

SEMIGROUPS FOR INITIAL–BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS

MARJETA KRAMAR, DELIO MUGNOLO, AND RAINER NAGEL

1. SEMIGROUPS EVERYWHERE

In the foreword of what later became the classic in semigroup theory, E. Hille [Hi48] wrote in 1948:

“The analytical theory of semi-groups is a recent addition to the ever-growing list of mathematical disciplines. It was my good fortune to take an early interest in this discipline and to see it reach maturity. It has been a pleasant association: I hail a semi-group when I see one and

I seem to see them everywhere!”

With this quite general (and provocative) statement he probably expressed his conviction that behind every parabolic or hyperbolic (linear and autonomous) partial differential equation there is a *semigroup* yielding its solutions. In the meantime this has been confirmed in many ways and is presented in excellent form, e.g. in [9] or [16]. We briefly recall one of the standard examples.

Example 1.1. Let Ω be a bounded open domain in \mathbb{R}^n with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. The heat equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions is

$$(HE) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} u(t, x), & t \geq 0, x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \Omega, \\ u(t, z) = 0, & t \geq 0, z \in \partial\Omega, \\ u(0, x) = f(x), & x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

If we now choose an appropriate function space, e.g., $X := L^2(\Omega)$ and define an operator

$$Au := \Delta u := \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} u \quad \text{with domain} \quad D(A) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega),$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 47D06; Secondary 35K99, 47B65.

Key words and phrases. Operator matrices, C_0 -semigroups, spectral theory, initial–boundary value problems.

We thank K.-J. Engel for many helpful comments.

The second author is supported by the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica “Francesco Severi”.

This article was originally published in: M. Iannelli, G. Lumer (eds), *Evolution Equations: Applications to Physics, Industry, Life Sciences and Economics. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications*, vol 55. Birkhäuser, Basel. 2003, 275–292.

the system (HE) can then be re-written as an abstract Cauchy problem

$$(ACP) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{u}(t) = Au(t), & t \geq 0, \\ u(0) = f, & x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

It is well-known (see, e.g., [16, Thm. 7.2.7]) that $(A, D(A))$ generates a strongly continuous (and analytic) semigroup $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$ on X such that

$$u(t, x) := T(t)f(x), \quad t \geq 0, x \in \Omega,$$

are the (mild) solutions of (HE).

Once a partial differential equation is solved in this way by a semigroup, there exist by now powerful tools to describe the qualitative behavior of the solutions. We only mention the spectral theory for semigroups (see [7, Chap. IV]) yielding various Liapunov-type stability theorems or the recent results on maximal regularity of the inhomogeneous version of (ACP) (see, e.g., [4], [17], or [18]).

On the other hand, even when one admits the conceptual lucidity and the generality of the semigroup approach, scepticism may remain, and Hille continues his above quote:

“Friends have observed, however, that there are mathematical objects which are not semi-groups.”

Indeed, already for our heat equation (HE) semigroups seem to be inappropriate as soon as we add an inhomogeneous term on the boundary.

Example 1.2. For the heat equation on Ω as in Example 1.1, we consider inhomogeneous boundary values given by $u(t, z) = \phi(t, z)$ for $t \geq 0, z \in \partial\Omega$. As we will see below, it is more convenient to write this in the form

$$(iHE) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} u(t, x), & t \geq 0, x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, z) = \psi(t, z), & t \geq 0, z \in \partial\Omega, \\ u(0, x) = f(x), & x \in \Omega, \\ u(0, z) = g(z), & z \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\psi(t, z) := \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \phi(t, z)$. □

Such a situation typically occurs in all kinds of boundary control problems (see, e.g., [14]). The obstacle to use semigroups consists in the fact that the inhomogeneous term

$$t \mapsto \psi(t)$$

does not map into the state space chosen in Example 1.1. However, as for many other types of equations (e.g., delay equations, integro-differential equations) initially not having the form (ACP), it is possible to extend the state space and then write (iHE) as an inhomogeneous abstract Cauchy problem: take $X := L^2(\Omega)$, $\partial X := L^2(\partial\Omega)$, and $A := \Delta$ the Laplacian with appropriate domain (see § 3 below for details). On the product space

$$\mathcal{X} := X \times \partial X,$$

we define a new operator

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{A} := \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D(\mathcal{A}) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in D(A) \times \partial X \mid u|_{\partial\Omega} = v \right\}.$$

Then (iHE) becomes

$$(iACP) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{\mathcal{U}}(t) = \mathcal{A} \mathcal{U}(t) + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \psi(t) \end{pmatrix}, & t \geq 0, \\ \mathcal{U}(0) = \mathcal{U}_0, \end{cases}$$

for a function $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto \mathcal{U}(t) \in \mathcal{X}$ and with the initial data $\mathcal{U}_0 := \begin{pmatrix} f \\ g \end{pmatrix}$. Hence, it becomes an inhomogeneous abstract Cauchy problem and therefore semigroups should be applicable in this situation.

Remark 1.3. The idea to use a product space in order to convert inhomogeneous boundary conditions into the form (iACP) appears and is used systematically by Arendt in [2], see also [1, Chap. 6].

This important example, and the quotation of Hille's cited at the beginning, suggest the following.

Program 1.4.

- (i) Define an abstract setting for the situation described in Example 1.2.
- (ii) Show that well-posedness becomes equivalent to the well-posedness of the corresponding (ACP).
- (iii) Apply semigroup theory to obtain existence of the solutions.

In the following, we propose an appropriate abstract setting, develop this program, and discuss one typical application.

2. ABSTRACT INITIAL–BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS

Let X and ∂X be Banach spaces called *state space* and *boundary space*, respectively. We denote by $\mathcal{X} := X \times \partial X$ their product space, and by π_1 and π_2 the projections onto X and ∂X , respectively.

Assumption 2.1. We consider the following (linear) operators.

- $A : D(A) \subseteq X \rightarrow X$, called *maximal operator*.
- $L : D(A) \rightarrow \partial X$, called *boundary operator*.
- $B : D(B) \subseteq X \rightarrow \partial X$, called *feedback operator*.

For these operators, we assume that $D(A) \subseteq D(B)$ and consider what we call an *abstract initial-boundary value problem on the state space X and the boundary space ∂X* :

$$(AIBVP) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}u(t) = Au(t), & t \geq 0, \\ \frac{d}{dt}Lu(t) = Bu(t), & t \geq 0, \\ u(0) = f, \\ Lu(0) = g, \end{cases}$$

where $f \in X$, $g \in \partial X$. (If we want to emphasize the dependence on the initial data f , g , we write $(AIBVP)_{f,g}$).

