Non-local PDEs with discrete state-dependent delays: well-posedness in a metric space
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Abstract. Partial differential equations with discrete (concentrated) state-dependent delays are studied. The existence and uniqueness of solutions with initial data from a wider linear space is proven first and then a subset of the space of continuously differentiable (with respect to an appropriate norm) functions is used to construct a dynamical system. This subset is an analogue of the solution manifold proposed for ordinary equations in [H.-O. Walther, The solution manifold and $C^1$-smoothness for differential equations with state-dependent delay, J. Differential Equations, 195(1), (2003) 46–65]. The existence of a compact global attractor is proven.

1 Introduction

The partial differential equations (PDEs) with delays have attracted a lot of attention during the last decades as many processes of the real world (like an automatically controlled furnace, bi-directional associative memory (BAM) neural networks, reaction-diffusion processes) can be described by such kind of equations. Studying these equations is based on the well-developed approaches to the ordinary differential equations (ODEs) with delays [11] and PDEs without delays [8, 9, 15, 14]. Under certain assumptions both types of equations describe a kind of dynamical systems that are infinite-dimensional, see [2, 30] and references therein; see also [31, 4, 5, 3] and to the monograph [37] that are very close to this work.
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In many evolution systems arising in applications the presented delays are frequently state-dependent (SDDs). The theory of such equations, especially the ODEs, is rapidly developing and many deep results have been obtained up to now (see e.g. [32, 33, 34, 16, 18, 35] and also the survey paper [12] for details and references). The underlying main mathematical difficulty of the theory of PDEs with SDDs lies in the fact that the functions describing state-dependent delays are not Lipschitz continuous on the space of continuous functions - the main space, on which the classical theory of equations with delays is developed. This implies that the corresponding initial value problem (IVP) is not generally well-posed in the sense of J. Hadamard [8, 9].

The partial differential equations with state-dependent delays were first studied in [21] (the case of distributed delays, weak solutions), [13] (mild solutions, infinite discrete delay), and [22] (weak solutions, finite discrete and distributed delays). An alternative approach to the PDEs with discrete SDDs is proposed in [24].

This paper is a continuation of the work [25] and its goal is to study the approach used for ODEs with SDDs [32, 33, 12] in the case of PDEs. The main idea lies in finding a wider space \( Y \supset X \) such that a solution \( u : [a, b] \to Y \) be a Lipschitz function (with respect to a weaker norm of \( Y \)), and constructing a dynamical system on a subset of the space \( C([a, b]; Y) \). It should be emphasized that the dynamical system is constructed on a metric space that is nonlinear. More precisely, the existence and uniqueness of solutions with initial data from a wider linear space is proven first and then a subset of the space of continuously differentiable (with respect to an appropriate norm) functions is used to construct the aforementioned dynamical system. This subset is an analogue of the solution manifold proposed in [33], see also [12]. We use the same class of non-local in space variables nonlinear PDEs as in [25].

The paper is organized as follows. The section 2 is devoted to the formulation of the model. The proof of the existence and uniqueness of (strong) solutions for initial functions from a Banach space forms a main part of the section 3. In the section 4, an evolution operator \( S_t \) is constructed and its asymptotic properties in different functional spaces are investigated. The dissipativeness is obtained in a Banach space, while the existence of a global attractor is proven on a smaller metric space (the solution manifold). The choice of this smaller space is different from that proposed in [25].
2 The model with discrete state-dependent delay and preliminaries

Consider the following non-local partial differential equation with a discrete state-dependent delay $\eta$

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, x) + Au(t, x) + d u(t, x) = b \left( [B u(t - \eta(u_t), \cdot)](x) \right) \equiv (F_1(u_t))(x), \quad x \in \Omega,
$$

(1)

where $A$ is a densely-defined self-adjoint positive linear operator with domain $D(A) \subset L^2(\Omega)$ and compact resolvent, which means that $A : D(A) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ generates an analytic semigroup, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a smooth bounded domain, $B : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ denotes a bounded operator that will be defined later, $b : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ stands for a locally Lipschitz map, $d \in \mathbb{R}, d \geq 0$, and the function $\eta : C([-r, 0]; L^2(\Omega)) \rightarrow [0, r] \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ denotes a state-dependent discrete delay. Let $C \equiv C([-r, 0]; L^2(\Omega))$. Norms defined on $L^2(\Omega)$ and $C$ are denoted by $\| \cdot \|$ and $\| \cdot \|_C$, respectively, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ stands for the inner product in $L^2(\Omega)$. As usually, $u_t \equiv u_t(\theta) \equiv u(t + \theta)$ for $\theta \in [-r, 0]$.

Remark 1. The operator $B$ may for example be of the following forms (linear operators)

$$
[B v](x) \equiv \int_\Omega v(y) \tilde{f}(x, y) dy, \quad x \in \Omega,
$$

(2)

or even simpler

$$
[B v](x) \equiv \int_\Omega v(y) f(x - y) \ell(y) dy, \quad x \in \Omega,
$$

(3)

where $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function and $\ell \in C^\infty_0(\Omega)$. In the last case the nonlinear term in (1) is of the form

$$
(F_1(u_t))(x) \equiv b \left( \int_\Omega u(t - \eta(u_t), y) f(x-y) \ell(y) dy \right), \quad x \in \Omega.
$$

(4)

Consider the equation (1) with the initial condition

$$
u_{\mid_{[-r,0]}} = \varphi
$$

(5)

and let

$$
H \equiv \left\{ \varphi \in C([-r, 0]; D(A^{-\frac{1}{2}})) \mid \varphi(0) \in D(A^{\frac{1}{2}}) \right\}.
$$

(6)
Let further
\[ \|\varphi\|_H \equiv \max_{s \in [-r,0]} \|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi(s)\| + \|A^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi(0)\| \]
be a norm defined on the space \( H \) and \( D(A^{\alpha}) \) denote the domain of the operator \( A^{\alpha} \). In the sequel the following assumptions will play an important role.

