemma 9.17]).

Remark 5.2. It is easy to obtain from Definition 1.3(i) that

$$\Pi^+(t)\Pi^-(t)=\Pi^-(t)\Pi^+(t)=0_{\mathcal{L}(Z)}.$$

We also trivially have

$$U^+(t,t)=\Pi^+(t) \quad \text{and} \quad U^+(t,r)U^+(r,l)=U^+(t,l), \quad \forall\, t\geq r\geq l,$$

while

$$U^-(t,t)=\Pi^-(t) \quad \text{and} \quad U^-(t,r)U^-(r,l)=U^-(t,l). \quad \forall\, t,r,l\in\mathbb{R}.$$

It follows that U^+ (resp. U^-) is a strongly continuous semiflow (resp. flow). One can also observe that

$$\begin{aligned} U^-(t,r)U(r,l)&=U^-(t,l), && \forall (r,t),(r,l)\in\Delta,\\ U^+(t,r)U(r,l)&=U^+(t,l), && \forall (t,r),(r,l)\in\Delta. \end{aligned}$$

Notation 5.3. Let $(Z,\|\cdot\|)$ be a Banach space. The following weighted Banach space will be used in the following:

$$BC^\eta(\mathbb{R},Z) := \Big\{f\in C(\mathbb{R},Z) : \|f\|_\eta := \sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} e^{-\eta|t|}\big\|f(t)\big\|_Z<+\infty\Big\}, \quad \eta\geq 0.$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Note that we have the following continuous embedding

$$BC^{\eta_1}(\mathbb{R}, Z) \subseteq BC^{\eta_2}(\mathbb{R}, Z) \quad \text{if} \quad \eta_1 \leq \eta_2.$$

If $\eta = 0$, we set

$$BC(\mathbb{R}, Z) := \left\{ f \in C(\mathbb{R}, Z) : \|f\|_\infty := \sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|f(t)\|_Z < +\infty \right\}$$

and define

$$C_0(\mathbb{R}, Z) := \left\{ f \in BC(\mathbb{R}, Z) : \lim_{t\to\pm\infty} f(t) = 0 \right\}.$$

The following result is well known in the context of exponential dichotomy. We refer the reader to [7, 15, 16].

Theorem 5.4 *Let Z be a Banach space. Let $\{U(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta} \subset \mathcal{L}(Z)$ be an exponentially bounded evolution family. Consider the following integral equation*

$$u(t) = U(t,t_0)u(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} U(t,s)f(s)ds, \ (t,t_0) \in \Delta. \tag{5.2}$$

Then the following properties are equivalent

(i) *$\{U(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta} \subset \mathcal{L}(Z)$ has an exponential dichotomy.*
(ii) *Let $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}, Z)$ be the space $BC(\mathbb{R}, Z)$ or $C_0(\mathbb{R}, Z)$. Then for any $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}, Z)$, there exists a unique solution $u \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}, Z)$ of (5.2).*

Moreover, if $\{U(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$ has an exponential dichotomy, then for each $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}, Z)$, the unique solution $u \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}, Z)$ of (5.2) is given by

$$u(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \Gamma(t,s)f(s)ds, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $\{\Gamma(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{R}^2} \subset \mathcal{L}(Z)$ is the Green's operator function associated with $\{U(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$.

In what follows, we will give an analogue of Theorem 5.4 for the evolution family $\{U_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta} \subset \mathcal{L}(X_0)$. To do so, we will first prove some estimates.

Proposition 5.5 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 be satisfied. Assume in addition that*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} < +\infty.$$

Then there exists a non-decreasing function $\delta^* : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ with $\delta^*(t) \to 0$ as $t \to 0^+$ such that for each $f \in C(\mathbb{R}, X)$ and $\lambda > w + 1$, the map

$$v_\lambda(t, t_0) = \int_{t_0}^{t} U_B(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds, \quad (t,t_0) \in \Delta,$$

satisfies

$$\|v_\lambda(t,t_0)\| \leq \delta^*(t-t_0) \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} \|f(s)\|, \quad \forall (t,t_0) \in \Delta.$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof Let $\lambda > \omega$ be given. Thus, by Lemma 3.3, there exists $\gamma > \max(0, w)$ large enough (independent of t_0) such that for each $t \geq t_0$,

$$\sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{-\gamma s}\|v_\lambda(s,t_0)\| \leq 2 \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{-\gamma s}\|\lambda R_\lambda(A)w(s,t_0)\|$$

with

$$w(t_1,t_2) = \big(S_A \diamond f(t_2+\cdot)\big)(t_1-t_2), \quad \forall (t_1,t_2) \in \Delta.$$

Since $w(t_1,t_2) \in X_0$ for all $(t_1,t_2) \in \Delta$ and by Assumption 1.3,

$$\|w(t_1,t_2)\| \leq \delta(t_2-t_1) \sup_{s\in[t_1,t_2]} \|f(s)\|, \quad \forall (t_1,t_2) \in \Delta,$$

it follows that for each $\lambda > \omega$ and $t \geq t_0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{-\gamma s}\|v_\lambda(s,t_0)\| &\leq 2 \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{-\gamma s}\big\|\lambda R_\lambda(A_0)w(s,t_0)\big\| \\ &\leq 2\frac{M|\lambda|}{\lambda-\omega} \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{-\gamma s}\big\|w(s,t_0)\big\| \\ &\leq 2\frac{M|\lambda|}{\lambda-\omega} \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} \Big[e^{-\gamma s}\delta(s-t_0) \sup_{l\in[t_0,s]} \|f(l)\|\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Then by using the fact that δ is non-decreasing and $\gamma > 0$, we obtain for each $\lambda > \omega$ and $t \geq t_0$ that

$$\sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{-\gamma s}\|v_\lambda(s,t_0)\| \leq 2\frac{M|\lambda|}{\lambda-\omega} e^{-\gamma t_0}\delta(t-t_0) \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} \|f(s)\|, \quad \forall t \geq t_0,$$

providing that

$$\|v_\lambda(t,t_0)\| \leq 2\frac{M|\lambda|}{\lambda-\omega} e^{\gamma(t-t_0)}\delta(t-t_0) \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} \|f(s)\|, \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

This conclusion follows by using the fact that

$$\lambda > \omega + 1 \Longrightarrow \frac{|\lambda|}{\lambda - w} < 1 + |\omega|. \qquad \blacksquare$$

In the rest of this paper, the following assumption will be used.

Assumption 5.6 Assume that $\{U_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta} \subset \mathcal{L}(X_0)$ has an exponential dichotomy with exponent $\beta > 0$, constant $\kappa \geq 1$, and strongly continuous projectors $\{\Pi_B^+(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \subset \mathcal{L}(X_0)$ and $\{\Pi_B^-(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \subset \mathcal{L}(X_0)$.

Note that if $\{U_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$ has an exponential dichotomy, then combining Remark 5.2 and Definition 1.3(iv), we have

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|\Pi_B^+(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(Z)} \leq \kappa \text{ and } \sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|\Pi_B^-(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(Z)} \leq \kappa. \tag{5.3}$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proposition 5.7 *Let Assumption 1.1 be satisfied. Let* $\{U(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta} \subset \mathcal{L}(X_0)$ *be a given evolution family such that there exist* $\widehat{M} \geq 1$, $\widehat{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}$, *and*

$$\|U(t,s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0)} \leq \widehat{M} e^{\widehat{\omega}(t-s)}, \quad \forall (t,s) \in \Delta.$$

Assume that for each $f \in C(\mathbb{R}, X)$, *the map*

$$v_\lambda(t,t_0) = \int_{t_0}^{t} U(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A) f(s) ds, \quad (t,t_0) \in \Delta,$$

satisfies

$$\|v_\lambda(t,t_0)\| \leq \delta^{**}(t-t_0) \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} \|f(s)\|, \quad \forall (t,t_0) \in \Delta,$$

with $\delta^{**} : [0,+\infty) \to [0,+\infty)$ *a non-decreasing function such that* $\delta^{**}(t) \to 0$ *as* $t \to 0^+$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ *be given and fixed. Then, for each* $\tau_\varepsilon > 0$ *satisfying* $\widehat{M}\delta^{**}(\tau_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$ *and each* $\lambda > \omega + 1$, *we have*

$$\|v_\lambda(t,t_0)\| \leq \widetilde{C}(\varepsilon,\gamma,\widehat{\omega},\widehat{M}) \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{\gamma(t-s)} \|f(s)\|, \quad \forall (t,t_0) \in \Delta,$$

whenever $\gamma > \widehat{\omega}$ *and* $f \in C(\mathbb{R}, X)$ *with*

$$\widetilde{C}(\varepsilon,\gamma,\widehat{\omega},\widehat{M}) := \widehat{M} e^{\max(0,\widehat{\omega})\tau_\varepsilon} \frac{2\varepsilon \max(1, e^{-\gamma\tau_\varepsilon})}{1 - e^{(\widehat{\omega}-\gamma)\tau_\varepsilon}}.$$

Proof Without loss of generality, we can assume that $t_0 = 0$. Let $\tau_\varepsilon > 0$ be given such that

$$\widehat{M}\delta^{**}(s) \leq \varepsilon, \quad \forall s \in [0, \tau_\varepsilon].$$

