



# Spectral analysis of semigroups and growth-fragmentation equations

S. Mischler<sup>a,\*</sup>, J. Scher<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Université Paris-Dauphine & IUF, CEREMADE, UMR CNRS 7534, Place du Maréchal de Lattre de Tassigny, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France*

<sup>b</sup> *Université Paris-Dauphine, CEREMADE, UMR CNRS 7534, Place du Maréchal de Lattre de Tassigny, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France*

Received 29 October 2013; received in revised form 23 January 2015; accepted 28 January 2015

Available online 13 February 2015

## Abstract

The aim of this paper is twofold:

(1) On the one hand, the paper revisits the spectral analysis of semigroups in a general Banach space setting. It presents some new and more general versions, and provides comprehensible proofs, of classical results such as the spectral mapping theorem, some (quantified) Weyl's Theorems and the Krein–Rutman Theorem. Motivated by evolution PDE applications, the results apply to a wide and natural class of generators which split as a dissipative part plus a more regular part, without assuming any symmetric structure on the operators nor Hilbert structure on the space, and give some growth estimates and spectral gap estimates for the associated semigroup. The approach relies on some factorization and summation arguments reminiscent of the Dyson–Phillips series in the spirit of those used in [96,87,51,86].

(2) On the other hand, we present the semigroup spectral analysis for three important classes of “growth-fragmentation” equations, namely the cell division equation, the self-similar fragmentation equation and the McKendrick–Von Foerster age structured population equation. By showing that these models lie in the class of equations for which our general semigroup analysis theory applies, we prove the exponential rate of convergence of the solutions to the associated first eigenfunction or self-similar profile for a very large and natural class of fragmentation rates. Our results generalize similar estimates obtained in [103,73] for the cell division model with (almost) constant total fragmentation rate and in [19,18] for the self-similar fragmentation equation and the cell division equation restricted to smooth and positive fragmentation rate and total fragmentation rate which does not increase more rapidly than quadratically. It also improves the convergence results without rate obtained in [84,36] which have been established under similar assumptions to those made in the present work.

© 2015 L'Association Publications de l'Institut Henri Poincaré. Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

*MSC:* primary 47D06, 35P15, 35B40, 92D25; secondary 34G10, 34K30, 35P05, 45C05, 47A10, 45C05, 45K05, 35A10, 92C37, 82D60

*Keywords:* Spectral mapping theorem; Weyl's Theorem; Krein–Rutman theorem; Growth-fragmentation equations; Self-similarity; Exponential rate of convergence

\* Corresponding author.

*E-mail address:* [mischler@ceremade.dauphine.fr](mailto:mischler@ceremade.dauphine.fr) (S. Mischler).

## 1. Introduction

This paper deals with the study of decay properties for  $C_0$ -semigroup of bounded and linear operators and their link with spectral properties of their generator in a Banach framework as well as some applications to the long-time asymptotic of growth-fragmentation equations.

### 1.1. Spectral analysis of semigroups

The study of spectral property of (unbounded) operators and of  $C_0$ -semigroups of operators has a long history which goes back (at least) to the formalization of functional analysis by D. Hilbert [60,61] at the beginning of the 20th century for the first issue and surely before the modern theoretical formalization of  $C_0$ -semigroups of operators in general Banach spaces impulsed by E. Hille and K. Yosida [62,123,63] in the 1940's for the second issue. For a given operator  $\Lambda$  on a Banach space  $X$  which generates a  $C_0$ -semigroup  $S_\Lambda(t) = e^{t\Lambda}$  of bounded operators, the two following issues are of major importance:

- describe its spectrum  $\Sigma(\Lambda)$ , the set of its eigenvalues and the associated eigenspaces;
- prove the spectral mapping theorem

$$\Sigma(e^{t\Lambda}) \setminus \{0\} = e^{t\Sigma(\Lambda)}, \quad (1.1)$$

and deduce the asymptotical behavior of trajectories associated to the semigroup.

Although it is well-known that the first issue can be a complicated task and the second issue is false in general (see [64] or [35, Section IV.3.a] for some counterexamples), there exist some particular classes of operators (among which is the class of self-adjoint operators with compact resolvent in a Hilbert space) for which these problems can be completely solved. In the present paper, motivated by evolution partial differential equation applications and inspired by the recent paper [51] (see also [96,87,86]), we identify a class of operators which split as

$$\Lambda = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $\mathcal{A}$  is “much more regular than  $\mathcal{B}$ ” and  $\mathcal{B}$  has some dissipative property (and then a good localization of its spectrum) for which a positive answer can be given. The dissipative property assumption we make can be formulated in terms of the time indexed family of iterated time convolution operators  $(\mathcal{ASB})^{(**k)}(t)$  in the following way

**(H1)** for some  $a^* \in \mathbb{R}$  and for any  $a > a^*$ ,  $\ell \geq 0$ , there exists a constant  $C_{a,\ell} \in (0, \infty)$  such that the following growth estimate holds

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \|\mathcal{S}_B * (\mathcal{ASB})^{(**\ell)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \leq C_{a,\ell} e^{at}. \quad (1.3)$$

On the other hand, we make the key assumption that some iterated enough time convolution enjoys the growth and regularizing estimate:

**(H2–3)** there exists an integer  $n \geq 1$  such that for any  $a > a^*$ , there holds

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \|(\mathcal{ASB})^{(**n)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X,Y)} \leq C_{a,n,Y} e^{at}, \quad (1.4)$$

or

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \|\mathcal{S}_B * (\mathcal{ASB})^{(**n)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X,Y)} \leq C_{a,n,Y} e^{at}, \quad (1.5)$$

for some suitable subspace  $Y \subset X$  and a constant  $C_{a,n,Y} \in (0, \infty)$ .

In assumption **(H2–3)** we will typically assume that  $Y \subset D(\Lambda^\zeta)$ ,  $\zeta > 0$ , and/or  $Y \subset X$  with compact embedding. Roughly speaking, for such a class of operators, we will obtain the following set of results:

- *Spectral mapping theorem.* We prove a partial, but principal, spectral mapping theorem which asserts that

$$\Sigma(e^{t\Lambda}) \cap \Delta_{e^{at}} = e^{t\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \forall a > a^*, \quad (1.6)$$

where we define the half-plane  $\Delta_a := \{ \xi \in \mathbb{C}; \Re \xi > a \}$  for any  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . Although (1.6) is less accurate than (1.1), it is strong enough to describe the semigroup evolution at first order in many situations. In particular, it implies that the spectral bound  $s(\Lambda)$  and the growth bound  $\omega(\Lambda)$  coincide if they are at the right hand side of  $a^*$ , or in other words

$$\max(s(\Lambda), a^*) = \max(\omega(\Lambda), a^*), \tag{1.7}$$

and it gives even more accurate asymptotic information on the semigroup whenever  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_{a^*} \neq \emptyset$ .

- *Weyl’s Theorem.* We prove some (quantified) version of the Weyl’s Theorem which asserts that the part of the spectrum  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_{a^*}$  consists only of *discrete eigenvalues* and we get some information on the localization and number of eigenvalues as well as some estimates on the total dimension of the associated sum of eigenspaces.

- *Krein–Rutman Theorem.* We prove some (possibly quantified) version of the Krein–Rutman Theorem under some additional (strict) positivity hypotheses on the generator  $\Lambda$  and the semigroup  $S_\Lambda$ .

Let us describe our approach in order to get the above mentioned “*spectral mapping theorem*”, this one being the key result in order to get our versions of Weyl’s Theorem and Krein–Rutman Theorem. Following [96,87,51] (and many authors before!), the spectral analysis of the operator  $\Lambda$  with splitting structure (1.2) is performed by writing the resolvent factorization identity (with our definition of the resolvent in (2.1))

$$\mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) = \mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z) - \mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z)\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) \tag{1.8}$$

as well as

$$\mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) = \mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z) - \mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z)\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z), \tag{1.9}$$

or an iterative version of (1.9), and by exploiting the information that one can deduce from (1.3), (1.4) and (1.5) at the level of the resolvent operators.

At the level of the semigroup, (1.8) yields the Duhamel formula

$$S_\Lambda = S_\mathcal{B} + S_\mathcal{B} * (\mathcal{A}S_\Lambda),$$

in its classic form, and (1.9) yields the Duhamel formula

$$S_\Lambda = S_\mathcal{B} + S_\Lambda * (\mathcal{A}S_\mathcal{B}), \tag{1.10}$$

in a maybe less standard form (but also reminiscent of perturbation arguments in semigroup theory).

On the other hand, iterating infinitely one of the above identities, it is well-known since the seminal articles by Dyson and Phillips [33,105], that  $S_\Lambda$  can be expanded as the Dyson–Phillips series

$$S_\Lambda = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} S_\mathcal{B} * (\mathcal{A}S_\mathcal{B})^{(*\ell)}, \tag{1.11}$$

as soon as the right hand side series converges, and that matter has not an easy answer in general. The summability issue of the Dyson–Phillips series can be circumvented by considering the finite iteration of the Duhamel formula (1.10)

$$S_\Lambda = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} S_\mathcal{B} * (\mathcal{A}S_\mathcal{B})^{(*\ell)} + S_\Lambda * (\mathcal{A}S_\mathcal{B})^{(*n)}. \tag{1.12}$$

It is a usual trick in order to establish eventual norm continuity (see [16] and the references therein) and it has been also recently used in [51,86] in order to enlarge or to shrink the functional space where the semigroup  $S_\Lambda$  satisfies some spectral gap estimate.

In the present work, and in the case  $\Delta_{a^*} \cap \Sigma(\Lambda) = \{\lambda\}$ , where  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  is a semisimple eigenvalue and  $a^* < a < \Re \lambda$  in order to make the discussion simpler, our spectral mapping theorem simply follows by using the classical representation of the semigroup by means of the inverse Laplace transform of the resolvent, as already established by Hille in [62]. More precisely, we may write

$$\begin{aligned}
S_\Lambda(t) &= \Pi_{\Lambda,\lambda} e^{\lambda t} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \Pi_{\Lambda,\lambda}^\perp S_{\mathcal{B}} * (\mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}})^{(*\ell)}(t) \\
&\quad + \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{a-i\infty}^{a+i\infty} e^{zt} (-1)^N \Pi_{\Lambda,\lambda}^\perp \mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z))^N dz,
\end{aligned} \tag{1.13}$$

for  $N$  large enough, in such a way that each term is appropriately bounded. Here  $\Pi_{\Lambda,\lambda}$  stands for the projector on the (finite dimensional) eigenspace associated to  $\lambda$  and  $\Pi_{\Lambda,\lambda}^\perp := I - \Pi_{\Lambda,\lambda}$ . From that formula, we will deduce the spectral mapping theorem (1.6), and more importantly for us, we will generalize the Liapunov result [75] about the asymptotic behavior of trajectories to that class of equations. It is worth emphasizing that our result characterizes the class of operators with “separable spectrum” for which the partial spectral mapping theorem holds (in the sense that we exhibit a condition which is not only sufficient but also necessary!) and then, in some sense, we prove for *general semigroup* the spectral mapping theorem known for *analytic semigroup* or more generally *eventually continuous semigroup* [104,64] and for *general Banach space* the partial spectral mapping theorem in a *Hilbert space* framework that one can deduce from the Gearhart–Prüss Theorem [44,107].

With such a representation formula at hand, the precise analysis of the semigroup  $S_\Lambda$  reduces to the analysis of the spectrum of  $\Lambda$  at the right hand side of  $a$ , for any  $a > a^*$ . In other words, the next fundamental issue consists in describing the part of the spectrum  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a$  in order to take advantage of the information given by (1.6). The simplest situation is when  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a$  only contains eigenvalues with finite (algebraical) multiplicity which is the situation one gets when one can apply Weyl’s Theorem [122] (see also [67, Theorem IV.5.35]). In our second main result in an abstract setting, we recover Voigt’s version [118] of Weyl’s Theorem (for which we give a comprehensive and elementary proof) and we deduce a characterization of semigroups in a general Banach space for which the partial spectral mapping theorem holds with finite and discrete eigenspectrum in  $\Delta_a$ . We must emphasize that our proof is very simple (it exclusively uses the Fredholm alternative [40] in its most basic form) and in particular does not use the essential spectrum set nor the Fredholm operators theory. Moreover we are able to formulate a quantified version of the Weyl’s Theorem in the sense that we exhibit a bound on the total dimension of the eigenspaces associated to the discrete eigenvalues which lie in  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a$ .

In order to describe in a more accurate way the spectrum  $\Sigma(\Lambda)$ , one of the most popular techniques is to use a self-adjointness argument for the operator  $\Lambda$  as an infinite dimensional generalization of the symmetric structure of matrix. That implies  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \subset \mathbb{R}$  and, together with Weyl’s Theorem, leads to a completely satisfactory description of the operator’s spectrum and the dynamics of the associated semigroup. One of the most famous applications of that strategy is due to Carleman [23] who carried on with the study of the linearized space homogeneous Boltzmann equation initiated by Hilbert and who obtained the spectral gap for the associated operator by combining Weyl’s Theorem together with the symmetry of the operator [60] and the regularity of the gain term [61] (see also the work by Grad [46,47] on the same issue, and the work by Ukai [113] on the more complicated space nonhomogeneous setting). It is worth emphasizing that this kind of hilbertian arguments have been recently extended to a class of operators, named as “*hypocoercive operators*”, which split as a self-adjoint partially coercive operator plus an anti-adjoint operator. For such an operator one can exhibit an equivalent Hilbert norm which is also a Liapunov function for the associated evolution dynamics and then provides a spectral gap between the first eigenvalue and the remainder of the spectrum. We refer the interested reader to [115] for a pedagogical introduction as well as to [59,56,97,57,58,116,31,30] for some of the original articles.

In the seminal work [96], C. Mouhot started an abstract theory of “*enlargement of the functional space of spectral analysis of operators*” which aims to carry on the spectral knowledge on an operator  $\Lambda$  and its associated semigroup  $S_\Lambda$  in some space  $E$  (typically a “small Hilbert space” in which some self-adjointness structure can be exploited) to another larger general Banach space  $\mathcal{E} \supset E$ . It is worth emphasizing that the “*enlargement of functional spaces*” trick for spectral analysis is reminiscent of several earlier papers on Boltzmann equations and on Fokker–Planck type equations where, however, the arguments are intermingled with some nonlinear stability arguments [4,5,121] and/or reduced to some particular evolution PDE in some situation where explicit eigenbasis can be exhibited [15,43]. While [96] was focused on the linearized space homogeneous Boltzmann operator and the results applied to sectorial operators, the “*extension theory*” (we mean here “*enlargement*” or “*shrinkage*” of the functional space) has been next developed in the series of papers [87,51,86] in order to deal with non-sectorial operators. A typical result of the theory

is that the set  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a$  does not change when the functional space on which  $\Lambda$  is considered changes. We do not consider the *extension* issue, which is however strongly connected to our approach, in the present work and we refer to the above mentioned articles for recent developments on that direction.

Let us also mention that one expects that the spectrum  $\Sigma(\Lambda)$  of  $\Lambda$  is close to the spectrum  $\Sigma(\mathcal{B})$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  if  $\mathcal{A}$  is “small”. Such a “*small perturbation method*” is an efficient tool in order to get some information on the spectrum of an operator  $\Lambda$  “in a perturbation regime”. It has been developed in [105,64,117,67], and more recently in [1,16]. Again, we do not consider that “*small perturbation*” issue here, but we refer to [87,88,6,112] where that kind of method is investigated in the same framework as the one of the abstract results of the present paper.

Last, we are concerned with a positive operator  $\Lambda$  defined on a Banach lattice  $X$  and the associated semigroup  $S_\Lambda$  as introduced by R.S. Phillips in [106]. For a finite dimensional Banach space and a strictly positive matrix the Perron–Frobenius Theorem [101,42] states that the eigenvalue with largest real part is unique, real and simple. Or in other words, there exists  $a^{**} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_{a^{**}} = \{ \lambda \}$  with  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  a simple eigenvalue. In an infinite dimensional Banach space the Krein–Rutman Theorem [71] establishes the same result for a class of Banach lattices and under convenient strict positivity and compactness assumptions on  $\Lambda$ . The Krein–Rutman Theorem is then extended to broader classes of Banach lattices and broader classes of operator in many subsequent articles, see e.g. [49,50,3]. We present a very natural and general version of the abstract Krein–Rutman Theorem on a Banach lattice assuming that, additionally to the above splitting structure, the operator  $\Lambda$  satisfies a weak and a strong maximum principle. Our result improves the known versions of Krein–Rutman Theorem in particular because we weaken the required compactness assumption made on (the resolvent of)  $\Lambda$ . Moreover, our result is quite elementary and self-contained.

Let us stress again that our approach is very similar to the “*extension of the functional space of spectral analysis of operators*” and that our starting point is the work by Mouhot [96] where (1.9) is used in order to prove an enlargement of the operator spectral gap for the space homogeneous linearized Boltzmann equation. Because of the self-adjointness structure of the space homogeneous linearized Boltzmann equation one can conclude thanks to a classical argument (namely the operator  $\mathcal{B}$  is sectorial and the last term in (1.13) with the choice  $N = 1$  converges, see [100] or [35, Corollary IV.3.2 and Lemma V.1.9]). Our approach is in fact reminiscent of the huge number of works on the spectral analysis of operators which take advantage of a splitting structure (1.2) and then consider  $\Lambda$  as a (compact, small) perturbation of  $\mathcal{B}$ . One of the main differences with the classical approach introduced by Hilbert and Weyl is that when one usually makes the decomposition

$$\Lambda = \mathcal{A}_0 + \mathcal{B}_0 \tag{1.14}$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_0$  is dissipative and  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is  $\mathcal{B}_0$ -compact, we make the additional splitting  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}^c$  with  $\mathcal{A}$  “smooth” and  $\mathcal{A}^c$  small (it is the usual way to prove that  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is  $\mathcal{B}_0$ -compact) and we write

$$\Lambda = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}, \quad \mathcal{B} := \mathcal{A}^c + \mathcal{B}_0. \tag{1.15}$$

In such a way, we get quite better “smoothing properties” on  $\mathcal{A}$  (with respect to  $\mathcal{A}_0$ ) without losing too much of the “dissipative property” of  $\mathcal{B}$  (with respect to  $\mathcal{B}_0$ ). That splitting makes possible to get quantitative estimates (with constructive constants) in some situations. Of course, the drawback of the method is that one has to find an appropriate splitting (1.2) for the operator as well as an appropriate space  $X$  for which one is able to prove the estimates (1.3), (1.4) and (1.5). However, the efficiency of the method is attested by the fact that it has been successfully used for several evolution PDEs such as the space homogeneous and space nonhomogeneous elastic Boltzmann equations in [96,51], the space homogeneous and space nonhomogeneous inelastic Boltzmann equations in [87,112], some Fokker–Planck type equations in [51,6,86,34], the Landau equation in [24] and the growth-fragmentation equation in [19,18] and in the present paper.

## 1.2. Growth-fragmentation equations

The second aim of the paper is to establish the long-time asymptotics for the solutions of some growth-fragmentation equations as a motivation, or an illustration, of the abstract theory developed in parallel. We then consider the growth-fragmentation equation

$$\partial_t f = \Lambda f := \mathcal{D}f + \mathcal{F}f \quad \text{in } (0, \infty) \times (0, \infty). \tag{1.16}$$

Here  $f = f(t, x) \geq 0$  stands for the *number density of cells* (or *particles, polymers, organisms, individuals*), where  $t \geq 0$  is the *time* variable and  $x \in (0, \infty)$  is the *size* (or *mass, age*) variable. In Eq. (1.16) the *growth operator* is given by

$$(\mathcal{D}f)(x) := -\partial_x(\tau(x)f(x)) - \nu(x)f(x) \tag{1.17}$$

where the (continuous) function  $\tau : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the *drift speed* (or *growth rate*), and we will choose  $\tau(x) = 1$  or  $\tau(x) = x$  in the sequel, and the function  $\nu : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is a *damping rate*. The drift and damping term  $\mathcal{D}$  models the *growth* (for particles and cells) or the *aging* (for individuals) and the *death* which can be represented by the scheme

$$\{x\} \xrightarrow{e^{-\nu(x)}} \{x + \tau(x) dx\}.$$

On the other hand, the *fragmentation operator*  $\mathcal{F}$  is defined by

$$(\mathcal{F}f)(x) := \int_x^\infty k(y, x)f(y)dy - K(x)f(x) \tag{1.18}$$

and the fragmentation kernel  $k$  is related to the total rate of fragmentation  $K$  by

$$K(x) = \int_0^x k(x, y) \frac{y}{x} dy. \tag{1.19}$$

The fragmentation operator  $\mathcal{F}$  models the *division* (breakage) of a single *mother particle* of size  $x$  into two or more pieces (*daughter particles, offspring*) of size  $x_i \geq 0$ , or in other words, models the event

$$\{x\} \xrightarrow{k} \{x_1\} + \dots + \{x_i\} + \dots, \tag{1.20}$$

in such a way that the mass is conserved

$$x = \sum_i x_i, \quad 0 \leq x_i \leq x.$$

It is worth emphasizing that the above mass conservation at the microscopic level is rendered by Eq. (1.19) at the statistical level.

In order to simplify the presentation we will only consider situations where the size repartition of offspring is invariant by the size scaling of the mother particle, or more precisely that there exists a function (or abusing notation, a measure)  $\wp : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that

$$k(x, y) = K(x)\kappa(x, y), \quad \kappa(x, y) = \wp(y/x)/x, \tag{1.21}$$

as well as, in order that the compatibility relation (1.19) holds,

$$\int_0^1 z \wp(dz) = 1. \tag{1.22}$$

Here  $\kappa(x, \cdot)$  represents the probability density of the distribution of daughter particles resulting of the breakage of a mother particle of size  $x \in (0, \infty)$  and the assumption (1.21) means that this probability density is invariant by scaling of the size. As a first example, when a mother particle of size  $x$  breaks into two pieces of exact size  $\sigma x$  and  $(1 - \sigma)x$ ,  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ , the associated kernel is given by

$$\kappa(x, y) = \delta_{y=\sigma x}(dy) + \delta_{y=(1-\sigma)x}(dy) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \delta_{x=\frac{y}{\sigma}}(dx) + \frac{1}{1-\sigma} \delta_{x=\frac{y}{1-\sigma}}(dx), \tag{1.23}$$

or equivalently  $\wp = \delta_\sigma + \delta_{1-\sigma}$ . In the sequel, we will also consider the case when  $\wp$  is a smooth function. In any cases, we define

$$z_0 := \inf \text{supp } \wp \in [0, 1). \tag{1.24}$$

The evolution equation (1.16) is complemented with an initial condition

$$f(0, \cdot) = f_0 \quad \text{in } (0, \infty), \tag{1.25}$$

and a boundary condition that we will discuss for each example presented below.

Instead of trying to analyze the most general growth-fragmentation equation, we will focus our study on some particular but relevant classes of models, namely the cell division equation with constant growth rate, the self-similar fragmentation equation and the age structured population equation.

1.2.1. Example 1. Equal mitosis equation

We consider a population of cells which divide through a binary fragmentation mechanism with equal size offspring, grow at constant rate and are not damped. The resulting evolution equation is the *equal mitosis equation* which is associated to the operator  $\Lambda = \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{F}$ , where  $\mathcal{D}$  is defined by (1.17) with the choice  $\tau = 1$  and  $\nu = 0$ , and where  $\mathcal{F}$  is the equal mitosis operator defined by (1.18) with the following choice of fragmentation kernel

$$k(x, y) = 2 K(x) \delta_{x/2}(dy) = 4 K(x) \delta_{2y}(dx). \tag{1.26}$$

Equivalently,  $k$  is given by (1.21) with  $\wp(dz) := 2 \delta_{z=1/2}$ . The associated equal mitosis equation takes the form

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} f(t, x) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(t, x) + K(x) f(t, x) = 4K(2x) f(t, 2x), \tag{1.27}$$

and it is complemented with the boundary condition

$$f(t, 0) = 0. \tag{1.28}$$

As its name suggests, such an equation appears in the modeling of cell division when mitosis occurs (see [12,111,81, 11] and the references therein for linear models as well as [54,11] for more recent nonlinear models for tumor growth) but also appears in telecommunication systems to describe some internet protocols [7].

We assume that the total fragmentation rate  $K$  is a nonnegative  $C^1$  function defined on  $[0, \infty)$  which satisfies the positivity assumption

$$\exists x_0 \geq 0, \quad K(x) = 0 \quad \forall x < x_0, \quad K(x) > 0 \quad \forall x > x_0, \tag{1.29}$$

as well as the growth assumption

$$K_0 x^\gamma \mathbf{1}_{x \geq x_1} \leq K(x) \leq K_1 \max(1, x^\gamma), \tag{1.30}$$

for  $\gamma \geq 0, x_0 \leq x_1 < \infty, 0 < K_0 \leq K_1 < \infty$ .