We now make precise what we understand by a solution of $(AIBVP)$.

Definition 2.2. Let $(f, g) \in D(A) \times \partial X$ be given initial data. A **classical solution** to $(AIBVP)_{f,g}$ is a function u such that

- (CS₁) $u \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$ and $u(t) \in D(A)$ for all $t \geq 0$,
- (CS₂) $Lu \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+, \partial X)$,
- (CS₃) u satisfies $(AIBVP)_{f,g}$.

Moreover, $(AIBVP)$ is called **well-posed** if

- (WP₁) $\overline{D(A)} = X$,
- (WP₂) $(AIBVP)_{f,g}$ admits a unique classical solution $u(\cdot, f, g)$ for all $(f, g) \in D(A) \times \partial X$ satisfying $Lf = g$,
- (WP₃) for all sequences of initial data $(f_n, g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq D(A) \times \partial X$ tending to 0 and such that $Lf_n = g_n$, one has $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u(t, f_n, g_n) = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Lu(t, f_n, g_n) = 0$ uniformly for t on compact intervals.

A **mild solution** to $(AIBVP)_{f,g}$ for arbitrary $(f, g) \in \mathcal{X}$ is a function u such that

- (MS₁) $u \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$ and $\int_0^t u(s)ds \in D(A)$ for all $t \geq 0$,
- (MS₂) $B\left(\int_0^t u(s)ds\right) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \partial X)$,
- (MS₃) u satisfies the integrated problem

$$\begin{cases} u(t) = f + A \int_0^t u(s)ds, & t \geq 0, \\ L \int_0^t u(s)ds = tg + \int_0^t B \left(\int_0^s u(r) dr \right) ds, & t \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

In order to treat $(AIBVP)$ using semigroups we consider the operator matrices on \mathcal{X} given by

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{A} := \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with domain} \quad D(\mathcal{A}) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in D(A) \times \partial X \mid Lu = v \right\},$$

and

$$(2.2) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{A}} := \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ B & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with domain} \quad D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}) := D(\mathcal{A}).$$

We briefly state some of their properties.

Lemma 2.3. *Let B be relatively A -bounded. Then the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is closed if and only if the operator $\begin{pmatrix} A \\ L \end{pmatrix} : D(A) \subseteq X \rightarrow X \times \partial X$ is closed.*

Proof. Assume first that $\begin{pmatrix} A \\ L \end{pmatrix}$ is a closed operator. Let

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u_n \\ v_n \end{pmatrix} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq D(\mathcal{A}), \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \begin{pmatrix} u_n \\ v_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \begin{pmatrix} u_n \\ v_n \end{pmatrix} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \begin{pmatrix} Au_n \\ Bu_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w \\ z \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $u, w \in X$ and $v, z \in \partial X$. Since

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \begin{pmatrix} A \\ L \end{pmatrix} u_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \begin{pmatrix} Au_n \\ Lu_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w \\ v \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\begin{pmatrix} A \\ L \end{pmatrix}$ is closed, we obtain $u \in D(A)$ and $Lu = v$, thus showing that $\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$. Furthermore, $Au = w$. Finally, the continuity of B with respect to the graph norm of A implies that $z = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Bu_n = Bu$, and hence $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w \\ z \end{pmatrix}$.

Assume now $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ to be closed. Let

$$\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq D(A), \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n = u, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \begin{pmatrix} A \\ L \end{pmatrix} u_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \begin{pmatrix} Au_n \\ Lu_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w \\ v \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $u, w \in X$, $v \in \partial X$. It follows that $\{Bu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to some $z \in \partial X$, and that

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_n \\ Lu_n \end{pmatrix}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq D(\mathcal{A}), \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \begin{pmatrix} u_n \\ Lu_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \begin{pmatrix} u_n \\ Lu_n \end{pmatrix} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \begin{pmatrix} Au_n \\ Bu_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w \\ z \end{pmatrix},$$

and hence, due to closedness of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in D(\mathcal{A}) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} Au \\ Bu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w \\ z \end{pmatrix},$$

i.e., $u \in D(A)$, $Lu = v$, and $Au = w$. □

Lemma 2.4. *Assume that L is surjective and $\ker(L)$ is dense in X . Then the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is densely defined.*

Proof. Let $u \in X$, $v \in \partial X$, $\varepsilon > 0$. Surjectivity of L ensures that there exists $w \in D(A)$ such that $Lw = v$. Take $\tilde{u}, \tilde{w} \in \ker(L)$ such that $\|u - \tilde{u}\|_X < \varepsilon$ and $\|w - \tilde{w}\|_X < \varepsilon$. Let $z := \tilde{u} + w - \tilde{w} \in D(A)$. Then

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} z \\ v \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq \left\| \begin{pmatrix} u - \tilde{u} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\| + \left\| \begin{pmatrix} w - \tilde{w} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

Since $L(z) = L(w) = v$, we obtain $\begin{pmatrix} z \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$. □

For the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, we consider the abstract Cauchy problem on the product space \mathcal{X}

$$(ACP_{\mathbf{x}}) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{\mathcal{U}}(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{U}(t), & t \geq 0, \\ \mathcal{U}(0) = \mathbf{x}, \end{cases}$$

with initial data $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$.

As usual (cf. [7, Def. II.6.1]), for $\mathbf{x} \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ a function \mathcal{U} is called **classical solution** of the abstract Cauchy problem $(ACP_{\mathbf{x}})$ if

- $\mathcal{U} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{X})$,
- $\mathcal{U}(t) \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ for all $t \geq 0$,
- \mathcal{U} satisfies $(ACP)_{\mathbf{x}}$.

As in [7, Def. II.6.8], the abstract Cauchy problem (ACP) associated to the closed operator $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is called **well-posed** if

- $D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ is dense in \mathcal{X} ,
- $(ACP)_{\mathbf{x}}$ admits a unique classical solution $\mathcal{U}(\cdot, \mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$,
- for every sequence of initial data $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ tending to 0 there holds $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U}(t, \mathbf{x}_n) = 0$ uniformly in t on compact intervals.

Further (cf. [7, Def. II.6.3]), for arbitrary $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ a function \mathcal{U} is called **mild solution** of $(ACP)_{\mathbf{x}}$ if

- $\mathcal{U} \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{X})$,
- $\int_0^t \mathcal{U}(s) ds \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ for all $t \geq 0$,
- \mathcal{U} satisfies the integrated problem

$$\mathcal{U}(t) = \mathbf{x} + \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \int_0^t \mathcal{U}(s) ds, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (\text{IP})$$

We now apply the semigroup characterization of well-posedness of abstract Cauchy problems (see [7, Prop. II.6.2, Prop. II.6.4, Cor. II.6.9]).

