

Linearization and Hölder continuity of generalized ODEs with application to measure differential equations *

Weijie Lu^a Y-H. Xia^{a†}

^a *College of Mathematics Science, Zhejiang Normal University, 321004, Jinhua, China*

Email: luwj@zjnu.edu.cn; yhxia@zjnu.cn

Abstract

The generalized ordinary differential equations (for short, GODEs) in Banach space were defined via its solution, which include measure differential equations, impulsive differential equations, functional differential equations and the classical ordinary differential equations as special cases. It should be mentioned that even the symbol $\frac{dx}{d\tau}$ does not indicate that the solution has a derivative. In this paper, we study the linearization and its Hölder continuity of a class of GODEs. Firstly, we construct the formulas for bounded solutions of the nonlinear GODEs in the Kurzweil integral sense under the linear GODEs have an exponential dichotomy. Afterwards, we establish a topological conjugacy between the linear and nonlinear GODEs. Further, we show that the conjugacies are both Hölder continuous by using the Gronwall-type inequality (in the Perron-Stieltjes integral sense) and other nontrivial estimate techniques. Finally, applications to the measure differential equations and impulsive differential equations, our results are very effective.

Keywords: generalized ordinary differential equations; Perron integrals; measure differential equations; Topological equivalence; impulsive differential equations;

MSC2020: 26A39; 34A36; 45N05; 37C15;

1 Introduction

1.1 History of the generalized ordinary differential equations

The generalized ordinary differential equations (for short, GODEs) in Banach space have received widespread attentions recently, which has the form of:

$$\frac{dx}{d\tau} = DK(x, t), \quad (1.1)$$

*This paper was jointly supported from Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China (No.LZ23A010001) and National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11671176, 11931016).

†Corresponding author. yhxia@zjnu.cn.

where $K : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a given map on Banach space \mathcal{X} . In addition, as mentioned by Schwabik ([1], Remark 3.2), the letter D of (1.1) means that (1.1) is a generalized differential equation, this concept being defined via its solution, and even the symbol $\frac{dx}{dt}$ does not indicate that the solution has a derivative. By an simple example (see [1] pp. 100), he pointed out that the GODE is a formal equation-like object for which one has defined its solutions. The GODEs include various types of other differential equations as special cases, such as the classical ODEs, measure differential equations (MDEs), impulsive differential equations (IDEs), functional differential equations (FDEs) as well as dynamic equations on time scales. In particular, a pretty application of GODEs is MDEs, which have well studied (see e.g., Federson and Mesquita [2], Federson, Mesquita and Slavík [3], Piccoli [4], Piccoli and Rossi [5], Meng [6], Meng and Zhang [7], Zhang [8], Wen [9], Wen and Zhang [10]), another application of GODEs is IDEs (see Federson and Schwabik [11], Afonso, Bonotto, Federson and Schwabik [12]).

The concept of GODEs was initiated in Kurzweil [13, 14], who introduced it to generalize the classical results on the continuous dependence of the solutions of ODEs with respect to parameters in 1957. Later, the fundamental theory in the framework of GODEs was established, one can consult Schwabik [1, 15, 16]. More recently, the stability theory and the qualitative property of GODEs are developed by many scholars. For example, the variation of constants formula for the GODEs was proposed by Collegari et al. [17], the boundedness of solutions for GODEs were derived by Afonso et al. [18] and Federson et al. [19], the concepts of exponential dichotomy and its robustness results were given by Bonotto et al. [20, 21], the results on topological properties of flows for nonnegative time in the framework of GODEs were also presented by Bonotto et al. [22], the existence of periodic solutions for autonomous GODEs can be seen Federson et al. [23], the converse Lyapunov theorem for GODEs were described by Andrade da Silva et al. [24] and the boundary value problems for GODEs was obtained from Bonotto et al. [25]. Other concepts on the GODEs were considered in the monograph of Bonotto et al. [26].

1.2 History of linearization

Linearization, as an important topic in dynamical systems, portrays the nonlinear perturbation systems through the dynamical behavior of the linear systems. A fundamental contributions to this project in the autonomous systems is the Hartman-Grobman theorem (see [27, 28]), which describes that C^1 hyperbolic diffeomorphism $G : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ can be C^0 linearized near the fixed point. Later, Palis [29] and Pugh [30] generalized the local and global Hartman-Grobman theorem to Banach space, respectively. In addition, infinite dimensional versions of this results were well presented by Lu [31] (scalar reaction-diffusion equation), Bates and Lu [32] (Cahn-Hilliard equation and phase field equations), Hein and Prüss [33] (semilinear hyperbolic evolution equations), Farkas [34] (retarded functional equations). Except for the C^0 linearization of the differential equations, Sternberg ([35, 36]) initially investigated C^r linearization for C^k diffeomorphisms. Sell ([37]) extended

the theorem of Sternberg. More mathematicians paid particular attention on the C^1 linearization. Belitskii [38], ElBialy [39], Rodrigues and Solà-Morales [40] studied that C^1 linearization of hyperbolic diffeomorphisms on Banach space independently. Recently, Zhang et al. [41, 42, 43, 44] showed the $C^{1,\beta}$ -linearization for $C^{1,\alpha}$ or $C^{1,1}$ hyperbolic diffeomorphisms (where $0 < \beta < \alpha \leq 1$), and they proved that the regularity for the transformations is sharp.

More recently, many scholars paid attention to the linearization of nonautonomous systems, which was originated from Palmer [45]. Palmer established the global topological conjugacy between the nonautonomous nonlinear system and its linear part by constructing conjugate maps, which also relies on the exponential dichotomy theory (see Coppel [46]) for nonautonomous linear systems. After that, by weakening the assumption of exponential dichotomy, Jiang [47] obtained a version of Hartman-Grobman theorem for ordinary dichotomy. Backes and Dragičević [48] proved a linearization result for generalized exponential dichotomy, which extended the result of Bernardes and Messaoudi [49] from autonomous to nonautonomous systems. As well as Barreira and Valls [50, 51] presented linearization results with the nonuniform exponential dichotomy. Reinfelds and Šteinberga [52] firstly studied the C^0 linearization for non-hyperbolic systems, and Backes et al. [53] extended it to the non-hyperbolic coupled systems.

On the other hand, by reducing the condition of boundedness for the nonlinear perturbations, Xia et al. [54] reported a Hartman-Grobman theorem under locally integrable conditions. Castañeda and Robledo [55] and Huerta [56] considered the linearization of the unbounded nonlinear system under the nonuniform exponential contraction, respectively. Backes and Dragičević [57] gave a version of multiscale linearization. Qadir [58] presented a geometric linearization of second order semilinear ordinary differential equations. Furthermore, C^0 -linearization theory was investigated in various dynamical systems, for instance, the functional differential equations (see Farkas [34]), the classical impulsive differential equations (see Reinfelds and Sermone [59], Reinfelds [60, 61], Sermone [63, 62], Fenner and Pinto [64] and Xia et al. [65]), dynamic equations on time scales (see Pötzche [66] and Xia et al. [67]), the differential equations with piecewise constant argument (see Pappaschinos [68], Pinto and Robledo [69]). Many scholars also focus on the smooth linearization for nonautonomous systems. Castañeda and Robledo [70] first formulated sufficient conditions for smooth linearization of nonautonomous differential equations whose linear part admits a uniform exponential contraction. Cuong et al. [71] proved a Sternberg-type theorem for nonautonomous systems while the linear part has a uniform exponential dichotomy. Dragičević et al. [72, 73] showed discrete and continuous smooth linearization results with nonuniform exponential dichotomy, respectively.

1.3 Motivation and contributions of the present paper

The theory of linear GODEs has been established, see the monographs of Schwabik [1] and Bonotto et al. [26]. However the theory of nonlinear GODEs is not yet mature. The Hartman-Grobman

theorem is exactly the bridge between the two. Up till now, there is no papers considering the topological conjugacy between the linear systems and their nonlinear perturbations for GODEs. In this paper, we firstly establish the Hartman-Grobman-type theorem in the framework of GODEs.

Consider the linear GODEs

$$\frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x] \quad (1.2)$$

and their nonlinear perturbation

$$\frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x + F(x, t)] \quad (1.3)$$

on Banach space \mathcal{X} , where $A : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ is a bounded linear operator on \mathcal{X} and $F : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is Kurzweil integrable. Bonotto, Federson and Santo [20] presented the concept of exponential dichotomy for Eq. (1.2). They further studied the existence and uniqueness of bounded solutions of the linear inhomogeneous GODE

$$\frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x + g(t)],$$

where $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a regulated function.

Firstly, we construct the formulas for bounded solution of Eq. (1.3) provided that the linear GODE (1.2) admits an exponential dichotomy. We achieve this using the technique of Picard's stepwise approximation, and obtain the following explicit expression for the bounded solution of a class of nonlinear GODEs:

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) = & \int_0^t DF(x(\tau), s) - \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(\tau), s) \\ & + \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(\tau), s), \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

where $\mathcal{V}(t) := V(t, 0)$ is the fundamental operator of Eq. (1.2) and P is a projection, I is an identity operator. Note that the term $\int_0^t DF(x(\tau), s)$ is a form specific to the nonlinear GODEs, since the Kurzweil integral is involved. Once the Kurzweil integral reduces to the Riemann integral or the Lebesgue integral, the expression (1.4) degenerates into the case of the classical ODEs, see Coppel [46].

Secondly, we show that Eq. (1.3) is topologically conjugated to Eq. (1.2). More precisely, constructing the approximately identical maps and using the relationship between the integral equations, we verify that these maps are homeomorphisms and achieve the bijection between the solutions of Eqs. (1.2) and (1.3). Furthermore, we study the regularity of these maps (or conjugacies). We give a result for Hölder conjugacies with the help of the Gronwall-type inequality (in the Perron-Stieltjes integral sense) and other nontrivial estimate techniques. As applications, we derive results on the Hartman-Grobman theorem for MDEs and IDEs.

1.4 Outline

This paper is split section wise as follows. In Section 2, we give the preliminary results for GODEs. Subsections 2.1 and 2.2 introduce the regulated functions, bounded variation functions and Kurzweil integral. Subsection 2.3 presents the fundamental theory for GODEs. And a concept of strong exponential dichotomy is given. In Section 3, we analyze the bounded solution for Eq. (1.3). Section 4 presents results which characterize the topological conjugacy between Eq. (1.2) and Eq. (1.3). In Section 5, we derive the Hölder continuity for the conjugacies. We present some useful inequalities and then give rigorous proofs in subsections 5.2 and 5.3, respectively. Finally, we apply the results of GODEs to MDEs and IDEs.

2 Preliminaries for the GODEs

2.1 regulated and bounded variation functions

Let \mathcal{X} be a Banach space with the norm $\|\cdot\|$. We assert that a function $g : [a_1, a_2] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is said to be *regulated* if the following limits exist:

$$g(t^+) := \lim_{\tau \rightarrow t^+} g(\tau), \quad t \in [a_1, a_2) \quad \text{and} \quad g(t^-) := \lim_{\tau \rightarrow t^-} g(\tau), \quad t \in (a_1, a_2].$$

Let $G([a_1, a_2], \mathcal{X})$ denote the space of all regulated functions $g : [a_1, a_2] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Obviously, with the supremum norm $\|g\|_\infty := \sup_{t \in [a_1, a_2]} \|g(t)\|$ is a Banach space, (see [74], Theorem 3.6).

We say that a finite point set $D = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_j\} \subset [a_1, a_2]$ such that $a_1 = t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_j = a_2$ is a *division* of $[a_1, a_2]$. We write $D = \{t_0, \dots, t_{|D|}\}$ if $|D|$ is the number of subintervals $[t_{j-1}, t_j]$ of a division D of $[a_1, a_2]$. Denote that $\mathcal{D}[a_1, a_2]$ is the set of all division of $[a_1, a_2]$. A map $g : [a_1, a_2] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is said to be a *variation* if

$$\text{var}_{a_1}^{a_2} g := \sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}[a_1, a_2]} \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} \|g(t_j) - g(t_{j-1})\|.$$

If $\text{var}_{a_1}^{a_2} g < \infty$, then g is a *bounded variation* function on $[a_1, a_2]$. Let $BV([a_1, a_2], \mathcal{X})$ be the set of all bounded variation function g on \mathcal{X} equipped with the variation norm $\|g\|_{BV} := \|g(a_1)\| + \text{var}_{a_1}^{a_2} g$. Then $(BV([a_1, a_2], \mathcal{X}), \|\cdot\|_{BV})$ is a Banach space, and $BV([a_1, a_2], \mathcal{X}) \subset G([a_1, a_2], \mathcal{X})$, see [74].

