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1. Introduction

In the pioneering work [42], Perron published his celebrated theorem asserting that the spectral radius of a positive matrix is an eigenvalue of the matrix which corresponds to a positive eigenvector. This result was later extended by Frobenius to nonnegative irreducible matrices [19], which is now known as the Perron-Frobenius (PF in short) theorem. Since in practice it is often the case that a matrix has nonnegative entries, the theorem has found an astonishing wide range of applications in diverse areas; see e.g. MacCluer [31] for a complete review on this topic. This greatly stimulated mathematicians to seek for various proofs from different perspectives, aiming at opening up new ways to this fruitful area. Many elegant proofs of the theorem were summarized in [31], including the Perron’s original proofs [41, 42] based on a technical use of the Cramer’s rule or the resolvent of matrices, Wielandt’s 1950 proof [52] built on Frobenius’s mini-max idea, Birkhoff’s proof via the Jordan canonical form [7], Karlin’s proof using the complex variable theorem about power series with positive coefficients [26]. Other proofs based on geometric methods and fixed-point theorems can be found in [8, 9, 23, 25, 28, 43, 47], etc.

As we have seen in the literature, the new ideas and techniques involved in different proofs have led to many important extensions of the PF theorem. An outstanding extension is the famous Krein-Rutman (KR in short) theorem established in 1948 [29] dealing with positive compact linear operators, which was obtained by a substantial use of the Schauder fixed-point theorem. This infinite-dimensional extension tremendously expanded the scope of applications of the PF theory, and therefore aroused a great interest in further studies in the past decades; see e.g. [3, 6, 14, 15, 27, 33, 37, 47, 48, 49].

Another remarkable one is the nonlinear PF theory, whose development was originally due to a simple-looking observation made by Birkhoff [8] and Samelson [17] (who remarked that one can use Hilbert’s projective metric and the contraction mapping principle to prove PF type theorems for nonnegative matrices). The interested reader may consult [30] for a complete statement on this topic in finite dimensional case, and [11, 32, 34, 38, 40] etc. for infinite dimensional results. In recent years there even appeared some important extensions of the PF theorem to positive tensors [12, 13, 53].

In [44] Rugh generalized the notions of a real Birkhoff cone and its Hilbert’s metric to complex spaces and obtained a set of spectral gap theorems. In particular, the classical PF theorem and KR theorem were extended in some ways to complex matrices and operators. Extensions of the PF theorem to complex matrices in other ways can also be found in [39, 46] etc. It is desirable that these complex extensions can be helpful in deriving uniform complex estimates needed in the study of Markov additive processes and non-autonomous or random dynamical systems [39, 45].
The main purpose of this paper is twofold. One is of a methodological sense. Specifically, we present a self-contained new dynamical approach towards the PF theory by using only some elementary knowledge on linear ODEs, which is significantly different from those in the literature and gives us a dynamical picture of the theory. The other is to develop a complex version of the theory and prove a variety of generalized KR type theorems for both bounded and unbounded real operators.

This work will be carried out as follows. In Section 2 we introduce some basic notions and notations concerning cones and operators. In particular, we introduce the notion of rotational strong positivity for complex operators to replace the one of strong positivity which plays a crucial role in the real KR theorem. Some simple facts used throughout the paper will also be presented. In Section 3 we prove two technical lemmas. One concerns a fundamental projective property of cones, and the other relates to the asymptotic behaviour of linear ODEs in finite-dimensional complex Banach spaces.

Sections 4 and 5 are concerned with a finite-dimensional complex version of the PF theory. Specifically, we develop in a self-contained manner an elementary dynamical approach towards the PF theory and prove in Section 4 a generalized finite-dimensional KR type theorem for complex operators under weaker assumptions (Theorem 4.1). This result immediately yields a refined complex version of the KR theorem as long as we impose on the operator the rotational strong positivity assumption, which forms the main ingredients of Section 5.

In Section 6 we extend the finite-dimensional results in previous sections to infinite-dimensional spaces by a simple use of direct sum decompositions of the spaces which reduces infinite-dimensional problems to finite-dimensional ones.

Section 7 is devoted to real bounded linear operators. By considering the complexifications of real operators and applying the results for complex operators, we obtain a generalized KR type theorem (Theorem 7.3) and give simple proofs for some strong complete versions of the classical KR theorem. We mention that a wonderful dynamical systems proof for a major part of the KR theorem can be found in Alikakos and Fusco [1]. But our proof here is of a completely different nature from the one given in [1].

Elliptic operators are a class of particularly important unbounded operators. Although the KR theorem for bounded operators can be used to discuss their principal eigenvalue problems via the resolvent operators, generally only a part of the information concerning the principal eigenpairs can be obtained directly from the KR theorem, and in many cases one has to do much technical PDE argument if he/she wants to get more refined information; see e.g. Du [14, Chap. 1], Evans [17, Section 6.5] and Ni [36]. One reason is that there might be no one-one correspondence between the boundary spectrum of an elliptic operator and the peripheral spectrum of its resolvent. To what extent we can derive the
information on the principal eigenpairs of such operators by functional analytic methods seems to be a natural problem which has aroused many interests.

There have already been many nice theories on this problem in the literature, mainly from the point of view of generators of semigroups. In [21] the authors proved that the spectral bound of the generator of a positive $C_0$-semigroup on a Banach space with a normal reproducing cone lies in the spectrum. The monograph [4] contains a far reaching theory on the problem in the framework of generators of $C_0$-semigroups on the functional space $C_0(X)$ consisting of continuous functions vanishing at infinity, where $X$ is a locally compact space. Later Nussbaum extended in some ways a major part of the KR theorem to the generators of general $C_0$-semigroups on Banach spaces with reproducing cones; see [38, Theorem 1.3]. Recent development can be found in Kanigowski and Kryszewski [25] and the references therein.

On the other hand, the situation in the case of an elliptic operator $A$ (such as the one considered in Section 8.2) can be rather complicated. For instance, it may happen that the cone of nonnegative functions in an appropriate space (say $L^p(\Omega)$) in which $A$ generates a $C_0$-semigroup fails to be solid or reproducing, whereas in another suitable space in which the cone is solid and the required positive properties of $A$ can be successfully examined, $A$ may fail to generate a semigroup. As one of the main ingredients in this paper, once again by using a simple dynamical argument, we establish in Section 8 some new KR type theorems for sectorial operators in a formalism that seems to be more suitable for elliptic operators. As we will see, our abstract results can be directly applied to these operators and enable us to reduce significantly the technical PDE argument involved in the study of their principal eigenvalue problems. As an illustrating example, the principal eigenvalue problem of general elliptic operators associated with degenerate mixed boundary conditions is discussed by using only the $L^p$-theory and some classical maximum principles.

2. Preliminaries

In this paper $\mathbb{C}$ denotes the field of complex numbers, and $i$ the unit imaginary number in $\mathbb{C}$. Let $S_r = \{w \in \mathbb{C} : |w| = r\}$ ($r > 0$), and $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$.

Let $E$ be a Banach space (real or complex) with norm $\| \cdot \|$. For $M \subset E$, the interior and closure of $M$ are denoted respectively by $\overset{\circ}{M}$ and $\overline{M}$. When we need to emphasize in which space the interior and closure are taken, we may use the notations $\interior_E M$ and $\clos_E M$ in place of $\overset{\circ}{M}$ and $\overline{M}$, respectively. Given $x \in E$, set $d(x, M) = \inf_{y \in M} \|x - y\|$.
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2.1. Some basic knowledge in the spectral theory of operators

Let $E$ be a complex Banach space, and $A$ a closed densely defined operator in $E$. Denote by $\sigma(A)$ and $\rho(A)$ the spectrum and resolvent set of $A$, respectively. For $\lambda \in \rho(A)$, let $R_\lambda(A) := (\lambda - A)^{-1}$ be the resolvent of $A$.

Given $\mu \in \sigma(A)$, set

$$GE_\mu(A) = \{\xi : (A - \mu)^j \xi = 0 \text{ for some } j \geq 1\}. \quad (2.1)$$

It is trivial to check that $A$ leaves $GE_\mu(A)$ invariant. If $GE_\mu(A) \neq \{0\}$, then we call each $\xi \in GE_\mu(A) \setminus \{0\}$ a generalized eigenvector of $A$. Clearly for such a $\xi$, there is an integer $k \geq 1$ such that

$$(A - \mu)^j \xi \neq 0 \quad (0 \leq j \leq k - 1), \quad (A - \mu)^k \xi = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

(Here we assign $(A - \mu)^0 = I$, the identity mapping on $E$.) For convenience in statement, we call the number $k$ in (2.2) the rank of $\xi$, denoted by rank($\xi$). Note that an eigenvector $w$ is a generalized eigenvector with rank($w$) = 1.

Denote by $\sigma_e(A)$ the essential spectrum of $A$ in the terminology of Browder [5] pp. 107-108, Def. 11. Then each $\mu \in \sigma(A) \setminus \sigma_e(A)$ is isolated in $\sigma(A)$ with $GE_\mu(A)$ being a finite-dimensional subspace of $E$; see [5] pp. 108.

Let $\mathcal{L}(E)$ be the space of bounded linear operators on $E$. If $A \in \mathcal{L}(E)$, we define the spectral radius $r(A)$ and essential spectral radius $r_e(A)$ as

$$r(A) = \sup\{\|\mu\| : \mu \in \sigma(A)\}, \quad r_e(A) = \sup\{\|\mu\| : \mu \in \sigma_e(A)\}.$$

It is a basic knowledge that $r(A) = \lim_{k \to \infty} \|A^k\|^{1/k}$.

The following fundamental fact will be used in Section 8 when dealing with unbounded operators.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let $\mu \in \sigma(A)$, and $\lambda \in \rho(A)$. Then

$$R_\lambda(A)GE_\mu(A) = GE_\mu(A) = GE_{\lambda - \mu}^{-1}(R_\lambda(A)). \quad (2.3)$$

**Proof.** Let $\xi \in GE_\mu(A)$. Then $(A - \mu)^k \xi = 0$, where $k = \text{rank}(\xi) \geq 1$. Hence

$$(A - \mu)^k (R_\lambda(A)\xi) = R_\lambda(A)(A - \mu)^k \xi = R_\lambda(A)0 = 0.$$ 

It follows that $R_\lambda(A)\xi \in GE_\mu(A)$. Simple calculations also yield

$$(\lambda - A)^k (R_\lambda(A) - \lambda_{\mu})^k \xi = \lambda_{\mu}^k (A - \mu)^k \xi = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

where $\lambda_{\mu} = (\lambda - \mu)^{-1}$. Since $\lambda \in \rho(A)$, (2.4) implies that $(R_\lambda(A) - \lambda_{\mu})^k \xi = 0$. Therefore $\xi \in GE_{\lambda_{\mu}}(R_\lambda(A))$. In conclusion, we have

$$R_\lambda(A)GE_\mu(A) \subset GE_\mu(A) \subset GE_{\lambda_{\mu}}(R_\lambda(A)).$$

The verification of the inverse inclusions is similar. We omit it.
2.2. Cones

Let $E$ be a (real or complex) Banach space. A wedge in $E$ is a closed subset $P \subset E$ with $P \neq \{0\}$ such that $tP \subset P$ for all $t \geq 0$.

A convex wedge $P$ with $P \cap (-P) = \{0\}$ is called a cone.

It is a basic knowledge that if $P$ is a cone then $P + P \subset P$.

Let $P$ be a cone in $E$. $P$ is said to be total (resp., solid), if $P - P = E$ (resp., $P \neq \emptyset$). We remark that the notion of totalness for cones is a bit restrictive in the complex case, because in such a case $P - P$ may fail to be a subspace of $E$. Instead, we introduce a weaker notion which works equal well as totalness.

**Definition 2.2.** We say that $P$ is full, if there is no proper closed subspace $E_0$ of $E$ such that $P \subset E_0$.

In other words, $P$ is called full if $E_0$ is a closed subspace of $E$ and $P \subset E_0$, then $E_0 = E$. It is easy to deduce that a solid cone is total, and a total cone is full. However, in the complex case a full cone may not be total.

**Example 2.1.** Let $E = \mathbb{R}^2 + i\mathbb{R}^2$, and set

$$P_1 = \{(x,0) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \geq 0\}, \quad P_2 = \{(0,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y \geq 0\}.$$ 

Put $P = P_1 + iP_2$. Then $P$ is a cone in $E$. Note that

$$P - P = (P_1 + iP_2) - (P_1 + iP_2) = (P_1 - P_1) + i(P_2 - P_2) = X_1 + iX_2,$$

where $X_1 = \{(x,0) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$, and $X_2 = \{(0,y) : y \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Clearly $P - P = P - P \neq E$. Hence $P$ is not total. Nevertheless, it can be shown that $P$ is full.

Indeed, let $E_0 \subset E$ be a subspace (in the complex sense). If $P = P_1 + iP_2 \subset E_0$ then we have $P_1, iP_2 \subset E_0$. Now observe that $P_2 = -iP_2 \subset E_0$. Therefore $\mathbb{R}^2_+ = P_1 + P_2 \subset E_0$. Thus $\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2_+ - \mathbb{R}^2_+ \subset E_0$. It then follows that $i\mathbb{R}^2 \subset E_0$. Consequently $E = \mathbb{R}^2 + i\mathbb{R}^2 \subset E_0$, which implies that $P$ is full.

