

Existence of φ -attractor and estimate of their attractive velocity for infinite-dimensional dynamical systems*

Chunyan Zhao, Chengkui Zhong*, Xiangming Zhu

Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, Nanjing, 210093, PR China

Abstract

This paper is devoted to the quantitative study of the attractive velocity of generalized attractors for infinite-dimensional dynamical systems. We introduce the notion of φ -attractor whose attractive speed is characterized by a general non-negative decay function φ , and prove that φ -decay with respect to noncompactness measure is a sufficient condition for a dissipative system to have a φ -attractor. Furthermore, several criteria for φ -decay with respect to noncompactness measure are provided. Finally, as an application, we establish the existence of a generalized exponential attractor and the specific estimate of its attractive velocity for a semilinear wave equation with a critical nonlinearity.

Keywords: φ -attractor, Attractive velocity, φ -decay with respect to noncompactness measure, Wave equation

2010 MSC: 35B40, 35B41, 35L05

1. Introduction

In this paper, we will study the attractive velocity of generalized attractors for infinite-dimensional dynamical systems.

The global attractor \mathcal{A} of a dynamical system $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ is a compact, invariant subset of X which attracts any bounded set $B \subseteq X$. By the definition, the global attractor (if exists) captures all the asymptotic behavior of the system. According to the Hölder-Mañé theorem (see [6, 8]), each compact set with finite fractal dimension is homeomorphic to a compact subset of Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n . Therefore, if the fractal dimension of the global attractor is finite, then the infinite-dimensional dynamical system restricted to the global attractor can be reduced to a finite-dimensional dynamical system (see [11]).

Even so, as an object to describe the long term behavior of dissipative systems, the global attractor still has its limitations. First, its definition does not contain quantitative information about the speed at which it attracts bounded sets. In fact, it may attract bounded sets at arbitrarily low rates. Second, the global attractor may be sensitive to perturbations. In general, the global attractor is upper semicontinuous with respect to perturbations, whereas its lower semicontinuity is much more difficult to obtain. Finally,

*The work is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.11731005; No.11801071).

*Corresponding author.

E-mails: emmanuelz@163.com(C. Zhao), ckzhong@nju.edu.cn(C. Zhong), zxmxygmt@163.com(X. Zhu)

when the system has a global attractor with finite fractal dimension, the reduced finite-dimensional dynamical system given by the Hölder-Mañé theorem is only Hölder continuous, not necessarily Lipschitz continuous, so it is not necessarily generated by ordinary differential equations (see [11, 13]).

In order to overcome these limitations, Foias, Sell and Temam[7] proposed the notion of inertial manifold in 1988. It is defined as a positively invariant, finite-dimensional, Lipschitz manifold which exponentially attracts bounded subsets and contains the global attractor. The dynamical system restricted to the inertial manifold can be reduced to a Lipschitz continuous system of ordinary differential equations which is called the inertial form of the original system. Almost all known methods of constructing inertial manifolds are based on the “spectral interval” condition (see [7]), which is difficult to verify. The existence of inertial manifolds has been proved for a large number of equations with space dimension 1 or 2 (see[3, 7, 13, 14, 16]). However, its existence is still an open problem for several important equations, such as the two-dimensional incompressible Navier-Stokes equations. Furthermore, its nonexistence has been proved for damped Sine-Gordon equations[12].

As it is not always possible to obtain inertial manifolds, Eden, Foias, Nicolaenko and Temam[5] proposed the concept of exponential attractor in 1994. An exponential attractor is a positively invariant, compact set which has finite fractal dimension and attracts all bounded subsets at exponential rates. Actually, to the best of our knowledge, exponential attractors exist indeed for almost all equations with finite-dimensional global attractors.

If a dynamical system possesses an exponential attractor A_{exp} , then $\mathcal{A} = \omega(A_{exp}) \subseteq A_{exp}$ is its global attractor, where $\omega(A_{exp})$ denotes the ω -limit set of A_{exp} . Furthermore, its global attractor $\mathcal{A} = \omega(A_{exp})$ has finite fractal dimension. The finiteness of fractal dimension of the attractor is an ideal property which make infinite dynamical systems can be reduced to finite dimensional systems. There are indeed a large number of reality-based models with finite-dimensional attractors. However, it has been proved that the solution semigroups of many evolution equations have global attractors with infinite fractal dimension; for instance, the p -Laplace equations with $p > 2$ (see [23]), some reaction-diffusion equations in unbounded domains (see[18, 19]), some hyperbolic equations in unbounded domains (see [17]), and so on. When a dynamical system has an global attractor of infinite fractal dimension, it has no exponential attractors, but may still have positively invariant and exponentially attractive compact sets. Based on this observation, Zhang, Kloeden, Yang and Zhong([20]) thought that the properties of exponential attractiveness and finite fractal dimension should be discussed separately, and proposed the concept of exponential decay with respect to noncompactness measure for the first time. They have proved that a sufficient and necessary condition for a dissipative dynamical system to have a positively invariant and exponentially attractive compact set \mathcal{A}^* is that the noncompactness measure of bounded sets decays exponentially. They also gave some criteria for exponential decay with respect to noncompactness measure and proved this property for a class of wave equations with weak damping via the (C^*) condition.

Inspired by the work of Zhang et al. [20], we will focus on the quantitative study of the attractive velocity of generalized attractors for dynamical systems in this paper. We notice that, when $g(0) = g'(0) = 0$, there is no conclusion as to whether the fractal dimension of the global attractor is finite and whether the noncompactness measure decays exponentially

for the semilinear wave equation or beam equation with nonlinear damping $g(u_t)$. There are other equations that face the same problem in the degenerate case. Motivated by this, we put forward the concept of φ -attractor (see Definition 2.6) whose attractive speed is characterized by a general non-negative decay function φ . In particular, when φ is an exponential function, a φ -attractor is a generalized exponential attractor, whose fractal dimension is not required to be finite compared with the exponential attractor in the normal sense; and when φ is a polynomial function, a φ -attractor is a polynomial attractor. Following the idea in [20], we study the specific attractive speed of attractors by estimating the decay speed of noncompactness measure. To this end, we propose the notion of φ -decay with respect to noncompactness measure (see Definition 2.7), which is a sufficient condition for a dissipative system to have a φ -attractor. We also establish several criteria for φ -decay with respect to noncompactness measure.

In the existing literature, the research on the attractive velocity of attractors is mainly limited to the range of exponential attractive velocity. Besides, there are many studies on estimating the decay velocity of energy functionals for various dynamical systems. However, we have not found any literature on the quantitative study of the general attractive speed of attractors, and this article has filled this gap to some extent.

On the other hand, all the criteria for exponential decay of noncompactness measure given by Zhang et al.[20] depend on the compactness of a system. In the critical case, due to the lack of compactness, these criteria are no longer applicable. Chueshov[2] proposed the method of contractive function by which the existence of the global attractor can be established for the critical case. We are inspired to establish a criterion based on contractive function for φ -decay with respect to noncompactness measure. This criterion only involves some rather weak compactness associated with the repeated limit inferior and requires no compactness, which makes it suitable for critical cases. In addition, we prove that quasi-stable systems are exponentially decaying with respect to noncompactness measure and therefore have generalized exponential attractors.

Finally, as an application of the abstract theory, we establish the existence of a generalized exponential attractor and the specific estimate of its attractive velocity for a semilinear wave equation with a critical nonlinearity. We have proved in [21, 22] the global well-posedness, dissipativity and the existence of the global attractor for a semilinear wave equations with nonlocal weak damping and anti-damping

$$u_{tt} - \Delta u + k\|u_t\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^p u_t + f(u) = \int_{\Omega} K(x, y)u_t(y)dy + h(x) \quad (1.1)$$

in both the subcritical and critical cases. We hope to advance the study of this wave equation and estimate the specific attractive velocity of its attractor under critical conditions. However, due to the degenerate damping, we can't get the exponential attractive velocity. So we add a linear damping term lu_t ($l > 0$) (see (5.1) below) to this model. Then by the criterion based on contractive function and energy estimate, we obtain the decay rate of noncompactness measure and thus verify the existence of a generalized exponential attractor. Furthermore, we prove that the attractive rate of the generalized exponential attractor depends on the coefficient l of the linear damping term in a certain range.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains some preliminaries. φ -decay with

respect to noncompactness measure is proved to be a sufficient condition for the existence of φ -attractors in Section 3. Section 4 presents several criteria for φ -decay with respect to noncompactness measure. In Section 5, as an application we establish the existence of a generalized exponential attractor for a semilinear wave equation with a critical nonlinearity.

