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Abstract

In this paper we aim to construct some abstract model of the second order differential operator with the fractional integro-differential operators composition in final terms, where modeling is understood as an interpretation of some concrete differential operators in terms of semigroups generators. Along with this, as a generalization, we consider the m-accretive operators transform. Continuing the chosen line of reasonings we identify some general operators class and supply the description of its spectral properties.
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1 Introduction

To write this paper, we were firstly motivated by the boundary value problems of the Sturm-Liouville type for fractional differential equations. Many authors devoted their attention to such problems, nevertheless this kind of problems are relevant for today. First of all, it is connected with the fact that they model various physical-chemical processes: filtration of liquid and gas in highly porous fractal medium; heat exchange processes in medium with fractal structure and memory; casual walks of a point particle that starts moving from the origin by self-similar fractal set; oscillator motion under the action of elastic forces which is characteristic for viscoelastic media, etc. In particular, we would like to study the eigenvalue problem for the second order fractional differential operator with the fractional derivative in final terms. Many papers, for instance the papers [6]-[9], [33], [56] were devoted to this question. The singular number problem for the resolvent of the second order differential operator with the Riemann-Liouville fractional derivative in the final term was considered in the paper [6]. It was proved that the resolvent belongs to the Hilbert-Schmidt class. The problem of completeness of the root functions system was studied in the paper [7], also a similar problem was considered in the paper [9].

However, we deal with a more general operator — the second order differential operator with the fractional integro-differential operators composition in final terms which covers the operator
mentioned above. Note that several types of compositions of fractional integro-differential operators were studied by such mathematicians as Prabhakar T.R. [59], Love E.R. [40], Erdelyi A. [16], McBride A. [47], Dimovski I.H., Kiryakova V.S. [15], Nakhushev A.M. [57]. The research in this direction reproduced the number of auxiliary problems in fractional calculus and the papers devoted to them are also worth noticing, such as Marichev O.I. [48], Prabhakar T.R. [60], Belward J.A. [10]. It should be noted that we use a principal different method of study which is based on the results of the paper [39]. The central idea of this paper is to built an algebraic model that gives us a description of the second order differential operator with the fractional integro-differential operators composition in final terms. For instance we can similarly represent a differential operator second order as some kind of the operator transform. In accordance with belonging a resolvent to the Schatten-von Neumann class and formulate a sufficient condition of completeness of the root vectors system. As the most significant result we obtain an asymptotic equivalence between the real component of the resolvent and the resolvent of the real component for the considering operators class. We obtain a classification in accordance with belonging a resolvent to the Schatten-von Neumann class and formulate a sufficient condition of completeness of the root vectors system. As the most significant result we obtain an asymptotic formula for the eigenvalues.

2 Preliminaries

Let $C, C_i, \ i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be positive real constants. We assume that a value of $C$ can be different in various formulas but values of $C_i, \ i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ are certain. Everywhere further, if the contrary is not stated, we consider linear densely defined operators acting on a separable complex Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$. Assume that $L$ is a closed operator acting on $\mathfrak{H}$, let us define the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}_L := \{f, g \in D(L), (f, g)_{\mathfrak{H}_L} = (Lf, Lg)_{\mathfrak{H}}\}$. Denote by $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ the set of linear bounded operators on $\mathfrak{H}$. Denote by $D(L)$, $\text{R}(L)$ the domain of definition and the range of an operator $L$ respectively. Let $P(L)$ be the resolvent set of an operator $L$. Let $R_L(\zeta), \ \zeta \in P(L), [R_L := R_L(0)]$ denotes the resolvent of an operator $L$. Denote by $\lambda_i(L), \ i \in \mathbb{N}$ the eigenvalues of an operator $L$. Suppose $L$ is a compact operator and $N := (L^*L)^{1/2}$, $r(N) := \text{R}(N)$; then the eigenvalues of the operator $N$ are called the singular numbers (s-numbers) of the operator $L$ and are denoted by $s_i(L), \ i = 1, 2, ..., r(N)$. If $r(N) < \infty$, then we put by definition $s_i = 0, i = r(N) + 1, 2, ...$. According to the terminology of the monograph [48] the dimension of the root vectors subspace corresponding to a certain eigenvalue $\lambda_k$ is called the algebraic multiplicity of the eigenvalue $\lambda_k$. Let $\nu(L)$ denotes the sum of all algebraic multiplicities of an operator $L$. Let $\mathfrak{S}_p(\mathfrak{H}), \ 0 < p < \infty$ be the Schatten-von Neumann class and $\mathfrak{S}_\infty(\mathfrak{H})$ be the set of compact operators. By definition, put

$$\mathfrak{S}_p(\mathfrak{H}) := \left\{L : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}, \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} s_i^p(L) < \infty, \ 0 < p < \infty \right\}. $$

Suppose $L$ is an operator with a compact resolvent and $s_n(R_L) \leq C n^{-\mu}, \ n \in \mathbb{N}, \ 0 \leq \mu < \infty$; then we denote by $\mu(L)$ order of the operator $L$ in accordance with the definition given in the paper [63]. Denote by $L_R := (L + L^*)/2, L_\Im := (L - L^*)/2i$ the real and imaginary components of an operator $L$ respectively. Let $\mathfrak{H}$ be the closure of an operator $L$. In accordance with the
terminology of the monograph [22] the set $\Theta(L) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : z = (L_f, f)_\gamma, f \in D(L), \|f\|_\gamma = 1\}$ is called the numerical range of an operator $L$. An operator $L$ is called sectorial if its numerical range belongs to a closed sector $\Sigma_\gamma := \{\zeta : |\arg(\zeta - \gamma)| \leq \theta < \pi/2\}$, where $\gamma$ is the vertex and $\theta$ is the semi-angle of the sector $\Sigma_\gamma$. We shall say that the operator $L$ has a positive sector if $\text{Im} \gamma = 0, \gamma > 0$. An operator $L$ is called semibounded from below if the following relation holds $\text{Re}(L_f, f)_\gamma \geq -C\|f\|_\gamma^2, f \in D(L)$. An operator $L$ is called strictly accretive if the following relation holds $\text{Re}(L_f, f)_\gamma \geq C\|f\|_\gamma^2, f \in D(L)$. An operator $L$ is called $m$-accretive if the next relation holds $(A + \zeta)^{-1} \in B(\mathcal{H}), \|(A + \zeta)^{-1}\| \leq (\text{Re}\zeta)^{-1}, \text{Re} \zeta > 0$. An operator $L$ is called $m$-sectorial if $L$ is sectorial and $L + \beta$ is $m$-accretive for some constant $\beta$. An operator $L$ is called symmetric if one is densely defined and the next equality holds $(L_f, g)_\gamma = (f, Lg)_\gamma, f, g \in D(L)$. A symmetric operator is called positive if the values of its quadratic form are nonnegative. Everywhere further if it is not stated otherwise we use the notations accepted in the literature [18], [22], [62].

1. Spectral theorems

Consider a pair of complex separable Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_+$ under the assumptions

$$\mathcal{H}_+ \hookrightarrow \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}. \quad (1)$$

This denotation means that $\mathcal{H}_+$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$ as a set of elements and we have the bounded embedding provided by the inequality

$$\|f\|_\gamma \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_+}, f \in \mathcal{H}_+, \quad (2)$$

moreover any bounded set with respect to the norm $\mathcal{H}_+$ is compact with respect to the norm $\mathcal{H}$. Denote by $\mathcal{H}_L, \|\cdot\|_L$ the energetic space generated by the operator $L$ and the norm in this space respectively (more detailed, see [66], [54]). We consider non-selfadjoint operators which can be represented by the sum $W = T + S$ under certain assumptions relative to the main part - operator $T$ and the lower term - operator $S$, both these operators act in $\mathcal{H}$. We assume that there exists a linear manifold $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{H}_+$ dense in $\mathcal{H}_+$ on which the operators $T, S$ are well defined with their adjoint operators. Thus in further we suppose $D(W) = \mathcal{M}$, what gives us an opportunity to approve that $D(W) \subset D(W^*)$. We assume that the operators satisfy the following hypotheses

$$(\text{H1}) \quad \text{Re}(Tf, f)_\gamma \geq C_0\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_+}^2, \quad \text{Re}(Sf, f)_\gamma \geq C_2\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_+}^2,$$

$$(\text{H2}) \quad \|(Tf, g)_\gamma\| \leq C_1\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_+}\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_+}, \quad \|(Sf, g)_\gamma\| \leq C_4\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_+}\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad (3)$$

where $f, g \in \mathcal{M}$. Due to conditions (3) and by virtue of Theorem 3.4 [22, p.268] the operator $W$ is closable. Thus further, we are able to assume that $W$ is closed. It is proved in [38] that under assumptions (1)-(3), the operator $W$ is sectorial, where the sector top is situated at the point zero. The following series of propositions are true.

