Jaroslav Kurzweil On solutions of nonautonomous linear delayed differential equations, which are defined and exponentially bounded for  $t \longrightarrow -\infty$ 

Časopis pro pěstování matematiky, Vol. 96 (1971), No. 3, 229--238

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/117720

## Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1971

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* http://project.dml.cz

## ON SOLUTIONS OF NONAUTONOMOUS LINEAR DELAYED DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS, WHICH ARE DEFINED AND EXPONENTIALLY BOUNDED FOR $t \rightarrow -\infty$

JAROSLAV KURZWEIL, Praha (Received October 22, 1970)

Dedicated to the memory of my teacher Prof. VOJTĚCH JARNÍK

Let  $M_n$  be the space of square matrices of order n, R – the real line,  $R^+$  – the positive halfline (closed),  $R^-$  – the negative halfline,  $A: R^- \to M_n$ ,  $B: R^- \to M_n$  locally integrable. For  $y \in R^n$  denote by |y| the Euclidean norm of y and for  $C \in M_n$  put  $|C| = \sup_{|y| \le 1} |Cy|$ .

For  $\gamma \in R^+$  let  $\mathscr{Z}(\gamma)$  be the set of such solutions  $x : R^- \to R^n$  of

(1) 
$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t}(t) = A(t)x(t) + B(t)x(t-1)$$

that

(2) 
$$\sup_{t\leq 0} e^{\gamma t} |x(t)| < \infty.$$

Obviously  $\mathscr{Z}(\gamma)$  is a linear manifold.

**Theorem 1.** Assume that  $|B|^2$  is locally integrable and that

(3) 
$$\sup_{t\leq 0}\int_{t-1}^{t}|A(\tau)| d\tau < \infty, \quad \sup_{t\leq 0}\int_{t-1}^{t}|B(\tau)|^{2} d\tau < \infty.$$

Then the dimension of  $\mathscr{Z}(\gamma)$  is finite. Moreover, there exists  $\Theta: (R^+)^3 \to R^+$  such that if

(4) 
$$\sup_{t \leq 0} \int_{t-1}^{t} |A(\tau)| d\tau \leq a, \quad \sup_{t \leq 0} \int_{t-1}^{t} |B(\tau)|^2 d\tau \leq b^2,$$

then

(5) 
$$\dim \mathscr{Z}(\gamma) \leq \Theta(a, b, \gamma).$$

229

Note 1.  $\Theta(a, b, \gamma)$  may be calculated (of course not the best one). Thus it may be shown that

(6) dim 
$$\mathscr{Z}(\gamma) \leq n$$
, if  $e^{(n+1)\gamma} [1 + 4e^{2a} \max(1, b^2)]^{n/2} e^{ab} < 1$ 

(7) dim  $\mathscr{Z}(\gamma) \leq n+1$ , if  $e^{(n+2)\gamma} [1 + 4e^{2a} \max(1, b^2)]^{n/2} e^{2a} b^2 < 1$ 

(8) if 
$$e^a b \ge 1$$
 and  $e^{\gamma}(1 + ae^a) b \to \infty$ 

then

$$\Theta(a, b, \gamma) \approx \frac{2ne}{\pi^2} e^{2\gamma} (1 + ae^a)^2 b^2$$

(i.e. to any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists such a  $\varrho > 0$  that

$$|\Theta(a, b, \gamma) \pi^2 (2ne)^{-1} e^{-2\gamma} (1 + ae^a)^{-2} b^{-2} - 1| \leq \varepsilon$$

provided that  $e^a b \ge 1$  and  $e^{\gamma}(1 + ae^a) b \ge \varrho$ .

Note 2. Theorem 1 is related to applications of Theory of Invariant Manifolds to Delayed Differential Equations (cf. [1], [2], [3]). Let us review some results, which may be obtained for (1). For this purpose extend A and B to R putting A(t) = 0 = B(t) for t > 0.

