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#### Abstract

We consider the second order Cauchy problem $$
\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime}+u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}+m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}\right) A u_{\varepsilon}=0, \quad u_{\varepsilon}(0)=u_{0}, \quad u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(0)=u_{1},
$$


and the first order limit problem

$$
u^{\prime}+m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}\right) A u=0, \quad u(0)=u_{0},
$$

where $\varepsilon>0, H$ is a Hilbert space, $A$ is a self-adjoint nonnegative operator on $H$ with dense domain $D(A)$, $\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right) \in D(A) \times D\left(A^{1 / 2}\right)$, and $m:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow[0,+\infty)$ is a function of class $C^{1}$.

We prove decay estimates (as $t \rightarrow+\infty$ ) for solutions of the first order problem, and we show that analogous estimates hold true for solutions of the second order problem provided that $\varepsilon$ is small enough. We also show that our decay rates are optimal in many cases.

The abstract results apply to parabolic and hyperbolic partial differential equations with nonlocal nonlinearities of Kirchhoff type.
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## 1. Introduction

Let $H$ be a real Hilbert space. Given $x$ and $y$ in $H,|x|$ denotes the norm of $x$, and $\langle x, y\rangle$ denotes the scalar product of $x$ and $y$. Let $A$ be a self-adjoint linear operator on $H$ with dense domain $D(A)$. We always assume that $A$ is nonnegative, namely $\langle A u, u\rangle \geqslant 0$ for every $u \in D(A)$. For any such operator the power $A^{\alpha}$ is defined for every $\alpha \geqslant 0$ in a suitable domain $D\left(A^{\alpha}\right)$. Let $m:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow[0,+\infty)$ be a function of class $C^{1}$.

For every $\varepsilon>0$ we consider the second order Cauchy problem

$$
\begin{gather*}
\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime}(t)+u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)+m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}\right) A u_{\varepsilon}(t)=0 \quad \forall t \geqslant 0,  \tag{1.1}\\
u_{\varepsilon}(0)=u_{0}, \quad u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(0)=u_{1} . \tag{1.2}
\end{gather*}
$$

This problem is just an abstract setting of the initial boundary value problem for the hyperbolic partial differential equation (PDE)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon u_{t t}^{\varepsilon}(t, x)+u_{t}^{\varepsilon}(t, x)-m\left(\int_{\Omega}\left|\nabla u^{\varepsilon}(t, x)\right|^{2} d x\right) \Delta u^{\varepsilon}(t, x)=0 \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

in an open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n}$. This equation is a model for the damped small transversal vibrations of an elastic string $(n=1)$ or membrane $(n=2)$ with uniform density $\varepsilon$.

We also consider the first order Cauchy problem

$$
\begin{gather*}
u^{\prime}(t)+m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}\right) A u(t)=0 \quad \forall t \geqslant 0,  \tag{1.4}\\
u(0)=u_{0}, \tag{1.5}
\end{gather*}
$$

obtained setting formally $\varepsilon=0$ in (1.1), and forgetting the initial condition $u_{1}$ in (1.2). In the concrete setting of (1.3) the limit problem involves a PDE of parabolic type.

The main research lines on this subject concern the behavior of $u_{\varepsilon}(t)$ as $t \rightarrow+\infty$ and as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^{+}$. In this paper we focus on the first issue, proving decay estimates for $u(t)$ and $u_{\varepsilon}(t)$ as $t \rightarrow+\infty$. The decay properties of $u(t)$ are stated in Theorem 3.2 and are proved by means of classical energy estimates for parabolic equations. We used these estimates on $u(t)$ as a benchmark when looking at the second order problem, and indeed in Theorem 3.6 we show that solutions of (1.1), (1.2) satisfy similar decay estimates provided that $\varepsilon$ is small enough. Also the constants (and not only the decay rates) involved in our estimates for the second order problem tend (as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^{+}$) to the corresponding constants for the first order problem.

Most of our estimates are independent on $\varepsilon$. For this reason we plan to apply them in a future paper in order to provide global-in-time estimates for $\left|u_{\varepsilon}-u\right|$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^{+}$(see also [8,9]).

Our proofs involve comparison principles for ordinary differential equations (see Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2) together with estimates of suitable first order energies (see Proposition 3.10). Our methods are quite general and do not require any special assumption on the nonlinearity $m$. Nevertheless we obtain decay rates for $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2},\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2},\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}$ which are optimal and often better than those stated in the literature.

As a byproduct of our energy inequalities we get also decay estimates for $\varepsilon\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}$. We state them because in some cases they improve the existing literature, but we suspect they are not
optimal (we can indeed prove better estimates both for more regular data, and for special choices of $m$ ).

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains a reasonably short summary of the literature and a comparison with the estimates obtained in this paper. Our results are formally stated in Section 3 and proved in Section 4.

## 2. Survey of existence results and decay estimates

Let us recall some terminology.

- The operator $A$ is called coercive if there exists a constant $v>0$ such that $\langle A u, u\rangle \geqslant v|u|^{2}$ for every $u \in D(A)$.
- Eq. (1.1) or (1.4) is called nondegenerate if there exists a constant $\mu>0$ such that $m(\sigma) \geqslant \mu$ for every $\sigma \geqslant 0$.
- Problem (1.1), (1.2) or (1.4), (1.5) is called mildly degenerate if the initial condition $u_{0}$ belongs to $D\left(A^{1 / 2}\right)$ and satisfies the nondegeneracy condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}\right)>0 \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

This means that $m$ may vanish, but not at the initial time. In many statements we also assume that $u_{0}$ satisfies the stronger nondegeneracy condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2} m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}\right)>0 . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that (2.2) is equivalent to (2.1) if $m(0)=0$.

### 2.1. Existence results

Existence of a global solution for problem (1.4), (1.5) can be established under very general assumptions on $m, A, u_{0}$. In particular one can prove the following result (see [2,7,13]).

Theorem 2.1. Let $m:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow[0,+\infty)$ be a locally Lipschitz continuous function. Let us assume that $u_{0} \in D(A)$ satisfies the nondegeneracy condition (2.2).

Then problem (1.4), (1.5) has a unique solution

$$
u \in C^{1}([0,+\infty) ; H) \cap C^{0}([0,+\infty) ; D(A))
$$

Moreover $A^{1 / 2} u(t) \neq 0$ for every $t \geqslant 0$, and $u \in C^{1}\left((0,+\infty) ; D\left(A^{\alpha}\right)\right)$ for every $\alpha \geqslant 0$.
The standard result concerning problem (1.1), (1.2) is the existence of a unique global solution provided that $\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right) \in D(A) \times D\left(A^{1 / 2}\right)$ satisfy (2.1) and $\varepsilon$ is small enough. This was proved by E. de Brito [3], Y. Yamada [24], and K. Nishihara [17] in the nondegenerate case, then by K. Nishihara and Y. Yamada [18] in the mildly degenerate case with $m(\sigma)=\sigma^{\gamma}(\gamma \geqslant 1)$, and finally by the authors [6] with a general locally Lipschitz continuous nonlinearity $m(\sigma) \geqslant 0$.

The following theorem is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 2.2 of [6].

Theorem 2.2. Let $m:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow[0,+\infty)$ be a locally Lipschitz continuous function. Let us assume that $\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right) \in D(A) \times D\left(A^{1 / 2}\right)$ satisfy the nondegeneracy condition (2.1).

Then there exists $\varepsilon_{0}>0$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{0}\right)$ problem (1.1), (1.2) has a unique global solution

$$
u_{\varepsilon} \in C^{2}([0,+\infty) ; H) \cap C^{1}\left([0,+\infty) ; D\left(A^{1 / 2}\right)\right) \cap C^{0}([0,+\infty) ; D(A)) .
$$

We recall also that there is a wide literature on the nondissipative case: the interested reader is referred to the surveys [1] and [23], or to the most recent papers [10,12].

### 2.2. The hyperbolic problem: Decay estimates

A lot of papers have been devoted to decay estimates for dissipative Kirchhoff equations. Comparing such results is a hard task because of the different settings (abstract or concrete equation, with or without forcing terms), of the different approaches (either $\varepsilon=1$ and small data, or fixed data and small $\varepsilon$ ), of the different quantities considered ( $u_{\varepsilon}, A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}, A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$, $A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime}$ ), and of the different assumptions on $m$ (degenerate or nondegenerate), $A$ (coercive or noncoercive), $u_{0}, u_{1}$ (more or less regular). For this reason in this section we do not quote the results exactly as they are stated in the appropriate papers, but we always rephrase them in the setting of Theorem 2.2.

We also neglect decay estimates on $u_{\varepsilon}$ because in the coercive case they can be easily deduced from estimates on $A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}$, while in the noncoercive case there is no reason for $u_{\varepsilon}(t)$ to tend to 0 , even for a linear equation (when $m$ is a positive constant).

### 2.2.1. Decay estimates for coercive operators

The nondegenerate case was considered by M. Hosoya and Y. Yamada [11] (see also [4,16]).
The degenerate case with $m(\sigma)=\sigma^{\gamma}(\gamma \geqslant 1)$ was considered by K. Nishihara and Y. Yamada [18].

Later on, better estimates have been obtained by T. Mizumachi [14] and K. Ono [19] in the special case $\gamma=1$. Indeed their decay rates for $A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}$ and $u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$ improve those obtained by setting $\gamma=1$ in the corresponding estimates of [18].

All these results are summed up in the left column of Table 1.
The case of a general nonlinearity $m(\sigma) \geqslant 0$ was considered by the authors in [6]. When $m(\sigma)>0$ for every $\sigma>0$ they proved that $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right| \rightarrow 0$ and $\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right| \rightarrow 0$, without estimates of the decay rate.

In this paper we provide such estimates in terms of $m$. Our results, when applied to the particular choices of $m$ considered in the literature, improve most of the known estimates. In particular we always obtain lower bounds for $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$ and $\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$, our estimates on $\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}$ are $\varepsilon$-independent, and we have better exponents in the case $m(\sigma)=\sigma^{\gamma}$ (note that our estimates for $m(\sigma)=\sigma$ are just the case $\gamma=1$ in our estimates for $\left.m(\sigma)=\sigma^{\gamma}\right)$.

### 2.2.2. Decay estimates for noncoercive operators

The nondegenerate case was considered by Y. Yamada [24], then by K. Ono [21], and finally in the recent paper by H. Hashimoto and T. Yamazaki [9], where the $\varepsilon$-independent estimate on $u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$ is proved.

The case $m(\sigma)=\sigma^{\gamma}$ was considered by K. Ono [22]. Finally, better estimates were obtained by T. Mizumachi [15] and K. Ono [20] in the special case $\gamma=1$.

