

Parabolic equations with coefficients depending on t and parameters

by T. WINIARSKA (Kraków)

Zdzisław Opial in memoriam

Abstract. The main object of this paper is to study the continuity with respect to both h and t of solutions of the problem

$$\frac{du}{dt}(t) + A_h(t)u(t) = f(h, t), \quad u(0) = u_h^0.$$

Introduction. In this paper, we consider the parabolic problem

$$(*) \quad \frac{du}{dt}(t) + A_h(t)u(t) = f(h, t), \quad t \in (0, T], \quad h \in \Omega,$$

$u(0) = u_h^0$. It is well known (see e.g. [8]) that in some cases the solution is given by the formula

$$(**) \quad u_h(t) = U_h(t, 0)u_h^0 + \int_0^t U_h(t, s)f(h, s)ds,$$

where U_h is the fundamental solution of equation (*). Since the sufficient conditions for $u_h(t)$ (given by (**)) to be the solution to problem (*) are well known in the literature, we do not discuss them here. We shall only study the continuity of the mapping

$$(***) \quad u: \Omega \times [0, T] \ni (h, t) \rightarrow u_h(t) \in X$$

with $u_h(t)$ given by (**), without specifying assumptions which guarantee that u_h is the solution of (*). Our assumptions enable us to repeat the construction of U_h presented in [8], Chapter 5, and to prove that $u_h(t)$ is continuous with respect to both h and t .

Theorems on the class of regularity of $u_h(t)$ with respect to h and t will be published elsewhere.

Similar problems are considered in [1], [6], [9], [10] for differential equations with coefficients independent of t .

2. Notation and definitions. Let X be a Banach space and let Ω be a locally compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n .

We denote by $B(X, Y)$ the space of bounded linear operators from X to Y . If $X = Y$, then $B(X, X)$ is denoted by $B(X)$. The space of closed linear operators from X to X will be denoted $\mathcal{C}(X)$. For a given operator $A \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ the resolvent set of A will be denoted by $P(A)$.

We shall consider a family $(A_h(t))_{(h,t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]}$ of closed linear operators from X to X defined for each $h \in \Omega$ on a dense linear subspace $D(A_h(t)) = D$ of X .

ASSUMPTION Z_1 . There exists a Banach space Z and a bijective mapping $T: Z \rightarrow D$ such that $T \in B(Z, X)$ and the mapping

$$(1) \quad \Omega \times [0, T] \ni (\tau, r) \rightarrow A_\tau(r)T \in B(Z, X)$$

is continuous.

ASSUMPTION Z_2 . There exist a Banach space Z , a continuous linear bijective mapping $T: Z \rightarrow D$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ such that the mapping

$$(2) \quad [0, T] \ni t \rightarrow A_\tau(t)T \in B(Z, X) \quad \text{for } \tau \in \Omega$$

is Hölder continuous, i.e. there exists $\tilde{L} > 0$ such that

$$\|A_\tau(t)T - A_\tau(s)T\| \leq \tilde{L}|t - s|^\alpha \quad \text{for } \tau \in \Omega,$$

$0 \leq s \leq T$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$.

We easily see that Assumptions Z_1, Z_2 are independent of the choice of (Z, T) .

ASSUMPTION Z_3 . $A_h(t) \in G(C_0)$ for $(h, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$, where

$$(3) \quad G(C_0) = \{A \in \mathcal{C}(X): \overline{D(A)} = X, [0, +\infty) \subset P(-A), \|(A + \xi)^{-k}\| \leq C_0 \xi^{-k} \text{ for } \xi > 0, k = 1, 2, \dots \text{ and } \|A \exp(-tA)\| \leq C_0 t^{-1} \text{ for } t > 0\}.$$

Remark 1. It follows from Assumption Z_1 that if, for $(h, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$, $A_h(t)$ is invertible (1-1 and onto), then

$$(4) \quad A_h(t)A_{h_0}^{-1}(s) \rightarrow A_{h_0}(t)A_{h_0}^{-1}(s) \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow h_0,$$

uniformly on $\Delta_T = \{(t, s): 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T\}$. Hence, if K is a bounded subset of X , then

$$(5) \quad (A_h(t) - A_{h_0}(t))A_{h_0}^{-1}(s)x \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow h_0$$

uniformly on $\Delta_T \times K$.

LEMMA 1. If for every $(h, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$ the operator $A_h(t)$ is invertible and Assumptions Z_1, Z_2 are satisfied, then for every compact subset K of Ω there exists $L > 0$ such that

$$(6) \quad \|A_\tau(t)A_h^{-1}(r) - A_\tau(s)A_h^{-1}(r)\| \leq L|t - s|^\alpha$$

for $h, \tau \in K$ and $t, s, r \in [0, T]$.