**Remark 2.3.** If $E$ is a real Banach space, then one easily verifies that $P$ is full if and only if it is total.

The following simple fact will be frequently used throughout the paper.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let $E_0$ be a finite-dimensional subspace of $E$ with $P \cap E_0 = \{0\}$, and let $\{x_k\}_{k \geq 1} \subset P$ be a sequence. Suppose $d(x_k, E_0) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Then

$$x_k \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$
2.3. Rotational strong positivity of complex operators

Recall that in case $E$ is a real Banach space and $P$ is a solid cone in $E$, an operator $A \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ is called strongly positive if $A(P \setminus \{0\}) \subset \bar{P}$. This notion plays a crucial role in the real KR theorem. However, it is not suitable for complex operators. This can be seen from the following simple observation.

Let $E$ be a finite-dimensional complex Banach space, and $P$ a solid cone in $E$. Let $A \in \mathcal{L}(E)$. Suppose that $A$ is strongly positive in the terminology as above. Then as in Theorem 5.1 we deduce that $r = r(A)$ is an eigenvalue of $A$ with a corresponding eigenvector $w \in \bar{P}$. On the other hand, noticing that $-w \notin P$, one easily deduces that there is a $z_1 \in S_1$ such that $w_1 := z_1 w \in \partial P$. Because $w_1$ is also an eigenvector corresponding to $r$, we then have $Aw_1 = rw_1 \in \partial P$, which contradicts the strong positivity hypothesis.

Let us also mention that the complexification of a strongly positive real operator may fail to be strongly positive (see Section 7 for detail). In what follows we introduce an alternative notion, called rotational strong positivity, for complex operators.

Definition 2.5. Let $E$ be a complex Banach space, and $P$ a solid cone. An operator $A \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ is called rotationally strongly positive, if $S_1(Ax) \cap \partial \bar{P} \neq \emptyset$ for all $x \in P \setminus \{0\}$, where and below $S_1(Ax) = \{zAx : z \in S_1\}$.

Example 2.2. The complexification of a strongly positive real operator is rotational strongly positive; see Section 7.

Example 2.3. Let $| \cdot |$ be the usual norm of $\mathbb{C}$, and set $|z|' = |x| + |y|$ for $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{C}$. Note that if $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}_+ = \{x + iy \in \mathbb{C} : x, y \geq 0\}$, then $|z_1 + z_2|' = |z_1|' + |z_2|'$. It is trivial to check that

$$|z| \leq |z|' \leq \sqrt{2}|z|, \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{C}. $$
Let $E = \mathbb{C}^2$, and define

$$P = \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}_+ \times \mathbb{C} : |w| \leq |z|\}. \quad (2.6)$$

We claim that $P$ is a cone in $E$. To see this, it suffices to check that $P$ is convex and $P \cap (-P) = \{0\}$. Let $u_i = (z_i, w_i) \in P$, $i = 1, 2$. Then for every $\theta \in [0, 1]$,

$$|\theta w_1 + (1 - \theta)w_2| \leq \theta |w_1| + (1 - \theta)|w_2|$$

$$\leq \theta |z_1| + (1 - \theta)|z_2| = |\theta z_1 + (1 - \theta)z_2|'.
$$

Hence by definition we have $\theta w_1 + (1 - \theta)w_2 \in P$. This verifies the convexity of $P$. Now assume that $u = (z, w) \in P \cap (-P)$. We show that $u = 0$, thus proving what we desired. Suppose on the contrary that $u \neq 0$. Then either $z \neq 0$, or $w \neq 0$. If $z = 0$, since $u \in P$, by the definition of $P$ one would have $w = 0$. This contradicts the hypothesis $u \neq 0$. Therefore we see that $z \neq 0$. It then follows by $u \in -P$ that $-z \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Since $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, this leads to a contradiction.

Note that $P$ is a solid cone in $E$ with

$$\overset{\circ}{P} = \{(z, w) \in P : z \in \mathbb{C}_+, |w| < |z|\},$$

where $\mathbb{C}_+ = \{z = x + iy : x > 0, y > 0\}$.

Let $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & c \\ b & d \end{pmatrix}$, where $a > 0$ is a real number, and $b, c, d \in \mathbb{C}$. $A$ generates an operator on $E$,

$$Au = (az + bw, cz + dw), \quad u = (z, w) \in E.$$

In what follows we show that $A$ is rotationally strongly positive, provided that

$$|b| < 1/2, \quad 0 < |c| + |d| \leq \sqrt{2}(a - 2|b|). \quad (2.7)$$

Let $u = (z, w) \in P, u \neq 0$. Then $z \neq 0$. We may write $z = re^{i\beta}$ ($r > 0$, $0 \leq \beta \leq \pi/2$). Let $\lambda = e^{i(\pi/4 - \beta)}$. Clearly $\lambda z = re^{i\pi/4} \in \mathbb{C}_+$. We observe that

$$|\lambda (cz + dw)| = |cz + dw| \leq |c||z| + |d||w|$$

$$\leq |c||z| + |d||z|' = (|c| + |d|)|z|'. \quad (2.8)$$

Note that $|z|' \leq \sqrt{2}|z| = \sqrt{2}|\lambda z| \leq \sqrt{2}|\lambda z|'$. Therefore

$$|\lambda (cz + dw)| \leq \sqrt{2}(|c| + |d|)|lz|' \leq \sqrt{2}(|c| + |d|)|lz|'. \quad (2.9)$$

Let $\tilde{w} = az + bw$. Then

$$|\lambda \tilde{w}|' \geq |\lambda az|' - |\lambda bw|' \geq |\lambda az|' - \sqrt{2}|\lambda bw|$$

$$= |\lambda az|' - \sqrt{2}|b||w| \geq |\lambda az|' - \sqrt{2}|b||z|'$$

$$\geq a|\lambda z|' - 2|b||\lambda z|' = (a - 2|b|)|\lambda z|'.$$
Combining this with (2.9) it yields
\[ |\lambda(cz + dw)| < \frac{\sqrt{2}|c|+|d|}{2(\alpha-2|b|)} |\lambda\tilde{w}|' \leq (\text{by (2.7)}) \leq |\lambda\tilde{w}|'. \] (2.10)

Recall that \( \lambda z = re^{i\pi/4} = |z|e^{i\pi/4} \). Therefore \( \text{Re}(\lambda z) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}|z| \). Because
\[ |\text{Re}(\lambda bw)| \leq |bw| < |b||z|' \leq \sqrt{2}|b||z|, \]
we deduce by (2.7) that
\[ \text{Re}(\lambda\tilde{w}) \geq a \text{Re}(\lambda z) - |\text{Re}(\lambda bw)| \geq \sqrt{2}(1/2 - |b|)|z| > 0. \]

Similarly \( \text{Im}(\lambda\tilde{w}) > 0 \). Hence \( \lambda\tilde{w} \in \mathbb{S}_+ \). This and (2.10) show that \( \lambda Au \in \mathbb{S}_+ \).

2.4. Positivity of solutions of ODEs with positive operators

Let \( E \) be a (real or complex) Banach space with a cone \( P \). An operator \( A \in \mathcal{L}(E) \) is called positive, if \( AP \subset P \).

Given a positive operator \( A \in \mathcal{L}(E) \) and \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \), consider in \( E \) the system:
\[ \dot{x} = Ax + \alpha x, \quad x(0) = x_0. \]

Denote by \( x(t; x_0) \) the solution of system.

Lemma 2.6. If \( x_0 \in P \), then \( x(t; x_0) \in P \) for all \( t \geq 0 \).

Proof. This is a well known basic fact. One may consult [22, pp. 60-61] (Exercises 6-8), [21, Lemma 5.1] and [25] for more general results. We include a simple proof just for completeness and the reader’s convenience.

Let \( x_0 \in P \), and \( t \geq 0 \). Since \( A \) is a bounded linear operator, we have
\[ x(t; x_0) = e^{\alpha t} e^{tA} x_0, \quad \text{where } e^{tA} = \lim_{m \to \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{m} \frac{t^k}{k!} A^k. \]

The positivity of \( A \) implies that \( A^k x_0 \in P \) for all \( k \geq 0 \). Hence \( \sum_{k=0}^{m} \frac{t^k}{k!} A^k x_0 \in P \) for \( m \geq 1 \). It follows by the closedness of \( P \) that \( e^{tA} x_0 \in P \). Therefore \( x(t; x_0) = e^{\alpha t} e^{tA} x_0 \in P \).

3. Two Technical Lemmas

In this section we give two technical lemmas concerning a projective property of cones and the asymptotic behaviour of linear ODEs, each of which may be of independent interest.
3.1. Projective properness of cones

Let $E$ be a Banach space (real or complex), and $P$ a cone in $E$. One trivially verifies that if $E_0$ is a closed subspace of $E$, then $P_0 := P \cap E_0$ is a cone in $E_0$ as long as $P_0 \neq \{0\}$.

Let $\mathcal{D} : E = \oplus_{i=1}^{n} E_i$ be a direct sum decomposition of $E$. Denote by $\Pi_i$ the projection from $E$ to $E_i$.

**Definition 3.1.** $P$ is called projectively proper (with respect to $\mathcal{D}$), if

$$
(\Pi_i P) \cap (-\Pi_i P) = \{0\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.
$$

(3.1)

Intuitively by “projectively proper” it means that $P$ looks like a cone from any direction. Generally a cone may not possess this property itself. This can be seen from the following simple example.

**Example 3.1.** Let $E = \mathbb{R}^2$, and let $E_1$ and $E_2$ be the $x$-axis and $y$-axis, respectively. Then $\mathcal{D} : E = E_1 \oplus E_2$ is a direct sum decomposition of $E$. Set $P = \{(x, y) \in E : y \geq |x|\}$. Clearly $P$ is a cone in $E$. However, since $\Pi_1 P = E_1$, $P$ is not projectively proper.

Fortunately, we have the following fundamental fact.

**Proposition 3.2.** For any cone $P$ in $E$, there is a nonempty index set $J_0 \subset \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ such that $P_0 := P \cap E_0$ is a cone in $E_0 = \oplus_{s \in J_0} E_s$ which is projectively proper (w.r.t $\mathcal{D}_0 : E_0 = \oplus_{s \in J_0} E_s$).

**Proof.** Let us argue by induction. First, if $n = 1$ then the conclusion trivially holds true. Suppose now that the conclusion holds true with $n = N \geq 1$. We show that it remains true for $n = N + 1$.

Thus we let $E = \oplus_{i=1}^{N+1} E_i$ be a direct sum decomposition of $E$. If (3.1) holds true for all $i$, $1 \leq i \leq N + 1$, then we are done. Hence we assume, without loss of generality, that

$$
(\Pi_{N+1} P) \cap (-\Pi_{N+1} P) \neq \{0\}.
$$

Then there is an element $x \neq 0$ such that $\pm x \in \Pi_{N+1} P$. Let $\pm x = \Pi_{N+1} u^\pm$, where $u^\pm \in P$. Obviously $u^\pm \neq 0$. We may write

$$
u^+ = y_1 + x, \quad u^- = y_2 - x,$$

where $y_1, y_2 \in V_1 = \oplus_{i=1}^{N} E_i$. Then $y = y_1 + y_2 \in V_1$. We observe that

$$y = (y_1 + x) + (y_2 - x) = u^+ + u^- \in P.$$ 

(3.2)
We claim that \( y \neq 0 \). Indeed, if \( y = 0 \) then \( y^2 = -y_1 \), and hence

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{u}^- &= y_2 - x = -y_1 - x = -\mathbf{u}^+ \in P.
\end{align*}
\]

Since \( \mathbf{u}^+ \in P \), this leads to a contradiction.

We infer from the above argument that \( y \in P \cap V_1 := P_1 \). Hence \( P_1 \neq \{0\} \).
Therefore it is a cone in \( V_1 = \oplus_{i=1}^{N} E_i \). Now by the induction hypothesis, there is a nonempty index set \( J_0 \subset \{1, 2, \cdots, N\} \) such that \( P_0 := P \cap E_0 \) is a cone in \( E_0 = \oplus_{s \in J_0} E_s \) which is projectively proper. ■

**Remark 3.3.** In Proposition 3.2 one may expect that \( m = 1 \), in which case the conclusion of the proposition amounts to say that there is an index \( i \) such that \( P \cap E_i \) is a cone in \( E_i \). Unfortunately this may fail to be true. For instance, let \( E = \mathbb{R}^2 \), and let \( E_1, E_2 \) and \( D \) be the same as in Example 3.1. Set

\[
P = \{(x, y) : x, y \geq 0, \frac{1}{2}x \leq y \leq x\}.
\]

One easily verifies that \( P \) is projectively proper with respect to \( D \). However, \( P \cap E_i = \{0\} \) is not a cone for \( i = 1, 2 \).

### 3.2. On the Asymptotic behaviour of ODEs

Let \( E \) be a finite-dimensional complex Banach space, and \( A \in \mathcal{L}(E) \). By the basic knowledge in linear algebra, \( E \) has a unique primary decomposition:

\[
\mathcal{D} : \quad E = \oplus_{i=1}^{m} E_i,
\]

where each \( E_i \) is a cyclic subspace of \( A \) generated by a generalized eigenvector \( \xi_i \) of \( A \) corresponding to an eigenvalue \( \mu_i \in \sigma(A) \),

\[
E_i = \text{span} \{ \xi_i, (A - \mu_i)\xi_i, \cdots, (A - \mu_i)^{\kappa_i - 1} \xi_i \},
\]

where \( \kappa_i = \text{rank}(\xi_i) \) is the rank of \( \xi_i \). It may happen that for \( i \neq j \), \( \xi_i \) and \( \xi_j \) correspond to the same eigenvalue, i.e., \( \mu_i = \mu_j \). We write \( \mu_i = \alpha_i + i\beta_i \), \( i = 1, 2, \cdots, m \).