Table 1
Decay estimates in the coercive case

|  | Literature | Present paper |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ | $\left\|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\|^{2} \leqslant c_{2} e^{-\alpha_{2} t}$ | $c_{1} e^{-\alpha_{1} t} \leqslant\left\|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\|^{2} \leqslant c_{2} e^{-\alpha_{2} t}$ |
| ミ | $\left\|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\|^{2} \leqslant c_{2} e^{-\alpha_{2} t}$ | $c_{1} e^{-\alpha_{1} t} \leqslant\left\|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\|^{2} \leqslant c_{2} e^{-\alpha_{2} t}$ |
| $\stackrel{\text { b }}{\text { ® }}$ | $\varepsilon\left\|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2} \leqslant c e^{-\alpha t}$ | $\left\|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right\|^{2} \leqslant c e^{-\alpha t}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{6} \\ & \\| \\ & \frac{1}{6} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{(1+t)^{1 / \gamma}}$ | $\frac{c_{1}}{(1+t)^{1 / \gamma}} \leqslant\left\|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{(1+t)^{1 / \gamma}}$ |
|  | $\left\|A u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant c$ | $\frac{c_{1}}{(1+t)^{1 / \gamma}} \leqslant\left\|A u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{(1+t)^{1 / \gamma}}$ |
|  | $\varepsilon\left\|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{(1+t)^{1+1 / \gamma}}$ | $\left\|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{(1+t)^{2+1 / \gamma}}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { b } \\ & \stackrel{\ddots}{6} \\ & \equiv \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{c_{1}}{1+t} \leqslant\left\|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{1+t}$ | $\frac{c_{1}}{1+t} \leqslant\left\|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{1+t}$ |
|  | $\frac{c_{1}}{1+t} \leqslant\left\|A u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{1+t}$ | $\frac{c_{1}}{1+t} \leqslant\left\|A u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{1+t}$ |
|  | $\varepsilon\left\|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{(1+t)^{3}}$ | $\left\|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{(1+t)^{3}}$ |

Table 2
Decay estimates for noncoercive operators

|  | Literature | Present paper |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\wedge}{\wedge}$ | $\left\|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{1+t}$ | $c_{1} e^{-\alpha_{1} t} \leqslant\left\|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{1+t}$ |
| ミ | $\left\|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{(1+t)^{2}}$ | $\left\|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{(1+t)^{2}}$ |
| $\stackrel{\text { b }}{\text { B }}$ | $\left\|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{(1+t)^{2}}$ | $\left\|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{(1+t)^{2}}$ |
| b$\stackrel{1}{11}$$\stackrel{6}{6}$® | $\left\|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{(1+t)^{1 /(\gamma+1)}}$ | $\frac{c_{1}}{(1+t)^{1 / \gamma}} \leqslant\left\|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{(1+t)^{1 /(\gamma+1)}}$ |
|  | $\left\|A u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant c$ | $\left\|A u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{(1+t)^{1 / \gamma}}$ |
|  | $\varepsilon\left\|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{1+t}$ | $\left\|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{(1+t)^{1+\left(\gamma^{2}+1\right) /\left(\gamma^{2}+\gamma\right)}}$ |
| $\stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{\circ}{6}}$ | $\frac{c_{1}}{(1+t)^{\alpha / \varepsilon}} \leqslant\left\|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{\sqrt{1+t}}$ | $\frac{c_{1}}{1+t} \leqslant\left\|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{\sqrt{1+t}}$ |
|  | $\left\|A u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{1+t}$ | $\left\|A u_{\varepsilon}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{1+t}$ |
|  | $\varepsilon\left\|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{(1+t)^{2}}$ | $\left\|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c}{(1+t)^{2}}$ |

All these results are stated in the left column of Table 2.
In this paper, with different techniques, we obtain decay estimates in the case of a general nonlinearity $m(\sigma) \geqslant 0$. When applied with special choices of $m$, we re-obtain or improve the
results found in the literature. In particular we always have a lower bound for $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$, our estimate on $\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}$ is $\varepsilon$-independent, and we get better decay rates in the case $m(\sigma)=\sigma^{\gamma}$.

## 3. Statements

### 3.1. Notations and preliminaries

Throughout this paper we assume that $m:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow[0,+\infty)$ is a function of class $C^{1}$. We set $\sigma_{0}:=\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}$, and $\mu_{0}:=m\left(\sigma_{0}\right)$. Since we consider mildly degenerate equations we always have that $\mu_{0} \neq 0$. Let

$$
\sigma_{1}:=\sup \left\{\sigma \in\left[0, \sigma_{0}\right]: \sigma \cdot m(\sigma)=0\right\} .
$$

In a few words, $\sigma_{1}$ is either 0 or the largest $\sigma<\sigma_{0}$ such that $m(\sigma)=0$. Let us choose $\sigma_{2}>\sigma_{0}$ in such a way that $m(\sigma)>0$ for every $\sigma \in\left(\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right]$. We set

$$
\mu_{1}:=\min _{\sigma \in\left[\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right]} m(\sigma), \quad \mu_{2}:=\max _{\sigma \in\left[\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right]} m(\sigma),
$$

and we denote by $L$ the Lipschitz constant of $m$ in $\left[\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right]$. We finally set

$$
c(t):=m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}\right), \quad c_{\varepsilon}(t):=m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}\right)
$$

The following result contains the fundamental $\varepsilon$-independent estimates on the solutions of (1.1), (1.2).

Proposition 3.1. Let $A, m, u_{0}, u_{1}, \varepsilon_{0}$ be as in Theorem 2.2.
Then there exist $\delta_{1}>0$ and $\varepsilon_{1} \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{0}\right]$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{1}\right)$ the unique global solution of (1.1), (1.2) satisfies the following estimates:

$$
\begin{gather*}
\sigma_{1} \leqslant\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2} \quad \text { and } \quad \varepsilon \frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)}+\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant \sigma_{2} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0  \tag{3.1}\\
\mu_{1} \leqslant c_{\varepsilon}(t) \leqslant \mu_{2} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0,  \tag{3.2}\\
c_{\varepsilon}(t) \neq 0 \quad \text { and }\left|\frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)}\right| \leqslant \delta_{1} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 . \tag{3.3}
\end{gather*}
$$

The proof of Proposition 3.1 involves a careful examination of the main step of the proof of the existence Theorem 2.2, and heavily depends on the particular form of the nonlinearity. In Proposition 3.10 below we state more $\varepsilon$-independent estimates on the solutions of (1.1), (1.2), but in that case all of them hold true more generally for solutions of the linear equation obtained from (1.1) by replacing $m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}\right)$ with any function $c_{\varepsilon}(t)$ satisfying (3.2) and (3.3).

We point out that (3.1) means in particular that we are interested in the behavior of $m(\sigma)$ only for $\sigma \in\left[\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right]$ : in particular we can say that Eq. (1.1) is nondegenerate if and only if $\mu_{1}>0$, which in turn is true if and only if $\sigma_{1}=0$ and $m(0)>0$.

The function $\psi$. There exists a function $\psi \in C^{1}\left(\left[\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right]\right)$ such that

$$
\begin{align*}
& 0<\psi(\sigma) \leqslant \sigma m(\sigma) \quad \forall \sigma \in\left(\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right]  \tag{3.4}\\
& \psi(\sigma) \text { is strictly increasing in }\left[\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right] . \tag{3.5}
\end{align*}
$$

Indeed we can set $\psi(\sigma)=\sigma m(\sigma)$ whenever $\sigma m(\sigma)$ is strictly increasing. When this is not the case $\psi(\sigma)$ is any positive (for $\sigma>\sigma_{1}$ ) strictly increasing function less or equal than $\sigma m(\sigma)$. For example, in the nondegenerate case $\left(\mu_{1}>0\right)$ we can take $\psi(\sigma)=\mu_{1} \sigma$, in the case $m(\sigma)=\sigma^{\gamma}$ we can take $\psi(\sigma)=\sigma^{\gamma+1}$.

A Cauchy problem. We consider the Cauchy problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime}=-2 y m(y), \quad y(0)=\sigma_{0} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $\sigma_{0} m\left(\sigma_{0}\right)=0$ the solution $y(t)$ is constant. If $\sigma_{0} m\left(\sigma_{0}\right) \neq 0$, which corresponds to the strong nondegeneracy condition (2.2), there exists $t_{0}>0$ and a unique decreasing function $y:\left(-t_{0},+\infty\right) \rightarrow\left(\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right)$ satisfying (3.6). Moreover $y(t) \rightarrow \sigma_{1}$ as $t \rightarrow+\infty$.

The heuristic reason for considering this Cauchy problem is the following. Let us assume that $H=\mathbb{R}$ and $A$ is the identity operator, and let $u(t)$ be the solution of the first order problem (1.4), (1.5). Then $y(t):=\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}=|u(t)|^{2}$ solves (3.6), and therefore in this trivial case $y(t)$ is by definition the best estimate on the decay rate of $\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}$. In statement (3) of Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.6 we show that $y(t)$ gives the decay rate of solution both for the first order and for the second order problem, even for general nonnegative operators.

### 3.2. Decay estimates for the parabolic equation

If $A^{1 / 2} u_{0}=0$ or $m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}\right)=0$ the solution of (1.4), (1.5) is constant. Therefore in the parabolic case we can always assume (2.2) without loss of generality.

Theorem 3.2. Let $A$ be a nonnegative operator, and let $m \in C^{1}([0,+\infty),[0,+\infty))$. Let us assume that $u_{0} \in D(A)$ satisfies the strong nondegeneracy condition (2.2).

Then we have the following estimates.
(1) If $\psi \in C^{1}\left(\left[\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right]\right)$ satisfies (3.4) and (3.5) then

$$
\begin{equation*}
t \cdot \psi\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}\right) \leqslant \frac{\left|u_{0}\right|^{2}}{2} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

(2) We have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|A u(t)|^{2} \leqslant \frac{\left|A u_{0}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}} \cdot\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

(3) Let $y:\left(-t_{0},+\infty\right) \rightarrow\left(\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right)$ be the solution of the Cauchy problem (3.6). Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2} \geqslant y\left(\frac{\left|A u_{0}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}} t\right) \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

If moreover $A$ is coercive with constant $v>0$ then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant y(v t) \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 . \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

(4) If $\mu_{1}>0$ then

$$
\begin{equation*}
t^{2} \cdot|A u(t)|^{2} \leqslant \frac{\left|u_{0}\right|^{2}}{2 \mu_{1}^{2}} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

(5) Let $\phi:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow[0,+\infty)$ be defined by

$$
\phi(t):=\int_{0}^{t} \frac{m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u(s)\right|^{2}\right)}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u(s)\right|^{2}} d s \quad \forall t \geqslant 0
$$

Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi(t) \cdot|A u(t)|^{2} \leqslant \frac{1}{2} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 . \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 3.3. Let us make a few comments on the estimates provided by Theorem 3.2.

