

A TOPOLOGICAL EQUIVALENCE RESULT FOR A FAMILY OF NONLINEAR DIFFERENCE SYSTEMS HAVING GENERALIZED EXPONENTIAL DICHOTOMY

ÁLVARO CASTAÑEDA AND GONZALO ROBLEDO

ABSTRACT. We obtain sufficient conditions ensuring the topological equivalence of two perturbed difference linear systems whose linear part has a property of generalized exponential dichotomy. When the exponential dichotomy is verified, we obtain a strongly and Hölder topological equivalence.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this article is to find sufficient conditions ensuring the topological equivalence (see Definition 1 in the next section) between the difference systems

$$(1.1) \quad x_{n+1} = A_n x_n + f(n, x_n),$$

$$(1.2) \quad y_{n+1} = A_n y_n + g(n, y_n),$$

where x_n and y_n are sequences of d -dimensional column vectors, $A_n \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and the functions $f, g: \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfy

(A1) A_n is bounded, nonsingular and

$$\|A_n - I\| \leq M \quad \text{for any } n \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is a matrix norm.

(A2) The functions f and g are in the set \mathcal{S} defined by

$$\mathcal{S} = \left\{ \mathcal{U}: \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d: |\mathcal{U}(n, x_1) - \mathcal{U}(n, x_2)| \leq r_n |x_1 - x_2| \quad \text{for any } n \in \mathbb{Z} \right\},$$

where $|\cdot|$ is a vector norm and the sequence r_n is nonnegative.

This problem was initially studied by G. Papaschinopoulos in [12], where the topological equivalence of (1.1) and (1.2) was an intermediate technical step in the study of the topological equivalence of some hybrid systems. In [12], it was assumed that f and g satisfy some smallness assumptions, are Lipschitz and the linear system

$$(1.3) \quad z_{n+1} = A_n z_n$$

has a property of α -exponential dichotomy (see Definition 5 in the next section).

Date: July 2015.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 39A06, 39A12.

Key words and phrases. Topological equivalence, Generalized exponential dichotomy, Difference equations.

The first author was funded by FONDECYT Iniciación Project 1121122 and by the Center of Dynamical Systems and Related Fields DySyRF (Anillo Project 1103, CONICYT). The second author was funded by FONDECYT Regular Project 1120709.

In this work, we consider more general assumptions compared with [12]. In particular, we assume that (1.3) has a generalized exponential dichotomy (namely, a more general property) and obtain sufficient conditions ensuring topological equivalence and strong topological equivalence. In addition, if (1.3) has an α -exponential dichotomy, we obtain sufficient conditions ensuring Hölder topological equivalence. In spite that our results are strongly inspired in the works of Shi & Xiong [16] and Jiang [6],[7] developed in the continuous case, the consequences obtained by our approach are not exactly the same ones.

The article is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the main definitions (topological equivalence and exponential dichotomies). Section 3 states the main results. Section 4 is devoted to several intermediate results. The proof of the main results is developed in the section 5.

2. DEFINITIONS

The following definition has been introduced by Palmer [11] in the continuous case and extended to the discrete case in a series of papers of Kurzweil, Papaschinopoulos and Schinas [8],[9],[15]:

Definition 1. *The systems (1.1) and (1.2) are topologically equivalent if there exists a map $H: \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with the properties*

- (i) *For each fixed $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the map $u \mapsto H(n, u)$ is an homeomorphism of \mathbb{R}^d .*
- (ii) *$H(n, u) - u$ is bounded in $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d$.*
- (iii) *If x_n is a solution of (1.1), then $H[n, x_n]$ is a solution of (1.2).*

In addition, the map $u \mapsto L(n, u) = H^{-1}(n, u)$ has properties (i)–(iii) also.

Remark 1. Notice that the notation $H[n, x_n]$ is reserved to the special case when x_n is a solution of (1.1). On the other hand, the topological equivalence between (1.1) and (1.3) can be defined in a similar way.

The following definitions have been introduced by Shi and Xiong [16] in the continuous case and we introduce its discrete version

Definition 2. *If the maps $u \mapsto H(n, u)$ and $u \mapsto L(n, u)$ are uniformly continuous for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and satisfy properties (i)–(iii) of the previous definition, then we say that the systems (1.1) and (1.2) are strongly topologically equivalent.*

Definition 3. *If the maps $u \mapsto H(n, u)$ and $u \mapsto L(n, u)$ are Hölder continuous for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and satisfy properties (i)–(iii) of the previous definition, then we say that the systems (1.1) and (1.2) are Hölder topologically equivalent.*

The problem of the topological equivalence has been extensively studied in the continuous non-autonomous case for several authors, which follow the seminal paper of Palmer [11]. We pay special attention to the works of [3],[6],[7], which use the concept of generalized exponential dichotomy introduced by Martin [10].

Before to introduce the next definitions, we will denote the fundamental matrix of (1.3) by W_n (i.e., $W_{n+1} = A_n W_n$).

The generalized exponential dichotomy in a discrete context is defined as follows:

Definition 4. *The system (1.3) has a generalized exponential dichotomy if there exists a projection P ($P^2 = P$), a constant $K \geq 1$ and a non-negative sequence*

$\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ satisfying

$$(2.1) \quad \sum_{j=p}^q a_j \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{as } q \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{for fixed } p \in \mathbb{Z},$$

$$(2.2) \quad \sum_{j=p}^q a_j \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{as } p \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{for fixed } q \in \mathbb{Z}$$

such that

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} \|W_n P W_m^{-1}\| \leq K \exp\left(-\sum_{j=m}^n a_j\right) & \text{if } n \geq m \\ \|W_n (I - P) W_m^{-1}\| \leq K \exp\left(-\sum_{j=n}^m a_j\right) & \text{if } n < m. \end{cases}$$

It is interesting to observe that (2.1)–(2.2) are satisfied in the case $a_j = \alpha > 0$ for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, which leads to the classic definition of α -exponential dichotomy:

Definition 5. *The system (1.3) has an α -exponential dichotomy if there exists a projection P ($P^2 = P$), a constant $K \geq 1$ and*

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{cases} \|W_n P W_m^{-1}\| \leq K e^{-\alpha(n-m)} & \text{if } n \geq m \\ \|W_n (I - P) W_m^{-1}\| \leq K e^{-\alpha(m-n)} & \text{if } n < m. \end{cases}$$

Remark 2. The notation (2.4) was taken from [12, p.165] but other equivalent notations have been introduced in [8] and [13]. For a deeper discussion about discrete dichotomies, we refer the reader to [2] and [14].

