THE ORLICZ WEISS CONJECTURE
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Abstract. In this work we continue developments on the \( p \)-Weiss conjecture, which characterizes \( L^p \)-admissibility in terms of a resolvent condition for a special class of Orlicz spaces. This extends previous derived characterizations due to Le Merdy \(( p = 2)\) and Haak \(( p \geq 1)\), under the assumption of bounded analytic semigroups.

1. Introduction

We are concerned with linear observation systems of the form

\[
\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t), \ t \geq 0, \\
x(0) &= x_0, \\
y(t) &= Cx(t),
\end{aligned}
\]

where \( A \) generates a \( C_0 \)-semigroup \((T(t))_{t \geq 0}\) on a Banach space \( X \), the state space, \( x_0 \in X \) is the initial state and \( C \) is the output operator mapping the domain of \( A \) (equipped with the graph norm) continuously into another Banach space \( Y \), the output space. Since the (mild) solution to the evolution equation

\[
\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t), \quad x(0) = x_0
\]

is given by the semigroup applied to the initial state

\[
x(\cdot) = T(\cdot)x_0,
\]

the output is formally given by

\[
y(\cdot) = CT(\cdot)x_0.
\]

In systems theory well-posedness is an elementary concept which unifies the existence and uniqueness of a continuous solution, regularity of the output function \( y \) as well as continuously dependencies of these with respect to the initial data. For a introduction on well-posedness (with respect to \( L^2 \) in a more abstract setting), we refer to [18]. In our situation well-posedness reduces to admissibility of the observation operator \( C \) with respect to some function space. The choice of the function space is related to the demanded regularity of the output functions. It is not uncommon to consider \( L^p \) spaces in this context. In this situation admissibility with respect to \( L^p \) (or \( L^p \)-admissibility) means that \( D(A) \ni x_0 \mapsto CT(\cdot)x_0 \) has a continuous extension to a mapping from \( X \) to \( L^p(0, \tau; Y) \). Here we distinguish between finite-time admissibility (or just admissibility), that is if \( \tau < \infty \) and infinite-time admissibility, that is if \( \tau = \infty \).

For applications it might be advantageous to have an alternative characterization to check admissibility. For \( p = 2 \), Weiss conjectured in [19] that on Hilbert spaces \( (\text{finite-time}) \) \( L^2 \)-admissibility of \( C \) is equivalent to the so called \( 2 \)-Weiss condition for \( C \), i.e.

\[
(\text{Re } z)^{1/2}||CR(z, A)|| \leq K_\alpha \quad \text{for all } \alpha \quad \text{for all } \text{Re } z > \alpha
\]
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for some $\alpha > \omega(A)$, a constant $K_\alpha > 0$, where $\alpha$ is assumed to be zero in the infinite-time case. Here, $\omega(A)$ denotes the growth bound of the semigroup generated by $A$ and $R(z,A)$ denotes the resolvent of $A$ in $z$. In the infinite-time case we assume a bounded semigroup, so that $R(z,A)$ makes sense for $\text{Re} \ z > 0$. Originally, Weiss formulated this conjecture for control systems, but by the duality of control and observation systems it is enough for us to consider observation systems. In [19] it is already mentioned that the 2-Weiss condition is necessary for $C$ being (infinite-time) $L^2$-admissible by an Hölder inequality argument applied to the Laplace transform representation of the resolvent. The question is in which cases the 2-Weiss condition is sufficient for (infinite-time) $L^2$-admissibility of $C$. Weiss himself already stated in [19] that the conjecture fails to hold in the general Banach space setting. The Weiss conjecture has received much attention and some positive results, as well as counterexamples, have been found. We mention here some of them and refer to [9] for a larger overview. In [10, 11] it is shown, that the Weiss conjecture does not hold in arbitrary Hilbert spaces without further assumptions. Some positive results for Hilbert spaces are given by [19] for a semigroup of normal operators and one-dimensional output space as well as for an exponentially stable and left-invertible semigroup and by [8] for a semigroup of contractions and finite-dimensional output space. But it fails for infinite-dimensional output spaces, even if we have a semigroup of isometries [10]. Le Merdy showed in [15] that the Weiss conjecture is true in the Hilbert space situation under the assumption of an analytic contractive semigroup. Moreover, he showed for Banach spaces and a bounded analytic semigroup that the (infinite-time) Weiss conjecture holds if and only if the generator $(-A)\frac{1}{2}$ defined via the holomorphic functional calculus is (infinite-time) $L^2$-admissible. The 2-Weiss conjecture has a generalization to $p \geq 1$, which reads: If $C$ is (infinite-time) $L^p$-admissible if and only if for $C$ the $p$-Weiss condition holds, i.e.

$$(\text{Re} \ z)^{1-1/p}\|CR(z,A)\| \leq K_\alpha \quad \text{for all} \quad \text{for all} \quad \text{Re} \ z > \alpha \quad (2)$$

for some $\alpha > \omega(A)$ and $K_\alpha > 0$. Again, in the infinite-time case, the semigroup is assumed to be bounded and $\alpha$ is assumed to be zero. Haak [3] extended Le Merdy’s results to this more general setting as follows: If $A$ generates a bounded analytic semigroup and $A$ has dense range, then the infinite-time $p$-Weiss conjecture holds if and only if $(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is infinite-time $L^p$-admissible. He used generalized square function estimates for the operator $A$ which are equivalent to $(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ being infinite-time $L^p$-admissible. Later, in [7] an, at the first glance, different proof for the statement of Haak was given. Since $L^p$-admissibility, the $p$-Weiss conjecture and $L^p$-admissibility of $(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ are invariant under scaling of the semigroup and hence under shifting of the generator (for the latter see [15, Prop. 3.4] for $p = 2$) the result of Haak fully characterizes the finite-time case as well. We continue these developments in the context of Orlicz spaces $L_\Phi$ for a certain class of Young functions $\Phi$, which we call class $\mathcal{P}$. In Section 2 we introduce the class $\mathcal{P}$ and briefly recall Young functions and Orlicz spaces, which are a natural generalization of $L^p$ spaces. Indeed, for the Young function $\Phi(s) = s^p$ for $1 < p < \infty$ it holds that $L_\Phi = L^p$. The notion of $L^p$-admissibility can easily be generalized to Orlicz spaces $L_\Phi$. In the following $X$ and $Y$ are Banach spaces and $A$ is the generator of a $C_0$ semigroup $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$ with growth bound $\omega(A)$. The domain of $A$ equipped with the graph norm is denoted by $D(A)$. The spectrum of $A$ is $\sigma(A)$ and its resolvent is $R(z,A)$. The set of all bounded operators from $D(A)$ to $Y$ is given by $L(D(A),Y)$. By $C_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and $S_\beta$, $\delta \in (0,\frac{\pi}{2})$ we mean the open right half plane with abcissa $\alpha$ and the open sector with opening angle $2\delta$, i.e.

$${C_\alpha} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \text{Re} \ z > \alpha\}$$
and

\[ S_\delta = \{ z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} \mid |\arg z| < \delta \}. \]

For \( \delta = 0 \) we write \( S_0 = (0, \infty) \).

With this notation our main results reads:

**Main result (Theorem 3.13).** Suppose \( A \) generates a bounded analytic semigroup and that the Young function \( \Phi \) is of class \( \mathcal{P} \) and either

\- \( A \) is selfadjoint or
\- \( \Phi^{-1} \) is holomorphic on some sector \( S_\delta \) for \( \delta \in (\omega(A), \pi/2) \) and there exist constants \( m_0, m_1 > 0 \) with

\[ m_0 \Phi^{-1}(|z|) \leq |\Phi^{-1}(z)| \leq m_1 \Phi^{-1}(|z|) \]

for all \( z \in S_\delta \).

Then the following are equivalent

(i) \( \Phi^{-1}(-A) \) is (infinite-time) \( L_\Phi \)-admissible,

(ii) The (infinite-time) \( \Phi \)-Weiss conjecture holds, i.e.

\[ C \in \mathcal{L}(D(A), Y) \text{ is } L_\Phi \text{-admissible } \Leftrightarrow \sup_{\Re z > \alpha} \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(\Re z) \| CR(z, A) \| < \infty \]

for some \( \alpha > \omega(A) \) and with \( \alpha = 0 \) in the infinite-time case.

