

UNIFORM EXPONENTIAL ATTRACTORS FOR A SINGULARLY PERTURBED DAMPED WAVE EQUATION

PIERRE FABRIE ¹, CEDRIC GALUSINSKI ¹, ALAIN MIRANVILLE ² AND SERGEY ZELIK ²

¹ Université Bordeaux-I
Mathématiques Appliquées
351 Cours de la Libération, 33405 Talence Cedex - France

² Université de Poitiers
Laboratoire d'Applications des Mathématiques - SP2MI
Boulevard Marie et Pierre Curie - Téléport 2
86962 Chasseneuil Futuroscope Cedex - France

Dedicated to Professor Mark Iosifovich Vishik on the occasion of his eightieth birthday

ABSTRACT. Our aim in this article is to construct exponential attractors for singularly perturbed damped wave equations that are continuous with respect to the perturbation parameter. The main difficulty comes from the fact that the phase spaces for the perturbed and unperturbed equations are not the same; indeed, the limit equation is a (parabolic) reaction-diffusion equation. Therefore, previous constructions obtained for parabolic systems cannot be applied and have to be adapted. In particular, this necessitates a study of the time boundary layer in order to estimate the difference of solutions between the perturbed and unperturbed equations. We note that the continuity is obtained without time shifts that have been used in previous results.

INTRODUCTION

The study of the long time behavior of equations arising from mechanics and physics is very important, as it is essential, for practical purposes, to understand and predict the asymptotic behavior of the system. Several objects have been introduced for this study.

A first object is the global attractor. It is a compact set, invariant by the flow which attracts all the trajectories as time goes to infinity. Since it is the smallest (with respect to inclusion) set enjoying these properties, it is a suitable object for the study of the long time behavior of the system. Furthermore, in many cases, one can prove that it has finite

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B40, 35B45, 35L30.

Key words and phrases. Singularly perturbed damped wave equations, reaction-diffusion equations, uniform exponential attractors, time boundary layer.

dimension (in the sense of the Hausdorff or the fractal dimension). We refer the reader to [BV], [CV], [H], [L], [R2] and [T] for extensive reviews on this subject. Now, the global attractor has two drawbacks. Indeed, it can attract slowly the trajectories (see for instance [Ko]) and (consequently) it can be sensitive to perturbations.

In order to overcome these difficulties, Foias, Sell and Temam have introduced in [FoST] the notion of inertial manifold. An inertial manifold is a smooth, finite dimensional, hyperbolic (and thus robust), semi-invariant manifold which contains the global attractor and attracts the trajectories exponentially. Unfortunately, all the known constructions of inertial manifolds are based on a very restrictive property, the so-called spectral gap condition. Consequently, the existence of inertial manifolds is not known for many physically important equations such as the Navier-Stokes equations (even in two space dimensions) and reaction-diffusion and damped wave equations in three space dimensions. A non existence result has even been obtained for reaction-diffusion equations in higher space dimensions (see [MpS]).

So, Eden, Foias, Nicolaenko and Temam have introduced in [EFNT] the notion of an exponential attractor (also called an inertial set), which can be seen as an intermediate object between the two ideal objects that the global attractor and an inertial manifold are. An exponential attractor is a compact, semi-invariant set which contains the global attractor, attracts the trajectories exponentially and has finite fractal dimension. So, compared with an inertial manifold, an exponential attractor is not necessarily regular and, compared with the global attractor, it is expected to be more stable (since it attracts the trajectories exponentially). We shall come back to this last point below. We note finally that, since it is not unique, the actual choice of an exponential attractor may, in a sense, be artificial.

Exponential attractors have been constructed for a large class of equations (see [BN], [EFNT], [EFK], [EfM1], [EfM2], [EfMZ1], [EfMZ2], [EfMZ3], [FG1], [FG2], [FM], [FN], [G], [M1], [M2], [M3] and the references therein). In particular, in [EfMZ1] (see also [EfMZ2] and [EfMZ3]), a construction that is valid in Banach spaces is given (all the previous constructions made an essential use of orthogonal projectors with finite ranks and were thus valid in Hilbert spaces only); another construction, due to Le Dung and Nicolaenko and valid in Banach spaces, is given in [LdN] (see also [BaN]). So, exponential attractors are as general as global attractors.

Let us come back to the problem of the robustness of the global attractor. Generally, global attractors are only upper semicontinuous with respect to perturbations. The lower semicontinuity property is much more delicate to obtain and can be established only for some particular cases (see e.g. [R2]); for instance, it is true when the semigroup possesses a global Lyapunov function and all equilibria are hyperbolic. In this particular case, the corresponding attractor (the so-called regular attractor in the terminology of Babin and Vishik) is exponential and is robust under perturbations (i.e. it is upper and lower semicontinuous with respect to perturbations, see [BV]). Moreover, if \mathcal{A}_ε is the global attractor of a perturbed system and \mathcal{A}_0 is that of the unperturbed one, then, under natural assumptions on the perturbations, we have

$$\text{dist}_{sym}(\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{A}_0) \leq c\varepsilon^\kappa,$$

where dist_{sym} denotes the symmetric distance between sets, $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is the perturbation parameter.

As already mentioned, exponential attractors are more robust objects. In particular, one can prove the continuity of exponential attractors under perturbations in many cases (see [EFNT] for the continuity for Galerkin approximations and [FGM], [FG1], [FG2] and [G] for examples of (singular) perturbations of partial differential equations), even when this property is not known or is violated for the global attractor. The drawback of these results is that the continuity is obtained up to a time shift.

In [EfMZ3], by adapting the construction of [EfMZ1], a construction of continuous exponential attractors, without such time shifts, is given. Moreover, analogous (to the case of regular attractors) estimates for the symmetric distance between the perturbed (\mathcal{M}_ε) and unperturbed (\mathcal{M}_0) exponential attractors are obtained:

$$\text{dist}_{sym}(\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_0) \leq c_1\varepsilon^{\kappa_1},$$

without assuming that the system possess a global Lyapunov function and that all equilibria be hyperbolic. We also note that, in contrast to the case of regular attractors, the constants c_1 and κ_1 can be computed explicitly in terms of the physical parameters in specific examples. This construction was then applied to a (singularly) perturbed viscous Cahn-Hilliard system.

Our aim in this article is to extend this construction to singularly perturbed damped wave equations (see e.g. [R1] for the study of the (upper semi)continuity of the global attractor and [FGM] for the continuity (up to a time shift) of exponential attractors). The difficulty here comes from the fact that the phase spaces for the perturbed and unperturbed equations are not the same (the limit equation being a (parabolic) reaction-diffusion equation). Therefore, the abstract construction of [EfMZ3] cannot be applied and must be deeply reworked. In particular, in order to adapt it to our setting, we need to make a precise study of the time boundary layer, which is necessary for obtaining proper estimates for the difference of solutions of the perturbed and unperturbed equations.

This article is dedicated to Professor Mark Iosifovich Vishik on the occasion of his eightieth birthday in recognition of the impact he had on the development of the theory of infinite dimensional dynamical systems in mathematical physics.

§0 SETTING OF THE PROBLEM

We consider the following singularly perturbed damped wave equation in a smooth bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$:

$$(0.1) \quad \begin{cases} \varepsilon \partial_t^2 u + \gamma \partial_t u - \Delta_x u + f(u) = g, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0, \quad \partial_t u|_{t=0} = u'_0, \quad u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small parameter and $\gamma > 0$. We assume that the nonlinear interaction function f satisfies the following assumptions:

$$(0.2) \quad \begin{cases} 1. f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}), & f(0) = 0, \\ 2. f'(u) \geq -K, \\ 3. f(u) \cdot u \geq 0 \text{ if } |u| \geq L, \\ 4. |f''(u)| \leq C(1 + |u|), \end{cases}$$

where C , K and L are fixed positive constants. We also assume that the external force g belongs to the Sobolev space $H^1(\Omega)$:

$$(0.3) \quad g \in H^1(\Omega).$$

Remark 0.1. We note that assumptions (0.2) are satisfied for cubic nonlinearities:

$$(0.4) \quad f(u) = u^3 - \alpha u, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R},$$

and, consequently, all the results formulated and proved below will be valid for this physically relevant class of nonlinearities. We also note that, for simplicity, we require the regularity (0.3) for the external force g , although our approach allows us (after minor changes) to obtain the main results for the case $g \in L^2(\Omega)$ as well (see also Remark 1.1). We finally note that assumption (0.2)₃ is not satisfied for the Sine-Gordon equation ($f(u) = \sin u$). However, the calculations are simpler in that case (since f and its derivative are bounded) and the results obtained below are valid for this equation as well.

In order to simplify the notations, we set $\xi_u(t) := [u(t), \partial_t u(t)]$ and introduce the following energy norms depending on the small parameter $\varepsilon \geq 0$ on the pairs of functions ξ_u :

$$(0.5) \quad \|\xi_u\|_{\mathcal{E}^\kappa(\varepsilon)}^2 := \varepsilon \|\partial_t u\|_{H^\kappa}^2 + \|\partial_t u\|_{H^{\kappa-1}}^2 + \|u\|_{H^{\kappa+1}}^2.$$

In view of these norms, we introduce the energy spaces $\mathcal{E}^\kappa(\varepsilon)$ as follows: for $\varepsilon \neq 0$, we set

$$(0.6) \quad \mathcal{E}^\kappa(\varepsilon) := (H^{\kappa+1}(\Omega) \cap \{u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}) \times (H^\kappa(\Omega) \cap \{\partial_t u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}),$$

and, for $\varepsilon = 0$, we set

$$(0.7) \quad \mathcal{E}^\kappa(0) := (H^{\kappa+1}(\Omega) \cap \{u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}) \times (H^{\kappa-1}(\Omega) \cap \{\partial_t u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}),$$

where $H^\kappa(\Omega)$ denotes the standard Sobolev space; we agree that the boundary conditions are added only for the κ for which they have a sense according to the Sobolev embedding theorems, see e.g. [Tr]. We will write in the sequel $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$ instead of $\mathcal{E}^0(\varepsilon)$.

We note that the space (0.6) is a natural phase space for the hyperbolic equation (0.1) (see e.g. [BV]). On the other hand, in the case $\varepsilon = 0$, the space (0.7) is naturally associated

with the limit parabolic problem (0.1) (with $\varepsilon = 0$). As we will show below, the norms (0.5) reflect in a right way the dependence on ε of the norms of the solutions of the singularly perturbed hyperbolic equations (0.1) as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

The rest of the article is organized as follows.

The solvability results for problem (0.1) in the phase spaces $\mathcal{E}^\kappa(\varepsilon)$, $\kappa = 1, 2, 3$, together with several uniform (with respect to $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) estimates for these solutions, are obtained in Section 1.

In Section 2, we derive estimates for the difference of solutions of problem (0.1) that are crucial for our study of exponential attractors. In particular, we give a precise study of the time boundary layer near $t = 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, which is necessary to obtain the proper estimates for the difference of solutions of the perturbed ($\varepsilon \neq 0$) and unperturbed ($\varepsilon = 0$) equations (0.1).

Section 3 is devoted to the study of singular perturbations of exponential attractors in an abstract setting. In this section, we extend the construction given in [EfMZ3] to the case where the perturbed and unperturbed dynamical systems are defined in different phase spaces.

Based on the results of Section 3, we prove, in Section 4, that the dynamical systems associated with problems (0.1) possess uniform exponential attractors \mathcal{M}_ε in the spaces $\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$(0.8) \quad \text{dist}_{\text{sym}, \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_0) \leq C\varepsilon^{\kappa_1},$$

where $C > 0$ and $0 < \kappa_1 < 1$ are independent of ε .

We note that, in Section 4, we construct the exponential attractors in the spaces $\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)$ only, although the convergence (0.8) is established in a *different* (weaker) space (namely, $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$). In order to overcome this disadvantage, we prove, in Section 5, an abstract result on the transitivity of exponential attraction and, based on this result, we verify that \mathcal{M}_ε attracts exponentially the bounded subsets of $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$ as well. Thus, it is finally established that the uniform exponential attraction property for \mathcal{M}_ε and the convergence (0.8) take place in the *same* phase space $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$.

§1 UNIFORM BOUNDS ON THE SOLUTIONS

In this section, we derive several estimates on the solutions of (0.1) in the spaces $\mathcal{E}^\kappa(\varepsilon)$, $\kappa = 0, 1, 2$, which are necessary for the construction of attractors.

Theorem 1.1. *Let assumptions (0.2) and (0.3) hold and let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. Then, for every $\xi_u(0) := (u_0, u'_0) \in \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$, problem (0.1) has a unique solution $\xi_u(t) \in \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$ and the following estimate is valid:*

$$(1.1) \quad \|\xi_u(T)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}^2 + \int_T^{T+1} (\varepsilon \|\partial_t^2 u(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2) dt \leq Q \left(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}^2 \right) e^{-\alpha T} + Q(\|g\|_{L^2}),$$

where the monotonic function Q and the constant $\alpha > 0$ are independent of $\varepsilon > 0$. Moreover, system (0.1) possesses a global Lyapunov function:

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{U}(u, \partial_t u) := \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon \|\partial_t u\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2}^2 + (F(u), 1) - (g, u),$$

which satisfies the relation

$$(1.3) \quad \mathcal{U}(\xi_u(T)) - \mathcal{U}(\xi_u(0)) = -\gamma \int_0^T \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt,$$

for every solution $\xi_u(t)$. Here, $F(u) := \int_0^u f(s) ds$ and (\cdot, \cdot) denotes the standard inner product in $L^2(\Omega)$.

