101. A Remark on Perturbation of m-accretive Operators in Banach Space

By Yoshio KONISHI

Department of Mathematics, University of Tokyo (Comm. by Kunihiko KODAIRA, M. J. A., May 12, 1971)

1. Introduction. Let X be a real Banach space with the norm denoted by $\|\cdot\|$. By definition a (possibly) multiple-valued operator A in X is accretive if for each $\lambda > 0$ and $u, v \in D(A)$,

 $||x-y|| \ge ||u-v||$ whenever $x \in (I+\lambda A)u, y \in (I+\lambda A)v$. An accretive operator A in X is said to be *m*-accretive if R(I+A)=X. For the notion of "multiple-valued" operator, we refer to T. Kato [6], § 2.

The purpose of the present paper is to give a criterion for the maccretiveness of the sum of two m-accretive operators in X and then apply it to a certain nonlinear partial differential equation. Our result may be considered to constitute an analogue of the result of H. Brezis, M. G. Crandall and A. Pazy [1] for perturbation of maximal monotone sets.

2. A perturbation lemma. Let A and B be m-accretive operators in X. As usual we define the Yosida approximation $B_{\epsilon}(\varepsilon > 0)$ of B by

$$B_{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^{-1} \{ I - (I + \varepsilon B)^{-1} \},$$

which is a single-valued Lipschitz continuous operator defined on all of X. It is easily seen that $A + B_*$ is again m-accretive and accordingly that for each $f \in X$ there exists a unique solution $u_* \in D(A)$ of the equation

$$(2.1) u_{\mathfrak{s}} + y_{\mathfrak{s}} + B_{\mathfrak{s}} u_{\mathfrak{s}} = f, y_{\mathfrak{s}} \in A u_{\mathfrak{s}}.$$

Lemma 1. Assume that X is a real Banach space with the uniformly convex dual space X^* and that A and B are m-accretive operators in X such that $D(A) \cap D(B) \ni 0$. If for each fixed $f \in X ||B_*u_*||$ in (2.1) is bounded as ε tends to zero, then A + B is m-accretive.

We notice that if X^* is uniformly convex, the duality map F defined as

$$Fu = \{u^* \in X^*; (u, u^*) = ||u||^2 = ||u^*||^2\}, \quad u \in X,$$

is single-valued and is uniformly continuous on any bounded set (T. Kato [5]).

Proof of Lemma 1. The argument of the proof is standard (see Y. Kōmura [7] and T. Kato [5,6]). Since $D(A+B) \ni 0$, there is no loss