

ON LINEAR SCHRÖDINGER PARABOLIC PROBLEMS IN MORREY SPACES

JAN W. CHOLEWA¹ AND ANIBAL RODRIGUEZ-BERNAL²

¹Institute of Mathematics
University of Silesia in Katowice
40-007 Katowice, Poland
E-mail: jan.cholewa@us.edu.pl

²Departamento de Análisis Matemático y Matemática Aplicada
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
28040 Madrid, Spain
and
Instituto de Ciencias Matemáticas
CSIC-UAM-UC3M-UCM*, Spain
E-mail: arober@ucm.es

ABSTRACT. We consider parabolic Schrödinger type equations associated to fractional powers of uniformly elliptic $2m$ -order operators with constant coefficients. Potentials and initial data are considered in suitable Morrey spaces. By means of perturbation techniques we prove that several properties of the problem with no potential are preserved. We also prove continuous dependence of solutions with respect to perturbations. To carry out the analysis a general abstract perturbation approach is developed, which broadens the results known in the literature.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider parabolic Schrödinger type evolution problems of the form

$$\begin{cases} u_t + A_0^\mu u = V(x)u, & t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $0 < \mu \leq 1$ gives a fractional power of a uniformly elliptic $2m$ order operator of the form

$$A_0 = \sum_{|\zeta|=2m} a_\zeta D^\zeta \quad \text{with constant real coefficients } a_\zeta, \quad (1.2)$$

and we want to consider potentials V and initial data u_0 in suitable Morrey spaces to be introduced below. This includes the case $A_0 = (-\Delta)^m$ and, in particular when $m = 1$, fractional Schrödinger equations.

In order to solve problems like (1.1) in any given function space there are usually two different, although related, strategies. One is to prove suitable *resolvent estimates* on the elliptic operator in the equation, $A_0^\mu - V(x)I$, which allow to prove that (1.1) defines a suitable semigroup of solutions, see e.g. [12, 8, 11]. Another one, which we take here, is to exploit the known results for the unperturbed problem, $V = 0$ in (1.1), and then prove that the *perturbed* problem (1.1) can be solved for some class of initial data for which the unperturbed problem can be solved. This is done by means of Duhamel's

Date: **July 24, 2024.**

Partially supported by Projects PID2019-103860GB-I00 and PID2022-137074NB-I00, MINECO, Spain.

Key words and phrases: initial value problems for higher-order parabolic equations, fractional partial differential equations.

Mathematical Subject Classification 2020: 35K30, 35R11.

*Partially supported by Severo Ochoa Grant CEX2019-000904-S funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033.

principle, or variations of constants formula

$$u(t) = S_\mu(t)u_0 + \int_0^t S_\mu(t-s)Vu(s) ds, \quad t > 0,$$

where $S_\mu(t)u_0$ represents the solution of the unperturbed problem with initial data u_0 . In this way properties of the unperturbed problems, e.g. spaces of admissible initial data, smoothing properties, exponential growth etc, can be obtained for the perturbed problem. Besides the abstract approach in [8] using the fractional power spaces associated to the elliptic operator, this approach has been used in [14] for second order parabolic problems in Lebesgue, Bessel and uniform spaces, [13] for fourth order problems in the same spaces and [2] for general $2m$ order parabolic problems in the same scales of spaces. Here we extend this approach to the scale of Morrey spaces and fractional operators. It is worth mentioning that in all the references mentioned in the previous paragraph, the family of spaces one works in is a one real-parameter scale of spaces a situation that strongly simplifies the analysis. This will not be the case here as we explain below and is one of the main sources of difficulties in our analysis.

Morrey spaces, to be described in detail in Section 2, are made up of functions, or measures, which have some more precise mass distribution in space, compared to functions in standard Lebesgue spaces, see (2.1). So, in a sense they are some sort of intermediate spaces between $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Therefore subtle differences and heavy difficulties appear when dealing with evolution problems of the type (1.1) in them.

The homogeneous or unperturbed problem, that is $V = 0$, has been studied with initial data in Morrey spaces in several references, see Section 4. Several of these results stem from the corresponding problem with initial data in uniform spaces, which is a setting for which previous results are also available, see Section 3.

Using these results our goal is to solve (1.1) when the potential V is also in a Morrey space, or is a sum of such potentials. For this we use perturbation techniques, so we can use in an essential way properties of the solutions of the unperturbed problem in Morrey spaces. This technique also requires that the multiplication operator defined by V , transforms some Morrey spaces into some others. This is the reason to take V in a Morrey spaces itself, see Section 5. Previous perturbations results in [4] used specific homogeneous perturbations and the techniques in that reference can not be applied to the general potentials we consider here.

Now we describe in some detail the difficulties we face in our approach. As will be seen in Section 2, Morrey spaces $M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ depend on two parameters $0 < \ell \leq N$ and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, so we have a two parameter scale of spaces. The unperturbed problem, $V = 0$, defines a semigroup of solutions in this scale that has suitable smoothing properties between only some of the spaces of this scale, where both parameters must be chosen in a very specific way, see (4.2). These estimates are known to be optimal from [3]. For the perturbed problem on the other hand, if we have the potential in a Morrey space, $V \in M^{p_0,\ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, the corresponding multiplication operator acts continuously only between quite specific pairs of Morrey spaces, see (5.3). Therefore, to solve (1.1) using Duhamel's principle, (or variations of constants formula), which is the main perturbation tool we use, requires putting all these properties together in a nontrivial way.

For this, in Section 6, we develop an abstract perturbation theory for semigroups defined in general scales of spaces without any specific assumption in the set of indexes that label the spaces of the family. These results allow for several simultaneous perturbations and describe the subset of the scale of spaces for the initial data for which the perturbed problem can be solved and the spaces of the scale to which the solutions regularise. These, in turn, determine the part of the scale in which the perturbed problem defines a semigroup that behaves near time $t = 0$ as the original unperturbed semigroup. The results also discuss the exponential growth of the perturbed semigroup in terms of the sizes of the perturbations, the continuous dependence of solutions with respect to perturbations and the analyticity of the perturbed semigroup.

These results are applied in full detail to the scale of Morrey spaces in Section 7 but this still requires a nontrivial analysis of this particular case. Also, the results in Section 6 can be applied

to other interesting situations, like two parameter scale of Sobolev spaces. This will be pursued somewhere else.

For the case of a single perturbation, our main results in Section 7.1 state that given a potential $V \in M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, the problem (1.1) can be solved for initial data u_0 in Morrey spaces $M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $\ell \leq \ell_0$ and defines a semigroup of solutions that satisfy the same smoothing estimates than the unperturbed semigroup, see Theorem 7.2. That is, the perturbation preserves part of the scale of spaces and the smoothing estimates. Also the perturbed semigroup depends continuously with respect to the perturbations, see Theorem 7.4. The corresponding results when the perturbation is the sum of two (or more) potentials in different Morrey spaces are stated in Section 7.2. This situation adds additional difficulties to the analysis.

In general in this paper we denote by c or C generic constants that may change from line to line, whose value is not important for the results.

2. MORREY SPACES OF FUNCTIONS AND MEASURES

A function $\phi \in L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ belongs to the Morrey space $M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\ell \in [0, N]$, $p \in [1, \infty)$ iff

$$\|\phi\|_{M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \sup_{x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N, R > 0} R^{\frac{\ell-N}{p}} \|\phi\|_{L^p(B(x_0, R))} < \infty. \quad (2.1)$$

If $\ell = N$ then $M^{p, N}(\mathbb{R}^N) = L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $p \in [1, \infty)$ (taking $R \rightarrow \infty$), whereas if $\ell = 0$ then $M^{p, 0}(\mathbb{R}^N) = L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ (taking $R \rightarrow 0$ and using Lebesgue's differentiation theorem). We also set $M^{\infty, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N) := L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\ell \in [0, N]$.

Morrey spaces can be characterized in terms of the locally uniform Lebesgue's spaces $L^p_U(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $p \in [1, \infty]$, which can be traced back to [9] and are composed of $\phi \in L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\|\phi\|_{L^p_U(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \sup_{x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N} \|\phi\|_{L^p(B(x_0, 1))} < \infty,$$

where $L^\infty_U(\mathbb{R}^N) = L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Using dilations defined for functions in \mathbb{R}^N by

$$\phi_R(x) = \phi(Rx), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad R > 0$$

we have that

$$\phi \in M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \sup_{R > 0} R^{\frac{\ell}{p}} \|\phi_R\|_{L^p_U(\mathbb{R}^N)} < \infty$$

and $\|\phi\|_{M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \sup_{R > 0} R^{\frac{\ell}{p}} \|\phi_R\|_{L^p_U(\mathbb{R}^N)}$ (see [4, Proposition 2.1]). Given any $\ell \in [0, N]$ and $p \in [1, \infty)$ we have in particular continuous embedding

$$M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset L^p_U(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

The dotted Morrey spaces $\dot{M}^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $1 < p < \infty$, $\ell \in (0, N]$ denote subspaces of $M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ in which translations are continuous, that is

$$\tau_y \phi - \phi \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad y \rightarrow 0 \quad (2.2)$$

in $M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, where $\tau_y \phi(x) = \phi(x - y)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Given $\ell \in [0, N]$ and $p \in [1, \infty)$, $\dot{M}^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is in particular a subspace of $L^p_U(\mathbb{R}^N)$ consisting of functions from $L^p_U(\mathbb{R}^N)$ which satisfy (2.2) in $L^p_U(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Regarding spaces of Morrey measures (see [7, 10]), we consider for $\ell \in [0, N]$ the space $\mathcal{M}^\ell(\mathbb{R}^N)$ which consists of Radon measures μ satisfying

$$\|\mu\|_{\mathcal{M}^\ell(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \sup_{x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N, R > 0} R^{\ell-N} |\mu|(B(x_0, R)) < \infty.$$

Given any $\ell \in (0, N]$,

$$M^{1, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset \mathcal{M}^\ell(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{isometrically}$$

where $M^{1, N}(\mathbb{R}^N) = L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, whereas $\mathcal{M}^N(\mathbb{R}^N) = \mathcal{M}_{BTV}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is the space of Radon measures with bounded total variation.

All above mentioned spaces are in particular contained in the space of uniform measures $\mathcal{M}_U(\mathbb{R}^N)$, which consists of Radon measures μ satisfying

$$\|\mu\|_{\mathcal{M}_U(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \sup_{x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N} |\mu|(B(x_0, 1)) < \infty.$$

3. THE HOMOGENEOUS LINEAR EQUATION IN UNIFORM SPACES

In this section, given A_0 as in (1.2), we consider the linear *fractional diffusion* problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t + A_0^\mu u = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^N \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where $0 < \mu \leq 1$ and A_0^μ is the fractional power of A_0 . We collect below several known results for (3.1) when the initial data is taken in locally uniform spaces. This strategy allows to obtain similar results in Morrey spaces, see Section 4 and [4].

Proposition 3.1. *Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $0 < \mu \leq 1$ and assume that A_0 is as in (1.2).*

- (i) *Then (3.1) defines a semigroup of solutions $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in each one of the spaces $L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\mathcal{M}_U(\mathbb{R}^N)$.*
- (ii) *The semigroup is analytic and has a sectorial generator provided $0 < \mu < 1$, or $\mu = 1$ and $1 < p \leq \infty$.*
- (iii) *The semigroup has a selfsimilar kernel $k_\mu(t, x, y) = \frac{1}{t^{\frac{N}{2m\mu}}} K_\mu\left(\frac{x-y}{t^{\frac{1}{2m\mu}}}\right)$, that is,*

$$S_\mu(t)u_0(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} k_\mu(t, x, y)u_0(y) dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0.$$

Moreover if the semigroup generated by $-A_0$, that is, $\{S_1(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is order preserving (e.g. if $A_0 = -\Delta$), so is $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ for $0 < \mu < 1$ and actually $k_\mu(t, x, y) \geq 0$ for all t, x, y .

- (iv) *The space $\dot{L}_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is invariant for the semigroup.*

Proof. We start with (i), (ii) and the case $\mu = 1$. The results for $L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ can be found in [2]. The results for $\mathcal{M}_U(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and the properties of the kernel in (iii) can be found in [5].

Then Proposition B.1 in [4] gives the analyticity results for $0 < \mu < 1$ in all the spaces above.

Since kernel is selfsimilar, translations τ_z given in the line below (2.2) commute with $S_\mu(t)$, that is, $\tau_z S_\mu(t)u_0 = S_\mu(t)\tau_z u_0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $t > 0$, $u_0 \in L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\mu \in (0, 1]$. Hence $\|\tau_z S_\mu(t)u_0 - S_\mu(t)u_0\|_{L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq \|S_\mu(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N))} \|\tau_z u_0 - u_0\|_{L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)}$ and the invariance of $\dot{L}_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ in (iv) follows. ■

The next result collects several estimates for the semigroup above between the uniform spaces.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, $\mu \in (0, 1]$, be as in Proposition 3.1.*

Given $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$ we have for some constant $c = c_{\mu, p, q}$ that

$$\|S_\mu(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N), L_U^q(\mathbb{R}^N))} \leq c \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{2m\mu}(\frac{N}{p} - \frac{N}{q})}}\right), \quad t > 0, \quad (3.2)$$

which remains true if for $p = 1$ we replace $L_U^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by $\mathcal{M}_U(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Proof. With $\mu = 1$ this follows from the estimates in [5, Theorem 3.1] (since from [5, Theorem 6.1] we can apply that theorem with the constant $a = 0$).

With $\mu \in (0, 1)$ this follows from the estimate for $\mu = 1$ and [3, Lemma 4.4]. This is straightforward if $\frac{1}{2m}(\frac{N}{p} - \frac{N}{q}) < 1$. If $\frac{1}{2m}(\frac{N}{p} - \frac{N}{q}) \geq 1$, we choose a finite number of points q_j , $j = 0, \dots, J$ such that $q_0 = p < q_1 < \dots < q_J = q$ and $\frac{1}{2m}(\frac{N}{q_j} - \frac{N}{q_{j+1}}) < 1$ to get via [3, Lemma 4.4] that $\|S_\mu(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L_U^{q_j}(\mathbb{R}^N), L_U^{q_{j+1}}(\mathbb{R}^N))} \leq c \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{2m\mu}(\frac{N}{q_j} - \frac{N}{q_{j+1}})}}\right)$ for $j = 1, \dots, J - 1$. From these estimates we get the result using the semigroup property and Young's inequality. ■

The next result states the time continuity properties of the trajectories of the semigroup.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, $\mu \in (0, 1]$, be as in Proposition 3.1.*

Then for $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ we have

$$(0, \infty) \times L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N) \ni (t, u_0) \rightarrow S_\mu(t)u_0 \in L_U^q(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ is continuous,}$$

which remains true if for $p = 1$ we replace $L_U^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by $\mathcal{M}_U(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Proof. If $(0, \infty) \times L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N) \ni (t_n, u_{0n}) \rightarrow (t_0, u_0) \in (0, \infty) \times L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then for any small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ we can write

$$S_\mu(t_n)u_{0n} - S_\mu(t_0)u_0 = S_\mu(t_n)u_{0n} - S_\mu(t_n)u_0 + S_\mu(t_n - \varepsilon)S(\varepsilon)u_0 - S_\mu(t_0 - \varepsilon)S_\mu(\varepsilon)u_0.$$

Then for $p \leq q \leq \infty$ we have from (3.2)

$$\|S_\mu(t_n)u_{0n} - S_\mu(t_n)u_0\|_{L_U^q(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq c \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_n^{\frac{1}{2m\mu}(\frac{N}{p} - \frac{N}{q})}} \right) \|u_{0n} - u_0\|_{L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Also, since $S_\mu(\varepsilon)u_0 \in L_U^q(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by (3.2), we see that

$$\|S_\mu(t_n - \varepsilon)S_\mu(\varepsilon)u_0 - S_\mu(t_0 - \varepsilon)S_\mu(\varepsilon)u_0\|_{L_U^q(\mathbb{R}^N)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

since by Proposition 4.1 the semigroup $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is analytic (thus continuous at each positive time) in $L_U^q(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $0 < \mu < 1$, or $\mu = 1$ and $q \neq 1$. For $\mu = 1$ and $q = 1$ it is continuous in $L_U^q(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for positive times from [2, Theorem 4.5].

Finally, for $1 \leq q < p$, since we have proven continuity in $L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$, so we have it in $L_U^q(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as $L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset L_U^q(\mathbb{R}^N)$. ■

About the way the semigroup approaches the initial data, we have the following result.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, $\mu \in (0, 1]$, be as in Proposition 4.1.*

Then for any $u_0 \in L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $1 \leq p < \infty$ we have

$$S_\mu(t)u_0 \rightarrow u_0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow 0^+, \text{ in } L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^N), \quad (3.3)$$

The convergence in (3.3) is in $L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ if $u_0 \in \dot{L}_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Proof. If $\mu = 1$ then (3.3) in $L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is from [2, Theorems 4.1, 4.5 and Proposition 4.9], (3.3) in $L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $u_0 \in \dot{L}_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is from [2, (4.1), (4.5) and (4.6)].

Now, given $\mu \in (0, 1)$ observe that (3.3) in $L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ follows from the convergence properties in the case $\mu = 1$ using the expressions in [15, (20'), p. 264 and (14), p. 262] (see also [4, Appendix B]). Indeed, given $u_0 \in L_U^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, with $f_{1,\mu}$ as in [15, p. 264] we have that

$$\|S_\mu(t)u_0 - u_0\|_{L^p(B)} \leq \int_0^\infty f_{1,\mu}(s) \|S_1(st^{\frac{1}{\mu}})u_0 - u_0\|_{L^p(B)} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow 0^+,$$

where the convergence on the right is due to Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. ■

4. THE HOMOGENEOUS LINEAR EQUATION IN MORREY SPACES

In this section, given A_0 as in (1.2), we consider the linear *fractional diffusion* problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t + A_0^\mu u = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^N \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where $0 < \mu \leq 1$ and A_0^μ is the fractional power of A_0 . We collect below several previous results for (4.1) when the initial data are taken in Morrey spaces.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $0 < \ell \leq N$, $0 < \mu \leq 1$ and assume that A_0 is as in (1.2).*

- (i) *Then (4.1) defines a semigroup of solutions $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in each one of the spaces $M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\mathcal{M}^\ell(\mathbb{R}^N)$*
- (ii) *The semigroup is analytic and has a sectorial generator provided $0 < \mu < 1$, or $\mu = 1$ and $1 < p \leq \infty$.*

(iii) The semigroup has a selfsimilar kernel $k_\mu(t, x, y) = \frac{1}{t^{\frac{N}{2m\mu}}} K_\mu\left(\frac{x-y}{t^{\frac{1}{2m\mu}}}\right)$, that is,

$$S_\mu(t)u_0(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} k_\mu(t, x, y)u_0(y) dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t > 0.$$

Moreover if the semigroup generated by $-A_0$, that is, $\{S_1(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is order preserving (e.g. if $A_0 = -\Delta$), so is $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ for $0 < \mu < 1$ and actually $k_\mu(t, x, y) \geq 0$ for all t, x, y .

(iv) The space $\dot{M}^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is invariant for the semigroup.

Proof. The results for the semigroup in $M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\mathcal{M}^\ell(\mathbb{R}^N)$, can be found in [4], whereas for the kernel in [5]. As in the proof of Proposition 3.1, translations τ_z commute with $S_\mu(t)$. Hence $\|\tau_z S_\mu(t)u_0 - S_\mu(t)u_0\|_{M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq \|S_\mu(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N))} \|\tau_z u_0 - u_0\|_{M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)}$ and the invariance of $\dot{M}^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ follows. ■

Remark 4.2. For $0 < \mu \leq 1$, $1 < p \leq \infty$ and $0 < \ell \leq N$ the sectorial generator of the semigroup $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in $M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ in Proposition 4.1 is $-A_0^\mu$, which follows from [4, Proposition B.1, p. 1604].

The next result collects several estimates for the semigroup above between the spaces considered before.

Proposition 4.3. Let $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, $\mu \in (0, 1]$, be as in Proposition 4.1.

Given $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $0 < \ell \leq N$, for $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $0 \leq s \leq \ell \leq N$ satisfying $\frac{s}{q} \leq \frac{\ell}{p}$, we have for some constant $c = c_{\mu,p,\ell,q,s}$ that

$$\|S_\mu(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N), M^{q,s}(\mathbb{R}^N))} = \frac{c}{t^{\frac{1}{2m\mu}(\frac{\ell}{p} - \frac{s}{q})}}, \quad t > 0, \quad (4.2)$$

which remains true if for $p = 1$ we replace $M^{1,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by $\mathcal{M}^\ell(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Proof. This is from [4, Theorems 1.4 and 1.5]. ■

The next result states the time continuity properties of the trajectories of the semigroup.

Proposition 4.4. Let $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, $\mu \in (0, 1]$, be as in Proposition 4.1.

Then for $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ and $0 \leq s \leq \ell \leq N$ satisfying $\frac{s}{q} \leq \frac{\ell}{p}$ we have

$$(0, \infty) \times M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N) \ni (t, u_0) \rightarrow S_\mu(t)u_0 \in M^{q,s}(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{is continuous,} \quad (4.3)$$

which remains true if for $p = 1$ we replace $M^{1,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by $\mathcal{M}^\ell(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Proof. We argue below in three cases.