**Proposition.** Assume that A fulfils (4), that B instead of (3) and (4) fulfils

(9) 
$$\sup_{t} \int_{t-1}^{t} |B(\tau)| \, \mathrm{d}\tau \leq \beta$$

and that there exists L > 0 such that

(10) 
$$e^{a}(e^{a}+L)^{2} b \leq L,$$

(11) 
$$e^{a}(e^{a}+1)(e^{a}+L)b < 1$$
.

Denote by U a fundamental matrix of

(12) 
$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t}(t) = A(t) x(t) \, .$$

Then there exists  $Q: R \to M_n$ , continuous,  $|Q(t)| \leq L$  for  $t \in R$  such that every solution of

(13) 
$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t}(t) = (A(t) + B(t) [U(t-1) U^{-1}(t) + Q(t)]) x(t)$$

fulfils (1). Moreover, solutions of (13) belong to  $\mathscr{Z}(\gamma)$  with  $\gamma = a + \log [1 + \beta(e^{\alpha} + L)]$ , so that dim  $\mathscr{Z}(\gamma) \ge n$ .

As  $\int_{t-1}^{t} |B(\tau)| d\tau \leq (\int_{t-1}^{t} |B(\tau)|^2)^{1,2}$ , Proposition may be applied if B fulfils (4) and if (10) and (11) hold,  $\beta$  being replaced by b.

Fix a and choose L, e.g.  $L = e^a$ . Find such a b that (10) and (11) are fulfilled for  $\beta$  being replaced by b and that the inequality in (6) is fulfilled with  $\gamma \ge a + \log [1 + b(e^a + L)]$ . Then it may be concluded that dim  $\mathscr{Z}(\gamma) = n$  (provided that A and B fulfil (4)).

Theorem 1 will be deduced from Theorem 2, which will be formulated below. If X, Y are linear spaces,  $X \subset Y$  the codimension of X with respect to Y will be denoted by codim  $(X \mid Y)$  or codim X if no confusion can arise. If Y is a Hilbert space, then  $\langle x, y \rangle$  will be the scalar product of x,  $y \in Y$ , ||y|| will be the norm of y and if  $C : Y \to Y$ is linear and continuous, then  $||C|| = \sup_{\|y\| \le 1} ||Cy||$ .

Let H be a Hilbert space,  $k_j$  integers,  $r_j \in R^+$ , j = 0, 1, 2, ... such that

(14) 
$$\lim_{j \to \infty} r_j = 0, \quad 0 = k_0 < k_1 < k_2 < \dots$$

Denote by  $\Omega = \Omega\begin{pmatrix} r_0, r_1, r_2, \dots \\ k_0, k_1, k_2, \dots \end{pmatrix}$  the set of bounded linear operators  $Q: H \to H$  which fulfil the following condition:

(15) there exist linear subspaces  $H^{(j)}$  of H such that  $H^{(0)} = H$ ,  $H^{(j)} \supset H^{(j+1)}$ , codim  $(H^{(j)} | H) \leq k_j$  and  $||Qx|| \leq r_j ||x||$  for  $x \in H^{(j)}$ , j = 0, 1, 2, ...

(Subspaces  $H^{(j)}$  may depend on  $Q \in \Omega$ .)

Note 3. If  $T \in \Omega\begin{pmatrix} r_0, r_1, r_2, \dots \\ k_0, k_1, k_2, \dots \end{pmatrix}$ , then T is completely continuous. In order to show it, let  $H^{(j)}$  be the linear subspaces of H which correspond to T according to (15). Denote by  $Y^{(j)}$  the orthogonal complements of  $H^{(j)}$  and define a linear operator  $U^{(j)}: H \to H$  by  $U^{(j)}y = Ty$  for  $y \in Y^{(j)}$ ,  $U^{(j)}z = 0$  for  $z \in H^{(j)}$ . By  $\mathfrak{N}(U)$  denote the null-space of a linear operator U. Obviously  $\mathfrak{N}(U^{(l)}) \supset H^{(j)}$  for  $l \leq j$  and it may be seen that the following conditions are fulfilled:

(i) 
$$\operatorname{codim}\left(\prod_{l=0}^{j} \mathfrak{N}(U^{(l)})\right) \leq k_{j},$$

(ii) 
$$||1 - U^{(j)}|| \le r_j, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, ...$$

Therefore T is completely continuous. On the other hand, if  $T: H \to H$  is a linear operator and if there exist finitedimensional operators  $U^{(j)}: H \to H$  such that conditions (i), (ii) are fulfilled, then  $T \in \Omega\begin{pmatrix} r_0, r_1, r_2, ... \\ k_0, k_1, k_2, ... \end{pmatrix}$ .