Theorem 3.10 and Corollary 3.11 tell us what to expect when we drop the (infinite-time) \( L_\Phi \)-admissibility of \( \Phi^{-1}(-A) \) in our main result.

2. **Young functions and Orlicz spaces**

In this section we recall the concept of Young functions and Orlicz spaces. We only state the aspects which are of interest for us. For a larger overview the reader is referred to [1, 13, 14]. The definitions and results we mention below can be found therein.

We start introducing Young functions.

**Definition 2.1.** A strictly increasing continuous and convex function \( \Phi : (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty) \) is called Young-function if

\[ \lim_{s \to 0} \frac{\Phi(s)}{s} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{s \to \infty} \frac{\Phi(s)}{s} = \infty. \]

As a direct consequence of the continuity and the first limit property one can uniquely extend \( \Phi \) to \([0, \infty)\) by \( \Phi(0) = 0 \). Further, by monotonicity \( \Phi \) is invertible.

**Definition 2.2.** Let \( \Phi \) be a Young function. Then, the function \( \tilde{\Phi} \) defined by

\[ \tilde{\Phi}(s) = \sup_{t \geq 0} (st - \Phi(t)) \]

is called the to \( \Phi \) complementary Young function and \( \Phi \) and \( \tilde{\Phi} \) are called complementary to each other.

Indeed, one can prove that \( \tilde{\Phi} \) defines also a Young function and that we reobtain \( \Phi \) from \( \tilde{\Phi} \) via \( \Phi(s) = \sup_{t \geq 0} (st - \tilde{\Phi}(t)) \).

From now on, whenever a Young function \( \Phi \) is given, we denote its complementary Young function by \( \tilde{\Phi} \). If \( \Phi \) and \( \tilde{\Phi} \) are complementary Young functions then Young’s inequality holds, i.e. for all \( s, t \geq 0 \)

\[ st \leq \Phi(s) + \tilde{\Phi}(t) \]

and equality holds if and only if \( s = \tilde{\varphi}(t) \) or \( t = \varphi(s) \), where \( \varphi \) and \( \tilde{\varphi} \) are the right-derivatives of \( \Phi \) and \( \tilde{\Phi} \), respectively. In particular, the supremum in the definition
of the complementary Young function is a maximum. From Young’s inequality one can deduce
\[ t \leq \Phi^{-1}(t)\Phi^{-1}(t) \leq 2t \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \] (3)

One important property of Young functions is the so called \( \Delta_2 \) condition. A Young function \( \Phi \) satisfies the \( \Delta_2 \) condition \( (\Phi \in \Delta_2) \) if there exists constants \( K, s_0 \geq 0 \) such that
\[ \Phi(2s) \leq K\Phi(s) \quad \text{for all } s \geq s_0. \] (4)
We say that \( \Phi \) satisfies the \( \Delta_2 \) condition globally if (4) holds with \( s_0 = 0 \).

Now, let \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)\) be a measure space and \( Y \) be a Banach space. Whenever \( \Omega \) is an interval in \( \mathbb{R} \) we consider the Borel \( \sigma \)-algebra and the Lebesgue measure on it.

**Definition 2.3.** Let \( \Phi \) be a Young function. The Orlicz space \( L_\Phi(\Omega; Y) \) is given by
\[ L_\Phi(\Omega; Y) := \left\{ f : \Omega \to Y \mid f \text{ is Bochner measurable and} \right. \]
\[ \left. \text{for some } k > 0 : \int_{\Omega} \Phi \left( \frac{\|f(\cdot)\|_Y}{k} \right) \, d\mu < \infty \right\}, \]
where we identify functions which coincide almost everywhere. As usual, we sometimes only write \( L_\Phi \) if the measure space and \( Y \) are clear from the context. Further, we define the so called Luxemburg norm for \( f \in L_\Phi(\Omega; Y) \) by
\[ \|f\|_{L_\Phi(\Omega; Y)} := \inf \left\{ k > 0 : \int_{\Omega} \Phi \left( \frac{\|f(\cdot)\|_Y}{k} \right) \, d\mu \leq 1 \right\}. \]

It can be proved that \( L_\Phi(\Omega; Y) \) equipped with the Luxemburg norm is a Banach space.

The Young function \( \Phi(s) = s^p \) with \( 1 < p < \infty \) leads to the Orlicz space \( L_\Phi = L^p \) and the Luxemburg norm is just the standard norm on \( L^p \). Further, the \( p \) Young complementary Young function is (up to constants) given by \( \tilde{\Phi}(s) = s^{p'} \) with \( \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1 \) and hence \( L_{\tilde{\Phi}} = L^{p'} \). Thus, Orlicz spaces and the concept of complementary Young functions generalize \( L^p \) spaces and the concept of Hölder conjugates in a natural way. Comparing the \( L^p \) space and the Orlicz space defined above one might expect the integral condition without the constants \( k \), i.e.
\[ \int_{\Omega} \Phi \left( \|f(\cdot)\|_Y \right) \, d\mu < \infty. \]

Unfortunately, this would lead to the so called Orlicz class which is a vector space if and only if \( \Phi \) satisfies some \( \Delta_2 \) condition (non-globally or globally depending on whether the measure space is finite).

Similar than for \( L^p \) spaces the **generalized Hölder inequality**
\[ \int_{\Omega} \|f(\cdot)\|_Y \|g(\cdot)\|_Y \, d\mu \leq 2\|f\|_{L_\Phi(\Omega; Y_1)} \|g\|_{L_{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega; Y_2)} \] (5)
holds for all \( f \in L_\Phi(\Omega; Y_1) \) and \( g \in L_{\tilde{\Phi}}(\Omega; Y_2) \) and Banach spaces \( Y_1, Y_2 \). There is also an equivalent norm, the so called **Orlicz norm** on \( L_\Phi \) given by
\[ \|f\|_{L_\Phi} := \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \|f(\cdot)\| \, g \, d\mu \mid g : \Omega \to [0, \infty) \text{ measurable}, \int_{\Omega} \Phi(g) \, d\mu \leq 1 \right\}. \]

It holds that
\[ \|f\|_{L_\Phi} \leq \|f\|_{L_\Phi} \leq 2\|f\|_{L_\Phi} \quad \text{for all } f \in L_\Phi. \]

Another result which is known for \( L^p \) spaces and can be generalized to Orlicz spaces is the Minkowski’s integral inequality. Although the proof is simple, the authors are not aware that such a result already exists for Orlicz spaces. Therefore, the following version of Minkowski’s integral inequality seems to be new.


Lemma 2.4 (generalized Minkowski inequality). Let Φ be a Young function such that Ψ(t) = Φ(t^{1/r}) also defines a Young function, where r ≥ 1. Further let (Ω_i, F_i, μ_i), i = 1, 2 be measure spaces and let f : Ω_1 × Ω_2 → [0, ∞) be measurable. Then

\[ \left\| \left( \int_{Ω_2} (f(·, y))^r \, dμ_2(y) \right)^{1/r} \right\|_{L^q(Ω_1)} \leq 2^{1/r} \left( \int_{Ω_2} \|f(·, y)\|_{L^r(Ω_1)} \, dμ_2(y) \right)^{1/r} \]

Proof. First we prove the statement for r = 1. Note that Ψ is trivially a Young function in this case. Using the equivalent Orlicz norm on L_Φ we obtain that

\[ \left\| \int_{Ω_2} f(·, y) \, dμ_2(y) \right\|_{L^Ω_Φ} \]

\[ \leq \sup \left\{ \int_{Ω_1} \int_{Ω_2} f(x, y) \, g(x) \, dμ_2(y) \, dμ_1(x) \left| \int_{Ω_1} Φ(g(x)) \, dμ_1(x) \leq 1 \right\} \]

\[ = \sup \left\{ \int_{Ω_1} \int_{Ω_2} f(x, y) \, g(x) \, dμ_2(y) \, dμ_1(x) \left| \int_{Ω_1} Φ(g(x)) \, dμ_1(x) \leq 1 \right\} \]

\[ \leq \int_{Ω_2} \sup \left\{ \int_{Ω_1} f(x, y) \, g(x) \, dμ_1(x) \left| \int_{Ω_1} Φ(g(x)) \, dμ_1(x) \leq 1 \right\} \, dμ_2(y) \]

\[ \leq 2 \int_{Ω_2} \|f(·, y)\|_{L^r(Ω_1)} \, dμ_2(y). \]

In the last step we applied the generalized Hölder inequality and that \|g\|_{L^r} ≤ 1 if \int_{Ω_1} Φ(g(x)) \, dx ≤ 1.