Let $t \geq 0$ be fixed. Then since we can write $t = n\tau_\varepsilon + \theta$ with $\theta \in [0, \tau_\varepsilon)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
v_\lambda(t,0) &= \int_0^t U(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A) f(s) ds \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \int_{k\tau_\varepsilon}^{(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon} U(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A) f(s) ds + \int_{n\tau_\varepsilon}^{t} U(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A) f(s) ds \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} U(t,(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon) \int_{k\tau_\varepsilon}^{(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon} U((k+1)\tau_\varepsilon, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A) f(s) ds \\
&\quad + U(t,n\tau_\varepsilon) \int_{n\tau_\varepsilon}^{t} U(n\tau_\varepsilon, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A) f(s) ds \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} U\big(t,(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon\big) v_\lambda\big((k+1)\tau_\varepsilon, k\tau_\varepsilon\big) + U(t,n\tau_\varepsilon) v_\lambda(t,n\tau_\varepsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

so that

(5.4)

$$v_\lambda(t,0) = U(t,n\tau_\varepsilon) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} U(n\tau_\varepsilon,(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon) v_\lambda\big((k+1)\tau_\varepsilon, k\tau_\varepsilon\big) + U(t,n\tau_\varepsilon) v_\lambda(t,n\tau_\varepsilon).$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Next observe that for all $(r_0, r_1) \in \Delta$ and $r \geq r_0$ with $0 \leq r_0 - r_1 \leq \tau_\varepsilon$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| U(r, r_0) v_\lambda(r_0, r_1) \right\| &\leq \widehat{M} e^{\widehat{\omega}(r-r_0)} \| v_\lambda(r_0, r_1) \| \\ &\leq e^{\widehat{\omega}(r-r_0)} \widehat{M} \delta^*(r_0 - r_1) \sup_{s \in [r_1, r_0]} \| f(s) \| \\ &\leq e^{\widehat{\omega}(r-r_0)} \varepsilon \sup_{s \in [r_1, r_0]} \| f(s) \|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Let $\gamma > \widehat{\omega}$ be fixed. Set $\varepsilon_1 := \max(1, e^{-\gamma \tau_\varepsilon})$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \in [k\tau_\varepsilon, (k+1)\tau_\varepsilon]$ be given and fixed. Then if $\gamma \geq 0$, we have

$$\varepsilon \sup_{s \in [k\tau_\varepsilon, r]} \| f(s) \| = \varepsilon \sup_{s \in [k\tau_\varepsilon, r]} e^{-\gamma s} e^{\gamma s} \| f(s) \| \leq \varepsilon_1 e^{\gamma r} \sup_{s \in [k\tau_\varepsilon, r]} e^{-\gamma s} \| f(s) \|, \tag{5.6}$$

while if $\gamma < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \sup_{s \in [k\tau_\varepsilon, r]} \| f(s) \| &= \varepsilon \sup_{s \in [k\tau_\varepsilon, r]} e^{-\gamma s} e^{\gamma s} \| f(s) \| \\ &\leq \varepsilon e^{\gamma k \tau_\varepsilon} \sup_{s \in [k\tau_\varepsilon, r]} e^{-\gamma s} \| f(s) \| \\ &\leq \varepsilon e^{\gamma r} e^{-\gamma(r - k\tau_\varepsilon)} \sup_{s \in [k\tau_\varepsilon, r]} e^{-\gamma s} \| f(s) \| \\ &\leq \varepsilon e^{\gamma r} e^{-\gamma \tau_\varepsilon} \sup_{s \in [k\tau_\varepsilon, r]} e^{-\gamma s} \| f(s) \| \\ &\leq \varepsilon_1 e^{\gamma r} \sup_{s \in [k\tau_\varepsilon, r]} e^{-\gamma s} \| f(s) \|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, each $r \in [k\tau_\varepsilon, (k+1)\tau_\varepsilon]$, and $\gamma > \widehat{\omega}$, we obtain

$$\varepsilon \sup_{s \in [k\tau_\varepsilon, r]} \| f(s) \| \leq \varepsilon_1 e^{\gamma r} \sup_{s \in [k\tau_\varepsilon, r]} e^{-\gamma s} \| f(s) \|. \tag{5.7}$$

By (5.5) and (5.7), we obtain for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, each $r \geq (k+1)\tau_\varepsilon$ and $\gamma > \widehat{\omega}$ that

$$\left\| U(r, (k+1)\tau_\varepsilon) v_\lambda((k+1)\tau_\varepsilon, k\tau_\varepsilon) \right\| \leq e^{(\widehat{\omega} - \gamma)(r - (k+1)\tau_\varepsilon)} \varepsilon_1 e^{\gamma r} \sup_{s \in [k\tau_\varepsilon, (k+1)\tau_\varepsilon]} e^{-\gamma s} \| f(s) \|. \tag{5.8}$$

Since $t - n\tau_\varepsilon \in [0, \tau_\varepsilon)$, we have from (5.5) and (5.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| U(t, n\tau_\varepsilon) v_\lambda(t, n\tau_\varepsilon) \right\| &\leq e^{\widehat{\omega}(t - n\tau_\varepsilon)} \varepsilon \sup_{s \in [n\tau_\varepsilon, t]} \| f(s) \| \\ &\leq e^{\widehat{\omega}(t - n\tau_\varepsilon)} \varepsilon_1 e^{\gamma t} \sup_{s \in [n\tau_\varepsilon, t]} e^{-\gamma s} \| f(s) \| \\ &\leq e^{\max(0, \widehat{\omega})\tau_\varepsilon} \varepsilon_1 e^{\gamma t} \sup_{s \in [n\tau_\varepsilon, t]} e^{-\gamma s} \| f(s) \|, \end{aligned}$$

and by using (5.4) and (5.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \| v_\lambda(t, 0) \| \leq \widehat{M} e^{\widehat{\omega}(t - n\tau_\varepsilon)} &\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \| U(n\tau_\varepsilon, (k+1)\tau_\varepsilon) v_\lambda((k+1)\tau_\varepsilon, k\tau_\varepsilon) \| \\ &+ \| U(t, n\tau_\varepsilon) v_\lambda(t, n\tau_\varepsilon) \| \end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \widehat{M}e^{\widehat{\omega}(t-n\tau_\varepsilon)}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}e^{(\widehat{\omega}-\gamma)(n\tau_\varepsilon-(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon)}\varepsilon_1 e^{\gamma n\tau_\varepsilon}\sup_{s\in[k\tau_\varepsilon,(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon]}e^{-\gamma s}\|f(s)\|\\
&\quad+e^{\max(0,\widehat{\omega})\tau_\varepsilon}\varepsilon_1 e^{\gamma t}\sup_{s\in[n\tau_\varepsilon,t]}e^{-\gamma s}\|f(s)\|\\
&\leq \widehat{M}e^{\widehat{\omega}(t-n\tau_\varepsilon)}e^{\gamma n\tau_\varepsilon}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}e^{(\widehat{\omega}-\gamma)(n-1-k))\tau_\varepsilon}\right]\varepsilon_1\sup_{s\in[0,t]}e^{-\gamma s}\|f(s)\|\\
&\quad+e^{\max(0,\widehat{\omega})\tau_\varepsilon}\varepsilon_1 e^{\gamma t}\sup_{s\in[n\tau_\varepsilon,t]}e^{-\gamma s}\|f(s)\|\\
&\leq \widehat{M}e^{(\widehat{\omega}-\gamma)(t-n\tau_\varepsilon)}e^{\gamma t}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}e^{(\widehat{\omega}-\gamma)k\tau_\varepsilon}\right]\varepsilon_1\sup_{s\in[0,t]}e^{-\gamma s}\|f(s)\|\\
&\quad+e^{\max(0,\widehat{\omega})\tau_\varepsilon}\varepsilon_1 e^{\gamma t}\sup_{s\in[0,t]}e^{-\gamma s}\|f(s)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Then since $\widehat{\omega}-\gamma<0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v_\lambda(t,0)\|&\leq \widehat{M}e^{\max(0,\widehat{\omega})\tau_\varepsilon}e^{\gamma t}\left[1+\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty}(e^{(\widehat{\omega}-\gamma)\tau_\varepsilon})^k\right]\varepsilon_1\sup_{s\in[0,t]}e^{-\gamma s}\|f(s)\|\\
&\leq \widehat{M}e^{\max(0,\widehat{\omega})\tau_\varepsilon}e^{\gamma t}\left[\frac{2}{1-e^{(\widehat{\omega}-\gamma)\tau_\varepsilon}}\right]\varepsilon_1\sup_{s\in[0,t]}e^{-\gamma s}\|f(s)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. ∎

As a direct consequence of Propositions 5.7 and 5.5, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 5.8 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 5.6 be satisfied. Assume in addition that*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)}<+\infty.$$

Let $\varepsilon>0$ be given and fixed. Then, for each $\tau_\varepsilon>0$ satisfying $\kappa\delta^*(\tau_\varepsilon)\leq\varepsilon$ and each $\lambda>\omega+1$, the map

$$v_\lambda(t,t_0)=\int_{t_0}^{t}U_B(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds,\quad (t,t_0)\in\Delta,$$

satisfies

$$\|\Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t,t_0)\|\leq\widehat{C}(\varepsilon,\gamma)\sup_{s\in[t_0,t]}e^{\gamma(t-s)}\|f(s)\|,\quad\forall(t,t_0)\in\Delta,$$

whenever $\gamma>-\beta$ and $f\in C(\mathbb{R},X)$ with

$$\widehat{C}(\varepsilon,\gamma):=\kappa\frac{2\varepsilon\max(1,e^{-\gamma\tau_\varepsilon})}{1-e^{-(\beta+\gamma)\tau_\varepsilon}}.\tag{5.9}$$

Proposition 5.9 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 5.6 be satisfied. Assume in addition that*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)}<+\infty.$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given and fixed. Then, for each $\tau_\varepsilon > 0$ satisfying $\kappa\delta^*(\tau_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$ and each $\lambda > \omega + 1$, the map

$$v_\lambda(t, t_0) = \int_{t_0}^{t} U_B(t, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds, \ (t, t_0) \in \Delta,$$

satisfies

$$\left\| U_B^-(t_0, t)v_\lambda(t, t_0) \right\| \leq \widehat{C}(\varepsilon, \gamma) \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{\gamma(s-t_0)}\|f(s)\|, \quad \forall (t, t_0) \in \Delta,$$

whenever $\gamma > -\beta$ and $f \in C(\mathbb{R}, X)$ with $\widehat{C}(\varepsilon, \gamma)$ defined in (5.9).