Note 4. If  $T: H \to H$  is linear and completely continuous, then there exist  $k_j, r_j$  fulfilling (14) such that  $T \in \Omega\begin{pmatrix} r_0, r_1, r_2, \dots \\ k_0, k_1, k_2, \dots \end{pmatrix}$ . Qtherwise there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

for any linear subspace  $V \subset H$  such that  $\operatorname{codim}(V \mid H) < \infty$  there exists  $v \in V$ ,  $\|Tv\| \ge \varepsilon \|v\| > 0$ . By induction there exists a sequence  $v_j \in H$ , j = 1, 2, ... such that  $\|v_j\| = 1$ ,  $\|Tv_j\| \ge \varepsilon$ ,  $(Tv_j, Tv_k) = 0$  for  $j \neq k$ . Followingly  $\|Tv_j - Tv_k\| \ge \varepsilon$  for  $j \neq k$  and T is not completely continuous.

For  $\varrho \ge 1$ , m = 1, 2, 3, ... find s that  $k_s < m \le k_{s+1} = 0, 1, 2, ...$  and put

$$S(\varrho, m) = \varrho^m r_0^{k_1} r_1^{k_2 - k_1} \dots r_{s-1}^{k_s - k_{s-1}} r_s^{m-k_s}.$$

Obviously  $S(\varrho, m) \to 0$  with  $m \to \infty$ . Let  $\vartheta(\varrho)$  be the smallest (nonnegative) integer such that  $S(\varrho, \vartheta(\varrho) + 1) < 1$ .

Let  $Q_i \in \Omega$  for i = -1, -2, -3, ... Denote by  $Z(\varrho), \varrho \ge 1$  the set of such sequences  $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^{-\infty}, x_i \in H$  that

(16)  $\cdot \qquad Q_i x_i = x_{i+1}, \quad i = -1, -2, \dots$ 

(17) 
$$\sup_{i\leq 0} \varrho^i \|x_i\| < \infty.$$

 $Z(\varrho)$  is obviously a linear manifold.

**Theorem 2.** dim  $Z(\varrho) \leq \vartheta(\varrho)$  for  $\varrho \geq 1$ .

## Corollary.

(18) if 
$$\rho r_0 < 1$$
, then  $\vartheta(\rho) = 0$ , i.e. dim  $Z(\rho) = 0$ ;

- (19) if  $\varrho r_0 \geq 1$ ,  $\varrho^{k_1+1}r_0^{k_1}r_1 < 1$  then  $\vartheta(\varrho) = k_1$ , i.e. dim  $Z(\varrho) \leq k_1$ ;
- (20) if  $k_2 > k_1 + 1$ ,  $\varrho^{k_1 + 1} r_0^{k_1} r_1 \ge 1$ ,  $\varrho^{k_1 + 2} r_1^{k_1} r_2^2 < 1$ , then  $\vartheta(\varrho) = k_1 + 1$ , i.e. dim  $Z(\varrho) \le k_1 + 1$  etc.

Let  $G: \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$  be linear. Choose  $\{e_1, ..., e_m\}, \{f_1, ..., f_m\}$  – orthonormal bases in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  and put

$$(21) (Ge_i, f_j) = g_{j,i}$$

i.e.  $G \sum_{i} \lambda_i e_i = \sum_{i} (\sum_{j} g_{j,i} \lambda_i) f_j$ . It is easy to see that det  $g_{j,i}$  does not depend on the choice of orthonormal bases  $\{e_1, \ldots, e_m\}, \{f_1, \ldots, f_m\}$ ; put det  $G = \det g_{j,i}$ .