Now, let r ≥ 1 be given such that Ψ(t) = Φ(t^{1/r}) defines a Young function. We deduce from the definition of the Luxemburg norm

\[ \left\| \left( \int_{Ω_2} (f(·, y))^r \, dμ_2(y) \right)^{1/r} \right\|_{L^q(Ω_1)} = \left\| \int_{Ω_2} (f(·, y))^r \, dμ_2(y) \right\|_{L^Ω_Φ} \]

\[ \leq 2^{1/r} \left( \int_{Ω_2} \|f(·, y)\|_{L^r(Ω_1)} \, dμ_2(y) \right)^{1/r} \]

\[ = 2^{1/r} \left( \int_{Ω_2} \|f(·, y)\|_{L^r(Ω_1)} \, dμ_2(y) \right)^{1/r}, \]

where we applied the previous derived estimate for r = 1 and the Young function Ψ.

When working with the resolvent of an operator the Laplace transform representation is sometimes advantageous. Due to this representation the exponential function appears and therefore, the next lemma will be of interest.

Lemma 2.5. For a Young function ˜Φ we have that

\[ ˜Φ^{-1}(s) \leq \left( \|e^{-s}\|_{L^Ω_Φ} \right)^{-1} \quad \text{for all } s > 0 \]

and if ˜Φ ∈ Δ₂, then there exists a constant c > 0 such that

\[ e \left( \|e^{-s}\|_{L^Ω_Φ} \right)^{-1} ≤ ˜Φ^{-1}(s) ≤ \left( \|e^{-s}\|_{L^Ω_Φ} \right)^{-1} \quad \text{for all } s > 0. \quad (6) \]

Proof. The convexity of ˜Φ yields for k ≥ \( ˜Φ^{-1}(s)^{-1} \)

\[ \int_0^∞ \frac{e^{-st}}{k} \, dt ≤ ˜Φ \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \int_0^∞ e^{-st} \, dt ≤ 1 \]
and hence, \( \| e^{-x} \|_{L^q(0, \infty)} \leq \left( \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(s) \right)^{-1} \). For the second part assume \( \tilde{\Phi} \in \Delta_2 \), i.e. there is \( K > 1 \) such that \( \tilde{\Phi}(ex) \leq K\tilde{\Phi}(x) \) for all \( x > 0 \). By monotonicity
\[
\tilde{\Phi}(e^r x) \leq \tilde{\Phi}(e^r x) \leq K^{r+1}\tilde{\Phi}(x)
\]
follows for all \( r > 0 \) and taking \( x = e^{-r}\tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(s) \) leads to
\[
K^{-(r+1)}s \leq \tilde{\Phi}(e^{-r}\tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(s)).
\]
Let \( c = \min\{1, \frac{1}{K \log(K)}\} \in (0, 1) \). Now, convexity of \( \tilde{\Phi} \) yields
\[
\int_0^\infty \tilde{\Phi} \left( \frac{e^{-st}\tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(s)}{c} \right) dt \geq \frac{1}{c} \int_0^\infty \tilde{\Phi} \left( e^{-st}\tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(s) \right) dt
\]
\[
\geq \frac{1}{c} \int_0^\infty K^{-(st+1)}s dt = \frac{1}{c \cdot K \log(K)} \geq 1.
\]
By the definition of the Luxemburg norm, we infer that
\[
c \left( \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(s) \right)^{-1} \leq \| e^{-x} \|_{L^q(0, \infty)},
\]
which completes the proof. \( \square \)

Next, we introduce a class of Young functions with polynomial behavior at zero and infinity. This class of Young functions has been considered in [12] in the context of interpolation spaces and it guarantees that associated Orlicz spaces are interpolation spaces between \( L^p \) spaces.

**Lemma 2.6.** Let \( f : (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty) \) be given by
\[
f(t) = t^{1/p} (t^{1/q} - t^p)
\]
for \( t > 0 \), where \( \rho : (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty) \) is a continuous concave function such that \( \rho(st) \leq \max(1, s) \rho(t) \) for all \( s, t > 0 \). Then \( f \) is strictly increasing and hence invertible on \( (0, \infty) \). Its inverse \( f^{-1} \) is a Young function.

**Proof.** From \( \rho(st) \leq \max(1, s) \rho(t) \) we deduce that \( \rho \) is increasing. The concavity of \( \rho \) implies that \( s \mapsto \frac{\rho(s)}{s} \) is decreasing on \( (0, \infty) \) and since \( \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p} < 0 \), \( s \mapsto \frac{\rho(st)}{s^{1/q} - t^p} \) is increasing for every \( t > 0 \). For \( s \in (0, 1) \)
\[
f(st) = s^{1/p} t^{1/p} (p(st)^{1/q} - t^p)
\]
\[
\geq s^{1/p} t^{1/p} (p(t^{1/q} - t^p)) = s^{1/p} f(t)
\]
and for \( s \in [1, \infty) \)
\[
f(st) = s^{1/p} t^{1/p} (p(st)^{1/q} - t^p)
\]
\[
\geq s^{1/p} t^{1/p} (p(t^{1/q} - t^p)) = s^{1/p} f(t).
\]
These inequalities and the properties of \( \rho \) imply
\[
\min(s^{1/p}, s^{1/q}) f(t) \leq f(st) \leq \max(s^{1/p}, s^{1/q}) f(t)
\]
for \( s, t > 0 \). We conclude that \( f \) is strictly increasing on \( (0, \infty) \) and \( f((0, \infty)) = (0, \infty) \). Hence, \( f \) possesses a inverse \( f^{-1} : (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty) \), which is again continuous and strictly increasing. For the convexity of \( f^{-1} \) we refer to [12]. It follows from (7) for \( t = 1 \) that \( \frac{f(s)}{s^{1/p}} \to \infty \) as \( s \to 0 \) and \( \frac{f(s)}{s^{1/q}} \to 0 \) as \( s \to \infty \) holds, hence \( f^{-1} \) is a Young function. \( \square \)
Definition 2.7. We say that a function $\Phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is of class $P$ ($\Phi \in P$), if $\Phi$ is invertible and
\[
\Phi^{-1}(t) = t^{\frac{1}{p}} \rho(t^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p}}) \quad \text{with } 1 < p < q < \infty \tag{8}
\]
for $t > 0$, where $\rho : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a continuous concave function such that
\[
\rho(st) \leq \max(1, s) \rho(t) \quad \text{for all } s, t > 0. \tag{9}
\]

Remark 2.8. 1. By Lemma 2.6, functions of class $P$ are Young functions.

2. In [12] the authors state the following result on the representation of $\Phi$ and $\tilde{\Phi}$, see [12, Lem. 3.2]: If $\Phi \in P$ is characterized by (8), then
\[
\Phi(t) = t^q h(t^{p-q}) \tag{10}
\]
and
\[
\tilde{\Phi}(t) = t^q h(t^{p-q}) \tag{11}
\]
where $p'$ and $q'$ are the Hölder conjugates to $p$ and $q$ and $h, k : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ are continuous quasi-concave functions such that $h(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$ and $h(s) \leq \max(1, s) \rho(t)$ for all $s, t > 0$ (for $k$ the same). The functions $h$ and $k$ are defined by (10) and (11).

3. From (8), (10) and (11) we derive
\[
\Phi^{-1}(st) \leq \max(s^{\frac{1}{p}}, s^{\frac{1}{q}}) \Phi^{-1}(t),
\]
\[
\Phi(st) \leq \max(s^q, s^p) \Phi(t),
\]
\[
\tilde{\Phi}(st) \leq \max(s^{p'}, s^{q'}) \tilde{\Phi}(t) \tag{12}
\]
for $s, t > 0$ and with the transformations $u = \max(s^q, s^p)$, $v = \Phi(t)$ and $u = s^p \max(s^{p'}, s^{q'})$, $v = \tilde{\Phi}(t)$
\[
\min(u^{\frac{1}{p}}, u^{\frac{1}{q}}) \Phi^{-1}(v) \leq \Phi^{-1}(uv),
\]
\[
\min(u^{\frac{1}{p'}}, u^{\frac{1}{q'}}) \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(v) \leq \tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(uv). \tag{13}
\]

In particular we infer by (12) that $\Phi, \tilde{\Phi} \in \Delta_2$.