There is no conservation law for the equal mitosis equation. However, by solving the dual eigenvalue–eigenfunction problem

$$\mathcal{D}^* \phi + \mathcal{F}^* \phi = \lambda \phi, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \phi \geq 0, \quad \phi \neq 0, \tag{1.31}$$

one immediately observes that any solution  $f$  to the equal mitosis equation (1.27) satisfies

$$\int_0^\infty f(t, x) \phi(x) dx = e^{\lambda t} \int_0^\infty f_0 \phi(x) dx.$$

The first eigenvalue  $\lambda$  corresponds to an exponential growth rate of (some average quantity of) the solution. In an ecology context  $\lambda$  is often called the *Malthus parameter* or the *fitness* of the cells/organisms population. In order to go further in the analysis of the dynamics, one can solve the primal eigenvalue–eigenfunction problem

$$\mathcal{D} f_\infty + \mathcal{F} f_\infty = \lambda f_\infty, \quad f_\infty \geq 0, \quad f_\infty \neq 0, \tag{1.32}$$

which provides a Malthusian profile  $f_\infty$ , and then define the remarkable (in the sense that it is a separated variables function) solution  $f(t, x) := e^{\lambda t} f_\infty(x)$  to the equal mitosis equation (1.27). It is expected that (1.32) captures the main features of the model or, more precisely, that

$$f(t, x) e^{-\lambda t} = f_\infty(x) + o(1) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \tag{1.33}$$

We refer to [29,81,103,84,102,73] (and the references therein) for results about the existence of solutions to the primal and dual eigenvalue problems (1.31) and (1.32) as well as for results on the asymptotic convergence (1.33) without rate or with exponential rate.

### 1.2.2. A variant of example 1. Smooth cell-division equation

We modify the previous equal mitosis model by considering the case of a general fragmentation operator (1.18) where the total fragmentation rate  $K$  still satisfies (1.29) and (1.30) and where, however, we restrict ourselves to the case of a smooth size offspring distribution  $\wp$ . More precisely, we assume

$$\wp'_0 := \int_0^1 |\wp'(z)| dz < \infty. \quad (1.34)$$

We will sometimes make the additional strong positivity assumption

$$\wp(z) \geq \wp_* \quad \forall z \in (0, 1), \quad \wp_* > 0, \quad (1.35)$$

or assume the additional monotony condition and the constant number of offspring condition

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \int_0^x \kappa(y, z) dz \leq 0, \quad n_F := \int_0^x \kappa(x, z) dz > 1, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+. \quad (1.36)$$

Observe that this monotony condition is fulfilled for the equal and unequal mitosis kernel (1.23) and for the smooth distribution of offspring functions  $\wp(z) := c_\theta z^\theta$ ,  $\theta > -1$ , see [73].

The smooth cell-division equation reads

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} f(t, x) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(t, x) = (\mathcal{F}f(t, \cdot))(x), \quad (1.37)$$

and it is complemented again with the boundary condition (1.28) and the initial condition (1.25). We call the resulting model as the *smooth cell-division equation*.

The general fragmentation operator is used in physics in order to model the dynamics of cluster breakage and it is often associated in that context to the coagulation operator which models the opposite agglomeration mechanism (see [80]). It appears later associated with the drift operator  $\mathcal{D} = -\tau(x)\partial_x + \tau'(x)$  under the name of “cell population balance model” (see [41,55]) in a chemical or biological context. The general fragmentation operator is used in order to take into account unequal cell-division according to experimental evidence [68,99]. In recent years, the above smooth cell-division equation (1.37) has also appeared in many articles on the modeling of proteins [48,108,22,21].

Concerning the mathematical analysis of the *smooth cell-division equation*, and in particular the long-time behavior of solutions, a similar picture as for the equal mitosis equation is expected and some (at least partial) results have been obtained in [83,84,82,73,32,19,20,8].

With the above notation and for later references, for both equal mitosis and smooth cell-division equations, we introduce the critical exponent  $\alpha^* \geq 1$  uniquely implicitly defined by the equation

$$\wp_{\alpha^*} = K_0/K_1 \in (0, 1], \quad \wp_\alpha := \int_0^1 z^\alpha \wp(dz). \quad (1.38)$$

### 1.2.3. Example 2. Self-similar fragmentation equation

We consider now a fragmentation rate associated to a power law total fragmentation rate

$$k(x, y) = K(x) \wp(y/x)/x, \quad K(x) = x^\gamma, \quad \gamma > 0, \quad (1.39)$$

where  $\wp$  is a continuous function satisfying (1.34). The pure fragmentation model is then obtained for  $\tau = \nu \equiv 0$  in (1.16) and therefore reads

$$\partial_t g = \tilde{\mathcal{F}} g,$$



where  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  is a temporary notation for the fragmentation operator associated to the kernel  $\tilde{k} := k/\gamma$ . By analogy with the probabilistic name for the associated Markov process, see e.g. [13], we call that model the “self-similar fragmentation equation”. This equation arises in physics to describe fragmentation processes. We refer to [39,124,14] for the first study and the physics motivations, to [13] and the references therein for a probabilistic approach.

For this equation the only steady states are the Dirac masses, namely  $x g(t, x) = \rho \delta_{x=0}$ . On the other hand, if  $g$  is a solution to the pure fragmentation equation, we may introduce the rescaled density  $f$  defined by

$$f(t, x) = e^{-2t} g(e^{\gamma t} - 1, x e^{-t}), \tag{1.40}$$

which is a solution to the fragmentation equation in self-similar variables (see for instance [36])

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} f = \Lambda f = \mathcal{F} f - x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f - 2f. \tag{1.41}$$

This is a mass preserving equation with no detailed balance condition. However, defining the associated adjoint operator  $\Lambda^*$ , one can show that

$$\Lambda f_\infty = 0, \quad \Lambda^* \phi = 0,$$

for some positive function  $f_\infty$  and for  $\phi(x) = x$ . Eq. (1.41) falls into the class of growth-fragmentation equation with first eigenvalue  $\lambda = 0$  (because of the mass conservation). As for the cell-division equation one expects that the remarkable (self-similar profile) solution  $f_\infty$  is attractive and that (1.33) holds again. Existence of the self-similar profile  $f_\infty$  and convergence (without rate) to this one have been established in [36,84], while a rate of convergence for  $\gamma \in (0, 2)$  has been proved in [19,18].

### 1.2.4. Example 3. Age structured population equation

We consider an age structured population of individuals which age, die and give birth, and which is described by the density  $f(t, x)$  of individuals with age  $x \geq 0$  at time  $t \geq 0$ . The very popular associated evolution PDE is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} f + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\tau(x) f) = -\nu(x) f, \quad f(t, x = 0) = \int_0^\infty K(y) f(t, y) dy, \tag{1.42}$$

and it is commonly attributed to A. McKendrick [79] and H. von Foerster [119] (although the dynamics of age structured population has been anteriorly developed by A. Lotka and F. Sharpe [77] and before by L. Euler, as well as by P.H. Leslie [74] in a discrete time and age framework). In the sequel we call that model as the *age structured population equation*. Let us also mention that nonlinear versions of Eq. (1.42) which take into account possibly overcrowding effect can be found in the work of Gurtin and MacCamy [53].

In Eq. (1.42) the function  $K$  corresponds to the birth rate, the function  $\nu$  to the death rate and the function  $\tau$  to the aging rate (so that  $\tau \equiv 1$ ). Notice that the age structured population equation can be seen as a particular example of the growth-fragmentation equation (1.16)–(1.18) making the following choice for  $k$ :

$$k(x, y) = K(x) [\delta(y = x) + \delta(y = 0)], \tag{1.43}$$

which corresponds to the limit case  $\sigma = 0$  in (1.23). In order to simplify the presentation we make the assumptions

$$\tau = \nu = 1, \quad 0 \leq K \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}_+) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}_+), \quad \|K\|_{L^1} > 1. \tag{1.44}$$

The expected long-time behavior of solutions to the age structured population equation is the same as the one described for a general growth-fragmentation equation, in particular the long-time convergence (1.33) with exponential rate is known to hold. Here, the mathematical analysis is greatly simplified by remarking that the offspring number satisfies a (Volterra) delay equation (the so-called renewal equation) which in turn can be handled through the direct Laplace transform, as first shown by W. Feller [37] and developed later in [38,81,120,65]. Let us also mention that the long-time convergence (1.33) can also be obtained by entropy method [89,84].

### 1.2.5. Main result

Let us introduce the functional spaces in which we will work. For any exponent  $p \in [1, \infty]$  and any nonnegative weight function  $\xi$ , we denote by  $L^p(\xi)$  the Lebesgue space  $L^p(\mathbb{R}_+; \xi dx)$  or  $L^p(\mathbb{R}; \xi dx)$  associated to the norm

$$\|u\|_{L^p(\xi)} := \|u\xi\|_{L^p},$$

and we simply use the shorthand  $L^p_\alpha$  for the choice  $\xi(x) := \langle x \rangle^\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\langle x \rangle^2 := 1 + |x|^2$ , as well as the shorthand  $\dot{L}^p_\alpha$  for the choice  $\xi(x) := |x|^\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *Consider the growth-fragmentation equations with the corresponding structure assumption and boundedness of coefficients as presented in the previous sections and define the functional space  $X$  as follows:*

- (1) *Cell-division equation: take  $X = L^1_\alpha$ ,  $\alpha > \alpha^*$ , where  $\alpha^* \geq 1$  is defined in (1.38);*
- (2) *Self-similar fragmentation equation: take  $X = \dot{L}^1_\alpha \cap \dot{L}^1_\beta$ ,  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 < \beta$ ;*
- (3) *Age structured population equation: take  $X = L^1$ .*

There exists a unique couple  $(\lambda, f_\infty)$ , with  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $f_\infty \in X$ , solution to the stationary equation

$$\mathcal{F}f_\infty - \partial_x(\tau f) - \nu f_\infty = \lambda f_\infty, \quad f_\infty \geq 0, \quad \|f_\infty\|_X = 1. \quad (1.45)$$

There exists  $a^{**} < \lambda$  and for any  $a > a^{**}$  there exists  $C_a$  such that for any  $f_0 \in X$ , the associated solution  $f(t) = e^{\Lambda t} f_0$  satisfies

$$\|f(t) - e^{\lambda t} \Pi_{\Lambda, \lambda} f\|_X \leq C_a e^{at} \|f_0 - \Pi_{\Lambda, \lambda} f_0\|_X, \quad (1.46)$$

where  $\Pi_{\Lambda, \lambda}$  is the projection on the one dimensional space spanned by the remarkable solution  $f_\infty$ . It is given by

$$\Pi_{\Lambda, \lambda} h = \langle \phi, h \rangle f_\infty$$

where  $\phi \in X'$  is the unique positive and normalized solution to the dual first eigenvalue problem

$$\mathcal{F}^* \phi + \tau \partial_x \phi - \nu \phi = \lambda \phi, \quad \phi \geq 0, \quad \langle \phi, f_\infty \rangle = 1. \quad (1.47)$$

Moreover, an explicit bound on the spectral gap  $\lambda - a^{**}$  is available for

- (i) *the cell-division equation with constant total fragmentation rate  $K \equiv K_0$  on  $(0, \infty)$ ,  $K_0 > 0$ , and a fragmentation kernel which satisfies the monotony condition and constant number of offspring condition (1.36);*
- (ii) *the self-similar fragmentation equation with smooth and positive offspring distribution in the sense that (1.34) and (1.35) hold.*

Let us make some comments about the above result.

**Theorem 1.1** generalizes, improves and unifies the results on the long-time asymptotic convergence with exponential rate which were known only for particular cases of growth fragmentation equation, namely for the cell division model with (almost) constant total fragmentation rate and monotonous offspring distribution in [103,73] and for the self-similar fragmentation equation and the cell division equation restricted to smooth and positive fragmentation rate and total fragmentation rate which increases at most quadratically in [19,18]. The rate of convergence (1.46) is proved under similar hypotheses as those made in [84,36], but in [84,36] the convergence is established without rate. It has been established in [103,73] a similar  $L^1$ -norm decay as in (1.46), when however the initial datum is bounded in the sense of a (strange and) stronger norm than the  $L^1$ -norm. It was also conjectured that the additional strong boundedness assumption on the initial datum is necessary in order to get an exponential rate of convergence. **Theorem 1.1** disproves that conjecture in the sense that the norm involved in both sides of estimate (1.46) is the same. Let us emphasize that we do not claim that **Theorem 1.1** is new for the age structured population equation. However, we want to stress here that our proof of the convergence (1.46) is similar for all these growth-fragmentation equations while the previous available proofs (of convergence results with rate) were very different for the three subclasses of models. It is also likely that our approach can be generalized to larger classes of growth operator and of fragmentation kernel such as considered in [82,32,20,8]. However, for the sake of simplicity, we have not followed that line of research here.

It is finally worth noticing that our result excludes the two “degenerate equations” which are the equal self-similar fragmentation equation associated to equal mitosis offspring distribution and the age structured population equation associated to deterministic birth rate  $K(z) := K \delta_{z=L}$ .

Let us make some comments about the different methods of proof which may be based on linear tools (Laplace transform, Eigenvalue problem, suitable weak distance, semigroup theory) and nonlinear tools (existence of self-similar profile by fixed point theorems, GRE and E-DE methods).

- *Direct Laplace transform method.* For the age structured population equation a direct Laplace transform analysis can be performed at the level of the associated renewal equation and leads to an exact representation formula which in turn implies the rate of convergence (1.46) (see [37,38,65]).

- *PDE approach via compactness and GRE methods.* Convergence results (without rate) have been proved in [89, 36,84] for a general class of growth-fragmentation equation which is basically the same class as considered in the present paper thanks to the use of the so-called *general relative entropy method*. More precisely, once the existence of a solution  $(\lambda, f_\infty, \phi)$  to the primal eigenvalue problem (1.45) and dual eigenvalue problem (1.47) is established, we refer to [103,20,82,32] where that issue is tackled, one can easily compute the evolution of the generalized relative entropy  $\mathcal{J}$  defined by

$$\mathcal{J}(f) := \int_0^\infty j(f/f_\infty) f_\infty \phi dx$$

for a convex and nonnegative function  $j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and for a generic solution  $f = f(t)$  to the growth-fragmentation equation. One can then show the (at least formal) identity

$$\mathcal{J}(f(t)) + \int_0^t \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(f(s)) ds = \mathcal{J}(f(0)) \quad \forall t \geq 0, \tag{1.48}$$

where  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} \geq 0$  is the associated generalized dissipation of relative entropy defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(f) := \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty k(x_*, x) \mathbf{1}_{x_* \geq x} [j(u) - j(u_*) - j'(u_*)(u - u_*)] f_\infty \phi_* dx dx_*,$$

with the notation  $u := f/f_\infty$  and  $h_* = h(x_*)$ . Identity (1.48) clearly implies that  $\mathcal{J}$  is a Liapunov functional for the growth fragmentation dynamics which in turn implies the long-time convergence  $f(t) \rightarrow f_\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  (without rate) under positivity assumption on the kernel  $k$  or the associated semigroup.

- *Suitable weak distance.* In order to circumvent the possible weak information given by  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}$  in the case of cell-division models when  $k$  is not positive (for the equal mitosis model for instance) an exponential rate of convergence for an (almost) constant total rate of fragmentation has been established by Perthame and co-authors in [103,73] by exhibiting a suitable weak distance.

- *Entropy–dissipation of entropy (E-DE) method.* In the case of the strong positivity assumption (1.35) an entropy–dissipation of entropy method has been implemented in [19,8] where the inequality  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} \geq c \mathcal{J}$  is proved for  $j(s) = (s - 1)^2$ . The Gronwall lemma then straightforwardly implies a rate of convergence in a weighted Lebesgue  $L^2$  framework.

- *Extension semigroup method.* For a general fragmentation kernel (including the smooth cell-division equation and the self-similar fragmentation equation) the *enlargement of semigroup spectral analysis* has been used in [19,18] in order to extend to an  $L^1$  framework some of the convergence (with rate) results proved in [19] in a narrow weighted  $L^2$  framework thanks to the above E-DE method.

- *Markov semigroup method.* Markov semigroups techniques have been widely used since the first papers by Metz, Diekmann and Webb on the age structured equation and the equal mitosis equation in a bounded size setting [120,81], see also [35] and the references therein for more recent papers. That approach has also been applied to more general growth-fragmentation equations (still in a bounded interval setting) in [110] (see also [10] and the references therein for recent developments) and to other linear Boltzmann models (related to neuron transport theory) by Mokhtar-Kharroubi in [92–94]. The Markov semigroup method consists in proving that the spectral bound is an algebraic simple eigenvalue associated to a positive eigenfunction and a positive dual eigenfunction and the only eigenvalue

with maximum real part. It fundamentally uses the positivity structure of the equation and some compactness argument (at the level of the resolvent of the operator or at the level of the terms involved in the Dyson–Phillips series). This approach classically provides a convergence result toward the first eigenfunction, but does not provide any rate of convergence in general (see however the recent work [95] where a rate of convergence is established).

Let us conclude that our method in the present paper is clearly a Markov semigroup approach. Our approach is then completely linear, very accurate and still very general. The drawback is the use of the abstract semigroup framework and some complex analysis tool (and in particular the use of the Laplace transform and the inverse Laplace transform) at the level of the abstract (functional space) associated evolution equation. The main novelty comes from the fact that we are able to prove that the considered growth-fragmentation operator falls in the class of operators with splitting structure as described in the first part of the introduction and for which our abstract Krein–Rutman Theorem applies. In particular, in order to deduce the growth estimates on the semigroup from the spectral knowledge on the generator, we use the iterated Duhamel formula (instead of the Dyson–Phillips series) as a consequence of our more suitable splitting (1.15) (instead of (1.14)). That more suitable splitting and our abstract semigroup spectral analysis theory make possible to establish some rate of convergence where the usual arguments lead to mere convergence results (without rate).

The outline of the paper is as follows. In the next section, we establish the partial spectral mapping theorem in an abstract framework. In Section 3, we establish two versions of the Weyl’s Theorem in an abstract framework and we then verify that they apply to the growth-fragmentation equations in Section 4. Section 5 is devoted to the statement and proof of an abstract version of the Krein–Rutman Theorem. In the last section we apply the Krein–Rutman theory to the growth-fragmentation equation which ends the proof of Theorem 1.1.

## 2. Spectral mapping for semigroup generators

### 2.1. Notation and definitions

There are many textbooks addressing the theory of semigroups since the seminal books by Hille and Philipps [63, 64] among them the ones by Kato [67], Davies [28], Pazy [100], Arendt et al. [3] and more recently by Engel and Nagel [35] to which we refer for more details. In this section we summarize some basic definitions and facts on the analysis of operators in an abstract and general Banach space picked up from above mentioned books as well as from the recent articles [51,85]. It is worth mentioning that we adopt the sign convention of Kato [67] on the resolvent operator (which is maybe opposite to the most widespread convention), see (2.1). For a given real number  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ , we define the half complex plane

$$\Delta_a := \{z \in \mathbb{C}, \Re z > a\}.$$

For some given Banach spaces  $(X_1, \|\cdot\|_{X_1})$  and  $(X_2, \|\cdot\|_{X_2})$  we denote by  $\mathcal{B}(X_1, X_2)$  the space of bounded linear operators from  $X_1$  to  $X_2$  and we denote by  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{B}(X_1, X_2)}$  or  $\|\cdot\|_{X_1 \rightarrow X_2}$  the associated norm operator. We write  $\mathcal{B}(X_1) = \mathcal{B}(X_1, X_1)$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{C}(X_1, X_2)$  the space of closed unbounded (and thus possibly bounded) linear operators from  $X_1$  to  $X_2$  with dense domain, and  $\mathcal{C}(X_1) = \mathcal{C}(X_1, X_1)$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{K}(X_1, X_2)$  the space of compact linear operators from  $X_1$  to  $X_2$  and again  $\mathcal{K}(X_1) = \mathcal{K}(X_1, X_1)$ .

For a given Banach space  $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{G}(X)$  the space of generators of a  $C_0$ -semigroup. For  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{G}(X)$  we denote by  $S_\Lambda(t) = e^{t\Lambda}$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , the associated semigroup, by  $D(\Lambda)$  its domain, by  $N(\Lambda)$  its null space, by

$$M(\Lambda) = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^*} N(\Lambda^\alpha)$$

its algebraic null space, and by  $R(\Lambda)$  its range. For any given integer  $k \geq 1$ , we define  $D(\Lambda^k)$  the Banach space associated with the norm

$$\|f\|_{D(\Lambda^k)} = \sum_{j=0}^k \|\Lambda^j f\|_X.$$

For two operators  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ , we say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded if  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(D(\mathcal{B}), X)$  or, in other words, if there exists a constant  $C \in (0, \infty)$  such that

$$\forall f \in X, \quad \|\mathcal{A}f\|_X \leq C(\|f\|_X + \|\mathcal{B}f\|_X).$$

Of course a bounded operator  $\mathcal{A}$  is always  $\mathcal{B}$ -bounded (whatever is  $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ ).

For  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{G}(X)$ , we denote by  $\Sigma(\Lambda)$  its spectrum, so that for any  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Sigma(\Lambda)$  the operator  $\Lambda - z$  is invertible and the resolvent operator

$$\mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) := (\Lambda - z)^{-1} \tag{2.1}$$

is well-defined, belongs to  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  and has range equal to  $D(\Lambda)$ . We then define the spectral bound  $s(\Lambda) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  by

$$s(\Lambda) := \sup\{\Re \xi; \xi \in \Sigma(\Lambda)\}$$

and the growth bound  $\omega(\Lambda) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  by

$$\omega(\Lambda) := \inf\{b \in \mathbb{R}; \exists M_b \text{ s.t. } \|S_\Lambda(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \leq M_b e^{bt} \forall t \geq 0\},$$

and we recall that  $s(\Lambda) \leq \omega(\Lambda)$  as a consequence of Hille’s identity [62]: for any  $\xi \in \Delta_{\omega(\Lambda)}$  there holds

$$-R_\Lambda(\xi) = \int_0^\infty S_\Lambda(t) e^{-\xi t} dt, \tag{2.2}$$

where the RHS integral normally converges.

We say that  $\Lambda$  is *a-hypo-dissipative* on  $X$  if there exists some norm  $\|\cdot\|_X$  on  $X$  equivalent to the initial norm  $\|\cdot\|_X$  such that

$$\forall f \in D(\Lambda), \exists \varphi \in F(f) \text{ s.t. } \Re \langle \varphi, (\Lambda - a) f \rangle \leq 0, \tag{2.3}$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is the duality bracket for the duality in  $X$  and  $X'$  and  $F(f) \subset X'$  is the dual set of  $f$  defined by

$$F(f) = F_{\|\cdot\|}(f) := \left\{ \varphi \in X'; \langle \varphi, f \rangle = \|f\|_X^2 = \|\varphi\|_{X'}^2 \right\}.$$

We just say that  $\Lambda$  is *hypo-dissipative* if  $\Lambda$  is *a-hypo-dissipative* for some  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . From the Hille–Yosida Theorem it is clear that any generator  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{G}(X)$  is a hypo-dissipative operator and that

$$\omega(\Lambda) := \inf\{b \in \mathbb{R}; \Lambda \text{ is } b\text{-hypo-dissipative}\}.$$

A spectral value  $\xi \in \Sigma(\Lambda)$  is said to be isolated if

$$\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \{z \in \mathbb{C}, |z - \xi| \leq r\} = \{\xi\} \text{ for some } r > 0.$$

In the case when  $\xi$  is an isolated spectral value we may define the spectral projector  $\Pi_{\Lambda, \xi} \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  by the Dunford integral

$$\Pi_{\Lambda, \xi} := \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{|z-\xi|=r'} \mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) dz, \tag{2.4}$$

with  $0 < r' < r$ . Note that this definition is independent of the value of  $r'$  as the resolvent

$$\mathbb{C} \setminus \Sigma(\Lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(X), \quad z \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z)$$

is holomorphic. It is well-known that  $\Pi_{\Lambda, \xi}^2 = \Pi_{\Lambda, \xi}$ , so that  $\Pi_{\Lambda, \xi}$  is indeed a projector, and its range  $R(\Pi_{\Lambda, \xi}) = \overline{M(\Lambda - \xi)}$  is the closure of the algebraic eigenspace associated to  $\xi$ . More generally, for any compact part of the spectrum of the form  $\Gamma = \Delta_a \cap \Sigma(\Lambda)$  we may define the associated spectral projector  $\Pi_{\Lambda, \Gamma}$  by

$$\Pi_{\Lambda, \Gamma} := \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_\gamma \mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) dz, \tag{2.5}$$

for any closed path  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Delta_a$  which makes one direct turn around  $\Gamma$ .