**Lemma.** Let  $G: \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$  be linear. Let  $V_i$ , i = 0, 1, 2, ..., l be linear subspaces of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^m = V_0 \supset V_1 \supset ... \supset V_i$ , codim  $(V_i \mid \mathbb{R}^m) = k_i$ ,  $r_i \ge 0$ , i = 0, 1, 2, ..., l and assume that

(22) 
$$|Gx| \leq r_i |x|$$
 for  $x \in V_i$ ,  $i = 0, 1, 2, ..., l$ .

Then

(23) 
$$\left|\det G\right| \leq r_0^{k_1} \cdot r_1^{k_2-k_1} \cdots r_{l-1}^{k_l-k_{l-1}} \cdot r_l^{m-k_l}$$

Proof. For  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^m$  let (u, v) denote the scalar product. Find an orthonormal basis  $e_1, \ldots, e_m \in \mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $e_{k_s+1}, \ldots, e_{k_{s+1}} \in V_s$  for  $s = 0, 1, \ldots, l$ . Let G' be adjoint to G. Obviously det  $G = \det G'$  and - by the usual identification of  $\mathbb{R}^m$  with its adjoint  $-(\det G)^2 = \det G'G = \det ((G'Ge_i, e_j))$ .  $((G'Ge_i, e_j))$  is a positive semidefinite matrix and by Hadamard inequality (cf. [4], II, (10,3) or [5], IX, §5)

$$\det\left(\left(G'Ge_{i}, e_{j}\right)\right) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{m} \left(G'Ge_{i}, e_{i}\right) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \left(Ge_{i}, Ge_{i}\right) = r_{0}^{2k_{1}} r_{1}^{2(k_{2}-k_{1})} \dots r_{l}^{2(m-k_{l})}$$

and (23) holds.

Proof of Theorem 2. Take at first the special case  $\rho = 1$  and put  $m = \vartheta(1) + 1$ . If Theorem 2 is false, there exist  $\{x_i^{(j)}\}_{i \leq 0} \in Z(1), j = 1, 2, ..., m$  linearly independent. If  $x_i^{(j)}, j = 1, 2, ..., m$  are linearly dependent for some i < 0, then  $x_r^{(j)}, j = 1, 2, ..., m$  are linearly dependent for any  $r \geq i$  with the same constants. Hence it can be shown that there exists such a  $p \leq 0$  that  $x_i^{(j)}, j = 1, 2, ..., m$  are linearly independent for any  $i \leq p$ .

For  $i \leq -1$  let  $H_i^{(j)}$  be linear subspaces of H such that (15) is fulfilled (with  $Q = Q_i$ ). Find s such that  $k_s < m \leq k_{s+1}$ . Let  $V_i^{(0)}$  be spanned by  $x_i^{(j)}, j = 1, 2, ..., m$ ,  $i \leq p$ . Obviously dim  $V_i^{(0)} = m$  and codim  $(V_i^{(0)} \cap H_i^{(j)} | V_i^{(0)}) \leq k_j, j = 1, 2, ...$ Choose linear spaces  $V_i^{(j)}, j = 1, 2, ..., s$  such that  $V_i^{(j-1)} \supset V_i^{(j)}, V_i^{(j)} \subset V_i^{(0)} \cap H_i^{(j)}$  and codim  $(V_i^{(j)} | V_i^{(0)}) = k_j, j = 1, 2, ..., s$ .  $Q_i|_{V_i^{(0)}}$  maps  $V_i^{(0)}$  onto  $V_{i+1}^{(0)}$  for i < p and by Lemma and by the choice of m

$$\left|\det\left(Q_{i}\Big|_{V^{(0)}}\right)\right| \leq r_{0}^{k_{1}}r_{1}^{k_{2}-k_{1}}\dots r_{s}^{m-k_{s}} = \varkappa < 1.$$

Let  $\Lambda_i$ ,  $i \leq p$  be the simplex with the vertices  $0, x_i^{(1)}, x_i^{(2)}, \dots, x_i^{(m)}$  and let  $\lambda_i$  be its volume. Obviously  $Q_i(\Lambda_i) = \Lambda_{i+1}$  and therefore  $\varkappa \lambda_i \geq \lambda_{i+1}$ . Hence  $\lambda_i \to \infty$  with  $i \to -\infty$  and this is impossible, as  $\{x_i^{(j)} \mid j = 1, 2, \dots, m, i = 0, -1, -2, \dots\}$  is a bounded set. Theorem 2 holds in the special case  $\varrho = 1$ .