**(H1.\( \eta \))** The discrete delay function \( \eta : H \to [0,r] \) is such that
\[ \exists L_\eta > 0, \ \exists q \geq 0 \ \text{such that} \forall \varphi, \psi \in H \Rightarrow \]
\[ |\eta(\varphi) - \eta(\psi)| \leq L_\eta \left( q \|A^{\frac{1}{2}}(\varphi(0) - \psi(0))\|^2 + \int_{-r}^{0} \|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\varphi(\theta) - \psi(\theta))\|^2 \, d\theta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \] \hspace{1cm} (7)

**(H.B)** The following Lipschitz property of the operator \( B \) holds.
\[ \exists L_B > 0 \ \text{such that} \forall u, v \in D(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \Rightarrow \|Bu - Bv\| \leq L_B \|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(u - v)\| \] \hspace{1cm} (8)

**Remark 2.** Under the assumption that for all (almost all) \( x \in \Omega \Rightarrow f(\cdot - x)\ell(\cdot) \in D(A^{\frac{1}{2}}) \) and \( u \in D(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \), the term of the form (3) implies that
\[ \| \langle u, f(\cdot - x)\ell(\cdot) \rangle \| \leq \|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}u\| \|A^{\frac{1}{2}}f(\cdot - x)\ell(\cdot)\| , \]
which gives
\[ \left( \int_{\Omega} \left( \int_{\Omega} u(y)f(y - x)\ell(y)dy \right)^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}u\| \left( \int_{\Omega} \|A^{\frac{1}{2}}f(\cdot - x)\ell(\cdot)\|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} . \]

Hence, the property (H.B) (see (8)) holds with \( L_B \equiv \left( \int_{\Omega} \|A^{\frac{1}{2}}f(\cdot - x)\ell(\cdot)\|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \). The same arguments hold (with \( L_B \equiv \left( \int_{\Omega} \|A^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{f}(x,\cdot)\|^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \)) for a more general term of the form (2). \hfill \Box

Let now the following space
\[ \mathcal{L} \equiv \left\{ \varphi \in C([-r,0]; D(A^{-\frac{1}{2}})) \mid \sup_{s \neq t} \left\{ \frac{\|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\varphi(s) - \varphi(t))\|}{|s - t|} \right\} < +\infty; \varphi(0) \in D(A^{\frac{1}{2}}) \right\} , \]
with the natural norm
\[ \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{L}} \equiv \max_{s \in [-r,0]} \|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}\varphi(s)\| + \sup_{s \neq t} \left\{ \frac{\|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\varphi(s) - \varphi(t))\|}{|s - t|} \right\} + \|A^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi(0)\| \] \hspace{1cm} (9)

\[ \]
be defined. For any segment \([a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}\) (c.f. (9)) and any Lipschitz-on-[\(a, b\)] function \(\varphi\), let
\[
|||\varphi|||_{[a,b]} \equiv \sup \left\{ \frac{||A^{-1/2}(\varphi(s) - \varphi(t))||}{|s - t|} : s \neq t; s, t \in [a, b] \right\}
\] (11)
denote its Lipschitz constant and let \(|||\varphi||| \equiv |||\varphi|||_{[-r,0]}\). Then the following lemma holds.

**Lemma 1.** Let the assumptions \((\text{H}1.\eta)\) and \((\text{H.B})\) hold (see (7), (8)) and let the function \(b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\) is Lipschitz and bounded \((||b(s)|| \leq M_b\) for all \(s \in \mathbb{R}\)). Then any two functions \(\varphi \in \mathcal{L}, \psi \in H\) (with \(H\) and \(\mathcal{L}\) defined in (6) and (9)) the nonlinearity \(F\) satisfies
\[
||F_1(\varphi) - F_1(\psi)|| \leq L_{F_1} \left[ |||\varphi||| \right] \left( q ||A^{1/2}(\varphi(0) - \psi(0))|| + ||A^{-1/2}(\varphi - \psi)||_C \right),
\] (12)
where
\[
L_{F_1}[\ell] \equiv L_b L_B \sqrt{2} \max \left\{ 1; \ell L_\eta \max \{1; \sqrt{r}\} \right\}
\] (13)
and \(L_{F_1}[\ell]\) is used in (12) with
\[
\ell = L_\varphi \equiv |||\varphi||| \equiv \sup \left\{ \frac{||A^{-1/2}(\varphi(s) - \varphi(t))||}{|s - t|} : s \neq t; s, t \in [-r, 0] \right\}.
\]

**Proof of Lemma 1.** Using the Lipschitz property of \(b\) and \(B\) (see \((\text{H.B})\)), it follows that
\[
||F_1(\varphi) - F_1(\psi)||^2 = \int_\Omega |b([B\varphi](-\eta(\varphi), x)) - b([B\psi](-\eta(\psi), x))|^2\, dx \leq
\]
\[
\leq L_b^2 \int_\Omega \left( ||B\varphi||(-\eta(\varphi), x) - ||B\psi||(-\eta(\psi), x) \right)^2 dx = L_b^2 ||B\varphi||(-\eta(\varphi), \cdot) - ||B\psi||(-\eta(\psi), \cdot)||^2 \leq
\]
\[
\leq L_b^2 L_B^2 \|A^{-1/2} \{ \varphi(-\eta(\varphi)) - \psi(-\eta(\psi)) \pm \varphi(-\eta(\psi)) \} \|_C^2 \leq 2L_b^2 L_B^2 \left( ||A^{-1/2} \{ \varphi(-\eta(\varphi)) - \psi(-\eta(\psi)) \} ||_C^2 + ||A^{-1/2}(\varphi - \psi)||_C^2 \right).
\]

Next, \(\varphi \in \mathcal{L}\) implies that there exists \(L_\varphi \equiv |||\varphi||| > 0\), (see (10), (11)) such that
\[
||A^{-1/2}(\varphi(s^1) - \varphi(s^2))|| \leq L_\varphi |s^1 - s^2|, \quad \forall s^1, s^2 \in [-r, 0].
\] (14)

Hence, (13) and \((\text{H}1.\eta)\) give
\[
||F_1(\varphi) - F_1(\psi)||^2 \leq
\]
\[ \leq 2L_B^2L^2 b \left[ L^2 \left( q \| A^{1/2} (\varphi(0) - \psi(0)) \|^2 + \int_{-r}^{0} \| A^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\varphi(\theta) - \psi(\theta)) \|^2 d\theta \right) + \right. \\
+ \left. \| A^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\varphi - \psi) \|^2 \right] \leq \\
\leq 2L_B^2L^2 b \left[ L^2 \left( q \| A^{1/2} (\varphi(0) - \psi(0)) \|^2 + r \| A^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\varphi - \psi) \|^2 \right) + \right. \\
+ \left. \| A^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\varphi - \psi) \|^2 \right] \leq \\
\leq 2L_B^2L^2 \max \left\{ 1; L^2 \max \{1; r\} \right\} \left[ q \| A^{1/2} (\varphi(0) - \psi(0)) \|^2 + \| A^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\varphi - \psi) \|^2 \right]. \]

The last estimate and using the formulas \( \sqrt{\max\{|a|; |b|\}} = \max\{\sqrt{|a|}; \sqrt{|b|}\} \) and \( \sqrt{a^2 + b^2} \leq |a| + |b| \) give (12), (13), which completes the proof. \( \square \)

### 3 The existence and uniqueness of solutions

As in [25] we need the following

**Definition 1.** A vector-function \( u(t) \in C([-r, T]; D(A^{-1/2})) \cap C([0, T]; D(A^{1/2})) \cap L^2(0, T; D(A)) \) with derivative \( \dot{u}(t) \in L^\infty(0, T; D(A^{-1/2})) \) is a (strong) solution to the problem defined by (1) and (5) on \([0, T]\) if

1. \( u(\theta) = \varphi(\theta) \) for \( \theta \in [-r, 0] \);
2. \( \forall v \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega)) \) such that \( \dot{v} \in L^2(0, T; D(A^{-1})) \) and \( v(T) = 0 \) implies

\[
- \int_0^T \langle u(t), \dot{v}(t) \rangle dt + \int_0^T \langle A^{1/2} u(t), A^{1/2} v(t) \rangle dt = \\
= \langle \varphi(0), v(0) \rangle + \int_0^T \langle F_1(u_t) - d \cdot u(t), v(t) \rangle dt. \quad (15)
\]

Now we prove the following theorem on the existence and uniqueness of solutions.