Proof Let $(t, t_0) \in \Delta$ be given. Without loss of generality, one can assume that $t = 0$. From now on fix $t_0 \leq 0$. Let $\tau_\varepsilon > 0$ be given such that

$$\kappa\delta^*(s) \leq \varepsilon, \quad \forall s \in [0, \tau_\varepsilon].$$

Then since we can write $t_0 = -n\tau_\varepsilon - \theta$ with $\theta \in [0, \tau_\varepsilon)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
U_B^-(0, t_0)v_\lambda(0, t_0) &= \int_{t_0}^{0} U_B^-(0, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \int_{-(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon}^{-k\tau_\varepsilon} U_B^-(0, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds \\
&\quad + \int_{t_0}^{-n\tau_\varepsilon} U_B^-(0, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} U_B^-(0, -k\tau_\varepsilon) \int_{-(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon}^{-k\tau_\varepsilon} U_B^-(-k\tau_\varepsilon, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds \\
&\quad + U_B^-(0, -n\tau_\varepsilon) \int_{t_0}^{-n\tau_\varepsilon} U_B^-(-n\tau_\varepsilon, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds,
\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi^-(0)v_\lambda(0, t_0) = &\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} U_B^-(0, -k\tau_\varepsilon)v_\lambda(-k\tau_\varepsilon, -(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon) \\
&+ U_B^-(0, -n\tau_\varepsilon)v_\lambda(-n\tau_\varepsilon, t_0).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Since $U_B^-(0, t_0)$ is invertible from $\Pi^-(t_0)(X_0)$ into $\Pi^-(0)(X_0)$ with inverse $U_B^-(t_0, 0)$, by applying $U_B^-(t_0, 0)$ to (5.10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
U_B^-(t_0, 0)v_\lambda(0, t_0) = &\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} U_B^-(t_0, -k\tau_\varepsilon)v_\lambda\big(-k\tau_\varepsilon, -(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon\big) \\
&+ U_B^-(t_0, -n\tau_\varepsilon)v_\lambda(-n\tau_\varepsilon, t_0),
\end{aligned}$$

and by using the evolution property of U_B^-, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
U_B^-(t_0, 0)v_\lambda(0, t_0) = U_B^-(t_0, -n\tau_\varepsilon) &\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} U_B^-(-n\tau_\varepsilon, -k\tau_\varepsilon)v_\lambda\big(-k\tau_\varepsilon, -(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon\big) \\
&+ U_B^-(t_0, -n\tau_\varepsilon)v_\lambda(-n\tau_\varepsilon, t_0).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Next observe that for all $(r_0, r_1) \in \Delta$ and $r \le r_1$ with $0 \le r_0 - r_1 \le \tau_\varepsilon$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| U_B^-(r, r_0) v_\lambda(r_0, r_1) \right\| &\le \kappa e^{-\beta(r_0 - r)} \| v_\lambda(r_0, r_1) \| \\ &\le e^{-\beta(r_0 - r)} \kappa \delta^*(r_0 - r_1) \sup_{s \in [r_1, r_0]} \| f(s) \| \\ &\le e^{-\beta(r_0 - r)} \varepsilon \sup_{s \in [r_1, r_0]} \| f(s) \|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Let $\gamma > -\beta$ be fixed. Set $\varepsilon_1 := \max(1, e^{-\gamma\tau_\varepsilon})$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \in [-(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon, -k\tau_\varepsilon]$ be given and fixed. Then if $\gamma \ge 0$, we have

$$\varepsilon \sup_{s \in [r, -k\tau_\varepsilon]} \| f(s) \| = \varepsilon \sup_{s \in [r, -k\tau_\varepsilon]} e^{-\gamma s} e^{\gamma s} \| f(s) \| \le \varepsilon_1 e^{-\gamma r} \sup_{s \in [r, -k\tau_\varepsilon]} e^{\gamma s} \| f(s) \|,$$

while if $\gamma < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon \sup_{s \in [r, -k\tau_\varepsilon]} \| f(s) \| &= \varepsilon \sup_{s \in [r, -k\tau_\varepsilon]} e^{-\gamma s} e^{\gamma s} \| f(s) \| \\ &\le \varepsilon e^{\gamma k \tau_\varepsilon} \sup_{s \in [r, -k\tau_\varepsilon]} e^{\gamma s} \| f(s) \| \\ &\le \varepsilon e^{-\gamma r} e^{\gamma(r + k\tau_\varepsilon)} \sup_{s \in [r, -k\tau_\varepsilon]} e^{\gamma s} \| f(s) \| \\ &\le \varepsilon e^{-\gamma r} e^{-\gamma\tau_\varepsilon} \sup_{s \in [r, -k\tau_\varepsilon]} e^{\gamma s} \| f(s) \| \\ &\le \varepsilon_1 e^{-\gamma r} \sup_{s \in [r, -k\tau_\varepsilon]} e^{\gamma s} \| f(s) \|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, each $r \in [-(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon, -k\tau_\varepsilon]$, and $\gamma > -\beta$, we obtain

$$\varepsilon \sup_{s \in [r, -k\tau_\varepsilon]} \| f(s) \| \le \varepsilon_1 e^{-\gamma r} \sup_{s \in [r, -k\tau_\varepsilon]} e^{\gamma s} \| f(s) \|. \tag{5.13}$$

By (5.12) and (5.13), we obtain for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, each $r \le -(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon$, and $\gamma > -\beta$ that

$$\left\| U_B^-(r, -k\tau_\varepsilon) v_\lambda(-k\tau_\varepsilon, -(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon) \right\| \le e^{(\beta+\gamma)(r + (k+1)\tau_\varepsilon)} e^{-\gamma r} \varepsilon_1 \sup_{s \in [-(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon, -k\tau_\varepsilon]} e^{\gamma s} \| f(s) \|.$$

Since $-n\tau_\varepsilon - t_0 = \theta \in [0, \tau_\varepsilon)$, we obtain from (5.11) and (5.13)

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| U_B^-(t_0, -n\tau_\varepsilon) v_\lambda(-n\tau_\varepsilon, t_0) \right\| &\le e^{\beta(t_0 + n\tau_\varepsilon)} \varepsilon \sup_{s \in [t_0, -n\tau_\varepsilon]} \| f(s) \| \\ &\le e^{\beta(t_0 + n\tau_\varepsilon)} \varepsilon_1 e^{-\gamma t_0} \sup_{s \in [t_0, -n\tau_\varepsilon]} e^{\gamma s} \| f(s) \|, \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and by using (5.11) and (5.14), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|U_B^-(t_0,0)\Pi^-(0)v_\lambda(0,t_0)\right\| \\
&\quad\le \kappa e^{\beta(t_0+n\tau_\varepsilon)}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} e^{(\beta+\gamma)(-n+k+1)\tau_\varepsilon}e^{\gamma n\tau_\varepsilon}\varepsilon_1 \sup_{s\in[-(k+1)\tau_\varepsilon,-k\tau_\varepsilon]} e^{\gamma s}\|f(s)\|\right] \\
&\qquad + e^{\beta(t_0+n\tau_\varepsilon)}\varepsilon_1 e^{-\gamma t_0}\sup_{s\in[t_0,-n\tau_\varepsilon]} e^{\gamma s}\|f(s)\| \\
&\quad\le \kappa e^{\beta(t_0+n\tau_\varepsilon)}e^{\gamma n\tau_\varepsilon}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} e^{(\beta+\gamma)(-n+k+1)\tau_\varepsilon}\varepsilon_1 \sup_{s\in[t_0,0]} e^{\gamma s}\|f(s)\|\right] \\
&\qquad + e^{\beta(t_0+n\tau_\varepsilon)}\varepsilon_1 e^{-\gamma t_0}\sup_{s\in[t_0,0]} e^{\gamma s}\|f(s)\| \\
&\quad\le \kappa e^{(\beta+\gamma)(t_0+n\tau_\varepsilon)}e^{-\gamma t_0}\left[\sum_{k=-n+1}^{0} (e^{(\beta+\gamma)\tau_\varepsilon})^k\varepsilon_1 \sup_{s\in[t_0,0]} e^{\gamma s}\|f(s)\|\right] \\
&\qquad + e^{\beta(t_0+n\tau_\varepsilon)}\varepsilon_1 e^{-\gamma t_0}\sup_{s\in[t_0,0]} e^{\gamma s}\|f(s)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, since $\gamma+\beta>0$ and $t_0+n\tau_\varepsilon<0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|U_B^-(t_0,0)\Pi^-(0)v_\lambda(0,t_0)\| &\le \kappa\left[1+\sum_{k=-n+1}^{0}(e^{(\beta+\gamma)\tau_\varepsilon})^k\right]\varepsilon_1 e^{-\gamma t_0}\sup_{s\in[t_0,0]} e^{\gamma s}\|f(s)\| \\
&\le \kappa\left[1+\sum_{k=-\infty}^{0}(e^{(\beta+\gamma)\tau_\varepsilon})^k\right]\varepsilon_1 e^{-\gamma t_0}\sup_{s\in[t_0,0]} e^{\gamma s}\|f(s)\| \\
&\le \kappa\left[\frac{2}{1-e^{-(\beta+\gamma)}}\right]\varepsilon_1 e^{-\gamma t_0}\sup_{s\in[t_0,0]} e^{\gamma s}\|f(s)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ∎

Lemma 5.10 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 5.6 be satisfied. Assume in addition that*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)}<+\infty.$$

Let $\eta\in[0,\beta)$ be given. Then for each $\lambda>\omega+1$, each $f\in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R},X)$, and $t\in\mathbb{R}$,

(5.15)

$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)(t):=\lim_{t_0\to-\infty}\int_{t_0}^{t}U_B^+(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds:=\int_{-\infty}^{t}U_B^+(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds$$

exists. Moreover, the following properties hold

(i) *For each $\eta\in[0,\beta)$ and each $\lambda>\omega+1$, $\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+$ is a bounded linear operator from $BC^\eta(\mathbb{R},X)$ into itself. More precisely, for any $\nu\in(-\beta,0)$,*

$$\|\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)\|_\eta\le\widehat{C}(1,\nu)\|f\|_\eta,\quad\forall f\in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R},X)\ \text{ with }\ \eta\in[0,-\nu],$$

where $\widehat{C}(1,\nu)$ is the constant introduced in Proposition 5.8.