Next, we give some examples for functions of class $P$. Note that it suffices to find examples for continuous concave functions $\rho : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ with (9). This will lead to the inverse $\Phi^{-1}$ of a function $\Phi \in P$. However, it might be not possible to deduce an explicit representation for $\Phi$.

Example 2.9. (i) If $\rho, \mu : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ are continuous concave functions satisfying (9), then so are $a \rho + b \mu$ and $\rho \circ \mu$ for $a, b > 0$. To see that $\rho \circ \mu$ satisfies (9), note that $\rho$ is increasing by (9).

(ii) The trivial examples $\rho_0(t) = t^r$ for some $r \in [0, 1]$ lead to the Young functions $\Phi(t) = t^\alpha$ with $\alpha \in [p, q]$ (depending on $r$) when $\Phi^{-1}$ is given by (8) with $1 < p < q < \infty$. If $r = 0$, then $\alpha = p$ and if $r = 1$, then $\alpha = q$. Indeed, $\alpha$ is given by $
\frac{1}{\alpha} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} \in \left[\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{p}\right].$

For $r = 0$ and $r = 1$ the corresponding functions $\rho_0(t) = 1$ and $\rho_1(t) = t$ can be seen as the extreme cases for $\rho$ when talking about the slope of increasing concave functions.

(iii) The following example can be found in [12]. Let $\Phi^{-1}$ be given by (8) with $\rho(t) = \min(1, t)$, $t \geq 0$ and any choice of $1 < p < q < \infty$. Then $\Phi$ is given by (10) with $h(t) = \max(1, t)$, $t \geq 0$. It is obvious that $\Phi$ is of class $P$.

(iv) Let $\Phi^{-1}$ be given by (8) with $\rho(t) = \log(1 + t)$, $t \geq 0$ and any choice of $1 < p < q < \infty$. Then, $\Phi$ is of class $P$, $\Phi^{-1}$ has a holomorphic extension to any sector $S_\delta$ (taking the principal branch of the complex logarithm) and if $\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ then $|\Phi^{-1}(z)| \sim \Phi^{-1}(|z|)$ for $z \in S_\delta$. 


Proof. It is well known that $\rho$ is concave and that it holomorphic on any sector $S_\delta$. We first check that $\rho(st) \leq \max(1,s)\rho(t)$ for $s, t > 0$ holds. For $s \leq 1$ the monotonicity of $\rho$ implies $\rho(st) \leq \rho(t)$. For $s > 1$, $\rho(st) \leq sp(t)$ is equivalent to $\log(1 + st) \leq \log(1 + t)^s$. The letter holds by Bernoulli’s inequality. Hence, $\Phi$ is of class $P$.

For the last part, it suffices to prove $|\rho(z)| \sim \rho(|z|)$ on $S_\delta$ for $\delta \leq \frac{\pi}{4}$ or equivalently $2 \cos(\delta) \geq 1$. Let $z = re^{i\theta} \in S_\delta$, i.e. $r > 0$ and $\theta \in (-\delta, \delta)$. Note that $1 + z \in S_\delta$ and $|1 + z|^2 = 1 + 2 \cos(\theta)r + r^2$ holds. We infer that

$$|\log(1 + z)|^2 = |\log(1 + |z|) + i \arg(1 + z)|^2$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{2} \log \left(\sqrt{1 + 2 \cos(\theta)r + r^2}\right)\right)^2 + (\arg(1 + z))^2$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{16} (\ln(1 + 2 \cos(\delta)r))^2$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{16} (\ln(1 + r))^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{16} (\ln(1 + |z|))^2.$$

We proved $\frac{1}{2} \rho(|z|) \leq |\rho(z)|$. Similar, we estimate

$$|\log(1 + z)|^2 = \left(\frac{1}{2} \log(1 + 2 \cos(\theta)r + r^2)\right)^2 + (\arg(1 + z))^2$$

$$\leq \log(1 + r)^2 + (\arg(1 + z))^2$$

$$= \rho(|z|)^2 + (\arg(1 + z))^2.$$

Thus, to derive $|\rho(z)| \leq m\rho(|z|)$ for some positive constant $m$ independent of $z$ we can show that

$$\frac{|\arg(1 + z)|}{\rho(|z|)} = \frac{|\arg(1 + z)|}{\log(1 + |z|)}$$

is bounded in $z \in S_\delta$. Since $\arg(1 + z)$ is continuous in $z \in S_\delta \setminus \{0\}$ the boundedness follows on compact subsets of $S_\delta \setminus \{0\}$. Moreover, $|\arg(1 + z)| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ implies the boundedness for large values of $|z|$ ($|z| \to \infty$). It is left to show that $\frac{|\arg(1 + z)|}{\log(1 + r)}$ is bounded for small values of $|z|$ ($|z| \to 0$). To this end we use $|1 + z|\sin(\arg(1 + z)) = \text{Im}(1 + z) = |z|\sin(\arg(z))$ on $S_\delta$ and that $\frac{\omega}{\sin(\omega)} \leq K$ for some $K > 0$ and $\omega \in (-\delta, \delta)$. With this at hand, we estimate for $z = re^{i\theta}$,

$$\frac{|\arg(1 + z)|}{\log(1 + |z|)} \leq K \frac{|\sin(\arg(1 + re^{i\theta}))|}{\log(1 + r)} \frac{r}{|1 + re^{i\theta}| \log(1 + r)}$$

$$= K \frac{r}{|1 + re^{i\theta}| \log(1 + r)} \leq K \frac{r}{\log(1 + r)} \leq \tilde{K}$$

for some $\tilde{K} > 0$ and small values of $r = |z|$.

\[
\square
\]
3. The Orlicz Weiss conjecture

3.1. Formulation and assumptions. Recall the $p$-Weiss conjecture for observation operators:

Every observation operator $C \in L(D(A), Y)$ is (infinite-time) $L^p$-admissible if and only if $C$ satisfies the (infinite-time) $p$-Weiss condition (2).

and Haak’s result:

If $A$ generates a bounded analytic semigroup and $A$ has dense range, then the infinite-time $p$-Weiss conjecture holds if and only if $(-A)^{1/p}$ is infinite-time $L^p$-admissible.

First, we like to mention that it is well known (see e.g. [2] or [6]) that $A$ is the generator of a bounded analytic semigroup if and only if $-A$ is densely defined and sectorial of type $\omega$ for some $\omega \in (0, \pi)$. The latter means that $\sigma(-A) \subset \Omega_\omega$ and for every $\delta \in (\omega, \pi)$ there is a constant $M_\delta > 0$ such that

$$\|zR(z, -A)\| \leq M_\delta \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Omega_\delta,$$

For more about sectorial operators and the holomorphic functional calculus, we refer to [6]. Whenever we are dealing with the generator $A$ of a bounded semigroup, $\omega_A$ is referred to as the angle of sectoriality of $-A$, that is the infimum of all $\omega$ such that $-A$ is sectorial of type $\omega$.

Since admissibility is an essential ingredient of Haak’s theorem, we give a precise definition for Orlicz spaces (which include $L^p$ spaces for $1 < p < \infty$).

**Definition 3.1.** An operator $C \in L(D(A), Y)$ is called $L_\Phi$-admissible for $A$ (or equivalently for $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$) if for some (and hence for all) $\tau > 0$ there exists a minimal constant $c_\tau > 0$ such that

$$\|CT(\cdot)x\|_{L_\Phi([0, \tau], Y)} \leq c_\tau\|x\|_X \quad \text{for all } x \in D(A).$$ (14)

If, additionally, $c_\infty := \sup_{\tau > 0} c_\tau < \infty$, then $C$ is called infinite-time $L_\Phi$-admissible for $A$. If $A$ and $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$ are clear from the context, then we just write that $C$ is (infinite-time) $L_\Phi$-admissible without referring to $A$ or $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$.

It is not hard to show that $L_\Phi$-admissibility is invariant under scaling of the semigroup, i.e. $C$ is $L_\Phi$-admissible for $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$ if and only if $C$ is $L_\Phi$-admissible for the scaled semigroup $(e^{-\varepsilon t}T(t))_{t \geq 0}$ (with generator $A - \varepsilon$) for any $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$. If the semigroup is exponentially stable, then finite-time and infinite-time $L_\Phi$-admissibility are equivalent. Moreover, $C$ is infinite-time $L_\Phi$-admissible if and only if (14) holds for $\tau = \infty$ and a constant $C_\infty < \infty$.