The following example shows a linear system having a generalized exponential dichotomy but not an exponential one: let us consider (1.3) with a matrix

$$A_n = \begin{bmatrix} b_n & 0 \\ 0 & 1/b_n \end{bmatrix},$$

where $0 < b_n = b_{-n} < 1$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $b_n \rightarrow 1$ monotonically as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and (2.1)–(2.2) are satisfied for $a_j = |\ln(b_j)|$.

Notice that this system has the generalized exponential dichotomy since

$$W_n = \begin{bmatrix} \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} b_j & 0 \\ 0 & \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{b_j} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with } P = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

leads to (2.3) with $K = 1$ and $a_j = |\ln(b_j)|$. Nevertheless, let us observe that the system has not an exponential dichotomy. Indeed, otherwise, there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{k=m}^n |\ln(b_k)| \geq \alpha(n-m), \quad \text{for any } n \geq m,$$

then, when considering $n = m + T$ (for some $T \in \mathbb{N}$), it follows that

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=m}^{m+T} |\ln(b_k)| \geq \alpha, \quad \text{for any } m \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Now, we obtain a contradiction by letting $m \rightarrow +\infty$.

Remark 3. Notice that (2.3) can be viewed in terms of the Green function:

$$(2.5) \quad G(n, m) = \begin{cases} W_n P W_m^{-1} & \text{if } n \geq m \\ -W_n (I - P) W_m^{-1} & \text{if } n < m. \end{cases}$$

Definition 6. For any sequence g_n ($n \in \mathbb{Z}$), let us define the map

$$N(n, g) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{n-1} K \exp\left(-\sum_{j=m+1}^n a_j\right) g_m + \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} K \exp\left(-\sum_{j=n}^{m+1} a_j\right) g_m,$$

where K and a_j are stated in Definition 4.

3. MAIN RESULTS

Theorem 1. Suppose that (1.3) has a generalized exponential dichotomy and the functions f and g satisfy

(H1) $|f(n, x)| \leq F_n$ and $|g(n, x)| \leq G_n$ where F_n and G_n are nonnegative sequences.

(H2) There exists $B > 0$ such that the sequences F_n and G_n verify

$$(3.1) \quad N(n, G + F) \leq B.$$

(H3) There exists $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that the sequence r_n stated in (A2) satisfies

$$(3.2) \quad N(n, r) \leq \theta < 1,$$

(H4) For any $(u, u', x, x') \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|u|, |u'| \leq B$, the function

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{n-1-J} K \exp\left(-\sum_{p=k+1}^n a_p\right) |\Delta_k(u, u', x, x')| + \sum_{k=n+J}^{\infty} K \exp\left(-\sum_{p=n}^{k+1} a_p\right) |\Delta_k(u, u', x, x')|$$

with Δ_k defined by

$$\Delta_k(u, u', x, x') = g(k, u + x) - g(k, u' + x') + f(k, x') - f(k, x),$$

converges uniformly on (u, u', x, x') to zero when $J \rightarrow +\infty$.

(H5) For any $(v, v', y, y') \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|v|, |v'| \leq B$, the function

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{n-1-J} K \exp\left(-\sum_{p=k+1}^n a_p\right) |\bar{\Delta}_k(v, v', y, y')| + \sum_{k=n+J}^{\infty} K \exp\left(-\sum_{p=n}^{k+1} a_p\right) |\bar{\Delta}_k(v, v', y, y')|$$

with $\bar{\Delta}_k$ defined by

$$\bar{\Delta}_k(v, v', y, y') = f(k, v + y) - f(k, v' + y') + g(k, y) - g(k, y'),$$

converges uniformly on (v, v', y, y') to zero when $J \rightarrow +\infty$,

then (1.1) and (1.2) are topologically equivalent.

Remark 4. A continuous version of this theorem has been studied by Chen & Xia [3] and Jiang [6], this last, considering $g(\cdot, \cdot) = 0$. As in [3, Theorem 2.2], we obtain a topological equivalence result. Nevertheless, in [7, Theorem 2] a result of strong topological equivalence is obtained. We will explain this point in the proof.

(H1) is a technical assumption which generalizes the case studied by Papaschiopoulos [12], where it is assumed that $|f(n, x)|$ and $|g(n, x)|$ are bounded by a small enough positive constant. We emphasize that F_n and G_n are not necessarily bounded sequences.

(H2) is introduced in order to ensure that if (1.3) is perturbed by linear combinations of f and g , then the corresponding perturbed systems has a unique bounded solution. Although F_n and G_n could be unbounded sequences, **(H2)** says that they must be dominated by terms $\exp(-\sum a_n)$ at $\pm\infty$.

(H3) is usual in the topological equivalence literature and plays a key role in several intermediate steps as the proof of the continuity of the map $u \mapsto H(n, u)$ and the use of the Banach fixed point. As before, r_n is not necessarily a bounded sequence but must be dominated by terms $\exp(-\sum a_n)$ at $\pm\infty$.

(H4) and **(H5)** are introduced in order to prove the continuity of the maps $u \mapsto H(n, u)$ and $u \mapsto H^{-1}(n, u)$. In spite of **(H2)** ensures that the corresponding limits are zero when $J \rightarrow +\infty$, the rate of convergence is not necessarily uniform, which is ensured by these hypotheses. It is important to emphasize that if $g(\cdot, \cdot) = 0$, these assumptions can be seen as the discrete version of a technical condition introduced by Jiang in Theorem 2 from [6].

Remark 5. In the case $g(t, \cdot) = 0$, we can obtain simpler conditions ensuring that (1.1) and (1.3) are topologically equivalent.