Proof. The proof of existence and uniqueness of solutions can be found, for instance, in [BV]. The existence of a Lyapunov function \mathcal{U} and relation (1.3) are also obtained in [BV]. So, there remains to verify the uniform estimate (1.1). We will give below a formal derivation of this estimate only; it can be justified by considering Galerkin approximations and consists of two steps.

Step 1. Multiplying equation (0.1) by $\partial_t u(t) + \beta u(t)$, $\beta > 0$ small enough, integrating over Ω and arguing in a standard way, we find

$$(1.4) \quad \int_T^{T+1} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt + \varepsilon \|\partial_t u(T)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u(T)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \\ \leq Q(\varepsilon \|\partial_t u(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u(0)\|_{H^1}^2) e^{-\alpha T} + Q(\|g\|_{L^2}),$$

where Q and $\alpha > 0$ are independent of ε (see e.g. [BV] for details).

Step 2. Thus, there only remains to estimate $\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-1}}$. In order to do so, we multiply equation (0.1) by $(-\Delta_x)^{-1} \partial_t^2 u(t)$, where Δ_x denotes the Laplacian associated with Dirichlet boundary conditions, and obtain, integrating by parts

$$(1.5) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{\gamma}{2} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + (u(t), \partial_t u(t)) + (f(u(t)) - g, (-\Delta_x)^{-1} \partial_t u(t)) \right] + \\ + \varepsilon \|\partial_t^2 u(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + \left[\frac{\gamma}{2} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + (u(t), \partial_t u(t)) + \right. \\ \left. + (f(u(t)) - g, (-\Delta_x)^{-1} \partial_t u(t)) \right] \leq h(t),$$

where

$$(1.6) \quad h(t) := \left[\frac{\gamma}{2} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + (u(t), \partial_t u(t)) + (f(u(t)) - g, (-\Delta_x)^{-1} \partial_t u(t)) \right] + \\ + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + (f'(u(t)) \partial_t u(t), (-\Delta_x)^{-1} \partial_t u(t)).$$

It follows from the growth restriction (0.2)₄ on f , from (1.2), from the Sobolev embedding $H^1 \subset L^6$ and from estimate (1.4) that

$$(1.7) \quad \int_T^{T+1} |h(t)| dt \leq Q(\varepsilon \|\partial_t u(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u(0)\|_{H^1}^2) e^{-\alpha T} + Q(\|g\|_{L^2}).$$

Indeed, the only difficulty to derive (1.7) is to estimate the last term in (1.6). Applying Hölder's inequality, together with the embedding $H^1 \subset L^6$, to this term, we have

$$(1.8) \quad |(f'(u(t))\partial_t u(t), (-\Delta_x)^{-1}\partial_t u(t))| \leq \\ \leq \|f'(u(t))\|_{L^3} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2} \|(-\Delta_x)^{-1}\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^6} \leq C(1 + \|u(t)\|_{H^1})^2 \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Integrating (1.8) over $[T, T+1]$ and estimating the right-hand side of the inequality that we obtain by using (1.4), we find the right-hand side of (1.7). The other terms in (1.6) can be estimated analogously.

Applying now Gronwall's inequality to (1.5) and using estimate (1.7), we obtain, after simple transformations

$$(1.9) \quad Y(T) \leq CY(0)e^{-t} + Q_1(\varepsilon \|\partial_t u(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u(0)\|_{H^1}^2) e^{-\alpha T} + Q_1(\|g\|_{L^2}),$$

where $Y(t) := \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + (u(t), \partial_t u(t)) + (f(u(t)) - g, (-\Delta_x)^{-1}\partial_t u(t))$ and where $C > 0$ and the monotonic function Q_1 are independent of $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. It follows from the growth restriction (0.2)₄ and from the Sobolev embedding theorems that, analogously to (1.8)

$$(1.10) \quad C_1 \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 - Q_2(\|u(t)\|_{H^1}) \leq Y(t) \leq C_2 \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + Q_2(\|u(t)\|_{H^1}),$$

for *positive* constants C_i and a monotonic function Q_2 that are independent of ε .

Combining estimates (1.4), (1.9) and (1.10), we obtain the necessary estimates for $\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{-1}}$. The estimates for $\varepsilon \|\partial_t^2 u(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2$ can be easily derived by then integrating inequality (1.5) over $[T, T+1]$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

We now derive, based on (1.1), uniform bounds on the solutions in the spaces $\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)$ for more regular initial data.

Theorem 1.2. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 hold and let in addition $\xi_u(0)$ belong to $\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)$. Then, the solution $\xi_u(t)$ of problem (0.1) belongs to $\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)$, for every $t \geq 0$, and the following analogue of estimate (1.1) is valid:*

$$(1.11) \quad \|\xi_u(T)\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)}^2 + \int_T^{T+1} (\varepsilon \|\partial_t^2 u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^1}^2) dt \leq \\ \leq Q\left(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)}^2\right) e^{-\alpha T} + Q(\|g\|_{L^2}),$$

where the monotonic function Q and the constant $\alpha > 0$ are independent of $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. As in Theorem 1.1, we restrict ourselves to the (formal) derivation of estimate (1.11).

We introduce the solution $G = G(x)$ of the following problem:

$$(1.12) \quad \Delta_x G = g, \quad G|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

Then, thanks to the elliptic regularity, we have the following estimates:

$$(1.13) \quad \|G\|_{H^2} \leq C\|g\|_{L^2}, \quad \|G\|_{H^3} \leq C_1\|g\|_{H^1}.$$

We set $w(t) := u(t) - G$. This function obviously satisfies the equation

$$(1.14) \quad \varepsilon \partial_t^2 w + \gamma \partial_t w - \Delta_x w + f(w + G) = 0, \quad w|_{t=0} = u_0 - G, \quad \partial_t w|_{t=0} = u'_0, \quad w|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

We multiply equation (1.14) by $-\Delta_x(\partial_t w(t) + \beta w(t))$ and integrate over Ω to obtain

$$(1.15) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} [\varepsilon \|\partial_t \nabla_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\beta\varepsilon(\partial_t w(t), \Delta_x w(t))] + \\ & + (\gamma - \beta\varepsilon) \|\partial_t \nabla_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \beta \|\Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - \gamma\beta(\partial_t \nabla_x w(t), \nabla_x w(t)) = \\ & = \beta(f(u(t)), \Delta_x w(t)) + (f(w(t) + G), \Delta_x \partial_t w(t)). \end{aligned}$$

We transform the (most complicated) last term of (1.15) (the other terms are easier to treat) as follows:

$$(f(w + G), \Delta_x \partial_t w) = \partial_t(f(w + G), \Delta_x w) - (f'(w + G) \partial_t w, \Delta_x w),$$

and we estimate the last term of this equality via Hölder's inequality:

$$(1.16) \quad |(f'(w + G) \partial_t w, \Delta_x w)| \leq \|f'(w + G)\|_{L^6} \|\partial_t w\|_{L^3} \|\Delta_x w\|_{L^2}.$$

We recall that, due to the growth restriction (0.2)₄ and due to the regularity (1.13), we have an estimate of the form

$$\|f'(w + G)\|_{L^6} \leq C(1 + \|g\|_{L^2}^2 + \|w\|_{L^{12}}^2).$$

According to a classical interpolation inequality (see e.g. [Tr]), we obtain

$$\|w\|_{L^{12}}^2 \leq C\|w\|_{H^1}^{3/2} \|w\|_{H^2}^{1/2}, \quad \|\partial_t w\|_{L^3} \leq C\|\partial_t w\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\partial_t w\|_{H^1}^{1/2}.$$

Inserting these estimates into (1.16), we find

$$|(f'(w + G) \partial_t w, \Delta_x w)| \leq Q(\|\xi_u(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}) \|\Delta_x w\|_{L^2}^{3/2} \|\partial_t w\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_x \partial_t w\|_{L^2}^{1/2}.$$

Applying Young's inequality and noting that

$$\|\partial_t w\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \leq \mu + C_\mu \|\partial_t w\|_{L^2}^{3/2},$$

for every $\mu > 0$, we finally obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |(f'(w(t) + G)\partial_t w(t), \Delta_x w(t))| &\leq \mu (\|\partial_t \nabla_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2) + \\ &\quad + Q_\mu (\|\xi_u(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}) \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \|\Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Fixing $\mu > 0$ small enough (but independently of ε) and inserting this estimate into the right-hand side of (1.15), we derive the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} (1.17) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} [\varepsilon \|\partial_t \nabla_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\beta\varepsilon(\partial_t w(t), \Delta_x w(t)) - \\ - 2(f(u(t)), \Delta_x w(t))] + \beta_1 (\|\partial_t \nabla_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2) \leq \\ \leq Q(\|\xi_u(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}) \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \|\Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|f(u(t))\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

for a sufficiently small $\beta_1 > 0$ that is independent of ε . We set

$$Y(t) = \varepsilon \|\partial_t \nabla_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\beta\varepsilon(\partial_t w(t), \Delta_x w(t)) - 2(f(u(t)), \Delta_x w(t)).$$

Then, due to Hölder's inequality, due to the growth restriction (0.2)₄ and due to classical embedding theorems, we have (for a sufficiently small $\beta > 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} (1.18) \quad C_1 (\varepsilon \|\partial_t w(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|w(t)\|_{H^2}^2) - Q_1(\|u(t)\|_{H^1}) \leq Y(t) \leq \\ \leq C_2 (\varepsilon \|\partial_t w(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|w(t)\|_{H^2}^2) + Q_1(\|u(t)\|_{H^1}), \end{aligned}$$

for appropriate positive constants C_i and monotonic function Q_1 that are independent of ε .

Inequality (1.17) now implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (1.19) \quad \frac{d}{dt} Y(t) + (\beta_1 - Q(\|\xi_u(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}) \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2) Y(t) \leq \\ \leq (\beta_1 + Q(\|\xi_u(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}) \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2) [2\beta\varepsilon |(\partial_t w(t), \Delta_x w(t))| + 2|(f(u(t)), \Delta_x w(t))|] + \\ + C\|f(u(t))\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Hölder's inequality to the right-hand side of (1.19), using (1.18) and the obvious estimate

$$\|f(u(t))\|_{L^2}^2 \leq Q(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}) e^{-\alpha t} + Q(\|g\|_{L^2}),$$

we find

$$(1.20) \quad \frac{d}{dt} Y(t) + B(t)Y(t) \leq (Q_2(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}) e^{-\alpha t} + Q_2(\|g\|_{L^2})) (1 + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2),$$

where $B(t) := \frac{1}{2}\beta_1 - 2Q(\|\xi_u(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}) \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2$.

We note that it easily follows from (1.4) that

$$\int_0^T \|\partial_t u(t)\|^2 dt \leq Q_3(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}),$$

for a function Q_3 that is independent of $T \geq 0$ and ε , and, consequently

$$(1.21) \quad \int_0^T B(t) dt \geq \frac{1}{2}\beta_1 T - Q_4(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}),$$

where $\beta_1 > 0$ and Q_4 are independent of T and ε . Applying then Gronwall's inequality to (1.20) and using (1.21), we find, after simple computations

$$(1.22) \quad \varepsilon \|\partial_t w(T)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|w(T)\|_{H^2}^2 \leq Q(\varepsilon \|\partial_t u(0)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|u(0)\|_{H^2}^2) e^{-\alpha T} + Q(\|g\|_{L^2}),$$

where Q and $\alpha > 0$ are independent of ε .

A similar estimate for $\int_T^{T+1} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 dt$ can be easily derived by now integrating (1.17) over $[T, T+1]$ and by using (1.22). So, there only remains to estimate $\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}$ and $\varepsilon \int_T^{T+1} \|\partial_t^2 u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt$. To this end, we multiply equation (1.14) by $\partial_t^2 w(t)$ and argue as in Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 1.1. We also note that this reasoning is simpler than that performed in the proof of Theorem 1.1 because we already have an estimate of the L^∞ -norm of the solution $u(t)$ (due to (1.22) and due to the embedding $H^2 \subset C$) and, consequently, we do not need to worry about the growth of f . That is the reason why we leave the rigorous proof of these estimates to the reader. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

We now derive uniform bounds on the solutions in $\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 hold. Let also $\xi_u(0)$ belong to $\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)$ and the compatibility condition*

$$(1.23) \quad \Delta_x u_0|_{\partial\Omega} = g|_{\partial\Omega},$$

be satisfied. Then, the solution $\xi_u(t)$ of equation (0.1) belongs to $\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)$, for every $t \geq 0$, and the following estimate is valid:

$$(1.24) \quad \|\xi_u(T)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}^2 + \int_T^{T+1} (\varepsilon \|\partial_t^2 u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^2}^2) dt \leq \\ \leq Q(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}) e^{-\alpha T} + Q(\|g\|_{H^1}),$$

where the monotonic function Q and the constant $\alpha > 0$ are independent of $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. As above, we only give a formal derivation of (1.24). We set, as in the proof of Theorem 1.2, $w(t) := u(t) - G$, where G is solution of (1.12). Then, due to equation (0.1)

and due to the compatibility condition (1.23), the function w satisfies equation (1.14), together with the following boundary conditions:

$$(1.25) \quad w(t)|_{\partial\Omega} = \Delta_x w(t)|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

Here, we have implicitly used the condition $f(0) = 0$.