Proposition 2.5. *Let $(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}))$ be a closed operator on a Banach space \mathcal{X} . Then (ACP) is well-posed if and only if $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup. Moreover, if $(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}))$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup $(\tilde{T}(t))_{t \geq 0}$, then the function*

$$\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto \mathcal{U}(t) := \tilde{T}(t)\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}) \quad (\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, \text{ respectively})$$

is the unique classical (mild, respectively) solution to $(ACP)_{\mathbf{x}}$.

We now show that well-posedness of $(AIBVP)$ is equivalent to well-posedness of the corresponding (ACP) . To that purpose we relate the (classical and mild) solutions of the two problems.

Lemma 2.6. (i) *If u is a classical solution to $(AIBVP)_{f,g}$, then $\mathcal{U} := \begin{pmatrix} u \\ Lu \end{pmatrix}$ is a classical solution to $(ACP)_{\begin{pmatrix} f \\ g \end{pmatrix}}$.*

(ii) *Conversely, if \mathcal{U} is a classical solution to $(ACP)_{\mathbf{x}}$, then $u := \pi_1 \mathcal{U}$ is a classical solution to $(AIBVP)_{\pi_1(\mathbf{x}), \pi_2(\mathbf{x})}$.*

Proof. (i) Let u be a classical solution to $(\text{AIBVP})_{f,g}$. It follows that $u \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$ and $Lu \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+, \partial X)$, and therefore $\mathcal{U} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{X})$. Moreover, $Lf = g$ holds, hence $\binom{f}{g} \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$, and also $\mathcal{U}(t) \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ for all $t \geq 0$. Finally, one can see that $(\text{ACP})_{\binom{f}{g}}$ is fulfilled.

(ii) Assume now $\binom{u}{v} := \mathcal{U}$ to be a classical solution to $(\text{ACP})_{\mathbf{x}}$. Then $\mathcal{U}(t) \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ for all $t \geq 0$ and hence $u(t) \in D(A)$ and $v(t) = Lu(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. It also follows from $\mathcal{U} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{X})$ that $u \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$ and $Lu \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+, \partial X)$. Finally, $\pi_2(\mathbf{x}) = v(0) = Lu(0) = L(\pi_1(\mathbf{x}))$, and $(\text{AIBVP})_{\pi_1(\mathbf{x}), \pi_2(\mathbf{x})}$ is fulfilled. \square

Lemma 2.7. (i) If u is a mild solution to $(\text{AIBVP})_{f,g}$, then $\mathcal{U} := \binom{u}{v}$ is a mild solution to $(\text{ACP})_{\binom{f}{g}}$, where $v(t) := g + B \left(\int_0^t u(s) ds \right)$, $t \geq 0$.
(ii) Conversely, assume that \mathcal{U} is a mild solution to $(\text{ACP})_{\mathbf{x}}$. Then $u := \pi_1 \mathcal{U}$ is a mild solution to $(\text{AIBVP})_{\pi_1(\mathbf{x}), \pi_2(\mathbf{x})}$.

Proof. (i) Let u be a mild solution to $(\text{AIBVP})_{f,g}$. It follows that $u \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$ and $B \left(\int_0^t u(s) ds \right) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \partial X)$, and therefore $\mathcal{U} \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{X})$. Moreover, u fulfills the condition (MS_3) , and this implies that $L \int_0^t u(s) ds = \int_0^t v(s) ds$, i.e., $\int_0^t \mathcal{U}(s) ds \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ for all $t \geq 0$. Finally, there holds

$$u(t) = f + A \int_0^t u(s) ds, \quad \text{and} \quad v(t) = g + B \int_0^t u(s) ds$$

(respectively, by (MS_3) and by definition). These equalities express that (IP) is satisfied.

(ii) Assume now $\binom{u}{v} := \mathcal{U}$ to be a mild solution to $(\text{ACP})_{\mathbf{x}}$. It follows that $\mathcal{U} \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathcal{X})$, and hence $u \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, X)$ and $B \left(\int_0^t u(s) ds \right) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \partial X)$. Moreover, $\int_0^t \mathcal{U}(s) ds \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ for all $t \geq 0$, and this yields

$$\int_0^t u(s) ds \in D(A) \quad \text{and} \quad L \int_0^t u(s) ds = \int_0^t v(s) ds = tg + \int_0^t B \left(\int_0^s u(r) dr \right) ds,$$

for all $t \geq 0$.

Finally, taking the first coordinate of (IP), it follows that $u(t) = \pi_1(\mathbf{x}) + A \int_0^t u(s) ds$. \square

Theorem 2.8. (i) If $(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}))$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup $(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ on \mathcal{X} , then (AIBVP) is well-posed. In this case, the unique classical solution to $(\text{AIBVP})_{f,g}$ is given by $\pi_1 \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot) \binom{f}{g}$ for all initial data $(f, g) \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$.

(ii) Conversely, assume $(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}))$ to be closed and densely defined. If (AIBVP) is well-posed, then $(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}))$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup $(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ on \mathcal{X} .

Proof. (i) Let $(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}))$ generate a strongly continuous semigroup $(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ on \mathcal{X} . Then $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is densely defined, which implies that A is densely defined, too. Moreover, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is closed and, by Proposition 2.5, the associated (ACP) is well-posed. By Lemma 2.6.(ii), $u(\cdot, f, g) = \pi_1 \mathcal{U}(\cdot, \binom{f}{g}) = \pi_1 \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\cdot) \binom{f}{g}$ yields a classical solution to $(\text{AIBVP})_{f,g}$ for all $(f, g) \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}) \times \partial X$ such that $Lf = g$, i.e., for all $(f, g) \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$. This classical solution is unique by Lemma 2.6.(i).

Let now $t_0 > 0$ and $(f_n, g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of initial data satisfying $Lf_n = g_n$ and tending to 0. Note that $\begin{pmatrix} f_n \\ g_n \end{pmatrix} \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ and $\mathcal{U}(t, \begin{pmatrix} f_n \\ g_n \end{pmatrix}) \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ for all $t \geq 0$. Hence we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U}(t, \begin{pmatrix} f_n \\ g_n \end{pmatrix}) = 0$ uniformly in $[0, t_0]$ if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u(t, f_n, g_n) = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Lu(t, f_n, g_n) = 0$ (both uniformly in $[0, t_0]$). Since (ACP) is well-posed, the assertion follows.