Denote by \( x(t) = x(t; x_0) \) the solution of the initial value problem:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x} &= Ax, & x(0) &= x_0.
\end{align*}
\]

Then \( x(t) = e^{tA}x_0 \). Therefore if \( x_0 \in \text{GE}_\mu(A) \) with \( \text{rank}(x_0) = \nu \), then

\[
\begin{align*}
x(t) &= e^{tA}x_0 = e^{\mu t} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{t^k}{k!} (A - \mu)^k x_0 \\
&= e^{\mu t} \left( I + \frac{t}{1!} (A - \mu) + \cdots + \frac{t^{\nu-1}}{(\nu-1)!} (A - \mu)^{\nu-1} \right) x_0.
\end{align*}
\]
Proposition 3.4. Let \( x_0 \neq 0 \). Write \( x_0 = \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} u_{ik} \), where \( u_{ik} \in E_{ik} \setminus \{0\} \).
Let \( \nu_{ik} = \text{rank}(u_{ik}) \), and set \( \nu = \max_{1 \leq k \leq \ell} \nu_{ik} \), \( \alpha = \max_{1 \leq k \leq \ell} \alpha_{ik} \). Put
\[
J_0 = \{ i_k : \alpha_{ik} = \alpha, \ \nu_{ik} = \nu, \ 1 \leq k \leq \ell \}.
\]
Then \( \lim_{t \to \infty} \| t^{-(\nu-1)} e^{-\alpha t} x(t) - \gamma(t) \| = 0 \), where
\[
\gamma(t) = \sum_{s \in J_0} e^{\beta_s t} w_s, \quad w_s = \frac{1}{(\nu-1)!} (A - \mu_s)^{\nu-1} u_s.
\] (3.6)

Remark 3.5. For each \( s \in J_0 \), since \( u_s \in E_s \subset G \mathcal{E}_s(A) \) and \( \text{rank}(u_s) = \nu_s \), the vector \( w_s \) given in (3.6) is an eigenvector of \( A \) pertaining to \( \mu_s \). Note also that \( w_s \in E_s \). Therefore \( w_s (s \in J_0) \) are linearly independent.

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Set
\[
J_1 = \{ i_k : \alpha_{ik} = \alpha, \ \nu_{ik} < \nu, \ 1 \leq k \leq \ell \},
\]
\[
J_2 = \{ i_k : \alpha_{ik} < \alpha, \ \nu_{ik} < \nu, \ 1 \leq k \leq \ell \}.
\]
Then \( J_0 \cup J_1 \cup J_2 = \{ i_k : 1 \leq k \leq \ell \} \). Hence we can write \( x_0 \) as
\[
x_0 = y_0 + y_1 + y_2, \quad \text{where } y_j = \sum_{s \in J_j} u_s.
\]
Let \( y_j(t) = e^{tA} y_j \). Obviously \( x(t) = e^{tA} x_0 = y_0(t) + y_1(t) + y_2(t) \).

By (3.5) we deduce that
\[
y_j(t) = \sum_{s \in J_j} e^{\alpha_s t} e^{\beta_s t} \left( I + \frac{t}{1!} (A - \mu_s) + \cdots + \frac{t^{\nu_s - 1}}{(\nu_s - 1)!} (A - \mu_s)^{(\nu_s - 1)} \right) u_s
\]
for \( j = 0, 1, 2 \). Since \( \alpha_s = \alpha \) and \( \nu_s < \nu \) for \( s \in J_1 \), and \( \alpha_s < \alpha \) for \( s \in J_2 \), by the above expression we trivially have \( \| t^{-(\nu-1)} e^{-\alpha t} y_j(t) \| \to 0 \) as \( t \to \infty \) for \( j = 1, 2 \). Now we observe that
\[
y_0(t) = \sum_{s \in J_0} e^{\alpha_s t} e^{\beta_s t} \left( I + \frac{t}{1!} (A - \mu_s) + \cdots + \frac{t^{\nu_s - 1}}{(\nu_s - 1)!} (A - \mu_s)^{(\nu_s - 1)} \right) u_s,
\]
from which it can be easily seen that \( t^{-(\nu-1)} e^{-\alpha t} y_0(t) = \gamma(t) + R_\nu(t) \), where \( \gamma(t) \) is the function given in (3.6), \( R_\nu(t) \equiv 0 \) if \( \nu = 1 \), and
\[
R_\nu(t) = \sum_{s \in J_0} \left( e^{\beta_s t} t^{-(\nu-1)} \sum_{k=0}^{\nu-2} \frac{t^k}{k!} (A - \mu_s)^k u_s \right) \quad \text{if } \nu \geq 2.
\]
In either case it is easy to see that \( R_\nu(t) \to 0 \) as \( t \to \infty \). Combining the above facts together one immediately concludes the validity of the lemma. ■

The main purpose in this section is to prove a general KR type theorem for complex operators via a completely self-contained dynamical approach based on linear ODEs.

Let $E$ be an $n$-dimensional complex Banach space, and $P$ a cone in $E$. Let $A \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ be a positive operator. Set $r = r(A)$. For convenience in statement, if $r \in \sigma(A)$ then we call $r$ and the corresponding eigenvectors the principal eigenvalue and principal eigenvectors of $A$, respectively.

**Theorem 4.1.** Suppose that $P$ is full. Then the following assertions hold:

1. $r \in \sigma(A)$ with a principal eigenvector $w \in P$.
2. Let $\mu \in \sigma(A)$. If $GE_{\mu}(A) \cap P \neq \{0\}$, then $\mu \in [0, r]$ with a corresponding eigenvector $v \in P$.
3. No eigenvectors pertaining to other eigenvalues $\mu \neq r$ are contained in $\overset{\circ}{P}$.
4. If $\overset{\circ}{P}$ contains a principal eigenvector $w$ (hence $P$ is a solid cone), the algebraic and geometric multiplicities of $r$ coincide.

4.1. A weaker version of the KR theorem

To prove Theorem 4.1, we start with a weaker version of the KR theorem for positive operators without any additional assumptions on $P$.

**Theorem 4.2.** Let $P$ be a cone in $E$. Then every positive operator $A$ (with respect to $P$) has a real eigenvalue $\mu$ with a corresponding eigenvector $w \in P$.

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{D} : E = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} E_i$ be the primary decomposition of $E$ given in [3.3] with each subspace $E_i$ corresponding to an eigenvalue $\mu_i = \alpha_i + i\beta_i$. By Proposition 3.2 there is a nonempty index set $J_0 \subset \{1, 2, \cdots, m\}$ such that $P_0 := P \cap E_0$ is a cone in $E_0 = \bigoplus_{s \in J_0} E_s$ which is projectively proper, i.e.,

$$\langle \Pi_s P_0 \rangle \cap (-\Pi_s P_0) = \{0\}, \quad s \in J_0,$$

(4.1)

where $\Pi_i$ denotes the projection from $E$ to $E_i$.

Let $A_0 = A|_{E_0}$. Since $AE_0 \subset E_0$, we trivially have

$$A_0 P_0 = A_0 (P \cap E_0) = A (P \cap E_0) = (AP) \cap (AE_0) \subset P \cap E_0 = P_0.$$
Hence $A_0$ is positive in $E_0$ with respect to $P_0$. Consider in $E_0$ the linear system:

$$\dot{x} = A_0 x, \quad x(0) = x_0 \in E_0. \tag{4.2}$$

Denote by $x(t) = x(t; x_0)$ the solution of (4.2). Pick an $x_0 \in P_0$, $x_0 \neq 0$. Thanks to Proposition 3.4 and Remark 3.5 there exist $\alpha, \nu \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\nu \geq 1$ and a nonempty index set $J_\alpha \subset J_0$ such that

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} ||t^{-(\nu-1)}e^{-\alpha t}x(t) - \gamma(t)|| = 0, \tag{4.3}$$

where $\gamma(t) = \sum_{s \in J_\alpha} e^{i\beta_s t}w_s$, and $w_s \in E_s$ is an eigenvector of $A$ corresponding to $\mu_s$ for each $s \in J_\alpha$. Furthermore, $\mu_s$ ($s \in J_\alpha$) share the same real part $\alpha$, i.e., $\mu_s = \alpha + i\beta_s = \alpha + i\beta_s$.

We claim that

$$\gamma(t) \in P_0, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.4}$$

Indeed, by Lemma 2.6 we know that $x(t) \in P_0$ for $t \geq 0$. Therefore $y(t) := t^{-(\nu-1)}e^{-\alpha t}x(t) \in P_0$ for $t > 0$. Noticing that $\gamma(t)$ is an almost periodic function in the terminology in Corduneanu [10], for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ fixed, by the basic properties of almost periodic functions (see Property B in [10] pp. 24]) it is easy to deduce that there is a sequence $t_n \to \infty$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \|\gamma(t_n) - \gamma(t)\| = 0.$$

Thus by (4.3) we have $\|y(t_n) - \gamma(t)\| = 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Since $y(t_n) \in P_0$ for $t_n > 0$, the closedness of $P_0$ implies that $\gamma(t) \in P_0$. Hence the claim holds true.

By (4.4) one concludes that for each $s \in J_\alpha,$

$$\gamma_s(t) := \Pi_s \gamma(t) = e^{i\beta_s t}w_s \in \Pi_s P_0, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.5}$$

Now we show that $\beta_s = 0$ for all $s \in J_\alpha$, and hence $\sigma_0 := \{\mu_s : s \in J_\alpha\}$ consists of exactly one real eigenvalue $\mu = \alpha$. We argue by contradiction and suppose that $\beta_s \neq 0$ for some $s \in J_\alpha$. Pick a $\tau > 0$ such that $e^{i\beta_s \tau} = -1$. Then

$$\gamma_s(\tau) = e^{i\beta_s \tau} w_s = -w_s = -\gamma_s(0).$$

This and (4.5) assert that $\pm \gamma_s(0) \in \Pi_s P_0$, which contradicts (4.4).

Let us finally verify that $A$ has an eigenvector $w \in P_0 \subset P$. Since $\sigma_0 = \{\alpha\}$, all the eigenvectors $w_s$ ($s \in J_\alpha$) correspond to the same eigenvalue $\mu = \alpha$. Consequently $w := \sum_{s \in J_\alpha} w_s$ is an eigenvector of $A$ pertaining to $\alpha$. Note that $\gamma(t) = \sum_{s \in J_\alpha} e^{i\beta s t}w_s \equiv w$. Because $t^{-(\nu-1)}e^{-\alpha t}x(t) \in P_0$ for all $t \geq 0$, by (4.3) we deduce that $w \in P_0$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \blacksquare
4.2. Proof of Theorem 4.1

We split the proof of Theorem 4.1 into two independent lemmas. Given a cone $P$ in $E$, let $A \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ be a positive operator with respect to $P$.

Lemma 4.3. If $P$ is full, then $r \in \sigma(A)$ with a principal eigenvector $w \in P$.

Proof. If $r = 0$ then $\sigma(A) = \{0\}$. By virtue of Theorem 4.2 the conclusion trivially holds true. Thus we assume $r > 0$. It can be assumed that $r = 1$; otherwise one may argue with $A_1 = r^{-1}A$ in place of $A$.

Take a $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small so that all the eigenvalues $\mu$ of $A$ with $|\mu| > 1 - 2\delta$ are contained in $S_1$. Set

$$\sigma_0 = \{z \in \sigma(A) : |z| \leq 1 - 2\delta\}, \quad \sigma_1 = \{z \in \sigma(A) : |z| = 1\}.$$  \hfill (4.6)

Obviously $\sigma(A) = \sigma_0 \cup \sigma_1$. Let $E = E_0 \oplus E_1$ be the corresponding decomposition of $E$. Then both $E_0$ and $E_1$ are invariant subspaces of $A$. We show that

$$P_1 := P \cap E_1 \neq \{0\}. \quad \hfill (4.7)$$

Take a number $\rho$ with $1 < \rho \leq (1 - \delta)/(1 - 2\delta)$, and set $B = \rho A$. Then

$$\sigma(B|_{E_0}) = \rho \sigma_0 \subset \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 1 - \delta\},$$

$$\sigma(B|_{E_1}) = \rho \sigma_1 \subset \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = \rho\}.$$  \hfill (4.8)

Hence we deduce that

$$||B^k x|| \to 0 \quad (x \in E_0), \quad \text{and} \quad ||B^k x|| \to \infty \quad (x \in E_1 \setminus \{0\}).$$ \hfill (4.9)

We may assume that $\dim(E_0) \geq 1$; otherwise $E = E_1$ and (4.6) readily holds. Since $P$ is full, we deduce that $P \setminus E_0 \neq \emptyset$. Pick an $x \in P \setminus E_0$, $x \neq 0$. We may write $x = x_0 + x_1$, where $x_i \in E_i$. Then $x_1 \neq 0$. Note that $B^k x_i \in E_i$ for all $k$. By the first relation in (4.7) we have $B^k x_0 \to 0$. Therefore

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} d(B^k x, E_1) = \lim_{k \to \infty} d(B^k x_0 + B^k x_1, E_1) = 0. \quad \hfill (4.10)$$

Now if $P \cap E_1 = \{0\}$, then because $B^k x = \rho^k A^k x \in P$ for $k \geq 1$, by Lemma 2.4 we deduce that $B^k x \to 0$. Consequently $B^k x_1 = B^k x - B^k x_0 \to 0$. This leads to a contradiction. Hence (4.6) holds true.