We recall that  $\xi \in \Sigma(\Lambda)$  is said to be an eigenvalue if  $N(\Lambda - \xi) \neq \{0\}$ . The range of the spectral projector is finite-dimensional if and only if there exists  $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{N}^*$  such that

$$N(\Lambda - \xi)^\alpha = N(\Lambda - \xi)^{\alpha_0} \neq \{0\} \text{ for any } \alpha \geq \alpha_0,$$

and in such a case

$$\overline{M(\Lambda - \xi)} = M(\Lambda - \xi) = N((\Lambda - \xi)^{\alpha_0}) \quad \text{and} \quad N(\Lambda - \xi) \neq \{0\}.$$

In that case, we say that  $\xi$  is a discrete eigenvalue, written as  $\xi \in \Sigma_d(\Lambda)$ . For any  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_J\}$$

where  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_J$  are distinct discrete eigenvalues, we define without any risk of ambiguity

$$\Pi_{\Lambda,a} := \Pi_{\Lambda,\xi_1} + \dots + \Pi_{\Lambda,\xi_J}.$$

For some given Banach spaces  $X_1, X_2, X_3$  and some given functions

$$S_1 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{B}(X_1, X_2)) \text{ and } S_2 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{B}(X_2, X_3)),$$

we define the convolution  $S_2 * S_1 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{B}(X_1, X_3))$  by

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad (S_2 * S_1)(t) := \int_0^t S_2(s) S_1(t - s) ds.$$

When  $S_1 = S_2$  and  $X_1 = X_2 = X_3$ , we define recursively  $S^{(*1)} = S$  and  $S^{(*\ell)} = S * S^{*(\ell-1)}$  for any  $\ell \geq 2$ .

For a generator  $L$  of a semigroup such that  $\omega(L) < 0$  we define the fractional powers  $L^{-\eta}$  and  $L^\eta$  for  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  by Dunford formulas [69,70], see also [35, Section II.5.c],

$$L^{-\eta} := c_{-\eta} \int_0^\infty \lambda^{-\eta} \mathcal{R}_L(\lambda) d\lambda, \quad L^\eta := c_\eta \int_0^\infty \lambda^{\eta-1} L \mathcal{R}_L(\lambda) d\lambda, \tag{2.6}$$

for some constants  $c_\eta, c_{-\eta} \in \mathbb{C}^*$ . The operator  $L^{-\eta}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  and, denoting  $X_\eta := R(L^{-\eta})$ , the operator  $L^\eta$  is the unbounded operator with domain  $D(L^\eta) = X_\eta$  and defined by  $L^\eta = (L^{-\eta})^{-1}$ . We also denote  $X_0 = X$  and  $X_1 = D(L)$ . Moreover, introducing the  $J$ -method interpolation norm

$$\|f\|_{\tilde{X}_\eta} := \inf \left\{ \sup_{t>0} \|t^{-\eta} J(t, g(t))\|_X; \ g \text{ such that } f = \int_0^\infty g(t) \frac{dt}{t} \right\}$$

with  $J(t, g) := \max(\|g\|_X, t \|Lg\|_X)$  and the associated Banach space  $\tilde{X}_\eta$  which corresponds to the interpolation space  $S(\infty, -\eta, X_0; \infty, 1 - \eta, X_1)$  of Lions and Peetre [76] defined by

$$\tilde{X}_\eta := \{f \in X; \|f\|_{\tilde{X}_\eta} < \infty\},$$

the following inclusions

$$X_\eta \subset \tilde{X}_\eta \subset X_{\eta'} \tag{2.7}$$

hold with continuous embedding for any  $0 < \eta' < \eta < 1$ . Let us emphasize that the first inclusion follows from the second inclusion in [70, Proposition 2.8] and [70, Theorem 3.1] while the second inclusion in (2.7) is a consequence of the first inclusion in [70, Proposition 2.8] together with [70, Theorem 3.1] and the classical embedding  $S(\infty, -\theta, X_0; \infty, 1 - \eta, X_1) \subset S(1, -\theta', X_0; \infty, 1 - \theta', X_1)$  whenever  $X_1 \subset X_0$  and  $0 < \theta' < \theta < 1$ .

### 2.2. An abstract spectral mapping theorem

We present in this section a “principal spectral mapping theorem” for a class of semigroup generators  $\Lambda$  on a Banach space which split as a hypodissipative part  $\mathcal{B}$  and a “more regular part”  $\mathcal{A}$ , as presented in the introduction. In order to do so, we introduce a more accurate version of the growth and regularizing assumption (H2–3), namely

**(H2)** there exist  $\zeta \in (0, 1]$  and  $\zeta' \in [0, \zeta)$  such that  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\mathcal{B}^{\zeta'}$ -bounded and there exists an integer  $n \geq 1$  such that for any  $a > a^*$ , there holds

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \|S_{\mathcal{B}} * (\mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}})^{(*n)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X, D(\Lambda^\zeta))} \leq C_{a,n,\zeta} e^{at} \tag{2.8}$$

for a constant  $C_{a,n,\zeta} \in (0, \infty)$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** Consider a Banach space  $X$ , the generator  $\Lambda$  of a semigroup  $S_{\Lambda}(t) = e^{t\Lambda}$  on  $X$ , two real numbers  $a^*, a' \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $a^* < a'$ , and assume that the spectrum  $\Sigma(\Lambda)$  of  $\Lambda$  satisfies the following separation condition

$$\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_{a^*} \subset \Delta_{a'}. \tag{2.9}$$

The following growth estimate on the semigroup

**(1)** there exists a projector  $\Pi \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  satisfying  $\Lambda\Pi = \Pi\Lambda$ ,  $\Lambda_1 := \Lambda|_{X_1} \in \mathcal{B}(X_1)$ ,  $X_1 := R\Pi$ ,  $\Sigma(\Lambda_1) \subset \Delta_{a^*}$  and for any real number  $a > a^*$  there exists a constant  $C_a$  such that

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \left\| e^{t\Lambda}(I - \Pi) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \leq C_a e^{at}, \tag{2.10}$$

is equivalent to the following splitting structure hypothesis

**(2)** there exist two operators  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ , such that  $\Lambda = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$  and hypothesizes **(H1)** and **(H2)** are satisfied.

Moreover, under assumption **(2)**, for any  $a > a^*$  there exists an explicitly computable constant  $M = M(a, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  such that

$$\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a \subset B(0, M) := \{z \in \mathbb{C}; |z| < M\}. \tag{2.11}$$

**Remark 2.2.**

- (a)** **Theorem 2.1** gives a characterization (and thus a criterium with the conditions **(H1)** and **(H2)**) for an operator  $\Lambda$  to satisfy a partial (but principal) spectral mapping theorem under the only additional assumption that the spectrum satisfies a separation condition.
- (b)** Hypothesis **(H1)** holds for any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  if it is true for  $\ell = 0$  (that is  $(\mathcal{B} - a)$  is hypodissipative in  $X$  for any real number  $a > a^*$ ) and  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ .
- (c)** The implication **(1)**  $\Rightarrow$  **(2)** is just straightforward by taking  $\mathcal{A} := \Lambda\Pi$  and  $\mathcal{B} := \Lambda(I - \Pi)$ . With such a choice we have  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  by assumption, next  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(X, D(\Lambda))$ , because  $\Lambda\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^2 \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ , and  $\mathcal{B} - a$  is hypodissipative in  $X$  for any real number  $a > a^*$  so that hypothesis **(H1)** is satisfied as well as hypothesis **(H2)** with  $n = 1$ ,  $\zeta = 1$  and  $\zeta' = 0$ .
- (d)** We believe that the implication **(2)**  $\Rightarrow$  **(1)** is new. It can be seen as a condition under which a “spectral mapping theorem for the principal part of the spectrum holds” in the sense that **(1.6)** holds. Indeed, defining  $\Lambda_0 := \Lambda(I - \Pi)$ , for any  $a > a^*$  there holds  $\Sigma(\Lambda) = \Sigma(\Lambda_0) \cup \Sigma(\Lambda_1)$ ,  $\Sigma(e^{t\Lambda}) = \Sigma(e^{t\Lambda_0}) \cup \Sigma(e^{t\Lambda_1})$ ,  $\Sigma(e^{t\Lambda_1}) = e^{t\Sigma(\Lambda_1)}$  (because  $\Lambda_1 \in \mathcal{B}(X_1)$ ),  $\Sigma(\Lambda_0) \subset \Delta_a$  (by hypothesis) and  $\Sigma(e^{t\Lambda_0}) \subset \Delta_{e^{at}}$  (from the conclusion **(2.10)**). In particular, under assumption **(2)** the spectral bound  $s(\Lambda)$  and the growth bound  $\omega(\Lambda)$  coincide if they are at the right hand side of  $a^*$ , or in other words **(1.7)** holds.
- (e)** When  $a^* < 0$  the above result gives a characterization of uniformly exponentially stable semigroup (see e.g. **[35, Definition V.1.1]**) in a Banach space framework. More precisely, if assumption **(2)** holds with  $a^* < 0$ , then

$$S_{\Lambda} \text{ is uniformly exponentially stable iff } s(\Lambda) < 0.$$

That last assertion has to be compared to the Gearhart–Prüss Theorem which gives another characterization of uniform exponential stability in a Hilbert framework, see **[44,107,3]** as well as **[35, Theorem V.1.11]** for a comprehensive proof.

- (f) Although the splitting condition in (2) may seem to be strange, it is in fact quite natural for many partial differential operators, including numerous cases of operators which have not any self-adjointness property, as that can be seen in the many examples studied in [96,87,88,51,6,19,18,24,34,112,25].
- (g) For a sectorial operator  $\mathcal{B}$ , hypothesis (H1) holds for any operator  $\mathcal{A}$  which is suitably bounded with respect to  $\mathcal{B}$ . More precisely, in a Hilbert space framework, for a “hypo-elliptic operator  $\mathcal{B}$  of order  $\zeta$ ” and for a  $\mathcal{B}^\zeta$ -bounded operator  $\mathcal{A}$ , with  $\zeta' \in [0, \zeta)$ , in the sense that for any  $f \in D(\mathcal{B})$

$$(\mathcal{B}f, f) \leq -a \|\mathcal{B}^\zeta f\|^2 + C\|f\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{A}f\| \leq C(\|\mathcal{B}^{\zeta'} f\| + \|f\|),$$

then (H1) holds and (H2) holds with  $n = 0$ . A typical example is  $\mathcal{B} = -\Delta$  and  $\mathcal{A} = a(x) \cdot \nabla$  in the space  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $a \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . In that case, Theorem 2.1 is nothing but the classical spectral mapping theorem which is known to hold in such a sectorial framework. We refer to [100, Section 2.5] and [35, Section II.4.a] for an introduction to sectorial operators (and analytic semigroups) as well as [35, Section IV.3.10] for a proof of the spectral mapping theorem in that framework.

- (h) Condition (H2) is fulfilled for the same value of  $n$  if  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfy (H1) as well as

$$t \mapsto \|(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{S}_\mathcal{B})^{(*n)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X, D(\Lambda^\zeta))} e^{-at} \in L^p(0, \infty)$$

for any  $a > a^*$  and for some  $p \in [1, \infty]$ .

- (i) It is worth emphasizing that our result does not require any kind of “regularity” on the semigroup as it is usually the case for “full” spectral mapping theorem. In particular, we do not require that the semigroup is eventually norm continuous as in [64] or [35, Theorem IV.3.10]. Let us also stress that some “partial” spectral mapping theorems have been obtained in several earlier papers as in [66,114,118,91,72] under stronger assumptions than (H1)–(H2). See also Remark 3.2-(e).

**Proof of Theorem 2.1.** We only prove that (2) implies (1) since the reverse implication is clear (see Remark 2.2-(c)). The proof is split into four steps. From now on, let us fix  $a \in (a^*, a')$ .

*Step 1.* We establish the cornerstone estimate

$$\forall z \in \Delta_a, \quad \|(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z))^{n+1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \leq C_a \frac{1}{\langle z \rangle^\alpha}, \tag{2.12}$$

where  $n \geq 1$  is the integer given by assumption (H2) and  $\alpha := (\zeta - \zeta')^2/8 \in (0, 1)$ . We recall the notation  $X_s = D(\Lambda^s)$  for  $0 \leq s \leq 1$ , with  $X_0 = X$  and  $X_1 = D(\Lambda)$ . On the one hand, from (2.8) we have

$$\forall z \in \Delta_a, \quad \|\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z) (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z))^n\|_{X \rightarrow X_\zeta} \leq C'_{a,n},$$

for a constant  $C'_{a,n} \in (0, \infty)$  only depending on  $a, a^*$  and  $C_{a,n,\zeta}$ . As a consequence, writing

$$\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z)^{1-\varepsilon} (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z))^n = (\mathcal{B} - z)^\varepsilon [\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z) (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z))^n],$$

we get

$$\forall z \in \Delta_a, \quad \|\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z)^{1-\varepsilon} (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z))^n\|_{X \rightarrow X_{\zeta-\varepsilon}} \leq C_{a,n}, \tag{2.13}$$

for any  $\varepsilon \in [0, \zeta]$ .

On the other hand, we claim that

$$\forall z \in \Delta_a, \quad \|\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z)^\varepsilon\|_{\tilde{X}_{\zeta-\varepsilon} \rightarrow \tilde{X}_{\zeta'}} \leq C_{a,\varepsilon} / \langle z \rangle^\varepsilon (\zeta - \zeta' - \varepsilon), \tag{2.14}$$

for any  $0 \leq \varepsilon < \zeta - \zeta'$  and a constant  $C_{a,\varepsilon}$ . First, from the resolvent identity

$$\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z) = z^{-1} (\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z)\mathcal{B} - I),$$

we have for  $i, j = 0, 1, i \geq j$ ,

$$\forall z \in \Delta_a, \quad \|\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z)\|_{X_i \rightarrow X_j} \leq C_{i,j}^{1,a}(z),$$



with  $C_{0,0}^{1,a}(z) = C_{1,1}^{1,a}(z) = C^{1,a}$  and  $C_{1,0}^{1,a}(z) = C_{1,0}^{1,a}/\langle z \rangle$ ,  $C_{i,j}^{1,a} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Next, thanks to the first representation formula in (2.6), we clearly have

$$\| \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z)^\varepsilon \|_{X_1 \rightarrow X_0} \leq C(a, \varepsilon) \int_0^\infty \frac{\lambda^{-\varepsilon}}{\langle z \rangle + \lambda} d\lambda \leq C_{1,0}^{\varepsilon,a}(z) := \frac{C_{1,0}^{\varepsilon,a}}{\langle z \rangle^\varepsilon}.$$

Last, thanks to the interpolation theorem [76, Théorème 3.1] we get with some  $0 \leq \theta < \theta' < 1$

$$\| \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z)^\varepsilon \|_{\tilde{X}_{\theta'} \rightarrow \tilde{X}_\theta} \leq \| \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z)^\varepsilon \|_{X_1 \rightarrow X_1}^\theta \| \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z)^\varepsilon \|_{X_1 \rightarrow X_0}^{\theta' - \theta} \| \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z)^\varepsilon \|_{X_0 \rightarrow X_0}^{1 - \theta'},$$

from which we conclude to (2.14). Writing now

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z) (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z))^n = \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z)^\varepsilon [ \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z)^{1-\varepsilon} (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z))^n ],$$

with the optimal choice  $\varepsilon = (\zeta - \zeta')/2$ , we finally deduce from (2.13), (2.14) and the inclusions (2.7) that

$$\forall z \in \Delta_a, \quad \| \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z) (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z))^n \|_{X \rightarrow X_{\zeta'}} \leq \frac{C_a}{\langle z \rangle^\alpha}.$$

Because  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\mathcal{B}^{\zeta'}$ -bounded we conclude to (2.12).

Step 2. We prove (2.11). From the splitting  $\Lambda = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$ , we have

$$\mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) = \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z) - \mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) \mathcal{A} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z)$$

on the open region of  $\mathbb{C}$  where  $\mathcal{R}_\Lambda$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}$  are well defined functions (and thus analytic), and iterating the above formula, we get

$$\mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} (-1)^\ell \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z) (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z))^\ell + \mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) (-1)^N (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z))^N \tag{2.15}$$

for any integer  $N \geq 1$ . We define

$$U(z) := \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z) - \dots + (-1)^n \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z) (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z))^n \tag{2.16}$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}(z) := (-1)^{n+1} (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{B}}(z))^{n+1}, \tag{2.17}$$

where  $n \geq 1$  is again the integer given by assumption (H2). With  $N = n + 1$ , we may rewrite the identity (2.15) as

$$\mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) (I - \mathcal{V}(z)) = U(z). \tag{2.18}$$

Observing that (2.12) rewrites as

$$\forall z \in \Delta_a, \quad \| \mathcal{V}(z) \|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \leq C_a \frac{1}{\langle z \rangle^\alpha}, \tag{2.19}$$

we have in particular, for  $M$  large enough,

$$z \in \Delta_a, |z| \geq M \quad \Rightarrow \quad \| \mathcal{V}(z) \|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \leq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{2.20}$$

As a consequence, in the region  $\Delta_a \setminus B(0, M)$  the operator  $I - \mathcal{V}$  is invertible and thus  $\mathcal{R}_\Lambda$  is well-defined because of (2.18), which is nothing but (2.11).

Step 3. We write a representation formula for the semigroup which follows from some classical complex analysis arguments as in [51, Proof of Theorem 2.13] or [100, Chapter 1]. First, the inclusion (2.11) together with the separation condition (2.9) implies that

$$\Gamma := \Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a \subset \Delta_{a'} \cap B(0, M),$$

so that  $\Gamma$  is a compact set of  $\Delta_a$  and we may define the projection operator  $\Pi$  on the corresponding eigenspace thanks to the Dunford integral (2.5). The projector  $\Pi$  fulfills all the requirements stated in (1). In order to conclude we just have to prove (2.10). In order to do so, for any integer  $N \geq 0$ , we write

$$\begin{aligned} S_\Lambda (I - \Pi) &= (I - \Pi) S_\Lambda \\ &= (I - \Pi) \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} (-1)^\ell S_B * (\mathcal{A}S_B)^{(*\ell)} + ((I - \Pi)S_\Lambda) * (\mathcal{A}S_B)^{(*N)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the iteration of the Duhamel formula (1.12) in the second line. For  $b > \max(\omega(\Lambda), a)$ , we may use the inverse Laplace formula

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}(t)f &:= ((I - \Pi)S_\Lambda) * (\mathcal{A}S_B)^{(*N)} f \\ &= \lim_{M' \rightarrow \infty} \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{b-iM'}^{b+iM'} e^{zt} (-1)^{N+1} (I - \Pi)\mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_B(z))^N f dz \end{aligned}$$

for any  $f \in D(\Lambda)$  and  $t \geq 0$ , and we emphasize that the term  $\mathcal{T}(t)f$  might be only defined as a semi-convergent integral. Because  $z \mapsto (I - \Pi)\mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_B(z))^{N+1}$  is an analytic function on a neighborhood of  $\bar{\Delta}_a$ , we may move the segment on which the integral is performed, and we obtain the representation formula

$$\begin{aligned} S_\Lambda(t)(I - \Pi)f &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} (-1)^\ell (I - \Pi)S_B * (\mathcal{A}S_B)^{(*\ell)}(t)f \\ &\quad + \lim_{M' \rightarrow \infty} \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{a-iM'}^{a+iM'} e^{zt} (-1)^{N+1} (I - \Pi)\mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_B(z))^N f dz, \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

for any  $f \in D(\Lambda)$  and  $t \geq 0$ .

Step 4. In order to conclude we only have to explain why the last term in (2.21) is appropriately bounded for  $N$  large enough. Thanks to (2.18), we have

$$\mathcal{W}(z) := \mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_B(z))^N = \mathcal{U}(z) \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{V}(z)^\ell (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_B(z))^N, \tag{2.22}$$

provided the RHS series converges. On the one hand, defining  $N := ([1/\alpha] + 1)(n + 1)$  and  $\beta := ([1/\alpha] + 1)\alpha > 1$ , we get from (2.12) that

$$\| (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_B(z))^N \|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \leq \| \mathcal{V}(z) \|_{\mathcal{B}(X)}^{[1/\alpha]+1} \leq \frac{C}{|y|^\beta} \tag{2.23}$$

for any  $z = a + iy$ ,  $|y| \geq M$ . On the other hand, we get from (2.20) that the series term in (2.22) is normally convergent uniformly in  $z = a + iy$ ,  $|y| \geq M$ . All together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{W}(z)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} &\leq \|\mathcal{U}(z)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \left\| \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{V}(z)^\ell \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \|(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_B(z))^N\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{|y|^\beta} \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

for any  $z = a + iy$ ,  $|y| \geq M$ .

In order to estimate the last term in (2.21), we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \lim_{M' \rightarrow \infty} \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{a-iM'}^{a+iM'} e^{zt} (I - \Pi) \mathcal{W}(z) dz \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \\ & \leq \frac{e^{at}}{2\pi} \int_{a-iM}^{a+iM} \|(I - \Pi) \mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \|(\mathcal{A} \mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z))^N\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} dy \\ & \quad + \frac{e^{at}}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-M, M]} \|(I - \Pi) \mathcal{W}(a + iy)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} dy, \end{aligned}$$

where the first integral is finite thanks to  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap [a - iM, a + iM] = \emptyset$  and (2.23), and the second integral is finite because of (2.24).  $\square$

We give now two variants of Theorem 2.1 which are sometimes easier to apply. First, for a generator  $\Lambda$  of a semigroup  $S_\Lambda$  with the splitting structure (1.2) we introduce an alternative growth assumption to (H1), namely

(H1') for some  $a^* \in \mathbb{R}$  and for any  $a > a^*$ , the operator  $\mathcal{B} - a$  is hypodissipative and there exists a constant  $C_a \in (0, \infty)$  such that

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-as} \|\mathcal{A} S_\mathcal{B}(s)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} ds \leq C_a. \tag{2.25}$$

**Remark 2.3.** Estimate (2.25) is reminiscent of the usual condition under which for a given generator  $\mathcal{B}$  of a semigroup  $S_\mathcal{B}$  the perturbed operator  $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$  also generates a semigroup (see [104,90], [117, condition (1.1)]). Here however the condition  $C_a < 1$  is not required since we have already made the assumption that  $S_\Lambda$  exists.

It is clear by writing

$$S_\mathcal{B} * (\mathcal{A} S_\mathcal{B})^{(*\ell)} = [S_\mathcal{B} * (\mathcal{A} S_\mathcal{B})^{(*\ell-1)}] * (\mathcal{A} S_\mathcal{B})$$

and performing an iterative argument, that (H1') implies (H1). We then immediately deduce from Theorem 2.1 a first variant:

**Corollary 2.4.** Consider a Banach space  $X$ , the generator  $\Lambda$  of a semigroup  $S_\Lambda(t) = e^{t\Lambda}$  on  $X$  and a real number  $a^* \in \mathbb{R}$ . Assume that the spectrum  $\Sigma(\Lambda)$  of  $\Lambda$  satisfies the separation condition (2.9) and that there exist two operators  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{C}(X)$  such that  $\Lambda = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$  and hypothesizes (H1') and (H2) are met. Then the conclusions (2.11) and (1) in Theorem 2.1 hold.

Next, for a generator  $\Lambda$  of a semigroup  $S_\Lambda$  with the splitting structure (1.2) we introduce the alternative growth and regularizing assumptions to (H1') and (H2), namely

(H1'') for some  $a^* \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\zeta \in (0, 1]$  and for any  $a > a^*$ ,  $\zeta' \in [0, \zeta]$  the operator  $\mathcal{B} - a$  is hypodissipative and assumption (H1) or (H1') also holds with  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  replaced by  $\mathcal{B}(D(\Lambda^{\zeta'}))$ ;  
 (H2'') there exist an integer  $n \geq 1$  and a real number  $b > a^*$  such that

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \|(\mathcal{A} S_\mathcal{B})^{(*n)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X, D(\Lambda^\zeta))} \leq C_{b,n,\zeta} e^{bt},$$

for a constant  $C_{b,n,\zeta} \in (0, \infty)$ .

Our second variant of Theorem 2.1 is the following.

**Corollary 2.5.** Consider a Banach space  $X$ , the generator  $\Lambda$  of a semigroup  $S_\Lambda(t) = e^{t\Lambda}$  on  $X$  and a real number  $a^* \in \mathbb{R}$ . Assume that the spectrum  $\Sigma(\Lambda)$  of  $\Lambda$  satisfies the separation condition (2.9) and that there exist two operators  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{C}(X)$  such that  $\Lambda = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$  and hypothesizes **(H1'')** and **(H2'')** are met. Then the conclusions (2.11) and (1) in Theorem 2.1 hold.

Corollary 2.5 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.1 or Corollary 2.4 together with the following simple variant of [51, Lemma 2.15] which makes possible to deduce the more accurate regularization and growth condition **(H2)** from the rough regularization and growth condition **(H2'')**.