Proof. Let K be a compact subset of Ω . Since the mapping

$$\Omega \times [0, T] \ni (h, r) \rightarrow (A_h(r)T)^{-1} = T^{-1}A_h^{-1}(r) \in B(X, Z)$$

is continuous, there exists $\tilde{C} > 0$ such that

$$\|(A_h(r)T)^{-1}\| \leq \tilde{C} \quad \text{for } (h, r) \in K \times [0, T].$$

Hence

$$\|A_\tau(t)A_h^{-1}(r) - A_\tau(s)A_h^{-1}(r)\| \leq \tilde{C}\|A_\tau(t)T - A_h(s)T\| \leq \tilde{C}\tilde{L}|t-s|^\alpha = L|t-s|^\alpha.$$

LEMMA 2. Let U be a compact space, let $\Phi(h, z) \in B(X)$ for $(h, z) \in \Omega \times U$, let D be a dense subset of X and let $h_0 \in \Omega$. Suppose that there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$(7) \quad \|\Phi(h, z)\| \leq C_1 \quad \text{for } (h, z) \in \Omega \times U.$$

If, for any $x \in D$,

$$\Phi(h, z)x \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow h_0,$$

uniformly in U , then

(i) for any $x \in X$, $\Phi(h, z)x \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow h_0$, uniformly in U ;

(ii) for any compact subset K of X , $\Phi(h, z)x \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow h_0$, uniformly in $U \times K$.

Proof. (i) is obvious. To prove (ii), let us observe that the family $(\Phi(h, z))$ is equicontinuous. Therefore, for every $x_0 \in X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta = \delta(x_0) > 0$ such that

$$\Phi(h, z)(B(x_0, \delta)) \subset B(\Phi(h, z)x_0, \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon)$$

where $B(x_0, \delta)$ is the ball of radius δ centered at x_0 . Since K is a compact subset of X , there exist points $x_j \in K$, $j = 1, \dots, l$, such that

$$K \subset \sum_{j=1}^l B(x_j, \delta(x_j)).$$

Therefore, by (i), there exists $\mu > 0$ such that

$$\|\Phi(h, z)x_j\| < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, l,$$

provided $|h - h_0| < \mu$ and $z \in U$. Thus $\Phi(h, z)(K) \subset B(0, \varepsilon)$ and this ends the proof.

We shall consider the following parabolic problem:

$$(8) \quad \frac{du}{dt}(t) + A_h(t)u(t) = f(h, t), \quad 0 < t \leq T,$$

$$(9) \quad u(0) = u_h^0$$

with the parameter $h \in \Omega$, given $u_h^0 \in X$ and a continuous function $f: \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow X$.

DEFINITION 1. We say that a function

$$u: \Omega \times [0, T] \ni (h, t) \rightarrow u_h(t) = u(h, t) \in X$$

is a *solution of problem (8)–(9)* if $u_h \in C([0, T]; X) \cap C^1((0, T]; X)$, $u_h(0) = u_h^0$ and u_h satisfies (9) in $(0, T]$ for $h \in \Omega$.

For convenience we now recall the construction of the fundamental solution $U_h(t, s)$ of (8) (for details see [8], Chapter 5), for $h \in \Omega$. Some inequalities needed in the sequel will also be recalled:

$$(10) \quad R_1^h(t, s) := -(A_h(t) - A_h(s)) \exp(-(t-s)A_h(s)),$$

where $\exp(-tA_h(s))$ is the strongly continuous semigroup with the infinitesimal generator $A_h(s)$ for $h \in \Omega$, $s \in [0, T]$.

$$(11) \quad R_m^h(t, s) = \int_s^t R_1^h(t, \tau) R_{m-1}^h(\tau, s) d\tau \quad \text{for } m = 2, 3, \dots,$$

$$(12) \quad R^h(t, s) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} R_m^h(t, s),$$

$$(13) \quad W^h(t, s) = \int_s^t \exp(-(t-\tau)A_h(\tau)) R^h(\tau, s) d\tau,$$

$$(14) \quad U_h(t, s) = \exp(-(t-s)A_h(s)) + W^h(t, s),$$

$$(15) \quad \|R_1^h(t, s)\| \leq LC_0(t-s)^{\alpha-1} \quad \text{for } h \in \Omega, s < t \leq T,$$

$$(16) \quad \|R_m^h(t, s)\| \leq \tilde{M}(t-s)^{m\alpha-1} \quad \text{for } h \in \Omega, s < t \leq T,$$

where

$$\tilde{M} = (LC_0\Gamma(\alpha))^m / \Gamma(m\alpha),$$

$$(17) \quad \|R^h(t, s)\| \leq C(t-s)^{\alpha-1} \quad \text{for } s < t,$$

where

$$C = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (LC_0\Gamma(\alpha))^m T^{(m-1)\alpha} (\Gamma(m\alpha))^{-1},$$

$$(18) \quad \|W^h(t, s)\| \leq C(t-s)^{\alpha},$$

$$(19) \quad \|U_h(t, s)\| \leq C.$$

3. Preparatory lemmas. In this section we consider the case of a one-point set $\Omega = \{h_0\}$. For simplicity we omit the parameter h_0 .

