

RATIONAL APPROXIMATION OF OPERATOR SEMIGROUPS VIA THE \mathcal{B} -CALCULUS

ALEXANDER GOMILKO AND YURI TOMILOV

ABSTRACT. We improve the classical results by Brenner and Thomée on rational approximations of operator semigroups. In the setting of Hilbert spaces, we introduce a finer regularity scale for initial data, provide sharper stability estimates, and obtain optimal approximation rates. Moreover, we strengthen a result due to Egert-Rozendaal on subdiagonal Padé approximations of operator semigroups. Our approach is direct and based on the theory of the \mathcal{B} -functional calculus developed recently. On the way, we elaborate a new and simple approach to construction of the \mathcal{B} -calculus thus making the paper essentially self-contained.

1. INTRODUCTION

The theory of rational approximation of C_0 -semigroups on Banach spaces is a classical chapter of semigroup theory with a multitude of important applications, e.g. in numerical methods for the study of PDE. However, a number of well-known results of the theory were obtained solely in the framework of abstract Banach spaces, and the influence of geometrical properties of the spaces was not exploited enough. One of the reasons was apparently a lack of an appropriate functional calculus for semigroup generators taking into account fine properties of the underlying spaces. In this paper, using the theory of \mathcal{B} -calculus developed recently in [3] and [4], we intend to fill this gap and to obtain Hilbert space versions of several crucial results on rational approximation of semigroups.

Starting a very brief introduction to the subject, observe that if $-A$ is the generator of a C_0 -semigroup $(e^{-tA})_{t \geq 0}$ on a Banach space X , then the Cauchy problem

$$(1.1) \quad x'(t) = -Ax(t), \quad x(0) = x \in \text{dom}(A),$$

where $\text{dom}(A)$ stands for the domain of A , is well-posed. Many time-discretisation methods of (1.1) lead to the problem of high accuracy approximation of the propagator $(e^{-tA})_{t \geq 0}$ to (1.1) by rational functions of A , not relying on the specific structure of A . Without loss of generality, one

Date: April 10, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 47A60, 41A20, 41A25; Secondary: 47D03, 30E10, 41A21, 65J08.

Key words and phrases. rational approximation, operator semigroup, functional calculus, Padé approximation, Hilbert space.

may assume that $(e^{-tA})_{t \geq 0}$ is bounded, so in the sequel we will deal only with bounded semigroups. Given a sequence of rational functions $(r_n)_{n \geq 1}$ holomorphic in the open right half-plane \mathbb{C}_+ , it is thus of substantial interest to characterise the convergence $r_n(tA)x \rightarrow e^{-tA}x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $x \in X$, in a priori terms, and to equip this convergence with optimal approximation rates depending on regularity of the initial data x . A simple but a very natural choice is provided by

$$r_n(z) = r^n(z/n), \quad n \geq 1,$$

for a rational function r , and it will be the main focus in this paper.

The study of such approximation problems even in the context of finite-dimensional X (see e.g. [22]) reveals a necessity to deal with \mathcal{A} -stable rational functions and to quantify their approximation properties. Recall that a rational function r is said to be \mathcal{A} -stable if r is holomorphic in \mathbb{C}_+ and $\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}_+} |r(z)| \leq 1$, and r is said to be an approximation of order $q \in \mathbb{N}$ to the exponential function e^{-z} if

$$(1.2) \quad e^{-z} - r(z) = O(|z|^{q+1}), \quad z \rightarrow 0,$$

or, in other words, $r^{(k)}(0) = (-1)^k$ for all $0 \leq k \leq q$. In the following, we will often refer to e^{-z} as *the exponential*.

If r is an \mathcal{A} -stable rational approximation to the exponential of certain order, then by the well-known Lax-Richtmyer-Chernoff theorem the approximation property $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r(tA/n)^n x = e^{-tA}x$ for all $x \in X$ and $t \geq 0$ is equivalent to the stability condition $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}, t \geq 0} \|r(tA/n)^n\| < \infty$, see e.g. [24, p. 437], and also [13, Theorem 2.1]. (This also follows from Theorem 1.1 below.) Moreover, \mathcal{A} -stable approximations r of order q allow one to obtain approximation rates for $e^{-tA}x - r^n(tA/n)x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ depending on q , often at the price of considering the initial data x with additional regularity, in particular from $\text{dom}(A^s)$ with suitable $s > 0$, and the stability condition plays a role here. Even when the condition does not hold, it is often useful to quantify the growth of $\|r(tA/n)^n\|$ for fixed $t > 0$. A thorough discussion of these and related issues with a number of pertinent references can be found in [24, Section 2], see also [12, Section 1] and [13].

1.1. Rational approximation of semigroups: a glimpse at the state of the art. Let $M(\mathbb{R}_+)$ be the Banach algebra of bounded Borel measures on $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$ and let $\mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$ be the Banach algebra of Laplace transforms $\widehat{\nu}$ of $\nu \in M(\mathbb{R}_+)$ with the norm $\|\widehat{\nu}\|_{\mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)} := \|\nu\|_{M(\mathbb{R}_+)}$. Note that if r is an \mathcal{A} -stable rational function, then $r_n \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If, moreover, r is an \mathcal{A} -stable rational approximation to e^{-z} of order q , and $\Delta_{n,r,s}(z) := (e^{-z} - r_n(z))z^{-s}$, then $\Delta_{n,r,s} \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and integers s such that $0 \leq s \leq q+1$. These observations (see [7, p. 685]) put rational approximations $(r_n(A))_{n \geq 1}$ of $(e^{-tA})_{t \geq 0}$ into the framework of the Hille-Phillips (HP-) functional calculus. Recall that if $-A$ generates a bounded C_0 -semigroup $(e^{-tA})_{t \geq 0}$ on a Banach space X , and $M := \sup_{t \geq 0} \|e^{-tA}\|$,

then the Hille-Phillips (HP-) calculus for A is defined as a bounded homomorphism $\Psi_A : \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+) \rightarrow L(X)$ given by the following operator version of Laplace transform:

$$\Psi_A(\widehat{\nu})x = \widehat{\nu}(A)x = \int_0^\infty e^{-tA}x d\nu(t), \quad x \in X, \quad \widehat{\nu} \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+),$$

so that $\|\widehat{\nu}(A)\| \leq M\|\nu\|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}_+)}$. More details on the HP-calculus can be found e.g. in [19, Chapter 3.3]. The approach to the study of rational approximations by means of the HP-calculus was pioneered by Hersch and Kato in [23], and elaborated by Brenner and Thomee in [7]. In particular, the next basic result in the theory of rational approximation of semigroups was obtained in in [7, Theorem 1, Theorem 4 and Remarks]. (See also [1, Sections 2,3] and [11, Section 5] for generalisations of this result.)

Theorem 1.1. *Let $-A$ be the generator of a C_0 -semigroup $(e^{-tA})_{t \geq 0}$ on Banach space X , and $M := \sup_{t \geq 0} \|e^{-tA}\| < \infty$.*

- (i) *If r is an A -stable rational function, then there exists $C = C(r)$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \geq 0$,*

$$(1.3) \quad \|r^n(tA/n)\| \leq CMn^{1/2}.$$

- (ii) *If r is an A -stable rational approximation of order $q \in \mathbb{N}$ to the exponential, and $s \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies $s \in (0, q+1], s \neq (q+1)/2$, then there exists $C = C(s, r) > 0$ such that*

$$(1.4) \quad \|e^{-tA}x - r^n(tA/n)x\| \leq CM \frac{t^s}{n^{s-1/2}} \|A^s x\|, \quad s \in (0, (q+1)/2),$$

$$(1.5) \quad \|e^{-tA}x - r^n(tA/n)x\| \leq CM \frac{t^s}{n^{sq/(q+1)}} \|A^s x\|, \quad s \in ((q+1)/2, q+1],$$

for all $x \in \text{dom}(A^s), t \geq 0$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If, under the assumptions above, $s = (q+1)/2$, then there is $C = C(s, r) > 0$ such that

$$(1.6) \quad \|e^{-tA}x - r^n(tA/n)x\| \leq CM \frac{t^s \log(n+1)}{n^{q/2}} \|A^s x\|,$$

for all $x \in \text{dom}(A^s), t \geq 0$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The estimates in Theorem 1.1, are, in general, optimal, as the examples of shift semigroups on $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ (or on $C_0(\mathbb{R})$) show. The sharpness of stability estimate (1.3) is discussed already in [7, p. 687], see also [8, Section 2], [26, Theorem 2.2] and [25, Theorem 3.3] for more explicit arguments. The optimality of (1.4), (1.5) and (1.6) is elaborated in [26, Section 5], see also [7, Remarks, p. 691].

It is natural to try to use interpolation and to extend the estimates in Theorem 1.1 to the whole range of $s \in (0, q+1]$. This idea was realised in [26], where for $s > 0$ the Favard interpolation spaces \mathcal{F}_s containing $\text{dom}(A^s)$ were introduced, and other, related interpolation spaces were studied. However, the estimates obtained in [26] do not seem to yield Theorem 1.1 for all $s \in (0, q+1]$. It looks plausible that one may just repeat the arguments in

[7, Theorems 1 and 4] for any fixed $s \in (0, q + 1]$, and, using the product rule for the HP-calculus (as in the proof of Theorem 1.3, (ii) below), obtain Theorem 1.1 as formulated above with s from $(0, q + 1] \cap \mathbb{N}$ replaced by $s \in (0, q + 1]$. A justification of this claim goes beyond the scope of the present paper, and thus is omitted.

Apart from fundamental use of the HP-calculus, the arguments in [23] relied on Fourier multiplier estimates for $L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ provided by Carlson's inequality. A refinement of this technique in [7] based on appropriate partitions of unity and local application of Carlson's inequality led to Theorem 1.1. These techniques with variations and adjustments were used in virtually all subsequent papers dealing with rational approximations of (in general, non-holomorphic) C_0 -semigroups.

Comparatively recently, there appeared other approaches to semigroup rational approximation relying on Padé approximations to the exponential. As emphasized already in [23] the examples of rational functions satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 can be constructed using Padé approximations. Toy examples are provided by, for instance, Euler's and Crank-Nicolson's schemes corresponding to $r(z) = (1 + z)^{-1}$ and $r(z) = (1 - z/2)(1 + z/2)^{-1}$. Because of their strong approximation properties and explicit form, Padé approximations play a distinguished role in the theory of rational approximation. Recall that if $r = P/Q$, where P and Q are polynomials with $\deg P = m$ and $\deg Q = n$, then r satisfies (1.2) with order q not exceeding $m + n$, and Padé approximations satisfy (1.2) with the maximal order $m + n$. Setting $Q(0) = 1$, the Padé approximations $r_{[m,n]} = P_m/Q_n$ of order $m + n$ to the exponential are unique and can be written explicitly. So they can be thought of as an infinite (m, n) -table. By a famous result proved in [10] and [32], see e.g. [22, Theorem 4.12], the approximations $r_{[m,n]}$ are \mathcal{A} -stable if and only if $m \leq n \leq m + 2$. Thus, the diagonal, the first subdiagonal, and the second subdiagonal Padé approximations $r_{[n,n]}$, $r_{[n,n+1]}$ and $r_{[n,n+2]}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, are of primary interest from the point of view of numerical methods.

In the context of Theorem 1.1, it was observed in [27] that when approximating the exponential it is computationally advantageous to replace the sequence $(r(\cdot/n)^n)_{n \geq 1}$ by the sequence $(r_{[n,n+1]})_{n \geq 1}$ of subdiagonal Padé approximations, so that each $r_{[n,n+1]}$ is a linear combination of simple fractions, and thus $r_{[n,n+1]}(A)$ is a linear combination of resolvents. However, the convergence of $r_{[n,n+1]}(tA)x$ to $e^{-tA}x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for, at least, regular enough data x and all $t \geq 0$ was left as an open problem in [27], and it was explored very thoroughly in [9] in the spirit of considerations of [7]. The key results from [9] can be summarized as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $-A$ generate a C_0 -semigroup $(e^{-tA})_{t \geq 0}$ on a Banach space X , and $M := \sup_{t \geq 0} \|e^{-tA}\| < \infty$. Let $(r_{[n,n+1]})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the first subdiagonal Padé approximations to the exponential, and let $s > 0$ and $x \in \text{dom}(A^s)$ be given.*

(i) If $s > 1/2$, then there exists $C = C(s) > 0$ such that

$$\|e^{-tA}x - r_{[n,n+1]}(tA)x\| \leq CM \frac{t^s}{n^{s-1/2}} \|A^s x\|$$

for all $t \geq 0$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq s - \frac{1}{2}$.