- Estimates on $\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|$. A lower bound is given by (3.9), and two upper bounds are given by (3.7) and (3.10). The second one is in general better, but it requires the coerciveness of the operator. In conclusion:
- if $A$ is coercive we have upper and lower bounds with the same decay rate given by (3.10) and (3.9);
- if $A$ is noncoercive we have an upper bound given by (3.7) and a (generally worse) lower bound given by (3.9).
- Estimates on $|A u|$. We have three types of estimates for $|A u(t)|$.
- Let us assume that $A$ is coercive. Using the coerciveness and (3.8) we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant|A u(t)|^{2} \leqslant \frac{\left|A u_{0}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}}\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}, \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

which allows to obtain upper and lower bounds for $|A u(t)|^{2}$ from the corresponding bounds for $\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}$. If the bounds on $\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}$ are optimal, then also the bounds on $|A u(t)|^{2}$ are optimal.

- If $A$ is noncoercive the estimate from above on $|A u|$ coming from (3.7) and (3.8) is not optimal. Better estimates are indeed provided by (3.11) in the nondegenerate case, and by (3.12) in the general case.

In the noncoercive case we do not have estimates for $|A u(t)|$ from below.

- Estimates on $\left|u^{\prime}\right|$. Due to (1.4) they can be easily derived from the estimates on $\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|$ and $|A u(t)|$.

Corollary 3.4. Let $A$ be a nonnegative operator, let $u_{0} \in D(A)$ with $A^{1 / 2} u_{0} \neq 0$. Let us assume that Eq. (1.4) is nondegenerate $\left(\mu_{1}>0\right)$.

- If $A$ is coercive there exist positive constants $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, c_{1}, c_{2}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{1} e^{-\alpha_{1} t} \leqslant\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}+|A u(t)|^{2}+\left|u^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant c_{2} e^{-\alpha_{2} t} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 . \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

- If $A$ is noncoercive there exist positive constants $\alpha_{1}, c_{1}, c_{2}, c_{3}$ such that

$$
\begin{align*}
& c_{1} e^{-\alpha_{1} t} \leqslant\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{1+t} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0,  \tag{3.15}\\
& \left|u^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}+|A u(t)|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{3}}{(1+t)^{2}} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 . \tag{3.16}
\end{align*}
$$

Corollary 3.5. Let $A$ be a nonnegative operator, let $m(\sigma)=\sigma^{\gamma}$ with $\gamma \geqslant 1$, and let $u_{0} \in D(A)$ with $A^{1 / 2} u_{0} \neq 0$.

- If $A$ is coercive there exist positive constants $c_{1}, \ldots, c_{4}$ such that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{c_{1}}{(1+t)^{1 / \gamma}} \leqslant\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}+|A u(t)|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{(1+t)^{1 / \gamma}} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0,  \tag{3.17}\\
\frac{c_{3}}{(1+t)^{2+1 / \gamma}} \leqslant\left|u^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{4}}{(1+t)^{2+1 / \gamma}} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 . \tag{3.18}
\end{gather*}
$$

- If $A$ is noncoercive there exist positive constants $c_{1}, \ldots, c_{4}$ such that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{c_{1}}{(1+t)^{1 / \gamma}} \leqslant\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{2}}{(1+t)^{1 /(\gamma+1)}} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0,  \tag{3.19}\\
|A u(t)|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{3}}{(1+t)^{1 / \gamma}} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0,  \tag{3.20}\\
\left|u^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant \frac{c_{4}}{(1+t)^{1+\left(\gamma^{2}+1\right) /\left(\gamma^{2}+\gamma\right)}} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 . \tag{3.21}
\end{gather*}
$$

### 3.3. Decay estimates for the hyperbolic equation

The following result is the hyperbolic counterpart of Theorem 3.2.
Theorem 3.6. Let $A$ be a nonnegative operator, and let $m \in C^{1}([0,+\infty),[0,+\infty))$. Let us assume that $\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right) \in D(A) \times D\left(A^{1 / 2}\right)$ satisfy the nondegeneracy condition (2.1).

Then there exist $\varepsilon_{\star}>0$, and positive constants $k_{1}, \ldots, k_{10}$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{\star}\right)$ we have the following estimates.
(1) If $\psi \in C^{1}\left(\left[\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right]\right)$ satisfies (3.4) and (3.5), then

$$
\begin{equation*}
t \cdot \psi\left(\varepsilon \frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)}+\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}\right) \leqslant \frac{\left|u_{0}\right|^{2}}{2}+k_{1} \varepsilon \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 \tag{3.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

(2) Let us assume that $u_{0}$ satisfies (2.2). Then

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant\left[\frac{\left|A u_{0}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}}+\varepsilon k_{2}\right] \cdot\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0  \tag{3.23}\\
\frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}^{2}(t)} \leqslant k_{3}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 \tag{3.24}
\end{gather*}
$$

(3) Let us assume that $u_{0}$ satisfies (2.2), and let $y:\left(-t_{0},+\infty\right) \rightarrow\left(\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right)$ be the solution of the Cauchy problem (3.6). Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2} \geqslant y\left(\left(\frac{\left|A u_{0}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}}+k_{4} \varepsilon\right) t+k_{5} \varepsilon\right) \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 . \tag{3.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

If moreover $A$ is coercive with constant $v>0$ then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant y\left(\left(v-k_{6} \varepsilon\right) t-k_{5} \varepsilon\right) \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 \tag{3.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

(4) If $\mu_{1}>0$ then

$$
\begin{gather*}
t^{2} \cdot\left(\varepsilon \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)}+\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}\right) \leqslant \frac{\left|u_{0}\right|^{2}}{2 \mu_{1}^{2}}+k_{7} \varepsilon \quad \forall t \geqslant 0,  \tag{3.27}\\
t^{2} \cdot\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant \mu_{2}^{2} \frac{\left|u_{0}\right|^{2}}{2 \mu_{1}^{2}}+k_{8} \varepsilon \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 . \tag{3.28}
\end{gather*}
$$

(5) Let us assume that $u_{0}$ satisfies (2.2), and let $\phi_{\varepsilon}:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow[0,+\infty)$ be defined by

$$
\phi_{\varepsilon}(t):=\int_{0}^{t} \frac{m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2}\right)}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2}} d s \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 .
$$

Then

$$
\begin{gather*}
\phi_{\varepsilon}(t) \cdot\left(\varepsilon \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)}+\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{2}+k_{9} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0,  \tag{3.29}\\
\phi_{\varepsilon}(t) \cdot \frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}^{2}(t)} \leqslant k_{10} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 . \tag{3.30}
\end{gather*}
$$

We remark that setting formally $\varepsilon=0$ in (3.22), (3.23), (3.25), (3.26), (3.27), (3.29) we obtain the corresponding estimates of Theorem 3.2. Also the comments contained in Remark 3.3 can be easily transposed to the hyperbolic setting.

Corollary 3.7. Let $A$ be a nonnegative operator, and let $\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right) \in D(A) \times D\left(A^{1 / 2}\right)$. Let us assume that Eq. (1.1) is nondegenerate ( $\mu_{1}>0$ ).

- If $A$ is coercive and $A^{1 / 2} u_{0} \neq 0$, then for every small enough $\varepsilon$ the solution $u_{\varepsilon}$ of (1.1), (1.2) satisfies all the estimates quoted in the appropriate section of Table 1.
- If $A$ is noncoercive, then for every small enough $\varepsilon$ the solution $u_{\varepsilon}$ of (1.1), (1.2) satisfies all the estimates quoted in the appropriate section of Table 2 (the estimate from below for $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$ requires that $A^{1 / 2} u_{0} \neq 0$ ).

In both cases $\varepsilon\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}$ decays as $\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}$.
Corollary 3.8. Let $A$ be a nonnegative operator, let $m(\sigma)=\sigma^{\gamma}$, and let $\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right) \in D(A) \times$ $D\left(A^{1 / 2}\right)$ with $A^{1 / 2} u_{0} \neq 0$.

Then for every small enough $\varepsilon$ the solution $u_{\varepsilon}$ of (1.1), (1.2) satisfies all the estimates quoted in the appropriate section of Table 1 (if A is coercive) or Table 2 (if A is noncoercive).

As for $\varepsilon\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}$ we have that $\varepsilon\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant c(1+t)^{-1-1 / \gamma}$ in the coercive case, and $\varepsilon\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant c(1+t)^{-1-1 /\left(\gamma^{2}+\gamma\right)}$ in the noncoercive case.

Corollary 3.9. Let A be a nonnegative operator, let $m:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow[0,+\infty)$ be a function of class $C^{1}$ such that $m(\sigma)=0$ if and only if $\sigma=0$, and let $\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right) \in D(A) \times D\left(A^{1 / 2}\right)$ with $A^{1 / 2} u_{0} \neq 0$.

Then there exists a function $\varphi:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow(0,+\infty)$ such that

- $\varphi(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow+\infty$;
- for every small enough $\varepsilon$ the solution $u_{\varepsilon}$ of (1.1), (1.2) satisfies

$$
\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}+\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}+\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}+\varepsilon\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant \varphi(t) \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 .
$$

### 3.4. Energy estimates

Our proofs rely on suitable energy estimates. In the parabolic case they follow from the monotonicity of the classical quantities

$$
E_{k}(t):=\left|A^{k / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}, \quad P(t):=\frac{|A u(t)|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}}
$$

There are several ways to adapt these energies to the hyperbolic setting. We consider three extensions of $E_{k}(t)$ (we actually need only the cases $k=0$ and $k=1$ )

$$
\begin{align*}
D_{\varepsilon, k} & :=\frac{\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}{2}+\varepsilon\left\langle A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}, A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle  \tag{3.31}\\
E_{\varepsilon, k} & :=\varepsilon \frac{\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}}+\left|A^{(k+1) / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}  \tag{3.32}\\
G_{\varepsilon} & :=\frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}^{2}} \tag{3.33}
\end{align*}
$$

and the following three extensions of $P(t)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{\varepsilon}:=\frac{\varepsilon}{c_{\varepsilon}} \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}-\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{4}}+\frac{\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}, \tag{3.34}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
Q_{\varepsilon} & :=\frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}^{2}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}  \tag{3.35}\\
R_{\varepsilon} & :=\varepsilon \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}+\frac{\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} . \tag{3.36}
\end{align*}
$$

We point out that the first summand in the definition of $P_{\varepsilon}$ is nonnegative by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. As far as we know, $D_{\varepsilon, k}$ and $E_{\varepsilon, k}$ have been largely used in the literature, $G_{\varepsilon}$ appeared in [6], $P_{\varepsilon}$ and $Q_{\varepsilon}$ where introduced in [5], and $R_{\varepsilon}$ seems to be new. Most of the first order energies used in literature in the particular cases $m(\sigma)=\sigma$ or $m(\sigma)=\sigma^{\gamma}$ are special instances of those defined above.

