A SPECTRAL CHARACTERIZATION OF EXPONENTIAL STABILITY FOR LINEAR TIME-INVARIANT SYSTEMS ON TIME SCALES

CHRISTIAN PÖTZSCHE

Institut für Mathematik
Universität Augsburg
86135 Augsburg, Germany

STEFAN SIEGMUND

Department of Mathematics
University of California at Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720, U.S.A.

FABIAN WIRTH

Zentrum für Technomathematik
Universität Bremen
28334 Bremen, Germany

(Communicated by Konstantin Mischaikow)

Abstract. We prove a necessary and sufficient condition for the exponential stability of time-invariant linear systems on time scales in terms of the eigenvalues of the system matrix. In particular, this unifies the corresponding characterizations for finite-dimensional differential and difference equations. To this end we use a representation formula for the transition matrix of Jordan reducible systems in the regressive case. Also we give conditions under which the obtained characterizations can be exactly calculated and explicitly calculate the region of stability for several examples.

1. **Introduction.** It is well-known that exponential decay of the solution of a linear autonomous ordinary differential equation (ODE) $\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, or of an autonomous difference equation (OΔE) $x_{t+1} = Ax_t$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, can be characterized by spectral properties of A. Namely, the solutions tend to 0 exponentially as $t \to \infty$, if and only if all the eigenvalues of $A \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ have negative real parts or a modulus smaller than 1, respectively (cf. HAHN [7, p. 14], AGARWAL [1, p. 227]). In the present paper we generalize this classical result to linear time-invariant dynamic equations $x^{\Delta} = Ax$ on arbitrary time scales. Here the problem is more subtle due to the possible inhomogeneity of the time scale and so far only sufficient conditions for the exponential decay of solutions are available.

The first result concerning the case of general time scales was obtained by AULBACH & HILGER [2, Theorem 13] and it contains a condition for the boundedness of solutions on time scales with bounded graininess. Although it unifies the time scales $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{T} = h\mathbb{Z}$, $h > 0$, its assumptions are often too pessimistic, e.g. on asymptotically homogeneous time scales (cf. Example 4.10), since the maximal graininess is involved. More detailed results are presented in KELLER [11, p. 29, Satz 2.5.8], including criteria for asymptotic stability or instability. A totally

---

different approach to the asymptotic stability of linear dynamic equations using Lyapunov functions can be found in HILGER & KLOEDEN [10, Theorem 3] and PÖTZSCHE [12, Abschnitt 2.1] provides sufficient conditions for the uniform exponential stability in (infinite-dimensional) Banach spaces, as well as spectral stability conditions for time-varying systems on time scales. Finally, stability and instability results for real scalar dynamic equations have been obtained recently by GARD & HOFFACKER [6].

As a thorough introduction into dynamic equations on time scales we refer to the paper HILGER [9] or the monograph BOHNER & PETERSON [3]. The paper [2] presents the theory with a focus on linear systems.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the class of systems we wish to study and define the concepts of exponential, uniform exponential and robust exponential stability. In Section 3 we completely analyze the case of scalar equations and use this characterization to define the set of exponential stability. We discuss some basic properties of this set and present several cases in which this set is easily calculated. To make the step to higher dimensions we consider in Section 4 the case of Jordan reducible time-varying systems. We introduce the notion of monomials on a time scale and show growth conditions for such monomials under the condition of uniform graininess. These results are used in Section 5 to study exponential stability for regressive matrices. The general case is investigated in Section 6.

First, however, we fix some notation. In the following $\mathbb{K}$ denotes the real ($\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$) or the complex ($\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$) field. For a complex number $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we denote by $\Re z$ and $\Im z$ the real and the imaginary part, respectively, and $B_\varepsilon(z)$ is the open ball with center z and radius $\varepsilon > 0$ in the complex plane. As usual, $\mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ is the space of square matrices with d rows, I_d is the identity mapping on the d-dimensional space $\mathbb{K}^d$ over $\mathbb{K}$ and $\sigma(A) \subset \mathbb{C}$ denotes the set of eigenvalues of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$.