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(ii) *For each* $\eta \in [0, \beta)$, *each* $\lambda > \omega + 1$, *and each* $f \in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R}, X)$, *we have*

(5.16)
$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)(t) = U_B^+(t,l)\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)(l) + \int_l^t U_B^+(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds, \quad \forall (t,l) \in \Delta.$$

Proof Let $\eta \in [0, \beta)$ be given. Let $\lambda > \omega + 1$ be given and fixed. Recall

$$v_\lambda(t,t_0) := \int_{t_0}^t U_B(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds, \quad \forall (t,t_0) \in \Delta,$$

and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t,t_0) &= \int_{t_0}^t U_B^+(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds, && \forall (t,t_0) \in \Delta, \\ \mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)(t) &= \lim_{t_0 \to -\infty} \Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t,t_0), && \forall t \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove the existence of the limit, we will show that for each fixed $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{\Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t,t_0)\}_{t_0 \le t}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Fix $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $f \in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R}, X)$ be given. Let $t_0, r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $t_0 \le r \le t$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t,t_0) &= U_B^+(t,r)\int_{t_0}^r U_B^+(r,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds + \int_r^t U_B^+(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds \\ &= U_B^+(t,r)v_\lambda(r,t_0) + \Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t,r) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t,t_0) - \Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t,r) = U_B(t,r)\Pi^+(r)v_\lambda(r,t_0). \tag{5.17}$$

Hence, by Proposition 5.8, we can find a constant $\widehat{C}(1,\gamma) > 0$ with $\gamma \in (-\beta, -\eta)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|\Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t,t_0) - \Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t,r)\right\| &\le \kappa e^{-\beta(t-r)}\widehat{C}(1,\gamma) \sup_{s\in[t_0,r]} e^{\gamma(r-s)}\|f(s)\| \\ &\le \kappa e^{-\beta(t-r)}\widehat{C}(1,\gamma)\|f\|_\eta \sup_{s\in[t_0,r]} e^{\gamma(r-s)}e^{\eta|s|} \\ &\le \kappa e^{-\beta(t-r)}\widehat{C}(1,\gamma)\|f\|_\eta e^{-\gamma(t-r)} \sup_{s\in[t_0,r]} e^{\gamma(t-s)}e^{\eta|s|} \\ &\le \kappa e^{-(\beta+\gamma)(t-r)}\widehat{C}(1,\gamma)\|f\|_\eta \sup_{s\in[t_0,r]} e^{\gamma(t-s)}e^{\eta(|t-s|+|t|)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then using the fact that $\beta + \gamma > 0$ and $\eta + \gamma < 0$, we obtain

$$\left\|\Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t,t_0) - \Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t,r)\right\| \le \kappa e^{-(\beta+\gamma)(t-r)}\widehat{C}(1,\gamma)\|f\|_\eta e^{\eta|t|},$$

that is

$$\lim_{t_0, r \to -\infty} \left\|\Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t,t_0) - \Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t,r)\right\| = 0.$$

This proves the existence of the limit (5.15) for any fixed $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(i) Let $\eta \in [0, \beta)$ be given. Let $\nu \in (-\beta, 0)$. By Proposition 5.8, we can find a constant $\widehat{C}(1, \nu) > 0$ such that

$$\left\|\Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t, t_0)\right\| \leq \widehat{C}(1, \nu) \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{\nu(t-s)}\|f(s)\|, \quad \forall (t, t_0) \in \Delta.$$

Then for all $(t, t_0) \in \Delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t, t_0)\| &\leq \widehat{C}(1, \nu) \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{\nu(t-s)}\|f(s)\| \\ &\leq \widehat{C}(1, \nu)\|f\|_\eta \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{\nu(t-s)}e^{\eta|s|} \\ &\leq \widehat{C}(1, \nu)\|f\|_\eta \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{\nu(t-s)}e^{\eta|t-s|+\eta|t|} \\ &\leq \widehat{C}(1, \nu)\|f\|_\eta e^{\eta|t|} \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{(\nu+\eta)(t-s)},\end{aligned}$$

and since $\nu + \eta < 0$, we obtain

$$\|\Pi^+(t)v_\lambda(t, t_0)\| \leq \widehat{C}(1, \nu)\|f\|_\eta e^{\eta|t|}. \tag{5.18}$$

The result follows by letting $t_0 \to -\infty$ in (5.18).

(ii) Let $\eta \in [0, \beta)$ and $(t, l) \in \Delta$ be given. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}^+_\lambda(f)(t) &= U^+_B(t, l)\int_{-\infty}^{l} U^+_B(l, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds + \int_l^t U^+_B(t, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds \\ &= U^+_B(t, l)\mathcal{J}^+_\lambda(f)(l) + \int_l^t U^+_B(t, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ∎

Lemma 5.11 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 5.6 be satisfied. Assume in addition that*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} < +\infty.$$

Let $\eta \in [0, \beta)$ be given. Then for each $\lambda > \omega + 1$, each $f \in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R}, X)$, and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}^-_\lambda(f)(t_0) &:= -\lim_{t\to+\infty} \int_{t_0}^{t} U^-_B(t_0, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds \\ &:= -\int_{t_0}^{+\infty} U^-_B(t_0, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds \qquad (5.19)\end{aligned}$$

exists. Moreover, the following properties hold:

(i) *For each $\eta \in [0, \beta)$ and each $\lambda > \omega + 1$, $\mathcal{J}^-_\lambda$ is a bounded linear operator from $BC^\eta(\mathbb{R}, X)$ into itself. More precisely, for any $\nu \in (-\beta, 0)$,*

$$\|\mathcal{J}^-_\lambda(f)\|_\eta \leq \widehat{C}(1, \nu)\|f\|_\eta, \quad \forall f \in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R}, X) \text{ with } \eta \in [0, -\nu],$$

where $\widehat{C}(1, \nu)$ is the constant introduced in Proposition 5.8.

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(ii) *For each* $\eta \in [0, \beta)$, *each* $\lambda > \omega + 1$ *and each* $f \in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R}, X)$ *we have*

$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t) = U_B^-(t,l)\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(l) + \int_l^t U_B^-(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds, \ \forall (t,l) \in \Delta. \tag{5.20}$$

Proof Let $\eta \in [0, \beta)$ be given. Let $\lambda > \omega + 1$ be given and fixed. Recall

$$v_\lambda(t,t_0) := \int_{t_0}^t U_B(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds, \quad \forall (t,t_0) \in \Delta.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} U_B^-(t_0,t)v_\lambda(t,t_0) &= \int_{t_0}^t U_B^-(t_0,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds, && \forall (t,t_0) \in \Delta, \\ \mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t_0) &= -\lim_{t\to+\infty} z_\lambda(t,t_0), && \forall t_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$z_\lambda(t,t_0) := U_B^-(t_0,t)v_\lambda(t,t_0), \quad \forall (t,t_0) \in \Delta. \tag{5.21}$$

To prove the existence of the limit, we will show that for each $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{w_\lambda(t,t_0)\}_{t\geq t_0}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Let $f \in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R}, X)$ be given. Let $t, r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $t_0 \leq r \leq t$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} z_\lambda(t,t_0) &= \int_{t_0}^r U_B^-(t_0,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds + U_B^-(t_0,r)\int_r^t U_B^-(r,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds \\ &= z_\lambda(r,t_0) + U_B^-(t_0,r)z_\lambda(r,t), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$z_\lambda(t,t_0) - z_\lambda(r,t_0) = U_B^-(t_0,r)z_\lambda(r,t). \tag{5.22}$$

Then by Proposition 5.9 and the definition of z_λ in (5.21), we can find a constant $\widehat{C}(1,\gamma) > 0$ with $\gamma \in (-\beta, -\eta)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_\lambda(t,t_0) - z_\lambda(r,t_0)\| &\leq \kappa e^{-\beta(r-t_0)}\widehat{C}(1,\gamma)\sup_{s\in[t,r]} e^{\gamma(s-t)}\|f(s)\| \\ &\leq \kappa e^{-\beta(r-t_0)}\widehat{C}(1,\gamma)\|f\|_\eta e^{-\gamma(t-t_0)}\sup_{s\in[t,r]} e^{\gamma(s-t_0)}e^{\eta|s|} \\ &\leq \kappa e^{-\beta(r-t_0)}\widehat{C}(1,\gamma)\|f\|_\eta e^{-\gamma(r-t_0)}e^{-\gamma(t-r)}\sup_{s\in[t,r]} e^{\gamma(s-t_0)}e^{\eta|s|} \\ &\leq \kappa e^{-(\beta+\gamma)(r-t_0)}\widehat{C}(1,\gamma)\|f\|_\eta e^{-\gamma(t-r)}\sup_{s\in[t,r]} e^{\gamma(s-t_0)}e^{\eta|s|} \\ &\leq \kappa e^{-(\beta+\gamma)(r-t_0)}\widehat{C}(1,\gamma)\|f\|_\eta \sup_{s\in[t,r]} e^{\gamma(s-t_0)}e^{\eta|s|} \\ &\leq \kappa e^{-(\beta+\gamma)(r-t_0)}\widehat{C}(1,\gamma)\|f\|_\eta \sup_{s\in[t,r]} e^{\gamma(s-t_0)}e^{\eta(|s-t_0|+|t_0|)} \\ &\leq \kappa e^{-(\beta+\gamma)(r-t_0)}\widehat{C}(1,\gamma)\|f\|_\eta \sup_{s\in[t,r]} e^{(\gamma+\eta)(s-t_0)}e^{\eta|t_0|}, \end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and since $\beta + \gamma > 0$, $\gamma + \eta < 0$, we obtain

$$\|z_\lambda(t,t_0) - z_\lambda(r,t_0)\| \leq \kappa e^{-(\beta+\gamma)(r-t_0)}\widehat{C}(1,\gamma)\|f\|_\eta e^{\eta|t_0|},$$

which gives

$$\lim_{t,r\to+\infty} \|z_\lambda(t,t_0) - z_\lambda(r,t_0)\| = 0,$$

and proves the existence of the limit (5.19).