Corollary 1. *Suppose that (1.3) has a generalized exponential dichotomy and the functions f and g satisfy **(H1)**–**(H5)**. If $\{r_n\}$ verifies*

$$(3.3) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=n-L}^{n+L} r_k < M_0,$$

then (1.1) is strongly topologically equivalent to (1.2).

Remark 6. The left side of (3.3) can be seen as a discrete Stepanov's norm (see e.g., [1]). In addition, (3.3) is always satisfied when $\{r_k\}_k \in \ell_\infty(\mathbb{Z})$.

As stated above, if $a_n = \alpha > 0$, then (1.3) has an α -exponential dichotomy. In addition, if F_n , G_n and r_n are also positive constants (namely, F, G and r), then **(H4)** and **(H5)** are immediately satisfied since $|\Delta_k|$ and $|\bar{\Delta}_k|$ are bounded by $2(F + G)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{n-1-J} e^{-\alpha(n-k-1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=n+J}^{+\infty} e^{-\alpha(k+1-n)}$$

converge to zero when $J \rightarrow +\infty$ and the rate of convergence is independent of the points. This allows to formulate:

Theorem 2. *Suppose that (1.3) has an α -exponential dichotomy and the functions f and g satisfy*

(D1) $|f(n, x)| \leq F$ and $|g(n, x)| \leq G$ where F and G are nonnegative constants.

(D2) The functions f and g are in the set \mathcal{S}' defined by

$$\mathcal{S}' = \left\{ \mathcal{U}: \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d: |\mathcal{U}(n, x_1) - \mathcal{U}(n, x_2)| \leq r|x_1 - x_2| \quad \text{for any } n \in \mathbb{Z} \right\},$$

where $r > 0$ is such that

$$(3.4) \quad \theta = Kr \frac{1 + e^{-\alpha}}{1 - e^{-\alpha}} < 1,$$

then (1.1) and (1.2) are strongly topologically equivalent.

Moreover, if $M + r < \alpha$, then (1.1) and (1.2) are Hölder topologically equivalent.

4. PRELIMINAR RESULTS

Lemma 1. *If (1.3) has a generalized exponential dichotomy, then the unique solution of (1.3) bounded on \mathbb{Z} is $y_n = 0$.*

Proof. As in [4, p.11], it is easy to verify that (2.3) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|W_n P \xi\| &\leq K \exp\left(-\sum_{j=m}^n a_j\right) \|W_m P \xi\| \quad \text{if } n \geq m \\ \|W_n (I - P) \xi\| &\leq K \exp\left(-\sum_{j=n}^m a_j\right) \|W_m (I - P) \xi\| \quad \text{if } n < m. \end{aligned}$$

for any initial condition $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In addition, let us assume that the projection P has rank $k \leq d$.

The first inequality above is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{K} \exp\left(\sum_{j=m}^n a_j\right) \|W_n P \xi\| \leq \|W_m P \xi\| \quad \text{if } n \geq m.$$

By using (2.2), we can see that there exists a k -dimensional subspace of initial conditions leading to solutions tending to the infinite when $m \rightarrow -\infty$.

On the other hand, the second inequality is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{K} \exp\left(\sum_{j=n}^m a_j\right) \|W_n (I - P) \xi\| \leq \|W_m (I - P) \xi\| \quad \text{if } n < m.$$

As before, by (2.1), we can see that there exists a $(d - k)$ -dimensional subspace of initial conditions leading to solutions tending to the infinite when $m \rightarrow +\infty$. In consequence, the unique bounded solution can be the trivial one. \square

Lemma 2. *If (1.3) has a generalized exponential dichotomy and a sequence q_n verifies*

$$\text{(E1)} \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |N(n, |q|)| < +\infty,$$

then the system

$$(4.1) \quad z_{n+1} = A_n z_n + q_n$$

has a unique bounded solution given by

$$\hat{\phi}_n = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} G(n, m+1) q_m.$$

Proof. The proof has two steps:

Boundedness of $\hat{\phi}_n$: It is straightforward (see *e.g.*, [5]) to see that $\hat{\phi}_n$ is solution of (4.1). In order to verify that $\hat{\phi}_n$ is bounded, notice that:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\hat{\phi}_n| &\leq \sum_{m=-\infty}^{n-1} |G(n, m+1)q_m| + \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} |G(n, m+1)q_m| \\
&= \sum_{m=-\infty}^{n-1} |W_n P W_{m+1}^{-1} q_m| + \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} |W_n (I - P) W_{m+1}^{-1} q_m| \\
&\leq \sum_{m=-\infty}^{n-1} K \exp\left(-\sum_{j=m+1}^n a_j\right) |q_n| + \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} K \exp\left(-\sum_{j=n}^{m+1} a_j\right) |q_n| \\
&= N(n, |q|)
\end{aligned}$$

and the boundedness follows from **(E1)**.

Uniqueness of the bounded solution: As in [3] (continuous framework), let y_n be another bounded solution of (4.1). By variation of parameters (see *e.g.* [5, Th. 3.17]), we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
y_n &= W_n W_0^{-1} y_0 + \sum_{r=0}^{n-1} W_n W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r \\
&= W_n W_0^{-1} y_0 + \sum_{r=0}^{n-1} W_n P W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r + \sum_{r=0}^{n-1} W_n (I - P) W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r \\
&= W_n W_0^{-1} y_0 + \sum_{r=-\infty}^{n-1} W_n P W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r - \sum_{r=-\infty}^{-1} W_n P W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r \\
&\quad + \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} W_n (I - P) W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r - \sum_{r=n}^{\infty} W_n (I - P) W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r.
\end{aligned}$$

It is important to note that the expression above is well defined because

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \sum_{r=-\infty}^{-1} W_n P W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r \right| &= \left| W_n W_0^{-1} \sum_{r=-\infty}^{-1} W_0 P W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r \right| \\
&\leq |W_n W_0^{-1}| \sum_{r=-\infty}^{-1} |W_0 P W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r| \\
&\leq |W_n W_0^{-1}| \sum_{r=-\infty}^{-1} K \exp\left(-\sum_{j=r}^{-1} a_j\right) |q_r| \\
&\leq |W_n W_0^{-1}| N(r, |q|)
\end{aligned}$$

and let us denote

$$\sum_{r=-\infty}^{-1} W_n P W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r = W_n W_0^{-1} y_1.$$