We also introduce some notions which are specific for the calculus on time scales. A *time scale* $\mathbb{T}$ is a non-empty, closed subset of the reals $\mathbb{R}$. If $\mathbb{T}$ has a left-scattered maximum m, then $\mathbb{T}^\kappa := \mathbb{T} \setminus \{m\}$ and otherwise $\mathbb{T}^\kappa := \mathbb{T}$. If $\mathbb{T}$ is unbounded above, then $\mathbb{T}^\kappa = \mathbb{T}$. On the subset $\mathbb{T}^\kappa$ the *graininess* is defined as $\mu^*(t) := \inf \{s \in \mathbb{T} : t < s\} - t$. A time scale $\mathbb{T}$ which is unbounded above is called *homogeneous* if the graininess is constant. If $\lim_{t \to \infty} \mu^*(t)$ exists, then $\mathbb{T}$ is said to be *asymptotically homogeneous*. The space of rd-continuous, regressive mappings from $\mathbb{T}^\kappa$ to $\mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{C}_{rd}\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{T}^\kappa, \mathbb{K}^{d \times d})$. Furthermore, given a function $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{rd}\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{T}^\kappa, \mathbb{C})$, then

$$(\hat{\Re}\lambda)(t) := \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{|1 + s\lambda(t)| - 1}{s} \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{T}^\kappa$$

is the *Hilger real part* of λ, and we have the inclusion $\hat{\Re}\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{rd}^+\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{T}^\kappa, \mathbb{R})$, where

$$\mathcal{C}_{rd}^+\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{T}^\kappa, \mathbb{R}) := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_{rd}\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{T}^\kappa, \mathbb{R}) : 1 + \mu^*(t)\alpha(t) > 0 \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{T}^\kappa\}.$$

2. **Preliminaries.** In this section we define the class of systems we consider and several notions of stability associated to these systems. We show by example that these notions do not coincide. To begin with we work with time-varying systems as our first statements are also applicable in this case.

Let $A : \mathbb{T}^\kappa \to \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ be rd-continuous and consider the d-dimensional linear system of dynamic equations

$$x^\Delta = A(t)x. \tag{2.1}$$

Let $\Phi_A : \{(t, \tau) \in \mathbb{T}^\kappa \times \mathbb{T}^\kappa : t \geq \tau\} \to \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ denote the *transition matrix* corresponding to (2.1), that is, $\varphi(t, \tau, \xi) = \Phi_A(t, \tau)\xi$ solves the initial value problem (2.1) with initial condition $x(\tau) = \xi$ for $\xi \in \mathbb{K}^d$ and $t, \tau \in \mathbb{T}$ with $t \geq \tau$. The classical examples for this setup are the following.

Example 2.1. If $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}$ we consider linear time-varying systems of the form $\dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t)$. If $\mathbb{T} = h\mathbb{Z}$, then (2.1) reduces to $(x(t + h) - x(t))/h = A(t)x(t)$ or equivalently $x(t + h) = [I_d + hA(t)]x(t)$.

We are interested in the stability of the equilibrium position $x^* = 0$ of system (2.1) and introduce the following definitions.

Definition 2.2 (Exponential stability). Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a time scale which is unbounded above. We call system (2.1)

(i) *exponentially stable* if there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that for every $t_0 \in \mathbb{T}$ there exists a $K = K(t_0) \geq 1$ with

$$\|\Phi_A(t, t_0)\| \leq Ke^{-\alpha(t - t_0)} \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0 , \tag{2.2}$$

(ii) *uniformly exponentially stable* if K can be chosen independently of t_0 in the definition of exponential stability,

(iii) *robustly exponentially stable* if there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the exponential stability of (2.1) implies the exponential stability of $x^\Delta = B(t)x$ for any rd-continuous $B : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ with $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \|B(t) - A(t)\| \leq \varepsilon$. In particular, if A is constant we call (2.1) robustly exponentially stable if for all matrices B in a suitable neighborhood of A the corresponding system is exponentially stable.