Throughout this paper, we will denote the inner product and the norm on $L^2(\Omega)$ by (\cdot, \cdot) and $\|\cdot\|$ respectively, and the norm on $L^p(\Omega)$ by $\|\cdot\|_p$. The symbols \hookrightarrow and $\hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow$ stand for continuous embedding and compact embedding respectively. The capital letter “C” with a (possibly empty) set of subscripts will denote a positive constant depending only on its subscripts and may vary from one occurrence to another.

2. Preliminaries

We first briefly recall the definition of Kuratowski α -measure of noncompactness and its basic properties. For more details, we refer to [1, 4].

Definition 2.1. [1, 4] *Let (X, d) be a metric space and let B be a bounded subset of X . The Kuratowski α -measure of noncompactness is defined by*

$$\alpha(B) = \inf\{\delta > 0 \mid B \text{ has a finite cover of diameter } < \delta\}.$$

Lemma 2.1. [1, 4] *Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and α be the Kuratowski measure of noncompactness. Then*

- (i) $\alpha(B) = 0$ if and only if B is precompact;
- (ii) $\alpha(A) \leq \alpha(B)$ whenever $A \subseteq B$;
- (iii) $\alpha(A \cup B) = \max\{\alpha(A), \alpha(B)\}$;
- (iv) $\alpha(B) = \alpha(\overline{B})$, where \overline{B} is the closure of B ;
- (v) if $B_1 \supseteq B_2 \supseteq B_3 \dots$ are nonempty closed sets in X such that $\alpha(B_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\bigcap_{n \geq 1} B_n$ is nonempty and compact;
- (vi) if X is a Banach space, then $\alpha(A + B) \leq \alpha(A) + \alpha(B)$.

Next, we will briefly review the definitions and fundamental conclusions of dynamical systems and the global attractor.

Definition 2.2. [2, 13, 16] *A dynamical system is a pair of objects $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ consisting of a complete metric space X and a family of continuous mappings $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ of X into itself with the semigroup properties:*

- (i) $S(0) = I$,
- (ii) $S(t + s) = S(t)S(s)$ for all $t, s \geq 0$,

where X is called a phase space (or state space) and $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is called an evolution semigroup.

Definition 2.3. [2, 13, 16] Let $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a semigroup on a complete metric space (X, d) . A closed set $\mathcal{B} \subseteq X$ is said to be absorbing for $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ iff for any bounded set $B \subseteq X$ there exists $t_0(B)$ (the entering time of B into \mathcal{B}) such that $S(t)B \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ for all $t > t_0(B)$. $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is said to be dissipative iff it possesses a bounded absorbing set.

Lemma 2.2. [2] Let $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a semigroup on a complete metric space (X, d) . If $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is dissipative, then it possesses a positively invariant bounded absorbing set. To be more precise, let \mathcal{B} be its bounded absorbing set, then $\mathcal{B}_0 = \bigcup_{t \geq t_{\mathcal{B}}} S(t)\mathcal{B}$ is a positively invariant bounded absorbing set, where $t_{\mathcal{B}} > 0$ is the entering time of \mathcal{B} into itself.

Definition 2.4. [2, 13, 16] A compact set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X$ is said to be a global attractor of the dynamical system $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ iff

- (i) $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X$ is an invariant set, i.e., $S(t)\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}$ for all $t \geq 0$,
- (ii) $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X$ is uniformly attracting, i.e., for all bounded set $B \subseteq X$ we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \text{dist}(S(t)B, \mathcal{A}) = 0,$$

where $\text{dist}(A, B) := \sup_{x \in A} \text{dist}_X(x, B)$ is the Hausdorff semi-distance.

Ma, Wang and Zhong put forward the concept of ω -limit compact in [10] and proved that ω -limit compactness is a necessary and sufficient condition for a dissipative dynamical system to possess a global attractor.

Definition 2.5. The dynamical system $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ is called to be ω -limit compact iff for every positively invariant bounded set $B \subseteq X$ we have $\alpha(S(t)B) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, where $\alpha(\cdot)$ is the Kuratowski measure of noncompactness.

Theorem 2.1. The dynamical system $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ has a global attractor in X if and only if it is both dissipative and ω -limit compact.

In the definition of global attractor, the description of its attractiveness to bounded sets is qualitative. In fact, it may attract bounded sets arbitrarily slowly. And there is no quantitative information about the attractive rate. In order to describe the attractive velocity of attractor quantitatively, we introduce the following concept of φ -attractor.

Definition 2.6. Assume that $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfies $\varphi(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. We call a compact $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq X$ a φ -attractor for the dynamical system $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$, iff \mathcal{A}^* is positively invariant with respect to $S(t)$ and there exists $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for every bounded set $B \subseteq X$ there exists $t_B \geq 0$ such that

$$\text{dist}(S(t)B, \mathcal{A}^*) \leq \varphi(t + t_0 - t_B), \quad \forall t \geq t_B.$$

In particular,

- (i) if $\varphi(t) = Ce^{-\beta t}$ for certain positive constants C, β , then \mathcal{A}^* is called a generalized exponential attractor;

- (ii) if $\varphi(t) = Ct^{-\beta}$ for certain positive constants C, β , then \mathcal{A}^* is called a polynomial attractor;
- (iii) if $\varphi(t) = C(\ln t)^{-\beta}$ for certain positive constants C, β , then \mathcal{A}^* is called a logarithm-polynomial attractor.

Remark 2.1. We emphasize that the finiteness of fractal dimension is not required in the above definition of φ -attractor.

It is not difficult to verify the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3. Let $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a dynamical system on a complete metric space (X, d) . Assume that $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ possesses a positively invariant, compact attracting set K , i.e., $K \subseteq X$ is compact, positively invariant with respect to $S(t)$, and for every bounded set $B \subseteq X$ we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \text{dist}(S(t)B, K) = 0.$$

Then $\mathcal{A} = \omega(K) \subseteq K$ is its global attractor.

Lemma 2.3 indicates that a dynamical system with a φ -attractor \mathcal{A}^* possesses the global attractor $\mathcal{A} = \omega(\mathcal{A}^*) \subseteq \mathcal{A}^*$.

We introduce the following concept of φ -decay with respect to noncompactness measure, which will be proved in Theorem 3.1 below as a sufficient condition for the existence of φ -attractors.

Definition 2.7. The dynamical system $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ is called to be φ -decaying with respect to noncompactness measure iff it is dissipative and there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that

$$\alpha(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq \varphi(t), \quad \forall t \geq t_0, \quad (2.1)$$

where \mathcal{B}_0 is a positively invariant bounded absorbing set of $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a decreasing function satisfying $\varphi(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.

In particular,

- (i) if $\varphi(t) = Ce^{-\beta t}$ for certain positive constants C, β , then $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ is said to be exponentially decaying with respect to noncompactness measure;
- (ii) if $\varphi(t) = Ct^{-\beta}$ for certain positive constants C, β , then $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ is said to be polynomially decaying with respect to noncompactness measure;
- (iii) if $\varphi(t) = C(\ln t)^{-\beta}$ for certain positive constants C, β , then $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ is said to be logarithm-polynomially decaying with respect to noncompactness measure.

The following lemma shows that the decay rate of noncompact measure of a positively invariant bounded absorbing set determines the decay rate of noncompact measure of any bounded set, which guarantees the justification of Definition 2.7.

Lemma 2.4. Assume that the dynamical system $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ is φ -decaying with respect to noncompactness measure, which implies that there exist a positively invariant bounded absorbing set \mathcal{B}_0 and a positive constant t_0 such that

$$\alpha(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq \varphi(t), \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

Then for every bounded subset B of X , we have

$$\alpha(S(t)B) \leq \varphi(t - t_*(B)), \quad \forall t \geq t_*(B) + t_0,$$

where $t_*(B)$ is the entering time of B into \mathcal{B}_0 .