In a similar way, we can verify that

$$\sum_{r=n}^{\infty} W_n (I - P) W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r = W_n W_0^{-1} y_2.$$

Now, we can see that

$$y_n = W_n W_0^{-1}(y_0 - y_1 + y_2) + \sum_{r=-\infty}^{n-1} W_n P W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r - \sum_{r=n}^{\infty} W_n (I - P) W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r.$$

As y_n is a bounded solution of (4.1) and **(E1)** implies that

$$\sum_{r=-\infty}^{n-1} W_n P W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r - \sum_{r=n}^{\infty} W_n (I - P) W_{r+1}^{-1} q_r$$

is also bounded, it follows that $x_n = W_n W_0^{-1}(y_0 - y_1 + y_2)$ is a bounded solution of (1.3). Finally, Lemma 1 implies that $y_0 = y_1 - y_2$ and the uniqueness follows. \square

Lemma 3. *If (1.3) has a generalized exponential dichotomy and the system*

$$(4.2) \quad z_{n+1} = A_n z_n + q(n, z_n)$$

is such that

$$(4.3) \quad |q(n, z)| \leq Q_n \quad \text{and} \quad |q(n, z) - q(n, \tilde{z})| \leq r_n |z - \tilde{z}|,$$

where Q_n and r_n satisfy

$$(4.4) \quad N(n, Q) \leq \tilde{B} \quad \text{and} \quad N(n, r) \leq \theta < 1,$$

then, there exists a unique bounded solution of (4.2).

Proof. Existence: Let us consider the sequence $\{\varphi^{(j)}\}_j$, recursively defined by

$$\varphi_{n+1}^{(j)} = A_n \varphi_n^{(j)} + q(n, \varphi_n^{(j-1)}),$$

where $\varphi^{(0)}$ is an arbitrary sequence in $\ell_\infty(\mathbb{Z})$ satisfying $|\varphi^{(0)}|_\infty \leq \tilde{B}$.

By using Lemma 2 combined with the first inequalities of (4.3)–(4.4), we can see that $\varphi^{(j)}$ is the unique solution of the above system and verifies

$$\varphi_n^{(j)} = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} G(n, k+1) q(k, \varphi_k^{(j-1)}),$$

with $|\varphi^{(j)}|_\infty \leq \tilde{B}$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

On the other hand, the second inequalities of (4.3)–(4.4) imply that

$$|\varphi^{(j)} - \varphi^{(j-1)}|_\infty \leq \theta |\varphi^{(j-1)} - \varphi^{(j-2)}|_\infty$$

with $\theta \in (0, 1)$, and we can see that $\varphi^{(j)}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\ell_\infty(\mathbb{Z})$. Now, letting $j \rightarrow +\infty$ in $\varphi_n^{(j)}$, it follows that

$$\varphi_n^* = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} G(n, k+1) q(k, \varphi_k^*),$$

is a bounded solution of (4.2).

Uniqueness: Let y_n be another bounded solution of (4.2). By following the lines of the proof of Lemma 2 combined with (4.3)–(4.4), the reader can verify that

$$y_n = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} G(n, k+1) q(k, y_k).$$

Finally, by using the second inequalities of (4.3)–(4.4), we have that

$$|\varphi^* - y|_\infty \leq \theta |\varphi^* - y|_\infty$$

and the uniqueness follows since $0 < \theta < 1$. \square

Lemma 4. *Suppose that (1.3) has a generalized exponential dichotomy. If the systems (1.1)–(1.2) satisfy **(H1)**–**(H3)** and $x(n, m, \xi)$ is the solution of (1.1) with initial condition ξ at $n = m$, then the (m, ξ) –parameter dependent system*

$$(4.5) \quad w_{n+1} = A_n w_n - f(n, x(n, m, \xi)) + g(n, w_n + x(n, m, \xi)).$$

has a unique bounded solution $n \mapsto \chi(n; (m, \xi))$ with $|\chi(n; (m, \xi))|_\infty \leq B$.

Proof. By using **(H1)**–**(H3)** and Lemma 3 with $q(n, w_n) = -f(n, x(n, m, \xi)) + g(n, w_n + x(n, m, \xi))$, we know that the unique bounded solution of (4.5) is

$$(4.6) \quad \chi(n; (m, \xi)) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} G(n, k+1) \{g(k, \chi(k; (m, \xi)) + x_{k,m}(\xi)) - f(k, x_{k,m}(\xi))\},$$

where $x_{k,m}(\xi) = x(k, m, \xi)$ and the Lemma follows. \square

Lemma 5. *Suppose that (1.3) has a generalized exponential dichotomy. If the systems (1.1)–(1.2) satisfy **(H1)**–**(H3)** and $y(n, m, \nu)$ is the solution of (1.2) with initial condition ν at $n = m$, then the (m, ν) –parameter dependent system*

$$(4.7) \quad z_{n+1} = A_n z_n + f(n, z_n + y(n, m, \nu)) - g(n, y(n, m, \nu)),$$

has a unique bounded solution $n \mapsto \vartheta(n; (m, \nu))$ with $|\vartheta(n; (m, \nu))|_\infty \leq B$.

Proof. As before, by using **(H1)**–**(H3)** and Lemma 3 with $q(n, z_n) = f(n, z_n + y(n, m, \nu)) - g(n, y(n, m, \nu))$, the unique bounded solution of (4.7) is

$$(4.8) \quad \vartheta(n; (m, \nu)) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} G(n, k+1) \{f(k, \vartheta(k; (m, \nu)) + y_{k,m}(\nu)) - g(k, y_{k,m}(\nu))\},$$

where $y_{k,m}(\nu) = y(k, m, \nu)$. \square

Remark 7. By uniqueness of the solution of (1.1), we know that $x(n, n, x(n, m, \xi)) = x(n, m, \xi)$, which implies that (4.5) is similar to

$$w_{n+1} = A_n w_n - f(n, x(n, n, x(n, m, \xi))) + g(n, w_n + x(n, n, x(n, m, \xi)))$$

and Lemma 4 implies that

$$(4.9) \quad \chi(n; (m, \xi)) = \chi(n; (n, x(n, m, \xi))).$$

In a similar way, it can be proved that

$$(4.10) \quad \vartheta(n; (m, \nu)) = \vartheta(n; (n, y(n, m, \nu))).$$

Lemma 6. *Suppose that (1.3) has a generalized exponential dichotomy. If the systems (1.1)–(1.2) satisfy **(H1)**–**(H3)**, then there exists a unique map $H: \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, which verifies the following properties*

- a) $H(n, \xi) - \xi$ is bounded for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
- b) If $x_n = x(n, m, \xi)$ is solution of (1.1), then $H[n, x_n]$ is solution of (1.2).