(A) We have the following classification

$$R_W \in \mathcal{S}_p, p = \begin{cases} l, l > 2/\mu, \mu \leq 1, \\ 1, \mu > 1. \end{cases}$$

Moreover under the assumptions $\lambda_n(R_H) \geq C n^{-\mu}, n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$R_W \in \mathcal{S}_p \Rightarrow \mu p > 1, 1 \leq p < \infty, \quad 3$$
where \( \mu := \mu(H) \).

**(B)** The following relation holds

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}(R_{W})|^{p} \leq \sec^{\theta} \| S^{-1} \| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i}^{p}(R_{H}), \quad 1 \leq p < \infty, \quad (n = 1, 2, ..., \nu(R_{W})).
\]

(4)

Moreover if \( \nu(R_{W}) = \infty \) and order \( \mu(H) \neq 0 \), then the following asymptotic formula holds

\[
|\lambda_{i}(R_{W})| = o \left( i^{-\mu+\varepsilon} \right), \quad i \to \infty, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.
\]

(5)

**(C)** Let \( \theta < \pi \mu/2 \), then the system of root vectors of \( R_{W} \) is complete in \( \mathcal{H} \).

2. Strictly accretive and m-accretive operators

For a reader convenience, we would like to establish known facts of the operator theory under the point of view that is required for our next reasonings. Consider a closed densely defined operator \( A \) under the following imposed conditions

\[
\|(A + t)^{-1}\|_{R \to \mathcal{H}} \leq \frac{1}{t}, \quad t > 0,
\]

(5)

where the shorthand denotation \( R := R(A + t) \) is used. If we have

\[
\|(A + t)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{\text{Re}t}, \quad \text{Re}t > 0,
\]

(6)

then in accordance with the definition given in [22] we call the operator \( A \) m-accretive. Let us show that assumptions (5) being imposed allow us to prove that the operator \( A \) is m-accretive. Using (5) consider

\[
\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{t^2} \|(A + t)f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2; \quad \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{t^2} \left\{ \|Af\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + 2t\text{Re}(Af, f)_{\mathcal{H}} + t^2\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right\};
\]

\[
t^{-1}\|Af\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + 2\text{Re}(Af, f)_{\mathcal{H}} \geq 0, \quad f \in D(A).
\]

Let \( t \) be tended to infinity, then we obtain

\[
\text{Re}(Af, f)_{\mathcal{H}} \geq 0, \quad f \in D(A).
\]

(7)

It means that the operator \( A \) has an accretive property. Due to (7), we have \( \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Re}\lambda < 0 \} \subset \Delta(A) \), where \( \Delta(A) = \mathbb{C} \setminus \Theta(A) \). Applying Theorem 3.2 [22, p.268], we obtain that \( A - \lambda \) has a closed range and \( \text{nul}(A - \lambda) = 0 \), \( \text{def}(A - \lambda) = \text{const}, \forall \lambda \in \Delta(A) \). Let \( \lambda_0 \in \Delta(A) \), \( \text{Re}\lambda_0 < 0 \). Note that in consequence of inequality (7), we have

\[
\text{Re}(f, (A - \lambda)f)_{\mathcal{H}} \geq -\text{Re}\lambda\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \quad f \in D(A).
\]

(8)

Since the operator \( A - \lambda_0 \) has a closed range, then

\[
\mathcal{H} = R(A - \lambda_0) \oplus R(A - \lambda_0)^{\perp}.
\]
We remark that the intersection of the sets $D(A)$ and $R(A - \lambda_0)^\bot$ is zero, because if we assume the contrary, then applying inequality (25), for any element $f \in D(A) \cap R(A - \lambda_0)^\bot$ we get

$$-\Re \lambda_0 \|f\|_\beta^2 \leq \Re (f, [A - \lambda_0]f)_\beta = 0,$$

hence $f = 0$. It implies that

$$(f, g)_\beta = 0, \ \forall f \in R(A - \lambda_0)^\bot, \ \forall g \in D(A).$$

Since $D(A)$ is a dense set in $\mathcal{H}$, then $R(A - \lambda_0)^\bot = 0$. It implies that $\text{def}(A - \zeta_0) = 0$ and if we take into account Theorem 3.2 [22, p.268], then we came to conclusion that $\text{def}(A - \lambda) = 0$, $\forall \lambda \in \Delta(A)$, relation (6) is fulfilled.

In accordance with the definition given in [10] we can define a positive and negative fractional powers of a positive operator $A$ as follows

$$A^\alpha := \frac{\sin \alpha \pi}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \lambda^{\alpha - 1}(\lambda + A)^{-1}A d\lambda; \quad A^{-\alpha} := \frac{\sin \alpha \pi}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \lambda^{-\alpha}(\lambda + A)^{-1}d\lambda, \ \alpha \in (0, 1). \quad (9)$$

This definition can be correctly extended on m-accretive operators, the corresponding reasonings can be found in [22]. Thus, further we define positive and negative fractional powers of m-accretive operators due to formula (9). Let us show that a fractional power $A^\alpha$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ of a m-accretive operator $A$ is an accretive operator. We have

$$\Re ([\lambda + A]^{-1}Af, f)_\beta = \Re ([\lambda + A]^{-1}[\lambda + A]f, f)_\beta - \Re (\lambda[\lambda + A]^{-1}f, f)_\beta \geq \|f\|_\beta^2 (1 - \lambda \cdot \|((\lambda + A)^{-1})\|), \ f \in D(A), \ \lambda > 0.$$  

Using condition (6), we obtain the following inequality

$$\Re ([\lambda + A]^{-1}Af, f)_\beta \geq 0, \ f \in D(A).$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\Re (A^\alpha f, f)_\beta = \frac{\sin \alpha \pi}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \lambda^{\alpha - 1}\Re ([\lambda + A]^{-1}Af, f)_\beta d\lambda \geq 0, \ f \in D(A).$$

Since in accordance with Theorem 3.35 [22, p.281] the set $D(A)$ is a core of $A^\alpha$, then we can extend the previous inequality to the set $D(A^\alpha)$, i.e.

$$\Re (A^\alpha f, f)_\beta \geq 0, \ f \in D(A^\alpha).$$

Let us show that the operator $A^*$ is m-accretive, if an operator $A$ is m-accretive. Since it is proved that $\text{def}(A + \lambda) = 0$, $\lambda > 0$, then $\text{mul}(A + \lambda)^* = 0$, $\lambda > 0$. In accordance with the well-known fact, we have $([\lambda + A]^{-1})^* = [(\lambda + A)^*]^{-1}$. Using the obvious inclusion $\lambda + A^* \subset (\lambda + A)^*$, we can deduce $(\lambda + A^* )^{-1} \subset [(\lambda + A)^*]^{-1}$. Also it is obvious that $\|((\lambda + A)^{-1})\| = \|([\lambda + A]^{-1})^*\|$. Hence

$$\|((\lambda + A)^{-1})f\|_\beta = \|([\lambda + A]^{-1})^*f\|_\beta = \|((\lambda + A)^{-1})^*f\|_\beta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}\|f\|_\beta, \ f \in R(\lambda + A^*), \ \lambda > 0.$$
This relation can be rewritten as follows

\[ \| (\lambda + A^\ast)^{-1} \|_{R \rightarrow \delta} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}, \lambda > 0. \]

In accordance with the proved above fact, we conclude that

\[ \| (\lambda + A^\ast)^{-1} \| \leq \frac{1}{\text{Re}\lambda}, \text{Re}\lambda > 0. \] (10)

Let us show that \( A^{\alpha \ast} \supset A^{\ast \alpha} \). Note that formula (9) means that there exists a limit with respect to \( \delta \) norm

\[ \sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_i^{\alpha - 1}(\lambda_i + A)^{-1}Af \Delta \lambda_i \overset{\delta}{\rightarrow} A^{\alpha}f, \ n \rightarrow \infty, \ \lambda_i \rightarrow \infty, \ \Delta \lambda_i \rightarrow 0, \] (11)

where \( f \in D(A), \alpha \in (0, 1) \). Hence using (11), we have

\[ (A^{\alpha}f, g)_\delta = \frac{\sin \alpha \pi}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \lambda^{\alpha - 1}([\lambda + A]^{-1}Af, g)_\delta d\lambda = \frac{\sin \alpha \pi}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \lambda^{\alpha - 1}(f, ([\lambda + A]^{-1}A)^{\ast}g)_\delta d\lambda, \]

\[ f \in D(A), g \in D\{([\lambda + A]^{-1}A)^{\ast}\}. \] (12)