If  $\varrho > 1$ , put  $\tilde{Q}_i = \varrho Q_i$ ,  $\tilde{r}_j = \varrho r_j$ , i = -1, -2, ..., j = 0, 1, 2, ... and for  $\tilde{\varrho} \ge 1$ denote by  $\tilde{Z}(\tilde{\varrho})$  the set of such sequences  $\{\tilde{x}_i\}_{i\ge 0}$ ,  $\tilde{x}_i \in H$  that  $\tilde{Q}_i \tilde{x}_i = \tilde{x}_{i+1}$  for i = -1, -2, ... and  $\sup_{i\le 0} \tilde{\varrho}^i ||x_i|| < \infty$ . If  $\{x_i\}_{i\le 0} \in Z(\varrho)$ , put  $\tilde{x}_i = \varrho^i x_i$ , i = 0, -1, -2, ... Obviously  $\{\tilde{x}_i\}_{i\ge 0} \le \tilde{Z}(1)$ . Therefore dim  $Z(\varrho) = \dim \tilde{Z}(1)$  and the proof of Theorem 2 may be finished by applying Theorem 2 in case  $\tilde{\varrho} = 1$  to  $\tilde{Z}(1)$ .

Proof of Theorem 1. For  $S \subset \langle -1, 0 \rangle$  Lebesgue measurable denote by |S| the Lebesgue measure of S, let  $v_1(S) = 1$  if  $-1 \in S$ ,  $v_1(S) = 0$  otherwise, let  $v_2(S) = 1$  if  $0 \in S$ ,  $v_2(S) = 0$  otherwise and put  $\mu(S) = |S| + v_1(S) + v_2(S)$ . Let  $H = L_{2,\mu}(\langle -1, 0 \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n)$ , (i.e. elements of H are classes of  $\mu$ -equivalent square integrable functions from  $\langle -1, 0 \rangle$  to  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ). If  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , let (u, v) be the scalar product of u, v and for  $x, y \in H$  define the scalar product by

$$\langle x, y \rangle = (x(-1), y(-1)) + \int_{-1}^{0} (x(t), y(t)) dt + (x(0), y(0))$$

Let  $U: \mathbb{R}^- \to \mathbb{R}^n$  be a fundamental matrix of

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(t\right)=A(t)\,x(t)\,.$$

Define  $U_i: (-\infty, -i) \to M_n$  by  $U_i(t) = U(t+i) U^{-1}(i)$ , i = 0, -1, -2, ... and  $Q_i: H \to H$  by

(24) 
$$(Q_i y)(t) = U_i(t+1) y(0) + U_i(t+1) \int_0^{t+1} U_i^{-1}(\sigma) B(\sigma+i) y(\sigma-1) d\sigma$$
.

The estimate

(25) 
$$|U_i(t+1)| \leq e^a$$
,  $|U_i(t+1)U_i^{-1}(\sigma)| \leq e^a$  for  $i = -1, -2, \dots, t \in \langle -1, 0 \rangle$ ,  $\sigma \in \langle 0, t+1 \rangle$ 

follows from (4): Keep  $\sigma$  and *i* fixed and put  $L(\tau) = U_i(\tau) U_i^{-1}(\sigma)$ . Obviously  $L(\tau) = I + \int_{\sigma}^{\tau} A(i + \zeta) L(\zeta) d\zeta$ , *I* being the identity matrix and  $L(\tau) = \lim_{\substack{j \to \infty \\ j \to \infty}} L_j(\tau)$  with  $L_0(\tau) = I$ ,  $L_{j+1}(\tau) = I + \int_{\sigma}^{\tau} A(i + \zeta) L_j(\zeta) d\zeta$ , j = 0, 1, 2, ... Put  $\alpha(\tau) = \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tau} |A(\zeta)| d\zeta \right|$ . As |I| = 1, we obtain by induction that  $|L_j(\tau)| \leq e^{\alpha(\tau)}$  for  $\tau \in (-\infty, -i)$  and the second inequality in (25) holds. The first inequality in (25) is a special case of the second one for  $\sigma = 0$ .

