



HAL
open science

Quantitative estimates of L^p maximal regularity for nonautonomous operators and global existence for quasilinear equations

Théo Belin, Pauline Lafitte

► To cite this version:

Théo Belin, Pauline Lafitte. Quantitative estimates of L^p maximal regularity for nonautonomous operators and global existence for quasilinear equations. 2024. hal-04484486v1

HAL Id: hal-04484486

<https://hal.science/hal-04484486v1>

Preprint submitted on 29 Feb 2024 (v1), last revised 11 Mar 2024 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Quantitative estimates of L^p maximal regularity for nonautonomous operators and global existence for quasilinear equations*

Théo Belin^{1,2} and Pauline Lafitte¹

¹Fédération de Mathématiques de CentraleSupélec (FR CNRS 3487)

²Laboratoire MICS, CentraleSupélec

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Main results	6
2.1	Operators, spaces and measurability	6
2.2	L^p maximal regularity	9
2.3	Relatively continuous operators	11
2.4	Main results and scheme of the proof	13
2.4.1	Asymptotic behavior of diagonal perturbations	14
2.4.2	Maximal regularity constant of relatively continuous operators	15
2.4.3	Topologies for the persistence of maximal regularity in limits	17
2.4.4	Global existence for a quasilinear equation	18
3	Perturbation and asymptotic behavior	21
3.1	The operator $L_A := \frac{d}{dt} + \mathcal{A}$	21
3.2	Diagonal perturbations by constants in $mr_p(I)$ and $\mathcal{MR}_p(I)$	22
3.3	Nonautonomous perturbations of autonomous operators in mr_p	26
4	Gluing maximally regular operators	28
4.1	Behavior of $[\cdot]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}$ under a change of variable in time	28
4.2	Gluing finitely many \mathcal{MR}_p operators	30
5	Proofs of the main estimates and examples	35
5.1	Estimation for general relatively continuous operators	35
5.2	Estimation for Hölder-type relatively continuous operators	38
5.3	Examples	43

*AMS Classifications: Primary: 35K90, 35K59, 35D35 Secondary: 47D06

6	Global existence for quasilinear equation	46
6.1	A general existence result	46
6.2	Existence of strong solutions for relatively continuous operators	49
7	Conclusion and perspectives	50
	Appendices	51

Abstract

In this work, we obtain quantitative estimates of the continuity constant for the L^p maximal regularity of relatively continuous nonautonomous operators $A : I \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D, X)$, where $D \hookrightarrow X$ densely and compactly. They allow in particular to establish a new general growth condition for the global existence of strong solutions of Cauchy problems for nonlocal quasilinear equations for a certain class of nonlinearities $u \mapsto \mathbb{A}(u)$. The estimates obtained rely on the precise asymptotic analysis of the continuity constant with respect to perturbations of the operator of the form $A(\cdot) + \lambda I$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty$. A complementary work in preparation supplements this abstract inquiry with an application of these results to nonlocal parabolic equations in noncylindrical domains depending on the time variable.

Keywords: Nonautonomous Cauchy problem, L^p maximal regularity, relatively continuous operators, quasilinear equations.

1 Introduction

The L^p maximal regularity theory deals with the well-posedness in the strong sense of the following abstract nonautonomous Cauchy problem,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}u(t) + A(t)u(t) &= f(t) & t \in I = (a, b) \\ u(a) &= 0 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The problem is set on a time interval $I = (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ bounded from below, the source term f lies in $L^p(I; X)$ and $A : I \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D(A); X)$ is a nonautonomous linear operator with a uniform-in-time domain $D(A) \subset X$.

For a generic source term $f \in L^p(I; X)$, a strong solution of (1), i.e. a solution u such that $t \mapsto [\frac{d}{dt}u](t), A(t)u(t)$ are elements of $L^p(I; X)$, lies in the Banach space $\text{MR}^p(I) := W^{1,p}(I; X) \cap L^p(I; D(A))$ called the *maximal regularity space*. Given the regularity of the source term $f \in L^p(I; X)$, this is the best regularity one can possibly obtain for u , giving a precise semantic meaning to the terminology of L^p *maximal regularity*. More precisely if there exists $K \geq 0$ such that for any $f \in L^p(I; X)$ there exists a unique solution $u \in \text{MR}^p(I)$ to (1) and

$$\|u\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} \leq K \|f\|_{L^p(I; X)} \quad (2)$$

then we say that A is *maximally regular* in L^p .

It is of interest to study the following questions which have numerous applications, *e.g.* to the study of the well-posedness and regularity of solutions of Cauchy problems for general parabolic equations:

- (Q1) Under which conditions on A is (1) well-posed with respect to the source term $f \in L^p(I; X)$?
- (Q2) Can we identify quantities related to the operator A which give fine estimates and precise asymptotic behaviors of the constant K in (2)?

- (Q3) In which topologies on the set of nonautonomous operators is the set of maximally regular operators closed? In these topologies, does the continuity of strong solutions in $\text{MR}^p(I)$ hold?
- (Q4) Can answering (Q2) and (Q3) allow to infer well-posedness criteria of the Cauchy problem for nonlocal quasilinear equations of the form $\frac{d}{dt}u(t) + \mathbb{A}(u, t)u = \mathbb{F}(u, t)$, $u(0) = x$?

Logically, answers to questions (Q2), (Q3) and (Q4) must rely on the already existing answers to question (Q1), and we hereby give a short summary of the standard results found for L^p maximal regularity regarding (Q1) for autonomous and nonautonomous operators.

For *autonomous operators* $A(t) = A$, (Q1) has received a lot of attention. Since de Simon [13] it is known that if X is a Hilbert space, the maximal regularity on the unbounded interval $(0, +\infty)$ is equivalent to the sectoriality of the operator $-A$ which is also equivalent to the analyticity of the semi-group generated by $-A$ on a sector of the complex plane. In the setting where X is merely a Banach space, the sectoriality of $-A$ is necessary (see e.g. [24]) but not sufficient in general. More recently, in [21], it has been proved that the \mathcal{R} -boundedness of the resolvent operator of A yields maximal regularity in Banach spaces X of the *UMD* class, that is, the Banach spaces for which the Hilbert transform is a bounded operator in $L^q(\mathbb{R}; X)$, for some $1 < q < +\infty$. For a thorough introduction on maximal regularity for autonomous operators we refer the reader to the lecture notes of Kunstmann and Weis [21].

The study of the autonomous case relies on a Fourier transform in the time variable and the study of the regularizing properties of the subsequent kernel. Such a technique logically leads to difficulties in the *nonautonomous* case. Sufficient conditions known in the literature for maximal regularity usually require a certain degree of regularity in time of $A(\cdot)$ as well as the maximal regularity of each $A(t)$, $t \in I$.

The first notable results were obtained by Acquistapace and Terreni [1] who have uncovered a Hölder-type condition in time of the operator, which may have a time-dependent domain $D(A(t))$. In the case of a constant domain $D(A)$, which is our interest here, Prüss and Schnaubelt [26] showed that the strong continuity in time along with the maximal regularity of each $A(t)$ is sufficient to guarantee the maximal regularity of the nonautonomous operator. These inquiries were further refined and developed by Amann [3], Yagi [28, Chapter 3], Gallarati and Veraar [15]. In this direction, Arendt and coauthors [10] gave a weaker sufficient time-regularity condition called *relative continuity*.

Overall, on the subject of nonautonomous maximal regularity, we refer the reader to the reviews by Monniaux [24] or most recently by Pyatkov [27].

We rely on relative continuity assumptions to provide new answers to questions (Q2), (Q3) and (Q4). We introduce the space $RC(I; (D, X))$ of relatively continuous operators and isolate meaningful quantities through which one can estimate the constant K .

The L^p maximal regularity has shown its wide uses in various settings for the study of strong solutions of very wide classes of parabolic-type equations. Again we refer the reader to the monograph [24] and references therein. The framework of maximal regularity is a crucial tool to study the strong solutions of nonlinear equations. Let us mention the recent work of Danchin and coauthors [12] who explore the critical setting $p = 1$. It turns out that this L^1 setting is natural to study

the equivalence of Lagrangian and Eulerian formulations globally in time. Their inquiries lead to well-posedness results in free boundary problems of fluid mechanics.

Answers to (Q4) can rely on answers to (Q2). To fix some ideas, we focus our interest on a class of *nonlocal* quasilinear equations of the form

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}u(t) + \mathbb{A}(u, t)u(t) &= \mathbb{F}(u, t) & t \in I \\ u(a) &= x \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

on a bounded time interval $I = (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$, $b < +\infty$. The nonlinearities $u \mapsto \mathbb{A}(u)$ and $u \mapsto \mathbb{F}(u)$ are assumed to be defined on $\mathcal{X}(I)$, a functional space on I for which the following chain of embeddings holds:

$$\mathrm{MR}^p(I) \hookrightarrow_c \mathcal{X}(I) \hookrightarrow L^p(I; X)$$

where the first embedding is compact. As such these nonlinear operators may include nonlocal effects in time. They are sometimes assumed to satisfy a certain *causality* principle translated by the Volterra property (see Amann [4]): the restriction of $\mathbb{A}(u)$ and $\mathbb{F}(u)$ to any subinterval of the form (a, t) , $t \leq b$ only depends on $u|_{I_t}$.

These equations appear in various models of elasticity and solid mechanics with memory and nonlocal effects (see [11, 5], [14] and references therein) or population dynamics [20]. They generally model phenomena which have a memory of their past states. Their interest is both found in applications and in theoretical studies since they also appear when regularizing certain singular equations, for instance in the Perona-Malik model of anisotropic diffusion [6, 17, 18].

The well-posedness of these Cauchy problems in an abstract framework has been studied by Amann (see [7, 3, 4, 5]). His most important result in [4] shows that if $\mathcal{X}(I) = \mathrm{MR}^p(I)$ and under the Lipschitz continuity of $u \mapsto \mathbb{A}(u)$ in $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$ and $u \mapsto \mathbb{F}(u)$ in $L^p(I; X)$ then the local well-posedness of (3) holds. Amann further shows existence of a Lipschitz semi-flow associated to the equation. These results rely on a Banach fixed point theorem which inherently requires the Lipschitz continuity of the operators.

Since the embedding $D \hookrightarrow X$ is compact, we rely here on Schauder's fixed point theorem to obtain existence results. No Lipschitz continuity is required, thereby permitting lower regularity assumptions on the nonlinearities \mathbb{A} and a mere weak continuity condition for \mathbb{F} (see e.g. Arendt [9]). The existence is guaranteed through growth conditions on the regularity constant $K_{\mathbb{A}(u)}$ in the regime $\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)} \rightarrow +\infty$. We use our answers to (Q2) in the setting of relatively continuous operators of Hölder-type to obtain quantitative growth conditions on $\mathbb{A}(u)$ and $\mathbb{F}(u)$. An interesting interplay between the pointwise maximal regularity constant of each operator $\mathbb{A}(u)$ and their Hölder semi-norm is observed.

In Section 2, we introduce the notion of L^p maximal regularity on bounded and unbounded intervals as well as the maximal regularity constant. We describe the maximal regularity space $\mathrm{MR}^p(I)$ and a special discussion is dedicated to scale-invariant norms. Then relatively continuous operators and their *ranges of relative continuity* are introduced. Related preliminary results pertaining to relatively continuous operators are further presented. This context allows the exposition of our main result: we first present the quantitative behavior of the regularity constant with respect to perturbations of the form $A(\cdot) + \lambda I$, in particular in the asymptotic regime $\lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty$ (Theorem 2.5), we then show our main quantitative estimates of the regularity constant for relatively continuous

operators (Theorem 2.6, Theorem 2.7).

As an application to the estimate in Theorem 2.6, we present various conditions giving positive answers to (Q3) (Corollary 2.9, Corollary 2.10, Corollary 2.11). The growth condition for the global existence for quasilinear equations is then presented for a Hölder-type class of relatively continuous operators Theorem 2.12, Theorem 2.13.

In Section 3 we describe the operators $L_A^I := \frac{d}{dt} + \mathcal{A}^I$ related to the Cauchy problem on $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and recall known properties in the autonomous case. We then prove precise perturbation results with asymptotic behavior through fine manipulations of the chosen norm of the maximal regularity space.

Section 4 is dedicated to the proof of intermediate results, in particular Theorem 4.4 which provides the frame of the quantitative estimate Theorem 2.6 proved in Section 5.

Lastly Section 6 treats the global existence of nonlocal quasilinear equations for a class of relatively continuous operators.

2 Main results

In the quantitative study of L^p maximal regularity, the choice of the norm in the maximal regularity space $\text{MR}^p(I)$ can have a noticeable impact and should be chosen with care. Hence in Section 2.1 we set basic notations for operators and norms and we motivate our choices for the norm of the maximal regularity space via time-scaling invariance. We further introduce in Section 2.2 basic notations of L^p maximal regularity and elementary results. Section 2.3 contains an introduction to the class of relatively continuous operators and we describe topological properties of this space of operators. Section 2.4 finally showcases our main results.

2.1 Operators, spaces and measurability

Graph norms and domains of operators If two norms N_1 and N_2 are *equivalent* in a given Banach space, meaning there exist $c, C > 0$ such that

$$cN_2 \leq N_1 \leq CN_2$$

we write $N_1 \stackrel{c,C}{\sim} N_2$ or equivalently $N_2 \stackrel{\frac{1}{C}, \frac{1}{c}}{\sim} N_1$. If the constants are universal or not of interest for further development we may simply write $N_1 \sim N_2$.

A linear operator $A : D(A) \rightarrow X$ on a Banach space X , defined on a linear subspace $D(A) \subset X$, is said to be *closed* if its graph $\Gamma(A) := \{(x, Ax); x \in D(A)\}$ is closed. In such a case, we can equip $D(A)$ with the *p-graph norm* induced by A , $p \in [1, +\infty)$, and defined by

$$\|\cdot\|_{A,p} := (\|\cdot\|_X^p + \|A\cdot\|_X^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

The domain $D(A)$ is then a Banach space. It is straightforward to see that for any two $p, q \in (1, +\infty)$,

$\|\cdot\|_{A,p} \stackrel{\frac{1}{2}, 2}{\sim} \|\cdot\|_{A,q}$. Since the constants of equivalence are universal, we denote without ambiguity $\|\cdot\|_A$ for any p -graph norm of A .

Let $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ be a Banach space and let $D \xhookrightarrow{d} X$ be a Banach space with norm denoted $\|\cdot\|_D$, which injects densely and compactly in X . We denote by $\mathcal{L}(D; X)$ the space of *bounded linear operators* from D to X . For the rest of our developments X and D are fixed, as well as $p, q \in (1, +\infty)$ two conjugate exponents satisfying $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$.

Functional spaces for L^p maximal regularity Let $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be any open interval bounded from below i.e. $I = (a, b)$, with $-\infty < a < b \leq +\infty$ and Y be a Banach space.

We define the vector valued Lebesgue space $L^p(I; Y)$ as the space of Bochner-measurable functions $u : I \rightarrow Y$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^p(I; Y)} = \left(\int_I \|u(t)\|_Y^p dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < +\infty$$

We denote by $W^{1,p}(I; Y)$ the Y -valued Sobolev space. It is the space of functions $u \in L^p(I; Y)$ which admit a weak derivative $\frac{d}{dt}u \in L^p(I; Y)$ which satisfies

$$- \int_I \left[\frac{d}{dt} \phi \right](t) u(t) dt = \int_I \phi(t) \left[\frac{d}{dt} u \right](t) dt$$

for all $\phi \in C_c^\infty(I; \mathbb{R})$. It is endowed with the semi-norm

$$[u]_{W^{1,p}(I; Y)} := \left\| \frac{d}{dt} u \right\|_{L^p(I; Y)} = \left(\int_I \left\| \left[\frac{d}{dt} u \right](t) \right\|_Y^p dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad (4)$$

As usual in the spaces $L^p(I; Y)$ and $W^{1,p}(I; Y)$ we identify two elements u and v if they agree \mathcal{L}^1 -almost everywhere on I for the Lebesgue measure \mathcal{L}^1 . Throughout we endow the equality relation $=$ with this meaning when we identify elements of such spaces.

Hereafter we define the maximal regularity space on I along with its norm.

Definition 2.1. Define $\text{MR}^p(I)$, the L^p maximal regularity space as

$$\text{MR}^p(I) := L^p(I; D) \cap W^{1,p}(I; X)$$

If $b < +\infty$ we choose the following norm

$$\|u\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} := \left(\|u\|_{L^p(I; X)}^p + \|u\|_{L^p(I; D)}^p + |I|^p [u]_{W^{1,p}(I; X)}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad (5)$$

Otherwise if $b = +\infty$ then

$$\|u\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} := \left(\|u\|_{L^p(I; X)}^p + \|u\|_{L^p(I; D)}^p + [u]_{W^{1,p}(I; X)}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad (6)$$

The norm Equation 6 is more classical: it allows for a unified treatment of maximal regularity on bounded and unbounded intervals. However in our work, we mostly study maximal regularity in the bounded setting $b < +\infty$. The norm (5) is well behaved under time rescalings thanks to the weight $|I|^p$ in front of the $W^{1,p}$ semi-norm. In fact, for any $\lambda \neq 0$ a natural *isometry* from $\text{MR}^p(I)$

to $\text{MR}^p(\lambda I)$ can be defined as $\iota_\lambda : u \mapsto \lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} u(\lambda^{-1} \cdot)$. This rescaling property will prove useful in the development of the arguments throughout.

For further use, let us also define the closed subspace $\text{MR}_0^p(I) \subset \text{MR}^p(I)$ defined as follows

$$\text{MR}_0^p(I) := \{u \in \text{MR}^p(I) \mid u(a) = 0\} \quad (7)$$

Remark 2.1. It makes sense to evaluate $u \in \text{MR}^p(I)$ at any point of I (e.g. $u(a)$) as the following continuous embedding $\text{MR}^p(I) \hookrightarrow C(\bar{I}; \text{Tr}^p)$ holds, where $\text{Tr}^p := (D, X)_{\frac{1}{q}, p}$ is a *real interpolation* between D and X of parameters $(\frac{1}{q}, p)$ (see e.g. [23, Theorem 3.12.2]). Equivalently Tr^p can be interpreted as a *trace space* of $\text{MR}^p(I)$ meaning $\text{Tr}^p = \{u(a) \mid u \in \text{MR}^p(I)\}$ equipped with the norm

$$\|x\|_{\text{Tr}^p, I} = \inf \left\{ \|u\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} \mid u \in \text{MR}^p(I), u(a) = x \right\}$$

In the case of a bounded interval $b < +\infty$, under the isometry $\iota_\lambda : \text{MR}^p(I) \rightarrow \text{MR}^p(\lambda I)$ the norm of the trace space is scaled accordingly. More precisely we have for any $x \in \text{Tr}^p$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\|_{\text{Tr}^p, I} &= \inf \left\{ \|u\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} \mid u \in \text{MR}^p(I), u(a) = x \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \|\iota_\lambda^{-1}(v)\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} \mid v \in \text{MR}^p(\lambda I), \iota_\lambda^{-1}(v)(a) = x \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \|v\|_{\text{MR}^p(\lambda I)} \mid v \in \text{MR}^p(\lambda I), \lambda^{\frac{1}{p}} v(\lambda a) = x \right\} \\ &= |\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|x\|_{\text{Tr}^p, \lambda I} \end{aligned}$$

Using the time-reversing rescaling ι_{-1} we see that the trace can either be taken on the left or on the right of the interval in the definition i.e. $\text{Tr}^p = \{u(b) \mid u \in \text{MR}^p(a, b)\}$.

Strong measurability of nonautonomous operators Let $I = (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open interval, bounded from below. For nonautonomous operators $A : \bar{I} \mapsto \mathcal{L}(D; X)$, the notion of *strong measurability* is necessary to allow the definition of the associated multiplication operators \mathcal{A} defined in the next paragraph. We want to give meaning to the quantity

$$\|\mathcal{A}v\|_{L^p(I; X)} = \left(\int_I \|A(t)v(t)\|_X^p dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

which requires the measurability of the map $t \mapsto \|A(t)v(t)\|_X$. And if $t \mapsto A(t)$ is *strongly measurable* as defined below, the measurability of this map will hold for any $v \in L^p(I; D)$.

Definition 2.2. A nonautonomous operator $A : \bar{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D; X)$ is said to be *strongly measurable* if for any $x \in D$, the map $A(\cdot)x : I \rightarrow X$ is *Bochner-measurable* in X .

The following remarks motivate the use of this notion of strong measurability for applications.

Remark 2.2. (i) The notion of strong measurability for operators is a weaker type of measurability than the measurability of $t \mapsto A(t)$ in $\mathcal{L}(D; X)$. Even with D and X separable, these two notions of measurability are not equivalent in general.

(ii) By virtue of Pettis' theorem [25], since X is separable, if $t \mapsto A(t)x$ is weakly continuous in X for any $x \in D$, then A is strongly measurable. Pettis' theorem allows to show the strong measurability of differential operators with continuous coefficients. For example fix $c \in C_b(\bar{I} \times \mathbb{R})$, let $X = L^2(\mathbb{R})$, $D = H^1(\mathbb{R})$ and define for each $t \in \bar{I}$ the operator $A(t)u := \{x \mapsto c(t, x) \frac{d}{dx} u(x)\} \in \mathcal{L}(D, X)$. We see that $t \mapsto [A(t)]u = c(t, x) \frac{d}{dx} u(x)$ is weakly continuous in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ if $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$. Since $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ is separable, Pettis' theorem applies and we obtain the strong measurability of A .

We may then equip this notion of strong measurability to Lebesgue spaces of nonautonomous operators.

Definition 2.3. We define the Lebesgue space

$$L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D; X)) := \left\{ A : I \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D; X) \left| \begin{array}{l} A \text{ is strongly measurable} \\ \text{and} \\ \text{For any } x \in D, \|A(\cdot)x\|_X \in L^\infty(I; \mathbb{R}) \end{array} \right. \right\}$$

The separability of D and the uniform boundedness principle ensure that the map $t \mapsto \|A(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(D; X)}$ is essentially bounded in I for any $A \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D; X))$.

As usual, the identification in $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D; X))$ is performed almost everywhere in I (for the one-dimensional Lebesgue measure) and the norm $\|A\|_{L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D; X))} := \left\| \|A(\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{L}(D; X)} \right\|_{L^\infty(I)}$ gives it the structure of a Banach space. When there is no ambiguity, we shall often write $\|A\|_\infty$ for this norm.

2.2 L^p maximal regularity

Let $I = (a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be an open interval bounded from below, i.e. $-\infty < a < b \leq +\infty$. We define the maximal regularity property and the maximal regularity constant for autonomous and nonautonomous operators on I . We then derive elementary properties of the classes defined below, in particular the stability of the maximal regularity property under restriction of the time interval.