Using the mentioned above fact \( \text{def}(A + \lambda) = \text{def}(A^\ast + \lambda) = 0, \lambda > 0 \), let us prove that \( \lambda + A^\ast = (\lambda + A)^\ast, \lambda > 0 \). First, it is obvious that \( \lambda + A^\ast \subset (\lambda + A)^\ast \). Assume that there exists \( g_1 \in D((\lambda + A)^\ast), g_1 \in \lambda + A^\ast \), we have

\[ ([\lambda + A]f, g_1)_\delta = (f, [\lambda + A]^{\ast}g_1)_\delta. \]

On the other hand, since \( \text{def}(A^\ast + \lambda) = 0 \), then there exists \( g_2 \in D(\lambda + A^\ast) \) such that \( (\lambda + A)^{\ast}g_1 = (\lambda + A^\ast)g_2 \). Hence

\[ ([\lambda + A]f, g_1 - g_2)_\delta = 0. \]

Now, if we use the relation \( \text{def}(A + \lambda) = 0 \), then we obtain \( g_1 = g_2 \). Thus, we come to the contradiction, which implies that \( \lambda + A^\ast = (\lambda + A)^\ast, \lambda > 0 \). Hence \( (\lambda^{\alpha - 1})^\ast = ([\lambda + A]^{-1})^\ast = (\lambda + A)^{-1}, \lambda > 0 \). If we take into account \( ([\lambda + A]^{-1}A)^{\ast} \supset A^\ast ([\lambda + A]^{-1})^\ast \), then we get

\[ ([\lambda + A]^{-1}A)^{\ast} \supset A^\ast ([\lambda + A]^{-1})^\ast. \] (13)

It can be checked by direct calculations that

\[ A^\ast ([\lambda + A]^{-1}f) = (\lambda + A^\ast)^{-1}A^\ast f, f \in D(A^\ast), \] (14)

we should just consider the identity \( A^\ast ([\lambda + A^\ast]^{-1}f) = I - \lambda (\lambda + A^\ast)^{-1}, \) since a rest part of the relation (14) proof looks like understandable. Using (14), let us consider the equality

\[ \int_0^\infty \lambda^{\alpha - 1}A^\ast ([\lambda + A^\ast]^{-1}f) d\lambda = \int_0^\infty \lambda^{\alpha - 1}A^\ast (\lambda + A^\ast)^{-1}A^\ast f d\lambda, f \in D(A^\ast). \]

In accordance with the formula (9), the right part of the previous relation is the operator \( A^{\alpha \ast} \). Taking into account (2), (13), we obtain \( A^{\alpha \ast} \subset A^{\ast \alpha} \).
3 Main results

In this section we aim to study some operator class and prove that hypotheses $(H1), (H2)$ are fulfilled for operators belonging to this class. We prove that the second order operator with the fractional integro-differential operators composition in final terms belongs to considered class and the representation in terms of semigroup generator takes place for this operator.

1. Transform

The following theorem gives us a tool to describe spectral properties of some class of $m$-accretive operators and, as it will be shown further, it has an important application in fractional calculus, allows to present fractional differential operators as a semigroups generators transform.

**Theorem 1.** Assume that $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, $J$ is a $m$-accretive operator acting on a separable Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$, the operator $J^{-1}$ is compact, the Kato conjecture is fulfilled for the operator $J^\alpha$, $\alpha \in [1/2, 1)$. The operator $G$ is bounded, strictly accretive, $D(Q) \subset D(Q^*)$, $D(Q) = \mathfrak{H}$, where $Q = J^*GJ$. The operator $F$ is bounded, such that $\Re(FJ^\alpha f, f)_{\mathfrak{H}} \geq \eta \|f\|^2_{\mathfrak{H}}$, $f \in D(J)$, $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$, $F^*: D(J^\alpha) \to D(J^\alpha)$. Then for the operator

$$L := J^*GJ + FJ^\alpha + \psi I,$$

where $\psi + \eta > 0$, hypotheses $(H1), (H2)$ are fulfilled.

**Proof.** Note that it follows from the $m$-accretive property that $J$ is densely defined (see [22, p.279]), by virtue of Theorem 3.4 [22, p.268] we conclude that $J$ is closable. Thus, further for the sake of the simplicity we consider that $J$ is a closed densely defined operator and this assumption does not restrict generality of reasonings. First we want to check condition (11), where the denotation $\mathfrak{H}_+ := \mathfrak{H}J$ is used. Since $J^{-1}$ is compact, then it is clear that $\|f\|_{\mathfrak{H}} \leq C\|Jf\|_{\mathfrak{H}}$, $f \in D(J)$. Without lose of generality we can consider $C = 1$. Thus, we obtain the fulfillment of inequality (2). In consequence of the operator $J^{-1}$ compactness property, the embedding provided by inequality (2) is compact. Hence we have the fulfillment of (11). Let us show that $D(L) \subset D(L^*)$. We have proved that $J^* \subset J^*$, (see section 2). Therefore $(FJ^\alpha)^* \supset J^*F^* \supset J^*F^*$. Note that due to the results of T.Kato [21], we have $D(J^\alpha) = D(J^\alpha)$, thus in accordance with the theorem conditions, we have $D(J^\alpha) = D(J^\alpha)$. Hence, taking into account the theorem conditions and the facts discussed above, we conclude in an obvious way that

$$D(L) \subset D(Q^* + J^*F^*) \subset D(L^*).$$

Now we want to show that the hypothesis $(H1), (H2)$ are fulfilled. Using the strictly accretive property of the operator $G$, it is not hard to deduce

$$\Re(Qf, f)_{\mathfrak{H}} = \Re(GJf, Jf)_{\mathfrak{H}} \geq C\|Jf\|^2_{\mathfrak{H}} := C\|f\|^2_{\mathfrak{H}}^2, f \in D(Q).$$

Note that in accordance with the theorem conditions, we have

$$\Re(FJ^\alpha + \psi I)f, f)_{\mathfrak{H}} \geq C\|f\|^2_{\mathfrak{H}}^2, f \in D(J).$$

(15)

Suppose $T := J^*GJ$, $S := FJ^\alpha + \psi I$; then it is clear that hypothesis $(H1)$ is fulfilled. Using the theorem conditions and applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$|(J^*GJf, g)_{\mathfrak{H}}| = |(GJf, Jg)_{\mathfrak{H}}| \leq C\|Jf\|_{\mathfrak{H}}\|Jg\|_{\mathfrak{H}}, f, g \in D(Q).$$
Similarly, we get

\[ |(FJ^\alpha f, g)_{\mathcal{B}}| \leq \|FJ^\alpha f\|_{\mathcal{B}}\|g\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq C\|J^\alpha f\|_{\mathcal{B}}\|g\|_{\mathcal{B}}, \; f, g \in D(J). \]  

(16)

In accordance with (9), we have \( J^\alpha = J^{\alpha - 1}J \). Let us prove that operator \( J^{\alpha - 1} \), \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) is bounded in \( \mathfrak{H} \), for this purpose consider

\[ J^{\alpha - 1} = \int_0^1 \lambda^{\alpha - 1}(\lambda + J)^{-1}d\lambda + \int_1^\infty \lambda^{\alpha - 1}(\lambda + J)^{-1}d\lambda = I_1 + I_2. \]

Using the fact \( J(\lambda + J)^{-1}f = (\lambda + J)^{-1}Jf, \; f \in D(J) \), we can evaluate respectively

\[
\|I_1f\|_{\mathcal{B}} = \left\| \int_0^1 \lambda^{\alpha - 1}J(\lambda + J)^{-1}f d\lambda \right\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \|J^{-1}\|_{R \to \mathcal{B}} \cdot \left\| \int_0^1 \lambda^{\alpha - 1}J(\lambda + J)^{-1}f d\lambda \right\|_{\mathcal{B}}
\]

\[
\leq 2\|J^{-1}\|_{R \to \mathcal{B}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}} \int_0^1 \lambda^{\alpha - 1}d\lambda, \; f \in D(J);
\]

\[
\|I_2f\|_{\mathcal{B}} = \left\| \int_1^\infty \lambda^{\alpha - 1}(\lambda + J)^{-1}f d\lambda \right\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}} \int_1^\infty \lambda^{\alpha - 1}(\lambda + J)^{-1}d\lambda \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}} \int_1^\infty \lambda^{\alpha - 2}d\lambda.
\]