Proof. The proof will be divided in two steps:

Step i: Existence of H . We will prove that

$$H(n, \xi) = \xi + \chi(n; (n, \xi))$$

satisfy properties a) and b).

Indeed, by using (4.6) combined with **(H1)**–**(H2)**, we obtain that $|H(n, \xi) - \xi| \leq B$. On the other hand, we replace (n, ξ) by $(n, x(n, m, \xi))$ and (4.9) implies

$$\begin{aligned} H[n, x(n, m, \xi)] &= x(n, m, \xi) + \chi(n; (n, x(n, m, \xi))) \\ &= x(n, m, \xi) + \chi(n; (m, \xi)) \end{aligned}$$

and the reader can verify easily that $H[n, x(n, m, \xi)]$ is solution of (1.2) since $n \mapsto \chi(n; (m, \xi))$ is solution of (4.5).

Step ii: Uniqueness of H . Let \tilde{H} be another map satisfying a) and b). Let us observe that $u_n = \tilde{H}[n, x_n] - x_n$ is also a bounded solution of (4.5), which implies by Lemma 4 that $\tilde{H}[n, x_n] - x_n = \chi(n; (m, \xi))$ and the uniqueness follows. \square

Lemma 7. *Suppose that (1.3) has a generalized exponential dichotomy. If the systems (1.1)–(1.2) satisfy **(H1)**–**(H3)**, then there exists a unique map $L: \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, which verifies the following properties*

- a) $L(n, \nu) - \nu$ is bounded for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
- b) If $y_n = y(n, m, \nu)$ is solution of (1.2), then $L[n, y_n]$ is solution of (1.1).

Proof. It can be proved analogously as the previous result that the map

$$L(n, \nu) = \nu + \vartheta(n; (n, \nu))$$

is the unique satisfying properties a) and b). \square

Remark 8. By Lemma 6 combined with (4.6), we know that $H[n, x(n, m, \xi)]$ can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (4.11) \quad H[n, x(n, m, \xi)] &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} G(n, k+1)g(k, H[k, x(k, m, \xi)]) \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} G(n, k+1)f(k, x(k, m, \xi)) + x(n, m, \xi). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by Lemma 7 combined with (4.8), we know that:

$$\begin{aligned} (4.12) \quad L[n, y(n, m, \nu)] &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} G(n, k+1)f(k, L[k, y(k, m, \nu)]) \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} G(n, k+1)g(k, y(k, m, \nu)) + y(n, m, \nu). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 8. *For any solution $x(n, m, \xi)$ of (1.1) and $y(n, m, \nu)$ of (1.2) and any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, it follows that*

$$L[n, H[n, x(n, m, \xi)]] = x(n, m, \xi) \quad \text{and} \quad H[n, L[n, y(n, m, \nu)]] = y(n, m, \nu).$$

Proof. By Lemma 6 and Remark 8, we know that (4.11) is solution of (1.2). Now, by Lemma 7, we also know that $L[n, H[n, x_n(\xi)]]$ is a solution of (1.1) that can be

written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
L[n, H[n, (n, m, \xi)]] &= V[n, x(n, m, \xi)] \\
&= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} G(n, k+1) f(k, V[k, x(k, m, \xi)]) \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} G(n, k+1) g(k, H[k, x(k, m, \xi)]) + H[n, x(n, m, \xi)].
\end{aligned}$$

Now, by using (4.11) combined with **(A2)**, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
|V[n, x(n, m, \xi)] - x(n, m, \xi)| &\leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} |G(n, k+1)| \\
&\quad |f(k, V[k, x(k, m, \xi)]) - f(k, x(k, m, \xi))| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} |G(n, k+1)| r_k |V[k, x(k, m, \xi)] - x(k, m, \xi)|
\end{aligned}$$

and **(H3)** implies that

$$|L[n, H[n, x(n, m, \xi)]] - x(n, m, \xi)|_{\infty} \leq \theta |L[n, H[n, x(n, m, \xi)]] - x(n, m, \xi)|_{\infty},$$

with $\theta \in (0, 1)$, which is equivalent to

$$(4.13) \quad L[n, H[n, x(n, m, \xi)]] = x(n, m, \xi).$$

In a similar way, the reader can verify that

$$(4.14) \quad H[n, L[n, y(n, m, \nu)]] = y(n, m, \nu).$$

□

Remark 9. The maps $\xi \mapsto H(n, \xi)$ and $\nu \mapsto L(n, \nu)$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
H(n, \xi) &= \xi + \chi(n; (n, \xi)) \\
&= \xi + \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} G(n, k+1) \{g(k, \chi(k; (n, \xi)) + x_{k,n}(\xi)) - f(k, x_{k,n}(\xi))\},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
L(n, \nu) &= \nu + \vartheta(n; (n, \nu)) \\
&= \nu + \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} G(n, k+1) \{f(k, \vartheta(k; (n, \nu)) + y_{k,n}(\nu)) - g(k, y_{k,n}(\nu))\},
\end{aligned}$$

satisfy properties (ii) and (iii) from Definition 1, which is consequence of Lemmas 6 and 7. In order to verify property (i), notice that if $n = m$ in the identities (4.13)–(4.14), we obtain that

$$L(n, H(n, \xi)) = \xi \quad \text{and} \quad H(n, L(n, \nu)) = \nu$$

for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. These identities ensure that $H^{-1}(n, \cdot) = L(n, \cdot)$ for any fixed n . However, the continuity of both maps must be proved. In order to do that, we will follow the approach developed by Shi and Xiong [16] and Jiang [6] in a continuous framework.