Autonomous operators: $mr_p(I)$

Definition 2.4. An operator $A \in \mathcal{L}(D; X)$ has the L^p maximal regularity property on I if

(aut.i) $\|\cdot\|_A \sim \|\cdot\|_D$.

(aut.ii) For each $f \in L^p(I; X)$ there exists a unique solution $v_f^A \in \text{MR}^p(I)$ of the following abstract Cauchy problem,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt} v(t) + Av(t) &= f(t) & \text{for } t \in I \\ v(a) &= 0 \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

and there exists $K \geq 0$, independent of f such that

$$\|v_f^A\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} \leq K \|f\|_{L^p(I; X)}. \quad (9)$$

We denote $mr_p(I)$ this family of maximally regular autonomous operators and for each $A \in mr_p(I)$, the infimum K in (9) is denoted by $[A]_{mr_p(I)}$. It is called the *maximal regularity constant* of A on I .

Nonautonomous operators: $\mathcal{MR}_p(I)$

Definition 2.5. A nonautonomous operator $A \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D; X))$ has the L^p maximal regularity property on I if

(*nonaut-i*) For any $t \in I$, $\|\cdot\|_{A(t)} \sim \|\cdot\|_D$.

(*nonaut-ii*) For any $f \in L^p(I; X)$ there exists a unique solution $v_f^A \in \mathcal{MR}^p(I)$ of the following abstract nonautonomous Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}v(t) + A(t)v(t) &= f(t) & t \in I \\ v(a) &= 0 \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

And there exists $K \geq 0$, independent of f such that

$$\|v_f^A\|_{\mathcal{MR}^p(I)} \leq K\|f\|_{L^p(I; X)} \quad (11)$$

We denote $\mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ this family of nonautonomous and maximally regular operators and for each $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ the infimum K in (11) is denoted by $[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}$. It is also called the maximal regularity constant of A .

Following these definitions several clarifying remarks are in order.

Remark 2.3. (i) The condition $\|\cdot\|_A \sim \|\cdot\|_D$ is equivalent to asking that A be a closed unbounded operator on X with domain D , provided $D \subsetneq X$. If $D = X$, then maximal regularity will hold for all $A \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ by virtue of the abstract Cauchy-Lipschitz theorem. In the case $X = L^p(\Omega)$, $D = W^{2,p}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ it is known that autonomous second order and uniformly elliptic operators with continuous coefficients are maximally regular, condition (*aut.i*) being given by the theory of elliptic regularity (see e.g. [16]).

(ii) See that $mr_p(I)$ (resp. $\mathcal{MR}_p(I)$) is not stable by finite sum because requirement (*aut.i*) (resp. (*nonaut-i*)) fails in general for the sum of two operators.

A counter-example is provided in the following pair of operators on $L^2(0, 1)$: $Au := u'$ and $Bu = \frac{1}{2}u(0) \cdot 1$, with domains $D(B) = D(A) = \{u \in H^1(0, 1) : u(1) = 0\}$. Since A is closed and from the Poincaré inequality on $[0, 1]$, we have $\|Bu\|_{L^2(0,1)} \leq \frac{1}{2}\|Au\|_{L^2(0,1)}$, which is to say that the A -bound of B is at most $\frac{1}{2}$ which is smaller than 1. By [19, Theorem IV.1.1] it follows that the sum $S := A + B$ is closed.

However see that B is not closed on $D(B) = H^1(0, 1)$, indeed define for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$u_n(t) := \begin{cases} 1 - nt & 0 \leq t < \frac{1}{n} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{n} \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

The sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of elements in $H^1(0, 1)$ converges to 0 in $L^2(0, 1)$, however $\lim Bu_n = \frac{1}{2} \neq 0 = B \lim u_n$, yielding that the sum $S + (-A)$ is not closed.

(iii) When the time interval I is clear by context, we shall write mr_p and \mathcal{MR}_p instead of $mr_p(I)$ or $\mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ respectively. Moreover we easily see that $mr_p(I) \subset \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$.

(iv) For autonomous operators, $mr_p(I) = mr_p(J)$ for any two bounded intervals $I, J \subset \mathbb{R}$, in other words, in the case of bounded intervals, maximal L^p regularity is independent of the interval. However we remark that, according to Definition 2.4 $mr_p(0, 1) \neq mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+)$ in general. Fix an open bounded space interval $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$ and consider the diagonally perturbed Dirichlet Laplacian operator $A := -\Delta_D - \lambda \text{Id}$ defined on $D = H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \subset L^2(\Omega)$, where $\lambda \geq 0$ is some eigenvalue of $-\Delta_D$. We have $A \in mr_p(0, 1)$ while $A \notin mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Indeed, if $u_\lambda \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ is an eigenvector of $-\Delta_D$ associated to λ , then $t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto u_\lambda$, is the unique solution of the homogeneous Cauchy problem with initial condition $u(0) = u_\lambda \in \text{Tr}^p$. Hence $u \in \text{MR}^p(0, 1)$ while $u \notin \text{MR}^p(\mathbb{R}_+^*)$.

Another way to see that $A \notin mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+^*)$ is to remark that it is not a sectorial operator.

If we are given a nonautonomous operator $A : \overline{I} \mapsto \mathcal{L}(D, X)$, a source term $f \in L^p(I; X)$ and an initial condition $x \in \text{Tr}^p$ we can consider the following Cauchy problem:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}v(t) + A(t)v(t) &= f(t) & t \in I \\ v(a) &= x \end{cases} \quad (\text{CP})$$

where recall that $I = (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ is bounded from below. We use the notation $(\text{CP})_{x,f}^I$ to refer to the above Cauchy problem: we explicitly specify the initial datum x , the source term f and the time interval I under consideration. It turns out that condition (nonaut-ii) is equivalent to the well-posedness of the general Cauchy problem $(\text{CP})_{x,f}^I$ for any $x \in \text{Tr}^p$, $f \in L^p(I; X)$. We omit the proof of this result which relies on standard lifting techniques.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $A \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D; X))$ be a nonautonomous operators satisfying (nonaut-i).*

Then $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ if and only if for any $x \in \text{Tr}^p$, $f \in L^p(I; X)$ there exists a unique solution to $(\text{CP})_{x,f}^I$ and there exists $K \geq 0$, independent of f and x such that

$$\|v\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} \leq K \left(\|f\|_{L^p(I; X)} + \|x\|_{\text{Tr}^p, I} \right)$$

It is quite natural to want to be able to restrict an operator $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ to any subinterval $J \subset I$ while keeping the maximal regularity property of the restricted operator $A|_J$. This property amounts to the existence of a regular evolution operator for the equation. In our case, the compactness of the embedding $D \hookrightarrow X$ is a key ingredient that allows to derive this property. The proof of the result can be found in Appendix D.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open interval bounded from below and let $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$.*

Then for any subinterval $J \subset I$, $A|_J \in \mathcal{MR}_p(J)$. Moreover, if either $|J| = |I| = \infty$ or $|J| \leq |I| < +\infty$ then

$$[A|_J]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(J)} \leq [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \quad (12)$$

Otherwise if $|J| < |I| = +\infty$, then

$$[A|_J]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(J)} \leq (|J| \vee 1)[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \quad (13)$$

2.3 Relatively continuous operators

Regarding nonautonomous operators, relative continuity is a weaker type of continuity than strong continuity. Relative continuity incorporates the idea of perturbing continuous operators and as

such allows to treat with generality various kinds of such perturbations. The definition, which we reformulate here, was first given by Arendt and coauthors in [10, Definition 2.5]. We state elementary topological properties of $RC(I)$, the space of relatively continuous operators on I . In particular $RC(I)$ is a closed linear subspace of $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D; X))$. Then we exhibit a theorem, analogous in shape, to the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem for continuous maps.

Definition 2.6. Let $I = (a, b)$ be a bounded open interval.

- We say that a strongly measurable nonautonomous operator $A : \bar{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D; X)$ is *relatively continuous* if for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ and $\eta \geq 0$ such that

$$\forall x \in D, \forall t, s \in \bar{I}, \quad |t - s| \leq \delta \implies \|A(t)x - A(s)x\|_X \leq \epsilon \|x\|_D + \eta \|x\|_X \quad (P_{\eta, \delta}^\epsilon)$$

We denote by $RC(I; (D; X))$ the class of nonautonomous operators of $\mathcal{L}(D; X)$ which are relatively continuous.

- For $A \in RC(I; (D; X))$, we call the *ranges of relative continuity* the following set-valued function, which is nondecreasing with respect to set inclusion

$$r_A^* : \begin{cases} (0, +\infty) & \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}((0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty)) \\ \epsilon & \longmapsto \left\{ (\delta, \eta) \mid (P_{\eta, \delta}^\epsilon) \text{ holds} \right\} \end{cases}$$

- We say that $r_A = (\delta, \eta) : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow (0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty)$ is a *specific* range of relative continuity of A if

- (★) $r_A(\epsilon) \in r_A^*(\epsilon)$ for any $\epsilon \in (0, +\infty)$.
- (★) $\epsilon \mapsto \delta(\epsilon)$ is nondecreasing.
- (★) $\epsilon \mapsto \eta(\epsilon)$ is nonincreasing.

Here D and X are fixed, therefore we write $RC(I)$ unambiguously for $RC(I; (D; X))$. Furthermore, when we wish to select a specific range of relative continuity r_A , with a slight abuse of notation, we may simply write $r_A \in r_A^*$. If $A \in RC(I)$, then it is always possible to select a specific range of relative continuity for A .

We now state some topological facts about relatively continuous operators which are proved in Appendix B.

Proposition 2.3. $RC(I)$ is a closed and proper linear subspace of $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D; X))$.

Before stating our Arzelà-Ascoli type result, let us define the notion of relative equicontinuity.

Definition 2.7. We say that a family $\mathcal{F} \subset RC(I)$ is *relatively equicontinuous*, if for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ and $\eta \geq 0$ such that $(P_{\eta, \delta}^\epsilon)$ holds for any $A \in \mathcal{F}$.

Equivalently, this means that

$$\bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{F}} r_A^* \neq \emptyset$$

For the statement of the Arzelà-Ascoli-type theorem, we describe several topologies one may put on the space $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D; X))$, here translated in terms of convergence. Given a family $\{A_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \subset \mathcal{L}(D; X)^I$ of nonautonomous operators, where Λ is some unspecified metric space, we can describe the following convergences:

(t, x) -pointwise convergence in X : In this topology $A_\lambda \xrightarrow[\lambda \rightarrow \bar{\lambda}]{} A_{\bar{\lambda}}$ if for all $(t, x) \in I \times D$, $A_\lambda(t)x \xrightarrow[\lambda \rightarrow \bar{\lambda}]{} A_{\bar{\lambda}}(t)x$ strongly in X . It is generated by the product topology of $X^{I \times D}$.

t -pointwise convergence in $\mathcal{L}(D; X)$: In this topology $A_\lambda \xrightarrow[\lambda \rightarrow \bar{\lambda}]{} A_{\bar{\lambda}}$ if for all $t \in I$, $A_\lambda(t) \xrightarrow[\lambda \rightarrow \bar{\lambda}]{} A_{\bar{\lambda}}(t)$ for the norm topology in $\mathcal{L}(D; X)$. It is generated by the product topology of $\mathcal{L}(D; X)^I$.

Uniform convergence: This is the topology generated by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ as defined in Definition 2.3.

There is an obvious hierarchy of these three topologies, the former being the weakest and the latter being the strongest.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subset RC(I)$ be a family of relatively continuous operators on I . The following properties hold:*

- (i) *If \mathcal{F} is relatively compact in $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$ then \mathcal{F} is relatively equicontinuous.*
- (ii) *If \mathcal{F} is relatively equicontinuous and for each $t \in I$, $\{A(t) \mid A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{L}(D, X)$ then \mathcal{F} is bounded in $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$.*
- (iii) *If \mathcal{F} is relatively equicontinuous then $\overline{\mathcal{F}} \subset RC(I)$ and is also relatively equicontinuous, where $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ is the sequential closure of \mathcal{F} for the (t, x) -pointwise convergence.*

Note that, contrary to the standard Arzelà-Ascoli theorem for continuous maps, if we replace the two occurrences of "bounded" by the expression "relatively compact" in (ii) then the conclusion may fail. A counter-example is provided by the sequence of nonautonomous operators, $n \geq 2$, $t \in [0, 1]$, $A_n(t) := A + 1_{[\frac{1}{n}, \frac{2}{n}]}(t)B$ where $A \in \mathcal{L}(D, X)$ and $B \in \mathcal{L}(D, X)$ satisfies an interpolation inequality i.e. there exists $L > 0$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that for any $x \in D$,

$$\|Bx\|_X \leq L \|x\|_X^\theta \|x\|_D^{1-\theta}$$

Thanks to Young's inequality, it is straightforward to check that the family $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset RC(0, 1)$ is relatively equicontinuous and that $A_n(t)x \rightarrow A$ in X as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$, $x \in D$. However

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \|A_n - A\|_\infty = \|B\|_{\mathcal{L}(D, X)} > 0$$

2.4 Main results and scheme of the proof

In our main result, we derive quantitative estimates of the maximal regularity constant for relatively continuous operators which satisfy pointwise maximal regularity up to a small perturbation. This result is proved through a combination of intermediate results which have their own interest. In Section 2.4.1 we describe the asymptotic behavior of the regularity constant under diagonal perturbations (i.e. taking the form $A + \lambda \text{Id}$). In Section 2.4.2 we describe the main quantitative estimate as a result of a gluing-up of operators defined on subintervals. Section 2.4.3 discusses limiting

behavior of operators in \mathcal{MR}_p in particular its persistence in the limit. Finally in Section 2.4.4 a global well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for abstract quasilinear equations on bounded intervals and a corollary are presented.

2.4.1 Asymptotic behavior of diagonal perturbations

For our quantitative inquiry it becomes important to evaluate quite precisely the behavior of the maximal regularity constant with respect to diagonal perturbations. Indeed, the proof of the main result relies on a perturbation argument. It is stated in the following.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded open interval and let $A \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D; X))$ be a nonautonomous operator. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $A + \lambda_0 \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$.*
- (ii) *$A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$.*
- (iii) *For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $A + \lambda \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$.*

And if one of these statements holds true, we have for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$[A + \lambda]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \leq c_p(\lambda|I|)[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \quad (14)$$

where the function $c_p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfies

$$c_p(\nu) := (|\nu| + \kappa_p(\nu))(1 + e^{p\nu_-} - e^{-p\nu_+})^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad (15)$$

with $\frac{\kappa_p(\nu)}{|\nu|} \xrightarrow{|\nu| \rightarrow +\infty} 0$ and $\kappa_p(0) = 1$. In particular the following asymptotic behavior is observed for c_p :

$$\begin{aligned} c_p(\nu) &\underset{\nu \rightarrow -\infty}{\sim} -\nu e^{-\nu} \\ c_p(\nu) &\underset{\nu \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \nu \end{aligned}$$

It is not surprising to see the exponential factor $e^{-\nu}$ appear in the regime $\nu \rightarrow -\infty$ since this exponential behavior is already sharp for autonomous operators (see later Lemma 3.3). It is however still not clear to the authors whether one can discard the extra factor ν appearing. This asymptotic result is shown in Section 3. We can remark (14) possesses a particular invariance related to the behavior of $[A]$ with respect to the rescaling $A \mapsto \mu A(\mu \cdot)$ (see Remark 4.1 later). This is a direct consequence of the use of the norm (5) for $\mathcal{MR}^p(I)$. In fact any estimate in the form

$$[A + \lambda]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \leq C(\lambda, |I|)[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}$$

can be reduced to an estimate with $\tilde{C}(\lambda, T) := \inf_{\mu > 0} C(\mu\lambda, \frac{T}{\mu})$ thereby forcing the invariance of the inequality with respect to these transformations.

2.4.2 Maximal regularity constant of relatively continuous operators

We introduce here several auxiliary quantities which are involved in the estimate of the maximal regularity constant of nonautonomous operators. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded open interval and let $A_0 : I \mapsto \mathcal{L}(D, X)$ satisfy the pointwise autonomous maximal regularity on the unbounded interval \mathbb{R}_+ :

$$\forall t \in I, \quad A_0(t) \in mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+). \quad (16)$$

It is then well-known that for each $t \in I$, $-A_0(t)$ is the generator of a bounded analytic semi-group $\{e^{-\tau A_0(t)}\}_{\tau \geq 0}$ on X and from Proposition 2.2, we infer $[A(t)]_{mr_p(I)} < +\infty$. Hence we can define the following positive maps:

$$K_0 : t \mapsto [A(t)]_{mr_p(I)} \quad M_0 : t \mapsto \sup_{\tau \geq 0} \|e^{-\tau A_0(t)}\|_X \quad (17)$$

$$\epsilon_0 : t \mapsto \frac{1}{2(K_0(t) + 1)(M_0(t) + 1)} \quad (18)$$

Now let us describe the main assumption on $A : I \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D, X)$ which guarantees nonautonomous maximal regularity of A .

$$\left(\text{A1} \right) \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
 \text{(a) **Relative continuity:** } A \in RC(I; (D; X)). \\
 \text{(b) **Decomposition:** There exist } A_0 : I \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D, X) \text{ and } B : I \times I \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D, X) \text{ such that} \\
 \quad \text{(b.1) For all } t, s \in I, A(s) = A_0(t) + B(t, s). \\
 \quad \text{(b.2) For all } t \in I, A_0(t) \in mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+). \\
 \quad \text{(b.3) There exists a range } r_A = (\delta_A, \eta_A) \in r_A^* \text{ such that for all } x \in D, \\
 \quad \quad \forall t, s \in I, \quad |t - s| \leq \rho_A(t) \implies \|B(t, s)x\|_X \leq \epsilon_0(t)\|x\|_D + \mu_A(t)\|x\|_X \quad (19) \\
 \quad \quad \text{where } \rho_A := \delta_A \circ \epsilon_0, \mu_A := \eta_A \circ \epsilon_0 \text{ and } \epsilon_0 \text{ is defined by (17)-(18).}
 \end{array} \right.$$

Assumption (b) says that we can decompose A into the sum of a pointwise maximally regular operator A_0 and a *perturbation* B , the meaning of this perturbation being expressed by (b.3). Note that we may have $B \equiv 0$ in which case **(A1)** amounts to the assumptions of relative continuity and pointwise maximal regularity of A given in [10, Theorem 2.11] of Arendt and coauthors.

Theorem 2.6. *Assume that A satisfies **(A1)** on the bounded open interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$. Then $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ and there exists a subdivision $\mathcal{T} := \{\tau_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq N}$ of \bar{I} and center points $\mathcal{C} := \{t_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ such that*

$$a = \tau_0 < t_1 < \tau_1 < \dots < t_N < \tau_N = b \quad (20)$$

$$\rho_A(t_i) \leq \tau_i - \tau_{i-1} \leq 2\rho_A(t_i), \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \quad (21)$$

and there exists $K := K(p, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}, K_0, M_0, \|A\|_\infty) \geq 0$ such that

$$[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \leq K \quad (22)$$

Quantitative description of K In order to obtain quantitative growth conditions for the global existence for quasilinear evolution equations, it is of interest to describe the form of K found in (22). Define for $(\tau, \mu, M, K) \in \mathbb{R}_+^4$, the function

$$G(\tau, \mu, M, K) := 4(M+1)c_p(-4M\tau\mu)K$$

where c_p is given in Theorem 2.5. Given \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C} as in Theorem 2.6, for $1 \leq i \leq N$ denote

$$G_i := G(\tau_i - \tau_{i-1}, \mu_A(t_i), M_0(t_i), K_0(t_i))$$

We show that K in (22) is written as

$$K := \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\tau_i - \tau_0}{\tau_i - \tau_{i-1}} \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^N H_j(p, \mathcal{T}, \|A\|_\infty, G_j) \right) G_i \quad (23)$$

where for fixed $p, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}$, the functions $H^j(p, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, $j \in \{2, \dots, N\}$ have linear growth at most. Observe in particular that K only depends on the evaluation of the maps $K_0, M_0 : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ at the center points $\mathcal{C} \subset I$, and remark that this dependence is *not* invariant under permutation of the values $(K_0(t_1), \dots, K_0(t_N))$: this is due to the intrinsic direction of time imposed in the Cauchy problem. The proof of the estimate is found in Section 5.

We obtain a even more explicit estimate in the particular class of relatively continuous operators which satisfy a Hölder-type regularity and when an additional integrability condition holds for the maps K_0 and M_0 .

For $\alpha \in [1, +\infty)$ and $\beta \in [0, +\infty)$, let us introduce the subspace $RC^{\alpha, \beta}(I) \subset RC(I)$.

Definition 2.8. We say that $A \in RC^{\alpha, \beta}(I)$ if there exists a range of relative continuity $r_A = (\delta_A, \eta_A) \in r_A^*$ for A and $m_\delta \in (0, 1]$, $m_\eta \geq 0$ such that

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \quad \delta_A(\epsilon) = m_\delta \epsilon^\alpha$$

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \quad \eta_A(\epsilon) \leq m_\eta \epsilon^{-\beta}$$

$RC^{\alpha, \beta}(I)$ is a closed linear subspace of $RC(I)$ equipped with the topology induced by $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$. In many applications the differential operators encountered fall in the class $RC^{\alpha, \beta}(I)$, since it amounts to a Hölder regularity of order $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ in the higher order coefficients and bounded lower-order coefficients. Let $A : I \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D, X)$ satisfy assumption **(A1)** with the decomposition A_0 and B , for the more explicit estimate we ask the additional assumptions:

$$(A2) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(a) } (\alpha, \beta)\text{-Hölder regularity: } A \in RC^{\alpha, \beta}(I; (D; X)) \text{ for some } \alpha \geq 1, \beta \geq 0. \\ \text{(b) } L^{\alpha r}(I) \text{ Integrability condition: There exists } r > 1 \text{ such that} \\ \Gamma = \Gamma(\alpha, r, M_0, K_0) := \left(\int_I (K_0(t) + 1)^{\alpha r} (M_0(t) + 1)^{\alpha r} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} < +\infty \end{array} \right.$$

Theorem 2.7. *Assume that A satisfies (A1) and (A2). Then there exists a constant $C = C(|I|, \|A\|_\infty, p, r, \alpha, \beta)$ such that,*

$$\log([A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}) \leq C \left(\left(\frac{\Gamma}{m_\delta} \right)^{r^*} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ + \\ m_\eta m_\delta^{s_2(\alpha, \beta, r)} \Gamma^{s_1(\alpha, \beta, r)} \\ + \\ \log\left(\frac{\Gamma}{m_\delta}\right) \end{array} \right\} + m_\eta + 1 \right) \quad (24)$$

where $s_1(\alpha, \beta, r) := r^* \left(\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha} - 1 \right)$ and $s_2(\alpha, \beta, r) := \frac{\beta+1}{\alpha+1} - \left(\frac{\alpha+\frac{1}{r}}{\alpha+1} \right) s_1(\alpha, \beta, r)$, $r^* := \frac{r}{r-1}$.