2.2 Kurzweil integral

We recall the concept of the Kurzweil integral, which is defined by [13] and [1]. To begin it, we give some basic concepts.

A *tagged division* of $[a_1, a_2] \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a finite collection of point-interval pairs $D = \{(\tau_j, [s_{j-1}, s_j]) : j = 1, 2, \dots, |D|\}$, where $a_1 = s_0 \leq s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_{|D|} = a_2$ is a division of $[a_1, a_2]$ and the tag $\tau_j \in [s_{j-1}, s_j]$. A *gauge* on $[a_1, a_2]$ is an arbitrary positive function $\varepsilon : [a_1, a_2] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$. A tagged division $D = \{(\tau_j, [s_{j-1}, s_j]), j = 1, 2, \dots, |D|\}$ of $[a_1, a_2]$ is ε -fine for any gauge ε on $[a_1, a_2]$ if

$$[s_{j-1}, s_j] \subset (\tau_j - \varepsilon(\tau_j), \tau_j + \varepsilon(\tau_j)).$$

Definition 2.1. (*Kurzweil integrable*) A function $V : [a_1, a_2] \times [a_1, a_2] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is said to be *Kurzweil integrable* on $[a_1, a_2]$, if there exists a unique element $J \in \mathcal{X}$ satisfying for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a gauge ε of $[a_1, a_2]$ such that for each ε -fine tagged division $D = \{(\tau_j, [s_{j-1}, s_j]), j = 1, 2, \dots, |D|\}$ of $[a_1, a_2]$, we have

$$\|K(V, d) - J\| < \epsilon,$$

where $K(V, d) = \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} [V(\tau_j, s_j) - V(\tau_j, s_{j-1})]$. We write $J = \int_{a_1}^{a_2} DV(\tau, t)$ in this situation.

2.3 The fundamental theory for the GODEs

We review the fundamental theory of GODEs. Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ be the set of all bounded linear operators with the operator norm $\|\cdot\|$. Given $\mathbb{I} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, consider the linear GODEs

$$\frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x], \quad (2.1)$$

where $A : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$. As point out in [1], a function $x : [a_1, a_2] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is said to be a solution of (2.1) iff

$$x(a_2) = x(a_1) + \int_{a_1}^{a_2} D[A(s)x(\tau)]. \quad (2.2)$$

The integral on the right-hand side of (2.2) is a Kurzweil integral, which is denoted by the Perron-Stieltjes integral $\int_{a_1}^{a_2} d[A(s)]x(s)$ (see [1, 15]), since we represent $\int_{a_1}^{a_2} D[A(t)x(\tau)]$ as Riemann-Stieltjes sum taking the form of $\sum [A(t_j) - A(t_{j-1})]x(\tau_j)$.

Let I be an identity operator, $A(t^+) = \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} A(s)$ and $A(t^-) = \lim_{s \rightarrow t^-} A(s)$, we suppose the following conditions throughout this paper.

(H1) $A \in BV([a_1, a_2], \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}))$ for $[a_1, a_2] \subset \mathbb{I}$,

(H2) $(I + [A(t^+) - A(t)])^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ for $t \in \mathbb{I} \setminus \text{sup}(\mathbb{I})$ and $(I - [A(t) - A(t^-)])^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ for $t \in \mathbb{I} \setminus \text{inf}(\mathbb{I})$.

The above assumptions guarantee the existence and uniqueness of the solution of (2.1).

Lemma 2.2. ([16], Theorem 2.10) Assume that (H1) and (H2) hold. Given $(t_0, x_0) \in \mathbb{I} \times \mathcal{X}$. Then the following linear GODE

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x(\tau)], \\ x(t_0) = x_0, \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

admits a unique solution on \mathbb{I} .

Lemma 2.3. ([17], Theorem 4.3) An operator $V : \mathbb{I} \times \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ is said to be a fundamental operator of Eq. (2.1) if

$$V(t, s) = I + \int_s^t d[A(r)]V(r, s), \quad t, s \in \mathbb{I}, \quad (2.4)$$

and for any fixed $s \in \mathbb{I}$, $V(\cdot, s)$ is of locally bounded variation in \mathbb{I} . Furthermore, the unique solution of (2.3) is given by $x(t) = V(t, s)x_s$.

Lemma 2.4. ([17], Theorem 4.4) The operator $V : \mathbb{I} \times \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ has the following properties:

- (1) $V(t, t) = I$;
- (2) for any $[a_1, a_2] \subset \mathbb{I}$, there exists a positive constant $N > 0$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \|V(t, s)\| &\leq N, \quad t, s \in [a_1, a_2], \quad \text{var}_{a_1}^{a_2} V(t, \cdot) \leq N, \quad t \in [a_1, a_2], \\ \text{var}_{a_1}^{a_2} V(\cdot, s) &\leq N, \quad s \in [a_1, a_2]; \end{aligned}$$

- (3) $V(t, s) = V(t, r)V(r, s)$ for any $t, r, s \in \mathbb{I}$;
- (4) $V^{-1}(t, s) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ and $V^{-1}(t, s) = V(s, t)$.

Definition 2.5. (exponential dichotomy [20]) We say that a linear GODEs (2.1) have an exponential dichotomy on \mathbb{I} if there exist a projection $P : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and constants $K, \alpha > 0$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \|\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(s)\| \leq Ke^{-\alpha(t-s)} & \text{for } t \geq s, \\ \|\mathcal{V}(t)(Id - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(s)\| \leq Ke^{\alpha(t-s)} & \text{for } t < s, \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

where $\mathcal{V}(t) = V(t, 0)$ and $\mathcal{V}^{-1}(t) = V(0, t)$.

Definition 2.6. (strong exponential dichotomy) If the linear GODEs (2.1) have a strong exponential dichotomy on \mathbb{I} if (2.5) holds and there exists a constant $\tilde{\alpha} \geq \alpha$ such that

$$\|\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(s)\| \leq Ke^{\tilde{\alpha}(t-s)}, \quad \text{for } t, s \in \mathbb{I}. \quad (2.6)$$

Now we give the results on the perturbation theory of GODEs.

Lemma 2.7. ([20], Proposition 4.5) Suppose that the linear homogenous GODEs (2.1) satisfy (H1)–(H2) and admit an exponential dichotomy. If $g \in G(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{X})$ and the Perron-Stieltjes integrals

$$\int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)](g(\sigma) - g(0)) \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)](g(\sigma) - g(0)) \quad (2.8)$$

exist for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and the maps (2.7) and (2.8) are bounded, then the non-homogenous GODEs

$$\frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x + g(t)] \quad (2.9)$$

have a unique bounded solution.

We observe that in Remark 4.11 from [20], if f is bounded with $\|f(t)\| \leq M$ and

$$V_A := \sup\{\text{var}_a^b A : a, b \in \mathbb{R}, a < b\} < \infty,$$

then Bonotto et al. [20] proved the existence of (2.7) and (2.8). Furthermore, they obtained that

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left\| \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)](f(\sigma) - f(0)) \right\| \leq 2MK\|P\|C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_A^2 \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left\| \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)](f(\sigma) - f(0)) \right\| \leq 2MK(1 + \|P\|)C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_A^2. \quad (2.11)$$

Lemma 2.8. ([17], Theorem 4.10) *Assume that (H1) and (H2) hold. If $F : \mathcal{X} \times [a_1, a_2] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is Kurzweil integrable, $[\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2] \subseteq [a_1, a_2]$ and $t_0 \in [\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2]$, then the GODEs*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x + F(x, t)], \\ x(t_0) = x_0, \end{cases}$$

are equivalent to the following integral equations

$$x(t) = V(t, t_0)x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t DF(x(\tau), \gamma) - \int_{t_0}^t d_\sigma[V(t, \sigma)] \left(\int_{t_0}^\sigma DF(x(\tau), \gamma) \right).$$

We then define a special class of functions $F : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. For convenience, we write $\Omega := \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{I}$.

Definition 2.9. [20] *Given a function $h : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is nondecreasing. We say that a function $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ belongs to the class $\mathcal{F}(\Omega, h)$ if*

$$\|F(x, t_2) - F(x, t_1)\| \leq |h(t_2) - h(t_1)| \quad (2.12)$$

for any (x, t_2) and $(x, t_1) \in \Omega$ and

$$\|F(x, t_2) - F(x, t_1) - F(z, t_2) + F(z, t_1)\| \leq \|x - z\| |h(t_2) - h(t_1)| \quad (2.13)$$

for any $(x, t_2), (x, t_1), (z, t_2)$ and $(z, t_1) \in \Omega$.

3 The formulas for bounded solutions of the nonlinear GODEs

In the present paper, we consider the following nonlinear GODEs

$$\frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x + F(x, t)], \quad (3.1)$$

where $A : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ is a map and $F : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is Kurzweil integrable. Furthermore, we make the following assumptions on A and F :

(A1) suppose that (2.1) admits an exponential dichotomy;

(A2) there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that $\|[I - (A(t) - A(t^-))]^{-1}\| \leq C$, $\|[I - (A(t^+) - A(t))]^{-1}\| \leq C$ and

$$V_A := \sup\{\text{var}_a^b A : a, b \in \mathbb{R}, a < b\} < \infty;$$

(A3) the function $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Omega, h)$, where $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a nondecreasing function such that

$$V_h := \sup\{\text{var}_a^b h : a, b \in \mathbb{R}, a < b\} < \infty.$$

Then we state the following result in this section.

Theorem 3.1. *If conditions (A1)–(A3) hold, then the nonlinear GODEs (3.1) have a unique bounded solution, which is defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) = & \int_0^t DF(x(\tau), s) - \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(\tau), s) \\ & + \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(\tau), s). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.2. *We note that different from the expression of bounded solution under the classical ODEs, Theorem 3.1 presents the formula of bounded solution of nonlinear GODEs in the sense of Kurzweil integral. If the nonlinear equation (3.1) is in a Riemann-integrable or Lebesgue-integrable environment, then the formula of the bounded solution is*

$$x(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t \mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)F(x(\sigma), \sigma)d\sigma - \int_t^\infty \mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)F(x(\sigma), \sigma)d\sigma.$$

Obviously the result is the same as that of the classical ODEs.

Remark 3.3. *As pointed out by Schwabik [1], the GODE often does not involve differentiation. Therefore, it is indispensable to deal with the relationship between various integral equations throughout the proof.*

Before giving the proof, we present a proposition that plays an important role in Theorem 3.1 and subsequent linearization results.

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose that the linear homogeneous GODEs (2.1) have an exponential dichotomy. Then the GODEs (2.1) have no non-trivial bounded solutions.*

Proof. Different from Bonotto et al. [20] (see Proposition 4.3), we prove it by contradiction. (i) If $x(t) = 0$, then the result is obvious. (ii) We now suppose that the bounded solution $x(t) \neq 0$. Let $\zeta = x(0)$. Notice that

$$x(t) = \mathcal{V}(t)P\zeta + \mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\zeta.$$

Consider the case of $t \leq 0$, from the first inequality of (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|P\zeta\| &= \|\mathcal{V}(0)P\zeta\| = \|\mathcal{V}(0)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(t)\mathcal{V}(t)P\zeta\| \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{V}(0)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(t)\| \|\mathcal{V}(t)P\zeta\| \leq Ke^{\alpha t} \|\mathcal{V}(t)P\zeta\|,\end{aligned}$$

thus,

$$\|\mathcal{V}(t)P\zeta\| \geq K^{-1}e^{-\alpha t} \|P\zeta\|. \quad (3.2)$$

On the other hand, we get (also using (2.5))

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{V}(t)(I-P)\zeta\| &= \|\mathcal{V}(t)(I-P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(0)\mathcal{V}(0)(I-P)\zeta\| \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{V}(t)(I-P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(0)\| \|\mathcal{V}^{-1}(0)\mathcal{V}(0)(I-P)\zeta\| \leq K\|(I-P)\zeta\|e^{\alpha t}.\end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Combining (3.2) and (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|x(t)\| &= \|\mathcal{V}(t)P\zeta + \mathcal{V}(t)(I-P)\zeta\| \\ &\geq \|\mathcal{V}(t)P\zeta\| - \|\mathcal{V}(t)(I-P)\zeta\| \\ &\geq K^{-1}e^{-\alpha t} \|P\zeta\| - Ke^{\alpha t} \|(I-P)\zeta\|,\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \|x(t)\| = \infty,$$

and thus $x(t)$ is unbounded solution, which contradicts to the assumption. Hence, $x(t) = 0$ for all $t \leq 0$. A similar argument can be applied to $t \geq 0$, then $x(t) = 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Step 1. We claim that there exists a bounded solution satisfying Eq. (3.1). Indeed, let $x_0(t) := 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}x_1(t) &:= \int_0^t DF(x_0(\tau), s) - \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x_0(\tau), s) \\ &\quad + \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I-P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x_0(\tau), s).\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of Kurzweil integral, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a gauge ε of $[0, t]$ such that for every ε -fine tagged division $D = \{(\tau_j, [s_{j-1}, s_j]), j = 1, 2, \dots, |D|\}$ of $[0, t]$, we have

$$\left\| \int_0^t DF(x_0(\tau), s) \right\| = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} [F(x(\tau_j), s_j) - F(x(\tau_j), s_{j-1})] \right\|.$$