Case A: either $\mu \neq 1$, or $\mu = 1$ and $q \neq 1$. In this case we first remark that if $(0, \infty) \times M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N) \ni (t_n, u_{0n}) \rightarrow (t_0, u_0) \in (0, \infty) \times M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then for any small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ we can write

$$S_\mu(t_n)u_{0n} - S_\mu(t_0)u_0 = S_\mu(t_n)u_{0n} - S_\mu(t_n)u_0 + S_\mu(t_n - \varepsilon)S(\varepsilon)u_0 - S_\mu(t_0 - \varepsilon)S_\mu(\varepsilon)u_0.$$

Due to Proposition 4.3 we have

$$\|S_\mu(t_n)u_{0n} - S_\mu(t_n)u_0\|_{M^{q,s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq \frac{c}{t_n^{\frac{1}{2m\mu}(\frac{\ell}{p} - \frac{s}{q})}} \|u_{0n} - u_0\|_{M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Also

$$\|S_\mu(t_n - \varepsilon)S_\mu(\varepsilon)u_0 - S_\mu(t_0 - \varepsilon)S_\mu(\varepsilon)u_0\|_{M^{q,s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

because Proposition 4.3 yields $S_\mu(\varepsilon)u_0 \in M^{q,s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and by Proposition 4.1 the semigroup $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is analytic (thus, in particular, continuous for positive times) in $M^{q,s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Case B: $\mu = 1$ and $q = 1$ and $p \neq 1$. Given $p \neq 1$, $0 < s \leq \ell \leq N$, $u_0 \in M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $t > 0$ we have from [4, p. 1587, Theorem 5.1] that

$$\nabla S_1(t)u_0 \in M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N),$$

whereas from Proposition 4.3

$$S_1(t)u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N),$$

so via [4, p.1571, Proposition 2.2] we see that

$$S_1(t)u_0 \in \dot{M}^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

This and [4, formula (1.8), p. 1563] yield

$$\lim_{h \searrow 0} \|S_1(h)S_1(t)u_0 - S_1(t)u_0\|_{M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 0 \text{ for each } t > 0. \quad (4.4)$$

Now for $t > 0$ and $-\frac{t}{2} < h < 0$, since by Proposition 4.3 $\sup_{h \in (-\frac{t}{2}, 0)} \|S_1(\frac{t}{2} + h)\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N))} = c$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_1(t+h)u_0 - S_1(t)u_0\|_{M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} &= \|S_1\left(\frac{t}{2} + h\right) \left(S_1\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)u_0 - S_1(-h)S_1\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)u_0 \right)\|_{M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \\ &\leq c \|S_1\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)u_0 - S_1(-h)S_1\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)u_0\|_{M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

and due to (4.4) the right hand of (4.5) tends to zero as $h \nearrow 0$. As a consequence,

$$\lim_{h \nearrow 0} \|S_1(t+h)u_0 - S_1(t)u_0\|_{M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 0 \text{ for each } t > 0.$$

Given $u_0 \in M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ we thus see that $(0, \infty) \ni t \rightarrow S_1(t)u_0 \in M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is continuous.

This and the estimate $\|S_1(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N), M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N))} = \frac{c}{t^{\frac{1}{2m}(\frac{\ell}{p}-s)}}$ from Proposition 4.3 yield (4.3) in the considered case after we use a similar argument as in Case A above.

Case C: $\mu = 1$ and $q = 1$ and $p = 1$ and $s < \ell$. In this case for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $s < \frac{\ell}{1+\varepsilon} < \ell$ and given $u_0 \in M^{1,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ we observe from Proposition 4.3 that

$$S_1(t)u_0 \in M^{1+\varepsilon,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ and } S_1(\tau)S_1(t)u_0 \in M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ whenever } t, \tau > 0.$$

Now, if $t > 0$ and $t_n \rightarrow t$ then choosing small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\|S_1(t_n)u_0 - S_1(t)u_0\|_{M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \|S_1(t_n - \varepsilon)S_1(\varepsilon)u_0 - S_1(t - \varepsilon)S_1(\varepsilon)u_0\|_{M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$S_1(\varepsilon)u_0 \in M^{1+\varepsilon,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ and } s < \frac{\ell}{1+\varepsilon} < \ell,$$

so due to the continuity proved in Case B above the right hand side of (4.6) tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Given $u_0 \in M^{1,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ we thus see that $(0, \infty) \ni t \rightarrow S_1(t)u_0 \in M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is continuous. This together with the estimate $\|S_1(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{1,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N), M^{1,s}(\mathbb{R}^N))} = \frac{c}{t^{\frac{1}{2m}(\ell-s)}}$ from Proposition 4.3 yield (4.3) in the considered case with a similar argument as in Case A above.

Case D: $\mu = 1$ and $q = 1$ and $p = 1$ and $s = \ell$. Given $u_0 \in M^{1,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and a ball $B(x_0, R) \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, we denote by $\chi_{B(x_0, R)}$ the characteristic function of $B(x_0, R)$ and observe that for $t > 0$, $t+h > 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} &R^{\ell-N} \|S(t+h)u_0 - S(t)u_0\|_{L^1(B(x_0, R))} \\ &\leq R^{\ell-N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\chi_{B(x_0, R)}(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \frac{K_1\left(\frac{z}{(t+h)\frac{N}{2m}}\right)}{(t+h)\frac{N}{2m}} - \frac{K_1\left(\frac{z}{t\frac{N}{2m}}\right)}{t\frac{N}{2m}} \right| |u_0(x-z)| dz \right) dx \\ &= R^{\ell-N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\left| \frac{K_1\left(\frac{z}{(t+h)\frac{N}{2m}}\right)}{(t+h)\frac{N}{2m}} - \frac{K_1\left(\frac{z}{t\frac{N}{2m}}\right)}{t\frac{N}{2m}} \right| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_0(x-z)| \chi_{B(x_0, R)}(x) dx \right) dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \frac{K_1\left(\frac{z}{(t+h)\frac{N}{2m}}\right)}{(t+h)\frac{N}{2m}} - \frac{K_1\left(\frac{z}{t\frac{N}{2m}}\right)}{t\frac{N}{2m}} \right| R^{\ell-N} \|u_0\|_{L^1(B(x_0-z, R))} dz \\ &\leq \|u_0\|_{M^{1,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \frac{K_1\left(\frac{z}{(t+h)\frac{N}{2m}}\right)}{(t+h)\frac{N}{2m}} - \frac{K_1\left(\frac{z}{t\frac{N}{2m}}\right)}{t\frac{N}{2m}} \right| dz. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Taking $\delta \in \mathcal{M}^N(\mathbb{R}^N) = \mathcal{M}_{BTV}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ we have as in [5, Proposition 6.1(i)] that $K_1 = S_1(1)\delta$. Since due to [5, Proposition 3.2] $S_1(t)\delta$ immediately enters $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for any $p \geq 1$, we see from [2, Proposition 2.3 and Remark 2.6] that $S_1(t)\delta$ also enters immediately $H_q^{2m}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for arbitrarily large q . Thus, via Sobolev embedding, K_1 is in particular a bounded uniformly continuous function in \mathbb{R}^N , which in turn implies that

$$\left| \frac{K_1\left(\frac{z}{(t+h)^{\frac{1}{2m}}}\right)}{(t+h)^{\frac{N}{2m}}} - \frac{K_1\left(\frac{z}{t^{\frac{1}{2m}}}\right)}{t^{\frac{N}{2m}}} \right| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0 \text{ for each } t > 0, z \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Using pointwise Gaussian bound (see [5, formula (2.3) in Theorem 2.2]) we also have

$$\left| K_1(\cdot) \right| \leq \exp\left(-c \cdot \left|\frac{z}{t^{\frac{1}{2m}}}\right|^{\frac{2m}{2m-1}}\right)$$

for some positive constant c . Hence due to Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \frac{K_1\left(\frac{z}{(t+h)^{\frac{1}{2m}}}\right)}{(t+h)^{\frac{N}{2m}}} - \frac{K_1\left(\frac{z}{t^{\frac{1}{2m}}}\right)}{t^{\frac{N}{2m}}} \right| dz \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.8)$$

From (4.7) and (4.8) we conclude that $\|S(t+h)u_0 - S(t)u_0\|_{M^{1,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow 0$.

This and the estimate $\|S_\mu(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{1,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N))} = c$ from Proposition 4.3 yield (4.3) in the considered case with a similar argument as in Case A above. ■

About the way the semigroup approaches the initial data, we have the following result.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, $\mu \in (0, 1]$, be as in Proposition 4.1.*

Then for any $u_0 \in M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $0 < \ell \leq N$ we have

$$S_\mu(t)u_0 \rightarrow u_0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow 0^+, \text{ in } L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}^N). \quad (4.9)$$

The convergence in (4.9) is in $M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ if $u_0 \in \dot{M}^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Proof. If $\mu = 1$ then the result is from [4, Theorem 1.1], whereas for $\mu \in (0, 1)$ it follows analogously as in the proof of Proposition 3.4. ■

5. MORREY POTENTIALS

As mentioned in the Introduction, our goal is now to perturb the fractional diffusion equation (4.1) with some potential terms. Previous results in this direction can be found in [4, Section 7] for specific type of homogeneous potentials of the form $\frac{c}{|x|^\beta}$ and suitable $\beta > 0$. In that reference the results rely on suitable Gagliardo-Nirenberg-Hardy type inequalities that can not be applied here for more general potentials.

Here our goal is to include a general potentials in Morrey spaces, using different techniques. Of course, our results here apply to these type of potentials as well. Hence, we will assume that

$$V \in M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq p_0 \leq \infty, \ell_0 \in (0, N]. \quad (5.1)$$

Then we consider the multiplication operator P_V , defined for functions ϕ in \mathbb{R}^N by

$$P_V \phi(x) = V(x)\phi(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (5.2)$$

The following result states how the multiplication operator (5.2) acts between Morrey spaces.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume $V \in M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for some $1 \leq p_0 \leq \infty$, $\ell_0 \in (0, N]$ and let p'_0 be Hölder's conjugate of p_0 .*

Given any $w \in [p'_0, \infty]$ and $0 < \kappa \leq N$ we have that if z and ν satisfy

$$\frac{1}{z} = \frac{1}{w} + \frac{1}{p_0}, \quad \frac{\nu}{z} = \frac{\kappa}{w} + \frac{\ell_0}{p_0}$$

then for any $\phi \in M^{w, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $P_V \phi$ as in (5.2), we have $P_V \phi \in M^{z, \nu}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and

$$\|P_V \phi\|_{M^{z, \nu}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq \|\phi\|_{M^{w, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \|V\|_{M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N)}.$$

In particular,

$$P_V \in \mathcal{L}(M^{w,\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^N), M^{z,\nu}(\mathbb{R}^N)) \quad \text{and} \quad \|P_V\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{w,\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^N), M^{z,\nu}(\mathbb{R}^N))} \leq \|V\|_{M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N)}. \quad (5.3)$$

Proof. The result follows applying the following consequence of Hölder's inequality

$$\|fg\|_{M^{z,\nu}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq \|f\|_{M^{w,\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \|g\|_{M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N)},$$

see [4, formula (2.5)]. ■

6. LINEAR PERTURBATIONS IN THE SCALE: AN ABSTRACT APPROACH

As a consequence of the results in Sections 4 and 5, we have a semigroup $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, $0 < \mu \leq 1$, in the scale of spaces $\{M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)\}_{p,\ell}$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $0 < \ell \leq N$ (where, for $p = 1$, we can even replace $M^{1,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by $\mathcal{M}^\ell(\mathbb{R}^N)$). This semigroup has continuous curves as in Proposition 4.4, attains the initial data as in Proposition 4.5 and acts within these spaces as in (4.2). On the other hand, we have a potential that acts within these spaces as in (5.3). Notice the corresponding restrictions on the indexes of the spaces of the scale in these two latter equations.

We can accomodate this situation in an abstract setting that will allow further applications to other situations. This will be done elsewhere.

First, assume we have a family of Banach spaces, $\{X^\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{J}}$ which we call *the scale*, where \mathbb{J} is a certain set of indexes. The norm in X^γ is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_\gamma$. The spaces of the scale are assumed to be topologically consistent, that is, if $\{u_{0n}\} \subset X^\gamma \cap X^{\tilde{\gamma}}$ and $\{u_{0n}\}$ converges both in X^γ and in $X^{\tilde{\gamma}}$ then the limit is the same.

Each space in the scale, has an associated *regularity index* given by a mapping $\mathbf{r} : \mathbb{J} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

As several of the results below do not depend on the semigroup property, we consider a slightly more general situation for a family of linear mappings $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ acting in the scale as we now define.

Definition 6.1. *Given the scale $\{X^\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{J}}$ and a family of linear operators $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ with $S(0) = I$ defined in a consistent way on the spaces of the scale, that is, if $u_0 \in X^\gamma \cap X^{\tilde{\gamma}}$ then the value of $S(t)u_0$ as operators in X^γ and $X^{\tilde{\gamma}}$ coincide.*

(i) *We say that $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ smooths from X^γ to $X^{\tilde{\gamma}}$ for positive times, which we denote as*

$$\gamma \xrightarrow{S(t)} \tilde{\gamma},$$

iff for any $T > 0$ there is a constant $M = M(\gamma, \tilde{\gamma}, T)$ (that can always assume to be nondecreasing with respect to T), such that

$$\|S(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma, X^{\tilde{\gamma}})} \leq \frac{M}{t^{d(\tilde{\gamma}, \gamma)}} \quad \text{for } 0 < t \leq T \quad (6.1)$$

where $d(\tilde{\gamma}, \gamma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{r}(\tilde{\gamma}) - \mathbf{r}(\gamma) \geq 0$.

(ii) *We say that $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ continuously smooths from X^γ to $X^{\tilde{\gamma}}$ for positive times, which we denote as*

$$\gamma \xrightarrow{S(t)} \tilde{\gamma},$$

iff additionally to (i), we have that $(0, \infty) \ni t \rightarrow S(t)u_0 \in X^{\tilde{\gamma}}$ is continuous for each $u_0 \in X^\gamma$.

(iii) *If for each $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}$, $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a (not necessarily C^0) semigroup in X^γ and $\gamma \xrightarrow{S(t)} \tilde{\gamma}$ then we say that we have a semigroup $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in the scale.*

Therefore the results in Sections 4 and 5 for Morrey spaces $X^\gamma = M^{p,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, correspond to

$$\gamma = (p, \ell) \in \mathbb{J} = [1, \infty] \times (0, N], \quad \mathbf{r}(\gamma) = -\frac{\ell}{2m\mu p} \quad (6.2)$$

(for $p = 1$, $M^{1,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ can be replaced by $\mathcal{M}^\ell(\mathbb{R}^N)$). The operators $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, $0 < \mu \leq 1$, are a semigroup in the Morrey scale in the sense above. Notice that (6.1) holds in this case with M independent of T , see (4.2).

As the case of semigroups in a scale is specially relevant for applications, we make the following important remark.

Lemma 6.2. Assume $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup in the scale $\{X^\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{J}}$.

(i) For each $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}$, there exists constants $M_0 = M_0(\gamma)$, a_γ , such that

$$\|S(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma)} \leq M_0 e^{a_\gamma t}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (6.3)$$

(ii) If $\gamma \xrightarrow{S(t)} \gamma'$ denote $\omega \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{a_\gamma, a_{\gamma'}\}$. Then for each $T > 0$ there exists a constant $M = M(\gamma, \gamma', T)$ such that

$$\|S(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma, X^{\gamma'})} \leq \begin{cases} \frac{M}{t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}}, & 0 < t \leq T \\ M e^{\omega t}, & T < t. \end{cases}$$

In particular, for each $a > \omega$ there is a constant $M_1 = M_1(\gamma, \gamma')$ such that

$$\|S(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma, X^{\gamma'})} \leq \frac{M_1}{t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}} e^{at}, \quad t > 0. \quad (6.4)$$

Proof. (i) Since $\|S(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma)} \leq C$ for $\tau \in [0, 1]$, then, by the semigroup property, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\tau \in [0, 1]$, $\|S(k + \tau)\|_{X^\gamma} \leq C^{k+1}$ and, letting $t = k + \tau$, we get (6.3).

(ii) The estimate for $0 < t \leq T$ comes from (6.1). Now for $u_0 \in X^\gamma$ and $t > T$, by the semigroup property, we get $\|S(t)u_0\|_{X^{\gamma'}} \leq \|S(t - T)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^{\gamma'}, X^{\gamma'})} \|S(T)u_0\|_{X^{\gamma'}} \leq \frac{C}{T^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}} e^{a_{\gamma'} T} e^{a_{\gamma'} t} \|u_0\|_\gamma$.

Also, for $t > T$, $\|S(t)u_0\|_{X^{\gamma'}} \leq \|S(T)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma, X^{\gamma'})} \|S(t - T)u_0\|_{X^\gamma} \leq \frac{C}{T^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}} e^{a_{\gamma'} T} e^{a_\gamma t} \|u_0\|_\gamma$. So we get the result.

Also, these two estimates together yield (6.4). ■

Now we want to consider an equation of the form

$$u(t) = S(t)u_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t S(t - \tau) P_i u(\tau) d\tau, \quad t > 0, \quad (6.5)$$

for suitable u_0 in some space in the scale, and suitable linear perturbations P_i acting within the scale, as we now define.

Definition 6.3. Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}$ and $R > 0$,

- (i) Denote $\mathcal{P}_{\beta, R}$, with $\beta \in \mathbb{J}$, the set of linear bounded mappings $P \in \mathcal{L}(X^\alpha, X^\beta)$ with $0 \leq d(\alpha, \beta) = \mathbf{r}(\alpha) - \mathbf{r}(\beta) < 1$ and $\beta \xrightarrow{S(t)} \alpha$ and $\|P\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha, X^\beta)} \leq R$.
- (ii) For $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n \in \mathbb{J}$ consider sets of perturbations $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ such that $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_{\beta_i, R}$. Then we say that

$$P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\} \in \mathcal{P}_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, R}. \quad (6.6)$$

Notice that if all β_i are the same, then we can add the perturbations and (6.5) would be equivalent to

$$u(t) = S(t)u_0 + \int_0^t S(t - \tau) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n P_i \right) u(\tau) d\tau, \quad (6.7)$$

so, a single perturbation would be considered. Analogously, if in (6.5) some $\beta_i = \beta_j$ then P_i and P_j can be added into a single perturbation. Hence we can, without loss of generality, assume that in (6.5) all β_i are different.

Hence if P is as in (6.6), notice that for (6.5) to make sense we need $u : (0, T) \rightarrow X^\alpha$ and then $\tau \mapsto S(t - \tau) P_i u(\tau) \in X^\alpha$, but it must be integrable, so we need a precise control on how u enters in X^α and use (6.1). Also notice that we can allow $u_0 \in X^\gamma$ as long as $\gamma \xrightarrow{S(t)} \alpha$.

This motivates to consider the following set of functions.

Definition 6.4. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}$, $T > 0$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$ we define

$$\mathcal{L}_{\alpha, \varepsilon}^\infty((0, T]) = \{\varphi \in L_{loc}^\infty((0, T], X^\alpha) : \|\varphi\|_{\alpha, \varepsilon, T} = \sup_{t \in (0, T]} t^\varepsilon \|\varphi(t)\|_\alpha < \infty\},$$

and $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha, \varepsilon}^\infty = \bigcap_{T > 0} \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, \varepsilon}^\infty((0, T])$.

6.1. Perturbations in the scale. Existence, uniqueness and regularity. Then we have the following existence and uniqueness result for (6.5), for u_0 in a set of spaces in the scale determined by \mathcal{E}_α below; the set of existence and uniqueness for (6.5). Notice in particular that if $\alpha \xrightarrow{S(t)} \alpha$ then $\alpha \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$.

Theorem 6.5 (Existence of solutions). *Assume $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}$ and $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6) and let*

$$\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\gamma \in \mathbb{J} : \mathbf{r}(\gamma) \in (\mathbf{r}(\alpha) - 1, \mathbf{r}(\alpha)] \text{ and } \gamma \xrightarrow{S(t)} \alpha\}.$$

Then for $u_0 \in X^\gamma$ there is a unique $u = u(\cdot, u_0)$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty$ satisfying (6.5) for each $t > 0$.

Therefore we have a family of linear operators $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in X^γ given by

$$S_P(0)u_0 = u_0 \quad \text{and} \quad S_P(t)u_0 = u(t, u_0) \tag{6.8}$$

and $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ continuously smooths from X^γ to X^α for positive times, that is,

$$\gamma \xrightarrow{S_P(t)} \alpha. \tag{6.9}$$

Finally, $\beta_i \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and in particular,

$$\beta_i \xrightarrow{S_P(t)} \alpha, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Also, if $\alpha \xrightarrow{S(t)} \alpha$ then $\alpha \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and $\alpha \xrightarrow{S_P(t)} \alpha$.