**Lemma 2.6.** Consider two Banach spaces  $E$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  such that  $E \subset \mathcal{E}$  with dense and continuous embedding. Consider some operators  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  on  $\mathcal{E}$  such that  $\mathcal{L}$  splits as  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$ , some real number  $a^* \in \mathbb{R}$  and some integer  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Denoting with the same letter  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{L}$  the restriction of these operators on  $E$ , we assume that the two following dissipativity conditions are satisfied:

(i) for any  $a > a^*$ ,  $\ell \geq m$ ,  $X = E$  and  $X = \mathcal{E}$ , there holds

$$\|(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{B})^{(*\ell)}\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \leq C_{a,\ell} e^{a\ell};$$

(ii) for some constants  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $b > a^*$ , and  $C_b \geq 0$ , there holds

$$\|(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{B})^{(*m)}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E},E)} \leq C_b e^{bt}.$$

Then for any  $a > a^*$ , there exist some constructive constants  $n = n(a) \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $C_a \geq 1$  such that

$$\forall t \geq 0 \quad \|(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{B})^{(*n)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E},E)} \leq C_a e^{at}.$$

**Proof of Lemma 2.6.** We fix  $a > a^*$  and  $a' \in (a^*, a)$ , and we note  $T := (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{B})^{(*m)}$ . For  $n = pm$ ,  $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , we write

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{B})^{(*n)}(t) &= T^{(*p)}(t) \\ &= \int_0^t dt_{p-1} \int_0^{t_{p-1}} dt_{p-2} \dots \int_0^{t_2} dt_1 T(\delta_p) \dots T(\delta_1) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\delta_1 = t_1, \quad \delta_2 = t_2 - t_1, \quad \dots, \quad \delta_{p-1} = t_{p-1} - t_{p-2} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_p = t - t_{p-1}.$$

For any  $p \geq 1$ , there exists at least one increment  $\delta_r$ ,  $r \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ , such that  $\delta_r \leq t/p$ . Using (ii) in order to estimate  $\|T(\delta_r)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E},E)}$  and (i) in order to bound the other terms  $\|T(\delta_q)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)}$  in the appropriate space  $X = \mathcal{E}$  or  $X = E$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|T(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{B})^{(*n)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E},E)} \\ &\leq \int_0^t dt_{p-1} \int_0^{t_{p-1}} dt_{p-2} \dots \int_0^{t_2} dt_1 C'_b e^{b\delta_r} \prod_{q \neq r} C_{a',m} e^{a'\delta_q} \\ &\leq C'_b C_{a',m}^{p-1} e^{a't} e^{bt/p} \int_0^t dt_{p-1} \int_0^{t_{p-1}} dt_{p-2} \dots \int_0^{t_2} dt_1 \\ &= C t^{p-1} e^{(a'+b/p)t} \leq C' e^{at}, \end{aligned}$$

by taking  $p$  (and then  $n$ ) large enough so that  $a' + b/p < a$ .  $\square$

### 3. Weyl’s Theorem for semigroup generators

#### 3.1. An abstract semigroup Weyl’s Theorem

We present in this section a version of Weyl’s Theorem about compact perturbation of dissipative generator in the spirit of the above spectral mapping theorem. For that purpose, we introduce the growth and compactness assumption

**(H3)** for the same integer  $n \geq 1$  as in assumption **(H2)** and with the same notation, the time indexed family of operators  $(AS_{\mathcal{B}})^{*(n+1)}(t)$  satisfies the growth and compactness estimate

$$\forall a > a^*, \int_0^\infty \|(AS_{\mathcal{B}})^{*(n+1)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X,Y)} e^{-at} dt \leq C''_{n+1,a},$$

for some constant  $C''_{n+1,a} \geq 0$  and some (separable) Banach space  $Y$  such that  $Y \subset X$  with compact embedding.

**Theorem 3.1.** Consider a Banach space  $X$ , the generator  $\Lambda$  of a semigroup  $S_\Lambda(t) = e^{t\Lambda}$  on  $X$  and a real number  $a^* \in \mathbb{R}$ . The following quantitative growth estimate on the semigroup

(1) for any  $a > a^*$  there exist an integer  $J \in \mathbb{N}$ , a finite family of distinct complex numbers  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_J \in \bar{\Delta}_a$ , some finite rank projectors  $\Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_J \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  and some operators  $T_j \in \mathcal{B}(R\Pi_j)$ , satisfying  $\Lambda\Pi_j = \Pi_j\Lambda = T_j\Pi_j$ ,  $\Sigma(T_j) = \{\xi_j\}$ , in particular

$$\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \bar{\Delta}_a = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_J\} \subset \Sigma_d(\Lambda),$$

and a constant  $C_a$  such that

$$\forall t \geq 0, \left\| e^{t\Lambda} - \sum_{j=1}^J e^{tT_j} \Pi_j \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \leq C_a e^{at}, \tag{3.1}$$

is equivalent to the following splitting structure of the generator

(2) there exist two operators  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{C}(X)$  such that  $\Lambda = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$  and hypothesizes **(H1)**, **(H2)** and **(H3)** are met.

**Remark 3.2.**

- (a) When  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_{a^*} \neq \emptyset$  the above theorem gives a description of the principal asymptotic behavior of the  $C_0$ -semigroup  $S_\Lambda$ , namely it states that it is essentially compact (see e.g. [45, Definition 2.1]). As a matter of fact, if conditions **(H1)**, **(H2)** and **(H3)** hold with  $a^* < 0$ , then the  $C_0$ -semigroup  $S_\Lambda$  is either uniformly exponentially stable or essentially compact.
- (b) We adopt the convention  $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_J\} = \emptyset$  if  $J = 0$ .
- (c) In the case when  $\mathcal{B}$  is sectorial and  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\mathcal{B}$ -compact, Theorem 3.1 is nothing but the classical Weyl’s Theorem on the spectrum [122] or [67, Theorem IV.5.35] combined with the spectral mapping theorem, see [35, Section IV.3.10] for instance.
- (d) Assumption (2) in Theorem 3.1 is similar to the definition in [118] of the fact that “ $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\mathcal{B}$ -power compact”, but it is written at the semigroup level rather than at the resolvent level. Under such a power compact hypothesis, Voigt establishes a generalization of Weyl’s Theorem. His proof uses the analytic property of the resolvent function  $\mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z)$  obtained by Ridav and Vidav in [109] as we present here. As a matter of fact, Theorem 3.1 is a simple consequence of [118, Theorem 1.1] together with Theorem 2.1. However, for the sake of completeness we give an elementary proof of Theorem 3.1 (which consists essentially to prove again [118, Theorem 1.1] without the help of [109] and to apply Theorem 2.1).
- (e) It has been observed in [118] (see also [66,114,91,72]) that a similar conclusion as (3.1) holds under a compactness condition on the remainder term

$$\sum_{\ell=n-1}^{\infty} (\mathcal{AS}_{\mathcal{B}})^{* \ell} = S_{\Lambda} * (\mathcal{AS}_{\mathcal{B}})^{(*n)} = (S_{\mathcal{B}\mathcal{A}})^{(*n)} * S_{\Lambda}$$

in the Dyson–Phillips series (1.11). Hypotheses **(H1)**–**(H2)**–**(H3)** provide some conditions on the only operators  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  such that the above remainder term enjoys such a nice property.

**Proof of Theorem 3.1.** Again, we only prove that **(2)** implies **(1)** since the reverse implication is clear (see Remark 2.2-(c)).

The cornerstone of the proof is the use of the identity

$$\mathcal{R}_{\Lambda}(z)(I - \mathcal{V}(z)) = \mathcal{U}(z)$$

established in (2.18), where we recall that the functions  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  defined by (2.16) and (2.17) are analytic functions on  $\Delta_{a^*}$  with values in  $\mathcal{B}(X)$ . Moreover, we have

$$\mathcal{V}(z) \in \mathcal{B}(X, Y) \subset \mathcal{H}(X) \quad \forall z \in \Delta_a \tag{3.2}$$

because of assumption **(H3)** and

$$\|\mathcal{V}(z)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \leq 1/2 \quad \forall z \in \Delta_a \cap B(0, M)^c \tag{3.3}$$

for some  $M = M(a)$  thanks to (2.12).

*Step 1.* We prove that  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a$  is finite for any  $a > a^*$ .

Let us fix  $\xi \in \Delta_a$  and define  $C(z) := I - \mathcal{V}(z)$ ,  $C_0 := C(\xi)$ . Because of (3.2) and thanks to the Fredholm alternative [40] (see also [17, Théorème VI.6] for a modern and comprehensible statement and proof), there holds

$$R(C_0) = N(C_0^*)^{\perp}, \quad \dim N(C_0) = \dim N(C_0^*) := N \in \mathbb{N}.$$

If  $N \geq 1$ , we introduce  $(f_1, \dots, f_N)$  a basis of the null space  $N(C_0)$  and  $(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N)$  a family of independent linear forms in  $X'$  such that  $\varphi_i(f_j) = \delta_{ij}$ . Similarly, we introduce  $(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_N)$  a basis of the null space  $N(C_0^*)$  and  $(g_1, \dots, g_N)$  a family of independent linear vectors in  $X$  such that  $\psi_i(g_j) = \delta_{ij}$ . Then defining the projectors on  $X$

$$\pi_0 := \sum_{i=1}^n f_i \varphi_i \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_1 := \sum_{i=1}^n g_i \psi_i,$$

and  $X_1 := \pi_0(X)$ ,  $X_0 := (I - \pi_0)(X)$ ,  $Y_1 := \pi_1(X)$ ,  $Y_0 := (I - \pi_1)(X)$ , we have

$$X = X_0 \oplus X_1, \quad X_1 = N(C_0) = \text{Vect}(f_1, \dots, f_N),$$

and

$$X = Y_0 \oplus Y_1, \quad Y_0 = R(C_0), \quad Y_1 = \text{Vect}(g_1, \dots, g_N).$$

On the one hand,  $C_0 : X_0 \rightarrow Y_0$  is bijective by definition, and the family of linear mappings

$$D_0(z) := C_0^{-1} (I - \pi_1) C(z)|_{X_0} : X_0 \rightarrow X_0,$$

is an analytic function with respect to the parameter  $z \in \Delta_a$  and satisfies  $D_0(\xi) = I_{X_0}$ . We deduce that  $D_0(z)$  is also invertible for  $z$  belonging to a neighborhood  $B(\xi, r_0(\xi))$  of  $\xi$ ,  $r_0(\xi) > 0$ , and then

$$(I - \pi_1) C(z)|_{X_0} : X_0 \rightarrow Y_0 \text{ is invertible for any } z \in B(\xi, r_0(\xi)). \tag{3.4}$$

On the other hand, the family of linear mappings

$$D_1(z) := \pi_1 C(z)|_{Y_1} : Y_1 \rightarrow Y_1,$$

is an analytic function with respect to the parameter  $z \in \Delta_a$  and  $D_1(z)$  is invertible for any  $z \in \Delta_a \cap B(0, M')^c$  for  $M'$  large enough, because  $\mathcal{V}(z) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\Im m z \rightarrow \infty$  from (2.12). Since  $Y_1$  is finite dimensional we may define  $z \mapsto \det(D_1(z))$ , which is an analytic function on  $\Delta_a$  and satisfies  $\det(D_1(z)) \neq 0$  for any  $z \in \Delta_a \cap B(0, M')^c$ . As a

consequence,  $z \mapsto \det(D_1(z))$  has isolate zeros and since  $\det(D_1(z_0)) = 0$  there exists a neighborhood  $B(\xi, r_1(\xi))$  of  $\xi, r_1(\xi) > 0$ , such that  $\det(D_1(z)) \neq 0$  for any  $z \in B(z_0, r_1(\xi)) \setminus \{\xi\}$  from which we deduce

$$\pi_1 C(z)|_{Y_1} : Y_1 \rightarrow Y_1 \text{ is invertible for any } z \in B(\xi, r_1(\xi)) \setminus \{\xi\}. \tag{3.5}$$

Gathering (3.4) and (3.5), we get that  $C(z) : X \rightarrow Y_0 \oplus Y_1 = X$  is surjective for any  $z \in B(\xi, r(\xi)) \setminus \{\xi\}$ ,  $r(\xi) := \min(r_0(\xi), r_1(\xi)) > 0$ , and then bijective thanks to the Fredholm alternative.

By compactness of the set  $\bar{\Delta}_a \cap B(0, M')$ , we may cover that set by a finite number of balls  $B(\xi_j, r(\xi_j)), 1 \leq j \leq J$ , so that  $C(z) = I - \mathcal{V}(z)$  is invertible for any  $z \in \Omega := \Delta_a \setminus \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_J\}$ . As a consequence, the function

$$\mathcal{W}(z) := \mathcal{U}(z) (I - \mathcal{V}(z))^{-1}$$

is well defined and analytic on  $\Omega$  and coincides with  $\mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z)$  on the half plane  $\Delta_b$ , where  $b = \omega(\Lambda)$  is the growth bound of  $S_\Lambda$ . These facts immediately imply that  $\mathcal{R}_\Lambda = \mathcal{W}$  on  $\Omega$  and then

$$\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a \subset \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_J\} = \Delta_a \setminus \Omega.$$

*Step 2.* We prove that  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_{a^*} \subset \Sigma_d(\Lambda)$ . Indeed, for any  $\xi \in \Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_{a^*}$ , we may write with the notation of step 1

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\Lambda, \xi} (I - \pi_1) &= \int_{|z-\xi|=r(\xi)/2} \mathcal{R}_\Lambda(z) (I - \pi_1) \\ &= \int_{|z-\xi|=r(\xi)/2} \mathcal{U}(z) (I - \mathcal{V}(z))^{-1} (I - \pi_1) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we have used that  $I - \mathcal{V}(z) : X_0 \rightarrow Y_0$  is bijective for any  $z \in B(\xi, r(\xi))$  so that  $(I - \mathcal{V}(z))^{-1} (I - \pi_1)$  is well defined and analytic on  $B(\xi, r(\xi))$ . We deduce that

$$\Pi_{\Lambda, \xi} = \Pi_{\Lambda, \xi} \pi_1,$$

and then

$$\dim R(\Pi_{\Lambda, \xi}) \leq \dim R(\pi_1) = N.$$

That precisely means  $\xi \in \Sigma_d(\Lambda)$ .

*Step 3.* The fact that  $S_\Lambda$  satisfies the growth estimate (3.1) is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.1.  $\square$

### 3.2. A quantified version of the Weyl’s Theorem

We present now a quantified version of Weyl’s Theorem 3.1.

**Theorem 3.3.** Consider a Banach space  $X$ , the generator  $\Lambda$  of a semigroup  $S_\Lambda(t) = e^{t\Lambda}$  on  $X$ , a real number  $a^* \in \mathbb{R}$  and assume that there exist two operators  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{C}(X)$  such that  $\Lambda = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$  and the hypotheses (H1), (H2) and (H3) of Theorem 3.1 are met. Assume furthermore that

$$\forall a > a^*, \int_0^\infty \|\mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X,Y)} e^{-at} dt \leq C_a, \tag{3.6}$$

for some constant  $C_a \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , and there exists a sequence of  $N$  dimensional range increasing projectors  $\pi_N$  and a sequence of positive real numbers  $\varepsilon_N \rightarrow 0$  such that

$$\forall f \in Y \quad \|\pi_N^\perp f\|_X \leq \varepsilon_N \|f\|_Y. \tag{3.7}$$

For any  $a > a^*$ , there exists an integer  $n^*$  (which depends on a constructive way on  $a, (\pi_N), (\varepsilon_N)$  and the constants involved in the assumptions (H1), (H2), (H3) and (3.6)) such that

$$\sharp(\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a) \leq n^*, \quad \dim R(\Pi_{\Lambda,a}) \leq n^*. \tag{3.8}$$

We assume moreover **(H1'')** and  $\|(S_B \mathcal{A})^{(*n)}\|_{\mathcal{B}(X, D(\Lambda^\xi))} e^{-at} \in L^1(0, \infty)$  for any  $a > a^*$ . Then, for any  $a > a^*$ , there exists a constant  $C'_a$  such that for any Jordan basis  $(g_{i,j})$  associated to the eigenspace  $R\Pi_{\Lambda,a}$  there holds

$$\|g_{i,j}\|_X = 1, \quad \|g_{i,j}\|_{D(\Lambda^\xi) \cap Y} \leq C'_a. \tag{3.9}$$

**Proof of Theorem 3.3.** *Step 1.* Let us fix  $a > a^*$  and let us define for any  $z \in \Delta_a$  the compact perturbation of the identity

$$\Phi(z) := I + \mathcal{A} \mathcal{R}_B(z) : X \rightarrow X.$$

On the one hand, because of (3.6), we know that there exists a constant  $C_a$  such that

$$\forall z \in \Delta_a \quad \|\mathcal{A} \mathcal{R}_B(z)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X,Y)} \leq C_a,$$

and then

$$\|\pi_N^\perp \mathcal{A} \mathcal{R}_B(z)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \leq \varepsilon_N C_a < 1$$

for  $N$  large enough. We deduce from the above smallness condition that

$$I + \pi_N^\perp \mathcal{A} \mathcal{R}_B(z) : R\pi_N^\perp \rightarrow R\pi_N^\perp$$

is an isomorphism for any  $z \in \Delta_a$ . On the other hand, thanks to the Fredholm alternative, it is clear that  $\Phi(z)$  is invertible if, and only if,  $\pi_N \Phi(z)$  has maximal rank  $N$ .

*Step 2.* For a given basis  $(g_1, \dots, g_N)$  of  $R\pi_N$  we denote by  $\pi_{N,i}$  a projection on  $\mathbb{C}g_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , and we define  $\Phi_{N,i}(z) := \pi_{N,i} \Phi(z)$ . For a given  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  and if  $z_i \in \Delta_a$  satisfies  $\Phi_{N,i}(z_i) = 0$  we have

$$\pi_{N,i} + \pi_{N,i} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{R}_B(z_i) = 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{N,i}(z) = \pi_{N,i} + \pi_{N,i} \mathcal{A} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}_B(z_i)^{n+1} (z - z_i)^n \quad \forall z \in \Delta_a \cap B(z_i, r),$$

with  $r := \|\mathcal{R}_B(z_i)\|^{-1} \geq C_a^{-1} > 0$ . From the two last equations, we deduce

$$\Phi_{N,i}(z) = -\pi_{N,i} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}_B(z_i)^n (z - z_i)^n \quad \forall z \in \Delta_a \cap B(z_i, r_i)$$

and we observe that  $\text{rank } \Phi_{N,i}(z) = 1$  for any  $z \in B(z_i, r)$ ,  $z \neq z_i$ . As a consequence, in any ball  $B$  of radius  $r$ ,  $\text{rank } \pi_N \Phi(z) = N$  for any  $z \in B \cap \Delta_a$  except at most  $N$  points  $z_1, \dots, z_N \in B$ , and the total dimension of the “defect of surjectivity”  $\text{codim } R(\pi_N \Phi(z_i)) = \dim \Pi_{\Lambda, z_i}$  is at most  $N$ . Covering the region  $\bar{\Delta}_a \cap B(0, M)$  by  $(1 + 2M/r)^2$  balls of radius  $r \in (C_a^{-1}, M)$ , we see that (3.8) holds with  $n^* := (1 + 2MC_a)^2 N$ .

*Step 3.* Consider a Jordan basis  $(g_{j,m})$  associated to an eigenvalue  $\xi \in \Sigma_d(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a$ , and then defined by

$$\Lambda g_{j,m} = \xi g_{j,m} + g_{j,m-1}.$$

We write

$$g_{j,m} = \mathcal{R}_B(\xi) g_{j,m-1} - \mathcal{R}_B(\xi) \mathcal{A} g_{j,m},$$

and iterating the formula

$$g_{j,m} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} (-1)^\ell \mathcal{R}_B(\xi) (\mathcal{A} \mathcal{R}_B(\xi))^\ell g_{j,m-1} + (-1)^L (\mathcal{R}_B(\xi) \mathcal{A})^L g_{j,m},$$

from which we easily conclude that (3.9) holds.  $\square$



#### 4. Semigroup Weyl’s Theorem for the growth-fragmentation equations

##### 4.1. Equal mitosis and smooth cell-division equations

In this paragraph we are concerned with the equal mitosis equation (1.27) and the cell-division equation (1.37) with smooth offspring distribution, so that we consider the operator

$$\Lambda f(x) := -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x) - K(x)f(x) + (\mathcal{F}^+ f)(x)$$

where  $K$  satisfies (1.29) and (1.30) and the gain part  $\mathcal{F}^+$  of the fragmentation operator is defined by

$$\mathcal{F}^+ f(x) := \int_x^\infty k(y, x) f(y) dy \tag{4.10}$$

with  $k$  satisfying (1.21) and  $\wp = 2\delta_{1/2}$  (in the equal mitosis case) or  $\wp$  is a function which satisfies (1.22) and (1.34) (in the case of the smooth cell-division equation). We recall that the operator is complemented with a boundary condition (1.28).

We fix  $\alpha > \alpha^*$ , with  $\alpha^* > 1$  defined thanks to Eq. (1.38), and we set  $K'_0 := K_0 - \wp_\alpha K_1 > 0$ . When  $K(0) = 0$  or  $\wp = 2\delta_{1/2}$ , we then define the critical abscissa  $a^* \in \mathbb{R}$  by

$$a^* := -K'_0 \text{ if } \gamma = 0, \quad a^* := -\infty \text{ if } \gamma > 0.$$

Observe that when  $K(0) > 0$ , the positivity conditions (1.29) and (1.30) imply that there exists a constant  $K_* > 0$  such that

$$K(x) \geq K_* \quad \forall x \geq 0. \tag{4.11}$$

When  $K(0) > 0$  and  $\wp$  satisfies (1.34), we then define the critical abscissa  $a^* \in \mathbb{R}$  by

$$a^* := -\min(K'_0, K_*) \text{ if } \gamma = 0, \quad a^* := -K_* \text{ if } \gamma > 0.$$

We perform the spectral analysis of  $\Lambda$  in the Banach space  $X = L^1_\alpha$  defined at the beginning of Section 1.2.5. We also define, for later reference, the Sobolev spaces

$$W^{1,1}_\alpha = \{f \in L^1_\alpha, \partial_x f \in L^1_\alpha\}, \quad \dot{W}^{1,1}_\alpha := \{f \in L^1_{loc}; \partial_x f \in \dot{L}^1_\alpha\}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It is worth emphasizing that we classically have (and that is also a straightforward consequence of the lemmas which follow)

$$D(\Lambda) = \{f \in L^1_{\alpha+\gamma}, \partial_x f \in L^1_\alpha, f(0) = 0\}.$$

As a first step in the proof of Theorem 1.1 we have

**Proposition 4.4.** *Under the above assumptions and definitions of  $\alpha^* > 1$  and  $a^* < 0$ , the conclusion (2), and then (2.11) and (1), of Theorem 3.1 holds for the cell-division semigroup in  $L^1_\alpha$  for any  $\alpha > \alpha^*$  and for any  $a > a^*$ . Moreover the conclusions of Theorem 3.3 hold under the additional assumptions that  $K(0) = 0$  and  $\wp$  satisfies the smoothness condition (1.34).*

In order to establish Proposition 4.4 we will introduce an adequate splitting  $\Lambda = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$  and we prove that  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfy conditions (H1), (H2) and (H3) (or one of the “prime” variants of them) for  $n = 1$  or  $2$  as a consequence of the series of technical Lemmas 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 below.

Taking a real number  $R \in [1, \infty)$  to be chosen later, we define

$$K_R := K \chi_R \quad K^c_R := K \chi^c_R, \quad k_R = K_R \kappa, \quad k^c_R = K_R \kappa$$

where  $\chi_R(x) = \chi(x/R)$ ,  $\chi^c_R(x) = \chi^c(x/R)$ ,  $\chi$  being the Lipschitz function defined on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  by  $\chi(0) = 1$ ,  $\chi' = -\mathbf{1}_{[1,2]}$  and  $\chi^c = 1 - \chi$ , as well as

$$\mathcal{F}_R^+ = \int_x^\infty k_R(y, x) f(y) dy, \quad \mathcal{F}_R^{+,c} = \int_x^\infty k_R^c(y, x) f(y) dy,$$

and then

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_R = \mathcal{F}_R^+, \quad \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_R = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} - K(x) + \mathcal{F}_R^{+,c}$$

so that  $\Lambda = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$ .

**Lemma 4.5.**

- (1) For any  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \leq \beta$  there holds  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\dot{L}_\alpha^1, \dot{L}_\alpha^1 \cap \dot{L}_\beta^1)$ .
- (2) For the mitosis operator, there holds  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(W^{1,1}, W_\alpha^{1,1})$  for any  $\alpha \geq 0$ . In particular  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(D(\Lambda^\eta))$  for  $\eta = 0, 1$ .
- (3) Under assumption (1.34) on  $\wp$  there holds  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\dot{L}_{\beta-1}^1, \dot{W}_\beta^{1,1})$  for any  $\beta \geq 0$ .
- (4) Under assumption (1.34) on  $\wp$  and the additional assumption  $K(0) = 0$ , there holds  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(L_\alpha^1, W_\alpha^{1,1})$  for any  $\alpha \geq 0$ .

**Proof of Lemma 4.5.** We split the proof into four steps.

*Step 1.* Fix  $0 \leq f \in \dot{L}_\alpha^1$  as well as  $\alpha' \geq \alpha$ . Recalling from (1.30) that  $K(x) \leq K_1 \langle x \rangle^\gamma$ ,  $\langle x \rangle := (1 + x^2)^{\gamma/2}$ , we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{A}f\|_{\dot{L}_{\alpha'}^1} &= \int_0^\infty f(x) \int_0^x k_R(x, y) y^{\alpha'} dy dx \\ &= \wp_{\alpha'} \int_0^\infty f(x) K_R(x) x^{\alpha'} dx \\ &\leq \wp_{\alpha'} K_1 \langle R \rangle^{\gamma+\alpha'-\alpha} \int_0^{2R} f(x) x^\alpha dx, \end{aligned}$$

so that  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\dot{L}_\alpha^1, \dot{L}_{\alpha'}^1)$ .