Estimate (24) is only suitable to evaluate $[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}$ near $+\infty$ with some precision. Indeed by definition $\Gamma > 0$ therefore, the left-hand side cannot be made smaller than a given positive constant. However the estimate allows the derivation of asymptotic behavior of the constant in terms of the three quantities m_δ, m_η and Γ . We will see that the asymptotic behaviors have practical uses in existence results for quasilinear equations.

2.4.3 Topologies for the persistence of maximal regularity in limits

Let us be given a metric space (Λ, d_Λ) which describes the range of a given parameter of our operator. Consider a mapping

$$A_{(\cdot)} : \begin{cases} \Lambda & \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}(D, X)^{\bar{I}} \\ \lambda & \longmapsto A_\lambda \end{cases}$$

of nonautonomous operators on \bar{I} . We are given an open subset $\mathcal{O} \subset \Lambda$ where for each $\lambda \in \mathcal{O}$ A_λ is maximally regular. We are also given a corresponding map of source terms $f_{(\cdot)} : \Lambda \rightarrow L^p(I; X)$.

We equip the closure $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ of \mathcal{O} with the natural induced topology by d_Λ , and we denote $\lambda \xrightarrow{\bar{\mathcal{O}}} \bar{\lambda}$ the corresponding convergence.

To study (Q2), we rely on the following elementary result.

Proposition 2.8. *Assume $\{A_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}} \subset \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ is such that $\bar{K} := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [A_n]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} < +\infty$. Assume further that there exists $\bar{\lambda} \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}$ such that one of the following convergences holds:*

$$(CV_I) \quad \|A_\lambda - A_{\bar{\lambda}}\|_\infty \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } \lambda \xrightarrow{\bar{\mathcal{O}}} \bar{\lambda}.$$

$$(CV_{II}) \quad \forall t \in \bar{I}, \quad \|A_\lambda(t) - A_{\bar{\lambda}}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(D; X)} \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } \lambda \xrightarrow{\bar{\mathcal{O}}} \bar{\lambda}.$$

Then $A_{\bar{\lambda}} \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ and $[A_{\bar{\lambda}}]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \leq \bar{K}$.

Moreover denote $v_{(\cdot)} : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \text{MR}^p(I)$ the corresponding mapping of solutions to $(\text{CP})_{0, f_{(\cdot)}}^I$. Then,

(i) If (CV_I) holds and $f_\lambda \rightharpoonup f_{\bar{\lambda}}$ weakly in $L^p(I; X)$ then

$$v_\lambda \xrightarrow[\mathcal{O}]{\lambda \rightarrow \bar{\lambda}} v_{\bar{\lambda}} \quad \text{weakly in } \mathcal{MR}^p(I)$$

(ii) If (CV_{II}) holds and $f_\lambda \rightarrow f_{\bar{\lambda}}$ strongly in $L^p(I; X)$ then

$$v_\lambda \xrightarrow[\mathcal{O}]{\lambda \rightarrow \bar{\lambda}} v_{\bar{\lambda}} \quad \text{strongly in } \mathcal{MR}^p(I)$$

Obviously if (CV_I) holds, then (CV_{II}) also holds hence the conclusion also holds.

We observe the following assumptions on the mapping restricted to \mathcal{O} :

$$(\mathbf{A}_\Lambda) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(a) For any } t \in \bar{I}, \text{ the family } \{A_\lambda(t)\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}} \subset mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+^*) \text{ and } \sup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}} [A_\lambda(t)]_{mr_p(I)} < +\infty. \\ \text{(b) The family } \{A_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}} \subset RC(I; (D; X)) \text{ and is relatively equicontinuous.} \\ \text{(c) For any } t \in \bar{I}, \text{ the family } \{A_\lambda(t)\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}} \text{ is bounded in } \mathcal{L}(D; X). \end{array} \right.$$

These assumptions can be used straightforwardly along with Theorem 2.6 to infer the following uniform boundedness of the maximal regularity constant on \mathcal{O} :

Corollary 2.9. *Assume that $A_{(\cdot)}$ satisfies (\mathbf{A}_Λ) in $\mathcal{O} \subset \Lambda$. Then $\{A_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}} \subset \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ and we have*

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}} [A_\lambda]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} < +\infty$$

The above corollary may be used to infer several results answering (Q2) affirmatively. The rather elementary proofs of the results below rely on Proposition 2.4; for the convenience of the reader we chose to collect them in Appendix C.

Corollary 2.10. *Assume that $A_{(\cdot)}$ satisfies $(\mathbf{A}_\Lambda)(a)$ in $\mathcal{O} \subset \Lambda$ and that there exists $\bar{\lambda} \in \Lambda$ such that (CV_I) holds.*

Then $A_{\bar{\lambda}} \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ and (i) of Proposition 2.8 holds.

Corollary 2.11. *Assume that $A_{(\cdot)}$ satisfies (\mathbf{A}_Λ) in $\mathcal{O} \subset \Lambda$ and that there exists $\bar{\lambda} \in \Lambda$ such that (CV_{II}) holds.*

Then $A_{\bar{\lambda}} \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ and (ii) of Proposition 2.8 holds.

2.4.4 Global existence for a quasilinear equation

We state a global existence result for a class of abstract quasilinear equations. Assume that $\mathcal{X}(I) \hookrightarrow L^p(I; X)$ is a functional space on I , and we make the further assumption that the injection

$$\mathcal{MR}^p(I) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}(I) \text{ is continuous and compact}$$

Since the injection $D \hookrightarrow X$ is compact, we already know that $\mathcal{MR}^p(I)$ injects in $L^p(I; X)$ compactly. Hence there exist such spaces $\mathcal{X}(I)$, take for example any real interpolation between $L^p(I; X)$ and $\mathcal{MR}^p(I)$. We consider the following nonlocal-in-time Cauchy problem for a quasilinear equation,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}u(t) + \mathbb{A}(u)(t)u(t) &= \mathbb{F}(u)(t) \quad t \in I \\ u(a) &= x \end{cases} \quad (\text{QL})$$

where the initial condition $x \in \text{Tr}^p$.

To ensure existence of global strong solutions to (QL), i.e. solutions $u \in \text{MR}^p(I)$ which satisfy the equation for a.e. $t \in I$, we introduce the following assumptions on the maps $A_{(\cdot)} : \mathcal{X}(I) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D; X)^{\overline{I}}$ and $F : \mathcal{X}(I) \rightarrow L^p(I; X)$:

(\mathbf{E}_I) For all $R \geq 0$, define the quantities:

$$\gamma(R) := \sup_{\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)}=R} [\mathbb{A}(u)]_{\mathcal{MR}^p(I)} \quad (25)$$

$$\kappa(R) := \sup_{\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)}=R} \left\{ \|\mathbb{A}(u)\|_{\infty} + \|\mathbb{F}(u)\|_{L^p(I; X)} + 1 \right\} \quad (26)$$

and assume that for any $L > 0$ the following sublinear growth condition holds,

$$\sup_{R_1, R_2 \in [R-L, R+L]} \frac{\gamma(R_1)\kappa(R_2)}{R} \xrightarrow{R \rightarrow +\infty} 0 \quad (27)$$

(\mathbf{E}_{II}) We ask the following continuity properties:

- (i) $\mathbb{F} : \begin{cases} \mathcal{X}(I) & \longrightarrow & L^p(I; X) \\ u & \longmapsto & \mathbb{F}(u) \end{cases}$ is weakly continuous.
- (ii) $\mathbb{A} : \begin{cases} \mathcal{X}(I) & \longrightarrow & L^{\infty}(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X)) \\ u & \longmapsto & \mathbb{A}(u) \end{cases}$ is continuous.

The sublinear growth condition stated in (\mathbf{E}_I) does not allow local singularities or degeneracies to develop in the operator \mathbb{A} and imposes a quite restrictive growth condition on the source term \mathbb{F} . Indeed, in the case of a constant operator $\mathbb{A}(u) = A$, it is required that \mathbb{F} have a strictly sublinear growth.

The statement of the growth condition involves the supremum over the two variables R_1 and R_2 in the interval $[R - L, R + L]$. This allows to treat any initial condition $x \in \text{Tr}^p$. One can restrict the range of $L > 0$ if one has a smallness assumption on the initial data x . In the case of a homogeneous initial data, we can reduce the assumption to $L = 0$ and take $\kappa(R) := \sup_{\|u\|=R} \left\{ \|\mathbb{A}(u)\|_{\infty} + \|\mathbb{F}(u)\|_{L^p(I; X)} \right\}$ instead.

The existence of strong solutions no longer requires the Lipschitz continuity of the nonlinearities \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{F} .

The method of proof uses Schauder's fixed-point theorem contrary to the proof in [4] which uses Banach's fixed point. The uniqueness of the solution is thus not guaranteed with this method.

Theorem 2.12. *Assume that \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{F} satisfy conditions (\mathbf{E}_I) - (\mathbf{E}_{II}). Then for any $x \in \text{Tr}^p$ there exists a global solution $u \in \text{MR}^p(I)$ of (QL)*

This framework is then used to infer quantitative growth conditions on the regularity constant for relatively continuous operators in $RC^{\alpha,\beta}(I)$ which satisfy **(A1)**-**(A2)**. Denote by $\mathbb{A}_0 : u \mapsto \mathcal{A}_0(u)$ the operator given by the decomposition **(A1)**(b) and the subsequent $u \mapsto K_0(u), M_0(u)$ given in (17). Naturally this gives rise to the following maps:

- (i) $m_\delta : \mathcal{X}(I) \longrightarrow (0, 1]$
- (ii) $m_\eta : \mathcal{X}(I) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$
- (iii) $\Gamma : \begin{cases} \mathcal{X}(I) & \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \\ u & \longmapsto \|(K_0(u) + 1)(M_0(u) + 1)\|_{L^{\alpha r}(I)}^\alpha \end{cases}$

Our existence criterion reads as follows:

(E'_I) For any $R \geq 0$, define the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\log}(R) &:= \sup_{\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)}=R} \left\{ \left(\frac{\Gamma(u)}{m_\delta(u)} \right)^{r^*} \left(1 + m_\eta(u)m_\delta(u)^{s_2}\Gamma(u)^{s_1} + \log\left(\frac{\Gamma(u)}{m_\delta(u)} \right) \right) + m_\eta(u) \right\} \\ \kappa_{\log}(R) &:= \sup_{\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)}=R} \left\{ \log\left(\|\mathbb{A}(u)\|_\infty + \|\mathbb{F}(u) + 1\|_{L^p(I;X)} \right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and assume that there exists $h_0 > 0$, such that for any $L > 0$, there exists $R_0 \geq 0$ such that for all $R \geq R_0$ we have

$$\sup_{R_1, R_2 \in [R-L, R+L]} \frac{\gamma_{\log}(R_1) + \kappa_{\log}(R_2)}{\log(R)} \leq 1 - h_0 \quad (28)$$

where $s_1(\alpha, \beta, r) = r^* \left(\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha} - 1 \right)$ and $s_2(\alpha, \beta, r) := \frac{\beta+1}{\alpha+1} - \left(\frac{\alpha+\frac{1}{r}}{\alpha+1} \right) s_1(\alpha, \beta, r)$.

Theorem 2.13. *Assume that for each $u \in \mathcal{X}(I)$, $\mathbb{A}(u)$ satisfies **(A1)** and **(A2)**. Moreover assume that \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{F} satisfy **(E'_I)** and **(E_{II})**. Then for any $x \in \text{Tr}^p$, there exists a global solution u to (QL).*

3 Perturbation and asymptotic behavior

We here study the influence of well-chosen perturbations on the maximal regularity constant. First we recall useful notions of L^p maximal regularity for autonomous operators on unbounded intervals. For such operators, we describe the asymptotic behavior of their maximal regularity constant under diagonal perturbations on bounded intervals. The same prospect is then carried out for nonautonomous, even though much less is known about. Lastly we exhibit the influence of suitable nonautonomous perturbations on the regularity constant.

3.1 The operator $L_A := \frac{d}{dt} + A$

We assume throughout that $A : \bar{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D; X)$ is a strongly measurable operator. Before our asymptotic study, let us describe the operators of interest in the Cauchy problem (CP):

- \mathcal{A}^I is the multiplication operator associated to A on $L^p(I; X)$; it is defined on the domain

$$D(\mathcal{A}^I) := \{u \in L^p(I; X) : t \mapsto A(t)u(t) \in L^p(I; X)\}$$

By definition, $(\mathcal{A}^I u) : t \mapsto A(t)u(t)$ for any $u \in D(\mathcal{A}^I)$;

- $\frac{d}{dt}$ is the time-derivative operator defined on the domain of $L^p(I; X)$

$$D\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right) = W_0^{1,p}(I; X) := \{u \in W^{1,p}(I; X) : v(a) = 0\}$$

Their sum is an unbounded operator on $L^p(I; X)$ denoted by

$$L_A^I := \frac{d}{dt} + \mathcal{A}^I$$

and defined on the domain $D(L_A^I) \supset D(\mathcal{A}^I) \cap D\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right) = \text{MR}_0^p(I)$ where $\text{MR}_0^p(I)$ is defined in (7).

Lemma 3.1. *$A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ if and only if L_A^I is closed on $D(L_A^I) = \text{MR}_0^p(I)$ and L_A^I is invertible in $\mathcal{L}(\text{MR}_0^p(I); L^p(I; X))$. In such a case we have*

$$[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} = \|(L_A^I)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^p(I; X); \text{MR}_0^p(I))} \quad (29)$$

Proof. ★ The fact that L_A^I is closed on $\text{MR}_0^p(I)$ follows from inequality (11). Indeed, let $x_n \rightarrow x$ in $L^p(I; X)$, $x_n \in D(L_A^I)$ such that $L_A^I x_n \rightarrow y$ in $L^p(I; X)$. Since $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$, there exists $u \in \text{MR}_0^p(I)$ such that $L_A^I u = y$. Therefore, $L_A^I(x_n - u) = L_A^I x_n - y$, meaning by (11) that $\|x_n - u\|_{\text{MR}_p(a,b)} \leq K \|L_A^I x_n - y\|_{L^p(I; X)} \rightarrow 0$. Therefore $x = u$.

- ★ The surjectivity of $L_A^I \in \mathcal{L}(\text{MR}_0^p(I); L^p(I; X))$ is equivalent to the solvability of (CP) for any $f \in L^p(I; X)$ and the injectivity to the uniqueness of its solution. The bounded inverse theorem ensures inequality (11) as L_A^I is indeed bounded from $\text{MR}_0^p(I)$ to $L^p(I; X)$. □

We can concisely describe

$$\mathcal{MR}_p(I) := \left\{ A : I \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D; X), \|\cdot\|_{A(t)} \sim \|\cdot\|_D \text{ for all } t \in I, [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} < +\infty \right\}.$$

As before, we shall often write \mathcal{A} and L_A instead of \mathcal{A}^I and L_A^I when the time interval is clear by context.

3.2 Diagonal perturbations by constants in $mr_p(I)$ and $\mathcal{MR}_p(I)$

Let us show that the maximal regularity property of the operator on a bounded interval I is not affected by a constant diagonal perturbation of the form λId . We first show it for autonomous operators in $mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+)$ (Lemma 3.3) with associated decays and then for nonautonomous operators (Theorem 3.4); in each case we give asymptotic bounds of $[A + \lambda I]_{mr_p(I), \mathcal{MR}_p(I)}$ when $|\lambda| \rightarrow +\infty$.

The autonomous case Let $A \in mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Recall (see e.g. [24, Proposition 2.2]) that $-A$ is the generator of an *analytic semi-group* $(e^{-tA})_{t \geq 0}$. It means that the semi-group $(e^{-tA})_{t \geq 0}$ can be analytically extended to a sector $\Sigma_\theta := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |\arg(z)| < \theta\} \cup \{0\}$, $\theta \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ of the complex plane and $\sup_{z \in \Sigma_\theta} \|e^{-zA}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} < +\infty$. The analyticity of the semi-group is equivalent to the *sectoriality* of the original operator A .

These facts will prove useful in the study of the resolvent operator $R_\lambda := (\lambda I + L_A)^{-1}$ of $-L_A$ for real values of λ , since this operator can be represented by a Laplace transformation of the semi-group generated by $-L_A$, as stated in the following result.

Lemma 3.2. *If $A \in mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+)$, then for any bounded open interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda \text{Id} + L_A^I$ is invertible in $\mathcal{L}(L^p(I; X))$ and we can express*

$$R_\lambda = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda\tau} e^{-\tau L_A} d\tau \quad (30)$$

Proof. We aim at representing R_λ as a Laplace transform of the semi-group generated by $-L_A$ on the Banach space $L^p(I; X)$.

On the one hand note that the multiplication operator $-\mathcal{A}$ generates the strongly continuous semi-group

$$e^{-\tau \mathcal{A}} : \begin{cases} L^p(I; X) & \longrightarrow L^p(I; X) \\ v & \longmapsto \{t \mapsto (e^{-\tau A} v)(t)\} \end{cases}$$

for $\tau \geq 0$. From the uniform boundedness of $\|e^{-zA}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)}$ on Σ_θ , we obtain the following uniform boundedness,

$$\sup_{\tau \geq 0} \|e^{-\tau \mathcal{A}}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^p(I; X))} \leq \sup_{\tau \geq 0} \|e^{-\tau A}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} =: M < +\infty \quad (31)$$

On the other hand $-\frac{d}{dt}$ generates the shift semi-group $(S_\tau)_{\tau \geq 0}$ on $L^p(I; X)$ where

$$S_\tau : \begin{cases} L^p(I; X) & \longrightarrow L^p(I; X) \\ v & \longmapsto \begin{cases} v(t - \tau) & \text{if } t - \tau \in \bar{I} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

for $\tau \geq 0$. $(S_\tau)_{\tau \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous contraction semi-group and it is nilpotent since $S_\tau = 0$ for $\tau \geq |I|$. Observe also that for any $\tau \geq 0$, S_τ and $e^{-\tau A}$ commute.

We see in fact that the two operators \mathcal{A} and $\frac{d}{dt}$ satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma A.1 with $Y = L^p(I; X)$. Consequently $-L_A$, which is closed since $A \in mr_p$, is the generator of the strongly continuous semi-group $e^{-\tau L_A} = S_\tau e^{-\tau A} = e^{-\tau A} S_\tau$ on $L^p(I; X)$. As a consequence $\tau \mapsto e^{-\tau L_A}$ is also nilpotent, so for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, the integral $\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda \tau} e^{-\tau L_A} d\tau$, which is a Laplace transform of the semi-group, is well-defined.

We finally check via standard computations that this Laplace transform is indeed the resolvent operator of $-L_A$. \square

Using representation (30), we further refine our study of R_λ by obtaining bounds and asymptotic behaviors when $\lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty$.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that $A \in mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+)$, then for any bounded interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\|R_\lambda\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^p(I; X))} \leq M \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda|I|}}{\lambda} \quad (32)$$

and

$$[A + \lambda \text{Id}]_{mr_p(I)} = \|R_\lambda\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^p(I; X); MR^p(I))} \leq \left(1 + M|1 - e^{-\lambda|I|}|\right) [A]_{mr_p(I)} \quad (33)$$

where $M := \sup_{t \geq 0} \|e^{-tA}\|_X$.

Proof. From (30), since S_τ is a contraction semi-group and vanishes for $\tau \geq |I|$, we have for any $\lambda \neq 0$ and $v \in L^p(I; X)$, using the triangle inequality and (31),

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_\lambda v\|_{L^p(I; X)} &\leq \int_0^{|I|} e^{-\lambda \tau} \|e^{-\tau A} v\|_{L^p(I; X)} d\tau \\ &\leq M \left(\int_0^{|I|} |e^{-\lambda \tau}| d\tau \right) \|v\|_{L^p(I; X)} \\ &\leq M \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda|I|}}{\lambda} \|v\|_{L^p(I; X)} \end{aligned}$$

and the above inequality also holds for $\lambda = 0$ if we extend $\lambda \mapsto \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda|I|}}{\lambda}$ by continuity. This yields estimate (32). Observe that $R_\mu = (L_A + \mu \text{Id})^{-1} = L_{A + \mu \text{Id}}^{-1}$ for any $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. Now use the resolvent identity $R_\lambda = R_0 - \lambda R_0 R_\lambda = R_0 (\text{Id} - \lambda R_\lambda)$ and (32) to find (33). \square

The nonautonomous case Similarly we show that a constant diagonal perturbation λId does not change the maximal regularity property of a nonautonomous operator on a bounded interval. Moreover we describe the asymptotic behavior of the maximal regularity constant as the diagonal perturbation goes to $\pm\infty$. Parts of the proof techniques are inspired by the proof of [22, Proposition 2.2].

Theorem 3.4. *Let $A : \bar{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D; X)$ be a nonautonomous operator on the bounded open interval I . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $A + \lambda_0 \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$.*
- (ii) *$A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$.*
- (iii) *For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $A + \lambda \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$.*

And if one of these statements holds true, we have for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$[A + \lambda]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \leq c_p(\lambda|I|)[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \quad (34)$$

where the function $c_p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfies

$$c_p(\nu) := (|\nu| + \kappa_p(\nu))(1 + e^{p\nu^-} - e^{-p\nu^+})^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad (35)$$

with $\kappa_p(\nu) = o_{\pm\infty}(|\nu|)$ and $\kappa_p(0) = 1$. In particular the following asymptotic behavior is observed for c_p :

$$\begin{aligned} c_p(\nu) &\underset{\nu \rightarrow -\infty}{\sim} -\nu e^{-\nu} \\ c_p(\nu) &\underset{\nu \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \nu \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.1. Note that the bounds in the autonomous case (33) and nonautonomous case (34) do not have the same asymptotic behaviors in $\nu \rightarrow \pm\infty$ as they differ by a factor ν . However note that $c_p(\nu)$ is sharp around 0 since $c_p(0) = 1$. It is not yet known to the authors whether or not this asymptotic at $\pm\infty$ for the nonautonomous case is sharp or not.

Proof. First see that (iii) \Rightarrow (ii) \Rightarrow (i) obviously.

Also for $t \in [a, b]$, since $\|\cdot\|_{A(t)+\lambda} \sim \|\cdot\|_{A(t)+\mu}$ for any $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$, we obtain $\|\cdot\|_{A(t)+\lambda} \sim \|\cdot\|_D$ if and only if $\|\cdot\|_{A(t)+\mu} \sim \|\cdot\|_D$.

There only remains to show (i) \Rightarrow (iii).

Existence and estimate: Possibly renaming $A + \lambda_0$ as A , let us assume without loss of generality that $\lambda_0 = 0$. Also upon performing a time translation, we can further assume that $I = (0, T)$, with $T = |I|$.

Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $f \in L^p(0, T; X)$. Define $g : t \mapsto e^{\lambda t} f(t) \in L^p(0, T; X)$, because $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p$, there exists $v \in \text{MR}^p(0, T)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}v(t) + A(t)v(t) &= g(t) \\ v(0) &= 0 \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

And further for any $t \in (0, T]$, using Proposition 2.2 (12) we find

$$\|v\|_{\text{MR}^p(0,t)} \leq [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(0,T)} \|g\|_{L^p((0,t);X)} \quad (37)$$

Now let $u : t \mapsto e^{-\lambda t}v(t) \in L^p((0, T); X)$ and for all $t \in [0, T]$ the integrand of the norm of $\text{MR}^p(a, b)$ defined in (5) is $[u]^p(t) := \|u(t)\|_X^p + \|u(t)\|_D^p + T^p \left\| \frac{d}{dt} u(t) \right\|_X^p \in L^1((0, T); \mathbb{R}_+)$. Note that by convexity of $r \mapsto r^p$, for any $\mu \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{d}{dt} u(t) \right\|_X^p &\leq \left(\left\| \lambda e^{-\lambda t} v(t) \right\|_X + \left\| e^{-\lambda t} \frac{d}{dt} v(t) \right\|_X \right)^p \\ &= \left(\mu \frac{|\lambda| \|v(t)\|_X}{\mu} + (1 - \mu) \frac{\left\| \frac{d}{dt} v(t) \right\|_X}{1 - \mu} \right)^p e^{-p\lambda t} \\ &\leq \left(\mu^{1-p} |\lambda|^p \|v(t)\|_X^p + (1 - \mu)^{1-p} \left\| \frac{d}{dt} v(t) \right\|_X^p \right) e^{-p\lambda t} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have the bound,

$$\begin{aligned} [u]^p(t) &\leq \left((1 + \mu^{1-p} T^p |\lambda|^p) \|v(t)\|_X^p + \|v(t)\|_D^p + (1 - \mu)^{1-p} T^p \left\| \frac{d}{dt} v(t) \right\|_X^p \right) e^{-p\lambda t} \\ &\leq R_p(\mu, \lambda T) e^{-p\lambda t} [v]^p(t) \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where $R_p(\mu, \nu) := (1 + \mu^{1-p} |\nu|^p) \vee (1 - \mu)^{1-p}$. Performing an integration by parts, we obtain the following if $\lambda \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T e^{-p\lambda t} [v]^p(t) dt &= e^{-p\lambda T} \int_0^T [v]^p(t) dt + \underbrace{p\lambda \int_0^T e^{-p\lambda t} \int_0^t [v]^p(t) dr dt}_{\leq 0 \text{ if } \lambda < 0} \\ &\leq [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p}^p \left(e^{-p\lambda T} \|g\|_{L^p((0,T);X)}^p + p\lambda_+ \int_0^T e^{-p\lambda t} \int_0^t \|g(r)\|_X^p dr dt \right) \\ &\leq [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p}^p \left(e^{-p\lambda T} \|g\|_{L^p((0,T);X)}^p + p\lambda_+ \int_0^T \|f(r)\|_X^p \int_r^T e^{-p\lambda(t-r)} dt dr \right) \\ &\leq [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p}^p \left(e^{p\lambda-T} \|f\|_{L^p((0,T);X)}^p + \frac{p\lambda_+}{p\lambda} \int_0^T \|f(r)\|_X^p (1 - e^{-p\lambda(T-r)}) dr \right) \\ &\leq [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p}^p \left(e^{p\lambda-T} \|f\|_{L^p((0,T);X)}^p + (1 - e^{-\lambda+pT}) \|f\|_{L^p((0,T);X)}^p \right) \\ &\leq [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p}^p (1 + e^{\lambda-pT} - e^{-\lambda+pT}) \|f\|_{L^p((0,T);X)}^p \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_+ := \lambda \vee 0$ and $\lambda_- := (-\lambda) \vee 0$. Note that this final inequality also obviously holds if $\lambda = 0$. Now combining with (38) we find that for any $\mu \in (0, 1)$,

$$\|u\|_{\text{MR}^p(0,T)} \leq R_p(\mu, \lambda T)^{\frac{1}{p}} (1 + e^{\lambda-pT} - e^{-\lambda+pT})^{\frac{1}{p}} [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p} \|f\|_{L^p(I;X)} \quad (39)$$

From (39) we infer that $u \in \text{MR}^p(I)$ and solves

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}u(t) + A(t)u(t) + \lambda u(t) &= f(t), \quad t \in I \\ u(0) &= 0 \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

Uniqueness: If $\tilde{u} \in \text{MR}^p(I)$ also solves (40) then $\tilde{v} : t \mapsto e^{\lambda t}\tilde{u}(t) \in \text{MR}^p(I)$ must also solve (36) and by unique solvability, $v = \tilde{v}$ hence $u = \tilde{u}$.

Optimization of $R_p(\mu, \nu)$: For any $\nu \neq 0$, there exists a unique minimum $\mu_\nu := \underset{\mu \in (0,1)}{\text{argmin}} R_p(\mu, \nu)$.

Indeed any minimizer μ_ν of $R_p(\cdot, \nu)$ is the unique zero of the continuous and strictly decreasing function $\mu \mapsto 1 + \mu^{1-p}|\nu|^p - (1 - \mu)^{1-p}$ which diverges to $+\infty$ and $-\infty$ at $\mu = 0$ and $\mu = 1$ respectively. Moreover $\nu \mapsto \mu_\nu$ is increasing on $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Since $(\mu_\nu)_{\nu>0}$ is bounded from below, by monotonicity, there exists $\mu_0 \in [0, 1)$ such that $\mu_\nu \xrightarrow{\nu \rightarrow 0} \mu_0$. Assume by contradiction that $\mu_0 > 0$ then we see that upon taking the limit $\nu \rightarrow 0$, in the identity $0 = 1 + \mu_\nu^{1-p}\nu^p - (1 - \mu_\nu)^{1-p}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= 1 - (1 - \mu_0)^{1-p} \\ 1 &= (1 - \mu_0)^{1-p} \\ \mu_0 &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

We find a contradiction, meaning $\mu_0 = 0$. Hence $\alpha_p(\nu) := R_p(\mu_\nu, \nu)^{\frac{1}{p}} = (1 - \mu_\nu)^{\frac{1-p}{p}} \xrightarrow{\nu \rightarrow 0} 1$. Since $(\mu_\nu)_{\nu>0}$ is bounded from above, again by monotonicity, there exists $\mu_\infty \in (0, 1]$ such that $\mu_\nu \xrightarrow{\nu \rightarrow +\infty} \mu_\infty$. And observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \mu_\nu)^{1-p} &= 1 + \mu_\nu^{1-p}\nu^p \\ (1 - \mu_\nu)^{1-p} &\xrightarrow{\nu \rightarrow +\infty} +\infty \end{aligned}$$

Meaning $\mu_\infty = 1$. We then infer that $\alpha_p(\nu) = (1 + \mu_\nu^{1-p}\nu^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} \underset{\nu \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \mu_\nu^{\frac{1-p}{p}} \nu \sim \nu$.

□

We will use this result later to estimate the effect of well-suited nonautonomous perturbations on the maximal regularity constant.

3.3 Nonautonomous perturbations of autonomous operators in mr_p

Let us state the following perturbation result, also found in [10, Proposition 2.7]. The novelty being that a quantitative estimate of the maximal regularity constant is given.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $A_0 \in mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $B : \bar{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D; X)$ be strongly measurable on the bounded interval I . Assume there exists $\eta \geq 0$, such that for any $t \in I$, $x \in D$,*

$$\|B(t)x\|_X \leq \epsilon_0 \|x\|_D + \eta \|x\|_X$$

where $\epsilon_0 := \frac{1}{2([A_0]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}+1)(M_0+1)}$ and $M_0 = \sup_{\tau \geq 0} \|e^{-\tau A_0}\|_X$.

Then $A_0 + B \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ and we have the following bound,

$$[A_0 + B]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \leq G(|I|, \eta, M_0, [A_0]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}) \quad (41)$$

where $G(\tau, \eta, M, K) := 4(1 + M)c_p(-4M\eta\tau)K$ for $(\tau, \eta, M, K) \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^4$ and c_p is given by (35).

In such a case we call B a regular perturbation of A_0 .

Proof. First see that for any $t \in \bar{I}$, $\|\cdot\|_{A_0+B(t)} \sim \|\cdot\|_{A_0} \sim \|\cdot\|_D$, since $\epsilon_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}$. As before, denote for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $R_\lambda := (\lambda + L_A)^{-1}$ and observe that $\lambda + L_{A_0+B} = (\text{Id} + \mathcal{B}R_\lambda)(\lambda + L_A)$ where \mathcal{B} is the multiplication operator on $L^p(I; X)$ associated with B , this operator is well-defined by strong measurability of $t \mapsto B(t)$. Now for $\lambda > 0$ and using the bounds (32) and (33) of Lemma 3.3 compute the following,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{B}R_\lambda f\|_{L^p(I; X)} &\leq \epsilon_0 \|R_\lambda f\|_{L^p(I; D)} + \eta \|R_\lambda f\|_{L^p(I; X)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2([A_0]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} + 1)(M_0 + 1)} \|R_\lambda f\|_{\mathcal{MR}^p(I)} + \eta \|R_\lambda f\|_{L^p(I; X)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|f\|_{L^p(I; X)} + \eta M \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda|I|}}{\lambda} \|f\|_{L^p(I; X)} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\eta M_0}{\lambda} \right) \|f\|_{L^p(I; X)} \end{aligned}$$

Fix $\lambda_0 := 4\eta M$ for which we then have

$$\|\mathcal{B}R_{\lambda_0} f\|_{L^p(I; X)} \leq \frac{3}{4} \|f\|_{L^p(I; X)}$$

Hence $\text{Id} + \mathcal{B}R_{\lambda_0}$ is an invertible operator of $L^p(I; X)$, and so $L_{A_0+B+\lambda_0} = (\text{Id} + \mathcal{B}R_{\lambda_0})(\lambda_0 + L_{A_0})$ is invertible as an operator of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{MR}^p(I), L^p(I; X))$. By virtue of (33) in Lemma 3.1 we infer that $A_0 + B + \lambda_0 \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} [A_0 + B + \lambda_0]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} &\leq \left(1 - \frac{3}{4}\right)^{-1} (1 + M)[A_0]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \\ &= 4(1 + M)[A_0]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \end{aligned}$$

Apply Theorem 3.4 with $-\lambda_0$ to obtain that $A_0 + B = (A_0 + B + \lambda_0) - \lambda_0 \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ with the desired bound (41). \square

This perturbation result is key to the analysis of the maximal regularity property of nonautonomous operators which are relatively continuous.

4 Gluing maximally regular operators

As a tool for the quantitative study of regularity constant of relatively continuous operators, let us derive an estimate concerning the gluing of finite family $(A_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ of maximally regular operators defined on a subdivision of the bounded time interval $I = (a, b)$.

4.1 Behavior of $[\cdot]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}$ under a change of variable in time

To refine the bounds on the maximal regularity constants obtained in the next section, it is useful to study the behavior of $[\cdot]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}$ with respect to a change of variables in time. An invariance stemming from the choice of the norm of $\mathcal{MR}^p(I)$ (5) is observed when the change of variables is linear (see Remark 4.1 later).

Lemma 4.1. *Let $I, J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be two bounded open intervals and $\phi : I \rightarrow J$ be a C^1 -diffeomorphism and denote $\psi := \phi^{-1}$. Let $A : J \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D, X) \in \mathcal{MR}_p(J)$, then the nonautonomous operator A_ϕ defined by*

$$A_\phi = \phi'(\cdot)(A \circ \phi)(\cdot) : I \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D, X)$$

belongs to $\mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ and we have,

$$[A_\phi]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \leq \|\psi'\|_\infty \max\left(1, \frac{|I|}{|J|} \|\phi'\|_\infty\right) [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(J)} \quad (42)$$

Proof. Before proving inequality (42) we first estimate the continuity constant of the isomorphism $\iota_\phi : u \mapsto u \circ \phi$ from $\mathcal{MR}^p(J)$ to $\mathcal{MR}^p(I)$ induced by ϕ .

Let $u \in \mathcal{MR}^p(J)$ and let us estimate $\|\iota_\phi(u)\|_{\mathcal{MR}^p(I)}$.

Estimation of the $L^p(I; X)$ and $L^p(I; D)$ norms: We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \|u \circ \phi\|_{L^p(I; X)}^p &= \int_I \|u(\phi(t))\|_X^p dt \\ &= \int_J \|u(s)\|_X^p |\psi'(s)| ds \\ &\leq \|\psi'\|_\infty \|u\|_{L^p(J; X)}^p. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Applying the previous computations with the Banach space D , we obtain the similar result

$$\|u \circ \phi\|_{L^p(I; D)}^p \leq \|\psi'\|_\infty \|u\|_{L^p(J; D)}^p \quad (44)$$

Estimation of the $W^{1,p}(I; X)$ semi-norm:

$$\begin{aligned} |I|^p \left\| \frac{d}{dt}(u \circ \phi) \right\|_{L^p(I; X)}^p &= |I|^p \int_I \left\| \phi'(t) \left(\frac{d}{ds} u \right) (\phi(t)) \right\|_X^p dt \\ &= |I|^p \int_J |\phi'(\psi(s))|^p \left\| \frac{d}{ds} u(s) \right\|_X^p |\psi'(s)| ds \\ &\leq \|\psi'\|_\infty \left(\frac{|I|}{|J|} \|\phi'\|_\infty \right)^p |J|^p \left\| \frac{d}{ds} u \right\|_{L^p(J; X)}^p. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Operator norm of ι_ϕ : By combining inequalities (43), (44) and (45) we obtain a bound on the operator norm $\|\iota_\phi\|_{\mathcal{L}(\text{MR}^p(J), \text{MR}^p(I))}$ of ι_ϕ :

$$\|\iota_\phi\| \leq \|\psi'\|_\infty^{\frac{1}{p}} \max\left(1, \frac{|I|}{|J|} \|\phi'\|_\infty\right) \quad (46)$$

Inequality (46) becomes an identity in the case of affine homomorphisms (i.e. ϕ of the form $\phi(t) = \lambda t + t_0$), since inequalities (43) - (45) saturate and $\frac{|I|}{|J|} \|\phi'\|_\infty = 1$. Remark that if $\phi' \geq 0$, then ι_ϕ also induces an isomorphism of $\text{MR}_0^p(J)$ onto $\text{MR}_0^p(I)$ with the same operator norm.

Maximal regularity of A_ϕ : Denote $a_I := \inf I$, $a_J := \inf J$ and let $f \in L^p(I; X)$. By the isomorphism ι_ϕ , the unique solvability in $\text{MR}_0^p(I)$ of the nonautonomous Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}v + A_\phi v = f, & \text{in } I \\ v(a_I) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

is equivalent to the unique solvability in $\text{MR}_0^p(J)$ of

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{ds}u + Au = \frac{1}{\phi' \circ \psi} f \circ \psi, & \text{in } J \\ u(a_J) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

Since $\left\| \frac{1}{\phi' \circ \psi} f \circ \psi \right\|_{L^p(J; X)} \leq \|\psi'\|_\infty^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \|f\|_{L^p(I; X)} < +\infty$, the assumption $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(J)$ shows existence and uniqueness of $v \in \text{MR}_0^p(I)$ solution of (47). Let us then estimate $[A_\phi]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(J)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} &\leq \|\iota_\phi\| \|u\|_{\text{MR}^p(J)} \\ &\leq \|\iota_\phi\| [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(J)} \left\| \frac{1}{\phi' \circ \psi} f \circ \psi \right\|_{L^p(J; X)} \\ &\leq \|\iota_\phi\| [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(J)} \|\psi'\|_\infty^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \|f\|_{L^p(I; X)} \\ &\leq \|\psi'\|_\infty \max\left(1, \frac{|I|}{|J|} \|\phi'\|_\infty\right) [A]_{\text{MR}^p(J)} \|f\|_{L^p(I; X)} \end{aligned}$$

From which we infer (42). □

As a direct application of Lemma 4.1 we derive the two following important remarks for any $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(J)$:

Remark 4.1. (i) Note that $(A_\phi)_\psi = A$, hence using (42) with ψ we obtain a lower bound for $[A_\phi]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}$ as

$$\frac{1}{\|\phi'\|_\infty} \min\left(1, \frac{|I|}{|J|} \frac{1}{\|\psi'\|_\infty}\right) [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(J)} \leq [A_\phi]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \quad (49)$$

(ii) Let $\phi : I \mapsto J$ be a linear homomorphism, denote $\phi' = \lambda := \frac{|J|}{|I|}$. Using both (42) and (49) we find

$$\frac{1}{\lambda}[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(J)} \leq [A_\phi]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(J)},$$

yielding

$$[A_\phi]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} = \frac{1}{\lambda}[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(J)} \quad (50)$$

4.2 Gluing finitely many \mathcal{MR}_p operators

We here show that finitely many adjacent maximally regular operators can be glued-up together to form a maximally regular operator on the joined interval. The results are all stated as quantitatively as possible with the tools developed before. The estimations here described are new in the theory of L^p maximal regularity.

A first lemma is derived on the gluing of functions in \mathcal{MR}^p . Working with the weighted $W^{1,p}$ semi-norm in (5) yields nonstandard norm behavior with respect to restriction and extension of functions in \mathcal{MR}^p .

Lemma 4.2. *Let $v_1 \in \mathcal{MR}^p(a, b)$, $v_2 \in \mathcal{MR}^p(b, c)$, with $a < b < c \in \mathbb{R}$ and assume that $v_1(b) = v_2(b)$. Then $v := v_1 1_{[a,b]} + v_2 1_{[b,c]} \in \mathcal{MR}^p(a, c)$ and we have*

$$\|v\|_{\mathcal{MR}^p(a,c)} \leq \kappa_1 \|v_1\|_{\mathcal{MR}^p(a,b)} + \kappa_2 \|v_2\|_{\mathcal{MR}^p(b,c)} \quad (51)$$

where $\kappa_1 = \frac{c-a}{b-a}$, $\kappa_2 := \frac{c-a}{c-b}$.

Proof. Let $\xi \in C_c^1((a, c); \mathbb{R})$ and see

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^c \left(\frac{d}{dt} \xi(t) \right) v(t) dt &= \int_a^b \left(\frac{d}{dt} \xi(t) \right) v_1(t) dt + \int_b^c \left(\frac{d}{dt} \xi(t) \right) v_2(t) dt \\ &= [\xi(t)v_1(t)]_a^b - \int_a^b \xi(t) \frac{d}{dt} v_1(t) dt + [\xi(t)v_2(t)]_b^c - \int_b^c \xi(t) \frac{d}{dt} v_2(t) dt \\ &= \underbrace{\xi(b)v_1(b) - \xi(b)v_2(b)}_{=0} - \int_a^c \xi(t) \left(\frac{d}{dt} v_1(t) \right) 1_{[a,b]}(t) + \left(\frac{d}{dt} v_2(t) \right) 1_{[b,c]}(t) dt \\ &= - \int_a^c \xi(t) \left(\frac{d}{dt} v_1(t) \right) 1_{[a,b]}(t) + \left(\frac{d}{dt} v_2(t) \right) 1_{[b,c]}(t) dt \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\frac{d}{dt} v = \left(\frac{d}{dt} v_1 \right) 1_{[a,b]} + \left(\frac{d}{dt} v_2 \right) 1_{[b,c]} \in L^p((a, c); X)$. Since also $v \in L^p((a, c); D)$ we infer that

$v \in \text{MR}^p(a, c)$. Furthermore observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v\|_{\text{MR}^p(a,c)}^p &= \|v\|_{L^p((a,c);X)}^p + \|v\|_{L^p((a,c);D)}^p + (c-a)^p \left\| \frac{d}{dt} v \right\|_{L^p((a,c);X)}^p \\
&= \|v_1\|_{L^p((a,b);X)}^p + \|v_2\|_{L^p((b,c);X)}^p + \|v_1\|_{L^p((a,b);D)}^p + \|v_2\|_{L^p((b,c);D)}^p \\
&\quad + (c-a)^p \left(\left\| \frac{d}{dt} v_1 \right\|_{L^p((a,b);X)}^p + \left\| \frac{d}{dt} v_2 \right\|_{L^p((b,c);X)}^p \right) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{c-a}{b-a} \right)^p \|v_1\|_{\text{MR}^p(a,b)}^p + \left(\frac{c-a}{c-b} \right)^p \|v_2\|_{\text{MR}^p(b,c)}^p
\end{aligned}$$

Now see that $(\alpha^p + \beta^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \alpha + \beta$ for any $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ to conclude (51). \square

As a first step, we glue two operators together and then proceed by induction to show maximal regularity and bound on the regularity constant for finitely many operators. Some asymptotic behaviors are discussed as well as the sharpness of obtained estimate.

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that $A_1 \in \mathcal{MR}_p(a, b)$ and $A_2 \in \mathcal{MR}_p(b, c)$ for some $a < b < c \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the glued-up operator A defined by*

$$A(t) := \begin{cases} A_1(t), & a \leq t < b \\ A_2(t), & b \leq t \leq c \end{cases}$$

belongs to $\mathcal{MR}_p(a, c)$ and we have

$$[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(a,c)} \leq \kappa_1 [A_1] + \kappa_2 [A_2] + \kappa_1^{\frac{1}{p}} \kappa_2^{\frac{1}{q}} Q_p(c-b, \|A_2\|_\infty, [A_2]) [A_1]. \quad (52)$$

where $\kappa_1 := \frac{c-a}{b-a}$ and $\kappa_2 := \frac{c-a}{c-b}$. Moreover denoting $w_p := 2^{\frac{1}{q}}(p-1)$ we have

$$Q_p(T, C, G) := \begin{cases} 1 + 2^{\frac{1}{q}} (CG \vee \frac{G}{T}) & \text{if } w_p \frac{G}{T} \leq 1 \\ \frac{2^{\frac{1}{q}} p}{(p-1)^{\frac{1}{q}}} \left(\frac{G}{T} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} & \text{if } 1 \leq w_p \frac{G}{T} \leq \frac{1}{CT} \\ \left(\frac{1}{CT} \vee 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(1 + 2^{\frac{1}{q}} CG \right) & \text{if } \frac{1}{CT} \leq w_p \frac{G}{T} \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

Proof. \star Remark that A obviously satisfies (*nonaut-i*) by maximal regularity of A_1 and A_2 .

\star Let $f \in L^p((a, c); X)$, let us show that there exists a unique $v \in \text{MR}^p(a, c)$ satisfying $(\text{CP})_{0,f}^{(a,c)}$ and that (11) holds.