Multiplying equation (1.14) by $\Delta_x^2(\partial_t w(t) + \beta w(t))$, integrating by parts using (1.25), and arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1.2, we obtain

$$(1.26) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} [\varepsilon \|\partial_t \Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_x \Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\beta\varepsilon(\partial_t \nabla_x w(t), \nabla_x \Delta_x w(t))] + \\ & + (\gamma - \beta\varepsilon) \|\partial_t \Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \beta \|\nabla_x \Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - \gamma\beta(\partial_t \nabla_x w(t), \nabla_x \Delta_x w(t)) = \\ & = -\beta(f(u(t)), \Delta_x^2 w(t)) + (f'(u(t))\Delta_x u(t), \Delta_x \partial_t w(t)) + (f''(u(t))|\nabla_x u(t)|^2, \partial_t \Delta_x w(t)). \end{aligned}$$

We set $Y(t) := \varepsilon \|\partial_t \Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_x \Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\beta\varepsilon(\partial_t \nabla_x w(t), \nabla_x \Delta_x w(t))$. Then, for a sufficiently small $\beta > 0$, we easily have

$$(1.27) \quad \begin{aligned} C_1 (\varepsilon \|\partial_t \Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_x \Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2) & \leq Y(t) \leq \\ & \leq C_2 (\varepsilon \|\partial_t \Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_x \Delta_x w(t)\|_{L^2}^2), \end{aligned}$$

for positive constants C_i that are independent of ε .

We again estimate the most complicated term in the right-hand side of (1.26) only (the other terms can be estimated analogously). Using Hölder's inequality, we find

$$(1.28) \quad \begin{aligned} |(f'(u(t))\Delta_x u(t), \Delta_x \partial_t w(t))| & \leq C \|f'(u(t))\|_{L^\infty} \|u(t)\|_{H^2} \|\partial_t w(t)\|_{H^2} \leq \\ & \leq C_\nu \|f'(u(t))\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|u(t)\|_{H^2}^2 + \nu \|\partial_t w(t)\|_{H^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $H^2 \subset C$, we have

$$(1.29) \quad \|f'(u(t))\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq Q(\|u(t)\|_{H^2}),$$

for an appropriate monotonic function Q depending only on f .

Estimating the H^2 -norm of $u(t)$ using Theorem 1.2, inserting (1.28) and (1.29) into (1.26) and using (1.27), we find, after standard calculations

$$\frac{d}{dt} Y(t) + \beta_1 Y(t) \leq Q(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)}) e^{-\alpha t} + Q(\|g\|_{L^2}),$$

for a positive constant β_1 and a function Q that are independent of ε . Applying now Gronwall's inequality and using (1.27) again, we finally obtain

$$(1.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_T^{T+1} \|\partial_t w(t)\|_{H^2}^2 dt + \varepsilon \|\partial_t w(T)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|w(T)\|_{H^3}^2 & \leq \\ & \leq Q(\varepsilon \|\partial_t u(0)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|u(0)\|_{H^3}^2) e^{-\alpha T} + Q(\|g\|_{L^2}), \end{aligned}$$

for appropriate monotonic function Q and positive constant α that are independent of ε . We recall that, according to (1.13), we have

$$\|u(t)\|_{H^3} \leq \|w(t)\|_{H^3} + \|g\|_{H^1},$$

and (1.30) then implies an analogous (to (1.30)) estimate for $u(t)$.

Multiplying finally equation (1.14) by $\Delta_x \partial_t^2 w$ and arguing as in Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 1.1, we derive the necessary estimates for $\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^1}$ and $\int_T^{T+1} \varepsilon \|\partial_t^2 u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 dt$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Remark 1.1. We note that we have actually proved the analogue of (1.24) for the function $w(t)$ under the assumption $g \in L^2(\Omega)$ and that we need the regularity (0.3) to return from w to u only. So, in the more general case where $g \in L^2(\Omega)$, we only need to replace the space $\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)$ by $\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon) + [G, 0]$, where G is solution of (1.12), and all the results that will be formulated below remain valid for $g \in L^2(\Omega)$.

Let us consider, to conclude this section, the limit parabolic problem

$$(1.31) \quad \gamma \partial_t u = \Delta_x u - f(u) + g, \quad u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad u|_{t=0} = u_0,$$

that is associated with (0.1) for $\varepsilon = 0$. It is well known (see e.g. [BV]) that, under the above assumptions, this equation has a unique solution $u(t)$, for every $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$. Moreover, it is not difficult to verify that all the estimates of Theorems 1.1-1.3 remain valid for $\varepsilon = 0$ as well (obviously, in that case, the quantity $\partial_t u(0)$ should be expressed through $u(0)$ using equation (1.31)). To be more precise, the following assertion is valid.

Corollary 1.1. *Let assumptions (0.2)-(0.3) hold and let in addition (1.23) be satisfied. Then, the solution $u(t)$ of problem (1.31) satisfies the following estimate:*

$$(1.32) \quad \|u(T)\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\partial_t u(T)\|_{H^1}^2 + \int_T^{T+1} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^2}^2 dt \leq Q(\|u_0\|_{H^3})e^{-\alpha T} + Q(\|g\|_{H^1}),$$

where $\alpha > 0$ and Q is an appropriate monotonic function. Moreover, if $u(0) \in H^i(\Omega) \cap \{u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}$, for $i = 1, 2$, then

$$\|u(T)\|_{H^i}^2 + \|\partial_t u(T)\|_{H^{i-2}}^2 + \int_T^{T+1} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^{i-1}}^2 dt \leq Q(\|u_0\|_{H^i})e^{-\alpha T} + Q(\|g\|_{L^2}).$$

Actually, we will need in the sequel stronger estimates for the solutions of (1.31). We have the

Corollary 1.2. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 hold. Then, the solution $u(t)$ of problem (1.31) satisfies the following estimates:*

$$(1.33) \quad \|\partial_t^2 u(T)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + \int_T^{T+1} (\|\partial_t^2 u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(-\Delta_x)^{-1} \partial_t^3 u(t)\|_{L^2}^2) dt \leq \\ \leq Q(\|u_0\|_{H^3})e^{-\alpha T} + Q(\|g\|_{H^1}),$$

where $\alpha > 0$ and Q is a monotonic function.

Proof. Differentiating (1.31) with respect to t and setting $\theta(t) := \partial_t u(t)$, we have the equation

$$(1.34) \quad \gamma \partial_t \theta = \Delta_x \theta - h(t), \quad \theta(0) := \frac{1}{\gamma} (\Delta_x u_0 - f(u_0) + g), \quad \theta|_{\partial\Omega} = 0,$$

where $h(t) := f'(u(t))\partial_t u(t)$. According to (1.32) and to the Sobolev embedding $H^2 \subset C$, we obtain the estimates

$$\|\theta(0)\|_{H^1} \leq Q(\|u_0\|_{H^3}) + Q(\|g\|_{H^1}), \quad \|h(t)\|_{L^2} \leq Q(\|u_0\|_{H^3})e^{-\alpha t} + Q(\|g\|_{H^1}),$$

and the L^2 -regularity theorem, applied to the heat equation (1.34), then implies the necessary estimates for $\partial_t^2 u$. In order to derive the proper estimate for the third derivative, we take the $(-\Delta_x)^{-1}$ of (1.34) and differentiate once more with respect to t . Then, setting $W(t) := \partial_t(-\Delta_x)^{-1}\partial_t u(t)$, we find the equation

$$(1.35) \quad \gamma \partial_t W = \Delta_x W - H(t), \quad W(0) := \frac{1}{\gamma} (-\theta(0) - (-\Delta_x)^{-1} (f(u_0)\theta(0))),$$

with $H(t) := (-\Delta_x)^{-1} (f''(u(t))(\partial_t u(t))^2 + f'(u(t))\partial_t^2 u(t))$. It is not difficult to check, using estimate (1.32) and estimate (1.33) for $\partial_t^2 u(t)$, that

$$\|W(0)\|_{H^1} \leq Q(\|u_0\|_{H^3}) + Q(\|g\|_{H^1}), \quad \int_T^{T+1} \|H(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt \leq Q(\|u_0\|_{H^3})e^{-\alpha T} + Q(\|g\|_{H^1}).$$

The L^2 -regularity theorem for the heat equation, applied to equation (1.35), finishes the proof of the corollary.

§2 ESTIMATES ON THE DIFFERENCE OF SOLUTIONS

In this section, we derive several estimates on the difference of solutions of (0.1) which will be useful for the construction of exponential attractors.

Theorem 2.1. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 hold and let $u_1(t)$ and $u_2(t)$ be two solutions of equation (0.1) with initial data belonging to $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$. Then, the following estimate holds:*

$$(2.1) \quad \|\xi_{u_1}(t) - \xi_{u_2}(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} \leq C e^{Kt} \|\xi_{u_1}(0) - \xi_{u_2}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)},$$

where the constants C and K depend on $\|\xi_{u_i}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}$, $i = 1, 2$, but are independent of ε .

Proof. We set $v(t) = u_1(t) - u_2(t)$. Then, we have

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} \varepsilon \partial_t^2 v + \gamma \partial_t v - \Delta_x v + l(t)v = 0, \\ \xi_v(0) = \xi_{u_1}(0) - \xi_{u_2}(0), \end{cases}$$

where $l(t) := \int_0^1 f'(su_1(t) + (1-s)u_2(t)) ds$.

We note that, according to the growth restrictions on f' , the Sobolev embedding theorems and estimate (1.1)

$$(2.3) \quad \|l(t)\|_{L^3} \leq C(1 + \|u_1(t)\|_{H^1} + \|u_2(t)\|_{H^1})^2 \leq Q(\|\xi_{u_1}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} + \|\xi_{u_2}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}).$$

Multiplying now equation (2.2) by $\partial_t v$, integrating over Ω and using the obvious estimate

$$(2.4) \quad |(l(t)v(t), \partial_t v(t))| \leq C\|l(t)\|_{L^3}(\|v(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^2),$$

we obtain, after standard transformations (see e.g. [BV])

$$(2.5) \quad \int_T^{T+1} \|\partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt + \varepsilon\|\partial_t v(T)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t v(T)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \\ \leq Ce^{KT} (\varepsilon\|\partial_t v(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|v(0)\|_{H^1}^2).$$

In order to obtain an estimate for $\|\partial_t v(t)\|_{H^{-1}}$, we multiply equation (2.2) by $(-\Delta_x)^{-1}\partial_t^2 v$ and integrate over Ω . We then have

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{\gamma}{2} \|\partial_t v(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + (v(t), \partial_t v(t)) + (l(t)v(t), (-\Delta_x)^{-1}\partial_t v(t)) \right] + \\ + \varepsilon\|\partial_t^2 v(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 \leq \|\partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + (l'(t)v(t), (-\Delta_x)^{-1}\partial_t v(t)) + \\ + (l(t)\partial_t v(t), (-\Delta_x)^{-1}\partial_t v(t)) \equiv h(t).$$

Estimate (2.5), together with Hölder's inequality and the growth restrictions on f , gives

$$(2.7) \quad \int_T^{T+1} |h(t)| dt \leq Q(\|\xi_{u_1}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} + \|\xi_{u_2}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)})e^{KT} (\varepsilon\|\partial_t v(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|v(0)\|_{H^1}^2).$$

To do so, we only estimate the second term in $h(t)$ (the other terms can be estimated analogously). It follows from the growth restrictions on f'' that

$$(2.8) \quad \|l'(t)\|_{L^{3/2}} \leq C(1 + \|u_1(t)\|_{H^1} + \|u_2(t)\|_{H^1})(\|\partial_t u_1(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_t u_2(t)\|_{L^2}).$$

Thus, due to (1.1) and (2.5) and due to Hölder's inequality

$$(2.9) \quad |(l'(t)v(t), (-\Delta_x)^{-1}\partial_t v(t))| \leq \\ \leq C\|l'(t)\|_{L^{3/2}}\|v(t)\|_{H^1}\|\partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C'\|l'(t)\|_{L^{3/2}}^2\|v(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \\ \leq Q(\|\xi_{u_1}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} + \|\xi_{u_2}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)})(\varepsilon\|\partial_t v(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|v(0)\|_{H^1}^2) \times \\ \times e^{Kt}(\|\partial_t u_1(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t u_2(t)\|_{L^2}^2) + \|\partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Integrating (2.9) over $[T, T+1]$ and using estimates (1.1) and (2.5), we obtain (2.7) (for this part of h). Integrating finally (2.6) and using (2.7), we find, after standard calculations, the necessary estimate for $\|\partial_t v(t)\|_{H^{-1}}$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.1.

We now derive an (asymptotically) smoothing property for the difference of solutions of (0.1), assuming that their initial values belong to $\mathcal{E}^1(\Omega)$. To this end, we decompose the function $v(t) := u_1(t) - u_2(t)$ into the sum of an exponentially decaying and a smoothing parts: $v(t) = v_1(t) + v_2(t)$, where the functions v_1 and v_2 satisfy the equations

$$(2.10) \quad \varepsilon \partial_t^2 v_1 + \gamma \partial_t v_1 - \Delta_x v_1 = 0, \quad \xi_{v_1}(0) = \xi_v(0),$$

and

$$(2.11) \quad \varepsilon \partial_t^2 v_2 + \gamma \partial_t v_2 - \Delta_x v_2 = -l(t)v, \quad \xi_{v_2}(0) = 0,$$

respectively, where $l(t)$ is defined above.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $u_1(t)$ and $u_2(t)$ be two solutions of (0.1) with initial values belonging to $\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)$ and let the functions $v_1(t)$ and $v_2(t)$ be defined as above. Then, the following estimates hold:*

$$(2.12) \quad \|\xi_{v_1}(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C e^{-\alpha t} \|\xi_v(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}^2,$$

$$(2.13) \quad \|\xi_{v_2}(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)}^2 \leq C_1 e^{Kt} \|\xi_v(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}^2,$$

where all the constants are independent of ε (the constants C and $\alpha > 0$ depend only on equation (0.1) and the constants C_1 and K depend also on $\|\xi_{u_i}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)}$, $i = 1, 2$).

Proof. We will only prove estimate (2.13) (estimate (2.12) is straightforward, v_1 being the solution of a linear equation).