LEMMA 3. *If Assumptions Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are fulfilled, then the mapping $\Phi: [0, T] \times [0, T] \times X \rightarrow D \subset X$ given by*

$$(20) \quad \Phi(\tau, s, x) = \exp(-\tau A(s))x$$

is continuous.

Proof. This is a simple consequence of Proposition 1 from [9].

LEMMA 4. *If Assumptions Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are fulfilled, then for any $x \in D$ the mapping*

$$\Delta_T \ni (t, s) \rightarrow R_1(t, s)x \in X$$

is continuous.

Proof. For $x \in D$ we have (see [3])

$$A(s)\exp(-(t-s)A(s))x = \exp(-(t-s)A(s))A(s)x,$$

$$R_1(t, s)x = (A(t) - A(s))A^{-1}(s)\exp(-(t-s)A(s))A(s)x.$$

Thus, by assumptions and Lemma 3, $R_1(t, s)x$ is a continuous function of (t, s, x) .

Remark 2. Combining Lemma 4 and Lemma 2, we have:

(a) for every $x \in X$ the mapping

$$\Delta_T^0 = \{(t, s) \in \Delta_T : t > s\} \ni (t, s) \rightarrow R_1(t, s)x$$

is continuous;

(b) for any compact subset K of X and any $(t_0, s_0) \in \Delta_T^0$ the convergence

$$R_1(t, s)x \rightarrow R_1(t_0, s_0)x \quad \text{when } (t, s) \rightarrow (t_0, s_0)$$

is uniform on K .

LEMMA 5. *If Assumptions Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are fulfilled, then:*

(a) *the mappings*

$$(21) \quad \Delta_T^0 \times X \ni (t, s, x) \rightarrow R_m(t, s)x \in X, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots$$

are continuous;

(b) *for any $x \in D$ the mappings*

$$(22) \quad \Delta_T \ni (t, s) \rightarrow R_m(t, s)x, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots$$

are continuous.

Proof (induction on m). We start with $m = 1$. Let $(t_v, s_v) \in \Delta_T^0$, $x_v \in X$, $v = 1, 2, \dots$, and let $(t_v, s_v) \rightarrow (t_0, s_0) \in \Delta_T^0$, $x_v \rightarrow x_0$. We have, by Remark 2(b),

$$\begin{aligned} & \|R_1(t_v, s_v)x_v - R_1(t_0, s_0)x_0\| \\ & \leq \|R_1(t_v, s_v)x_v - R_1(t_0, s_0)x_v\| + \|R_1(t_0, s_0)(x_v - x_0)\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } v \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that (a) is true for $k = 1, \dots, m-1$ and fix $(t_0, s_0) \in \Delta_T^0$, $x_0 \in X$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{4}(t_0 - s_0)$. For $(t, s, x) \in \Delta_T^0 \times X$ such that $|s - s_0| < \delta$, $|t - t_0| < \delta$, $\|x\| \leq \|x_0\| + 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \int_s^t R_1(t, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s) x d\tau - \int_{s_0}^{t_0} R_1(t_0, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s_0) x_0 d\tau \right\| \\
&= \left\| \int_s^{s_0+\delta} R_1(t, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s) x d\tau \right\| + \left\| \int_{t_0-\delta}^t R_1(t, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s) x d\tau \right\| \\
&\quad + \left\| \int_{s_0}^{s_0+\delta} R_1(t_0, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s_0) x_0 d\tau \right\| + \left\| \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0} R_1(t_0, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s_0) x_0 d\tau \right\| \\
&\quad + \left\| \int_{s_0+\delta}^{t_0-\delta} (R_1(t, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s) x - R_1(t_0, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s_0) x_0) d\tau \right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by inequalities (15), (16),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \int_s^{s_0+\delta} R_1(t, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s) x d\tau \right\| &\leq \int_s^{s_0+\delta} C_0 L(t-\tau)^{\alpha-1} M(\tau-s)^{(m-1)\alpha-1} \|x\| d\tau \\
&\leq (\|x_0\| + 1) C_0 L \tilde{M} \left(\frac{1}{2}(t_0-s_0)\right)^{\alpha-1} \int_s^{s_0+\delta} (\tau-s)^{(m-1)\alpha-1} d\tau \\
&= M_1 (s_0+\delta-s)^{(m-1)\alpha}
\end{aligned}$$