Proof. Step 1. Existence. First, if $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ then $0 \leq d(\alpha, \gamma) = \mathbf{r}(\alpha) - \mathbf{r}(\gamma) < 1$. Then with $T > 0$ and $\theta > 0$ we consider in $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty((0, T])$ an equivalent norm given by

$$\|\|\varphi\|\|_{T, \theta} = \sup_{t \in (0, T]} e^{-\theta t} t^{d(\alpha, \gamma)} \|\varphi(t)\|_\alpha.$$

Then take $K_0 > 0$ to be chosen below and letting

$$\mathcal{K}_{T, K_0, \theta} = \{\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty((0, T]) : \|\|\varphi\|\|_{T, \theta} \leq K_0\}$$

and for $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty((0, T])$

$$\mathcal{F}(\varphi, u_0)(t) = S(t)u_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t S(t-\tau) P_i \varphi(\tau) d\tau, \quad t \in (0, T], \tag{6.10}$$

we look for a fixed point of $\varphi \mapsto \mathcal{F}(\varphi, u_0)$ in $\mathcal{K}_{T, K_0, \theta}$.

We remark that if $\varphi \in \mathcal{K}_{T, K_0, \theta}$ then φ is measurable with respect to a Lebesgue's σ -field as in [6, Definition §5, p. 4] and, by assumptions on P_i and $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, we see via [6, Proposition §13, p. 7] that $S(t-\cdot)P_i\varphi(\cdot)$ is then measurable for every $t \in (0, T]$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$. Hence $S(t-\cdot)P_i\varphi(\cdot)$ with values in X^α is integrable on $(0, t)$ whenever $\|S(t-\cdot)P_i\varphi(\cdot)\|_\alpha$ is integrable on $(0, t)$. Also, the technical Lemma 6.6 proved below ensures that $\mathcal{F}(\varphi, u_0)$ is actually continuous in $(0, T]$ with values in X^α and thus measurable (see [1, Corollary 1.4.8]).

Given $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{K}_{T, K_0, \theta}$ and $t \in (0, T]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\theta t} t^{d(\alpha, \gamma)} \|\mathcal{F}(\varphi, u_0)(t)\|_\alpha &\leq C \|u_0\|_\gamma + e^{-\theta t} t^{d(\alpha, \gamma)} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{C}{(t-s)^{d(\alpha, \beta_i)}} R \|\varphi(s)\|_\alpha ds \\ &\leq C \|u_0\|_\gamma + C \sum_{i=1}^n R t^{1-d(\alpha, \beta_i)} e^{-\theta t} \int_0^1 \frac{e^{\theta t \zeta}}{(1-\zeta)^{d(\alpha, \beta_i)} \zeta^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} d\zeta \|\|\varphi\|\|_{T, \theta} \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\theta t} t^{d(\alpha, \gamma)} \|\mathcal{F}(\varphi, u_0)(t) - \mathcal{F}(\psi, u_0)(t)\|_\alpha &\leq e^{-\theta t} t^{d(\alpha, \gamma)} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{C}{(t-s)^{d(\alpha, \beta_i)}} R \|\varphi(s) - \psi(s)\|_\alpha ds \\ &\leq C \sum_{i=1}^n R t^{1-d(\alpha, \beta_i)} e^{-\theta t} \int_0^1 \frac{e^{\theta t \zeta}}{(1-\zeta)^{d(\alpha, \beta_i)} \zeta^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} d\zeta \|\|\varphi - \psi\|\|_{T, \theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Now choose $K_0 > 2C\|u_0\|_\gamma$ and denote

$$c_i(\theta) = \sup_{t \in (0, T]} t^{1-d(\alpha, \beta_i)} e^{-\theta t} \int_0^1 \frac{e^{\theta t \zeta}}{(1-\zeta)^{d(\alpha, \beta_i)} \zeta^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} d\zeta$$

so we obtain for $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{K}_{T, K_0, \theta}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{F}(\varphi, u_0)\|_{T, \theta} &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + CR \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(\theta)\right) K_0, \\ \|\mathcal{F}(\varphi, u_0) - \mathcal{F}(\psi, u_0)\|_{T, \theta} &\leq CR \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(\theta) \|\varphi - \psi\|_{T, \theta}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

Given $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we have via Hölder's inequality that for $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$

$$\begin{aligned} c_i(\theta) &\leq \sup_{t \in (0, T]} t^{1-d(\alpha, \beta_i)} e^{-\theta t} \left(\int_0^1 e^{\theta t \zeta q'} d\zeta\right)^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left(\int_0^1 (1-\zeta)^{-qd(\alpha, \beta_i)} \zeta^{-qd(\alpha, \gamma)} d\zeta\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\leq \sup_{t \in (0, T]} t^{\frac{1}{q}-d(\alpha, \beta_i)} (\theta q')^{-\frac{1}{q'}} (1 - e^{-\theta t q'})^{\frac{1}{q'}} B^{\frac{1}{q}}(1 - qd(\alpha, \beta_i), 1 - qd(\alpha, \gamma)) \\ &\leq \theta^{-\frac{1}{q'}} T^{\frac{1}{q}-d(\alpha, \beta_i)} q'^{-\frac{1}{q'}} B^{\frac{1}{q}}(1 - qd(\alpha, \beta_i), 1 - qd(\alpha, \gamma)) \end{aligned}$$

where $B(\cdot, \cdot)$ is Euler's beta function and $1 - qd(\alpha, \beta_i), 1 - qd(\alpha, \gamma) > 0$ for $q > 1$ close enough to 1, because $1 - d(\alpha, \beta_i) > 0$ and $1 - d(\alpha, \gamma) > 0$. Therefore, for such q , we see that $c_i(\theta)$ is bounded from above by a multiple of $\theta^{-\frac{1}{q'}} T^{\frac{1}{q}-d(\alpha, \beta_i)}$ and then

$$\text{given } T > 0 \text{ we have } \lim_{\theta \rightarrow \infty} c_i(\theta) = 0 \text{ for every } i = 1, \dots, n. \tag{6.13}$$

Therefore, from this and (6.12) for a given $T > 0$, we can choose θ large such that $\mathcal{F}(\cdot, u_0)$ is a contraction in $\mathcal{K}_{T, K_0, \theta}$. Hence, $\mathcal{F}(\cdot, u_0)$ has a unique fixed point u in $\mathcal{K}_{T, K_0, \theta}$ and then $u \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty((0, T])$ satisfies (6.5) for $t \in (0, T]$.

Step 2. Uniqueness. For fixed T notice the sets $\mathcal{K}_{T, K_0, \theta}$ are increasing in K_0 and in θ . Hence if $v \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty((0, T])$ satisfies (6.5) in $(0, T]$, with θ and u as in Step 1 above, denote $K_1 = \max\{K_0, \|v\|_{T, \theta}\}$. Then $u, v \in \mathcal{K}_{T, K_1, \theta}$. Now choose θ_1 larger than θ and such \mathcal{F} has a unique fixed point in $\mathcal{K}_{T, K_1, \theta_1} \supset \mathcal{K}_{T, K_1, \theta} \supset \mathcal{K}_{T, K_0, \theta}$. Therefore $u, v \in \mathcal{K}_{T, K_1, \theta_1}$ and are fixed points, whence $u = v$ in $(0, T]$. Therefore, there is a unique element in $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty((0, T])$ that satisfies (6.5).

In particular, if $T_1 < T_2$ and $u_i \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty((0, T_i])$ satisfy (6.5) in $(0, T_i]$ then $u_1 = u_2$ in $(0, T_1]$.

As we can construct, as above, for each $T > 0$ an $u \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty((0, T])$ that satisfies (6.5) in $(0, T]$, we have therefore a unique $u \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty$ that satisfies (6.5) for $t > 0$.

Step 3. Linearity. Now for $t > 0$, $S_P(t)$ in (6.8) is a well defined map from X^γ into X^α . The linearity of $S_P(t)$ is now a consequence of the uniqueness in $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty$ and the linearity in u_0 and in φ in (6.10).

Step 4. Estimates. Now for $S_P(t)u_0 = u(t; u_0)$ and $T > 0$, from (6.11), for $0 < t \leq T$ we have

$$e^{-\theta t} t^{d(\alpha, \gamma)} \|u(t)\|_\alpha \leq C\|u_0\|_\gamma + CR \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(\theta) \|u\|_{T, \theta},$$

and therefore

$$\|u\|_{T, \theta} \leq C\|u_0\|_\gamma + CR \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(\theta) \|u\|_{T, \theta}.$$

From (6.13) we can choose θ large enough such that $CR \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(\theta) \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and then $\|u\|_{T, \theta} \leq 2C\|u_0\|_\gamma$ which in turn leads to the estimate

$$\|S_P(t)u_0\|_\alpha \leq \frac{2C e^{\theta T}}{t^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} \|u_0\|_\gamma, \quad t \in (0, T). \tag{6.14}$$

This and the continuity in Lemma 6.6 below, completes the proof of (6.9).

Finally, that $\beta_i \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and $\beta_i \xrightarrow{S_P^{(t)}} \alpha$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and that if $\alpha \xrightarrow{S_P^{(t)}} \alpha$ then $\alpha \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and $\alpha \xrightarrow{S_P^{(t)}} \alpha$, follows by the definitions. ■

We now prove the technical lemma used above.

Lemma 6.6. *Assume $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6) and let $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$.*

If $u_0 \in X^\gamma$ and $u \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty((0, T])$ then

$$(0, T] \ni t \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(u, u_0)(t) = S(t)u_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t S(t-\tau)P_i u(\tau) d\tau \in X^\alpha \text{ is continuous.}$$

Proof. We consider $0 < t \leq T$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\frac{t}{2} \leq t+h \leq T. \quad (6.15)$$

We see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{F}(u, u_0)(t+h) - \mathcal{F}(u, u_0)(t)\|_\alpha &\leq \|S(t+h)u_0 - S(t)u_0\|_\alpha \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \int_0^{t+h} S(t+h-s)P_i u(s) ds - \int_0^t S(t-s)P_i u(s) ds \right\|_\alpha \\ &=: I_{1,\alpha}(h) + I_{2,\alpha}(h). \end{aligned} \quad (6.16)$$

Since $\gamma \xrightarrow{S_P^{(t)}} \alpha$, we get $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} I_{1,\alpha}(h) = 0$. The proof that $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} I_{2,\alpha}(h) = 0$ follows in two cases.

Case $h > 0$. If $h > 0$ then $I_{2,\alpha}(h) \leq j_{h,\alpha}^+ + k_{h,\alpha}^+$ where

$$\begin{aligned} j_{h,\alpha}^+ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \|(S(t+h-s) - S(t-s))P_i u(s)\|_\alpha ds, \\ k_{h,\alpha}^+ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \int_t^{t+h} \|S(t+h-s)P_i u(s)\|_\alpha ds. \end{aligned} \quad (6.17)$$

We see that $\|(S(t+h-s) - S(t-s))P_i u(s)\|_\alpha$ is bounded by $\|S(t+h-s)P_i u(s)\|_\alpha + \|S(t-s)P_i u(s)\|_\alpha$, which for $s \in (0, t)$ is estimated by $G_i(s) = \frac{RC}{(t-s)^{d(\alpha, \beta_i)} s^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} \|u\|_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma), T}$. Since $d(\alpha, \beta_i) < 1$ and $d(\alpha, \gamma) < 1$, function $G_i(s)$ is integrable for $s \in (0, t)$. For such s we also have

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \|(S(t+h-s) - S(t-s))P_i u(s)\|_\alpha = 0, \quad (6.18)$$

because $P_i u(s) \in X^{\beta_i}$ and by assumption $(0, \infty) \ni t \rightarrow S(t)\phi \in X^\alpha$ is continuous when $\phi \in X^{\beta_i}$. Thus, via Lebesgue's theorem $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} j_{h,\alpha}^+ = 0$,

For $s \in (t, t+h)$ we see in turn that $\|S(t+h-s)P_i u(s)\|_\alpha$ is bounded from above by $\frac{RC \|u\|_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma), T}}{(t+h-s)^{d(\alpha, \beta_i)} t^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}}$. Then $k_{h,\alpha}^+ \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{RC}{(1-d(\alpha, \beta_i)) t^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} \|u\|_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma), T} h^{1-d(\alpha, \beta_i)}$, which implies that $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} k_{h,\alpha}^+ = 0$. As a consequence $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} I_{2,\alpha}(h) = 0$.

Case $h < 0$. If $h < 0$, we have $I_{2,\alpha}(h) \leq j_{h,\alpha}^- + k_{h,\alpha}^-$ where

$$\begin{aligned} j_{h,\alpha}^- &= \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{t+h} \|(S(t+h-s) - S(t-s))P_i u(s)\|_\alpha ds, \\ k_{h,\alpha}^- &= \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{t+h}^t \|S(t-s)P_i u(s)\|_\alpha ds. \end{aligned}$$

For $s \in (t+h, t)$, recalling (6.15), we see that $\|S(t-s)P_i u(s)\|_\alpha$ is estimated from above by $\frac{RC}{(t-s)^{d(\alpha, \beta_i)} (\frac{t}{2})^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} \|u\|_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma), T}$ and $k_{h,\alpha}^- \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{RC}{(1-d(\alpha, \beta_i)) (\frac{t}{2})^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} \|u\|_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma), T} (-h)^{1-d(\alpha, \beta_i)}$, which yields $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^-} k_{h,\alpha}^- = 0$.

Given any $\xi > 0$ such that $\frac{t}{4} \leq t - \xi$ we now write for $h \in (-\xi, 0)$ (thus $t - \xi \leq t + h$)

$$\begin{aligned} j_{h,\alpha}^- &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{t-\xi} \|(S(t+h-s) - S(t-s))P_i u(s)\|_\alpha ds \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{t-\xi}^{t+h} (\|S(t+h-s)P_i u(s)\|_\alpha + \|S(t-s)P_i u(s)\|_\alpha) ds =: l_\alpha(h, \xi) + m_\alpha(h, \xi). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, since $h \in (-\xi, 0)$ and $\frac{t}{4} \leq t - \xi$, $\|S(t+h-s)P_i u(s)\|_\alpha + \|S(t-s)P_i u(s)\|_\alpha$ is for $s \in (t-\xi, t+h)$ bounded from above by $\frac{2RC}{(t+h-s)^{d(\alpha, \beta_i)} (\frac{t}{4})^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} \|u\|_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma), T}$, whereas $m_\alpha(h, \xi) \leq \frac{2nRC}{(1-d(\alpha, \beta_i)) (\frac{t}{4})^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} \|u\|_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma), T} \xi^{d(\alpha, \beta_i)}$. Hence, given $\eta > 0$, there exists $\xi > 0$ such that $m_\alpha(h, \xi) < \eta$ for all $h \in (-\xi, 0)$. Having fixed such ξ , note that $(0, t-\xi) \subset (0, t+h)$ and $\|(S(t+h-s) - S(t-s))P_i u(s)\|_\alpha$ is for $s \in (0, t-\xi)$ bounded from above by $H_i(s) = RC \|u\|_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma), T} ((t-\xi-s)^{-d(\alpha, \beta_i)} s^{-d(\alpha, \gamma)} + (t-s)^{-d(\alpha, \beta_i)} s^{-d(\alpha, \gamma)})$ and that $H_i(s)$ is integrable for $s \in (0, t-\xi)$, because $d(\alpha, \gamma) < 1$ and $d(\alpha, \beta_i) < 1$. From (6.18) we also have $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \|(S(t+h-s) - S(t-s))P_i u(s)\|_\alpha = 0$. Therefore, via Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^-} l_\alpha(h, \xi) = 0$ and we conclude that $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^-} I_{2,\alpha}(h) = 0$. ■

Now we prove that the family of operators $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ constructed in Theorem 6.5 is consistent in the spaces X^γ with $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$.

Lemma 6.7. *Assume $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}$ and $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6) and let $\gamma, \tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$.*

Given $u_0 \in X^\gamma \cap X^{\tilde{\gamma}}$, if $u \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty$ and $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \tilde{\gamma})}^\infty$ are the unique functions satisfying (6.5) for $t > 0$ then $u(t) = \tilde{u}(t)$ for every $t > 0$.

Consequently, the family $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ defined in (6.8) is the family of consistent operators in the spaces X^γ , $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume that $d(\alpha, \tilde{\gamma}) \geq d(\alpha, \gamma)$. Then, since $t^{d(\alpha, \tilde{\gamma})} \|u(t)\|_\alpha = t^{d(\alpha, \tilde{\gamma}) - d(\alpha, \gamma)} t^{d(\alpha, \gamma)} \|u(t)\|_\alpha$ and $u \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty$, we see that $u \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \tilde{\gamma})}^\infty$. Then both u and \tilde{u} belong to $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \tilde{\gamma})}^\infty$ and satisfy (6.5) for $t > 0$, so that by the uniqueness in Theorem 6.5 we get the result. ■

Assume $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6). Since the set \mathcal{E}_α does not depend on P , we can perturb the original family $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in the scale sequentially by first considering $\{S_{P_1}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ defined in X^γ for $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ as the unique solutions in $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty$ of

$$u(t) = S(t)u_0 + \int_0^t S(t-\tau)P_1 u(\tau) d\tau$$

for $u_0 \in X^\gamma$. Now, by Theorem 6.5, since $\beta_2 \xrightarrow{S_{P_1}(t)} \alpha$ and (6.6) we can perturb $\{S_{P_1}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ with P_2 to get $\{(S_{P_1})_{P_2}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ as the unique solutions in $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty$ of

$$u(t) = S_{P_1}(t)u_0 + \int_0^t S_{P_1}(t-\tau)P_2 u(\tau) d\tau,$$

to get $\{(S_{P_1})_{P_2}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, and so on. Our next result shows that this sequential perturbation leads to the same family $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$. In particular, the order in which the perturbations are applied is irrelevant.

Proposition 6.8 (Iterated perturbations). *Assume $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6) and $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is given by (6.8).*

For $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and $u_0 \in X^\gamma$ we have

$$S_P(t)u_0 = ((S_{P_1})_{P_2} \dots)_{P_n}(t)u_0, \quad t > 0.$$

Proof. We use induction in n . For $n = 1$ there is nothing to prove. Assume that the result holds for n perturbations we will now prove that it holds for $n + 1$ ones. Thus consider a set $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_{n+1}\} \in \mathcal{P}_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n+1}, R}$ as in (6.6). Denoting $\tilde{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$, by the induction assumption we have $S_{\tilde{P}}(t) = ((S_{P_1})_{P_2} \dots)_{P_n}(t)$, $t > 0$.

Given $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and $u_0 \in X^\gamma$, let $u, v \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty$ be $u(t) = S_P u_0(t)$ and $v(t) = ((S_{P_1})_{P_2} \dots)_{P_{n+1}}(t) u_0$ for $t > 0$. Therefore, they are, respectively, the unique solutions in $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty$ of

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) &= S(t)u_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \int_0^t S(t-s)P_i u(s) ds, \\ v(t) &= S_{\bar{P}}(t)u_0 + \int_0^t S_{\bar{P}}(t-s)P_{n+1}v(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

The induction assumption gives that

$$S_{\bar{P}}(t)u_0 = S(t)u_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t S(t-s)P_i S_{\bar{P}}(s)u_0 ds,$$

and also

$$S_{\bar{P}}(t-s)P_{n+1}v(s) = S(t-s)P_{n+1}v(s) + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{t-s} S(t-s-\xi)P_i S_{\bar{P}}(\xi)P_{n+1}v(s) d\xi.$$

Therefore

$$v(t) = S(t)u_0 + \int_0^t S(t-s)P_{n+1}v(s) ds + \mathcal{R}(t)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(t) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t S(t-s)P_i S_{\bar{P}}(s)u_0 ds + \int_0^t \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{t-s} S(t-s-\xi)P_i S_{\bar{P}}(\xi)P_{n+1}v(s) d\xi \right) ds \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t S(t-s)P_i S_{\bar{P}}(s)u_0 ds + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \left(\int_s^t S(t-\sigma)P_i S_{\bar{P}}(\sigma-s)P_{n+1}v(s) d\sigma \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using the uniqueness in Theorem 6.5, we will get $u(t) = v(t)$ for $t > 0$ if we show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t S(t-s)P_i v(s) ds = \mathcal{R}(t) \tag{6.19}$$

for which we compute below the term in the left hand side.