For  $x \in \mathscr{Z}(\gamma)$ , i = 0, -1, -2, ... define  $x_i \in H$  by  $x_i(t) = x(i + t)$  and put  $Px = \{x_i\}_{i \le 0}$ . The following Lemma is easy to verify.

**Lemma 3.** P is a linear bijection of  $\mathscr{Z}(\gamma)$  onto  $Z(e^{\gamma})$ .

In order to deduce Theorem 1 from Theorem 2 we have to find numbers  $r_j \in R^+$ and integers  $k_j$ ,  $j = 0, 1, 2, ..., r_j \ge r_{j+1}$ ,  $\lim_{j \to \infty} r_j = 0$ ,  $0 = k_0 < k_1 < k_2 < ...$ such that  $Q_i \in \Omega\begin{pmatrix} r_0, r_1, ... \\ k_0, k_1, ... \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $i = -1, -2, -3, ..., r_j$  and  $k_j$  will dpend on a, b; we will denote the corresponding function  $\vartheta$  by  $\vartheta_{a,b}$  and we shall put  $\Theta(a, b, \gamma) = = \vartheta_{a,b}(e^{\gamma})$ . Obviously

(26)  

$$\|Q_{i}y\|^{2} = |y(0)|^{2} + \int_{-1}^{0} |U_{i}(t+1) y(0) + \int_{0}^{t+1} U_{i}(t+1) U_{i}^{-1}(\sigma) B(\sigma+i) y(\sigma-1) d\sigma|^{2} dt + |U_{i}(1) y(0) + \int_{0}^{1} U_{i}(1) U_{i}^{-1}(\sigma) B(\sigma+i) y(\sigma-1) d\sigma|^{2} \text{ for } y \in H.$$

Using  $(\alpha + \beta)^2 \leq 2(\alpha^2 + \beta^2)$  we obtain from (25) and (26) that

(27) 
$$\|Q_{I}y\|^{2} \leq |y(0)|^{2} (1 + 4e^{2a}) + 4e^{2a}b^{2} \int_{-1}^{0} y^{2}(\sigma) d\sigma$$

and hence we may put

(28) 
$$r_0 = \left[1 + 4e^{2a} \max(1, b^2)\right]^{1/2}.$$

Define linear functionals  $\varphi_k: H \to \mathbb{R}^n, k = 1, 2, ...$  by

$$\begin{split} \varphi_1(y) &= y(0), \\ \varphi_2(y) &= \int_0^1 U_i^{-1}(\sigma) B(\sigma + i) y(\sigma - 1) \, d\sigma, \\ \varphi_3(y) &= \int_{-1}^0 (Q_i y) (t) \, dt, \\ \varphi_{2s}(y) &= \sqrt{2} \int_{-1}^0 (Q_i y) (t) \cos (2\pi (s - 1) t) \, dt, \\ \varphi_{2s+1}(y) &= \sqrt{2} \int_{-1}^0 (Q_i y) (t) \sin (2\pi (s - 1) t) \, dt, \quad s = 1, 2, 3, \dots \end{split}$$

Put  $H_i^{(0)} = H$ ,  $H_i^{(j)} = \{y \in H \mid \varphi_l(y) = 0, l = 1, 2, ..., 2j - 1\}$ , j = 1, 2, ..., i = -1, 2, ...; therefore we may define

(29) 
$$k_j = n(2j-1)$$
.