and so, for small enough δ ,

$$\left\| \int_s^{s_0+\delta} R_1(t, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s) x d\tau \right\| < \frac{1}{8}\varepsilon \quad \text{for } s \in (s_0-\delta, s_0+\delta), t \in (t_0-\delta, t_0+\delta).$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \int_{t_0-\delta}^t R_1(t, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s) x d\tau \right\| &< \frac{1}{8}\varepsilon, \\
\left\| \int_{s_0}^{s_0+\delta} R_1(t_0, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s_0) x_0 d\tau \right\| &< \frac{1}{8}\varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left\| \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0} R_1(t_0, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s_0) x_0 d\tau \right\| < \frac{1}{8}\varepsilon \quad \text{for } s \in (s_0-\delta, s_0+\delta), t \in (t_0-\delta, t_0+\delta).$$

To finish the proof of (a), it is enough to prove that there exists $0 < \delta_1 < \frac{1}{2}\delta$ such that

$$\left\| \int_{s_0+\delta}^{t_0-\delta} (R_1(t, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s) x - R_1(t_0, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s_0) x_0) d\tau \right\| < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon,$$

whenever $|t-t_0| < \delta_1$, $|s-s_0| < \delta_1$, $\|x-x_0\| < \delta_1$.

Setting

$$\Psi(t, \tau, s)x = R_1(t, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s)x,$$

we have

$$\|\Psi(t, \tau, s)x - \Psi(t_0, \tau, s_0)x_0\| \leq \|\Psi(t, \tau, s)(x - x_0)\| + \|(\Psi(t, \tau, s) - \Psi(t_0, \tau, s_0))x_0\|$$

and, by (15) and (16),

$$\|\Psi(t, \tau, s)\| \leq \begin{cases} LC_0 \tilde{M} (\frac{1}{2}\delta)^{\alpha-1} (\frac{1}{2}\delta)^{(m-1)\alpha-1} & \text{if } (m-1)\alpha-1 < 0, \\ LC_0 \tilde{M} (\frac{1}{2}\delta)^{\alpha-1} T^{(m-1)\alpha-1} & \text{if } (m-1)\alpha-1 \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

when $|t-t_0| \leq \frac{1}{2}\delta$, $|s-s_0| \leq \frac{1}{2}\delta$, $\tau \in [s_0 + \delta, t_0 - \delta]$.

Since Ψ is continuous on the compact set $K \times \{x_0\}$, where

$$K = \{(t, \tau, s): |t-t_0| \leq \frac{1}{2}\delta, |s-s_0| \leq \frac{1}{2}\delta, \tau \in [s_0 + \delta, t_0 - \delta]\},$$

there exists $0 < \delta_1 < \frac{1}{2}\delta$ such that

$$\|\Psi(t, \tau, s)x_0 - \Psi(t_0, \tau, s_0)x_0\| < \varepsilon/4T$$

and

$$\|\Psi(t, \tau, s)\| \|x - x_0\| < \varepsilon/4T$$

for $|t-t_0| < \delta_1$, $|s-s_0| < \delta_1$, $\|x-x_0\| < \delta_1$ and $\tau \in [s_0 + \delta, t_0 - \delta]$.

To prove assertion (b) it is enough to show that the mapping (22) is continuous at any point (t_0, s_0) with $t_0 = s_0$. By Lemma 4 this is true for $m = 1$. Suppose that (22) is continuous for $k = 1, \dots, m-1$. Since $R_m(t_0, t_0) = 0$,

$$R_m(t, s)x - R_m(t_0, t_0)x = \int_s^t R_1(t, \tau) R_{m-1}(\tau, s)x d\tau.$$

By the inductive assumption there exists $M > 0$ such that $\|R_{m-1}(\tau, s)x\| \leq M$. Thus,

$$\|R_m(t, s)x\| \leq \text{const} \cdot (t-s)^\alpha \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t-s \rightarrow 0.$$

PROPOSITION 1. *If Assumptions Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are fulfilled, then*

(a) *the mapping*

$$\Delta_T^0 \times X \ni (t, s, x) \rightarrow R(t, s)x$$

is continuous;

(b) *for every $x \in D$ the mapping*

$$\Delta_T \ni (t, s) \rightarrow R(t, s)x$$

is continuous.

Proof. Let $x \in D$, $m_0 = [1/\alpha] + 1$ and let

$$\Phi(m) = (LC_0 \Gamma(\alpha))^m / \Gamma(m\alpha).$$

By (16)

$$\|R_m(t, s)\| \leq \Phi(m)(t-s)^{m\alpha-1}.$$

Since (cf. [4]).

$$(23) \quad \Gamma(x) = \sqrt{2\pi} x^{x-1/2} e^{-x} (1+r(x))$$

with $|r(x)| \leq e^{1/12x} - 1$, we have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[m]{\Phi(m)} = 0.$$

Since

$$(24) \quad \|R_m(t, s)\| \leq \Phi(m)(t-s)^{m\alpha-1} \leq \Phi(m) T^{m\alpha-1}$$

for $m \geq m_0$, $(t, s) \in \Delta_T$, the series $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} R_m(t, s)$ is uniformly convergent on Δ_T .