**Theorem 1.** Let the assumptions (H1.\( \eta \)) and (H.B) hold and let the function \( b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) be Lipschitz and bounded, i.e. \( |b(s)| \leq M_b \) for all \( s \in \mathbb{R} \). Let further \( \varphi \in \mathcal{L} \) be a given initial condition. Then the problem defined by (1) and (5) has a unique solution on any time interval \([0, T]\) such that \( \dot{u} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega)) \).
Remark 3. Notice that \( \varphi \) does not assume \( \varphi \in L^2([-r,0]; D(A)) \). However, the definition of a strong solution implies that

\[ u_t \in L^2([-r,0]; D(A)), \quad \forall t \geq r. \tag{16} \]

\[ \Box \]

Proof of Theorem 1. We follow the proof of Theorem 1 in [25]. Notice that the assumption (H1.\( \eta \)) is slightly more general than the assumption (H.\( \eta \)) in [25]. This implies some changes in the proof of the uniqueness of solutions.

Let \( \{e_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \) denote an orthonormal basis of \( L^2(\Omega) \) such that \( Ae_k = \lambda_k e_k, \ 0 < \lambda_1 < \ldots < \lambda_k \to +\infty \) and consider the Galerkin approximate solution \( u^m = u^m(t,x) = \sum_{k=1}^m g_{k,m}(t)e_k \) of order \( m \) such that

\[ \begin{cases} \langle \dot{u}^m + Au^m + du^m - F_1(u^m_t), e_k \rangle = 0, \\ \langle u^m(\theta), e_k \rangle = \langle \varphi(\theta), e_k \rangle, \quad \forall \theta \in [-r,0] \end{cases} \tag{17} \]

\( \forall k = 1, \ldots, m, \ g_{k,m} \in C^1(0,T; \mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(-r,T; \mathbb{R}) \) with \( \dot{g}_{k,m}(t) \) absolutely continuous.

The system (17) is a system of (ordinary) differential equations in \( \mathbb{R}^m \) with a concentrated (discrete) state-dependent delay for the unknown vector function \( U(t) \equiv (g_{1,m}(t), \ldots, g_{m,m}(t)) \) (for the corresponding theory see [33, 34] and also a recent review [12]).

The key difference between equations with state-dependent and state-independent (concentrated) delays is that the first type of equations is not well-posed in the space of continuous (initial) functions. To get a well-posed initial value problem, it is better [33, 34, 12] to use a smaller space of Lipschitz continuous functions or even a smaller subspace of \( C^1([-r,0]; \mathbb{R}^m) \).

The condition \( \varphi \in L \) implies that the function \( U(\cdot)|_{[-r,0]} \equiv P_m \varphi(\cdot) \), which defines initial data, is Lipschitz continuous as a function from \([-r,0]\) to \( \mathbb{R}^m \). Here \( P_m \) is the orthogonal projection onto the subspace \( \text{span} \{e_1, \ldots, e_m\} \subset L^2(\Omega) \). Hence, we can apply the theory of ODEs with discrete state-dependent delay (see e.g. [12]) to get the local existence and uniqueness of solutions to (17).

Next, we will get an a priori estimate to prove the continuation of solutions \( u^m \) to (17) on any time interval \([0,T]\) and then use it for the proof (by the method of compactness, see [15]) of the existence of strong solutions to (1) and (5). To that end, multiply the first
Integrating (18) with respect to \( t \) the equation in (17) by \( \lambda \) to get

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} ||A^{1/2}u^m(t)||^2 + ||Au^m(t)||^2 + d \cdot ||A^{1/2}u^m(t)||^2 = \langle P_m F(u^m_t), Au^m(t) \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2} ||P_m F(u^m_t)||^2 + \frac{1}{2} ||Au^m(t)||^2.
\]

As the function \( b \) is bounded, \( ||F(u^m)||^2 \leq M_b^2 |\Omega| \) (here \( |\Omega| \equiv \int_\Omega 1 \, dx \)), which gives

\[
\frac{d}{dt} ||A^{1/2}u^m(t)||^2 + ||Au^m(t)||^2 \leq M_b^2 |\Omega|.
\]  

Integrating (18) with respect to \( t \) and using the relationships \( \varphi(0) \in D(A^{1/2}), \; u^m(0) = P_m \varphi(0) \in D(A^{1/2}), \; ||A^{1/2}u^m(0)|| = ||A^{1/2}P_m \varphi(0)|| \leq ||A^{1/2} \varphi(0)|| \), we get an a priori estimate

\[
||A^{1/2}u^m(t)||^2 + \int_0^t ||Au^m(\tau)||^2 d\tau \leq ||A^{1/2} \varphi(0)||^2 + M_b^2 |\Omega| T, \; \forall m, \forall t \in [0, T].
\]  

The above relationship (19) means that

\[
\{u^m\}_{m=1}^\infty \text{ is a bounded set in } L^\infty(0, T; D(A^{1/2})) \cap L^2(0, T; D(A)).
\]

Using this fact and (17), it follows that

\[
\{u^m\}_{m=1}^\infty \text{ is a bounded set in } L^\infty(0, T; D(A^{-1/2})) \cap L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega)).
\]

Hence, the family \( \{(u^m, \dot{u}^m)\}_{m=1}^\infty \) is a bounded set in

\[
Z_1 \equiv (L^\infty(0, T; D(A^{1/2})) \cap L^2(0, T; D(A))) \times \times (L^\infty(0, T; D(A^{-1/2})) \cap L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))).
\]  

Therefore, there exist a subsequence \( \{(u^k, \dot{u}^k)\} \) and an element \((u, \dot{u})\) in \( Z_1 \) such that

\[
\{(u^k, \dot{u}^k)\} \text{ *-weak converges to } (u, \dot{u}) \text{ in } Z_1.
\]  

The proof that any *-weak limit is a strong solution is standard. To prove the property \( u(t) \in C([0, T]; D(A^{1/2})) \), we use the well-known (see also [14, thm. 1.3.1])

**Proposition 1.** (Proposition 1.2 in [26]). Let \( V \) denote a dense Banach space that is continuously embedded in a Hilbert space \( X \) and let \( X = X^* \) so that \( V \hookrightarrow X \hookrightarrow V^* \). Then the Banach space \( W_p(0, T) \equiv \{u \in L^p(0, T; V) : \dot{u} \in L^q(0, T; V^*)\} \) (here \( p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1 \)) is contained in \( C([0, T]; X) \).
In our case $X = D(A^{1/2})$, $V = D(A)$, $V^* = L^2(\Omega)$, $p = q = 1/2$.