It follows from condition (A3) that

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} [F(x(\tau_j), s_j) - F(x(\tau_j), s_{j-1})] \right\| \leq \left| \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} h(s_j) - h(s_{j-1}) \right| \leq |h(t) - h(0)| \leq 2V_h. \quad (3.4)$$

Then $x_1(t)$ is well defined, since

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_1(t)\| &\leq |h(t) - h(0)| + \int_{-\infty}^t \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| |h(\sigma) - h(0)| \\ &\quad + \int_t^\infty \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| |h(\sigma) - h(0)|, \end{aligned}$$

which together with conditions (A1)–(A2) and (2.10), (2.11) yields that

$$\|x_1(t)\| \leq 2V_h + 2K\|P\|C^3e^{3CV_A}V_A^2V_h + 2K(1 + \|P\|)C^3e^{3CV_A}V_A^2V_h.$$

Taking $t = s$, by (2.5), we have that $\|P\| \leq K$ and thus $\|x_1(t)\| < \infty$, namely, $x_1(t)$ is bounded and well-defined. If for any fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_m(t)$ is well defined and bounded, then

$$\begin{aligned} x_{m+1}(t) &:= \int_0^t DF(x_m(\tau), s) - \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x_m(\tau), s) \\ &\quad + \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x_m(\tau), s) \end{aligned}$$

and $x_{m+1}(t)$ is also bounded. By the induction principle, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the function sequence $\{x_m(t)\}_{m=0}^\infty$ is bounded. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{m+1}(t) - x_m(t)\| &\leq \int_0^t \|DF(x_m(\tau), s) - DF(x_{m-1}(\tau), s)\| \\ &\quad + \int_{-\infty}^t \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| \int_0^\sigma \|DF(x_m(\tau), s) - DF(x_{m-1}(\tau), s)\| \\ &\quad + \int_t^\infty \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| \int_0^\sigma \|DF(x_m(\tau), s) - DF(x_{m-1}(\tau), s)\|. \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of Kurzweil integral and the condition (A3), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \int_0^t DF(x(\tau), s) - DF(y(\tau), s) \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} [F(x(\tau_j), s_j) - F(x(\tau_j), s_{j-1})] - [F(y(\tau_j), s_j) - F(y(\tau_j), s_{j-1})] \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} \|x(\tau_j) - y(\tau_j)\| \cdot |h(s_j) - h(s_{j-1})| \\ &= \int_0^t \|x(\tau) - y(\tau)\| dh(s). \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

By using condition (A3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{m+1}(t) - x_m(t)\| &\leq \int_0^t \|x_m(\tau) - x_{m-1}(\tau)\| dh(s) \\ &\quad + \int_{-\infty}^t \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| \int_0^\sigma \|x_m(\tau) - x_{m-1}(\tau)\| dh(s) \\ &\quad + \int_t^\infty \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| \int_0^\sigma \|x_m(\tau) - x_{m-1}(\tau)\| dh(s). \end{aligned}$$

Set $T_m := \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|x_{m+1}(t) - x_m(t)\|$. We derive from conditions (A1)-(A2) and (2.10), (2.11) that

$$\begin{aligned} T_m &\leq |h(t) - h(0)| \cdot T_{m-1} + K^2 C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_A^2 |h(t) - h(0)| \cdot T_{m-1} \\ &\quad + K(1 + K) C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_A^2 |h(t) - h(0)| \cdot T_{m-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking V_h sufficiently small. Then there exist a positive constant $\delta < 1$ such that $T_m \leq \delta \cdot T_{m-1}$. Hence, $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \|x_{m+1}(t) - x_m(t)\|$ converges uniformly on \mathbb{R} , which means that the function sequence $\{x_m(t)\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ also converges uniformly on \mathbb{R} . We write

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} x_m(t) = \tilde{x}(t),$$

thus $\tilde{x}(t)$ is bounded and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}(t) &= \int_0^t DF(\tilde{x}(\tau), s) - \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(\tilde{x}(\tau), s) \\ &\quad + \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(\tilde{x}(\tau), s). \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Step 2. We claim the uniqueness of the solution for GODE (3.1). Let $y(t)$ be another bounded solution of GODE (3.1) satisfying the initial value $y(0) = y$. From Lemma 2.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &= \mathcal{V}(t)y + \int_0^t DF(y(\tau), s) - \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(y(\tau), s) \\ &= \mathcal{V}(t)y + \int_0^t DF(y(\tau), s) - \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(y(\tau), s) \\ &\quad \pm \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(y(\tau), s) \\ &\quad - \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(y(\tau), s) \\ &\quad \pm \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(y(\tau), s) \\ &= \mathcal{V}(t)y + \int_0^t DF(y(\tau), s) - \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(y(\tau), s) \\ &\quad + \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(y(\tau), s) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{V}(t) \left(\int_{-\infty}^0 d_\sigma[P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] - \int_0^\infty d_\sigma[(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \right) \int_0^\sigma DF(y(\tau), s). \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$y_1 := \int_{-\infty}^0 d_\sigma[P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(y(\tau), s) \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$y_2 := \int_0^\infty d_\sigma[(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(y(\tau), s). \tag{3.8}$$

Then it is not difficult to show that the above two integrals are well defined. Note that $y(t)$ is bounded, and since by using (3.4) and conditions (A1)–(A3), the following expression

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t DF(y(\tau), s) - \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(y(\tau), s) \\ & + \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I-P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(y(\tau), s) \end{aligned}$$

is bounded. Then $\mathcal{V}(t)(y + y_1 + y_2)$ is also bounded, which implies that

$$\mathcal{V}(t)(y + y_1 + y_2) = 0$$

due to Proposition 3.4. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &= \int_0^t DF(y(\tau), s) - \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(y(\tau), s) \\ &+ \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I-P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(y(\tau), s). \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Combining (3.6) and (3.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{x}(t) - y(t)\| &\leq \int_0^t \|DF(\tilde{x}(\tau), s) - DF(y(\tau), s)\| \\ &+ \int_{-\infty}^t \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| \int_0^\sigma \|DF(\tilde{x}(\tau), s) - DF(y(\tau), s)\| \\ &+ \int_t^\infty \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I-P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| \int_0^\sigma \|DF(\tilde{x}(\tau), s) - DF(y(\tau), s)\|, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

which implies

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\tilde{x}(t) - y(t)\| \leq \delta \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\tilde{x}(t) - y(t)\|,$$

due to conditions (A1)–(A3) and (2.10), (2.11). Since V_h is sufficiently small such that $\delta < 1$, we assert that $\tilde{x}(t) = y(t)$. Consequently, the uniqueness is claimed. \square

4 Topological conjugacy for the GODEs

In this section, we presents a version of Hartman-Grobman-type theorem in the framework of GODEs.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that assumptions (A1)–(A3) hold. For the sufficiently small V_h , the nonlinear GODEs (3.1) are topologically conjugated to the linear GODEs (2.1).*

Remark 4.2. *Theorem 4.1 states the Hartman-Grobman theorem in the framework of GODEs. We construct two approximate identity maps Φ and Ψ ,*

- (i) *prove that Φ sends the solution of the linear GODEs onto the solution of the nonlinear GODEs;*
- (ii) *prove that Ψ maps the solution of the nonlinear GODEs to the solution of the linear GODEs;*

(iii) verify that Φ is a homeomorphism map and its inverse is Ψ , that is, $\Phi \circ \Psi = I$ and $\Psi \circ \Phi = I$. Finally, the definition of topological conjugacy for nonautonomous systems proposed by Palmer [45] is verified. Different from Palmer, in the GODEs' environment, we use the Kurzweil integral theory to deal with the relationship between more complicated integral equations.

Proof. Step 1. We establish the existence of the map Φ , where $\Phi(t, x) := x + \phi(t, x)$. Let Θ be the space of all maps $\phi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ such that

$$\|\phi\|_\infty := \sup_{t,x} \|\phi(t, x)\| < \infty.$$

Then $(\Theta, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ is a Banach space. Given $\phi \in \Theta$, we define an operator $\mathcal{T} : \Theta \rightarrow \Theta$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{T}\phi)(\tau, \xi) &= \int_0^\tau DF(p(r), s) - \int_{-\infty}^\tau d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(\tau)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(p(r), s) \\ &\quad + \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(\tau)(I-P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(p(r), s), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$p(r) = \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)\xi + \phi(r, \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)\xi) \quad (4.1)$$

and $(\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{X}$. Similar to the procedure of (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_\tau &:= \left\| \int_0^\tau DF(p(r), s) \right\| = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} [F(p(r_j), s_j) - F(p(r_j), s_{j-1})] \right\| \\ &= |h(\tau) - h(0)| \leq 2V_h. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\|(\mathcal{T}\phi)(\tau, \xi)\| \leq C_\tau + \int_{-\infty}^\tau \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(\tau)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| \cdot C_\sigma + \int_\tau^\infty \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(\tau)(I-P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| \cdot C_\sigma < \infty,$$

by Theorem 3.1. This implies that $\mathcal{T}\phi \in \Theta$. Set

$$q_i(r) = \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)\xi + \phi_i(r, \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)\xi), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Then, taking any $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \Theta$, and by using (3.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(\mathcal{T}\phi_1)(\tau, \xi) - (\mathcal{T}\phi_2)(\tau, \xi)\| \\
& \leq \int_0^\tau \|DF(q_1(r), s) - DF(q_2(r), s)\| \\
& \quad + \int_{-\infty}^\tau \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(\tau)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| \int_0^\sigma \|DF(q_1(r), s) - DF(q_2(r), s)\| \\
& \quad + \int_\tau^\infty \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(\tau)(I-P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| \int_0^\sigma \|DF(q_1(r), s) - DF(q_2(r), s)\| \\
& \leq \int_0^\tau \|\phi_1(r, \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)\xi) - \phi_2(r, \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)\xi)\| dh(s) \\
& \quad + \int_{-\infty}^\tau \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(\tau)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| \int_0^\sigma \|\phi_1(r, \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)\xi) - \phi_2(r, \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)\xi)\| dh(s) \\
& \quad + \int_\tau^\infty \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(\tau)(I-P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| \int_0^\sigma \|\phi_1(r, \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)\xi) - \phi_2(r, \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)\xi)\| dh(s).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (A1)–(A3) and (2.10), (2.11) that

$$\|\mathcal{T}\phi_1 - \mathcal{T}\phi_2\|_\infty \leq 2V_h(1 + K\|P\|C^3e^{3CV_A}V_A^2 + K(1 + \|P\|)C^3e^{3CV_A}V_A^2)\|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_\infty.$$

Taking V_h sufficiently small satisfying

$$2V_h(1 + K\|P\|C^3e^{3CV_A}V_A^2 + K(1 + \|P\|)C^3e^{3CV_A}V_A^2) < 1.$$

Then we obtain that the map $\mathcal{T} : \Theta \rightarrow \Theta$ is a contraction and consequently \mathcal{T} has a unique fixed point $\phi \in \Theta$ such that $\mathcal{T}\phi = \phi$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\tau, \xi) &= \int_0^\tau DF(p(r), s) - \int_{-\infty}^\tau d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(\tau)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(p(r), s) \\
& \quad + \int_\tau^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(\tau)(I-P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(p(r), s),
\end{aligned}$$

where $p(r)$ is given by (4.1). By using the identity

$$\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(r)\mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)x = \mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)x,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^t DF(\mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(t)\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)x + \phi(r, \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(t)\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)x), s) \\
&= \int_0^t DF(\mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)x + \phi(r, \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)x), s),
\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& \phi(t, \mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)x) \\
&= \int_0^t DF(\mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)x + \phi(r, \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)x), s) \\
& \quad - \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(\mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)x + \phi(r, \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)x), s) \\
& \quad + \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I-P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(\mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)x + \phi(r, \mathcal{V}(r)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\tau)x), s).
\end{aligned}$$

If $t \mapsto x(t)$ is a solution of (2.1), then

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(t, x(t)) &= \int_0^t DF(x(r) + \phi(r, x(r)), s) - \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(r) + \phi(r, x(r)), s) \\ &\quad + \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(r) + \phi(r, x(r)), s).\end{aligned}$$

We next prove that $\Phi(t, x(t)) := x(t) + \phi(t, x(t))$ sends the solution of the linear GODEs (2.1) onto the solution of the nonlinear GODEs (3.1). In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(t, x(t)) &= \mathcal{V}(t)x + \int_0^t DF(x(r) + \phi(r, x(r)), s) \\ &\quad - \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(r) + \phi(r, x(r)), s) \\ &\quad + \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(r) + \phi(r, x(r)), s) \\ &= \mathcal{V}(t)x + \int_0^t DF(\Phi(r, x(r)), s) - \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(\Phi(r, x(r)), s) \\ &\quad + \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(\Phi(r, x(r)), s) \\ &:= \mathcal{V}(t)x + \int_0^t DF(\Phi(r, x(r)), s) - I_1 + I_2.\end{aligned}$$

We divide the integrals I_1 and I_2 into two parts:

$$I_1 = \int_0^t + \int_{-\infty}^0 := I_{11} + \mathcal{V}(t) \cdot I_{12} \quad \text{and} \quad I_2 = \int_t^0 + \int_0^\infty := I_{21} + \mathcal{V}(t) \cdot I_{22}.$$

It is easy to obtain that

$$-I_{11} + I_{21} = \int_t^0 d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(\Phi(r, x(r)), s).$$

Similar to (3.7) and (3.8), we see that I_{12} and I_{22} are bounded, and we denote them by x_1 and x_2 . Consequently,

$$\Phi(t, x(t)) = \mathcal{V}(t)(x - x_1 + x_2) + \int_0^t DF(\Phi(r, x(r)), s) - \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(\Phi(r, x(r)), s),$$

which implies that $\Phi(t, x(t))$ is a solution of the nonlinear GODEs (3.1).