Hence \( J^{\alpha - 1} \) is bounded on \( D(J) \), since \( D(J) \) is dense in \( \mathfrak{H} \), then \( J^{\alpha - 1} \) is bounded in \( \mathfrak{H} \). Therefore

\[
\|J^\alpha f\|_{\mathcal{B}} = \|J^{\alpha - 1}Jf\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq C\|Jf\|_{\mathcal{B}}, \; f \in D(J).
\]

Combining this fact with (16) and taking into account that the case corresponding to \((\alpha = 0)\) is trivial since the operator \( J^{-1} \) is compact, we obtain

\[
|(FJ^\alpha f, g)_{\mathcal{B}}| \leq C\|Jf\|_{\mathcal{B}}\|g\|_{\mathcal{B}}, \; f, g \in D(J).
\]

Also, it is obvious that

\[
|[(FJ^\alpha + \psi I)f, g)_{\mathcal{B}}| \leq C\|Jf\|_{\mathcal{B}}\|g\|_{\mathcal{B}}, \; f, g \in D(J).
\]

Hence, in terms of the denotations made above, we have the fulfillment of hypothesis \((H2)\). \( \square \)

Now, we consider more particular conditions related to a Hilbert space, we deal with a space with a measure \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)\) and the corresponding Hilbert space \( L_2(\Omega, \mu) \) of functions defined on a set \( \Omega \). Our aim to study various particular cases for which Theorem 1 can be applied. Further, we assume that \( \{T_t; t \geq 0\} \) is a \( C_0 \) semigroup of contractions acting on \( L_2(\Omega, \mu) \) and denote by \( A \) the infinitesimal generator of the semigroup. Note that due to the Hille-Yosida theorem (Theorem 3.1 p.8), we have the fulfillment of inequality \((5)\). Hence positive fractional powers of \( A \) are defined. Also under this assumption, we know that the so-called Balakrishnan formula takes a place (see (5) p.260), these allow us to formulate a series of theorems, that establish the sufficient conditions of semiboundedness from below for the operator \( FA^\alpha \).
Theorem 2. Assume that $F$ is bounded, $F^* A^\alpha 1 > N$, $N \in \mathbb{R}$, the following condition holds

$$\int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha-1} \{ \Psi(f,0) - \Psi(f,t) + \Phi(f,t) + \Upsilon(f,t) \} dt > 0,$$

where

$$\Psi(f,t) = \int_\Omega (f F^T f - F f T_t f) d\mu,$$

$$\Phi(f,t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega F |f - T_t f|^2 d\mu,$$

then

$$\Re (f, FA^\alpha f)_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)} \geq \frac{N}{2} \| f \|^2_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)}, f \in D(A^\alpha).$$

Proof. First, consider a real case. Note that using the Balakrishnan formula, we get

$$I = \int_\Omega f F A^\alpha f d\mu = \frac{\alpha}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_\Omega F(I-T_t)f \frac{dt}{t^{\alpha+1}}, f \in D(A).$$

Since the infinitesimal generator $A$ exists, then representing the inner integral by a sum

$$\int_0^\infty F(I-T_t) \frac{dt}{t^{\alpha+1}} f dt = \int_0^\varepsilon F(I-T_t) \frac{dt}{t^{\alpha+1}} f dt + \int_\varepsilon^\infty F(I-T_t) \frac{dt}{t^{\alpha+1}} f dt,$$

it is not hard to prove that

$$\left\| \int_0^\varepsilon F(I-T_t) \frac{dt}{t^{\alpha+1}} f dt \right\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)} \leq \| F \| \int_0^\varepsilon t^{-\alpha} \left\| \frac{I-T_t}{t} f \right\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)} dt \leq \| F \| \int_0^\varepsilon t^{-\alpha} \left\{ \| A f \|_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)} + \delta \right\} dt,$$

where $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon, f)$. Analogously, we have

$$\left\| \int_\varepsilon^\infty F(I-T_t) \frac{dt}{t^{\alpha+1}} f dt \right\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)} \leq \| F \| \int_\varepsilon^\infty \left\| \frac{I-T_t}{t^{\alpha+1}} f \right\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)} dt$$

$$\leq \| F \| \int_\varepsilon^\infty t^{-\alpha-1} \left\{ \| f \|_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)} + \| T_t f \|_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)} \right\} dt \leq 2 \| F \| \| f \|_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)} \int_\varepsilon^\infty t^{-\alpha-1} dt.$$

Thus applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega d\mu \int_0^\infty \left| \frac{f F(I-T_t)f}{t^{\alpha+1}} \right| dt < \infty, f \in D(A).$$
Also it is clear that the function \( \tilde{f}(Q, t) := f(Q)F(I-\imath t)f(Q)t^{-\alpha-1} \) is the \((L)\) measurable function on \( \Omega \times (0, \infty) \). It gives us an opportunity, having applied the Fubini theorem, to deduce

\[
I = \frac{\alpha}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha-1} dt \int_\Omega fF(I-\imath t)f d\mu, \ f \in D(A).
\]

Let us investigate the conditions, that after being imposed on the operator \( F \), make the operator \( FA^\alpha \) semibounded from below. For this purpose consider

\[
fF(I-\imath t)f = \{ fFf - Ff^2 - (fFTf - FfTf) \} + \frac{1}{2} [TfFf^2 - F(Tf)^2] + \frac{1}{2} (Ff^2 - TfFf^2) + \frac{1}{2} (f - Tf)^2.
\]

By virtue of the theorem conditions, we get

\[
\int_\Omega fFA^\alpha f d\mu \geq \frac{\alpha}{2\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_\Omega f d\mu \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{(1-\imath t)Ff^2}{t^{\alpha+1}} \right) dt = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega A^\alpha Ff^2 d\mu \geq \frac{N}{2} \int_\Omega f^2 d\mu, \ f \in D(A).
\]

Since \( D(A) \) is the core of the operator \( A^\alpha \), then we can extend the previous inequality to the set \( D(A^\alpha) \). Note that

\[
\text{Re} \left( f, FA^\alpha f \right)_{L^2(\Omega, \mu)} = (u, FA^\alpha u)_{L^2(\Omega, \mu)} + (v, FA^\alpha v)_{L^2(\Omega, \mu)}, \ f = u + iv, \ f \in D(A^\alpha).
\]

Hence

\[
\text{Re} \left( f, FA^\alpha f \right)_{L^2(\Omega, \mu)} \geq \frac{N}{2} \| f \|^2_{L^2(\Omega, \mu)}, \ f \in D(A^\alpha).
\]

\[\square\]

**Corollary 1.** Assume that \( T_1fg = T_1f \cdot T_1g, \ Ff := \rho f \), where \( \rho \geq 0, \rho \in L_\infty(\Omega, \mu), \rho A^\alpha 1 > N, N \in \mathbb{R} \). If at least one of the following inequalities holds

i) \( \| \rho - T_1 \rho \|_{L_\infty(\Omega, \mu)} \leq Mt^\lambda, \lambda > \alpha, \ M > 0; \)

ii) \( T_1 \rho(Q) - \rho(Q) \geq 0, \text{ a.e.} \),

then

\[
\text{Re} \left( f, \rho A^\alpha f \right)_{L^2(\Omega, \mu)} \geq \eta \| f \|^2_{L^2(\Omega, \mu)}, \ f \in D(A^\alpha), \ \eta \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ (18)}
\]

where \( \eta = (N - 2\alpha^{-1} \| \rho \|_{L_\infty(\Omega, \mu)} + M[\lambda - \alpha]^{-1}) / 2, \eta = N/2 \) in the cases (i), (ii) respectively.