For this, using again that $v(s) = S_{\bar{P}}(s)u_0 + \int_0^s S_{\bar{P}}(s-\xi)P_{n+1}v(\xi) d\xi$ and that $S(t-s)P_i \in \mathcal{L}(X^\alpha)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, we see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t S(t-s)P_i v(s) ds = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t S(t-s)P_i S_{\bar{P}}(s)u_0 ds + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \int_0^s S(t-s)P_i S_{\bar{P}}(s-\xi)P_{n+1}v(\xi) d\xi ds,$$

which after integration with respect to $s \in (0, t)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t S(t-s)P_i v(s) ds &= \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t S(t-s)P_i S_{\bar{P}}(s)u_0 ds \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \left(\int_0^s S(t-s)P_i S_{\bar{P}}(s-\xi)P_{n+1}v(\xi) d\xi \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the first term above is the same as the first term in $\mathcal{R}(t)$ above. After changing the order of integration, the second term above equals

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \left(\int_\xi^t S(t-s)P_i S_{\bar{P}}(s-\xi)P_{n+1}v(\xi) ds \right) d\xi$$

and after relabelling $s \mapsto \sigma$ and $\xi \mapsto s$, this is precisely the second term $\mathcal{R}(t)$ above. Hence (6.19) holds true and the result is proved. ■

Now we analyse the regularisation properties of the family $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in the scale. That is, the set of spaces to which $S_P(t)u_0$ belongs; the regularity set for (6.5). For this, for each $\beta \in \mathbb{J}$ define

$$\mathcal{R}_\beta \stackrel{\text{def}}{:=} \{\gamma' \in \mathbb{J} : \mathbf{r}(\gamma') \in [\mathbf{r}(\beta), \mathbf{r}(\beta) + 1) \text{ and } \beta \overset{S(t)}{\rightsquigarrow} \gamma'\}. \quad (6.20)$$

In particular for such γ' we have $0 \leq d(\gamma', \beta) < 1$.

Theorem 6.9 (Smoothing of solutions). *Assume $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6) and \mathcal{R}_{β_i} as in (6.20) and consider*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{:=} \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}_{\beta_i}.$$

Then $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n}$. Moreover,

- (i) *Assume $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$, $\gamma' \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n}$ and $\gamma \overset{S(t)}{\dashrightarrow} \gamma'$. Then $\gamma \overset{S_P(t)}{\dashrightarrow} \gamma'$, that is, for any $T > 0$ there exists $M = M(\gamma, \gamma', T)$ (non decreasing in T) such that*

$$\|S_P(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma, X^{\gamma'})} \leq \frac{M}{t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}}, \quad 0 < t \leq T. \quad (6.21)$$

- (ii) *Assume $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$, $\gamma' \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n}$ and $\gamma \overset{S(t)}{\rightsquigarrow} \gamma'$. Then $\gamma \overset{S_P(t)}{\rightsquigarrow} \gamma'$, that is, (6.21) holds and*

$$(0, t) \ni t \rightarrow S_P(t)u_0 \in X^{\gamma'} \text{ is continuous for every } u_0 \in X^\gamma. \quad (6.22)$$

Proof. Notice that (6.6) implies $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n}$.

Now, given $u_0 \in X^\gamma$ and $T > 0$ and using (6.5) with $u(t) = S_P(t)u_0$ we have for $0 < t \leq T < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t)\|_{\gamma'} &\leq \frac{C}{t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}} \|u_0\|_\gamma + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{C}{(t-s)^{d(\gamma', \beta_i)}} \|P_i\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha, X^{\beta_i})} \|u(s)\|_\alpha ds \\ &\leq \frac{C}{t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}} \|u_0\|_\gamma + CR \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 \frac{t^{1-d(\alpha, \gamma)-d(\gamma', \beta_i)}}{(1-\zeta)^{d(\gamma', \beta_i)} \zeta^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} d\zeta \|u\|_T \end{aligned} \quad (6.23)$$

where we have set $\|u\|_T = \|u\|_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma), T}$. Since $d(\alpha, \gamma) < 1$ and $d(\gamma', \beta_i) < 1$ for all i , we conclude that

$$u(t) = S_P(t)u_0 \in X^{\gamma'} \quad \text{for } t > 0.$$

From (6.14) we see that $\|u\|_T \leq C\|u_0\|_\gamma$. Hence from (6.23) we obtain

$$\|u(t)\|_{\gamma'} \leq \left(\frac{C}{t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}} + RC \sum_{i=1}^n t^{1-d(\alpha, \gamma)-d(\gamma', \beta_i)} \int_0^1 \frac{d\zeta}{(1-\zeta)^{d(\gamma', \beta_i)} \zeta^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} \right) \|u_0\|_\gamma.$$

Now, we multiply both sides of the above inequality by $t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}$ and observing that $1 - d(\alpha, \gamma) - d(\gamma', \beta_i) + d(\gamma', \gamma) = 1 - d(\alpha, \beta_i) > 0$, because of (6.6), we get

$$t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)} \|S_P(t)u_0\|_{\gamma'} \leq C\|u_0\|_\gamma, \quad u_0 \in X^\gamma, \quad 0 < t \leq T.$$

This completes the proof of part (i).

Concerning part (ii) we only need to prove (6.22). Not being too exhaustive we now observe that continuity in (6.22) follows analogously as in the proof of Lemma 6.6. Namely, we replace in (6.16) and (6.17) α by γ' and see that $\|(S(t+h-s) - S(t-s))P_i u(s)\|_{\gamma'}$ is estimated by function $\frac{2RC}{(t-s)^{d(\gamma', \beta_i)} s^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} \|u\|_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma), T}$, which is integrable for $s \in (0, t)$ and for such s we also see that (6.18) holds true with α replaced by γ' , because $P_i u(s) \in X^{\beta_i}$ and by assumption $(0, \infty) \ni t \rightarrow S(t)\phi \in X^{\gamma'}$ is continuous when $\phi \in X^{\beta_i}$. Hence we get, via Lebesgue's theorem $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} j_{h, \gamma'}^+ = 0$. After similar modifications we get $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} I_{2, \gamma'}(h) = 0$ and $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^-} I_{2, \gamma'}(h) = 0$, which leads to (6.22). ■

Now we can prove the joint continuity of $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ with respect to time and the initial data.

Corollary 6.10. Assume $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6).

If $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$, $\gamma' \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n}$ and $\gamma \xrightarrow{S(t)} \gamma'$ then

$$(0, \infty) \times X^\gamma \ni (t, u_0) \rightarrow S_P(t)u_0 \in X^{\gamma'} \text{ is continuous.}$$

Proof. Consider $(t_0, u_0) \in (0, \infty) \times X^\gamma$ and a sequence $\{(t_n, u_{0n})\} \subset (0, \infty) \times X^\gamma$ such that $(t_n, u_{0n}) \rightarrow (t_0, u_0)$ in $(0, \infty) \times X^\gamma$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Write

$$S_P(t_n)u_{0n} - S_P(t_0)u_0 = S_P(t_n)u_{0n} - S_P(t_n)u_0 + S_P(t_n)u_0 - S_P(t_0)u_0.$$

From (6.21) $\|S_P(t_n)u_{0n} - S_P(t_n)u_0\|_{X^{\gamma'}} \leq \frac{C}{t_n^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}} \|u_{0n} - u_0\|_{X^\gamma} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, from (6.22), $\|S_P(t_n)u_0 - S_P(t_0)u_0\|_{X^{\gamma'}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S_P(t_n)u_{0n} - S_P(t_0)u_0\|_{X^{\gamma'}} \rightarrow 0$. ■

The next result describes the behavior of $S_P(t)u_0$ at $t = 0$.

Theorem 6.11. Assume $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6) and let $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and $\gamma' \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n}$ such that $0 \leq d(\gamma', \gamma) < 1 - d(\alpha, \beta_i)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Then for $u_0 \in X^\gamma$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \|S_P(t)u_0 - S(t)u_0\|_{\gamma'} = 0. \quad (6.24)$$

Proof. Observe that $v(t) = S_P(t)u_0 - S(t)u_0$ satisfies, as the second term in (6.23),

$$\|v(t)\|_{\gamma'} \leq RC \sum_{i=1}^n t^{1-d(\alpha, \gamma) - d(\gamma', \beta_i)} \int_0^1 \frac{1}{(1-\zeta)^{d(\gamma', \beta_i)} \zeta^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} d\zeta \|S_P(\cdot)u_0\|_T$$

and $1 - d(\alpha, \gamma) - d(\gamma', \beta_i) = 1 - d(\alpha, \beta_i) - d(\gamma', \gamma) > 0$ which leads to (6.24). ■

Now we show Lipschitz continuous dependence of $S_P(t)u_0$ with respect to P and u_0 .

Theorem 6.12 (Continuous dependence on perturbations). Assume $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ and $\tilde{P} = \{\tilde{P}_1, \dots, \tilde{P}_n\}$ satisfy (6.6) and define $|P - \tilde{P}|_{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n} = \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \|P_i - \tilde{P}_i\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha, X^{\beta_i})}$. Also, assume $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and $u_0, \tilde{u}_0 \in X^\gamma$ are such that $\|u_0\|_\gamma, \|\tilde{u}_0\|_\gamma \leq \mathcal{R}$.

Then for $\gamma' \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n}$ such that $\gamma \xrightarrow{S(t)} \gamma'$, and $T > 0$, we have, for $0 < t \leq T$,

$$\|S_P(t)u_0 - S_{\tilde{P}}(t)\tilde{u}_0\|_{\gamma'} \leq \frac{M_0}{t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}} \left(\|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_\gamma + |P - \tilde{P}|_{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n} \right), \quad (6.25)$$

and

$$\|S_P(t) - S_{\tilde{P}}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma, X^{\gamma'})} \leq \frac{M_1}{t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}} |P - \tilde{P}|_{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n}, \quad (6.26)$$

where M_0 and M_1 depend on $\alpha, \beta_i, \gamma, \gamma', R$ and T . Additionally M_0 depends on \mathcal{R} .

Proof. We see that $U(\cdot) := S_P(\cdot)u_0 - S_{\tilde{P}}(\cdot)\tilde{u}_0$ satisfies

$$U(t) = S(t)(u_0 - \tilde{u}_0) + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t S(t-\tau) \left(P_i U(\tau) + (P_i - \tilde{P}_i) S_{\tilde{P}}(\tau) \tilde{u}_0 \right) d\tau, \quad t > 0$$

and that given $\theta > 0$ we have, for $0 < t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\theta t} t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)} \|U(t)\|_{\gamma'} &\leq C \|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_\gamma + C \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{e^{-\theta t} t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}}{(t-\tau)^{d(\gamma', \beta_i)}} R \|U(\tau)\|_\alpha d\tau \\ &\quad + C \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}}{(t-\tau)^{d(\gamma', \beta_i)}} |P - \tilde{P}|_{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n} \|S_{\tilde{P}}(\tau) \tilde{u}_0\|_\alpha d\tau \\ &\leq C \|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_\gamma + RC \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 \frac{t^{1-d(\alpha, \beta_i)} e^{-\theta t(1-\zeta)}}{(1-\zeta)^{d(\gamma', \beta_i)} \zeta^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} d\zeta \|U\|_{T, \theta} \\ &\quad + |P - \tilde{P}|_{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n} C \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 \frac{t^{1-d(\alpha, \beta_i)} e^{-\theta t(1-\zeta)}}{(1-\zeta)^{d(\gamma', \beta_i)} \zeta^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}} d\zeta \|S_{\tilde{P}}(s) \tilde{u}_0\|_{T, \theta}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have set $||| \cdot |||_{T,\theta} = ||| \cdot |||_{\alpha,d(\alpha,\gamma),T,\theta}$. From (6.14) we have $|||S_{\tilde{P}}(s)\tilde{u}_0|||_{T,\theta} \leq C\|\tilde{u}_0\|_\gamma$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} |||U|||_{\gamma',d(\gamma',\gamma),T,\theta} &\leq RC \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(\theta) |||U|||_{T,\theta} \\ &+ C \left(1 + \mathcal{R} \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(\theta) \right) \left(\|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_\gamma + |P - \tilde{P}|_{\alpha,\beta_1,\dots,\beta_n} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.27)$$

with

$$c_i(\theta) = \sup_{t \in (0,T]} t^{1-d(\alpha,\beta_i)} e^{-\theta t} \int_0^1 \frac{e^{\theta t \zeta}}{(1-\zeta)^{d(\gamma',\beta_i)} \zeta^{d(\alpha,\gamma)}} d\zeta.$$

Now, observe that $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta_1,\dots,\beta_n}$, see Theorem 6.9, and since $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ then $\gamma \overset{S(t)}{\rightsquigarrow} \alpha$. Hence, we can take first $\gamma' = \alpha$, and as in (6.13), for θ large enough $RC \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(\theta) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and hence we get

$$|||U|||_{T,\theta} \leq 2C \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{R}}{R} \right) \left(\|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_\gamma + |P - \tilde{P}|_{\alpha,\beta_1,\dots,\beta_n} \right).$$

Plugging this in the right side of (6.27) we obtain (6.25).

Finally, (6.25) with $u_0 = \tilde{u}_0$ and $\mathcal{R} = 1$ gives (6.26). ■

6.2. Perturbations of a semigroup in the scale. We now assume that we have a semigroup in the scale as in Definition 6.1. As noticed above Theorem 6.5 in this case we have $\alpha \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$. Our goal is to show that $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is still a semigroup at least in some spaces of the scale. The first basic result is the following.

Proposition 6.13. *Assume $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup in the scale and $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6).*

If $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and $u_0 \in X^\gamma$ then

$$S_P(t_1 + t_2)u_0 = S_P(t_1)S_P(t_2)u_0 \quad (6.28)$$

holds as the equality in X^α for all $t_1, t_2 > 0$.

Proof. For $u_0 \in X^\gamma$, using (6.5) and that $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup in the scale, we have

$$S_P(t + t_1)u_0 = S(t)S(t_1)u_0 + S(t) \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{t_1} S(t_1 - \tau)P_i S_P(\tau) d\tau + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{t_1}^{t+t_1} S(t + t_1 - \tau)P_i S_P(\tau) d\tau.$$

After the change of variable $\tau - t_1 = s$ in the last integral above, we conclude that

$$S_P(t + t_1)u_0 = S(t)S_P(t_1)u_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t S(t - s)P_i S_P(s + t_1)u_0 ds,$$

that is, $v(\cdot) = S_P(\cdot + t_1)u_0$ satisfies

$$v(t) = S(t)S_P(t_1)u_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t S(t - s)P_i v(s) ds$$

for $t > 0$. By the uniqueness in $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha,d(\alpha,\gamma)}^\infty$, we get $v(t) = S_P(t)S_P(t_1)u_0$ for $t > 0$ as claimed. ■

Corollary 6.14. *Assume $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup in the scale and $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6).*

Then for $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{P, cI\}$ satisfies (6.6) with $\beta_{n+1} = \alpha$ and for $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and $u_0 \in X^\gamma$

$$S_{\{P,cI\}}(t)u_0 = (S_P)_{cI}(t)u_0 = (S_{cI})_P(t)u_0 = e^{ct}S_P(t)u_0, \quad t > 0.$$

Proof. Since $\alpha \overset{S(t)}{\rightsquigarrow} \alpha$ then clearly $\{P, cI\}$ satisfies (6.6) with $\beta_{n+1} = \alpha$. Also, from Proposition 6.8 it is enough to show that $(S_P)_{cI}(t)u_0 = e^{ct}S_P(t)u_0$ for $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and $u_0 \in X^\gamma$ and $t > 0$.

Let $v \in \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, d(\alpha, \gamma)}^\infty$ be $v(t) = e^{ct}S_P(t)u_0$ for $t > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} S_P(t)u_0 + \int_0^t S_P(t-s)cv(s) ds &= S_P(t)u_0 + \int_0^t S_P(t-s)ce^{cs}S_P(s)u_0 ds \\ &\stackrel{(6.28)}{=} \left(1 + \int_0^t ce^{cs} ds\right)S_P(t)u_0 = e^{ct}S_P(t)u_0 = v(t) \end{aligned}$$

which is precisely the integral equation for $u(t) = (S_P)_{cI}(t)u_0$. ■

In the next theorem we specify spaces in the scale in which $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup.

Theorem 6.15 (Perturbed semigroup in the scale). *Assume $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup in the scale and $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6). Define for each P_i , $\Sigma_{\alpha, \beta_i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{E}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{R}_{\beta_i}$ and*

$$\Sigma_{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{E}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{R}_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n} = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \Sigma_{\alpha, \beta_i}.$$

Then $\alpha \in \Sigma_{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n}$ and for

$$\gamma \in \Sigma_{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n} = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \{\gamma \in \mathbb{J} : \beta_i \overset{S(t)}{\rightsquigarrow} \gamma, \gamma \overset{S(t)}{\rightsquigarrow} \alpha \text{ and } \mathbf{r}(\gamma) \in [\mathbf{r}(\beta_i), \mathbf{r}(\alpha)]\}$$

then $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup in X^γ satisfying for some constants $M_0 = M_0(\gamma)$, ω_γ

$$\|S_P(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma)} \leq M_0 e^{\omega_\gamma t}, \quad t \geq 0 \quad (6.29)$$

and for $u_0 \in X^\gamma$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \|S_P(t)u_0 - S(t)u_0\|_{X^\gamma} = 0. \quad (6.30)$$

For $\gamma' \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n}$ such that $\gamma \overset{S(t)}{\dashrightarrow} \gamma'$ and $T > 0$ there exists a constant $M = M(\gamma, \gamma', T)$ such that

$$\|S_P(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma, X^{\gamma'})} \leq \begin{cases} \frac{M}{t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}}, & 0 < t \leq T \\ M e^{\omega_\gamma t}, & T < t. \end{cases}$$

In particular, for any $\omega > \omega_\gamma$, there exists a constant $M_1 = M_1(\gamma, \gamma')$ independent of $t > 0$ such that

$$\|S_P(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma, X^{\gamma'})} \leq \frac{M_1}{t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}} e^{\omega t}, \quad t > 0. \quad (6.31)$$

Proof. This is a consequence of Theorem 6.9, Proposition 6.13 and Lemma 6.2. Finally, using (6.24) with $\gamma' = \gamma$ we obtain (6.30). ■

Finally we obtain some result in which we have a more precise estimate on the exponential type of $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, that is, of the exponents in the exponentials in (6.29) for $\gamma = \alpha$. This estimate will be obtained in terms of the corresponding exponentials for $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ and the size of the perturbations.

Proposition 6.16 (Exponential bounds for the perturbed semigroup). *Assume $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup in the scale and $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6) and assume*

$$\|S(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha)} \leq M_0 e^{\omega_\alpha t}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Then for any $a > \omega_\alpha$ there exists a constant M_1 such that for $u_0 \in X^\alpha$

$$\|S_P(t)u_0\|_\alpha \leq M_1 \|u_0\|_\alpha e^{(a + \theta_P)t}, \quad t > 0$$

with

$$\theta_P = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \|P_i\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha, X^{\beta_i})}^{\frac{1}{1-d(\alpha, \beta_i)}}.$$

for some constants $c_i = c_i(\alpha, \beta_i)$.

Also for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and $T > 0$ there is a certain constant $M = M(T)$ such that

$$\|S_P(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma, X^\alpha)} \leq \begin{cases} \frac{M}{t^{d(\alpha, \gamma)}}, & 0 < t \leq T \\ Me^{(a+\theta_P)t}, & T < t. \end{cases} \quad (6.32)$$

Proof. Using Proposition 6.8 we add one perturbation at a time. By the assumption we have $\beta_1 \overset{S(t)}{\rightsquigarrow} \alpha$ and by Lemma 6.2 we have, for any $a > \omega_\alpha$,

$$\|S(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha)} \leq Ce^{at}, \quad \|S(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^{\beta_1}, X^\alpha)} \leq \frac{C}{t^{d(\alpha, \beta_1)}} e^{at}, \quad t > 0. \quad (6.33)$$

Then

$$\|S_{P_1}(t)u_0\|_\alpha \leq Ce^{at}\|u_0\|_\alpha + \int_0^t \frac{Ce^{a(t-s)}}{(t-s)^{d(\alpha, \beta_1)}} \|P_1\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha, X^{\beta_1})} \|S_{P_1}(s)u_0\|_\alpha ds, \quad t > 0.$$

Hence, $u(t) = e^{-at}\|S_{P_1}(t)u_0\|_\alpha$ satisfies

$$u(t) \leq C\|u_0\|_\alpha + \int_0^t \frac{C}{(t-s)^{d(\alpha, \beta_1)}} \|P_1\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha, X^{\beta_1})} u(s) ds, \quad t > 0.$$

Then from [8, Lemma 7.1.1] we get

$$u(t) \leq C\|u_0\|_\alpha e^{\theta_1 t}, \quad t \geq 0$$

with

$$\theta_1 = \left(CT(1 - d(\alpha, \beta_1)) \|P_1\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha, X^{\beta_1})} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-d(\alpha, \beta_1)}}.$$

Hence

$$\|S_{P_1}(t)u_0\|_\alpha \leq C\|u_0\|_\alpha e^{(a+\theta_1)t} \quad t > 0. \quad (6.34)$$

Now by assumption we have $\beta_2 \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and then, by Theorem 6.5, $\beta_2 \overset{S_{P_1}(t)}{\rightsquigarrow} \alpha$ so we use again Lemma 6.2 for $S_{P_1}(t)$ so we get

$$\|S_{P_1}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^{\beta_2}, X^\alpha)} \leq \frac{C}{t^{d(\alpha, \beta_2)}} e^{(a+\theta_1)t}, \quad t > 0$$

which together to (6.34) is like (6.33) but for $S_{P_1}(t)$.