(ii) Since $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is closed, it suffices by Proposition 2.5 to show that the associated (ACP) is well-posed. Let $\mathbf{x} \in D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$. Well-posedness of (AIBVP) yields, by Lemma 2.6, existence and uniqueness of a classical solution to (ACP) $_{\mathbf{x}}$. By assumption, $\overline{D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})} = \mathcal{X}$, therefore it only remains to show the continuous dependence on initial data. Let $t_0 > 0$ and $(\mathbf{x}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ be a sequence of initial data tending to 0. Then, $(\pi_1(\mathbf{x}_n), \pi_2(\mathbf{x}_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of initial data for (AIBVP) tending to 0 and such that $L\pi_1(\mathbf{x}_n) = \pi_2(\mathbf{x}_n)$, and, by assumptions, there holds $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u(t, \pi_1 \mathbf{x}_n, \pi_2 \mathbf{x}_n) = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Lu(t, \pi_1 \mathbf{x}_n, \pi_2 \mathbf{x}_n) = 0$ (both uniformly in $[0, t_0]$). Also, $\mathcal{U}(\cdot, \mathbf{x}_n) = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ Lu \end{pmatrix}(\cdot, \begin{pmatrix} \pi_1 \mathbf{x}_n \\ \pi_2 \mathbf{x}_n \end{pmatrix})$ is the (unique) classical solution to (ACP) $_{\mathbf{x}_n}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and we finally obtain $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U}(t, \mathbf{x}_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ Lu \end{pmatrix}(t, \begin{pmatrix} \pi_1 \mathbf{x}_n \\ \pi_2 \mathbf{x}_n \end{pmatrix}) = 0$ uniformly in $[0, t_0]$. \square

In the same way we obtain mild solutions to (AIBVP).

Corollary 2.9. *Let $(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}))$ generate a strongly continuous semigroup $(\tilde{T}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ on \mathcal{X} . Then $u(t) := \pi_1 \tilde{T}(\cdot) \begin{pmatrix} f \\ g \end{pmatrix}$ yields the unique mild solution to (AIBVP) $_{f,g}$ for all initial data $(f, g) \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Sufficient conditions on the operators A , B , and L implying \mathcal{A} and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ to be generators, hence implying the well-posedness of (AIBVP), will be given in the next section.

3. WELL-POSED INITIAL–BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS

We first study the situation from Example 1.2, i.e., we consider the case where $B = 0$.

Assumption 3.1. In order to obtain well-posedness of (AIBVP), we now impose the following.

- (G₁) The restriction $A_0 := A|_{\ker(L)} : D(A_0) := \ker(L) \rightarrow X$ is closed and densely defined, and it has non-empty resolvent set.
- (G₂) The boundary operator $L : D(A) \rightarrow \partial X$ is surjective.
- (G₃) The operator $\begin{pmatrix} A \\ L \end{pmatrix} : D(A) \subseteq X \rightarrow X \times \partial X$ is closed.

The following key lemma is essentially due to Greiner ([10, Lemma 1.2 and Lemma 1.3], see also [3, Lemma 2.3]).

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\lambda \in \rho(A_0)$. Then the restriction $L|_{\ker(\lambda - A)}$ is invertible and its inverse*

$$\mathcal{D}_\lambda := \left(L|_{\ker(\lambda - A)} \right)^{-1} : \partial X \rightarrow \ker(\lambda - A),$$

*called **Dirichlet operator**, is bounded. Moreover, for all $\mu \in \rho(A_0)$, \mathcal{D}_μ is related to \mathcal{D}_λ by*

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{D}_\lambda = (I + (\mu - \lambda)R(\lambda, A_0))\mathcal{D}_\mu.$$

These Dirichlet operators play an important role in the following.

Lemma 3.3. *Let A_0 generate a strongly continuous semigroup $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$. For each $\lambda \in \rho(A_0)$ define a family of operators $(Q_\lambda(t))_{t \geq 0}$ from ∂X to X by*

$$Q_\lambda(t)v := (\lambda - A_0) \int_0^t T(s) \mathcal{D}_\lambda v \, ds, \quad t \geq 0, v \in \partial X.$$

Then, for a given $t \geq 0$, all the operators $Q_\lambda(t)$, $\lambda \in \rho(A_0)$, coincide, and will be denoted by $Q(t)$. In particular, if A_0 is invertible, then

$$(3.2) \quad Q(t) = (I_X - T(t)) \mathcal{D}_0$$

for all $t \geq 0$.

Proof. Let $\lambda, \mu \in \rho(A_0)$, $v \in \partial X$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\lambda(t)v &= (\lambda - A_0) \int_0^t T(s) \mathcal{D}_\lambda v \, ds \\ &\stackrel{(3.1)}{=} (\lambda - A_0) \int_0^t T(s) \mathcal{D}_\mu v \, ds + (\mu - \lambda)(\lambda - A_0) \int_0^t T(s) R(\lambda, A_0) \mathcal{D}_\mu v \, ds \\ &= (\lambda - A_0) \int_0^t T(s) \mathcal{D}_\mu v \, ds + (\mu - \lambda) \int_0^t T(s) \mathcal{D}_\mu v \, ds = Q_\mu(t)v \end{aligned}$$

by standard properties of strongly continuous semigroups, cf. [7, Lemma II.1.13 and Thm. II.1.14]). Integrating by parts we obtain (3.2). \square

We now return to the operator matrix \mathcal{A} defined in (2.1).

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\lambda \in \rho(A_0)$. Then*

$$D(\mathcal{A}) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in D(A) \times \partial X : Lu = v \right\}$$

coincides with

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{H} := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in X \times \partial X : u - \mathcal{D}_\lambda v \in D(A_0) \right\}.$$

Moreover, the identity

$$(3.4) \quad \mathcal{A} - \lambda = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 - \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_X & -\mathcal{D}_\lambda \\ 0 & I_{\partial X} \end{pmatrix} =: \mathcal{A}_\lambda \mathcal{R}_\lambda$$

holds.

Proof. To show that $D(\mathcal{A})$ equals \mathcal{H} take a vector $\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{X}$. Then, $\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{H}$ if and only if $u - \mathcal{D}_\lambda v \in \ker(L)$. But $\mathcal{D}_\lambda v \in \ker(\lambda - A) \subseteq D(A)$, and hence $u - \mathcal{D}_\lambda v \in D(A_0) = \ker(L)$ if and only if $u \in D(A)$ and $L(u - \mathcal{D}_\lambda v) = Lu - v = 0$, i.e., $Lu = v$. Thus $D(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{H}$.