In order to extend the $p$-Weiss conjecture and Haak’s result for Orlicz spaces $L_\Phi$ we face the following two questions:

1. How to replace the $p$-Weiss condition?
2. How to replace $(-A)^{1/p}$?

Whereas the first question is rather easy to answer, the second one seems to require further assumptions on $\Phi$ or $A$ since the functional calculus is involved. In [7, Prop. 2.7] it was shown that the assumption of having an bounded analytic semigroup is necessary in the sense that if $(-A)^{1/p}$ is $L^p$-admissible and the semigroup is bounded then it is also analytic. Further, boundedness of the semigroup is a reasonable assumption for the infinite-time $p$-Weiss condition. Therefore we will consider bounded analytic semigroups. Given such a semigroup we formulate the following assumption on $\Phi$.

**Assumption 1.** Assume that $\Phi^{-1}$ is holomorphic on some sector $S_\delta$ for $\delta \in (\omega_A, \pi)$. and there exist constants $m_0, m_1 > 0$ such that

$$m_0 \Phi^{-1}(|z|) \leq |\Phi^{-1}(z)| \leq m_1 \Phi^{-1}(|z|) \quad \text{for all } z \in S_\delta.$$
Recall Example 2.9. While Example (iii) is only useful when $A$ is selfadjoint, Examples (ii) and (iv) yield Young functions $\Phi$ which suffices Assumption 1. Example (i) tells us how to construct further examples of class $\mathcal{P}$, e.g. $\rho(t) = t^r + \log(t)$, $r \in [0, 1]$, yields $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}$ via (8) for any choice of $1 < p < q < \infty$. However, in general it is not clear whether this construction leads to functions satisfying Assumption 1 again.

Independent of our assumptions one can make the following definition. Its motivation becomes clear by Lemma 3.4.

**Definition 3.2.** An operator $C \in \mathcal{L}(D(A), Y)$ is said to satisfy the $\Phi$-Weiss condition, for a Young function $\Phi$, if

$$
\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}_\alpha} \left( \| e^{-Re z} \|_{L_\Phi([0, \infty))} \right)^{-1} \| CR(z, A) \| < \infty \tag{15}
$$

for some $\alpha > 0$, where $\tilde{\Phi}$ is the complementary Young function for $\Phi$. We say that $C$ satisfies the infinite-time $\Phi$-Weiss condition if (15) holds for $\alpha = 0$.

**Remark 3.3.** If $\tilde{\Phi} \in \Delta_2$ then we could replace $(\| e^{-Re z} \|_{L_\Phi([0, \infty))})^{-1}$ by $\tilde{\Phi}^{-1}(\text{Re } z)$ by Lemma 2.5. Recall that $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}$ always satisfies $\tilde{\Phi} \in \Delta_2$. It is obvious that definitions of the $\Phi$-Weiss conjecture and the $p$-Weiss conjecture are consistency in the sense that they are the same if we consider $\Phi(t) = t^p$ for $1 < p < \infty$.

Similar to $L^p$ spaces it is easy to prove that (infinite-time) $L_\Phi$-admissibility of $C \in \mathcal{L}(D(A), Y)$ implies the (infinite-time) $\Phi$-Weiss conjecture. However, for sake of completeness we will give the proof.

**Lemma 3.4.** If $C \in \mathcal{L}(D(A), Y)$ is (infinite-time) $L_\Phi$-admissible, then the (infinite-time) $\Phi$-Weiss condition holds.

**Proof.** If $C$ is infinite-time $L_\Phi$-admissible. Using the generalized Hölder inequality (5) we obtain for all $x \in D(A)$ that

$$
\| CR(z, A)x \| = \left\| \int_0^\infty e^{-zt} CT(t)x \, dt \right\|
\leq 2 \| e^{-Re z} \|_{L_\Phi([0, \infty))} \| CT(\cdot)x \|_{L_\Phi([0, \infty); Y)}
\leq 2c_\infty \| e^{-Re z} \|_{L_\Phi([0, \infty))} \| x \|,
$$

holds where $c_\infty$ denotes the admissibility constant from Definition 3.1. If $C$ is $L_\Phi$-admissible for $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$, then $C$ is infinite-time $L_\Phi$-admissible for the exponentially stable semigroup generated by $A - \alpha$, where $\alpha > \omega(A)$ and $\alpha > 0$. Hence, the proof can be deduced by the infinite-time case. \( \square \)

Next, we try to answer the second question by finding a suitable replacement for $(-A)^{1/p}$. A natural choice would be $\Phi^{-1}(-A)$ since $\Phi^{-1}(t) = t^{1/p}$ if $\Phi(t) = t^p$, i.e. if $L_\Phi = L^p$. If $A$ is the selfadjoint and $\sigma(-A)$ or if $A$ generates a bounded analytic semigroup and Assumption 1 holds then $\Phi^{-1}(-A)$ is well-defined via the measurable or the holomorphic functional calculus, respectively. If $A$ is selfadjoint with $\sigma(-A) \subseteq [0, \infty)$ and $\Phi$ is holomorphic on any sector then both functional calculi lead to the same operator $\Phi^{-1}(-A)$, c.f. [5]. Note that every selfadjoint operator with $\sigma(-A) \subseteq [0, \infty)$ generates a bounded analytic semigroup, see [2, Cor. 4.7].

**Lemma 3.5.** Suppose that $A$ generates a bounded analytic semigroup. If either

(i) $A$ is selfadjoint or

(ii) Assumption 1 holds and $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}$
then $\Phi^{-1}(-A)$ is well-defined via the measurable and holomorphic functional calculus, respectively, and $\Phi^{-1}(-A) \in \mathcal{L}(D(A), X)$.

Proof. For technical details on the measurable and holomorphic functional calculus we will use in this proof, we refer to Chapter 3 in [5] and Chapter 2 in [6].

(i) The function $s \mapsto \frac{\Phi^{-1}(s)}{1+s}$ is a bounded function on $[0, \infty)$. Thus we derive from the measurable functional calculus that $(\frac{\Phi^{-1}(s)}{1+s})(-A)$ is a bounded operator and $(\frac{\Phi^{-1}(s)}{1+s})(-A)(1-A) \subseteq \Phi^{-1}(-A)$, where the former is considered as a function in $\Phi$ “applied” to $-A$.

(ii) By Assumption 1, $\Phi^{-1}$ is holomorphic on some sector $S_\delta$. We will prove that there exists $c, \alpha > 0$ such that

$$|f(z)| \leq c \min(|z|^\alpha, |z|^{-\alpha}) \quad \text{for all } z \in S_\delta,$$

where $f(z) = \frac{\Phi^{-1}(z)}{1+z}$. In this case $f(-A)$ defined via the holomorphic functional calculus is a bounded operator and we have that

$$\frac{\Phi^{-1}(z)}{1+z}(-A)(1-A) \subseteq \Phi^{-1}(-A).$$

This shows $\Phi^{-1}(-A) \in \mathcal{L}(D(A), X)$. We infer by (12), (13) and (3) that for $|z| \leq 1$

$$\frac{\Phi^{-1}(|z|)}{1+|z|} \leq \Phi^{-1}(|z|) \leq \Phi^{-1}(1)|z|^{\nu}$$

holds and that for $|z| \geq 1$

$$\frac{\Phi^{-1}(|z|)}{1+|z|} \leq \frac{2}{\Phi^{-1}(|z|)} \leq \frac{2}{\Phi^{-1}(1)}|z|^{-\nu'}$$

holds. The properties of $\Phi$ from Assumption 1 imply (16). \hfill \square

3.2. Main results. We will prove that if $A$ generates a bounded analytic semigroup the (infinite-time) $\Phi$ Weiss conjecture is equivalent to $\Phi^{-1}(-A)$ being (infinite-time) $L_p$-admissible. This generalizes the results from Haak for $\Phi(t) = \tilde{\nu}^s$ [3]. Haak’s proof strongly relies on generalized square function estimates for $L^p$. It is a nontrivial challenge to generalize these square function estimates for Orlicz spaces. Therefore, our approach is based on the slightly more elementary ideas from [7], even though Haak’s approach seems more natural.