Multiplying equation (2.11) by $-\Delta_x \partial_t v_2(t)$, we have

$$(2.14) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\varepsilon \|\nabla_x \partial_t v_2(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta_x v_2(t)\|_{L^2}^2) + \gamma \|\nabla_x \partial_t v_2(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = (l(t)v(t), \Delta_x \partial_t v_2(t)).$$

We recall that $H^2 \subset C$; therefore, it follows from Theorem 1.2 that

$$(2.15) \quad \|l(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla_x l(t)\|_{L^6} \leq Q (\|\xi_{u_1}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)} + \|\xi_{u_2}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)}).$$

Thus, the right-hand side of (2.14) can be estimated as follows:

$$(2.16) \quad |(l(t)v(t), \Delta_x \partial_t v_2(t))| \leq |(\nabla_x l(t)v(t), \partial_t \nabla_x v_2(t))| + |(l(t)\nabla_x v(t), \partial_t \nabla_x v_2(t))| \leq \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\nabla_x \partial_t v_2(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + C' \|v(t)\|_{H^1}^2,$$

where the constant C' depends on $\|\xi_{u_i}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)}$, but is independent of ε . Inserting this estimate into (2.14) and using (2.1), we have

$$(2.17) \quad \int_T^{T+1} \|\partial_t v_2(t)\|_{H^1}^2 dt + \varepsilon \|\partial_t v_2(T)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|v_2(T)\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C e^{KT} \|\xi_v(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}^2.$$

So, there only remains to estimate $\|\partial_t v_2(t)\|_{L^2}^2$. To this end, we multiply (as above) equation (2.11) by $\partial_t^2 v_2(t)$ and integrate over Ω . We obtain

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\gamma}{2} \|\partial_t v_2(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - (\Delta_x v_2(t), \partial_t v_2(t)) + (l(t)v(t), \partial_t v_2(t)) \right) + \varepsilon \|\partial_t^2 v_2(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = \\ = \|\nabla_x \partial_t v_2(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + (\partial_t l(t)v(t), \partial_t v_2(t)) + (l(t)\partial_t v(t), \partial_t v_2(t)) \equiv h(t). \end{aligned}$$

We note that, using the growth restriction (0.2)₄, estimate (1.11) and the embedding $H^2 \subset C$, we have, arguing as in (2.8), the estimate

$$(2.19) \quad \|\partial_t l(t)\|_{L^{3/2}} \leq Q \left(\|\xi_{u_1}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)} + \|\xi_{u_2}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)} \right),$$

and, consequently, due to (2.15) and (2.19)

$$(2.20) \quad |h(t)| \leq C_1 (\|v(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t v_2(t)\|_{H^1}^2).$$

Inserting (2.20) into (2.18), integrating the inequality that we obtain over $[0, T]$ and using (2.5) and (2.17), we find the necessary estimate for $\|\partial_t v_2(t)\|_{L^2}$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.2.

Let us now consider the analogues of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 for the limit parabolic problem (1.31) ($\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$). We recall that, in contrast to the hyperbolic problem (0.1), the parabolic problem possesses a smoothing property on a finite interval and, consequently, we do not need to decompose the difference $u_1(t) - u_2(t)$ into a sum of two components (see (2.10) and (2.11)).

Theorem 2.3. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 hold and let $u_1(t)$ and $u_2(t)$ be two solutions of the limit problem (1.31) such that $u_i(0) \in H^1(\Omega) \cap \{u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}$. Then, the following estimate holds:*

$$(2.21) \quad \|u_1(t) - u_2(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C e^{Kt} \|u_1(0) - u_2(0)\|_{H^1}.$$

Moreover, for every $t > 0$, the following estimate holds:

$$(2.22) \quad \|u_1(t) - u_2(t)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C \frac{t+1}{t} e^{Kt} \|u_1(0) - u_2(0)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where the constants C and K depend on the H^1 -norm of the initial data for u_i .

This theorem is well known (see e.g. [BV]) and we omit its proof here.

We are now going to estimate the difference of solutions between the unperturbed ($\varepsilon = 0$) and perturbed ($\varepsilon \neq 0$) problems. To this end, we look for a formal asymptotic expansion of u^ε near $t = 0$ with respect to ε . According to the standard scheme (see e.g. [LyV]), we introduce a time scale $\tau = \frac{t}{\varepsilon}$ and seek for an asymptotic expansion of the form

$$(2.23) \quad u^\varepsilon(t) = u^0(t, \tau) + \varepsilon u^1(t, \tau) + \varepsilon^2 u^2(t, \tau) + \dots$$

Moreover, in order to define the function $u^i(t, \tau)$, the following assumption should be added: each term u^i can be decomposed as follows:

$$(2.24) \quad \begin{cases} u^i(t, \tau) = \bar{u}^i(t) + \tilde{u}^i(\tau), \\ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \tilde{u}^i(\tau) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Inserting expansion (2.23) into equation (0.1), we have

$$(2.25) \quad \varepsilon^{-1} \partial_\tau^2 u^0 + \varepsilon^0 (\partial_\tau^2 u^1 + 2\partial_t \partial_\tau u^1 + \gamma \partial_t u^0 + \gamma \partial_\tau u^1 - \Delta_x u^0 - f(u^0) - g) + \\ + \varepsilon^1 (\partial_t^2 u^0 + 2\partial_t \partial_\tau u^1 + \partial_\tau^2 u^2 + \gamma \partial_t u^1 + \gamma \partial_\tau u^2 - \Delta_x u^1 + f'(u^0)u^1) + \varepsilon^2 (\dots) + \dots$$

Expanding the initial data in a similar way, we have

$$0 = \varepsilon^0 (u^0(0, 0) - u_0) + \varepsilon^1 u^1(0, 0) + \varepsilon^2 u^2(0, 0) + \dots, \\ 0 = \varepsilon^{-1} \partial_\tau u^0(0, 0) + \varepsilon^0 (\partial_t u^0(0, 0) + \partial_\tau u^1(0, 0) - u'_0) + \varepsilon^1 (\partial_t u^1(0, 0) + \partial_\tau u^2(0, 0)) + \dots$$

Taking into account the fact that the u^i are assumed to be independent of ε , we can now write recurrent formulae for the functions u^i . Indeed, at order ε^{-1} , there remains from (2.25)

$$\partial_\tau^2 u^0 = 0, \quad \partial_\tau u^0(0, 0) = 0,$$

and, consequently, due to (2.24), $u^0(t, \tau) = \bar{u}^0(t)$, $\tilde{u}^0(\tau) \equiv 0$. Analogously, at order ε^0 , there remains from (2.25)

$$\partial_\tau^2 u^1 + \gamma \partial_t u^0 + \gamma \partial_\tau u^1 - \Delta_x u^0 - f(u^0) - g = 0, \quad \bar{u}^0(t) = u_0, \quad \partial_\tau u^1(0, 0) = \partial_t \bar{u}^0(0) - u'_0.$$

Passing to the limit $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ and using (2.24), we find the equation for the function $\bar{u}^0(t)$:

$$(2.26) \quad \gamma \partial_t \bar{u}^0 - \Delta_x \bar{u}^0 + f(\bar{u}^0) = g, \quad \bar{u}^0|_{t=0} = u_0,$$

which coincides with the limit parabolic problem (1.31) associated with (0.1) for $\varepsilon = 0$. Subtracting this equation from the equation of order ε^0 , we have

$$(2.27) \quad \partial_\tau^2 u^1 + \gamma \partial_\tau u^1 = 0, \quad \partial_\tau u^1(0, 0) = \partial_t \bar{u}^0(0) - u'_0.$$

Equation (2.27), together with assumption (2.24), defines in a unique way the function $\tilde{u}^1(\tau)$, namely

$$(2.28) \quad \tilde{u}^1(\tau) := -\frac{1}{\gamma} e^{-\gamma\tau} \phi_{u^\varepsilon}(0),$$

where $\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(0) := u'_0 - \frac{1}{\gamma} (\Delta_x u_0 - f(u_0) + g)$ (here, we have expressed the value of $\partial_t \bar{u}^0(0)$ from equation (2.26)).

A similar analysis of equation (2.25) at order ε^1 gives the equation for $\bar{u}^1(t)$:

$$\gamma \partial_t \bar{u}^1 - \Delta_x \bar{u}^1 + f'(\bar{u}^0) \bar{u}^1 = -\partial_t^2 \bar{u}^0, \quad \bar{u}^1(0) := \frac{1}{\gamma} \phi_{u^\varepsilon}(0).$$

Arguing analogously, we can determine all the functions u^i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$, in expansion (2.23) (if the nonlinearity f and the external force g are smooth). However, it is sufficient, for our purpose, to use the first two terms in (2.23). Moreover, it will be convenient to include to the remainder the term $\varepsilon \bar{u}^1(t)$ as well. So, we will look for a solution $u^\varepsilon(t)$ of problem (0.1) in the following form:

$$(2.29) \quad u^\varepsilon(t) := u^0(t) + \varepsilon \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) + \varepsilon \mathcal{R}(t),$$

where $u^0(t)$ is solution of the limit parabolic problem (1.31), the boundary layer term $\tilde{u}^1(\tau)$ is defined via (2.28) and $\mathcal{R}(t) := \mathcal{R}(t, \varepsilon)$ is a rest that will be estimated in the next theorem below.

Theorem 2.4. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 hold. Then, the solution $u^\varepsilon(t)$ of problem (0.1) possesses a decomposition (2.29), where $u^0(t)$ is solution of problem (1.31), the boundary layer \tilde{u}^1 is defined via (2.28) and the remainder \mathcal{R} can be estimated as follows:*

$$(2.30) \quad \|\xi_{\mathcal{R}}(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} \leq C e^{Kt}, \quad \xi_{\mathcal{R}}(t) := [\mathcal{R}(t), \partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)],$$

where the constants C and K depend on $\|\xi_{u^\varepsilon}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}$, but are independent of ε .

Proof. Owing to the construction of the asymptotic expansion, the remainder \mathcal{R} is solution of the following wave equation:

$$(2.31) \quad \begin{cases} \varepsilon \partial_t^2 \mathcal{R} + \gamma \partial_t \mathcal{R} - \Delta_x \mathcal{R} + l(t) \mathcal{R} = -l(t) \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) + \Delta_x \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) - \partial_t^2 u^0, \\ \mathcal{R}|_{t=0} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \phi_{u^\varepsilon}(0), \quad \partial_t \mathcal{R}|_{t=0} = 0, \quad \mathcal{R}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $l(t) \equiv l_{u^\varepsilon, u^0}(t) := \int_0^1 f'(u^0 + \theta(u^\varepsilon - u^0)) d\theta$. We note that, due to Theorem 1.3, $\xi_{\mathcal{R}}(0) \in \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$ and

$$\|\xi_{\mathcal{R}}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(0)\|_{H^1} \leq Q(\|\xi_{u^\varepsilon}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}).$$

As usual, multiplying equation (2.22) by $\partial_t \mathcal{R}$, integrating over Ω and integrating by parts, we obtain

$$(2.32) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\varepsilon \|\partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_x \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2 \left(\nabla_x \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right), \nabla_x \mathcal{R}(t) \right) \right) + \gamma \|\partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = \\ = - \left(l(t)(\mathcal{R}(t) + \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)), \partial_t \mathcal{R}(t) \right) + \left(\partial_t \nabla_x \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right), \nabla_x \mathcal{R}(t) \right) - (\partial_t^2 u^0(t), \partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)).$$

We note that, due to Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.1, we have an estimate of the form

$$(2.33) \quad \|l(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(1 + \|u^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2} + \|u^0(t)\|_{H^2})^2 \leq C_1 \left(1 + \|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)}^2 \right),$$

where C_1 is independent of ε . Consequently, we have no difficulty to estimate the first term in the right-hand side of (2.32), namely

$$\left| \left(l(t)(\mathcal{R}(t) + \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)), \partial_t \mathcal{R}(t) \right) \right| \leq K \|\nabla_x \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\gamma}{4} \|\partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + K \|\tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\|_{H^1}^2,$$

where K depends on $\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)}$, but is independent of ε . Also, the last term in (2.32) arises no difficulty since, according to Corollary 1.2, we have an estimate of the integral of $\partial_t^2 u^0$. We estimate the second term in the right-hand side of (2.32) in the following way:

$$\left| \left(\partial_t \nabla_x \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right), \nabla_x \mathcal{R}(t) \right) \right| \leq \|\partial_t \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\|_{H^1} \|\nabla_x \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq \|\partial_t \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\|_{H^1} (1 + \|\nabla_x \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2}^2).$$

Inserting these estimates into (2.32), we find

$$(2.34) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\varepsilon \|\partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{R}(t)\|_{H^1}^2 - 2 \left(\nabla_x \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right), \nabla_x \mathcal{R}(t) \right) \right) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \\ \leq K \left(1 + \|\partial_t \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\|_{H^1} \right) \|\mathcal{R}(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + C \left(\|\partial_t \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\|_{H^1} + \|\tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\partial_t^2 u^0(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \right).$$