Uniqueness: Assume that v is a solution to $(\text{CP})_{0,f}^{(a,c)}$. It implies that $v|_{[a,b]}$ is a solution of the Cauchy problem with operator A_1 and source term 0, hence $v = 0$ on $[a, b]$. Now this implies that $v|_{[b,c]}$ starts at 0 and is a solution of the Cauchy problem with operator A_2 and source term 0, again $v = 0$ on $[b, c]$.

Existence and initial estimate: Denote $f_1 := f|_{[a,b]} \in L^p((a,b); X)$, $f_2 = f|_{[b,c]} \in L^p((b,c); X)$. For convenience of notations let us set $[A_1] := [A_1]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(a,b)}$ and $[A_2] := [A_2]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(b,c)}$.

Since $A_1 \in \mathcal{MR}_p(a,b)$, there exists a (unique) solution $v_1 \in \text{MR}^p(a,b)$, solution of the Cauchy problem starting at 0 with source term f_1 and such that

$$\|v_1\|_{\text{MR}^p(a,b)} \leq [A_1] \|f_1\|_{L^p((a,b); X)} \quad (54)$$

Denote $x = v_1(b) \in \text{Tr}^p$. Fix $\mu \geq 1$ and let $z \in \{w \in \text{MR}^p(b, b + \mu(c-b)) : w(b) = x\}$, which is nonempty since $x \in \text{Tr}^p$. By definition, $L_{A_2} z|_{(b,c)} \in L^p((b,c); X)$, let us then denote $g_z := f_2 - L_{A_2} z|_{[b,c]} \in L^p((b,c); X)$. Since $A_2 \in \mathcal{MR}_p(b,c)$ there exists $v_z \in \text{MR}^p(b,c)$ such that,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt} v_z(t) + A_2(t) v_z(t) &= g_z(t), & \text{a.e. } t \in (b,c) \\ v_z(b) &= 0 \end{cases}$$

And by linearity $v_2 := v_z + z|_{[b,c]}$ must be the (unique) solution to

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt} v_2(t) + A_2(t) v_2(t) &= f_2(t), & \text{a.e. } t \in (b,c) \\ v_2(b) &= x \end{cases}$$

Now by maximal regularity of A_2 we infer:

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_z\|_{\text{MR}^p(b,c)} &\leq [A_2] \|g\|_{L^p((b,c); X)} \\ &\leq [A_2] \|f_2\|_{L^p((b,c); X)} + [A_2] \|L_{A_2} z\|_{L^p((b,c); X)} \end{aligned}$$

Observe that,

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_{A_2} z\|_{L^p((b,c); X)}^p &= \int_b^c \left\| \frac{d}{dt} z(t) + A_2(t) z(t) \right\|_X^p dt \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} \left(\int_b^c \left\| \frac{d}{dt} z(t) \right\|^p dt + C^p \int_b^c \|z(t)\|_D^p dt \right) \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} \left(\int_b^{b+\mu(c-b)} \left\| \frac{d}{dt} z(t) \right\|^p dt + C^p \int_b^{b+\mu(c-b)} \|z(t)\|_D^p dt \right) \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} \left(C^p \vee \frac{1}{\mu^p(c-b)^p} \right) \|z\|_{\text{MR}^p(b, b+\mu(c-b))}^p \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

according to (5) of Definition 2.1 and where $C := \|A_2\|_{L^\infty((b,c); \mathcal{L}(D, X))} < +\infty$. Therefore we can infer the following bound using (55):

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_2\|_{\text{MR}^p(b,c)} &\leq \|v_z\|_{\text{MR}^p(b,c)} + \|z\|_{\text{MR}^p(b,c)} \\ &\leq [A_2] \|f_2\|_{L^p((b,c); X)} + 2^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(C \vee \frac{1}{\mu(c-b)} \right) [A_2] \|z\|_{\text{MR}^p(b, b+\mu(c-b))} + \|z\|_{\text{MR}^p(b, b+\mu(c-b))} \\ &\leq [A_2] \|f_2\|_{L^p((b,c); X)} + \left(1 + 2^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(C \vee \frac{1}{\mu(c-b)} \right) [A_2] \right) \|z\|_{\text{MR}^p(b, b+\mu(c-b))} \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the infimum over $z \in \{w \in \text{MR}^p(b, b + \mu(c - b)) \mid w(b) = x\}$, we find

$$\|v_2\|_{\text{MR}^p(b,c)} \leq \left(1 + 2^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(C \vee \frac{1}{\mu(c-b)}\right) [A_2]\right) \|x\|_{\text{Tr}^p, (b, b + \mu(c-b))} + [A_2] \|f_2\|_{L^p(b,c;X)}$$

Using the rescaling of the norms on the trace space described in Remark 2.1 together with (54), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\|_{\text{Tr}^p, (b, b + \mu(c-b))} &= (\mu\kappa_*)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|x\|_{\text{Tr}^p, (a,b)} \\ &\leq (\mu\kappa_*)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|v_1\|_{\text{MR}^p(a,b)} \\ &\leq (\mu\kappa_*)^{\frac{1}{p}} [A_1] \|f_1\|_{L^p((a,b);X)} \end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa_* := \frac{c-b}{b-a}$, therefore we finally obtain,

$$\|v_2\|_{\text{MR}^p(b,c)} \leq (\mu\kappa_*)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(1 + 2^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(C \vee \frac{1}{\mu(c-b)}\right) [A_2]\right) [A_1] \|f_1\|_{L^p((a,b);X)} + [A_2] \|f_2\|_{L^p((b,c);X)} \quad (56)$$

Define the function $v := v_1 1_{[a,b]} + v_2 1_{[b,c]}$. Since $v_1(b) = v_2(b)$, we infer from Lemma 4.2 that $v \in \text{MR}^p(a, c)$. Further we observe that v is in fact a solution to (CP) for a.e. $t \in [a, c]$. Moreover recall that

$$\|v\|_{\text{MR}^p(a,c)} \leq \kappa_1 \|v_1\|_{\text{MR}^p(a,b)} + \kappa_2 \|v_2\|_{\text{MR}^p(b,c)} \quad (57)$$

where $\kappa_1 = \frac{c-a}{b-a}$ and $\kappa_2 = \frac{c-a}{c-b}$. Remark that $\frac{1}{\kappa_1} + \frac{1}{\kappa_2} = 1$ and $\kappa_* = \frac{\kappa_1}{\kappa_2}$. Hence assembling (56) and (57), together with the fact that $\|f_1\|_{L^p((a,b);X)}, \|f_2\|_{L^p((b,c);X)} \leq \|f\|_{L^p((a,c);X)}$:

$$\|v\|_{\text{MR}^p(a,c)} \leq \left(\kappa_1 [A_1] + \kappa_2 \left((\mu\kappa_*)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(1 + 2^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(C \vee \frac{1}{\mu(c-b)}\right) [A_2]\right) [A_1] + [A_2]\right)\right) \|f\|_{L^p((a,c);X)}$$

By remarking that $\kappa_2(\kappa_*)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \kappa_1^{\frac{1}{p}} \kappa_2^{\frac{1}{q}}$ we deduce the following estimate of $[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(a,c)}$:

$$[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(a,c)} \leq \kappa_1 [A_1] + \kappa_2 [A_2] + \kappa_1^{\frac{1}{p}} \kappa_2^{\frac{1}{q}} \mu^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(1 + 2^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(C \vee \frac{1}{\mu(c-b)}\right) [A_2]\right) [A_1] \quad (58)$$

Optimization with μ : Let us denote $\tilde{Q}_p(T, C, G, \mu) := \mu^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(1 + 2^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(C \vee \frac{1}{\mu T}\right) G\right)$. Let G, C, T be given and let us minimize $\mu \mapsto P(\mu) := \tilde{Q}_p(T, C, G, \mu)$ on $[1, +\infty)$. Remark that $P(\mu) = \alpha(\mu) \vee \beta(\mu)$, where

$$\alpha(\mu) := \mu^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(1 + 2^{\frac{1}{q}} CG\right)$$

is increasing and

$$\beta(\mu) := \mu^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(1 + \frac{2^{\frac{1}{q}} G}{\mu T}\right)$$

We note that $\mu \mapsto \beta(\mu)$ admits a unique global minimum on \mathbb{R}_+^* attained at $\mu_1 := (p-1)2^{\frac{1}{q}}\frac{G}{T} =: w_p\frac{G}{T}$, because β is decreasing on $(0, \mu_1]$ and increasing on $[\mu_1, +\infty)$. Moreover observe that α and β both meet at a unique point $\mu_2 = \frac{1}{CT}$. Therefore the global minimum of $P(\mu)$ on \mathbb{R}_+^* is attained at $\mu_* := \mu_1 \wedge \mu_2$. We can therefore infer that the minimum of P on $[1, +\infty)$ is attained at $1 \vee (\frac{1}{CT} \wedge w_p\frac{G}{T})$ which yields our result. \square

Remark 4.2. Note that in (52), the roles of A_1 and A_2 are not symmetric, this accounts for the fact that the maximal regularity constant is defined with the initial condition $x = 0$. It is worth noting that it is the multiplicative interaction between $[A_1]$ and $[A_2]$ of the term $q\kappa_1\kappa_2Q_p(c-b, C, [A_2])[A_1]$ which gives rise to the asymmetry.

It might seem possible to further refine (52) by exploiting a piecewise linear change of variable ϕ such that $|\phi((a, b))| = |\phi((b, c))|$ so as to obtain optimality on the factors κ_1 and κ_2 . Unfortunately the factor in (42) cancels out the optimality.

Remark that for any $\lambda > 0$, $C, T, G \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have the invariance $Q_p(C, T, G) = Q_p(\lambda C, \frac{T}{\lambda}, \frac{G}{\lambda})$. This invariance is compatible with a linear change of variables in time (see Remark 4.1 (50)). This then implies that (52) is invariant with respect to a linear change of variables in time.

Now we derive the result for the glued-up operator of a finite family of nonautonomous operators. We first define the following geometrical parameters related to the subdivision.

Definition 4.1. Let $N \geq 2$ and $\mathcal{T}_N = \{\tau_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq N}$ be such that $a = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_N = b$, define for each $j \in \{2, \dots, N\}$ the function $H_j(p, \mathcal{T}, \cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as

$$H_j(p, \mathcal{T}, C, G) := \kappa_{1,j} + \kappa_{1,j}^{\frac{1}{p}} \kappa_{2,j}^{\frac{1}{q}} Q_p(\tau_j - \tau_{j-1}, C, G) \quad (59)$$

$$\text{where } \kappa_{1,j} := \frac{\tau_j - \tau_0}{\tau_{j-1} - \tau_0}, \quad \kappa_{2,j} := \frac{\tau_j - \tau_0}{\tau_j - \tau_{j-1}}.$$

We now give an estimate of the \mathcal{MR}_p constant for the glueing of finitely many operators in terms of these geometrical parameters.

Theorem 4.4. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{\tau_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq N}$ be any finite subdivision of I . Let us be given a family $\{A_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ of nonautonomous operators such that $A_i \in \mathcal{MR}_p(\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i)$.

Then the operator A defined by

$$A(t) := \begin{cases} A_1(t), & \text{if } \tau_0 \leq t < \tau_1 \\ A_2(t), & \text{if } \tau_1 \leq t < \tau_2 \\ \vdots \\ A_N(t), & \text{if } \tau_{N-1} \leq t \leq \tau_N \end{cases}$$

belongs to $\mathcal{MR}_p(a, b)$ and we have

$$[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(a,b)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^N H_j(p, \mathcal{T}, \|A_j\|_\infty, [A_j]) \right) \kappa_{2,i} [A_i]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i)} \quad (60)$$

Proof. We show the estimate by induction on N .

- ★ For $N = 1$, the result is trivial.
- ★ Fix some $N \geq 2$ and assume that the result holds for any subdivision of size $N - 1$, let us show that the result holds for any subdivision of size N .

Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a < b$, $\mathcal{T} := \{\tau_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq N}$ be a subdivision of size N and let $\{A_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ be a family of maximally regular nonautonomous operators on each $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i]$ respectively. Denote by A the resulting glued-up operator on $[a, b]$.

Denote $B_1 := A|_{[\tau_0, \tau_{N-1}]}$ and $B_2 := A_N$. By our induction hypothesis, we are able to apply Lemma 4.3 on B_1 and B_2 . We obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(a,b)} &\leq \left(\kappa_{1,N} + \kappa_{1,N}^{\frac{1}{p}} \kappa_{2,N}^{\frac{1}{q}} Q_p(\tau_{N-1} - \tau_N, \|B_2\|_\infty, [B_2]) \right) [B_1]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(\tau_0, \tau_{N-1})} + \kappa_{2,N} [B_2]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(\tau_{N-1}, \tau_N)} \\ &= H_N(p, \mathcal{T}, \|B_2\|_\infty, [B_2]) [B_1]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(\tau_0, \tau_{N-1})} + \kappa_{2,N} [B_2]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(\tau_{N-1}, \tau_N)} \end{aligned}$$

Let us then apply our induction hypothesis on the subdivisions $\mathcal{T}' = \{\tau_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq N-1}$ and the corresponding family of operators $\{A_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N-1}$ glueing-up to B_1 and each of size $N - 1$. For simplicity denote $H_j := H_j(p, \mathcal{T}, \|A_j\|_\infty, [A_j]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(\tau_j, \tau_{j-1})})$. We infer:

$$\begin{aligned} [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(a,b)} &\leq H_N \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{N-1} H_j \right) \kappa_{2,i} [A_i]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i)} + \kappa_{2,N} [A_N]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(\tau_{N-1}, \tau_N)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^N H_j \right) \kappa_{2,i} [A_i]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i)} + \kappa_{2,N} [A_N]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(\tau_{N-1}, \tau_N)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^N H_j \right) \kappa_{2,i} [A_i]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i)} \end{aligned}$$

This completes our proof. □

5 Proofs of the main estimates and examples

In this section we prove our main estimation results. The general estimate Theorem 2.6 is derived in Section 5.1. It is then used in Section 5.2 to show the quantitative version Theorem 2.7 for operators in $RC^{\alpha, \beta}(I)$. Finally Section 5.3 contains some examples.

5.1 Estimation for general relatively continuous operators

The idea for the study of the maximal regularity of relatively continuous operators, is to subdivide the time interval $[a, b]$ and consider the operator on each subinterval $I_i \subset [a, b]$ as the sum of an autonomous maximal operator A_i and a regular perturbation B arising from the relative continuity.

We start with a somewhat precise version of the Besicovitch covering theorem in dimension 1 (found e.g. in [8, Theorem 2.18]).

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\rho : [a, b] \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ be a positive function, then there exists $N = N(\rho) \in \mathbb{N}$, a set of center points $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C}(\rho) = \{t_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N} \subset [a, b]$ and a subdivision of $[a, b]$, $\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{T}(\rho) = \{\tau_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq N}$ such that*

$$a = \tau_0 \leq t_1 < \tau_1 < t_2 < \dots < \tau_{N-1} < t_N \leq \tau_N = b \quad (61)$$

such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,

$$|t_i - \tau_i|, |t_i - \tau_{i-1}| \leq \rho(t_i) \quad (62)$$

$$\rho(t_i) \leq |\tau_i - \tau_{i-1}| \leq 2\rho(t_i) \quad (63)$$

Hence we can write

$$[a, b] = \bigcup_{i=1}^N [\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i]$$

Proof. We have $[a, b] \subset \bigcup_{t \in [a, b]} I_t$, $I_t := (t - \rho(t), t + \rho(t))$. By compactness there exists a finite family of intervals $\mathcal{F} \subset \{I_t\}_{t \in [a, b]}$ covering $[a, b]$.

★ Claim: there exists a subcover $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subset \mathcal{F}$ which satisfies both of the following nonoverlapping properties:

(P1) For any $I, J \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, $I \subset J \Rightarrow I = J$.

(P2) For any $I, J, K \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, $I \cap J \cap K \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow I = J$ or $J = K$ or $K = I$.

We show the claim by induction on the size N of \mathcal{F} .

Base: If $N = 1$, the result is trivial.

Induction: Assume the claim holds for some $N \geq 1$. Let \mathcal{F} be a covering family of size $N + 1$. If \mathcal{F} already satisfies (P1) and (P2) we are done. Otherwise, either (P1) or (P2) fail to be satisfied.

Case 1: Assume that (P1) fails for \mathcal{F} . There exist $I, J \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $I \subset J$ and $I \neq J$. Observe then that $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{I\}$ still covers $[a, b]$ and is of size N .

Case 2: Assume now that (P2) fails for \mathcal{F} . There exist $I, J, K \in \mathcal{F}$, all distinct such that $I \cap J \cap K \neq \emptyset$. Write $I = (a_I, b_I)$, $J = (a_J, b_J)$ and $K = (a_K, b_K)$ and assume without loss of generality that $a_I \leq a_J \leq a_K$.

★ If $b_K \leq b_I$ or $b_K \leq b_J$ then we conclude that $K \subset I$ or $K \subset J$ hence $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{K\}$ covers $[a, b]$ and is of size N .

★ Otherwise if $b_K > b_I$ and $b_K > b_J$, then since $I \cap K \neq \emptyset$, $a_K < b_I$. Thus we have $I \cup K = (a_I, b_K)$ and so $J \subset I \cup K$. Therefore $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{J\}$ covers $[a, b]$ and is of size N .

In any case we can cover $[a, b]$ with a subfamily $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subset \mathcal{F}$ of size N . The induction hypothesis allows to conclude.

★ We still denote by $\mathcal{F} = \{I_{t_i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ some finite subcover of $[a, b]$ satisfying **(P1)** and **(P2)**. Let us assume furthermore that $(t_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ are ordered in an increasing fashion, i.e. $a \leq t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_N \leq b$ and define $\tau_0 = a$, $\tau_N = b$ and $\tau_i := \frac{t_{i+1} + t_i}{2} + \frac{\rho(t_i) - \rho(t_{i+1})}{2}$ for $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$. From the properties **(P1)** and **(P2)**, we infer for any $i \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$ that,

$$\rho(t_i) - \rho(t_{i+1}) < t_{i+1} - t_i < \rho(t_i) + \rho(t_{i+1})$$

and

$$t_{i+1} - \rho(t_{i+1}) > t_{i-1} + \rho(t_{i-1})$$

From these we straightforwardly infer (61) and (63). □

Let us now state and prove an explicit version of the result of Arendt (found in [10, Theorem 2.7, Theorem 2.11]). First let us recall the quantities of interest and the main assumption of the theorem.

$$\left(\text{(A1)} \right) \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
 \text{(a) **Relative continuity:** } A \in RC(I; (D; X)). \\
 \text{(b) **Decomposition:** There exist } A_0 : I \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D, X) \text{ and } B : I \times I \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D, X) \text{ such that} \\
 \quad \text{(b.1) For all } t, s \in I, A(s) = A_0(t) + B(t, s). \\
 \quad \text{(b.2) For all } t \in I, A_0(t) \in mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+). \\
 \quad \text{(b.3) There exists a range } r_A = (\delta_A, \eta_A) \text{ such that for all } x \in D, \\
 \quad \quad \forall t, s \in I, |t - s| \leq \rho_A(t) \implies \|B(t, s)x\|_X \leq \epsilon_0(t)\|x\|_D + \mu_A(t)\|x\|_X \quad (64) \\
 \quad \text{where } \rho_A := \delta_A \circ \epsilon_0, \mu_A := \eta_A \circ \epsilon_0 \text{ and } \epsilon_0 \text{ is defined through (17)-(18).}
 \end{array} \right.$$

Recall also the auxiliary quantities K_0 and M_0 for A_0 defined in (17).

Theorem 5.2. *Assume that A satisfies (A1). Then $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ and there exists a subdivision $\mathcal{T} := \{\tau_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq N}$ of \bar{I} and center points $\mathcal{C} := \{t_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ such that*

$$a = \tau_0 < t_1 < \tau_1 < \dots < t_N < \tau_N = b \quad (65)$$

$$\rho_A(t_i) \leq \tau_i - \tau_{i-1} \leq 2\rho_A(t_i), \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \quad (66)$$

and there exists $K := K(p, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}, K_0, M_0, \|A\|_\infty) \geq 0$ such that

$$[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \leq K \quad (67)$$

Proof. Apply Lemma 5.1 with $\rho_A = \delta_A \circ \epsilon_0$ on $[a, b]$. This yields the corresponding $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{C} := (t_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ and $\mathcal{T} := (\tau_i)_{0 \leq i \leq N}$.

Define $A_i := A|_{\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i}$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. By the decomposition assumption (b), we have $A_i(s) = A_0(t_i) + B(t_i, s)$ and by (62), $s \mapsto B(t_i, s)$ is a regular perturbation of $A_0(t_i)$ on the interval $[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i]$. Hence by Theorem 3.5 we have $A_i \in \mathcal{MR}_p(\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i)$ and,

$$[A_i]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i)} \leq G(\tau_i - \tau_{i-1}, \mu_A(t_i), M_0(t_i), K_0(t_i))$$

Finally we can apply Theorem 4.4 to A with the subdivision \mathcal{T} to obtain (67). □

5.2 Estimation for Hölder-type relatively continuous operators

In order to estimate the L^p regularity constant more explicitly, we use an integrability condition on the maps K_0 and M_0 stated in **(A2)** (b): $(K_0 + 1)(M_0 + 1) \in L^{\alpha r}(I)$. This implies in fact that $\frac{1}{\rho_A} \in L^r(I)$.

Under this condition, the Besicovitch covering theorem can be explicitated with concrete constants with the use of Techebyshev inequalities.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $\rho : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be measurable and such that $\frac{1}{\rho} \in L^r(I)$ for some $r \in (1, +\infty]$. Then there exist $(N, \{t_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}, \{\tau_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq N})$ satisfying (61) and such that*

$$\left\lceil \frac{1}{2} |I| \left\| \frac{1}{\rho} \right\|_{L^r(a,b)}^{r^*} \right\rceil \leq N \leq \left\lceil |I| \left\| \frac{1}{\rho} \right\|_{L^r(I)}^{r^*} \right\rceil \vee 1 \quad (68)$$

where r^* is such that $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r^*} = 1$.

Proof. Denote for $\epsilon > 0$, $E_\epsilon := \{t \in \bar{I} \mid \rho(t) > \epsilon\}$. From Markov's inequality we have for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$|\bar{I} \setminus E_\epsilon| \leq \epsilon^r \left\| \frac{1}{\rho} \right\|_{L^r(I)}^r \quad (69)$$

Hence there exists $\epsilon^* := \frac{|I|^{\frac{1}{r}}}{\left\| \frac{1}{\rho} \right\|_{L^r}^{\frac{1}{r}}} > 0$ such that $E_\epsilon \neq \emptyset$ for any $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon^*$. If $\epsilon^* > |I|$, then we may take $N = 1$, hence (68) obviously holds. From now on we assume that $\epsilon^* \leq |I|$.