5. PROOF OF MAIN RESULTS

As stated above, we will prove the continuity properties of the maps $\xi \mapsto H(n, \xi)$ and $\nu \mapsto L(n, \nu)$, for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The proof of Theorem 1 follow critically the lines of Jiang [6, Theorem 2] while the proof of Theorem 2 is inspired in Shi and Xiong [16, Lemma 10].

Lemma 9. *Let $n \mapsto x(n, k, \xi)$ (resp. $n \mapsto x(n, k, \xi')$) the solution of (1.1) passing through ξ (resp. ξ') at $n = k$. Then, it follows that*

$$(5.1) \quad |x(n, k, \xi) - x(n, k, \xi')| \leq |\xi - \xi'| \exp\left(\sum_{p=k}^{n-1} (\|A_p - I\| + r_p)\right) \quad \text{if } n > k$$

and

$$(5.2) \quad |x(n, k, \xi) - x(n, k, \xi')| \leq |\xi - \xi'| \exp\left(\sum_{p=n}^{k-1} (\|A_p - I\| + r_p)\right) \quad \text{if } n < k.$$

Proof. We will prove only the case $n > k$, the other one can be done similarly. It is straightforward to see that

$$x(n, k, \xi) = \xi + \sum_{p=k}^{n-1} (A_p - I)x(p, k, \xi) + f(p, x(p, k, \xi)).$$

By using **(A2)**, we have

$$|x(n, k, \xi) - x(n, k, \xi')| \leq |\xi - \xi'| + \sum_{p=k}^{n-1} (\|A_p - I\| + r_p) |x(p, k, \xi) - x(p, k, \xi')|.$$

Finally, by the discrete Gronwall's inequality (see *e.g.*, [5, Lemma 4.32]), we have (5.1). □

5.1. Proof of Theorem 1. We will give the proof (in three steps) only for the map H since the other one can be done analogously.

Step 1: Preliminary facts. As the identity is a continuous map, we only need to prove that the map $\xi \mapsto \chi(n; (n, \xi))$ is continuous for any fixed n . Now, let us recall that $n \mapsto \chi(n; (m, \xi))$ is the unique bounded solution of (4.5), which can be obtained as the limit of the successive approximations as done in Lemma 3:

$$\chi_{j+1}(n; (m, \xi)) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} G(n, k+1) \{g(k, \chi_j(k; (m, \xi)) + x_{k,m}(\xi)) - f(k, x_{k,m}(\xi))\},$$

such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \chi_j(n; (m, \xi)) = \chi(n; (m, \xi)),$$

uniformly on \mathbb{Z} , which implies that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $J(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(5.3) \quad |\chi(n; (n, \xi)) - \chi_j(n; (n, \xi))| < \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon \quad \text{for any } j > J.$$

On the other hand, by **(H4)**, we know that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\ell(\varepsilon) > 1$ such that

$$(5.4) \quad \sum_{k=-\infty}^{n-1-\ell} K \exp\left(-\sum_{p=k+1}^n a_p\right) \Delta_k + \sum_{k=n+\ell}^{\infty} K \exp\left(-\sum_{p=n}^{k+1} a_p\right) \Delta_k < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{3}\right),$$

where Δ_k is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_k &= g(k, \chi(n; (n, \xi) + x_{k,n}(\xi))) - g(k, \chi(n; (n, \xi') + x_{k,n}(\xi'))) \\ &\quad + f(k, x_{k,n}(\xi')) - f(k, x_{k,n}(\xi)).\end{aligned}$$

Step 2: Claim. Given $\ell(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ defined in (5.4). For any j , there exists $\delta_j(\varepsilon, \ell, n) > 0$ such that

$$(5.5) \quad |\chi_j(n; (n, \xi)) - \chi_j(n; (n, \xi'))| < \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon \quad \text{if} \quad |\xi - \xi'| < \delta_j.$$

Step 3: End of proof. Finally, if $|\xi - \xi'| < \delta_j$ with $j > J$, then

$$\begin{aligned}|\chi(n; (n, \xi)) - \chi(n; (n, \xi'))| &\leq |\chi(n; (n, \xi)) - \chi_j(n; (n, \xi))| \\ &\quad + |\chi_j(n; (n, \xi)) - \chi_j(n; (n, \xi'))| \\ &\quad + |\chi_j(n; (n, \xi')) - \chi(n; (n, \xi'))| \\ &< \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon + \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon + \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon = \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

and the continuity of $\xi \mapsto \xi + \chi(n; (n, \xi))$ follows.

Proof of Claim: The proof will be made by induction by considering an initial term

$$\chi_0(n; (n, \xi)) = \chi_0(n; (n, \xi')) = \phi \in \ell_\infty(\mathbb{Z}) \quad \text{with} \quad |\phi|_\infty < B.$$

and supposing that (5.5) is verified for some j as inductive hypothesis. Now, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_{j+1}(n; (n, \xi)) - \chi_{j+1}(n; (n, \xi')) &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} G(n, k+1)\Delta_k(g) - \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} G(n, k+1)\Delta_k(f) \\ &= \underbrace{\sum_{k=-\infty}^{n-1-\ell} G(n, k+1)[\Delta_k(g-f)] + \sum_{k=n+\ell}^{\infty} G(n, k+1)[\Delta_k(g-f)]}_{=A} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=n-\ell}^{n-1} G(n, k+1)\Delta_k(g)}_{=B_1} + \underbrace{\sum_{k=n}^{n+\ell-1} G(n, k+1)\Delta_k(g)}_{=B_2} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\sum_{k=n-\ell}^{n-1} G(n, k+1)\Delta_k(f)}_{=C_1} - \underbrace{\sum_{k=n}^{n+\ell-1} G(n, k+1)\Delta_k(f)}_{=C_2},\end{aligned}$$

where ℓ is the same as in (5.4), and $\Delta_k(g)$, $\Delta_k(f)$ and $\Delta_k(g-f)$ are described by:

$$\Delta_k(g) = g(k, \chi_j(k; (n, \xi)) + x_{k,n}(\xi)) - g(k, \chi_j(k; (n, \xi')) + x_{k,n}(\xi')),$$

$$\Delta_k(f) = f(k, x_{k,n}(\xi')) - f(k, x_{k,n}(\xi)),$$

$$\Delta_k(g-f) = \Delta_k(g) - \Delta_k(f).$$

By (5.4), we have that

$$(5.6) \quad |A| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{3}\right).$$