We now note that, in view of the explicit expression (2.28) of the boundary layer term, we have an estimate of the form

$$(2.35) \quad \|\tilde{u}^1(\tau)\|_{H^1} + \int_0^\infty \|\partial_t \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\|_{H^1} dt \leq Q(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}),$$

where Q is independent of ε . Thus, applying Gronwall's inequality to (2.34) and using (1.33) and (2.35), we obtain

$$(2.36) \quad \varepsilon \|\partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{R}(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \int_t^{t+1} \|\partial_t \mathcal{R}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq C_1 e^{K_1 t},$$

where the constants C_1 and K_1 depend on $\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}$, but are independent of ε . Therefore, it only remains to estimate $\|\partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{H^{-1}}$. In order to do so, we multiply as above equation (2.31) by $(-\Delta_x)^{-1} \partial_t^2 \mathcal{R}$ and integrate by parts. We then have

$$(2.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \Gamma(t) = & - \left(\tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right), \partial_t^2 \mathcal{R}(t) \right) - \left(l(t) \tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right), (-\Delta_x)^{-1} \partial_t^2 \mathcal{R}(t) \right) + \\ & + (\partial_t [l(t) \mathcal{R}(t)], (-\Delta_x)^{-1} \partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)) + \\ & + \|\partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 - \varepsilon \|\partial_t^2 \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + ((-\Delta_x)^{-1} \partial_t^3 u^0(t), \partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)) \equiv H(t), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(t) := & \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + (\mathcal{R}(t), \partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)) + (l(t) \mathcal{R}(t), (-\Delta_x)^{-1} \partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)) + \\ & + (\partial_t^2 u^0(t), (-\Delta_x)^{-1} \partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)). \end{aligned}$$

It is not difficult to verify, using Hölder's inequality, estimate (2.33) and estimate (1.33) for $\|\partial_t^2 u^0(t)\|_{H^{-1}}$, that

$$(2.38) \quad \frac{\gamma}{4} \|\partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 - C \|\mathcal{R}(t)\|_{H^1}^2 - C_1 \leq \Gamma(t) \leq \gamma \|\partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{H^{-1}}^2 + C \|\mathcal{R}(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + C_1,$$

where the constants C and C_1 depend on $\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}$, but are independent of ε . So, it only remains to estimate the function $H(t)$ in the right-hand side of (2.37). To do so, we note that, due to the embeddings $H^1 \subset L^6$ and $H^2 \subset C$, we can easily deduce from estimates (1.24) and (1.32) the inequality

$$\|\partial_t l(t)\|_{L^6} \leq C (1 + \|u^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^2} + \|u^0(t)\|_{H^2}) (1 + \|\partial_t u^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1} + \|\partial_t u^0(t)\|_{H^1}) \leq C_1,$$

where C_1 depends only on $\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}$ (and is independent of ε). Consequently, due to Hölder's inequality, the function H satisfies

$$(2.39) \quad |H(t)| \leq C \left(\|\mathcal{R}(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(-\Delta_x)^{-1} \partial_t^3 u^0(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} \|\tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\|_{H^1}^2 \right),$$

where C is independent of ε . We now observe that the explicit expression (2.28) of the boundary layer \tilde{u}^1 implies that

$$(2.40) \quad \varepsilon^{-1} \int_0^\infty \|\tilde{u}^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\|_{H^1}^2 dt \leq C \|\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(0)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C',$$

where C' depends on $\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}$, but is independent of ε .

Integrating (2.37) over $[0, T]$ and using estimates (1.33), (2.36) and (2.38)-(2.40), we derive the necessary estimate for $\|\partial_t \mathcal{R}(t)\|_{H^{-1}}$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.4.

Corollary 2.1. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 hold and let $u^\varepsilon(t)$ and $u^0(t)$ be solutions of (0.1) and (1.31) respectively such that $u^\varepsilon(0) = u^0(0) = u_0$. Then, the following estimate holds:*

$$(2.41) \quad \|\xi_{u^\varepsilon - u^0}(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} \leq C_1 \varepsilon e^{Kt} + C_2 e^{-\frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon}t} \left(\|\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(0)\|_{H^{-1}} + \varepsilon^{1/2} \|\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(0)\|_{L^2} \right),$$

where $\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(t) := \partial_t u^\varepsilon(t) - \frac{1}{\gamma} (\Delta_x u^\varepsilon(t) - f(u^\varepsilon(t)) + g)$ and where the constants C_i , $i = 1, 2$, and K depend on $\|\xi_{u^\varepsilon}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}$, but are independent of ε .

Indeed, (2.41) is an immediate corollary of Theorem 2.4.

Corollary 2.2. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 2.4 hold and let $u^\varepsilon(t)$ and $u(t)$ be solutions of problems (0.1) and (1.31) respectively, with $u(0) \in H^3 \cap \{u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}$ satisfying the compatibility condition (1.23), but such that $u(0) \neq u_0$. Then, the following estimate holds:*

$$(2.42) \quad \|\xi_{u^\varepsilon - u}(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}(0)} \leq C_1 \varepsilon e^{Kt} + C_2 \|u^\varepsilon(0) - u(0)\|_{H^1} e^{Kt} + C_3 e^{-\frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon}t} \left(\|\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(0)\|_{H^{-1}} + \varepsilon^{1/2} \|\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(0)\|_{L^2} \right),$$

where the constants C_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, and K depend on $\|\xi_{u^\varepsilon}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}$ and $\|u^0(0)\|_{H^3}$, but are independent of ε .

Proof. Let $u^0(t)$ be solution of the parabolic equation with $u^0(0) = u^\varepsilon(0) = u_0$. Then, on the one hand, we have estimate (2.41) for the difference between $u^\varepsilon(t)$ and $u^0(t)$ and, on the other hand, estimate (2.21) implies that

$$(2.43) \quad \|\xi_u(t) - \xi_{u^0}(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}(0)} \leq C e^{Kt} \|u(0) - u^0(0)\|_{H^1}.$$

Combining (2.41) and (2.43), we obtain (2.42).

In the sequel, we will also need to control the evolution of the quantity

$$(2.44) \quad -\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(t) \equiv \gamma \varepsilon \partial_t^2 u^\varepsilon(t).$$

Corollary 2.3. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 2.4 hold. Then*

$$(2.45) \quad \|\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(t)\|_{H^{-1}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C \left(e^{-\frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon}t} \|\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(0)\|_{H^{-1}} + \varepsilon \right),$$

where C depends on $\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}$, but is independent of ε .

Proof. It follows from the asymptotic expansion (2.29) of u^ε that

$$(2.46) \quad \gamma \phi_{u^\varepsilon}(t) = -\varepsilon \gamma \partial_t \tilde{u}_1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) + \varepsilon \left(\Delta_x \tilde{u}_1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) + \Delta_x \mathcal{R}(t) - \gamma \partial_t \mathcal{R}(t) \right) + \varepsilon l(t) \left(\tilde{u}_1^1\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) + \mathcal{R}(t) \right).$$

We note that, without loss of generality, we may assume that $t \leq 1$. It then follows from (2.28), (2.30) and (2.33) that

$$(2.47) \quad \gamma \|\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(t)\|_{H^{-1}} \leq e^{-\frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon}t} \|\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(0)\|_{H^{-1}} + C\varepsilon,$$

where the constant C depends on $\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}$. We then recall that, due to Theorem 1.3, we have the estimate

$$(2.48) \quad \|\phi_{u^\varepsilon}(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C_1.$$

Finally, interpolating between the spaces H^{-1} and H^1 , we derive the necessary estimate for the second term in the left-hand side of (2.45).

Remark 2.1. We note that, due to (2.44), estimate (2.45) can be rewritten as follows:

$$(2.49) \quad \|\partial_t^2 u^\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^{-1}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_t^2 u^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{C_1}{\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon}t} + C_2,$$

where the constants C_i , $i = 1, 2$, depend on $\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}$, but are independent of ε .

§3 PERTURBATIONS OF EXPONENTIAL ATTRACTORS: THE ABSTRACT SETTING

In this section, we formulate and prove an abstract result on the construction of uniform exponential attractors for a singularly perturbed family of maps which generalizes that given in [EfMZ3] and will be applied to our problem in Section 4 below (see also [MZ] for the application to phase-field type equations). In order to do so, we will use the concept of Kolmogorov ε -entropy.

Definition 3.1. Let K be a (pre)compact set in a metric space V . Then, due to the Hausdorff criterium, for every $\mu > 0$, the set K can be covered by a finite number of μ -balls in V . Let $N_\mu(K, V)$ be the minimal number of such balls. Then, by definition, the Kolmogorov μ -entropy of K is the following number:

$$\mathbb{H}_\mu(K, V) := \ln N_\mu(K, V),$$

(see e.g. [KT] for details). We recall that the fractal dimension of the set K can be expressed in terms of the μ -entropy:

$$\dim_F(K, V) := \limsup_{\mu \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathbb{H}_\mu(K, V)}{\ln \frac{1}{\mu}}.$$

We are now in a position to formulate our abstract scheme.

Let $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$ and $\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)$, $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, be two families of Banach spaces (which are embedded into a larger topological space \mathcal{V}) such that $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon) \subset\subset \mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)$, for every $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$. We also assume that these compact embeddings are uniform with respect to ε in the following sense:

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbb{H}_\mu(B(0, 1, \mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)), \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)) \leq \mathbb{M}(\mu), \quad \forall \mu > 0,$$

where $\mathbb{M}(\mu)$ is some monotonic function that is independent of ε (here and below, $B(v, R, V)$ denotes the R -ball in V centered at v).

We further assume that we are given a family of closed sets $B_\varepsilon \subset \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$ (with B_0 bounded in $\mathcal{E}(0)$) and a family of maps $S_\varepsilon : B_\varepsilon \rightarrow B_\varepsilon$ such that

1. $B_0 \subset \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$, for every $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, and

$$(3.2) \quad \|b_0\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} \leq C_1 \|b_0\|_{\mathcal{E}(0)} + C_2 \varepsilon, \quad \forall b_0 \in B_0.$$

2. There exist maps \mathcal{C}_ε and \mathcal{K}_ε (which map B_ε into $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$) such that $S_\varepsilon = \mathcal{C}_\varepsilon + \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$ and, for every $b_\varepsilon^1, b_\varepsilon^2 \in B_\varepsilon$, the following estimates hold:

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{cases} \|\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon b_\varepsilon^1 - \mathcal{C}_\varepsilon b_\varepsilon^2\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} \leq \kappa \|b_\varepsilon^1 - b_\varepsilon^2\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}, \\ \|\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon b_\varepsilon^1 - \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon b_\varepsilon^2\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)} \leq K \|b_\varepsilon^1 - b_\varepsilon^2\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}, \end{cases}$$

where $\kappa < \frac{1}{2}$ and K are independent of ε .

3. There exist nonlinear 'projectors' $\Pi_\varepsilon : B_\varepsilon \rightarrow B_0$ such that

$$(3.4) \quad \|S_\varepsilon^{(k)} b_\varepsilon - S_0^{(k)} \Pi_\varepsilon b_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} \leq C \varepsilon L^k,$$

for every $b_\varepsilon \in B_\varepsilon$, where the constants C and L are independent of ε (here and below, $S_\varepsilon^{(k)}$ denotes the k th iteration of the map S_ε).

The main result of this section is the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let assumptions (3.1)–(3.4) hold. Then, there exists a family of exponential attractors $\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon \subset B_\varepsilon$ for the maps S_ε such that $S_\varepsilon \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon \subset \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon$ and the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *The rate of exponential attraction is uniform with respect to ε , i.e.*

$$(3.5) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(S_\varepsilon^{(k)} B_\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon) \leq C_3 e^{-\nu k},$$

where the positive constants C_3 and ν are independent of ε .

2. *The sets \mathcal{M}_ε are compact in $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$, for $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, and their fractal dimensions are uniformly bounded with respect to ε :*

$$(3.6) \quad \dim_F(\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)) \leq C_4,$$

where the positive constant C_4 is independent of ε .

3. *The symmetric distance between \mathcal{M}_ε and \mathcal{M}_0 satisfies*

$$(3.7) \quad \text{dist}_{\text{sym}, \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_0) \leq C_5 \varepsilon^\tau.$$

Moreover, the constants C_i , $i = 3, 4, 5$, and $0 < \tau < 1$ can be calculated explicitly.

Proof. As usual (see [EfMZ3]), we first construct the exponential attractor \mathcal{M}_0 . To this end, we construct a family of sets $V_i \subset S_0^{(i)} B_0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, by the following inductive procedure.

We recall that, due to our assumptions, the set B_0 is bounded in $\mathcal{E}(0)$. Consequently, there exists a ball $B(b_0, R, \mathcal{E}(0))$ such that $b_0 \in B_0$ and $B_0 \subset B(b_0, R, \mathcal{E}(0))$. We set $V_0 := \{b_0\}$. We now assume that the set V_k is already constructed such that $V_k \subset S_0^{(k)} B_0$ and V_k is an $R_k := R(\kappa + \frac{1}{2})^k$ -net of $S_0^{(k)} B_0$ (we recall that, due to our assumptions, $\kappa < \frac{1}{2}$). We then construct the next set V_{k+1} preserving these properties. To this end, we use estimates (3.3). Let b belong to V_k . We consider a ball $B(b, R_k, \mathcal{E}(0))$ and its image under the map S_0 . It follows from (3.3) that

$$(3.8) \quad \mathcal{K}_0 B(b, R_k, \mathcal{E}(0)) \subset B(\mathcal{K}_0 b, KR_k, \mathcal{E}^1(0)).$$

We now recall that $\mathcal{E}^1(0) \subset\subset \mathcal{E}(0)$. Consequently, there exists a covering of the right-hand side of (3.8) by a finite number of $R_k \frac{1-2\kappa}{4}$ -balls in $\mathcal{E}(0)$. We fix a covering with a minimal number of balls and denote by $W_k(b)$ the set of all the centers of this covering. Furthermore, we note that

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \#W_k(b) &= N_{R_k \frac{1-2\kappa}{4}}(B(\mathcal{K}_0 b, KR_k, \mathcal{E}^1(0)), \mathcal{E}(0)) \leq \\ &\leq N_{\frac{1-2\kappa}{4K}}(B(0, 1, \mathcal{E}^1(0)), \mathcal{E}(0)) \leq \exp\left(\mathbb{M}\left(\frac{1-2\kappa}{4K}\right)\right) := N. \end{aligned}$$

It is essential for us that the number N defined in (3.9) be independent of k (and of $b \in V_k$; moreover, thanks to (3.1), this number will be independent of ε as well if we replace the spaces $\mathcal{E}(0)$ and $\mathcal{E}^1(0)$ by $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$ and $\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)$).