Now we perturb this semigroup with P_2 and denote $P = \{P_1, P_2\}$ then from the argument above, for any $a > \omega_\alpha$,

$$\|S_P(t)u_0\|_\alpha \leq C\|u_0\|_\alpha e^{(a+\theta_1+\theta_2)t}, \quad t > 0$$

with $\theta_2 = \left(CT(1 - d(\alpha, \beta_2)) \|P_2\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha, X^{\beta_2})} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-d(\alpha, \beta_2)}}$.

Reiterating the perturbations for $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ we get for any $a > \omega_\alpha$,

$$\|S_P(t)u_0\|_\alpha \leq C\|u_0\|_\alpha e^{(a+\theta_P)t}, \quad t > 0$$

with $\theta_P = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i$ as in the statement.

Finally, (6.32) is a consequence of Lemma 6.2. ■

6.3. Perturbations of an analytic semigroup in the scale. We now consider the case when the unperturbed semigroup is analytic with sectorial generator in some space of the scale as we now define, see e.g. [11, Definition 2.0.1] although notice that we changed a bit the notations in this reference. The goal is to show that the perturbed semigroup is also analytic and to identify its generator.

Definition 6.17. If $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup in a Banach space X , we say that $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is analytic in X with sectorial generator iff there is a linear operator L defined on domain $D(L)$ (which we do not assume to be dense in X) such that, denoting in general, for $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $\theta \in (0, \pi)$,

$$S_{a, \theta} = \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{C_{a, \theta}} \quad \text{where } C_{a, \theta} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{a\}, |\text{Arg}(z - a)| < \theta\},$$

then for some $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\theta_0 \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$ we have $S_{a_0, \theta_0} \subset \rho(L)$ (the resolvent set of L) and

$$\sup_{\lambda \in S_{a_0, \theta_0}} |\lambda - a_0| \|(L - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} < \infty \quad (6.35)$$

and

$$S(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{a_0 + \Gamma_{r,\eta}} e^{-\lambda t} (L - \lambda)^{-1} d\lambda \quad \text{for } t > 0$$

where, for fixed $0 < \theta_0 < \eta < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $r > 0$, $\Gamma_{r,\eta}$ denotes the clockwise oriented curve $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\text{Arg}(\lambda)| = \eta, |\lambda| \geq r\} \cup \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\text{Arg}(\lambda)| \leq \eta, |\lambda| = r\}$.

In such a case, we write $S(t) = e^{-Lt}$ in X for $t > 0$ and $-L$ is the sectorial generator of the semigroup.

Remark 6.18. (i) When a semigroup is analytic with sectorial generator as above, then the resolvent operator of L can be computed with the semigroup. More precisely, if $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is analytic in X with sectorial generator as above, then in particular $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Re}(\lambda) < a_0\} \subset \rho(L)$,

$$D(L) = (L - \lambda)^{-1}(X), \quad \text{Re}(\lambda) < a_0 \quad (6.36)$$

and from [11, (2.1.1)(a)] for some constant c

$$\|S(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \leq ce^{-a_0 t}, \quad t > 0.$$

Then, from [11, Lemma 2.1.6], for $\text{Re}(\lambda) < a_0$ and $u_0 \in X$, we have

$$(L - \lambda)^{-1}u_0 = G(\lambda)u_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} S(t)u_0 dt. \quad (6.37)$$

(ii) To identify the sectorial generator of the perturbed semigroup $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ and to prove it is analytic, we will consider the candidate for resolvent, as in the right hand side of (6.37), see (6.40) below, which are denoted pseudoresolvents, and prove, using a result in [11], that (6.40) is actually the resolvent of some operator, see Lemma 6.20.

The next result establishes a relationship between the pseudoresolvents of the semigroups $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ and $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$. Observe that we do not use yet that $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is analytic. Also notice that the subscripts in the operators $G_{\gamma,\gamma'}$ and $F_{\gamma,\gamma'}$ below are used to indicate in which spaces these operators act.

Proposition 6.19. Assume $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup in the scale and $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6).

(i) If $\gamma \overset{S(t)}{\rightsquigarrow} \gamma'$ with $d(\gamma', \gamma) < 1$ then let $a_{\gamma'}$ be the exponent in (6.3) for the space $X^{\gamma'}$. Then for $a > a_{\gamma'}$ and $\text{Re}(\lambda) < -a$, the pseudoresolvent maps

$$X^\gamma \ni u_0 \rightarrow G_{\gamma,\gamma'}(\lambda)u_0 = \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} S(t)u_0 dt \in X^{\gamma'} \quad (6.38)$$

satisfy, for some constant M ,

$$\|G_{\gamma,\gamma'}(\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma, X^{\gamma'})} \leq \frac{M\Gamma(1 - d(\gamma', \gamma))}{|\text{Re}(\lambda + a)|^{1-d(\gamma', \gamma)}}, \quad \text{Re}(\lambda) < -a, \quad (6.39)$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is Euler's gamma function.

(ii) For $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and $\gamma' \in \Sigma_{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n}$ let $\omega_{\gamma'}$ be the exponent in (6.29) in the space $X^{\gamma'}$. Then for $\omega > \omega_{\gamma'}$ and $\text{Re}(\lambda) < -\omega$, the pseudoresolvent maps

$$X^\gamma \ni u_0 \mapsto F_{\gamma,\gamma'}(\lambda)u_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} S_P(t)u_0 dt \in X^{\gamma'} \quad (6.40)$$

satisfy, for some constant C ,

$$\|F_{\gamma,\gamma'}(\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma, X^{\gamma'})} \leq \frac{C\Gamma(1 - d(\gamma', \gamma))}{|\text{Re}(\lambda + \omega)|^{1-d(\gamma', \gamma)}}, \quad \text{Re}(\lambda) < -\omega.$$

(iii) For $\gamma \in \Sigma_{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n}$ and $\gamma \overset{S(t)}{\rightsquigarrow} \gamma$, there exists $k > 0$ such that for $\text{Re}(\lambda) < -k$, the pseudoresolvents $G_{\gamma,\gamma}(\lambda)$, $G_{\beta_i,\gamma}(\lambda)$ with $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $F_{\gamma,\gamma}(\lambda)$, $F_{\gamma,\alpha}(\lambda)$ as above are well defined and for $u_0 \in X^\gamma$

$$F_{\gamma,\gamma}(\lambda)u_0 = G_{\gamma,\gamma}(\lambda)u_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n G_{\beta_i,\gamma}(\lambda)P_i F_{\gamma,\alpha}(\lambda)u_0, \quad \text{Re}(\lambda) < -k. \quad (6.41)$$

Proof. (i) Since for $u_0 \in X^\gamma$, $(0, \infty) \ni t \rightarrow S(t)u_0 \in X^{\gamma'}$ is continuous and $Re(\lambda) < -a$, then using (6.4) we have $\int_0^\infty \|e^{\lambda t} S(t)u_0\|_{X^{\gamma'}} dt \leq M \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{Re(\lambda+a)t}}{t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}} dt \|u_0\|_{X^\gamma}$ and we get the estimate.

(ii) From Theorem 6.9, $(0, \infty) \ni t \rightarrow S_P(t)u_0 \in X^{\gamma'}$ is continuous and since $Re(\lambda) < -\omega$ and (6.31), we see that $\int_0^\infty \|e^{\lambda t} S_P(t)u_0\|_{X^{\gamma'}} dt \leq C \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{Re(\lambda+\omega)t}}{t^{d(\gamma', \gamma)}} dt \|u_0\|_{X^\gamma}$ and we get the estimate.

(iii) For $u_0 \in X^\gamma$ and negative enough $Re(\lambda)$, since $u(t) = S_P(t)u_0$ satisfies (6.5), we multiply this expression by $e^{\lambda t}$ and then we integrate with respect to $t \in (0, \infty)$ to get

$$F_{\gamma, \gamma}(\lambda)u_0 = G_{\gamma, \gamma}(\lambda)u_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\infty \left(e^{\lambda t} \int_0^t S(t-s)P_i S_P(s)u_0 ds \right) dt. \quad (6.42)$$

After changing the order of integration and the change of variable $\tau = t - s$ we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\infty \left(\int_0^t e^{\lambda t} S(t-s)P_i S_P(s)u_0 ds \right) dt &= \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\infty \left(\int_s^\infty e^{\lambda t} S(t-s)P_i S_P(s)u_0 dt \right) ds \\ &= \int_0^\infty \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda \tau} S(\tau)P_i e^{\lambda s} S_P(s)u_0 d\tau \right) ds \\ &= \int_0^\infty \sum_{i=1}^n G_{\beta_i, \gamma}(\lambda)P_i e^{\lambda s} S_P(s)u_0 ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using (6.39) with $\gamma = \beta_i$, $\gamma' = \gamma$ and (6.6) we see that $\sum_{i=1}^n G_{\beta_i, \gamma}(\lambda)P_i \in \mathcal{L}(X^\alpha, X^\gamma)$, whereas using (6.39) with $\gamma' = \alpha$ we see that $e^{\lambda \cdot} S_P(\cdot)u_0 \in L^1((0, \infty), X^\alpha)$. Therefore, via [1, Proposition 1.4.22] we obtain

$$\int_0^\infty \sum_{i=1}^n G_{\beta_i, \gamma}P_i e^{\lambda s} S_P(s)u_0 ds = \sum_{i=1}^n G_{\beta_i, \gamma}(\lambda)P_i \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda s} S_P(s)u_0 ds = \sum_{i=1}^n G_{\beta_i, \gamma}(\lambda)P_i F_{\gamma, \alpha}(\lambda)u_0.$$

As a consequence, for all negative enough $Re(\lambda)$ the right hand side in (6.42) is equal to $G_{\gamma, \gamma}(\lambda)u_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n G_{\beta_i, \alpha}(\lambda)P_i F_{\gamma, \alpha}(\lambda)u_0$ and thus (6.41) is proven. ■

The next result shows that if $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is analytic in X^γ with sectorial generator then the pseudoresolvents above are actually the resolvent of some operator.

Lemma 6.20. *Assume $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup in the scale and $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6).*

Assume $\gamma \in \Sigma_{\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n}$ and $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is analytic in X^γ with sectorial generator, then there exists ω_γ such that for $Re(\lambda) < -\omega_\gamma$ the maps $F_{\gamma, \gamma}(\lambda)$ in Proposition 6.19 are well defined and there exists a linear operator Λ in X^γ such that $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : Re(\lambda) < -\omega_\gamma\} \subset \rho(\Lambda)$ and for $u_0 \in X^\gamma$

$$(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1}u_0 = F_{\gamma, \gamma}(\lambda)u_0, \quad Re(\lambda) < -\omega_\gamma.$$

Also, the domain $D(\Lambda)$ of Λ is given by

$$D(\Lambda) = (\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1}(X^\gamma), \quad Re(\lambda) < -\omega_\gamma. \quad (6.43)$$

Proof. From Proposition 6.19 with $\gamma' = \gamma$, the maps $F_{\gamma, \gamma}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{L}(X^\gamma)$ are well defined for $Re(\lambda) < -\omega_\gamma$. We also have, see [11, p. 42],

$$F_{\gamma, \gamma}(\lambda_1) - F_{\gamma, \gamma}(\lambda_2) = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)F_{\gamma, \gamma}(\lambda_1)F_{\gamma, \gamma}(\lambda_2), \quad Re(\lambda_1), Re(\lambda_2) < -\omega_\gamma. \quad (6.44)$$

Now we prove that $F_{\gamma, \gamma}(\lambda)$ is injective for $Re(\lambda) < -\omega_\gamma$. Due to (6.44), if $u_0 \in X^\gamma$ and $F_{\gamma, \gamma}(\lambda)u_0 = 0$ for some $Re(\lambda) < -\omega_\gamma$ then $F_{\gamma, \gamma}(\lambda)u_0 = 0$ for all $Re(\lambda) < -\omega_\gamma$. Then for any functional $l \in (X^\gamma)'$ the function $\chi_l(\cdot) = l(S_P(\cdot)u_0)$ satisfies

$$\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} \chi_l(t) dt = 0 \quad \text{for all } Re(\lambda) < -\omega_\gamma. \quad (6.45)$$

Then we claim that $\chi_l(\cdot)$ must be zero in $(0, \infty)$ for every $l \in (X^\gamma)'$, which implies that $S_P(\cdot)u_0 = 0$ in $(0, \infty)$. Since $u(t) = S_P(t)u_0$ satisfies (6.5) then we get that $S(\cdot)u_0 = 0$ in $(0, \infty)$. Then [11, Corollary 2.1.7] yields $u_0 = 0$. Thus $F_{\gamma, \gamma}(\lambda)$ is injective for $Re(\lambda) < -\omega_\gamma$ and using [11, Proposition A.0.2] we get the result.

To prove the claim above, observe that χ_l grows like $e^{\omega_\gamma t}$. So take $\lambda = b - n - 1$ with $b < -\omega_\gamma$ and $n = 0, 1, \dots$ to get

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-nt} (e^{bt} e^{-t} \chi_l(t)) = 0.$$

Then take $s = e^{-t}$ to get

$$\int_0^1 s^n (s^{-b} \chi_l(-\ln(s))) = 0$$

and

$$|g(s)| := |s^{-b} \chi_l(-\ln(s))| \leq s^{-b} e^{-\omega_\gamma \ln(s)} = s^{-b-\omega_\gamma}$$

and $b < -\omega_\gamma$ implies $g(s)$ is bounded in $(0, 1)$. So g is orthogonal in $(0, 1)$ to all polynomials and then to all continuous functions and to all $L^1(0, 1)$ functions. So $g = 0$ and the claim is proved. ■

We are now ready to prove analyticity results for the perturbed semigroup $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$. The first result is about analyticity in the common domain of the perturbations.

Theorem 6.21. *Assume $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup in the scale and $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ satisfies (6.6).*

If $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is analytic in X^α with sectorial generator then $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is analytic in X^α with sectorial generator, $-L_P$.

Proof. By Definition 6.17 there exists an operator L satisfying (6.35) in X^α . In particular $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < a_0\} \subset \rho(L)$ and for some constant C_0

$$\|(L - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha)} \leq \frac{C_0}{|\lambda - a_0|}, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < a_0 \quad (6.46)$$

and from (6.37) and (6.38), for $u_0 \in X^\alpha$,

$$(L - \lambda)^{-1} u_0 = G_{\alpha, \alpha}(\lambda) u_0, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < a_0.$$

Now from Lemma 6.20 with $\gamma = \alpha$ we have the operator Λ in X^α such that $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -\omega_\alpha\} \subset \rho(\Lambda)$ and for $u_0 \in X^\alpha$,

$$(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1} u_0 = F_{\alpha, \alpha}(\lambda) u_0, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -\omega_\alpha. \quad (6.47)$$

Using these and part (iii) in Proposition 6.19 with $\gamma = \alpha$, we get for large enough k and $u_0 \in X^\alpha$,

$$(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1} u_0 = (L - \lambda)^{-1} u_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n G_{\beta_i, \alpha}(\lambda) P_i (\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1} u_0, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -k. \quad (6.48)$$

Now from (6.6) and (6.39), we can choose k so large that

$$\sup_{\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \leq -k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n G_{\beta_i, \alpha}(\lambda) P_i \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha)} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Then we get

$$\|(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1} u_0\|_\alpha \leq 2 \|(L - \lambda)^{-1} u_0\|_\alpha, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -k.$$

and from (6.46) we obtain

$$\|(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1} u_0\|_\alpha \leq \frac{2C_0}{|\lambda - a_0|} \|u_0\|_\alpha, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -k.$$

Then $\|\lambda(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha)} \leq \frac{2C_0}{|1 + \frac{a_0}{\lambda}|}$ for $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -k$ and, increasing k if needed, we conclude that

$$\sup_{\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \leq -k} |\lambda| \|(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha)} \leq 4C_0, \quad (6.49)$$

as $|\frac{a_0}{\lambda}| \leq \frac{|a_0|}{k} < \frac{1}{2}$ for $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \leq -k$.

This implies, using [11, Proposition 2.1.11] and Definition 6.17, that for some $0 < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$

$$S_{-k, \theta} \subset \rho(\Lambda), \quad \sup_{\lambda \in S_{-k, \theta}} |\lambda + k| \|(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\alpha)} < \infty.$$

Hence Λ is sectorial in X^α and the corresponding analytic semigroup $\{e^{-\Lambda t}\}_{t \geq 0}$ is given for $\theta < \eta < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $r > 0$ by the formula

$$e^{-\Lambda t} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-k + \Gamma_{r,\eta}} e^{-\lambda t} (\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1} d\lambda, \quad t > 0.$$

Also, [11, Lemma 2.1.6] implies for $u_0 \in X^\alpha$,

$$(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1} u_0 = \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} e^{-\Lambda t} u_0 dt, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -k. \quad (6.50)$$

Then combining (6.47), (6.40) and (6.50) we have for $u_0 \in X^\alpha$ and $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -k$, $\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} S_P(t) u_0 dt = \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} e^{-\Lambda t} u_0 dt$. Thus, arguing as in (6.45) we get

$$S_P(t) u_0 = e^{-\Lambda t} u_0, \quad u_0 \in X^\alpha, \quad t > 0 \quad (6.51)$$

and therefore $\Lambda = L_P$ and $-L_P$ is the sectorial generator of the semigroup $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in X^α . ■

In a similar way, the next result is about analyticity in the range of a single perturbation.

Theorem 6.22. *Assume (6.6) holds with $\beta_1 = \dots = \beta_n =: \beta$. Then we can assume that we have only one perturbation as in (6.7).*

If $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup in the scale and $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is analytic in X^β with sectorial generator then $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is analytic in X^β with sectorial generator, $-L_P$.

Proof. By Definition 6.17 there exists an operator L satisfying (6.35) in X^β . In particular $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < a_0\} \subset \rho(L)$ and for some constant C_0

$$\|(L - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\beta)} \leq \frac{C_0}{|\lambda - a_0|}, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < a_0 \quad (6.52)$$

and from (6.37) and (6.38), for $u_0 \in X^\beta$,

$$(L - \lambda)^{-1} u_0 = G_{\beta,\beta}(\lambda) u_0, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < a_0.$$

Now from Lemma 6.20 with $\gamma = \beta$ we have the operator Λ in X^β such that $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -\omega_\beta\} \subset \rho(\Lambda)$ and for $u_0 \in X^\beta$,

$$(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1} u_0 = F_{\beta,\beta}(\lambda) u_0 \quad \text{for } \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -\omega_\beta.$$

Part (ii) in Proposition 6.19 with $\gamma = \beta$ and $\gamma' = \alpha$ gives that for a suitably large ω

$$\|F_{\beta,\alpha}(\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\beta, X^\alpha)} \leq \frac{C \Gamma(1 - d(\alpha, \beta))}{|\operatorname{Re}(\lambda + \omega)|^{1 - d(\alpha, \beta)}}, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -\omega. \quad (6.53)$$

while part (iii) in Proposition 6.19 with $\gamma = \beta$ gives, for large enough k and $u_0 \in X^\beta$,

$$(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1} u_0 = (L - \lambda)^{-1} u_0 + (L - \lambda)^{-1} P F_{\beta,\alpha}(\lambda) u_0, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -k. \quad (6.54)$$

Now from (6.6) and (6.53) we can choose k so large that

$$\sup_{\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \leq -k} \|P F_{\beta,\alpha}(\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\beta)} < 1$$

and then

$$\|(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1} u_0\|_\beta \leq 2 \|(L - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\beta)} \|u_0\|_\beta, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -k$$

and from (6.52) we obtain

$$\|(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\beta)} \leq \frac{2C_0}{|\lambda - a_0|}, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -k.$$

From this, arguing as in (6.49)–(6.51) we get that for some $0 < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$

$$S_{-k,\theta} \subset \rho(\Lambda), \quad \sup_{\lambda \in S_{-k,\theta}} |\lambda + k| \|(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\beta)} < \infty,$$

and

$$S_P(t) u_0 = e^{-\Lambda t} u_0, \quad u_0 \in X^\beta, \quad t > 0$$

and therefore $\Lambda = L_P$ and $-L_P$ is the sectorial generator of the semigroup $\{S_P(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in X^β . ■

In the last results in this section, we characterize the operator L_P .

Proposition 6.23. *In the case of Theorem 6.22, let $-L$ be the sectorial generator of $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in X^β .*

Then

$$D(L_P) = D(L) \subset X^\alpha$$

and for $v \in D(L_P)$

$$L_P v = Lv - Pv \in X^\beta$$

Finally for $u_0 \in X^\beta$, $u(t) = S_P(t)u_0$, $t > 0$, satisfies in X^β

$$u_t + Lu = Pu, \quad t > 0.$$

Proof. We follow the notations in the proof of Theorem 6.22. Using (6.36) and (6.43) with $\gamma = \beta$ we have for negative enough $Re(\lambda)$

$$D(L) = (L - \lambda)^{-1}(X^\beta), \quad D(\Lambda) = (\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1}(X^\beta) = D(L_P).$$

Now (6.53) ensures that for $Re(\lambda)$ negative enough the norm of $PF_{\beta,\alpha}(\lambda)$ in X^β is strictly less than 1 and then $I + PF_{\beta,\alpha}(\lambda)$ is bijective from X^β in X^β . But then, from (6.54) we have

$$(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1} = (L - \lambda)^{-1} (I + PF_{\beta,\alpha}(\lambda))$$

and then $D(L) = D(\Lambda)$.