Step 2. We establish the existence of the map Ψ , where $\Psi(t, x) := x + \psi(t, x)$. Let $x(t, \tau, \xi)$ be the solution of the nonlinear GODEs (3.1) with the initial value $(\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{X}$. Set

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(\tau, \xi) &= - \int_0^\tau DF(x(r, \tau, \xi), s) + \int_{-\infty}^\tau d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(\tau)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(r, \tau, \xi), s) \\ &\quad - \int_\tau^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(\tau)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(r, \tau, \xi), s).\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the procedure in ϕ , we show that $\psi \in \Theta$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(t, x(t, \tau, x)) &= - \int_0^t DF(x(r, \tau, x), s) + \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(r, \tau, x), s) \\ &\quad - \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(r, \tau, x), s) \end{aligned}$$

since the identity

$$x(t, s, x(s, \tau, x)) = x(t, \tau, x).$$

We next prove that $\Psi(t, x(t)) := x(t) + \psi(t, x(t))$ is a solution of the linear GODEs (2.1). In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(t, x(t)) &= \mathcal{V}(t)x + \int_0^t DF(x(r), s) - \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(r), s) \\ &\quad - \int_0^t DF(x(r), s) + \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(r), s) \\ &\quad - \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(r), s) \\ &:= \mathcal{V}(t)x - \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(r), s) + J_1 - J_2. \end{aligned}$$

We also divide the integrals J_1 and J_2 into two parts:

$$J_1 = \int_0^t + \int_{-\infty}^0 := J_{11} + \mathcal{V}(t) \cdot J_{12} \quad \text{and} \quad J_2 = \int_t^0 + \int_0^\infty := J_{21} + \mathcal{V}(t) \cdot J_{22}.$$

Then

$$J_{11} - J_{21} = \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(x(r), s),$$

and J_{12} and J_{22} are bounded, and we denote them by x_3 and x_4 . Hence,

$$\Psi(t, x(t)) = \mathcal{V}(t)(x + x_3 - x_4),$$

which implies that $\Psi(t, x(t))$ maps the solution of the nonlinear GODEs (3.1) onto the solution of the linear GODEs (2.1).

Step 3. This step is to prove $\Psi \circ \Phi = I$, that is, $\Psi(t, \Phi(t, x(t))) = x(t)$, where $x(t)$ is the solution of the linear GODEs (2.1). Indeed, by Step 1, we see that $\Phi(t, x(t))$ is the solution of the nonlinear GODEs (3.1), and by Step 2, $\Psi(t, \Phi(t, x(t)))$ is the solution of the linear GODEs (2.1). We write $\hat{x}(t) = \Psi(t, \Phi(t, x(t)))$. Set $L(t) = \hat{x}(t) - x(t)$. Then $L(t)$ is also the solution of the linear GODEs (2.1). Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|L(t)\| &= \|\Psi(t, \Phi(t, x(t))) - x(t)\| \leq \|\Psi(t, \Phi(t, x(t))) - \Phi(t, x(t))\| + \|\Phi(t, x(t)) - x(t)\| \\ &\leq \|\psi(t, \Phi(t, x(t)))\| + \|\phi(t, x(t))\| < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

since $\phi, \psi \in \Theta$. From Proposition 3.4, it follows that $L(t) = 0$, namely, $\Psi(t, \Phi(t, x(t))) = x(t)$.

Step 4. We claim that $\Phi \circ \Psi = I$, that is, $\Phi(t, \Psi(t, x(t))) = x(t)$, where $x(t)$ is the solution of the

nonlinear GODE (3.1). In fact, it follows from Step 2 and Step 1 that $\Psi(t, x(t))$ is the solution of the linear GODEs (2.1) and $\Phi(t, \Psi(t, x(t)))$ is the solution of the nonlinear GODEs (3.1). We write $\tilde{x}(t) := \Phi(t, \Psi(t, x(t)))$. Set $H(t) = \tilde{x}(t) - x(t)$. Then $H(t)$ is the solution of the following integral equation

$$\begin{aligned} H(t) &= \mathcal{V}(t)(\tilde{x}(0) - x(0)) + \int_0^t (DF(H(r) + x(r), s) - DF(x(r), s)) \\ &\quad - \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma (DF(H(r) + x(r), s) - DF(x(r), s)) \\ &:= K_1 + K_2 - K_3. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \|H(t)\| &= \|\Phi(t, \Psi(t, x(t))) - x(t)\| \leq \|\Phi(t, \Psi(t, x(t))) - \Psi(t, x(t))\| + \|\Psi(t, x(t)) - x(t)\| \\ &\leq \|\phi(t, \Psi(t, x(t)))\| + \|\psi(t, x(t))\| < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

due to $\phi, \psi \in \Theta$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} K_3 &= \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma (DF(H(r) + x(r), s) - DF(x(r), s)) \\ &= \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma (DF(H(r) + x(r), s) - DF(x(r), s)) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma (DF(H(r) + x(r), s) - DF(x(r), s)) \\ &:= K_{31} + \mathcal{V}(t) \cdot K_{32} + K_{33} + \mathcal{V}(t) \cdot K_{34}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K_{31} &= \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma (DF(H(r) + x(r), s) - DF(x(r), s)), \\ K_{32} &= \int_0^{-\infty} d_\sigma[P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma (DF(H(r) + x(r), s) - DF(x(r), s)), \\ K_{33} &= - \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma (DF(H(r) + x(r), s) - DF(x(r), s)), \\ K_{34} &= \int_0^\infty d_\sigma[(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma (DF(H(r) + x(r), s) - DF(x(r), s)). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (3.7) and (3.8), the integrals K_{32} and K_{34} are bounded, we denote them by x_5 and x_6 . By using Theorem 3.1, it is obvious that the integral $K_2 + K_{31} + K_{33}$ is bounded. It means that $K_1 + \mathcal{V}(t)(x_5 + x_6)$ is bounded, but $K_1 + \mathcal{V}(t)(x_5 + x_6)$ is a solution of the linear GODE (2.1), which further implies that $K_1 + \mathcal{V}(t)(x_5 + x_6) = 0$ (by using Proposition 3.4). Thus, (4.2) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} H(t) &= \int_0^t (DF(H(r) + x(r), s) - DF(x(r), s)) \\ &\quad - \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma (DF(H(r) + x(r), s) - DF(x(r), s)) \\ &\quad + \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma (DF(H(r) + x(r), s) - DF(x(r), s)) \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (3.10), we have

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|H(t)\| \leq \delta \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|H(t)\|,$$

where $\delta < 1$. Therefore, $H(t) = 0$, namely, $\Phi(t, \Psi(t, x(t))) = x(t)$.

Consequently, it follows from Steps 1–4 that the nonlinear GODEs (3.1) is topologically conjugated to the linear GODEs (2.1). \square

5 Hölder conjugacies

In this section, we consider the Hölder regularity for the conjugacies Φ and Ψ . We propose a strong hypothesis:

$$\|F(x, s) - F(x, t)\| \leq e^{-\alpha|s-t|} |h(s) - h(t)|, \quad \text{for } t, s \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (5.1)$$

where α is defined in (2.5). Notice that this hypothesis does not change our linearization results since

$$e^{-\alpha|s-t|} |h(s) - h(t)| \leq |h(s) - h(t)|.$$

Then we have the result of this section.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that all conditions of Theorem 4.1 hold. If further $F(x, t)$ satisfies (5.1), then*

(i) *there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ satisfying $0 < \|x - \tilde{x}\| < 1$, we have*

$$\|\Psi(t, x) - \Psi(t, \tilde{x})\| \leq C \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}},$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}$ is given by Definition 2.6;

(ii) *there exist positive constants $\widehat{C} > 0$ and $0 < q \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}$ such that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ satisfying $0 < \|x - \tilde{x}\| < 1$, we have*

$$\|\Phi(t, x) - \Phi(t, \tilde{x})\| \leq \widehat{C} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^q.$$

Remark 5.2. *We emphasize that condition (5.1) is to help us deal with the integral term $\int_0^t DF(X(\tau), s)$ under Kurzweil integrable. If it is under Riemann integrable or Lebesgue integrable, condition (5.1) is not required, one can refer to Pinto and Robledo [69].*

To prove it, we first present some useful inequalities and then give rigorous proofs in subsections 5.2 and 5.3, respectively. For the sake of convenience, given $t, t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x, y \in X$, let $X(t, t_0, x)$ be the solution of Eq. (3.1) satisfying the initial value $x(t_0) = x$, and let $Y(t, t_0, y) = \mathcal{V}(t)y$ be the solution of Eq. (2.1) such that $Y(t_0) = y$.

5.1 Some useful estimates

Lemma 5.3. ([21], Corollary 1.43) *Suppose that $h : [a, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a nondecreasing left continuous function. If $u : [a, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is bounded and Perron-Stieltjes integrable with respect to h such that*

$$u(t) \leq c_1 + c_2 \int_a^t u(s)dh(s), \quad t \in [a, \infty),$$

where $c_1, c_2 > 0$ are constants, then

$$u(t) \leq c_1 e^{c_2|h(t)-h(0)|}.$$

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose that the linear GODE (2.1) admits a strong exponential dichotomy and conditions (A1)-(A3) hold. Then we have*

$$\|X(t, 0, x) - X(t, 0, \tilde{x})\| \leq K \|x - \tilde{x}\| e^{(1+\mathcal{L})|h(t)-h(0)|} e^{\tilde{\alpha}|t|}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $\mathcal{L} := KC^3 e^{3CVA} V_A^2$.