(i) Let $\eta \in [0,\beta)$ be given. Let $\nu \in (-\beta, 0)$. Note that by Proposition 5.9, we can find a constant $\widehat{C}(1,\nu) > 0$ such that

$$\|w_\lambda(t,t_0)\| \leq \widehat{C}(1,\nu) \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{\gamma(s-t_0)}\|f(s)\|, \quad \forall (t,t_0) \in \Delta.$$

Then for all $(t,t_0) \in \Delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|w_\lambda(t,t_0)\| &\leq \widehat{C}(1,\nu)\|f\|_\eta \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{\nu(s-t_0)}e^{\eta|s|}\\ &\leq \widehat{C}(1,\nu)\|f\|_\eta \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{\nu(s-t_0)}e^{\eta(|s-t_0|+|t_0|)}\\ &\leq \widehat{C}(1,\nu)\|f\|_\eta \sup_{s\in[t_0,t]} e^{(\nu+\eta)(s-t_0)}e^{\eta|t_0|},\end{aligned}$$

and since $\nu + \eta < 0$, we obtain

$$\|w_\lambda(t,t_0)\| \leq \widehat{C}(1,\nu)\|f\|_\eta e^{\eta|t_0|}. \tag{5.23}$$

The result follows by letting $t \to +\infty$ in (5.23).

(ii) Let $\eta \in [0,\beta)$ and $(t,l) \in \Delta$ be given. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(l) &= -\int_l^t U_B^-(l,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds - \int_t^{+\infty} U_B^-(l,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds\\ &= -U_B^-(l,t)\int_l^t U_B^-(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds\\ &\quad - U_B^-(l,t)\int_t^{+\infty} U_B^-(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds,\end{aligned}$$

and because $U_B^-(l,t)$ is invertible from $\Pi^-(t)(X_0)$ into $\Pi^-(l)(X_0)$ with inverse $U_B^-(t,l)$ and $\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(l) \in \Pi^-(l)(X_0)$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}U_B^-(t,l)\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(l) &= -\int_l^t U_B^-(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds - \int_t^{+\infty} U_B^-(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds\\ &= -\int_l^t U_B^-(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds + \mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t),\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows. ∎

Lemma 5.12 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 5.6 be satisfied. Assume in addition that*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} < +\infty.$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let $\eta \in [0,\beta)$ be given. For each $\lambda > \omega + 1$ and each $f \in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R},X)$, define

(5.24)
$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda(f)(t) := \mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)(t) + \mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t) := \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \Gamma_B(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R},$$

Then the following properties hold.

(i) *For each $\eta \in [0,\beta)$ and each $\lambda > \omega + 1$, $\mathcal{J}_\lambda$ is a bounded linear operator from $BC^\eta(\mathbb{R},X)$ into itself. More precisely, for any $\nu \in (-\beta, 0)$,*

(5.25) $$\|\mathcal{J}_\lambda(f)\|_\eta \le 2\,\widehat{C}(1,\nu)\|f\|_\eta, \quad \forall f \in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R},X) \text{ with } \eta \in [0,-\nu],$$

where $\widehat{C}(1,\nu)$ is the constant introduced in Proposition 5.8.

(ii) *For each $\eta \in [0,\beta)$, each $\lambda > \omega + 1$, and each $f \in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R},X)$, we have*

(5.26)
$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda(f)(t) = U_B(t,l)\mathcal{J}_\lambda(f)(l) + \int_l^t U_B(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds, \quad \forall (t,l) \in \Delta.$$

(iii) *For each $\eta \in [0,\beta)$, each $f \in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R},X)$, $\mathcal{J}_\lambda(f)$ is uniformly convergent on compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$ as $\lambda \to +\infty$.*

(iv) *For each $f \in BUC(\mathbb{R},X) \subset BC^0(\mathbb{R},X)$ with relatively compact range, $\mathcal{J}_\lambda(f)$ is uniformly convergent on $\mathbb{R}$ as $\lambda \to +\infty$.*

Proof The proof of (i) follows from Lemmas 5.10 and 5.11.

(ii) Let $\eta \in [0,\beta)$, $f \in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R},X)$, and $(t,l) \in \Delta$ be given. Since $\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)(l) \in \Pi^+(l)$, $\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(l) \in \Pi^-(l)$, one gets from (5.16) and (5.20),

(5.27) $$\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)(t) = U_B(t,l)\Pi^+(l)\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)(l) + \Pi^+(t)\int_l^t U_B(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds.$$

and

(5.28) $$\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t) = U_B(t,l)\Pi^-(l)\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(l) + \Pi^-(t)\int_l^t U_B(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds.$$

and the result follows by adding up (5.27) and (5.28) combined with the fact that $\Pi^+(t) + \Pi^-(t) = \Pi^+(l) + \Pi^-(l) = I$.

(iii) To do this, we will prove the convergence for $\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+$ and $\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-$ as λ goes to $+\infty$. Let $\eta \in [0,\beta)$ and $f \in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R},X)$ be given. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given given and fixed. Let $r > 0$ be large enough such that

(5.29) $$2\kappa e^{-\beta r}\widehat{C}(1,\nu)\|f\|_\eta \le \varepsilon.$$

We first prove the convergence for $\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+$ as λ goes to $+\infty$. Indeed by using (5.27) combined with the estimate in (i), we obtain for each $\lambda, \mu > \omega + 1$, each $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)(t) - \mathcal{J}_\mu^+(f)(t)\| &\le \kappa e^{-\beta r}\|\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)(t-r) - \mathcal{J}_\mu^+(f)(t-r)\| \\ &\quad + \kappa\Big\|\int_{t-r}^t U_B(t,s)[\lambda R_\lambda(A) - \mu R_\mu(A)f(s)ds\Big\| \\ &\le 2\kappa e^{-\beta r}\widehat{C}(1,\nu)\|f\|_\eta \\ &\quad + \kappa\Big\|\int_{t-r}^t U_B(t,s)[\lambda R_\lambda(A) - \mu R_\mu(A)f(s)ds\Big\|,\end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and by using (5.29), we obtain the estimate

(5.30)
$$\|\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)(t)-\mathcal{J}_\mu^+(f)(t)\|\leq \varepsilon+\kappa\Big\|\int_{t-r}^{t}U_B(t,s)[\lambda R_\lambda(A)-\mu R_\mu(A)f(s)ds\Big\|,\quad \forall t\in\mathbb{R}.$$

Now infer from Theorem 1.5 that

$$\lim_{\lambda,\mu\to+\infty}\int_{t-r}^{t}U_B(t,s)[\lambda R_\lambda(A)-\mu R_\mu(A)f(s)ds=0,$$

uniformly for t in a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$ and (5.30) yields

$$\lim_{\lambda,\mu\to+\infty}\|\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)(t)-\mathcal{J}_\mu^+(f)(t)\|\leq\varepsilon,$$

uniformly for t in a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$. Since $\varepsilon>0$ is arbitrarily fixed, we conclude by a Cauchy sequence argument that $\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)(t)$ exists uniformly for t in a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$.

Now we prove the convergence for $\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-$. First, recall that for each $t\in\mathbb{R}$, $U_B^-(t+r,t)$ is invertible from $\Pi^-(t)(X_0)$ into $\Pi^-(t+r)(X_0)$ with inverse $U_B^-(t,t+r)$. Then by applying $U_B^-(t,t+r)$ to the left-hand side of (5.28), one gets for all $t\in\mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}U_B^-(t,t+r)&\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t+r)\\&=U_B^-(t,t+r)U_B(t+r,t)\Pi^-(t)\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t)\\&\quad+U_B^-(t,t+r)\Pi^-(t+r)\int_t^{t+r}U_B(t+r,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds,\quad\forall t\in\mathbb{R};\end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned}U_B^-(t,t+r)\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t+r)&=\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t)\\&\quad+U_B^-(t,t+r)\int_t^{t+r}U_B(t+r,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds,\quad\forall t\in\mathbb{R},\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t)&=U_B^-(t,t+r)\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t+r)\\&\quad-U_B^-(t,t+r)\int_t^{t+r}U_B(t+r,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds,\quad\forall t\in\mathbb{R}.\end{aligned}$$

Then for each $\lambda,\mu>\omega+1$, each $t\in\mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t)-\mathcal{J}_\mu^-(f)(t)\|&\leq\kappa e^{-\beta r}\|\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t+r)-\mathcal{J}_\mu^-(f)(t+r)\|\\&\quad+\Big\|\int_t^{t+r}U_B^-(t,s)[\lambda R_\lambda(A)-\mu R_\mu(A)]f(s)ds\Big\|\\&\leq 2\kappa e^{-\beta r}\widehat{C}(1,\nu)\|f\|_\eta\\&\quad+\kappa\Big\|\int_t^{t+r}U_B(t+r,s)[\lambda R_\lambda(A)-\mu R_\mu(A)]f(s)ds\Big\|,\end{aligned}$$

and by using (5.29), we obtain the estimate

(5.31)
$$\big\|\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t)-\mathcal{J}_\mu^-(f)(t)\big\|\leq\varepsilon+\kappa\Big\|\int_t^{t+r}U_B(t+r,s)\big[\lambda R_\lambda(A)-\mu R_\mu(A)\big]f(s)ds\Big\|.$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Now we infer from Theorem 1.5 that

$$\lim_{\lambda,\mu\to+\infty}\int_t^{t+r} U_B(t+r,s)\big[\lambda R_\lambda(A)-\mu R_\mu(A)\big]f(s)ds=0,$$

uniformly for t in a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$, and (5.31) yields

$$\lim_{\lambda,\mu\to+\infty}\|\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t)-\mathcal{J}_\mu^-(f)(t)\|\le\varepsilon$$

uniformly for t in a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$. Since $\varepsilon>0$ is arbitrarily fixed, we conclude by a Cauchy sequence argument that $\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t)$ exists uniformly for t in a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$.

Finally, we obtain that

$$\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\mathcal{J}_\lambda(f)(t)=\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\mathcal{J}_\lambda^+(f)(t)+\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\mathcal{J}_\lambda^-(f)(t)$$

exists uniformly for t in a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$.