From the consistency of these operators in the spaces of the scale, if $u_0 \in X^\beta$ then $v_0 = (\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1}u_0 = F_{\beta,\alpha}(\lambda)u_0 \in X^\alpha$ and therefore $D(L) \subset X^\alpha$.

Also, from (6.54) we have

$$v_0 = (L - \lambda)^{-1} (I + PF_{\beta,\alpha}(\lambda)) (\Lambda - \lambda)v_0.$$

Applying in both sides $L - \lambda$ we get

$$Lv_0 = \Lambda v_0 + PF_{\beta,\alpha}(\lambda)(\Lambda - \lambda)v_0 = \Lambda v_0 + PF_{\beta,\alpha}(\lambda)u_0 = Lv_0 + Pv_0.$$

The last statement about the equation $u_t + L_P u = 0$ follows now from [11, Proposition 2.1.1] since the perturbed semigroup is analytic in X^β . ■

In the case the perturbations have different ranges we have the following result on the operator L_P in Theorem 6.21 that requires that the unperturbed semigroup is well defined and analytic in a *superspace* that contains all target spaces of the perturbations.

Proposition 6.24. *In the case of Theorem 6.21 assume there is a Banach space Z such that $X^\alpha \subset Z$, $X^{\beta_1} \subset Z, \dots, X^{\beta_n} \subset Z$ continuously and $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is an analytic semigroup in Z with sectorial generator so that $S(t) = e^{-\mathcal{L}t}$ in Z .*

Then

$$D_{X^\alpha}(L_P) \subset D_Z(\mathcal{L})$$

and for $v \in D_{X^\alpha}(L_P)$

$$L_P v = \mathcal{L}v - Pv.$$

Finally for $u_0 \in X^\alpha$, $u(t) = S_P(t)u_0$, $t > 0$, satisfies in X^α

$$u_t + (\mathcal{L}u - \sum_{i=1}^n P_i u) = 0, \quad t > 0.$$

Proof. By assumption, for all negative enough $Re(\lambda)$ and $z_0 \in Z$ we have

$$(\mathcal{L} - \lambda)^{-1}z_0 = \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} S(t)z_0 dt.$$

By consistency, for $Re(\lambda)$ sufficiently negative and $u_0 \in X^{\beta_i} \subset Z$, we have $G_{\beta_i, \alpha}(\lambda)u_0 = (L - \lambda)^{-1}u_0 = (\mathcal{L} - \lambda)^{-1}u_0$, see (6.38). Then (6.48) reads, for $u_0 \in X^\alpha$,

$$(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1}u_0 = (\mathcal{L} - \lambda)^{-1}u_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathcal{L} - \lambda)^{-1}P_i(\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1}u_0. \quad (6.55)$$

Since $D(\Lambda) = (\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1}(X^\alpha) = D_{X^\alpha}(L_P)$ in X^α and $(\mathcal{L} - \lambda)^{-1}(X^\alpha), (\mathcal{L} - \lambda)^{-1}(X_i^\beta) \subset D_Z(\mathcal{L})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, we get $D_{X^\alpha}(L_P) \subset D_Z(\mathcal{L})$.

Now for $u_0 \in X^\alpha$ and $v_0 = (\Lambda - \lambda)^{-1}u_0 \in D_{X^\alpha}(L_P)$, from (6.55) we get

$$v_0 = (\mathcal{L} - \lambda)^{-1}(\Lambda - \lambda)v_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathcal{L} - \lambda)^{-1}P_i v_0.$$

After applying $\mathcal{L} - \lambda$ to both sides of the last equality above and using that $L_P = \Lambda$, we get $L_P v_0 = \mathcal{L} v_0 - \sum_{i=1}^n P_i v_0$.

The last statement about the equation $u_t + L_P u = 0$ follows now from [11, Proposition 2.1.1] since the perturbed semigroup is analytic in X^α . ■

7. LINEAR EQUATION WITH MORREY POTENTIAL

In this section we will use the approach from Section 6, to perturb the semigroup $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, $0 < \mu \leq 1$ associated with the homogeneous problem (4.1) in the Morrey scale.

For this, we first represent the Morrey spaces $\{M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)\}_{p, \ell}$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $0 < \ell \leq N$ (where, for $p = 1$, we can even replace $M^{1, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by $\mathcal{M}^\ell(\mathbb{R}^N)$) in a more convenient way than in (6.2) as follows: we write $X^\gamma = M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ (or $\mathcal{M}^\ell(\mathbb{R}^N)$ if $p = 1$) with

$$(p, \ell) \mapsto \gamma = \gamma(p, \ell) = \left(\frac{1}{p}, \frac{\ell}{2m\mu p} \right) \in \mathbb{J} \quad (7.1)$$

with

$$\mathbb{J} = \mathbb{J}_* \cup \{(0, 0)\}, \quad \mathbb{J}_* = \left\{ (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in (0, 1] \times \left(0, \frac{N}{2m\mu} \right] : \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \leq \frac{N}{2m\mu} \right\} \quad (7.2)$$

which is a planar triangle with vertices $(0, 0)$, $(0, 1)$ and $\left(1, \frac{N}{2m\mu}\right)$, so all points in $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathbb{J}_*$, have slopes $0 \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} = \frac{\ell}{2m\mu p} \leq \frac{N}{2m\mu}$. Also notice that for $p = \infty$ all Morrey spaces $M^{\infty, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ are equal to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and they are mapped by (7.1) into $(0, 0)$. For any $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathbb{J}_*$ there exist a unique $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $0 < \ell \leq N$ such that $X^\gamma = M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

7.1. One perturbation. For simplicity in the exposition we will first consider below only one perturbation given by the multiplication operator by a given potential as in Section 5, see (5.1),

$$V \in M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq p_0 \leq \infty, \ell_0 \in (0, N] \quad (7.3)$$

and so we will show that

$$\begin{cases} u_t + A_0^\mu u = V(x)u, & t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^N \end{cases} \quad (7.4)$$

defines a semigroup in Morrey spaces possessing suitable smoothing and analyticity properties.

Abusing of the notations we will denote by V itself the multiplication operator by V in Morrey spaces.

The next result translates the smoothing of the semigroup $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, $0 < \mu \leq 1$, in Section 4 and the properties of the multiplication operator in Lemma 5.1 into the parameters in (7.1), (7.2).

Lemma 7.1. (i) *The semigroup $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a semigroup in the scale $\{X^\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{J}}$ as in (7.2) as in*

Definition 6.1 and moreover $\gamma \xrightarrow{S_\mu(t)} \tilde{\gamma}$ provided that

$$\tilde{\gamma}_2 \leq \gamma_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_2}{\tilde{\gamma}_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}. \quad (7.5)$$

Moreover,

$$\|S_\mu(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma, X^{\tilde{\gamma}})} = \frac{c}{t^{d(\tilde{\gamma}, \gamma)}} \quad t > 0, \quad (7.6)$$

with $d(\tilde{\gamma}, \gamma) = \mathbf{r}(\gamma') - \mathbf{r}(\gamma) \geq 0$ and regularity mapping

$$\mathbf{r}(\gamma) = -\gamma_2 = -\frac{\ell}{2m\mu p}.$$

Finally for $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}$ the semigroup is analytic in X^γ with the additional restriction that $\gamma_1 < 1$ if $\mu = 1$.

(ii) The assumption (7.3) on V reads

$$V \in X^{\gamma^0}, \quad \gamma^0 = \left(\frac{1}{p_0}, \frac{\ell_0}{2m\mu p_0} \right) \in \mathbb{J}.$$

(iii) For $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}$, the multiplication operator defined by V in Morrey spaces is linear and bounded

$$V : X^\alpha \rightarrow X^\beta, \quad \beta \in \mathbb{J}, \quad \beta = \alpha + \gamma^0$$

provided

$$\alpha_1 + \gamma_1^0 \leq 1.$$

Proof. Part (i) follows from Propositions 4.3 and 4.4, where analyticity is from Proposition 4.1.

(ii) This is by (7.1). Part (iii) is by Lemma 5.1 and since $\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}, \frac{\gamma_2^0}{\gamma_1^0} \leq \frac{N}{2m\mu}$ we have

$$\frac{\beta_2}{\beta_1} = \frac{\alpha_2 + \gamma_2^0}{\alpha_1 + \gamma_1^0} \leq \frac{\frac{N}{2m\mu}(\alpha_1 + \gamma_1^0)}{\alpha_1 + \gamma_1^0} = \frac{N}{2m\mu}.$$

Therefore $\beta = \alpha + \gamma^0 \in \mathbb{J}$ if and only if $\alpha_1 + \gamma_1^0 \leq 1$. ■

Using the results in Section 6, specifically Theorem 6.15, leads us to the following result.

Theorem 7.2. Let A_0 be as in (1.2), $\mu \in (0, 1]$ and assume V is as in (5.1), that is, $V \in M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $1 \leq p_0 \leq \infty$, $0 < \ell_0 \leq N$ and moreover assume

$$\kappa_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\ell_0}{2m\mu p_0} < 1.$$

(i) **(The perturbed semigroup)** For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $0 < \ell \leq \ell_0$, (7.4) defines a semigroup $\{S_{\mu, V}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in $M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that for $u_0 \in M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $u(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S_{\mu, V}(t)u_0$ satisfies

$$u(t) = S_\mu(t)u_0 + \int_0^t S_\mu(t-s)Vu(s)ds, \quad t > 0,$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \|u(t) - S_\mu(t)u_0\|_{M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 0.$$

Also,

$$\|S_{\mu, V}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N))} \leq Ce^{\omega t}, \quad t \geq 0 \quad (7.7)$$

for some constants C, ω . For $p = 1$ all the above remains true if we replace $M^{1, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by $\mathcal{M}^\ell(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Moreover, when $p \in [p'_0, \infty]$ the exponent in (7.7) can be taken as

$$\omega = c \|V\|_{M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{\frac{1}{1-\kappa_0}}, \quad (7.8)$$

for some positive constant $c = c(p, \ell)$.

(ii) **(Smoothing properties)** For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $0 < \ell \leq \ell_0$, if $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $0 < s \leq \ell$ satisfy $\frac{s}{q} \leq \frac{\ell}{p}$ we have, for some constants a, b ,

$$\|S_{\mu, V}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N), M^{q, s}(\mathbb{R}^N))} \leq \frac{be^{at}}{t^{\frac{1}{2m\mu}(\frac{\ell}{p} - \frac{s}{q})}}, \quad t > 0 \quad (7.9)$$

and

$$(0, \infty) \times M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N) \ni (t, u_0) \rightarrow S_{\mu, V}(t)u_0 \in M^{q, s}(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ is continuous.} \quad (7.10)$$

For $p = 1$ all these remain true if we replace $M^{1,\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by $\mathcal{M}^\ell(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Moreover, if $p \in [p_0, \infty]$, or $q \in [p_0, \infty]$, then (7.9) holds with any a satisfying

$$a = c \|V\|_{M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{\frac{1}{1-\kappa_0}} \quad (7.11)$$

for some positive constant $c = c(p, q, \ell, s)$.

(iii) **(Analyticity)** For either

(a) $p'_0 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $0 < \ell \leq \ell_0$, or

(b) $1 \leq p \leq p_0$ and $0 < \ell \leq \ell_0$ satisfying $\frac{\ell_0}{p_0} \leq \frac{\ell}{p}$,

the semigroup $\{S_{\mu, V}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is analytic in $M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with sectorial generator with the additional restriction that $p \neq 1$ when $\mu = 1$.

(iv) **(The perturbed equation)** For $1 < p \leq p_0$ and $0 < \ell \leq \ell_0$ satisfying $\frac{\ell_0}{p_0} \leq \frac{\ell}{p}$, we have that $u = S_{\mu, V}(\cdot)u_0$ with $u_0 \in M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ satisfies, for $t > 0$,

$$u_t + A_0^\mu u = V u \quad \text{in } M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Proof. (i) **(The perturbed semigroup)** We show that we can use Theorem 6.15 in the setting of Lemma 7.1, whose notations we use all the time below.

For convenience, if $\gamma^0 \neq (0, 0)$, in what follows we will denote \mathbb{J}_{γ^0} the set of $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}$ that satisfy

$$\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2^0}{\gamma_1^0} = \frac{\ell_0}{2m\mu} \quad (7.12)$$

(that is, a triangle of elements in \mathbb{J} with slopes less or equal that of γ^0), while if $\gamma^0 = (0, 0)$ then we will denote $\mathbb{J}_{(0,0)} = \mathbb{J}$.

Then, in the following steps we are going to prove that for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$ we can apply Theorem 6.15.

Step 1. Assume first $\gamma^0 \neq (0, 0)$. For $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{J}$ with $\beta = \alpha + \gamma^0$, the multiplication operator belongs to the class of admissible perturbations $\mathcal{P}_{\beta, R}$, as in Definition 6.3, if and only if $\alpha_1 \leq 1 - \gamma_1^0$ and

$$\gamma_2^0 = \kappa_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\ell_0}{2m\mu p_0} < 1, \quad \|V\|_{M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq R, \quad \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2^0}{\gamma_1^0},$$

that is, $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$.

To see this, observe that after (iii) in Lemma 7.1 we must have $\alpha_1 \leq 1 - \gamma_1^0$ and in Definition 6.3 we require $0 \leq d(\alpha, \beta) = \mathbf{r}(\alpha) - \mathbf{r}(\beta) = \gamma_2^0 = \frac{\ell_0}{2m\mu p_0} < 1$. On the other hand, from (7.5) the condition $\beta \xrightarrow{S_{\mu, V}(t)} \alpha$ reads

$$\alpha_2 \leq \beta_2 = \alpha_2 + \gamma_2^0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \leq \frac{\beta_2}{\beta_1} = \frac{\alpha_2 + \gamma_2^0}{\alpha_1 + \gamma_1^0}.$$

The former is always satisfied and the latter one is equivalent to $\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2^0}{\gamma_1^0}$, that is, $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$.

Step 2. With the restrictions in Step 1, we have that $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$, as in Theorem 6.5 if and only if $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}$ and

$$\alpha_2 \leq \gamma_2 < \alpha_2 + 1, \quad \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}.$$

To see this, note that the conditions $\gamma \xrightarrow{S_{\mu, V}(t)} \alpha$, with (7.5), and $\mathbf{r}(\gamma) \in (\mathbf{r}(\alpha) - 1, \mathbf{r}(\alpha)]$ give the restrictions above.

Step 3. With the restrictions in Step 1, we have that $\gamma' \in \mathcal{R}_\beta$, as in Theorem 6.9, see (6.20), if and only if $\gamma' \in \mathbb{J}$ and

$$\gamma'_2 \leq \beta_2 = \alpha_2 + \gamma_2^0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\gamma'_2}{\gamma'_1} \leq \frac{\beta_2}{\beta_1} = \frac{\alpha_2 + \gamma_2^0}{\alpha_1 + \gamma_1^0} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma'_2 > \alpha_2 - j_0$$

with $j_0 = 1 - \gamma_2^0 > 0$. In particular $\gamma' \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$, that is $\mathcal{R}_\beta \subset \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$.

Actually, the first two conditions stem from $\beta \xrightarrow{S_{\mu, V}(t)} \gamma'$ and Lemma 7.1 and the third one from the condition $\mathbf{r}(\gamma') \in [\mathbf{r}(\beta), \mathbf{r}(\beta) + 1)$.

Also observe that since from Step 1 we have $\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2^0}{\gamma_1^0}$ then $\frac{\alpha_2 + \gamma_2^0}{\alpha_1 + \gamma_1^0} = \frac{\gamma_2^0 \frac{\alpha_2}{\gamma_1^0} + \gamma_2^0}{\gamma_1^0 \frac{\alpha_1}{\gamma_1^0} + \gamma_1^0} \leq \frac{\gamma_2^0}{\gamma_1^0}$. Therefore $\beta \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$, and in particular we have $\frac{\gamma_2'}{\gamma_1'} \leq \frac{\gamma_2^0}{\gamma_1^0}$ and then $\gamma' \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$.

Step 4. With the restrictions in Step 1, we have that $\gamma \in \Sigma_{\alpha, \beta} = \mathcal{E}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{R}_\beta$, as in Theorem 6.15, if and only if

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_1 + \gamma_1^0 \leq 1 \\ \alpha_2 \leq \gamma_2 \leq \alpha_2 + \gamma_2^0 \\ \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \leq \frac{\alpha_2 + \gamma_2^0}{\alpha_1 + \gamma_1^0}. \end{cases} \quad (7.13)$$

In particular $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$, that is, $\Sigma_{\alpha, \beta} \subset \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$.

This follows immediately from Steps 1 to 3.

Step 5. Given $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$, we show that we can produce $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}$ and $\beta = \alpha + \gamma^0 \in \mathbb{J}$ such that $\gamma \in \Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}$ as in (7.13) (so such α, β will belong to \mathbb{J}_{γ^0}). Hence for such γ , Theorem 6.15 applies.

To see this, assume first $\gamma \neq (0, 0)$ and we take α with the same slope than γ , that is $\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} = \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}$ so the third condition in (7.13) is met.

Now we can furthermore take $\alpha_2 = \gamma_2$ (so the second condition in (7.13) is met), and therefore $\alpha = \gamma$, provided $\gamma_1 \leq 1 - \gamma_1^0$, which comes from the first condition in (7.13).

If, on the other hand, $1 - \gamma_1^0 < \gamma_1$, then we must choose $\alpha_2 = \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \alpha_1$ with $0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq 1 - \gamma_1^0$ from the first condition in (7.13), such that the second condition in (7.13) is satisfied, that is $\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \alpha_1 \leq \gamma_2 \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \alpha_1 + \gamma_2^0$.

Then we claim that choosing $\alpha_1 = 1 - \gamma_1^0$ achieves that. For this notice that, since γ satisfies (7.12),

$$\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} (1 - \gamma_1^0) + \gamma_2^0 = \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} (1 - \gamma_1^0) + \gamma_1^0 \frac{\gamma_2^0}{\gamma_1^0} \geq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} (1 - \gamma_1^0) + \gamma_1^0 \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} = \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}$$

and $\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \geq \gamma_2$ because $\gamma_1 \leq 1$. On the other hand, $\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \alpha_1 \leq \gamma_2$ is satisfied because $\alpha_1 = 1 - \gamma_1^0 < \gamma_1$.

Finally, if $\gamma = (0, 0)$ we take $\alpha = \gamma = (0, 0)$ and (7.13) is satisfied.

Step 6. Assume now $\gamma^0 = (0, 0)$, that is $V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Then in Step 1 above we have $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}$ and $\beta = \alpha$, while in Steps 2 to 4 we just get $\Sigma_{\alpha, \beta} = \{\alpha\}$. In Step 5 for $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}$, we take $\alpha = \gamma$. Then we can apply Theorem 6.15 as well in this case.

Step 7. Finally, as seen in Step 5 above, if $\gamma_1 \leq 1 - \gamma_1^0$ then we can take $\alpha = \gamma$ and then the exponential estimates on the perturbed semigroup with exponent (7.8), follow from Proposition 6.16 since from (7.6) in Lemma 7.1 we have (6.33) with $a = 0$ and then we get (6.34) with $a = 0$. In terms of the original parameters of the Morrey scale, the case $\gamma_1 \leq 1 - \gamma_1^0$ corresponds to $p \geq p'_0$.

(ii) (**Smoothing**) We will use Theorem 6.9, Corollary 6.10, or the second part of Theorem 6.15 to get the smoothing.

Step 8. Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}$ and $\beta = \alpha + \gamma^0 \in \mathbb{J}$ to apply Theorem 6.9, Corollary 6.10 (or the second part of Theorem 6.15) we need $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ (or $\gamma \in \Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}$) and $\gamma' \in \mathcal{R}_\beta$ such that $\gamma \xrightarrow{S(t)} \gamma'$. Hence, by Steps 2 and 3 above and Lemma 7.1, we need

$$\gamma_2' \leq \gamma_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\gamma_2'}{\gamma_1'} \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}$$

and then we would get $\gamma \xrightarrow{S_{\mu, V}(t)} \gamma'$, provided (7.13) and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \gamma_2' \\ \alpha_2 - j_0 &< \gamma_2' \leq \gamma_2 \leq \alpha_2 + \gamma_2^0 \\ \frac{\gamma_2'}{\gamma_1'} &\leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \leq \frac{\alpha_2 + \gamma_2^0}{\alpha_1 + \gamma_1^0}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.14)$$

Step 9. Given $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$ we want to produce $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}$ (and $\beta = \alpha + \gamma^0 \in \mathbb{J}$) such that $\gamma \in \Sigma_{\alpha, \beta}$ as in (7.13) and such that the set of γ' in (7.14) is as large as possible. We remark that such $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \gamma'$ will belong to \mathbb{J}_{γ^0} .