Proof. Since $X(t, 0, x)$ is the solution of the nonlinear GODE (3.1), we obtain that for any $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} X(t, 0, x) - X(t, 0, \tilde{x}) &= \mathcal{V}(t)(x - \tilde{x}) + \int_0^t (DF(X(\tau, 0, x), s) - DF(X(\tau, 0, \tilde{x}), s)) \\ &\quad - \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma (DF(X(\tau, 0, x), s) - DF(X(\tau, 0, \tilde{x}), s)) ds. \end{aligned}$$

By taking the supremum norm and using strong exponential dichotomy (see Definition 2.6) and (A2), (A3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|X(t, 0, x) - X(t, 0, \tilde{x})\| &\leq K e^{\tilde{\alpha}t} \|x - \tilde{x}\| + \int_0^t \|X(s, 0, x) - X(s, 0, \tilde{x})\| dh(s) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)]\| \int_0^\sigma \|X(s, 0, x) - X(s, 0, \tilde{x})\| dh(s). \end{aligned}$$

Set $Z(t) := e^{-\tilde{\alpha}t} \|X(t, 0, x) - X(t, 0, \tilde{x})\|$. Then

$$Z(t) \leq K \|x - \tilde{x}\| + \int_0^t e^{\tilde{\alpha}(s-t)} Z(s) dh(s) + \left\| \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \right\| \int_0^\sigma e^{\tilde{\alpha}(s-t)} Z(s) dh(s).$$

We deal with the integral $\left\| \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \right\|$. Given a ϵ -fine tagged division $D = \{(\tau_j, [s_{j-1}, s_j]), j = 1, 2, \dots, |D|\}$ of $[0, t]$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_0^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \right\| &= \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} [\mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(s_j) - \mathcal{V}(t)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(s_{j-1})] \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} \|\mathcal{V}(t)\| \|\mathcal{V}^{-1}(s_j) - \mathcal{V}^{-1}(s_{j-1})\|. \end{aligned}$$

By using Theorem 6.15 in [1], one has

$$\|V(t, s)\| \leq C e^{C \text{var}_s^t A}, \quad \text{var}_s^t V(\cdot, s) \leq C e^{C \text{var}_s^t A} \text{var}_s^t A \quad \text{and} \quad \text{var}_s^t V(t, \cdot) \leq C^2 e^{2C \text{var}_s^t A} \text{var}_s^t A,$$

Recall that $\mathcal{V}^{-1}(t) = V(0, t)$. Then by condition (A2), the following estimate holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} \|\mathcal{V}(t)\| \|\mathcal{V}^{-1}(s_j) - \mathcal{V}^{-1}(s_{j-1})\| &\leq K e^{\tilde{\alpha}(t-s)} \|\mathcal{V}(s)\| C^2 e^{2C \text{var}_s^t A} \text{var}_s^t A \\ &\leq K e^{\tilde{\alpha}(t-s)} C^3 e^{3C V_A} V_A^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} Z(t) &\leq K \|x - \tilde{x}\| + \int_0^t e^{\tilde{\alpha}(s-t)} Z(s) dh(s) + \int_0^\sigma K C^3 e^{3C V_A} V_A^2 \cdot Z(s) dh(s) \\ &\leq K \|x - \tilde{x}\| + \int_0^t Z(s) dh(s) + \int_0^t K C^3 e^{3C V_A} V_A^2 \cdot Z(s) dh(s) \\ &\leq K \|x - \tilde{x}\| + \int_0^t (1 + K C^3 e^{3C V_A} V_A^2) \cdot Z(s) dh(s), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$Z(t) \leq K \|x - \tilde{x}\| e^{(1 + K C^3 e^{3C V_A} V_A^2)(h(t) - h(0))},$$

due to Lemma 5.3. Hence, for all $t \geq 0$, we conclude that

$$\|X(t, 0, x) - X(t, 0, \tilde{x})\| \leq K \|x - \tilde{x}\| e^{(1 + K C^3 e^{3C V_A} V_A^2)(h(t) - h(0))} e^{\tilde{\alpha} t}.$$

A similar conclusion is reached for $t \leq 0$. □

5.2 Hölder continuous for the conjugacy Ψ

We claim in this subsection that $\Psi(t, x) := x + \psi(t, x)$ is Hölder continuous with respect to x . For this purpose, we estimate $\psi(t, x) - \psi(t, \tilde{x})$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(t, x) - \psi(t, \tilde{x}) &= - \int_0^t (DF(X(r, t, x), s) - DF(X(r, t, \tilde{x}), s)) \\ &\quad + \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t) P \mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma (DF(X(r, t, x), s) - DF(X(r, t, \tilde{x}), s)) \\ &\quad - \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t) (I - P) \mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma (DF(X(r, t, x), s) - DF(X(r, t, \tilde{x}), s)) \\ &:= \mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2 + \mathcal{I}_3. \end{aligned}$$

We then deal with \mathcal{I}_1 , \mathcal{I}_2 and \mathcal{I}_3 . Without loss of generality, assume that $0 < \|x - \tilde{x}\| < 1$. Set $\theta = \frac{1}{\tilde{\alpha} + \alpha} \ln \frac{1}{\|x - \tilde{x}\|}$ such that $t - \theta \geq \theta$, where $\tilde{\alpha}$ is given by Definition 2.6. Then we split \mathcal{I}_1 , \mathcal{I}_2 and

\mathcal{I}_3 into several parts:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_1 &= - \int_0^\theta - \int_\theta^{t-\theta} - \int_{t-\theta}^t = \mathcal{I}_{11} + \mathcal{I}_{12} + \mathcal{I}_{13}, \\ \mathcal{I}_2 &= \int_{-\infty}^{t-\theta} + \int_{t-\theta}^t = \mathcal{I}_{21} + \mathcal{I}_{22}, \\ \mathcal{I}_3 &= - \int_{t+\theta}^\infty - \int_t^{t+\theta} = \mathcal{I}_{31} + \mathcal{I}_{32}.\end{aligned}$$

From the definition of Kurzweil integral and conditions (A3), (5.1), there is a ϵ -fine tagged division of $[0, \theta]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{I}_{11}\| &\leq 2 \left\| \int_0^\theta DF(X(r, t, x), s) \right\| \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} e^{-\alpha(s_j - s_{j-1})} |h(s_j) - h(s_{j-1})| \\ &\leq 4V_h e^{-\alpha\theta} \leq 4V_h \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\alpha}}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{I}_{12}\| &\leq 2 \left\| \int_\theta^{t-\theta} DF(X(r, t, x), s) \right\| \leq 2 \left\| \int_0^{t-\theta} DF(X(r, t, x), s) \right\| \\ &\leq 4V_h e^{-\alpha(t-\theta)} \leq 4V_h e^{-\alpha\theta} \leq 4V_h \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\alpha}}.\end{aligned}$$

By using conditions (A1)–(A3) and (2.10), (2.11), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{I}_{21}\| &\leq 2 \left\| \int_{-\infty}^{t-\theta} d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(X(r, t, x), s) \right\| \\ &\leq 4e^{-\alpha\sigma} V_h \lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \int_{-\eta}^{t-\theta} d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \right\| \\ &\leq 4V_h e^{-\alpha\sigma} K^2 C^3 e^{3CV_A V_A^2} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\alpha(t-\theta+\eta)} \\ &\leq 4V_h e^{-\alpha\sigma} K^2 C^3 e^{3CV_A V_A^2} e^{-\alpha\theta} \\ &\leq 4V_h e^{-\alpha\sigma} K^2 C^3 e^{3CV_A V_A^2} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\alpha}}.\end{aligned}$$

By a similar procedure, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{I}_{31}\| &\leq 2 \left\| \int_{t+\theta}^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I-P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(X(r, t, x), s) \right\| \\ &\leq 4V_h e^{-\alpha\sigma} K(1+K)C^3 e^{3CV_A V_A^2} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\alpha}}.\end{aligned}$$

It remains to estimate \mathcal{I}_{13} , \mathcal{I}_{22} and \mathcal{I}_{32} . From condition (A3) and Lemma 5.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{I}_{13}\| &\leq \int_{t-\theta}^t \|X(s, t, x) - X(s, t, \tilde{x})\| dh(s) \\
&\leq \int_{t-\theta}^t K \|x - \tilde{x}\| e^{2(1+\mathcal{L})V_h} e^{\tilde{\alpha}|s-t|} dh(s) \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} K \|x - \tilde{x}\| e^{2(1+\mathcal{L})V_h} e^{\tilde{\alpha}(t-s_j)} |h(s_j) - h(s_{j-1})| \\
&\leq 2K e^{2(1+\mathcal{L})V_h} e^{\tilde{\alpha}\theta} \theta V_h \|x - \tilde{x}\| \\
&\leq 2K\theta V_h e^{2(1+\mathcal{L})V_h} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\tilde{\alpha}+\alpha}}, \\
\|\mathcal{I}_{22}\| &\leq \left\| \int_{t-\theta}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \right\| \left\| \int_0^\sigma \|X(s, t, x) - X(s, t, \tilde{x})\| dh(s) \right\| \\
&\leq 2K\theta V_h e^{2(1+\mathcal{L})V_h} K^2 C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_A^2 e^{(\tilde{\alpha}-\alpha)\theta} \|x - \tilde{x}\| \\
&\leq 2\theta K^3 C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_A^2 V_h e^{2(1+\mathcal{L})V_h} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{2\alpha}{\tilde{\alpha}+\alpha}}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{I}_{32}\| &\leq \left\| \int_{t-\theta}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I-P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \right\| \left\| \int_0^\sigma \|X(s, t, x) - X(s, t, \tilde{x})\| dh(s) \right\| \\
&\leq 2\theta(1+K)K^2 C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_A^2 V_h e^{2(1+\mathcal{L})V_h} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{2\alpha}{\tilde{\alpha}+\alpha}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, it follows from the above all inequalities that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\psi(t, x) - \psi(t, \tilde{x})\| &\leq \|\mathcal{I}_1\| + \|\mathcal{I}_2\| + \|\mathcal{I}_3\| \\
&\leq 8V_h \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\tilde{\alpha}+\alpha}} + 8V_h e^{-\alpha\sigma} K^2 C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_A^2 \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\tilde{\alpha}+\alpha}} \\
&\quad + 2K\theta V_h e^{2(1+\mathcal{L})V_h} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\tilde{\alpha}+\alpha}} + 2\theta K^3 C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_A^2 V_h e^{2(1+\mathcal{L})V_h} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{2\alpha}{\tilde{\alpha}+\alpha}} \\
&\quad + 2\theta(1+K)K^2 C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_A^2 V_h e^{2(1+\mathcal{L})V_h} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{2\alpha}{\tilde{\alpha}+\alpha}} \\
&\leq C_1 \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\tilde{\alpha}+\alpha}},
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$. Consequently, if $\|x - \tilde{x}\| < 1$, then

$$\|\Psi(t, x) - \Psi(t, \tilde{x})\| \leq \|x - \tilde{x}\| + \|\psi(t, x) - \psi(t, \tilde{x})\| \leq C \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\tilde{\alpha}+\alpha}},$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

5.3 Hölder continuous for the conjugacy Φ

Next, we claim that $\Phi(t, x) := x + \phi(t, x)$ is Hölder continuous with respect to x . By Step 1 in Theorem 4.1, we see that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \phi_k(t, x) = \phi(t, x), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Furthermore, we define $\phi_0(t, x) = 0$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and by recursion define

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{k+1}(t, x) &= \int_0^t DF(Y(r, t, x) + \phi_k(r, Y(r, t, x)), s) \\ &\quad - \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(Y(r, t, x) + \phi_k(r, Y(r, t, x)), s) \\ &\quad + \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(Y(r, t, x) + \phi_k(r, Y(r, t, x)), s).\end{aligned}$$

Now we prove that if $0 < \|x - \tilde{x}\| < 1$, then

$$\|\phi_k(t, x) - \phi_k(t, \tilde{x})\| \leq \tilde{C}\|x - \tilde{x}\|^q, \quad (5.2)$$

where $\tilde{C} > 0$ and $0 < q \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + \alpha}$. If $k = 0$, then the inequality (5.2) holds obviously. Making the inductive assumption that (5.2) holds, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\phi_{k+1}(t, x) - \phi_{k+1}(t, \tilde{x})\| &\leq \left\| \int_0^t \bar{h}(r) \right\| + \left\| \int_{-\infty}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma \bar{h}(r) \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \int_t^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma \bar{h}(r) \right\| \\ &:= \mathcal{J}_1 + \mathcal{J}_2 + \mathcal{J}_3,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\bar{h}(r) = DF(Y(r, t, x) + \phi_k(r, Y(r, t, x)), s) - DF(Y(r, t, \tilde{x}) + \phi_k(r, Y(r, t, \tilde{x})), s).$$