(ii) If X is a Hilbert space, $a \in (0, s)$, and $(e^{-tA})_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies $\|e^{-tA}\| \leq Me^{-\omega t}$ for some $M \geq 1$ and $\omega > 0$, then there is $C = C(M, \omega, s - a)$ such that

$$\|e^{-tA}x - r_{[n,n+1]}(tA)x\| \leq C \left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^a \|A^s x\|$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \geq \frac{a}{2} - 1$.

(iii) If A admits a bounded H^∞ -calculus on \mathbb{C}_+ with H^∞ -bound C , then

$$\|e^{-tA}x - r_{[n,n+1]}(tA)x\| \leq 2C \left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^s \|A^s x\|$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n > \frac{s}{2} - 1$.

As in the case of Theorem 1.1, the proof of (i) was based on Fourier multiplier estimates and Carlson's inequality, while the proof of (ii) relied on an advanced transference technique developed in [20] and [21]. Note that the assumption of exponential stability in (ii) is indispensable for the methods of [9]. The assumption of boundedness of the H^∞ -calculus in (iii) allows one to employ direct estimates of rational functions in the H^∞ -norm. It is difficult to express it in abstract terms, especially if A is far from being sectorial. For L^p (and more general) spaces X and C_0 -groups $(e^{-tA})_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ on X , decaying exponentially as $t \rightarrow \infty$, the stability properties and approximation rates in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 were improved in [30]. However, the improvements are still weaker than our Hilbert space results formulated in the next section.

1.2. Rational approximation via the \mathcal{B} -calculus: the results. Recently, the HP-calculus was used in [17] and [18] to unify and extend a number of basic approximation formulas in semigroup theory and to equip them with optimal approximation rates depending on smoothness of initial data. The formulas were recast in terms of completely monotone and Bernstein functions, and thus the arguments relied essentially on the study of Laplace transforms of positive measures. The positivity of measures led to results which are optimal even in the Hilbert space setting.

While the approach in [17] and [18] encompassed some rational functions, e.g. $(1+z)^{-1}$ originating from Euler's formula, the studies of rational approximations for semigroups often require to deal with Laplace transforms of, in general, non-positive measures. Obtaining sharp estimates in this case is problematic, and the optimal bounds require a finer functional calculus. The theory of such a calculus, called the \mathcal{B} -calculus in [3], was created recently in [3] and [4] in the setting of bounded C_0 -semigroups on Hilbert spaces. Being based on a Banach algebra $\mathcal{B} \supset \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$, the \mathcal{B} -calculus

strictly extends the HP-calculus, and leads to, in general, sharper operator-norm estimates than the ones provided by the HP-calculus. For more details on the \mathcal{B} -calculus see Section 3.

In the present article, using the \mathcal{B} -calculus, we substantially improve Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 if X is a Hilbert space. Our first result reads as follows.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $-A$ be the generator of a C_0 -semigroup $(e^{-tA})_{t \geq 0}$, on a Hilbert space X , and $M := \sup_{t \geq 0} \|e^{-tA}\| < \infty$.*

- (i) *If r is an \mathcal{A} -stable rational function, then there exists $C = C(r)$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \geq 0$,*

$$(1.7) \quad \|r^n(tA/n)\| \leq C\pi M^2(1 + \log(n)).$$

- (ii) *If r is an \mathcal{A} -stable rational approximation of order q to the exponential and $s \in (0, q + 1]$, then there exists $C = C(s, r) > 0$ such that*

$$(1.8) \quad \|e^{-tA}x - r^n(tA/n)x\| \leq C\pi M^2 \frac{t^s}{n^{sq/(q+1)}} \|A^s x\|$$

for all $x \in \text{dom}(A^s)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $t \geq 0$.

The estimates given in (1.8) are optimal with respect to approximation rates as we show in Theorem 3.8 below. The optimality of (1.7) is not clear, and it is related to the long-standing open problem on power boundedness for Cayley's transform of A , see e.g. [16] and Section 3 for more on that.

If a rational function r is \mathcal{A} -stable, then the limit

$$r(\infty) := \lim_{\text{Re } z \rightarrow \infty} r(z),$$

exists and $|r(\infty)| \leq 1$. The stability part of Theorem 1.3 can be strengthened if one assumes that r is small at infinity in the sense that $|r(\infty)| < 1$. The latter smallness condition, called sometimes strong \mathcal{A} -stability or L -stability in the literature, is part of condition (*) in [7, p. 687]. In the situation of Hilbert spaces it suffices to employ this smallness condition alone. As we show below the condition ensures convergence of rational approximations on the whole of X , the property appearing usually in the study of rational approximations for *holomorphic* semigroups.

Theorem 1.4. *Let A be as in Theorem 1.3, and let r be an \mathcal{A} -stable rational function satisfying*

$$(1.9) \quad |r(\infty)| < 1.$$

Then there exists $C = C(r)$ such that

$$(1.10) \quad \|r^n(tA/n)\| \leq C\pi M^2, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

As a consequence, if r is an \mathcal{A} -stable rational approximation of any order to the exponential, and (1.9) holds, then

$$(1.11) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r^n(tA/n)x = e^{-tA}x, \quad x \in X, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Observe that the first and the second subdiagonal Padé approximations to the exponential provide natural examples of r satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.4.

Using the power of the \mathcal{B} -calculus, we also substantially strengthen Theorem 1.2 and obtain an estimate similar to Theorem 1.2,(iii) for *arbitrary* bounded Hilbert space C_0 -semigroups, however modulo a logarithmic correction term. Namely, the next statement holds.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $-A$ be the generator of a C_0 -semigroup $(e^{-tA})_{t \geq 0}$ on a Hilbert space X , and let $M := \sup_{t \geq 0} \|e^{-tA}\| < \infty$. If $(r_{[n,n+1]})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are the first subdiagonal Padé approximations to the exponential, then for every $s > 0$ there exists $C = C(s) > 0$ such that*

$$(1.12) \quad \|e^{-tA}x - r_{[n,n+1]}(tA)x\| \leq \frac{\pi M^2 t^s}{n^s} (C + 4 \log(2n + 1)) \|A^s x\|$$

for all $x \in \text{dom}(A^s)$, $t \geq 0$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \geq (s - 1)/2$.

It would be of interest to clarify whether the logarithmic correction term in the right hand side of (1.12) can be omitted. Recalling that the optimality of the logarithmic bound in (1.7) has been open for a long time, this problem does not look surprising. It is also related to another, apparently open, problem of whether $r_{[n,n+1]}(tA) \rightarrow e^{-tA}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ strongly for every $t \geq 0$ or, equivalently, whether $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|r_{[n,n+1]}(tA)\| < \infty$.

Finishing this section, we fix some relevant notations and conventions. For a Hilbert space X , we denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the inner product of X , and we let $L(X)$ stand for the Banach algebra of all bounded linear operators on X . The domain and the spectrum of a linear operator A on X are denoted by $\text{dom}(A)$ and $\sigma(A)$, respectively. If A a densely defined linear operator A on X , then A^* denotes the Hilbert space adjoint of A .

Denote by $\text{Hol}(\Omega)$ the space of functions holomorphic on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$. For any function $f : \mathbb{C}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ we write $f(\infty) := \lim_{\text{Re } z \rightarrow \infty} f(z)$ if the latter limit exists in \mathbb{C} .

For a subset S of the complex plane \mathbb{C} we denote by ∂S the topological boundary of S , and by \overline{S} the closure of S . The open right half-plane $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Re } z > 0\}$ is denoted by \mathbb{C}_+ . Using the notation $x + iy$ (or similar notations) we always mean that $x = \text{Re } z$ and $y = \text{Im } z$.

Writing $C = C(r)$ for a rational function r we will mean that C depends on r and other parameters associated exclusively with r , such as its approximation order q or its domain of holomorphicity. If C will depend on other parameters, then they will be mentioned explicitly.

2. FUNCTION-THEORETICAL ESTIMATES

It was shown in [3, Sections 2.2 and 2.4], see also [31, Section 1.5], that if \mathcal{B} is the space of functions f holomorphic in \mathbb{C}_+ and satisfying

$$(2.1) \quad \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} := \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |f'(x + iy)| dx < \infty,$$

then $\mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+) \subset \mathcal{B} \subset H^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)$, where $H^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)$ is the Banach algebra of bounded holomorphic functions on \mathbb{C}_+ . Moreover, \mathcal{B} equipped with the norm $\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}} := \|f\|_{H^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)} + \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_0}$, $f \in \mathcal{B}$, is a Banach algebra, and if $\widehat{\nu} \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$, then $\|\widehat{\nu}\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \|\widehat{\nu}\|_{\mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)}$. For every $f \in \mathcal{B}$ the limit $f(\infty) = \lim_{\operatorname{Re} z \rightarrow \infty} f(z)$ exists, $f(\infty) \in \mathbb{C}$, and $\mathcal{B}_0 := \{f \in \mathcal{B} : f(\infty) = 0\}$ is the closed subalgebra of \mathcal{B} . Note that (2.1) defines a seminorm on \mathcal{B} , and since by [3, Proposition 2.2, (2)]

$$\|f\|_{H^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)} \leq |f(\infty)| + \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_0}, \quad f \in \mathcal{B},$$

it defines a norm on \mathcal{B}_0 equivalent to the norm on \mathcal{B} .

Given $s > 0$ and an appropriate rational function r or the first sub-diagonal Padé approximations $(r_{[n, n+1]})_{n \geq 1}$ to the exponential, we obtain sharp \mathcal{B}_0 -norm estimates for sequences of the form $(r(z/n)^n)_{n \geq 1}$, $((e^{-z} - r^n(z/n))z^{-s})_{n \geq 1}$ and $((e^{-z} - r_{[n, n+1]}(z))z^{-s})_{n \geq 1}$, arising in the functional calculi approach to Theorems 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5. Using the \mathcal{B} -calculus, these estimates will then be transferred to the corresponding operator norm-estimates in (1.7), (1.8), (1.10) and (1.12). Note that if $f \in \mathcal{B}$, $a > 0$, and $f_a(z) := f(az)$, $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, then $f_a \in \mathcal{B}$ and

$$(2.2) \quad \|f_a\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} = \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_0}, \quad \|f_a\|_{\mathcal{B}} = \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

This very simple invariance property will be useful for our studies.

2.1. Stability estimates in terms of \mathcal{B} -norms. In this section, given an \mathcal{A} -stable rational function r , we will study the \mathcal{B} -norm estimates for r^n and other rational functions mentioned above. Since $|r(\infty)| \leq 1$ and $r_{[n, n+1]}(\infty) = 0$ it will suffice to concentrate on estimates of their \mathcal{B}_0 -(semi)norms. The next elementary lemma will be crucial.

Lemma 2.1. *If a rational function r is \mathcal{A} -stable, different from constant, and satisfies $|r(it)| = 1$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then r is a finite Blaschke product:*

$$(2.3) \quad r(z) = c \prod_{j=1}^m \frac{z_j - z}{\bar{z}_j + z},$$

for some $(z_j)_{j=1}^m \subset \mathbb{C}_+$ and $c \in \mathbb{C}$, $|c| = 1$.

Proof. Indeed, let $|r| = 1$ on $i\mathbb{R}$, and $r = P/Q$, where P and Q are polynomials. Then $\deg P = \deg Q$, and therefore $\lim_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} |r(z)| = 1$. Let

$$B_m(z) := \prod_{j=1}^m \frac{z_j - z}{\bar{z}_j + z}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+,$$

be the Blaschke product in \mathbb{C}_+ whose zeros $(z_j)_{j=1}^m$ are the same as the zeros of r in \mathbb{C}_+ , counting multiplicities. Observe that both, r/B_m and B_m/r , are holomorphic and bounded in \mathbb{C}_+ , and have moduli identically equal to 1 on $i\mathbb{R}$. From the maximum principle it follows that r/B_m is a constant in \mathbb{C}_+ (and then in \mathbb{C}) of modulus 1. \square

The direct argument above can essentially be found e.g. in [15, Chapter 1.2, p. 6], and we gave it here in view of its importance for the sequel.

Thus, if a rational function r is \mathcal{A} -stable and different from a constant, then either $|r| \not\equiv 1$ on $i\mathbb{R}$, or, otherwise r is a finite Blaschke product. We will split the study of powers of r into considering these two cases. First, we consider the situation when r is a Blaschke product. This assumption will be replaced by a more general assumption on r to have at least one zero in \mathbb{C}_+ . The arguments are essentially the same under both assumptions, while the technical details become somewhat clearer in a more general set-up. We will need a family of auxiliary functions. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \geq 0$, define

$$F_{n,s}(x, t) := \frac{((x-1)^2 + t)^{n-1}}{((x+1)^2 + t)^{n+1+s}}, \quad x, t > 0,$$

and denote

$$a_{n,s} := \frac{(2n+s) - 2\sqrt{(n+1+s)(n-1)}}{(2+s)}$$

and

$$b_{n,s} := a_{n,s}^{-1} = \frac{(2n+s) + 2\sqrt{(n+1+s)(n-1)}}{(2+s)}.$$

Observe that

$$(2.4) \quad 1 \leq \frac{2n+s}{2+s} \leq b_{n,s} \leq \frac{2(2n+s)}{2+s} \leq 2n.$$

The next elementary technical lemma will simplify our estimates of powers of rational functions having at least one zero in \mathbb{C}_+ .