It is clear that $\mathcal{H} = D(\mathcal{A}_\lambda \mathcal{R}_\lambda)$ since $\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in D(\mathcal{A}_\lambda \mathcal{R}_\lambda)$ if and only if

$$\mathcal{R}_\lambda \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u - \mathcal{D}_\lambda v \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in D(\mathcal{A}_\lambda) = D(A_0) \times \partial X.$$

To show (3.4), we take $\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in D(\mathcal{A}_\lambda \mathcal{R}_\lambda)$ and obtain

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda \mathcal{R}_\lambda \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 - \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u - \mathcal{D}_\lambda v \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (A - \lambda)u \\ -\lambda v \end{pmatrix} = (\mathcal{A} - \lambda) \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}. \quad \square$$

Remark 3.5. (1) The factorization (3.4) shows that $\mathcal{A} - \lambda$ is a so-called *one-sided coupled operator matrix*. For more details about this general theory, we refer the reader to [5], [6], or [12].

(2) Observe that, under the Assumptions 3.1, and by Lemma 2.3 and 2.4, $(\mathcal{A}, D(\mathcal{A}))$ is closed and densely defined. Therefore, Theorem 2.8 implies that (AIBVP) is well-posed if and only if \mathcal{A} generates a strongly continuous semigroup.

Theorem 3.6. *Under the Assumptions 3.1 the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (a) *The operator $(\mathcal{A}, D(\mathcal{A}))$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup on \mathcal{X} .*
- (b) *The operator $(A_0, D(A_0))$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup on X .*

If (a) holds, the semigroup $(\mathcal{T}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ generated by \mathcal{A} is given by

$$(3.5) \quad \mathcal{T}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} T(t) & Q(t) \\ 0 & I_{\partial X} \end{pmatrix},$$

for all $t \geq 0$, where $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is the semigroup generated by A_0 and $(Q(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is the family of operators introduced in Lemma 3.3. In the particular case of invertible A_0 , $(\mathcal{T}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is given by

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{T}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} T(t) & (I_X - T(t))\mathcal{D}_0 \\ 0 & I_{\partial X} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b). Assume that \mathcal{A} is a generator. Observe first that $\rho(\mathcal{A}) = \rho(A_0) \setminus \{0\}$. Indeed, it follows from (3.4) that for all $\lambda \in \rho(A_0) \setminus \{0\}$ the resolvent is given by

$$(3.7) \quad R(\lambda, \mathcal{A}) = \begin{pmatrix} R(\lambda, A_0) & \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\lambda} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, its powers are

$$R(\lambda, \mathcal{A})^n = \begin{pmatrix} R(\lambda, A_0)^n & * \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\lambda^n} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Therefore, $\|R(\lambda, A_0)^n\|$ can be dominated by $\|R(\lambda, \mathcal{A})^n\|$ and satisfies a Hille–Yosida estimate. The closedness of A_0 follows by the closedness of \mathcal{A} . Finally, $D(A_0)$ is dense in X by Assumption (G_1) , and hence A_0 is a generator.

(b) \Rightarrow (a). Assume first A_0 to be invertible, and define $\mathcal{T}(t)$ as in (3.6). We show that the family $(\mathcal{T}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup and then verify that its generator is \mathcal{A} .

To prove the semigroup property, take $t, s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $u \in X$, $v \in \partial X$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}(t)\mathcal{T}(s)\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} T(t) & Q(t) \\ 0 & I_{\partial X} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} T(s) & Q(s) \\ 0 & I_{\partial X} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} T(t)T(s)u + T(t)\mathcal{D}_0v - T(t)T(s)\mathcal{D}_0v + \mathcal{D}_0v - T(t)\mathcal{D}_0v \\ v \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} T(t+s)u + (I_X - T(t+s))\mathcal{D}_0v \\ v \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \mathcal{T}(t+s)\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{T}(0) = \begin{pmatrix} T(0) & Q(0) \\ 0 & I_{\partial X} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_X & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\partial X} \end{pmatrix} = I_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

To show strong continuity of $(\mathcal{T}(t))_{t \geq 0}$, i.e.,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{T}(t)\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} [T(t)u + Q(t)v] \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}$$

for all $\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{X}$, it suffices to verify that the operators $Q(t)$ converge to 0 as $t \rightarrow 0^+$. This follows indeed from (3.2) and from the boundedness of \mathcal{D}_0 .

Finally, in order to show that \mathcal{A} is actually the generator of $(\mathcal{T}(t))_{t \geq 0}$, we note that for λ with large real part the Laplace transform of $\mathcal{T}(\cdot)$ coincides with the resolvent of its generator. In particular, and taking into account the explicit formula (3.7) for the resolvent of \mathcal{A} , we obtain for the Laplace transform of the upper right entry $\mathcal{T}(\cdot)_{12}$ of $\mathcal{T}(\cdot)$ the equality

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}(\cdot)_{12})(\lambda) = R(\lambda, \mathcal{A})_{12} = \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathcal{D}_\lambda.$$

On the other hand, the convolution theorem for the Laplace transform implies that $\mathcal{L}(Q(\cdot)v)(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathcal{D}_\lambda v$ for all $v \in \partial X$ and λ sufficiently large. This finally proves that $\mathcal{L}(Q(\cdot)v)(\lambda) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}(\cdot)_{12}v)(\lambda)$ for all $v \in \partial X$ and λ large. The injectivity of the Laplace transformation then implies that $\mathcal{T}(\cdot)_{12} = Q(\cdot)$.

Finally, the case of $0 \notin \rho(A_0)$ can be discussed as above, by rescaling arguments. \square

Corollary 3.7. *Under the Assumptions 3.1, A_0 generates a bounded strongly continuous semigroup if and only if \mathcal{A} generates a bounded strongly continuous semigroup.*

Proof. Assume, without loss of generality, A_0 to be invertible. Hence the formula (3.6) yields the semigroup generated by \mathcal{A} , and the claim follows. \square

Proposition 3.8. *Under the Assumptions 3.1, \mathcal{A} generates a bounded analytic semigroup on \mathcal{X} if and only if A_0 generates a bounded analytic semigroup on X .*

This result may be shown by the same similarity and perturbation techniques of Proposition 4.3 below. However, the following more direct proof can also be used as suggested to us by the referee whom we thank for this remark.

Proof. Assume A_0 to generate a bounded analytic semigroup. By [7, Thm. II.4.6], this is equivalent to assume that (i) A_0 generates a bounded strongly continuous semigroup, and (ii) there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(3.8) \quad \|sR(r + is, A_0)\| \leq C$$

for all $r > 0$ and $0 \neq s \in \mathbb{R}$.