Proof. It follows from

$$S(t)B \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0, \quad \forall t \geq t_*(B)$$

that $S(t)B = S(t - t_*(B))S(t_*(B))B \subseteq S(t - t_*(B))\mathcal{B}_0$. Consequently by Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\alpha(S(t)B) \leq \alpha(S(t - t_*(B))\mathcal{B}_0) \leq \varphi(t - t_*(B)), \quad \forall t \geq t_*(B) + t_0.$$

□

3. The existence of φ -attractors

In this section we will present a key theorem which illustrates that we can obtain the specific estimate of attractive velocity of an attractor by estimating the decay rate of the noncompactness measure.

Theorem 3.1. Assume that the dynamical system $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ is φ -decaying with respect to noncompactness measure, which implies that there exist a positively invariant bounded absorbing set \mathcal{B}_0 and a positive constant t_0 such that

$$\alpha(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq \varphi(t), \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

Then $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ possesses a φ -attractor \mathcal{A}^* such that for every bounded set $B \subseteq X$ we have

$$\text{dist}(S(t)B, \mathcal{A}^*) \leq \varphi(t - t_*(B) - 1), \quad \forall t \geq t_*(B) + t_0 + 1, \quad (3.1)$$

where $t_*(B)$ is the entering time of B into \mathcal{B}_0 .

Proof. Step1: It follows from

$$\begin{cases} \varphi(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow +\infty, \\ \alpha(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq \varphi(t), \quad \forall t \geq t_0 \end{cases}$$

that

$$\alpha(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \rightarrow 0(t \rightarrow +\infty), \quad (3.2)$$

from which we can deduce that $\mathcal{A} = \omega(\mathcal{B}_0) \equiv \bigcap_{t \geq 0} \overline{S(t)\mathcal{B}_0}$ is the global attractor of this system.

Since

$$\alpha(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq \varphi(t), \quad \forall t \geq t_0,$$

for every positive integer $m \geq t_0$, $S(m)\mathcal{B}_0$ has a finite $\varphi(m)$ -net which we denote by $E_m = \bigcup_{i=1}^{K_m} S(m)a_i^{(m)}$, $a_i^{(m)} \in \mathcal{B}_0$, i.e., $S(m)\mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq \bigcup_{x_\lambda \in E_m} B(x_\lambda, \varphi(m))$.

Let $F_m = \bigcup_{t \geq 0} S(t)E_m = \bigcup_{t \geq 0} S(t) \bigcup_{i=1}^{K_m} S(m)a_i^{(m)}$, $a_i^{(m)} \in \mathcal{B}_0$. Take $\mathcal{A}^* = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}, m \geq t_0} F_m \cup \mathcal{A}$. It is obvious that \mathcal{A}^* is positively invariant.

Since $\mathcal{A}^* \supseteq \bigcup_{m=[t_0]+1}^{+\infty} E_m$ (where $[t_0]$ is the integral part of t_0),

$$\text{dist}(S(m)\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{A}^*) \leq \varphi(m), \quad \forall m \geq t_0. \quad (3.3)$$

By the positive invariance of \mathcal{B}_0 , $S(t)\mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq S([t])\mathcal{B}_0$. Hence we deduce from the monotonicity of $\varphi(t)$ and (3.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{A}^*) &\leq \text{dist}(S([t])\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{A}^*) \\ &\leq \varphi([t]) \\ &\leq \varphi(t-1) \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

holds for all $t \geq t_0 + 1$. For every bounded set $B \subseteq X$, there exists $t_*(B)$ such that

$$S(t)B \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0, \quad \forall t \geq t_*(B).$$

Therefore $S(t)B = S(t-t_*(B))S(t_*(B))B \subseteq S(t-t_*(B))\mathcal{B}_0$, and thus for every $t \geq t_*(B) + t_0 + 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(S(t)B, \mathcal{A}^*) &\leq \text{dist}(S(t-t_*(B))\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{A}^*) \\ &\leq \varphi(t-t_*(B)-1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Step2: Next we shall verify that \mathcal{A}^* is compact, i.e., every sequence $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^*$ has a subsequence which converges to a point in \mathcal{A}^* . Since the global attractor \mathcal{A} is compact, if there exists a subsequence $\{x_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^{+\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, then \mathcal{A}^* is compact. Therefore, without loss of generality we can assume that $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subseteq \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}, m \geq t_0} F_m$. Write

$$x_n = S(t_n)S(m_n)a_{i_n}^{(m_n)}, \quad t_n \geq 0, m_n \geq t_0, 1 \leq i_n \leq K_{m_n}, a_{i_n}^{(m_n)} \in \mathcal{B}_0. \quad (3.6)$$

(i) If $\{t_n + m_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ is unbounded, then there exists a subsequence $\{n_k\}$ of $\{n\}$ such that $t_{n_k} + m_{n_k} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Hence we can deduce from (3.2) that there exists a subsequence of $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ convergent in $\mathcal{A} = \omega(\mathcal{B}_0) \subseteq \mathcal{A}^*$.

(ii) If there exists a positive integer N_0 such that $t_n + m_n \leq N_0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\{x_n\} \subseteq \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}, t_0 \leq m \leq N_0} \bigcup_{i=1}^{K_m} \bigcup_{t \in [0, N_0]} S(t)S(m)a_i^{(m)}$. For given m and i , mapping $t \rightarrow S(t)S(m)a_i^{(m)}$ is continuous, and $[0, N_0]$ is a compact set, so $\bigcup_{t \in [0, N_0]} S(t)S(m)a_i^{(m)}$ is compact, and thus $\bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}, t_0 \leq m \leq N_0} \bigcup_{i=1}^{K_m} \bigcup_{t \in [0, N_0]} S(t)S(m)a_i^{(m)}$ is also compact. Consequently, there exists a subsequence of $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ convergent in $\bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}, t_0 \leq m \leq N_0} \bigcup_{i=1}^{K_m} \bigcup_{t \in [0, N_0]} S(t)S(m)a_i^{(m)} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^*$.

This finishes the proof. \square

Remark 3.1. *The idea of constructing a φ -attractor is to add a countable collection of positively invariant point sets to the global attractor such that the added point sets can attract a positively invariant bounded absorbing set \mathcal{B}_0 at the so called φ -speed and thus can attract any bounded set B at the φ -speed. The decay rate of the noncompactness measure α of a positively invariant bounded absorbing set \mathcal{B}_0*

$$\alpha(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq \varphi(t), \quad \forall t \geq t_0 \text{ (see (2.1))}$$

can guarantee that the union of the global attractor and these added point sets is compact. Therefore, the decay rate with respect to noncompact measure α essentially characterizes the attractive rate that a positively invariant compact set may reach.

Due to non-uniqueness of finite $\varphi(m)$ -net of $S(m)\mathcal{B}_0$, φ -attractor \mathcal{A}^* constructed in the Theorem 3.1 is not unique. In fact, the following corollary illustrates that for any $\epsilon > 0$, a dynamical system which is φ -decaying with respect to noncompactness measure may have a more regular $(\epsilon + 1)\varphi$ -attractor.