We also split \mathcal{J}_1 , \mathcal{J}_2 and \mathcal{J}_3 into several parts:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_1 &= \int_0^\theta + \int_\theta^{t-\theta} + \int_{t-\theta}^t = \mathcal{J}_{11} + \mathcal{J}_{12} + \mathcal{J}_{13}, \\ \mathcal{J}_2 &= - \int_{-\infty}^{t-\theta} - \int_{t-\theta}^t = \mathcal{J}_{21} + \mathcal{J}_{22}, \\ \mathcal{J}_3 &= \int_{t+\theta}^\infty + \int_t^{t+\theta} = \mathcal{J}_{31} + \mathcal{J}_{32},\end{aligned}$$

where $\theta = \frac{1}{\bar{\alpha} + \alpha} \ln \frac{1}{\|x - \tilde{x}\|}$ such that $t - \theta \geq \theta$. Similar to \mathcal{I}_{11} , \mathcal{I}_{12} , \mathcal{I}_{21} and \mathcal{I}_{31} , the following estimates are valid:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{J}_{11}\| &\leq 2 \left\| \int_0^\theta DF(Y(r, t, x) + \phi_k(r, Y(r, t, x)), s) \right\| \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} e^{-\alpha(s_j - s_{j-1})} |h(s_j) - h(s_{j-1})| \leq 4V_h \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha} + \alpha}}, \\
\|\mathcal{J}_{12}\| &\leq 2 \left\| \int_\theta^{t-\theta} DF(Y(r, t, x) + \phi_k(r, Y(r, t, x)), s) \right\| \leq 4V_h \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha} + \alpha}}, \\
\|\mathcal{J}_{21}\| &\leq 2 \left\| \int_{-\infty}^{t-\theta} d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(Y(r, t, x) + \phi_k(r, Y(r, t, x)), s) \right\| \\
&\leq 4V_h e^{-\alpha\sigma} K^2 C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_A^2 \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha} + \alpha}}, \\
\|\mathcal{J}_{31}\| &\leq 2 \left\| \int_{t+\theta}^\infty d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \int_0^\sigma DF(Y(r, t, x) + \phi_k(r, Y(r, t, x)), s) \right\| \\
&\leq 4V_h e^{-\alpha\sigma} (1 + K) K C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_A^2 \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha} + \alpha}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\|Y(s, t, x) - Y(s, t, \tilde{x})\| \leq K e^{\bar{\alpha}|t-s|} \|x - \tilde{x}\|$$

and by (5.2),

$$\|\phi_k(s, Y(s, t, x)) - \phi_k(s, Y(s, t, \tilde{x}))\| \leq \tilde{C} K^q e^{\bar{\alpha}q|t-s|} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^q,$$

for $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{J}_{13}\| &\leq \int_{t-\theta}^t \|Y(s, t, x) - Y(s, t, \tilde{x}) + \phi_k(s, Y(s, t, x)) - \phi_k(s, Y(s, t, \tilde{x}))\| dh(s) \\
&\leq \int_{t-\theta}^t K e^{\bar{\alpha}(t-s)} \|x - \tilde{x}\| dh(s) + \int_{t-\theta}^t \tilde{C} K^q e^{\bar{\alpha}q(t-s)} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^q dh(s) \\
&\leq K \|x - \tilde{x}\| \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} e^{\bar{\alpha}(t-s_j)} |h(s_j) - h(s_{j-1})| + \tilde{C} K^q \|x - \tilde{x}\|^q \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} e^{\bar{\alpha}q(t-s_j)} |h(s_j) - h(s_{j-1})| \\
&\leq 2K\theta V_h \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{\bar{\alpha} + \alpha}} + 2\tilde{C} K^q \theta V_h \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}q}{\bar{\alpha} + \alpha}},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{J}_{22}\| &\leq \left\| \int_{t-\theta}^t d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)P\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \right\| \int_0^\sigma \|Y(s, t, x) - Y(s, t, \tilde{x}) + \phi_k(s, Y(s, t, x)) - \phi_k(s, Y(s, t, \tilde{x}))\| dh(s) \\
&\leq 2K^3 \theta C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_h V_A^2 e^{(\bar{\alpha} - \alpha)\theta} \|x - \tilde{x}\| + 2\tilde{C} K^{2+q} \theta C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_h V_A^2 e^{(\bar{\alpha}q - \alpha)\theta} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^q \\
&\leq 2K^3 \theta C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_h V_A^2 \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{2\alpha}{\bar{\alpha} + \alpha}} + 2\tilde{C} K^{2+q} \theta C^3 \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha q + \alpha}{\bar{\alpha} + \alpha}},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{J}_{32}\| &\leq \left\| \int_t^{t+\theta} d_\sigma[\mathcal{V}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\sigma)] \right\| \int_0^\sigma \|Y(s, t, x) - Y(s, t, \tilde{x}) + \phi_k(s, Y(s, t, x)) - \phi_k(s, Y(s, t, \tilde{x}))\| dh(s) \\
&\leq 2(1 + K) K^2 \theta C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_h V_A^2 \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{2\alpha}{\bar{\alpha} + \alpha}} + 2\tilde{C} (1 + K) K^{1+q} \theta C^3 \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha q + \alpha}{\bar{\alpha} + \alpha}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $0 < q \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\alpha}$, and from the above all inequalities, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\phi_{k+1}(t, x) - \phi_{k+1}(t, \tilde{x})\| &\leq \|\mathcal{J}_1\| + \|\mathcal{J}_2\| + \|\mathcal{J}_3\| \\
&\leq 8V_h \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\alpha}} + 4V_h e^{-\alpha\sigma} K^2 C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_A^2 \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\alpha}} \\
&\quad + 4V_h e^{-\alpha\sigma} (1+K) K C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_A^2 \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\alpha}} + 2K\theta V_h \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\alpha}} \\
&\quad + 2\tilde{C} K^q \theta V_h \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha q}{\alpha+\alpha}} + 2K^3 \theta C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_h V_A^2 \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{2\alpha}{\alpha+\alpha}} \\
&\quad + 2\tilde{C} K^{2+q} \theta C^3 \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha q + \alpha}{\alpha+\alpha}} + 2(1+K) K^2 \theta C^3 e^{3CV_A} V_h V_A^2 \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{2\alpha}{\alpha+\alpha}} \\
&\quad + 2\tilde{C} (1+K) K^{1+q} \theta C^3 \|x - \tilde{x}\|^{\frac{\alpha q + \alpha}{\alpha+\alpha}} \\
&\leq \tilde{C} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^q,
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $\tilde{C} > 0$, which implies that (5.2) holds for all k . Consequently, if $\|x - \tilde{x}\| < 1$, then

$$\|\Phi(t, x) - \Phi(t, \tilde{x})\| \leq \tilde{C} \|x - \tilde{x}\|^q.$$

6 Applications

6.1 A Hartman-Grobman theorem for Measure differential equations (MDEs)

6.1.1 Fundamental theory for MDEs

Denote that \mathcal{X} is a Banach space and $\mathbb{I} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an interval. Consider the linear MDE

$$Dx = \mathcal{A}(t)x + \mathcal{C}(t)Du, \tag{6.1}$$

where Dx and Du denote the distributional derivatives of x and u , and the functions $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$, $\mathcal{C} : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ and $u : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the following conditions:

(D1) $\mathcal{A}(t)$ is Perron integrable for any $t \in \mathbb{I}$.

(D2) $u(t)$ is of locally bounded variation for any $t \in \mathbb{I}$ and continuous from the left on $\mathbb{I} \setminus \{\inf \mathbb{I}\}$.

(D3) du denotes the Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure generated by the function u , $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is Perron-Stieltjes integrable with respect to u for any $t \in \mathbb{I}$.

Moreover, we consider some additional assumptions:

(D4) There is a Lebesgue measure function $m_1 : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying for any $c, d \in \mathbb{I}$, we have $\int_c^d m_1(s) ds < \infty$ and

$$\left\| \int_c^d \mathcal{A}(s) ds \right\| \leq \int_c^d m_1(s) ds.$$

(D5) There exists a function du -measurable $m_2 : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying for any $c, d \in \mathbb{I}$, we have $\int_c^d m_2(s) du(s) < \infty$ and

$$\left\| \int_c^d \mathcal{C}(s) du(s) \right\| \leq \int_c^d m_2(s) du(s).$$

(D6) For all t such that t is a point of discontinuity of u , we have

$$\left(I + \lim_{r \rightarrow t^+} \int_t^r \mathcal{C}(s) du(s) \right)^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}).$$

By conditions (D1)–(D3), we say that $x : [c, d] \subset \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a solution of (6.1) satisfying the initial value $x(t_0) = x_0$, if

$$x(t) = x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t \mathcal{A}(s)x(s)ds + \int_{t_0}^t \mathcal{C}(s)x(s)du(s).$$

If all conditions (D1)–(D6) hold, then the existence and uniqueness of a solution of (6.1) associated to the initial value $x(t_0) = x_0$ follows from Theorem 5.2 in [20] immediately. Hence, conditions (D1)–(D6) are valid throughout this subsection.

Lemma 6.1. ([1] Theorem 5.17) *Given $t_0 \in [c, d]$, the function $x : [c, d] \subset \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a solution of (6.1) iff x is a solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x + G(t)x], \\ x(t_0) = x_0, \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

where $A(t) = \int_{t_0}^t \mathcal{A}(s)ds$ and $G(t) = \int_{t_0}^t \mathcal{C}(s)du(s)$.

The fundamental operator $U : \mathbb{I} \times \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ of MDEs (6.1) was given by [20] satisfying

$$U(t, s) = I + \int_s^t \mathcal{A}(r)U(r, s)dr + \int_s^t \mathcal{C}(r)U(r, s)du(r), \quad t, s \in \mathbb{I}. \quad (6.3)$$

Moreover, the function $x(t) = U(t, t_0)x_0$ is the solution of (6.1) satisfying the initial value $x(t_0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$.

Definition 6.2. (exponential dichotomy, [20]) *The MDEs (6.1) have an exponential dichotomy with (P, K, α) on \mathbb{I} , if there exist a projection $P : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and constants K, α satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \|\mathcal{U}(t)P\mathcal{U}^{-1}(s)\| \leq Ke^{-\alpha(t-s)}, & t \geq s; \\ \|\mathcal{U}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{U}^{-1}(s)\| \leq Ke^{\alpha(t-s)}, & t \leq s, \end{cases} \quad (6.4)$$

where $\mathcal{U}(t) = U(t, 0)$ and $\mathcal{U}^{-1}(t) = U(0, t)$.

Definition 6.3. (strong exponential dichotomy) *The MDEs (6.1) have a strong exponential dichotomy on \mathbb{I} , if (6.4) holds and there exists a positive constant $\tilde{\alpha} > \alpha$ such that*

$$\|\mathcal{U}(t)\mathcal{U}^{-1}(s)\| \leq Ke^{\tilde{\alpha}|t-s|}, \quad \text{for } t, s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (6.5)$$

Lemma 6.4. ([20] Proposition 5.7) *The MDEs (6.1) have an exponential dichotomy with (P, K, α) iff the GODEs*

$$\frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x + F(t)x], \quad t \in \mathbb{I}, \quad (6.6)$$

have an exponential dichotomy with (P, K, α) , where $A(t) = \int_{t_0}^t \mathcal{A}(s)ds$ and $G(t) = \int_{t_0}^t \mathcal{C}(s)du(s)$.

6.1.2 Main results for MDEs

Consider the nonlinear MDEs as follows.

$$Dx = \mathcal{A}(t)x + \mathcal{C}(t)xDu + \mathcal{H}(t, x)Du, \quad (6.7)$$

where $\mathcal{H}(t, x) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is Lebesgue-Stieltjes integrable with respect to u and $\mathcal{H}(t, 0) = 0$. Suppose that:

(a) for all t such that t is a point of discontinuity of u , there exists a positive constant $C_g > 0$ satisfying

$$\left\| \left(Id + \lim_{r \rightarrow t^+} \int_t^r \mathcal{C}(s) du(s) \right)^{-1} \right\| \leq C_g;$$

(b) u is a bounded variation function on \mathbb{R} , i.e.,

$$V_u := \sup\{\text{var}_c^d u : c, d \in \mathbb{R}, c < d\} < \infty;$$

(c) $\mathcal{H}(t, x)$ is uniformly bounded in $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with constant $M_h > 0$ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, i.e.,

$$\|\mathcal{H}(t, x)\| \leq M_h;$$

(d) there is a sufficiently small Lipschitz constant L_h such that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\|\mathcal{H}(t, x) - \mathcal{H}(t, \tilde{x})\| \leq L_h \|x - \tilde{x}\|.$$

Then we establish our main results for MDEs.

Theorem 6.5. *Suppose that linear MDEs (6.1) possess an exponential dichotomy with the form (6.4). Further assume that conditions (a), (b), (c), (d) hold. If*

$$2L_h V_u (1 + K(1 + 2K)C_g^3 e^{3C_g V_{A+F}} V_{A+F}^2) < 1,$$

then Eq. (6.7) has a unique bounded solution.

Theorem 6.6. *Suppose that all conditions of Theorem 6.5 hold. Then the linear MDEs (6.1) are topologically conjugated to the nonlinear MDEs (6.7).*

Theorem 6.7. *Suppose that linear MDEs (6.1) admits a strong exponential dichotomy with the form (6.5) and all conditions of Theorem 6.5 hold. If further the bounded variation function u satisfies $|u(t) - u(s)| \leq e^{-\alpha|t-s|}$, then the conjugacies are both Hölder continuous.*

We only prove Theorem 6.5, and verify that Theorem 6.5 satisfies all the conditions of Theorem 3.1. The proofs of the other two theorems are similar to Theorem 6.5.

Proof of Theorem 6.5. Since (6.1) has an exponential dichotomy with (P, K, α) , we derive from Lemma 6.4 that

$$\frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x + F(t)x]$$

has an exponential dichotomy with the same (P, K, α) on \mathbb{R} .