It hence follows by Theorem 3.6 and Corollary 3.7 that also \mathcal{A} generates a bounded strongly continuous semigroup. Moreover, since $\rho(\mathcal{A}) = \rho(A_0) \setminus \{0\}$ as remarked in the proof of Theorem 3.6, the resolvent operator $R(r + is, \mathcal{A})$ is defined for $r > 0$ and $0 \neq s \in \mathbb{R}$. Taking into account (3.1), (3.7), and (3.8), the resolvent of \mathcal{A} satisfies an estimate of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \|sR(r + is, \mathcal{A})\| &\leq \|sR(r + is, A_0)\| + \|\mathcal{D}_\mu\| + \|sR(r + is, A_0)\mathcal{D}_\mu\| + 1 \\ &\leq \mathcal{C} := C + \|\mathcal{D}_\mu\| + C\|\mathcal{D}_\mu\| + 1 \end{aligned}$$

for all $r > 0$ and $0 \neq s \in \mathbb{R}$, and arbitrary $\mu \in \rho(A_0)$. It follows that also \mathcal{A} generates a bounded analytic semigroup. The converse implication can be proven likewise. \square

An answer to the problem posed in Example 1.2 can now be given by simply using the variation of constants formula for semigroups (see [7, §VI.7]).

Proposition 3.9. *Assume that the Assumptions 3.1 hold and that A_0 generates a strongly continuous semigroup, and take $f \in X$ and $g \in \partial X$. If $\psi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+, \partial X)$, then the unique (mild, in the sense of [7, Def. VI.7.2]) solution to the inhomogeneous problem (iACP) is given by*

$$\mathcal{U} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{X}, \quad \mathcal{U} : t \mapsto \mathcal{U}(t) := \mathcal{T}(t) \begin{pmatrix} f \\ g \end{pmatrix} + \int_0^t \mathcal{T}(t-s) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \psi(s) \end{pmatrix} ds.$$

In the particular case where A_0 is invertible, \mathcal{U} is given by

$$(3.9) \quad \mathcal{U}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} T(t)f + \mathcal{D}_0 g - T(t)\mathcal{D}_0 g + \int_0^t (\mathcal{D}_0 \psi(s) - T(t-s)\mathcal{D}_0 \psi(s)) ds \\ g + \int_0^t \psi(s) ds \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, if $f \in D(A)$, $f|_{\partial\Omega} = g$, and $\psi \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}_+, \partial X)$, then \mathcal{U} is a classical solution to (iACP).

This result can now be applied to the inhomogeneous problem stated in Example 1.2.

Example 3.10. We have to show that the setting introduced in Example 1.2 fits the hypotheses yielding the results presented in §§2–3.

Take as state and boundary space $X := L^2(\Omega)$ and $\partial X := L^2(\partial\Omega)$, respectively. As operator A we take the Laplacian

$$A := \Delta \quad \text{with domain} \quad D(A) := \{u \in H^{1/2}(\Omega) \cap H_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega) : \Delta u \in L^2(\Omega)\}$$

and as boundary operator L the trace operator

$$Lu := u|_{\partial\Omega} \quad \text{with domain} \quad D(L) := D(A)$$

as introduced in [13, §§2.5-8]. In particular, A is defined on the maximal domain such that the traces of its elements exist as $L^2(\partial\Omega)$ functions. This is why $(A, D(A))$ can be called the *maximal operator*.

With these definitions, (iHE) takes the form (iACP). In order to apply Proposition 3.9 we have to show the well-posedness of (AIBVP). For this, it suffices, by Theorem 2.8, that \mathcal{A} generates a strongly continuous semigroup on the product space \mathcal{X} .

We first note that the operator A_0 is in this case nothing but the Dirichlet Laplacian Δ^D , which, by standard results (see, e.g., [16, Thm. 7.2.7]) generates an analytic semigroup on X . Surjectivity of L follows from [13, Thm. 2.7.4], see also [3, Lemma 3.1]. Finally, the proof of the closedness of $\binom{A}{L}$ can be found in [3, Lemma 3.2].

The Dirichlet Laplacian on $L^2(\Omega)$ is invertible, and hence an explicit solution to (iHE) is yielded by (3.9), where $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is the heat semigroup and \mathcal{D}_0 the operator that maps each $g \in D(A)$ into the unique harmonic function attaining boundary values g .

Summing up, the Assumptions 3.1 are satisfied and by Proposition 3.8 well-posedness of the homogeneous (HE) is ensured. Existence and uniqueness of the solution to problem (iHE) then follows from Proposition 3.9 under suitable assumptions on the inhomogeneous term ψ (see [7, §VI.7]).

Remark 3.11. Although the Dirichlet Laplacian is dissipative, the operator \mathcal{A} is *not* dissipative and the semigroup $(\mathcal{T}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ generated by \mathcal{A} is not contractive on \mathcal{X} (but bounded indeed, by Remark 3.5). In [8] it is shown how weighted norms and suitable feedbacks can be used in this context to obtain contractivity.

4. ABSTRACT BOUNDARY FEEDBACK SYSTEMS

We now return to the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ defined in (2.2). This means that we replace the inhomogeneous term ψ in (iHE) or in (iACP) by a boundary feedback, i.e., we take

$$\psi(t) := Bu(t), \quad t \geq 0,$$

for some operator B from X into ∂X . With this interpretation, we call (AIBVP) an *abstract boundary feedback system*. We combine the results obtained in the previous section and perturbation theory for semigroups. The simplest case in which B is bounded follows directly from [7, Thm. III.1.3].

Proposition 4.1. *Assume that $B : X \rightarrow \partial X$ is bounded. Under the Assumptions 3.1 the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ generates a strongly continuous (respectively, analytic) semigroup on \mathcal{X} if and only if A_0 generates a strongly continuous (respectively, analytic) semigroup on X .*

The case of unbounded feedback operators defined on $D(A)$ can be treated by using the results of [5] on one-sided coupled operator matrices. We briefly sketch the main steps. First, define

$$B_\lambda := B\mathcal{D}_\lambda : \partial X \rightarrow \partial X$$

for all $\lambda \in \rho(A_0)$ (observe that B_λ is well defined since $R(\mathcal{D}_\lambda) \subseteq D(A) \subseteq D(B)$). Then, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 4.2. *For $\lambda \in \rho(A_0)$ the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} - \lambda$ can be factorized as*

$$(4.1) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{A}} - \lambda = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 - \lambda & 0 \\ B & B_\lambda - \lambda \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_X & -\mathcal{D}_\lambda \\ 0 & I_{\partial X} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}) = \mathcal{H}$ as defined in (3.3).