Corollary 3.1. *Assume that the dynamical system $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ is φ -decaying with respect to noncompactness measure, which implies that there exist a positively invariant bounded absorbing set \mathcal{B}_0 and a positive constant t_0 such that*

$$\alpha(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq \varphi(t), \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

Let D be a dense subset of \mathcal{B}_0 . Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a positively invariant compact set \mathcal{A}^ satisfying:*

(i) *for every bounded set $B \subseteq X$ we have*

$$\text{dist}(S(t)B, \mathcal{A}^*) \leq (\epsilon + 1)\varphi(t - t_*(B) - 1), \quad \forall t \geq t_*(B) + t_0 + 1, \quad (3.7)$$

where $t_(B)$ satisfies*

$$S(t)B \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0, \quad \forall t \geq t_*(B);$$

(ii) *$\mathcal{A}^* = \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}_1$, where \mathcal{A} is the global attractor of $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$, \mathcal{A}_1 is a set of orbits starting from points in D .*

Proof. Since

$$\alpha(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq \varphi(t), \quad \forall t \geq t_0,$$

for every positive integer $m \geq t_0$, $S(m)\mathcal{B}_0$ has a finite $\varphi(m)$ -net which we denote by

$$E_m = \cup_{i=1}^{K_m} S(m)a_i^{(m)}, \quad a_i^{(m)} \in \mathcal{B}_0,$$

hence

$$S(m)\mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^{K_m} B(S(m)a_i^{(m)}, \varphi(m)). \quad (3.8)$$

Because $S(t) : X \rightarrow X$ is continuous and D is dense in \mathcal{B}_0 , there exists $b_i^{(m)} \in D$ such that

$$d(S(m)b_i^{(m)}, S(m)a_i^{(m)}) < \epsilon\varphi(m). \quad (3.9)$$

Let

$$E'_m = \cup_{i=1}^{K_m} S(m)b_i^{(m)}.$$

It follows from (3.8) and (3.9) that

$$S(m)\mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^{K_m} B(S(m)b_i^{(m)}, (1+\epsilon)\varphi(m)) \equiv \mathcal{N}_{(1+\epsilon)\varphi(m)} E'_m, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, m \geq t_0. \quad (3.10)$$

Take $\mathcal{A}_1 = \cup_{m \in \mathbb{N}, m \geq t_0} \cup_{t \geq 0} S(t)E'_m$, $\mathcal{A}^* = \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}$. Obviously, \mathcal{A}_1 is a set of orbits starting from points in D and \mathcal{A}^* is positively invariant. Analysis similar to that in the third step in the proof of Theorem 3.1 shows that \mathcal{A}^* is compact. From (3.10) we have

$$S(m)\mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{(1+\epsilon)\varphi(m)} \mathcal{A}^*, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, m \geq t_0. \quad (3.11)$$

For every $B \subseteq X$, there exists $t_*(B)$ such that

$$S(t)B \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0, \forall t \geq t_*(B).$$

Hence

$$S(t)B = S(t - t_*(B))S(t_*(B))B \subseteq S(t - t_*(B))\mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq S([t - t_*(B)])\mathcal{B}_0. \quad (3.12)$$

We deduce from (3.11), (3.12) and the monotonicity of φ that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(S(t)B, \mathcal{A}^*) &\leq (1+\epsilon)\varphi([t - t_*(B)]) \\ &\leq (1+\epsilon)\varphi(t - t_*(B) - 1). \end{aligned}$$

holds for all $t \geq t_0 + t_*(B) + 1$

The proof is completed. \square

Remark 3.2. The significance of Corollary 3.1 lies in that \mathcal{A}^* constructed here often has higher regularity since the global attractor \mathcal{A} is often more regular than the phase space and the phase space often has dense subspaces with higher regularity.

4. Criteria for φ -decay with respect to noncompactness measure

In this section, we will give several criteria for φ -decay with respect to noncompactness measure.

Theorem 4.1. Let $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ be a dissipative dynamical system and \mathcal{B}_0 be its positively invariant bounded absorbing set. If there exist a compact set $A \subseteq X$ and a positive constant t_0 such that

$$\text{dist}(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0, A) \leq \varphi(t), \forall t \geq t_0, \quad (4.1)$$

where function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfies $\varphi(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, then $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is 2φ -decaying with respect to noncompactness measure.

Proof. Let ϵ be an arbitrary positive number.

Since A is compact, A has a finite ϵ -net x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n , i.e., $A \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^n B(x_i, \epsilon)$. By (4.1), for every $x \in \mathcal{B}_0$, there exists $y \in A$ such that

$$d(S(t)x, y) < \varphi(t) + \epsilon, \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

Therefore there exists $i \in 1, 2, \dots, n$ such that

$$d(S(t)x, x_i) < d(S(t)x, y) + d(y, x_i) \leq \varphi(t) + \epsilon + \epsilon,$$

i.e., $S(t)\mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^n B(x_i, \varphi(t) + 2\epsilon)$. Consequently, by the definition of Kuratowski's noncompactness measure, we obtain $\alpha(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq 2\varphi(t)$ ($\forall t \geq t_0$) and thus complete the proof. \square

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a dissipative semigroup in a Banach space $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ and \mathcal{B}_0 be its positively invariant bounded absorbing set. Assume that function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfies $\varphi(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. If there exists a positive constant t_0 such that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a finite dimensional subspace $X_1 \subseteq X$, such that*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{B}_0} \|(I - P)S(t)x\| \leq \varphi(t) + \epsilon, \quad \forall t \geq t_0, \quad (4.2)$$

where $P : X \rightarrow X_1$ is a bounded projection operator, then $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is 2φ -decaying with respect to noncompactness measure.

Proof. As a bounded set of finite dimensional subspace X_1 , $PS(t)\mathcal{B}_0$ is precompact, and thus

$$\alpha(PS(t)\mathcal{B}_0) = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

By the definition of Kuratowski's noncompactness measure, (4.2) implies that

$$\alpha((I - P)S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq 2\varphi(t) + 2\epsilon, \quad \forall t > t_0. \quad (4.4)$$

Since $S(t)\mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq PS(t)\mathcal{B}_0 + (I - P)S(t)\mathcal{B}_0$, combining (4.3) and (4.4) yields that

$$\alpha(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq \alpha(PS(t)\mathcal{B}_0) + \alpha((I - P)S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq 2\varphi(t) + 2\epsilon, \quad \forall t > t_0.$$

By the arbitrariness of ϵ , we have

$$\alpha(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq 2\varphi(t), \quad \forall t > t_0,$$

which completes the proof. \square

The next criterion is based on the method of contractive function and only involves some rather weak compactness associated with the repeated limit inferior, therefore it can be used to prove φ -decay with respect to noncompact measure for infinite-dimensional dynamical systems under critical conditions.

Definition 4.1. *Let X be a complete metric space and B be a bounded subset of X . Function $\Phi : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is said to be contractive on $B \times B$ if it satisfies the following conditions:*

$$\liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(y_n, y_m) = 0, \quad \forall \{y_n\} \subseteq B.$$

We denote by $\text{Contr}(B)$ the set of all contractive functions on $B \times B$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a semigroup on a complete metric space (X, d) and $B \subseteq X$ be its positively invariant bounded set. Assume that function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfies $\varphi(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$ and T is a positive constant. If for every $t > T$ and every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\Psi_{t, \epsilon} \in \text{Contr}(B)$ such that*

$$d(S(t)y_1, S(t)y_2) \leq \varphi(t) + \epsilon + \Psi_{t, \epsilon}(y_1, y_2), \forall y_1, y_2 \in B, \quad (4.5)$$

then

$$\alpha(S(t)B) \leq 3\varphi(t), \quad \forall t > T. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. If (4.6) was false, then there would exist $t_0 > T$ such that

$$\alpha(S(t_0)B) > 3\varphi(t_0).$$

Hence according to the definition of noncompactness measure, $S(t_0)B$ has no finite cover of diameter less than or equal to $3\varphi(t_0)$. Consequently, for any $y_1 \in B$, there exists $y_2 \in B$ such that

$$d(S(t_0)y_1, S(t_0)y_2) > \frac{3}{2}\varphi(t_0).$$

And then we can find $y_3 \in B$ satisfying

$$d(S(t_0)y_3, S(t_0)y_i) > \frac{3}{2}\varphi(t_0), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Iterating in this way, we obtain a sequence $\{y_n\} \subseteq B$ satisfying

$$d(S(t_0)y_n, S(t_0)y_m) > \frac{3}{2}\varphi(t_0), \quad \forall m \neq n. \quad (4.7)$$

By (4.5), for t_0 and $\epsilon = \frac{1}{4}\varphi(t_0)$, there exists $\Psi_{t_0} \in \text{Contr}(B)$ such that

$$d(S(t_0)y_n, S(t_0)y_m) \leq \varphi(t_0) + \frac{1}{4}\varphi(t_0) + \Psi_{t_0}(y_n, y_m). \quad (4.8)$$

Combining (4.7) and (4.8) yields

$$\Psi_{t_0}(y_n, y_m) \geq \frac{1}{4}\varphi(t_0) > 0, \quad (4.9)$$

which implies

$$\liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{t_0}(y_n, y_m) \geq \frac{1}{4}\varphi(t_0) > 0. \quad (4.10)$$