Hence and by Lemma 5, Proposition 1 follows.

4. Continuity with respect to parameters. In this section we study the continuity of the function $u_h(t)$ given by the formula

$$(25) \quad u_h(t) = U_h(t, 0)u_h^0 + \int_s^t U_h(t, s)f(h, s)ds$$

with respect to both h and t , where U_h is given by (14).

Since conditions (14) for U_h to be the fundamental solution of (8) are well known in the literature (see e.g. [8], Chapter 5), we do not discuss them here. We shall only inspect the continuity of the mapping

$$u: \Omega \times [0, T] \ni (h, t) \rightarrow u_h(t) \in X$$

with $u_h(t)$ given by (25), without specifying assumptions which would guarantee that $u_h(t)$ is the solution of problem (8)–(9). The continuity of u will be proved here under Assumptions Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 , which are weaker than the conditions given in [8], sufficient for the function (25) to be the solution of problem (8)–(9).

Remark 3. Suppose that Assumptions Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are fulfilled; then (following [9], Proposition 1) the function

$$[0, T] \times \Omega \times [0, T] \times X \ni (r, h, \tau, x) \rightarrow \exp(-rA_h(\tau))x$$

is continuous. This fact will be used in the sequel.

LEMMA 6. *If Assumptions Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are fulfilled, then*

(a) *for any $x \in D$ and $h_0 \in \Omega$*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} R_1^h(t, s)x = R_1^{h_0}(t, s)x$$

uniformly on Δ_T ;

(b) *for any compact sets $K_1 \subset \Delta_T^0, K_2 \subset X$*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} R_1^h(t, s)x = R_1^{h_0}(t, s)x$$

uniformly on $K_1 \times K_2$.

Proof. To prove (a) let us fix $x \in D$ and $h_0 \in \Omega$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_1^h(t, s)x - R_1^{h_0}(t, s)x\| &\leq \| (A_h(t) - A_{h_0}(s)) \exp(-(t-s)A_h(s))x \\ &\quad - (A_{h_0}(t) - A_{h_0}(s)) \exp(-(t-s)A_{h_0}(s))x \| \\ &\leq \| (A_h(t) - A_{h_0}(t)) \exp(-(t-s)A_h(s))x \| \\ &\quad + \| (A_h(s) - A_{h_0}(s)) \exp(-(t-s)A_h(s))x \| \\ &\quad + \| (A_{h_0}(t) - A_{h_0}(s)) [\exp(-(t-s)A_h(s)) - \exp(-(t-s)A_{h_0}(s))]x \|. \end{aligned}$$

Setting $\exp(-(t-s)A_h(s)) = T(h, t, s)$ we have

$$\|T(h, t, s)\| \leq \tilde{C} \quad \text{for } (h, t, s) \in \Omega \times \Delta_T$$

with a positive constant \tilde{C} . Thus

$$\| (A_h(t) - A_{h_0}(t)) T(h, t, s)x \| \leq \| (A_h(t) - A_{h_0}(t)) A_{h_0}^{-1}(s) A_{h_0}(s) T(h, t, s)x \|.$$

By (4),

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} \| (A_h(t) - A_{h_0}(t)) A_{h_0}^{-1}(s) \| = 0$$

uniformly on Δ_T . Next, we have

$$A_{h_0}(s) T(h, t, s)x = A_{h_0}(s) A_h^{-1}(s) A_h(s) T(h, t, s)x.$$

But

$$A_{h_0}(s) A_h^{-1}(s) = (A_h(s) A_{h_0}^{-1}(s))^{-1}.$$

By (4) applied to $t = s, s \in [0, T]$, we have

$$(26) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} \| (A_h(s) - A_{h_0}(s)) A_{h_0}^{-1}(s) \| = 0$$

uniformly on $[0, T]$.