If  $y \in H_i^{(1)}$ , then

$$(Q_i y)(t) = \int_0^{t+1} U_i(t+1) U_i^{-1}(\sigma) B(\sigma+i) y(\sigma-1) d\sigma;$$

hence  $||Q_iy|| \leq e^a b ||y||$  and we may put

$$(30) r_1 = e^a b .$$

It follows from the Fourier expansion of  $Q_i y$  that

(31) 
$$||Q_iy||^2 = \sum_{l=2j}^{\infty} (\varphi_l(y))^2$$
 for  $y \in H_i^{(j)}$ ,  $j = 2, 3, ..., i = -1, -2, ...$ 

As  $(Q_i y)(-1) = 0 = (Q_i y)(0)$  for  $y \in H_i^{(2)}$ , it follows that

$$\varphi_{2s}(y) = \sqrt{2} \int_{-1}^{0} \int_{0}^{1+t} U_{i}(1+t) U_{i}^{-1}(\sigma) B(\sigma+i) y(\sigma-1) d\sigma \cos 2\pi(s-1) t dt =$$

$$= \frac{-\sqrt{2}}{2\pi(s-1)} \int_{-1}^{0} \left[ B(i+1+t) y(t) + A(i+1+t) \int_{0}^{1+t} U_{i}(1+t) U_{i}^{-1}(\sigma) B(\sigma+i) \right] \cdot y(\sigma-1) d\sigma d\sigma d\sigma d\sigma$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi(s-1)} \int_{-1}^{0} \left[ sin 2\pi(s-1) t dt \right] \cdot y \in H_{i}^{(2)}, \quad s = 2, 3, ..., \quad i = -1, -2, ...$$
(235)

Hence (cf. (25))

$$\left|\varphi_{2s}(y)\right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2\pi(s-1)} \left[1 + ae^{a}\right] b \left\|y\right\|$$

and similarly

$$|\varphi_{2s+1}(y)| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2\pi(s-1)} [1 + ae^{a}] b||y||.$$

It follows from (31) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_{i}y\|^{2} &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi^{2}} \left[1 + ae^{a}\right]^{2} b \|y\|^{2} 2\sum_{l=j}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(l-1)^{2}} \leq \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\pi^{2}(j-2)} \left[1 + ae^{a}\right]^{2} b \|y\|^{2}, \quad y \in H_{i}^{(j)}, \quad j = 3, 4, \dots, \quad i = -1, -2, \dots \end{aligned}$$

and we may put (cf. (30))

(32) 
$$r_2 = e^a b$$
,  $r_j = \frac{1}{\pi} [1 + ae^a] b(j-2)^{-1/2}$ ,  $j = 3, 4, ...$ 

The assumptions of Theorem 2 are fulfilled and Theorem 1 is proved completely (cf. Lemma 3).

(6) and (7) in Note 1 follow from (18) and (19) in Corollary and (28), (29), (30) and (32). Let us indicate, how (8) may be obtained. For m = 1, 2, 3, ... define the iteger t(m) by

(33) 
$$(2t(m) + 1) n < m \leq (2t(m) + 3) n$$
.

As  $e^a b \ge 1$ , it follows that  $S(e^{\gamma}, m) \ge 1$  for m = 1, 2, ..., 5n, (cf. (28), (29), (30) and (32)).  $S(e^{\gamma}, m)$  may be given the following form for m > 5n

(34) 
$$S(e^{\gamma}, m) = (\pi^{-1}e^{\gamma}(1 + ae^{a}) b)^{m-5n} \cdot e^{5n\gamma}(1 + 4e^{2a} \max(1, b^{2}))^{n/2} \cdot (e^{a}b)^{4n} \cdot ((t(m) - 2)!)^{-n} \cdot (t(m) - 1)^{-(m-(2t(m)+1)n)/2} \cdot (t(m) - 1)^{-(m-(2t(m)+1)n}) \cdot (t(m) - 1)^{-(m-(2t(m)+1)n$$

Let  $\eta$  be such an integer that

(35) 
$$S(e^{\gamma}, \eta) \ge 1 > S(e^{\gamma}, \eta + 1)$$
.

It is easy to see that  $\eta \ge 6$  and that  $\eta$  is unique.  $\eta = \Theta(a, b, \gamma)$  by definition of  $\vartheta$  and  $\Theta$ .

Let  $\varphi$  be the smallest integer greater than  $\pi^{-1}e^{\gamma}(1 + ae^{\alpha}) b$ . Applying Stirling formula  $(s! = (s/e)^{s} \cdot (2\pi s)^{1/2} \psi_{1}(s), \psi_{1}(s) \to 1$  with  $s \to \infty$ ) to (34) we obtain (cf.