Now we prove the uniqueness of solutions. Using the fact that $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$, the definition 1 of a solution $v$, and $\dot{v}(t) \in L^\infty(0, T; D(A^{-1/2}))$ (see [21]), it follows that for any such a solution $v$ and any $T > 0$, there exists $L_{v,T} > 0$, such that

$$||A^{-1/2}(v(s^1) - v(s^2))|| \leq L_{v,T} |s^1 - s^2|, \quad \forall s^1, s^2 \in [-r, T].$$ (22)

In the light of [11], let $L_{v,T} \equiv ||v||_{[-r,T]}$.

Consider any two solutions $u$ and $v$ of [11, 5] (not necessarily with the same initial function). The standard variation-of-constants formula $u(t) = e^{-At}u(0) + \int_0^t e^{-A(t-\tau)}F(u_\tau)\,d\tau$ and the estimate $||A^\alpha e^{-tA}|| \leq (\frac{a}{t})^\alpha e^{-\alpha}$ (see e.g. [6, (1.17), p.84]) give

$$||A^{1/2}(u(t) - v(t))|| \leq e^{-\lambda t}||A^{1/2}(u(0) - v(0))|| + \int_0^t ||A^{1/2}e^{-A(t-\tau)}|| \,||F(u_\tau) - F(v_\tau)||\,d\tau \leq$$

$$\leq e^{-\lambda t}||A^{1/2}(u(0) - v(0))|| + \int_0^t \left(\frac{1/2}{t-\tau}\right)^{1/2} e^{-1/2} \,||F(u_\tau) - F(v_\tau)||\,d\tau, \quad (23)$$

as $||A^{1/2}e^{-A(t-\tau)}|| \leq \left(\frac{1/2}{t-\tau}\right)^{1/2} e^{-1/2}$ and similarly,

$$||A^{-1/2}(u_t - v_t)||_C \leq ||A^{-1/2}(u_0 - v_0)||_C + \int_0^t ||F(u_\tau) - F(v_\tau)||\,d\tau.$$

The last estimate and (23) give (just the case when $q = 1$ is shown for the purpose of clarity)

$$||A^{1/2}(u(t) - v(t))|| + ||A^{-1/2}(u_t - v_t)||_C \leq e^{-\lambda t}||A^{1/2}(u(0) - v(0))|| +$$

$$+ \int_0^t \left\{1 + (2e(t-\tau))^{-1/2}\right\} ||F(u_\tau) - F(v_\tau)||\,d\tau. \quad (24)$$

It follows, from Lemma [1] that

$$||F(u_t) - F(v_t)|| \leq L_{F_1,v,T} \left( q ||A^{1/2}(u(t) - v(t))|| + ||A^{-1/2}(u_t - v_t)||_C \right), \quad (25)$$

where $L_{F_1,v,T}$ is defined in the same way as $L_{F_1}$ in [13], just with $\ell = L_{v,T}$ instead of $L_{\varphi}$ - see [13] and [22].

$$L_{F_1,v,T} \equiv L_{F_1} \left[L_{v,T}\right] \equiv L_b L_B \sqrt{2} \max\{1; L_{v,T} L_q \max\{1; \sqrt{r}\}\}. \quad (26)$$
It should be emphasized how the Lipschitz constant $L_{v,T} \equiv |||v|||_{[-r,T]}$ of a strong solution $v$ is taken into account in (26) (see (22) and (11)).

Let

$$g(t) \equiv ||A^{1/2}(u(t) - v(t))|| + ||A^{-1/2}(u_t - v_t)||_C.$$

Then the relationships (24) and (25) lead to the following estimate

$$g(t) \leq g(0) + \int_0^t \left\{ 1 + (2e(t - \tau))^{-1/2} \right\} L_{F_1,v,T} \cdot g(\tau) \, d\tau$$

**Lemma 2 (Gronwall).** Let $u, \alpha \in C[a,b], \beta(t) \geq 0, \beta$ is integrable on $[a,b]$ and

$$u(t) \leq \alpha(t) + \int_a^t \beta(\tau)u(\tau) \, d\tau, \quad a \leq t \leq b$$

Then

$$u(t) \leq \alpha(t) + \int_a^t \beta(\tau)\alpha(\tau) \exp \left\{ \int_\tau^t \beta(s) \, ds \right\} d\tau, \quad a \leq t \leq b$$

Moreover, if $\alpha$ is non-decreasing, then

$$u(t) \leq \alpha(t) \exp \left\{ \int_a^t \beta(s) \, ds \right\}, \quad a \leq t \leq b.$$

It follows, from the above lemma and equality $\int_0^t (t - \tau)^{-1/2} d\tau = 2t^{1/2}$, that

$$g(t) \leq g(0) \exp \left\{ L_{F_1,v,T} \int_0^t \left\{ 1 + (2e(t - s))^{-1/2} \right\} ds \right\} \leq g(0) \exp \left\{ L_{F_1,v,T} \left( t + \sqrt{2t} \right) \right\},$$

which implies, $\forall t \in [0,T]$, that

$$||A^{1/2}(u(t) - v(t))|| + ||A^{-1/2}(u_t - v_t)||_C \leq \leq E_{F_1,v,T} \left( ||A^{1/2}(u(0) - v(0))|| + ||A^{-1/2}(u_0 - v_0)||_C \right), \quad (27)$$

where

$$E_{F_1,v,T} \equiv \exp \left\{ L_{F_1,v,T} \cdot \left( T + \sqrt{2T} \right) \right\}, \quad (28)$$

see (26) for the definition of $L_{F_1,v,T} \equiv L_{F_1} \left[ L_{v,T} \right]$. This proves the uniqueness of the solution to (11) and (5), and completes the proof of theorem 1.
4 Asymptotic properties of solutions

This section is devoted to studies of the asymptotic behavior of solutions in different functional spaces. We define first (in a standard way) the evolution semigroup \( S_t : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L} \) (the space \( \mathcal{L} \) is defined in (9)) by the formula

\[
S_t \varphi \equiv u_t, \quad t \geq 0,
\]

where \( u(t) \) is a unique solution to the problem (1) and (5) (see definition 1).