In order to estimate $|B|$, by using (2.3), **(A2)**, inductive hypothesis and Lemma 9, we can deduce:

$$\begin{aligned} |B_1| &\leq \sum_{k=n-\ell}^{n-1} K \exp\left(-\sum_{p=k+1}^n a_p\right) r_k \{|\chi_j(k; (n, \xi)) - \chi_j(k; (n, \xi'))| + |x_{k,n}(\xi) - x_{k,n}(\xi')|\} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=n-\ell}^{n-1} K \exp\left(-\sum_{p=k+1}^n a_p\right) r_k \left\{ \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon + |\xi - \xi'| \exp\left(\sum_{l=k}^{n-1} \{ \|A_l - I\| + r_l \} \right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|B_2| \leq \sum_{k=n}^{n+\ell-1} K \exp\left(-\sum_{p=n}^{k+1} a_p\right) r_k \left\{ \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon + |\xi - \xi'| \exp\left(\sum_{l=n}^{k-1} \{ \|A_l - I\| + r_l \} \right) \right\}.$$

Analogously, we can verify that

$$\begin{aligned} |C_1| &\leq \sum_{k=n-\ell}^{n-1} K \exp\left(-\sum_{p=k+1}^n a_p\right) r_k |x_{k,n}(\xi) - x_{k,n}(\xi')| \\ &\leq |\xi - \xi'| \sum_{k=n-\ell}^{n-1} K \exp\left(-\sum_{p=k+1}^n a_p\right) r_k \exp\left(\sum_{l=k}^{n-1} \{ \|A_l - I\| + r_l \} \right). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|C_2| \leq |\xi - \xi'| \sum_{k=n}^{n+\ell-1} K \exp\left(-\sum_{p=n}^{k+1} a_p\right) r_k \exp\left(\sum_{l=n}^{k-1} \{ \|A_l - I\| + r_l \} \right).$$

By using **(H3)**, we can deduce that

$$|B_1| + |B_2| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\theta + |\xi - \xi'| \Gamma(n, \ell) \quad \text{and} \quad |C_1| + |C_2| \leq |\xi - \xi'| \Gamma(n, \ell),$$

where $\Gamma(n, \ell)$ a finite term is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(n, \ell) &= \sum_{k=n-\ell}^{n-1} K \exp\left(-\sum_{p=k+1}^n a_p\right) r_k \exp\left(\sum_{l=k}^{n-1} \{ \|A_l - I\| + r_l \} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=n}^{n+\ell-1} K \exp\left(-\sum_{p=n}^{k+1} a_p\right) r_k \exp\left(\sum_{l=n}^{k-1} \{ \|A_l - I\| + r_l \} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{j+1}(n; (n, \xi)) - \chi_{j+1}(n; (n, \xi')) &= |A| + |B| + |C| \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{3}\right) + \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\theta + 2|\xi - \xi'| \Gamma(n, \ell). \end{aligned}$$

When choosing $\delta_{j+1} = \min \left\{ \delta_j, \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{3}\right) \frac{\varepsilon}{4\Gamma(n, \ell)} \right\}$, we can see that (5.5) is verified and the claim follows. \square

Remark 10. A careful examination of the inductive proof of (5.5) show us that δ_j can be dependent of n since we cannot prove that $\Gamma(n, \ell)$ has an upper bound independent of n . This fact has been analyzed in the continuous framework by Jiang [6, p.484] but is not clear for us.

5.2. Proof of Corollary 1. We only need to prove that $\Gamma(n, \ell)$ has an upper bound does not depend on n . Indeed, by **(A2)**, **(H3)** and (3.3), we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(n, \ell) &\leq \exp \left(\sum_{l=n-\ell}^{n+\ell} \{ \|A_l - I\| + r_l \} \right) N(n, r) \\ &\leq \exp \left(2\{M\ell + M_0\ell\} \right) \theta \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows. \square

5.3. Proof of Theorem 2. Firstly, note that the topological equivalence is a direct consequence of Theorem 1. Indeed, **(H1)** and **(H3)** are equivalent to **(D1)** and **(D2)**. On the other hand, **(H2)** is always satisfied since

$$N(n, F + G) \leq K(F + G) \frac{1 + e^{-\alpha}}{1 - e^{-\alpha}} = B.$$

Finally, **(H4)**–**(H5)** are a consequence of **(D1)**–**(D2)** as stated in Section 2 and all the hypotheses of Theorem 1 are satisfied, which implies topological equivalence.

Moreover, by following the lines of the proof of Corollary 1, we can deduce that $\Gamma(n, \ell)$ has an upper bound independent of n , and consequently δ_j in (5.5) also. This fact allows to prove the uniform continuity of $\xi \mapsto H(t, \xi)$ and $\nu \mapsto L(t, \nu)$.