Fix some $0 < \alpha < 1$, and note that if there exists some $0 < \epsilon_0 < \epsilon^*$ such that

$$|E_{\epsilon_0}| \geq |I| - \alpha \epsilon_0 \quad (70)$$

then for any $t \in \bar{I}$, we have $\text{dist}(t, E_{\epsilon_0}) \leq \alpha \epsilon_0$ otherwise we could fit a ball of diameter strictly bigger than $\alpha \epsilon_0$ outside E_{ϵ_0} which would contradict (70). Therefore we have

$$\bar{I} \subset \bigcup_{t \in E_{\epsilon_0}} B(t, \epsilon_0)$$

Compactness of \bar{I} allows to extract a finite subcover, which we may assume satisfies **(P1)**-**(P2)**, yielding (61) with $\epsilon_0 \leq |\tau_i - \tau_{i-1}| \leq 2\epsilon_0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N$. Therefore we can bound N from above and below:

$$\left\lceil \frac{|I|}{2\epsilon_0} \right\rceil \leq N \leq \left\lceil \frac{|I|}{\epsilon_0} \right\rceil \quad (71)$$

Now from (69), condition (70) is satisfied for ϵ_0 satisfying

$$\epsilon_0^r \left\| \frac{1}{\rho} \right\|_{L^r(I)}^r = \alpha \epsilon_0$$

After some rearranging we find that $\epsilon_0 := \frac{\alpha^{r^*-1}}{\left\| \frac{1}{\rho} \right\|_{L^r(I)}^{r^*-1}} < \epsilon^*$ because we assumed $\epsilon^* \geq |I|$. Denoting

$\beta = \left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{r^*-1}} \in (1, +\infty)$, we find from (71)

$$\left\lceil \frac{\beta}{2} |I| \left\| \frac{1}{\rho} \right\|_{L^r(I)}^{r^*} \right\rceil \leq N \leq \left\lfloor \beta |I| \left\| \frac{1}{\rho} \right\|_{L^r(I)}^{r^*} \right\rfloor \quad (72)$$

Letting β be close to 1 in (72), we obtain (68). \square

Assume that A satisfies **(A1)** and **(A2)**. Recall that then $A \in RC^{\alpha, \beta}(I)$: it has a specific range of relative continuity $r_A = (\delta_A, \eta_A)$ such that there exists $m_\delta \geq 0$, $m_\delta \in (0, 1]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \epsilon > 0, \quad \delta_A(\epsilon) &= m_\delta \epsilon^\alpha \\ \forall \epsilon > 0, \quad \eta_A(\epsilon) &\leq m_\eta \epsilon^{-\beta} \end{aligned}$$

The integrability condition **(A2)** (b), lets us define $\Gamma := \|(K_0 + 1)(M_0 + 1)\|_{L^{\alpha r}(I)}^\alpha$.

Theorem 5.4. *Assume that A satisfies **(A1)** and **(A2)**. Then there exists a constant $C = C(|I|, \|A\|_\infty, p, r, \alpha, \beta)$ such that,*

$$\log([A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}) \leq C \left(\left(\frac{\Gamma}{m_\delta} \right)^{r^*} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ + \\ m_\eta m_\delta^{s_2(\alpha, \beta, r)} \Gamma^{s_1(\alpha, \beta, r)} \\ + \\ \log \left(\frac{\Gamma}{m_\delta} \right) \end{array} \right\} + m_\eta + 1 \right) \quad (73)$$

where $s_1(\alpha, \beta, r) := r^* \left(\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha} - 1 \right)$ and $s_2(\alpha, \beta, r) := \frac{\beta+1}{\alpha+1} - \left(\frac{\alpha+\frac{1}{r}}{\alpha+1} \right) s_1(\alpha, \beta, r)$.

This result is useful for applications, it allows to express an explicit bound of the regularity constant in terms of the parameters of relative continuity of the nonautonomous operator A . This estimate is then used to infer a global existence result for quasilinear equations, stated in the next section.

Proof. For this rest of the proof, we shall denote $\Theta \lesssim \Lambda$ when the quantity Θ is bounded by the quantity Λ up to a factor C that is independent of m_δ, m_η and Γ .

As a preliminary note that

$$\log(c_p(\nu)) \lesssim \nu + 1$$

Let $(N, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{T})$ be the parameters of the subdivision given in Proposition 5.3. First assume that $N = 1$, in this case then we can directly apply Theorem 3.5 to obtain,

$$[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \lesssim (M_0(t_1) + 1) c_p(-4M_0(t_1)\mu(t_1)|I|) [A(t_1)]_{mr_p(I)} \quad (74)$$

And since $N = 1$, $m_\delta \leq 1$ we have $\rho_A(t_1) \geq \frac{1}{2^{\alpha(K_0(t_1)+1)} (M_0(t_1)+1)^\alpha} \geq \frac{|I|}{2}$, therefore

$$M_0(t_1), K_0(t_1), (K_0(t_1) + 1)(M_0(t_1) + 1) \lesssim |I|^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$$

and also $\mu(t_1) = \eta_A(\epsilon_0(t_1)) \lesssim m_\eta |I|^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}}$. Therefore from (74), there exists $C \geq 0$ independent of m_η, m_δ and Γ such that

$$[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \lesssim c_p(-Cm_\eta)$$

Hence

$$\log\left([A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}\right) \lesssim m_\eta + 1$$

Hence (73) holds.

From now on we consider that $N \geq 2$. The bound is obtained first for $m_\delta = 1$, then we treat the general case by using a time rescaling.

Case $m_\delta = 1$: Let $(N, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{T})$ be the parameters of the subdivision given in Proposition 5.3 with $\rho = \rho_A := \delta \circ \epsilon_0 = 2^{-\alpha}(K_0 + 1)^{-\alpha}(M_0 + 1)^{-\alpha}$. Therefore the bound (68) can be rewritten,

$$\left\lceil \frac{N_\Gamma}{2} \right\rceil \leq N \leq \lfloor N_\Gamma \rfloor$$

where $N_\Gamma = |I|\bar{\Gamma}^{r^*} \geq 1$, with $\bar{\Gamma} = \left(\int_I (2(K_0 + 1)(M_0 + 1))^{\alpha r} dt\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} = 2^\alpha \Gamma$ by assumption. For simplicity denote $\Gamma_* := \bar{\Gamma}^{r^*}$. We find from the first bound that

$$\frac{1}{2\Gamma_*} \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \rho(t_i)$$

and for $1 \leq i \leq N$,

$$\frac{1}{2\Gamma_*} \leq |\tau_i - \tau_{i-1}| \leq \frac{1}{\Gamma_*}$$

Therefore, $\epsilon_0(t_i) = \frac{1}{2(K_0(t_i)+1)(M_0(t_i)+1)} \geq \left(\frac{1}{2\Gamma_*}\right)^\alpha$. Hence we infer the following bounds for any $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} (K_0(t_i) + 1)(M_0(t_i) + 1) \\ K_0(t_i) \\ M_0(t_i) \end{array} \right\} \lesssim \Gamma_*^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$$

and also

$$\mu_A(t_i) = \eta_A(\epsilon_0(t_i)) \lesssim m_\eta \Gamma_*^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}}$$

From which we then infer that there exists C independent of m_δ, m_η and Γ_* such that for

$j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
G_j &:= G(\tau_j - \tau_{j-1}, \mu(t_j), M_0(t_j), K_0(t_j)) \\
&\lesssim (M_0(t_j) + 1)(K_0(t_j) + 1)c_p(-4M_0(t_j)\mu(t_i)(\tau_j - \tau_{j-1})) \\
&\lesssim \Gamma_*^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} c_p \left(-C\Gamma_*^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} m_\eta \Gamma_*^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} \frac{1}{\Gamma_*} \right) \\
&= \Gamma_*^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} c_p \left(-Cm_\eta \Gamma_*^{\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha}-1} \right) \\
&=: D(m_\eta, \Gamma_*)
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover we have $\kappa_{1,j} \lesssim 1$ and $\kappa_{2,j} \lesssim N_\Gamma$. We use the previous estimates and the somewhat crude estimate $Q(T, C, G) \leq 1 + (C + \frac{1}{T})G$, to find for any $j \in \{2, \dots, N\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
H_j(p, \mathcal{T}, \|A_j\|_\infty, G_j) &\lesssim 1 + N_\Gamma^{\frac{1}{q}} (1 + (\|A_j\|_\infty + \Gamma_*)D(m_\eta, \Gamma_*)) \\
&= 1 + |I|^{\frac{1}{q}} \Gamma_*^{\frac{1}{q}} + |I|^{\frac{1}{q}} \Gamma_*^{\frac{1}{q}} \|A_j\|_\infty D(m_\eta, \Gamma_*) + |I|^{\frac{1}{q}} \Gamma_*^{1+\frac{1}{q}} D(m_\eta, \Gamma_*) \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{\Gamma_*^{-1-\frac{1}{q}}}{D(m_\eta, \Gamma_*)} + \frac{|I|^{\frac{1}{q}} \Gamma_*^{-1}}{D(m_\eta, \Gamma_*)} + |I|^{\frac{1}{q}} \Gamma_*^{-1} \|A_j\|_\infty + |I|^{\frac{1}{q}} \right) \Gamma_*^{1+\frac{1}{q}} D(m_\eta, \Gamma_*)
\end{aligned}$$

Since by assumption $\Gamma_* \geq |I|^{-1}$ and $m_\eta \geq 0$, we have $D(m_\eta, \Gamma_*) \geq D(0, 2^\alpha |I|^{\frac{r^*}{\alpha}}) \gtrsim |I|^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
H_j(p, \mathcal{T}, \|A\|_\infty, G_j) &\lesssim \left(|I|^{1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{\alpha}} + |I|^{1+\frac{1}{q}} \|A_j\|_\infty + |I|^{\frac{1}{q}} \right) \Gamma_*^{1+\frac{1}{q}} D(m_\eta, \Gamma_*) \\
&\lesssim \left(1 + |I|^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|A_j\|_\infty + |I|^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \right) |I|^{1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{\alpha}} \Gamma_*^{1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{\alpha}} c_p \left(-C_1 m_\eta \Gamma_*^{\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha}-1} \right) \\
&=: E(|I|, \|A\|_\infty) N_\Gamma^{1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{\alpha}} c_p \left(-Cm_\eta \Gamma_*^{\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha}-1} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the following global estimate can be obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} &\lesssim \sum_{i=1}^N \left(EN_\Gamma^{1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{\alpha}} c_p \left(-Cm_\eta \Gamma_*^{\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha}-1} \right) \right)^{N-i-1} N_\Gamma D(m_\eta, \Gamma_*) \\
&\lesssim \left(EN_\Gamma^{1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{\alpha}} c_p \left(-Cm_\eta \Gamma_*^{\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha}-1} \right) \right)^{N-1} N_\Gamma D(m_\eta, \Gamma_*)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we used the fact that $E, N_\Gamma, c_p \geq 1$. Moreover, $N_\Gamma D(m_\eta, \Gamma_*) \leq |I|^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} EN_\Gamma^{1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{\alpha}} c_p \left(-Cm_\eta \Gamma_*^{\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha}-1} \right)$, therefore we have,

$$[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \lesssim |I|^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \left(EN_\Gamma^{1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{\alpha}} \bar{c}_p \left(-C_2 m_\eta \Gamma_*^{\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha}-1} \right) \right)^{N_\Gamma}$$

Let us denote $F(|I|, \|A\|_\infty, m_\eta, \Gamma_*) := |I|^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \left(E(|I|, \|A\|_\infty) N_\Gamma^{1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{\alpha}} c_p \left(-C_1 m_\eta \Gamma_*^{\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha}-1} \right) \right)^{N_\Gamma}$.

General case: There exists $\lambda(m_\delta) \in (0, 1]$ such that $A_\lambda := \lambda A(\lambda \cdot)$ falls in the first case $m_\delta^\lambda = 1$. And we find the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= m_\delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} \\ m_\eta^\lambda &= \lambda^{\beta+1} m_\eta \\ \Gamma_* \leq \Gamma_*^\lambda &\leq \lambda^{-r^*(\alpha+\frac{1}{r})} \Gamma_* \\ |I_\lambda| &= \frac{|I|}{\lambda} \\ \|A_\lambda\|_\infty &= \lambda \|A\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we deduce that $N_\Gamma^\lambda = |I_\lambda| \Gamma_*^\lambda = \lambda^{-r^*(\alpha+\frac{1}{r})-1} N_\Gamma = \lambda^{-r^*(\alpha+1)} N_\Gamma$.

Using the time-scaling invariance (50), we have the following bound

$$[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} = \lambda [A_\lambda]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I_\lambda)} \leq \lambda F\left(\frac{|I|}{\lambda}, \lambda \|A\|_\infty, \lambda^{\beta+1}, \lambda^{-r^*(\alpha+\frac{1}{r})} \Gamma_*\right)$$

Since $m_\delta \leq 1$, we have $\lambda \leq 1$, hence we can see that $E(|I_\lambda|, \|A_\lambda\|_\infty) \leq E(|I|, \|A\|_\infty)$. Assembling together the estimates yields,

$$[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \lesssim \lambda^{1+\frac{1}{\alpha}} |I|^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \left(E_p \lambda^{-r^*(1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{\alpha})(\alpha+1)} N_\Gamma^{1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{\alpha}} c_p \left(-C m_\eta \lambda^{\beta+1-r^*(\alpha+\frac{1}{r})} \Gamma_*^{\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha}-1} \right) \right)^{\lambda^{-r^*(\alpha+1)} N_\Gamma}$$

Upon replacing $\lambda = m_\delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}$ we find,

$$[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \lesssim m_\delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} |I|^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \left(E m_\delta^{-(1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{\alpha})r^*} N_\Gamma^{1+\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{\alpha}} c_p \left(-C m_\eta m_\delta^{\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha+1}-r^*(\frac{\alpha+\frac{1}{r}}{\alpha+1})(\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha}-1)} \Gamma_*^{\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha}-1} \right) \right)^{m_\delta^{-r^*} N_\Gamma}$$

Let us compose by the logarithm in order to identify the dominant factors of this product. We do not display the dependence with $|I|$ or $\|A\|_\infty$, they are hidden in the constants. We obtain,

$$\log\left([A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}\right) \lesssim \underbrace{\log m_\delta}_{\leq 0} + \left(\frac{\Gamma}{m_\delta}\right)^{r^*} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ + \\ \log c_p \left(-C m_\eta m_\delta^{s_2(\alpha, \beta, r)} \Gamma^{s_1(\alpha, \beta, r)} \right) \\ + \\ \log\left(\frac{\Gamma}{m_\delta}\right) \end{array} \right\}$$

where we denoted $s_1(\alpha, \beta, r) = r^* \left(\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha} - 1 \right)$ and $s_2(\alpha, \beta, r) := \frac{\beta+1}{\alpha+1} - \left(\frac{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}}{\alpha+1} \right) s_1(\alpha, \beta, r)$. Now $\log c_p(\nu) \lesssim \nu + 1$ for $\nu \leq 0$ allows to conclude (73).

□

5.3 Examples

We here give two simple but useful examples of operators in the class $RC^{\alpha, \beta}(I)$ for which we can apply our explicit estimate in Theorem 2.7.

Throughout the development of these examples we fix $\bar{A} \in mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+)$ a given maximally regular operator on \mathbb{R}_+ and an additional operator $B \in \mathcal{L}(D'; X)$ where $D \hookrightarrow D' \hookrightarrow X$ is an intermediate space between D and X , that is we assume there exists $L \geq 0, \theta \in (0, 1)$ such that for any $x \in D$ the following interpolation inequality holds,

$$\|Bx\|_X \leq L \|x\|_D^\theta \|x\|_X^{1-\theta}$$

The reader may think of \bar{A} as a well-known, autonomous and maximally regular operator (e.g. $A = -\Delta$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $A = -\operatorname{div}_x(a(x)\nabla_x \cdot)$ with $a, a^{-1} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{S}^{++}(\mathbb{R}))$) and B as representing an operator with "low-order coefficients" (e.g. Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation inequalities).

Example 5.1. Fix some $\lambda \in C^{0, \frac{1}{\alpha}}(\bar{I}; \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that $\frac{1}{\lambda^2} \in L^{\alpha r}(I)$ for some $r > 1$ and define for $t \in I$,

$$A(t) := \lambda(t)\bar{A}$$

Then $A \in C^{0, \frac{1}{\alpha}}(I; \mathcal{L}(D; X)) \subset RC^{\alpha, \beta}(I)$ with $m_\delta = \left(1 + \|A\|_{\mathcal{L}(D; X)} [\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\right)^{-\alpha}$, where $[\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}} := \sup_{t \neq s \in I} \frac{|\lambda(t) - \lambda(s)|}{|t - s|^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}$ is the $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ -Hölder semi-norm of λ .

The operator A satisfies assumption **(A1)** with $A_0 = A$ and $B = 0$. Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned} K_0(t) &:= [A(t)]_{mr_p(I)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda(t)} [\bar{A}]_{mr_p(\frac{I}{\lambda(t)})} \\ &\leq \frac{|I| + \lambda(t)}{\lambda(t)^2} [\bar{A}]_{mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+)} \\ &\leq C(\bar{A}, |I|, \|\lambda\|_\infty) \frac{1}{\lambda(t)^2} \end{aligned}$$

first by time rescaling invariance (see (50) in Remark 4.1) then by Proposition 2.2. Also $M_0(t) := \sup_{\tau \geq 0} \left\| e^{-\tau \bar{A}} \right\|_X$, therefore

$$\Gamma \leq C(\bar{A}, |I|, \|\lambda\|_\infty) \left\| \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \right\|_{L^{\alpha r}(I)}^\alpha$$

Therefore from Theorem 2.7 (24) we find that there exists $C(\bar{A}, |I|, \|\lambda\|_\infty, p, \alpha, r) \geq 0$ such that

$$\log \left([A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \right) \leq C \left(1 + [\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \right)^{\alpha r^*} \left\| \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \right\|_{L^{\alpha r}}^{\alpha r^*} \left(1 + \log \left(\left(1 + [\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \right) \left\| \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \right\|_{L^{\alpha r}} \right) \right) \quad (75)$$

We observe from estimate (75) that the behavior of the regularity constant of A can be expressed in terms of the strength of the oscillations of λ represented by $[\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ and of the term $\left\|\frac{1}{\lambda^{2\alpha}}\right\|_{L^r}$ representing a measure of the degeneracy of the operator.

Example 5.2. We now consider a more general operator of the form

$$A(t) = \lambda(t)\overline{A} + \gamma(t)B$$

where as before $\lambda \in C^{0, \frac{1}{\alpha}}(\overline{I}; \mathbb{R}_+)$ and $\gamma \in L^\infty(I; \mathbb{R})$. As above we show how to obtain a log-estimate of $[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}$ using Theorem 2.7.

Relative continuity: $A \in RC^{\alpha, \frac{\theta}{1-\theta}}(I)$.

Let us compute a range of relative continuity for $A(\cdot)$. Let $t, s \in I$, $t \neq s$ and $x \in D$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(t)x - A(s)x\|_X &\leq |\lambda(t) - \lambda(s)| \|\overline{A}\|_{\mathcal{L}(D; X)} \|x\|_D + |\gamma(t) - \gamma(s)| \|Bx\|_X \\ &\leq [\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|\overline{A}\|_{\mathcal{L}(D; X)} |t - s|^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|x\|_D + 2L \|\gamma\|_\infty \|x\|_D^\theta \|x\|_X^{1-\theta} \end{aligned}$$

Now for any $h > 0$, from Young's inequality with $p = \frac{1}{\theta}$, $q = \frac{1}{1-\theta}$, we have $a^\theta b^{1-\theta} \leq \theta h^{\frac{1}{\theta}} a + (1-\theta) h^{-\frac{1}{1-\theta}} b$. Therefore,

$$\|A(t)x - A(s)x\|_X \leq \left([\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|\overline{A}\|_{\mathcal{L}(D; X)} |t - s|^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + 2\theta L \|\gamma\|_\infty h^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \right) \|x\|_D + 2(1-\theta)L \|\gamma\|_\infty h^{-\frac{1}{1-\theta}} \|x\|_X$$

Fix $r > 0$ and take $h = (r|t - s|)^{\frac{\theta}{\alpha}}$ to find,

$$\|A(t)x - A(s)x\|_X \leq \left([\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|\overline{A}\|_{\mathcal{L}(D; X)} + 2\theta L \|\gamma\|_\infty r^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \right) |t - s|^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|x\|_D + 2(1-\theta)L \|\gamma\|_\infty (r|t - s|)^{-\frac{\theta}{\alpha(1-\theta)}} \|x\|_X$$

Now choose $r := \left(\frac{[\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|\overline{A}\|}{2\theta L \|\gamma\|_\infty} \right)^\alpha$ to find,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(t)x - A(s)x\|_X &\leq 2[\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|\overline{A}\|_{\mathcal{L}(D; X)} |t - s|^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|x\|_D + 2(1-\theta)L \|\gamma\|_\infty \left(\frac{2\theta L \|\gamma\|_\infty}{[\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|\overline{A}\|} \right)^{\frac{\theta}{(1-\theta)}} |t - s|^{-\frac{\theta}{\alpha(1-\theta)}} \|x\|_X \\ &= C_\lambda |t - s|^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|x\|_D + (2\theta)^{\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}} (1-\theta) C_\gamma \left(\frac{C_\gamma}{C_\lambda} \right)^{\frac{\theta}{(1-\theta)}} |t - s|^{-\frac{\theta}{\alpha(1-\theta)}} \|x\|_X \end{aligned}$$

where $C_\lambda := 2[\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \|\overline{A}\|_{\mathcal{L}(D; X)}$ and $C_\gamma := 2L \|\gamma\|_\infty$. Observe then that for any $\epsilon > 0$, if $|t - s| \leq C_\lambda^{-\alpha} \epsilon^\alpha$, then we find

$$\begin{aligned}\|A(t)x - A(s)x\|_X &\leq \epsilon \|x\|_D + C_\theta C_\gamma \left(\frac{C_\gamma}{C_\lambda}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}} C_\lambda^{\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}} \epsilon^{-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}} \|x\|_X \\ &\leq \epsilon \|x\|_D + C_\theta C_\gamma^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}} \epsilon^{-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}} \|x\|_X\end{aligned}$$

A range of relative continuity of A can be

$$\bar{\delta}(\epsilon) := (C_\lambda + 1)^{-\alpha} \epsilon^\alpha$$

$$\bar{\eta}(\epsilon) := C_\theta C_\gamma^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}} \epsilon^{-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}}$$

and therefore $A \in RC^{\alpha, \frac{\theta}{1-\theta}}(I)$.

Maximal regularity: $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$.