Proof. Taking into account the identity (3.4), a matrix computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{A}} - \lambda &= \mathcal{A}_\lambda \mathcal{R}_\lambda + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ B & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \left[\mathcal{A}_\lambda + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ B & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{R}_\lambda^{-1} \right] \mathcal{R}_\lambda \\ &= \left[\begin{pmatrix} A_0 - \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ B & B_\lambda \end{pmatrix} \right] \mathcal{R}_\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 - \lambda & 0 \\ B & B_\lambda - \lambda \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_X & -\mathcal{D}_\lambda \\ 0 & I_{\partial X} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the domain of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} - \lambda$ coincides with \mathcal{H} from (3.3). \square

Proposition 4.3. *Let the Assumptions 3.1 hold, and assume that B is relatively A_0 -bounded, and that B_{λ_0} is bounded for some $\lambda_0 \in \rho(A_0)$. Then the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ generates a strongly continuous (resp., analytic) semigroup on \mathcal{X} if and only if the operator $A_0 - \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_0}B$, defined on $D(A_0)$, generates a strongly continuous (resp., analytic) semigroup on X .*

Proof. By (4.1), we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & 0 \\ B & B_{\lambda_0} \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{R}_{\lambda_0} + \lambda_0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_0} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} =: \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\lambda_0} \mathcal{R}_{\lambda_0} + \lambda_0 \mathcal{P}_{\lambda_0}.$$

By Lemma 3.2, \mathcal{P}_{λ_0} is a bounded perturbation, so it suffices to show that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\lambda_0} \mathcal{R}_{\lambda_0}$ generates a strongly continuous (resp., analytic) semigroup. Due to the invertibility of \mathcal{R}_{λ_0} , $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\lambda_0} \mathcal{R}_{\lambda_0}$ is similar to

$$\mathcal{R}_{\lambda_0} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\lambda_0} = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 - \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_0}B & -\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_0}B_{\lambda_0} \\ B & B_{\lambda_0} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 - \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_0}B & 0 \\ B & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_0}B_{\lambda_0} \\ 0 & B_{\lambda_0} \end{pmatrix} =: \mathcal{M} + \mathcal{N}.$$

Since B_{λ_0} is bounded, also $-\mathcal{D}_{\lambda_0}B_{\lambda_0}$ and \mathcal{N} are bounded. Hence, by bounded perturbation and similarity arguments, we can conclude that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is a generator if and only if the operator matrix \mathcal{M} is a generator.

Observe further that B is also $(A_0 - \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_0}B)$ -bounded and while the operator matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ does not have diagonal domain, $D(\mathcal{M}) = D(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\lambda_0}) = D(A_0) \times \partial X$: hence, by well-known results on matrices with diagonal domain (see, e.g., [15, Cor. 3.2 and Cor. 3.3]) one can see that \mathcal{M} generates a strongly continuous (respectively, analytic) semigroup on \mathcal{X} if and only if $A_0 - \mathcal{D}_{\lambda_0}B$ does the same on X . \square

Remark 4.4. Observe that, in particular, if B is relatively $\begin{pmatrix} A \\ L \end{pmatrix}$ -bounded, then B is relatively A_0 -bounded and B_{λ_0} is bounded for all $\lambda_0 \in \rho(A_0)$. Indeed, $\|u_{\begin{pmatrix} A \\ L \end{pmatrix}}\| = \|u_A\|$ for all $u \in D(A_0)$, and hence B is relatively A_0 -bounded.

Further, the closedness of $\begin{pmatrix} A \\ L \end{pmatrix} : D(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ implies the closedness of the operator matrix

$$\mathcal{L} := \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ L & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D(\mathcal{L}) := D(A) \times \partial X,$$

on \mathcal{X} , and hence we can define the Banach space $\mathcal{Y} := (D(\mathcal{L}), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}})$, with $\mathcal{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Now observe that, by virtue of Lemma 3.2, the operator

$$\mathcal{H}_\lambda := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathcal{D}_\lambda \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$$

is bounded from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{X} and its range is contained in \mathcal{Y} for all $\lambda \in \rho(A_0)$. It then follows by [7, Cor. B.7] that \mathcal{H}_λ is also bounded from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Y} , and since under the above assumptions

$$\mathcal{B} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ B & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D(\mathcal{B}) := D(A) \times \partial X$$

is bounded from \mathcal{Y} to \mathcal{X} ,

$$\mathcal{B}\mathcal{H}_\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B_\lambda \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$$

is bounded, and the claim follows.

Example 4.5 (Diffusion-transport equation with dynamical boundary conditions). We consider the diffusion-transport equation with dynamical boundary conditions

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{u}(t, x) = u''(t, x) + ku'(t, x), & t \geq 0, x \in (0, 1), \\ \dot{u}(t, 0) = u'(t, 0) + cu(t, 0), & t \geq 0, \\ \dot{u}(t, 1) = -u'(t, 1) + du(t, 1), & t \geq 0, \\ u(0, x) = f(x), & x \in (0, 1), \\ u(0, 0) = a, \quad u(0, 1) = b, \end{cases}$$

where $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{C}$, $k \geq 0$. This system becomes an (AIBVP) if we consider the state space $X := L^2(0, 1)$, the boundary space $\partial X := \mathbb{C}^2$, the operator

$$Au := u'' + ku', \quad D(A) := H^2(0, 1),$$

the boundary operator

$$Lu := \begin{pmatrix} u(0) \\ u(1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad D(L) := D(A),$$

and the feedback operator

$$Bu := \begin{pmatrix} u'(0) + cu(0) \\ -u'(1) + du(1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad D(B) := D(A).$$

We first show that the Assumptions (G₁)–(G₃) hold. Observe that L is surjective onto \mathbb{C}^2 . The operator A_0 , defined as the restriction of A to $D(A_0) := H^2(0, 1) \cap H_0^1(0, 1)$, generates an analytic semigroup and, in particular, (G₁) is satisfied. Finally, one can show as in [3, Lemma 3.3] that the operator $\mathcal{L} := \left(\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\right)$ is closed on $D(A)$. Since $\left(k\frac{d}{dx}\right)$ is relatively \mathcal{L} -bounded with \mathcal{L} -bound 0 for $k \geq 0$, their sum $\left(\frac{A}{L}\right)$ is also closed (see [7, Lemma III.2.4]). Hence, the Assumptions 3.1 are satisfied and we are now in the position to apply Proposition 4.3.