We note that the first estimate of (3.3) implies that the system of $R_k \frac{1-2\kappa}{4} + \kappa R_k = R_k \frac{1+2\kappa}{4}$ -balls centered at the points of the set $\mathcal{C}_0 b + W_k(b)$ covers the set $S_0 B(b, R_k, \mathcal{E}(0))$ and that the number of balls in this system does not exceed N . Therefore, the system of $R_k \frac{1-2\kappa}{4}$ -balls centered at the points of $\cup_{b \in V_k} (\mathcal{C}_0 b + W_k(b))$ covers $S_0^{(k+1)} B_0$ and the number of balls in this system is not greater than $N \#V_k$. Increasing the radius of every ball in this covering by a factor of two, we may assume that the centers of the covering belong to $S_0^{(k+1)} B_0$. We now denote by V_{k+1} the (new) centers of this covering and we note that $R_{k+1} = R_k \frac{1+2\kappa}{2}$.

Thus, we have constructed by induction the family of sets $V_k \subset S_0^{(k)} B_0$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which satisfy the following properties:

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{cases} 1. \ \#V_k \leq N^k, \\ 2. \ \text{dist}_{\mathcal{E}(0)}\left(S_0^{(k)} B_0, V_k\right) \leq R(\kappa + \frac{1}{2})^k. \end{cases}$$

(We recall that, due to our assumptions, $\kappa + \frac{1}{2} < 1$.)

We now define a new family of sets E_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, by the following inductive formula:

$$E_1 := V_1, \quad E_{k+1} := S_0 E_k \cup V_{k+1}.$$

Then, evidently

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{cases} 1. & E_k \subset S_0^{(k)} B_0, \quad S_0 E_k \subset E_{k+1}, \\ 2. & \#E_k \leq N^{k+1}, \\ 3. & \text{dist}_{\mathcal{E}(0)} \left(S_0^{(k)} B_0, E_k \right) \leq R(\kappa + \frac{1}{2})^k. \end{cases}$$

We finally set

$$(3.12) \quad \mathcal{M}'_0 := \cup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} E_k, \quad \mathcal{M}_0 := [\mathcal{M}'_0]_{\mathcal{E}(0)},$$

where $[\cdot]_V$ denotes the closure in V . It is not difficult to verify that the set \mathcal{M}_0 is an exponential attractor for the map S_0 on B_0 . Indeed, (3.11)₁ and (3.12) imply that $S_0 \mathcal{M}_0 \subset \mathcal{M}_0$ and the exponential attraction (3.5) is an immediate corollary of (3.11)₃. Furthermore, it follows from (3.11)₂, together with (3.11)₁, that the fractal dimension of \mathcal{M}_0 satisfies

$$(3.12') \quad \dim_F(\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{E}(0)) \leq \frac{\mathbb{M}(\frac{1-2\kappa}{4K})}{\ln \frac{2}{2\kappa+1}},$$

(see [EfMZ1] for details).

We then construct the exponential attractors \mathcal{M}_ε for $\varepsilon \neq 0$ using the construction of the attractor \mathcal{M}_0 . To this end, we fix inverse images of the sets E_k under the maps $S_0^{(k)}$ (it is possible to do so due to (3.11)₁). To be more precise, we assume that the family of sets $\widehat{E}_k \subset B_0$ is such that

$$(3.13) \quad 1. \ S_0^{(k)} \widehat{E}_k = E_k, \quad 2. \ \#\widehat{E}_k = \#E_k \leq N^{k+1}.$$

We fix an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and arbitrary liftings of the sets $\widehat{E}_k \subset B_0$ to B_ε (with respect to the projection Π_ε), i.e. the $\widehat{E}_k(\varepsilon) \subset B_\varepsilon$ are such that

$$(3.14) \quad 1. \ \Pi_\varepsilon \widehat{E}_k(\varepsilon) = \widehat{E}_k, \quad 2. \ \#\widehat{E}_k(\varepsilon) = \#E_k \leq N^{k+1}.$$

We finally set $\widetilde{E}_k(\varepsilon) := S_\varepsilon^{(k)} \widehat{E}_k(\varepsilon)$. We claim that

$$(3.15) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} \left(S_\varepsilon^{(k)} B_\varepsilon, \widetilde{E}_k(\varepsilon) \right) \leq 2C\varepsilon L^k + C_1 R(\kappa + \frac{1}{2})^k + C_2 \varepsilon,$$

where the constants C , C_1 , C_2 and L are defined in (3.2) and (3.4). Indeed, let $b \in B_\varepsilon$ be an arbitrary point. We set $b_0 := S_0^{(k)} \Pi_\varepsilon b \in S_0^{(k)} B_0$. We recall that E_k is a $R(\kappa + \frac{1}{2})^k$ -net of the set $S_0^{(k)} B_0$. Consequently, there exists a point $b_k \in E_k$ such that

$$(3.16) \quad \|b_0 - b_k\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} \leq C_1 \|b_0 - b_k\|_{\mathcal{E}(0)} + C_2 \varepsilon \leq C_1 R(\kappa + \frac{1}{2})^k + C_2 \varepsilon.$$

Let \widehat{b}_k , $\widehat{b}_k(\varepsilon)$ and $\widetilde{b}_k(\varepsilon)$ be the images of the point b_k in \widehat{E}_k , $\widehat{E}_k(\varepsilon)$ and $\widetilde{E}_k(\varepsilon)$ respectively (i.e. $b_k = S_0^{(k)}\widehat{b}_k$, $\Pi_\varepsilon\widehat{b}_k(\varepsilon) = \widehat{b}_k$ and $\widetilde{b}_k(\varepsilon) = S_\varepsilon^{(k)}\widehat{b}_k(\varepsilon)$). Then, estimates (3.4) imply that

$$(3.17) \quad \|S_\varepsilon^{(k)}b - b_0\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon L^k, \quad \|\widetilde{b}_k(\varepsilon) - b_k\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon L^k.$$

Combining estimates (3.16) and (3.17), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_\varepsilon^{(k)}b - \widetilde{b}_k(\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} &\leq \|S_\varepsilon^{(k)}b - b_0\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} + \|b_0 - b_k\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} + \|b_k - \widetilde{b}_k(\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} \leq \\ &\leq 2C\varepsilon L^k + C_1R(\kappa + \frac{1}{2})^k + C_2\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (3.15).

Let now $k(\varepsilon)$ and $1 > \tau > 0$ be solutions of

$$(3.18) \quad \varepsilon L^k = (\frac{1}{2} + \kappa)^k = \varepsilon^\tau,$$

i.e. $k(\varepsilon) = \frac{\log_L \varepsilon}{\log_L(\frac{1}{2} + \kappa) - 1}$, $\tau = \frac{-\log_L(\frac{1}{2} + \kappa)}{1 - \log_L(\frac{1}{2} + \kappa)}$. Then, it follows from (3.4), (3.15) and (3.18) that

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{cases} 1. & \text{dist}_{sym, \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(\widetilde{E}_k(\varepsilon), E_k) \leq C'\varepsilon^\tau, \\ 2. & \text{dist}_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(S_\varepsilon^{(k)}B_\varepsilon, \widetilde{E}_k(\varepsilon)) \leq C''R(\frac{1}{2} + \kappa)^k, \end{cases}$$

for every $1 \leq k \leq k(\varepsilon)$, where the constants C' and C'' are independent of k and ε .

Thus, we may take $E_k(\varepsilon) := \widetilde{E}_k(\varepsilon)$, if $k \leq k(\varepsilon)$. In order to construct the sets $E_k(\varepsilon)$ for $k > k(\varepsilon)$, we forget the exponential attractor \mathcal{M}_0 and the sets $\widetilde{E}_k(\varepsilon)$ and construct them by the inductive procedure described above based on (3.3) and starting from $E_{k(\varepsilon)}(\varepsilon)$ rather. Thus, we have a family of sets $E_k(\varepsilon)$ which satisfy the following conditions:

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{cases} 1. & E_k(\varepsilon) \subset S_\varepsilon^{(k)}B_\varepsilon, \quad S_\varepsilon E_k(\varepsilon) \subset E_{k+1}(\varepsilon), \quad \#E_k(\varepsilon) \leq N^{k+1}, \\ 2. & \text{dist}_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(S_\varepsilon^{(k)}B_\varepsilon, E_k(\varepsilon)) \leq C'R(\frac{1}{2} + \kappa)^k. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, for $k \leq k(\varepsilon)$, we have

$$(3.21) \quad \text{dist}_{sym, \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(E_k(\varepsilon), E_k) \leq C''\varepsilon^\tau.$$

We finally define the exponential attractor \mathcal{M}_ε as follows:

$$(3.22) \quad \mathcal{M}'_\varepsilon := \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} E_k(\varepsilon), \quad \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon := [\mathcal{M}'_\varepsilon]_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}.$$

Arguing as in [EfMZ3], we can verify that the family of exponential attractors \mathcal{M}_ε satisfies all the assertions of the theorem. Indeed, the semi-invariance property is straightforward.

Furthermore, the uniform exponential attraction property (3.5) is an immediate corollary of (3.20)₂. Estimate (3.6) for the fractal dimension of \mathcal{M}_ε can be derived from (3.20) as in the case of \mathcal{M}_0 (see [EfMZ1]). Moreover, since the quantities N , κ and C'' in (3.20) are independent of ε , the estimate that we will obtain will be uniform with respect to ε (actually, the dimension of \mathcal{M}_ε for $\varepsilon \neq 0$ has the same upper bound (3.12') as in the case $\varepsilon = 0$).

So, there remains to verify estimate (3.7). We shall actually only prove the estimate

$$(3.23) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_0) \leq C'' \varepsilon^\tau.$$

The other inequality (giving the symmetric distance) can be proved analogously. Moreover, it is sufficient to check (3.23) for \mathcal{M}'_ε instead of \mathcal{M}_ε . So, let b_ε belong to \mathcal{M}'_ε . Then, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $b_\varepsilon \in E_k(\varepsilon)$. If $k \leq k(\varepsilon)$, the result follows immediately from (3.21). Let us therefore assume that $k > k(\varepsilon)$. There exists $\widehat{b}_\varepsilon \in S_\varepsilon^{(k-[k(\varepsilon)])} B_\varepsilon \subset B_\varepsilon$ such that $S_\varepsilon^{([k(\varepsilon)])} \widehat{b}_\varepsilon = b_\varepsilon$. We set $\widehat{b}_0 := \Pi_\varepsilon \widehat{b}_\varepsilon$. Then, on the one hand, (3.4) implies that

$$(3.24) \quad \|b_\varepsilon - S_0^{([k(\varepsilon)])} \widehat{b}_0\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon L^{k(\varepsilon)},$$

and, on the other hand, it follows from (3.11) that

$$(3.25) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}\left(S_0^{([k(\varepsilon)])} \widehat{b}_0, \mathcal{M}_0\right) \leq R\left(\kappa + \frac{1}{2}\right)^{[k(\varepsilon)]}.$$

Combining (3.24), (3.25) and (3.2) and using the explicit expression for $k(\varepsilon)$, we obtain estimate (3.23) and Theorem 3.1 is proved.

Remark 3.1. It is essential for the next section below to note that \mathcal{M}_ε satisfies

$$(3.26) \quad \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon \subset S_\varepsilon B_\varepsilon.$$

§4 UNIFORM EXPONENTIAL ATTRACTORS FOR DAMPED HYPERBOLIC EQUATIONS

In this section, we apply the abstract result obtained in Section 3 in order to construct a uniform family of exponential attractors for the family of equations (0.1).

First of all, according to Theorem 1.1, the hyperbolic problem (0.1) with $\varepsilon \neq 0$ generates a semigroup $S_t(\varepsilon) : \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$ via the formula

$$(4.1) \quad S_t(\varepsilon)\xi_u(0) = \xi_u(t), \quad \text{where } \xi_u(t) \text{ is solution of (0.1).}$$

(Here, the $\mathcal{E}^\kappa(\varepsilon)$ denote the spaces defined by (0.5)-(0.7).) Moreover, due to Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, this semigroup is well defined in the phase spaces $\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)$ and $\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon) \cap \{(1.23)\}$ as well. Analogously, according to Corollary 1.1, the limit parabolic problem (1.31) corresponding to $\varepsilon = 0$ generates a semigroup $S_t : H^1 \cap \{u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\} \rightarrow H^1 \cap \{u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}$ via the formula

$$(4.2) \quad S_t u_0 = u(t), \quad \text{where } u(t) \text{ is solution of (1.31).}$$

Moreover, this semigroup is well defined in the phase spaces $H^2 \cap \{u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}$ and $H^3 \cap \{u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\} \cap \{(1.23)\}$ as well. We note however that this semigroup and the semigroups $S_t(\varepsilon)$ introduced above are defined in different phase spaces. In order to overcome this difficulty, we introduce an infinite dimensional submanifold \mathcal{N}^i of $\mathcal{E}^i(0)$ by the following expression:

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{N}^i := \{[u, v] \in \mathcal{E}^i(0), v = \frac{1}{\gamma} (\Delta_x u - f(u) + g) \equiv \mathcal{N}(u)\},$$

$i = 0, 1, 2$, and we define a semigroup $S_t(0) : \mathcal{N}^i \rightarrow \mathcal{N}^i$ by the following expression:

$$(4.4) \quad S_t(0)[u, v] := [S_t u, \mathcal{N}(S_t u)].$$

We easily check that $\mathcal{N} \in C^1(H^i(\Omega), H^{i-2}(\Omega))$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ (see e.g. [BV]). Moreover, the following estimates are satisfied, for $i = 1, 2, 3$:

$$(4.5) \quad \|\mathcal{N}(u)\|_{H^{i-2}} + \|D_u \mathcal{N}(u)\|_{\mathcal{L}(H^i, H^{i-2})} \leq Q(\|u\|_{H^i}),$$

for an appropriate monotonic function Q . Thus, \mathcal{N}^i is indeed a C^1 -submanifold of $\mathcal{E}^i(0)$ and the semigroups S_t and $S_t(0)$ are conjugated by the diffeomorphism $\Phi : u \mapsto [u, \mathcal{N}(u)]$. Therefore, the assertions of Theorem 2.3 remain valid for the semigroup $S_t(0)$:

Corollary 4.1. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 2.3 hold and let ξ_{u_1} and ξ_{u_2} belong to \mathcal{N}^0 . Then, the following estimates hold:*

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{cases} \|S_t(0)\xi_{u_1} - S_t(0)\xi_{u_2}\|_{\mathcal{E}(0)} \leq C e^{Kt} \|\xi_{u_1} - \xi_{u_2}\|_{\mathcal{E}(0)}, \\ \|S_t(0)\xi_{u_1} - S_t(0)\xi_{u_2}\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(0)}^2 \leq C \frac{1+t}{t} e^{Kt} \|\xi_{u_1} - \xi_{u_2}\|_{\mathcal{E}(0)}^2, \quad t > 0, \end{cases}$$

where the constants C and K depend on $\|\xi_{u_i}\|_{\mathcal{E}(0)}$, $i = 1, 2$.

