

Ivan Straškraba; Otto Vejvoda

Correction to our paper “Periodic solutions to abstract differential equations”

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 27 (1977), No. 3, 511–513

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/101486>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1977

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



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

CORRECTION TO OUR PAPER: PERIODIC SOLUTIONS
TO ABSTRACT DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS*)

IVAN STRAŠKRABA, OTTO VEJVODA, Praha

(Received March 4, 1977)

V. LOVICAR brought our attention to the fact that in Lemma 1.2.1 of our paper [1] the assertion $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{A})$ is closed is not valid unless another assumption, namely e.g. assumption

$$(1) \quad \inf_{\lambda \in A \setminus A_1} \sum_{i,j=1}^2 |a_{ij}(\lambda)|^2 = \alpha_0 > 0,$$

where $A_1 = \{\lambda \in \sigma(\mathbf{A}); a_{ij}(\lambda) = 0, i, j = 1, 2\}$, is added. He suggested a more general version of the lemma and also a simpler proof. Further he pointed out that the assumption $A = \{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ may be omitted. Let us introduce the correct proof of the closedness of $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{A})$ under the new assumptions.

We suppose that all the assumptions of Lemma 1.2.1 are satisfied except for $A = \{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and that (1) holds. Let P be as in the proof of Lemma 1.2.1 and denote by Q the orthogonal projection onto $\mathcal{N}(\sum_{i,j=1}^2 A_{ij}^2) = \bigcap_{i,j=1}^2 \mathcal{N}(A_{ij}) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(D)$ and $R = P - Q$. First, we see that $\mathcal{R}(\sum_{i,j=1}^2 A_{ij}^2)$ is closed. This can be deduced from (1) similarly as $\mathcal{R}(D) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(D)}$ was deduced from (1.2.5) of [1]. Second, by elementary calculation, for $[f_1, f_2] \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{A})$ we get $A_{22}f_1 - A_{12}f_2, -A_{21}f_1 + A_{11}f_2 \in \mathcal{R}(D)$ and hence the same is true for $[f_1, f_2] \in \overline{\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{A})} = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^*)^\perp$. Now, let $[f_1, f_2] \perp \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^*)$. Show that $[f_1, f_2] \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{A})$. The solution of the equation $\mathbf{A}(x_1, x_2) = [(I - P)f_1, (I - P)f_2]$ reads

$$y_1 = \int_{R \setminus A} d(\lambda)^{-1} dE(\lambda) (A_{22}(I - P)f_1 - A_{12}(I - P)f_2),$$

$$y_2 = \int_{R \setminus A} d(\lambda)^{-1} dE(\lambda) (-A_{21}(I - P)f_1 + A_{11}(I - P)f_2).$$

*) Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, 23 (98) 1973, 635-669.

So we have $[(I - P)f_1, (I - P)f_2] \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^*)^\perp$ and hence $[Pf_1, Pf_2] \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^*)^\perp$. The latter together with $A_{ij}P = A_{ij}R$ imply

$$(2) \quad A_{22}Rf_1 - A_{12}Rf_2 = -A_{21}Rf_1 + A_{11}Rf_2 = 0.$$

Since $Rf_1, Rf_2 \in \mathcal{N}(\sum_{i,j=1}^2 A_{ij}^2)^\perp$ we can define

$$\begin{aligned} z_1 &= \int_{\sigma(A) \setminus A_1} a_{11}(\lambda) \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^2 a_{ij}(\lambda)^2 \right)^{-1} dE(\lambda) Rf_1 + \\ &+ \int_{\sigma(A) \setminus A_1} a_{21}(\lambda) \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^2 a_{ij}(\lambda)^2 \right)^{-1} dE(\lambda) Rf_2, \\ z_2 &= \int_{\sigma(A) \setminus A_1} a_{12}(\lambda) \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^2 a_{ij}(\lambda)^2 \right)^{-1} dE(\lambda) Rf_1 + \\ &+ \int_{\sigma(A) \setminus A_1} a_{22}(\lambda) \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^2 a_{ij}(\lambda)^2 \right)^{-1} dE(\lambda) Rf_2 \end{aligned}$$

and by (2) clearly obtain $\mathbf{A}(z_1, z_2) = [Rf_1, Rf_2]$. As $[Rf_1, Rf_2] \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^*)^\perp$ it is $[Qf_1, Qf_2] \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^*)^\perp$ too. But on the other hand $Qf_1, Qf_2 \in \bigcap_{i,j=1}^2 \mathcal{N}(A_{ij})$ which implies $[Qf_1, Qf_2] \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^*)$. Hence $Qf_1 = Qf_2 = 0$. Setting $x_j = y_j + z_j, j = 1, 2$ we get $\mathbf{A}(x_1, x_2) = [f_1, f_2]$.

Our omission in Lemma 1.2.1 necessitates some further changes in the text.

In the proof of Lemma 3.2.1 there is to set $\psi = -\omega^{-1}P_0g_1 + \int_m^\infty d(\lambda)^{-1} dE(\lambda)(A_{21}g_1 - A_{11}g_2)$. The third formula in (4.2.2) and the fourth formula in (4.3.2) and $G_4(\varepsilon)(u)$ on page 663 change to

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_2 &= \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{sh}^{-1} \omega(\alpha - \beta\gamma) \int_0^\omega e^{2\tau(\alpha - \beta\gamma)} PF(\tau, u(\tau)) d\tau + \\ &+ 2(D/\mathcal{N}(P))^{-1} \int_0^\omega e^{-(\alpha + \beta A)(\omega - \tau)} \sin(\tau - \frac{1}{2}\omega) [A + \gamma - (\alpha + \beta A)^2]^{1/2} * \\ &* \sin \frac{1}{2}\omega [A + \gamma - (\alpha + \beta A)^2]^{1/2} (I - P) F(\tau, u(\tau)) d\tau \end{aligned}$$

and to

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_2 &= - \int_0^\omega \frac{\tau}{\omega} P_0 F(\tau, u(\tau)) d\tau + 2[A^e D/\mathcal{N}(P)]^{-1} \\ &\int_0^\omega \sin(\tau - \frac{1}{2}\omega) (A + \gamma)^{1/2} * \sin \frac{1}{2}\omega (A + \gamma)^{1/2} * A^e (I - P_0) F(\tau, u(\tau)) d\tau \end{aligned}$$

and to

$$G_4(\varepsilon)(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}_4 + \varepsilon \int_0^\omega \frac{\tau}{\omega} P_0 F(\tau, \mathbf{u}_1(\tau)) \, d\tau - 2\varepsilon [A^q D/\mathcal{N}(P)]^{-1} * \\ * \int_0^\omega \sin(\tau - \frac{1}{2}\omega) (A + \gamma)^{1/2} * \sin \frac{1}{2}\omega (A + \gamma)^{1/2} * A^q (I - P_0) \tilde{F}(\tau, \mathbf{u}_1(\tau)) \, d\tau$$

respectively.

References

- [1] I. Straškraba, O. Vejvoda: Periodic solutions to abstract differential equations. Czech. Math. J., 23 (98) 1973, 635–669.

Authors' address: 115 67 Praha 1, Žitná 25, ČSSR (Matematický ústav ČSAV).