Now, we will prove that the map $\xi \mapsto H(n, \xi)$ is Hölder continuous for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The other one can be done in a similar way. As before, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\chi(n; (n, \xi)) - \chi(n; (n, \xi'))| &\leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} G(n, k+1) |\Delta_k(g)| + \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} G(n, k+1) |\Delta_k(f)| \\ &\leq \underbrace{2 \sum_{k=-\infty}^{n-1-\ell} G(n, k+1) [F + G] + 2 \sum_{k=n+\ell}^{\infty} G(n, k+1) [F + G]}_{=A} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k=n-\ell}^{n-1} K e^{-\alpha(n-k-1)} \Delta_k(g)}_{=B_1} + \underbrace{\sum_{k=n}^{n+\ell-1} K e^{-\alpha(k+1-n)} \Delta_k(g)}_{=B_2} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\sum_{k=n-\ell}^{n-1} K e^{-\alpha(n-k-1)} \Delta_k(f)}_{=C_1} - \underbrace{\sum_{k=n}^{n+\ell-1} K e^{-\alpha(k+1-n)} \Delta_k(f)}_{=C_2}. \end{aligned}$$

The reader can deduce that

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \frac{2K(F+G)}{1-e^{-\alpha}} e^{-\ell\alpha}.$$

On the other hand, by using **(A2)** and Lemma 9, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{B}_1| &\leq \sum_{k=n-\ell}^{n-1} K e^{-\alpha(n-k-1)r} \left\{ \|\chi(\cdot; (n, \xi)) - \chi(\cdot; (n, \xi'))\|_\infty + |x_{k,n}(\xi) - x_{k,n}(\xi')| \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=n-\ell}^{n-1} K e^{-\alpha(n-k-1)r} \left\{ \|\chi(\cdot; (n, \xi)) - \chi(\cdot; (n, \xi'))\|_\infty + |\xi - \xi'| e^{(M+r)(n-1-k)} \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=n-\ell}^{n-1} K e^{-\alpha(n-k-1)r} \left\{ \|\chi(\cdot; (n, \xi)) - \chi(\cdot; (n, \xi'))\|_\infty + |\xi - \xi'| e^{(M+r)(\ell-1)} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\|\chi(\cdot; (n, \xi)) - \chi(\cdot; (n, \xi'))\|_\infty = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |\chi(j; (n, \xi)) - \chi(j; (n, \xi'))|.$$

Similarly, it follows that

$$|\mathcal{B}_2| \leq \sum_{k=n}^{n+\ell-1} K e^{-\alpha(k+1-n)r} \left\{ \|\chi(\cdot; (n, \xi)) - \chi(\cdot; (n, \xi'))\|_\infty + |\xi - \xi'| e^{(M+r)(\ell-2)} \right\},$$

which implies that

$$|\mathcal{B}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_2| \leq \theta \|\chi(\cdot; (n, \xi)) - \chi(\cdot; (n, \xi'))\|_\infty + \theta |\xi - \xi'| e^{(M+r)\ell},$$

where

$$\theta = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{n-1} K r e^{-\alpha(n-k-1)} + \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} K r e^{-\alpha(k+1-n)} = K r \left\{ \frac{1+e^{-\alpha}}{1-e^{-\alpha}} \right\} < 1.$$

The inequality

$$|\mathcal{C}_1| + |\mathcal{C}_2| \leq \theta |\xi - \xi'| e^{(M+r)\ell},$$

can be deduce as above. Now, it follows that

$$|\chi(n; (n, \xi)) - \chi(n; (n, \xi'))| \leq \frac{2K(F+G)}{(1-e^{-\alpha})(1-\theta)} e^{-\alpha\ell} + \frac{2\theta}{1-\theta} |\xi - \xi'| e^{(M+r)\ell}$$

Let us assume that $|\xi - \xi'| < 1$ and let us choose

$$\ell = \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln \left(\frac{1}{|\xi - \xi'|} \right)$$

and introduce the constants

$$D_1 = 1 + \frac{2K(F+G)}{(1-e^{-\alpha})(1-\theta)} \quad \text{and} \quad D_2 = \frac{2\theta}{1-\theta}.$$

Finally, a careful computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} |h(n, \xi) - h(n, \xi')| &\leq D_1 |\xi - \xi'| + D_2 |\xi - \xi'|^{1 - (\frac{M+r}{\alpha})} \\ &\leq (D_1 + D_2) |\xi - \xi'|^{1 - (\frac{M+r}{\alpha})}, \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] A.S. Besicovitch. Almost Periodic Functions. Dover, 1954.
- [2] Ch.V. Coffman and J.J. Schäfer. *Dichotomies for linear difference equations*, Mat. Ann., **172** 139–166, 1967.
- [3] X. Chen and Y. Xia, *Topological conjugacy between two kinds of nonlinear differential equations via generalized exponential dichotomy*. Int. J. Differential Equations. (2011) Article ID 871574.
- [4] W. Coppel, “Dichotomies in Stability Theory”. Lecture notes in mathematics 629, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1978.
- [5] S. Elaydi, “An Introduction to Difference Equations”, Springer–Verlag, New–York, 2005.
- [6] L. Jiang, *Generalized exponential dichotomy and global linearization*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **315** (2006), 474–490.
- [7] L. Jiang, *Strongly topological linearization with generalized exponential dichotomy*, Nonlinear Anal., **67** (2007), 1102–1110.
- [8] J. Kurzweil and G. Papaschinopoulos, *Structural stability of linear discrete systems via the exponential dichotomy*, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, **38** 280–284, 1988.
- [9] J. Kurzweil and G. Papaschinopoulos, *Topological equivalence and structural stability for linear difference equations*, J. Differential Equations, **89** 89–94, 1991.
- [10] R.H. Martin Jr., *Conditional stability and separation of solutions to differential equations*, J. Differential Equations, **13** 81–105, 1973.
- [11] K.J. Palmer, *A generalization of Hartman’s linearization theorem*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **41** 753–758, 1973.
- [12] G. Papaschinopoulos. *A Linearization result for a differential equation with piecewise constant argument*, Analysis, **16** 161–170, 1996.
- [13] G. Papaschinopoulos and J. Schinas, *Criteria for exponential dichotomy of difference equations*, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, **35** 295–299, 1985.
- [14] M. Pinto, *Discrete dichotomies*, Comput. Math. Appl., **28** 259–270, 1994.
- [15] J. Schinas and G. Papaschinopoulos, *Topological equivalence for linear discrete systems via dichotomies and Lyapunov functions*, Boll. Un. Math. Ital., **4** 61–70, 1985.
- [16] J. Shi and K. Xiong. *On Hartman’s linearization and Palmer’s linearization theorem*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **192** 813–832, 1995.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE CHILE, CASILLA 653, SANTIAGO, CHILE

E-mail address: `castaneda@u.uchile.cl`, `grobledo@u.uchile.cl`