The following result contains the estimates we need on these energies. We state them in the setting of linear equations.

Proposition 3.10. Let $A$ be a nonnegative operator, let $\left(u_{0}, u_{1}\right) \in D(A) \times D\left(A^{1 / 2}\right)$, and let $\varepsilon_{0}>0$. For every $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{0}\right)$ let $c_{\varepsilon}:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow[0,+\infty)$. Let us assume that (3.2) and (3.3) are satisfied for every $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{0}\right)$ for suitable nonnegative constants $\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}, \delta_{1}$. Let $u_{\varepsilon}$ be the solution of the linear problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime}(t)+u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)+c_{\varepsilon}(t) A u_{\varepsilon}(t)=0 \quad \forall t \geqslant 0, \tag{3.37}
\end{equation*}
$$

with initial data (1.2). Then we have the following estimates.
(1) Let us define $D_{\varepsilon, k}, E_{\varepsilon, k}$ (for $k \in\{0,1\}$ ), and $G_{\varepsilon}$ according to (3.31), (3.32), (3.33). Then there exists $\varepsilon_{1} \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{0}\right]$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{1}\right)$ we have that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}}{4}+\int_{0}^{t} c_{\varepsilon}(s)\left|A^{(k+1) / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2} d s \leqslant D_{\varepsilon, k}(0)+2 \varepsilon \mu_{2} E_{\varepsilon, k}(0) \quad \forall t \geqslant 0  \tag{3.38}\\
E_{\varepsilon, k}(t)+\int_{0}^{t} \frac{\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(s)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(s)} d s \leqslant E_{\varepsilon, k}(0) \quad \forall t \geqslant 0  \tag{3.39}\\
G_{\varepsilon}(t) \leqslant \max \left\{G_{\varepsilon}(0), 4 E_{\varepsilon, 1}(0)\right\} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 \tag{3.40}
\end{gather*}
$$

(2) Let us assume in addition that $A^{1 / 2} u_{0} \neq 0$. Then there exist $\varepsilon_{2} \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{1}\right]$ and $\delta_{2}>0$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{2}\right)$ we have that

$$
\begin{gather*}
A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t) \neq 0 \quad \forall t \geqslant 0,  \tag{3.41}\\
\frac{\left|\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}(t), u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right|}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}} \leqslant \delta_{2} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 . \tag{3.42}
\end{gather*}
$$

In particular the functions $P_{\varepsilon}(t), Q_{\varepsilon}(t), R_{\varepsilon}(t)$ introduced in (3.34), (3.35), (3.36) are well defined. Moreover for every $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{2}\right)$ they satisfy the following estimates

$$
\begin{gather*}
P_{\varepsilon}(t) \leqslant P_{\varepsilon}(0) \quad \forall t \geqslant 0,  \tag{3.43}\\
Q_{\varepsilon}(t) \leqslant \max \left\{Q_{\varepsilon}(0), 4 P_{\varepsilon}(0)\right\} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0,  \tag{3.44}\\
R_{\varepsilon}(t)+\int_{0}^{t} \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(s)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(s)\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2}} d s \leqslant R_{\varepsilon}(0)+2 \delta_{2} P_{\varepsilon}(0) t \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 . \tag{3.45}
\end{gather*}
$$

## 4. Proofs

### 4.1. ODE lemmata

The following comparison result has already been used in [6].
Lemma 4.1. Let $T>0$, and let $f \in C^{0}([0, T]) \cap C^{1}([0, T))$. Let us assume that $f(t) \geqslant 0$ in $[0, T)$, and that there exist two constants $c_{1}>0, c_{2} \geqslant 0$ such that

$$
f^{\prime}(t) \leqslant-\sqrt{f(t)}\left(c_{1} \sqrt{f(t)}-c_{2}\right) \quad \forall t \in[0, T)
$$

Then we have that $f(t) \leqslant \max \left\{f(0),\left(c_{2} / c_{1}\right)^{2}\right\}$ for every $t \in[0, T]$.
Lemma 4.2. Let $t_{0}>0$, let $y:\left(-t_{0},+\infty\right) \rightarrow\left(\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right)$ be the solution of Cauchy problem (3.6), and let $w:[0,+\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function of class $C^{1}$ with $w(0)=\sigma_{0}$.

Let $f \in C^{0}([0,+\infty))$, and let us assume that there exist constants $c_{1} \geqslant 0$ and $c_{2} \in\left[0, t_{0}\right)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\int_{0}^{t} f(s) d s\right| \leqslant c_{1} t+c_{2} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then for every $\alpha \geqslant c_{1}$ we have the following implications.
(1) If $w$ satisfies the differential inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
w^{\prime}(t) \leqslant 2 w(t) m(w(t))\{-\alpha+f(t)\} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0, \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

then we have the following estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
w(t) \leqslant y\left(\left(\alpha-c_{1}\right) t-c_{2}\right) \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 . \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

(2) If $w$ satisfies the differential inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
w^{\prime}(t) \geqslant 2 w(t) m(w(t))\{-\alpha+f(t)\} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

then we have the following estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
w(t) \geqslant y\left(\left(\alpha+c_{1}\right) t+c_{2}\right) \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. For every $t \geqslant 0$ let us set

$$
F(t):=\int_{0}^{t} f(s) d s, \quad z(t):=y(\alpha t-F(t))
$$

We point out that $z(t)$ is well defined because our assumptions on $c_{1}$ and $c_{2}$ imply that

$$
\alpha t-F(t) \geqslant\left(\alpha-c_{1}\right) t-c_{2} \geqslant-c_{2}>-t_{0} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0
$$

Moreover $z(t)$ is a solution of the differential equation $z^{\prime}=2 z m(z)\{-\alpha+f(t)\}$, while assumption (4.2) is equivalent to say that $w(t)$ is a subsolution of the same equation. Since $w(0)=z(0)$, the standard comparison principle implies that

$$
w(t) \leqslant z(t)=y(\alpha t-F(t)) \leqslant y\left(\alpha t-c_{1} t-c_{2}\right)
$$

where in the last inequality we exploited assumption (4.1) and the fact that $y(t)$ is a decreasing function. This proves that (4.2) implies (4.3).

Under assumption (4.4) $w(t)$ is a supersolution of the same equation, hence

$$
w(t) \geqslant z(t)=y(\alpha t-F(t)) \geqslant y\left(\alpha t+c_{1} t+c_{2}\right)
$$

which implies (4.5).

### 4.2. Proof of Theorem 3.2 and corollaries

Statement (1). Since $\psi^{\prime} \geqslant 0$ we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d t}\left[t \psi\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}\right)\right] & =\psi\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}\right)-2 t \psi^{\prime}\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}\right) c(t)|A u|^{2} \\
& \leqslant \psi\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}\right) \leqslant m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}\right)\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}=-\frac{d}{d t}\left[\frac{1}{2}|u|^{2}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Integrating in $[0, t]$ we obtain (3.7).
Statement (2). By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|A u|^{4}=\left(\left\langle A^{3 / 2} u, A^{1 / 2} u\right\rangle\right)^{2} \leqslant\left|A^{3 / 2} u\right|^{2}\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2} \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

hence

$$
\frac{d}{d t}\left[\frac{|A u|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}}\right]=-2 \frac{c(t)}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{4}}\left(\left|A^{3 / 2} u\right|^{2}\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}-|A u|^{4}\right) \leqslant 0
$$

and therefore

$$
\frac{|A u(t)|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}} \leqslant \frac{\left|A u_{0}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0
$$

which is equivalent to (3.8).

Statement (3). Let us consider the function $w(t):=\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}$. Computing the time derivative and using (3.8) we have that

$$
w^{\prime}=-2 m(w) \frac{|A u|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}}\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2} \geqslant-2 w \cdot m(w) \frac{\left|A u_{0}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}}
$$

Applying the second statement of Lemma 4.2 with $\alpha=\left|A u_{0}\right|^{2}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{-2}$ and $f=0$ we obtain (3.9).

If the operator is coercive with constant $v$, then

$$
w^{\prime}=-2 m(w) \frac{|A u|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}}\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2} \leqslant-2 v w \cdot m(w)
$$

Therefore (3.10) follows from statement (1) of Lemma 4.2 (with $\alpha=v$ and $f=0$ ).

Statement (4). We have that

$$
\frac{d}{d t}\left[t\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}\right]+2 t c(t)|A u|^{2}=\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2} \leqslant \frac{1}{\mu_{1}} c(t)\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}=-\frac{1}{2 \mu_{1}} \frac{d}{d t}|u|^{2},
$$

hence

$$
t\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}+2 \int_{0}^{t} s \cdot c(s)|A u(s)|^{2} d s \leqslant \frac{1}{2 \mu_{1}}\left|u_{0}\right|^{2} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0,
$$

and therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 \int_{0}^{t} s|A u(s)|^{2} d s \leqslant \frac{2}{\mu_{1}} \int_{0}^{t} s \cdot c(s)|A u(s)|^{2} d s \leqslant \frac{1}{2 \mu_{1}^{2}}\left|u_{0}\right|^{2} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 . \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since

$$
\frac{d}{d t}\left[t^{2}|A u|^{2}\right]=2 t|A u|^{2}-2 t^{2} c(t)\left|A^{3 / 2} u\right|^{2} \leqslant 2 t|A u|^{2}
$$

integrating in $[0, t]$ and using (4.7) we obtain that

$$
t^{2}|A u(t)|^{2} \leqslant 2 \int_{0}^{t} s|A u(s)|^{2} d s \leqslant \frac{1}{2 \mu_{1}^{2}}\left|u_{0}\right|^{2} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0
$$

which is (3.11).

Statement (5). By (4.6) we have that

$$
\frac{d}{d t}\left[\frac{1}{|A u|^{2}}\right]=\frac{2 c(t)\left|A^{3 / 2} u\right|^{2}}{|A u|^{4}}=2 \frac{c(t)}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}} \frac{\left|A^{3 / 2} u\right|^{2}\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}}{|A u|^{4}} \geqslant 2 \frac{c(t)}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}}=2 \phi^{\prime}(t)
$$

Integrating in $[0, t]$ we obtain that

$$
2 \phi(t) \leqslant \frac{1}{|A u(t)|^{2}}-\frac{1}{\left|A u_{0}\right|^{2}} \leqslant \frac{1}{|A u(t)|^{2}} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0
$$

which is equivalent to (3.12).

Proof of Corollary 3.4. By (1.4) we easily obtain that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu_{1}|A u(t)| \leqslant\left|u^{\prime}(t)\right| \leqslant \mu_{2}|A u(t)| . \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the nondegenerate case we have that $\mu_{1}>0$ and therefore any lower or upper bound on $|A u|$ yields a similar lower or upper bound on $\left|u^{\prime}\right|$.