Observe that the mappings

$$(h, s) \rightarrow A_{h_0}(0) A_{h_0}^{-1}(s), \quad (h, s) \rightarrow A_h(s) A_{h_0}^{-1}(s),$$

$$(h, s) \rightarrow A_{h_0}(s) A_h^{-1}(s), \quad (h, s) \rightarrow A_{h_0}(s)x$$

and

$$\varphi: (h, s) \rightarrow A_h(s) A_{h_0}^{-1}(s) A_{h_0}(s)x$$

are continuous in $\Omega \times [0, T]$ and

$$A_h(s) T(h, t, s)x = T(h, t, s) A_h(s)x = T(h, t, s) A_h(s) A_{h_0}^{-1}(s) A_{h_0}(s)x.$$

Let $V \subset \Omega$ be a compact neighbourhood of h_0 . Since φ is continuous, there exists $K > 0$ such that

$$(27) \quad \|A_h(s) T(h, t, s)\| \leq K \quad \text{for } (h, s) \in V \times [0, T].$$

Now, it is clear that

$$(28) \quad \begin{aligned} & \| (A_h(t) - A_{h_0}(t)) T(h, t, s) x \| \\ & \leq \| (A_h(t) - A_{h_0}(t)) A_{h_0}^{-1}(s) \| \| A_{h_0}(s) A_h^{-1}(s) \| \| A_h(s) T(h, t, s) x \| \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $h \rightarrow h_0$, uniformly on Δ_T .

Similarly,

$$(29) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} (A_h(s) - A_{h_0}(s)) T(h, t, s) x = 0$$

uniformly on Δ_T .

We finally prove that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} \| (A_{h_0}(t) - A_{h_0}(s)) (T(h, t, s) - T(h_0, t, s)) x \| = 0$$

uniformly on Δ_T . Since by Lemma 1, $\| (A_{h_0}(t) - A_{h_0}(s)) A_{h_0}^{-1}(s) \|$ is bounded in Δ_T , we have to prove that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} \| A_{h_0}(s) (T(h, t, s) - T(h_0, t, s)) x \| = 0$$

uniformly on Δ_T . Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \| A_{h_0}(s) (T(h, t, s) - T(h_0, t, s)) x \| \\ & \leq \| A_{h_0}(s) A_h^{-1}(s) - A_{h_0}(s) A_{h_0}^{-1}(s) \| \| T(h, t, s) A_h(s) x \| \\ & \quad + \| T(h, t, s) A_h(s) x - T(h_0, t, s) A_{h_0}(s) x \|. \end{aligned}$$

By (4) and (27) we see that the first term of the right-hand side of this inequality tends to 0 as $h \rightarrow h_0$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \| T(h, t, s) A_h(s) x - T(h_0, t, s) A_{h_0}(s) x \| \\ & \leq \| T(h, t, s) (A_h(s) x - A_{h_0}(s) x) \| + \| T(h, t, s) - T(h_0, t, s) \| \| A_{h_0}(s) x \|, \end{aligned}$$

we see, by our assumptions and Remark 3, that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} \| T(h, t, s) A_h(s) x - T(h_0, t, s) A_{h_0}(s) x \| = 0$$

uniformly in Δ_T .

To prove (b) it is enough to use inequality (15) and Lemma 2.

PROPOSITION 2. *If Assumptions Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are fulfilled and $x \in D$, then*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} R_m^h(t, s) x = R_m^{h_0}(t, s) x, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots,$$

uniformly on Δ_T .

Proof. Fix $x \in D, h_0 \in \Omega$. If $m = 1$, then the statement is true, by Lemma 6.

Suppose that the claim is true for $k = 1, \dots, m-1$. Then

$$(30) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|R_m^h(t, s)x - R_m^{h_0}(t, s)x\| \\ & \leq \int_s^t \|(R_1^h(t, \tau) - R_1^{h_0}(t, \tau)) R_{m-1}^{h_0}(\tau, s)x\| d\tau \\ & \quad + \int_s^t \|R_1^h(t, \tau)(R_{m-1}^h(\tau, s)x - R_{m-1}^{h_0}(\tau, s)x)\| d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Let us fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Setting

$$\mu(h) = \sup \{ \|R_{m-1}^h(\tau, s)x - R_{m-1}^{h_0}(\tau, s)x\| : (\tau, s) \in \Delta_T \}$$

we have, by the inductive assumption

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} \mu(h) = 0.$$

Next, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_s^t \|R_1^h(t, \tau)(R_{m-1}^h(\tau, s)x - R_{m-1}^{h_0}(\tau, s)x)\| d\tau \\ & \leq \mu(h) \int_s^t LC_0(t-\tau)^{\alpha-1} d\tau = LC_0 \mu(h) (t-s)^\alpha / \alpha \leq \frac{LC_0}{\alpha} \mu(h) T^\alpha \quad \text{for } (t, s) \in \Delta_T. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that

$$(31) \quad \int_s^t \|R_1^h(t, \tau)(R_{m-1}^h(\tau, s)x - R_{m-1}^{h_0}(\tau, s)x)\| d\tau < \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon$$

for $(t, s) \in \Delta_T$, whenever $|h - h_0| < \delta_1$.