(33)) that  $S(e^{\gamma}, \varphi) > 1$  so that

(36) 
$$\eta \geq \pi^{-1} e^{\gamma} (1 + a e^a) b$$

(the right hand side in (36) being sufficiently large).

(34) implies that

$$S(e^{\gamma}, \eta) S^{-1}(e^{\gamma}, \eta + 1) = (t(\eta + 1) - 2)^{1/2} \pi e^{-\gamma} (1 + ae^{a})^{-1} b^{-1}$$

and by (35)

(37) 
$$1 \leq S(e^{\gamma}, \eta) \leq (t(\eta + 1) - 2)^{1/2} \pi e^{-\gamma} (1 + ae^{a})^{-1} b^{-1}.$$

(36), (37) and (33) imply that

(38) 
$$(S(e^{\gamma}, \eta))^{1/\eta} \to 1 \quad \text{with} \quad e^{\gamma}(1 + ae^{\alpha}) \ b \to \infty \ .$$

By Stirling formula  $(s!)^{1/s} = (s/e) \psi_2(s), \psi_2(s) \to 1$  with  $s \to \infty$ . Observe that

(39) 
$$((t(m) - 2)!)^{-n/m} = \left(\frac{2ne}{m}\right)^{1/2} \psi_3(m), \quad \psi_3(m) \to 1 \quad \text{with} \quad m \to \infty$$

and (as  $0 < m - (2t(m) + 1) n \leq 2n$ )

(40) 
$$(t(m) - 1)^{-(m - (2t(m) + 1)n)/2m} \to 1 \text{ with } m \to \infty$$

Obviously

$$(1 + ae^{a})^{-2} b^{-2} \leq (1 + 4e^{2a} \max(1, b^{2})) (1 + ae^{a})^{-2} b^{-2} \leq (1 + ae^{a}) b \geq e^{a}b \geq 1$$

and

$$\left[\left(\left(1 + ae^{a}\right)b\right)^{-1}\right]^{\left(\left(1 + a^{a}\right)b\right)^{-1}} \ge e^{-e^{-1}}.$$

Therefore (cf. (36))

$$((1 + ae^{a})^{-1} b^{-1})^{1/\eta} \to 1 \text{ with } e^{\gamma}(1 + ae^{a}) b \to \infty$$

and

(41) 
$$[(1 + 4e^{2a} \max(1, b^2))(1 + ae^{a})^{-2} b^{-2}]^{n/2\eta} \to 1 \text{ with } e^{\gamma}(1 + ae^{a}) b \to \infty.$$

As  $(e^{-a} + a)^{-1} = e^a b(1 + ae^a)^{-1} b^{-1} \le 1$ , it may be shown (in a similar way as (41)) that

(42) 
$$[e^a b(1 + ae^a)^{-1} b^{-1}]^{4n/\eta} \to 1 \text{ with } e^{\gamma}(1 + ae^a) b \to \infty.$$

Substituting (34) in (38) and making use of the Stirling formula, (36), (39)-(42) we obtain that

 $\pi^{-1} e^{\gamma} (1 + a e^a) \ b(2ne)^{1/2} \ \eta^{-1/2} \to 1 \quad \text{with} \quad e^{\gamma} (1 + a e^a) \ b \to \infty \ ,$ 

which is equivalent to (8).

## References

- [1] A. Halanay, J. Kurzweil: A Theory of Invariant Manifolds for Flows, Rev. Roum. math. pures et appl., XIII (1968), 1079-1087.
- [2] J. Kurzweil: Invariant Manifolds fo a Class of Linear Functional Differential Equations, Rev. Roum. math. pures et appl., XIII (1968), 1113-1120.
- [3] J. Kurzweil: Invariant Manifolds I, Comm. Math. Univ. Carolinae 11 (1970), 309-336.
- [4] E. F. Beckenbach, R. Bellman: Inequalities, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1961.
- [5] Ф. Р. Гантмахер: Теория матриц, Изд. Наука, Москва 1966.

Author's address: Praha 1, Žitná 25 (Matematický ústav ČSAV v Praze).