Let us assume now that $A$ is coercive, hence (3.13) is satisfied. By (4.8) and (3.13) we have that any upper or lower bound for $\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}$ yields the same upper or lower bound for $|A u(t)|^{2}$ and $\left|u^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}$. In order to estimate $\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}$ we apply (3.9) and (3.10). In the nondegenerate case the solution $y(t)$ of (3.6) satisfies $\sigma_{0} e^{-\mu_{2} t} \leqslant y(t) \leqslant \sigma_{0} e^{-\mu_{1} t}$, which proves (3.14).

Let us assume now that $A$ is noncoercive. The exponential lower bound on $\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}$ follows from (3.9) as in the coercive case. In order to obtain an upper bound for $\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}$ we have to use (3.7). Since in this case we can take $\psi(\sigma)=\mu_{1} \sigma$ we obtain that $\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant c t^{-1}$. Since of course $\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}$, up to changing the constant we have (3.15).

As for $|A u|$ (hence also for $\left.\left|u^{\prime}\right|\right)$, (3.11) gives $|A u(t)|^{2} \leqslant c t^{-2}$. Since of course we have also that $|A u(t)| \leqslant\left|A u_{0}\right|$, up to changing the constant we obtain (3.16).

Proof of Corollary 3.5. Let us assume that $A$ is coercive. Due to (3.13) estimates on $|A u|^{2}$ follow from estimates on $\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}$. In order to obtain such estimates it is enough to apply (3.9) and (3.10). In the case $m(\sigma)=\sigma^{\gamma}$ the solution of the Cauchy problem (3.6) is $y(t)=\sigma_{0}(1+$ $\left.2 \gamma \sigma_{0}^{\gamma} t\right)^{-1 / \gamma}$, from which we obtain (3.17). Since $\left|u^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}=\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{4 \gamma}|A u(t)|^{2}$, (3.18) follows form (3.17).

Let us assume now that $A$ is noncoercive. The lower bound on $\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}$ can be proved as in the coercive case. In order to obtain an upper bound for $\left|A^{1 / 2} u\right|^{2}$ we have to use (3.7). Since in this case we can take $\psi(\sigma)=\sigma^{\gamma+1}$ we obtain that $\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant c t^{-1 /(\gamma+1)}$. Since of course $\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}$, up to changing the constant we have (3.19).

In order to estimate $|A u|^{2}$, let us examine (3.12). Up to constants we have that

$$
\phi^{\prime}(t)=m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2}\right)\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{-2}=\left|A^{1 / 2} u(t)\right|^{2(\gamma-1)} \geqslant c(1+t)^{-1+1 / \gamma},
$$

hence $\phi(t) \geqslant c_{1}(1+t)^{1 / \gamma}-c_{2}$. Since of course $|A u(t)|^{2} \leqslant\left|A u_{0}\right|^{2}$, (3.12) implies (3.20).
As in the coercive case, (3.21) follows from (3.19) and (3.20).

### 4.3. Proof of Propositions 3.1 and 3.10

Derivatives of energies. Let us consider the energies defined in (3.31) through (3.36). With simple computations (well, not so simple in the case of $P_{\varepsilon}$ ) we obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
D_{\varepsilon, k}^{\prime} & =-c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{(k+1) / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}+\varepsilon\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}  \tag{4.9}\\
E_{\varepsilon, k}^{\prime} & =-\left(2+\varepsilon \frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{c_{\varepsilon}}\right) \frac{\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}},  \tag{4.10}\\
G_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} & =-\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\left(1+\varepsilon \frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{c_{\varepsilon}}\right) G_{\varepsilon}-\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \frac{\left\langle u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}, A u_{\varepsilon}\right\rangle}{c_{\varepsilon}},  \tag{4.11}\\
P_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} & =-\left(2+\varepsilon \frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{c_{\varepsilon}}+4 \varepsilon \frac{\left\langle u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}, A u_{\varepsilon}\right\rangle}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}\right) \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}-\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{4}}  \tag{4.12}\\
Q_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} & =-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left(2+2 \varepsilon \frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{c_{\varepsilon}}+2 \varepsilon \frac{\left\langle u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}, A u_{\varepsilon}\right\rangle}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}\right) Q_{\varepsilon}-\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \frac{\left\langle u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}, A u_{\varepsilon}\right\rangle}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}},  \tag{4.13}\\
R_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} & =-\left(2+\varepsilon \frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{c_{\varepsilon}}+2 \varepsilon \frac{\left\langle u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}, A u_{\varepsilon}\right\rangle}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}\right) \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}-2 \frac{\left\langle u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}, A u_{\varepsilon}\right\rangle}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} \frac{\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} . \tag{4.14}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof of Proposition 3.1. We know from Theorem 2.2 that a global solution exists for every $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{0}\right)$. Now let us choose

$$
\delta_{1}>2 L \cdot\left(E_{\varepsilon_{0}, 1}(0) \cdot \max \left\{G_{\varepsilon_{0}}(0), 4 E_{\varepsilon_{0}, 1}(0)\right\}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

and let us choose $\varepsilon_{1}$ in such a way that the following three conditions are satisfied

$$
0<\varepsilon_{1} \leqslant \varepsilon_{0}, \quad 2 \varepsilon_{1} \delta_{1} \leqslant 1, \quad E_{\varepsilon_{1}, 0}(0) \leqslant \sigma_{2}
$$

From now on let $\varepsilon<\varepsilon_{1}$. When $c_{\varepsilon}(t) \neq 0$ we have that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)}\right| & =\left|m^{\prime}\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}\right) \frac{2\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}(t), u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)}\right| \\
& \leqslant 2\left|m^{\prime}\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}\right)\right| \cdot\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right| \cdot \frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)} \\
& \leqslant 2\left|m^{\prime}\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}\right)\right| \cdot\left\{E_{\varepsilon, 1}(t) \cdot G_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\}^{1 / 2} . \tag{4.15}
\end{align*}
$$

By definition of $\delta_{1}$ this expression is less than $\delta_{1}$ for $t=0$. We can therefore define

$$
t_{\varepsilon}:=\sup \left\{\tau>0: c_{\varepsilon}(t)>0 \text { and }\left|\frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)}\right| \leqslant \delta_{1} \forall t \in[0, \tau]\right\} .
$$

We claim that $t_{\varepsilon}=+\infty$. Let us assume by contradiction that $t_{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}$. This means that either $c\left(t_{\varepsilon}\right)=0$ or $\left|c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(t_{\varepsilon}\right) / c_{\varepsilon}\left(t_{\varepsilon}\right)\right|=\delta_{1}$. From $\left|c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t) / c_{\varepsilon}(t)\right| \leqslant \delta_{1}$ we easily deduce that $c_{\varepsilon}(t) \geqslant$ $c_{\varepsilon}(0) e^{-\delta_{1} t}>0$, which rules out the first possibility. In order to rule out the second one we estimate the three factors in (4.15).

- Since $\delta_{1} \varepsilon \leqslant 1 / 2 \leqslant 1$, from (4.10) we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{\varepsilon, k}^{\prime}(t) \leqslant-\frac{\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)} \tag{4.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

in $\left[0, t_{\varepsilon}\right]$, and in particular $E_{\varepsilon, k}(t) \leqslant E_{\varepsilon, k}(0)$ for every $t \in\left[0, t_{\varepsilon}\right]$.

- Using once more that $\delta_{1} \varepsilon \leqslant 1 / 2$, from (4.11) we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \leqslant-\frac{1}{\varepsilon} G_{\varepsilon}+\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right| \frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|}{c_{\varepsilon}} \leqslant-\sqrt{G_{\varepsilon}(t)}\left\{\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{G_{\varepsilon}(t)}-\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{E_{\varepsilon, 1}(0)}\right\} \tag{4.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

and therefore from Lemma 4.1 we deduce that $G_{\varepsilon}(t) \leqslant \max \left\{G_{\varepsilon}(0), 4 E_{\varepsilon, 1}(0)\right\}$ for every $t \in\left[0, t_{\varepsilon}\right]$.

- We prove that (3.1) holds true for every $t \in\left[0, t_{\varepsilon}\right]$, hence in particular $\sigma_{1} \leqslant$ $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\left(t_{\varepsilon}\right)\right|^{2} \leqslant \sigma_{2}$, and therefore $\left|m^{\prime}\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\left(t_{\varepsilon}\right)\right|^{2}\right)\right| \leqslant L$.
Indeed the inequality on the left is trivial if $\sigma_{1}=0$ and follows from the fact that $c_{\varepsilon}(t)>0$ in $\left[0, t_{\varepsilon}\right]$ if $\sigma_{1}>0$. The inequality on the right follows from the estimate $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant$ $E_{\varepsilon, 0}(t) \leqslant E_{\varepsilon_{1}, 0}(0)$ and our assumption that $E_{\varepsilon_{1}, 0}(0) \leqslant \sigma_{2}$.

We have therefore that

$$
\left|\frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(t_{\varepsilon}\right)}{c_{\varepsilon}\left(t_{\varepsilon}\right)}\right| \leqslant 2 L \cdot\left(E_{\varepsilon_{0}, 1}(0) \cdot \max \left\{G_{\varepsilon_{0}}(0), 4 E_{\varepsilon_{0}, 1}(0)\right\}\right)^{1 / 2}<\delta_{1}
$$

which rules out the second possibility and shows that $t_{\varepsilon}=+\infty$.
Now we know that (3.3) holds true for every $t \geqslant 0$, and therefore all the estimates stated in this proof hold true for every $t \geqslant 0$. This proves (3.1). Finally, (3.2) is a simple consequence of (3.1).

Proof of statement (1) of Proposition 3.10. As soon as $\varepsilon \delta_{1} \leqslant 1 / 2$ we have that (4.16) holds true for every $t \geqslant 0$. Integrating in $[0, t]$ we obtain (3.39). Also (4.17) holds true for every $t \geqslant 0$, so that (3.40) follows from Lemma 4.1.

Finally, integrating (4.9) in $[0, t]$ we obtain that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{t} c_{\varepsilon}(s)\left|A^{(k+1) / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right| d s=D_{\varepsilon, k}(0)-D_{\varepsilon, k}(t)+\varepsilon \int_{0}^{t}\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(s)\right|^{2} d s \tag{4.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now let us estimate the last two terms in the right-hand side. By (3.39) we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon \int_{0}^{t}\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(s)\right|^{2} d s \leqslant \varepsilon \mu_{2} \int_{0}^{t} \frac{\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(s)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(s)} d s \leqslant \varepsilon \mu_{2} E_{\varepsilon, k}(0) \tag{4.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover

$$
-D_{\varepsilon, k}(t)=-\frac{\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}}{2}-\varepsilon\left\langle A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t), A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \leqslant-\frac{\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}}{2}+\frac{\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}}{4}+\varepsilon^{2} \frac{\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)} c_{\varepsilon}(t) \\
& \leqslant-\frac{\left|A^{k / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}}{4}+\varepsilon \mu_{2} E_{\varepsilon, k}(0) . \tag{4.20}
\end{align*}
$$

Replacing (4.19) and (4.20) in (4.18) we obtain (3.38).