(4.6) implies that $P_1$ is a cone in $E_1$. Let $A_1 = A|_{E_1}$. Then $A_1$ is positive in $E_1$ (with respect to $P_1$) with $\sigma(A_1) \subset S_1$. By virtue of Theorem 4.2 one concludes that $\sigma(A_1)$ contains a real eigenvalue $\mu$ with a corresponding eigenvector $w \in P_1 \subset P$. Since $\mu \in S_1$, we necessarily have $\mu \in \{1, -1\}$.

We claim that $\mu \neq -1$, and consequently $\mu = 1$, which finishes the proof of the lemma. Indeed, suppose $\mu = -1$. Then since $w \in P$, by the positivity of $A$ we would have $-w = A_1 w = Aw \in P$. This leads to a contradiction. \[\blacksquare\]
Lemma 4.4. Suppose that \( r \in \sigma(A) \) with a principal eigenvector \( w \in P \). Then the following assertions hold:

(1) Given \( \mu \in \sigma(A) \), if \( \text{GE}_{\mu}(A) \cap P \neq \{0\} \), then \( \mu \in [0, r] \) with a corresponding eigenvector \( v \in P \).

(2) The eigenvectors of any other eigenvalue \( \mu \neq r \) are contained in \( E \setminus \hat{P} \).

(3) If \( \hat{P} \) contains a principal eigenvector, then the algebraic and geometric multiplicities of \( r \) coincide.

Proof. (1) We may assume \( \mu \neq r \). Let \( \mu = \alpha + i \beta \). Pick a \( \zeta \in \text{GE}_{\mu}(A) \cap P \), \( \zeta \neq 0 \). Denote by \( x(t) \) the solution of system \( \dot{x} = Ax \) with \( x(0) = \zeta \). Then

\[
x(t) = e^{(\alpha + i\beta)t} \left( I + \frac{1}{\nu}(A - \mu) + \frac{t^2}{2
u}(A - \mu)^2 + \cdots + \frac{t^{\nu-1}}{(\nu-1)!}(A - \mu)^{\nu-1} \right) \zeta,
\]

where \( \nu = \text{rank}(\zeta) \). We observe that

\[
\|t^{-(\nu-1)} e^{-\alpha t} x(t) - \gamma(t)\| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad t \to +\infty,
\]

where \( \gamma(t) = e^{i\beta t} \eta \), and \( \eta = \frac{1}{(\nu-1)!}(A - \mu)^{\nu-1} \zeta \) is an eigenvector of \( A \) associated with \( \mu \). Since \( x(t) \in P \) (by Lemma [2.6]), as in the proof of Theorem [4.2] it can be shown that \( \gamma(t) \in P \) for all \( t \in \mathbb{R} \). In particular,

\[
\eta = \gamma(0) \in P. \tag{4.9}
\]

We show that \( \beta = 0 \), therefore \( \mu = \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \). Indeed, suppose \( \beta \neq 0 \). Then one can find a \( \tau > 0 \) such that \( e^{i\beta \tau} = -1 \). Thus \( -\eta = e^{i\beta \tau} \eta = \gamma(\tau) \in P \), which contradicts (4.9).

To prove assertion (1), there remains to check that \( \mu \geq 0 \). First, by (4.9) and the positivity of \( A \), \( \mu \eta = A \eta \in P \). Now if \( \mu < 0 \), then \( -\eta = \frac{\mu}{|\mu|} \eta = \frac{1}{|\mu|} (\mu \eta) \in P \), which yields a contradiction. Thus we see that \( \mu \geq 0 \).

(2) Let \( v \in P \) be an eigenvector corresponding to an eigenvalue \( \mu \neq r \). We need to check that \( v \notin \hat{P} \).

We argue by contradiction and suppose that \( v \in \hat{P} \) (hence \( \hat{P} \neq \emptyset \)). Then by assertion (1) we deduce that \( \mu \in [0, r) \). Let \( w \) be the principal eigenvector given in the theorem, and let \( \pi \) be the real plane spanned by \( w \) and \( v \),

\[
\pi = \{aw + bv : a, b \in \mathbb{R} \}.
\]

Obviously \( \pi \) is isomorphic to \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). Note that \( P_\pi := P \cap \pi \neq \{0\} \). Therefore it is a cone in \( \pi \). Denote by \( \hat{P}_\pi \) the interior of \( P_\pi \) in \( \pi \). One easily sees that \( \hat{P}_\pi \neq \emptyset \).
As \( w \) and \( v \) are eigenvectors of \( A \) associated with real eigenvalues, we trivially have \( A \pi \subset \pi \). Let \( A \pi = A | \pi \). Then \( A \pi \) is a real linear operator on \( \pi \). Fix a real number \( \lambda \) with \( \mu < \lambda < r \) and consider the planar system:

\[
\dot{y} = (A \pi - \lambda) y, \quad y(0) = y_0. \tag{4.10}
\]

By Lemma 2.6 the cone \( P_\pi \) is invariant under system (4.10).

The two lines \( l_1 : u = sw \) and \( l_2 : u = sv \ (s \in \mathbb{R}) \) split \( P_\pi \) into three subcones \( C_1, C_2 \) and \( C_3 \), where \( C_2 \) denotes the cone with boundary \( \partial C_2 = (l_1 \cup l_2) \cap P_\pi \); see Fig. 4.1. Since \( l_1 \neq l_2 \), \( C_2 \) is a solid cone in \( P_\pi \). Because \( v \in \mathring{P}_\pi \), it is also easy to see that \( \mathring{C}_3 : = \text{int}_\pi C_3 \neq \emptyset \).

Figure 4.1: \( C_2 \) and \( C_3 \) are solid cones in \( \pi \)

The operator \( A_{\pi} - \lambda \) has two eigenvalues \( \mu_1 : = r - \lambda > 0 \) and \( \mu_2 : = -\lambda < 0 \) corresponding to eigenvectors \( w \) and \( v \), respectively. Hence \( l_1 \) and \( l_2 \) are unstable and stable manifolds of system (4.10), respectively. Since any solution of (4.10) can not cross the lines \( l_1 \) and \( l_2 \), we infer from the invariance of \( P_\pi \) with respect to (4.10) that every subcone \( C_i \ (i = 1, 2, 3) \) is preserved under (4.10).

Take a \( y_0 \in \mathring{C}_3 \). Write \( y_0 = aw + bv \). Then \( a \neq 0 \neq b \). The solution of (4.10) reads as \( y(t) = ae^{\mu_1 t} w + be^{\mu_2 t} v \). Since \( be^{\mu_2 t} v \to 0 \) as \( t \to \infty \), we deduce that

\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} |y(t)| = \lim_{t \to \infty} |ae^{\mu_1 t} w| = \infty, \tag{4.11}
\]

and

\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} d(y(t), l_1) = 0. \tag{4.12}
\]

On the other hand, the invariance of \( C_i \) with respect to (4.10) implies that \( y(t) \in C_3 \) for all \( t \geq 0 \). Because \( l_1 \cap C_3 = \{0\} \), by (4.12) we conclude that \( y(t) \to 0 \) as \( t \to \infty \), which contradicts (4.11) and finishes the proof of (2).

(3) Assume that \( \mathring{P} \) contains a principal eigenvector \( \omega \). We need to check that \( \text{rank}(\xi) = 1 \) for every \( \xi \in \text{GE}_r(A) \), \( \xi \neq 0 \).

We argue by contradiction and suppose that \( \nu : = \text{rank}(\xi) \geq 2 \) for some \( \xi \in \text{GE}_r(A) \), \( \xi \neq 0 \). Let \( \xi_0 = (A - r)^{\nu - 2} \xi \). Clearly \( \xi_0 \in \text{GE}_r(A) \) with \( \text{rank}(\xi_0) = 2 \).
Since \( \omega \in \mathcal{G} \), there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that \( u := \omega + z\xi_0 \in P \) for \( z \in \mathbb{C} \) with \( |z| < \delta \). Note that \( u \in \text{GE}_r(A) \) with \( \text{rank}(u) = 2 \). The same argument as in the verification of (4.9) then applies to show that
\[
v := (A - r)u = z(A - r)\xi_0 \in P.
\]
Taking \( z = \pm \frac{\delta}{2} \), one concludes that \( \pm \frac{\delta}{2}(A - r)\xi_0 \in P \), which leads to a contradiction because \( (A - r)\xi_0 = (A - r)^{\nu-1}\xi \neq 0. \)

**Proof of Theorem 4.1.** Combining Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 together, one immediately concludes the validity of all the assertions in the theorem. ■

**5. The Finite-dimensional KR Theorem: A Strong Version**

Let \( E \) be a finite-dimensional complex Banach space, and \( P \) a cone in \( E \). Let \( A \in \mathcal{L}(E) \) be a positive operator on \( E \). Set \( r = r(A) \). The main result in this section is the following theorem:

**Theorem 5.1.** Assume \( P \) is a solid cone. Suppose that \( A \) is rotationally strongly positive. Then the following assertions hold:

1. \( r \in \sigma(A) \) with a principal eigenvector \( w \in P \).
2. The algebraic and geometric multiplicities of \( r \) coincide. Moreover,
   \[
   (S_1\xi) \cap \mathcal{P} \neq \emptyset
   \]
   for any principal eigenvector \( \xi \).
3. \( \text{GE}_\mu(A) \cap P = \{0\} \) for any other eigenvalue \( \mu \neq r \).
4. \( |\mu| < r \) for all \( \mu \in \sigma(A) \setminus \{r\} \).

**Proof.** We only need to verify (2)-(4). As before, we may assume that \( r = 1 \).

Let \( w \) be the principal eigenvector in assertion (1). By the rotational strong positivity of \( A \), there exists \( \lambda_1 \in S_1 \) such that \( \lambda_1 Aw \in \mathcal{P} \). Set \( \xi_1 = \lambda_1 w \). Clearly \( \xi_1 \) is a principal eigenvector. Note that
\[
\xi_1 = A\xi_1 = \lambda_1 Aw \in \mathcal{P}.
\]

In what follows we first prove assertion (4). Let us argue by way of contradiction and suppose that \( A \) has an eigenvalue \( \mu \neq 1 \) with \( |\mu| = 1 \). Let \( \xi_2 \) be an eigenvector of \( \mu \). Then \( z\xi_2 \) is an eigenvector of \( \mu \) for every \( z \in S_1 \). Set
\[
C_1 = S_1\xi_1, \quad C_2 = S_1\xi_2.
\]
We claim that $C_2 \cap P = \emptyset$. Indeed, if $z \xi_2 \in P$ for some $z \in S_1$, then since $\mu \neq 1$, by Theorem 4.1 (2) we deduce that $\mu \in [0, 1)$, which leads to a contradiction.

Now that $C_2 \cap P = \emptyset$, by the compactness of $C_2$ we have

$$\inf_{v \in C_2} d(v, P) := \delta > 0. \quad (5.3)$$

For each $t \geq 0$, set

$$M(t) := C_1 + tC_2 = \{v_1 + tv_2 : \ v_i \in C_i\}.$$  

Noticing that $t^{-1}M(t) = t^{-1}C_1 + C_2$, by (5.3) it is easy to see that if $t > 0$ is sufficiently large, then $(t^{-1}M(t)) \cap P = \emptyset$. Hence

$$M(t) \cap P = t ((t^{-1}M(t)) \cap (t^{-1}P)) \subset t ((t^{-1}M(t)) \cap P) = \emptyset.$$

On the other hand, since $\xi_1 \in \overset{\circ}{P}$, we see that if $t > 0$ is sufficiently small then $\xi_1 + tv_2 \in \overset{\circ}{P}$ for all $v_2 \in C_2$. Therefore $M(t) \cap \overset{\circ}{P} \neq \emptyset$.

Define $\tau = \inf\{t > 0 : M(t) \cap P = \emptyset\}$. Clearly $\tau > 0$, and $M(\tau) \cap P \neq \emptyset$. We claim that

$$M(\tau) \cap P \subset \partial P. \quad (5.4)$$

Indeed, if $M(\tau) \cap \overset{\circ}{P} \neq \emptyset$ then by the continuity of $M(t)$ in $t$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $M(t) \cap \overset{\circ}{P} \neq \emptyset$ for $t \in [\tau, \tau + \varepsilon]$. This contradicts the definition of $\tau$.

Take a $u \in M(\tau) \cap P$. By the rotational strong positivity of $A$, there is a $z' \in S_1$ such that $z' Au \in \overset{\circ}{P}$. Let $u = v_1 + \tau v_2$ for some $v_i \in C_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Noticing that $Av_1 = v_1$ and $Av_2 = \mu v_2$, we find that

$$z' Au = z' A(v_1 + \tau v_2) = z'v_1 + \tau(z' \mu)v_2.$$  

Since $|z'| = |z' \mu| = 1$, we see that $z'v_1 \in C_1$, and $(z' \mu)v_2 \in C_2$. Therefore $z' Au \in M(\tau)$. But this and $z' Au \in \overset{\circ}{P}$ contradict (5.4).