*Step 2.* For the mitosis operator, we have

$$\partial_x \mathcal{A}f = 8(\partial_x K_R)(2x) f(2x) + 8K_R(2x) (\partial_x f)(2x),$$

and similar estimates as above lead to the bound

$$\|\partial_x \mathcal{A}f\|_{L_\alpha^1} \leq 4 \langle R \rangle^\alpha \|K\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,2R)} \|f\|_{W^{1,1}}$$

for any  $\alpha \geq 0$  and  $f \in W^{1,1}$ , from which (2) follows.

*Step 3.* Under the regularity assumption (1.34), there holds

$$\partial_x \mathcal{A}f = \int_x^\infty K_R(y) \wp'(x/y) y^{-2} f(y) dy - K_R(x) \wp(1) f(x)/x,$$

so that

$$\|\partial_x \mathcal{A}f\|_{\dot{L}_\beta^1} \leq \{ \wp(1) + \wp'_\beta \} K_1 \langle R \rangle^\gamma \int_0^{2R} f(x) x^{\beta-1} dx,$$

and we conclude with  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\dot{L}_{\beta-1}^1, \dot{W}_\beta^{1,1})$ .

Step 4. With the assumption of point (4) and recalling that  $K$  is  $C^1$ , there holds  $\|K(x)/x\|_{L^\infty(0,2R)}$  for any  $R \in (0, \infty)$  and then from the above expression of  $\partial_x \mathcal{A}f$ , we get

$$\|\partial_x \mathcal{A}f\|_{L^1_\alpha} \leq \{ \wp(1) + \wp'_0 \} \|K(x)/x\|_{L^\infty(0,2R)} \|f\|_{L^1_\alpha}$$

for any  $f \in L^1_\alpha$  and  $\alpha \geq 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6.** For any  $a > a^*$  there exists  $R^*(a) > 0$  such that the operator  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $a$ -hypodissipative in  $L^1_\alpha$  for any  $R \in (R^*(a), \infty)$ .

**Proof of Lemma 4.6.** We introduce the primitive functions

$$\mathcal{K}(z) := \int_0^z K(u) du, \quad \mathcal{K}(z_1, z_2) := \mathcal{K}(z_2) - \mathcal{K}(z_1) \tag{4.12}$$

and, for any given  $a \in (a^*, 0]$ , we define the space

$$\mathcal{E} := L^1(\phi), \quad \phi(x) := \phi_0(x) \mathbf{1}_{x \leq x_2} + \phi_\infty(x) \mathbf{1}_{x \geq x_2},$$

where

$$\phi_0(x) := \frac{e^{\mathcal{K}(x)+ax}}{e^{\mathcal{K}(x_2)+ax_2}}, \quad \phi_\infty(x) := \frac{x^\alpha}{x_2^\alpha},$$

and where

$$x_2 := \max(1, x_1, 2\alpha/(a + K'_0)) \quad \text{if } \gamma = 0; \tag{4.13}$$

$$x_2 := \max(1, x_1, [3\alpha/(x_1 K'_0)]^{1/\gamma}, [-3a/K'_0]^{1/\gamma}) \quad \text{if } \gamma > 0. \tag{4.14}$$

We recall that  $x_1$  is defined in (1.30) and  $K'_0$  is defined at the beginning of Section 4.1.

Consider  $f \in D(\Lambda)$  a real-valued function and let us show that for any  $a > a^*$  and any  $R > R^*(a)$ ,  $R^*(a)$  to be chosen later,

$$\int_0^\infty \text{sign}(f(x)) \mathcal{B}f(x) \phi(x) dx \leq a \|f\|_{\mathcal{E}}. \tag{4.15}$$

Since the case of complex-valued functions can be handled in a similar way and since the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}}$  is clearly equivalent to  $\|\cdot\|_{L^1_\alpha}$ , that will end the proof.

On the one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{F}^{+,c} f\|_{L^1(\phi_0 \mathbf{1}_{x \leq x_2})} &= \int_R^\infty K_R^c(x) f(x) \int_0^{x \wedge x_2} \wp(y/x) \phi_0(y) \frac{dy}{x} dx \\ &\leq \eta(x_2/R) \int_R^\infty K_R^c(x) f(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\eta(u) := \left( \sup_{[0, x_2]} \phi_0 \right) \left( \int_0^u \wp(z) dz \right),$$

so that, performing one integration by part, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_0^{x_2} \text{sign}(f(x)) \mathcal{B}f(x) \phi_0(x) dx \\
 &= \int_0^{x_2} \{-K(x)|f(x)| - \partial_x |f(x)|\} \phi_0(x) dx + \int_0^{x_2} \text{sign}(f) (\mathcal{F}^{+,c} f) \phi_0 dx \\
 &\leq -|f(x_2)| + a \int_0^{x_2} |f(x)| \phi_0(x) dx + \eta(x_2/R) \int_R^\infty K_R^c(x) f(x) dx.
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

On the other hand, performing one integration by part again, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{x_2}^\infty \text{sign}(f(x)) \mathcal{B}_R f(x) \phi_\infty(x) dx \\
 &\leq |f(x_2)| + \int_{x_2}^\infty |f(x)| \{-K\phi_\infty + \partial_x \phi_\infty + K_R^c(x) \int_0^x \wp(\frac{y}{x}) \phi_\infty(y) \frac{dy}{x}\} dx \\
 &\leq |f(x_2)| + \int_{x_2}^\infty |f(x)| [(\wp_\alpha K_1 - K_0)x^\gamma + \alpha/x] \phi_\infty(x) dx \\
 &\leq |f(x_2)| + \int_{x_2}^\infty |f(x)| \{a + \theta x^\gamma\} \phi_\infty(x) dx,
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

with  $\theta := -(a + K'_0)/2$  if  $\gamma = 0$  and  $\theta := -K'_0/3$  if  $\gamma > 0$  thanks to the choice of  $x_2$ . Gathering (4.16) and (4.17), and taking  $R^*$  large enough in such a way that  $\eta(x_2/R^*) K_1 + \theta \leq 0$ , we get that  $\mathcal{B}_R$  is  $a$ -dissipative in  $\mathcal{E}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.7.** *The operator  $\Lambda$  generates a  $C_0$ -semigroup on  $L^1_\alpha$ .*

**Proof of Lemma 4.7.** Thanks to Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6, we have that  $\Lambda$  is  $b$ -dissipative in  $\mathcal{E}$  with  $b := \|\mathcal{A}_R\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E})} + a$ . On the other hand, one can show that  $R(\Lambda - b) = X$  for  $b$  large enough and conclude thanks to Lumer–Phillips Theorem ([78] or [100, Theorem I.4.3]) that  $\Lambda$  generates a  $C_0$ -semigroup. Equivalently, one can argue as in [36, proof of Theorem 3.2] by introducing an approximation sequence of bounded total fragmentation rates  $(K^n)$  and proving that for any fixed initial datum  $f_0 \in X$  the associated sequence of solutions  $(f^n)$  (constructed by a mere Banach fixed point theorem in  $C([0, T]; \mathcal{E})$ ,  $\forall T > 0$ ) is a Cauchy sequence. That establishes that for any  $f_0 \in \mathcal{E}$  there exists a unique solution  $f \in C(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{E})$  to the Cauchy problem associated to the operator  $\Lambda$  and then that  $\Lambda$  generates a  $C_0$ -semigroup.  $\square$

We define

$$Y_r := \{f \in W^{r,1}_\alpha \cap L^1_{\alpha+\gamma+1}(\mathbb{R}); \text{supp } f \subset [0, \infty)\}, \quad r \in [0, 1],$$

as a family of interpolating spaces between  $Y_0 = L^1_{\alpha+\gamma+1} \subset X$  and  $Y_1 \subset D(\Lambda)$ .

**Lemma 4.8.** *If  $\wp$  satisfies (1.34) and  $K(0) = 0$ , for any  $a > a^*$  there exists a constant  $C_a$  such that*

$$\|\mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X, Y_1)} \leq C_a e^{at}. \tag{4.18}$$

*If  $\wp$  satisfies (1.34) and  $K(0) \neq 0$ , for any  $a > a^*$  and any  $r \in [0, 1)$  there exists a constant  $C_{a,r}$  such that*

$$\|(\mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}})^{(*2)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X, Y_r)} \leq C_{a,r} e^{at}. \tag{4.19}$$

**Proof of Lemma 4.8.** Extending by 0 a function  $g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$  outside of  $[0, \infty)$ , we may identify  $L^1(\mathbb{R}_+) = \{g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}); \text{supp } g \subset [0, \infty)\}$  and extending  $k = k(x, y)$  by 0 outside of  $\{(x, y); 0 \leq y \leq x\}$ , we may consider  $S_{\mathcal{B}}(t)$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  as operators acting on  $L^1(\mathbb{R})$  which preserve the support  $[0, \infty)$  (they then also act on  $L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ ).

*Step 1.* Assume first  $K(0) = 0$ . From Lemma 4.5-(4) and Lemma 4.6, for any  $f \in L^1_{\alpha}$ , we get

$$\| \partial_x(\mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}}(t)f) \|_{L^1_{\alpha}} \leq C \| S_{\mathcal{B}}(t)f \|_{L^1_{\alpha}} \leq C_a e^{at} \| f \|_{L^1_{\alpha}}.$$

From Lemma 4.5-(1) and Lemma 4.6 we get a similar estimate on the quantity  $\| \mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}}(t) \|_{\mathcal{B}(L^1_{\alpha}, L^1_{\alpha+\gamma+1})}$  and that ends the proof of (4.18).

*Step 2.* We assume now  $K(0) \neq 0$ . We introduce the notation

$$\mathcal{B}_0 f(x) := -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x) - K(x)f(x)$$

and then the shorthands  $\mathcal{A}^c := \mathcal{F}^{+,c}$ ,  $U := \mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}}$ ,  $U^c := \mathcal{A}^c S_{\mathcal{B}}$ ,  $U_0 := \mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}_0}$  and  $U_0^c := \mathcal{A}^c S_{\mathcal{B}_0}$ , where  $S_{\mathcal{B}}$  (resp.  $S_{\mathcal{B}_0}$ ) is the semigroup associated to the generator  $\mathcal{B}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{B}_0$ ) complemented with the boundary condition (1.28). Thanks to the Duhamel formula

$$S_{\mathcal{B}} = S_{\mathcal{B}_0} + S_{\mathcal{B}_0} * \mathcal{A}^c S_{\mathcal{B}}, \tag{4.20}$$

we have

$$U = U_0 + U_0 * U^c. \tag{4.21}$$

From the explicit representation formula

$$(S_{\mathcal{B}_0}(t)f)(x) = e^{-\mathcal{K}(x-t,x)} f(x-t) \quad \forall t \geq 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.22}$$

where  $\mathcal{K}$  is the primitive function defined in (4.12), we get

$$U_0(t)f(x) = \int_x^{\infty} k_R(y, x) e^{-\mathcal{K}(y-t,y)} f(y-t) dy,$$

so that

$$\partial_x[U_0(t)f(x)] = \int_x^{\infty} K_R(y) \wp'(x/y) y^{-2} e^{-\mathcal{K}(y-t,y)} f(y-t) dy - \frac{K_R(x)}{x} \wp(1) e^{-\mathcal{K}(x-t,x)} f(x-t).$$

Using that  $\mathcal{K}(y-t, y) \geq K_* t$  for any  $y \geq t$ , we have

$$e^{-\mathcal{K}(y-t,y)} |f(y-t)| \leq e^{at} |f(y-t)| \quad \forall t \geq 0, \forall y \in \mathbb{R},$$

and we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \| \partial_x[U_0(t)f] \|_{L^1_{\alpha}} &\leq \wp(1) \int_0^{2R} K_R(x) \langle x \rangle^{\alpha} \frac{|f(x-t)|}{(x-t)+t} dx e^{at} + \int_0^{2R} K_R(x) \int_0^x |\wp'(y/x)| \langle y \rangle^{\alpha} \frac{dy}{x} \frac{|f(x-t)|}{(x-t)+t} dx e^{at} \\ &\leq (\wp(1) + \wp'_0) K_1 (2R)^{\gamma+\alpha} \frac{e^{at}}{t} \int_0^{2R} |f(x)| dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since clearly (from the explicit representation formula (4.22) for instance) the same estimate holds for  $\| U_0(t) \|_{\mathcal{B}(L^1, L^1_{\alpha+\gamma+1})}$  we get by interpolation and for any  $r \in [0, 1]$

$$\| U_0(t) \|_{\mathcal{B}(L^1, Y_r)} \leq C_a \frac{e^{at}}{t^r}.$$

Thanks to the identity (4.21), the fact that  $\mathcal{A}^c \in \mathcal{B}(L^1_{\gamma}, L^1)$  and Lemma 4.6, we deduce for  $r \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} \|U(t)f\|_{Y_r} &\leq C_a \frac{e^{at}}{t^r} \|f\|_{L^1} + \int_0^t C_a \frac{e^{a(t-s)}}{(t-s)^r} \|\mathcal{A}^c S_{\mathcal{B}}(s)f\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq C_{a,r} \frac{e^{at}}{t^r} \|f\|_{L^1_{\max(\alpha,\gamma)}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 4.5-(1) and Lemma 4.6, we know that

$$\|U(t)f\|_{L^1_{\alpha+\gamma}} \leq \|\mathcal{A}\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^1_{\alpha}, L^1_{\alpha+\gamma})} \|S_{\mathcal{B}}(t)f\|_{L^1_{\alpha}} \leq C_a e^{at} \|f\|_{L^1_{\alpha}}.$$

These two estimates together imply (4.19).  $\square$

**Lemma 4.9.** *For the equal mitosis equation, there holds*

$$\|(\mathcal{A} S_{\mathcal{B}})^{(*2)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(X, Y_1)} \leq C t \quad \forall t \geq 0 \quad (4.23)$$

for some constant  $C$  which only depends on  $K$  through its norm  $\|K\|_{W^{1,\infty}(0,R)}$ , where  $R$  is defined in Lemma 4.6.

**Proof of Lemma 4.9.** Thanks to the Duhamel formula (4.20) and the iterated Duhamel formula

$$S_{\mathcal{B}} = S_{\mathcal{B}_0} + S_{\mathcal{B}_0} * \mathcal{A}^c S_{\mathcal{B}_0} + S_{\mathcal{B}_0} * \mathcal{A}^c S_{\mathcal{B}_0} * \mathcal{A}^c S_{\mathcal{B}},$$

we have

$$U = U_0 + U_0 * U^c \quad \text{and} \quad U = U_0 + U_0 * U_0^c + U_0 * U_0^c * U^c,$$

from which we finally deduce

$$U^{*2} = U_0^{*2} + U_0^{*2} * U^c + U_0 * U_0^c * U + U_0 * U_0^c * U^c * U. \quad (4.24)$$

From the explicit representation formula (4.22), we get

$$(U_0(t)f)(x) = 4 K_R(2x) e^{-\mathcal{K}(2x-t, 2x)} f(2x-t)$$

as well as

$$(U_0^c(t)f)(x) = 4 K_R^c(2x) e^{-\mathcal{K}(2x-t, 2x)} f(2x-t).$$

We then easily compute

$$\begin{aligned} (U_0^{*2}(t)f)(x) &= \int_0^t (U_0(t-s)U_0(s)f)(x) ds \\ &= 4 K_R(2x) \int_0^t e^{-\mathcal{K}(2x-t+s, 2x)} (U_0(s)f)(2x-t+s) ds \\ &= 16 K_R(2x) \int_0^t K_R(2(2x-t+s)) e^{-\mathcal{K}(2x-t+s, 2x) - \mathcal{K}(4x-2t+s, 2(2x-t+s))} f(4x-2t+s) ds \\ &= 16 K_R(2x) \int_{u_0}^{u_1} K_R(2u-4x+2t) e^{-\Theta(u)} f(u) du \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

with  $u_0 := (4x-2t) \wedge (2x-t+R/2)$ ,  $u_1 := (4x-t) \wedge (2x-t+R/2)$  and  $\Theta(u) := \mathcal{K}(u-2x+t, 2x) + \mathcal{K}(u, 2u-4x+2t)$ . Similarly, we have

$$(U_0 * U_0^c(t)f)(x) = 16 K_R(2x) \int_{u_0}^{u_1} K_R^c(2u-4x+2t) e^{-\Theta(u)} f(u) du. \quad (4.26)$$

The two last terms are clearly more regular (in  $x$ ) than the initial function  $f$ . Moreover, extending by 0 the function  $f$  outside of  $[0, \infty)$ , we see thanks to (4.22) that  $S_{B_0}(t)f$ , and then  $U_0^{*2}(t)f$  and  $U_0 * U_0^c(t)f$ , are well defined as functions in  $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Using the lower bound  $\Theta \geq 0$  and performing some elementary computations, we easily get from (4.24), (4.25) and (4.26) the estimate

$$\| \partial_x[(AS_B)^{(*2)}(t)f] \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq C_R t \| f \|_{L^1}, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

which ends the proof of (4.23) since then  $(AS_B)^{(*2)}(t)f \in C(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\text{supp}((AS_B)^{(*2)}(t)f) \subset [0, \infty]$  imply  $(AS_B)^{(*2)}(t)f(0) = 0$ .  $\square$

With all the estimates established in the above lemmas, we are able to present the

**Proof of Proposition 4.4.** We just have to explain why the hypothesis of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied in each cases. Hypothesis (H1) is an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.5-(1) and Lemma 4.6 together with Remark 2.2-(b). For that last claim we use that  $Y_r \subset D(\Lambda^{r'})$  for any  $0 \leq r' < r < 1$  thanks to the classical interpolation theory, see (2.7), [70] and [76].

In the case when  $\wp$  satisfies (1.34), Lemma 4.8 and Remark 2.2-(h) imply that hypothesizes (H2) and (H3) are met with  $n = 1, \zeta = 1$  and  $\zeta' = 0$  in the case  $K(0) = 0$  and are met with  $n = 2, \zeta \in (0, 1)$  and  $\zeta' = 0$  in the case  $K(0) \neq 0$ . Also notice that the additional assumptions of Theorem 3.3 are met in the case that  $K(0) = 0$ .

For the equal mitosis equation, Lemma 4.5-(2) and Lemma 4.6 imply that assumption (H1) also holds with  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  replaced by  $\mathcal{B}(D(\Lambda))$  and  $\mathcal{B}(X, L^1_{\alpha+1})$ , while Lemma 4.9 implies that (H2'') holds with  $n = 2, \zeta = 1, \zeta' = 0$  and any  $b > 0$ , so that we can apply Corollary 2.5 (assumption (H2) holds with  $n$  large enough thanks to Lemma 2.6). Finally, hypothesis (H3) follows from (H2) and the fact that  $D(\Lambda) \cap L^1_{\alpha+1} \subset X$  compactly.  $\square$

#### 4.2. Quantified semigroup Weyl's Theorem for the self-similar fragmentation equation

In this paragraph we are concerned with the self-similar fragmentation equation (1.41), so that we consider the operator

$$\Lambda f(x) := -x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x) - 2 f(x) - K(x) f(x) + (\mathcal{F}^+ f)(x)$$

where  $K(x) = x^\gamma$  and  $\mathcal{F}^+$  is defined in (4.10) with  $k$  satisfying (1.21), (1.22) and (1.34).

We perform the spectral analysis of  $\Lambda$  in the Banach space  $X := \dot{L}^1_\alpha \cap \dot{L}^1_\beta$  for  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 < \beta < \infty$ , where we recall that the homogeneous Lebesgue space  $\dot{L}^1_\alpha$  has been defined at the beginning of Section 1.2.5, and we set  $a^* := \alpha - 1 \in [-1, 0)$ . It is worth emphasizing that we classically have (that is again a consequence of the estimates established in the series of lemmas which follow, moreover the inclusion  $\supset$  is just straightforward and it is the only inclusion that we will really use)

$$D(\Lambda) = \{ f \in \dot{L}^1_\alpha \cap \dot{L}^1_{\beta+\gamma}, \partial_x f \in \dot{L}^1_{\alpha+1} \cap \dot{L}^1_{\beta+1} \}.$$

As a first step in the proof of Theorem 1.1 we have

**Proposition 4.10.** *Under the above assumptions and definitions, the conclusion (2), and then (2.11) and (1), of Theorem 3.3 holds for the self-similar fragmentation semigroup in  $\dot{L}^1_\alpha \cap \dot{L}^1_\beta$  for any  $a > a^*$ .*

In order to establish Proposition 4.10 we introduce a suitable splitting  $\Lambda = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$  and we prove that  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfy conditions (H1), (H2), (H3) with  $n = 1$  as well as (3.6) with  $Y \subset D(\Lambda)$  as a consequence of the two technical Lemmas 4.11 and 4.12 below.

We introduce the following splitting inspired from [18]. With the notation of the previous section, we define

$$k^s(x, y) := k(x, y) \chi_\delta^c(x) \chi_\varepsilon^c(y) \chi_R(y)$$

for  $0 < \varepsilon \leq \delta/2 \leq 1, R \geq 2$  to be specified later, and then

$$k^c := k^{c,1} + k^{c,2} + k^{c,3}$$

with  $k^{c,1}(x, y) = k(x, y) \chi_\delta(x)$ ,  $k^{c,2}(x, y) = \chi_\delta^c(x) \chi_R^c(y)$  and  $k^{c,3}(x, y) = k(x, y) \chi_\delta^c(x) \chi_\varepsilon(y)$ . We then define

$$A f(x) = \int_x^\infty k^s(y, x) f(y) dy, \quad \mathcal{A}^{c,i} f(x) = \int_x^\infty k^{c,i}(y, x) f(y) dy,$$

and then

$$\mathcal{A}^c = \mathcal{A}^{c,1} + \mathcal{A}^{c,2} + \mathcal{A}^{c,3}, \quad \mathcal{B}_0 = -x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - 2 - K(x), \quad \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_0 + \mathcal{A}^c$$

so that  $\Lambda = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$ .

**Lemma 4.11.** For any  $0 \leq \alpha' \leq 1 \leq \beta'$ , there hold  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\dot{L}_1^1, \dot{W}_{\alpha'}^{1,1} \cap \dot{W}_{\beta'}^{1,1})$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{c,i} \in \mathcal{B}(\dot{L}_{\alpha'+\gamma}^1, \dot{L}_{\alpha'}^1)$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , with

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{A}^{c,1} f\|_{\dot{L}_{\alpha'}^1} &\leq \varrho_{\alpha'} \delta^\gamma \|f\|_{\dot{L}_{\alpha'+\gamma}^1}, \\ \|\mathcal{A}^{c,2} f\|_{\dot{L}_{\alpha'}^1} &\leq \varrho_{\alpha'} \int_R^\infty f(x) x^{\alpha'+\gamma} dx, \\ \|\mathcal{A}^{c,3} f\|_{\dot{L}_{\alpha'}^1} &\leq \|\varrho(z) z^{\alpha'}\|_{L^1(0,\varepsilon/\delta)} \|f\|_{\dot{L}_{\alpha'+\gamma}^1}. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof of Lemma 4.11.** For  $0 \leq f \in \dot{L}_{\alpha'+\gamma}^1$ , we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{A}^{c,3} f\|_{\dot{L}_{\alpha'}^1} &= \int_0^\infty f(x) x^\gamma \chi_\delta^c(x) \int_0^x \varrho(y/x) y^{\alpha'} \chi_\varepsilon(y) \frac{dy}{x} dx \\ &\leq \|\varrho(z) z^{\alpha'}\|_{L^1(0,2\varepsilon/\delta)} \|f\|_{\dot{L}_{\alpha'+\gamma}^1}, \end{aligned}$$

and that establishes the last claim. For the other claims we refer to Lemma 4.5 and [18, 3, proof of the main theorem] where very similar estimates have been proved.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.12.** For any  $a > a^*$  there exist  $R, \delta, \varepsilon > 0$  such that the operator  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $a$ -hypodissipative in  $X$ .

**Proof of Lemma 4.12.** We define the space

$$\mathcal{E} := L^1(\phi), \quad \phi(x) := x^\alpha + \eta x^\beta, \quad \eta > 0.$$

Consider a real-valued function  $f \in D(\Lambda)$  and let us show that for any  $a > a^*$  and for suitable  $R \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta/2)$  to be chosen later,

$$\int_0^\infty \text{sign}(f(x)) \mathcal{B} f(x) \phi(x) dx \leq a \|f\|_{\mathcal{E}}. \tag{4.27}$$

Since the case of complex-valued functions can be handled in a similar way and since the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}}$  is clearly equivalent to  $\|\cdot\|_X$ , that will end the proof.