Remark 2.3. (i) To the purist it may seem inadequate to define exponential stability for system (2.1) via the standard real exponential function instead of the exponential function $e_\alpha(t, t_0)$ on time scales, since the real exponential function has no intrinsic meaning on a general time scale. Although this may be the case we argue that our characterization gives a strong description of the asymptotic behavior of a solution which we believe to be of interest. The methods we employ are closely tied to our definition, which also makes us believe that the definition is right, as it is fruitful. Also the use of the real exponential function makes our result accessible to readers, who are not familiar with the "time scale calculus." Finally, let us point out that we deduce a criterion for exponential stability in Theorem 4.8 involving $e_\alpha(t, t_0)$.

(ii) The notion of exponential stability for linear time-varying systems is defined in different ways according to different authors. For example our notion of uniform exponential stability is called *exponential asymptotic stability* in [1, p. 240, Definition 5.4.1(xi)], whereas our exponential stability is not defined in that book. CESARI [4] avoids the concept of exponential stability but introduces the difference between uniform and nonuniform asymptotic stability of linear time-varying systems, which is the distinction that we want to emphasize. In the terminology of DALECKII & KREIN [5] exponential stability means negativity of the maximal Lyapunov exponent, whereas uniform exponential stability means negativity of the maximal Bohl exponent.

(iii) It is well-known that the three notions of stability from Definition 2.2 coincide in the autonomous case for ODEs and OΔEs. As Example 2.4 below demonstrates, this fails to be true on inhomogeneous time scales. Consequently, it is advantageous to distinguish between uniformly exponentially stable and only exponentially stable time-invariant dynamic equations, which

are our main topic in Section 5. Indeed the main result of this paper (Theorem 5.1) is based on an estimate of the type (2.2), where K is allowed to depend on t_0.

(iv) It can be shown that uniform exponential stability of a linear system implies robust exponential stability [12, p. 72, Satz 1.3.43]. Thus there was no call for the definition of "robust uniform exponential stability".

Before we proceed with our analysis of properties characterizing exponential stability we will first present some examples showing that even for time-invariant systems the different notions need not coincide. Furthermore, we present a negative example pertaining to the question of linearization theory. In particular, we show by example that in the time-invariant case

(i) exponential stability does not imply uniform exponential stability,
(ii) exponential stability does not imply robust exponential stability,
(iii) exponential stability of a linearization is not sufficient for local asymptotic stability of a nonlinear system linearized at a fixed point.

The examples are given in the order of the list above.

Example 2.4. Let $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ and $d = 1$. We define a sequence s_k recursively by

$$s_0 := 0, \quad s_{k+1} := s_k + 3k + 1, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

and the time scale $\mathbb{T}$ by the discrete set

$$\mathbb{T} := \{0, 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, \ldots, s_k, s_k + 3, \ldots, s_k + 3k, s_{k+1}, \ldots\}.$$

Consider on $\mathbb{T}$ the scalar equation

$$x^\Delta = -x. \tag{2.3}$$

For $k \geq 1$ elementary calculations yield for $t \in \mathbb{T}, x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ that

$$\varphi(t, s_k - 1, x_0) = 0, t > s_k - 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(s_k + 3k, s_k, x_0) = (-2)^k x_0.$$

This shows that the system (2.3) is exponentially stable, as all trajectories reach 0 in finite time. On the other hand the system is not uniformly exponentially stable, as a solution starting in $x_0 = 1$ may become arbitrarily large depending on the initial time t_0. This completes the example showing claim (i) from above.
We now show that the system is also not robustly exponentially stable. To this end let $|\eta| < 1/4$ and consider the system

$$x^\Delta = (-1 + \eta)x.$$

Then we have

$$\varphi(s_{k+1}, s_k, x_0) = (-2 + 3\eta)^k \eta x_0.$$

Now for every $|\eta| < 1/4, \eta \neq 0$ there exists a k_0 such that for all $k > k_0$ we have $|(-2 + 3\eta)^k \eta| > 2$. Hence all nonzero trajectories start to grow after time s_k. As no nonzero trajectory reaches 0 in finite time this shows exponential instability.