(iv) The proof of this part uses the same argument as in the proof of (iii). The uniform convergence on $\mathbb{R}$ is obtained by using Proposition 4.1, which ensures that the limits

$$\lim_{\lambda,\mu\to+\infty}\int_{t-r}^{t} U_B(t,s)\big[\lambda R_\lambda(A)-\mu R_\mu(A)\big]f(s)ds=0,$$

and

$$\lim_{\lambda,\mu\to+\infty}\int_t^{t+r} U_B(t+r,s)[\lambda R_\lambda(A)-\mu R_\mu(A)]f(s)ds=0$$

are uniform for $t\in\mathbb{R}$. ∎

We are now ready to prove an analogue of Theorem 5.4 for our purpose.

Theorem 5.13 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 be satisfied. Assume in addition that*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)}<+\infty.$$

Then the following assertions are equivalent.

(i) *The evolution family $\{U_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$ has an exponential dichotomy.*
(ii) *For each $f\in BC(\mathbb{R},X)$, there exists a unique integrated solution $u\in BC(\mathbb{R},X_0)$ of (1.1).*

Moreover, if U_B has an exponential dichotomy with exponent $\beta>0$, then for each $\eta\in[0,\beta)$ and each $f\in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R},X)$, there exists a unique integrated solution $u\in BC^\eta(\mathbb{R},X_0)$ of (1.1), which is given by

$$u(t)=\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\mathcal{J}_\lambda(f)(t)=\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\Gamma_B(t,s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)f(s)ds,\quad\forall t\in\mathbb{R},$$

where $\{\Gamma_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\mathbb{R}^2}$ is the Green's operator function associated with $\{U_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$.

Proof (i) ⇒ (ii) This is a direct consequence of Lemma 5.12 by taking the limit when λ goes to $+\infty$ in (5.26).

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(ii) ⇒ (i) First of all, note that since $BC(\mathbb{R}, X_0) \subset BC(\mathbb{R}, X)$, property (ii) ensures that for each $f \in BC(\mathbb{R}, X_0)$, there exists a unique integrated solution $u \in BC(\mathbb{R}, X_0)$ of (1.1). Furthermore, note that if $u_f \in BC(\mathbb{R}, X_0)$ is a solution of (1.1) for $f \in BC(\mathbb{R}, X_0)$, then by Corollary 3.1, we know that it satisfies the integral equation

$$u_f(t) = U_B(t, t_0)x_0 + \int_{t_0}^{t} U_B(t, s)f(s)ds, \quad \forall t \geq t_0,$$

and (i) follows by Theorem 5.4. The proof is complete. ∎

As a consequence of the foregoing theorem, we can obtain the following persistence result for exponential dichotomy

Theorem 5.14 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 5.6 be satisfied and assume in addition that*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} < +\infty.$$

Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for each strongly continuous family $\{C(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \subset \mathcal{L}(X_0, X)$ satisfying

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|B(t) - C(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_0,X)} \leq \varepsilon,$$

the evolution family generated by

$$\frac{du(t)}{dt} = (A + C(t))u(t), \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{5.32}$$

has an exponential dichotomy.

Proof The proof of this theorem is classical. Then, so we will only sketch the proof. Note that the the evolution family generated by (5.32) has an exponential dichotomy if and only if for each $f \in BC(\mathbb{R}, X)$, there exists a unique $u \in BC(\mathbb{R}, X_0)$ satisfying

$$\frac{du(t)}{dt} = \big(A + C(t)\big)u(t) + f(t), \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{du(t)}{dt} = \big(A + B(t)\big)u(t) + \big[C(t) - B(t)\big]u(t) + f(t), \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

This is equivalent to solve for each $f \in BC(\mathbb{R}, X)$ the fixed point problem to find $u \in BC(\mathbb{R}, X_0)$ such that

$$u(t) = \mathcal{J}\big(\big[C(.) - B(.)\big]u(.) + f(.)\big)(t),$$

where

$$\mathcal{J}(g)(t) = \lim_{\lambda\to+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \Gamma_B(t, s)\lambda R_\lambda(A)g(s)ds, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$$

which can be performed by using the uniform estimates (5.25) (for $\eta = 0$) obtained in Lemma 5.12. ∎

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

6 Example 1

In order to illustrate our results, we will apply some of the results to a parabolic equation. Let $p \in [1, +\infty)$ and $I := (0,1)$. Consider the following parabolic equation with non-local boundary condition for each initial time $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u(t,x)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial^2 u(t,x)}{\partial x^2} + \alpha u(t,x) + g(t,x), \text{ for } t \geq t_0 \text{ and } x \in (0,1), \\ -\frac{\partial u(t,0)}{\partial x} = \int_I \beta_0(t,x)\varphi(x)dx + h_0(t), \\ +\frac{\partial u(t,1)}{\partial x} = \int_I \beta_1(t,x)\varphi(x)dx + h_1(t), \\ u(t_0,.) = \varphi \in L^p(I,\mathbb{R}), \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

with $\alpha > 0$, $g \in C(\mathbb{R}, L^p(I,\mathbb{R}))$, $h_0, h_1 \in C(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$, and $\beta_0, \beta_1 \in C(\mathbb{R}, L^q(I,\mathbb{R}))$ (with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$).

Abstract reformulation: In order to incorporate the boundary condition into the state variable, we consider

$$X := \mathbb{R}^2 \times L^p(I,\mathbb{R})$$

which is a Banach space endowed with the usual product norm

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ x_1 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} \right\| = |x_0| + |x_1| + \|\varphi\|_{L^p},$$

and we set

$$X_0 := \{0_{\mathbb{R}^2}\} \times L^p(I,\mathbb{R}).$$

We consider $\mathcal{A} : D(\mathcal{A}) \subset X \to X$ the linear operator defined by

$$\mathcal{A}\begin{pmatrix} 0_{\mathbb{R}^2} \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \varphi'(0) \\ -\varphi'(1) \\ \varphi'' \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$D(\mathcal{A}) := \{0_{\mathbb{R}^2}\} \times W^{2,p}(I,\mathbb{R}).$$

By construction, $\mathcal{A}_0$ the part of $\mathcal{A}$ in X_0 coincides with the usual formulation for the parabolic equation (6.1) with homogeneous boundary conditions. Indeed, $\mathcal{A}_0 : D(\mathcal{A}_0) \subset X_0 \to X_0$ is a linear operator on X_0 defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_0\begin{pmatrix} 0_{\mathbb{R}^2} \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{\mathbb{R}^2} \\ \varphi'' \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$D(\mathcal{A}_0) = \{0_{\mathbb{R}^2}\} \times \left\{\varphi \in W^{2,p}\big((0,1),\mathbb{R}\big) : \varphi'(0) = \varphi'(1) = 0\right\}.$$

In the following lemma, we will first summarize some classical properties for the linear operator $\mathcal{A}_0$.

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lemma 6.1 *The linear operator $\mathcal{A}_0$ is the infinitesimal generator of $\{T_{\mathcal{A}_0}(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$, an analytic semigroup of bounded linear operators on X_0. Moreover, $T_{\mathcal{A}_0}(t)$ is compact for each $t>0$ and $(0,+\infty)\subset\rho(\mathcal{A}_0)$. The spectrum of $\mathcal{A}_0$ is given by*

$$\sigma(\mathcal{A}_0)=\{-(\pi k)^2 : k\in\mathbb{N}\},$$

and each eigenvalue $\lambda_k := -(\pi k)^2$ is associated with the eigenfunction

$$\psi_k(x) := \cos(\pi k x).$$

Furthermore, each eigenvalue λ_k is simple, and the projector on the generalized eigenspace associated with this eigenvalue is given by

$$\Pi_{k,0}\begin{pmatrix}0_{\mathbb{R}^2}\\ \varphi\end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix}0_{\mathbb{R}^2}\\ \frac{\int_0^1\psi_k(r)\varphi(r)dr}{\int_0^1\psi_k(r)^2dr}\psi_k\end{pmatrix}.$$

Set

$$\Omega_\omega=\{\lambda\in\mathbb{C} : \mathcal{R}e(\lambda)>\omega\},\quad \forall\omega\in\mathbb{R},$$

define for $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$,

$$\Delta(\lambda) := \mu^2(e^{\mu}-e^{-\mu}),$$

where $\mu := \sqrt{\lambda}$. Next we compute the resolvent of $\mathcal{A}$ explicitly.

Lemma 6.2 *For each $\omega_{\mathcal{A}}\geq 0$ such that*

$$\Omega_{\omega_{\mathcal{A}}}\subset\{\lambda\in\mathbb{C} : \Delta(\lambda)\neq 0\}\subset\rho(\mathcal{A}),$$

and for each $\lambda := \mu^2\in\Omega_{\omega_{\mathcal{A}}}$, we have

$$(\lambda I-\mathcal{A})\begin{pmatrix}0_{\mathbb{R}^2}\\ \varphi\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}y_0\\ y_1\\ f\end{pmatrix}\Longleftrightarrow$$

$$\begin{pmatrix}c0_{\mathbb{R}^2}\\ \varphi\end{pmatrix}=(\lambda I-\mathcal{A})^{-1}\begin{pmatrix}y_0\\ y_1\\ f\end{pmatrix}\Longleftrightarrow$$