Now we turn to the verification of assertion (2). The conclusion that $r$ has the same algebraic and geometric multiplicity is a simple consequence of (5.2) and Theorem 4.1 (4). So we only need to verify (5.1).

Let $\xi$ be a principal eigenvector. If $(S_1 \xi) \cap P = \emptyset$ then one can repeat the same argument as in the verification of assertion (4) with $\xi_2$ therein replaced by $\xi$ and obtain a contradiction. Therefore we deduce that $(S_1 \xi) \cap P \neq \emptyset$. Thus there is a $z \in S_1$ such that $z \xi \in P$. Note that $w' = z \xi$ is a principal eigenvector. Now repeating the same argument as in leading to (5.2) with $w$ therein replaced by $w'$, we deduce that $\lambda' w' \in \overset{\circ}{P}$ for some $\lambda' \in S_1$, i.e., $\eta \xi \in \overset{\circ}{P}$, where $\eta = z \lambda'$. Since $\eta \in S_1$, this finishes the proof of (5.1).

There remains to prove assertion (3). We argue by contradiction and suppose that $GE_\mu(A) \cap P \neq \{0\}$ for some $\mu \in \sigma(A) \setminus \{r\}$. Then by Theorem 4.1 (2),
there is a corresponding eigenvector \( \xi \in P \). By the rotational strong positivity of \( A \) we deduce that \( zA\xi \in \hat{P} \) for some \( z \in S_1 \). That is, \( z\mu \xi \in \hat{P} \). But this contradicts Theorem 4.1 (3) because \( v := z\mu \xi \) is an eigenvector of \( \mu \). ■

**Remark 5.2.** It remains an open question whether the principal eigenvalue \( r \) is geometrically simple under the hypotheses of Theorem 5.1.

### 6. The KR theorem: Infinite-dimensional Versions

We now give infinite-dimensional versions of Theorems 4.1 and 5.1. Let \( E \) be an infinite-dimensional complex Banach space, and \( P \) a cone in \( E \). Assume that \( A \in \mathcal{L}(E) \) is a positive operator. Set \( r_e := r_e(A) \) and \( r := r(A) \).

**Theorem 6.1.** Assume \( P \) is full, and that \( r_e < r \). Then the following assertions hold:

1. \( r \) is an eigenvalue of \( A \) with a principal eigenvector \( w \in P \).
2. Let \( \mu \in \sigma(A), |\mu| > r_e \). If \( P \) contains a generalized eigenvector pertaining to \( \mu \), then \( \mu \in [0, r] \) with a corresponding eigenvector \( v \in P \).
3. No eigenvectors of \( A \) corresponding to other eigenvalues \( \mu \neq r \) with \( |\mu| > r_e \) are contained in \( \hat{P} \).
4. If \( \hat{P} \neq \emptyset \) and contains a principal eigenvector, then the algebraic and geometric multiplicities of \( r \) coincide.

**Proof.** For any \( \varepsilon \in (0, r - r_e) \), the region \( \{ z \in \mathbb{C} : r_e + \varepsilon \leq |z| \leq r \} \) contains only a finite number of elements in \( \sigma(A) \) (see Section 2.1). Hence there is \( \delta > 0 \) such that \( \sigma(A) \cap \{ z \in \mathbb{C} : r_e + \varepsilon < |z| < r_e + \varepsilon + \delta \} = \emptyset \); see Fig. 6.1 (a). Set

\[
\sigma_0(\varepsilon) = \sigma(A) \cap \{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq r_e + \varepsilon \}, \\
\sigma_1(\varepsilon) = \sigma(A) \cap \{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \geq r_e + \varepsilon + \delta \}. \tag{6.1}
\]

Then \( \sigma(A) = \sigma_0(\varepsilon) \cup \sigma_1(\varepsilon) \) is a spectral decomposition of \( \sigma(A) \). Let \( E = E_0(\varepsilon) \oplus E_1(\varepsilon) \) be the corresponding direct sum decomposition of \( E \), where \( E_1(\varepsilon) = \oplus_{\mu \in \sigma_1(\varepsilon)} \text{GE}_\mu(A) \) is finite-dimensional (recall that \( \text{GE}_\mu(A) \) is finite-dimensional for every \( \mu \in \sigma(A) \setminus \sigma_e(A) \)). A similar argument as in the verification of (4.6) with some corresponding modifications applies to show that \( P \cap E_1(\varepsilon) \neq \{0\} \).
Let $A_1(\varepsilon) = A |_{E_1(\varepsilon)}$, and $P_1(\varepsilon) = P \cap E_1(\varepsilon)$. Then the operator $A_1(\varepsilon)$ leaves $P_1(\varepsilon)$ invariant. Choose an $\varepsilon' \in (0, r - r_e)$ such that $r_e + \varepsilon'$ is close to $r$ so that $\sigma_1(\varepsilon') \subset S_r$; see Fig. 6.1 (b). Applying Theorem 4.2 to $A_1(\varepsilon')$ and $P_1(\varepsilon')$, one immediately concludes that $r \in \sigma(A_1(\varepsilon')) = \sigma_1(\varepsilon')$ with a corresponding eigenvector $w \in P_1(\varepsilon')$. Hence assertion (1) holds true.

In what follows we check the validity of assertions (2)-(4).

Let $\mu$ be an eigenvalue of $A$ with $|\mu| > r_e$. Pick a number $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\mu) > 0$ sufficiently small so that $\mu \in \sigma_1(\varepsilon)$. Then clearly $r \in \sigma_1(\varepsilon)$.

For notational simplicity, we rewrite $E_1(\varepsilon) = E_1$, $P_1(\varepsilon) = P_1$, and $A_1(\varepsilon) = A_1$. Suppose that $P$ contains a generalized eigenvector $\xi$ of $A$ pertaining to $\mu$. Since $\xi \in \text{GE}_\mu(A) \subset E_1$, we naturally have $\xi \in \text{GE}_\mu(A_1)$. Note that $\xi \in P_1$. Because $r \in \sigma(A_1)$ with a principal eigenvector $w \in P_1$, Lemma 4.4 applies to $A_1$. This allows us to deduce that $\mu \in [0, r]$ with a corresponding eigenvector $v \in P_1 \subset P$, which completes the proof of assertion (2).

Now assume that $\mu \neq r$. Then by Lemma 4.4 we deduce that the eigenvectors of $A_1$ corresponding to $\mu$ are contained in $E_1 \setminus \text{int} E_1 P_1$. On the other hand, if $v$ contains an eigenvector $v$ of $\mu$, then one easily verifies that $\text{int} E_1 P_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $v \in \text{int} E_1 P_1$. This leads to a contradiction and proves assertion (3).

If $P \neq \emptyset$ and contains a principal eigenvector $u$, then as above we have $u \in \text{int} E_1 P_1$. Assertion (4) then directly follows from Lemma 4.4 (3).

\section*{Theorem 6.2}

Assume $P$ is solid, and that $r_e < r$. If $A$ is rotationally strongly positive, then the following assertions hold:

1. $r$ is an eigenvalue of $A$ with a principal eigenvector $w \in P$.

2. The algebraic and geometric multiplicities of $r$ coincide.

3. $(S_1 \xi) \cap P \neq \emptyset$ for every principal eigenvector $\xi$. 
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(4) \( \text{GE}_\mu(A) \cap P = \{0\} \) for any \( \mu \in \sigma(A) \setminus \{r\} \) with \( |\mu| > r_e \).

(5) \( |\mu| < r \) for all \( \mu \in \sigma(A) \setminus \{r\} \).

**Proof.** Assertion (1) follows from Theorem \ref{thm:theo6.1} (1). So we only need to verify assertions (2)-(5). We use the same notation as in the proof of Theorem \ref{thm:theo6.1}

Let \( \mu \) be an eigenvalue of \( A \) with \( |\mu| > r_e \). Pick a number \( \varepsilon = \varepsilon(\mu) > 0 \) sufficiently small so that \( \mu \in \sigma_1(\varepsilon) \). Let \( E_1(\varepsilon) = E_1 \), and \( A_1(\varepsilon) = A_1 \). Recall that \( E_1 \) is a finite-dimensional space and \( P_1 := P \cap E_1 \neq \{0\} \). Now we show that \( \text{int}_{E_1} P_1 \neq \emptyset \) and \( A_1 \) is rotationally strongly positive (with respect to \( P_1 \)), and the conclusions then immediately follow from Theorem \ref{thm:theo5.1}

First, the same argument leading to (5.2) applies to show that there is a principal eigenvalue \( \xi_1 \in \hat{P} \). As \( \xi_1 \in E_1 \), one easily checks that \( \xi_1 \in \text{int}_{E_1} P_1 \), that is, \( \text{int}_{E_1} P_1 \neq \emptyset \). Now let \( u \in P_1 \setminus \{0\} \). Then by the rotational strong positivity of \( A, S_1(Au) \cap \hat{P} \neq \emptyset \). As \( Au \in E_1 \) (and hence \( S_1(Au) \subset E_1 \)), we have

\[
S_1(A_1u) \cap \text{int}_{E_1} P_1 \supset S_1(Au) \cap \hat{P} \neq \emptyset.
\]

Hence \( A_1 \) is rotationally strongly positive. \( \blacksquare \)

7. The KR Type Theorems for Bounded Real Operators

Now we turn our attention to the real case. So let \( X \) be a real Banach space, and \( P \) a cone in \( X \). Let \( A \in \mathcal{L}(X) \).

Denote by \( \mathbb{X} = X + iX \) the complexification of \( X \), and let \( \mathbb{P} = P + iP \). Clearly \( \mathbb{P} \) is a cone in \( \mathbb{X} \). Let \( \mathbb{A} \) be a complexification of \( A \) which is defined by \( \mathbb{A} u = Ax + iAy \ (\forall u = x + iy \in \mathbb{X}) \). Given \( \mu \in \sigma(A) := \sigma(\mathbb{A}) \), set

\[
\text{GE}_\mu(\mathbb{A}) = \{ \Re \xi : \xi \in \text{GE}_\mu(\mathbb{A}) \} = \{ \Im \xi : \xi \in \text{GE}_\mu(\mathbb{A}) \}.
\]

(The second equality in \ref{eq:7.1} is due to the fact that if \( \xi \in \text{GE}_\mu(\mathbb{A}) \), then \( \pm i\xi \in \text{GE}_\mu(\mathbb{A}) \).) We first give two basic lemmas that will be used.

Note that by Remark \ref{rem:2.3} the cone \( P \) is full if and only if it is total.

**Lemma 7.1.** If \( P \) is total in \( X \), then \( \mathbb{P} \) is full in \( \mathbb{X} \).

**Proof.** Let \( \mathbb{X}_0 \) be a closed subspace of \( \mathbb{X} \). Assume that \( \mathbb{P} \subset \mathbb{X}_0 \). Then we have \( P \subset \mathbb{P} \subset \mathbb{X}_0 \). Set \( \mathbb{X}_0 \cap X \). Clearly \( \mathbb{X}_0 \) is a closed real subspace of \( X \) with \( P \subset \mathbb{X}_0 \). Since \( P \) is total in \( X \), we deduce that \( \mathbb{X}_0 = \mathbb{X} \). Hence we see that \( \mathbb{X}_0 \subset \mathbb{X}_0 \). But since \( \mathbb{X}_0 \) is a complex Banach space, it then follows that \( \mathbb{X} = X + iX \subset \mathbb{X}_0 \). Therefore \( \mathbb{X}_0 = \mathbb{X} \). \( \blacksquare \)

**Lemma 7.2.** Let \( P \) be a solid cone. If \( A \) is strongly positive, then \( \mathbb{A} \) is rotationally strongly positive.
Proof. Let $u = x + iy \in \mathbb{P} \setminus \{0\}$. If $x \neq 0 \neq y$, then $Ax, Ay \in \mathbb{P}$. Consequently $Au \in \mathbb{P}$. Now assume that $x = 0 \neq y$. Then by the strong positivity of $A$ we have $Ay \in \mathbb{P}$. Taking $z = (1 - i)/\sqrt{2}$, one finds that

$$zAu = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} (1 - i)(iAy) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} (Ay + iAy) \in \mathbb{P}.$$  

In the case where $x \neq 0 = y$, in a similar manner as above it can be shown that there is $z \in \mathbb{S}_1$ such that $zAu \in \mathbb{P}$.

Throughout this section we always assume that $(H) r_e := r_e(A) < r(A) := r.$

7.1. A general version of the KR theorem

Let us first give a general version of the KR Theorem.

Theorem 7.3. Assume that $P$ is total. Suppose that $r_e < r(A)$. Then the following assertions hold:

1. $r$ is an eigenvalue of $A$ with a principal eigenvector $u \in P$.
2. If $\mathbb{P} \neq \emptyset$ and contains a principal eigenvector $v$ of $A$, then the algebraic and geometric multiplicities of $r$ coincide.
3. If $\mu$ is a complex eigenvalue with $|\mu| > r_e$, then $\text{GE}_\mu(A) \cap P = \{0\}$.
4. All eigenvectors of $A$ pertaining to other eigenvalues $\mu \neq r$ with $|\mu| > r_e$ are contained in $X \setminus \mathbb{P}$.