To show that a linearization principle does not hold we consider a slight modification of the previous example. Note, however, that a linearization result is valid, if the corresponding linear dynamic equation is assumed to be regressive (cf. [6, Theorem 5.3]).

Example 2.5. Let $\{b_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of positive integers such that

$$\sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{b_k}{3^k} = \infty.$$

Now define the sequence s_k recursively by

$$s_0 := 0, \quad s_{k+1} := s_k + 3b_k + 1, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

and the time scale $\mathbb{T}$ by

$$\mathbb{T} := \{\ldots, s_k, s_k + 3, \ldots, s_k + 3b_k, s_{k+1}, \ldots\}.$$

Finally, consider the system

$$x^\Delta = -x - x^3. \tag{2.4}$$

Here, we have $x(s_k) = -x(s_{k-1})^3$ and $x(t+3) = -2x(t) - 3x(t)^3$, for $t \in \mathbb{T}, t \neq s_k, k \in \mathbb{N}$. This shows that all transitions are diffeomorphisms, hence no trajectory reaches 0 in finite time. Denote by $\varphi(t, \tau, x_0)$ the solution of the nonlinear equation (2.4) with respect to the initial condition $x(\tau) = x_0$. Then we also have

$$|\varphi(s_{k+1} - 1, s_k, x_0)| > 2^{b_k} |x_0|, \quad \text{hence } |\varphi(s_{k+1}, s_k, x_0)| > 2^{3b_k} |x_0|^3,$$

and inductively

$$|\varphi(s_{k+l}, s_k, x_0)| > |x_0|^{3^l} \prod_{j=0}^{l-1} 2^{3^{(l-j)} b_{k+j}}.$$

It suffices that $|\varphi(s_{k+l}, s_k, x_0)| > 1$ so that the trajectories remain bounded away from 0 for all $t > s_{k+l}$. Thus we have to consider the condition

$$|x_0|^{3^l} \prod_{j=0}^{l-1} 2^{3^{(l-j)} b_{k+j}} > 1,$$

or equivalently

$$\log_2(|x_0|) > -\sum_{j=k}^{l} \frac{b_j}{3^j}.$$

As the sum on the right diverges this shows that for all initial conditions (s_k, x_0) with $x_0 \neq 0$, the trajectory remains bounded away from 0 for all t large enough, so that the system is not asymptotically stable. It is immediate from Example 2.4 that the linearized system $x^\Delta = -x$ is exponentially stable.

3. The Set of Exponential Stability. From now on let $\mathbb{T}$ be a time scale which is unbounded above. In this section we define the subset of the complex plane which is relevant for a spectral characterization of exponential stability for linear time-invariant systems

$$\boxed{x^\Delta = Ax,} \tag{3.5}$$

where $A \in \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$. To motivate this definition we begin with the analysis of scalar equations and characterize their exponential stabilty.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a time scale which is unbounded above and let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. The scalar equation*

$$x^\Delta = \lambda x, \quad x \in \mathbb{C} \tag{3.6}$$

is exponentially stable if and only if one of the following conditions is satisfied for arbitrary $t_0 \in \mathbb{T}$:

(i) $\gamma(\lambda) := \limsup_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T - t_0} \int_{t_0}^{T} \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1 + s\lambda|}{s} \Delta t < 0$,
(ii) $\forall T \in \mathbb{T} : \exists t \in \mathbb{T} \text{ with } t > T \text{ such that } 1 + \mu^*(t)\lambda = 0$,

where we use the convention $\log 0 = -\infty$ in (i).