This is contrary to $\Psi_{t, \epsilon} \in \text{Contr}(B)$. We have thus proved the theorem. \square

The following theorem states that quasi-stable systems are exponentially decaying with respect to noncompact measure.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a dissipative semigroup on a complete metric space (X, d) and \mathcal{B}_0 be its positively invariant bounded absorbing set. Assume that there exist positive constants T, δ_0 , a constant $\eta \in [0, 1)$, a function $g : (\mathbb{R}^+)^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and pseudometrics ϱ_T^i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, m$) on \mathcal{B}_0 such that*

- (i) g is non-decreasing with respect to each variable, $g(0, \dots, 0) = 0$ and g is continuous at $(0, \dots, 0)$;
- (ii) $\varrho_T^i (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ is precompact on \mathcal{B}_0 , i.e., any sequence $\{x_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0$ has a subsequence $\{x_{n_k}\}$ which is Cauchy with respect to ϱ_T^i ;
- (iii) the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & d(S(T)y_1, S(T)y_2) \\ & \leq \eta d(y_1, y_2) + g\left(\varrho_{B,T}^1(y_1, y_2), \varrho_{B,T}^2(y_1, y_2), \dots, \varrho_{B,T}^m(y_1, y_2)\right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

holds for all $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{B}_0$ satisfying $\varrho_T^i(y_1, y_2) \leq \delta_0 (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$.

Then $(X, \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ is exponentially decaying with respect to noncompactness measure. And for each bounded $B \subseteq X$ we have

$$\alpha(S(t)B) < \eta^{\frac{t-t_*(B)-T}{T}} \alpha(\mathcal{B}_0), \quad \forall t \geq t_*(B) + T,$$

where $t_*(B)$ satisfies

$$S(t)B \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0, \quad \forall t \geq t_*(B).$$

Proof. Let $D \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0$.

For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist sets F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n such that

$$D \subseteq \cup_{j=1}^n F_j, \quad \text{diam} F_j < \alpha(S(t)D) + \epsilon. \quad (4.12)$$

It follows from assumption (i) that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $g(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) < \epsilon$ whenever $x_i \in [0, \delta]$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, m$). By the precompactness of $\varrho_T^i (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$, there exists a finite set $\mathcal{N}^i = \{x_j^i : j = 1, 2, \dots, k_i\} \subseteq D$ such that for every $y \in D$ there is $x_j^i \in \mathcal{N}^i$ with the property $\varrho_T^i(y, x_j^i) \leq \frac{1}{2} \min\{\delta, \delta_0\}$, i.e.,

$$D \subseteq \cup_{j=1}^{k_i} C_j^i, \quad C_j^i = \{y : \varrho_T^i(y, x_j^i) \leq \frac{1}{2} \min\{\delta, \delta_0\}\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (4.13)$$

Consequently, we have

$$D \subseteq \cup_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m, j} (C_{j_1}^1 \cap C_{j_2}^2 \cap \dots \cap C_{j_m}^m \cap F_j)$$

and

$$S(T)D \subseteq \cup_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m, j} (S(T)(C_{j_1}^1 \cap C_{j_2}^2 \cap \dots \cap C_{j_m}^m \cap F_j)).$$

By (4.12) and (4.13), for any $y_1, y_2 \in C_{j_1}^1 \cap C_{j_2}^2 \cap \dots \cap C_{j_m}^m \cap F_j$, we have

$$d(y_1, y_2) \leq \text{diam} F_j < \alpha(S(t)D) + \epsilon \quad (4.14)$$

and

$$\varrho_T^i(y_1, y_2) \leq \min\{\delta, \delta_0\}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m. \quad (4.15)$$

Inequality (4.15) implies

$$g\left(\varrho_T^1(y_1, y_2), \dots, \varrho_T^m(y_1, y_2)\right) < \epsilon. \quad (4.16)$$

We deduce from (4.11), (4.14) and (4.16) that

$$d(S(T)y_1, S(T)y_2) \leq \eta(\alpha(S(t)D) + \epsilon) + \epsilon,$$

i.e.,

$$\text{diam}(S(T)(C_{j_1}^1 \cap C_{j_2}^2 \cap \dots \cap C_{j_m}^m \cap F_j)) \leq \eta(\alpha(S(t)D) + \epsilon) + \epsilon.$$

Hence according to the definition of Kuratowski's noncompactness measure,

$$\alpha(S(T)D) \leq \eta\alpha(D). \quad (4.17)$$

From (4.17) we obtain

$$\alpha(S(nT)\mathcal{B}_0) = \alpha(S(T)S((n-1)T)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq \eta\alpha(S((n-1)T)\mathcal{B}_0), \forall n \in \mathbb{N},$$

which by iteration yields

$$\alpha(S(nT)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq \eta^n \alpha(\mathcal{B}_0).$$

Therefore, for all $t \geq T$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) &\leq \alpha(S([\frac{t}{T}]T)\mathcal{B}_0) \\ &\leq \eta^{[\frac{t}{T}]} \alpha(\mathcal{B}_0) \\ &\leq \eta^{\frac{t}{T}-1} \alpha(\mathcal{B}_0). \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

Thus by Lemma 2.4, for every bounded set $B \subseteq X$, we have estimate

$$\alpha(S(t)B) < \eta^{\frac{t-t_*(B)-T}{T}} \alpha(\mathcal{B}_0), \quad \forall t \geq t_*(B) + T,$$

where $t_*(B)$ satisfies

$$S(t)B \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0, \quad \forall t \geq t_*(B).$$

□

Remark 4.1. When $g = 0$, (4.11) implies that $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is exponentially stable in $B \subseteq X$. (4.11) is called *quasi-stability inequality*, since it pertains to decomposition of the flow into exponentially stable and compact parts.

5. Application to a class of wave equations

In the last section, we will establish the existence of generalized exponential attractors for a class of wave equations with critical nonlinearity by means of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 4.3.

Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^N ($N \geq 3$) with a sufficiently smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. Consider the wave equation:

$$u_{tt} - \Delta u + k||u_t||^p u_t + l u_t + f(u) = \int_{\Omega} K(x, y) u_t(y) dy + h(x), \quad x \in \Omega, t \geq 0, \quad (5.1)$$

$$u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (5.2)$$

$$u(x, 0) = u_0(x), u_t(x, 0) = u_1(x), \quad x \in \Omega. \quad (5.3)$$

We assume the following.

Assumption 5.1. (i) k, l and p are positive constants, $K \in L^2(\Omega \times \Omega)$, $h \in L^2(\Omega)$;

(ii) $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies the critical growth condition

$$|f'(s)| \leq M(|s|^{\frac{2}{N-2}} + 1) \quad (5.4)$$

and the dissipativity condition

$$\liminf_{|s| \rightarrow \infty} f'(s) \equiv \mu > -\lambda_1, \quad (5.5)$$

where $M \geq 0$ and λ_1 is the first eigenvalue of the operator $-\Delta$ equipped with Dirichlet boundary condition.

We have proved in [21] the global well-posedness and dissipativity for the problem (5.1)-(5.3) with $l = 0$. Adding the linear damping term $l u_t$ ($l > 0$) makes no essential difference to the proof of the well-posedness and dissipativity. Similarly as in [21], we have the lemma as follows.

Lemma 5.1. [21] Let $T > 0$ be arbitrary. Under Assumptions 5.1, for every $(u_0, u_1) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$, the initial boundary value problem (5.1)-(5.3) has a unique weak solution $u \in C([0, T]; H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0, T]; L^2(\Omega))$, which generates the semigroup

$$S(t)(u_0, u_1) = (u(t), u_t(t)), \quad t \geq 0$$

on $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$.

Furthermore, the semigroup $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is dissipative, which implies the existence of a positively invariant bounded absorbing set \mathcal{B}_0 .

To establish the main result in this section, the following lemmas are also needed.

Lemma 5.2. [9] The integral operator

$$\begin{aligned} K : L^2(\Omega) &\longrightarrow L^2(\Omega) \\ v &\longmapsto \int_{\Omega} K(x, y) v(y) dy \end{aligned}$$

is a compact operator provided that the kernel $K(x, y)$ is square integrable.