From the identity

$$\int_0^\infty \text{sign}(f(x)) \mathcal{B}_0 f(x) x^r dr = \int_0^\infty ((r-1)x^r - x^{r+\gamma}) |f| dx$$

and the following inequality which holds for  $\eta > 0$  small enough

$$\eta(\beta - 1 - a) x^\beta \leq \frac{1+a-\alpha}{2} x^\alpha + \eta \frac{1-\varrho\beta}{2} x^{\beta+\gamma} \quad \forall x > 0,$$



we readily deduce

$$\int_0^\infty \text{sign}(f(x)) \mathcal{B}_0 f(x) \phi(x) dx \leq a \int_0^\infty |f| \phi dx + \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{\alpha - a - 1}{2} x^\alpha - \eta \frac{\wp_\beta + 1}{2} x^{\beta+\gamma} \right) |f| dx.$$

On the other hand, we know from Lemma 4.11 that

$$\| \mathcal{A}^c f \|_{\mathcal{E}} \leq \wp_\alpha \delta^\gamma \| f \|_{\mathcal{E}} + \left( \frac{\wp_\alpha}{R^{\beta-\alpha}} + \eta \wp_\beta \right) \int_R^\infty x^{\beta+\gamma} |f| + \| \wp(z) z^\alpha \|_{L^1(0, 2\epsilon/\delta)} \| f \|_{\mathcal{E}}.$$

We then easily conclude to (4.27) putting together these two estimates and choosing  $R$  large enough,  $\delta$  small enough, and then  $\epsilon/\delta$  small enough.  $\square$

**Proof of Proposition 4.10.** We just have to explain why the hypotheses of Theorem 3.3 are satisfied. Hypothesis (H1) is an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.11-(1), Lemma 4.12 and Remark 2.2-(b).

We define

$$Y := \{ f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}); \text{supp } f \subset [\epsilon, 2R] \}$$

endowed with the norm  $\| \cdot \|_{W^{1,1}}$ . We also define on  $X$  the projection  $\pi_N$  onto the  $2N + 1$  dimension subspace

$$R\pi_N := \{ \mathbf{1}_{[0,2R]} p, p \in \mathbb{P}_{2N}(\mathbb{R}) \},$$

where  $\mathbb{P}_{2N}$  stands for the set of polynomials of degree less than  $2N$ , by

$$(\pi_N f)(x) := \chi_\epsilon^c(x) \chi_{2R}(x) (p_{N,R} * f)(x), \quad p_{N,R}(x) := p(x/(4R))/(4R),$$

where  $p_N$  stands for the Bernstein polynomial  $p_N(x) := \alpha_N (1 - x^2)^N$  with  $\alpha_N$  such that  $\| p_N \|_{L^1(-1,1)} = 1$ . By very classical approximation arguments, we have

$$\| f - \pi_N f \|_X \leq \frac{C_R}{\sqrt{N}} \| f \|_{W^{1,1}} \quad \forall f \in Y,$$

so that (3.7) is fulfilled.

Finally, Lemma 4.11-(1) and Lemma 4.12 imply that

$$\| \mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}(t)f \|_Y \leq C_a e^{at} \| f \|_X$$

for any  $t \geq 0, f \in X, a > a^*$ . We then deduce (H2) with  $n = 1, \zeta = 1$  and  $\zeta' = 0$  thanks to Remark 2.2-(h) and  $Y \subset D(\Lambda)$ , and also deduce (H3) with  $n = 1$  and (3.6) from the fact that  $Y$  is compactly embedded in  $X$ .  $\square$

### 4.3. A remark on the age structured population equation

The aim of this short section is to present a quantified version of the Weyl’s Theorem for the age structured population equation (1.42) in the simple case when  $\tau = \nu = 1$  and  $K \in C_b(\mathbb{R}_+) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ . More precisely, we consider the evolution equation

$$\partial_t f = \Lambda f = \mathcal{A}f + \mathcal{B}f \tag{4.28}$$

with  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  defined on  $M^1(\mathbb{R})$  by

$$(\mathcal{A}f)(x) := \delta_{x=0} \int_0^\infty K(y) f(y) dy$$

$$(\mathcal{B}f)(x) := -\partial_x f(x) - f(x),$$

and we emphasize that the boundary condition in (1.42) has been equivalently replaced by the term  $\mathcal{A}f$  involving a Dirac mass  $(\delta_0)(x) = \delta_{x=0}$  in  $x = 0$ . We perform the spectral analysis of  $\Lambda$  in the space  $L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$  as well as in the space  $X := M^1(\mathbb{R})$  of bounded measures endowed with the total variation norm. In that last functional space, the domain  $D(\Lambda)$  is the space  $BV(\mathbb{R})$  of functions with bounded variation.

**Lemma 4.13.** *In  $X = M^1(\mathbb{R})$ , the operators  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfy*  
 (i)  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(X, Y)$  where  $Y = \mathbb{C} \delta_0 \subset X$  with compact embedding;  
 (ii)  $S_{\mathcal{B}}(t)$  is  $-1$ -dissipative;  
 (iii) the family of operators  $S_{\mathcal{B}} * \mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}}(t)$  satisfy

$$\| (S_{\mathcal{B}} * \mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}})(t) \|_{X \rightarrow D(\Lambda)} \leq C e^{-t} \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

**Proof of Lemma 4.13.** We clearly have  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(X, Y)$  because  $K \in C_b(\mathbb{R}_+)$  and the  $-1$ -dissipativity of  $S_{\mathcal{B}}$  follows from the explicit formula

$$S_{\mathcal{B}}(t)f(x) = f(x - t) e^{-t} \mathbf{1}_{x-t \geq 0}.$$

We next prove (iii). We write

$$\mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}}(t)f = \delta_{x=0} \int_0^\infty K(y + t) f(y) dy e^{-t},$$

next

$$\begin{aligned} (S_{\mathcal{B}} * \mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}})(t)f &= \int_0^t S_{\mathcal{B}}(s) \mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}}(t - s) f ds \\ &= \int_0^t \delta_{x-s=0} e^{-s} \mathbf{1}_{x-s \geq 0} \int_0^\infty K(y + t - s) f(y) dy e^{-(t-s)} ds \\ &= e^{-t} \mathbf{1}_{x \leq t} \int_0^\infty K(y + t - x) f(y) dy, \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\partial_x (S_{\mathcal{B}} * \mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}})(t)f = -e^{-t} \delta_{x=t} \int_0^\infty K(y + t - x) f(y) dy - e^{-t} \mathbf{1}_{x \leq t} \int_0^\infty K'(y + t - x) f(y) dy.$$

As a consequence, we deduce

$$\| \partial_x (S_{\mathcal{B}} * \mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}})(t)f \|_{M^1} \leq \| K \|_{W^{1,\infty}} e^{-t} \| f \|_{M^1}$$

and a similar estimate for  $\| (S_{\mathcal{B}} * \mathcal{A}S_{\mathcal{B}})(t)f \|_{M^1}$ .  $\square$

As a first step in the proof of [Theorem 1.1](#) for the age structured population equation, we have

**Proposition 4.14.** *Under the above assumptions and notation, the conclusion (2), and then (2.11) and (1), of [Theorem 3.3](#) holds for the age structured population semigroup  $S_\Lambda$  in  $M^1(\mathbb{R})$  and in  $L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$  for any  $a > a^* := -1$ . Moreover, any eigenvalue  $\xi \in \Sigma_d(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_{-1}$  is algebraically simple.*

**Proof of Proposition 4.14.** In order to prove the result in  $X = M^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ , we just have to explain again why the hypothesis of [Theorem 3.3](#) are satisfied. Conditions **(H1)**, **(H3)** and (3.6) are immediate consequences of [Lemma 4.13](#)-(i) and (ii) together with [Remark 2.2](#)-(b). We refer to [\[52,26,81\]](#) and the references therein for the existence theory in  $L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$  (which extends without difficulty to  $M^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ ) for the semigroup  $S_\Lambda$ . Hypothesis **(H2)** with  $n = 1$ ,  $\zeta = 1$  and  $\zeta' = 0$  is nothing but [Lemma 4.13](#)-(iii). Finally, taking up again the proof of [Theorem 3.3](#) and using the additional fact that  $\dim Y = 1$ , we get the algebraic simplicity of the eigenvalues  $\xi \in \Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_{-1}$ .

We may then easily extend the spectral analysis performed in  $M^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$  to the functional space  $L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ . Indeed, for a function  $f \in L^1$ , [Theorem 3.3](#) implies that

$$\| e^{t\Lambda} f - \sum_{j=1}^J e^{t\xi_j} \Pi_j f \|_{M^1} \leq C_a e^{at} \| f \|_{M^1}$$

for any  $a > -1$  and  $t \geq 0$ . Because  $S_\Lambda$  is well defined in  $L^1$  and the domain of  $\Lambda$  as an operator in  $M^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$  is  $BV(\mathbb{R}_+) \subset L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ , all the terms involved in the above expression belong to  $L^1$  and we can replace the norms  $\| \cdot \|_{M^1}$  by the norms  $\| \cdot \|_{L^1}$ .  $\square$

### 5. The Krein–Rutman Theorem in an abstract setting

In this section we consider a “Banach lattice of functions”  $X$ . We recall that a Banach lattice is a Banach space endowed with an order denoted by  $\geq$  (or  $\leq$ ) such that the following hold:

- The set  $X_+ := \{f \in X; f \geq 0\}$  is a nonempty convex closed cone.
- For any  $f \in X$ , there exist some unique (minimal)  $f_\pm \in X_+$  such that  $f = f_+ - f_-$ , we then denote  $|f| := f_+ + f_- \in X_+$ .
- For any  $f, g \in X, 0 \leq f \leq g$  implies  $\| f \| \leq \| g \|$ .

We may define a dual order  $\geq$  (or  $\leq$ ) on  $X'$  by writing for  $\psi \in X'$

$$\psi \geq 0 \text{ (or } \psi \in X'_+) \text{ iff } \forall f \in X_+ \langle \psi, f \rangle \geq 0,$$

so that  $X'$  is also a Banach lattice.

We then restrict our analysis to the case when  $X$  is a “space of functions”. The examples of spaces we have in mind are the space of Lebesgue functions  $X = L^p(\mathcal{U}), 1 \leq p < \infty, \mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  borelian set, the space  $X = C(\mathcal{U})$  of continuous functions on a compact set  $\mathcal{U}$  and the space  $X = C_0(\mathcal{U})$  of uniformly continuous functions defined on an open set  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and which tend to 0 at the boundary of  $\mathcal{U}$ . For any element (function)  $f$  in such a “space of functions”  $X$ , we may define without difficulty the composition functions  $\theta(f)$  and  $\theta'(f)$  for  $\theta(s) = |s|$  and  $\theta(s) = s_\pm$  as well as the support  $\text{supp } f$  as a closed subset of  $\mathcal{U}$ . Although we believe that our results extend to a broader class of Banach lattices, by now on and in order to avoid technicality, we will restrict ourself to these examples of “space of functions” without specifying anymore but just saying that we consider a “Banach lattice of functions” (and we refer to the textbook [3] for possible generalization). As a first consequence of that choice, we may then obtain a nice and simple property on the generator of a positive semigroup.

**Definition 5.1.** Let us consider a Banach lattice  $X$  and a generator  $\Lambda$  of a semigroup  $S_\Lambda$  on  $X$ .

- (a) We say that the semigroup  $S_\Lambda$  is positive if  $S_\Lambda(t)f \in X_+$  for any  $f \in X_+$  and  $t \geq 0$ .
- (b) We say that a generator  $\Lambda$  on  $X$  satisfies Kato’s inequalities if the inequality

$$\forall f \in D(\Lambda) \quad \Lambda\theta(f) \geq \theta'(f) \Lambda f \tag{5.1}$$

holds for  $\theta(s) = |s|$  and  $\theta(s) = s_+$ .

- (c) We say that  $-\Lambda$  satisfies a “weak maximum principle” if for any  $a > \omega(\Lambda)$  and  $g \in X_+$  there holds

$$f \in D(\Lambda) \text{ and } (-\Lambda + a)f = g \text{ imply } f \geq 0. \tag{5.2}$$

- (d) We say that the opposite of the resolvent is a positive operator if for any  $a > \omega(\Lambda)$  and  $g \in X_+$  there holds  $-R_\Lambda(a)g \in X_+$ .

Here the correct way to understand Kato’s inequalities is

$$\forall f \in D(\Lambda), \forall \psi \in D(\Lambda^*) \cap X'_+ \quad \langle \theta(f), \Lambda^* \psi \rangle \geq \langle \theta'(f) \Lambda f, \psi \rangle,$$

where  $\Lambda^*$  is the adjoint of  $\Lambda$ .

It is well known (see [98] and [2, Remark 3.10] and the textbook [3, Theorems C.II.2.4, C.II.2.6 and Remark C-II.3.12]) that the generator  $\Lambda$  of a positive semigroup  $S_\Lambda$  on one of our Banach lattice space of functions satisfies Kato’s inequalities (5.1). It is also immediate from the Hille’s identity (2.2) that (a) implies (d) and then (c)

in the general Banach lattice framework. For a broad class of spaces  $X$  the properties (a), (b), (c) and (d) are in fact equivalent and we refer again to the textbook [3] for more details on that topics.

Last, we need some strict positivity notion on  $X$  and some strict positivity (or irreducibility) assumption on  $S_\Lambda$  that we will formulate in term of “strong maximum principle”. It is worth mentioning that we have not assumed that  $X_+$  has nonempty interior, so that the strict positivity property cannot be defined using that interior set (as in Krein–Rutman’s work [71], see also [27]). However, we may define the strict order  $>$  (or  $<$ ) on  $X$  by writing for  $f \in X$

$$f > 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall \psi \in X'_+ \setminus \{0\} \quad \langle \psi, f \rangle > 0,$$

and similarly a strict order  $>$  (or  $<$ ) on  $X'$  by writing for  $\psi \in X'$

$$\psi > 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall g \in X_+ \setminus \{0\} \quad \langle \psi, g \rangle > 0.$$

It is worth emphasizing that from the Hahn–Banach Theorem, for any  $f \in X_+$  there exists  $\psi \in X'_+$  such that  $\|\psi\|_{X'} = 1$  and  $\langle \psi, f \rangle = \|f\|_X$  from which we easily deduce that

$$\forall f, g \in X, \quad 0 \leq f < g \quad \text{implies} \quad \|f\|_X < \|g\|_X. \tag{5.3}$$

**Definition 5.2.** We say that  $-\Lambda$  satisfies the “strong maximum principle” if there holds

$$f \in D(\Lambda) \cap X_+ \setminus \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad (-\Lambda + \mu)f \geq 0 \quad \text{imply} \quad f > 0,$$

and there exists for some  $\ell \geq 0$  such that

$$f \in D(\Lambda^\ell) \quad \text{and} \quad |f| > 0 \quad \text{imply} \quad f > 0 \quad \text{or} \quad f < 0.$$

We can now state the following version of the Krein–Rutman Theorem in a general and abstract setting.

**Theorem 5.3.** We consider a generator  $\Lambda$  of a semigroup  $S_\Lambda$  on a Banach lattice of functions  $X$ , and we assume that

- (1)  $\Lambda$  satisfies the property (1) of the semigroup Weyl’s Theorem 3.1 for some  $a^* \in \mathbb{R}$ ;
- (2) there exist  $b > a^*$  and  $\psi \in D(\Lambda^*) \cap X'_+ \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $\Lambda^* \psi \geq b \psi$ ;
- (3)  $S_\Lambda$  is positive (and  $\Lambda$  satisfies Kato’s inequalities);
- (4)  $-\Lambda$  satisfies a strong maximum principle.

Defining  $\lambda := s(\Lambda)$ , there holds

$$a^* < \lambda = \omega(\Lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda \in \Sigma_d(\Lambda),$$

and there exist  $0 < f_\infty \in D(\Lambda)$  and  $0 < \phi \in D(\Lambda^*)$  such that

$$\Lambda f_\infty = \lambda f_\infty, \quad \Lambda^* \phi = \lambda \phi, \quad R\Pi_{\Lambda, \lambda} = \text{Vect}(f_\infty),$$

and then

$$\Pi_{\Lambda, \lambda} f = \langle f, \phi \rangle f_\infty \quad \forall f \in X.$$

Moreover, there exists  $a^{**} \in (a^*, \lambda)$  and for any  $a > a^{**}$  there exists  $C_a > 0$  such that for any  $f_0 \in X$

$$\| S_\Lambda(t) f - e^{\lambda t} \Pi_{\Lambda, \lambda} f_0 \|_X \leq C e^{at} \| f_0 - \Pi_{\Lambda, \lambda} f_0 \|_X \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

**Remark 5.4.**

- (a) Theorem 5.3 generalizes the Perron–Frobenius Theorem [101,42] for strictly positive matrix  $\Lambda$ , the Krein–Rutman Theorem [71] for irreducible, positive and compact semigroup on a Banach lattice with non-empty interior cone and the Krein–Rutman Theorem variant [3, Corollary III-C.3.17] (see also [49] for the original proof) for irreducible, positive, eventually norm continuous semigroup with compact resolvent in a general Banach lattice framework. We also refer to the book by Dautray and Lions [27] for a clear and comprehensible version of the Krein–Rutman Theorem as well as to the recent books [93,9] and the references therein for more

recent developments on the theory of positive operators. The main novelty here is that with assumptions (1) and (2) we do not ask for the semigroup to be eventually norm continuous and we only ask power compactness on the decompositions  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of the operator  $\Lambda$  instead of compactness on the resolvent  $\mathcal{R}_\Lambda$ .

- (b) Condition (2) is necessary because the requirement (1) only implies the needed compactness and regularity on the iterated operator  $(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{B}(z))^n$  for  $z \in \Delta_{a^*}$ . Condition (2) can be removed (it is automatically verified) if condition (1) holds for any  $a^* \in \mathbb{R}$ .
- (c) In a general Banach lattice framework and replacing the strong maximum principle hypothesis (4) by the more classical irreducibility assumption on the semigroup (see for instance [3, Definition C-III.3.1]) Theorem 5.3 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.1 together with [3, Theorem C-III.3.12] (see also [28,49,50]). We do not know whether the strong maximum principle and the irreducibility are equivalent assumptions although both are related to strict positivity of the semigroup or the generator. Anyway the strong maximum principle for the operator  $-\Lambda$  is a very natural notion and hypothesis from our PDE point of view and that is the reason why we have chosen to present the statement of Theorem 5.3 in that way. Moreover, the proofs in [3, part C] are presented in the general framework of Banach lattices and positive or reducible semigroups (no compactness assumption is required in the statement of [3, Theorem C-III.3.12]) so that quite abstract arguments are used during the proof. We give below a short, elementary and somewhat self-contained proof of Theorem 5.3, and thus do not use [3, Theorem C-III.3.12].

**Proof of Theorem 5.3.** We split the proof into five steps.

*Step 1.* On the one hand, let us fix  $0 \leq f_0 \in D(\Lambda)$  such that  $C := \langle f_0, \psi \rangle > 0$  which exists by definition of  $\psi$ . Then denoting  $f(t) := S_\Lambda(t)f_0$ , we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle f(t), \psi \rangle = \langle \Lambda f(t), \psi \rangle = \langle f(t), \Lambda^* \psi \rangle \geq b \langle f(t), \psi \rangle,$$

which in turn implies

$$\langle f(t), \psi \rangle \geq C e^{bt} \quad \forall t \geq 0. \tag{5.4}$$

On the other hand, from Theorem 2.1 we know that  $\omega(\Lambda) \leq \max(a^*, \lambda)$ . As a consequence, if  $\lambda < b$  for any  $a \in (\max(a^*, \lambda), b)$  there exists  $C_a \in (0, \infty)$  such that

$$\langle f(t), \psi \rangle \leq \|\psi\|_{X'} \|f(t)\|_X \leq C_a \|\psi\|_{X'} e^{at} \|f_0\|_X.$$

That would be in contradiction with (5.4). We conclude that  $a^* < b \leq \lambda = \omega(\Lambda)$ .

*Step 2.* We prove that there exists  $f_\infty \in X$  such that

$$\|f_\infty\| = 1, \quad f_\infty > 0, \quad \Lambda f_\infty = \lambda f_\infty. \tag{5.5}$$

Thanks to the Weyl’s Theorem 3.1 we know that for some  $a < 0$

$$\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a = \bigcup_{j=1}^J \{ \xi_j \} \subset \Sigma_d(\Lambda), \quad \Re \xi_j = \lambda,$$

with  $J \geq 1$ . We introduce the Jordan basis  $\mathcal{V} := \{ g_{1,1}, \dots, g_{J,L_j} \}$  of  $\Lambda$  in the invariant subspace  $R\Pi_{\Lambda,a}$  as the family of vectors

$$g_{j,\ell} \neq 0, \quad \Lambda g_{j,\ell} = \xi_j g_{j,\ell} + g_{j,\ell-1} \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, J\}, \quad \forall \ell \in \{1, \dots, L_j\},$$

with the convention  $g_{j,k} = 0$  if  $k \leq 0$  or  $k \geq L_j + 1$ , as well as the projectors (associated to the basis  $\mathcal{V}$ )

$$\Pi_{j,\ell} := \text{projection on } g_{j,\ell}, \quad \Pi_k := \text{projection on } \text{Vect}(g_{j,k}, 1 \leq j \leq J).$$

For any fix  $g \in \mathcal{V}$  we write  $g = g^1 - g^2 + i g^3 - i g^4$  with  $g^\alpha \geq 0$  and we remark that there exist  $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$  and  $k_0 \geq 1$  such that  $\Pi_{k_0} g^\alpha = \Pi_{\Lambda,a} g^\alpha \neq 0$ . We then define  $k^* = k^*(g^\alpha) := \max\{ k; \Pi_k g^\alpha \neq 0 \}$ , that set being not empty (since it contains  $k_0$ ). We may split the semigroup as

$$e^{\Lambda t} g^\alpha = \sum_j \sum_\ell e^{\Lambda t} \Pi_{j,\ell} g^\alpha + e^{\Lambda t} (I - \Pi_{\Lambda,a}),$$

with  $\Pi_{j,\ell} g^\alpha = (\pi_{j,\ell} g^\alpha) g_{j,\ell}$ ,  $\pi_{j,\ell} g^\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ , and

$$e^{\Lambda t} g_{j,\ell} = e^{\xi_j t} g_{j,\ell} + \dots + t^{\ell-1} e^{\xi_j t} g_{j,1}.$$

Using the positivity assumption (3) and keeping only the leading order term in the above expressions, we have thanks to Theorem 3.1

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{t^{k^*-1}} e^{(\Lambda-\lambda)t} g^\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^J (\pi_{j,k^*} g^\alpha) e^{(\xi_j-\lambda)t} g_{j,1} + o(1).$$

There exist a sequence  $(t_n)$  which tends to infinity and complex numbers  $z_j \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $|z_j| = 1$ , such that, passing to the limit in the above expression, we get

$$0 \leq \sum_{j=1}^J (\pi_{j,k^*} g^\alpha) z_j g_{j,1} =: g_\infty.$$

Because of the choice of  $\alpha$  and the fact that the vectors  $g_{j,1}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq J$ , is independent, we have then  $g_\infty \in R\Pi_{\Lambda,a} \cap X_+ \setminus \{0\}$ . Applying again the semigroup, we get

$$0 \leq e^{\Lambda t} g_\infty = \sum_{j=1}^J e^{\xi_j t} [(\pi_{j,k^*} g^\alpha) z_j g_{j,1}] \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

which in particular implies

$$\sum_{j=1}^J \Im m \{ e^{\xi_j t} [(\pi_{j,k^*} g^\alpha) z_j g_{j,1}] \} = 0 \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

and then  $\pi_{j,k^*} g^\alpha = 0$  if  $\Im m \xi_j \neq 0$ . As a conclusion, we have proved that there exists  $g_\infty \in N(\Lambda - \lambda) \cap X_+ \setminus \{0\}$ . Together with the strong maximum principle we conclude that  $f_\infty := g_\infty / \|g_\infty\|$  satisfies (5.5).

Moreover, the above argument for any  $g = g_{j,L_j}$  associated to  $\xi_j \neq \lambda$  and for any  $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$  such that  $\Pi_{j,L_j} g^\alpha \neq 0$  implies that  $\pi_{j,k^*} g^\alpha = 0$ , or in other words

$$\max_{\xi_j \neq \lambda} L_j < \max_{\xi_j = \lambda} L_j. \tag{5.6}$$

Step 3. We prove that there exists  $\phi \in X'$  such that

$$\phi > 0, \quad \Lambda^* \phi = \lambda \phi. \tag{5.7}$$

We define  $S_\Lambda^*$  to be the dual semigroup associated to  $S_\Lambda$  and we emphasize that it is not necessarily strongly continuous (for the norm in  $X'$ ) but only weakly continuous (for the weak topology  $\sigma(X', X)$ ). However, introducing the splitting

$$S_\Lambda^* = (S_\Lambda(I - \Pi_{\Lambda,a}))^* + (S_\Lambda \Pi_{\Lambda,a})^*$$

and observing that

$$\| (S_\Lambda(I - \Pi_{\Lambda,a}))^* \|_{\mathcal{B}(X)} \leq C_a e^{at}$$

for some  $a < \lambda$ , the same finite dimension argument as in Step 2 implies that there exists  $\phi \in N(\Lambda^* - \lambda) \cap X' \setminus \{0\}$ .