Note that the solution of Eq. (6.7) with the initial value $x(t_0) = x_0$ is defined by

$$x(t) = x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t \mathcal{A}(s)x(s)ds + \int_{t_0}^t \mathcal{C}(s)x(s)du(s) + \int_{t_0}^t \mathcal{H}(s, x(s))du(s).$$

Given $t, t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and set $A(t) = \int_{t_0}^t \mathcal{A}(s)ds$, $F(t) = \int_{t_0}^t \mathcal{C}(s)du(s)$. We define the Kurzweil integrable map $\mathcal{N} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$

$$\mathcal{N}(x(t), t) := \int_{t_0}^t \mathcal{H}(s, x(s))du(s).$$

Then we have

$$x(t) = x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t d[A(s)]x(s) + \int_{t_0}^t d[F(s)]x(s) + \int_{t_0}^t DN(x(s), s),$$

which is a solution of the following nonlinear GODEs with the initial value $x(t_0) = x_0$

$$\frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x + F(t)x + \mathcal{N}(x, t)]. \quad (6.8)$$

We now claim that $\mathcal{N}(x, t)$ belongs to the class $\mathcal{A}(\Omega, u)$, here $\Omega = \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$. In fact, for any $t, \tilde{t} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, by using condition (c), we have

$$\|\mathcal{N}(x, t) - \mathcal{N}(x, \tilde{t})\| = \left\| \int_{\tilde{t}}^t \mathcal{H}(s, x)du(s) \right\| \leq \|\mathcal{H}(s, x)\| |u(t) - u(\tilde{t})| \leq M_h |u(t) - u(\tilde{t})|,$$

and for any $t, \tilde{t} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, by using conditions (c) and (d), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{N}(x, t) - \mathcal{N}(x, \tilde{t}) - \mathcal{N}(\tilde{x}, t) + \mathcal{N}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t})\| &= \left\| \int_{\tilde{t}}^t (\mathcal{H}(s, x) - \mathcal{H}(s, \tilde{x})) du(s) \right\| \\ &\leq \int_{\tilde{t}}^t \|\mathcal{H}(s, x) - \mathcal{H}(s, \tilde{x})\| du(s) \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{H}(s, x) - \mathcal{H}(s, \tilde{x})\| |u(t) - u(\tilde{t})| \\ &\leq L_h \|x - \tilde{x}\| |u(t) - u(\tilde{t})|. \end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 5.2 of [20], it follows that $\text{var}_c^d(A + F) < \infty$ for all $c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c < d$. For convenience, we write $V_{A+F} = \text{var}_c^d(A + F)$. Indeed, let $D = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{|D|}\}$ be a division of $[c, d]$. Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{|D|} \|A(t_j) + F(t_j) - A(t_{j-1}) - F(t_{j-1})\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} \left\| \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \mathcal{A}(s)ds \right\| + \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} \left\| \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \mathcal{C}(s)du(s) \right\|,$$

by using condition (D4) and (D5), we deduce that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{|D|} \left\| \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \mathcal{A}(s) ds \right\| + \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} \left\| \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \mathcal{C}(s) du(s) \right\| \leq \int_c^d m_1(s) ds + \int_c^d m_2(s) du(s) < \infty,$$

that is, $V_{A+F} < \infty$. Hence, taking L_h is sufficiently small, and by using conditions (a), (b), (c) and (d), we can ensure that

$$2L_h V_u (1 + K(1 + 2K)) C_g^3 e^{3C_g V_{A+F}} V_{A+F}^2 < 1.$$

Consequently, all conditions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied, we assert that Eq. (6.7) has a unique bounded solution. \square

6.2 A Hartman-Grobman theorem for the impulsive differential equations (IDEs)

6.2.1 Fundamental theory for IDEs

Denote that \mathcal{X} is a Banach space and $\mathbb{I} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an interval. We consider the linear IDEs

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = \tilde{A}(t)x(t), & t \neq t_i, \\ \Delta x(t_i) = x(t_i^+) - x(t_i) = B_i x(t_i), & i \in \mathcal{I} := \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : t_i \in \mathbb{I}\}, \end{cases} \quad (6.9)$$

where $\tilde{A} : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ and $B_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ satisfy the following assumptions:

(B1) $\tilde{A}(t)$ is Perron integrable for any $t \in \mathbb{I}$;

(B2) there is a Lebesgue measure function $m : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying for any $c, d \in \mathbb{I}$ and $c < d$, the Lebesgue integral $\int_c^d m(s) ds$ is finite and

$$\left\| \int_c^d \tilde{A}(s) ds \right\| \leq \int_c^d m(s) ds.$$

(B3) $(I + B_i)^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$, where $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

In addition, let $\{t_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be the impulsive points satisfying the relation

$$\cdots < t_{-k} < \cdots < t_{-1} < t_0 = 0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_k < \cdots,$$

and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \pm\infty} t_k = \pm\infty$. Set $\mathcal{I}_c^d := \{i \in \mathcal{I} : c \leq t_i \leq d\}$ for $c, d \in \mathbb{I}$. Define the Heaviside function H_l :

$$H_l(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{for } t \leq l, \\ 1, & \text{for } t > l. \end{cases}$$

Then, the solution of Eq. (6.9) with the initial value $x(t_0) = x_0$ satisfying the following integral equation

$$x(t) = \begin{cases} x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t \tilde{A}(s)x(s) ds + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_c^t} B_i x(t_i) H_{t_i}(t), & t \geq t_0 (t \in \mathbb{I}), \\ x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t \tilde{A}(s)x(s) ds - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_t^{t_0}} B_i x(t_i) (1 - H_{t_i}(t)), & t < t_0 (t \in \mathbb{I}). \end{cases}$$

Then by using Theorem 5.20 from [1], $x(t)$ is a solution of Eq. (6.9) iff $x(t)$ is a solution of the linear GODE $\frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x]$, where A is given by

$$A(t) = \begin{cases} \int_{t_0}^t \tilde{A}(s)ds + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_{t_0}^t} B_i H_{t_i}(t), & t \geq t_0, \\ \int_{t_0}^t \tilde{A}(s)ds - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_i^{t_0}} B_i (1 - H_{t_i}(t)), & t < t_0. \end{cases} \quad (6.10)$$

Let $W : \mathbb{I} \times \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ be the evolution operator of the IDE (6.9), it has the following form: if $t \geq s$, $t \in (t_i, t_{i+1}]$ and $s \in (t_{j-1}, t_j]$, then

$$W(t, s) = \Upsilon(t, t_k) \left(\prod_{k=i}^{j+1} [Id + B_k] \Upsilon(t_k, t_{k-1}) \right) [Id + B_j] \Upsilon(t_j, s),$$

where $\Upsilon : \mathbb{I} \times \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ is the evolution operator of $\dot{x} = \tilde{A}(t)x$, and if $t < s$, $s \in (t_j, t_{j+1}]$ and $t \in (t_{j-1}, t_j]$, then

$$W(t, s) = [W(s, t)]^{-1} = \Upsilon(t, t_j) [Id + B_j]^{-1} \cdot [Id + B_i]^{-1} \Upsilon(t_j, s).$$

Definition 6.8. [20] *The IDEs (6.9) possess an exponential dichotomy with (P, K, α) on \mathbb{I} if there exist a projection P and constants K, α such that*

$$\begin{cases} \|\mathcal{W}(t)P\mathcal{W}^{-1}(s)\| \leq Ke^{-\alpha(t-s)}, & t \geq s, \\ \|\mathcal{W}(t)(I - P)\mathcal{W}^{-1}(s)\| \leq Ke^{\alpha(t-s)}, & t < s. \end{cases} \quad (6.11)$$

where $\mathcal{W}(t) = W(t, t_0)$ and $\mathcal{W}^{-1}(t) = W(t_0, t)$.

Definition 6.9. *The IDEs (6.9) admit a strong exponential dichotomy on \mathbb{I} , if (6.11) holds and there exists a positive constant $\tilde{\alpha} > \alpha$ such that*

$$\|\mathcal{W}(t)\mathcal{W}^{-1}(s)\| \leq Ke^{\tilde{\alpha}|t-s|}, \quad \text{for } t, s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (6.12)$$

Lemma 6.10. ([20] Proposition 5.21) *The IDEs (6.9) possess an exponential dichotomy with (P, K, α) iff the GODEs*

$$\frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x], \quad t \in \mathbb{I},$$

have an exponential dichotomy with (P, K, α) , where A is defined by (6.10).

6.2.2 Main results for IDEs

Consider the nonlinear IDEs as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = \tilde{A}(t)x(t) + f(t, x(t)), & t \neq t_i, \\ \Delta x(t_i) = B_i x(t_i), & i \in \mathbb{Z}, \end{cases} \quad (6.13)$$

where $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is Perron integrable and $f(t, 0) = 0$. We suppose that the following conditions hold:

(a) for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists a positive constant C_b such that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \|B_i\| \leq C_b \quad \text{and} \quad \|(Id + B_i)^{-1}\| \leq C_b;$$

(b) there exists a Lebesgue measure function $m : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the Lebesgue integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}} m(s)ds$ is finite and

$$\left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{A}(s)ds \right\| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} m(s)ds;$$

(c) for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists a Lebesgue measure function $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the Lebesgue integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma(s)ds$ is finite and

$$\|f(t, x)\| \leq \gamma(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \|f(t, x) - f(t, y)\| \leq \gamma(t)\|x - y\|.$$

Then we give our main results for IDEs.

Theorem 6.11. *Suppose that the IDEs (6.9) possess an exponential dichotomy with the form (6.11). If conditions (a), (b), (c) hold and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma(s)ds$ is sufficiently small, then Eq. (6.13) has a unique bounded solution.*

Theorem 6.12. *Suppose that all conditions of Theorem 6.11 hold. Then Eq. (6.9) is topologically conjugated to Eq. (6.13).*

Theorem 6.13. *Suppose that linear IDEs (6.9) admit a strong exponential dichotomy with the form (6.12) and all conditions of Theorem 6.11 hold. If further there exists a bounded nondecreasing function $\mu : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\mu(t) - \mu(s)| \leq e^{-\alpha|t-s|}$, then the conjugacies are both Hölder continuous.*

We only prove Theorem 6.11, and verify that Theorem 6.11 satisfies all the conditions of Theorem 3.1. The proofs of the other two theorems are similar to Theorem 6.11.

Proof. Since IDEs (6.9) possess an exponential dichotomy with (P, K, α) , we derive from Lemma 6.10 that

$$\frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x]$$

has an exponential dichotomy with the same (P, K, α) on \mathbb{R} .

For any $t \geq t_0$, we note that the solution of Eq. (6.13) with the initial value $x(t_0) = x_0$ is defined by

$$x(t) = x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t \tilde{A}(s)x(s)ds + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_{t_0}^t} B_i x(t_i) H_{t_i}(t) + \int_{t_0}^t f(s, x(s))ds.$$

Given $t, t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and set $A(t) = \int_{t_0}^t \tilde{A}(s)ds + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{t_0}^t} B_i H_{t_i}(t)$. We define the Kurzweil integrable map $\mathcal{Q} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$

$$\mathcal{Q}(x(t), t) := \int_{t_0}^t f(s, x(s))ds.$$

Then we obtain that for every $t \geq t_0$,

$$x(t) = x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t d[A(s)]x(s) + \int_{t_0}^t D\mathcal{Q}(x(s), s),$$

which is a solution of the following nonlinear GODEs with the initial value $x(t_0) = x_0$

$$\frac{dx}{d\tau} = D[A(t)x + \mathcal{Q}(x, t)]. \quad (6.14)$$

Now we claim that the function $\mathcal{Q}(x, t) \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega, \mu)$, here $\Omega = \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$. In fact, for any $t, \tilde{t} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, by condition (c), there must exists a bounded nondecreasing function $\mu : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|\mathcal{Q}(x, t) - \mathcal{Q}(x, \tilde{t})\| = \left\| \int_{\tilde{t}}^t f(s, x)ds \right\| \leq \int_{\tilde{t}}^t \gamma(s)ds \leq |\mu(t) - \mu(\tilde{t})|,$$

and for any $t, \tilde{t} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, by also using condition (c), we have

$$\|\mathcal{Q}(x, t) - \mathcal{Q}(x, \tilde{t}) - \mathcal{Q}(\tilde{x}, t) + \mathcal{Q}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t})\| = \left\| \int_{\tilde{t}}^t (f(s, x) - f(s, \tilde{x})) ds \right\| \leq \|x - \tilde{x}\| |\mu(t) - \mu(\tilde{t})|.$$

We now show that $V_A := \text{var}_c^d A < \infty$ for all $c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c < d$. Indeed, let $D = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{|D|}\}$ be a division of $[c, d]$. Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{|D|} \|A(t_j) - A(t_{j-1})\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} \left\| \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \tilde{A}(s)ds \right\| + \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j}} \|B_i H_{t_i}(t)\|,$$

by using condition (a) and (b), we deduce that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{|D|} \left\| \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \tilde{A}(s)ds \right\| + \sum_{j=1}^{|D|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j}} \|B_i H_{t_i}(t)\| \leq \int_c^d m(s)ds + C_b < \infty,$$

that is, $V_A < \infty$. Set $|\mu(t)| \leq M_\mu$ for some sufficiently small $M_\mu > 0$, and by using conditions (a), (b) and (c), we can ensure that

$$2M_\mu(1 + K(1 + 2K))C_b^3 e^{3C_b V_A} V_A^2 < 1.$$

Consequently, all assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are valid, we assert that Eq. (6.13) has a unique bounded solution. \square

Data Availability Statement

No data was used for the research in this article. It is pure mathematics.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Contributions

We declare that all the authors have same contributions to this paper.