Lemma 5.3. [15, Corollary 4] Assume $X \hookrightarrow B \hookrightarrow Y$ where X, B, Y are Banach spaces. The following statements hold.

- (i) Let F be bounded in $L^p(0, T; X)$ where $1 \leq p < \infty$, and $\partial F / \partial t = \{\partial f / \partial t : f \in F\}$ be bounded in $L^1(0, T; Y)$, where $\partial / \partial t$ is the weak time derivative. Then F is relatively compact in $L^p(0, T; B)$.
- (ii) Let F be bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; X)$ and $\partial F / \partial t$ be bounded in $L^r(0, T; Y)$ where $r > 1$. Then F is relatively compact in $C(0, T; B)$.

Lemma 5.4. Let $\{a_{m,n}\}_{m,n=1}^\infty$ be a non-negative real sequence with two variables $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. If there exists a subsequence $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of $\{n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $\lim_{k,l \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k, n_l} = 0$, then

$$\liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_{m,n} = 0.$$

Theorem 5.1. Under Assumptions 5.1, the dynamical system $(H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega), \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ generated by problem (5.1)-(5.3) possesses a generalized exponential attractor \mathcal{A}^* such that for every bounded set $B \subseteq X$ we have

$$\text{dist}(S(t)B, \mathcal{A}^*) \leq C e^{-\min\{\frac{\sqrt{\lambda_1}}{2}, \frac{l}{4}\}(t-t_*(B)-1)}, \quad \forall t \geq t_*(B) + 1, \quad (5.6)$$

where $t_*(B)$ is the entering time of B into \mathcal{B}_0 and λ_1 is the first eigenvalue of the operator $-\Delta$ equipped with Dirichlet boundary condition.

Proof. Write $\Psi(u_t(t, x)) = \int_\Omega K(x, y) u_t(t, y) dy$. Let $\mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ be a positively invariant bounded absorbing set and $w(t), v(t)$ be two weak solutions to (5.1)-(5.3) corresponding to initial data $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{B}_0$, i.e.,

$$(w(t), w_t(t)) \equiv S(t)y_1, (v(t), v_t(t)) \equiv S(t)y_2, \quad y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{B}_0.$$

Since \mathcal{B}_0 is positively invariant, we have

$$\begin{cases} \|(w(t), w_t(t))\|_{H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)} \leq C, \\ \|(v(t), v_t(t))\|_{H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)} \leq C, \end{cases} \quad \forall t > 0, y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{B}_0. \quad (5.7)$$

The difference $z(t) = w(t) - v(t)$ satisfies

$$z_{tt} - \Delta z + k(\|w_t\|^p w_t - \|v_t\|^p v_t) + l z_t + f(w) - f(v) = \Psi(z_t). \quad (5.8)$$

Let $E(z) = \frac{1}{2}(\|z_t\|^2 + \|\nabla z\|^2)$, $E_\delta(z) = E(z) + \delta(z_t, z)$. Take $\delta = \min\{\frac{\sqrt{\lambda_1}}{2}, \frac{l}{4}\}$. Then by Poincaré's inequality we have

$$\delta|(z, z_t)| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_1}}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}} \|\nabla z\| \|z_t\| \leq \frac{1}{4}(\|\nabla z\|^2 + \|z_t\|^2) \leq \frac{1}{2}E(z) \quad (5.9)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2}E(z) \leq E_\delta(z) \leq \frac{3}{2}E(z). \quad (5.10)$$

Multiplying (5.8) by $z_t + \delta z$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}E_\delta(z) + 2\delta E_\delta(z) = & - (k||w_t||^p w_t - k||v_t||^p v_t, w_t - v_t) - (l - 2\delta)||z_t||^2 \\
& - (f(w) - f(v), w_t - v_t) + (\Psi(w_t - v_t), w_t - v_t) \\
& - \delta(k||w_t||^p w_t - k||v_t||^p v_t, w - v) \\
& - \delta(f(w) - f(v), w - v) + \delta(\Psi(w_t - v_t), w - v) \\
& + (2\delta^2 - \delta l)(z_t, z).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

It follows from (5.7) that

$$\|\Psi(w_t - v_t)\| \leq \|K\|_{L^2(\Omega \times \Omega)} \|w_t - v_t\| \leq C. \tag{5.12}$$

We deduce from (5.4) and (5.7) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|f(w) - f(v)\| \\
& = \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \left[\int_0^1 f'(v + \theta(w - v))(w - v) d\theta \right]^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C \left\{ \int_{\Omega} (|w|^{\frac{4}{N-2}} + |v|^{\frac{4}{N-2}} + 1) |w - v|^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C \left(\|w\|^{\frac{2}{\frac{2N}{N-2}}} + \|v\|^{\frac{2}{\frac{2N}{N-2}}} + 1 \right) \|w - v\|^{\frac{2N}{N-2}} \\
& \leq C \left(\|\nabla w\|^{\frac{2}{N-2}} + \|\nabla v\|^{\frac{2}{N-2}} + 1 \right) \|\nabla(w - v)\| \\
& \leq C.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

We infer from (5.7), (5.12) and (5.13) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\delta(k||w_t||^p w_t - k||v_t||^p v_t, w - v) - \delta(f(w) - f(v), w - v) \\
& + \delta(\Psi(w_t - v_t), w - v) + (2\delta^2 - \delta l)(z_t, z) \leq C\|z\|
\end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

and

$$(\Psi(w_t - v_t), w_t - v_t) \leq C\|\Psi(w_t - v_t)\|. \tag{5.15}$$

Plugging (5.14) and (5.15) into (5.11) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d}{dt}E_\delta(z) + 2\delta E_\delta(z) \\
& \leq - (f(w) - f(v), w_t - v_t) + C\|\Psi(w_t - v_t)\| + C\|z\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

By Gronwall's inequality, (5.10) and (5.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}E(z(t)) &\leq E_\delta(z(t)) \\
&\leq e^{-2\delta t}E_\delta(z(0)) + C \int_0^t \|z(s)\| ds \\
&\quad + C \int_0^t \|\Psi(w_t(s) - v_t(s))\| ds \\
&\quad + \left| \int_0^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} (f(w(s)) - f(v(s)), w_t(s) - v_t(s)) ds \right| \\
&\leq e^{-2\delta t}E_\delta(z(0)) + Ct \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|z(s)\| \\
&\quad + C \int_0^t \|\Psi(w_t(s) - v_t(s))\| ds \\
&\quad + \left| \int_0^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} (f(w(s)) - f(v(s)), w_t(s) - v_t(s)) ds \right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

Write

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_t(y_1, y_2) &\equiv Ct \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|z(s)\| + C \int_0^t \|\Psi(w_t(s) - v_t(s))\| ds \\
&\quad + \left| \int_0^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} (f(w(s)) - f(v(s)), w_t(s) - v_t(s)) ds \right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

We derive from (5.10) and (5.17) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|S(t)y_1 - S(t)y_2\|_{H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)} &\leq 2e^{-\delta t} \sqrt{E_\delta(z(0))} + 2\sqrt{\Phi_t(y_1, y_2)} \\
&\leq 2e^{-\delta t} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}E(z(0))} + 2\sqrt{\Phi_t(y_1, y_2)} \\
&\leq Ce^{-\delta t} + 2\sqrt{\Phi_t(y_1, y_2)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

Next, we will prove that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} 2\sqrt{\Phi_t(y^{(n)}, y^{(m)})} = 0, \quad \forall \{y^{(n)}\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_t(y^{(n)}, y^{(m)}) = 0, \quad \forall \{y^{(n)}\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0. \tag{5.20}$$

We write $u^{(n)}(t) = S(t)y^{(n)}$ and thereby have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_t(y^{(n)}, y^{(m)}) &= \left| \int_0^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} (f(u^{(n)}(s)) - f(u^{(m)}(s)), u_t^{(n)}(s) - u_t^{(m)}(s)) ds \right| \\
&\quad + C \int_0^t \|\Psi(u_t^{(n)}(s) - u_t^{(m)}(s))\| ds + tC \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|u^{(n)}(s) - u^{(m)}(s)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

By Alaoglu's theorem, we deduce from

$$\|(u^{(n)}(t), u_t^{(n)}(t))\|_{H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)} \leq C, \quad \forall t \geq 0 \quad (5.21)$$

that there exists a subsequence of $\{u^{(n)}\}$, still denoted by $\{u^{(n)}\}$, such that

$$(u^{(n)}, u_t^{(n)}) \xrightarrow{*} (u, v) \quad \text{in } L^\infty(0, t; H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)). \quad (5.22)$$

Moreover, we can verify that $v = u_t$.