Proof of statement (2) of Proposition 3.10. Let $\varepsilon_{1}$ be given by statement (1). Let us choose

$$
\delta_{2}>\mu_{2}\left(P_{\varepsilon_{1}}(0) \cdot \max \left\{Q_{\varepsilon_{1}}(0), 4 P_{\varepsilon_{1}}(0)\right\}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

and let us choose $\varepsilon_{2}$ in such a way that

$$
0<\varepsilon_{2} \leqslant \varepsilon_{1}, \quad 2-2 \varepsilon_{2} \delta_{1}-4 \varepsilon_{2} \delta_{2} \geqslant 1 .
$$

For every $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{2}\right)$ let us set for simplicity $d_{\varepsilon}(t):=\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}$. When $d_{\varepsilon}(t) \neq 0$ we have that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\frac{d_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)}{d_{\varepsilon}(t)}\right| & =2\left|\frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}(t), u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}}\right| \\
& \leqslant 2 \frac{\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|} \cdot \frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|} \cdot c_{\varepsilon}(t) \\
& \leqslant 2\left\{P_{\varepsilon}(t) \cdot Q_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\}^{1 / 2} \cdot u_{2} . \tag{4.21}
\end{align*}
$$

It is easy to see that for $t=0$ this is less than $2 \delta_{2}$. We can therefore define

$$
t_{\varepsilon}:=\sup \left\{\tau>0: d_{\varepsilon}(t)>0 \text { and }\left|\frac{d_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)}{d_{\varepsilon}(t)}\right| \leqslant 2 \delta_{2} \forall t \in[0, \tau]\right\} .
$$

We claim that $t_{\varepsilon}=+\infty$. Let us assume by contradiction that $t_{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}$. This means that either $d_{\varepsilon}\left(t_{\varepsilon}\right)=0$ or $\left|d_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(t_{\varepsilon}\right) / d_{\varepsilon}\left(t_{\varepsilon}\right)\right|=2 \delta_{2}$.

From $\left|d_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t) / d_{\varepsilon}(t)\right| \leqslant 2 \delta_{2}$ we easily deduce that $d_{\varepsilon}(t) \geqslant d_{\varepsilon}(0) e^{-2 \delta_{2} t}>0$, which rules out the first possibility.

In order to rule out the second one we estimate the two factors in (4.21).

- Let us consider (4.12). Due to our assumption on $\varepsilon_{2}$ the term in the parentheses is nonnegative. The remaining fraction is nonnegative by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. It follows that $P_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t) \leqslant 0$ for every $t \in\left[0, t_{\varepsilon}\right)$, hence $P_{\varepsilon}(t) \leqslant P_{\varepsilon}(0)$ for every $t \in\left[0, t_{\varepsilon}\right]$.
- Using once more our assumptions on $\varepsilon_{2}$, from (4.13) we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \leqslant-\frac{1}{\varepsilon} Q_{\varepsilon}+\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \frac{\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|} \cdot \frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|} \leqslant-\sqrt{Q_{\varepsilon}}\left\{\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{Q_{\varepsilon}}-\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{P_{\varepsilon}(0)}\right\}, \tag{4.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

and therefore from Lemma 4.1 we deduce that $Q_{\varepsilon}(t) \leqslant \max \left\{Q_{\varepsilon}(0), 4 P_{\varepsilon}(0)\right\}$ for every $t \in\left[0, t_{\varepsilon}\right]$.

Coming back to (4.21) we have that

$$
\left|\frac{d_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left(t_{\varepsilon}\right)}{d_{\varepsilon}\left(t_{\varepsilon}\right)}\right| \leqslant 2 \mu_{2}\left(P_{\varepsilon_{1}}(0) \cdot \max \left\{Q_{\varepsilon_{1}}(0), 4 P_{\varepsilon_{1}}(0)\right\}\right)^{1 / 2}<2 \delta_{2}
$$

This shows that $t_{\varepsilon}=+\infty$ and proves estimates (3.41) and (3.42). At this point we have that $P_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t) \leqslant 0$ for every $t \geqslant 0$, which proves (3.43). Moreover also (4.22) holds true for every $t \geqslant 0$, and so (3.44) follows from Lemma 4.1.

Finally, from (4.14) and our choice of $\varepsilon_{2}$ we deduce that

$$
R_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t) \leqslant-\frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}}-\frac{d_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)}{d_{\varepsilon}(t)} \cdot \frac{\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}} \leqslant-\frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}}+2 \delta_{2} P_{\varepsilon}(0) .
$$

Integrating in $[0, t]$ we obtain (3.45).

### 4.4. Proof of Theorem 3.6

To begin with, let $\varepsilon_{1}$ be as in Proposition 3.1. For every small enough $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{1}\right)$ all the estimates of Proposition 3.10 hold true. Further smallness assumptions are needed in the proof of the five statements. In any case all such assumptions are satisfied for every $\varepsilon$ smaller than a given $\varepsilon_{\star}>0$.

Statement (1). Let us consider the function $\psi\left(E_{\varepsilon, 0}(t)\right)$ which is well defined for every $t \geqslant 0$ because of (3.1). Since $\psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(\sigma) \geqslant 0$ and $E_{\varepsilon, 0}^{\prime}(t) \leqslant 0$ we have that

$$
\frac{d}{d t}\left[t \psi\left(E_{\varepsilon, 0}(t)\right)\right]=\psi\left(E_{\varepsilon, 0}(t)\right)+t \psi^{\prime}\left(E_{\varepsilon, 0}(t)\right) E_{\varepsilon, 0}^{\prime}(t) \leqslant \psi\left(E_{\varepsilon, 0}(t)\right)
$$

and therefore integrating in $[0, t]$ we obtain that

$$
\begin{equation*}
t \psi\left(E_{\varepsilon, 0}(t)\right) \leqslant \int_{0}^{t} \psi\left(E_{\varepsilon, 0}(s)\right) d s \tag{4.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\Lambda$ be the Lipschitz constant of $\psi$ in $\left[\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\right]$. Then

$$
\psi\left(E_{\varepsilon, 0}(t)\right) \leqslant \psi\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}\right)+\Lambda \varepsilon \frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)}
$$

Thus we need to estimate the integral of the summands in the right-hand side. By (3.4) and (3.38) with $k=0$ we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{t} \psi\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}\right) d s \leqslant \int_{0}^{+\infty} m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}\right)\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2} d s \leqslant D_{\varepsilon, 0}(0)+2 \mu_{2} \varepsilon E_{\varepsilon_{1}, 0}(0) \tag{4.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (3.39) with $k=0$ we have that the integral of the second summand is less or equal than $\varepsilon \Lambda E_{\varepsilon_{1}, 0}(0)$. Replacing this estimate and (4.24) in (4.23), and using the definition of $D_{\varepsilon, 0}(0)$, we obtain (3.22).

Statement (2). Since $A^{1 / 2} u_{0} \neq 0$ we can apply inequalities (3.43) and (3.44). We obtain that

$$
\frac{\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}} \leqslant P_{\varepsilon}(t) \leqslant P_{\varepsilon}(0)=: \frac{\left|A u_{0}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}}+k_{2} \varepsilon
$$

and

$$
\frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}^{2}(t)\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}}=Q_{\varepsilon}(t) \leqslant \max \left\{Q_{\varepsilon_{1}}(0), 4 P_{\varepsilon_{1}}(0)\right\}=: k_{3} .
$$

This proves (3.23) and (3.24).
Statement (3). Let us set $w_{\varepsilon}(t):=\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}$. Then

$$
\begin{align*}
w_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} & =2\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle=-2 m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}\right)\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}-2 \varepsilon\left|A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime}\right\rangle \\
& =2 w_{\varepsilon} m\left(w_{\varepsilon}\right)\left\{-\frac{\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}-\varepsilon \frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime}\right\rangle}{m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}\right)\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}\right\} . \tag{4.25}
\end{align*}
$$

Now we plan to use Lemma 4.2. To this end we set for simplicity

$$
f_{\varepsilon}(t):=-\frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}(t), u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime}(t)\right\rangle}{m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}\right)\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}} .
$$

Combining (4.25) and (3.23) we have that $w_{\varepsilon}$ satisfies the differential inequality

$$
w_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \geqslant 2 w_{\varepsilon} m\left(w_{\varepsilon}\right)\left\{-\frac{\left|A u_{0}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}}-k_{2} \varepsilon+\varepsilon f_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\}
$$

If we assume the coerciveness of $A$, then $\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{-2} \geqslant v$, hence $w_{\varepsilon}$ satisfies the differential inequality

$$
w_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \leqslant 2 w_{\varepsilon} m\left(w_{\varepsilon}\right)\left\{-v+\varepsilon f_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\} .
$$

If we prove that there exist constants $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$, independent on $\varepsilon$ and $v$, such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\int_{0}^{t} \frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}(s), u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime}(s)\right\rangle}{m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2}\right)\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2}} d s\right| \leqslant M_{1} t+M_{2} \tag{4.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

then (3.25) and (3.26) follow from Lemma 4.2. Indeed in the first case we apply the lemma with $\alpha=\left|A u_{0}\right|^{2}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{-2}+k_{2} \varepsilon$, and $f=\varepsilon f_{\varepsilon}$, so that $c_{1}=\varepsilon M_{1}, c_{2}=\varepsilon M_{2}$ (the assumptions $c_{2}<t_{0}$ and $\alpha \geqslant c_{1}$ are trivially satisfied provided that $\varepsilon$ is small enough). In the second case we apply the lemma with $\alpha=v$ and once again $f=\varepsilon f_{\varepsilon}$ (the assumptions on $\alpha, c_{1}, c_{2}$ are satisfied as before for every small enough $\varepsilon$ ).