Proof. (1) Lemma 6.1 asserts that $\mathbb{P}$ is full in $X$. Thus by Theorem 6.1 we have $r \in \sigma(A)$; furthermore, $A$ has a corresponding eigenvector $w \in \mathbb{P}$. Let $w = u + iv, u, v \in X$. We may assume $u \neq 0$. Then by the definition of $A$ it can be easily seen that $u$ is an eigenvector of $A$. Note that $w \in \mathbb{P}$ implies $u \in P$.

(2) If $\mathbb{P}$ contains a principal eigenvector $v$ of $A$, then $\xi = v + iv \in \mathbb{P}$ and is a principal eigenvector of $A$. The conclusion then follows from Theorem 6.1 (4).

(3) Suppose on the contrary that $P_0 := \text{GE}_\mu(A) \cap P \neq \{0\}$. Then $P_0$ is a cone in the subspace $X_0 = \text{GE}_\mu(A)$. Let $A_0 = A|_{X_0}$. Since $X_0$ is $A$-invariant, we trivially have $A_0 P_0 \subset P_0$. We may assume that $P_0$ is total in $X_0$; otherwise one can use the space $Y_0 = P_0 - P_0$ in place of $X_0$. (Note that $Y_0$ is $A_0$-invariant.) By virtue of assertion (1) we deduce that $r(A_0)$ is an eigenvalue. This leads to a contradiction because $\sigma(A_0) = \{\mu\}$. 
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(4) If $\hat{P}$ contains an eigenvector $\eta$ of $A$ corresponding to a real eigenvalue $\mu \neq r$ with $|\mu| > r$, then $\xi = \eta + i\eta$ is an eigenvector of $A$ corresponding to $\mu$. Clearly $\xi \in \hat{P}$. This contradicts Theorem 6.1 (3) and verifies assertion (4). ■

Remark 7.4. Assertion (1) in Theorem 7.3 can be found in an earlier work due to Nussbaum [37] (see [37] Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.2).

We infer from Theorem 7.3 (4) that non-principal eigenvectors cannot occupy the interior $\hat{P}$ of the cone. However, the following easy example indicates that under the hypotheses of the theorem, they may lie on the boundary $\partial P$.

Example 7.1. Let $X = \mathbb{R}^2$, and $P = \mathbb{R}^2_+$. Then the matrix $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$ has two eigenvectors $w_1 = (1, 1)$ and $w_2 = (1, 0)$ corresponding to eigenvalues $r = 2$ and $\mu = 1$, respectively. Clearly $w_1 \in \hat{P}$, whereas $w_2 \in \partial P$.

7.2. Strong versions of the KR theorem

It is well known that the notions of strong positivity, irreducibility and primitivity play crucial roles in the PF theory for real operators. A common feature of these notions is that they exclude the possibility that eigenvectors of a given operator may lie on the boundary of the cone.

Definition 7.5. We say that $A$ is weakly irreducible, if $\partial P$ contains no eigenvectors of $A$ pertaining to nonnegative eigenvalues.

It is almost obvious that strongly positive operators and primitive operators are weakly irreducible. (Recall that $A$ is said to be primitive, if there is an integer $m \geq 1$ such that $A^m(P \setminus \{0\}) \subset \hat{P}$; see [30] pp. 285.) In what follows we show that irreducibility (in the terminology of [30]) implies weak irreducibility defined as above.

So we assume that $A$ is irreducible. Then by [30] Pro. 1.1.5 we have

$$R_\lambda(A)(P \setminus \{0\}) \subset \hat{P} \quad (7.2)$$

for some $\lambda > r(A)$. ([30] Pro. 1.1.5] is a finite-dimensional version. However, an infinite-dimensional version remains true for bounded operators.) Now we argue by contradiction and suppose that $A$ were not weakly irreducible. Then $A$ would have an eigenpair $(v, \mu)$ with $\mu \geq 0$ such that $v \in \partial P$. Note that $(\lambda - A)v = (\lambda - \mu)v$, where $\lambda$ is the number in (7.2). Hence we have $(\lambda - \mu)R_\lambda(A)v = v \in \partial P$. Since $\lambda - \mu > 0$, this implies that $R_\lambda(A)v \in \partial P$, which contradicts (7.2).

As a simple consequence of Theorem 7.3, one immediately obtains a refined version of the KR theorem for weakly irreducible operators:
Theorem 7.6. Let $P$ be a solid cone. Suppose $A$ is weakly irreducible, and that $r_{e} < r$. Then

1. $r$ is a simple eigenvalue of $A$ with a principal eigenvector $w \in \overset{0}{P}$;
2. $\text{GE}_{\mu}(A) \cap P = \{0\}$ for any $\mu \in \sigma(A) \setminus \{r\}$ with $|\mu| > r_{e}$.

Proof. (1) By virtue of assertion (1) in Theorem 7.3 we conclude that $r$ is an eigenvalue of $A$ with a corresponding eigenvector $w \in P$. The weak irreducibility of $A$ then implies that $w \in \overset{0}{P}$. Thus by Theorem 7.3 (2), we deduce that $r$ has the same algebraic and geometric multiplicities.

Now suppose that $A$ has another principle eigenvector $v$ which is not a multiple of $w$. Let $\pi = \{sw + tv : s, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ be the real plane spanned by $w$ and $v$. Since $w \in \overset{0}{P}$, it is easy to see that $\pi \cap \partial P$ contains a half-line. Take a $u \in \pi \cap \partial P$, $u \neq 0$. Then $u$ is a principal eigenvector of $A$, contradicting the weak irreducibility of $A$. This finishes the proof of assertion (1).

(2) In view of Theorem 7.3 (3), one only needs to consider the case where $\mu$ is a real eigenvalue of $A$.

We argue by contradiction and suppose that $\text{GE}_{\mu}(A) \cap P \neq \{0\}$. Then as in the proof of Theorem 7.3 (3), one deduces that $P_{0} = \text{GE}_{\mu}(A) \cap P$ is a cone in $X_{0} = \text{GE}_{\mu}(A)$ which is left invariant by $A_{0} := A|_{X_{0}}$. It can be assumed that $P_{0}$ is total in $X_{0}$. Thus by Theorem 7.3 (1), $A_{0}$ has an eigenvector $u \in P_{0}$ pertaining to $\mu$. Further by Theorem 7.3 (4), we conclude that $u \in \partial P$, which contradicts the weak irreducibility of $A$. ■

The following theorem is a slightly modified version of [54, Theorem 1.3]. Besides that we added in an additional conclusion (i.e. assertion (2) in Theorem 7.6), the real point here is that we actually give a substantially different dynamical proof.

Theorem 7.7. Let $P$ be a solid cone. Suppose $A$ is strongly positive, and that $r_{e} < r$. Then in addition to assertions (1) and (2) in Theorem 7.6, we have

$$|\mu| < r, \quad \forall \mu \in \sigma(A) \setminus \{r\}. \quad (7.3)$$

Proof. The conclusion in (7.3) is a direct consequence of Theorem 6.2 and Lemma 7.2. ■

8. KR Type Theorems for Sectorial Operators

This section is devoted to real sectorial operators. Once again by using a simple dynamical argument, we establish some new KR type theorems in a more flexible setting that can be directly applied to elliptic eigenvalue problems.
8.1. **KR type theorems for sectorial operators**

Let $X, Y$ be two real Banach spaces with $Y \hookrightarrow X$; moreover, $Y$ is dense in $X$. Denote by $\| \cdot \|_0$ and $\| \cdot \|_1$ the norms of $X$ and $Y$, respectively.

Assume that there has been given a cone $K$ in $Y$.

Let $A$ be a closed densely defined operator in $X$ with $-A$ being sectorial (see [22, Chap. 1] for definition). The spectral bound $\text{spb}(A)$ and essential spectral bound $\text{spb}_e(A)$ of $A$ are defined as follows:

$$\text{spb}(A) = \sup \{ \Re \mu : \mu \in \sigma(A) \}, \quad \text{spb}_e(A) = \sup \{ \Re \mu : \mu \in \sigma_e(A) \}. $$

(We assign $\text{spb}_e(A) = -\infty$ if $\sigma_e(A) = \emptyset$.) Denote by $\sigma_b(A)$ the boundary spectrum,

$$\sigma_b(A) = \sigma(A) \cap \{ \Re z = \text{spb}(A) \}. $$

For $\mu \in \sigma(A)$, define the invariant subspace $\text{GE}_\mu(A)$ of $A$ as in (7.1).

We will impose on $A$ the following assumptions:

(A1) $R_\lambda(A)K \subset K$ for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently large.

(A2) $s_e := \text{spb}_e(A) < \text{spb}(A) := s$.

(A3) $\text{GE}_\mu(A) \subset Y$ for every $\mu \in \sigma(A)$ with $\Re \mu > s_e$.

As in the case of bounded operators, if $s$ is an eigenvalue of $A$, then we call $s$ and the corresponding eigenvectors the principal eigenvalue and principal eigenvectors of $A$, respectively.

**Theorem 8.1.** Assume $K$ is total in $Y$, and that hypotheses (A1) – (A3) are fulfilled. Then the following assertions hold:

1. $s$ is an eigenvalue of $A$ admitting a principal eigenvector $u \in K$.

2. If $\text{int}_Y K \neq \emptyset$ and contains a principal eigenvector of $A$, then $s$ shares the same algebraic and geometric multiplicities.

3. All eigenvectors of $A$ corresponding to other eigenvalues $\mu \neq s$ with $\Re \mu > s_e$ are contained in $Y \setminus \text{int}_Y K$.

4. If $\mu \in \sigma(A)$, $\Re \mu > s_e$ and $\Im \mu \neq 0$, then

$$\text{GE}_\mu(A) \cap K = \{0\}. $$

(8.1)
Proof. For \( t > s_e \), set
\[
\Sigma_1(t) := \{ \mu \in \sigma(A) : \Re \mu \geq t \}.
\] (8.2)

Since \(-A\) is sectorial, \(\Sigma_1(t)\) is a compact subset of \(\mathbb{C}\) for every \( t > s_e \) (by the definition of sectorial operators). As every \( \mu \in \sigma(A) \setminus \sigma_e(A) \) is isolated in \(\sigma(A)\), one concludes that \(\Sigma_1(t)\) consists of a finite number of elements.

Let \( \eta \in (s_e, s] \), and \(\Sigma_0(\eta) = \sigma(A) \setminus \Sigma_1(\eta)\). By the finiteness of \(\Sigma_1(t) \ (\forall t > s_e)\), one trivially checks that for some \( \delta = \delta(\eta) > 0 \),
\[
\Re \mu \leq \eta - \delta, \quad \forall \mu \in \Sigma_0(\eta)
\] (8.3)

Hence \(\Sigma_0(\eta)\) and \(\Sigma_1(\eta)\) form a spectral decomposition of \(\sigma(A)\). Denote by
\[
X = X_0(\eta) \oplus X_1(\eta)
\] (8.4)
the corresponding decomposition of \(X\). Then \(X_1(\eta) = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \Sigma_i(\eta)} \text{GE}_{\mu}(A)\) is a finite-dimensional subspace of \(X\). By (A3) we have \(X_1(\eta) \subset Y\). For notational simplicity, we rewrite \(X_i(\eta) = X_i \ (i = 0, 1)\).

Let us split the argument below into several steps.

Step 1. We show that \(X_1 \cap K \neq \{0\}\). (8.5)

Let \(P = \text{Cl}_X K\), the closure of \(K\) in \(X\). Obviously \(P\) is a cone in \(X\). Recalling that \(X_1 \subset Y\), to prove (8.5) it suffices to check that
\[
X_1 \cap P \neq \{0\}.
\]

For this purpose, put \(\hat{A} = A - \eta + \delta\), where \(\delta\) is the positive number in (8.3). \(\sigma(\hat{A})\) has a corresponding spectral decomposition \(\sigma(\hat{A}) = \hat{\Sigma}_0(\eta) \cup \hat{\Sigma}_1(\eta)\) with
\[
\hat{\Sigma}_i(\eta) = \Sigma_i(\eta) - \eta + \delta, \quad i = 0, 1.
\]

We observe that
\[
\sup \{ \Re \mu : \mu \in \hat{\Sigma}_0(\eta) \} \leq -\delta, \quad \inf \{ \Re \mu : \mu \in \hat{\Sigma}_1(\eta) \} \geq \delta.
\] (8.6)

The direct sum decomposition of \(X\) corresponding to the above spectral decomposition of \(\sigma(\hat{A})\) remains the same as in (8.4).