As in Step 3, we take α with the same slope than γ , that is $\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} = \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}$, and then we want to take the smallest α_2 possible in (7.13) (and hence in (7.14)). Since $\alpha_2 = \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \alpha_1$, we minimize α_1 such that

$$\alpha_1 \leq 1 - \gamma_1^0, \quad \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \alpha_1 \leq \gamma_2 \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \alpha_1 + \gamma_2^0 = \alpha_2 + \gamma_2^0$$

that is, we can take α_2 up to $\alpha_2 = \max\{0, \gamma_2 - \gamma_2^0\}$, and so (7.13) is satisfied. Hence, since $j_0 = 1 - \gamma_2^0 > 0$ and $\max\{0, \gamma_2 - \gamma_2^0\} - j_0 = \max\{-j_0, \gamma_2 - 1\}$, the set of γ' in (7.14) is given by

$$0 \leq \gamma'_2, \quad \gamma_2 - 1 < \gamma'_2 \leq \gamma_2, \quad \frac{\gamma'_2}{\gamma'_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}. \quad (7.15)$$

Since for this γ' we have $\gamma \xrightarrow{S_{\mu, V}(t)} \gamma'$, then Lemma 6.2 and part (i) of the theorem give the estimates (7.9) and (7.11), whereas (7.10) is from Corollary 6.10.

Step 10. Now we prove that for any $\gamma, \gamma' \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$ such that

$$\gamma'_2 \leq \gamma_2, \quad \frac{\gamma'_2}{\gamma'_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \quad (7.16)$$

we have $\gamma \xrightarrow{S_{\mu, V}(t)} \gamma'$ with (7.9), (7.10) and (7.11). For this we construct a finite sequence $\gamma^j \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$ for $j = 1, \dots, M$, such that $\gamma^1 = \gamma$, $\gamma^M = \gamma'$ and, given $j = 1, \dots, M - 1$, $\gamma^j \xrightarrow{S_{\mu, V}(t)} \gamma^{j+1}$ as in (7.15). Actually, we choose

$$\gamma_2^j - \frac{1}{2} \leq \gamma_2^{j+1} \leq \gamma_2^j, \quad \frac{\gamma_2^{j+1}}{\gamma_1^{j+1}} \leq \frac{\gamma_2^j}{\gamma_1^j}$$

so (7.15) holds at each step of the iteration. To see that this is possible, observe that if we take points $\tilde{\gamma} = \theta \gamma' + (1 - \theta) \gamma$ with $\theta \in (0, 1)$ then

$$\gamma'_2 < \tilde{\gamma}_2 < \gamma_2, \quad \frac{\gamma'_2}{\gamma'_1} \leq \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_2}{\tilde{\gamma}_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}, \quad \theta \in (0, 1).$$

Therefore, we chose $\theta_j \in (0, 1)$ iteratively such that $\gamma_2^j - \frac{1}{2} \leq \gamma_2^{j+1} \leq \gamma_2^j$ until we can take $\gamma_2^M = \gamma'_2$ and thus $\gamma^M = \gamma'$.

To prove (7.9) and (7.10) between X^γ and $X^{\gamma'}$, observe that since they hold for each pair (γ^j, γ^{j+1}) , $j = 1, \dots, M - 1$ (even if with constants and exponents depending on j), we use the semigroup property $S_{\mu, V}(t) = S_{\mu, V}(\frac{t}{M}) \circ \dots \circ S_{\mu, V}(\frac{t}{M})$ and we get (7.9) and (7.10) for (γ, γ') .

Then using Lemma 6.2 and (7.9) and part (i) of the theorem we conclude (7.11).

(iii) **(Analyticity)** From part (i) in Lemma 7.1 the unperturbed semigroup is analytic in X^γ for $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}$ with the additional restriction that $\gamma_1 < 1$ if $\mu = 1$ that we take into account, without mentioning it further. For the perturbed semigroup, we now show we can apply either Theorem 6.21 or Theorem 6.22.

For $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$, Theorem 6.21 applies provided that in the proof of part (i) above we can take $\alpha = \gamma$. This can be done when $\gamma_1 \leq 1 - \gamma_1^0$ (see Step 5 in the proof of (i) above) which, from (7.1) corresponds to $p'_0 \leq p$ and $0 < \ell \leq \ell_0$. This gives part (a) of the statement.

On the other hand, Theorem 6.22 applies provided that in the proof of part (i) above we can take $\beta = \alpha + \gamma^0 = \gamma$, that is $\gamma \in (\gamma^0 + \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}) \cap \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$. The intersection of these two triangles is the triangle $\gamma_1^0 \leq \gamma_1 \leq 1$, $\gamma_2^0 \leq \gamma_2 \leq \frac{N}{2m\mu}$, and $\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2^0}{\gamma_1^0}$ and from (7.1) and (7.2) this corresponds to

$$\frac{1}{p_0} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq 1, \quad \frac{\ell_0}{2m\mu p_0} \leq \frac{\ell}{2m\mu p} \leq \frac{N}{2m\mu}, \quad \frac{\ell}{2m\mu} \leq \frac{\ell_0}{2m\mu}$$

i.e.

$$1 \leq p \leq p_0, \quad \frac{\ell_0}{p_0} \leq \frac{\ell}{p}, \quad \ell \leq \ell_0.$$

This completes the proof of part (b) in the statement.

(iv) **(The perturbed equation)** As we are in case (b) of part (iii) above, we have that Proposition 6.23 applies and we get the result, because from Remark 4.2 the sectorial generator of the unperturbed semigroup is $-A_0^\mu$. ■

Remark 7.3. As a summary of the results above, observe that for (7.4) we start with an unperturbed semigroup $\{S_\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ (that is $V = 0$) acting on the spaces in the triangle \mathbb{J} in (7.2) with the smoothing in (7.5).

Then we add a perturbation $V \in X^{\gamma^0}$ with $\kappa_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{:=} \frac{\ell_0}{2m\mu p_0} < 1$ and we end up with a perturbed semigroup $\{S_{\mu,V}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ acting on the spaces in the triangle $\mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0} \subset \mathbb{J}$ as in (7.12), with the smoothing in (7.16).

Observe that (7.5) and (7.16) are identical although the latter in the smaller triangle \mathbb{J}_{γ^0} .

As for the continuous dependence on perturbations we have the following result.

Theorem 7.4. Assume $V, \tilde{V} \in M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with

$$\kappa_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{:=} \frac{\ell_0}{2m\mu p_0} < 1$$

and $u_0, \tilde{u}_0 \in M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $0 < \ell \leq \ell_0$. Assume also

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N))}, \|\tilde{V}\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N))} \leq R$$

and

$$\|u_0\|_{M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)}, \|\tilde{u}_0\|_{M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq \mathcal{R}.$$

Then for $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $0 < s \leq \ell$ such that $\frac{s}{q} \leq \frac{\ell}{p}$ and $T > 0$, there exists C_0, C_1 depending on $p_0, \ell_0, p, \ell, q, s, R$ and T and C_0 depending also on \mathcal{R} , such that for $t \in (0, T]$ we have

$$\|S_{\mu, V}(t)u_0 - S_{\mu, \tilde{V}}(t)\tilde{u}_0\|_{M^{q, s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq \frac{C_0}{t^{\frac{1}{2m\mu}(\frac{\ell}{p} - \frac{s}{q})}} \left(\|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)} + \|V - \tilde{V}\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N))} \right)$$

and

$$\|S_{\mu, V}(t) - S_{\mu, \tilde{V}}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N), M^{q, s}(\mathbb{R}^N))} \leq \frac{C_1}{t^{\frac{1}{2m\mu}(\frac{\ell}{p} - \frac{s}{q})}} \|V - \tilde{V}\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N))}.$$

Proof. We will use Theorem 6.12 in the setting of Lemma 7.1 and the notations in the proof of Theorem 7.2.

Step 1. For $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$, we choose α satisfying $\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} = \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}$ and (7.13) and $\beta = \alpha + \gamma^0$ (as in Step 5 of the proof of Theorem 7.2). Hence we have $\gamma \in \Sigma_{\alpha, \beta} \subset \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ and the perturbations $P = V, \tilde{P} = \tilde{V} \in \mathcal{P}_{\beta, R}$.

Then for $\gamma' \in \mathcal{R}_\beta$, that is for γ' as in (7.15), from Theorem 6.12 we have the estimates, for $t \in (0, T]$,

$$\|S_{\mu, V}(t)u_0 - S_{\mu, \tilde{V}}(t)\tilde{u}_0\|_{X^{\gamma'}} \leq \frac{M_0}{t^{\mathbf{r}(\gamma') - \mathbf{r}(\gamma)}} \left(\|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{X^\gamma} + \|V - \tilde{V}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^{\gamma_0})} \right) \quad (7.17)$$

and

$$\|S_{\mu, V}(t) - S_{\mu, \tilde{V}}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma, X^{\gamma'})} \leq \frac{M_1}{t^{\mathbf{r}(\gamma') - \mathbf{r}(\gamma)}} \|V - \tilde{V}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^{\gamma_0})}. \quad (7.18)$$

Step 2. Now we show that (7.17) and (7.18) hold for γ' as in (7.16), that is satisfying $\gamma'_2 \leq \gamma_2$ and $\frac{\gamma'_2}{\gamma'_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}$. With this and (7.1), (7.2), the theorem is proved.

So we consider $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$ and γ' satisfying $\gamma'_2 \leq \gamma_2$ and $\frac{\gamma'_2}{\gamma'_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}$. As in Step 10 in the proof of part (ii) in Theorem 7.2, we construct points $\gamma^j \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$ for $j = 1, \dots, M$, such that $\gamma^1 = \gamma$, $\gamma^M = \gamma'$ and γ^j satisfy for $j = 1, \dots, M-1$ both $\gamma^j_2 - \frac{1}{2} \leq \gamma^{j+1}_2 \leq \gamma^j_2$ and $\frac{\gamma^{j+1}_2}{\gamma^{j+1}_1} \leq \frac{\gamma^j_2}{\gamma^j_1}$.

Due to Steps 1 and 2 above, (7.17) holds with γ replaced by γ^j and γ' replaced by γ^{j+1} , that is, for $j = 1, \dots, M-1$ and $t \in (0, T]$,

$$\|S_{\mu, V}(t)u_0 - S_{\mu, \tilde{V}}(t)\tilde{u}_0\|_{X^{\gamma^{j+1}}} \leq \frac{c}{t^{\mathbf{r}(\gamma^{j+1}) - \mathbf{r}(\gamma^j)}} \left(\|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{X^{\gamma^j}} + \|V - \tilde{V}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^{\gamma^0})} \right) \quad (7.19)$$

provided $\|u_0\|_{X^{\gamma^j}}, \|\tilde{u}_0\|_{X^{\gamma^j}} \leq \mathcal{R}$.

Using (7.19) and the semigroup property we will show below that for $j = 1, \dots, M-1$

$$\|S_{\mu, V}(t)u_0 - S_{\mu, \tilde{V}}(t)\tilde{u}_0\|_{X^{\gamma^{j+1}}} \leq \frac{c}{t^{\mathbf{r}(\gamma^{j+1}) - \mathbf{r}(\gamma^1)}} \left(\|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{X^{\gamma^1}} + \|V - \tilde{V}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^{\gamma^0})} \right) \quad (7.20)$$

for some constant c , which for $j = M-1$ gives the estimate in the statement.

First, (7.20) for $j = 1$ follows from (7.19) with $j = 1$. In order to establish (7.20) for $j = 2$ we first observe that we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|S_{\mu, V}(t)u_0 - S_{\mu, \tilde{V}}(t)\tilde{u}_0\|_{X^{\gamma^3}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\mathbf{r}(\gamma^2) - \mathbf{r}(\gamma^1)}} \left\| S_{\mu, V}\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \left[\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\mathbf{r}(\gamma^2) - \mathbf{r}(\gamma^1)} S_{\mu, V}\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) u_0 \right] - S_{\mu, \tilde{V}}\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \left[\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\mathbf{r}(\gamma^2) - \mathbf{r}(\gamma^1)} S_{\mu, \tilde{V}}\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \tilde{u}_0 \right] \right\|_{X^{\gamma^3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.21)$$

Using (7.20) with $j = 1$, $\tilde{u}_0 = 0$ and $\tilde{V} = 0$, and then with $u_0 = 0$ and $V = 0$, we get that

$$t^{\mathbf{r}(\gamma^2) - \mathbf{r}(\gamma^1)} \|S_{\mu, V}(t)u_0\|_{X^{\gamma^2}}, \quad t^{\mathbf{r}(\gamma^2) - \mathbf{r}(\gamma^1)} \|S_{\mu, \tilde{V}}(t)\tilde{u}_0\|_{X^{\gamma^2}}$$

are bounded uniformly in $t \in (0, T]$ provided $\|u_0\|_{X^{\gamma^1}}, \|\tilde{u}_0\|_{X^{\gamma^1}} \leq \mathcal{R}$ and $\|V\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^{\gamma^0})}, \|\tilde{V}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^{\gamma^0})} \leq R$. Hence we can use (7.19) with $j = 2$ to estimate the right hand side of (7.21) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \|S_{\mu, V}(t)u_0 - S_{\mu, \tilde{V}}(t)\tilde{u}_0\|_{X^{\gamma^3}} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\mathbf{r}(\gamma^2) - \mathbf{r}(\gamma^1)}} \left[\frac{c}{\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\mathbf{r}(\gamma^3) - \mathbf{r}(\gamma^2)}} \left(\left\| \left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\mathbf{r}(\gamma^2) - \mathbf{r}(\gamma^1)} S_{\mu, V}\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) u_0 - \left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\mathbf{r}(\gamma^2) - \mathbf{r}(\gamma^1)} S_{\mu, \tilde{V}}\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \tilde{u}_0 \right\|_{X^{\gamma^2}} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \|V - \tilde{V}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^{\gamma^0})} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

From this, after applying (7.20) with $j = 1$, we obtain

$$\|S_{\mu, V}(t)u_0 - S_{\mu, \tilde{V}}(t)\tilde{u}_0\|_{X^{\gamma^3}} \leq \frac{c}{\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\mathbf{r}(\gamma^3) - \mathbf{r}(\gamma^1)}} \left(\|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{X^{\gamma^1}} + \|V - \tilde{V}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^{\gamma^0})} \right)$$

that is, (7.20) for $j = 2$. With a similar procedure we conclude that (7.20) holds for every $j = 1, \dots, M-1$.

This proves the first inequality in the statement. The second follows from taking $u_0 = \tilde{u}_0$ of norm one. ■

7.2. Two perturbations. Assume now we have two perturbations given by the potentials

$$V^i \in M^{p_i, \ell_i}(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq p_i \leq \infty, \ell_i \in (0, N], \quad i = 0, 1, \quad (7.22)$$

with

$$\kappa_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\ell_i}{2m\mu p_i} < 1, \quad i = 0, 1. \quad (7.23)$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume

$$\ell_0 \leq \ell_1. \quad (7.24)$$

Then we have the following results concerning evolution problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t + A_0^\mu u = V^0(x)u + V^1(x)u, & t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \end{cases} \quad (7.25)$$

that clearly generalizes to more than two perturbations.

Theorem 7.5. *Let A_0 be as in (1.2), $\mu \in (0, 1]$ and assume (7.22), (7.23) and (7.24).*

- (i) **(The perturbed semigroup)** For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $0 < \ell \leq \ell_0$, (7.25) defines a semigroup $\{S_{\mu, \{V^0, V^1\}}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in $M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that for $u_0 \in M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $u(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S_{\mu, \{V^0, V^1\}}(t)u_0$ satisfies

$$u(t) = S_{\mu}(t)u_0 + \int_0^t S_{\mu}(t-s)V^0u(s)ds + \int_0^t S_{\mu}(t-s)V^1u(s)ds, \quad t > 0,$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \|u(t) - S_{\mu}(t)u_0\|_{M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 0.$$

Also,

$$\|S_{\mu, \{V^0, V^1\}}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N))} \leq Ce^{\omega t}, \quad t \geq 0 \quad (7.26)$$

for some constants C, ω . For $p = 1$ all the above remains true if we replace $M^{1, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by $\mathcal{M}^{\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Moreover, if $p \in [\max\{p'_0, p'_1\}, \infty]$ then (7.26) holds with any ω satisfying

$$\omega = c(\|V^0\|_{M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{\frac{1}{1-\kappa_0}} + \|V^1\|_{M^{p_1, \ell_1}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{\frac{1}{1-\kappa_1}}) \quad (7.27)$$

for some positive constant $c = c(p, \ell)$.

- (ii) **(Smoothing properties)** For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $0 < \ell \leq \ell_0$, if $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $0 < s \leq \ell$ satisfy $\frac{s}{q} \leq \frac{\ell}{p}$ we have, for some constants a, C ,

$$\|S_{\mu, \{V^0, V^1\}}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N), M^{q, s}(\mathbb{R}^N))} \leq \frac{Ce^{at}}{t^{\frac{1}{2m\mu}(\frac{\ell}{p} - \frac{s}{q})}}, \quad t > 0, \quad (7.28)$$

and

$$(0, \infty) \times M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N) \ni (t, u_0) \rightarrow S_{\mu, \{V^0, V^1\}}(t)u_0 \in M^{q, s}(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ is continuous.} \quad (7.29)$$

For $p = 1$ this remains true if we replace $M^{1, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by $\mathcal{M}^{\ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Moreover, if $p \in [\max\{p'_0, p'_1\}, \infty]$, or $q \in [\max\{p'_0, p'_1\}, \infty]$, then (7.28) holds with any a satisfying

$$a = c(\|V^0\|_{M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{\frac{1}{1-\kappa_0}} + \|V^1\|_{M^{p_1, \ell_1}(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{\frac{1}{1-\kappa_1}}) \quad (7.30)$$

for some positive constant $c = c(p, \ell, q, s)$.

- (iii) **(Analyticity)** If either

(a) $\max\{p'_0, p'_1\} \leq p \leq \infty$ and $0 < \ell \leq \ell_0$, or

(b) if $1 \leq p \leq \min\{p_0, p_1\}$ and $0 < \ell \leq \ell_0$ are such that $\max\{\frac{\ell_0}{p_0}, \frac{\ell_1}{p_1}\} \leq \frac{\ell}{p}$

the semigroup $\{S_{\mu, \{V^0, V^1\}}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is analytic in $M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with sectorial generator with the additional restriction that $p \neq 1$ when $\mu = 1$.

- (iv) **(The perturbed equation)** For $1 < p \leq \min\{p_0, p_1\}$ and $0 < \ell \leq \ell_0$ satisfying $\max\{\frac{\ell_0}{p_0}, \frac{\ell_1}{p_1}\} \leq \frac{\ell}{p}$, we have that $u = S_{\mu, \{V^0, V^1\}}(\cdot)u_0$ with $u_0 \in M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ satisfies, for $t > 0$,

$$u_t + A_0^\mu u = V^0 u + V^1 u \quad \text{in } M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Proof. (i) **(The perturbed semigroup)** Through (7.1), the perturbation potentials correspond to Morrey spaces $V^i \in X^{\gamma^i}$ with $\gamma^i \in \mathbb{J}$. Since we have assumed $\ell_0 \leq \ell_1$ then the slope of γ^0 is smaller than that of γ^1 and therefore with the definition (7.12), the corresponding triangles satisfy $\mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0} \subset \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^1}$.

Now we do sequential perturbations, following here the notations and the proof of Theorem 7.2.

Step 1. We apply Theorem 7.2 with the perturbation V^1 so we get the perturbed semigroup $\{S_{\mu, V^1}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ defined in the spaces X^γ with $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^1}$, that satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \|S_{\mu, V^1}(t) - S_{\mu}(t)u_0\|_{X^\gamma} = 0$ for $u_0 \in X^\gamma$.

Also, from Step 7 in the proof of part (i) in Theorem 7.2, we get that for $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^1}$ such that $\gamma_1 \leq 1 - \gamma_1^1$ we have that $\|S_{\mu, V^1}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma)} \leq Ce^{\omega_1^1 t}$ where $\omega_1^1 = c_1 \|V^1\|_{X^{\gamma^1}}^{\frac{1}{1-\kappa_1}}$ with $c_1 = c_1(\gamma)$.

Step 2. Since the perturbed semigroup $\{S_{\mu, V^1}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, defined in X^γ with $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^1}$, has the same properties in this scale than the original unperturbed semigroup, although in the smaller triangle $\mathbb{J}_{\gamma^1} \subset \mathbb{J}$ (compare (7.5) and (7.16)), we can apply again Theorem 7.2 to this semigroup with the perturbation V^0 , see Remark 7.3. So we get the perturbed semigroup $\{(S_{\mu, V^1})_{V^0}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ defined in

the spaces X^γ with $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0} \subset \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^1}$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \|(S_{\mu, V^1})_{V^0}(t)u_0 - S_{\mu, V^1}(t)u_0\|_{X^\gamma} = 0$ for $u_0 \in X^\gamma$. In particular, $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \|(S_{\mu, V^1})_{V^0}(t)u_0 - S_\mu(t)u_0\|_{X^\gamma} = 0$ for $u_0 \in X^\gamma$.

As in Step 1 above, we also get that for $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$ such that $\gamma_1 \leq \min\{1 - \gamma_1^0, 1 - \gamma_1^1\}$ we have that

$$\|(S_{\mu, V^1})_{V^0}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X^\gamma)} \leq C e^{\omega t}$$

where $\omega > \omega_\gamma^2 = c_1 \|V^1\|_{X^{\gamma^1}}^{\frac{1}{1-\kappa_1}} + c_2 \|V^0\|_{X^{\gamma^0}}^{\frac{1}{1-\kappa_0}}$ with $c_i = c_i(\gamma)$. This gives (7.26) and (7.27).