**Proof.** Consider the case (i) and assume that functions are real-valued, we have

\[
\Upsilon(f, t) = \int_\Omega \left[ T_1F \right] f^2 d\mu, \ f \in D(A),
\]

where \( [T_1F] = T_1F - FT_1 \) is a commutator. It is also obviously that \( \Psi(f, t) = 0, \Phi(f, t) > 0, t \in [0, \infty) \). In addition, we have

\[
|\Upsilon(f, t)| = \left| \int_\Omega T_1f^2 \cdot (T_1 \rho - \rho) d\mu \right| \leq \| T_1f \|^2_{L^2(\Omega, \mu)} \| \rho - T_1 \rho \|_{L_\infty(\Omega, \mu)}.
\]

10
By virtue of the previous inequality, we obtain \( \int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha-1} \mathcal{Y}(f,t) dt \geq -K \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)}^2 \), where \( K = 2\alpha^{-1}\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(\Omega,\mu)} + M(\lambda - \alpha)^{-1} \). This can be easily proved, if we consider the following reasonings

\[
\left| \int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha-1} \mathcal{Y}(f,t) dt \right| \leq \int_0^1 t^{-\alpha-1} |\mathcal{Y}(f,t)| dt + \int_1^\infty t^{-\alpha-1} |\mathcal{Y}(f,t)| dt \leq \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)}^2 \frac{1}{M \lambda^\alpha} \int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha} dt + 2\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(\Omega,\mu)} \int_1^\infty t^{-\alpha-1} dt \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega,\rho)}^2.
\]

By virtue of such conditions arrangement, using the reasonings of Theorem 2, we obtain

\[
\int_\Omega A^\alpha F f^2 d\mu := \int_\Omega A^\alpha \rho f^2 d\mu = \int_\Omega \rho f^2 A^\alpha 1 d\mu \geq \frac{N}{2} \int_\Omega f^2 \rho d\mu.
\]

Hence in the complex case, we obtain

\[
\text{Re} (f, \rho A^\alpha f)_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)} \geq \frac{1}{2} (N - K) \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)}^2, \ f \in D(A^\alpha).
\]

Consider the case (ii), we should only notice that due to such a conditions arrangement it can be easily proved that \( \Psi(f,t) = 0, \Phi(f,t) > 0, t \in [0, \infty), f \in D(A), \text{Im} f = 0, \) the fact \( \rho \in L^\infty(\Omega,\mu) \) supplies boundedness of the operator \( F \). In addition, using the Fubini theorem, we have

\[
\int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha-1} \mathcal{Y}(f,t) dt = \int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha-1} dt \int_\Omega T_t f^2 \cdot (T_t \rho - \rho) d\mu = \int_\Omega d\mu \int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha-1} T_t f^2 \cdot (T_t \rho - \rho) dt = \]

\[
= \int_\Omega d\mu \int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha-1} (T_t f)^2 \cdot (T_t \rho - \rho) dt \geq 0, \ f \in D(A), \text{Im} f = 0.
\]

Further, using the reasonings of Theorem 2, we obtain the desired result.

**Corollary 2.** Assume that \( Ff := \rho f, \rho := \rho(Q), \rho d\mu = d\xi, \) where the function \( \xi \) has the measure properties, \( A^\alpha > N, \ N \in \mathbb{R}, \tilde{T}_t \) is a \( C_0 \) semigroup of contractions acting in the space \( L^2(\Omega,\xi) \), \( \tilde{T}_t \) is a restriction or an extension of \( T_t, \tilde{T}_t f g = T_t f \cdot \tilde{T}_t g, f, g \in L^2(\Omega,\xi), \) then

\[
\text{Re} (f, \rho A^\alpha f)_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)} \geq \frac{N}{2} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mu)}^2, \ f \in D(A^\alpha) \cap D(\tilde{A}^\alpha),
\]

where \( \tilde{A} \) is the infinitesimal generator of the semigroup \( \tilde{T}_t \).

**Proof.** Under the made assumptions, we suppose \( F = 1 \); then applying the reasonings of Theorem 2 we get

\[
\int_\Omega \rho f A^\alpha f \ d\mu = \int_\Omega f \tilde{A}^\alpha f d\xi \geq \frac{\alpha}{2(1 - \alpha)} \int_\Omega f \ d\xi \int_0^\infty \frac{(I - \tilde{T}_t)f^2}{t^{\alpha+1}} dt = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \tilde{A}^\alpha f^2 d\xi = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \rho \tilde{A}^\alpha f^2 d\mu \geq \frac{N}{2} \int_\Omega f^2 d\mu, \ f \in D(A^\alpha) \cap D(\tilde{A}^\alpha), \text{Im} f = 0.
\]

Using this relation we achieve the complex case in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 2.
2. Model

Let us demonstrate one particular case that is suitable to our abstract main theorem (Theorem 1) within operator theory. Assume that \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{E}^n \) is a convex domain, with a sufficient smooth boundary, of \( n \)-dimensional Euclidian space. For the sake of the simplicity we consider that \( \Omega \) is bounded, but as it will be clear further, we can extend obtained results to some type of unbounded domains. Consider a linear combination of an uniformly elliptic operator, which is written in the divergence form, a composition of the fractional integro-differential operator, where the fractional differential operator is understood as adjoint to the Kipriyanov operator (see [36]), and the identity operator

\[
\mathcal{L} := -\mathcal{T} + \mathcal{J}_0^\sigma \mathcal{D}_{d-}^\alpha + \psi I, \; \alpha, \sigma \in [0, 1), \; \sigma + \alpha < 1,
\]

where \( \mathcal{T} := D_j (a^{ij} D_i \cdot) \), \( \mathcal{J}_0^\sigma := \mathcal{J}_{0+}^\sigma \mathcal{D}_{d-}^\alpha \), \( \psi = \text{const} \), under the following assumptions relative to the real-valued coefficients

\[
a^{ij}(Q) \in C^1(\bar{\Omega}), \; a^{ij} \xi_i \xi_j \geq a |\xi|^2, \; a > 0, \; \rho > 0, \; \rho \in \text{Lip } \mu, \; \alpha < \mu \leq 1. \tag{19}
\]

Note that in the one-dimensional case the operator \( \mathcal{J}_0^\sigma \mathcal{D}_{d-}^\alpha \) is reduced to some kind of weighted fractional integro-differential operators composition, which was studied by many scientists (see introduction). Consider the shift semigroup in the direction acting on \( L_2(\Omega) \) and defined as follows \( T_t f(Q) = f(Q + et) \), where \( Q \in \Omega, \; Q = P + er, \; r \) is the Euclidian distance between a fixed point \( P \) and a point \( Q \). We also suppose that all functions have the zero extension outside of \( \Omega \). We suppose \( \mathcal{J}_{0+}^\sigma = \mathcal{D}_{d-}^\alpha = I \). Nevertheless, this fact can be easily proved due to the reasonings corresponding to the one-dimensional case and given in [62].

**Lemma 1.** The semigroup \( T_t \) is a \( C_0 \) semigroup of contractions.

**Proof.** By virtue of continuous in average property, we conclude that \( T_t \) is a strongly continuous semigroup. It can be easily established due to the following reasonings, using the Minkowski inequality, we have

\[
\begin{aligned}
\left\{ \int_{\Omega} |f(Q + et) - f(Q)|^2 dQ \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |f(Q + et) - f_m(Q + et)|^2 dQ \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \\
&+ \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |f(Q) - f_m(Q)|^2 dQ \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |f_m(Q) - f_m(Q + et)|^2 dQ \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} = \\
&= I_1 + I_2 + I_3 < \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}
\]

where \( f \in L_2(\Omega), \; \{f_n\}_1^\infty \subset C_0^\infty(\Omega); \; m \) is chosen so that \( I_1, I_2 < \varepsilon/3 \) and \( t \) is chosen so that \( I_3 < \varepsilon/3 \). Thus, there exists such a positive number \( t_0 \) so that

\[
\|T_t f - f\|_{L_2} < \varepsilon, \; t < t_0,
\]
for arbitrary small $\varepsilon > 0$. Using the assumption that all functions have the zero extension outside $\Omega$, we have $\|T_t\| \leq 1$. Hence we conclude that $T_t$ is $C_0$ semigroup of contractions (see [58]), where the infinitesimal generator $A$ is defined as follows $Af = - (\nabla f, e_n)$, $f \in D(\nabla)$ in accordance with the definition.

Consider a restriction $A_0 \subset A$, $D(A_0) = C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ of the infinitesimal generator $A$. It is the well-known fact that an infinitesimal generator $A$ is a closed operator, hence $A_0$ is closeable. Let us prove the equivalence between the norms of the spaces $H^1_0(\Omega)$ and $\bar{H}_A^1(\Omega)$.