The main result of this section is the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Let assumptions (0.2) and (0.3) hold. Then, for every $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, the semigroup $S_t(\varepsilon)$ generated by problem (0.1) possesses an exponential attractor \mathcal{M}_ε which attracts exponentially the bounded subsets of $\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)$ in the topology of $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$, i.e. there exists a function Q and a constant $\alpha > 0$ that are independent of ε such that, for every $B \subset \mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)$*

$$(4.7) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(S_t(\varepsilon)B, \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon) \leq Q(\|B\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)})e^{-\alpha t}.$$

(Of course, for $\varepsilon = 0$, we take $B \subset \mathcal{N}^2 \subset \mathcal{E}^2(0)$.) Moreover, the fractal dimension of \mathcal{M}_ε in $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$ is uniformly bounded with respect to ε and the symmetric distance between \mathcal{M}_ε and \mathcal{M}_0 in $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$ satisfies

$$(4.8) \quad \text{dist}_{sym, \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_0) \leq C\varepsilon^\tau,$$

where the constants $C > 0$ and $0 < \tau < 1$ are independent of ε .

Proof. We apply Theorem 3.1 to our problem. To this end, we first note that, owing to Theorem 1.3, the balls

$$(4.9) \quad B_\varepsilon := \{\|\xi_u\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}^2 \leq 2Q(\|g\|_{H^1})\},$$

where Q is the same as in (1.24), are uniformly (with respect to ε) absorbing sets for the semigroups $S_t(\varepsilon)$ in $\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)$. Consequently, it is sufficient to verify the exponential attraction to \mathcal{M}_ε *only* for these bounded subsets of $\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)$. We complete the family $B_\varepsilon \subset \mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)$ with the set

$$(4.10) \quad B_0 := \{[u, v] \in \mathcal{N}^2, \|u\|_{H^3}^2 \leq 2Q(\|g\|_{H^1})\}.$$

We also note that, without loss of generality, we may assume that the functions Q in (1.24) and (1.32) are the same and that, consequently, B_0 is an absorbing set for $S_t(0)$ in \mathcal{N}^2 as well. Moreover, it follows from estimates (1.24) and (1.32) that there exists T_0 independent of $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$(4.11) \quad S_t(\varepsilon)B_\varepsilon \subset B_\varepsilon, \quad \text{if } t \geq T_0.$$

Let us now fix $T \geq T_0$ (independent of ε) such that, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and for every $\xi_{u_1}(0), \xi_{u_2}(0) \in B_\varepsilon$, the function $v_1(t)$ defined by equation (2.10) satisfies the estimate

$$(4.12) \quad \|\xi_{v_1}(T)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} \leq \kappa \|\xi_{u_1}(0) - \xi_{u_2}(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)},$$

where $\kappa < \frac{1}{2}$ (it is possible to do so thanks to (2.12)).

We then set $S_\varepsilon := S_T(\varepsilon)$ and construct the exponential attractors $\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon^d$ for the discrete semigroups generated by these maps. To this end, we need to verify the assumptions of Theorem 3.1.

Assumption (3.1) is obviously satisfied for the family of energy spaces $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$ and $\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)$ defined by (0.3). Moreover, the L^2 -norm (and even the H^1 -norm) of $\partial_t u := \mathcal{N}(u)$ is uniformly bounded on B_0 and, consequently

$$(4.13) \quad \|b_0\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}^2 \leq \|b_0\|_{\mathcal{E}(0)}^2 + C_1\varepsilon, \quad \forall b_0 \in B_0.$$

Thus, (3.2) is also valid (with ε replaced by $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$).

Let us now verify (3.3). To this end, we define the operators $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon : B_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$, $\varepsilon > 0$, as follows: $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon \xi_u(0) := \xi_{v_1}(T)$, where $v_1(t)$ is solution of the following linear problem:

$$(4.14) \quad \varepsilon \partial_t^2 v_1 + \gamma \partial_t v_1 - \Delta_x v_1 = 0, \quad \xi_{v_1}(0) = \xi_u(0).$$

Thus, $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon := S_\varepsilon - \mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$. For $\varepsilon = 0$, we set $\mathcal{C}_0 = 0$. Then, estimates (3.3) hold thanks to Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 4.1 and thanks to our choice of T .

Let us finally verify (3.4). To this end, we define the nonlinear projectors by the following formula:

$$(4.15) \quad \Pi_\varepsilon := \Pi, \quad \Pi[u, v] := [u, \mathcal{N}(u)].$$

Estimate (3.4) is then an immediate corollary of (2.41) (the boundary layer term disappears because we start from time $t = T > 0$).

Thus, all the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied and, consequently, there exists a family of discrete exponential attractors $\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon^d$ which satisfy conditions (3.5)–(3.7). Therefore, there only remains to construct the continuous exponential attractors.

As usual (see e.g. [EFNT]), we construct the continuous attractors by the following expressions:

$$(4.16) \quad \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon := \cup_{t \in [0, T]} S_t(\varepsilon) \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon^d.$$

We note that, by construction, $\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon \subset S_T(\varepsilon) B_\varepsilon$ (see Remark 3.1). Consequently (thanks to (2.45)), the boundary layer term in (2.42) will be of order ε . Therefore, (2.42) implies that

$$(4.17) \quad \text{dist}_{sym, \mathcal{E}(0)}(\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_0) \leq C_1 e^{KT} (\varepsilon + \text{dist}_{sym, \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon^d, \mathcal{M}_0^d)) + C_2 \varepsilon,$$

and, thanks to (3.7), (4.13) and (4.17), we find estimate (4.8) (where, compared with (3.7), the exponent τ is replaced by $\min\{\frac{1}{2}, \tau\}$). The exponential attraction (4.7) is an immediate corollary of (3.5) and of the uniform Lipschitz continuity (2.1) and (4.6). Thus, there only remains to verify the boundedness of the fractal dimensions. As usual, this property is an immediate corollary of the uniform (with respect to ε) time Lipschitz continuity of the solutions of (0.1) which is established in Lemma 4.1 below. Moreover, due to (3.26) and (4.16), this Lipschitz continuity is indeed necessary for the trajectories $\xi_u(t)$ with $\xi_u(0) \in B_\varepsilon$ for $t \geq T$ only.

Lemma 4.1. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 hold and let $u(t)$ be solution of (0.1). Then, for every $0 < T \leq t$, $0 < s \leq 1$, we have*

$$(4.18) \quad \frac{\|\xi_u(t+s) - \xi_u(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}}{s} \leq Q_T(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}),$$

where the function Q_T depends on T , but is independent of ε .

Proof. According to estimates (1.24) and (2.49), we have

$$(4.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\xi_u(t+s) - \xi_u(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)} &\leq \\ &\leq \int_t^{t+s} \left(\|\partial_t^2 u(t)\|_{H^{-1}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_t^2 u(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{H^1} \right) dt \leq \\ &\leq s Q(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)}) \left(1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon} T} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.1 is proved, hence the proof of Theorem 4.1.

§5 TRANSITIVITY OF EXPONENTIAL ATTRACTION
AND EXPONENTIAL ATTRACTION IN $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$

In this section, we formulate and prove an abstract result on the transitivity of exponential attraction and then apply this theorem to our problem to deduce that the attractors \mathcal{M}_ε attract uniformly (with respect to ε) not only the bounded subsets of $\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)$, but also the bounded subsets of $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let (\mathcal{M}, d) be a metric space and let S_t be a semigroup acting on this space such that*

$$(5.1) \quad d(S_t m_1, S_t m_2) \leq C e^{Kt} d(m_1, m_2),$$

for appropriate constants C and K . We further assume that there exist three subsets $M_1, M_2, M_3 \subset \mathcal{M}$ such that

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{cases} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(S_t M_1, M_2) \leq C_1 e^{-\alpha_1 t}, \\ \text{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(S_t M_2, M_3) \leq C_2 e^{-\alpha_2 t}. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$(5.3) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(S_t M_1, M_3) \leq C' e^{-\alpha' t},$$

where $C' = CC_1 + C_2$ and $\alpha' = \frac{\alpha_1 \alpha_2}{K + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2}$.

Proof. Let m_1 belong to M_1 and let us set $t = t_1 + t_2$, where $t_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, 2$, will be fixed below. Owing to the first estimate of (5.2), there exists $m_2 \in M_2$ such that

$$(5.4) \quad d(S_{t_1} m_1, m_2) \leq C_1 e^{-\alpha_1 t_1}.$$

Then, estimate (5.1) implies that

$$(5.5) \quad d(S_t m_1, S_{t_2} m_2) \leq CC_1 e^{Kt_2 - \alpha_1 t_1}.$$

On the other hand, using the second estimate of (5.2), we deduce that there exists $m_3 \in M_3$ such that

$$(5.6) \quad d(S_{t_2} m_2, m_3) \leq C_2 e^{-\alpha_2 t_2}.$$

Combining (5.4)–(5.6) and noting that $m_1 \in M_1$ and $t_1 \in [0, t]$ is arbitrary, we obtain

$$(5.7) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{M}}(S_t M_1, M_3) \leq \inf_{t_1+t_2=t} (CC_1 e^{Kt_2 - \alpha_1 t_1} + C_2 e^{-\alpha_2 t_2}).$$

Fixing the values t_i in an optimal way (i.e. such that $Kt_1 - \alpha_1 t_2 = \alpha_2 t_2$), we obtain (5.3).

The application of this theorem to our problem is based on the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 hold. Then, there exist a function Q and constants $R > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ that are independent of $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ such that, for every bounded subset $B \subset \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$*

$$(5.8) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(S_t(\varepsilon)B, \{\xi, \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)} \leq R\}) \leq Q(\|B\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)})e^{-\alpha t}.$$

Corollary 5.1. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 hold. Then, there exist a function Q and a positive constant $\alpha > 0$ such that, for every $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ and for every bounded subset $B \subset \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$ (for $\varepsilon = 0$, obviously, $B \subset \mathcal{N}^0 \subset \mathcal{E}(0)$)*

$$(5.9) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(S_t(\varepsilon)B, \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon) \leq Q(\|B\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)})e^{-\alpha t},$$

where the attractors \mathcal{M}_ε have been defined in Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Proposition 5.1. The case $\varepsilon = 0$ is straightforward, due to the smoothing property for parabolic equations. We will thus consider below the case $\varepsilon \neq 0$ only.

We will prove estimate (5.8) in several steps using the spaces $\mathcal{E}^\kappa(\varepsilon)$, with fractional order $0 < \kappa < 1$. The most complicated step is to prove the analogue of (5.9) for the space $\mathcal{E}^\kappa(\varepsilon)$, with $0 < \kappa < \frac{1}{2}$, instead of $\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)$. So, we will concentrate on this point only.

Step 1. We decompose (following [BV]) the nonlinearity f into a sum $f = f_1 + f_2$ such that

$$(5.10) \quad f_1'(v) \geq 0, \quad f_1(0) = f_1'(0) = 0, \quad |f_2(v)| + |f_2'(v)| + |f_2''(v)| \leq C,$$

where C is independent of v (such a decomposition exists, thanks to assumptions (0.2)). We then decompose a solution $u(t)$ of (0.1) into the sum $u(t) = v(t) + w(t)$, where $v(t)$ is solution of

$$(5.11) \quad \begin{cases} \varepsilon \partial_t^2 v + \gamma \partial_t v - \Delta_x v + f_1(v) = 0, \\ \xi_v|_{t=0} = \xi_u|_{t=0}, \quad v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, w satisfies the equation

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{cases} \varepsilon \partial_t^2 w + \gamma \partial_t w - \Delta_x w + [f_1(v+w) - f_1(v)] = g - f_2(u), \\ \xi_w|_{t=0} = 0, \quad w|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we can prove that the function $v(t)$ satisfies the estimate

$$(5.13) \quad \int_T^{T+1} \|\partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^2 dt + \|\xi_v(T)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}^2 \leq Q(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}) e^{-\alpha T},$$

where Q and $\alpha > 0$ are independent of ε .