Lemma 2.2. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \geq 0$, let*

$$(2.5) \quad G_{n,s}(x) := \sup_{t>0} F_{n,s}(x, t), \quad x > 0.$$

Then

$$(2.6) \quad G_{n,s}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{(x-1)^{2(n-1)}}{(x+1)^{2(n+1+s)}}, & x \notin [a_{n,s}, b_{n,s}], \\ \frac{(n-1)^{n-1}}{(n+1+s)^{n+1+s}} \cdot \frac{(2+s)^{2+s}}{4^{2+s}x^{2+s}}, & x \in [a_{n,s}, b_{n,s}], \end{cases}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \geq 0$.

Proof. If $x > 0$, $s \geq 0$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ are fixed, then

$$\frac{((x+1)^2 + t)^{n+2+s}}{(x-1)^2 + t)^{n-2}} \frac{d}{dt} F_{n,s}(x, t) = -(2+s)t + w_{n,s}(x),$$

where

$$w_{n,s}(x) = -(2+s)x^2 + 2(2n+s)x - (2+s).$$

Since the roots of $w_{n,s}(x) = 0$ are precisely $a_{n,s}$ and $b_{n,s}$, we have $w_{n,s}(x) > 0$ if and only if $x \in (a_{n,s}, b_{n,s})$. So, if $x \notin [a_{n,s}, b_{n,s}]$, then

$$G_{n,s}(x) = F_{n,s}(x, 0) = \frac{(x-1)^{2(n-1)}}{(x+1)^{2(n+1+s)}}.$$

On the other hand, if $x \in [a_{n,s}, b_{n,s}]$ and $t_{n,s}(x) = w_{n,s}(x)(2+s)^{-1}$, then

$$G_{n,s}(x) = F_{n,s}(x, t_{n,s}(x)) = \frac{(n-1)^{n-1}}{(n+1+s)^{n+1+s}} \cdot \frac{(2+s)^{2+s}}{4^{2+s}x^{2+s}}. \quad \square$$

Recall that if v is the Cayley transform, i.e. $v(z) = \frac{1-z}{1+z}$, then by [3, Lemma 3.7] (and its proof),

$$(2.7) \quad \|v^n\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} \leq 2 + 2\log(2n), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The logarithmic bound in (2.7) is optimal by [4, Lemma 5.1]. For a rational function r with at least one zero in \mathbb{C}_+ , our estimates will be reduced to the particular case when $r = v$. For $s \geq 0$ let

$$(2.8) \quad \eta_s(z) := (1+z)^{-s}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+.$$

Lemma 2.3. *Let r be an \mathcal{A} -stable rational function on \mathbb{C}_+ satisfying $r(\lambda) = 0$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$, and let $s > 0$. Then there exist $C = C(r) > 0$ and $C_1 = C_1(r, s) > 0$ such that*

$$(2.9) \quad \|r^n\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} \leq C(1 + \log(n))$$

and

$$(2.10) \quad \|r^n \eta_s\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} \leq C_1(r, s)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed. First observe that since $r(\lambda) = 0$, the \mathcal{A} -stability of r and the maximum principle imply that

$$(2.11) \quad r(z) = \left(\frac{\lambda - z}{\lambda + z} \right) r_0(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+,$$

where a rational function r_0 satisfy $\|r_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)} \leq 1$. Clearly, $r_0 = r(\infty) + P/Q$, where P and Q are polynomials with $\deg P < \deg Q$, and $r(\infty) = \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} r(z)$. So, by a partial fraction expansion, there exists $C = C(r_0) > 0$ such that

$$(2.12) \quad |r'_0(z)| \leq \frac{C}{|\lambda + z|^2}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+.$$

Hence, using (2.11), (2.12) and $\|r_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)} \leq 1$,

$$(2.13) \quad |(r^n(z))'| \leq n \frac{|\lambda - z|^{n-1} C + 2\operatorname{Re}\lambda}{|\lambda + z|^{n-1} |\lambda + z|^2}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+.$$

Denoting $C_\lambda = C + 2\operatorname{Re} \lambda$, $\lambda = a + ib$, and $z = x + iy$, we infer from (2.13) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|r^n\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} &\leq nC_\lambda \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{((x-a)^2 + (y+b)^2)^{(n-1)/2}}{((x+a)^2 + (y+b)^2)^{(n+1)/2}} dx \\
(2.14) \qquad &= nC_\lambda \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{((x-1)^2 + y^2)^{(n-1)/2}}{((x+1)^2 + y^2)^{(n+1)/2}} dx \\
&= \frac{C_\lambda}{2} \|v^n\|_{\mathcal{B}_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence (2.14) and (2.7) yield (2.9).

Next, let $s > 0$ be fixed. By (2.13) and the \mathcal{A} -stability of r ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|(r^n(z)\eta_s(z))'| &\leq \frac{|(r^n(z))'|}{|1+z|^s} + s \frac{|r^n(z)|}{|1+z|^{s+1}} \\
&\leq n \frac{|\lambda - z|^{n-1}}{|\bar{\lambda} + z|^{n-1}} \frac{C_\lambda}{|\bar{\lambda} + z|^{2+s}} + \frac{s}{|1+z|^{s+1}}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$(2.15) \quad \int_0^\infty \sup_{y>0} \frac{s}{((x+1)^2 + y^2)^{(s+1)/2}} dx = \int_0^\infty \frac{s dx}{(1+x)^{s+1}} = 1,$$

we have

$$\|r^n \eta_s\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} \leq C_\lambda I_{n,s} + 1,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{n,s} &= n \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{((x-a)^2 + (y+b)^2)^{(n-1)/2}}{((x+a)^2 + (y+b)^2)^{(n+1+s)/2}} dx \\
&= n \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{((x-a)^2 + y^2)^{(n-1)/2}}{((x+a)^2 + y^2)^{(n+1+s)/2}} dx \\
&= n \int_0^\infty (G_{n,s}(x))^{1/2} dx
\end{aligned}$$

and $G_{n,s}$ is given by (2.5).

Thus, by (2.6),

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{n,s} &= n \int_0^{a_{n,s}} \frac{(1-x)^{n-1}}{(x+1)^{n+1}} dx + n \int_{b_{n,s}}^\infty \frac{(x-1)^{n-1}}{(x+1)^{n+1}} dx \\
&\quad + n \frac{(n-1)^{(n-1)/2}}{(n+1+s)^{(n+1+s)/2}} \frac{(2+s)^{1+s/2}}{2^{2+s}} \int_{a_{n,s}}^{b_{n,s}} \frac{dx}{x^{1+s/2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $a_{n,s} = b_{n,s}^{-1}$, observe that

$$n \int_0^{a_{n,s}} \frac{(1-x)^{n-1}}{(x+1)^{n+1}} dx + n \int_{b_{n,s}}^\infty \frac{(x-1)^{n-1}}{(x+1)^{n+1}} dx = 2 \int_{b_{n,s}}^\infty d \left(\frac{(x-1)^n}{(x+1)^n} \right) \leq 2.$$

Therefore, taking into account (2.4),

$$I_{n,s} \leq 2 + \frac{2}{n^{s/2}} \frac{(2+s)^{1+s/2}}{2^{2+s}} b_{n,s}^{s/2} \leq 2 + \frac{(1+s/2)^{s/2+1}}{s},$$

and then

$$(2.16) \quad \|r^n \eta_s\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} \leq \left(2 + \frac{(1+s/2)^{s/2+1}}{s} \right) C_\lambda + 1.$$

Thus, (2.10) holds with $C(r, s)$ given by the right-hand side of (2.16). \square

Now we turn to the case when $|r|$ is not identically 1 on $i\mathbb{R}$ (but r may not have zeros in \mathbb{C}_+). As above, we will first need a technical lemma facilitating our estimates of $r^n, n \in \mathbb{N}$, under this assumption.

For $\alpha > 0, s \geq 0$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ define

$$S_{\alpha,n,s}(x, t) := \frac{e^{-\alpha n x / (x^2 + t)}}{(x^2 + t)^{1+s/2}}, \quad x, t > 0.$$

Lemma 2.4. *For all $\alpha, \beta > 0$ and $s \geq 0$ there are $C = C(\alpha, \beta, s) > 0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$(2.17) \quad \int_{\beta/n}^{\infty} \sup_{t>0} S_{\alpha,n,s}(x, t) dx \leq \begin{cases} C \frac{\log(n+1)}{n}, & \text{if } s = 0, \\ \frac{C}{n}, & \text{if } s > 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $\alpha, \beta > 0$ and $s \geq 0$ be fixed. Fix also $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x > 0$. Then for all $t > 0$,

$$e^{-\alpha n x / (x^2 + t)} (x^2 + t)^{3+s/2} \frac{d}{dt} S_{\alpha,n,s}(x, t) = \alpha n x - (1 + s/2)(x^2 + t),$$

and $\frac{d}{dt} S_{\alpha,n,s}(x, t)$ has the unique zero at $t_0 = \alpha_s n x - x^2$, where we denoted $\alpha_s = \frac{\alpha}{1+s/2}$ for shorthand. Therefore,

$$\sup_{t>0} S_{\alpha,n,s}(x, t) = S_{\alpha,n,s}(x, t_0) = \frac{e^{-(2+s)/2}}{(\alpha_s n x)^{1+s/2}}, \quad \text{if } x \in (0, \alpha_s n),$$

and

$$\sup_{t>0} S_{\alpha,n,s}(x, t) = S_{n,s}(x, 0) = \frac{e^{-\alpha n / x}}{x^{2+s}}, \quad \text{if } x \in (\alpha_s n, \infty).$$

Then for large enough n , we have

$$\int_{\beta/n}^{\infty} \sup_{t>0} S_{\alpha,n,0}(x, t) dx \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_s n} \int_{\beta/n}^{\alpha n} \frac{dx}{x} + \int_{\alpha n}^{\infty} \frac{dx}{x^2} \leq C \frac{\log(n+1)}{n}$$

and, if $s > 0$,

$$\int_{\beta/n}^{\infty} \sup_{t>0} S_{\alpha,n,s}(x, t) dx \leq \frac{1}{(\alpha_s n)^{1+s/2}} \int_{\beta/n}^{\alpha_s n} \frac{dx}{x^{1+s/2}} + \int_{\alpha_s n}^{\infty} \frac{dx}{x^{2+s}} \leq \frac{C}{n},$$

for appropriate constants $C = C(\alpha, \beta, s) > 0$. This finishes the proof. \square

The next lemma is a counterpart of Lemma 2.3 under complementary assumptions on r . For $R > 0$ denote

$$\mathbb{D}_R^+ := \{z \in \mathbb{C}_+ : |z| < R\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{D}_R := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < R\}.$$

Lemma 2.5. *Let r be an \mathcal{A} -stable rational function satisfying $|r| \not\equiv 1$ on $i\mathbb{R}$, and let $s > 0$. Then there exist $C = C(r) > 0$ and $C_1 = C_1(r, s)$ such that (2.9) and (2.10) hold for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Since $|r|$ is not identically 1 on $i\mathbb{R}$, the set $\{z \in i\mathbb{R} : |r(z)| = 1\}$ is at most finite. Therefore, taking into account that r is \mathcal{A} -stable, there exists $R > 0$ such that $|r(\pm iR)| < 1$. Since, by the maximum principle, $|r(z)| < 1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, we have

$$\omega := \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}_+, |z|=R} |r(z)| < 1.$$

If $\alpha = \frac{|\log \omega|}{R}$ and

$$f(z) := e^{\alpha z} r(z), \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}_+},$$

then

$$|f(z)| \leq 1, \quad z \in \partial \mathbb{D}_R^+,$$

and the maximum principle yields $|f(z)| \leq 1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}_R^+$. Thus

$$(2.18) \quad |r(z)| \leq e^{-\alpha \operatorname{Re} z}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}_R^+.$$

By applying the argument above to $r^*(z) := r(1/z)$ in place of r , we infer that

$$(2.19) \quad |r(z)| \leq e^{-\alpha \operatorname{Re}(1/z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+ \setminus \mathbb{D}_R^+.$$

Moreover, as in the proof of Lemma 2.3,

$$(2.20) \quad |r'(z)| \leq \frac{C}{|1+z|^2}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+,$$

for some $C = C(r) > 0$.