The estimate (27) means the continuity of the evolution operator \( S_t \) in the norm of the space \( H \) (see (6)), i.e.

\[
||S_t \varphi - S_t \psi||_H \leq E_{F_1,v,T} ||\varphi - \psi||_H \text{ for all } t \in [0,T].
\]

The aim now is to get a more precise estimate, e.g. the continuity of \( S_t \) in the norm of the space \( \mathcal{L} \) (see (9), (10)). Consider the definition of the Galerkin approximate solution (see (17)). It gives

\[
||A^{-1/2}(\dot{u}^m(t) - \dot{v}^m(t))|| \leq ||A^{1/2}(u^m(t) - v^m(t))|| + d||A^{-1/2}(u^m(t) - v^m(t))|| + ||F_1(u^m_t) - F_1(v^m_t)||
\]

and Lemma 1 implies

\[
||A^{-1/2}(\dot{u}^m(t) - \dot{v}^m(t))|| \leq (1 + d + L_{F_1}) \{||A^{1/2}(u^m(t) - v^m(t))|| + ||A^{-1/2}(u^m_t - v^m_t)||_C\}.
\]

An analogous estimate for a solution to the problem (1) and (5), can be obtained from (21) and the following

**Proposition 2.** [38, Theorem 9] Let \( X \) be a Banach space. Then any *-weak convergent sequence \( \{w_k\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset X^* \) *-weak converges to an element \( w_\infty \in X^* \) and \( ||w_\infty||_X \leq \lim \inf_{n \to \infty} ||w_n||_X \).

More precisely,

\[
\text{ess sup}_{t \in [0,T]} ||A^{-1/2}(\dot{u}(t) - \dot{v}(t))|| \leq (1 + d + L_{F_1}) \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \{||A^{1/2}(u(t) - v(t))|| + ||A^{-1/2}(u_t - v_t)||_C\}
\]
The last estimate and relationship (27) imply

\[
\text{ess sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \| A^{-1/2}(\dot{u}(t) - \dot{v}(t)) \| \leq (1 + d + L_{F1}) E_{F1,v,T} \left( \| A^{1/2}(u(0) - v(0)) \| + \| A^{-1/2}(u_0 - v_0) \| \right)
\]

(31)

Hence, see (11),

\[
\| u - v \|_{[0, T]} \leq (1 + d + L_{F1}) E_{F1,v,T} \left( \| A^{1/2}(u(0) - v(0)) \| + \| A^{-1/2}(u_0 - v_0) \| \right)
\]

From that and (27), it follows that

\[
\| u_t - v_t \|_{\mathcal{L}} \leq (2 + d + L_{F1}) E_{F1,v,T} \| u_0 - v_0 \|_{\mathcal{L}}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T],
\]

(32)

which finally means that for any \( T \geq 0 \) there exists a constant \( C_T > 0 \) such that \( \forall t \in [0, T] \) it gives

\[
\| u_t - v_t \|_{\mathcal{L}} = \| S_t \varphi - S_t \psi \|_{\mathcal{L}} \leq C_T \| \varphi - \psi \|_{\mathcal{L}}, \quad \forall \varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{L}
\]

(33)

The last inequality means the continuity of the evolution operator \( S_t \) in the norm of the space \( \mathcal{L} \) (see (29) and compare with (30)).

**Remark 4.** It should be noted that the evolution operator and, more generally, the time-shift is not a (strongly) continuous mapping in the norm of the space \( \mathcal{L} \) (see (9)). This can be illustrated by the following simple (scalar) example. Consider the space

\[
\mathcal{Lip}([-r, T]; \mathbb{R}) \equiv \left\{ v : [-r, T] \to \mathbb{R} : \sup \left\{ \frac{|v(s) - v(t)|}{|s - t|}, s \neq t; s, t \in [-r, T] \right\} < \infty \right\}
\]

and analogously define the space \( \mathcal{Lip}([-r, 0]; \mathbb{R}) \) with the natural norm

\[
\| v \|_{\mathcal{Lip}} \equiv \max_{\theta \in [-r, 0]} |v(\theta)| + \sup \left\{ \frac{|v(s) - v(t)|}{|s - t|}, s \neq t; s, t \in [-r, 0] \right\}.
\]

The (strong) continuity of the time-shift means that

\[
\forall v \in \mathcal{Lip}([-r, T]; \mathbb{R}) \text{ and } \forall t \in [0, T] \implies \lim_{h \to 0} \| v_{t+h} - v_t \|_{\mathcal{Lip}} = 0.
\]

(34)

Obviously, when \( t = 0 \) one considers \( h \to 0^+ \), while for \( t = T \), the case \( h \to 0^- \) should be investigated.

To prove the claim, we must show that (34) does not hold, i.e.

\[
\exists v \in \mathcal{Lip}([-r, T]; \mathbb{R}) \text{ and } \exists t_0 \in [0, T] \text{ for which } \lim_{h \to 0} \| v_{t_0+h} - v_{t_0} \|_{\mathcal{Lip}} \neq 0.
\]

(35)
Thus, consider the case $t_0 = 0, h \to 0^+$ and the function

$$v(t) \equiv \begin{cases} 0, & t \in [-r, 0] \\ t, & t \in (0, T) \end{cases}.$$ 

It can be seen that $v_{t_0} = v_0 \equiv 0$ and

$$v_{t_0 + h} = v_{t_0 + h}(\theta) \equiv \begin{cases} 0, & \theta \in [-r, -h] \\ h + \theta, & \theta \in (-h, 0] \end{cases}.$$ 

Hence, $||v_{t_0 + h} - v_{t_0}||_{Lip} = ||v_{t_0 + h}||_{Lip} = h + 1$ and finally $\lim_{h \to 0^+} ||v_{t_0 + h} - v_{t_0}||_{Lip} = \lim_{h \to 0^+} (h + 1) = 1 \neq 0$, which means that (34) does not hold. In the space $L$, we would proceed analogously.

**Remark 5.** In the same way as in the previous remark one can show that the time-shift is not a (strongly) continuous mapping in the topology of $L^\infty(-r, 0)$. One could consider the function $\tilde{v}(t) \equiv \begin{cases} 0, & t \in [-r, 0] \\ 1, & t \in (0, T) \end{cases}$ and $t_0 = 0$ to show that $\lim_{h \to 0^+} ||\tilde{v}_h - \tilde{v}_0||_{L^\infty(-r, 0)} = 1 \neq 0$. By the way, $\tilde{v} = \frac{d}{dt} v$, where, as usually, the time-derivative is understood in the sense of distributions.

The above remarks show that despite of the existence and uniqueness of solutions in the space $L$ and even strong continuity of the evolution operator $S_t$ in the norm of $L$ (see (33)), the pair $(S_t; L)$ does not form a dynamical system since $S_t$ is not strongly continuous as a mapping of time variable.