We claim that \(P \not\subset X_0\). Indeed, suppose on the contrary that \(P \subset X_0\). Then since \(K\) is total in \(Y\), one would have
\[
Y = \text{Cl}_Y (K - K) \subset \text{Cl}_X (K - K) \subset \text{Cl}_X (P - P) \subset X_0.
\]
(We emphasize that the closures \(\text{Cl}_Y\) and \(\text{Cl}_X\) are taken with respect to the topologies of \(Y\) and \(X\), respectively.) Because \(Y\) is dense in \(X\), we therefore have \(X = \text{Cl}_X Y \subset \text{Cl}_X X_0 = X_0\), a contradiction.
Take a \( u_0 \in P \setminus X_0 \). Write \( u_0 = x_0 + x_1 \), where \( x_i \in X_i \). Clearly \( x_1 \neq 0 \). Let \( u(t) = e^{tA}u_0 \) \((t \geq 0)\), where \( e^{tA} \) is the \( C_0 \)-semigroup generated by \( A \). Then
\[
    u(t) = e^{tA}x_0 + e^{tA}x_1 := x_0(t) + x_1(t).
\]
We infer from (8.6) that
\[
    \lim_{t \to \infty} \|x_0(t)\| = 0, \quad \lim_{t \to \infty} \|x_1(t)\| = \infty. \quad (8.7)
\]
By (A1) we have \( R_\lambda(A)K \subset K \subset P \) for \( \lambda > 0 \) sufficiently large. Therefore
\[
    R_\lambda(A)P = R_\lambda(A)K = \overline{R_\lambda(A)K} \subset K \subset P, \quad (8.8)
\]
where the closures are taken in \( X \). (The second equality in (8.8) is due to the fact that \( R_\lambda(A) \in \mathcal{L}(X) \).) This guarantees that \( A \) is semigroup positive, i.e., \( e^{tA}P \subset P \) for \( t \geq 0 \) (see e.g. Kato [24, Lemma 5.1]). Hence
\[
    e^{tA}P = e^{(i\theta-n)A}e^{tA}P \subset P, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (8.9)
\]
In particular, we have \( u(t) = e^{tA}u_0 \in P \) for all \( t \geq 0 \).

Now we show that \( X_1 \cap P \neq \{0\} \) and complete the proof of (8.5). First, by the first equality in (8.7) we see that \( \lim_{t \to \infty} d(u(t), X_1) = 0 \). Now suppose on the contrary that \( X_1 \cap P = \{0\} \). Then by Lemma 2.4 one deduces that \( \lim_{t \to \infty} \|u(t)\| = 0 \). This contradicts (8.7).

Step 2. The verification of assertions (1) and (2).

Take \( \eta = s \). Then \( \Sigma_1(\eta) = \sigma_0(A) \). Let \( K_1 = X_1 \cap K \), where \( X_i = X_i(\eta) = X_i(s) \) \((i = 0, 1)\) are given as in (8.4). Since \( X_1 \) is a finite-dimensional subspace of \( Y \), (8.5) implies that \( K_1 \) is a cone in \( X_1 \). As \( K \) is total in \( Y \), we have
\[
    \text{Cl}_{X_1}(K_1 - K_1) = \text{Cl}_Y(K_1 - K_1) = \text{Cl}_Y(X_1 \cap K - X_1 \cap K) \subset \text{Cl}_Y(X_1 \cap (K - K)) = X_1 \cap \text{Cl}_Y(K - K) = X_1 \cap Y = X_1.
\]
That is, \( K_1 \) is total in \( X_1 \). Let \( A_1 = A|_{X_1} \). For \( \lambda > 0 \) sufficiently large, we infer from (2.3) that \( R_\lambda(A_1)X_1 = X_1 \). Thus by (A1) one easily verifies that
\[
    R_\lambda(A_1)K_1 \subset K_1. \quad (8.10)
\]
Note that \( \sigma(A_1) = \Sigma_1(\eta) = \sigma_0(A) \). Let
\[
    \sigma(A_1) = \{ \mu_i = s + i\beta_i : 0 \leq i \leq n \}.
\]
We may assume that \( |\beta_0| = \min_{0 \leq i \leq n} |\beta_i| \). Fix a number \( \lambda > s \) such that (8.10) holds. Then \( |\lambda - \mu_0| = \min_{0 \leq i \leq n} |\lambda - \mu_i| \), and hence
\[
    r(R_\lambda(A_1)) = \sup\{1/|\lambda - \mu_i| : 0 \leq i \leq n\} = 1/|\lambda - \mu_0| := r.
\]
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By Theorem 7.3 one concludes that $r$ is an eigenvalue of $R_\lambda(A_1)$ with an eigenvector $w \in K_1$. On the other hand, since $1/|\lambda - \mu_i| < r$ for $\mu_i \in \sigma(A_1)$ with $\mu_i \neq \mu_0$, we see that the circle $S_r$ in $\mathbb{C}$ contains at most two eigenvalues of $R_\lambda(A_1)$, i.e., $1/(\lambda - \mu_0)$ and $1/(\lambda - \overline{\mu_0})$. Thus one necessarily has $1/(\lambda - \mu_0) = 1/(\lambda - \overline{\mu_0}) = r$, which implies that $\beta_0 = 0$. It follows that $\mu_0 = s$ is an eigenvalue of $A$; furthermore, $w$ is an eigenvector of $A$ corresponding to $s$. This completes the proof of (1).

If $\text{int}_Y K \neq \emptyset$ and contains a principal eigenvector $v$, one easily verifies that $\text{int}_{X_1} K_1$ is nonvoid and $v \in \text{int}_{X_1} K_1$. Thus by Theorem 7.3 we deduce that the eigenvalue $1/(\lambda - s)$ of $R_\lambda(A_1)$ has the same algebraic and geometric multiplicities. Consequently by 2.3 the algebraic and geometric multiplicities of the principal eigenvalue $s$ of $A$ coincide. Hence assertion (2) holds true.

**Step 3.** The verification of assertions (3) and (4).

Let $\mu \in \sigma(A) \setminus \{s\}$, $\Re \mu > s_e$. Take a real number $\eta$ with $s_e < \eta < s$ such that $\mu \in \Sigma_1(\eta)$. Let $X_1 = X_1(\eta)$, $K_1 = X_1 \cap K$, and $A_1 = A|_{X_1}$. Then as in Step 2 it can be shown that $K_1$ is a total cone in $X_1$. Furthermore, (8.10) remains valid for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently large. Take a $\lambda > s$ such that (8.10) holds and consider the resolvent operator $R_\lambda(A_1)$ of $A_1$ on $X_1$. Then by Theorem 7.3 (3), we deduce that $\text{int}_{X_1} K_1$ does not contain eigenvectors of $R_\lambda(A_1)$ pertaining to the eigenvalue $\lambda_\mu := 1/(\lambda - \mu)$. Now if $A$ has an eigenvector $v \in \text{int}_Y K$ corresponding to $\mu$. Then one easily verify that $v \in \text{int}_{X_1} K_1$ and is an eigenvector of $R_\lambda(A_1)$ corresponding to $\lambda_\mu$. This leads to a contradiction and verifies assertion (3).

If $\text{Im} \mu \neq 0$, Theorem 7.3 (4) asserts that $\text{GE}_{\lambda_\mu}(R_\lambda(A_1)) \cap K_1 = \{0\}$. We also infer from 2.3 that $\text{GE}_\mu(A_1) = \text{GE}_{\lambda_\mu}(R_\lambda(A_1))$. Therefore $\text{GE}_\mu(A) \cap K = \text{GE}_\mu(A_1) \cap K_1 = \{0\}$. This completes the proof of assertion (4). \hfill \blacksquare

**Remark 8.2.** Note that we do not require that $e^{tA}Y \subset Y$ in the proof of the above theorem. This allows us to avoid deriving higher regularity results on the corresponding parabolic equations when applying the theory to elliptic operators.

**Theorem 8.3.** In addition to $(A1) - (A3)$, assume that

$$\text{(A4) } K \text{ is a solid cone in } Y, \text{ and } R_\lambda(A)(K \setminus \{0\}) \subset \text{int}_Y K.$$  

Then $s$ is a simple eigenvalue with a unique normalized eigenvector $w \in \text{int}_Y K$. Moreover, for any $\mu \in \sigma(A) \setminus \{s\}$ with $\Re \mu > s_e$,

$$\text{GE}_\mu(A) \cap K = \{0\}.$$  

(8.11)
Proof. The proof follows a fully analogous argument as in the proof of Theorem 7.6. We omit it. ■

Remark 8.4. One may expect that in Theorem 8.3 the hypothesis (A4) guarantees the uniqueness of the elements in the boundary spectrum \( \sigma_b(A) \). Unfortunately the following simple example tells us that this may fail to be true.

Example 8.1. Let \( X = Y = \mathbb{R}^3 \). Define a cone \( K \) in \( X \) as

\[
K = \{ (x,y,z) \in X : z \geq \sqrt{x^2 + y^2} \}.
\]

Then \( \text{int}_Y K = \{ (x,y,z) \in X : z > \sqrt{x^2 + y^2} \} \).

Let \( A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \). Then \( A \) corresponds to a linear operator on \( X \), still denoted by \( A \). For \( \lambda > 0 \), simple calculations yield

\[
R_\lambda(A) := (\lambda - A)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} B & O \\ O & \lambda^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad B = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda^2} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 1 \\ -1 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Therefore

\[
R_\lambda(A)u = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda^2} \left( \lambda x - y, x + \lambda y, \frac{1 + \lambda^2}{\lambda} z \right) = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda^2} (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}).
\]

Observe that

\[
\tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2 = (x^2 + y^2) + \lambda^2(x^2 + y^2) = (1 + \lambda^2)(x^2 + y^2).
\]

Now let \( u = (x,y,z) \in K \). Then \( x^2 + y^2 \leq z^2 \). Since \( (1 + \lambda^2)/\lambda^2 > 1 \), by (8.12) we deduce that

\[
\tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2 \leq (1 + \lambda^2)z^2 \leq \left( \frac{1 + \lambda^2}{\lambda} \right)^2 z^2 = \tilde{z}^2.
\]

This implies \( (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) \in K \). Thus we see that \( R_\lambda(A)K \subset K \).

If \( u \in \partial K, u \neq 0 \), then \( x^2 + y^2 = z^2 \neq 0 \). By (8.12) we find that

\[
\tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2 = (1 + \lambda^2)z^2 < \left( \frac{1 + \lambda^2}{\lambda} \right)^2 z^2 = \tilde{z}^2.
\]

Hence \( (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) \in \text{int}_Y K \). Therefore \( R_\lambda(A)u \in \text{int}_Y K \). This indicates that the operator given by \( A \) satisfies all the requirements in Theorem 8.3. However, all the eigenvalues of \( A \) has the same real part \( s = 0 \).

To guarantee the uniqueness of elements in \( \sigma_b(A) \), Nussbaum [35] used the notion of “\( u_0 \)-positivity” due to Krasnosel’skii [27]; see [38, Theorem 1.3]. Here we remark that if the semigroup \( e^{tA} \) has some strong positivity property, then one can still ensure the uniqueness of \( \sigma_b(A) \).
Theorem 8.5. In addition to (A1) – (A4), assume that

(A5) for any \( t > 0 \) and \( \mu \in \sigma(A) \) with \( \text{Re} \mu > s \epsilon \),

\[
e^{tA}(K_\mu \setminus \{0\}) \in \text{int}_Y K,
\]

where \( K_\mu = \text{GE}_\mu(E) \cap K \).

Then \( \sigma_b(A) = \{s\} \).

Proof. Let \( Y' = \oplus_{\mu \in \sigma_b(A)} \text{GE}_\mu(E), A' = A|_{Y'} \). Denote \( K' = Y' \cap K \). Then by Theorem 8.3 we see that \( K' \neq \{0\} \). Hence \( K' \) is a cone in \( Y' \). Let \( v \in K' \), \( v \neq 0 \). By (A5) we have \( e^{tA}v \in \text{int}_Y K \) for \( t > 0 \). Since \( e^{tA}v \in Y' \), one trivially verifies that \( e^{tA}v \in \text{int}_{Y'} K' \). Therefore \( K' \) is a solid cone in \( Y' \) and

\[
e^{tA'}(K' \setminus \{0\}) \subset \text{int}_{Y'} K', \quad t > 0. \tag{8.13}
\]

Now let \( \mu := s + i\beta \in \sigma_b(A) \). Then \( \lambda := e^{\mu t} = e^{st}e^{i\beta t} \) is an eigenvalue of \( e^{tA'} \) with \( |\lambda| = e^{st} := r(t) \). But (8.13) implies that \( r(t) \) is the unique eigenvalue of \( e^{tA'} \) on the circle \( S_{r(t)} \) for \( t > 0 \). Hence we necessarily have \( e^{i\beta t} = 1 \), and therefore \( \beta t \in \{2k\pi : k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \) for all \( t > 0 \). But this is impossible unless \( \beta = 0 \). This proves what we desired. ■

8.2. An example

As an illustrating example, we consider the principal eigenvalue problem of the elliptic operator \( L \) on a smooth bounded domain \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n (n \geq 1) \):

\[
Lu = -\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{ij}(x) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i(x) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} + c(x)u, \tag{8.14}
\]

which is associated with the mixed boundary condition:

\[
Bu := \alpha(x)u + \beta(x)\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 \tag{8.15}
\]

on the boundary \( \Gamma := \partial \Omega \) of \( \Omega \), where \( \nu \) stands for the unit outward normal vector field on \( \Gamma \). The coefficients of \( L \) and \( B \) are assumed to be \( C^\infty \) functions satisfying the hypotheses below:

(H1) \( a_{ij} = a_{ji} (1 \leq i, j \leq n) \), and there is \( \theta > 0 \) such that

\[
\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{ij}(x)\varsigma_i \varsigma_j \geq \theta |\varsigma|^2, \quad \forall \varsigma \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ x \in \tilde{\Omega};
\]

(H2) \( c, \alpha, \beta \) are nonnegative functions satisfying that

\[
\alpha(x) + \beta(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \Gamma. \tag{8.16}
\]
In the case of the Dirichlet boundary condition or the Robin boundary condition (regular case), this problem has already been well understood; see e.g. [2, Theorem 12.1], [34, Theorem 1.4] and also [20, 38]. Here we are interested in a degenerate case where $\beta$ may vanish on a proper subset of $\Gamma$. In such a situation, if $L$ has a divergence form (hence $L$ enjoys some symmetric properties), one can find some nice results concerning the principal eigenvalue problem of $L$ in Taira [50, Theorem 1.2]. As an example of application for our abstract results, here we deal with the general case and present a less involved argument on the problem.