Lemma 3.6. Suppose that $A$ generates a bounded analytic semigroup. If either

- $A$ is selfadjoint or
- Assumption 1 holds and $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}$,

then we have that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \left(\Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)\right)^{-1} \|\Phi^{-1}(-A)T(t)\| < \infty.$$

Proof. Let $t > 0$ and $f(s) := \Phi^{-1}(s)e^{-st}$. If $A$ is selfadjoint $f(-A) = \Phi^{-1}(-A)T(t)$ holds and $\|f(-A)\| \leq \sup_{s \geq 0} f(s)$. First, note that $s \mapsto e^{-st}$ attains its maximum at $s = \frac{1}{t}$ and $s \mapsto \frac{\Phi^{-1}(s)}{s}$ is decreasing, since $\Phi^{-1}$ is concave. Hence, for $s \geq \frac{1}{t}$ we conclude that

$$f(s) = \frac{\Phi^{-1}(s)}{s} \cdot se^{-st} \leq \frac{\Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)}{\frac{1}{t}} \cdot \frac{1}{t}e^{-1} = f\left(\frac{1}{t}\right),$$
and \( \sup_{s \geq 0} f(s) = \sup_{s \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]} f(s) \). Monotonicity of \( \Phi^{-1} \) yields \( \sup_{s \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]} \Phi^{-1}(s) = \Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}) \). For \( s \in [0, \frac{1}{2}] \) it follows that
\[
\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}) e^{-t} \leq \sup_{s \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]} \Phi^{-1}(s) e^{-st} \leq \Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}) .
\]
Thus, there exists \( c \in [e^{-t}, 1] \) with \( \sup_{s \geq 0} f(s) = c \Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}) \), which completes the proof. If Assumption 1 holds and \( \Phi \in \mathcal{P} \). Let \( \omega, \delta, m_1 \) be as in Assumption 1 and choose \( \delta' \in (\omega, \delta) \) and take \( \Gamma = \partial S_\delta \) orientated positively. Then,
\[
\|\Phi^{-1}(-A)T(t)\| \leq \frac{m_1 M_{\delta'}}{2\pi} \int_\Gamma \Phi^{-1}(|z|) e^{-\Re z t} \|R(z, -A)\| \, dz
\]
\[
\leq \frac{m_1 M_{\delta'}}{2\pi} \int_\Gamma \frac{\Phi^{-1}(|z|)}{|z|} e^{-\Re z t} \, dz
\]
\[
= \frac{m_1 M_{\delta'}}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{\Phi^{-1}(r)}{r} e^{-r \cos(\delta') t} \, dr
\]
\[
\leq \frac{m_1 M_{\delta'}}{\pi} \max_{s \in [0, m_1]} (s^{1/2-1}, s^{1/2-1}) e^{-s \cos(\delta')} \int_0^\infty \frac{\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})}{s} e^{-st} \, ds
\]
where we used (12) in the last step. Since the last integral converges, the proof is complete. \( \square \)

**Remark 3.7.** We want to point out, that \( \Phi \in \mathcal{P} \) is only needed to guarantee \( \Phi^{-1}(-A) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}(A),X) \) and to deal with the singularity of the integrand in 0. If we consider the integral over \( (\varepsilon, \infty) \) with \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \) we derive the estimate
\[
\int_1^\infty \frac{\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})}{s} e^{-s \cos(\delta')} \, ds \leq \frac{\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})}{\varepsilon} \int_\varepsilon^\infty e^{-s \cos(\delta')} \, ds
\]
since \( s \mapsto \frac{\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})}{s} \) is decreasing and \( \Phi^{-1} \) is increasing.

**Lemma 3.8.** Suppose that \( A \) generates a bounded analytic semigroup. If either
- \( A \) is selfadjoint or
- Assumption 1 holds and \( \Phi \in \mathcal{P} \)
and if \( \Phi^{-1}(-A) \) is \( L_\omega \)-admissible, then for every \( t_0 > 0 \) there exists \( c_{\omega_0} > 0 \) such that
\[
\| t \Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}) T(t) Ax \|_{L_\omega(0,t_0,X)} \leq c_{\omega_0} \| x \|
\]
holds for all \( x \in \mathcal{D}(A) \).
If \( \Phi^{-1}(-A) \) is infinite-time \( L_\omega \)-admissible, then the above holds for \( t_0 = \infty \) and \( c_{\omega} < \infty \).

**Proof.** Define \( f : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty) \) by \( f(s) = \frac{s}{\Phi^{-1}(s)} e^{-s t/2} \). Similar to Lemma 3.6 we will prove that \( t \Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}) f(-A) \) is uniformly bounded in \( t \geq 0 \).
First, consider that \( A \) is selfadjoint. Note that \( f \) attains its maximum in \([0, \frac{2}{t}]\), since
\[
f(s) = \frac{1}{\Phi^{-1}(s)} s e^{-s t/2} \leq f(\frac{2}{t})
\]
holds for \( s \geq \frac{2}{t} \). The function \( s \mapsto \frac{1}{\Phi^{-1}(s)} \) is increasing. Hence, for \( s \in [0, \frac{2}{t}] \) we obtain that \( f(s) \leq \frac{2}{e^{\Phi^{-1}(\frac{2}{t})} - \Phi^{-1}(\frac{2}{t})} \leq \frac{2}{e^{\Phi^{-1}(\frac{2}{t})}} \), where we used the monotonicity of \( \Phi^{-1} \) in the last inequality. This shows
\[
\| f(-A) \| \leq \sup_{s \geq 0} f(s) \leq \frac{2}{t \Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})}
\]
and hence the uniform boundedness.

Second, consider Assumption 1 and ϕ ∈ ℙ. Let δ and m₀ be given as in Assumption 1. Choose δ′ ∈ (ω_A, δ) and let Γ = S_δ′ be orientated positively. Then,

\[ \|f(-A)\| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi m_0} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{|z|}{\Phi^{-1}(|z|)} e^{-Re z^{1/2}} R(z, -A) \, dz \]

\[ \leq \frac{M_0}{2\pi m_0} \int_{\Gamma} e^{-Re z^{1/2}} \frac{1}{\Phi^{-1}(|z|)} \, dz \]

\[ = \frac{M_0}{\pi m_0} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-\cos(\theta') \theta^{1/2}} \frac{1}{\Phi^{-1}(r)} \, dr \]

\[ = \frac{M_0}{\pi m_0} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-\cos(\theta') \theta^{1/2}} \frac{1}{\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2} \pi)} \, ds \]

\[ \leq \frac{1}{2\pi m_0} \frac{M_0}{\pi m_0} \int_{0}^{\infty} \max(s^{-1/p}, s^{-1/q}) e^{-\cos(\theta') \theta^{1/2}} \, ds \]

by (13). The last integral converges and hence \( t\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})f(-A) \) is uniformly bounded. Next, write

\[ t\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})T(t)Ax = -t\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})f(-A) \Phi^{-1}(-A)T(\frac{1}{2})x \]

for \( x \in D(A) \). While the first part is uniformly bounded, we can apply the admissibility estimate from Definition 3.1 to the second part to obtain the desired estimate.

We are allowed to decompose the operator in the above way by the properties of the functional calculus. Indeed, we have that \( D(\Phi^{-1}(-A)T(\frac{1}{2})) = X \), since ran \( T(s) \subseteq D(A) \subseteq D(\Phi^{-1}(-A)) \) for all \( s > 0 \) and \( D(f(-A)) = X \). Thus, we conclude that \( f(-A)\Phi^{-1}(-A)T(\frac{1}{2}) \subseteq (f(s)\Phi^{-1}(s)e^{-\theta^{1/2}}(-A) = (se^{-st})(-A) = -AT(t) \).

**Corollary 3.9.** Suppose that \( A \) generates a bounded analytic semigroup. If either

- \( A \) is selfadjoint or
- Assumption 1 holds and \( \Phi \in \mathcal{P} \)

and if \( \Phi^{-1}(-A) \) is \( L_\Phi \)-admissible and \( C \in \mathcal{L}(D(A), Y) \) satisfies

\[ \sup_{t > 0} \langle (\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}))^{-1} \rangle \|C(e^{-\beta t}T(t))\| < \infty \]

for some \( \beta \geq 0 \), then for every \( t_0 > 0 \) there exists \( c_{t_0} > 0 \) such that

\[ \|tC(e^{-\beta t}T(t))Ax\|_{L_\Phi(0, t_0; X)} \leq c_{t_0} \|x\| \]

holds for all \( x \in D(A) \).