The methods, developed for ordinary delay equations in [33] suggest to restrict our considerations to a smaller subset of the space of Lipschitz functions. In this paper we follow this suggestion and consider the evolution operator $S_t$ on the following subset of $L$

$$X \equiv \{ \varphi \in C^1([-r, 0]; D(A^{-1/2})) \text{ such that } \varphi(0) \in D(A^{1/2}) \text{ and } \dot{\varphi}(0) + A\varphi(0) + d\varphi(0) = F_1(\varphi) \} \subset L. \quad (36)$$

Here the equality $\dot{\varphi}(0) + A\varphi(0) + d\varphi(0) = F_1(\varphi)$ is understood as an equality in $D(A^{-1/2})$. 
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Remark 6. The set $X$ is an analogue of the solution manifold introduced in [33] for the case of ODEs with state-dependent delays.

To show that the set $X$ is invariant under the evolution operator $S_t$, we first have to establish an additional smoothness property of the solutions of problem (1), (5).

Lemma 3. For any $\varphi \in C^1([-r, 0]; D(A^{-1/2}))$ such that $\varphi(0) \in D(A^{1/2})$, the solution to (1), (5) (which is given by Theorem 1) has the property (c.f. Proposition 1 and Theorem 1)

$$\dot{u} \in C([0, T]; D(A^{-1/2})), \quad \forall T > 0.$$ (37)

Remark 7. We do not assume $\varphi(0) \in D(A)$, just $\varphi(0) \in D(A^{1/2})$, so we cannot directly use [19] Theorem 3.5, p.114].

Proof of Lemma 3. By Proposition 1 and Theorem 1, for any $\varphi \in C^1([-r, 0]; D(A^{-1/2}))$ such that $\varphi(0) \in D(A^{1/2})$, there exists a unique solution $u(t) \in C([-r, T]; D(A^{-1/2})) \cap C([0, T]; D(A^{1/2}))$. This property and Lemma 1 then imply the continuity of the function

$$p(t) \equiv F_1(u_t) \in C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)).$$ (38)

Consider the following auxiliary linear system without delay

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{v}(t) + Av(t) + dv(t) &= p(t), \quad t \geq 0, \\
v(0) &= \varphi(0) \in D(A^{1/2})
\end{aligned}$$ (39)

In the same way as in [17], the Galerkin approximate solution $v^m = v^m(t, x) = \sum_{k=1}^m g_{k,m}(t)e_k$ of order $m$ to (39) can be defined such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \dot{v}^m + Av^m + dv^m - p(t), e_k \rangle &= 0, \quad t \geq 0, \\
\langle v^m(0), e_k \rangle &= \langle \varphi(0), e_k \rangle, \quad \forall k = 1, \ldots, m.
\end{aligned}$$ (40)

where $g_{k,m} \in C^1(0, T; \mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(-r, T; \mathbb{R})$ and $\dot{g}_{k,m}(t)$ is absolutely continuous.

The difference between approximate solutions $u^m$ and $v^m$ lies in that $v^m$ are solutions just to linear system (40). So, for any two approximate solutions $v^n$ and $v^m$ (solutions to (40) of different orders $n$ and $m$), one has $g_{k,n}(t) \equiv g_{k,m}(t)$, which is denoted by $g_k(t)$.

Multiply (40) by $\lambda_k g_k$ and sum for $k = n + 1, \ldots, n + p$ ($p$ is any positive integer) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \dot{v}^{n+p}(t) - \dot{v}^n(t), A(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t)) \rangle + \|A(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t))\|^2 + \\
&+ d(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t), A(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t))) = \langle (P_{n+p} - P_n)p(t), A(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t)) \rangle
\end{aligned}$$
It should be recalled that, see the proof of Theorem \[11\] \(P_m\) is the orthogonal projection onto the subspace \(\text{span} \{e_1, \ldots, e_m\} \subset L^2(\Omega)\). Hence,

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|A^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t))\|^2 + \|A(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t))\|^2 + d\|A^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t))\|^2 \leq \\
\leq \|((P_{n+p} - P_n)p(t)) \cdot A(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t))\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|(P_{n+p} - P_n)p(t)\|^2 + \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \|A(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t))\|^2
\]

which gives

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \|A^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t))\|^2 + \|A(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t))\|^2 \leq \|((P_{n+p} - P_n)p(t)\|^2.
\]

Integrating the last estimate results \((\forall t \in [0, T])\) in

\[
\|A^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t))\|^2 + \int_0^t \|A(v^{n+p}(\tau) - v^n(\tau))\|^2 d\tau \leq \\
\leq \|A^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{n+p}(0) - v^n(0))\|^2 + \int_0^t \|((P_{n+p} - P_n)p(\tau))\|^2 d\tau \leq \\
\leq \|((P_{n+p} - P_n)A^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi(0))\|^2 + \int_0^T \|((P_{n+p} - P_n)p(\tau))\|^2 d\tau.
\]

Summing up, the above estimate, the fact that \(\varphi(0) \in D(A^{1/2})\), the strong convergence \(\|I - P_n\| \to 0\) for \(n \to \infty\), and \((38)\) imply that

the sequence \(\{v^n\}_{n=1}^\infty\) is a Cauchy sequence in \(C([0, T]; D(A^{1/2}))\). \hspace{1cm}\hspace{1cm}(41)\]

Now our goal is to show that the sequence \(\{\hat{v}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty\) is a Cauchy sequence in \(C([0, T]; D(A^{-1/2}))\). So, multiply first \((10)\) by \(\lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}\) to get \(\lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}\hat{g}_k(t) = -\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2}}g_k(t) - d\lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}g_k(t) + \langle \lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}p(t), e_k \rangle\). This gives \(\lambda_k^{-1}(\hat{g}_k(t))^2 \leq 3\lambda_k(g_k(t))^2 + 3d^2\lambda_k^{-1}(g_k(t))^2 + 3\langle \lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}p(t), e_k \rangle^2\). The sum for \(k = n + 1, \ldots, n + p\) reads

\[
\|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{v}^{n+p}(t) - \hat{v}^n(t))\|^2 \leq 3\|A^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t))\|^2 + \\
+ 3d^2\|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t))\|^2 + \frac{3}{\lambda_{n+1}}\|((P_{n+p} - P_n)p(t)\|^2 \leq \\
\leq 3 \left( 1 + \frac{d^2}{\lambda_{n+1}^2} \right) \|A^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^{n+p}(t) - v^n(t))\|^2 + \frac{3}{\lambda_{n+1}}\|I - P_n\|^2\|p(t)\|^2.
\]

The last estimation together with \((11)\) give that

the sequence \(\{\hat{v}^n\}_{n=1}^\infty\) is a Cauchy sequence in \(C([0, T]; D(A^{-1/2}))\). \hspace{1cm}\hspace{1cm}(42)\]

Thus, there exists a unique solution \(v(t) \ (v \equiv \lim_{n \to \infty} v^n)\) to the linear system \((39)\), which satisfies \(v \in C([0, T]; D(A^{1/2}))\) and \(\hat{v} \in C([0, T]; D(A^{-1/2}))\).
On the other hand, the nonlinear delay system (1), (5) with the initial function \( \varphi \) has also a unique solution. From the construction of \( p(t) \) (see (38)), it follows that \( u(t) \equiv v(t) \) for all \( t \in [0, T] \), which gives (37) and completes the proof of Lemma 3.