References

- [1] Š. Schwabik, Generalized Ordinary Differential Equations, Ser. Real Anal., vol. 5, World Scientific, Singapore, 1992.
- [2] M. Federson, Substitution formulas for the Kurzweil and Henstock vector integrals, *Math. Bohem.*, 127 (2002) 15–26.
- [3] M. Federson, J. Mesquita, A. Slavík, Measure functional differential equations and functional dynamic equations on time scales, *J. Differential Equations*, 252 (2012) 3816–3847.
- [4] B. Piccoli, Measure differential equations, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 233 (2019) 1289–1317.
- [5] B. Piccoli, F. Rossi, Measure dynamics with probability vector fields and sources, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 39 (2019) 6207–6230.
- [6] G. Meng, Extremal problems for eigenvalues of measure differential equations, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 143 (2015) 1991–2002.
- [7] G. Meng, M. Zhang, Dependence of solutions and eigenvalues of measure differential equations on measures, *J. Differential Equations*, 254 (2013) 2196–2232.
- [8] M. Zhang, Extremal eigenvalues of measure differential equations with fixed variation, *Sci. China Math.*, 53 (2010) 2573–2588.
- [9] Z. Wen, On principal eigenvalues of measure differential equations and a patchy Neumann eigenvalue problem, *J. Differential Equations*, 286 (2021) 710–730.
- [10] Z. Wen, M. Zhang, On the optimization problems of the principal eigenvalues of measure differential equations with indefinite measures, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 25 (2020) 3257–3274.
- [11] M. Federson, Š. Schwabik, Generalized ODE approach to impulsive retarded differential equations, *Differential Integral Equations*, 19 (2006) 1201–1234.
- [12] S. Afonso, E. Bonotto, M. Federson, Š. Schwabik, Discontinuous local semiflows for Kurzweil equations leading to LaSalle’s invariance principle for differential systems with impulses at variable times, *J. Differential Equations*, 250 (2011) 2936–3001.

- [13] J. Kurzweil, Generalized ordinary differential equations and continuous dependence on a parameter, *Czechoslovak Math. J.*, 7 (1957) 418–448.
- [14] J. Kurzweil, Generalized ordinary differential equations, *Czechoslovak Math. J.*, 8 (1958) 360–388.
- [15] Š. Schwabik, Abstract Perron-Stieltjes integral, *Math. Bohem.*, 121 (1996) 425–447.
- [16] Š. Schwabik, Linear Stieltjes integral equations in Banach spaces, *Math. Bohem.*, 124 (1999) 433–457.
- [17] R. Collegari, M. Federson, M. Frasson, Linear FDEs in the frame of generalized ODEs: variation-of-constants formula, *Czech. Math. J.*, 68 (2018) 889–920.
- [18] S. Afonso, E. Bonotto, M. Federson, L. Gimenes, Boundedness of solutions for functional differential equations with variable impulses via generalized ordinary differential equations, *Math. Nachr.*, 285 (2012) 545–561.
- [19] M. Federson, R. Grau, J. Mesquita, E. Toon, Boundedness of solutions of measure differential equations and dynamic equations on time scales, *J. Differential Equations*, 263 (2017) 26–56.
- [20] E. Bonotto, M. Federson, L. Santos, Dichotomies for generalized ordinary differential equations and applications, *J. Differential Equations*, 264 (2018) 3131–3173.
- [21] E. Bonotto, M. Federson, L. Santos, Robustness of exponential dichotomies for generalized ordinary differential equations, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 32 (2020) 2021–2060.
- [22] E. Bonotto, M. Federson, M. Gadotti, Recursive properties of generalized ordinary differential equations and applications, *J. Differential Equations*, 303 (2021) 123–155.
- [23] M. Federson, R. Grau, J. Mesquita, E. Toon, Permanence of equilibrium points in the basin of attraction and existence of periodic solutions for autonomous measure differential equations and dynamic equations on time scales via generalized ODEs, *Nonlinearity*, 35 (2022) 3118–3158.
- [24] F. Andrade da Silva, M. Federson, E. Toon, Stability, boundedness and controllability of solutions of measure functional differential equations, *J. Differential Equations*, 307 (2022) 160–210.
- [25] E. Bonotto, M. Federson, J. Mesquita, Boundary value problems for generalized ODEs, *J Geom Anal*, 33 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12220-022-01090-z>.
- [26] E. Bonotto, M. Federson, J. Mesquita, *Generalized Ordinary Differential Equations in Abstract Spaces and Applications*, Wiley, Hoboken 2021.
- [27] P. Hartman, On local homeomorphisms of Euclidean spaces, *Bol. Soc. Mat. Mexicana*, 5 (1960) 220–241.
- [28] D. Grobman, Homeomorphisms of systems of differential equations, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 128 (1965) 880–881.
- [29] J. Palis, On the local structure of hyperbolic points in Banach spaces, *An. Acad. Brasil. Ciênc.*, 40 (1968) 263–266.
- [30] C. Pugh, On a theorem of P. Hartman, *Amer. J. Math.*, 91 (1969) 363–367.
- [31] K. Lu, A Hartman-Grobman theorem for scalar reaction diffusion equations, *J. Differential Equations*, 93 (1991) 364–394.
- [32] P. Bates, K. Lu, A Hartman-Grobman theorem for the Cahn-Hilliard and phase-field equations, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 6 (1994) 101–145.
- [33] M. Hein, J. Prüss, The Hartman-Grobman theorem for semilinear hyperbolic evolution equations, *J. Differential Equations*, 261 (2016) 4709–4727.
- [34] G. Farkas, A Hartman-Grobman result for retarded functional differential equations with an application to the numerics around hyperbolic equilibria, *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, 52 (2001) 421–432.
- [35] S. Sternberg, Local C^n transformations of the real line, *Duke Math. J.*, 24 (1957) 97–102.
- [36] S. Sternberg, Local contractions and a theorem of Poincaré, *Amer. J. Math.*, 79(1957) 809–824.
- [37] G. Sell, Smooth Linearization near a fixed point, *Amer. J. Math.*, 107 (1985) 1035–1091.

- [38] G. Belitskii, Functional equations and the conjugacy of diffeomorphism of finite smoothness class, *Funct. Anal. Appl.*, 7 (1973) 268–277.
- [39] M. ElBialy, Local contractions of Banach spaces and spectral gap conditions, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 182 (2001) 108–150.
- [40] H. Rodrigues, J. Solà-Morales, Smooth linearization for a saddle on Banach spaces, *J. Dyn. Differ. Equ.*, 16 (2004) 767–793.
- [41] W. Zhang, W. Zhang, C^1 linearization for planar contractions, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 260 (2011) 2043–2063.
- [42] W. Zhang, W. Zhang, W. Jarczyk, Sharp regularity of linearization for $C^{1,1}$ hyperbolic diffeomorphisms, *Math. Ann.*, 358 (2014) 69–113.
- [43] W. Zhang, W. Zhang, Sharpness for C^1 linearization of planar hyperbolic diffeomorphisms, *J. Differential Equations*, 257 (2014), 4470–4502.
- [44] W. Zhang, K. Lu, W. Zhang, Differentiability of the conjugacy in the Hartman-Grobman theorem, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 369 (2017) 4995–5030.
- [45] K. Palmer, A generalization of Hartman’s linearization theorem, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 41 (1973) 753–758.
- [46] W. Coppel, *Dichotomies in Stability Theory*, Springer, Berlin/New York, 1978.
- [47] L. Jiang, Ordinary dichotomy and global linearization, *Nonlinear Anal.*, 70 (2009) 2722–2730.
- [48] L. Backes, D. Dragičević, A generalized Grobman-Hartman theorem for nonautonomous dynamics, *Collect. Math.*, 73 (2022) 411–431.
- [49] N. Bernardes, A. Messaoudi, A generalized Grobman-Hartman theorem, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 148, (2020) 4351–4360.
- [50] L. Barreira, C. Valls, A Grobman-Hartman theorem for nonuniformly hyperbolic dynamics, *J. Differential Equations*, 228 (2006) 285–310.
- [51] L. Barreira, C. Valls, A Grobman-Hartman theorem for general nonuniform exponential dichotomies, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 257 (2009) 1976–1993.
- [52] A. Reinfelds, D. Šteinberga, Dynamical equivalence of quasilinear equations, *Int. J. Pure Appl. Math.*, 98 (2015) 355–364.
- [53] L. Backes, D. Dragičević, K. Palmer, Linearization and Hölder continuity for nonautonomous systems, *J. Differential Equations*, 297 (2021) 536–574.
- [54] Y. Xia, R. Wang, K. Kou, D. O’Regan, On the linearization theorem for nonautonomous differential equations, *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 139 (2015) 829–846.
- [55] Á. Castañeda, G. Robledo, Dichotomy spectrum and almost topological conjugacy on nonautonomous unbounded difference systems, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 38 (2018) 2287–2304.
- [56] I. Huerta, Linearization of a nonautonomous unbounded system with nonuniform contraction: A spectral approach, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 40 (2020) 5571–5590.
- [57] L. Backes, D. Dragičević, Multiscale linearization of nonautonomous systems, preprint, arXiv: 2203.03694.
- [58] A. Qadir, Geometric linearization of ordinary differential equations, *SIGMA*, 3 (2007) 7 pages.
- [59] A. Reinfelds, L. Sermone, Equivalence of nonlinear differential equations with impulse effect in Banach space, *Acta Univ. Latviensis*, 577 (1992) 68–73.
- [60] A. Reinfelds, Dynamical equivalence of impulsive differential equations, *Nonlinear Anal.*, 30 (1997) 2743–2752.
- [61] A. Reinfelds, Decoupling of impulsive differential equations, *Math. Model. Anal.*, 2 (1997) 130–137.
- [62] L. Sermone, Equivalence of linear differential equations with impulse effect, *Proc. Latv. Acad. Sci. Sect. B.*, 2 (1994) 78–80.

- [63] L. Sermone, Reduction of differentiable equations with impulse effect, *J. Appl. Math. Stoch. Anal.*, 10 (1997) 79–87.
- [64] J. Fenner, M. Pinto, On a Hartman linearization theorem for a class of ODE with impulse effect, *Nonlinear Anal.*, 38 (1999) 307–325.
- [65] Y. Xia, X. Chen, V. Romanovski, On the linearization theorem of Fenner and Pinto, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 400 (2013) 439–451.
- [66] C. Pötzche, Topological decoupling, linearization and perturbation on inhomogeneous time scales, *J. Differential Equations*, 245 (2008) 1210–1242.
- [67] Y. Xia, J. Cao, M. Han, A new analytical method for the linearization of dynamic equation on measure chains, *J. Differential Equations*, 235 (2007) 527–543.
- [68] G. Papaschinopoulos, A linearization result for a differential equation with piecewise constant argument, *Analysis*, 16 (1996) 161–170.
- [69] M. Pinto, G. Robledo, A Grobman-Hartman theorem for differential equations with piecewise constant arguments of mixed type, *Z. Anal. Anwend.*, 37 (2018) 101–126.
- [70] Á. Castañeda, G. Robledo, Differentiability of Palmer’s linearization theorem and converse result for density function, *J. Differential Equations*, 259 (2015) 4634–4650.
- [71] L. Cuong, T. Doan, S. Siegmund, A Sternberg theorem for nonautonomous differential equations, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 31 (2019) 1279–1299.
- [72] D. Dragičević, W. Zhang, W. Zhang, Smooth linearization of nonautonomous difference equations with a nonuniform dichotomy, *Math. Z.*, 292 (2019) 1175–1193.
- [73] D. Dragičević, W. Zhang, W. Zhang, Smooth linearization of nonautonomous differential equations with a nonuniform dichotomy, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 121 (2020) 32–50.
- [74] C. Hönl, Volterra Stieltjes–Integral Equations, North–Holland Publ, Comp, Amsterdam, 1975.