If \( \Phi^{-1}(-A) \) is infinite-time \( L_\Phi \)-admissible, then the above holds for \( t_0 = \infty \) and \( c_{\infty} < \infty \).

**Proof.** Write

\[ tC(e^{-\beta t}T(t))Ax = (\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}))^{-1}C(e^{-\beta^{1/2}T(\frac{1}{2}))} t\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})(e^{-\beta^{1/2}T(\frac{1}{2})}Ax \]

for \( x \in D(A) \). Since \( (\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}))^{-1}C(e^{-\beta^{1/2}T(\frac{1}{2})}) \) is uniformly bounded by the assumptions and the concavity of \( \Phi^{-1} \), the assertion is a consequence of

\[ \|t\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})(e^{-\beta^{1/2}T(\frac{1}{2})}Ax\|_{L_\Phi(0, t_0; X)} \leq 2\| \Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2})T(\frac{1}{2})Ax\|_{L_\Phi(0, t_0; X)} \]

and Lemma 3.8.

The next result tells us what to expect when the infinite-time \( \Phi \)-Weiss condition holds if \( \Phi \in \mathcal{P} \) without further assumptions on \( \Phi^{-1}(A) \). more precisely, it contains the equivalence that \( C \in \mathcal{L}(D(A), Y) \) satisfies the infinite-time \( \Phi \)-Weiss condition if and only if \( C \) is infinite-time admissible with respect to the weak Orlicz space \( L_{\Phi, \infty} \).

In this context we briefly introduce the weak Orlicz space \( L_{\Phi, \infty} = L_{\Phi, \infty}(0, \infty; Y) \)
which consists of all measurable functions \( f : [0, \infty) \to Y \) (modulo functions that are zero almost everywhere) such that

\[
\| f \|_{L^\infty} := \sup_{t \geq 0} (\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})) f^*(t) < \infty,
\]

where \( f^* \) denotes the decreasing rearrangement of \( f \),

\[
f^*(t) := \inf\{ s \geq 0 \mid \lambda\{ \omega \in [0, \infty) \mid \| f(\omega) \| > s \} < t \}
\]

with the abbreviation \([g > s] := \{ \omega \in [0, \infty) \mid g(\omega) > s \}\) for any function \( g \) on \([0, \infty)\). As usually, we just write \( L^\infty_{\Phi, \infty}(0, \infty) \) if \( Y = \mathbb{C} \). The reader is referred to [16, 17] for more on Orlicz-Lorentz spaces.

**Theorem 3.10.** If \( A \) generates a bounded analytic semigroup \( \{T(t)\}_{t \geq 0} \) and if \( \Phi \in \mathcal{P} \), then the following statements are equivalent for \( C \in \mathcal{L}(D(A), Y) \)

(i) The infinite-time \( \Phi \)-Weiss property holds (i.e. (15) with \( \alpha = 0 \)),
(ii) \( \sup_{t \geq 0} (\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})) \| CT(t) x \| \leq M \| x \| \) for some \( M > 0 \) and all \( x \in X \),
(iii) \( C \) is infinite-time \( L^\infty_{\Phi, \infty} \)-admissible.

Theorem 3.10 generalizes [4, Thm. 2.3] and [7, Lem 2.3]. In [4] the above lemma was done for \( \Phi(t) = t^2 \) and our proof of ”(ii) \( \Rightarrow \) (iii)” \( \Rightarrow \) (i)” is based on the proof from Haak [4]. In [7] the equivalence of (i) and (ii) was shown for \( \Phi(t) = t^\beta \) and our proof relies on the ideas of [7].

**Proof of Theorem 3.10.** We start with the implication (ii) \( \Rightarrow \) (i). For \( \text{Re} z > 0 \) and \( x \in X \) we estimate

\[
\| CR(z, A)x \| \leq M \| x \| \int_0^\infty e^{-R \text{e} \langle z, A \rangle t} \Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t}) \, dt
\]

\[
= M \| x \| \int_0^{\text{Re} z} e^{-s} \frac{1}{\text{Re} z} \Phi^{-1}(\frac{\text{Re} z}{s}) \, ds
\]

\[
\leq 2M \| x \| \int_0^\infty e^{-s} \frac{1}{s} \Phi^{-1}(\frac{\text{Re} z}{s}) \, ds
\]

\[
\leq \frac{2M}{\Phi^{-1}(\text{Re} z)} \| x \| \int_0^\infty \text{max}(s^{1/p'-1}, s^{1/p'-1}) e^{-s} \, ds
\]

where we used the Laplace transform representation of the resolvent in the first inequality, (3) in the second one and (13) in the last one.

To prove (i) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii) let \( \delta < \frac{\pi}{2} \) be larger than \( \omega \), the type of sectoriality of \( A \) and choose \( M > 0 \) such that \( \| \lambda R(\lambda, A) \| M \) on \( S_\delta \). We assume \( \Gamma = \partial S_\delta' \) to be orientated positively for \( \delta' \in (\delta, \omega) \). For \( z \in \Gamma \) the resolvent equation yields

\[
\| CR(-z, A) \| = \| CR(z, A)(I + 2z R(-z, A)) \| \leq 1 + 2M.
\]

Then, for any \( t > 0 \) and \( x \in X \), we estimate

\[
\| CT(t) x \| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma} e^{-\text{Re} \langle z, A \rangle t} \| CR(z, A)x \| \, dz
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1+2M}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma} e^{-\text{Re} \langle z, A \rangle t} \| CR(z, A)x \| \, dz
\]

\[
\leq M \| x \| \int_{\Gamma} e^{-\text{Re} \langle z, A \rangle t} \, dz
\]
where $M' > 0$ is a suitable constant according to our assumptions. For $z \in \Gamma$ we can write $\text{Re } z = |z| \cos(\delta')$ and hence,
\[
\|CT(t)x\| \leq 2M'\|x\| \int_0^\infty e^{-\cos(\delta') tr} \frac{d\Phi^{-1}(r)}{\Phi^{-1}(r)} \, dr \\
= 2M'\|x\| \int_0^\infty e^{-\cos(\delta') s} \frac{ds}{t\Phi^{-1}(\frac{s}{t})} \\
\leq \frac{2M'}{t\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} \|x\| \int_0^\infty \max(s^{-1/\alpha'}, s^{-1/\alpha'}) e^{-\cos(\delta')} \, ds \\
\leq \frac{4M'}{\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} \int_0^\infty \max(s^{-1/\alpha'}, s^{-1/\alpha'}) e^{-\cos(\delta')} \, ds
\]
where we applied (13) and (3).

Next, we prove (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). Let $M$ be given as in (ii). For $x \in X$ we have that
\[
\lambda(||CT(t)|| > s) \leq \lambda(||\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})M||x||) \leq (\Phi(\frac{1}{t}M||x||))^{-1} \text{ and hence}
\]
\[
||CT(t)||_{L_\Phi,\infty(0,\infty,Y)} = \sup_{t \geq 0} ||\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})(CT(t)) * (t)\|
\leq \sup_{t \geq 0} (\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t}))^{-1} \inf\{s \geq 0 \mid (\Phi(\frac{s}{M||x||}))^{-1} < t\}
= \sup_{t \geq 0} (\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t}))^{-1} \Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})M||x||
= M||x||.
\]
This shows that $C$ is infinite-time $L_\Phi,\infty$-admissible.

To complete the proof we show (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). For $z \in C_0$ be given. The function $g : [0,\infty) \rightarrow [0,\infty)$, $g(t) = e^{-\text{Re } z t}$ is decreasing and hence $g = g^*$. Let $x \in X$ and set $f(t) = CT(t)x$. The Hardy-Littlewood inequality yields for every $z \in C_0$
\[
||CR(z,A)x|| = \int_0^\infty g(t)f(t) \, dt \\
\leq \int_0^\infty tf^*(t)\frac{1}{t}g^*(t) \, dt \\
\leq 2\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} f^*(t) \frac{g^*(t)}{t\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} \, dt \\
\leq 2\|f\|_{L_\Phi,\infty} \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-\text{Re } z t}}{t\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} \, dt \\
\leq 2\|f\|_{L_\Phi,\infty} \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-s}}{s\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})} \, ds.
\]

Similar to the proof of "(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i)" we can estimate
\[
\int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-s}}{s\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})} \, ds \leq \frac{K}{\Phi^{-1}(\text{Re } z)}
\]
for some $K > 0$. The assumption implies $\|f\|_{L_\Phi,\infty} \leq c_\infty \|x\|$ with admissibility constant $c_\infty < \infty$. Hence, (i) follows and the proof is complete.  