Lemma 3 particularly shows that the set \( X \), defined by (36), is invariant under the evolution operator \( S_t \) (see (29)). This fact allows to define an evolution operator (denoted again by \( S_t \)) \( S_t : X \to X \) in the same way as in (29). Now, if the natural norm 

\[
||\varphi||_X = \max_{s \in [-r,0]} ||A^{-1/2}\varphi(s)|| + \max_{s \in [-r,0]} ||A^{-1/2}\dot{\varphi}(s)|| + ||A^{1/2}\varphi(0)||
\]

on \( X \) is taken into account, then Theorem 1, Lemma 3, and Proposition 1 give the continuity of \( S_t \) with respect to \( t \) in the norm of \( X \). Hence, \( (S_t; X) \) defines a dynamical system.

Now we will pay attention to the long-time asymptotic behavior of the constructed evolution semigroup \( S_t : X \to X \).

**Theorem 2.** Using the above notation and under the assumptions of Theorem 1 the dynamical system \( (S_t, X) \) is dissipative. If, in addition, \( q = 0 \) in (H1.\( \eta \)), then \( (S_t, X) \) possesses a compact global attractor \( A \), which is a bounded set in the space \( C^1([-r,0]; D(A^{-1/2})) \cap C([-r,0]; D(A^\alpha)), \alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1) \).

**Proof of Theorem 2.** It will be shown first that \( (S_t, X) \) is a dissipative dynamical system. To that end, the below proposition is needed.

**Proposition 3.** [25, Lemma 1] Let all the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold and let \( \alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1) \). Then there exists a bounded subset \( BV_\alpha \) of the space \( C^1([-r,0]; D(A^{-1/2})) \cap C([-r,0]; D(A^\alpha)) \), which absorbs any strong solution to the problem (1) and (5) for any initial function \( \varphi \in L \).

Second, to apply the classical theorem on the existence of a global attractor (see, for example [2, 30, 6]), we show that \( (S_t, X) \) is asymptotically compact. Consider therefore any solution \( u(t) \) to the problem (1) and (5) with \( \varphi \in BV_\alpha \) as an initial function. We will show that for any \( \delta > r > 0 \) and any \( T > \delta \) the set \( U \equiv \{ u_t = S_t \varphi | \varphi \in BV_\alpha, t \in [\delta,T] \} \) is relatively compact in \( X \).

Recall that the set \( BV_\alpha \) is a ball in \( C^1([-r,0]; D(A^{-1/2})) \cap C([-r,0]; D(A^\alpha)) \) (for more details see [25]) and notice that, by Corollary 4 from [27], the set \( BV_\alpha \) is relatively compact.
in $C([-r,0]; D(A^{-1/2}))$ (see also [27, lemma 1]). It remains to show that $\{\dot{u}(t) | \varphi \in BV_{\alpha}, t \in [\delta - r, T]\}$ is equi-continuous in $C([\delta - r, T]; D(A^{-1/2}))$.

**Proposition 4.** [19, Corollary 4.3.3 and Theorem 4.3.5]. Let $A$ be an infinitesimal generator of an analytic semigroup \{\(T(t)\)\}_{t \geq 0}. If $f \in L^1((0,T); Y)$ is locally Hölder continuous on $(0,T]$, then for every $x \in Y$ the initial value problem

$$\dot{u}(t) = Au(t) + f(t), \quad t > 0; \quad u(0) = x$$

has a unique solution $u$. If $f \in C^\alpha([0,T]; Y)$, then for every $\delta > 0$, $Au \in C^\alpha([\delta,T]; Y)$ and $\dot{u} \in C^\alpha([\delta,T]; Y)$.

Here $C^\alpha([0,T]; Y)$ denotes the family of all Hölder continuous functions on $[0,T]$ with the exponent $\theta \in (0,1)$. In this case, $Y = L^2(\Omega)$.

In order to apply Proposition 4 to our case, we have to show that $p(t) = F_1(u_t) \in C^\alpha([\delta - r,T]; L^2(\Omega))$ (c.f. (38),(39)). Therefore, consider $t \in [\delta - r,T]$ and

$$||p(t + h) - p(t)|| = ||F_1(u_{t+h}) - F_1(u_t)|| \leq$$

$$\leq L_{F_1} [\ell_{BV_{\alpha}}] \max_{s \in [-r,0]} ||A^{-1/2}(u(t + h + s) - u(t + s))|| \leq L_{F_1} [\ell_{BV_{\alpha}}] \ell_{BV_{\alpha}} |h|$$

where $L_{F_1}[\ell_{BV_{\alpha}}]$ is the constant defined in Lemma 1 with $\ell_{BV_{\alpha}}$ such that $||\psi|| \leq \ell_{BV_{\alpha}} \forall \psi \in BV_{\alpha}$ (the existence of such $\ell_{BV_{\alpha}}$ follows from Proposition 2). Here, $q = 0$ is used.

The last inequality shows that $p : [\delta - r,T] \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ is Lipschitz continuous, which is the situation to which Proposition 3 can be applied. It should also be noted that the family $\{p(t)\}$, for all initial $\varphi \in BV_{\alpha}$, is uniformly Lipschitz, i.e. all the Lipschitz constants are lower or equal to $L \equiv L_{F_1}[\ell_{BV_{\alpha}}] \cdot \ell_{BV_{\alpha}}$. Then by Proposition 2 it is guaranteed (see the proof) that the family $\{\dot{u}(t) | \varphi \in BV_{\alpha}, t \in [\delta - r,T]\}$ is uniformly Hölder continuous, and thus equi-continuous in $C([\delta - r,T]; L^2(\Omega))$.

**Proposition 5.** [27] lemma 1] Let $B$ be a Banach space. A set $F$ of $C([0,T]; B)$ is relatively compact if and only if

(i) \(F(t) \equiv \{ f(t) : f \in F \} \) is relatively compact in $B$, $0 < t < T$,

(ii) $F$ is uniformly equi-continuous, i.e. $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \eta$ such that $||f(t_2) - f(t_1)||_B \leq \varepsilon, \forall f \in F, \forall 0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T$ such that $|t_2 - t_1| \leq \eta$
Applying Proposition 5 completes the proof of Theorem 2.

As an application we can consider the diffusive Nicholson blowflies equation (see e.g. [29]) with state-dependent delays, i.e. the equation (1) where $-A$ is the Laplace operator with the Dirichlet boundary conditions, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n_0$ is a bounded domain with a smooth boundary, the nonlinear (birth) function $b$ is given by $b(w) = \rho \cdot w e^{-w}$. The function $b$ is bounded, so for any delay function $\eta$ satisfying (H1.\eta), the conditions of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 are satisfied. As a result, we conclude that the initial value problem (1) and (5) is well-posed in $X$ and the dynamical system $(S_t, X)$ has a global attractor (Theorem 2).