Using (7.1), (7.2) the range of γ above correspond to $p \in [\max\{p'_0, p'_1\}, \infty]$ and $0 < \ell \leq \ell_0$.

Step 3. Now we prove that actually $\{(S_{\mu, V^1})_{V^0}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ coincides with $\{(S_{\mu, P}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ with $P = \{V^0, V^1\}$, in the spaces X^γ for $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$. For this we employ Proposition 6.8.

For this, given $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$ we must produce $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$ such that $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$, $\beta_i = \alpha + \gamma^i \in \mathbb{J}$, $\beta_i \xrightarrow{S(t)} \alpha$ and $0 \leq d(\alpha, \beta_i) = \mathbf{r}(\alpha) - \mathbf{r}(\beta_i) < 1$ for $i = 0, 1$ so the perturbations $P_i = V^i \in \mathcal{P}_{\beta_i, R}$.

From Step 1 in the proof of part (i) in Theorem 7.2, the conditions for $\beta_i = \alpha + \gamma^i \in \mathbb{J}$ and $\beta_i \xrightarrow{S_\mu(t)} \alpha$ for $i = 0, 1$ read

$$\alpha_1 + \gamma_1^i \leq 1 \tag{7.31}$$

and

$$\alpha_2 \leq (\beta_2)_i = \alpha_2 + \gamma_2^i \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \leq \frac{(\beta_2)_i}{(\beta_1)_i} = \frac{\alpha_2 + \gamma_2^i}{\alpha_1 + \gamma_1^i} \tag{7.32}$$

and are satisfied taking

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} \gamma & \text{if } \gamma_1 \leq \theta \\ (\theta, \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\theta) & \text{if } \gamma_1 > \theta \end{cases} \quad \text{where } \theta := \min\{1 - \gamma_1^0, 1 - \gamma_1^1\}. \tag{7.33}$$

Indeed, for α as in (7.33) both (7.31) and the first condition in (7.32) are clearly satisfied, whereas the second condition in (7.32) is so, because $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0} \subset \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^1}$. Also $0 \leq d(\alpha, \beta_i) < 1$ holds because $\kappa_i < 1$.

From Step 2 in the proof of part (i) in Theorem 7.2 we see that $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ if and only if

$$\alpha_2 \leq \gamma_2 < \alpha_2 + 1, \quad \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}. \tag{7.34}$$

For α as in (7.33) the first and third inequalities in (7.34) are clearly satisfied, whereas the second inequality needs to be checked only when $\gamma_1 > \theta$ and then $\alpha = (\theta, \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\theta)$ and in this case we need to justify that $\gamma_2 < \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\theta + 1$. For this observe that if i is such that $\theta = 1 - \gamma_1^i$ then, using that $\gamma_2^i = \kappa_i < 1$, we have

$$\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\theta + 1 > \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}(1 - \gamma_1^i) + \kappa_i = \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}(1 - \gamma_1^i) + \frac{\gamma_2^i}{\gamma_1^i}\gamma_1^i \geq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}(1 - \gamma_1^i) + \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\gamma_1^i = \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \geq \gamma_2$$

where we have used that $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0} \subset \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^1}$ and $\gamma_1 \leq 1$.

Therefore given γ in the triangle \mathbb{J}_{γ^0} we can always choose $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$ like in (7.33) above, and so employ Proposition 6.8. Part (i) is thus proved.

(ii) **(Smoothing properties)** We now observe that the proof of part (ii) in Theorem 7.2 can be repeated line by line perturbing $\{S_{\mu, V^1}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, defined in the spaces of the triangle \mathbb{J}_{γ^1} , with V^0 until (7.16) and therefore, since from Step 3 we have $S_{\mu, \{V^0, V^1\}}(t) = (S_{\mu, V^1})_{V^0}(t)$, we get

$$\gamma \xrightarrow{S_{\mu, \{V^0, V^1\}}(t)} \gamma' \quad \text{for } \gamma, \gamma' \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0} \text{ such that } \gamma'_2 \leq \gamma_2, \frac{\gamma'_2}{\gamma'_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}.$$

Using Lemma 6.2, this gives (7.28) and (7.29) and (7.30). This completes the proof of part (ii).

(iii) **(Analyticity)** From Lemma 7.1 the unperturbed semigroup is analytic in X^γ for $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}$ with the additional restriction that $\gamma_1 < 1$ if $\mu = 1$ that we take into account, without mentioning it further. For the perturbed semigroup, we now apply Theorem 6.21, which can be done provided that in Step 3 above we can take $\alpha = \gamma$. This, in turn, can be done provided that $\gamma_1 \leq \min\{1 - \gamma_1^0, 1 - \gamma_1^1\}$. This gives the part (a) in the statement.

To prove part (b) we consider sequential perturbations. We apply first Theorem 7.2(iii)(b) to get analyticity of $\{S_{\mu,V^1}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in X^γ for γ satisfying

$$\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^1}, \quad \gamma_1^1 \leq \gamma_1 \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_2^1 \leq \gamma_2 \leq \frac{N}{2m\mu}. \quad (7.35)$$

Then we proceed similarly to conclude analyticity of $\{(S_{\mu,V^1})_{V^0}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ in X^γ for γ which besides (7.35) satisfy also

$$\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}, \quad \gamma_1^0 \leq \gamma_1 \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_2^0 < \gamma_2 \leq \frac{N}{2m\mu}. \quad (7.36)$$

Since $\mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0} \subset \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^1}$, combining (7.35) and (7.36) gives the statement in (b).

(iv) **(The perturbed equation)** Using sequential perturbations we first see via Theorem 7.2(iv) that $u = S_{\mu,V^1}(\cdot)u_0$ with $u_0 \in X^\gamma$ and γ in (7.35) satisfying $\gamma_1 < 1$ solves, for $t > 0$,

$$u_t + A_0^\mu u = V^1 u \quad \text{in } X^\gamma,$$

and then $u = (S_{\mu,V^1})_{V^0}(\cdot)u_0$ with $u_0 \in X^\gamma$ and γ satisfying in addition (7.36) solves, for $t > 0$,

$$u_t + (A_0^\mu - V^1)u = V^0 u \quad \text{in } X^\gamma,$$

because for the considered parameters the sectorial generator of $\{S_{\mu,V^1}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is $-A_0^\mu + V^1$. ■

Remark 7.6. Observe that if say $V^1 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ then we can set $p_1 = \infty$ $\ell_1 = N$ so the restrictions in Theorem 7.5 come from $V^0 \in M^{p_0, \ell_0}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

The following result concerns continuous dependence with respect to two perturbations.

Theorem 7.7. Assume $V^i, \tilde{V}^i \in M^{p_i, \ell_i}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $1 \leq p_i \leq \infty$ and $\ell_i \in (0, N]$ which satisfy (7.23) and (7.24). Define the region of parameters (p, ℓ) for Morrey spaces as

$$1 \leq p \leq \infty, \quad \ell \leq \ell_0, \quad \ell \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{p_0 \vee p_1'} \right) \leq \frac{\ell_0}{p_0} \wedge \frac{\ell_1}{p_1}. \quad (7.37)$$

If

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p_i, \ell_i}(\mathbb{R}^N))}, \|\tilde{V}\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p_i, \ell_i}(\mathbb{R}^N))} \leq R \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1,$$

and

$$\|u_0\|_{M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)}, \|\tilde{u}_0\|_{M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq \mathcal{R}$$

then for $T > 0$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $0 < s \leq \ell$ satisfying $\frac{s}{q} \leq \frac{\ell}{p}$ and (q, s) belong to the region (7.37), we have in $(0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|S_{\mu, \{V^0, V^1\}}(t)u_0 - S_{\mu, \{\tilde{V}^0, \tilde{V}^1\}}(t)\tilde{u}_0\|_{M^{q, s}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \\ & \leq \frac{C_0}{t^{\frac{1}{2m\mu}(\frac{\ell}{p} - \frac{s}{q})}} (\|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N)} + \max_{i \in \{0, 1\}} \|V^i - \tilde{V}^i\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p_i, \ell_i}(\mathbb{R}^N))}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|S_{\mu, \{V^0, V^1\}}(t) - S_{\mu, \{\tilde{V}^0, \tilde{V}^1\}}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p, \ell}(\mathbb{R}^N), M^{q, s}(\mathbb{R}^N))} \leq \frac{C_1}{t^{\frac{1}{2m\mu}(\frac{\ell}{p} - \frac{s}{q})}} \max_{i \in \{0, 1\}} \|V^i - \tilde{V}^i\|_{\mathcal{L}(M^{p_i, \ell_i}(\mathbb{R}^N))},$$

where C_0, C_1 depend on $p_i, \ell_i, p, \ell, q, s, R$ and T . Additionally C_0 depends on \mathcal{R} .

Proof. For this result we will apply Theorem 6.12. For this we denote below $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$ and $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$.

Step 1. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$. From Step 3 in the proof of part (i) Theorem 7.5, see (7.31), (7.32), (7.34), we have $P = \{V^0, V^1\} \in \mathcal{P}_{\beta_0, \beta_1, R}$ and $\tilde{P} = \{\tilde{V}^0, \tilde{V}^1\} \in \mathcal{P}_{\beta_0, \beta_1, R}$, provided that

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_1 + \gamma_1^i \leq 1 \\ \alpha_2 \leq \alpha_2 + \gamma_2^i, \\ \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \leq \frac{\alpha_2 + \gamma_2^i}{\alpha_1 + \gamma_1^i} \end{cases} \quad i \in \{0, 1\} \quad (7.38)$$

and $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ provided

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_2 \leq \gamma_2 < \alpha_2 + 1 \\ \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}. \end{cases} \quad (7.39)$$

Notice the second condition in (7.38) is always satisfied and the third one is satisfied if $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$. So we need to solve (7.39) for $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$ with $\alpha_1 \leq \theta := 1 - (\gamma_1^0 \vee \gamma_1^1)$. For this we take α with the same slope than γ as in (7.33), that is,

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} \gamma & \text{if } \gamma_1 \leq \theta \\ (\theta, \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\theta) & \text{if } \gamma_1 > \theta \end{cases} \quad (7.40)$$

and all conditions are met, as we showed below (7.34).

Step 2. Since $\mathcal{R}_{\beta_0, \beta_1} = \mathcal{R}_{\beta_0} \cap \mathcal{R}_{\beta_1}$, from Step 3 in the proof of Theorem 7.2 we have $\gamma' \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta_0, \beta_1}$ provided that

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leq \gamma'_2 \\ \alpha_2 - j_i < \gamma'_2 \leq \alpha_2 + \gamma_2^i \quad \text{where } j_i := 1 - \gamma_2^i > 0, i \in \{0, 1\} \\ \frac{\gamma'_2}{\gamma'_1} \leq \frac{\alpha_2 + \gamma_2^i}{\alpha_1 + \gamma_1^i}, \end{cases} \quad (7.41)$$

while from Lemma 7.1 we have $\gamma \xrightarrow{S_\mu(t)} \gamma'$ provided that

$$\begin{cases} \gamma'_2 \leq \gamma_2 \\ \frac{\gamma'_2}{\gamma'_1} \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \end{cases} \quad (7.42)$$

and in particular $\gamma' \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$. So, for $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}$, α as in (7.40) and γ' as above, we can apply Theorem 6.12 to get the result.

Now observe that the second condition in (7.42) and the choice of α implies the third condition in (7.41). So, given the choice of α in (7.40), the conditions for γ' are given by (7.42), $0 < \gamma'_2$ and either

$$\gamma_2 + \gamma_2^i - 1 < \gamma'_2 \leq \gamma_2, \quad i \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{if } \gamma_1 \leq \theta$$

or

$$\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\theta + \gamma_2^i - 1 < \gamma'_2 \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\theta + \gamma_2^i \quad i \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{if } \gamma_1 > \theta.$$

These conditions can be recast as

$$\gamma_2 + (\gamma_2^0 \vee \gamma_2^1) - 1 < \gamma'_2 \leq \gamma_2, \quad \text{if } \gamma_1 \leq \theta$$

or

$$\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\theta + (\gamma_2^0 \vee \gamma_2^1) - 1 < \gamma'_2 \leq \gamma_2 \wedge \left(\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\theta + (\gamma_2^0 \wedge \gamma_2^1) \right) \quad \text{if } \gamma_1 > \theta$$

and notice that actually $\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\theta + (\gamma_2^0 \vee \gamma_2^1) - 1 < \gamma_2$, since $\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\theta < \gamma_2$ if $\gamma_1 > \theta$, and $(\gamma_2^0 \vee \gamma_2^1) - 1 < 0$ so this second condition is non void.

Step 3. Now, when $\gamma_1 > \theta$, we restrict to the region in \mathbb{J}_{γ^0} such that $\gamma_2 \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\theta + (\gamma_2^0 \wedge \gamma_2^1)$, that is

$$\gamma_2 \leq h(\gamma_1) = \gamma_2^0 \wedge \gamma_2^1 + \frac{(\gamma_2^0 \wedge \gamma_2^1)\theta}{\gamma_1 - \theta}, \quad \theta < \gamma_1 \leq 1$$

so h is convex, decreasing $h(\theta) = \infty$ and $h(1) = \gamma_2^0 \wedge \gamma_2^1 + \frac{(\gamma_2^0 \wedge \gamma_2^1)}{\gamma_1^0 \vee \gamma_1^1}(1 - \gamma_1^0 \vee \gamma_1^1) = \frac{\gamma_2^0 \wedge \gamma_2^1}{\gamma_1^0 \vee \gamma_1^1}$.

Hence we define the subset $\mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}^* = \{\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}, \gamma_2 \leq h(\gamma_1), \text{ if } \theta < \gamma_1 \leq 1\}$ and prove that for $\gamma, \gamma' \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}^*$ satisfying (7.42) we can apply Theorem 6.12.

First note that, with minor changes, the bootstrap of estimates along segments that we performed in Step 10 of the proof of Theorem 7.2 and in Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 7.5, allows us in this case to get the estimates in Theorem 6.12 if $\gamma, \gamma' \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}^*$ satisfy (7.42) and the segment joining them is contained in $\mathbb{J}_{\gamma^0}^*$.

In particular it remains to consider the case $\gamma_1 < \gamma'_1$ and the segment crosses the graph of h precisely in two points with coordinates $\gamma_1 \leq a < b \leq \gamma'_1$.

Then we can apply Lemma 7.9 in $[\gamma_1 - \delta, b]$ with $c = \gamma_1$ and $\delta > 0$ small, to get a tangent to h to the right through γ . Also we can apply Lemma 7.9 in $[a, \gamma'_1 + \delta]$ with $c = \gamma'_1$ and $\delta > 0$ small, to get a tangent to h to the left through γ' . Then these two tangents will cross at some point in $\mathbb{J}_{\gamma_0}^*$. This point and γ, γ' determine two segments and along each one we can do the bootstrap. So the claim is proved.

Step 4. It remains to describe the set $\mathbb{J}_{\gamma_0}^*$ in terms of the original parameters of the Morrey scale.

For this notice that from (7.1) we have that $\theta = 1 - (\gamma_1^0 \vee \gamma_1^1) = \frac{1}{p'_0 \vee p'_1}$ and $\gamma_2^0 \wedge \gamma_2^1 = \frac{1}{2m\mu} \frac{\ell_0}{p_0} \wedge \frac{\ell_1}{p_1}$.

Hence when $\gamma_1 \leq \theta$ the region reads

$$p \geq p'_0 \vee p'_1, \quad \ell \leq \ell_0$$

On the other hand, when $\gamma_1 > \theta$ the region $\gamma_2 \leq \frac{22}{\gamma_1} \theta + (\gamma_2^0 \wedge \gamma_2^1)$ reads

$$p < p'_0 \vee p'_1, \quad \ell \leq \ell_0, \quad \ell \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{p'_0 \vee p'_1} \right) \leq \frac{\ell_0}{p_0} \wedge \frac{\ell_1}{p_1}.$$

Hence both conditions can be summarised as (7.37). ■

Remark 7.8. (i) If $\gamma \in \mathbb{J}_{\gamma_0} \setminus \mathbb{J}_{\gamma_0}^*$ then there is a “threshold” in the possible jumps from γ to γ' as

$$\gamma'_2 \leq \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} \theta + (\gamma_2^0 \wedge \gamma_2^1) < \gamma_2.$$

In particular the estimates in the theorem can not be obtained for $\gamma' = \gamma$.

(ii) Condition (7.37) is satisfied if in particular

$$\frac{\ell}{p} \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\ell_0}{p_0}, \frac{\ell_1}{p_1} \right\}.$$

or if

$$p \geq p'_0 \vee p'_1, \quad \ell \leq \ell_0.$$

In both cases the Theorem holds if both (p, ℓ) and (q, s) satisfy either one of them and $0 < s \leq \ell$, $\frac{s}{q} \leq \frac{\ell}{p}$.

Lemma 7.9 (Exterior tangent lemma). Let $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a C^2 convex function with $f''(x) > 0$ in $[a, b]$ and let $c \in (a, b)$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

- (i) (Tangent to the left) There exist (a unique) $x_* \in [a, c)$ such that the tangent to f through x_* passes through (c, d) if and only if $d \leq f(c)$ and $\frac{f(a)-d}{a-c} \geq f'(a)$.
- (ii) (Tangent to the right) There exist (a unique) $x_* \in (c, b]$ such that the tangent to f through x_* passes through (c, d) if and only if $d \leq f(c)$ and $\frac{f(b)-d}{b-c} \leq f'(b)$.

Proof. For $x \in [a, b]$ the value of the tangent to f at x in the point c is given by $t(x) = f(x) + f'(x)(c - x)$ and $t'(x) = f''(x)(c - x)$.

Therefore, since $f'' > 0$ we have that $t' > 0$ in $[a, c)$ and $t' < 0$ in $(c, b]$. Hence, $t(x) = d$ for (a unique) some x if and only if either $t(a) \leq d \leq t(c) = f(c)$ or $t(b) \leq d \leq t(c) = f(c)$ which gives the result. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Cazenave and A. Haraux. *An introduction to semilinear evolution equations*, volume 13 of *Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1998. Translated from the 1990 French original by Yvan Martel and revised by the authors. Cited ↑ in page: 11, 22
- [2] J. W. Cholewa and A. Rodríguez-Bernal. Linear higher order parabolic problems in locally uniform Lebesgue’s spaces. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 449(1):1–45, 2017. Cited ↑ in page: 2, 4, 5, 8
- [3] J. W. Cholewa and A. Rodríguez-Bernal. Sharp estimates for homogeneous semigroups in homogeneous spaces. Applications to PDEs and fractional diffusion in \mathbb{R}^N . *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 24(1):Paper No. 2050070, 56, 2022. Cited ↑ in page: 2, 4
- [4] J. W. Cholewa and A. Rodríguez-Bernal. On linear higher-order parabolic equations in Morrey spaces. *Anal. Appl. (Singap.)*, 21(6):1561–1608, 2023. Cited ↑ in page: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9

- [5] J. W. Cholewa and A. Rodríguez-Bernal. Self-similarity in homogeneous stationary and evolution problems. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 23(2):Paper No. 42, 39, 2023. Cited ↑ in page: [4](#), [6](#), [8](#)
- [6] N. Dinculeanu. *Vector integration and stochastic integration in Banach spaces*. Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York). Wiley-Interscience, New York, 2000. Cited ↑ in page: [11](#)
- [7] Y. Giga and T. Miyakawa. Navier-Stokes flow in \mathbf{R}^3 with measures as initial vorticity and Morrey spaces. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 14(5):577–618, 1989. Cited ↑ in page: [3](#)
- [8] D. Henry. *Geometric theory of semilinear parabolic equations*, volume 840 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1981. Cited ↑ in page: [1](#), [2](#), [20](#)
- [9] T. Kato. The Cauchy problem for quasi-linear symmetric hyperbolic systems. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 58(3):181–205, 1975. Cited ↑ in page: [3](#)
- [10] T. Kato. Strong solutions of the Navier-Stokes equation in Morrey spaces. *Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat. (N.S.)*, 22(2):127–155, 1992. Cited ↑ in page: [3](#)
- [11] A. Lunardi. *Analytic semigroups and optimal regularity in parabolic problems*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 16. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1995. Cited ↑ in page: [1](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#), [23](#), [24](#), [25](#), [26](#)
- [12] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., 1983. Cited ↑ in page: [1](#)
- [13] C. Quesada and A. Rodríguez-Bernal. Smoothing and perturbation for some fourth order linear parabolic equations in \mathbb{R}^N . *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 412(2):1105–1134, 2014. Cited ↑ in page: [2](#)
- [14] A. Rodríguez-Bernal. Perturbation of analytic semigroups in scales of Banach spaces and applications to linear parabolic equations with low regularity data. *SeMA J.*, (53):3–54, 2011. Cited ↑ in page: [2](#)
- [15] K. Yosida. *Functional analysis*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, fifth edition, 1978. Cited ↑ in page: [5](#)