**Lemma 2.** The norms $\| \cdot \|_{\bar{H}_A^1}$ and $\| \cdot \|_{H^1_0(\Omega)}$ are equivalent.

**Proof.** Consider the space $L_{2,n}(\Omega) := \{ f = (f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_n), f_i \in L_2(\Omega) \}$, endowed with the inner product

$$(f, g)_{L_{2,n}} = \int_{\Omega} (f, g)_{E^n} dQ, \ f, g \in L_{2,n}(\Omega).$$

Consider the quadratic functional defined on $L_{2,n}(\Omega)$

$$\varphi(f) := \left\{ \frac{1}{\Omega} \int |(f, e)_{E^n}|^2 dQ \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \ f \in L_{2,n}(\Omega).$$

Assume that the following estimate is not true

$$\varphi(f) \geq C, \ \| f \|_{L_{2,n}} = 1,$$

then there exists such a sequence $\{ \psi_k \}_{1}^{\infty} \subset U$, where $U := \{ f \in L_{2,n}(\Omega), \ \| f \|_{L_{2,n}} = 1 \}$, so that $\varphi(\psi_k) \to 0, k \to \infty$. Since the sequence $\{ \psi_k \}_{1}^{\infty}$ is bounded, then we can extract a weakly convergent subsequence $\{ \psi_{kj} \}_{1}^{\infty}$ and claim that the weak limit $\psi$ of the sequence $\{ \psi_{kj} \}_{1}^{\infty}$ belongs to $U$. We have the following reasoning

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} (\psi_{kj}, e)_{E^n} (g, e)_{E^n} dQ \right| \leq \| g \|_{\infty, n} \int_{\Omega} |(\psi_{kj}, e)_{E^n}| dQ \leq$$

$$\leq C \| g \|_{\infty, n} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |(\psi_{kj}, e)_{E^n}|^2 dQ \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \ g \in C_0^{\infty}(\Omega),$$

where $\| g \|_{\infty, n} = \max_{i=1,2,\ldots,n} \| g_i \|_{L_\infty}, \ C_0^{\infty}(\Omega) := \{ g = (g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_n), g_i \in C_0^{\infty}(\Omega) \}$. Consider the functional

$$L_g(f) := \int_{\Omega} (f, e)_{E^n} (g, e)_{E^n} dQ, \ f \in L_{2,n}(\Omega).$$
Due to the obvious chain of the inequalities

\[ |L_g(f)| \leq \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |(g, e)_{\mathbb{E}^n}|^2 dQ \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|g\|_{L^2, n} \|f\|_{L^2, n}, \quad f \in L^2, n(\Omega), \]

we see that \( L_g \) is a linear bounded functional on \( L^2, n(\Omega) \). Hence, by virtue of weak convergence of the sequence \( \{\psi_k\} \), we have \( L_g(\psi_k) \to L_g(\psi) \), \( k_j \to \infty \). On the other hand, the right part of (3) tends to zero for arbitrary \( g \in C^\infty_0(\Omega) \). Hence, we have

\[ \int_{\Omega} (\psi, e)_{\mathbb{E}^n} (g, e)_{\mathbb{E}^n} dQ = 0, \quad \forall g \in C^\infty_0(\Omega). \] \hspace{1cm} (22)

Now consider the space \( L^2, e(\Omega) := \{f : f \in L^2, n(\Omega)\} \) endowed with the inner product

\[ (f, g)_{L^2, e} := \int_{\Omega} (f, e)_{\mathbb{E}^n} (g, e)_{\mathbb{E}^n} dQ, \quad f, g \in L^2, e(\Omega). \]

Note that the set \( C^\infty_{0, n}(\Omega) \) is dense in \( L^2, e(\Omega) \). It can be easily proved due to the following reasoning, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for sums, we have

\[ \|f - f_n\|_{L^2, e} \leq \|f - f_n\|_{L^2, n}, \quad f \in L^2, e(\Omega), \quad \{f_n\}_1^\infty \in C^\infty_{0, n}(\Omega). \]

Since an arbitrary element \( f \in L^2, n(\Omega) \) can be approximated with the elements of the set \( C^\infty_{0, n}(\Omega) \) with respect to the norm \( \| \cdot \|_{L^2, n} \), then \( C^\infty_{0, n}(\Omega) \) is dense in \( L^2, e(\Omega) \). Combining this fact with (22) and using the ordinary properties of Hilbert space, we obtain

\[ \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |(\psi, e)_{\mathbb{E}^n}|^2 dQ \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0. \] \hspace{1cm} (23)

Hence \((\psi(Q), e)_{\mathbb{E}^n} = 0\) a.e. Since \( \Omega \in \mathbb{E}^n \), then there exists \( P_i \in \partial \Omega, \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \), such that

\[ \Delta = \begin{vmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} & \cdots & P_{1n} \\ P_{21} & P_{22} & \cdots & P_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ P_{n1} & P_{n2} & \cdots & P_{nn} \end{vmatrix} \neq 0, \]

where \( P_i = (P_{i1}, P_{i2}, \ldots, P_{in}) \). It becomes clear if we remind that in the contrary case we can easily obtain that \( \Omega \in \mathbb{E}^{n-1} \). We will not lose generality of reasonings if we consider that (23) holds with the replacement \( P = P_i, \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \). We just should taking into account that another choice of the point \( P \) is possible and note that at the same time relation (23) remains true. Note that every \( P_i \) corresponds to the set \( \vartheta_i := \{Q \subset \vartheta_i : (\psi(Q), e)_{\mathbb{E}^n} \neq 0\} \). Consider \( \Omega' = \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n \vartheta_i \). It is clear that mes\(\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n \vartheta_i\right) = 0 \). Note that due to the made construction, we have

\[ \begin{cases} (P_{11} - Q_1)\psi_1(Q) + (P_{12} - Q_2)\psi_2(Q) + \ldots + (P_{1n} - Q_n)\psi_n(Q) = 0 \\ (P_{21} - Q_1)\psi_1(Q) + (P_{22} - Q_2)\psi_2(Q) + \ldots + (P_{2n} - Q_n)\psi_n(Q) = 0 \\ \vdots \\ (P_{n1} - Q_1)\psi_1(Q) + (P_{n2} - Q_2)\psi_2(Q) + \ldots + (P_{nn} - Q_n)\psi_n(Q) = 0 \end{cases} \]
where \( \psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2, \ldots, \psi_n) \), \( Q \in \Omega' \). Hence, if we prove that

\[
\Lambda(Q) = \begin{vmatrix}
P_{11} - Q_1 & P_{12} - Q_2 & \cdots & P_{1n} - Q_n \\
P_{21} - Q_1 & P_{22} - Q_2 & \cdots & P_{2n} - Q_n \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
P_{n1} - Q_1 & P_{n2} - Q_2 & \cdots & P_{nn} - Q_n
\end{vmatrix} \neq 0,
\]

where \( Q \in \Omega' \setminus \Theta \), \( \text{mess} \Theta = 0 \), then we obtain \( \psi = 0 \) a.e. Assume that \( \Lambda(Q) = 0 \), \( Q \in \Theta \subseteq \Omega' \), then we have

\[
\begin{vmatrix}
P_{11} - Q_1 & P_{12} - Q_2 & \cdots & P_{1n} - Q_n \\
P_{21} - Q_1 & P_{22} - Q_2 & \cdots & P_{2n} - Q_n \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
P_{n1} - Q_1 & P_{n2} - Q_2 & \cdots & P_{nn} - Q_n
\end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix}
P_{11} & P_{12} & \cdots & P_{1n} \\
P_{21} & P_{22} & \cdots & P_{2n} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
P_{n1} & P_{n2} & \cdots & P_{nn}
\end{vmatrix} - \begin{vmatrix}
P_{11} & P_{12} & \cdots & P_{1n} \\
P_{21} & P_{22} & \cdots & P_{2n} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
P_{n1} & P_{n2} & \cdots & P_{nn}
\end{vmatrix} - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Delta_j = 0.
\]

Therefore

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_j P_j = Q, \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_j = 1, \quad \alpha_j = \Delta_j / \Delta.
\]

It implies that \( \Theta \) is a hyperplane in \( \mathbb{E}^n \). Hence \( \text{mess} \Theta = 0 \) and we obtain \( \psi = 0 \) a.e. Notice that by virtue of this fact we come to the contradiction with the fact \( \| \psi \|_{L_2, n} = 1 \). Hence the following estimate is true

\[
\varphi(f) \geq C, \quad f \in U.
\]

Using this inequality, we can easily prove the following estimate for the norms \( \| f \|_{H_0^1} \leq C \| f \|_{\delta_{0, \lambda}} \).