Thus, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the estimates (2.18), (2.19) and (2.20) combined with the \mathcal{A} -stability of r imply that

$$(2.21) \quad |(r^n(z))'| \leq \begin{cases} Cn e^{-\alpha(n-1)\operatorname{Re} z}, & z \in \mathbb{D}_R^+, \\ Cn e^{-\alpha(n-1)\operatorname{Re}(1/z)} |1+z|^{-2}, & z \in \mathbb{C}_+ \setminus \mathbb{D}_R^+. \end{cases}$$

We simultaneously obtain both bounds (2.9) and (2.10) using the fact that $r^n = r^n \eta_0$. Fix $s \geq 0$ and $n \geq 2$, and let $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Writing

$$(2.22) \quad (r^n \eta_s(z))' = \frac{(r^n(z))'}{(z+1)^s} - s \frac{r^n(z)}{(z+1)^{s+1}}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+,$$

and employing (2.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|r^n \eta_s\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} &\leq \int_0^{\frac{R}{n}} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|(r^n(z))'|}{|1+z|^s} dx + \int_{\frac{R}{n}}^\infty \sup_{|z| > R, y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|(r^n(z))'|}{|1+z|^s} dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\frac{R}{n}}^R \sup_{|z| < R, y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|(r^n(z))'|}{|1+z|^s} dx + s \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|r^n(z)|}{|1+z|^{s+1}} dx \\
&\leq C + Cn \int_{\frac{R}{n}}^\infty \sup_{t > 0} S_{\alpha, n-1, s}(x, t) dx + Cn \int_{\frac{R}{n}}^R \frac{e^{-\alpha(n-1)x}}{(x+1)^{2+s}} dx \\
&\quad + s \int_0^\infty \frac{dx}{(x^2+1)^{(1+s)/2}} \leq C_1 + Cn \int_{\frac{R}{n}}^\infty \sup_{t > 0} S_{\alpha, n-1, s}(x, t) dx
\end{aligned}$$

for some $C_1 = C_1(s) > 0$. The estimates (2.9) and (2.10) follow from (2.17). \square

Observe that the estimate given by Lemma 2.5 is optimal, as the following example shows.

Example 2.6. Let $z = x + iy \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}_+$, and consider the rational function

$$r(z) = \frac{(z+2)^2}{(z+1)(z+4)}.$$

Noting that

$$r'(z) = \frac{z^2 - 4}{(z+1)^2(z+4)^2},$$

by a simple but somewhat tedious calculation, we conclude that

$$|r(z)| \geq \frac{|z-1|}{|z+1|}, \quad |r'(z)| \geq \frac{1}{4|z+1|^2}, \quad \operatorname{Re} z \geq 8.$$

Hence, for all $n \geq 2$,

$$|(r^n(z))'| \geq \frac{n|z-1|^{n-1}}{4|z+1|^{n+1}}, \quad \operatorname{Re} z \geq 8.$$

so that, by Lemma 2.3 with $s = 0$,

$$\|r^n\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} \geq \int_8^n \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |(r^n(z))'| dx \geq \frac{n(n-1)^{(n-1)/2}}{8(n+1)^{(n+1)/2}} \int_8^n \frac{dx}{x} \geq C \log(n+1)$$

for some $C > 0$.

Moreover, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$|r(it)|^2 = \frac{(t^2+4)^2}{(t^2+1)(t^2+16)} \leq 1,$$

and

$$|r(it)| < 1, \quad t \neq 0, \quad r(0) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad r(\infty) = 1.$$

Combining now Lemmas 2.3 and 2.5, we obtain (2.9) and (2.10) for any \mathcal{A} -stable r .

Corollary 2.7. *Let r be an \mathcal{A} -stable rational function, and let $s > 0$. Then there exist $C = C(r) > 0$ and $C_1 = C_1(r, s) > 0$ such that (2.9) and (2.10) hold for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, if $r_n(z) = r^n(z/n)$, $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, then*

$$(2.23) \quad \|r_n \eta_s\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} \leq C_1(r, s) + 1$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. If r is a constant function, then the statement is obvious. Otherwise, as noted in the beginning of this section, either $|r|$ is not identically 1 on $i\mathbb{R}$, or r is a finite Blaschke product. Thus, by combining Lemmas 2.3 and 2.5, we obtain (2.9) and (2.10) for some $C = C(r) > 0$, $C_1 = C_1(r, s) > 0$ and any \mathcal{A} -stable rational function r .

To obtain (2.23) it suffices to note that by (2.22) and (2.15), letting $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{C}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|r_n \eta_s\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} &\leq 1 + \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|(r_n(z))'|}{|1+z|^s} dx \\ &= 1 + \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|(r^n(z))'|}{|1+nz|^s} dx \leq 1 + \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|(r^n(z))'|}{|1+z|^s} dx \\ &= 1 + \|r^n \eta_s\|_{\mathcal{B}_0}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

The bound (2.9) can be substantially strengthened if $|r(\infty)| < 1$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let r be an \mathcal{A} -stable rational function such that $|r(\infty)| < 1$. Then*

$$(2.24) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|r^n\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} < \infty.$$

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed. Observe that there exists $C = C(r) > 0$ such that

$$(2.25) \quad |(r^n(z))'| \leq \frac{Cn}{|1+z|^2} |r(z)|^{n-1}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+.$$

Next, fix $\omega \in (|r(\infty)|, 1)$. By assumption, there exists $R > 0$ such that

$$(2.26) \quad |r(z)| \leq \omega < 1, \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}_+} \setminus \mathbb{D}_R^+.$$

Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 2.5 and letting $\alpha = \frac{|\log \omega|}{R}$, we infer that by the maximum principle,

$$(2.27) \quad |r(z)| \leq e^{-\alpha \operatorname{Re} z}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}_R^+.$$

From (2.25), (2.26) and (2.27), taking into account that $\|r\|_{\mathcal{H}^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)} \leq 1$, it then follows that

$$|(r^n(z))'| \leq \begin{cases} Cne^{-\alpha(n-1)\operatorname{Re} z}, & z \in \mathbb{D}_R^+, \\ Cn\omega^{n-1}|1+z|^{-2}, & z \in \mathbb{C}_+ \setminus \mathbb{D}_R^+. \end{cases}$$

Hence, letting $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{C}_+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|r^n\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} &\leq \int_0^R \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}, z \in \mathbb{D}_R^+} |(r^n(z))'| dx + \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}, z \in \mathbb{C}_+ \setminus \mathbb{D}_R^+} |(r^n(z))'| dx \\ &\leq Cn \int_0^R e^{-\alpha(n-1)x} dx + Cn\omega^{n-1} \int_0^\infty \frac{dx}{(1+x)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{Cn}{\alpha(n-1)} + Cn\omega^{n-1} \leq \frac{2CR}{|\log \omega|} + \frac{C}{e\omega |\log \omega|}, \end{aligned}$$

so that (2.24) holds. \square

2.2. Estimates for approximation rates in terms of \mathcal{B}_0 -norms. If a rational function r approximates the exponential with some order, $s \in [0, q+1]$, and $R_0 > 0$ is small enough, then r extends holomorphically to \mathbb{D}_{R_0} , and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we let

$$\Delta_{r,n}(z) := e^{-z} - r^n(z/n), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}_{R_0 n},$$

and

$$\Delta_{r,n,s}(z) := z^{-s} \Delta_{r,n}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}_{R_0 n}^+,$$

so that $\Delta_{r,n,0} = \Delta_{r,n}$ on $\mathbb{D}_{R_0 n}^+$. Clearly, $\Delta_{r,n} \in \text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}_{R_0 n})$ and $\Delta_{r,n,s} \in \text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}_{R_0 n}^+)$. Moreover, $\Delta_{r,n,s}$ extends continuously to $(-iR_0 n, iR_0 n)$. If, in addition, r is \mathcal{A} -stable, then both $\Delta_{r,n}$ and $\Delta_{r,n,s}$ extend holomorphically to \mathbb{C}_+ , and continuously to $\overline{\mathbb{C}_+}$. We denote the extensions by *the same symbols*.

Given a rational approximation r to the exponential, we turn to obtaining estimates for the \mathcal{B}_0 -norms of $\Delta_{r,n,s}$. In Section 3, these estimates will be converted into semigroup approximation rates by means of the \mathcal{B} -calculus. The next lemma is an important tool for obtaining the \mathcal{B}_0 -norm bounds for $\Delta_{r,n,s}$ which are optimal with respect to approximation order of r .

Lemma 2.9. *Let r be a rational approximation of order $q \in \mathbb{N}$ to the exponential. If*

$$(2.28) \quad s \in [0, q+1], \quad \delta := q/(q+1), \quad \text{and} \quad a := \frac{r^{(q+1)}(0) - (-1)^{q+1}}{(q+1)!},$$

then there exist $R = R(r) \in (0, 1)$ and $c = c(r) > 0$ such that the following hold.

(i) *One has*

$$(2.29) \quad |\Delta'_{r,n,s}(z)| \leq \left(|a|(q+1-s) \frac{|z|^{q-s}}{n^q} + \frac{c}{n^{\delta s}} \right) e^{-\text{Re } z}$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn^\delta}^+$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(ii) *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $u_n \in \text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}_{Rn})$ such that*

$$(2.30) \quad \Delta_{r,n,s}(z) = \left(1 - e^{az^{q+1}/n^q} e^{u_n(z)} \right) e^{-z} z^{-s}, \quad |u_n(z)| \leq c \frac{|z|^{q+2}}{n^{q+1}},$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn^\delta}^+$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The proof of Lemma 2.9 is rather technical, and is postponed to Appendix. The following result is behind Theorem 1.3,(ii).

Lemma 2.10. *Let r be an \mathcal{A} -stable rational approximation of order q to the exponential. If $\delta = q/(q+1)$, then for every $s \in (0, q+1]$ there exists $C = C(r, s) > 0$ such that*

$$(2.31) \quad \|\Delta_{r,n,s}\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} \leq Cn^{-\delta s}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. Let $s \in (0, q+1]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed. From Lemma 2.9,(i) it follows that there are $R \in (0, 1)$ and $c > 0$ (both depending on r) such that

$$(2.32) \quad |\Delta'_{r,n,s}(z)| \leq |a|(q+1-s) \frac{|z|^{q-s}}{n^q} + \frac{c}{n^{\delta s}} e^{-\operatorname{Re} z}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn^\delta}^+$$

where a is defined as in (2.28). For $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$ write $z = x + iy$. We have

$$(2.33) \quad \|\Delta_{r,n,s}\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} \leq B_{n,s} + U_{n,s}^{(1)} + U_{n,s}^{(2)},$$

where

$$B_{n,s} = \int_0^{n^\delta} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}, |z| \leq n^\delta} |\Delta'_{r,n,s}(z)| dx,$$

$$U_{n,s}^{(1)} = \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}, |z| > Rn^\delta} |\Delta'_{r,n,s}(z)| |z|^{-s} dx,$$

and

$$U_{n,s}^{(2)} = s \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}, |z| > Rn^\delta} |\Delta_{r,n,s}(z)| |z|^{-s-1} dx.$$

We estimate each of the terms in the right hand side of (2.33) separately.