Observe that $0 \in \rho(A_0)$, and the Dirichlet operator \mathcal{D}_0 maps, by definition, each pair $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ into the unique solution of the ordinary differential equation

$$\begin{cases} u''(x) + ku'(x) = 0, & x \in (0, 1), \\ u(0) = \alpha, & u(1) = \beta. \end{cases}$$

In order to show that Proposition 4.3 applies, we now check that B is relatively $\begin{pmatrix} A \\ L \end{pmatrix}$ -bounded. This will then yield, by virtue of Remark 4.4, that B is relatively A_0 -bounded, and that B_λ is bounded for all $\lambda \in \rho(A_0)$. Recall that the first derivative on $L^2(0, 1)$ is relatively bounded by the second derivative, with relative bound 0 (see, e.g., [7, §III.2]), and hence that the graph norm of the second derivative and the graph norm of A are equivalent. It then follows from the embedding $H^1(0, 1) \hookrightarrow C([0, 1])$ that we can find suitable constants ξ, ξ_1, ξ_2 such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Bu\| &= (|u'(0) + cu(0)|^2 + |u'(1) - du(1)|^2)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \zeta (\|u'\|_{C([0,1])} + \|Lu\|_{\mathbb{C}^2}) \\ &\leq \xi (\|u''\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}) + \zeta \|Lu\|_{\mathbb{C}^2} \\ &\leq \xi_1 \|u''\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \xi_2 \|u\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \zeta \|Lu\|_{\mathbb{C}^2} \leq \eta \|u\|_{\begin{pmatrix} A \\ L \end{pmatrix}}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $u \in D(A)$, where $\zeta = 2 \max\{1, |c|, |d|\}$ and $\eta = \max\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \zeta\}$. Hence, B is relatively $\begin{pmatrix} A \\ L \end{pmatrix}$ -bounded.

We finally show that $A_0 - \mathcal{D}_0 B$ generates an analytic semigroup. The boundedness of B from $(D(A_0), \|\cdot\|_{A_0})$ to \mathbb{C}^2 shows that B , and hence $\mathcal{D}_0 B$ is relatively A_0 -compact. It then follows from perturbation theory (see [7, Cor. III.2.17]) that $A_0 - \mathcal{D}_0 B$, defined on $D(A_0)$, is the generator of an analytic semigroup.

Therefore, the operator

$$\mathcal{A} := \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ B & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D(\mathcal{A}) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u \\ Lu \end{pmatrix} : u \in D(A) \right\}$$

on $\mathcal{X} := X \times \partial X$ generates an analytic semigroup by Proposition 4.3, and the diffusion-transport equation (4.2) is well-posed.

Remark 4.6. A question that naturally arises is how the stability of such a system is affected by the feedback operator. Under certain assumptions on the parameters c and d the semigroup generated by \mathcal{A} is positive, and it can be shown that *stability of our boundary feedback system is independent of the internal diffusion*. This means that the spectral bound of \mathcal{A} is negative if and only if the spectral bound of B_0 is negative. This allows to apply Liapunov-type stability results (see [7, Chap. V]), but we refer the reader to [12, §§7–9] for details.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Arendt, C.J.K. Batty, M. Hieber, and F. Neubrander, *Vector-valued Laplace Transforms and Cauchy Problems*, Monographs in Mathematics **96**, Birkhäuser 2001.
- [2] W. Arendt, *Resolvent positive operators and inhomogeneous boundary value problems*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Pisa Cl. Sci. **29** (2000), 639–670.

- [3] V. Casarino, K.-J. Engel, R. Nagel, and G. Nickel, *A semigroup approach to boundary feedback systems*, Tübinger Berichte zur Funktionalanalysis **10** (2000/01), 30–43.
- [4] R. Denk, M. Hieber, and J. Prüss, *R-boundedness, Fourier multipliers and problems of elliptic and parabolic type*. Preprint.
- [5] K.-J. Engel, *Spectral theory and generator property for one-sided coupled operator matrices*, Semigroup Forum **58** (1999), 267–295.
- [6] K.-J. Engel, *Operator Matrices and Systems of Evolution Equations*. Book preprint. Preliminary version available at www.fa.uni-tuebingen.de/people/klen.html
- [7] K.-J. Engel and R. Nagel, *One-Parameter Semigroups for Linear Evolution Equations*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **194**, Springer-Verlag 2000.
- [8] A. Favini, G. Ruiz Goldstein, J.A. Goldstein, and S. Romanelli, *The heat equation with generalized Wentzell boundary condition*, J. Evolution Equations **2** (2002), 1–19.
- [9] J.A. Goldstein, *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Oxford University Press 1985.
- [10] G. Greiner, *Perturbing the boundary conditions of a generator*, Houston J. Math. **13** (1987), 213–229.
- [11] E. Hille, *Functional Analysis and Semi-Groups*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications **31**, American Mathematical Society 1948.
- [12] M. Kramar, D. Mugnolo, and R. Nagel, *Theory and applications of one-sided coupled operator matrices*, Conf. Semin. Mat. Univ. Bari **283** (2003), 1–29.
- [13] J.L. Lions and E. Magenes, *Non-Homogeneous Boundary Value Problems and Applications. vol. 1*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften **181**, Springer-Verlag 1972.
- [14] I. Lasiecka and R. Triggiani, *Control Theory for Partial Differential Equations: Continuous and Approximation Theories, vol. 1: Abstract Parabolic Systems*, Cambridge University Press 2000.
- [15] R. Nagel, *Towards a “matrix theory” for unbounded operator matrices*, Math. Z. **201** (1989), 57–68.
- [16] A. Pazy, *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*, Applied Mathematical Sciences **44**, Springer-Verlag 1983.
- [17] L. Weis, *Operator-valued Fourier multiplier theorems and maximal regularity*, Math. Ann. **319** (2001), 735–758.
- [18] L. Weis, *A new approach to maximal regularity*, in: L. Weis, G. Lumer (eds.), “Evolution Equations and their Applications in Physical and Life Sciences” (Proceedings Bad Herrenalb 1999), Marcel Dekker 2001, 195–214.

MARJETA KRAMAR, UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA, FACULTY OF CIVIL AND GEODETIC ENGINEERING,
DEPARTMENT FOR MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, JAMOVA 2, 1000 LJUBLJANA, SLOVENIA
Email address: mkramar@fgg.uni-lj.si

DELIO MUGNOLO, ARBEITSBEREICH FUNKTIONALANALYSIS, MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT
TÜBINGEN, AUF DER MORGENSTELLE 10, D- 72076 TÜBINGEN, GERMANY
Email address: demu@fa.uni-tuebingen.de

RAINER NAGEL, ARBEITSBEREICH FUNKTIONALANALYSIS, MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT
TÜBINGEN, AUF DER MORGENSTELLE 10, D- 72076 TÜBINGEN, GERMANY
Email address: rana@fa.uni-tuebingen.de