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(x)=&\frac{\Delta_1(x)}{\Delta(\lambda)}\frac{1}{\mu}y_0+\frac{\Delta_2(x)}{\Delta(\lambda)}\frac{1}{\mu}y_1+\frac{\Delta_1(x)}{\Delta(\lambda)}\frac{1}{2\mu}\int_0^1 e^{-\mu s}f(s)ds\\ &+\frac{\Delta_2(x)}{\Delta(\lambda)}\frac{1}{2\mu}\int_0^1 e^{-\mu(1-s)}f(s)ds+\frac{1}{2\mu}\int_0^1 e^{-\mu|x-s|}f(s)ds,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Delta_1(x)=\mu^2\left[e^{\mu(1-x)}+e^{-\mu(1-x)}\right]\quad\text{and}\quad\Delta_2(x)=\mu^2\left[e^{-\mu x}+e^{\mu x}\right].$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof In order to compute the resolvent, we set

$$u(x) := \frac{1}{2\mu}\int_0^1 e^{-\mu|x-s|}f(s)ds = \frac{1}{2\mu}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\mu|x-s|}\tilde{f}(s)ds,$$

where $\tilde{f}$ extends f by 0 on $\mathbb{R}\backslash[0,1]$. We have

$$u(x) = \frac{1}{2\mu}\left[\int_{-\infty}^{x} e^{-\mu(x-s)}\tilde{f}(s)ds + \int_x^{+\infty} e^{\mu(x-s)}\tilde{f}(s)ds\right],$$

so

$$u'(x) = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{-\infty}^{x} e^{-\mu(x-s)}\tilde{f}(s)ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_x^{+\infty} e^{\mu(x-s)}\tilde{f}(s)ds.$$

We set

$$u(0) = y_0 := \frac{1}{2\mu}\int_0^1 e^{-\mu s}f(s)ds \quad \text{and} \quad u(1) = y_1 := \frac{1}{2\mu}\int_0^1 e^{-\mu(1-s)}f(s)ds,$$

and we observe that

$$u'(0) = \mu y_0 \quad \text{and} \quad u'(1) = -\mu y_1.$$

We set

$$u_1(x) := e^{-\mu x} \quad \text{and} \quad u_2(x) := e^{\mu x}.$$

In order to solve the problem

$$(\lambda I - \mathcal{A})\begin{pmatrix}0\\0\\\varphi\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}y_0\\y_1\\f\end{pmatrix},$$

we look for φ under the form

$$\varphi(x) = u(x) + z_1u_1(x) + z_2u_2(x),$$

where $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$.

We observe that to verify the boundary conditions

$$-\varphi'(0) = y_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi'(1) = y_1$$

is equivalent to verify

$$\begin{cases} u'(0) + z_1u_1'(0) + z_2u_2'(0) = -y_0, \\ u'(0) + z_1u_1'(0) + z_2u_2'(0) = y_1, \end{cases}$$

so we must solve the system

$$\begin{aligned} z_1u_1'(0) + z_2u_2'(0) &= -y_0 - u'(0), \\ z_1u_1'(1) + z_2u_2'(1) &= y_1 - u'(1), \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} -\mu z_1 + \mu z_2 &= -y_0 - \mu y_0, \\ -\mu e^{-\mu}z_1 + \mu e^{\mu}z_2 &= y_1 + \mu y_1; \end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hence,

$$z_1 = \frac{1}{\Delta(\lambda)}\big[-\mu e^{\mu}(-y_0 - \mu\gamma_0) + \mu(y_1 + \mu\gamma_1)\big],$$
$$z_2 = \frac{1}{\Delta(\lambda)}\big[-\mu e^{-\mu}(-y_0 - \mu\gamma_0) + \mu(y_1 + \mu\gamma_1)\big],$$

and the result follows. ∎

The following estimation shows that $\mathcal{A}$ is not a Hille–Yosida operator.

Lemma 6.3 *We have the following estimations:*

$$0 < \liminf_{\lambda\left(\in\mathbb{R}\right)\to+\infty} \lambda^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \left\|(\lambda I - \mathcal{A})^{-1}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \leq \limsup_{\lambda(\in\mathbb{R})\to+\infty} \lambda^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \left\|(\lambda I - \mathcal{A})^{-1}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} < +\infty,$$

with

$$p^* = \frac{2p}{1+p}.$$

Proof Let $\lambda > 0$ be large enough. We have

$$\left\|(\lambda I - \mathcal{A})^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y_1 \\ 0_{L^p} \end{pmatrix}\right\| = |y_1|\frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\Delta(\lambda)}\left\|e^{\sqrt{\lambda}\cdot} + e^{-\sqrt{\lambda}\cdot}\right\|_{L^p}.$$

Set

$$\gamma_\lambda := \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\Delta(\lambda)}\left\|e^{\sqrt{\lambda}\cdot} + e^{-\sqrt{\lambda}\cdot}\right\|_{L^p},$$

we have

$$\frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\Delta(\lambda)}\left[\|e^{\sqrt{\lambda}\cdot}\|_{L^p} - \|e^{-\sqrt{\lambda}\cdot}\|_{L^p}\right] \leq \gamma_\lambda \leq \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\Delta(\lambda)}\left[\|e^{\sqrt{\lambda}\cdot}\|_{L^p} + \|e^{-\sqrt{\lambda}\cdot}\|_{L^p}\right],$$
$$\frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\Delta(\lambda)}\|e^{\sqrt{\lambda}\cdot}\|_{L^p} = \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\lambda(e^{\sqrt{\lambda}} - e^{-\sqrt{\lambda}})}\left(\int_0^1 e^{p\sqrt{\lambda}x}dx\right)^{1/p},$$
$$\lim_{\lambda\to+\infty} \gamma_\lambda \lambda^{\frac{p+1}{2p}} = (1/p)^{1/p} > 0,$$

and the result follows. ∎

By using Lemmas 6.1–6.3, we deduce that Ducrot, Magal, and Prevost [6, Assumption 3.4] is satisfied. Therefore, by applying [6, Theorem 3.11], we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 6.4 *The linear operator $\mathcal{A}$ satisfies Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2.*

Remark 6.5. Since $\rho(\mathcal{A}) \neq \varnothing$, one can prove that $\sigma(\mathcal{A}_0) = \sigma(\mathcal{A})$ (see [20]).

Abstract Cauchy problem: By identifying $u(t,.)$ and $v(t) := \begin{pmatrix} 0_{\mathbb{R}^2} \\ u(t,.) \end{pmatrix}$, we can rewrite equation (6.1) as the following abstract Cauchy problem for each initial time

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\frac{dv(t)}{dt} = \mathcal{A}v(t) + \alpha v(t) + \mathcal{B}(t)v(t) + f(t), \text{ for } t \geq t_0 \text{ and } v(t_0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{\mathbb{R}^2} \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix}, \tag{6.2}$$

where

$$\mathcal{B}(t)\begin{pmatrix} 0_{\mathbb{R}} \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \int_I \beta_0(t,x)\varphi(x)dx \\ \int_I \beta_1(t,x)\varphi(x)dx \\ 0_{L^p} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad f(t) := \begin{pmatrix} h_0(t) \\ h_1(t) \\ g(t,.) \end{pmatrix}.$$

By using Lemma 6.1, we know that $(\mathcal{A} + \alpha I)_0$ the part of $(\mathcal{A} + \alpha I)$ in $X = \mathbb{R}^2 \times L^p((0,+\infty),\mathbb{R})$, is the infinitesimal generator of $\left\{T_{(\mathcal{A}+\alpha I)_0}(t)\right\}_{t\geq 0}$ an analytic semigroup of bounded linear operators on X_0. By using Lemma 6.4, we deduce that $(\mathcal{A} + \alpha I)$ generates an integrated semigroup $\left\{S_{(\mathcal{A}+\alpha I)}(t)\right\}_{t\geq 0}$. Consider for each initial time $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ the parabolic equation

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u(t,x)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial^2 u(t,x)}{\partial x^2} + \alpha u(t,x), \text{ for } t \geq t_0 \text{ and } x \in (0,1), \\ -\frac{\partial u(t,0)}{\partial x} = \int_I \beta_0(t,x)\varphi(x)dx, \\ +\frac{\partial u(t,1)}{\partial x} = \int_I \beta_1(t,x)\varphi(x)dx, \\ u(t_0,.) = \varphi \in L^p(I,\mathbb{R}). \end{cases} \tag{6.3}$$

This equation corresponds to the abstract Cauchy problem for each initial time $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\frac{dv(t)}{dt} = (\mathcal{A} + \alpha I)v(t) + \mathcal{B}(t)v(t), \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0 \text{ and } v(t_0) = \begin{pmatrix} c0_{\mathbb{R}^2} \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6.4}$$

Variation of constants formula: By using Proposition 1.4, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 6.6 *The Cauchy problem (6.4) generates a unique evolution family $\{U_{\mathcal{B}}(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta} \subset \mathcal{L}(X_0)$. Moreover, $U_{\mathcal{B}}(\cdot,t_0)x_0 \in C([t_0,+\infty),X_0)$ is the unique solution of the fixed point problem*

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\mathcal{B}}(t,t_0)x_0 = {} & T_{(\mathcal{A}+\alpha I)_0}(t-t_0)x_0 \\ & + \frac{d}{dt}\int_{t_0}^{t} S_{(\mathcal{A}+\alpha I)}(t-s)\mathcal{B}(s)U_{\mathcal{B}}(s,t_0)x_0 ds, \ t \geq t_0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

If we assume in addition that

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|\beta_0(t,.)\|_{L^q} + \|\beta_1(t,.)\|_{L^q} < +\infty,$$

then the evolution family $\{U_{\mathcal{B}}(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$ is exponentially bounded.

By using Theorem 1.5, we obtain the following result.

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Theorem 6.7 *For each $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, each $x_0 \in X_0$, and each $f \in C([t_0, +\infty], X)$ the unique integrated solution $v_f \in C([t_0, +\infty], X_0)$ of (6.2) is given for each $t \geq t_0$ by*

$$v_f(t) = U_{\mathcal{B}}(t, t_0)x_0 + \lim_{\lambda \to +\infty} \int_{t_0}^{t} U_{\mathcal{B}}(t, s)\lambda R_\lambda(\mathcal{A} + \alpha I)f(s)ds, \tag{6.6}$$

where the limit exists in X_0. Moreover, the convergence in (6.6) is uniform with respect to $t, t_0 \in I$ for each compact interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$.

Exponential dichotomy result: By using Theorem 5.13, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 6.8 *Assume that*

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\beta_0(t, .)\|_{L^q} + \|\beta_1(t, .)\|_{L^q} < +\infty.$$

Then the following assertions are equivalent.