First, note that by (2.32),

$$B_{n,s} \leq |a|B_{n,s}^{(1)} + cB_{n,s}^{(2)},$$

where

$$B_{n,s}^{(1)} = \frac{(q+1-s)}{n^q} \int_0^{n^\delta} \sup_{|y| \leq n^\delta} (x^2 + y^2)^{(q-s)/2} dx \quad \text{if } s \in (0, q+1),$$

$$B_{n,q+1}^{(1)} = 0,$$

and

$$B_{n,s}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{n^{\delta s}} \int_0^{n^\delta} e^{-x} dx \leq \frac{1}{n^{\delta s}}.$$

Furthermore, if $s \in (0, q]$, then

$$\begin{aligned} B_{n,s}^{(1)} &= \frac{(q+1-s)}{n^q} \int_0^{n^\delta} (x^2 + n^{2\delta})^{(q-s)/2} dx \\ &= \frac{(q+1-s)}{n^{\delta s}} \int_0^1 (t^2 + 1)^{(q-s)/2} dt \leq \frac{q+1}{n^{\delta s}} 2^{q/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and, if $s \in (q, q + 1)$, then

$$B_{n,s}^{(1)} = \frac{(q+1-s)}{n^q} \int_0^{n^\delta} \frac{dx}{x^{s-q}} = \frac{1}{n^{\delta s}}.$$

So, combining the estimates for $B_{n,s}^{(1)}$ and $B_{n,s}^{(2)}$ above, we obtain that

$$(2.34) \quad B_{n,s} \leq \frac{|a|(q+1)2^{q/2} + c}{n^{\delta s}}.$$

Next, since r is \mathcal{A} -stable, we have $\|\Delta_{r,n}\|_{H^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)} \leq 2$. Using this we infer that

$$(2.35) \quad \begin{aligned} U_{n,s}^{(2)} &\leq 2s \int_{Rn^\delta}^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |z|^{-s-1} dx + 2s \int_0^{Rn^\delta} \sup_{|y| \geq Rn^\delta} |z|^{-s-1} dx \\ &= 2s \int_{Rn^\delta}^\infty \frac{dx}{x^{s+1}} + 2s \int_0^{Rn^\delta} \frac{dx}{(x^2 + R^2 n^{2\delta})^{(s+1)/2}} \leq \frac{2(2+q)}{R^s n^{\delta s}} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, to estimate $U_{n,s}^{(1)}$, note that

$$\begin{aligned} U_{n,s}^{(1)} &\leq \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}, |z| \geq Rn^\delta} |z|^{-s} e^{-x} dx + \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}, |z| \geq Rn^\delta} \frac{|(r^n(z/n))'|}{|z|^s} dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{R^s n^{\delta s}} + \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}, |z| \geq Rn^{\delta-1}} \frac{|(r^n(z))'|}{n^s |z|^s} dx. \end{aligned}$$

If $|z| \geq Rn^{\delta-1}$, then, recalling that $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $R \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$2n|z| \geq n|z| + Rn^\delta \geq Rn^\delta(|z| + 1) \geq Rn^\delta|z| + 1|.$$

Hence, if $C_1(r, s)$ is the constant given by Corollary 2.7, then

$$(2.36) \quad U_{n,s}^{(1)} \leq \frac{1}{R^s n^{\delta s}} + \frac{2^s}{R^s n^{\delta s}} \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|(r^n(z))'|}{|1+z|^s} dx \leq \frac{1 + 2^s C_1(r, s)}{R^s n^{\delta s}}.$$

Using (2.33) and taking into account (2.34), (2.35), and (2.36), one obtains (2.31). \square

Remark 2.11. By combining (2.29) and the estimate for $C_1(r, s)$ from the proof of Corollary 2.7 (i.e. the proofs of Lemmas 2.3 and 2.5), it is easy to show that $C = C(r, s)$ in (2.31) satisfies $\sup_{x \leq s \leq q+1} C(r, s) < \infty$ for every $x > 0$.

2.3. Estimates for subdiagonal Padé approximations. Following the ideology of the previous subsections and having in mind Theorem 1.5, we proceed with obtaining fine \mathcal{B}_0 -norm estimates for $z \rightarrow (e^{-z} - r_{[n, n+1]}(z))z^{-s}$, where $(r_{[n, n+1]})_{n \geq 1}$ are the first subdiagonal Padé approximations of e^{-z} .

Recall that if P_n and Q_{n+1} are polynomials such that $r_{[n,n+1]} = P_n/Q_{n+1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $Q_{n+1}(0) = 1$, then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(2.37) \quad P_n(z) = \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{(2n+1-j)!n!}{(2n+1)!j!(n-j)!} (-z)^j,$$

$$(2.38) \quad Q_{n+1}(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} \frac{(2n+1-j)!(n+1)!}{(2n+1)!j!(n+1-j)!} z^j,$$

and $r_{[n,n+1]}$ are \mathcal{A} -stable rational approximations of order $2n+1$ to e^{-z} , see e.g. [22, Theorem 3.11]. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and define the approximation error $\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]}}$ by

$$\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]}}(z) := r_{[n,n+1]}(z) - e^{-z}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+.$$

The next classical Perron representation for $\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]}}$:

$$(2.39) \quad \Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]}}(z) = \frac{1}{Q_{n+1}(z)} \frac{z^{2n+2}}{(2n+1)!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^n t^{n+1} e^{-zt} dt, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+,$$

is behind several basic properties of Padé approximations to e^{-z} . It can be found in e.g. [2, p. 643], see also [9, p. 880] and [28, p. 3566]. Note that

$$(2.40) \quad |Q_{n+1}(z)| \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|Q'_{n+1}(z)|}{|Q_{n+1}(z)|} \leq 1,$$

for all $z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}_+}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For $z = it, t \in \mathbb{R}$, the bounds in (2.40) were noted in [28, Propositions 1 and 2] and [9, Lemma 3.1]. They extend to \mathbb{C}_+ by the maximum principle applied to $1/Q_{n+1}$ and Q'_{n+1}/Q_{n+1} . As noted in [9, Lemma 3.2], combining (2.39) with the first bound in (2.40) yields

$$|\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]}}(z)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{n!}{(2n+1)!} \right)^2 |z|^{2n+2}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+.$$

Hence, invoking the simple inequality ([9, Lemma 3.5]):

$$(2.41) \quad \frac{n!}{(2n+1)!} \leq \frac{1}{(n+1)^{n+1}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

we obtain

$$(2.42) \quad |\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]}}(z)| \leq \frac{|z|^{2n+2}}{2(n+1)^{2(n+1)}}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+.$$

To facilitate the subsequent estimates, we will need several additional properties of $\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]}}$ given in the lemma below.

Lemma 2.12. *Let $r_{[n,n+1]} = P_n/Q_{n+1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be the first subdiagonal Padé approximations to e^{-z} , where P_n and Q_{n+1} are given by (2.37) and (2.38), respectively.*

(i) *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$(2.43) \quad \|\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]}}\|_{H^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)} \leq 2, \quad \|\Delta'_{r_{[n,n+1]}}\|_{H^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)} \leq 2.$$

(ii) For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}_n^+$,

$$(2.44) \quad |\Delta'_{r_{[n,n+1]}}(z)| \leq 2 \frac{|z|^{2n+1}}{(2n)!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^n t^{n+1} e^{-t \operatorname{Re} z} dt.$$

Proof. Fix $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. To prove (i) it suffices to recall that by e.g. [22, Theorem 4.12] the function $r_{[n,n+1]}$ is \mathcal{A} -stable, and, moreover, by [14, p. 334], its derivative $r'_{[n,n+1]}$ is \mathcal{A} -stable as well. (A weaker property $\|r'_{[n,n+1]}\|_{H^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)} \leq 2$ was also noted in [28, Proposition 2].)

To deduce (ii), note that by (2.39) and (2.40),

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta'_{r_{[n,n+1]}}(z) &= -\frac{Q'_{n+1}(z)}{Q_{n+1}^2(z)} \frac{z^{2n+2}}{(2n+1)!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^n t^{n+1} e^{-zt} dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{Q_{n+1}(z)} \frac{(2n+2)z^{2n+1}}{(2n+1)!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^n t^{n+1} e^{-zt} dt \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{Q_{n+1}(z)} \frac{z^{2n+2}}{(2n+1)!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^n t^{n+2} e^{-zt} dt, \end{aligned}$$

and, letting $z = x + iy$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta'_{r_{[n,n+1]}}(z)| &\leq \frac{|z|^{2n+2}}{(2n+1)!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^n t^{n+1} e^{-xt} dt \\ &\quad + \frac{(2n+2)|z|^{2n+1}}{(2n+1)!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^n t^{n+1} e^{-xt} dt \\ &\quad + \frac{|z|^{2n+2}}{(2n+1)!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^n t^{n+2} e^{-xt} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if $z \in \mathbb{D}_n^+$, then

$$|\Delta'_{r_{[n,n+1]}}(z)| \leq 2 \frac{|z|^{2n+1}}{(2n)!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^n t^{n+1} e^{-xt} dt. \quad \square$$

For $s > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let now

$$\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]},s}(z) := z^{-s} \Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]}}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+.$$

The following statement provides an estimate for $\|\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]},s}\|_{\mathcal{B}_0}$ leading to the operator-norm error bound in Theorem 1.5 via the \mathcal{B} -calculus. In view of possible improvements, we formulate the result with an explicit constant.

Lemma 2.13. *For all $s > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \geq (s-1)/2$, one has*

$$(2.45) \quad \|\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]},s}\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} \leq \left\{ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{4}{s} + \frac{s}{2} + \frac{4\pi s}{(s+1) \sin(\pi/(1+s))} + 4 \log(2n+1) \right\} \frac{1}{n^s}.$$

Proof. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in (0, \infty)$ satisfying $2n+1 \geq s > 0$. We write

$$(2.46) \quad \Delta'_{r_{[n,n+1]},s}(z) = -s \frac{\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]}}(z)}{z^{s+1}} + \frac{\Delta'_{r_{[n,n+1]}}(z)}{z^s}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+,$$

and estimate the \mathcal{B}_0 -norm of each of the terms in the right hand side of (2.46) separately.

Let $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Then, observing that $|z| \geq n$ implies

$$2|z|^{s+1} \geq |z|^{s+1} + n^{s+1} \geq x^{s+1} + n^{s+1},$$

and using (2.42), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|\Delta_{r[n,n+1]}(z)|}{|z|^{s+1}} dx \\ (2.47) \quad & \leq \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}, |z| \leq n} \frac{|\Delta_{r[n,n+1]}(z)|}{|z|^{s+1}} dx + \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}, |z| \geq n} \frac{|\Delta_{r[n,n+1]}(z)|}{|z|^{s+1}} dx \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2n^{s+1}} \int_0^n dx + 4 \int_0^\infty \frac{dx}{x^{s+1} + n^{s+1}} \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{4\pi}{(s+1) \sin(\pi/(1+s))} \right) n^{-s}, \end{aligned}$$

since by [29, p. 295],

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{dx}{x^{s+1} + 1} = \frac{\pi}{(s+1) \sin(\pi/(1+s))}.$$

Next, in view of (2.43), we infer that

$$|(\Delta_{r[n,n+1]}(z))'| \leq x^{-1} \|\Delta_{r[n,n+1]}\|_{\mathcal{H}^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)} \leq \min\{2, x^{-1}\} \leq \frac{2}{x + 1/2}$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Hence, employing (2.44),

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|\Delta'_{r[n,n+1]}(z)|}{|z|^s} dx \\ (2.48) \quad & \leq \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}, |z| \leq n} \frac{|\Delta'_{r[n,n+1]}(z)|}{|z|^s} dx + \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}, |z| \geq n} \frac{|\Delta'_{r[n,n+1]}(z)|}{|z|^s} dx \\ & \leq \frac{2n^{2n+1-s}}{(2n)!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^n t^{n+1} \int_0^n e^{-xt} dx dt + \int_0^\infty \frac{4 dx}{(n^s + x^s)(1/2 + x)} \\ & \leq \frac{2(n!)^2 n^{2n+1-s}}{(2n)!(2n+1)!} + \frac{4}{n^s} \int_0^\infty \frac{dx}{(1+x^s)(1/(2n) + x)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we also used that

$$\int_0^1 (1-t)^n t^n dt = \frac{(n!)^2}{(2n+1)!}.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \frac{dx}{(1+x^s)(1/(2n) + x)} & \leq \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{x + 1/(2n)} + \int_1^\infty \frac{dx}{x^{s+1}} \\ & = \log(2n+1) + \frac{1}{s}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(2.49) \quad \frac{2(n!)^2 n^{2n+1-s}}{(2n)!(2n+1)!} \leq \frac{1}{2n^s},$$

from (2.48) it follows that

$$(2.50) \quad \int_0^\infty \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|\Delta'_{r[n,n+1]}(z)|}{|z|^s} dx \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \log(2n+1) + \frac{1}{s} \right) \frac{4}{n^s}.$$

Now (2.46), (2.47) and (2.50) imply (2.45). \square

We do not know whether $\log(n+1)$ in (2.45) can be omitted. This would follow from the estimate $\sup_{n \geq 1} \|r_{[n,n+1]}\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} < \infty$. Unfortunately, at the moment, this bound is out of reach as well.

3. THE \mathcal{B} -CALCULUS REVISITED AND OPERATOR-NORM ESTIMATES

3.1. Construction of the \mathcal{B} -calculus. As far as this paper relies on the \mathcal{B} -calculus we provide a streamlined approach to its construction, different from the one developed in [3] and [4], and thus make the paper essentially self-contained. In contrast to [3] and [4], the construction is based on the reproducing formula for the space \mathcal{B} , and does not depend on any advanced function-theoretical machinery.