References

[1] N.V. Azbelev, V.P. Maksimov and L.F. Rakhmatullina, ”Introduction to the theory of functional differential equations”, Moscow, Nauka, 1991.

[2] A.V. Babin, and M.I. Vishik, ”Attractors of Evolutionary Equations”, Amsterdam, North-Holland, 1992.

[3] L. Boutet de Monvel, I.D. Chueshov and A.V. Rezounenko, Inertial manifolds for retarded semilinear parabolic equations, Nonlinear Analysis, 34 (1998) 907-925.

[4] I. D. Chueshov, On a certain system of equations with delay, occuring in aeroelasticity, J. Soviet Math. 58, (1992) 385-390.

[5] I. D. Chueshov and A. V. Rezounenko, Global attractors for a class of retarded quasi-linear partial differential equations, C.R.Acad.Sci.Paris, Ser.I 321, 607-612 (1995); (detailed version: Math.Physics, Analysis, Geometry, Vol.2, N.3 (1995), 363-383).

[6] I. D. Chueshov, ”Introduction to the Theory of Infinite-Dimensional Dissipative Systems”, Acta, Kharkov, 1999) (in Russian). English transl. Acta, Kharkov (2002) (see http://www.emis.de/monographs/Chueshov/).

[7] O. Diekmann, S. van Gils, S. Verduyn Lunel, H-O. Walther, ”Delay Equations: Functional, Complex, and Nonlinear Analysis”, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

[8] J. Hadamard, Sur les problèmes aux derivees partielles et leur signification physique, Bull. Univ. Princeton (1902), 13.
[9] J. Hadamard, Le problème de Cauchy et les équations aux derivees partielles linéaires hyperboliques, Hermann, Paris, 1932.

[10] J. K. Hale, "Theory of Functional Differential Equations", Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg- New York, 1977.

[11] J. K. Hale and S. M. Verduyn Lunel, "Theory of Functional Differential Equations", Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.

[12] F. Hartung, T. Krisztin, H.-O. Walther, J. Wu, Functional Differential Equations with State-Dependent Delays: Theory and Applications, in "Handbook of Differential Equations: Ordinary Differential Equations, Volume 3" (A. Canada, P. Drabek, A. Fonda eds.), Elsevier B.V., 2006.

[13] E. Hernandez, A. Prokopczyk, L. Ladeira, A note on partial functional differential equations with state-dependent delay, Nonlinear Anal. R.W.A. 7(4), (2006) 510–519.

[14] J.L. Lions and E. Magenes, "Problèmes aux Limites Non Homogénes et applications". Dunon, Paris, 1968.

[15] J.L. Lions, "Quelques Méthodes de Résolution des Problèmes aux Limites Non Linéaires", Dunod, Paris, 1969.

[16] T. Krisztin, A local unstable manifold for differential equations with state-dependent delay, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 9, (2003) 933-1028.

[17] A.D. Myshkis, "Linear differential equations with retarded argument". 2nd edition, Nauka, Moscow, 1972.

[18] J. Mallet-Paret, R. D. Nussbaum, P. Paraskevopoulos, Periodic solutions for functional-differential equations with multiple state-dependent time lags, Topol. Meth. Nonlinear Anal. 3(1), (1994) 101–162.

[19] A. Pazy, "Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations", Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.

[20] A.V. Rezounenko, On singular limit dynamics for a class of retarded nonlinear partial differential equations, Matematicheskaya fizika, analiz, geometriya, 4 (1/2), (1997) 193-211.
[21] A.V. Rezounenko and J. Wu, A non-local PDE model for population dynamics with state-selective delay: local theory and global attractors, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics, 190 (1-2), (2006) 99-113.

[22] A.V. Rezounenko, Partial differential equations with discrete and distributed state-dependent delays, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 326(2), (2007), 1031-1045. (see also detailed preprint, March 22, 2005, http://arxiv.org/pdf/math.DS/0503470).

[23] A.V. Rezounenko, On a class of P.D.E.s with nonlinear distributed in space and time state-dependent delay terms, Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences, 31, Issue 13, (2008), 1569-1585.

[24] A.V. Rezounenko, Differential equations with discrete state-dependent delay: uniqueness and well-posedness in the space of continuous functions, Nonlinear Analysis Series A: Theory, Methods and Applications, Volume 70, Issue 11 (2009), 3978-3986. doi:10.1016/j.na.2008.08.006

[25] A.V. Rezounenko, Non-linear partial differential equations with discrete state-dependent delays in a metric space, Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods and Applications, 73 (6) (September 2010), 1707-1714; (see detailed Preprint, April 15, 2009, arXiv:0904.2308v1 http://arxiv.org/pdf/0904.2308v1).

[26] R.E. Showalter, ”Monotone operators in Banach space and nonlinear partial differential equations”, AMS, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs: vol. 49, 1997.

[27] J. Simon, Compact sets in the space $L^p(0,T;B)$, Annali di Mat. Pura ed Appl. 146, (1987) 65-96.

[28] J. W.-H. So, J. Wu and X. Zou, A reaction diffusion model for a single species with age structure. I. Travelling wavefronts on unbounded domains, Proc. Royal. Soc. Lond. A 457, (2001) 1841-1853.

[29] J. W.-H. So and Y. Yang, Dirichlet problem for the diffusive Nicholson’s blowflies equation, J. Differential Equations, 150(2), (1998) 317–348.

[30] R. Temam, ”Infinite Dimensional Dynamical Systems in Mechanics and Physics”, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1988.
[31] C. C. Travis and G. F. Webb, Existence and stability for partial functional differential equations, Transactions of AMS, 200, (1974) 395-418.

[32] H.-O. Walther, Stable periodic motion of a system with state dependent delay, Differential and Integral Equations, 15, (2002) 923-944.

[33] H.-O. Walther, The solution manifold and $C^1$-smoothness for differential equations with state-dependent delay, J. Differential Equations, 195(1), (2003) 46–65.

[34] H.-O. Walther, On a model for soft landing with state-dependent delay, J. Dynamics and Differential Eqs, 19(3), (2007) 593-622.

[35] H-O. Walther, Linearized Stability for Semiflows Generated by a Class of Neutral Equations, with Applications to State-Dependent Delays, Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations, 22 (3) (September 2010), 439-462.

[36] E. Winston, Uniqueness of the zero solution for differential equations with state-dependence, J. Differential Equations, 7, (1970) 395–405.

[37] J. Wu, ”Theory and Applications of Partial Functional Differential Equations”, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.

[38] K. Yosida, ”Functional analysis”, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1965.