Let us prove the strict positivity property. For  $a > s(\Lambda)$  and  $g \in X_+ \setminus \{0\}$ , thanks to the weak and strong maximum principles (3) and (4), there exists  $0 < f \in X$  such that

$$(-\Lambda + a)f = g.$$

As a consequence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi, g \rangle &= \langle \phi, (-\Lambda + a)f \rangle \\ &= \langle (a - \Lambda^*)\phi, f \rangle = (a - \lambda) \langle \phi, f \rangle > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $g \in X_+$  is arbitrary, we deduce that  $\phi > 0$ . That concludes the proof of (5.7).

Step 4. We prove that  $N(\Lambda - \lambda) = \text{Vect}(f_\infty)$ . Consider a normalized eigenfunction  $f \in X^{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}$  associated to the eigenvalue  $\lambda$ . First we observe that from Kato’s inequality

$$\lambda|f| = \lambda f \text{sign}(f) = \Lambda f \text{sign}(f) \leq \Lambda|f|.$$

That inequality is in fact an equality, otherwise we would have

$$\lambda\langle|f|, \phi\rangle \neq \langle\Lambda|f|, \phi\rangle = \langle|f|, \Lambda^*\phi\rangle = \lambda\langle|f|, \phi\rangle,$$

a contradiction. As a consequence,  $|f|$  is a solution to the eigenvalue problem  $\lambda|f| = \Lambda|f|$  so that the strong maximum principle assumption (4) implies  $f > 0$  or  $f < 0$ , and without loss of generality we may assume  $f > 0$ . Now, thanks to Kato’s inequality again, we write

$$\lambda(f - f_\infty)_+ = \Lambda(f - f_\infty) \text{sign}_+(f - f_\infty) \leq \Lambda(f - f_\infty)_+,$$

and for the same reason as above that last inequality is in fact an inequality. Since  $(f - f_\infty)_+ = |(f - f_\infty)_+|$ , the strong maximum principle implies that either  $(f - f_\infty)_+ = 0$ , or in other words  $f \leq f_\infty$ , either  $(f - f_\infty)_+ > 0$  or in other words  $f > f_\infty$ . Thanks to (5.3) and to the normalization hypothesis  $\|f\| = \|f_\infty\| = 1$  the second case in the above alternative is not possible. Repeating the same argument with  $(f_\infty - f)_+$  we get that  $f_\infty \leq f$  and we conclude with  $f = f_\infty$ . For a general eigenfunction  $f \in X^{\mathbb{C}}$  associated to the eigenvalue  $\lambda$  we may introduce the decomposition  $f = f_r + if_i$  and we immediately get that  $f_\alpha \in X^{\mathbb{R}}$  is an eigenfunction associated to  $\lambda$  for  $\alpha = r, i$ . As a consequence of what we have just established, we have  $f_\alpha = \theta_\alpha f_\infty$  for some  $\theta_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  and we conclude that  $f = (\theta_r + i\theta_i) f_\infty \in \text{Vect}(f_\infty)$  again.

Step 5. We first claim that  $\lambda$  is algebraically simple. Indeed, if it was not the case, there would exist  $f \in X^{\mathbb{R}}$  such that  $\Lambda f = \lambda f + f_\infty$  and then

$$\lambda\langle f, \phi\rangle = \langle f, \Lambda^*\phi\rangle = \langle \Lambda f, \phi\rangle = \langle \lambda f + f_\infty, \phi\rangle,$$

which in turn implies  $\langle f_\infty, \phi\rangle = 0$ , a contradiction. With the notation of step 2 and thanks to (5.6), that implies that for any  $\xi_j \neq \lambda$  there holds  $L_j < 1$  or in other words  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \bar{\Delta}_\lambda = \{\lambda\}$ . We conclude the proof by using the semigroup Weyl’s Theorem 3.1, which in particular implies that  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_{a^{**}} = \{\lambda\}$  for some  $a^{**} \in (a^*, \lambda)$  because  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a$  is finite for any  $a > a^*$ . □

## 6. Krein–Rutman Theorem for the growth-fragmentation equations

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1.

### 6.1. General growth-fragmentation equations

We present below the proof of the part of Theorem 1.1 which holds in full generality. Namely, we prove (1.45), (1.46) and (1.47) for the three models of growth-fragmentation equations.

We start with the cell-division equation for which we apply the Krein–Rutman Theorem 5.3 in the Banach lattice  $L^1((x_0z_0, \infty); \langle x \rangle^\alpha dx)$ ,  $\alpha > 1$ , where  $z_0$  is defined by (1.24), instead of  $L^1_\alpha$  in order that the operator  $\Lambda$  enjoys a strong maximum principle. We have proved (1) in Proposition 4.4. We have  $\Lambda^*1 = K(x)(1 - \wp_0) \geq 0$  so that (2) holds with  $b = 0 > a^*$ . The weak maximum principle (3) is an immediate consequence of Kato’s inequalities which in turn follows from the fact that  $\mathcal{F}^+\theta(f) \geq \theta'(f)\mathcal{F}^+f$  a.e for any  $f \in D(\Lambda)$ ,  $\theta(s) = |s|$  and  $\theta(s) = s_+$ . The strong maximum principle (4) follows from the fact that the equation

$$f \in D(\Lambda) \setminus \{0\}, \quad |f| \in D(\Lambda) \text{ and } (-\Lambda + \mu)|f| \geq 0$$

may be rewritten as

$$-\partial_x|f| + (K(x) + \mu)|f| \geq \mathcal{F}^+|f| \geq 0,$$

and we conclude as in [84, proof of Theorem 3.1] that the continuous function  $|f|$  does not vanish on  $(x_0z_0, \infty)$ , so that  $f > 0$  on  $(x_0z_0, \infty)$  or  $f < 0$  on  $(x_0z_0, \infty)$  because  $f$  is also continuous.

For the self-similar equation the proof is exactly the same by applying the Krein–Rutman [Theorem 5.3](#) in the Banach lattice  $L^1(\mathbb{R}_+; (x^\alpha + x^\beta)dx)$ ,  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 < \beta < \infty$ . Let us just emphasize that condition **(1)** has been proved in [Proposition 4.10](#) and that condition **(2)** with  $b = 0 > a^*$  follows from the fact that  $\Lambda^*\phi = 0$  for the positive function  $\phi(x) = x$ . We refer to [\[36, Section 3\]](#) for the proof of the weak and strong maximum principles **(3)** and **(4)**.

Finally, for the age structured population equation we apply the Krein–Rutman [Theorem 5.3](#) in the Banach lattice  $L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ . As in [\[89, Appendix\]](#), we observe that, denoting by  $\lambda > -1$  the real number such that

$$\int_0^\infty K(x) e^{-(1+\lambda)x} dx = 1,$$

which exists thanks to condition [\(1.44\)](#), the function

$$\psi(x) := e^{(1+\lambda)x} \int_x^\infty K(y) e^{-(1+\lambda)y} dy$$

is a solution to the dual eigenvalue problem

$$\Lambda^*\psi = \partial_x \psi - \psi + K(x)\psi(0) = \lambda \psi, \quad 0 \leq \psi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+),$$

so that in particular **(2)** holds with  $\lambda > a^* = -1$ . Condition **(1)** has been proved in [Proposition 4.14](#) and the proof of the weak and strong maximum principles **(3)** and **(4)** is classical.

### 6.2. Quantified spectral gap theorem for the cell-division equation with constant total fragmentation rate

We consider the particular case of the cell-division equation with constant total fragmentation rate and fragmentation kernel which furthermore fulfills condition [\(1.36\)](#) for which we can give an accurate long-time asymptotic behavior (as formulated in point (i) of [Theorem 1.1](#)) and answer to a question formulated in [\[103,73\]](#). We then consider the equation

$$\partial_t f + \partial_x f + K_0 f = K_0 \int_x^\infty \kappa(y, x) f(y) dy \tag{6.8}$$

with vanishing boundary condition [\(1.28\)](#), where  $K_0 > 0$  is a constant and  $\kappa$  satisfies [\(1.36\)](#). In such a situation, we have the following accurate description of the spectrum.

**Proposition 6.5.** *The first eigenvalue is given by  $\lambda = s(\Lambda) := (n_F - 1)K_0$  with  $n_F$  defined in [\(1.36\)](#). On the other hand, for any  $a^{**} \in (-K_0, (n_F - 1)K_0)$  and any  $\alpha > \alpha^*$ , with  $\alpha^*$  large enough (but explicit and given during the proof), the spectral gap  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_{a^{**}} = \{\lambda\}$  holds in  $X := L^1_\alpha$ .*

We use the following extension (shrinkage) of the functional space of the semigroup decay proved in [\[86\]](#).

**Theorem 6.6** (Extension of the functional space of the semigroup decay). *Let  $E$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  be two Banach spaces such that  $E \subset \mathcal{E}$  with dense and continuous embedding, and let  $L$  be the generator of a semigroup  $S_L(t) := e^{tL}$  on  $E$ ,  $\mathcal{L}$  the generator of a semigroup  $S_{\mathcal{L}}(t) := e^{t\mathcal{L}}$  on  $\mathcal{E}$  with  $\mathcal{L}|_E = L$ .*

*We assume that there exist two operators  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$  such that*

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}, \quad L = A + B, \quad A = \mathcal{A}|_E, \quad B = \mathcal{B}|_E,$$

*and a real number  $a^{**} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that there hold:*

- (i)**  $B - a$  is hypodissipative on  $E$ ,  $\mathcal{B} - a$  is hypodissipative on  $\mathcal{E}$  for any  $a > a^{**}$ ;
- (ii)**  $A \in \mathcal{B}(E)$ ,  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E})$ ;



(iii) there is  $n \geq 1$  such that, for any  $a > a^{**}$  and for some constant  $C'_a \in (0, \infty)$ ,

$$\left\| (AS_B)^{(*n)}(t) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}, E)} \leq C'_a e^{at}.$$

The following equivalences hold:

(1) There exists a finite rank projector  $\Pi_L \in \mathcal{B}(E)$  which commutes with  $L$  and satisfies  $\Sigma(L|_{\Pi_L}) = \{0\}$ , so that the semigroup  $S_L = e^{tL}$  satisfies the growth estimate

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \|S_L(t) - \Pi_L\|_{\mathcal{B}(E)} \leq C_{L,a} e^{at} \tag{6.9}$$

for any  $a > a^{**}$  and some constant  $C_{L,a} > 0$ ;

(2) There exists a finite rank projector  $\Pi_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E})$  which commutes with  $\mathcal{L}$  and satisfies  $\Sigma(\mathcal{L}|_{\Pi_{\mathcal{L}}}) = \{0\}$ , so that the semigroup  $S_{\mathcal{L}} = e^{t\mathcal{L}}$  satisfies the growth estimate

$$\forall t \geq 0, \quad \|S_{\mathcal{L}}(t) - \Pi_{\mathcal{L}}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E})} \leq C_{\mathcal{L},a} e^{at} \tag{6.10}$$

for any  $a > a^{**}$  and some constant  $C_{\mathcal{L},a} > 0$ .

**Proof of Proposition 6.5.** *Step 1.* We recall some facts presented in [103,73]. We introduce the rescaled function  $g(t, x) := f(t, x) e^{-\lambda t}$  and the associated rescaled equation

$$\partial_t g + \partial_x g + n_F K_0 g = K_0 \int_x^\infty \kappa(y, x) g(y) dy \tag{6.11}$$

with vanishing boundary condition (1.28) and initial condition  $g(0) = f_0$ . We observe that the number of particles

$$\int_0^\infty g(t, x) dx$$

is conserved. One can then show using the Tikhonov’s infinite dimensional version of the Brouwer fixed point theorem that there exists a steady state  $f_\infty$  by proceeding exactly as for the self-similar fragmentation equation [36, Section 3] (see also [103,73] where other arguments are presented). Existence of the steady state  $f_\infty$  is also given by the Krein–Rutman Theorem presented in Section 6.1. This steady state corresponds to the first eigenfunction associated to the first eigenvalue  $(n_F - 1) K_0$  of the cell-division equation (6.8).

Anyway, under assumption (1.36), it has been shown during the proof of [103, Theorem 1.1] and [73, Theorem 1.1] that the solution  $g$  to (6.11) satisfies

$$\|g(t) - \langle f_0 \rangle f_\infty\|_{-1,1} \leq e^{-\lambda t} \|f_0 - \langle f_0 \rangle f_\infty\|_{-1,1}$$

where for any  $f \in L^1_1$  with mean 0 we have defined

$$\|f\|_{-1,1} := \int_0^\infty \left| \int_0^x f(y) dy \right| dx.$$

*Step 2.* For the mitosis equation, we introduce the splitting  $\Lambda = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$  where

$$\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{F}_R^+, \quad \mathcal{B} := -\partial_x - n_F K_0 + \mathcal{F}_R^{+,c},$$

with the notation of Section 4.1. We define  $E := L^\alpha_\alpha$ ,  $\alpha > 1$ , and for any  $f \in L^1_\alpha$  with mean 0 we define

$$\|f\|_{-1,\alpha} := \int_0^\infty \left| \int_0^x f(y) dy \right| \langle x \rangle^{\alpha-1} dx,$$

as well as the Banach space  $\mathcal{E}$  obtained by completion of  $L^1_\alpha$  with respect to the norm  $\| \cdot \|_{-1,\alpha}$ . Let us explain now why the hypotheses **(i)**, **(ii)** and **(iii)** in [Theorem 6.6](#) are fulfilled. We clearly have that  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies **(ii)** in both spaces  $E$  and  $\mathcal{E}$ , as well as that  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfies **(i)** in the space  $E$  for any  $a > a^*$ ,  $a^* := -K_0(1 - \wp_\alpha)$  thanks to [Lemma 4.6](#). We claim that  $\mathcal{B}$  also satisfies **(i)** in the space  $\mathcal{E}$  for any  $\alpha > \log_2 3$  and any  $a > a' := 2K_0(3 \times 2^{-\alpha} - 1)$ . In order to prove that last claim we proceed along the line of the proof of [\[103, Theorem 1.1\]](#). For any  $g \in \mathcal{E}$ , we introduce the notation

$$g(t) := e^{Bt} g, \quad G(t, x) := \int_0^x g(t, u) du,$$

and we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t G + \partial_x G + 2K_0 G &= -2K_0 \int_x^\infty \chi_R^c(2y) \partial_y G(t, 2y) dy \\ &= 2K_0 \chi_R^c(2x) G(t, 2x) + 4K_0 \int_x^\infty (\chi_R^c)'(2y) G(t, 2y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly as in the proof of [Lemma 4.6](#), we define

$$\phi(x) := \mathbf{1}_{[0,x_2]} + \frac{x^{\alpha-1}}{x_2^{\alpha-1}} \mathbf{1}_{[x_2,\infty)}$$

and we compute for  $R \geq x_2$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \int_0^\infty |G| \phi + \int_0^\infty |G| \phi \frac{\alpha-1}{x} \mathbf{1}_{x \geq x_2} + 2K_0 \int_0^\infty |G| \phi \\ \leq \frac{K_0}{2^{\alpha-1}} \int_0^\infty |G| \phi \chi_R^c + \frac{K_0}{2^{\alpha-1}} \int_0^\infty |(\chi_R^c)'| x |G| \phi dx \\ \leq 3 \frac{K_0}{2^{\alpha-1}} \int_0^\infty |G| \phi, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we have used that  $|x(\chi_R^c)'| \leq 2$  by definition of  $\chi_R^c$ . We conclude by taking  $x_2 = R$  large enough.

Moreover, we claim that

$$\|(\mathcal{AS}_\mathcal{B})^{(*2)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}, E)} \leq C'(1+t)e^{-\mu t}, \tag{6.12}$$

with  $\mu := n_F K_0 = 2K_0$ . In order to prove estimate [\(6.12\)](#), as in the proof of [Lemma 4.9](#) and with the same notation, we compute starting from [\(4.25\)](#)

$$\begin{aligned} U_0^{(*2)}(t)g(x) &= 16K_0^2 \chi_R(2x) e^{-\mu t} \int_{u_0}^{u_1} \chi_R(2u - 4x + 2t)g(u) du \\ &= 16K_0^2 \chi_R(2x) e^{-\mu t} \left\{ [\chi_R(2u - 4x + 2t)G(u)]_{u=u_0}^{u=u_1} - \frac{2}{R} \int_{u_0}^{u_1} \chi_R'(2u - 4x + 2t)G(u) du \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and we get then for any  $\beta \geq 0$

$$\|U_0^{(*2)}(t)g\|_{L^1_\beta} \leq C(1+t)e^{-\mu t} \|G\|_{L^1}.$$

We have a similar estimate for  $U_0 * U_0^c$  and we then obtain (6.12) thanks to formula (4.24). We conclude by using the shrinkage of functional space result stated in Theorem 6.6, and we get for possible definition of  $\alpha^*$  the unique real number such that  $3\wp_{\alpha^*} - n_F = [a^{**} - (n_F - 1)K_0]/K_0$  for any fixed  $a^{**} \in (-K_0, (n_F - 1)K_0)$ .

Step 3. For the cell division equation with smooth offspring distribution  $\wp$  we can proceed along the line of [73, Theorem 1.1] and of step 2. We introduce the same splitting as for the mitosis equation and we work in the same spaces. We clearly have again that  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies (ii) in both spaces  $E$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfies (i) in  $E$ . We claim that  $\mathcal{B}$  also satisfies (i) in the space  $\mathcal{E}$  for any  $a > a' \in (-n_F K_0, 0)$  and any  $\alpha > \alpha'$  where  $\alpha' > 1$  is such that  $a'/K_0 = -n_F + \frac{4}{\alpha'}n_F + \wp_{\alpha'-1}$ . Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t G + \partial_x G + n_F K_0 G &= -K_0 \int_x^\infty \int_y^\infty \kappa_R^c(z, y) \partial_z G(z) dz dy \\ &= -K_0 \int_x^\infty \beta_R^c(z, x) G(z) dz, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_R^c(z, x) &:= -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \int_x^\infty \kappa_R^c(z, y) dy \\ &= -n_F(x/z) (\chi_R^c(z))' + \chi_R^c(z) \beta(z, x), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\beta(z, x) := -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \int_x^\infty \kappa(z, y) dy, \quad n_F(u) := \int_u^1 \wp(u') du',$$

and where  $\kappa_R^c(x, y) = \chi_R^c(x) \kappa(x, y)$  is defined on  $\mathbb{R}_+^2$  by extended it to 0 outside of the set  $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2; 0 < y < x\}$ . On the one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1(z) &:= \int_0^z n_F(x/z) |(\chi_R^c(z))'| \phi(x) dx \\ &\leq n_F |(\chi_R^c(z))'| (x_2 + z^\alpha/\alpha) \leq \frac{4}{\alpha} n_F \phi(z) \end{aligned}$$

for any  $z \geq 0$  if  $x_2 \leq R^\alpha/\alpha$ . On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_2(z) &:= \int_0^z \chi_R^c(z) \beta(z, x) \phi(x) dx \\ &\leq \chi_R^c(z) \left\{ \eta(x_2/R) + \wp_{\alpha-1} \phi(z) \right\}, \quad \eta(u) := \int_0^u \wp(u') du', \end{aligned}$$

for any  $z \geq 0$ . Next, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \int_0^\infty |G| \phi + \int_0^\infty |G| \phi \frac{\alpha - 1}{x} \mathbf{1}_{x \geq x_2} + n_F K_0 \int_0^\infty |G| \phi \\ \leq K_0 \int_0^\infty \left\{ \int_0^z |\beta_R^c(z, x)| \phi(x) dx \right\} |G(z)| dz \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq K_0 \int_0^\infty \left\{ \Phi_1(z) + \Phi_2(z) \right\} |G(z)| dz \\ &\leq K_0 \left\{ \frac{4}{\alpha} n_F + \eta(x_2/R) + \wp_{\alpha-1} \right\} \int_0^\infty |G| \phi dx, \end{aligned}$$

and we take  $\alpha > 1$  large enough and next  $R/x_2$  large enough.

We next claim that  $U_0 := \mathcal{AS}_{\mathcal{B}_0}$  with  $\mathcal{B}_0 := -\partial_x - \mu$ ,  $\mu := n_F K_0$ , satisfies

$$\| U_0(t)g \|_{L^1_\beta} \leq C \left( 1 + \frac{1}{t} \right) e^{-\mu t} \| g \|_{-1,1}. \tag{6.13}$$

Starting from the definition

$$\begin{aligned} (U_0(t))(x) &:= e^{-\mu t} K_0 \int_x^\infty \kappa_R(y, x) \partial_y G(y-t) dy \\ &= -e^{-\mu t} K_0 \kappa_R(x, x) G(x-t) - e^{-\mu t} K_0 \int_x^\infty \partial_y [\kappa_R(y, x)] G(y-t) dy, \end{aligned}$$

we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \| U_0(t)g \|_{L^1_\beta} &\leq K_0 e^{-\mu t} \int_0^\infty \chi_R(x) \langle x \rangle^\beta \wp(1) \frac{|G(x-t)|}{x-t+t} dx \\ &\quad + K_0 e^{-\mu t} \int_0^\infty \int_0^y \left\{ |(\chi_R)'| \frac{1}{y} \wp\left(\frac{x}{y}\right) + \chi_R(y) \frac{x}{y^3} |\wp'\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)| \right\} \langle x \rangle^\beta G(y-t) dy \\ &\leq K_0 e^{-\mu t} C_{R,\beta} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{t} \right) \int_0^\infty |G(z)| dz, \end{aligned}$$

and that ends the proof of (6.13). We introduce the notation  $\mathcal{E}_1 := E$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_0 := \mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{1/2}$  as the 1/2 complex interpolation between the spaces  $\mathcal{E}_0$  and  $\mathcal{E}_1$ . From the above estimates, we have for any  $a > -\mu$  that

$$\| U_0(t) \|_{\mathcal{E}_j, \mathcal{E}_{j+1/2}} \leq C t^{-1/2} e^{at}, \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1/2.$$

Thanks to (4.24) it is not difficult now to prove that (6.12) holds also in the present case. We conclude again by using the shrinkage of functional space result stated in Theorem 6.6.  $\square$

### 6.3. Quantified spectral gap for the self-similar fragmentation equation with positive kernel

We present a second situation where a very accurate and quantitative description of the spectrum (as formulated in point (ii) of Theorem 1.1) is possible.

**Proposition 6.7.** *Consider the self-similar fragmentation equation (1.41) and assume that the fragmentation kernel satisfies (1.39), (1.34) and (1.35). Then, there exists a computable constant  $a^{**} \in (a^*, 0)$  such that the spectral gap  $\Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_{a^{**}} = \{0\}$  holds in the functional space  $X = \dot{L}^1_\alpha \cap \dot{L}^1_\beta$ ,  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 < \beta$ .*

**Proof of Proposition 6.7.** We split the proof into four steps.

*Step 1. A priori bounds.* We fix  $a = a^*/2$ , where  $a^*$  is the same as in Proposition 4.10. From Proposition 4.10 and then Theorem 3.3, there exists a constant  $R_a$  such that for any eigenfunction  $f$  associated to an eigenvalue  $\xi \in \Sigma(\Lambda) \cap \Delta_a$ , which satisfies the normalization condition

$$\int_0^\infty |f(y)| y dy = 1, \tag{6.14}$$

there holds

$$\int_0^\infty |f(y)| \langle y \rangle^{2+\gamma} dy \leq R_a, \quad |\xi| \leq R_a. \tag{6.15}$$

Together with the eigenvalue problem rewritten as

$$\partial_x(x^2 f) = x^2 [x^\gamma f + \xi f - \mathcal{F}^+ f],$$

we deduce that  $x^2 f \in BV(\mathbb{R}_+) \subset L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$  and then, iterating the argument, that for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $C_\delta$  such that

$$\|f\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\delta, 1/\delta)} \leq C_\delta. \tag{6.16}$$

*Step 2. Positivity.* From (6.14) and (6.15) we clearly have

$$\int_\delta^{1/\delta} |f(y)| y dy \geq 1 - 2R\delta. \tag{6.17}$$

Taking  $\delta_1 := 1/(4R)$ , we see that there exists at least one point  $x_1 \in (2\delta_1, 1/(2\delta_1))$  such that

$$|f(x_1)| \geq \delta_1^2/2. \tag{6.18}$$

Introducing the logarithm function  $\theta$  defined by  $f(y) = |f(y)| e^{i\theta(y)}$  which is locally well defined for any  $y \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $f(y) \neq 0$ , we see from (6.18) and (6.16) that there exist an interval  $I_1 \subset (\delta_1, 1/\delta_1)$ ,  $x_1 \in I_1$ , and a computable real number  $\varepsilon_1 := \varepsilon(\delta_1) > 0$  such that

$$|I_1| \geq \varepsilon_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \Re e(f(x) e^{-i\theta(x_1)}) \geq \delta_1^2/4 \quad \forall x \in I_1, \tag{6.19}$$

and better (since  $\cos$  and  $|f(x)|$  are Lipschitz functions)

$$|I_1| \geq \varepsilon_1 \quad \text{and} \quad |f(x)| \geq \delta_1^2/4, \quad |\theta(x_1) - \theta(x)| \leq \pi/4 \quad \forall x \in I_1. \tag{6.20}$$

On the other hand, we know that  $\Pi_{\Lambda,0} f = 0$  which yields

$$\int_0^\infty \Re e \left\{ f(y) e^{-i\theta(x_1)} \right\} y dy = 0.$$

From (6.15) again, we deduce that

$$\int_\delta^{1/\delta} \Re e \left\{ f(y) e^{-i\theta(x_1)} \right\} y dy \leq 2R\delta.$$

But together with the positivity property (6.19), there exists  $\delta_2 < \delta_1$  such that  $2R\delta_2 < \kappa_2 := \varepsilon_1 \delta_1^2/8 > 0$  and for any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_2)$

$$\int_\delta^{1/\delta} \left( \Re e \left\{ f(y) e^{-i\theta(x_1)} \right\} \right)_- y dy \geq \kappa_2.$$

Using the same arguments as above, there exists  $x_2 \in (\delta_2, 1/\delta_2)$  such that

$$|f(x_2)| \cos(\theta(x_2) - \theta(x_1)) \leq -\kappa_2 \delta_2^2/2,$$

and then there exist an interval  $I_2 \subset (\delta_2, 1/\delta_2)$  and some constants  $\varepsilon_2, \kappa_2 > 0$  such that

$$|I_2| \geq \varepsilon_2 \quad \text{and} \quad |f(y)| \geq \kappa_2 \quad \forall y \in I_2,$$

as well as

$$\cos[\theta(y) - \theta(x)] \leq 0 \quad \forall x \in I_1, \forall y \in I_2.$$

We may assume without loss of generality that  $x_1 > x_2$ .