To start the construction, for $\lambda, z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, write $\lambda = \alpha + i\beta$, and let

$$K(z, \lambda) := -\frac{2}{\pi(z + \lambda)^2}, \quad D_\lambda := \frac{d}{d\lambda}, \quad \text{and} \quad dS(\lambda) := \alpha d\beta d\alpha.$$

Recall that if $f \in \mathcal{B}$ then by [3, Proposition 2.20] f can be recovered by the reproducing formula

$$(3.1) \quad f(z) = f(\infty) + \int_{\mathbb{C}_+} K(z, \bar{\lambda}) D_\lambda f(\lambda) dS(\lambda), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+,$$

where the integral converges absolutely for every $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$ in view of

$$\sup_{\alpha > 0} \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}} |K(z, \alpha - i\beta)| d\beta < \infty$$

and Fubini's theorem. The formula (3.1) was obtained initially in [3, Proposition 2.20] in a complicated manner, and it was reproved by elementary means in [4, Theorem 2.3] and also in [5, Corollary 3.10 and Proposition 3.15].

Following an established route in the case of classical Riesz-Dunford calculus, given an operator A on a Hilbert space X , it is natural to try to define $f(A)$ for $f \in \mathcal{B}$ by plugging A instead of independent variable z into (3.1), and thus creating an operator counterpart of (3.1). In what follows, we formalise this procedure and show that it leads indeed to a well-defined functional calculus. We say that an operator A admits a \mathcal{B} -calculus Φ if A is densely defined, $\sigma(A) \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}_+}$, and there is a bounded algebra homomorphism $\Phi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow L(X)$ such that $\Phi((\lambda + \cdot)^{-1}) = (\lambda + A)^{-1}$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Note

that if Φ is a \mathcal{B} -calculus for A , then $\Phi(1) = I$, see [4, p. 33]. If A admits a \mathcal{B} -calculus Φ , then we set $f(A) := \Phi(f)$, $f \in \mathcal{B}$.

Note that if $-A$ generates a bounded C_0 -semigroup $(e^{-tA})_{t \geq 0}$ on X , with $\sup_{t \geq 0} \|e^{-tA}\| := M$, then Plancherel's theorem implies that for every $x \in X$ the $L^2(\mathbb{R}, X)$ -norms of $\sqrt{\alpha}(\alpha + i \cdot + A)^{-1}x$ and $\sqrt{\alpha}(\alpha - i \cdot + A^*)^{-1}x$ are bounded by $\sqrt{\pi}M\|x\|$ uniformly in $\alpha > 0$. Using this fact, one infers easily that

$$(3.2) \quad \sup_{\alpha > 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha |\langle K(A, \alpha - i\beta)x, x^* \rangle| d\beta \leq \pi M^2 \|x\| \|x^*\|$$

for all $x, x^* \in X$. (See [3, Example 4.1] for a discussion of (3.2) and relevant references.)

From (3.2) it follows that the formula

$$(3.3) \quad \langle f(A)x, x^* \rangle := f(\infty)I + \int_{\mathbb{C}_+} \langle K(A, \bar{\lambda})x, x^* \rangle D_\lambda f(\lambda) dS(\lambda),$$

for all $x \in X$ and $x^* \in X$, defines a bounded linear operator $f(A)$ on X , and moreover

$$(3.4) \quad \|f(A)\| \leq |f(\infty)| + \pi M^2 \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_0} \leq \pi M^2 \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Thus, we have a well-defined, bounded linear mapping

$$(3.5) \quad \Phi_A : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow L(X), \quad \Phi_A(f) := f(A).$$

Moreover, as a simple calculation shows (see [3, p. 42 and Lemma 4.2]), if $f = \widehat{\nu}$ with $\nu \in M(\mathbb{R}_+)$, and $f(A)$ is given by (3.3), then

$$f(A)x = \int_0^\infty e^{-tA} x d\nu(t), \quad x \in X,$$

so that Φ_A extends the HP-calculus, $\|\widehat{\nu}(A)\| \leq \pi M^2 \|\widehat{\nu}\|_{\mathcal{B}}$, and $\Phi_A((\cdot + \lambda)^{-1}) = (\lambda + A)^{-1}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$. This fact was a starting point in [3], and it will also be useful below.

If Φ_A is multiplicative, then Φ_A is a functional calculus by the definition above. It would clearly coincide with the \mathcal{B} -calculus constructed in [3], since both calculi are given by the same formula (3.3). Having defined $f(A)$ by (3.3), the argument in [3] proceeds with showing the homomorphism property of Φ_A . This is the main step of the construction, and it is rather involved. Note that $\mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$ is not dense in \mathcal{B} . So the approach in [3] relies on finding convenient dense sets \mathcal{G} in \mathcal{B} and using them to show that $\mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$ is dense in \mathcal{B} in a suitable weak topology. Then the homomorphism property of Φ_A is established via several approximation unit arguments. The formula (3.1) is not used explicitly, and \mathcal{G} is created via Arveson's spectral theory for isometric groups applied to a C_0 -group of vertical shifts on \mathcal{B} .

We give a simple alternative proof for the homomorphism property of Φ_A , where a mere validity of (3.1) will allow us to set-up a functional calculus for A . The next identity, allowing one to separate the roles of f and g in $(fg)(A)$, is the heart matter of our approach.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{B}_0$. Then for all $x \in X$ and $x^* \in X$,*

$$(3.6) \quad \langle (fg)(A)x, x^* \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{C}_+} (D_\mu g)(\mu) \langle [K(\cdot, \bar{\mu})f](A)x, x^* \rangle dS(\mu).$$

Proof. Applying (3.3) to fg and (3.1) to g , and interchanging the integration order formally, we infer that for all $x \in X$ and $x^* \in X$,

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle (fg)(A)x, x^* \rangle \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{C}_+} \langle K(A, \bar{\lambda})x, x^* \rangle D_\lambda \left(f(\lambda) \int_{\mathbb{C}_+} K(\lambda, \bar{\mu}) D_\mu g(\mu) dS(\mu) \right) dS(\lambda) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{C}_+} \langle K(A, \bar{\lambda})x, x^* \rangle \left(\int_{\mathbb{C}_+} D_\lambda (K(\lambda, \bar{\mu})f(\lambda)) D_\mu g(\mu) dS(\mu) \right) dS(\lambda) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{C}_+} D_\mu g(\mu) \int_{\mathbb{C}_+} \langle K(A, \bar{\lambda})x, x^* \rangle D_\lambda (K(\lambda, \bar{\mu})f(\lambda)) dS(\lambda) dS(\mu). \end{aligned}$$

If the integrals in (3.7) converge absolutely, then Fubini's theorem makes the above argument rigorous, and the relation (3.6) follows from (3.7) and (3.3). Thus it remains to show the absolute convergence.

To this aim, letting $\mu = t + is$ with $t > 0$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, and assuming that $\|x\| = \|x^*\| = 1$, observe that

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{C}_+} |D_\mu g(\mu)| \int_{\mathbb{C}_+} |\langle K(A, \bar{\lambda})x, x^* \rangle| |D_\lambda (K(\lambda, \bar{\mu})f(\lambda))| dS(\lambda) dS(\mu) \\ & \leq \int_0^\infty \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} |g'(t + is)| t L(t) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where, for every $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} L(t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{C}_+} |\langle K(A, \bar{\lambda})x, x^* \rangle| |D_\lambda (K(\lambda, t - is)f(\lambda))| dS(\lambda) ds \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{C}_+} |\langle K(A, \bar{\lambda})x, x^* \rangle| \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |D_\lambda (K(\lambda, t - is)f(\lambda))| ds \right) dS(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Next, recalling that $\lambda = \alpha + i\beta$, where $\alpha > 0, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}} |D_\lambda (K(\lambda, t - is)f(\lambda))| ds \\ & \leq 2|f(\lambda)| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{ds}{|\alpha + i\beta + t - is|^3} + |f'(\lambda)| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{ds}{|\alpha + i\beta + t - is|^2} \\ & \leq 4 \left(\frac{|f(\lambda)|}{(\alpha + t)^2} + \frac{|f'(\lambda)|}{\alpha + t} \right), \quad t > 0. \end{aligned}$$

So, for all $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L(t)}{4} &\leq \int_0^\infty \alpha \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{|f(\lambda)|}{(\alpha+t)^2} + \frac{|f'(\lambda)|}{\alpha+t} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\langle K(A, \alpha - i\beta)x, x^* \rangle| d\beta d\alpha \\ &\leq \pi M^2 \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{1}{(\alpha+t)^2} \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} |f(\alpha + i\beta)| + \frac{1}{\alpha+t} \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} |f'(\alpha + i\beta)| \right) d\alpha \\ &\leq t^{-1} \pi M^2 \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the absolute convergence of the left-hand side of (3.8) and finishes the proof. \square

Now we are ready to prove the multiplicativity of Φ_A .

Proposition 3.2. *Let $f \in \mathcal{B}$ and $g \in \mathcal{B}$. Then*

$$(3.9) \quad f(A)g(A) = (fg)(A).$$

Proof. Assume that $f, g \in \mathcal{B}_0$. The proof of (3.9) will then be done in three steps.

a) Let first $f \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$ and $g \in \mathcal{B}_0$. Since Φ_A extends the HP-calculus, we use the product rule for the HP-calculus to obtain that

$$\langle [K(\cdot, \bar{\mu})f](A)x, x^* \rangle = \langle K(A, \bar{\mu})f(A)x, x^* \rangle$$

for all $\mu \in \mathbb{C}_+$, $x \in X$ and $x^* \in X$. Hence, by (3.6),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (fg)(A)x, x^* \rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{C}_+} (D_\mu g)(\mu) \langle K(A, \bar{\mu})f(A)x, x^* \rangle dS(\mu) \\ &= \langle f(A)g(A)x, x^* \rangle, \quad x \in X, x^* \in X, \end{aligned}$$

and (3.9) follows. Moreover, by symmetry, (3.9) holds if $g \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}_0$.

b) Let $\mu \in \mathbb{C}_+$ be fixed. By **a)**, applying (3.9) to $f \in \mathcal{B}_0$ and $g = K(\cdot, \bar{\mu}) \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$, we conclude that

$$(3.10) \quad \langle [K(\cdot, \bar{\mu})f](A)x, x^* \rangle = \langle K(A, \bar{\mu})f(A)x, x^* \rangle$$

for all $x \in X$ and $x^* \in X$.

c) Let now $f, g \in \mathcal{B}_0$. Then, using (3.6) and (3.10) and arguing as in **a)**, we obtain (3.9).

Finally, to deduce (3.9) for $f, g \in \mathcal{B}$, it suffices to apply (3.9) to $f - f(\infty)$ and $g - g(\infty)$ from \mathcal{B}_0 . \square

Thus we arrive at a Hilbert space part of the result established in [3, Theorem 4.4].

Corollary 3.3. *If $-A$ is the generator of a bounded C_0 -semigroup on a Hilbert space X , then the mapping $\Phi_A : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow L(X)$, given by (3.5), a functional calculus for A , extending the HP-calculus. Moreover, (3.4) holds.*

Since Φ_A coincides with the \mathcal{B} -calculus for A constructed in [3], we will refer to Φ_A as the \mathcal{B} -calculus in the sequel. It is instructive to note that if a linear operator A on X admits a \mathcal{B} -calculus Φ , then Φ is unique by [4, Theorem 6.2].

Remark 3.4. The construction of the \mathcal{B} -calculus given above can be adjusted to Banach spaces for a wider class of A satisfying the so-called GSF resolvent condition. This goes however beyond the scope of the present paper. Yet another simple and more powerful approach to construction of the \mathcal{B} -calculus covering the case of arbitrary number of commuting Hilbert space semigroup generators is developed in [6].

3.2. Applications of the \mathcal{B} -calculus to rational approximations. Now we turn to the proofs of the main results of this paper. The arguments are straightforward and based on function-theoretical estimates obtained in Section 2.1 and the \mathcal{B} -calculus. We also rely on the fact that the \mathcal{B} -calculus (strictly) extends the HP-calculus. While the HP-calculus will be used to keep a standard meaning for operator functions, the \mathcal{B} -calculus will produce fine operator-norm estimates. We employ the standard functional calculi theory, see e.g [19, Chapter 1], and also [9, Section 2.3] for a discussion close to our context.

The next lemma will be instrumental in the proof of Theorem 1.3. It shows, in particular, that estimating the \mathcal{B} -norms of $\Delta_{r,n,s}$ we, in fact, estimate the size of functions in \mathcal{LM} in a finer way provided by the \mathcal{B} -norm.