In order to prove (4.26) we consider the identity

$$
\frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime}\right\rangle}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}=\left(\frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}\right)^{\prime}-\frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}+\frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{c_{\varepsilon}} \cdot \frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}+2 \frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{4}} .
$$

Integrating in $[0, t]$ we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\int_{0}^{t} \frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime}\right\rangle}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} d s\right| \leqslant & \frac{\left|\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}(t), u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right|}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}}+\frac{\left|\left\langle A u_{0}, u_{1}\right\rangle\right|}{c_{\varepsilon}(0)\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}}+\int_{0}^{t} \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} d s \\
& +\int_{0}^{t} \frac{\left|c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|}{c_{\varepsilon}} \cdot \frac{\left|\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle\right|}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} d s+2 \int_{0}^{t} \frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{4}} d s \\
= & I_{1}+I_{2}+I_{3}+I_{4}+I_{5} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now let us estimate the five terms separately. By (3.43) and (3.44) there exists a constant $\delta_{3}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\left|\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle\right|}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} \leqslant \frac{\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|} \cdot \frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|} \leqslant \sqrt{P_{\varepsilon}(0) \cdot \max \left\{Q_{\varepsilon}(0), 4 P_{\varepsilon}(0)\right\}} \leqslant \delta_{3} \tag{4.27}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every $t \geqslant 0$. From (4.27) we have that $I_{1} \leqslant \delta_{3}$ and $I_{2} \leqslant \delta_{3}$. An estimate of $I_{3}$ is provided by (3.45). As for $I_{4}$ we have that $\left|c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} / c_{\varepsilon}\right| \leqslant \delta_{1}$ is bounded by (3.3), while the rest of the integrand can be estimated as in the case of $I_{1}$ : it follows that $I_{4} \leqslant \delta_{1} \delta_{3} t$. Finally, using again (4.27) we have that

$$
\frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{4}}=c_{\varepsilon} \cdot\left(\frac{\left|\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle\right|}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}\right)^{2} \leqslant \mu_{2} \delta_{3}^{2},
$$

so that $I_{5} \leqslant \mu_{2} \delta_{3}^{2} t$. This completes the proof of (4.26).
Statement (4). Step 1. There exists a constant $\gamma_{1}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
t E_{\varepsilon, 1}(t)+\int_{0}^{t} s \cdot \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(s)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(s)} d s \leqslant \gamma_{1} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 \tag{4.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed from (4.16) with $k=1$ we have that

$$
\left[t E_{\varepsilon, 1}(t)\right]^{\prime}=E_{\varepsilon, 1}(t)+t E_{\varepsilon, 1}^{\prime}(t) \leqslant E_{\varepsilon, 1}(t)-t \cdot \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)}
$$

hence integrating in $[0, t]$ we obtain that

$$
t E_{\varepsilon, 1}(t)+\int_{0}^{t} s \cdot \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(s)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(s)} d s \leqslant \int_{0}^{t} E_{\varepsilon, 1}(s) d s
$$

It remains to estimate the last integral. By (3.39) and (3.38) with $k=1$ we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{0}^{t} E_{\varepsilon, 1}(s) d s & \leqslant \varepsilon \int_{0}^{t} \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(s)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(s)} d s+\frac{1}{\mu_{1}} \int_{0}^{t} c_{\varepsilon}(s)\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2} d s \\
& \leqslant \varepsilon E_{\varepsilon, 1}(0)+\frac{1}{\mu_{1}}\left(D_{\varepsilon, 1}(0)+2 \varepsilon \mu_{2} E_{\varepsilon, 1}(0)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and it is clear that the last expression is bounded independently on $\varepsilon$.
Step 2. We show that there exists a constant $\gamma_{2}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{t} s \cdot\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2} d s \leqslant \frac{\left|u_{0}\right|^{2}}{4 \mu_{1}^{2}}+\varepsilon \gamma_{2} \quad \forall t \geqslant 0 \tag{4.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed from (4.9) with $k=1$ we have that

$$
\left[t D_{\varepsilon, 1}(t)\right]^{\prime}=D_{\varepsilon, 1}(t)+t D_{\varepsilon, 1}^{\prime}(t)=D_{\varepsilon, 1}(t)-t c_{\varepsilon}(t)\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}+\varepsilon t\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}
$$

hence integrating in $[0, t]$ we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
t D_{\varepsilon, 1}(t)+\int_{0}^{t} s \cdot c_{\varepsilon}(s)\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2} d s= & \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{t}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2} d s+\varepsilon \int_{0}^{t}\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}(s), u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(s)\right\rangle d s \\
& +\varepsilon \int_{0}^{t} s\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(s)\right|^{2} d s
\end{aligned}
$$

Now let us estimate the three integrals in the right-hand side. For the first one we use (3.38) with $k=0$ and we obtain that

$$
\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{t}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2} d s \leqslant \frac{1}{2 \mu_{1}} \int_{0}^{t} c_{\varepsilon}(s)\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2} d s \leqslant \frac{D_{\varepsilon, 0}(0)}{2 \mu_{1}}+\varepsilon \frac{\mu_{2} E_{\varepsilon_{1}, 0}(0)}{\mu_{1}}
$$

The second one is the integral of a derivative, hence

$$
\varepsilon \int_{0}^{t}\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}(s), u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(s)\right\rangle d s=\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\left\{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}-\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}\right\} \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2} \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{2} E_{\varepsilon_{1}, 0}(0) .
$$

For the third one we use (4.28) and we obtain that

$$
\varepsilon \int_{0}^{t} s\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(s)\right|^{2} d s \leqslant \varepsilon \mu_{2} \int_{0}^{t} s \cdot \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(s)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(s)} d s \leqslant \varepsilon \mu_{2} \gamma_{1}
$$

Recalling the definition of $D_{\varepsilon, 0}(0)$ we have thus proved that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{t} s \cdot\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2} d s \leqslant \frac{1}{\mu_{1}} \int_{0}^{t} s \cdot c_{\varepsilon}(s)\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2} d s \leqslant \frac{1}{4 \mu_{1}^{2}}\left|u_{0}\right|^{2}+\varepsilon \gamma_{3}-\frac{t D_{\varepsilon, 1}(t)}{\mu_{1}} \tag{4.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a suitable constant $\gamma_{3}$. Using once more (4.28) we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
-t D_{\varepsilon, 1}(t) & =-t\left(\frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}}{2}+\varepsilon\left\langle A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t), A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle\right) \leqslant t \cdot \frac{\varepsilon^{2}}{2}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} \\
& =\frac{\varepsilon}{2} c_{\varepsilon}(t) \cdot t \frac{\varepsilon\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(t)} \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \mu_{2} \cdot t E_{\varepsilon, 1}(t) \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \mu_{2} \gamma_{1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Together with (4.30) this inequality proves (4.29).
Step 3. We are now ready to prove (3.27). Since $E_{\varepsilon, 1}^{\prime}(t) \leqslant 0$ we have that

$$
\left[t^{2} E_{\varepsilon, 1}(t)\right]^{\prime}=2 t E_{\varepsilon, 1}(t)+t^{2} E_{\varepsilon, 1}^{\prime}(t) \leqslant 2 t E_{\varepsilon, 1}(t)
$$

Integrating in $[0, t]$ and using (4.28) and (4.29) we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
t^{2} E_{\varepsilon, 1}(t) & \leqslant 2 \int_{0}^{t} s E_{\varepsilon, 1}(s) d s \\
& \leqslant 2 \varepsilon \int_{0}^{t} s \cdot \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(s)\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}(s)} d s+2 \int_{0}^{t} s\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(s)\right|^{2} d s \\
& \leqslant 2 \varepsilon \gamma_{1}+\frac{\left|u_{0}\right|^{2}}{2 \mu_{1}^{2}}+2 \varepsilon \gamma_{2}=: \frac{\left|u_{0}\right|^{2}}{2 \mu_{1}^{2}}+k_{7} \varepsilon
\end{aligned}
$$

which is (3.27).
Step 4. We prove (3.28). To this end, we consider the function $\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon}(t):=t^{2}\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}$. We have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t) & =-\frac{2}{\varepsilon} t^{2}\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}-\frac{2}{\varepsilon} t^{2} c_{\varepsilon}(t)\left\langle u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t), A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right\rangle+2 t\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} \\
& \leqslant-\frac{2}{\varepsilon} t^{2}\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}+\frac{2}{\varepsilon} t^{2} \mu_{2}\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|+2 t\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} \\
& =-\frac{2}{\varepsilon} t^{2}\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}+\frac{2}{\varepsilon} t\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|\left\{\mu_{2} t\left|A u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|+\varepsilon\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

From (3.40) we have that $\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right|=c_{\varepsilon}(t) \sqrt{G_{\varepsilon}(t)} \leqslant \gamma_{4}$ for a suitable constant $\gamma_{4}$. From (3.27) we have that

$$
\mu_{2} t|A u(t)|+\varepsilon\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right| \leqslant \mu_{2}\left(\frac{\left|u_{0}\right|^{2}}{2 \mu_{1}^{2}}+k_{7} \varepsilon\right)^{1 / 2}+\varepsilon \gamma_{4}=: \Gamma_{\varepsilon} .
$$

Therefore we have that

$$
\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t) \leqslant-\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon}(t)}\left\{\sqrt{\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon}(t)}-\Gamma_{\varepsilon}\right\} .
$$

Applying Lemma 4.1, and recalling that $\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon}(0)=0$, we finally have that

$$
t^{2}\left|u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}=\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon}(t) \leqslant \Gamma_{\varepsilon}^{2} \leqslant \mu_{2}^{2} \frac{\left|u_{0}\right|^{2}}{2 \mu_{1}^{2}}+k_{8} \varepsilon
$$

for a suitable constant $k_{8}$. This proves (3.28).
Statement (5). Let $\psi_{\varepsilon}(t):=\phi_{\varepsilon}(t)+\sqrt{\varepsilon}$. Since $\psi_{\varepsilon}(t) \geqslant \phi_{\varepsilon}(t)$ it is enough to prove (3.29) and (3.30) with $\phi_{\varepsilon}$ replaced by $\psi_{\varepsilon}$.