*Step 3.* By definition of the growth-fragmentation operator  $\Lambda$  and denoting  $\overline{\text{sign} f} := \bar{f}/|f|^2$  where  $\bar{f}$  stands for the complex conjugate of  $f$ , we clearly have

$$\int_0^\infty (\Lambda|f| - (\Lambda f) \overline{\text{sign} f}) \phi = \int_0^\infty \int_0^y k(y, x) |f(y)| (1 - \text{sign} f(y) \overline{\text{sign} f}(x)) \phi(x) dx dy.$$

Since

$$\Re\{1 - \text{sign} f(y) \overline{\text{sign} f}(x)\} = 1 - \cos[\theta(y) - \theta(x)] \geq 1 \quad \forall x \in I_1, \forall y \in I_2,$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Re \int_0^\infty (\Lambda|f| - (\Lambda f) \overline{\text{sign} f}) \phi \\ & \geq \varrho_* \delta_2^{\gamma-1} \int_{I_2} |f(y)| \int_{I_1} \{1 - \cos[\theta(y) - \theta(x)]\} x dx dy \\ & \geq \varrho_* \delta_2^{\gamma-1} \delta_1 \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \kappa_2 =: -a^{**}. \end{aligned}$$

*Step 4. Conclusion.* For any mass normalized eigenvector  $f \in D(\Lambda)$  associated to an eigenvalue  $\xi \in \Delta_a \cap \Sigma(\Lambda) \setminus \{0\}$ , there holds thanks to step 3

$$\begin{aligned} \Re \xi \langle |f|, \phi \rangle &= \Re \langle \xi f \overline{\text{sign} f}, \phi \rangle \\ &= \Re \langle \Lambda f \overline{\text{sign} f}, \phi \rangle \\ &\leq \langle \Lambda|f|, \phi \rangle + a^{**} \end{aligned}$$

and then  $\Re \xi \leq a^{**}$ . As a consequence,  $\Delta_{a^{**}} \cap \Sigma(\Lambda) = \{0\}$  and we conclude thanks to [Theorem 3.1](#).  $\square$

### Conflict of interest statement

The authors declare there is no conflict of interest.

### Acknowledgement

The first author would like to thank O. Kavian for his encouragement to write the abstract part of the present paper as well as for his comments on a first proof of [Theorem 2.1](#) which had led to many simplifications on the arguments. The first author also would like to thank C. Mouhot for the many discussions of the spectral analysis of semigroups issue. We also would like to acknowledge O. Diekmann for having pointing out some interesting references related to our work. The authors thank the referees for helpful remarks and suggestions. The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the STAB ANR project (ANR-12-BS01-0019).

## References

- [1] F. Andreu, J. Martínez, J.M. Mazón, A spectral mapping theorem for perturbed strongly continuous semigroups, *Math. Ann.* 291 (3) (1991) 453–462.
- [2] W. Arendt, Kato’s equality and spectral decomposition for positive  $C_0$ -groups, *Manuscr. Math.* 40 (2–3) (1982) 277–298.
- [3] W. Arendt, A. Grabosch, G. Greiner, U. Groh, H.P. Lotz, U. Moustakas, R. Nagel, F. Neubrander, U. Schlotterbeck, *One-Parameter Semigroups of Positive Operators*, *Lect. Notes Math.*, vol. 1184, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.
- [4] L. Arkeryd, Stability in  $L^1$  for the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 103 (2) (1988) 151–167.
- [5] L. Arkeryd, R. Esposito, M. Pulvirenti, The Boltzmann equation for weakly inhomogeneous data, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 111 (3) (1987) 393–407.
- [6] A. Arnold, I.M. Gamba, M.P. Gualdani, S. Mischler, C. Mouhot, C. Sparber, The Wigner–Fokker–Planck equation: stationary states and large time behavior, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 22 (11) (2012) 1250034, 31.
- [7] F. Baccelli, D. McDonald, J. Reynier, A mean field model for multiple TCP connections through a buffer implementing red, *Perform. Evol.* 11 (2002) 77–97.
- [8] D. Balagué, J.A. Cañizo, P. Gabriel, Fine asymptotics of profiles and relaxation to equilibrium for growth-fragmentation equations with variable drift rates, *Kinet. Relat. Models* 6 (2) (2013) 219–243.
- [9] J. Banasiak, L. Arlotti, *Perturbations of Positive Semigroups with Applications*, *Springer Monogr. Math.*, Springer-Verlag London Ltd., London, 2006.
- [10] J. Banasiak, K. Pichór, R. Rudnicki, Asynchronous exponential growth of a general structured population model, *Acta Appl. Math.* 119 (2012) 149–166.
- [11] B. Basse, B.C. Baguley, E.S. Marshall, W.R. Joseph, B. van Brunt, G. Wake, D.J.N. Wall, A mathematical model for analysis of the cell cycle in cell lines derived from human tumors, *J. Math. Biol.* 47 (4) (2003) 295–312.
- [12] G. Bell, E. Anderson, Cell growth and division: I. A mathematical model with applications to cell volume distribution in mammalian suspension cultures, *Biophys. J.* 8 (4) (1967) 329–351.
- [13] J. Bertoin, The asymptotic behavior of fragmentation processes, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 5 (4) (2003) 395–416.
- [14] D. Beysens, X. Campi, E. Pefferkorn, *Fragmentation Phenomena*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1995.
- [15] A.V. Bobylév, The method of the Fourier transform in the theory of the Boltzmann equation for Maxwell molecules, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 225 (6) (1975) 1041–1044.
- [16] S. Brendle, R. Nagel, J. Poland, On the spectral mapping theorem for perturbed strongly continuous semigroups, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* 74 (5) (2000) 365–378.
- [17] H. Brezis, *Analyse fonctionnelle. Théorie et applications (Theory and applications)*, *Collection Mathématiques Appliquées pour la Maîtrise (Collection of Applied Mathematics for the Master’s Degree)*, Masson, Paris, 1983.
- [18] M.J. Cáceres, J.A. Cañizo, S. Mischler, Rate of convergence to self-similarity for the fragmentation equation in  $L^1$  spaces, *Commun. Appl. Ind. Math.* 1 (2) (2010) 299–308.
- [19] M.J. Cáceres, J.A. Cañizo, S. Mischler, Rate of convergence to an asymptotic profile for the self-similar fragmentation and growth-fragmentation equations, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) 96 (4) (2011) 334–362.
- [20] V. Calvez, M. Doumic, P. Gabriel, Self-similarity in a general aggregation–fragmentation problem. Application to fitness analysis, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) 98 (1) (2012) 1–27.
- [21] V. Calvez, N. Lenuzza, M. Doumic, J.-P. Deslys, F. Mouthon, B. Perthame, Prion dynamics with size dependency–strain phenomena, *J. Biol. Dyn.* 4 (1) (2010) 28–42.
- [22] V. Calvez, N. Lenuzza, D. Oelz, J.-P. Deslys, P. Laurent, F. Mouthon, B. Perthame, Size distribution dependence of prion aggregates infectivity, *Math. Biosci.* 217 (1) (2009) 88–99.
- [23] T. Carleman, *Problèmes mathématiques dans la théorie cinétique des gaz*, *Publ. Sci. Inst. Mittag-Leffler*, vol. 2, Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri Ab, Uppsala, 1957.
- [24] K. Carrapatoso, Exponential convergence to equilibrium for the homogeneous Landau equation, preprint.
- [25] K. Carrapatoso, G. Egaña, S. Mischler, Uniqueness and long time asymptotic for the Keller–Segel equation – part II, the parabolic–parabolic case, in progress.
- [26] M. Chipot, On the equations of age-dependent population dynamics, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 82 (1) (1983) 13–25.
- [27] R. Dautray, J.-L. Lions, *Mathematical Analysis and Numerical Methods for Science and Technology*, vol. 3: *Spectral Theory and Applications*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990 (with the collaboration of Michel Artola and Michel Cessenat; translated from the French by John C. Amson).
- [28] E.B. Davies, *One-Parameter Semigroups*, *London Math. Soc. Monogr. Ser.*, vol. 15, Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], London, 1980.
- [29] O. Diekmann, H.J.A.M. Heijmans, H.R. Thieme, On the stability of the cell size distribution, *J. Math. Biol.* 19 (2) (1984) 227–248.
- [30] J. Dolbeault, C. Mouhot, C. Schmeiser, Hypocoercivity for kinetic equations conserving mass, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* (2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-2015-06012-7>, in press, arXiv eprint 1005.1495.
- [31] J. Dolbeault, C. Mouhot, C. Schmeiser, Hypocoercivity for kinetic equations with linear relaxation terms, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 347 (9–10) (2009) 511–516.
- [32] M. Doumic Jauffret, P. Gabriel, Eigenelements of a general aggregation–fragmentation model, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 20 (5) (2010) 757–783.
- [33] F.J. Dyson, The radiation theories of Tomonaga, Schwinger, and Feynman, *Phys. Rev.* 75 (1949) 486–502.

- [34] G. Egaña, S. Mischler, Uniqueness and long time asymptotic for the Keller–Segel equation – part I. The parabolic–elliptic case, preprint.
- [35] K.-J. Engel, R. Nagel, One-Parameter Semigroups for Linear Evolution Equations, Grad. Texts Math., vol. 194, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000 (with contributions by S. Brendle, M. Campiti, T. Hahn, G. Metafune, G. Nickel, D. Pallara, C. Perazzoli, A. Rhandi, S. Romanelli and R. Schnaubelt).
- [36] M. Escobedo, S. Mischler, M. Rodriguez Ricard, On self-similarity and stationary problem for fragmentation and coagulation models, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Anal. Non Linéaire* 22 (1) (2005) 99–125.
- [37] W. Feller, On the integral equation of renewal theory, *Ann. Math. Stat.* 12 (1941) 243–267.
- [38] W. Feller, An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications, vol. II, John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1966.
- [39] A. Filippov, On the distribution of the sizes of particles which undergo splitting, *Theory Probab. Appl.* 6 (1961) 275–293.
- [40] I. Fredholm, Sur une classe d'équations fonctionnelles, *Acta Math.* 27 (1) (1903) 365–390.
- [41] A.G. Fredrickson, D. Ramakrishna, H.M. Tsuchiya, Statistics and dynamics of prokaryotic cell populations, *Math. Biosci.* (1967) 327–374.
- [42] G. Frobenius, Über Matrizen aus nicht negativen Elementen, *Sitzungsber. Königl. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, 1912, pp. 456–477.
- [43] T. Gallay, C.E. Wayne, Invariant manifolds and the long-time asymptotics of the Navier–Stokes and vorticity equations on  $\mathbf{R}^2$ , *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 163 (3) (2002) 209–258.
- [44] L. Gearhart, Spectral theory for contraction semigroups on Hilbert space, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 236 (1978) 385–394.
- [45] A. Grabosch, Compactness properties and asymptotics of strongly coupled systems, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 187 (2) (1994) 411–437.
- [46] H. Grad, Principles of the kinetic theory of gases, in: S. Flügge (Ed.), *Thermodynamik der Gase*, in: *Handbuch der Physik*, Bd. 12, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1958, pp. 205–294.
- [47] H. Grad, Asymptotic theory of the Boltzmann equation. II, in: *Rarefied Gas Dynamics*, vol. I, Academic Press, New York, 1963, pp. 26–59 (Proc. 3rd Internat. Sympos., Palais de l'UNESCO, Paris, 1962).
- [48] M.L. Greer, L. Pujo-Menjouet, G.F. Webb, A mathematical analysis of the dynamics of prion proliferation, *J. Theor. Biol.* 242 (3) (2006) 598–606.
- [49] G. Greiner, Zur Perron–Frobenius-Theorie stark stetiger Halbgruppen, *Math. Z.* 177 (3) (1981) 401–423.
- [50] G. Greiner, J. Voigt, M. Wolff, On the spectral bound of the generator of semigroups of positive operators, *J. Oper. Theory* 5 (2) (1981) 245–256.
- [51] M.P. Gualdani, S. Mischler, C. Mouhot, Factorization of non-symmetric operators and exponential  $H$ -theorem, hal-00495786.
- [52] M.E. Gurtin, R.C. MacCamy, Non-linear age-dependent population dynamics, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 54 (1974) 281–300.
- [53] M.E. Gurtin, R.C. MacCamy, Some simple models for nonlinear age-dependent population dynamics, *Math. Biosci.* 43 (3–4) (1979) 199–211.
- [54] M. Gyllenberg, G.F. Webb, A nonlinear structured population model of tumor growth with quiescence, *J. Math. Biol.* 28 (6) (1990) 671–694.
- [55] H.J.A.M. Heijmans, On the stable size distribution of populations reproducing by fission into two unequal parts, *Math. Biosci.* 72 (1) (1984) 19–50.
- [56] B. Helffer, F. Nier, Hypocoercive Estimates and Spectral Theory for Fokker–Planck Operators and Witten Laplacians, *Lect. Notes Math.*, vol. 1862, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.
- [57] F. Hérau, Hypocoercivity and exponential time decay for the linear inhomogeneous relaxation Boltzmann equation, *Asymptot. Anal.* 46 (3–4) (2006) 349–359.
- [58] F. Hérau, Short and long time behavior of the Fokker–Planck equation in a confining potential and applications, *J. Funct. Anal.* 244 (1) (2007) 95–118.
- [59] F. Hérau, F. Nier, Isotropic hypocoercivity and trend to equilibrium for the Fokker–Planck equation with a high-degree potential, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 171 (2) (2004) 151–218.
- [60] D. Hilbert, Begründung der kinetischen Gastheorie, *Math. Ann.* 72 (4) (1912) 562–577.
- [61] D. Hilbert, Grundzüge einer allgemeinen Theorie der linearen Integralgleichungen, Chelsea Publishing Company, New York, NY, 1953.
- [62] E. Hille, Representation of one-parameter semigroups of linear transformations, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 28 (1942) 175–178.
- [63] E. Hille, Functional Analysis and Semi-Groups, *Colloq. Publ. – Am. Math. Soc.*, vol. 31, American Mathematical Society, New York, 1948.
- [64] E. Hille, R.S. Phillips, Functional Analysis and Semi-Groups, rev. ed., *Colloq. Publ. – Am. Math. Soc.*, vol. 31, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1957.
- [65] M. Iannelli, Mathematical Theory of Age-Structured Population Dynamics, Giardini Editori and Stampore, Pisa, Italy, 1994.
- [66] K. Jörgens, An asymptotic expansion in the theory of neutron transport, *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 11 (1958) 219–242.
- [67] T. Kato, Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators, *Class. Math.*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995, Reprint of the 1980 edition.
- [68] A. Koch, M. Schaechter, A model for statistics of the cell division process, *J. Gen. Microbiol.* 29 (1962) 435–454.
- [69] H. Komatsu, Fractional powers of operators, *Pac. J. Math.* 19 (1966) 285–346.
- [70] H. Komatsu, Fractional powers of operators. II. Interpolation spaces, *Pac. J. Math.* 21 (1967) 89–111.
- [71] M.G. Krein, M.A. Rutman, Linear operators leaving invariant a cone in a Banach space, *Usp. Mat. Nauk (N.S.)* 3 (1(23)) (1948) 3–95.
- [72] K. Latrach, Compactness properties for perturbed semigroups and application to transport equation, *J. Aust. Math. Soc. A* 69 (1) (2000) 25–40.
- [73] P. Laurençot, B. Perthame, Exponential decay for the growth-fragmentation/cell-division equation, *Commun. Math. Sci.* 7 (2) (2009) 503–510.
- [74] P.H. Leslie, On the use of matrices in certain population mathematics, *Biometrika* 33 (1945) 183–212.
- [75] A.M. Liapunov, Stability of Motion, *Math. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 30, Academic Press, New York, 1966 (with a contribution by V.A. Pliss and an introduction by V.P. Basov; translated from the Russian by Flavian Abramovici and Michael Shimshoni).
- [76] J.-L. Lions, J. Peetre, Sur une classe d'espaces d'interpolation, *Publ. Math. IHÉS* 19 (1964) 5–68.
- [77] A.J. Lotka, F. Sharpe, A problem in age distribution, *Philos. Mag.* 21 (1911) 435–438.



- [78] G. Lumer, R.S. Phillips, Dissipative operators in a Banach space, *Pac. J. Math.* 11 (1961) 679–698.
- [79] A. McKendrick, Applications of mathematics to medical problems, *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc.* 44 (1926) 98–130.
- [80] Z.A. Melzak, A scalar transport equation, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 85 (1957) 547–560.
- [81] J.A.J. Metz, O. Diekmann (Eds.), *The Dynamics of Physiologically Structured Populations*, *Lect. Notes Biomath.*, vol. 68, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986 (Papers from the colloquium held in Amsterdam, 1983).
- [82] P. Michel, Existence of a solution to the cell division eigenproblem, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 16 (7, suppl.) (2006) 1125–1153.
- [83] P. Michel, S. Mischler, B. Perthame, General entropy equations for structured population models and scattering, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 338 (9) (2004) 697–702.
- [84] P. Michel, S. Mischler, B. Perthame, General relative entropy inequality: an illustration on growth models, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) 84 (9) (2005) 1235–1260.
- [85] S. Mischler, **Semigroup in Banach space, work in progress.**
- [86] S. Mischler, C. Mouhot, Exponential stability of slowly decaying solutions to the kinetic Fokker–Planck equation, arXiv:1412.7487.
- [87] S. Mischler, C. Mouhot, Stability, convergence to self-similarity and elastic limit for the Boltzmann equation for inelastic hard spheres, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 288 (2) (2009) 431–502.
- [88] S. Mischler, C. Mouhot, Stability, convergence to the steady state and elastic limit for the Boltzmann equation for diffusively excited granular media, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 24 (1) (2009) 159–185.
- [89] S. Mischler, B. Perthame, L. Ryzhik, Stability in a nonlinear population maturation model, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 12 (12) (2002) 1751–1772.
- [90] I. Miyadera, On perturbation theory for semi-groups of operators, *Tôhoku Math. J.* (2) 18 (1966) 299–310.
- [91] M. Mokhtar-Kharroubi, Compactness properties for positive semigroups on Banach lattices and applications, *Houst. J. Math.* 17 (1) (1991) 25–38.
- [92] M. Mokhtar-Kharroubi, Time asymptotic behavior and compactness in transport theory, *Eur. J. Mech. B, Fluids* 11 (1) (1992) 39–68.
- [93] M. Mokhtar-Kharroubi, *Mathematical Topics in Neutron Transport Theory*, *Ser. Adv. Math. Appl. Sci.*, vol. 46, World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1997 (New aspects, with a chapter by M. Choulli and P. Stefanov).
- [94] M. Mokhtar-Kharroubi, Spectral properties of a class of positive semigroups on Banach lattices and streaming operators, *Positivity* 10 (2) (2006) 231–249.
- [95] M. Mokhtar-Kharroubi, On  $L^1$  exponential trend to equilibrium for conservative linear kinetic equations on the torus, *J. Funct. Anal.* 266 (11) (2014) 6418–6455.
- [96] C. Mouhot, Rate of convergence to equilibrium for the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation with hard potentials, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 261 (3) (2006) 629–672.
- [97] C. Mouhot, L. Neumann, Quantitative perturbative study of convergence to equilibrium for collisional kinetic models in the torus, *Nonlinearity* 19 (4) (2006) 969–998.
- [98] R. Nagel, H. Uhlig, An abstract Kato inequality for generators of positive operators semigroups on Banach lattices, *J. Oper. Theory* 6 (1) (1981) 113–123.
- [99] P. Painter, A. Marr, Mathematics of microbial populations, *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.* 22 (1968) 519–548.
- [100] A. Pazy, *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*, *Appl. Math. Sci.*, vol. 44, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.
- [101] O. Perron, Zur Theorie der Matrizes, *Math. Ann.* 64 (2) (1907) 248–263.
- [102] B. Perthame, *Transport Equations in Biology*, *Front. Math.*, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2007.
- [103] B. Perthame, L. Ryzhik, Exponential decay for the fragmentation or cell-division equation, *J. Differ. Equ.* 210 (1) (2005) 155–177.
- [104] R.S. Phillips, Spectral theory for semi-groups of linear operators, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 71 (1951) 393–415.
- [105] R.S. Phillips, Perturbation theory for semi-groups of linear operators, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 74 (1953) 199–221.
- [106] R.S. Phillips, Semi-groups of positive contraction operators, *Czechoslov. Math. J.* 12 (87) (1962) 294–313.
- [107] J. Prüss, On the spectrum of  $C_0$ -semigroups, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 284 (2) (1984) 847–857.
- [108] J. Prüss, L. Pujo-Menjouet, G.F. Webb, R. Zacher, Analysis of a model for the dynamics of prions, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., Ser. B* 6 (1) (2006) 225–235.
- [109] M. Ribarič, I. Vidav, Analytic properties of the inverse  $A(z)^{-1}$  of an analytic linear operator valued function  $A(z)$ , *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 32 (1969) 298–310.
- [110] R. Rudnicki, K. Pichór, Markov semigroups and stability of the cell maturity distribution, *J. Biol. Syst.* 8 (1) (2000) 69–94.
- [111] J. Sinko, W. Streifer, A model for populations reproducing by fission, *Ecology* 52 (2) (1971) 330–335.
- [112] I. Tristani, **Boltzmann equation for granular media with thermal force in a weakly inhomogenous setting, preprint.**
- [113] S. Ukai, On the existence of global solutions of mixed problem for non-linear Boltzmann equation, *Proc. Jpn. Acad.* 50 (1974) 179–184.
- [114] I. Vidav, Spectra of perturbed semigroups with applications to transport theory, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 30 (1970) 264–279.
- [115] C. Villani, Hypocoercive diffusion operators, *Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. Sez. B Artic. Ric. Mat.* 10 (2) (2007) 257–275.
- [116] C. Villani, Hypocoercivity, *Mem. Am. Math. Soc.* 202 (950) (2009) iv+141.
- [117] J. Voigt, On the perturbation theory for strongly continuous semigroups, *Math. Ann.* 229 (2) (1977) 163–171.
- [118] J. Voigt, A perturbation theorem for the essential spectral radius of strongly continuous semigroups, *Monatshefte Math.* 90 (2) (1980) 153–161.
- [119] von Foerster, H. Some remarks on changing population, in: F. Stohlman (Ed.), *The Kinetics of Cell Proliferation*, Grune and Stratton, New York, 1959, pp. 382–407.
- [120] G.F. Webb, *Theory of Nonlinear Age-Dependent Population Dynamics*, *Monogr. Textb. Pure Appl. Math.*, vol. 89, Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1985.

- [121] B. Wennberg, Stability and exponential convergence for the Boltzmann equation, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 130 (2) (1995) 103–144.
- [122] H. Weyl, Über gewöhnliche Differentialgleichungen mit Singularitäten und die zugehörigen Entwicklungen willkürlicher Funktionen, *Math. Ann.* 68 (2) (1910) 220–269.
- [123] K. Yosida, On the differentiability and the representation of one-parameter semi-group of linear operators, *J. Math. Soc. Jpn.* 1 (1948) 15–21.
- [124] R.M. Ziff, E.D. McGrady, The kinetics of cluster fragmentation and depolymerisation, *J. Phys. A* 18 (15) (1985) 3027–3037.