Here A satisfies assumption **(A1)** with $A_0 : t \mapsto \lambda(t)\bar{A}$ and $B : (t, s) \mapsto (\lambda(s) - \lambda(t))\bar{A} + \gamma(s)B$. Now we have for $x \in D$, $\epsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\|B(t, s)x\|_X &\leq \|A(s)x - A(t)x\|_X + \|\gamma\|_\infty \|Bx\|_X \\ &\leq \|A(s)x - A(t)x\|_X + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|x\|_D + C_\theta C_\gamma \epsilon^{-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}} \|x\|_X\end{aligned}$$

Hence upon choosing $\delta_A(\epsilon) := \bar{\delta}(\frac{\epsilon}{2})$ and $\eta_A(\epsilon) := \bar{\eta}(\frac{\epsilon}{2}) + C_\theta C_\gamma \epsilon^{-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}}$ we find that (δ_A, η_A) is still a range of relative continuity for A , compatible in $RC^{\alpha, \frac{\theta}{1-\theta}}(I)$ and that B satisfies **(A1)**(b.3).

Logarithmic estimate: $\log\left([A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}\right)$.

As in the continuous case, we find that

$$\Gamma \leq C(\bar{A}, |I|, \|\lambda\|_\infty) \left\| \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \right\|_{L^{\alpha r}(I)}^\alpha < +\infty$$

Hence A satisfies **(A2)** for α and $\beta = \frac{\theta}{1-\theta}$. We also observe from the definitions of δ_A and η_A that

$$m_\delta \propto (1 + [\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}})^{-\alpha}$$

$$m_\eta \propto \|\gamma\|_\infty^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}}$$

where the proportionality factors only depend on θ , L and $\|\bar{A}\|_{\mathcal{L}(D, X)}$. Also see that $s_1(\alpha, \frac{\theta}{1-\theta}) = r^*\left(\frac{1}{\alpha(1-\theta)} - 1\right)$ and $s_2(\alpha, \frac{\theta}{1-\theta}) = \frac{1}{(1-\theta)(\alpha+1)} - r^*\left(\frac{\alpha+\frac{1}{r}}{\alpha+1}\right)\left(\frac{1}{(1-\theta)\alpha} - 1\right)$. Hence we can apply Theorem 2.7, to find

$$\log\left([A(\cdot)]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}\right) \leq C \left(\left(1 + [\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\right)^{\alpha r^*} \left\| \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \right\|_{L^{\alpha r}}^{\alpha r^*} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ + \\ \|\gamma\|_{\infty}^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}} \left(1 + [\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\right)^{\alpha s_2} \left\| \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \right\|_{L^{\alpha r}}^{\alpha s_1} \\ + \\ \log\left(\left(1 + [\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\right) \left\| \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \right\|_{L^{\alpha r}}\right) \end{array} \right\} + \|\gamma\|_{\infty}^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}} + 1 \right) \quad (76)$$

where $C := C(|I|, \|\lambda\|_{\infty}, p, \alpha, \theta, r)$.

As for the continuous case described in Example 5.1, the behavior of the regularity constant of A in (76) is expressed in terms of $[\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ representing the oscillations of the diffusion coefficient λ and in terms of $\left\| \frac{1}{\lambda^{2\alpha}} \right\|_{L^r}$ representing a measure of degeneracy of λ . Extra terms in $\|\gamma\|_{\infty}$ appear which account for the perturbation $\gamma(t)B$. Remark that if θ is close to 0, then the log-estimate becomes linear with respect to $\|\gamma\|_{\infty}$ which matches the asymptotic behavior of $[A + \gamma]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}$ as $\gamma \rightarrow +\infty$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ (see Theorem 3.4). If $\gamma \equiv 0$ we exactly find (75) back.

A regime of interest happens when $\alpha(1 - \theta) < 1$, in this case we have $s_1, s_2 < 0$. Therefore the above bound can be simplified as follows:

$$\log\left([A(\cdot)]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)}\right) \leq C \left(\left(1 + [\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\right)^{\alpha r^*} \left\| \frac{1}{\lambda(\cdot)^2} \right\|_{L^{\alpha r}}^{\alpha r^*} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ + \\ \|\gamma\|_{\infty}^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}} \\ + \\ \log\left(\left(1 + [\lambda]_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\right) \left\| \frac{1}{\lambda(\cdot)^2} \right\|_{L^{\alpha r}}\right) \end{array} \right\} + 1 \right)$$

6 Global existence for quasilinear equation

6.1 A general existence result

Let us recall here the criterion for the existence of global solutions on the bounded interval I of the following quasilinear problem:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}u + \mathbb{A}(u)u &= \mathbb{F}(u) \\ u(a) &= x \end{cases} \quad (\text{QL})$$

where $x \in \text{Tr}^p$.

(\mathbf{E}_I) For all $R \geq 0$, define the quantities:

$$\gamma(R) := \sup_{\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)}=R} [\mathbb{A}(u)]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \quad (77)$$

$$\kappa(R) := \sup_{\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)}=R} \left\{ \|\mathbb{A}(u)\|_\infty + \|\mathbb{F}(u)\|_{L^p(I;X)} + 1 \right\} \quad (78)$$

and assume that for any $L > 0$ the following sublinear growth condition holds,

$$\sup_{R_1, R_2 \in [R-L, R+L]} \frac{\gamma(R_1)\kappa(R_2)}{R} \xrightarrow{R \rightarrow +\infty} 0 \quad (79)$$

(\mathbf{E}_{II}) We ask the following continuity properties:

- (i) $\mathbb{F} : \begin{cases} \mathcal{X}(I) & \longrightarrow & L^p(I; X) \\ u & \longmapsto & \mathbb{F}(u) \end{cases}$ is weakly continuous.
- (ii) $\mathbb{A}(\cdot) : \begin{cases} \mathcal{X}(I) & \longrightarrow & L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X)) \\ u & \longmapsto & \mathbb{A}(u) \end{cases}$ is continuous.

Let us now prove the existence theorem.

Theorem 6.1. *Assume that \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{F} satisfy conditions (\mathbf{E}_I) and (\mathbf{E}_{II}). Then for any $x \in \text{Tr}^p$ there exists a unique global strong solution $u \in \text{MR}^p(I)$ of (QL)*

Proof. Reduction to $x = 0$: Fix a function $w \in \text{MR}^p(I)$ such that $w(a) = x$, and consider the following quasilinear problem:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}v + \mathbb{A}(v+w)v & = & \mathbb{F}(v+w) - \frac{d}{dt}w - \mathbb{A}(v+w)w \\ v(a) & = & 0 \end{cases} \quad (80)$$

If $v \in \text{MR}^p(I)$ is a solution of (80), then $u := v + w$ is a solution to the original problem (QL) starting from x . Let us show that

$$\mathbb{A}_x(\cdot) := \mathbb{A}(\cdot + w)$$

$$\mathbb{F}_x(\cdot) := \mathbb{F}(\cdot + w) - \frac{d}{dt}w - \mathbb{A}_x(\cdot)w$$

satisfy assumptions and (\mathbf{E}_I) - (\mathbf{E}_{II}). It is straightforward to see that they satisfy (\mathbf{E}_{II}). There only needs to show that they satisfy (\mathbf{E}_I).

Define as required

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_x(R) &:= \sup_{\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)}=R} [\mathbb{A}_x(u)]_{\mathcal{MR}^p(I)} \\ \kappa_x(R) &:= \sup_{\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)}=R} \left\{ \|\mathbb{A}_x(u)\|_\infty + \|\mathbb{F}_x(u)\|_{L^p(I;X)} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

For a given $u \in \mathcal{X}(I)$, from the triangle inequality we have $\|u+w\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)} - \|w\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)} \leq \|u\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)} \leq \|u+w\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)} + \|w\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)}$. We infer that if $L_w := \|w\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)}$, we have for any $R \geq L_w$,

$$\gamma_x(R) \leq \sup_{R_1 \in [R-L_w, R+L_w]} \gamma(R_1)$$

In a similar fashion, since there exists $C_w \geq 0$ such that

$$\|\mathbb{F}_x(u)\|_{L^p(I;X)} \leq C_w \left(\|\mathbb{F}(u+w)\|_{L^p(I;X)} + \|\mathbb{A}(u+w)\|_\infty + 1 \right)$$

we find that

$$\kappa_x(R) \leq \sup_{R_2 \in [R-L_w, R+L_w]} C_w \kappa(R_2)$$

Let $L > 0$ and let $R \geq 0$ and $R_1, R_2 \in [R-L, R+L]$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_x(R_1) \kappa_x(R_2) &\leq \sup_{R'_1 \in [R_1-L_w, R_1+L_w]} \gamma(R'_1) \sup_{R'_2 \in [R_2-L_w, R_2+L_w]} C_w \kappa(R'_2) \\ &\leq C_w \sup_{R'_1, R'_2 \in [R-L-L_w, R+L+L_w]} \gamma(R'_1) \kappa(R'_2) \end{aligned}$$

Now taking the supremum over R_1 and R_2 , we find from (\mathbf{E}'_I) with $L+L_w$ that

$$\sup_{R_1, R_2 \in [R-L, R+L]} \gamma_x(R_1) \kappa_w(R_2) \xrightarrow{R \rightarrow +\infty} 0$$

Existence: The existence of the solution is shown through Schauder's fixed point theorem. Define the following map:

$$T : \begin{cases} \mathcal{X}(I) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{X}(I) \\ u & \longmapsto & L_{\mathbb{A}(u)}^{-1} \mathbb{F}(u) \end{cases}$$

and note that any solution u of (QL) must be a fixed point of T .

- ★ The map T is continuous from $\mathcal{X}(I)$ equipped with the strong topology to $\text{MR}^p(I)$ equipped with the weak topology as a consequence of (i) of Proposition 2.8 and the continuity properties of \mathbb{F} and \mathbb{A} in (\mathbf{E}_{II}) . Now since the embedding $\text{MR}^p(I) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}(I)$ is compact, this implies the continuity of T onto the strong topology of $\mathcal{X}(I)$.
- ★ T is compact, again by the compact embedding $\text{MR}^p(I) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}(I)$.
- ★ Let $u \in \mathcal{X}(I)$, and denote $R := \|u\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tu\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} &\leq [\mathbb{A}(u)]_{\mathcal{MR}^p(I)} \|\mathbb{F}(u)\|_{L^p(I;X)} \\ &\leq \gamma(R) \kappa(R) \\ &\leq R \left(\frac{\gamma(R) \kappa(R)}{R} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Denote by $C > 0$ the continuity constant of the embedding $\text{MR}^p(I) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}(I)$, to find

$$\|Tu\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)} \leq CR \left(\frac{\gamma(R) \kappa(R)}{R} \right) \tag{81}$$

For any $r > 0$, denote $B_r = \overline{\mathbb{B}}_{\mathcal{X}(I)}(0, r)$ the closed ball of $\mathcal{X}(I)$ of radius $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and centered at 0.

By (\mathbf{E}_I) there exists $R_0 > 0$ large enough such that for any $R \geq R_0$ we have $C \frac{\gamma(R)\kappa(R)}{R} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. By continuity of the map T there exists $R_1 > 0$ large enough such that $T(B_{\frac{R_0}{2}}) \subset B_{R_1}$. We denote $R^* := R_0 \vee R_1$ and define the quantity

$$\alpha := \sup_{\frac{R_0}{2} \leq R \leq R^*} C \left(\frac{\gamma(R)\kappa(R)}{R} \right) < +\infty$$

★ We claim that $T(B_{\alpha R^*}) \subset B_{\alpha R^*}$. Indeed, if $\alpha \leq 1$ then it is obvious because from (81) that $T(B_{\alpha R^*}) \subset T(B_{R^*}) \subset B_{\alpha R^*}$. Otherwise if $\alpha > 1$ let us write $B_{\alpha R^*} = B_{\frac{R_0}{2}} \cup S_1 \cup S_2$ where $S_1 := B_{R^*} \setminus B_{\frac{R_0}{2}}$, $S_2 := B_{\alpha R^*} \setminus B_{R^*}$. We already know that $T(B_{\frac{R_0}{2}}) \subset B_{R_1} \subset B_{R^*} \subset B_{\alpha R^*}$. Now from (81) we find that $T(S_1) \subset B_{\alpha R^*}$, and from the definition of R_0 and again from (81) we find that $T(S_2) \subset B_{\frac{R_0}{2}} \subset B_{\alpha R^*}$.

Finally since $B_{\alpha R^*}$ is a closed and convex subset of the Banach space $\mathcal{X}(I)$, we can apply Schauder's fixed point theorem which yields the existence of a solution to (QL). \square

6.2 Existence of strong solutions for relatively continuous operators

We assume throughout this subsection that the map $\mathbb{A} : \mathcal{X}(I) \rightarrow RC(I)$ maps to the space of relatively continuous operators and that $\mathbb{A}(u)$ is globally bounded in $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$.

Let $\alpha \geq 1$, $\beta \geq 0$, $r > 1$ be fixed and assume that for each $u \in \mathcal{X}(I)$, $\mathbb{A}(u)$ satisfies $(\mathbf{A1})$ - $(\mathbf{A2})$. Denote by $\mathbb{A}_0 : u \mapsto \mathcal{A}_0(u)$ the operator given by the decomposition $(\mathbf{A1})$ (b) and the subsequent $u \mapsto K_0(u), M_0(u)$ given in (17).

Naturally this gives rise to the following maps:

- (i) $m_\delta : \mathcal{X}(I) \rightarrow (0, 1]$
- (ii) $m_\eta : \mathcal{X}(I) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$
- (iii) $\Gamma : \begin{cases} \mathcal{X}(I) & \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \\ u & \mapsto \|(K_{\mathbb{A}(u)} + 1)^\alpha (M_{\mathbb{A}(u)} + 1)^\alpha\|_{L^r(I)}^{r^*} \end{cases}$

(\mathbf{E}'_I) For any $R \geq 0$, define the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\log}(R) &:= \sup_{\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)}=R} \left\{ \left(\frac{\Gamma(u)}{m_\delta(u)} \right)^{r^*} \left(1 + m_\eta(u) m_\delta(u)^{s_2} \Gamma(u)^{s_1} + \log \left(\frac{\Gamma(u)}{m_\delta(u)} \right) \right) + m_\eta(u) \right\} \\ \kappa_{\log}(R) &:= \sup_{\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}(I)}=R} \left\{ \log \left(\|\mathbb{A}(u)\|_\infty + \|\mathbb{F}(u)\|_{L^p(I; X)} + 1 \right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and assume that there exists $h > 0$, such that for any $L > 0$, there exists $R_0 \geq 0$ such that for all $R \geq R_0$ we have

$$\sup_{R_1, R_2 \in [R-L, R+L]} \frac{\gamma_{\log}(R_1) + \kappa_{\log}(R_2)}{\log(R)} \leq 1 - h \quad (82)$$

where $s_1(\alpha, \beta, r) := r^* \left(\frac{\beta+1}{\alpha} - 1 \right)$ and $s_2(\alpha, \beta, r) := \frac{\beta+1}{\alpha+1} - \left(\frac{\alpha+\frac{1}{r}}{\alpha+1} \right) s_1(\alpha, \beta, r)$.

Theorem 6.2. *Assume that for each $u \in \mathcal{X}(I)$, $\mathbb{A}(u)$ satisfies **(A1)** and **(A2)**. Moreover assume that \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{F} satisfy **(E_I)** and **(E_{II})**. Then for any $x \in \text{Tr}^p$, there exists a unique solution u to (QL).*

Proof. The growth condition (82) straightforwardly implies the growth condition **(E_I)**. **(E_{II})** is fulfilled by assumption. We simply apply Theorem 6.1. \square

7 Conclusion and perspectives

This work gives new estimates of the maximal regularity constants of nonautonomous relatively continuous operators and describes the weak topologies of operators in $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$ for which the maximal regularity is persistent.

These inquiries are used to derive a new well-posedness criterion for a general class of Cauchy problems for nonlocal in time and quasilinear equations. This criterion allows to bypass the standard Lipschitz continuity of the nonlinearities and instead requires growth conditions on the pointwise constant of maximal regularity.

We hope that these inquiries will help the study of nonlinear parabolic equations arising in various models involving time-delays or memory effects with moderately low-regularity coefficients in time. A first inquiry pursued by the authors is to find concrete applications of the result.

Remaining inquiries would involve the existence and regularity of the semi-flow associated to (QL) and better asymptotic estimates of the maximal regularity constant to possibly improve the criterion (28).

A Generators of the product of commuting semi-groups

Lemma A.1. *Let A and B be two closed and densely defined operators of the Banach space Y . Assume the following:*

- (i) *The intersection of the domains $D(A) \cap D(B)$ is dense in Y .*
- (ii) *A and B are the negative generators of strongly continuous semi-groups $(T_\tau^A)_{\tau \geq 0}$ and $(T_\tau^B)_{\tau \geq 0}$.*
- (iii) *$(T_\tau^A)_{\tau \geq 0}$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{L}(Y)$.*
- (iv) *For any $\tau_1, \tau_2 \geq 0$, $T_{\tau_1}^A T_{\tau_2}^B = T_{\tau_2}^B T_{\tau_1}^A$.*

Then $U_\tau = T_\tau^A T_\tau^B$ is a strongly continuous semi-group, the sum $A + B$ is densely defined and closable on Y , and the closure $\overline{A + B}$ is the negative generator of U .

Proof. Remark that $U_0 = I$ and that $U_{\tau_1} U_{\tau_2} = U_{\tau_1 + \tau_2}$ for all $\tau_1, \tau_2 \geq 0$ since T^A and T^B commute. Now let $\tau \geq 0$ and see that for any $x_0 \in Y$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_\tau x_0 - x_0\|_Y &= \|T_\tau^A T_\tau^B x_0 - x_0\|_Y \\ &\leq \|T_\tau^A T_\tau^B x_0 - T_\tau^A x_0\|_Y + \|T_\tau^A x_0 - x_0\|_Y \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbb{R}_+} \|T_\tau^A(\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{L}(Y)} \|T_\tau^B x_0 - x_0\|_Y + \|T_\tau^A x_0 - x_0\|_Y \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$ yields that $(U_\tau)_{\tau \geq 0}$ is strongly continuous.

Now denote by C the infinitesimal negative generator of $(U_\tau)_{\tau \geq 0}$ which is a closed and densely defined operator. Take $x \in D(A) \cap D(B)$, $\tau > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{U_\tau x - x}{\tau} &= \frac{T_\tau^A T_\tau^B x - x}{\tau} \\ &= T_\tau^A \left[\frac{T_\tau^B x - x}{\tau} \right] + \frac{T_\tau^A x - x}{\tau} \end{aligned}$$

Now observe that by uniform boundedness of $(T_\tau^A)_{\tau \geq 0}$, $T_\tau^A \frac{T_\tau^B x - x}{\tau} \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow 0} -Bx$ strongly in Y . Hence taking the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$, we find

$$Cx = (A + B)x$$

which concludes our proof. □

B Proof of Proposition 2.3 and Proposition 2.4

We restate each proposition and prove them afterwards.

Proposition B.1. $RC(I)$ is a strict, closed, linear subspace of $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D; X))$.

Proof. $RC(I) \subset L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$: Let $A \in RC(I)$ and $(\delta_A, \eta_A) \in r_A^*$, then let $(t_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ be a regular subdivision of \bar{I} of step $\delta_A(1)$, i.e. $t_i = a + i\delta_A(1)$. Then for $t \in \bar{I}$, $x \in D$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(t)x\|_X &\leq \|A(t)x - A(t_i)x\|_X + \|A(t_i)x\|_X \\ &\leq \|x\|_D + \eta_A(1)\|x\|_X + \|A(t_i)\|_{\mathcal{L}(D;X)}\|x\|_D \\ &\leq \left(1 + \eta_A(1) + \|A(t_i)\|_{\mathcal{L}(D;X)}\right)\|x\|_D \end{aligned}$$

Now taking the supremum over $t \in [a, b]$, yields $A \in L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D; X))$.

$RC(I)$ is a linear subspace: If $A, B \in RC(I)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we can check that $\delta_{\lambda A+B}(\epsilon) := \min\left(\delta_A\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2|\lambda|+1}\right), \delta_B\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)\right)$ and $\eta_{\lambda A+B}(\epsilon) := \eta_A\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2|\lambda|+1}\right) + \eta_B\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)$ is a range of relative continuity for $\lambda A + B$.

$RC(I)$ is closed in $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$: Let $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a uniformly converging sequence of operators of RCI , i.e.

$$\sup_{t \in [a, b]} \|A(t) - A_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(D;X)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0$$

Then let $\epsilon > 0$, and let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\sup_{t \in [a, b]} \|A(t) - A_{n_0}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(D;X)} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}$. Now for each $x \in D$, and $|t - s| \leq \delta_{A_{n_0}}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{3}\right)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(t)x - A(s)x\|_X &\leq \|A(t)x - A_{n_0}(t)x\|_X + \|A_{n_0}(t)x - A_{n_0}(s)x\|_X + \|A_{n_0}(s)x - A(s)x\|_X \\ &\leq \frac{2\epsilon}{3}\|x\|_D + \frac{\epsilon}{3}\|x\|_D + \eta_{A_{n_0}}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{3}\right)\|x\|_X \\ &\leq \epsilon\|x\|_D + \eta_{A_{n_0}}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{3}\right)\|x\|_X \end{aligned}$$

Meaning $A \in RC(I)$. □

We say that $A_n \rightarrow A$ converges pointwise on $[a, b]$ and D if $A_n(t)x \rightarrow A(t)x$ for any $t \in [a, b]$ and $x \in D$. It is a weaker convergence than the pointwise convergence on $[a, b]$ in $\mathcal{L}(D, X)$ which itself is weaker than the convergence in $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$.

Proposition B.2. Let $\mathcal{F} \subset RC(I)$ be a family of relatively continuous operators on I . The following properties hold:

- (i) If \mathcal{F} is relatively compact in $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$ then \mathcal{F} is relatively equicontinuous.
- (ii) If \mathcal{F} is relatively equicontinuous and for each $t \in I$, $\{A(t) \mid A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{L}(D, X)$ then \mathcal{F} is bounded in $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$.
- (iii) If \mathcal{F} is relatively equicontinuous then $\overline{\mathcal{F}} \subset RC(I)$ and is also relatively equicontinuous, where $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ is the sequential closure of \mathcal{F} for the (t, x) -pointwise convergence.

Proof. (i) Assume by contradiction that there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $\delta > 0, \eta \geq 0$, there exist $A_{\delta, \eta} \in \mathcal{F}$, $t, s \in \bar{I}$, $|t - s| \leq \delta$ and $x \in D$ such that,

$$\|A_{\delta, \eta}(t)x - A_{\delta, \eta}(s)x\|_X > \epsilon_0 \|x\|_D + \eta \|x\|_X \quad (83)$$

Let $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\eta_n \rightarrow +\infty$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. From the contradiction hypothesis, we can construct the sequences $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \bar{I}$ with $|t_n - s_n| \leq \delta_n$ and $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset D$ such that, (83) holds for each n .