Applying the obvious inequality \( |(\nabla f, e)|_{\mathbb{E}^n} \leq |\nabla f|, f \in H_0^1(\Omega) \), we prove without any difficulties that \( \| A_0 f \|_{L_2} \leq C_1 \| f \|_{H_0^1}, f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \). From these facts, it follows that \( D(A_0) = H_0^1(\Omega) \), and the equivalence of the norms \( \| \cdot \|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}, \| \cdot \|_{\delta_{0, \lambda}} \).

**Lemma 3.** Assume that \( \rho \in \text{Lip}\lambda, \lambda > \alpha, 0 < \alpha < 1 \), then \( \rho \cdot \mathcal{Y}_{d_+}^\alpha (L_2) = \mathcal{Y}_{d_+}^\alpha (L_2), \rho \cdot \mathcal{Y}_{d_+}^\alpha (L_2) = \mathcal{Y}_{d_+}^\alpha (L_2).$$
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Proof. Consider the operator

\[
(\psi_\varepsilon^+ f)(Q) = \begin{cases}
\int_0^{\varepsilon - \varepsilon} f(Q) \frac{r^{n-1} - f(T)t^{n-1}}{(r-t)^{\alpha+1}r^{n-1}} dt, & \varepsilon \leq r \leq d, \\
\frac{f(Q)}{\alpha} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon^\alpha} - \frac{1}{r^\alpha} \right), & 0 \leq r < \varepsilon,
\end{cases}
\]

(25)

where \( T = P + \varepsilon t \). We should prove that there exists a limit

\[
\psi_\varepsilon^+ \rho f \xrightarrow{L_2} \psi f, \ f \in \mathcal{H}_0^+(L_2),
\]

where \( \psi f \) is some function corresponding to \( f \). We have

\[
(\psi_\varepsilon^+\rho f)(Q) = \int_0^{\varepsilon - \varepsilon} \frac{\rho(Q)f(Q)r^{n-1} - \rho(T)f(T)t^{n-1}}{(r-t)^{\alpha+1}r^{n-1}} dt = \rho(Q) \int_0^{\varepsilon - \varepsilon} \frac{f(Q)r^{n-1} - f(T)t^{n-1}}{(r-t)^{\alpha+1}r^{n-1}} dt +
\]

\[
\int_0^{\varepsilon - \varepsilon} \frac{f(T)[\rho(Q) - \rho(T)]}{(r-t)^{\alpha+1}} \left( \frac{t}{r} \right)^{n-1} dt = A_\varepsilon(Q) + B_\varepsilon(Q), \ \varepsilon \leq r \leq d;
\]

\[
(\psi_\varepsilon^+\rho f)(Q) = \rho(Q)f(Q) \frac{1}{\alpha} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon^\alpha} - \frac{1}{r^\alpha} \right), \ 0 \leq r < \varepsilon.
\]

Hence, we have

\[
\|\psi_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}^+ \rho f - \psi_{\varepsilon_n}^+ \rho f\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq \|\psi_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}^+ \rho f - \psi_{\varepsilon_n}^+ \rho f\|_{L_2(\Omega')} + \|\psi_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}^+ \rho f - \psi_{\varepsilon_n}^+ \rho f\|_{L_2(\Omega_n)},
\]

where \( \{\varepsilon_n\}_1^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \) is a monotonity sequence that is chosen in an arbitrary way, \( \Omega_n := \omega \times \{0 < r < \varepsilon_n\}, \Omega_{n+1} := \omega \times \{0 < r < \varepsilon_{n+1}\}, \Omega' := \Omega \setminus \Omega_n \). It is clear that

\[
\|A_{\varepsilon_{n+1}} - A_{\varepsilon_n}\|_{L_2(\Omega')} \leq \|\rho\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} \|\psi_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}^+ f - \psi_{\varepsilon_n}^+ f\|_{L_2(\Omega')},
\]

Since in accordance with Theorem 2.3 [36] the sequence \( \psi_{\varepsilon_n}^+ f, \ (n = 1, 2, \ldots) \) is fundamental for the defined function \( f \), with respect to the \( L_2(\Omega) \) norm, then the sequence \( A_{\varepsilon_n} \) is also fundamental with respect to the \( L_2(\Omega') \) norm. Having used the Hölder properties of \( \rho \), we have

\[
\|B_{\varepsilon_{n+1}} - B_{\varepsilon_n}\|_{L_2(\Omega')} \leq M \left\{ \int_{\Omega'} \left( \int_{0}^{\varepsilon_{n+1}} \left( \frac{f(T)}{(r-t)^{\alpha+1}r^{n-1}} \left( \frac{t}{r} \right)^{n-1} dt \right)^2 dQ \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}.
\]

Note that applying Theorem 2.3 [36], we have

\[
\left\{ \int_{\Omega} \left( \int_{0}^{r} \frac{|f(T)|}{(r-t)^{\alpha+1} \frac{t}{r}^{n-1}} dt \right)^{2} dQ \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\|f\|_{L_2}.
\]

Hence the sequence \( \{B_{\varepsilon_n}\}_1^\infty \) is fundamental with respect to the \( L_2(\Omega') \) norm. Therefore

\[
\|\psi_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}^+ \rho f - \psi_{\varepsilon_n}^+ \rho f\|_{L_2(\Omega')} \to 0, \ n \to \infty.
\]
Consider
\[ \|\psi_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}^+ \rho f - \psi_{\varepsilon_n}^+ \rho f\|_{L^2(\Omega_n)} \leq \|\psi_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}^+ \rho f - \psi_{\varepsilon_n}^+ \rho f\|_{L^2(\Omega_{n+1})} + \]
\[ + \left\{ \int d\chi \int_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}^{\varepsilon_n} |A_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}(Q) + B_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}(Q)|^2 r dr \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \]
\[ + \frac{1}{\alpha} \left\{ \int d\chi \int_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}^{\varepsilon_n} \left| \rho(Q) f(Q) \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n^{\alpha}} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{n+1}^{\alpha}} \right) \right|^2 r dr \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} = I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \]

We have
\[ I_1 \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n^{\alpha}} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{n+1}^{\alpha}} \right) \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \int d\chi \int_{0}^{\varepsilon_{n+1}} f(Q) r dr \leq \]
\[ \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n^{\alpha}} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{n+1}^{\alpha}} \right) \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \int d\chi \int_{0}^{\varepsilon_{n+1}} |f(Q)|^2 r dr \int_{0}^{\varepsilon_{n+1}} r dr \frac{1}{\alpha} \]
\[ \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n^{\alpha}} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{n+1}^{\alpha}} \right) \varepsilon_{n+1} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|f\|_{L^2}. \]

Hence \( I_1 \to 0, n \to \infty \). Using the used above estimates, it is not hard to prove that \( I_2, I_3 \to 0, n \to \infty \). The proof is left to the reader. Therefore
\[ \|\psi_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}^+ \rho f - \psi_{\varepsilon_n}^+ \rho f\|_{L^2(\Omega_n)} \to 0, n \to \infty. \]

Combining the obtained results, we have
\[ \|\psi_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}^+ \rho f - \psi_{\varepsilon_n}^+ \rho f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \to 0, n \to \infty. \]

Using Theorem 2.2 [36], we obtain the desired result for the case corresponding to the class \( \mathcal{A}^{a+}_{0+}(L_2) \). The proof corresponding to the class \( \mathcal{A}^{a-}_{0-}(L_2) \) is absolutely analogous. [\( \square \]

**Theorem 3.** We claim that \( L = \mathcal{L} \), where
\[ J = \bar{A}_0, G = B T B, B f(Q) = \int_0^t f(Q - e t) d t, F = \mathcal{A}^{a+}_{0+}. \]
\[ D(G) : = \{ \psi : \psi = \bar{A}_0 \varphi, \varphi \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H^1_0(\Omega) \}, D(B) = L^2(\Omega), D(F) = L^2(\Omega), \]
and \( \psi \) is sufficiently large.