Indeed, by (5.22), for any $\phi(s) \in C_c^\infty[0, t]$ and any $\psi_0(x) \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t (u_t^{(n)}(s), \phi(s) \Delta \psi_0(x)) ds \\ &= \int_0^t \phi(s) \frac{d}{dt} (u^{(n)}(s), \Delta \psi_0(x)) ds \\ &= - \int_0^t \phi'(s) (u^{(n)}(s), \Delta \psi_0(x)) ds \\ &= \int_0^t (\nabla u^{(n)}(s), \phi'(s) \nabla \psi_0(x)) ds \\ &\rightarrow \int_0^t (\nabla u(s), \phi'(s) \nabla \psi_0(x)) ds \\ &= \int_0^t (u_t(s), \phi(s) \Delta \psi_0(x)) ds \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_0^t (u_t^{(n)}(s), \phi(s) \Delta \psi_0(x)) ds \rightarrow \int_0^t (v(s), \phi(s) \Delta \psi_0(x)) ds$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It follows that $v = u_t$.

By Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem,

$$C([0, T], H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0, T], L^2(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow C([0, T], L^2(\Omega)). \quad (5.23)$$

Hence there exists a subsequence of $\{u^{(n)}\}$, still denoted by $\{u^{(n)}\}$, such that

$$u^{(n)} \rightarrow w \quad \text{in } C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)). \quad (5.24)$$

Besides, we have $w = u$.

Indeed, by (5.22), for every $\psi \in L^1(0, t; H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega))$, we have

$$\left| \int_0^t (u^{(n)}(s) - u(s), \Delta \psi(s)) ds \right| = \left| \int_0^t (\nabla(u^{(n)}(s) - u(s)), \nabla \psi(s)) ds \right| \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.25)$$

Meanwhile, it follows from (5.23) that

$$\left| \int_0^t (u^{(n)}(s) - w(s), \Delta \psi(s)) ds \right| \leq \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|u^{(n)}(s) - w(s)\| \int_0^t \|\Delta \psi(s)\| ds \rightarrow 0.$$

Consequently, $w = u$.

Let \mathcal{A} be the strictly positive operator on $L^2(\Omega)$ defined by $\mathcal{A} = -\Delta$ with domain $D(\mathcal{A}) = H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$.

We derive from $H^N(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)$ (where N denotes the spatial dimension) that $L^1(\Omega) \hookrightarrow (L^\infty(\Omega))^* \hookrightarrow H^{-N}(\Omega)$. Therefore, we deduce from (5.4) and (5.21) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathcal{A}^{-\frac{N}{2}} f(u^{(n)}(s)) - \mathcal{A}^{-\frac{N}{2}} f(u(s))\| \\
&= \|f(u^{(n)}(s)) - f(u(s))\|_{H^{-N}(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C \|f(u^{(n)}(s)) - f(u(s))\|_1 \\
&= C \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 f'(u(s) + \theta(u^{(n)}(s) - u(s))) \cdot (u^{(n)}(s) - u(s)) d\theta \right| dx \\
&\leq C \int_{\Omega} (|u^{(n)}(s)|^{\frac{2}{N-2}} + |u(s)|^{\frac{2}{N-2}} + 1) \cdot |u^{(n)}(s) - u(s)| dx \\
&\leq C \|u^{(n)}(s) - u(s)\| \cdot (1 + \|u^{(n)}(s)\|^{\frac{2}{N-2}} + \|u(s)\|^{\frac{2}{N-2}}) \\
&\leq C \|u^{(n)}(s) - u(s)\| (1 + \|\nabla u^{(n)}(s)\|^{\frac{2}{N-2}} + \|\nabla u(s)\|^{\frac{2}{N-2}}) \\
&\leq C \|u^{(n)}(s) - u(s)\|
\end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

holds for all $s \in [0, t]$.

Combining (5.24) and (5.26) gives

$$\sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\mathcal{A}^{-\frac{N}{2}} (f(u^{(n)}(s)) - f(u(s)))\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_0^t (f(u^{(n)}(s)) - f(u(s)), \varphi(s)) ds \right| \\
&= \left| \int_0^t \left(\mathcal{A}^{-\frac{N}{2}} (f(u^{(n)}(s)) - f(u(s))), \mathcal{A}^{\frac{N}{2}} \varphi(s) \right) ds \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \left\| \mathcal{A}^{-\frac{N}{2}} (f(u^{(n)}(s)) - f(u(s))) \right\| \int_0^t \|\varphi(s)\|_{H^N(\Omega)} ds \\
&\rightarrow 0
\end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

holds for all $\varphi \in L^1(0, t; H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega))$. Since $L^1(0, t; H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega))$ is dense in $L^1(0, t; L^2(\Omega))$, (5.27) implies

$$f(u^{(n)}) \xrightarrow{*} f(u) \text{ in } L^\infty(0, t; L^2(\Omega)). \tag{5.28}$$

We infer from (5.22) and (5.28) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} (f(u^{(n)}(s)), u_t^{(m)}(s)) ds \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t (e^{-2\delta(t-s)} f(u^{(n)}(s)), u_t^{(m)}(s)) ds \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t (e^{-2\delta(t-s)} f(u^{(n)}(s)), u_t(s)) ds \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t (f(u^{(n)}(s)), e^{-2\delta(t-s)} u_t(s)) ds \\
&= \int_0^t (f(u(s)), e^{-2\delta(t-s)} u_t(s)) ds \\
&= \int_0^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} (f(u(s)), u_t(s)) ds
\end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} (f(u^{(m)}(s)), u_t^{(n)}(s)) ds \\
&= \int_0^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} (f(u(s)), u_t(s)) ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

Write $F(\mu) = \int_0^\mu f(\tau) d\tau$. We deduce from (5.4) and (5.21) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_\Omega F(u^{(n)}(s)) dx - \int_\Omega F(u(s)) dx \right| \\
&\leq \int_\Omega \left| \int_0^1 f(u(s) + \theta(u^{(n)}(s) - u(s))) \cdot (u^{(n)}(s) - u(s)) d\theta \right| dx \\
&\leq C \int_\Omega (|u^{(n)}(s)|^{\frac{N}{N-2}} + |u(s)|^{\frac{N}{N-2}} + 1) \cdot |u^{(n)}(s) - u(s)| dx \\
&\leq C \|u^{(n)}(s) - u(s)\| \cdot \left(1 + \|u^{(n)}(s)\|^{\frac{N}{N-2}} + \|u(s)\|^{\frac{N}{N-2}}\right) \\
&\leq C \|u^{(n)}(s) - u(s)\| \left(1 + \|\nabla u^{(n)}(s)\|^{\frac{N}{N-2}} + \|\nabla u(s)\|^{\frac{N}{N-2}}\right) \\
&\leq C \|u^{(n)}(s) - u(s)\|
\end{aligned} \tag{5.31}$$

holds for all $s \in [0, t]$, which together with (5.24), yields

$$\sup_{s \in [0, t]} \left| \int_\Omega F(u^{(n)}(s)) dx - \int_\Omega F(u(s)) dx \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty). \tag{5.32}$$

It follows from (5.32) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} (f(u^{(n)}(s)), u_t^{(n)}(s)) ds \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\int_{\Omega} F(u^{(n)}(t)) dx - e^{-2\delta t} \int_{\Omega} F(u^{(n)}(0)) dx - \int_0^t 2\delta e^{-2\delta(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} F(u^{(n)}(s)) dx ds \right] \\
&= \int_{\Omega} F(u(t)) dx - e^{-2\delta t} \int_{\Omega} F(u(0)) dx - \int_0^t 2\delta e^{-2\delta(t-s)} \int_{\Omega} F(u(s)) dx ds \\
&= \int_0^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} (f(u(s)), u_t(s)) ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.33}$$