Lemma 3.5. *Let r be an \mathcal{A} -stable rational approximation of order q to the exponential. Then for all $s \in [0, q+1]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ one has $\Delta_{r,n,s} \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$.*

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed. Using a partial fraction expansion of r , we infer that $\Delta_{r,n} \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$, and, since $\Delta_{r,n,0} = \Delta_{r,n}$ on \mathbb{C}_+ , the statement holds for $s = 0$. Fix $s \in (0, q+1]$ and write

$$\Delta_{r,n,s}(z) = \Delta_{r,n}(z)\eta_s(z) + (\eta_s(z-1) - \eta_s(z))\Delta_{r,n}(z)$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Recalling that $\eta_s(z) = (1+z)^{-s}$, $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, note that $\eta_s \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$ (see e.g. [19, Lemma 3.3.4]). Hence, $\Delta_{r,n}\eta_s \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$. Letting

$$\nu_s(z) := \eta_s(z-1) - \eta_s(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+,$$

we prove next that $\Delta_{r,n}\nu_s \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$, and thus $\Delta_{r,n,s} \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$, as required. To this end, by the mean value inequality for η_s , observe that

$$|\nu_s(z)| \leq \frac{s}{|z|^{s+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad |(\nu_s(z))'| \leq \frac{s(s+1)}{|z|^{s+2}}$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Moreover, since r is \mathcal{A} -stable, decomposing r into partial fractions we infer that $\Delta'_{r,n} \in H^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)$. Hence,

$$(3.11) \quad |(\Delta_{r,n}\nu_s)'(z)| = O(|z|^{-(s+1)}) \quad \text{as } |z| \rightarrow \infty, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+.$$

Since r approximates e^{-z} with order q , by Lemma 2.9,(i),

$$(3.12) \quad |(\Delta_{r,n}\nu_s)'(z)| = O(1 + (q+1-s)|z|^{q-s}) \quad \text{as } |z| \rightarrow 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+.$$

Thus, combining (3.11) and (3.12), we conclude that

$$\sup_{x>0} \|(\Delta_{r,n\nu_s})'(x+i\cdot)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} < \infty,$$

i.e. $(\Delta_{r,n\nu_s})'$ belongs to the Hardy space $H^1(\mathbb{C}_+)$. In view of [5, Theorem 4.12], this implies that $\Delta_{r,n\nu_s} \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$, and then $\Delta_{r,n,s} \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$. \square

Remark 3.6. There is an alternative approach to the proof of Lemma 3.5. If r an \mathcal{A} -stable rational approximation of order q to the exponential, then as above, by a partial fraction expansion, $\Delta_{r,n} \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$. Moreover, $\Delta_{r,n,q+1} \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$ by, for instance, [7, p. 685]. Then Lemma 3.5 follows from an interpolation result in [17, Corollary 4.3]. However, the result from [17] is involved, and we preferred to give a direct, function-theoretical argument.

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Using a partial fraction expansion of r , define $r^n(A/n)$ by the HP-calculus. Since $-A$ generates a bounded C_0 -semigroup on a Hilbert space, A admits the \mathcal{B} -calculus. So Theorem 1.3,(i) follows directly from Corollary 2.7, the invariance property (2.2), and the norm-bound (3.4) for the \mathcal{B} -calculus. (Instead of invoking (2.2) one may observe that $-tA/n$ generates a semigroup with the uniform norm bound M for all $t \geq 0$.)

To prove Theorem 1.3,(ii), fix $s \in (0, q+1]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We define $\Delta_{r,n}(A)$ by the HP-calculus. If $h_s(z) := z^s, z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, then in view of $\eta_s \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$, we have $h_s \eta_{s+1} \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$, see e.g. [19, Lemma 3.3.1] (or [17, Lemma 4.1]). Thus h_s belongs to the extended HP-calculus with the regulariser η_{s+1} . By Lemma 3.5, $\Delta_{r,n,s}$ belongs to the HP-calculus, and thus $\Delta_{r,n,s}(A)$ and A^s are defined by the extended HP-calculus.

Using the product rule for the (extended) \mathcal{B} -calculus (see e.g. [19, Proposition 1.2.2]), we have

$$(3.13) \quad \Delta_{r,n}(A)x = \Delta_{r,n,s}(A)A^s x, \quad x \in \text{dom}(A^s).$$

In view of $\Delta_{r,n,s}(\infty) = 0$, Lemma 2.10 and (3.4) yield

$$(3.14) \quad \|\Delta_{r,n}(A)x\| \leq \frac{C\pi M^2}{n^{qs/(q+1)}} \|A^s x\|$$

for all $x \in \text{dom}(A^s)$. Replacing A by tA in (3.14), we obtain (1.8). \square

Remark 3.7. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1.3,(ii), and using (2.23), we conclude that, under the assumptions of Theorem 1.3, if $s > 0$ then there exists $C = C(s, r) > 0$ such that

$$(3.15) \quad \|r^n(tA/n)x\| \leq C\pi M^2 \|(1+tA)^s x\|$$

for all $x \in \text{dom}(A^s)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus the stability properties of $(r(tA/n))_{n \geq 1}$ improve for fixed $t > 0$. However, one can show easily that a version of (3.15) with tA replaced by A in the left hand side of (3.15) does not, in general, hold.

The proof of Theorem 1.4 is similar to the proof Theorem 1.3,(i), although it relies on stronger assumptions on r .

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Since A admits the \mathcal{B} -calculus, the estimate (1.10) is a direct implication of (2.24), (2.2) and (3.4). As noted in the introduction, if (1.10) holds, then (1.11) follows from general theory. Alternatively, using Theorem 1.3 (or Theorem 1.1), we note that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_{r,n}(tA)x = 0, \quad x \in \text{dom}(A), \quad t \geq 0,$$

and (1.11) is then an immediate corollary of (1.10). \square

It is crucial to emphasize that the estimates for approximation rates in Theorem 1.3,(ii) are sharp in a sense clarified in Theorem 3.8 below. To this end, recall that if $f \in \mathcal{B}$ (in particular, if $f \in \mathcal{LM}(\mathbb{C}_+)$) and $-A$ generates a bounded C_0 -semigroup on X , then the next spectral inclusion theorem holds:

$$(3.16) \quad \{f(\lambda) : \lambda \in \sigma(A)\} \subset \sigma(f(A)).$$

See e.g. [3, Theorem 4.17, (3)] for (3.16) and more general statements.

Theorem 3.8. *Let r be an \mathcal{A} -stable rational approximation of order q to the exponential, with $r^{(q+1)}(0) \neq (-1)^{q+1}$. If $-A$ generates a bounded C_0 -semigroup on a Hilbert space X , and $i\mathbb{R}_+ \subset \sigma(A)$, then there exist $C = C(r) > 0$ and $n_0 = n_0(r) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $s \in (0, q + 1]$,*

$$\|\Delta_{r,n,s}(tA)\| \geq \frac{Ct^s}{n^{sq/(q+1)}}, \quad n \geq n_0, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Remark 3.9. The assumption $r^{(q+1)}(0) \neq (-1)^{q+1}$ means that r approximates e^{-z} precisely with order q .

Proof. Let $s \in (0, q + 1]$ be fixed, and, let δ and a be defined as in (2.28). From $r^{(q+1)}(0) \neq (-1)^{q+1}$, it follows that a is different from zero. Using Lemma 2.9,(ii) we infer that there exist $R \in (0, 1)$, $c > 0$, and a sequence of functions $(u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ such that $u_n \in \text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}_{Rn})$ and

$$\Delta_{r,n,s}(z) = \left(1 - e^{az^{q+1}/n^q} e^{u_n(z)}\right) e^{-z} z^{-s}, \quad |u_n(z)| \leq c \frac{|z|^{q+2}}{n^{q+1}},$$

for all $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}_{Rn^\delta}^+$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Choose $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ satisfying also $\gamma \in (0, \min(R, \frac{2\pi}{|a|}))$ and set

$$z_n = i\gamma n^\delta, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

so that $(z_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset \overline{\mathbb{D}}_{Rn^\delta}^+$. If $b = a(i\gamma)^{q+1}$, then

$$|\Delta_{r,n,s}(z_n)| = |1 - e^b e^{u_n(i\gamma n^\delta)}| \gamma^{-s} n^{-\delta s}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and, taking into account (4.13),

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} n^{\delta s} |\Delta_{r,n,s}(z_n)| &\geq |1 - e^b| - e^b |u_n(i\gamma n^\delta)| e^{|u_n(i\gamma n^\delta)|} \\ &= |1 - e^b| + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/(q+1)}}\right), \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

with $|1 - e^b| \neq 0$.

Since $(z_n t^{-1})_{n \geq 1} \subset \sigma(A)$, using the spectral inclusion in (3.16) we have

$$\|\Delta_{r,n,s}(tA)\| \geq \sup_{z \in \sigma(A)} |\Delta_{r,n,s}(tz)| \geq t^s |\Delta_{r,n,s}(z_n)|, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and the estimate (3.17) implies the claim. \square

As a simple example satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 3.8, one may consider a skew-adjoint operator A with $\sigma(A) \supset i\mathbb{R}_+$.

We finish the section with indicating formally the argument for the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Fix $s > 0$ and $n \geq (s - 1)/2$. The proof follows the same lines as the proof of Theorem 1.3(ii), with $\Delta_{r,n}$ and $\Delta_{r,n,s}$ replaced by $\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]}}$ and $\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1],s}}$, respectively. By invoking the HP- and the \mathcal{B} -calculi, we have the identity

$$\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1]}}(A)x = \Delta_{r_{[n,n+1],s}}(A)A^s x, \quad x \in \text{dom}(A^s).$$

The statement is then a direct implication of Lemma 2.13, the fact that $\Delta_{r_{[n,n+1],s}}(\infty) = 0$, and (3.4). \square

4. APPENDIX: RATES FOR RATIONAL APPROXIMATION OF EXPONENTIAL FUNCTION

Here we prove Lemma 2.9 formulated in Section 2.1. Its proof is simple but rather technical, and it is divided into several steps.

Proof of Lemma 2.9. We will show that if r is a rational approximation of order q to the exponential, i.e.

$$(4.1) \quad e^{-z} - r(z) = O(|z|^{q+1}), \quad z \rightarrow 0,$$

and $s \in [0, q + 1]$ is fixed, then letting $\delta = q/(q + 1)$ and

$$a = \left(r^{(q+1)}(0) - (-1)^{q+1} \right) ((q + 1)!)^{-1},$$

there exist $R = R(r) \in (0, 1)$ and $c = c(r) > 0$ such that

$$(4.2) \quad |(\Delta_{r,n,s}(z))'| \leq \left(|a|(q + 1 - s) \frac{|z|^{q-s}}{n^q} + \frac{c}{n^{\delta s}} \right) e^{-\text{Re } z}$$

for all $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}_{Rn^\delta}^+$. This will provide the proof of Lemma 2.9(i), and on the way will prove Lemma 2.9(ii) as well. The proof will be done in several steps.

By (4.1), there is $R_0 = R_0(r) \in (0, 1)$ such that if $\psi \in \text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}_{R_0})$ is given by

$$\psi(z) := -e^z \Delta_{r,1}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}_{R_0},$$

then

$$(4.3) \quad r(z) = e^{-z}(1 + \psi(z))$$

with

$$(4.4) \quad |\psi(z)| \leq b|z|^{q+1},$$

and (as consequence)

$$(4.5) \quad |\psi'(z)| \leq b_1|z|^q,$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{D}_{R_0}$ and some positive $b = b(r)$ and $b_1 = b_1(r)$. Observing that for all $z \in \mathbb{D}_{R_0}$,

$$\psi^{(q+1)}(z) = -e^z \sum_{k=0}^{q+1} \binom{q+1}{k} \Delta_{r,1}^{(k)}(z),$$

and $\Delta_{r,1}^{(k)}(0) = 0$ for all $0 \leq k \leq q$, we infer that

$$\psi^{(q+1)}(0) = -\Delta_{r,1}^{(q+1)}(0) = r^{(q+1)}(0) - (-1)^{q+1},$$

and thus

$$\psi(z) = \frac{r^{(q+1)}(0) - (-1)^{q+1}}{(q+1)!} z^{q+1} + O(z^{q+2}), \quad z \rightarrow 0.$$

So, we can write

$$(4.6) \quad \psi(z) = az^{q+1} + m(z),$$

where $m \in \text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}_{R_0})$ and

$$(4.7) \quad |m(z)| \leq \tilde{b}|z|^{q+2}, \quad |m'(z)| \leq \tilde{b}_1|z|^{q+1}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}_{R_0},$$

for some positive $\tilde{b} = \tilde{b}(r)$ and $\tilde{b}_1 = \tilde{b}_1(r)$.

To simplify further presentation, given $\alpha \in (0, R]$ and positive functions f and g on \mathbb{D}_R we use the notation $f(z) \lesssim g(z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}_\alpha$ if $f(z) \leq Cg(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{D}_\alpha$, where a constant $C > 0$ depends only on parameters associated to r (and independent of z).