As a direct consequence of a scaling argument for the semigroup we can formulate the finite-time version of Theorem 3.10.

Corollary 3.11. If $A$ generates a bounded analytic semigroup and if $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}$, then the following statements are equivalent for $C \in \mathcal{L}(D(A), Y)$

(i) The finite-time $\Phi$-Weiss property (15) holds (for some $\alpha > 0$),
(ii) $\sup_{t>0}(\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t}))^{-1} \|C(e^{-\alpha t}T(t))x\| \leq M\|x\|$ for some $\alpha > \omega(A)$, $M > 0$ and all $x \in X$.
(iii) $C$ is $L_{\Phi, \infty}$-admissible.

The approach in [7] uses the boundedness of the integral operator $L$, defined for $\tau > 0$ by

\[
(Lf)(t) := \int_t^\tau \frac{f(s)}{s} \, ds \quad 0 \leq t \leq \tau
\]

on $L^p(0, t_0; Y)$ with operator norm bounded by $p$, see [7, Prop. 2.2]. As a direct consequence of the interpolation result from [12, Thm. 5.1] we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.12.** If $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}$ and $L$ is given by (17) for some $\tau > 0$ then $L$ is a bounded operator on $L_{\Phi}(0, \tau; Y)$ with operator norm independent of $\tau > 0$.

We put everything together to get our main theorem:

**Theorem 3.13.** Suppose that $A$ generates a bounded analytic semigroup. If $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}$ and either $A$ is selfadjoint or Assumption 1 holds. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) $\Phi^{-1}(A)$ is (infinite-time) $L_{\Phi}$-admissible,

(ii) $\Phi$-Weiss conjecture holds.

**Proof.** Since $A$ generates a bounded semigroup we have that $\omega(A) \leq 0$. First, assume (ii). From Lemma 3.6 and Theorem 3.10 we deduce the resolvent estimate $\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}_0} \Phi^{-1}(\text{Re} \, z) \|CR(z, A)\| < \infty$ for $C = \Phi^{-1}(A)$. Therefore since (ii) holds, $\Phi^{-1}(A)$ is (infinite-time) $L_{\Phi}$-admissible.

Second, assume (i). If $C$ is (infinite-time) $L_{\Phi}$-admissible, then the (infinite-time) $\Phi$-Weiss property (15) follows. This was Lemma 3.4.

It is left to prove that the (infinite-time) $\Phi$-Weiss property for $C$ implies (infinite-time) $L_{\Phi}$-admissibility of $C$. First consider the finite-time case. Let

\[
\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}_0} \Phi^{-1}(\text{Re} \, z) \|CR(z, A)\| < \infty.
\]

Choose $\beta > \max(\alpha, 0)$ such that the scaled semigroup $(e^{-\beta t}T(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is exponentially stable. It follows from the choice of $\beta$ and the monotonicity of $\Phi^{-1}$ that

\[
\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}_0} \Phi^{-1}(\text{Re} \, z) \|CR(z, A - \beta)\| < \infty.
\]

From Theorem 3.10 we deduce $M := \sup_{t \geq 0}(\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t}))^{-1}\|C(e^{-\beta t}T(t))\| < \infty$ and Corollary 3.9 implies that $f(t) = tC(e^{-\beta t}T(t))Ax$ lies in $L_{\Phi}(0, t_0; Y)$ for every $t_0 \in (0, \infty)$. For $x \in D(A)$ and $t \in (0, t_0)$ we have that

\[
C(e^{-\beta t}T(t))x = C(e^{-\beta t_0}T(t_0))x - \int_t^{t_0} C(e^{-\beta s}T(s))Ax \, ds \\
= C(e^{-\beta t_0}T(t_0))x - (Lf)(t),
\]

where $L$ is the integral operator given by (17), which is bounded on $L_{\Phi}(0, t_0; Y)$ by Lemma 3.12 since $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}$ and hence $\Phi$ and $\Phi$ satisfy the $\Delta_2$-condition. We obtain that

\[
\|C(e^{-\beta t}T(t))x\|_{L_{\Phi}(0, t_0; Y)} \leq \|C(e^{-\beta t_0}T(t_0))x\|_{L_{\Phi}(0, t_0; Y)} + \|Lf\|_{L_{\Phi}(0, t_0; Y)} \\
\leq (\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t_0}))^{-1} \|C(e^{-\beta t_0}T(t_0))x\|_Y + \|L\|\|f\|_{L_{\Phi}(0, t_0; Y)} \\
\leq (M + \|L\|\|x\|).
\]
where \( c_{t_0} \) is the constant from Corollary 3.9 and \( \|L\| \) denotes the operator norm of \( L \) on \( L_\Phi(0,t_0;Y) \). This shows that \( C \) is \( L_\Phi \)-admissible. The infinite-time \( \Phi \)-Weiss condition reads

\[
\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_{t_0}} \Phi^{-1}(\Re z) \|CR(z, A - \beta)\| < \infty
\]

with \( \beta = 0 \) and as before

\[
\|CT(t)x\|_{L_\Phi(0,t_0;Y)} \leq (M + \|L\| c_{t_0})\|x\|.
\]

Since \( \|L\| \) and \( c_{t_0} \) are bounded in \( t_0 > 0 \) (since \( \Phi^{-1}(-A) \) is infinite-time \( L_\Phi \)-admissible) we are allowed to take the supremum over \( t_0 > 0 \) and obtain that \( C \) is infinite-time \( L_\Phi \)-admissible.

On \( X = \ell^r, r \in [1,\infty) \) there is a sufficient condition on \( \Phi \) for infinite-time \( L_\Phi \)-admissibility of \( \Phi^{-1}(-A) \) when dealing with a diagonal operator \( A \) given by

\[
Ae_n = \lambda_n e_n, \tag{18}
\]

where \( (e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) is the standard basis on \( \ell^r \) and \( (\lambda_n)_n \) is assumed to be a sequence of non-positive decreasing numbers, i.e. \( \lambda_{n+1} \leq \lambda_n \leq 0 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). The assumption that \( (\lambda_n)_n \) is decreasing is not a restriction, since this can always be achieved by rearranging the basis. The maximal domain of \( A \) is given by

\[
D(A) = \left\{ x = (x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell^r \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_n x_n|^r < \infty \right. \right\}
\]

and it well-known that \( A \) is a self-adjoint operator and hence the generator of a bounded (since \( \lambda_n \leq 0 \)) analytic semigroup \( (T(t))_{t \geq 0} \) which is then given by

\[
T(t)e_n = e^{\lambda_n t} e_n.
\]

For any Young function \( \Phi \) we have that \( \Phi^{-1}(-A) \) is given by

\[
\Phi^{-1}(-A)e_n = \Phi^{-1}(-\lambda_n)e_n.
\]

**Proposition 3.14.** Consider the operator \( A \) on \( \ell^r \) given by (18). If \( \Phi \) and \( t \mapsto \Phi(t \cdot) \) are Young functions, then \( \Phi^{-1}(-A) \) is infinite-time \( L_\Phi \)-admissible.

**Proof.** Let \( k \) denote the smallest natural number such that \( \lambda_k \neq 0 \). Similar to the \( L^p \) case we obtain that for \( x = (x_n)_n \in D(A) \)

\[
\|\Phi^{-1}(-A)T(\cdot)x\|_{L_\Phi(0,\infty;\ell^r)} = \left\| \left( \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} |\Phi^{-1}(-\lambda_n)e^{\lambda_n \cdot} x_n|^r \right)^{1/r} \right\|_{L_\Phi(0,\infty)}
\]

\[
\leq 2^{1/r} \left( \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \|\Phi^{-1}(-\lambda_n)e^{\lambda_n \cdot} x_n\|_{L_\Phi(0,\infty)}^r \right)^{1/r}
\]

\[
\leq 2^{1/r} \|x\|_{\ell^r}
\]

holds, where we applied the generalized Minkowski inequality (Lemma 2.4) and Lemma 3.4. This proves that \( \Phi^{-1}(-A) \) is infinite-time \( L_\Phi \)-admissible. \( \square \)
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