From (5.29), (5.30) and (5.33), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_0^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} (f(u^{(n)}(s)) - f(u^{(m)}(s)), u_t^{(n)}(s) - u_t^{(m)}(s)) ds \right| \\
&= \left| \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left[\int_0^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} (f(u^{(n)}(s)) - f(u^{(m)}(s)), u_t^{(n)}(s) - u_t^{(m)}(s)) ds \right] \right| \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.34}$$

Let V be the completion of $L^2(\Omega)$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_V$ given by $\|\cdot\|_V = \|\Psi(\cdot)\| + \|\mathcal{A}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot\|$ and W be the completion of $L^2(\Omega)$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_W$ given by $\|\cdot\|_W = \|\mathcal{A}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot\|$. By Lemma 5.2, we have

$$L^2(\Omega) \hookrightarrow V \hookrightarrow W. \tag{5.35}$$

By (5.13),

$$\|f(u^{(n)}(t))\| \leq C. \tag{5.36}$$

In addition,

$$\|\Psi(u_t^{(n)}(t))\| \leq \|K\|_{L^2(\Omega \times \Omega)} \|u_t^{(n)}(t)\| \leq C. \tag{5.37}$$

We deduce from (5.1), (5.36) and (5.37) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{A}^{-\frac{1}{2}} u_{tt}^{(n)}(s)\| &\leq \|\nabla u^{(n)}(s)\| + (k \|u_t^{(n)}(s)\|^p + l) \|\mathcal{A}^{-\frac{1}{2}} u_t^{(n)}(s)\| \\
&\quad + \|\mathcal{A}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\Psi(u_t^{(n)}(s)) + h - f(u^{(n)}(s)))\| \\
&\leq C,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\int_0^t \|\mathcal{A}^{-\frac{1}{2}} u_{tt}^{(n)}(s)\| ds \leq C_t. \tag{5.38}$$

Besides, we have

$$\int_0^t \|u_t^{(n)}(s)\| dt \leq C_t. \tag{5.39}$$

By Lemma 5.3, (5.35), (5.38) and (5.39) imply that $\{u_t^{(n)}(t)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is relatively compact in $L^1(0, T; V)$. Thus there exists a subsequence of $\{(u^{(n)}, u_t^{(n)})\}_{n=1}^\infty$ (still denoted by itself) such that

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \|\Psi(u_t^{(n)}(s) - u_t^{(m)}(s))\| ds = 0. \quad (5.40)$$

It follows from (5.24) that

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|u^{(n)}(s) - u^{(m)}(s)\| = 0, \quad (5.41)$$

which, together with (5.40) and Lemma 5.4, leads to

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left[C \int_0^t \|\Psi(u_t^{(n)}(s) - u_t^{(m)}(s))\| ds + tC \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|u^{(n)}(s) - u^{(m)}(s)\| \right] = 0. \quad (5.42)$$

(5.20) follows from (5.34) and (5.42).

By Theorem 4.3, combining (5.19) and (5.20) yields

$$\alpha(S(t)\mathcal{B}_0) \leq Ce^{-\delta t} = Ce^{-\min\{\frac{\sqrt{\lambda_1}}{2}, \frac{l}{4}\}t}, \quad \forall t > 0. \quad (5.43)$$

Consequently, by Theorem 3.1,

Then $(H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega), \{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ possesses a generalized exponential attractor \mathcal{A}^* such that for every bounded set $B \subseteq X$ we have

$$\text{dist}(S(t)B, \mathcal{A}^*) \leq Ce^{-\min\{\frac{\sqrt{\lambda_1}}{2}, \frac{l}{4}\}(t-t_*(B)-1)}, \quad \forall t \geq t_*(B) + 1, \quad (5.44)$$

where $t_*(B)$ is the entering time of B into \mathcal{B}_0 .

The proof is completed. \square

Remark 5.1. As indicated by inequality (5.6), the index of the attractive speed is $\min\{\frac{\sqrt{\lambda_1}}{2}, \frac{l}{4}\}$. When $l < 2\sqrt{\lambda_1}$, the larger l is, the higher the attractive speed of the generalized exponential attractor is; however, when $l \geq 2\sqrt{\lambda_1}$, the increase of l will not continue to lead to the corresponding increase of the attractive velocity.

References

References

- [1] R.R. Akhmerov, M.I. Kamenskii, A.S. Potapov, A.E. Rodkina and B.N. Sadovskii, *Measures of Noncompactness and Condensing Operators*, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1992. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-0348-5727-7>
- [2] I. Chueshov and I. Lasiecka, *Long-time Behavior of Second Order Evolution Equations with Nonlinear Damping*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., 2008. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/memo/0912>.

- [3] P. Constantin, C. Foias, B. Nicolaenko and R. Temam, *Integral Manifolds and Inertial Manifolds for Dissipative Partial Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-3506-4>
- [4] K. Deimling, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, Springer, Berlin, 1985.
- [5] A. Eden, C. Foias, B. Nicolaenko and R. Temam, *Exponential Attractors for Dissipative Evolution Equations*, Masson, Paris, 1994.
- [6] C. Foias and E. Olson, Finite fractal dimension and Hölder-Lipshitz parametrization, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **45**(1996), 603–616.
- [7] C. Foias, G.R. Sell and R. Temam, Inertial manifolds for nonlinear evolution equations, *J. Diff. Eqns.*, **73**(1988), 309–353.
- [8] B.R. Hunt and V.Y. Kaloshin, Regularity of embeddings of infinite-dimensional fractal sets into finite-dimensional spaces, *Nonlinearity*, **12**(1999), 1263–1275. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0951-7715/12/5/303>
- [9] P. Lax, *Functional Analysis*, Wiley-Interscience [John Wiley & Sons], New York, 2002.
- [10] Q. Ma, S. Wang and C. Zhong, Necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of global attractors for semigroups and applications, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **51**(2002), 1541–1559. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1512/iumj.2002.51.2255>.
- [11] A. Miranville and S. Zelik, Attractors for dissipative partial differential equations in bounded and unbounded domains, in *Handbook of Differential Equations: Evolutionary Equations. Vol. IV*, Elsevier/North-Holland, Amsterdam, (2008), 103–200. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1874-5717\(08\)00003-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1874-5717(08)00003-0)
- [12] X. Mora and J. Solà-Morales, Existence and nonexistence of finite-dimensional globally attracting invariant manifolds in semilinear damped wave equations, in *Dynamics of Infinite-dimensional Systems*, Springer, Berlin, (1987), 187–210.
- [13] J.C. Robinson, *Infinite-dimensional Dynamical Systems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [14] G.R. Sell and Y. You, *Dynamics of Evolutionary Equations*, Springer, New York, 2002.
- [15] J. Simon, Compact sets in the space $L^p(0, T; B)$, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, **146**(1986), 65–96.
- [16] R. Temam, *Infinite-dimensional Dynamical Systems in Mechanics and Physics*, 2nd edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0645-3>.
- [17] S. Zelik, The attractor for a nonlinear hyperbolic equation in the unbounded domain, *Discrete Cont. Dyn. Systems*, **7**(2001), 593–641.

- [18] S. Zelik, The attractor for a nonlinear reaction-diffusion system in the unbounded domain and Kolmogorov's ϵ -entropy, *Math. Nachr.*, **232**(2001), 129–179. <https://doi.org/10.1142/97898127926170138>
- [19] S. Zelik, Attractors of reaction-diffusion systems in unbounded domains and their spatial complexity, *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, **56**(2003), 584–637.
- [20] J. Zhang, P. Kloeden, M. Yang and C. Zhong, Global exponential κ -dissipative semigroups and exponential attraction, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **37**(2017), 3487–3502. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3934/dcds.2017148>.
- [21] C. Zhao, C. Zhao and C. Zhong, Asymptotic behaviour of the wave equation with nonlocal weak damping and anti-damping, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **490**(2020), 124186–124202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2020.124186>
- [22] C. Zhao, C. Zhong and Z. Tang, Asymptotic behaviour of the wave equation with nonlocal weak damping, anti-damping and critical nonlinearity, preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.07395>
- [23] C. Zhong and W. Niu, On the Z_2 index of the global attractor for a class of p -Laplacian equations, *Nonlinear Anal.*, **73**(2010), 3698–3704.