Step 1. We prove that there exists a constant $h_{1}$ such that for every $\varepsilon$ small enough and every $t \geqslant 0$ we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{\varepsilon}(t) \geqslant \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}} \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \quad\left|\frac{\psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)}{\psi_{\varepsilon}(t)}\right| \leqslant \frac{h_{1}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} . \tag{4.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed let us assume that $2\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2} \delta_{3} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \leqslant 1$, where $\delta_{3}$ is the constant which appears in (4.27). In order to prove the first inequality in (4.31) it is enough to check that it holds true for $t=0$ and for $t \geqslant 0$ we have that

$$
\sqrt{\varepsilon} \frac{d}{d t}\left(\frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}\right)=-2\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle}{c_{\varepsilon}\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} \cdot \frac{c_{\varepsilon}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} \leqslant 2\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \delta_{3} \psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \leqslant \psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}
$$

This proves the first inequality, from which we have that

$$
\left|\frac{\psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)}{\psi_{\varepsilon}(t)}\right|=\frac{c_{\varepsilon}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{\psi_{\varepsilon}(t)} \leqslant \frac{c_{\varepsilon}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2} \sqrt{\varepsilon}} \leqslant \frac{\mu_{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2} \sqrt{\varepsilon}}=: \frac{h_{1}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} .
$$

Step 2 . We prove inequality (3.29) with $\psi_{\varepsilon}$ instead of $\phi_{\varepsilon}$.
To this end we compute

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d t}\left(\psi_{\varepsilon}^{2} E_{\varepsilon, 1}\right) & =2 \psi_{\varepsilon} \psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} E_{\varepsilon, 1}-\psi_{\varepsilon}^{2} \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}}\left[2+\varepsilon \frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{c_{\varepsilon}}\right] \\
& =2 \psi_{\varepsilon} \psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}+2 \psi_{\varepsilon} \psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \varepsilon \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}}-\psi_{\varepsilon}^{2} \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}}\left[2+\varepsilon \frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{c_{\varepsilon}}\right] \\
& =2 \psi_{\varepsilon} \psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}-\psi_{\varepsilon}^{2} \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}}\left[2+\varepsilon \frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{c_{\varepsilon}}-2 \varepsilon \frac{\psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{\psi_{\varepsilon}}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

By (3.3) and (4.31) the term in the brackets is greater than $2-\sqrt{\varepsilon} h_{2}$ for some constant $h_{2}$, and therefore

$$
\frac{d}{d t}\left(\psi_{\varepsilon}^{2} E_{\varepsilon, 1}\right) \leqslant 2 \psi_{\varepsilon} \psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}-\left(2-\sqrt{\varepsilon} h_{2}\right) \psi_{\varepsilon}^{2} \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}}
$$

In order to estimate the first term of the right-hand side we consider the identity

$$
\begin{aligned}
2 \psi_{\varepsilon} \psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}= & -2 \varepsilon \frac{d}{d t}\left[\frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} \psi_{\varepsilon}\right]+2 \varepsilon \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} \psi_{\varepsilon} \\
& +\frac{2\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} \psi_{\varepsilon}\left[\varepsilon \frac{\psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{\psi_{\varepsilon}}-2 \varepsilon \frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}-1\right] \\
= & I_{1}+I_{2}+I_{3} .
\end{aligned}
$$

By (4.31) we have that

$$
I_{2}=2 \varepsilon \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}} \cdot \frac{c_{\varepsilon}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} \cdot \psi_{\varepsilon}=2 \varepsilon \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}} \cdot \frac{\psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{\psi_{\varepsilon}} \cdot \psi_{\varepsilon}^{2} \leqslant 2 \sqrt{\varepsilon} h_{1} \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}} \cdot \psi_{\varepsilon}^{2}
$$

In order to estimate $I_{3}$ we use that the absolute value of the term in the brackets is less than $1+h_{3} \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ for a suitable constant $h_{3}$, and that for every $\delta_{\varepsilon}>0$ we have that

$$
\left|\frac{2\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} \psi_{\varepsilon}\right| \leqslant 2 \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|}{\sqrt{c_{\varepsilon}}} \psi_{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{c_{\varepsilon}}}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|} \leqslant \delta_{\varepsilon} \frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}} \psi_{\varepsilon}^{2}+\frac{1}{\delta_{\varepsilon}} \psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}
$$

It follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d t}\left(\psi_{\varepsilon}^{2} E_{\varepsilon, 1}\right) \leqslant & -2 \varepsilon \frac{d}{d t}\left[\frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} \psi_{\varepsilon}\right]+\frac{1+\sqrt{\varepsilon} h_{3}}{\delta_{\varepsilon}} \psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \\
& +\frac{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}} \psi_{\varepsilon}^{2}\left\{-2+h_{2} \sqrt{\varepsilon}+2 h_{1} \sqrt{\varepsilon}+\left(1+\sqrt{\varepsilon} h_{3}\right) \delta_{\varepsilon}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we choose $\delta_{\varepsilon}$ in such a way that the last term is 0 . It is not difficult to see that this implies that $\delta_{\varepsilon} \geqslant 2-h_{4} \sqrt{\varepsilon}$, which is positive provided that $\varepsilon$ is small enough. Therefore the previous inequality reduces to

$$
\frac{d}{d t}\left(\psi_{\varepsilon}^{2} E_{\varepsilon, 1}\right) \leqslant-2 \varepsilon \frac{d}{d t}\left[\frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}, u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right\rangle}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}} \psi_{\varepsilon}\right]+\left(\frac{1}{2}+h_{5} \sqrt{\varepsilon}\right) \psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}
$$

Integrating in $[0, t]$ we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\psi_{\varepsilon}^{2}(t) E_{\varepsilon, 1}(t) \leqslant & \psi_{\varepsilon}^{2}(0) E_{\varepsilon, 1}(0)-2 \varepsilon \frac{\left\langle A u_{\varepsilon}(t), u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)\right\rangle}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}} \psi_{\varepsilon}(t)+2 \varepsilon \frac{\left\langle A u_{0}, u_{1}\right\rangle}{\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{0}\right|^{2}} \psi_{\varepsilon}(0) \\
& +\left(\frac{1}{2}+h_{5} \sqrt{\varepsilon}\right)\left(\psi_{\varepsilon}(t)-\psi_{\varepsilon}(0)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the monotonicity of $\psi_{\varepsilon}$ we have that $\psi_{\varepsilon}^{2}(0) E_{\varepsilon, 1}(0) \leqslant \psi_{\varepsilon}(0) \psi_{\varepsilon}(t) E_{\varepsilon, 1}(0)=$ $\sqrt{\varepsilon} E_{\varepsilon, 1}(0) \psi_{\varepsilon}(t)$. By (3.42) the second term is less than $2 \delta_{2} \varepsilon \psi_{\varepsilon}(t)$. Using once more the monotonicity of $\psi_{\varepsilon}$ also the third term is less than $2 \delta_{2} \varepsilon \psi_{\varepsilon}(t)$. In conclusion there exists a constant $k_{9}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{\varepsilon}^{2}(t) E_{\varepsilon, 1}(t) \leqslant\left(\frac{1}{2}+k_{9} \sqrt{\varepsilon}\right) \psi_{\varepsilon}(t) \tag{4.32}
\end{equation*}
$$

Dividing by $\psi_{\varepsilon}(t)$ (which is positive) we obtain the required estimate.
Step 3. By (4.11) we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d t}\left[\psi_{\varepsilon} G_{\varepsilon}\right] & =\psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} G_{\varepsilon}+\psi_{\varepsilon} G_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \\
& =\psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} G_{\varepsilon}-\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \psi_{\varepsilon}\left(1+\varepsilon \frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{c_{\varepsilon}}\right) G_{\varepsilon}-\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \psi_{\varepsilon} \frac{\left\langle u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}, A u_{\varepsilon}\right\rangle}{c_{\varepsilon}} \\
& \leqslant \psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} G_{\varepsilon}-\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \psi_{\varepsilon}\left(1+\varepsilon \frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{c_{\varepsilon}}\right) G_{\varepsilon}+\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \psi_{\varepsilon} \frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|}{c_{\varepsilon}} \\
& =-\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \psi_{\varepsilon} G_{\varepsilon}\left(1+\varepsilon \frac{c_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{c_{\varepsilon}}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \frac{\psi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}}{\psi_{\varepsilon}}\right)+\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\psi_{\varepsilon} G_{\varepsilon}} \sqrt{\psi_{\varepsilon}\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\varepsilon$ is small enough the term in the parentheses is greater than $1 / 2$ and by (4.32) we have that $\psi_{\varepsilon}\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2} \leqslant \psi_{\varepsilon} E_{\varepsilon, 1} \leqslant 1$. It follows that

$$
\frac{d}{d t}\left[\psi_{\varepsilon} G_{\varepsilon}\right] \leqslant-\sqrt{\psi_{\varepsilon} G_{\varepsilon}}\left\{\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\psi_{\varepsilon} G_{\varepsilon}}-\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\right\} .
$$

Applying Lemma 4.1 to the function $\psi_{\varepsilon} G_{\varepsilon}$ we obtain that

$$
\psi_{\varepsilon} \frac{\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}}{c_{\varepsilon}^{2}} \leqslant \max \left\{\frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}\left|u_{1}\right|^{2}}{\mu_{0}^{2}}, 4\right\},
$$

which gives (3.30) with $\psi_{\varepsilon}$ in place of $\phi_{\varepsilon}$.
Proof of Corollary 3.7. Let us assume that $A$ is coercive. The estimates on $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$ follow from (3.25) and (3.26) as in the parabolic case. Also the estimates on $\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$ follow from (3.23) and the coercivity as in the parabolic case. The estimate on $\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}$ follows from (3.24). As for $\varepsilon\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}$, we have to use (3.29). By the estimates on $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$ we have that $\phi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$ (hence also $\phi_{\varepsilon}$ ) grows exponentially, and therefore $\varepsilon\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}$ decays exponentially.

Let us assume now that $A$ is not coercive. If $A^{1 / 2} u_{0} \neq 0$ the lower bound for $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$ follows from (3.25) as in the coercive case. The upper bound follows from (3.22) applied with $\psi(\sigma)=$ $\mu_{1} \sigma$ as in the parabolic case. The estimates on $\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2},\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}$ and $\varepsilon\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}$ follow from (3.27) and (3.28).

Proof of Corollary 3.8. Let us assume that $A$ is coercive. The estimates on $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$ follow from (3.25) and (3.26) as in the parabolic case. Also the estimates on $\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$ follow from (3.23) and the coercivity as in the parabolic case. The estimate on $\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}$ follows from (3.24). As for $\varepsilon\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}$, we have to use (3.29). Using the estimates from below for $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$ we have indeed that

$$
\phi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(t)=m\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2}\right)\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{-2}=\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}(t)\right|^{2(\gamma-1)} \geqslant c(1+t)^{-1+1 / \gamma},
$$

hence $\phi_{\varepsilon}(t) \geqslant c_{1}(1+t)^{1 / \gamma}-c_{2}$, from which the conclusion follows as in the parabolic case.
Let us assume now that $A$ is not coercive. The lower bound for $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$ follows from (3.25) as in the coercive case. The upper bound follows from (3.22) applied with $\psi(\sigma)=\sigma^{\gamma+1}$ as in
the parabolic case. For the remaining estimates we use (3.29) and (3.30) with the same estimate on $\phi_{\varepsilon}(t)$ found in the coercive case (as we have seen its proof requires only the lower bound for $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$, which is the same both in the coercive and in the noncoercive case).

Proof of Corollary 3.9. From (3.22), (3.1) and the monotonicity of $\psi$ we have that

$$
\psi\left(\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}\right) \leqslant \min \left\{\psi\left(\sigma_{2}\right), c t^{-1}\right\}
$$

Applying $\psi^{-1}$ to both sides we obtain an $\varepsilon$-independent estimate on $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$ which tends to 0 as $t \rightarrow+\infty$. At this point (3.23) and (3.24) provide similar estimates for $\left|A u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$ and $\left|u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}$. As for $\varepsilon\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}\right|^{2}$, the fastest way to obtain a (nonoptimal!) estimate is to use (3.39) with $k=1$ combined with the decay of $\left|A^{1 / 2} u_{\varepsilon}\right|^{2}$, hence of $c_{\varepsilon}(t)$.
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