**Proof.** Since due to Lemma 1 the semigroup \( T_t \) is a semigroup of contractions, then by virtue of Corollary 3.6 [58 p.11], we have
\[ \| (\lambda + A)^{-1} \| \leq \frac{1}{\text{Re}\lambda}, \text{Re}\lambda > 0. \] (26)
Inequality (26) implies that $A$ is m-accretive. Using formula (31), we can define positive fractional powers $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ of the operator $A$. Applying the Balakrishnan formula, we obtain

$$A^\alpha := \frac{\sin \alpha \pi}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \lambda^{\alpha-1}(\lambda + A)^{-1} A d\lambda = \frac{1}{\Gamma(-\alpha)} \int_0^\infty \frac{T_t - I}{t^{\alpha+1}} dt, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1).$$

(27)

Hence, in the concrete form of writing, we have

$$A^\alpha f(Q) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(-\alpha)} \int_0^\infty f(Q + et) - f(Q) \frac{dt}{t^{\alpha+1}} = \frac{\alpha}{\Gamma(1 - \alpha)} \int_r^{d(e)} \frac{f(Q) - f(P + et)}{(t - r)^{\alpha+1}} dt + \frac{f(Q)}{\Gamma(1 - \alpha)} \{d(e) - r\}^{-\alpha} = D_{d-}^\alpha f(Q), \quad f \in D(D_{d-}^\alpha),$$

where $d(e)$ is the distance from the point $P$ to the edge of $\Omega$ along the direction $e$. Applying relation (10), we get

$$\|((\lambda + A)^{-1})\| \leq \frac{1}{\Re \lambda}, \quad \lambda > 0.$$
where $R := R(\bar{A}_0 + t)$. Hence, in accordance with the results of section 2, we obtain that the operator $\bar{A}_0$ is $m$-accretive. Let us find the certain operator $G$ defined in Theorem 1 in the abstract form. It is obvious that

$$\int_\Omega A(BT f \cdot g) d\Omega = \int_\Omega A\bar{T} f \cdot g d\Omega + \int_\Omega BT f \cdot Ag d\Omega, \; f \in C^2(\bar{\Omega}), \; g \in C^\infty_0(\Omega). \tag{28}$$

Using the theorem on divergent, we get

$$\int_\Omega A(BT f \cdot g) (Q) d\Omega = \int_S (BT f \cdot g)(\sigma)(e, n)_{\mathbb{R}^n} d\sigma, \tag{29}$$

where $S$ is the surface of $\Omega$. Taking into account that $g(\partial \Omega) = 0$ and combining (28),(29), we get

$$-\int_\Omega ABT f \cdot g d\Omega = \int_\Omega BT f \cdot Ag d\Omega, \; f \in C^2(\bar{\Omega}), \; g \in C^\infty_0(\Omega). \tag{30}$$

Suppose that $f \in H^2(\Omega)$, then the well-known fact is that there exists a sequence $\{f_n\} \subset C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $f_n \rightharpoonup f$. Using this fact it is not hard to prove that $T f_n \rightharpoonup T f$. On the other hand, since $B$ is continuous, then $BT f_n \rightharpoonup BT f$.

Combining this fact with the previously established fact, we conclude that

$$BT f_n \rightharpoonup_{\bar{A}} BT f.$$ 

Since the infinitesimal generator of a $C_0$ semigroup is a closed operator, then $BT f \in D(A)$ and $ABT f = T f$. In accordance with the definition, we have

$$\forall g \in D(\bar{A}_0), \exists \{g_n\} \subset C^\infty_0(\Omega), \; g_n \rightharpoonup g.$$ 

Using the previously obtained facts, we can extend relation (30) to the set $D(\mathcal{L})$

$$-\int_\Omega T f \cdot g d\Omega = \int_\Omega G\bar{A}_0 f \bar{A}_0 g d\Omega, \; f, g \in D(\mathcal{L}), \tag{31}$$

where $G = BTB$, $D(G) := \{\psi: \psi = \bar{A}_0 \varphi, \varphi \in D(\mathcal{L})\}$. Estimating left part of (31), we come to the following inequality

$$|(G\psi, \varphi)_{L^2}| \leq C\|\nabla B\psi\|_{L^2}\|\nabla B\varphi\|_{L^2}, \; \psi, \varphi \in D(G).$$

More detailed proof of the last estimate can be found in [36]. Applying Lemma 2, we obtain the boundedness of the form

$$|(G\psi, \varphi)_{L^2}| \leq C\|\psi\|_{L^2}\|\varphi\|_{L^2}, \; \psi, \varphi \in D(G).$$

Hence $G$ is bounded (see [22, p.256]). By virtue of relation (22) it is clear that $G$ is strictly accretive (it follows from the uniformly elliptic property, see [36]). In addition, we should note that $A_0^* G A_0 f = -T f, \; f \in D(L)$, where $A_0^* \supset -A$. It is obvious that $D(A_0^* G A_0) \supset C^\infty_0(\Omega)$, hence
this set is dense in $L_2(\Omega)$. Therefore the operator $G$ satisfies to the conditions of Theorem 1. By virtue of Theorem 2.1 [36], it is not hard to prove that the operator $F$ is bounded. Let us show that

$$\text{Re} \left( \mathcal{I}_{0+}^{\sigma,\rho} \mathcal{D}_d^{-\alpha} f, f \right)_{L^2} \geq \eta \|f\|^2_{L^2}, \quad f \in H^1_0(\Omega), \quad \eta \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (32)$$

Note that the case $\alpha = \sigma = 0$ is trivial. This is why we consider the case $\alpha + \sigma \neq 0$, we have

$$\text{Re} \left( \mathcal{I}_{0+}^{\sigma,\rho} \mathcal{D}_d^{-\alpha} f, f \right)_{L^2} = \text{Re} \left( \mathcal{D}_d^{-\alpha} f, \rho \mathcal{I}_{\sigma} d^{-\alpha} f \right)_{L^2} = \text{Re} \left( \mathcal{D}_d^{-\alpha+\sigma} f, \rho \mathcal{I}_{\sigma} d^{-\alpha} f \right)_{L^2}, \quad f \in H^1_0(\Omega). \quad (33)$$

Note that $\mathcal{A}_0^\nu \subset \mathcal{D}_d^{\nu}, \nu \in (0,1)$, where $\mathcal{A}_0^\nu$ is a fractional power of $\mathcal{A}_0$. Due to Lemma 3, we have $D(\mathcal{A}_0) = H^1_0(\Omega)$. Estimating the right side of (33), having applied Corollary 1 case (i), then applying Theorem 2.1 [36], we obtain (32), where $\eta$ can be found without any difficulties. Using the facts given above, we can rewrite (32) as follows

$$\text{Re} \left( F \mathcal{A}_0^\alpha f, f \right)_{L^2} \geq \eta \|f\|^2_{L^2}, \quad f \in D(\mathcal{A}_0), \quad \eta \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (34)$$

Note that it is not hard to prove the inclusion $\mathcal{I}_{0+}^{\sigma,\rho} \subset \rho \mathcal{I}_d^{-\alpha}$. Using Lemma 3, we can conclude that $F^*: D(A^\alpha) \to D(A^\alpha)$. Now, if we use the notation $J := \mathcal{A}_0$, then taking into account the fact $\mathcal{A}_0^\alpha \subset \mathcal{D}_d^{\alpha}$ and the considerations given above, assuming that $\psi + \eta > 0$, we obtain the desired representation.

4 Conclusions

In this paper we firstly aimed to study a true mathematical nature of a differential operator second order with a fractional derivative in final terms. We constructed the algebraic model in terms of semigroups generators for the operator. Moreover we generalized the obtained results to some class of m-accretive operators and successfully applied the known spectral theorems to the m-accretive operators class, that can be treated as an introduction in fractional calculus for m-accretive operators. As a concrete achievement, due to the invented approach, we have the following results: The asymptotic equivalence between the real component of the resolvent and the resolvent of the real component was established for the considering operators class; The classification in accordance with belonging a resolvent to the Schatten-von Neumann class was obtained for the class; The sufficient condition of completeness of the root vectors system were formulated for the class; The asymptotic formula for the eigenvalues was obtained for the class. As an application, we considered and afterwards solved the eigenvalue problem for the differential operator second order with the composition of fractional integro-differential operators in final terms. In addition, note that auxiliary lemmas are also worth noticing, proved above Lemma 2 is not trivial and its proof itself is of interest. Essentially that throughout the paper, in the made reasonings, it looks like possible to consider an unbounded convex domain $\Omega$ with some restriction related to a solid angle containing $\Omega$. Due to this way we come to generalization of the Kipriyanov operator for the case corresponding to an unbounded domain. In addition, we should say that several kinds of conditions, that may be imposed on the coefficient operator $F$ to obtain the semiboundedness from bellow of its composition within the fractional power of a m-accretive operator, can be studied separately. Having taken into account all said above, we can say that this paper results create a motivation for further application of the functional analysis methods in fractional calculus.
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