Observe that from (4.4) it follows that there exists $R \in (0, R_0)$ satisfying

$$(4.8) \quad |\psi(z)| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}_R.$$

Using the elementary inequality

$$|\log(1+z) - z| \leq |z|^2, \quad |z| \leq 1/2,$$

the bound (4.8) and taking into account (4.7) and (4.4), we infer that for all $z \in \mathbb{D}_R$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\log(1 + \psi(z)) - az^{q+1}| &\leq |m(z)| + |\psi(z)|^2 \\ &\lesssim |z|^{q+2} + |z|^{2(q+1)} \lesssim |z|^{q+2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if $z \in \mathbb{D}_R$ then e.g. by power series expansion there is $m_0 \in \text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}_R)$ such that

$$(4.9) \quad \log(1 + \psi(z)) = az^{q+1} + m_0(z), \quad |m_0(z)| \lesssim |z|^{q+2},$$

and, in view of (4.3),

$$(4.10) \quad r(z) = e^{-z} e^{az^{q+1}} e^{m_0(z)}.$$

Thus if $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is fixed, and

$$r_n(z) = r^n(z/n), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn},$$

then, by (4.10), we have

$$(4.11) \quad r_n(z) = e^{-z} e^{az^{q+1}/n^q} e^{m_{0,n}(z)},$$

where $m_{0,n} \in \text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}_{Rn})$ is defined by $m_{0,n}(z) := n \cdot m_0(z/n)$, $z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn}$, and satisfies

$$(4.12) \quad |m_{0,n}(z)| \lesssim \frac{|z|^{q+2}}{n^{q+1}}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn^\delta}.$$

Letting $u_n(z) := m_{0,n}(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn^\delta}$, and noting that $\Delta_{r,n,s}$ extends continuously to $[-iRn^\delta, iRn^\delta]$, we obtain Lemma 2.9,(ii).

Next, using the estimates

$$(4.13) \quad |e^z - 1| \leq |z|e^{|z|}, \quad |e^z - 1 - z| \leq \frac{|z|^2}{2} e^{|z|}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C},$$

and (4.11), we define $m_{1,n} \in \text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}_{Rn})$ by

$$(4.14) \quad r_n(z) = (1 + m_{1,n}(z))e^{-z},$$

and note that

$$(4.15) \quad |m_{1,n}(z)| \leq (|az^{q+1}/n^q| + |m_{0,n}(z)|) e^{|az^{q+1}/n^q| + |m_{0,n}(z)|} \lesssim \frac{|z|^{q+1}}{n^q}$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn^\delta}$. Similarly, if $m_{2,n} \in \text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}_{Rn})$ is given by

$$(4.16) \quad r_n(z) = \left(1 + a \frac{z^{q+1}}{n^q} + m_{2,n}(z)\right) e^{-z},$$

then for every $z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn^\delta}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |m_{2,n}(z)| &\leq |m_{0,n}(z)| + (|az^{q+1}/n^q|^2 + |m_{0,n}(z)|^2) e^{|az^{q+1}/n^q| + |m_{0,n}(z)|} \\ &\lesssim \frac{|z|^{q+2}}{n^{q+1}} + \frac{|z|^{2(q+1)}}{n^{2q}} + \frac{|z|^{2(q+2)}}{n^{2(q+1)}} \lesssim \frac{|z|^{q+2}}{n^q}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, recalling that $\Delta_{r,n}(z) = e^{-z} - r_n(z)$, and using (4.14) and (4.16), note that

$$(4.17) \quad \Delta_{r,n}(z) = -e^{-z} m_{1,n}(z)$$

and

$$(4.18) \quad \Delta_{r,n}(z) = -e^{-z} \left(a \frac{z^{q+1}}{n^q} + m_{2,n}(z) \right).$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn}$. Since by (4.3),

$$\frac{r'(z)}{r(z)} = -1 + \frac{\psi'(z)}{1 + \psi(z)},$$

we have

$$(4.19) \quad \frac{r'_n(z)}{r_n(z)} = -1 + \psi'(z/n) \left(1 - \frac{\psi(z/n)}{1 + \psi(z/n)} \right), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn}.$$

Combining (4.6), (4.14), (4.17) and (4.19), we obtain that

$$(4.20) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\Delta_{r,n}(z))' \\ &= -\Delta_{r,n}(z) - r_n(z) \psi'(z/n) \left(1 - \frac{\psi(z/n)}{1 + \psi(z/n)} \right) \\ &= m_{1,n}(z) e^{-z} - (1 + m_{1,n}(z)) \left(a(q+1) \frac{z^q}{n^q} + m'(z/n) \right) \left(1 - \frac{\psi(z/n)}{1 + \psi(z/n)} \right) e^{-z} \\ &= -a(q+1) \frac{z^q}{n^q} e^{-z} + m_{3,n}(z) e^{-z}, \end{aligned}$$

where $m_{3,n} \in \text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}_{Rn})$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} m_{3,n}(z) &:= m_{1,n}(z) - m_{1,n}(z) \left(a(q+1) \frac{z^q}{n^q} + m'(z/n) \right) \frac{1}{1 + \psi(z/n)} \\ &\quad + \left(a(q+1) \frac{z^q}{n^q} + m'(z/n) \right) \frac{\psi(z/n)}{1 + \psi(z/n)} - m'(z/n), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account $|z| \lesssim n$, $z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn^\delta}$, and employing (4.7), (4.4), (4.8), and (4.15), we have

$$(4.21) \quad \begin{aligned} |m_{3,n}(z)| &\lesssim \frac{|z|^{q+1}}{n^q} \left(1 + \frac{|z|^q}{n^q} + \frac{|z|^{q+1}}{n^{q+1}} \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{|z|^q}{n^q} + \frac{|z|^{q+1}}{n^{q+1}} \right) \frac{|z|^{q+1}}{n^{q+1}} + \frac{|z|^{q+1}}{n^{q+1}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{|z|^{q+1}}{n^q}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn^\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using (4.18), (4.20), and (4.21), we infer that for every $z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn}^+$,
(4.22)

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta_{r,n,s}(z))' &= \frac{\Delta_{r,n}(z)'}{z^s} - s \frac{\Delta_{r,n}(z)}{z^{s+1}} \\ &= a(s - (q + 1)) \frac{z^{q-s}}{n^q} e^{-z} + \frac{m_{3,n}(z)}{z^s} e^{-z} + m_{2,n}(z) \frac{s}{z^{s+1}} e^{-z} \\ &= a(s - (q + 1)) \frac{z^{q-s}}{n^q} e^{-z} + m_{4,n}(z) e^{-z}, \end{aligned}$$

with $m_{4,n} \in \text{Hol}(\mathbb{D}_{Rn}^+)$ satisfying

$$(4.23) \quad |m_{4,n}(z)| \lesssim \frac{|z|^{q+1-s}}{n^q}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}_{Rn}^+.$$

Recalling the relation $(q + 1)\delta = q$, observe that

$$(4.24) \quad \frac{|z|^{q+1-s}}{n^q} \leq R^{q+1-s} \frac{n^{\delta(q+1-s)}}{n^q} = \frac{R^{q+1-s}}{n^{\delta s}}.$$

Hence, (4.22), (4.23) and (4.24) imply (4.2). \square

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank the referee for various useful suggestions and remarks that led to improvement of the paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Bakaev and A. Ostermann, *Long-term stability of variable stepsize approximations of semigroups*, Math. Comp. **71** (2002), 1545–1567.
- [2] G. Baker and P. Graves-Morris, *Padé Approximants*, Addison-Wesley Publ., 1981.
- [3] C. Batty, A. Gomilko, and Yu. Tomilov, *A Besov algebra calculus for generators of operator semigroups and related norm-estimates*, Math. Annalen, **379** (2021), 23–93.
- [4] C. Batty, A. Gomilko, and Yu. Tomilov, *The theory of Besov functional calculus: developments and applications to semigroups*, J. Funct. Anal., **281** (2021), No. 109089, 60 pp.
- [5] C. Batty, A. Gomilko, and Yu. Tomilov, *Functional calculi for sectorial operators and related function theory*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu, **22** (2023), 1383–1463.
- [6] C. Batty, A. Gomilko, D. Kobos, and Yu. Tomilov, *Analytic Besov functional calculus for several commuting operators*, J. Spectral Theory, to appear, arXiv:2311.18757.
- [7] P. Brenner and V. Thomée, *On rational approximation of semi-groups*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., **16** (1979), 683–694.
- [8] M. Crouzeix, S. Larsson, S. Piskarev, and V. Thomée, *The stability of rational approximations of analytic semigroups*, BIT **33** (1993), 74–84.
- [9] M. Egert and J. Rozendaal, *Convergence of subdiagonal Padé approximations of C_0 -semigroups*, J. Evol. Equ., **13** (2013), 875–895.
- [10] B. L. Ehle, *A-stable methods and Padé approximations to the exponential function*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **4** (1973), 671–680.
- [11] H. Emamirad and A. Rougirel, *A functional calculus approach for the rational approximation with nonuniform partitions*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **22** (2008), 955–972.

- [12] S. Flory, F. Neubrander, and L. Weis, *Consistency and stabilization of rational approximation schemes for C_0 -semigroups*, Evolution equations: applications to physics, industry, life sciences and economics, Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl., **55**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2003, 181–193.
- [13] S. Flory, F. Neubrander and Y. Zhuang, *On the regularization and stabilization of approximation schemes for C_0 -semigroups*, Partial Differential Equations and Spectral Theory, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., **126**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2001, 119–132.
- [14] A. Iserles and S. P. Nørsett, *A-acceptability of derivatives of rational approximations to $\exp(z)$* , J. Approx. Theory, **43** (1985), 327–337.
- [15] J. Garnett, *Bounded analytic functions*, Revised first ed., Graduate Texts in Math., **236**, Springer, NY, 2007.
- [16] A. Gomilko, *Inverses of semigroup generators : a survey and remarks*, Banach Center Publ., **112** (2017), 107–142.
- [17] A. Gomilko and Yu. Tomilov, *On convergence rates in approximation theory for operator semigroups*, J. Funct. Anal., **266** (2014), 3040–3082.
- [18] A. Gomilko, S. Kosowicz, and Yu. Tomilov, *A general approach to approximation theory of operator semigroups*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **127** (2019), 216–267.
- [19] M. Haase, *The functional calculus for sectorial operators*, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., **169**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2006.
- [20] M. Haase, *Transference principles for semigroups and a theorem of Peller*, J. Funct. Anal. **261** (2011), 2959–2998.
- [21] M. Haase and J. Rozendaal, *Functional calculus for semigroup generators via transference*, J. Funct. Anal., **265** (2013), 3345–3368.
- [22] E. Hairer and G. Wanner, *Solving ordinary differential equations, II, Stiff and differential-algebraic problems*, Springer Series in Comput. Math., Second revised ed., **14**, Springer, Berlin, 2010.
- [23] R. Hersh and T. Kato, *High-accuracy stable difference schemes for well-posed initial-value problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., **16** (1978), 670–682.
- [24] P. Jara, F. Neubrander, and K. Özer, *Rational inversion of the Laplace transform*, J. Evol. Equ. **12** (2012), 435–457.
- [25] P. Jara, *Rational approximation schemes for bi-continuous semigroups*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **344** (2008), 956–968.
- [26] M. Kovács, *On the convergence of rational approximations of semigroups on intermediate spaces*, Math. Comp. **76** (2007), 273–286.
- [27] F. Neubrander, K. Özer, and T. Sandmaier, *Rational approximations of semigroups without scaling and squaring*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **33** (2013), 5305–5317.
- [28] F. Neubrander, K. Özer, and L. Windsperger, *On subdiagonal rational Padé approximations and the Brenner-Thomé approximation theorem for operator semigroups*, Discrete and Contin. Dyn. Syst., Ser. S, **13** (2020), 3565–3579.
- [29] A. P. Prudnikov, Yu. A. Brychkov and O. I. Marichev, *Integrals and series. Vol. 1. Elementary functions*, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York, 1986.
- [30] J. Rozendaal, *Functional calculus for C_0 -groups using type and cotype*, Quaterly J. Math. **70** (2019), 17–47.
- [31] P. Vitse, *A Besov class functional calculus for bounded holomorphic semigroups*, J. Funct. Anal. **228** (2005), 245–269.
- [32] G. Wanner, E. Hairer, and S. P. Nørsett, *Order stars and stability theorems*, BIT, **18** (1978), 475–489.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, NICOLAS COPERNICUS UNIVERSITY, CHOPIN STR. 12/18, 87-100 TORUŃ, POLAND

Email address: alex@gomilko.com

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, ŚNIADECKICH 8, 00-656 WARSAW, POLAND

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, NICOLAS COPERNICUS UNIVERSITY, CHOPIN STR. 12/18, 87-100 TORUŃ, POLAND

Email address: ytomilov@impan.pl