We now estimate the solution w of (5.12). To this end, we multiply this equation by $(-\Delta_x)^\kappa \theta(t)$, $\theta(t) := \partial_t w(t) + \alpha w(t)$, where α is a fixed small strictly positive number and $0 < \kappa < \frac{1}{2}$, integrate over Ω and integrate by parts. We obtain, after standard transformations

$$(5.14) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} [\varepsilon \|\theta(t)\|_{\kappa,2}^2 + \|w(t)\|_{1+\kappa,2}^2 + (\Phi_v(t)w(t), (-\Delta_x)^\kappa w(t))] + \\ + (\gamma - \alpha\varepsilon) \|\theta(t)\|_{\kappa,2}^2 + \alpha \|w(t)\|_{1+\kappa,2}^2 - \alpha(\gamma - \alpha\varepsilon) (w(t), (-\Delta_x)^\kappa \theta(t)) = \\ = (g - f_2(u(t)), \partial_t (-\Delta_x)^\kappa \theta(t)) - \alpha (\Phi_v(t)w(t), (-\Delta_x)^\kappa w(t)) + \\ + (\partial_t \Phi_v(t)w(t), (-\Delta_x)^\kappa w(t)) + (\Phi_v(t)\partial_t w(t), (-\Delta_x)^\kappa w(t)),$$

where $\Phi_v := \int_0^1 f_1'(v + sw) ds$. We only estimate the last two terms in the right-hand side of (5.14) (the other terms are easier to estimate). Thanks to Hölder's inequality and the Sobolev embedding theorems, we have, for $\kappa < \frac{1}{2}$

$$(5.15) \quad |(\partial_t \Phi_v(t)w(t), (-\Delta_x)^\kappa w(t))| \leq C \|\partial_t \Phi_v(t)\|_{L^{3/2}} \|w(t)\|_{\kappa,2} \|w(t)\|_{1+\kappa,2} \leq \\ \leq \mu \|w(t)\|_{\kappa,2}^2 + C_\mu \|\partial_t \Phi_v(t)\|_{L^{3/2}}^2 \|w(t)\|_{1+\kappa,2}^2,$$

for an arbitrary $\mu > 0$. We note that, owing to the dissipative integrals for u and v (see (1.3) and (5.13)) and analogously to (2.8), we have the estimate

$$(5.16) \quad \int_0^\infty \|\partial_t \Phi_v(t)\|_{L^{3/2}}^2 dt \leq \\ \leq Q(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}) \int_0^\infty (\|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_t v(t)\|_{L^2}^2) dt \leq Q'(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}) < \infty.$$

We now estimate the last term in the right-hand side of (5.14), splitting it into two terms again:

$$(5.17) \quad (\Phi_v(t)\partial_t w(t), (-\Delta_x)^\kappa w(t)) = \\ = ((\Phi_v(t) - f_1'(v(t)))\partial_t w(t), (-\Delta_x)^\kappa w(t)) + (f_1'(v(t))\partial_t w(t), (-\Delta_x)^\kappa w(t)).$$

The second term in the right-hand side of (5.17) can be estimated using Hölder's inequality and appropriate embedding theorems:

$$(5.18) \quad |(f_1'(v(t))\partial_t w(t), (-\Delta_x)^\kappa w(t))| \leq C \|f_1'(v(t))\|_{L^3} \|\partial_t w(t)\|_{\kappa,2} \|w(t)\|_{1+\kappa,2} \leq \\ \leq \mu \|\partial_t w(t)\|_{\kappa,2}^2 + C_\mu \|f_1'(v(t))\|_{L^3}^2 \|w(t)\|_{1+\kappa,2}^2.$$

(Here, we have also implicitly used the assumption $\kappa < \frac{1}{2}$.) We note that, thanks to (5.10), we have $|f_1'(v)| \leq C|v|(1+|v|)$ and, consequently, due to (5.13), we have the analogue of a 'dissipative' integral:

$$(5.19) \quad \int_0^\infty \|f_1'(v(t))\|_{L^3}^2 dt \leq Q(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}) < \infty.$$

So, there only remains to estimate the first term in the right-hand side of (5.17). To this end, we note that, according to (0.2), we have

$$(5.20) \quad |\Phi_v(t) - f'_1(v(t))| \leq C|w(t)|(1 + |u(t)| + |v(t)|),$$

and, consequently, thanks to Hölder's inequality and the Sobolev embedding theorems, it follows that

$$(5.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & |((\Phi_v(t) - f'_1(v(t)))\partial_t w(t), (-\Delta_x)^\kappa w(t))| \leq \\ & \leq C(1 + \|u(t)\|_{H^1} + \|v(t)\|_{H^1})\|\partial_t w(t)\|_{L^2}\|w(t)\|_{L^{1+\kappa}}^2 \leq \\ & \leq \mu\|w(t)\|_{L^{1+\kappa}}^2 + C_\mu\|\partial_t w(t)\|_{L^2}^2\|w(t)\|_{L^{1+\kappa}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting estimates (5.15)–(5.21) into (5.14) and arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1.2, we obtain the estimate

$$(5.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \varepsilon\|\partial_t w(t)\|_{\kappa,2}^2 + \|w(t)\|_{1+\kappa,2}^2 + \int_t^{t+1} \|\partial_t w(s)\|_{\kappa,2}^2 ds \leq \\ \leq Q(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)})e^{-\alpha t} + Q(\|g\|_{H^1}), \end{aligned}$$

where Q and $\alpha > 0$ are independent of ε .

Multiplying equation (5.12) by $(-\Delta_x)^{\kappa-1}\partial_t^2 w$, arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 (Step 2) and using (5.22), we finally find

$$(5.23) \quad \|w(t)\|_{\mathcal{E}^\kappa(\varepsilon)} \leq Q(\|\xi_u(0)\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)})e^{-\alpha t} + Q(\|g\|_{H^1}).$$

(The derivation of (5.23) is standard and simpler than that of (5.22) because we can use the additional regularity of the solution $w(t)$ obtained above (in (5.22)). So, we leave the details to the reader.)

Estimates (5.13) and (5.23) imply that

$$(5.24) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(S_t(\varepsilon)B, \{u, \|u\|_{\mathcal{E}^\kappa(\varepsilon)} \leq R\}) \leq Q(\|B\|_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)})e^{-\alpha t},$$

for every bounded subset $B \subset \mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)$ and for $R = 2Q(\|g\|_{H^1})$. Thus, the first step is completed.

Step 2. Starting now from $\xi_u(0) \in \mathcal{E}^\kappa(\varepsilon)$, with κ close to $\frac{1}{2}$, and arguing as in the first step (but the proof is simpler since the solutions are more regular), we have the estimate

$$(5.25) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(S_t(\varepsilon)B, \{u, \|u\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)} \leq R'\}) \leq Q(\|B\|_{\mathcal{E}^\kappa(\varepsilon)})e^{-\alpha t},$$

for every bounded subset $B \subset \mathcal{E}^\kappa(\varepsilon)$.

Step 3. Starting from $\xi_u(0) \in \mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)$, we find similarly

$$(5.26) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon)}(S_t(\varepsilon)B, \{u, \|u\|_{\mathcal{E}^2(\varepsilon)} \leq R''\}) \leq Q(\|B\|_{\mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)})e^{-\alpha t},$$

for every bounded subset $B \subset \mathcal{E}^1(\varepsilon)$.

Finally, using (5.24)–(5.26) and the transitivity of exponential attraction (Theorem 5.1), we obtain (5.8). This finishes the proof of Proposition 5.1.

Acknowledgements : This work was initiated while three of the authors (P. F., A. M. and S. Z.) were visiting the Weierstrass Institute Berlin and the Freie Universität Berlin. They wish to thank Professor M. Efendiev for having invited them and for his warm hospitality.

REFERENCES

- [BV] A. V. Babin and M. I. Vishik, *Attractors of evolutionary equations*, Nauka, Moscow, 1989; English translation: North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992.
- [BN] A. Babin and B. Nicolaenko, Exponential attractors of reaction-diffusion systems in an unbounded domain, *J. Dyn. Diff. Equ.* 7, 567-590, 1995.
- [BaN] C. Bardos and B. Nicolaenko, Navier-Stokes equations and Dynamical systems, *Handbook of Dynamical Systems III: Towards Applications*, B. Fiedler, G. Iooss and N. Kopell eds., Elsevier, North-Holland, 2002.
- [CV] V. V. Chepyzhov and M. I. Vishik, *Attractors for equations of mathematical physics*, AMS, 2002.
- [EFNT] A. Eden, C. Foias, B. Nicolaenko and R. Temam, *Exponential attractors for dissipative evolution equations*, John-Wiley, New-York, 1994.
- [EFK] A. Eden, C. Foias and V. Kalantarov, A remark on the two constructions of exponential attractors for α -contractions, *J. Dyn. Diff. Equ.* 10 (1), 37-45, 1998.
- [EfM1] M. Efendiev and A. Miranville, Finite dimensional attractors for reaction-diffusion equations in \mathbb{R}^n with a strong nonlinearity, *Disc. Cont. Dyn. Systems* 15 (2), 399-424, 1999.
- [EfM1] M. Efendiev and A. Miranville, On the dimension of the global attractor for dissipative reaction-diffusion systems, *Applied Math. Letters*, To appear.
- [EfMZ1] M. Efendiev, A. Miranville and S. Zelik, Exponential attractors for a nonlinear reaction-diffusion system in \mathbb{R}^3 , *C.R.A.S.* 330, 713-718, 2000.
- [EfMZ2] M. Efendiev, A. Miranville and S. Zelik, Infinite dimensional exponential attractors for a non-autonomous reaction-diffusion system, *Math. Nachrichten*, To appear.
- [EfMZ3] M. Efendiev, A. Miranville and S. Zelik, Exponential attractors for a singularly perturbed Cahn-Hilliard system, Submitted.
- [FG1] P. Fabrie and C. Galusinski, Exponential attractors for the slightly compressible 2D Navier-Stokes equations, *Disc. Cont. Dyn. Systems* 2 (3), 315-348, 1996.
- [FG2] P. Fabrie and C. Galusinski, Exponential attractors for a partially dissipative reaction system, *Asymptotic Anal.* 12, 329-354, 1996.
- [FGM] P. Fabrie, C. Galusinski and A. Miranville, Uniform inertial sets for damped wave equations, *Disc. Cont. Dyn. Systems* 6 (2), 393-418, 2000.
- [FM] P. Fabrie and A. Miranville, Exponential attractors for nonautonomous first-order evolution equations, *Disc. Cont. Dyn. Systems* 4 (2), 225-240, 1998.
- [FN] P. Fabrie and B. Nicolaenko, Attracteurs exponentiels pour un modèle de convection naturelle en milieu poreux partiellement dissipatif, *Asymptotic Anal.* 12, 295-327, 1996.
- [FoST] C. Foias, G. Sell and R. Temam, Inertial manifolds for nonlinear evolution equations, *J. Diff. Equ.* 73, 309-353, 1988.
- [G] C. Galusinski, PhD thesis, Université Bordeaux-I, 1996.
- [H] J. Hale, *Asymptotic behavior of dissipative systems*, *Math. Surveys and Mon.*, Vol. 25, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1987.
- [KT] A. N. Kolmogorov and V. M. Tikhomirov, ε -entropy and ε -capacity of sets in functional spaces, In: *Selected works of A. N. Kolmogorov*, Vol. 3, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1993.

- [Ko] I. N. Kostin, Rate of attraction to a non-hyperbolic attractor, *Asymptotic Anal.* 16 (3-4), 203-222, 1998.
- [L] O. Ladyzhenskaya, *Attractors for semigroups of evolution equations*, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [LdN] Le Dung and B. Nicolaenko, Exponential attractors in Banach spaces, *J. Dyn. Diff. Equ.* 13 (4), 791-806, 2001.
- [LoM] J. L. Lions and E. Magenes, *Problèmes aux limites nonhomogènes et applications*, Vol. I, Dunod, Paris, 1968.
- [LyV] L. A. Lyusternik and M. I. Vishik, Regular degeneration and boundary layer for linear differential equations with small parameter, *Amer. Math. Soc. Trans.* 20 (2), 239-364, 1962.
- [MpS] J. Mallet-Paret and G. Sell, Inertial manifolds for reaction-diffusion equations in higher space dimensions, *J. Am. Math. Soc.* 1, 805-866, 1988.
- [M1] A. Miranville, Exponential attractors for nonautonomous evolution equations, *Applied Math. Letters* 11 (2), 19-22, 1998.
- [M2] A. Miranville, Exponential attractors for a class of evolution equations by a decomposition method, *C.R.A.S.* 328, 145-150, 1999.
- [M3] A. Miranville, Exponential attractors for a class of evolution equations by a decomposition method. II. The nonautonomous case, *C.R.A.S.* 328, 907-912, 1999.
- [MZ] A. Miranville and S. Zelik, Robust exponential attractors for singularly perturbed phase-field type equations, *Electronic J. Diff. Equ.* 63, 1-28, 2002.
- [R1] G. Raugel, Singularly perturbed hyperbolic equations revisited, *Proceedings of Equadiff 99*, World Scientific, 2000.
- [R2] G. Raugel, Global attractors in partial differential equations, in *Handbook of dynamical systems III: towards applications*, B. Fiedler, G. Iooss and N. Kopell eds., Elsevier, North-Holland, 2002.
- [T] R. Temam, *Infinite dimensional dynamical systems in physics and mechanics*, 2d ed., Springer-Verlag, New-York, 1997.
- [Tr] H. Triebel, *Interpolation theory, functional spaces, differential operators*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978.
- [Z] E. Zeidler, *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications. Part I. Fixed-point theorems*, Springer-Verlag, 1985.