- **Some fundamental results.** First, making use of the classical Hopf’s lemma, one can easily verify the comparison result below:

**Lemma 8.6.** Let $u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$, $u \not\equiv 0$. Assume that

$$Lu + \lambda u \geq 0 \ (\text{in } \Omega), \quad Bu \geq 0 \ (\text{on } \Gamma),$$

where $\lambda \geq 0$. Then $u(x) > 0$ for $x \in \Omega$.

Denote by $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ ($s \in \mathbb{R}_+, 1 \leq p < \infty$) the Sobolev spaces equipped with the standard norms. We infer from Taira [50, pp.5, Theorem 1] that the following existence and uniqueness result holds true.

**Lemma 8.7.** Let $1 < p < \infty$, $s > 1 + 1/p$, and let $\lambda \geq 0$. Then for any $f \in W^{s-2,p}(\Omega)$, the homogeneous boundary value problem

$$Lu + \lambda u = f \ (\text{in } \Omega), \quad Bu = 0 \ (\text{on } \Gamma) \quad (8.17)$$

has a unique solution $u \in W^{s,p}(\Omega)$. Here the boundary condition is understood in the sense that $B$ can be viewed as a linear operator from $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ to Besov space $B_s^{r-1/p,p}(\Gamma)$ (see [50] pp. 3 for details).

Note that Lemma 8.7 implies that if $f \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, then the solution $u$ of (8.17) belongs to $C^4(\overline{\Omega})$, and hence it solves (8.17) in the classical sense. Indeed, if $f \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ then $f \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for any $1 < p < \infty$. Lemma 8.7 then asserts that $u \in W^{3,p}(\Omega)$. Taking a number $p > 1$ sufficiently large so that $W^{3,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow C^2(\overline{\Omega})$, one immediately concludes that $u \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$.

By virtue of [50] pp.5, Theorem 1] we also deduce that

$$\|u\|_{C^2(\overline{\Omega})} \leq C\|u\|_{W^{3,p}(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{C^1(\overline{\Omega})} \quad (8.18)$$

for all $f \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, where $C$ denotes a general constant independent of $f$. 
• Resolvent strong positivity of $A = -L$. Let $X = L^2(\Omega)$, and set

$$Y = \{u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}) : \ u \text{ satisfies (8.15)}\}.$$ 

$Y$ is equipped with the usual norm of $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$. Clearly $Y \hookrightarrow X$.

Let $K$ be the positive cone in $Y$ consisting of nonnegative functions. 

Denote by $A$ the operator $-L$ with domain

$$D(A) = \{u \in H^2(\Omega) : Bu = 0\},$$

where the boundary condition $Bu = 0$ is understood in the same sense as in Lemma 8.7. Invoking [50, pp.5, Theorem 2] we deduce that $-A$ is a sectorial operator in $X$ with compact resolvent. Hence by [25, Ex. 2.4, (i)] it is easy to see that $\text{sp}(A) = -\infty < \text{sp}(A) < \infty$. Thus $A$ fulfills (A2) in Section 8.1.

The following result indicates that $A$ fulfills hypotheses (A1) and (A4) in Section 8.1. The proof of such a result is somewhat standard. We include the details in the Appendix part for the readers’ convenience.

**Lemma 8.8.** $R_\lambda(A)(K \setminus \{0\}) \subset \text{int} K$ for each $\lambda \geq 0$.

• Regularity of the generalized eigenfunctions. Let $\mathbb{A}$ be the complexification of $A$ with $D(\mathbb{A}) = D(A) + iD(A)$. We start with the eigenfunctions of $\mathbb{A}$, where $u, v \in D(A)$. Then $\mathbb{A}w = \mu w$ amounts to say that

$$Au = au - bv, \quad Av = av + bu. \quad (8.19)$$

Since $u, v \in H^2(\Omega)$, by Lemma 8.7 and (8.19) one finds that $u, v \in H^4(\Omega)$. Further by a simple bootstrap argument we finally conclude that $u, v \in H^s(\Omega)$ for all $s \geq 0$. It follows by the Sobolev embeddings that $u, v \in C^\infty(\Omega)$.

Now let $g \in \text{GE}_\mu(\mathbb{A})$ and $\text{rank}(g) \geq 2$. Set $k = \text{rank}(g) - 1$. Then $(\mathbb{A} - \mu)^kg := w$ is an eigenfunction of $\mathbb{A}$. Hence $w$ a $C^\infty$ function on $\Omega$.

Note that it is readily implied in $(\mathbb{A} - \mu)^kg = w$ that $(\mathbb{A} - \mu)^jg \in D(\mathbb{A})$ for all $j \leq k$. In particular,

$$(\mathbb{A} - \mu)^{k-1}g := f_1 \in D(\mathbb{A}) \subset \mathbb{H}^2(\Omega) := H^s(\Omega) + iH^s(\Omega).$$

Therefore by $(\mathbb{A} - \mu)f_1 = w$ we find that

$$\mathbb{A}f_1 = w + \mu f_1 := \tilde{f}_1 \in \mathbb{H}^2(\Omega). \quad (8.20)$$

It follows by Lemma 8.7 that $f_1 \in \mathbb{H}^4(\Omega)$. This in turn implies that $\tilde{f}_1 \in \mathbb{H}^4(\Omega)$. (8.20) and Lemma 8.7 then asserts that $f_1 \in \mathbb{H}^s(\Omega)$. Once again by a bootstrap argument we see that $f_1 \in \mathbb{H}^s(\Omega)$ for all $s \geq 0$. 
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Repeating the above argument with $w$ and $f_1$ therein replaced by $f_1$ and $(A - \mu)^{k-2}g := f_2$, respectively, one deduces that $f_2 \in H^s(\Omega)$ for $s \geq 0$. Continuing this procedure we finally obtain that $g = f_k \in H^s(\Omega)$ for all $s \geq 0$. The Sobolev embeddings then immediately imply that $g$ is a $C^\infty$ function.

It follows from the above results that $GE_\mu(A) \subset Y$ for any $\mu \in \sigma(A)$. Hence $A$ fulfills hypothesis (A3).

By far we have seen that the operator $A$ satisfies hypotheses (A1)-(A4).

**The verification of hypothesis (A5).** Let $\mu \in \sigma(A)$. Denote by $A_\mu$ the restriction of $A$ on $GE_\mu(A)$. Given $g \in GE_\mu(A)$, let $u = u(t)$ be the solution of equation $\dot{u} = Au$ with $u(0) = g$. Then $u(t) = e^{tA}g = e^{tA_\mu}g$. Since $A_\mu$ is a bounded operator on $GE_\mu(A)$, by (8.5) we have

$$u(t) = e^{t\mu} \left( I + \frac{t}{1!}(A_\mu - \mu) + \cdots + \frac{t^{k-1}}{(k-1)!}(A_\mu - \mu)^{(k-1)} \right) g,$$

(8.21)

where $k = \text{rank}(g)$. Noticing that $(A_\mu - \mu)^j g \in GE_\mu(A)$ for any integer $j \geq 0$, by what we have proved above it is clear that $(A_\mu - \mu)^j g$ is a $C^\infty$ function. Consequently for each $t \geq 0$ fixed, $u(t)$ is a $C^\infty$ function in the space variable on $\overline{\Omega}$. We rewrite $u(t, x) = u(t)(x)$ for $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \overline{\Omega}$. It can be easily seen that $u$ is a complex $C^\infty$ function on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \overline{\Omega}$.

Now we come back to the real situation. The above result implies that for each $v_0 \in GE_\mu(A)$, the function $v(t, x) := v(t)(x)$, where $v(t) = e^{tA}v_0$, is a $C^\infty$ function on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \overline{\Omega}$. Therefore $v$ is a classical solution of the parabolic equation:

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + Lv = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \ t > 0$$

(8.22)

associated with the boundary condition $Bv = 0$ on $\Gamma$. Thanks to the Hopf’s lemma for parabolic equations (see e.g. Friedman [13, Chap. 2, Theorem 14]), using almost the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 8.8 (see the Appendix), it can be shown that $v(t, \cdot) \in \text{int}_Y K$ if $v_0 \in K$, $v_0 \neq 0$. This is precisely what we desired.

Now that $A$ satisfies hypotheses (A1)–(A5), as a straightforward application of Theorems 8.3 and 8.5, one immediately obtains the following result.

**Theorem 8.9.** The following assertions hold true:

(1) The spectral bound $s$ of $A$ is an algebraically simple eigenvalue with a corresponding eigenvector $w \in \text{int}_Y K$.

(2) $GE_\mu(A) \cap K = \{0\}$ for any $\mu \in \sigma(A) \setminus \{s\}$.

(3) $\sigma_b(A) = \{s\}$
Remark 8.10. We mention that in the case of the Dirichlet (or Robin) boundary condition, almost all the facts concerning the operator $A$ needed in establishing Theorem 8.5 are well known and need not be checked. Therefore the theorem becomes nearly an immediate consequence of Theorems 8.3 and 8.5.

Appendix: The Proof of Lemma 8.8

Proof. Let $f \in K \setminus \{0\}$, and $u = R_\lambda(A)f$. Then $u \in C^2(\Omega)$. By Lemma 8.6 we deduce that $u(x) > 0$ for $x \in \Omega$. Set $\Gamma_0 = \{x \in \Gamma : u(x) = 0\}$. Then the classical Hopf’s lemma asserts that $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(x) < 0$ for $x \in \Gamma_0$. Hence by compactness of $\Gamma_0$, there is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(x) \leq -3\varepsilon_0$ for $x \in \Gamma_0$.

Denote $\| \cdot \|_1 = \| \cdot \|_{C^1(\Omega)}$. Take a neighborhood $W$ of $\Gamma_0$ in $\Gamma$ such that

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(x) \leq -2\varepsilon_0, \quad x \in W. \quad (8.23)$$

Then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all $h \in Y$ with $\|h\|_1 < \delta$,

$$\frac{\partial (u + h)}{\partial \nu}(x) \leq -\varepsilon_0 < 0, \quad x \in W. \quad (8.24)$$

We claim that $\alpha(x) > 0$ for $x \in \Gamma_0$. Indeed, if $\alpha(x) = 0$ then by (8.16) we have $\beta(x) > 0$. Thus by (8.23) one deduces that $Bu(x) = \beta(x)\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(x) \neq 0$, a contradiction. Hence the claim holds true. By compactness of $\Gamma_0$ we deduce that $\alpha(x) \geq 2\varepsilon_1 > 0$ for all $x \in \Gamma_0$. Therefore by continuity of $\alpha$ it can be assumed that the neighborhood $W$ of $\Gamma_0$ in $\Gamma$ such that

$$\alpha(x) \geq \varepsilon_1 > 0, \quad x \in W. \quad (8.25)$$

Now for any $h \in Y$ with $\|h\|_1 < \delta$, we have at any point $x \in W$ that

$$\alpha(x)(u + h)(x) = -\beta(x)\frac{\partial (u + h)}{\partial \nu}(x) \geq (\text{by } (8.24)) \geq 0. \quad (8.26)$$

Hence by (8.25) we see that

$$(u + h)(x) \geq 0, \quad x \in W. \quad (8.27)$$

Using (8.24) and (8.26) it is not difficult to deduce that there is a neighborhood $U$ of $\Gamma_0$ in $\Omega$ such that for any $h \in Y$ with $\|h\|_1 < \delta$,

$$(u + h)(x) \geq 0, \quad x \in U. \quad (8.28)$$

We may assume that $U$ is open relative to $\Omega$. Hence $\Gamma_1 := \Gamma \setminus U$ is compact. Because $u$ is positive on $\Gamma_1$, there is $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that $u(x) \geq 2\varepsilon_2$ for $x \in \Gamma_1$. 
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This allows us to pick a neighborhood $V$ of $\Gamma_1$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ such that $u(x) \geq \varepsilon_2$ for $x \in V$. Further one can restrict $\delta$ sufficiently small so that

$$(u + h)(x) \geq 0, \quad x \in V \quad (8.28)$$

for all $h \in Y$, $\|h\|_1 < \delta$. Note that $G := U \cup V$ is a neighborhood of $\Gamma$ in $\overline{\Omega}$.

It can be assumed that both $U, V$ are open relative to $\overline{\Omega}$. Hence $G$ is open in $\overline{\Omega}$. Consequently $F := \overline{\Omega} \setminus G$ is a compact subset of $\overline{\Omega}$. Since $u$ is positive on $F$, there exists $\varepsilon_3 > 0$ such that $u(x) \geq 2\varepsilon_3$ for $x \in F$. Therefore if $\delta$ is sufficiently small then $u + h$ is positive on $F$ for all $h \in Y$ with $\|h\|_1 < \delta$. Combining this with (8.27) and (8.28), it follows that $u + h \geq 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ for all $h \in Y$ with $\|h\|_1 < \delta$, i.e., $u + h \in K$. Hence $u \in \text{int}_Y K$. $\blacksquare$
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