By relative compactness in $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$ of \mathcal{F} , we can extract a subsequence, still denoted $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $A_n \rightarrow A$ in $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$. Now by Proposition 2.3, we know that $A \in RC(I)$ and denote $(\delta_A, \eta_A) \in r_A^*$.

Because $\delta_n \rightarrow 0, \eta_n \rightarrow +\infty$ and $A_n \rightarrow A$ in $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$ there exist $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \geq N$,

$$\eta_n \geq \eta_A \left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{3} \right)$$

$$\delta_n \leq \delta_A \left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{3} \right)$$

$$\sup_{t \in \bar{I}} \|A_n(t) - A(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(D, X)} \leq \frac{\epsilon_0}{6}$$

Let us then compute for $n \geq N$:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_0 \|x_n\|_D + \eta_n \|x_n\|_X &< \|A_n(t_n)x_n - A_n(s_n)x_n\|_X \\ &\leq \|A_n(t_n)x_n - A(t_n)x_n\|_X + \|A(t_n)x_n - A(s_n)x_n\|_X + \|A(s_n)x_n - A_n(t_n)x_n\|_X \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{t \in [a, b]} \|A_n(t) - A(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(D; X)} \|x_n\|_D + \frac{\epsilon_0}{3} \|x_n\|_D + \eta_A \left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{3} \right) \|x_n\|_X \\ &\leq \frac{2\epsilon_0}{3} \|x_n\|_D + \eta_A \left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{3} \right) \|x_n\|_X \end{aligned}$$

which yields the contradiction $\frac{\epsilon_0}{3} \|x_n\|_D < 0$.

(ii) Let $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and take $(\delta, \eta) \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{F}} r_A^*$, then let $(t_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ be a regular subdivision of \bar{I} of step $\delta(1)$, i.e. $t_i = a + i\delta(1)$. Then for any $t \in \bar{I}$, there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that $|t - t_i| \leq \delta(1)$ hence for any $x \in D$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(t)x\|_X &\leq \|A(t)x - A(t_i)x\|_X + \|A(t_i)x\|_X \\ &\leq \|x\|_D + \eta(1) \|x\|_X + \|A(t_i)\|_{\mathcal{L}(D; X)} \|x\|_D \\ &\leq \left(1 + \eta(1) + \|A(t_i)\|_{\mathcal{L}(D; X)} \right) \|x\|_D \end{aligned}$$

Now taking the supremum over $t \in \bar{I}$, and then over $A \in \mathcal{F}$ yields

$$\sup_{A \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{t \in \bar{I}} \|A(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(D;X)} \leq 1 + \eta(1) + \sup_{A \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{1 \leq i \leq N} \|A(t_i)\|_{\mathcal{L}(D;X)} < +\infty.$$

(iii) Denote by $r = (\delta(\cdot), \eta(\cdot)) \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{F}} r_A^*$ a common range of relative continuity of the sequence \mathcal{F} . Let $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{F}$ be a sequence that converges pointwise on \bar{I} and D to some operator A . Let us show that $A \in RC(I)$.

Let $x \in D$, $x \neq 0$ and $t, s \in \bar{I}$ such that $|t - s| \leq \delta(\frac{\epsilon}{3})$. Let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be large enough to ensure $\|A_{n_0}(t)x - A(t)x\|_X \vee \|A_{n_0}(s)x - A(s)x\|_X \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}\|x\|_D$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(t)x - A(s)x\|_X &\leq \|A(t)x - A_{n_0}(t)x\|_X + \|A_{n_0}(t)x - A_{n_0}(s)x\|_X + \|A_{n_0}(s)x - A(s)x\|_X \\ &\leq \epsilon\|x\|_D + \eta\left(\frac{\epsilon}{3}\right)\|x\|_X \end{aligned}$$

Now the previous inequality obviously also holds for $x = 0$, which finally yields $A \in RC(I)$ and $\tilde{r} := (\delta(\frac{\cdot}{3}), \eta(\frac{\cdot}{3})) \in r_A^*$. Now observe that \tilde{r} is independent of A and by the same argument is also a range of relative continuity for any pointwise limit of elements of \mathcal{F} .

Hence $\bigcap_{A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}^{pw}} r_A \supset \{\tilde{r}\} \neq \emptyset$ which conclude our proof.

□

C Proof of the corollaries

C.1 Persistence and continuity corollaries

Corollary C.1. *Assume that $A_{(\cdot)}$ satisfies $(\mathbf{A}_\Lambda)(a)$ in $\mathcal{O} \subset \Lambda$ and that there exists $\bar{\lambda} \in \Lambda$ such that (CV_I) holds.*

Then $A_{\bar{\lambda}} \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ and (i) of Proposition 2.8 holds.

Proof. For simplicity we denote $A := A_{\bar{\lambda}}$. From the convergence of A , remark that $L_{A_\lambda} \xrightarrow[\lambda \rightarrow \bar{\lambda}]{} L_A$ strongly in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{MR}_0^p(I); L^p(I; X))$.

Consider any sequence $\lambda_n \rightarrow \bar{\lambda}$ in \mathcal{O} and denote $A_n := A_{\lambda_n}$. Since $\mathcal{L}(L^p(I; X), \mathcal{MR}_0^p(I))$ is complete with respect to the strong topology, we will show that $\{L_{A_n}^{-1}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence which converges strongly to L_A^{-1} . This will suffice to show the theorem. From the hypothesis and (i) of Proposition 2.4, we know that $C := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [A_n]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} < +\infty$ as a conclusion of Corollary 2.9.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ be large enough so that $\|L_{A_m} - L_{A_n}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{MR}_0^p(I); L^p(I; X))} \leq \epsilon$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_{A_n}^{-1} - L_{A_m}^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^p(I; X), \mathcal{MR}_0^p(I))} &= \|L_{A_n}^{-1}(L_{A_m} - L_{A_n})L_{A_m}^{-1}\| \\ &\leq C^2 \|L_{A_m} - L_{A_n}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{MR}_0^p(I); L^p(I; X))} \\ &\leq C^2 \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Denote by $T \in \mathcal{L}(L^p(I; X); \mathcal{MR}_0^p(I))$ the limit of the Cauchy sequence and observe that $L_A T = L_A(T - L_{A_n}^{-1}) + (L_A - L_{A_n})L_{A_n}^{-1} + I$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The first two terms converge to 0 yield that T is a right inverse of L_A . A similar computation yields that T is a left inverse of L_A . \square

Corollary C.2. *Assume that $A_{(\cdot)}$ satisfies (\mathbf{A}_Λ) in $\mathcal{O} \subset \Lambda$ and that there exists $\bar{\lambda} \in \Lambda$ such that (CV_{II}) holds.*

Then $A_{\bar{\lambda}} \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ and (ii) of Proposition 2.8 holds.

Proof. Again for simplicity denote $A = A_{\bar{\lambda}}$. By (iii) of Proposition 2.4 we know that $A \in RC(I)$.

Consider any sequence $\lambda_n \rightarrow \bar{\lambda}$ in \mathcal{O} . Now since $A_n(t) \in mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $A_n(t) \rightarrow A(t)$ strongly in $\mathcal{L}(D, X)$, we easily infer that $A(t) \in mr_p(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Hence A satisfies $(\mathbf{A1})$ and as a conclusion of Theorem 2.6, we find that $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ and $[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [A_n]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} =: C < +\infty$.

Now remark that $(L_{A_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ does not necessarily converge strongly to L_A in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{MR}_0^p(I); L^p(I; X))$, however for any $v \in \mathcal{MR}^p(I)$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_{A_n} v - L_A v\|_{L^p(I; X)}^p &= \int_a^b \|A_n(s)v(s) - A(s)v(s)\|_X^p ds \\ &\leq \int_a^b \|A_n(s) - A(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(D, X)}^p \|v(s)\|_D^p ds \\ &\xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} 0 \end{aligned}$$

The convergence being given by dominated convergence, since $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(I; \mathcal{L}(D, X))$ by relative equicontinuity of the family. Hence L_{A_n} converges pointwise to L_A , by virtue of the Banach-Steinhaus theorem this implies that L_{A_n} converges to L_A uniformly on any compact subset of $\text{MR}^p(I)$.

Now let $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^p(I; X)$ be a sequence converging to f strongly. Remark that $K = \{L_A^{-1}f\} \cup \{L_A^{-1}f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a compact subset of $\text{MR}^p(I)$ by maximal regularity of A .

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be large enough such that $\sup_{v \in K} \|L_A v - L_{A_n} v\|_{L^p(I; X)} \leq \epsilon$ and $\|L_A^{-1}f_n - L_A^{-1}f\| \leq \epsilon$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v_n - v\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} &= \|L_{A_n}^{-1}f_n - L_A^{-1}f\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} \\
&\leq \|L_{A_n}^{-1}f_n - L_A^{-1}f_n\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} + \|L_A^{-1}f_n - L_A^{-1}f\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} \\
&\leq \|L_{A_n}^{-1}(L_A - L_{A_n})L_A^{-1}f_n\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} + \epsilon \\
&\leq C \|(L_A - L_{A_n})L_A^{-1}f_n\|_{L^p(I; X)} + \epsilon \\
&\leq C \sup_{v \in K} \|L_A v - L_{A_n} v\|_{L^p(I; X)} + \epsilon \\
&\leq (C + 1)\epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. □

D Proof of Proposition 2.2

Proposition D.1. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open interval bounded from below and let $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$. Then for any $J \subset I$, $A|_J \in \mathcal{MR}_p(J)$. Moreover, if either $|J| = |I| = \infty$ or $|J| \leq |I| < +\infty$ then*

$$[A|_J]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(J)} \leq [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \quad (84)$$

Otherwise if $|J| < |I| = +\infty$, then

$$[A|_J]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(J)} \leq (|J| \vee 1)[A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \quad (85)$$

Proof. Note first that for any $J \subset I$, condition (nonaut- i) is obviously satisfied.

Let us denote $I = (a, b)$ and for $t \in \bar{I}$, define $I_t := (t, b) \subset I$. Now consider the following set $\mathcal{M} := \{t \in \bar{I} \mid A|_{I_t} \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I_t)\} \neq \emptyset \subset \bar{I}$, where by convention we set $A|_\emptyset \in \mathcal{MR}_p(\emptyset)$.

If we manage to show that $\mathcal{M} = \bar{I}$ then the theorem is proved. Indeed, let $J \subset I$, and denote $J = (a_J, b_J)$.

Uniqueness: Assume that v is a solution of $(\text{CP})_{0,0}^J$. Denote $x = v(b_J)$ and recall that since $b_J \in \mathcal{M}$, $A|_{I_{b_J}} \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I_{b_J})$, hence denote w_x the unique solution to $(\text{CP})_{x,0}^{I_{b_J}}$. We can then define the extension $\tilde{v} := \begin{cases} v & \text{in } I \\ w_x & \text{in } I_{b_J} \end{cases} \in \text{MR}^p(I_{a_J})$ which solves $(\text{CP})_{0,0}^{I_{a_J}}$. Since $a_J \in \mathcal{M}$, we find $\tilde{v} \equiv 0$ hence $v \equiv 0$.

Existence: For any $f \in L^p(J; X)$, there exists a solution v of $(\text{CP})_{0,\tilde{f}}^{I_{a_J}}$ where $\tilde{f} = f$ in J , $\tilde{f} = 0$ in I_{b_J} . Hence $v|_J$ is a solution of $(\text{CP})_{0,f}^J$.

Estimate: Define the extension \hat{v} of v (as above) by 0 on I . $\hat{v} \in \text{MR}^p(I)$ because $v(a_j) = 0$. This extension solves $(\text{CP})_{0,\hat{f}}^I$ where \hat{f} is extended by 0 on I . From $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$, if $|I| < +\infty$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{\text{MR}^p(J)} &\leq \|\hat{v}\|_{\text{MR}^p(I)} \\ &\leq [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \left\| \hat{f} \right\|_{L^p(I; X)} \\ &= [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I)} \|f\|_{L^p(J; X)} \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

which yields (84) directly. The same estimate holds if $|J| = |I| = +\infty$. However if $|J| < |I| = +\infty$, the extra factor $|J| \vee 1$ appears in (86) yields (85).

Let us now proceed to show that $\mathcal{M} := \bar{I}$.

★ We note first that for any $t \in \bar{I}$, to show that $t \in \mathcal{M}$, it is sufficient to prove the existence of the solution to $(\text{CP})_{0,f}^{I_t}$ for any $f \in L^p(I_t; X)$.

Indeed, for the uniqueness, if $v \in \text{MR}_0^p(I_t)$ solves $(\text{CP})_{0,0}^{I_t}$, then note that $\tilde{v} := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{in } (a, t] \\ v & \text{in } I_t \end{cases} \in \text{MR}_0^p(I)$ solves $(\text{CP})_{0,0}^I$. Since $A \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I)$ this means that $\tilde{v} \equiv 0$ in I which implies $v \equiv 0$ in I_t . And the estimate can be performed in the same manner as in (86).

★ We show that \mathcal{M} is closed *from the left* in \bar{I} (i.e. stable under limits of nondecreasing sequences in $\mathcal{M} \cap \bar{I}$) and open *from the left* in \bar{I} (i.e. for any $t \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $[t, t + \delta) \cap \bar{I} \subset \mathcal{M}$). This implies our claim by a contradiction argument. Indeed assume that $\bar{I} \setminus \mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset$, denote $t^* := \inf \bar{I} \setminus \mathcal{M} < b$. Since $a \in \mathcal{M}$ and is open from the left, we also have $t^* > a$. Now since $\forall a \leq s < t^*, s \in \mathcal{M}$, closedness from the left implies $t^* \in \mathcal{M}$ and openness from the left then implies that $[t^*, t^* + \delta) \subset \mathcal{M}$ for some $\delta > 0$ small enough. This contradicts the definition of t^* .

\mathcal{M} is closed from the left in \bar{I} : Let $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{M}$ be an nondecreasing sequence of points of \mathcal{M} converging to $t \in \bar{I}$. Let us show that there exists a solution to $(\text{CP})_{0,f}^{I_t}$ for any $f \in L^p(I_t; X)$.

Let $f \in L^p(I_t; X)$, denote v the solution of $(\text{CP})_{0,\tilde{f}}^{I_t}$ where $\tilde{f} = f$ on I_t and is extended by 0 outside I_t . Denote $f_n = \tilde{f}|_{I_{t_n}}$ the restriction of \tilde{f} on I_{t_n} . For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the solution v_n to $(\text{CP})_{0,f_n}^{I_{t_n}}$ coincides with v on I_{t_n} . In particular $v(t_n) = v_n(t_n) = 0$ and by continuity of $v \in C(\bar{I}; \text{Tr}^p)$, we find $v(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} v(t_n) = 0$. Hence $v|_{I_t}$ is a solution to $(\text{CP})_{0,f}^{I_t}$.

\mathcal{M} is open from the left in \bar{I} : Let $t \in \mathcal{M}$, let us show there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $[t, t + \delta) \cap \bar{I} \subset \mathcal{M}$. As shown, we only need to prove the existence of solutions to $(\text{CP})_{0,f}^{I_s}$, for all $s \in [t, t + \delta) \cap \bar{I}$, $f \in L^p(I_s; X)$.

We assume without loss of generality that $t < b$. By assumption $A|_{I_t} \in \mathcal{MR}_p(I_t)$ hence for any $g \in L^p(I_t; X)$, there exists a unique solution $v_g \in \text{MR}^p(I)$ to $(\text{CP})_{0,g}^{I_t}$. Since the embedding $D \hookrightarrow X$ is compact, from [2, Theorem 1.1] we infer that $\text{MR}^p(I_t) \hookrightarrow C(\bar{I}_t; \text{Tr}^p)$ is also compact. Thus from the inequality,

$$\|v_g\|_{\text{MR}^p(I_t)} \leq [A]_{\mathcal{MR}_p(I_t)} \|g\|_{L^p(I_t; X)}$$

we infer that the set $\{v_g \mid g \in L^p(I_t; X), \|g\| \leq 1\}$ is relatively compact in $C(\bar{I}_t; \text{Tr}^p)$. The Arzelà-Ascoli theorem then states that there exists a uniform modulus of continuity $\omega : \bar{I}_t \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$, ω with $\omega(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, such that for any $g \in B$, for any $s_1, s_2 \in \bar{I}_t$,

$$\|v_g(s_1) - v_g(s_2)\|_{\text{Tr}^p, I_t} \leq \omega(|s_1 - s_2|)$$

where $B := \left\{ g \in L^p(I_t; X) \mid \|g\|_{L^p(I_t; X)} \leq 1 \right\}$ is the unit ball of $L^p(I_t; X)$.

There exists a continuous linear mapping $g \in L^p(I_t; X) \mapsto w_g \in \text{MR}^p(I_t)$, such that $x_s := w_g(s) = v_g(s)$ and satisfies $\|w_g\|_{\text{MR}^p(I_t)} \leq C_1 \|x_s\|_{\text{Tr}^p, I_t}$ for some fixed $C_1 > 0$. For instance w_g can be the suitably shifted solution to $(\text{CP})_{x_s, 0}^{I_t}$.

Consider the following linear mapping

$$\alpha_s : \begin{cases} L^p(I_s; X) & \longrightarrow & L^p(I_s; X) \\ g & \longmapsto & g - L_{A_{I_s}} w_{\tilde{g}} \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{g} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } t \in [a, s) \\ g(t), & \text{if } t \in \bar{I}_s \end{cases}$. Since $v_g(s) = w_g(s) = x_s$, remark that $(v_g - w_g)|_{I_s}$ is a solution to $(\text{CP})_{0, \alpha_s(g)}^{I_s}$.

Hence the surjectivity of $\alpha_s \in \mathcal{L}(L^p(I_s; X))$ will allow to conclude the existence. Note that $\alpha_s = \text{Id} + \beta_s$, with $\beta_s \in \mathcal{L}(L^p(I_s; X))$. We compute for any $g \in L^p(I_s; X)$, $\|g\|_{L^p(I_s; X)} \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta_s(g)\|_{L^p(I_s; X)} &= \|L_A w_{\tilde{g}}\|_{L^p(I_s; X)} \leq \left(\|A\|_\infty + \frac{1}{|I_t|} \right) \|w_{\tilde{g}}\|_{\text{MR}^p(I_t)} \\ &\leq C_1 \left(\|A\|_\infty + \frac{1}{|I_t|} \right) \|x_s\|_{\text{Tr}^p, I_t} \\ &\leq C_1 \left(\|A\|_\infty + \frac{1}{|I_t|} \right) \omega(|t - s|) \end{aligned}$$

Now there exists $0 < \delta < \frac{|I_t|}{2}$ such that for any $s \in [t, t + \delta)$, $\omega(|t - s|) \leq \frac{1}{2C_1(\|A\|_\infty + \frac{1}{|I_t|})}$. For such $s \in [t, t + \delta)$, $\|\beta_s\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, yielding that α_s is surjective.

□

References

- [1] P. Acquistapace and B. Terreni. A unified approach to abstract linear nonautonomous parabolic equations. *Rendiconti del seminario matematico della Università di Padova*, 78:47–107, 1987.
- [2] H. Amann. Compact embeddings of vector valued sobolev and besov spaces. *Glasnik matematički*, 35(1):161–177, 2000.
- [3] H. Amann. Maximal regularity for nonautonomous evolution equations. *Advanced Nonlinear Studies*, 4(4):417–430, 2004.
- [4] H. Amann. Quasilinear parabolic problems via maximal regularity. *Advances in Differential Equations*, 10(10):1081–1110, 2005.
- [5] H. Amann. Quasilinear parabolic functional evolution equations. In *Recent advances on elliptic and parabolic issues*, pages 19–44. World Scientific, 2006.
- [6] H. Amann. A time-delayed perona-malik type problems. *Proceedings of Equadiff 11*, pages 15–38, 2007.
- [7] H. Amann et al. *Linear and quasilinear parabolic problems*, volume 1. Springer, 1995.
- [8] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco, and D. Pallara. *Functions of Bounded Variation and Free Discontinuity Problems*. Oxford Science Publications. Clarendon Press, 2000.
- [9] W. Arendt and R. Chill. Global existence for quasilinear diffusion equations in isotropic nondivergence form. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa-Classe di Scienze*, 9(3):523–539, 2010.
- [10] W. Arendt, R. Chill, S. Fornaro, and C. Poupaud. Lp-maximal regularity for non-autonomous evolution equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 237(1):1–26, 2007.
- [11] P. Clément and J. Prüss. Global existence for a semilinear parabolic volterra equation. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 209:17–26, 1992.
- [12] R. Danchin, M. Hieber, P. B. Mucha, and P. Tolksdorf. Free Boundary Problems via Da Prato–Grisvard Theory. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, to appear.
- [13] L. De Simon. Un’applicazione della teoria degli integrali singolari allo studio delle equazioni differenziali lineari astratte del primo ordine. *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova*, 34:205–223, 1964.
- [14] Q. Du, J. Yang, and Z. Zhou. Analysis of a nonlocal-in-time parabolic equation. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 22(2):339–368, 2017.
- [15] C. Gallarati and M. Veraar. Maximal regularity for non-autonomous equations with measurable dependence on time. *Potential Analysis*, 46:527–567, 2017.
- [16] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, volume 224(2). Springer, 1977.

- [17] P. Guidotti. A new nonlocal nonlinear diffusion of image processing. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 246(12):4731–4742, 2009.
- [18] P. Guidotti. Anisotropic diffusions of image processing from perona–malik on. In *Variational Methods for Evolving Objects*, volume 67, pages 131–157. Mathematical Society of Japan, 2015.
- [19] T. Kato. *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, volume 132. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [20] N. Kosovalić, F. Magpantay, Y. Chen, and J. Wu. Abstract algebraic-delay differential systems and age structured population dynamics. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 255(3):593–609, 2013.
- [21] P. C. Kunstmann and L. Weis. *Maximal L_p -regularity for Parabolic Equations, Fourier Multiplier Theorems and H^∞ -functional Calculus*, pages 65–311. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004.
- [22] H. Laasri and O. El-Mennaoui. Stability for non-autonomous linear evolution equations with L^p -maximal regularity. *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 63(4):887–908, 2013.
- [23] J. Lofstrom and J. Bergh. Interpolation spaces. *Springer-Verlag, Neue*, 1976.
- [24] S. Monniaux. Maximal regularity and applications to pdes. *Analytical and numerical aspects of partial differential equations*, page 247, 2009.
- [25] B. Pettis. On integration in vector spaces. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 44(2):277–304, 1938.
- [26] J. Prüss and R. Schnaubelt. Solvability and maximal regularity of parabolic evolution equations with coefficients continuous in time. *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications*, 256(2):405–430, 2001.
- [27] S. Pyatkov. On the maximal regularity property for evolution equations. *Azerbaijan Journal of Mathematics*, 9(1), 2019.
- [28] A. Yagi. *Abstract parabolic evolution equations and their applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.