To prove that the first term of the right-hand side of (30) tends uniformly to 0, let us observe that there exists $\mu > 0$ such that

If $0 \leq c \leq d \leq T$, $d - c \leq \mu$, $d \leq t \leq T$, $0 \leq s \leq c$ and $h \in \Omega$, then

$$(32) \quad \int_c^d \|(R_1^h(t, \tau) - R_1^{h_0}(t, \tau)) R_{m-1}^{h_0}(\tau, s)x\| d\tau < \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon.$$

Indeed, this follows from (15) and Lemma 5b).

We now write

$$(33) \quad \Delta_T = K^\mu \cup (\Delta_T \setminus K^\mu),$$

where

$$(34) \quad K^\mu = \{(t, s) \in \Delta_T : t - s \geq \mu\}.$$

Then, by (32), if $(t, s) \in \Delta_T \setminus K^\mu$ then

$$\int_s^t \|(R_1^h(t, \tau) - R_1^{h_0}(t, \tau)) R_{m-1}^{h_0}(\tau, s)x\| d\tau < \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon$$

for all $h \in \Omega$.

If $(t, s) \in K^\mu$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_s^t \|(R_1^h(t, \tau) - R_1^{h_0}(t, \tau))R_{m-1}^{h_0}(\tau, s)x\| d\tau \\ &= \int_s^{s+\mu/4} \|(R_1^h(t, \tau) - R_1^{h_0}(t, \tau))R_{m-1}^{h_0}(\tau, s)x\| d\tau \\ & \quad + \int_{s+\mu/4}^{t-\mu/4} \|(R_1^h(t, \tau) - R_1^{h_0}(t, \tau))R_{m-1}^{h_0}(\tau, s)x\| d\tau \\ & \quad + \int_{t-\mu/4}^t \|(R_1^h(t, \tau) - R_1^{h_0}(t, \tau))R_{m-1}^{h_0}(\tau, s)x\| d\tau \end{aligned}$$

and, by Lemma 5(b) and (32), there exists $\delta_2 > 0$ such that

$$\int_s^t \|(R_1^h(t, \tau) - R_1^{h_0}(t, \tau))R_{m-1}^{h_0}(\tau, s)x\| d\tau < \frac{3}{4}\varepsilon$$

whenever $|h - h_0| < \delta_2$. Thus

$$\|R_m^h(t, s)x - R_m^{h_0}(t, s)x\| < \varepsilon \quad \text{for } (t, s) \in \Delta_T,$$

whenever $|h - h_0| < \delta = \min(\delta_1, \delta_2)$.

PROPOSITION 3. *If Assumptions Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are fulfilled and $x \in D$, then*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} R^h(t, s)x = R^{h_0}(t, s)x$$

uniformly on Δ_T .

Proof. Fix $x \in D \setminus \{0\}$, $h_0 \in \Omega$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Since (see the proof of Proposition 1) the series is uniformly convergent on $\Omega \times \Delta_T$, there exists ν_0 such that

$$(35) \quad \|R^h(t, s) - \sum_{m=1}^{\nu_0} R_m^h(t, s)\| \leq \varepsilon/4 \|x\| \quad \text{for } (h, t, s) \in \Omega \times \Delta_T.$$

Thus

$$(36) \quad \|R^h(t, s)x - \sum_{m=1}^{\nu_0} R_m^h(t, s)x\| < \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon \quad \text{for } (h, t, s) \in \Omega \times \Delta_T.$$

Moreover, in view of Proposition 2, there exist $\delta_j > 0$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$, such that

$$(37) \quad \|R_j^h(t, s)x - R_j^{h_0}(t, s)x\| < \varepsilon/2\nu_0 \quad \text{for } (t, s) \in \Delta_T$$

and $|h - h_0| < \delta_j$. Hence and from (36) and (37) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^h(t, s)x - R^{h_0}(t, s)x\| &\leq \|R^h(t, s)x - \sum_{m=1}^{\nu_0} R_m^h(t, s)x\| \\ & \quad + \|R^{h_0}(t, s)x - \sum_{m=1}^{\nu_0} R_m^{h_0}(t, s)x\| + \left\| \sum_{m=1}^{\nu_0} R_m^h(t, s)x - \sum_{m=1}^{\nu_0} R_m^{h_0}(t, s)x \right\| < \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

for $(t, s) \in \Delta_T$, $|h - h_0| < \delta = \min(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{\nu_0})$.

PROPOSITION 4. *If Assumptions Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are fulfilled and $x \in D$, then*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} W^h(t, s)x = W^{h_0}(t, s)x$$

uniformly on Δ_T .