(i) *The evolution family $\{U_{\mathcal{B}}(t, s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$ has an exponential dichotomy.*
(ii) *For each $f \in BC(\mathbb{R}, X)$, there exists a unique integrated solution $u \in BC(\mathbb{R}, X_0)$ of (6.2).*

Assumption 6.9 Assume that $\alpha > 0$ and $\alpha \neq -(\pi k)^2, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Then the spectrum of $\mathcal{A} + \alpha I$ does not contain any purely imaginary eigenvalue, and by using Lemma 6.1 and Remark 6.5, we deduce that

$$\sigma(\mathcal{A} + \alpha I) = \sigma(\mathcal{A}_0 + \alpha I) = \left\{-(\pi k)^2 + \alpha : k \in \mathbb{N}\right\}.$$

Therefore,

$$0 \notin \sigma(\mathcal{A}_0 + \alpha I).$$

Then $U(t, s) := T_{\mathcal{A}+\alpha I}(t - s)$ has an exponential dichotomy, and we can apply Theorem 5.14 with $A + B(t) := \mathcal{A} + \alpha I$ and $C(t) := \mathcal{B}(t)$.

Theorem 6.10 *Let Assumption 6.9 be satisfied. There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\beta_0(t, .)\|_{L^q} + \|\beta_1(t, .)\|_{L^q} < \varepsilon$$

implies that the evolution family $\{U_{\mathcal{B}}(t, s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta} \subset \mathcal{L}(X_0)$ has an exponential dichotomy.

7 Example 2

In this section, we briefly illustrate our results with an application to an age-structured model that is a hyperbolic partial differential equation. We consider

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u(t, a) + \partial_a u(t, a) = -\mu u(t, a), \text{ for } t \geq t_0 \text{ and } a \geq 0, \\ u(t, 0) = \int_0^{+\infty} \beta(t, a)u(t, a)da, \\ u(t_0, .) = \varphi \in L^p_+((0, +\infty), \mathbb{R}), \end{cases} \tag{7.1}$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with $\mu > 0, \beta \in C(\mathbb{R}, L^q((0,+\infty),\mathbb{R}))$ (with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$). As in the preceding example, we define the Banach space

$$X := \mathbb{R} \times L^p((0,+\infty),\mathbb{R})$$

in order to incorporate the boundary condition. The Banach space X is endowed with the usual product norm

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} r \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} \right\| = |r| + \|\varphi\|_{L^p}.$$

Set

$$X_0 := \{0\} \times L^p((0,+\infty),\mathbb{R})).$$

We consider $A : D(A) \subset X \to X$ the linear operator defined by

$$A \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} c - \varphi(0) \\ -\varphi' - \mu\varphi \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$D(A) := \{0\} \times W^{1,p}((0,+\infty),\mathbb{R}).$$

The following lemma is proved in [19, Lemmas 8.1 and 8.3].

Lemma 7.1 *The linear operator A satisfies Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2. Moreover, we have*

$$0 < \lim_{\lambda \to +\infty} \lambda^{\frac{1}{p}} \|R_\lambda(A)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} < +\infty.$$

Lemma 7.1 implies that the part A_0 of A on $X_0 := \overline{D(A)}$ generates a C_0-semigroup $\{T_{A_0}(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$.

Now we consider the family of bounded linear operators $\{B(t)\}_{t\geq 0} \subset \mathcal{L}(X)$ given by

$$B(t) \begin{pmatrix} r \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \int_0^{+\infty} \beta(t,a)\varphi(a)da \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \forall \begin{pmatrix} r \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} \in X.$$

Hence, by identifying $u(t,.)$ and $v(t) := \begin{pmatrix} 0_{\mathbb{R}^2} \\ u(t,.) \end{pmatrix}$, system (7.1) rewrites as the following abstract Cauchy problem for each initial time $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\frac{dv(t)}{dt} = Av(t) + B(t)v(t), \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0 \text{ and } v(t_0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{\mathbb{R}^2} \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix}. \tag{7.2}$$

Proposition 7.2 *The Cauchy problem (7.1) generates a unique evolution family $\{U_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta} \subset \mathcal{L}(X_0)$. Moreover, $U_B(\cdot,t_0)x_0 \in C([t_0,+\infty),X_0)$ is the unique solution of the fixed point problem*

$$U_B(t,t_0)x_0 = T_{A_0}(t-t_0)x_0 + \frac{d}{dt}\int_{t_0}^{t} S_A(t-s)B(s)U_B(s,t_0)x_0 ds, \quad t \geq t_0.$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

If we assume in addition that

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|\beta(t,.)\|_{L^q} < +\infty,$$

then the evolution family $\{U_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$ *is exponentially bounded.*

By using Theorem 1.5, we also obtain the following result concerning the existence of exponential dichotomy.

Theorem 7.3 *Assume that*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|\beta(t,.)\|_{L^q} < +\infty.$$

Then the following assertions are equivalent.

(i) *The evolution family* $\{U_B(t,s)\}_{(t,s)\in\Delta}$ *has an exponential dichotomy.*
(ii) *For each* $f \in BC(\mathbb{R},X)$*, there exists a unique integrated solution* $v \in BC(\mathbb{R},X_0)$ *of*

$$\frac{dv(t)}{dt} = Av(t) + B(t)v(t) + f(t), \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Acknowledgment The authors would like to thank the anonymous referees for their valuable comments that helped to improve the manuscript.

References

[1] W. Arendt, *Resolvent positive operators.* Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. **54**(1987), 321–349. http://dx.doi.org/10.1112/plms/s3-54.2.321
[2] W. Arendt, *Vector valued Laplace transforms and Cauchy problems.* Israel J. Math. **59**(1987), 327–352. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02774144
[3] A. G. Baskakov, *Semigroups of difference operators in spectral analysis of linear differential operators.* Funct. Anal. Appl. **30**(1996), 149–157. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02509501
[4] S. Boulite, L. Maniar, and M. Moussi, *Non-autonomous retarded differential equations: variation of constants formulas and asymptotic behaviour.* Elect. J. Differ. Equat. (2003), no. 62, 1–15.
[5] S. Boulite, L. Maniar, and M. Moussi, *Wellposedness and asymptotic behaviour of non-autonomous boundary Cauchy problems.* Forum Math. **18**(2006), 611–638. http://dx.doi.org/10.1015/FORUM.2006.032
[6] A. Ducrot, P. Magal, and K. Prevost, *Integrated semigroups and parabolic equations. Part I: linear perturbation of almost sectorial operators.* J. Evol. Equat. **10**(2010), 263–291. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00028-009-0049-z
[7] A. Ducrot, P. Magal, and O. Seydi, *A finite-time condition for exponential trichotomy in infinite dynamical systems.* Canad. J. Math. **67**(2015), 1065–1090. http://dx.doi.org/10.4153/CJM-2014-023-3
[8] A. Ducrot, P. Magal, and O. Seydi, *Persistence of exponential trichotomy for linear operators: A Lyapunov-Perron approach.* J. Dyn. Differ. Equat. **28**(2016), 93–126. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10884-015-9493-3
[9] A. Ducrot, Z. Liu, and P. Magal, *Projectors on the generalized eigenspaces for neutral functional differential equations in L spaces.* Canad. J. Math. **62**(2010), 74–93. http://dx.doi.org/10.4153/CJM-2010-005-2
[10] K.-J. Engel and R. Nagel, *One-parameter semigroups for linear evolution equations.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 194, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
[11] G. Gühring and F. Räbiger, *Asymptotic properties of mild solutions of nonautonomous evolution equations with applications to retarded differential equations.* Abstr. App. Anal. **4**(1999), 169–194. http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/S1085337599000214
[12] J. K. Hale and X. B. Lin, *Heteroclinic orbits for retarded functional differential equations.* J. Differ. Equat. **65**(1986), 175–202. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-0396(86)90032-X

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[13] D. Henry, *Geometric theory of semilinear parabolic equations*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 840, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1981.
[14] H. Kellermann and M. Hieber, *Integrated semigroups.* J. Funct. Anal. **84**(1989), 160–180. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-1236(89)90116-X
[15] Y. Latushkin, T. Randolph, and R. Schnaubelt, *Exponential dichotomy and mild solutions of nonautonomous equations in Banach spaces.* J. Dyn. Differ. Equat. **10**(1998), 489–510. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1022609414870
[16] B. M. Levitan and V. V. Zhikov, *Almost periodic functions and differential equations*. Translated from the Russian by L. W. Longdon, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York, 1982.
[17] Z. Lian and K. Lu, *Lyapunov exponents and invariant manifolds for random dynamical systems in a Banach space*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **206**(2010), no. 967. http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0065-9266-10-00574-0
[18] P. Magal and S. Ruan, *On integrated semigroups and age structured models in L^p spaces.* Differ. Integral Equat. **20**(2007), 197–239.
[19] P. Magal and S. Ruan, *On semilinear Cauchy problems with non-dense domain.* Adv. Differ. Equat. **14**(2009), 1041–1084.
[20] P. Magal and S. Ruan, *Center manifolds for semilinear equations with non-dense domain and applications to Hopf bifurcation in age structured models*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **202**(2009), no. 951. http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0065-9266-09-00568-7
[21] R. Schnaubelt, *Sufficient conditions for exponential stability and dichotomy of evolution equations.* Forum Math. **11**(1999), no. 5, 543–566. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/form.1999.013
[22] H. R. Thieme, *Integrated semigroups and integrated solutions to abstract Cauchy problems.* J. Math. Anal. App. **152**(1990), 416–447. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X(90)90074-P
[23] H. R. Thieme, *Differentiability of convolutions, integrated semigroups of bounded semi-variation, and the inhomogeneous Cauchy problem.* J. Evol. Equat. **8**(2008), 283–305. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00028-007-0355-2

Université de Bordeaux, IMB, UMR 5251, F-33076 Bordeaux, France
and
CNRS, IMB, UMR 5251, F-33400 Talence, France
e-mail: pierre.magal@u-bordeaux.fr

Département Tronc Commun, Ecole Polytechnique de Thiès, Thiès 21001, Sénégal
e-mail: oseydi@ept.sn

https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X20000541 Published online by Cambridge University Press