Proof. Fix $x \in D$ and $h_0 \in \Omega$. We have

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|W^h(t, s)x - W^{h_0}(t, s)x\| \\ & \leq \left\| \int_s^t [\exp(-(t-\tau)A_h(\tau)) - \exp(-(t-\tau)A_{h_0}(\tau))] R^{h_0}(\tau, s)x d\tau \right\| \\ & \quad + \left\| \int_s^t \exp(-(t-\tau)A_h(\tau)) [R^h(\tau, s)x - R^{h_0}(\tau, s)x] d\tau \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Let us write, for $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\delta) = \sup \{ & \|(\exp(-rA_h(\tau)) - \exp(-rA_{h_0}(\tau))) R^{h_0}(p, s)x\| : \\ & r \in [0, T], |h - h_0| \leq \delta, \tau \in [0, T], (p, s) \in \Delta_T \} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mu_1(\delta) = \sup \{ \|R^h(\tau, s)x - R^{h_0}(\tau, s)x\| : (\tau, s) \in \Delta_T \}.$$

Since, by (38),

$$\|W^h(t, s)x - W^{h_0}(t, s)x\| \leq T(\mu(\delta) + \tilde{C}\mu_1(\delta))$$

and $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mu(\delta) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mu_1(\delta) = 0$, we get

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} W^h(t, s)x = W^{h_0}(t, s)x$$

uniformly on Δ_T .

PROPOSITION 5. *If Assumptions Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are fulfilled, then the mapping*

$$\Omega \times \Delta_T \times X \ni (h, t, s, x) \rightarrow U_h(t, s)x$$

is continuous.

Proof. Let $h_v \rightarrow h_0, t_v \rightarrow t_0, s_v \rightarrow s_0, x_v \rightarrow x_0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} U_{h_v}(t_v, s_v)x_v - U_{h_0}(t_0, s_0)x_v &= U_{h_0}(t_v, s_v)x_v - U_{h_0}(t_v, s_v)x_v \\ & \quad + (U_{h_0}(t_v, s_v) - U_{h_0}(t_0, s_0))x_v + U_{h_0}(t_0, s_0)(x_v - x_0). \end{aligned}$$

If $x \in D$ then, by Proposition 4 and Remark 4,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} U_h(t, s)x = U_{h_0}(t, s)x$$

uniformly on Δ_T . Hence, by (19) and Lemma 2, for any compact $K \subset X$

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow h_0} U_h(t, s)x = U_{h_0}(t, s)x$$

uniformly on $\Delta_T \times K$. Thus,

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} U_{h_v}(t_v, s_v)x_v = U_{h_0}(t_0, s_0)x_0$$

ends the proof.

As a simple consequence of Proposition 5 we obtain the main result of this paper.

THEOREM 1. *If Assumptions Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are fulfilled and the mappings*

$$(39) \quad \Omega \ni h \rightarrow u_h^0 \in X$$

and

$$(40) \quad \Omega \times [0, T] \ni (h, t) \rightarrow f(h, t)$$

are continuous, then the mapping

$$\Omega \times [0, T] \ni (h, t) \rightarrow u_h(t) \in X$$

with $u_h(t)$ given by (25) is continuous.

Proof. By (25) and Proposition 5, we only have to prove that the mapping

$$(41) \quad \Omega \times [0, T] \ni (h, t) \rightarrow \int_0^t U_h(t, s)f(h, s)ds$$

is continuous. If $h_0 \in \Omega$ and $t_0 \in [0, T]$ are fixed, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t U_h(t, s)f(h, s)ds - \int_0^{t_0} U_{h_0}(t_0, s)f(h_0, s)ds \\ &= \int_0^T [\chi_{[0, t]}(s)U_h(t, s)f(h, s) - \chi_{[0, t_0]}(s)U_{h_0}(t_0, s)f(h_0, s)]ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $\chi_{[a, b]}$ denotes the characteristic function of $[a, b]$. Thus, by Lebesgue's theorem, the mapping (41) is continuous.

References

- [1] А. В. Бородин, *Дифференцируемость по параметру решений нелинейно нагруженных краевых задач для уравнений в частных производных второго порядка*, Дифференциальные Уравнения 15.1 (1979).
- [2] D. Henry, *Geometric Theory of Semilinear Parabolic Equations*, Springer-Verlag, 1981.
- [3] T. Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Springer-Verlag, 1966.

- [4] Н. Н. Лебедев, *Специальные функции и их приложения*, Москва 1963.
- [5] A. Pazy, *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*, Springer-Verlag, 1983.
- [6] M. Schechter, *Differentiability of solutions of elliptic problems with respect to parameters*, Bolletino U.M.I. 5, 13-A (1976), 601–608.
- [7] П. Е. Соболевский, *Об уравнениях параболического типа в банаховом пространстве*, Труды московского мат. общ. 10 (1961), 297–350.
- [8] H. Tanabe, *Equations of evolution*, Pitman 1979.
- [9] T. Winiarska, *Evolution equations with parameter*, Univ. Jag. Acta Math. 28 (1987), 219–227.
- [10] —, *Differential equations with parameter*, T. Kościuszko Technical Univ. of Cracow, Monograph 68 (1988).

Reçu par la Rédaction le 01.09.1988