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) Assume that (3.6) is exponentially stable and that $1 + \mu^*(t)\lambda \neq 0$ for all $t > t_0$ and some $t_0 \in \mathbb{T}$. Then [9, Theorem 7.4(iii)] implies the following explicit presentation of the modulus of the (possibly complex) evolution operator of (3.6)

$$|e_\lambda(T, t_0)| = \exp\left(\int_{t_0}^T \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1 + s\lambda|}{s} \Delta t\right) \quad \text{for } T \geq t_0$$

and the estimate $|e_\lambda(T, t_0)| \leq Ke^{-\alpha(T-t_0)}$ for $T \geq t_0$ with $K = K(t_0) \geq 1$ yields

$$\int_{t_0}^T \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1 + s\lambda|}{s} \Delta t \leq -\alpha(T - t_0) + \log K \quad \text{for } T \geq t_0 \,.$$

We therefore have

$$\limsup_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T - t_0} \int_{t_0}^T \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1 + s\lambda|}{s} \Delta t \leq -\alpha < 0$$

and the claim follows.

($\Leftarrow$) To prove the converse direction let $\tau \in \mathbb{T}$ be fixed. If $1 + \mu^*(t)\lambda = 0$ for some $t \geq \tau$, $t \in \mathbb{T}$, then trivially $\mu^*(t) > 0$ and

$$[x(t + \mu^*(t)) - x(t)]/\mu^*(t) = \lambda x(t)$$

or equivalently $x(t + \mu^*(t)) = 0$ and thus (3.6) is exponentially stable if for every $\tau \in \mathbb{T}$ there is a $\tau < t \in \mathbb{T}$ with this property. Now assume this is not the case so that $1 + \mu^*(T)\lambda \neq 0$ for all $T \geq \tau$ and some $\tau \in \mathbb{T}$ large enough, then

$$|e_\lambda(T, \tau)| = \exp\left(\int_\tau^T \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1 + s\lambda|}{s} \Delta t\right) \quad \text{for } T \geq \tau$$

and with

$$\alpha := -\limsup_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T - \tau} \int_\tau^T \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1 + s\lambda|}{s} \Delta t > 0$$

we obtain for any $\varepsilon > 0$ that there exists a constant $K = K(\tau) \geq 1$ such that

$$|e_\lambda(t, \tau)| \leq Ke^{-(\alpha - \varepsilon)(t - \tau)} \quad \text{for } t \geq \tau \,.$$

In particular, if we choose $\varepsilon < \alpha$ we obtain exponential stability of (3.6). $\qquad\square$

In view of the previous definition the following notion appears to be appropriate.

Definition 3.2 (Set of exponential stability). Given a time scale $\mathbb{T}$ which is unbounded above we define for arbitrary $t_0 \in \mathbb{T}$

$$\mathcal{S}_\mathbb{C}(\mathbb{T}) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \limsup_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T - t_0} \int_{t_0}^T \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1 + s\lambda|}{s} \Delta t < 0\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{T}) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} | \forall T \in \mathbb{T} : \exists t \in \mathbb{T} \text{ with } t > T \text{ such that } 1 + \mu^*(t)\lambda = 0\} \,.$$

The *set of exponential stability* for the time scale $\mathbb{T}$ is then defined by

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}) := \mathcal{S}_\mathbb{C}(\mathbb{T}) \cup \mathcal{S}_\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{T}) \,.$$

Remark 3.3.   (i) Note that the definition of $\mathcal{S}_\mathbb{C}(\mathbb{T})$ is independent of t_0.

(ii) For any time scale $\mathbb{T}$ we have $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T}) \subset \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid \Re\lambda < 0\}$ because $\Re\lambda \geq 0$ implies that $|1 + s\lambda| \geq 1$ for all nonnegative $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, if $\Re\lambda \geq 0$ the function appearing under the integral is nonnegative. Likewise, it is easy to see that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T}) \subset (-\infty, 0)$. Furthermore $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$ is symmetric with respect to the real axis, as $|1+s\lambda| = |1+s\bar{\lambda}|$ for real s. As s is not only real but also positive, this implies that $|1 + s\lambda_1| < |1 + s\lambda_2|$ if $\Re\lambda_1 = \Re\lambda_2$ and $0 \leq \Im\lambda_1 < \Im\lambda_2$. This shows that if $\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$, then the segment $\{\Re\lambda + i\alpha\Im\lambda \mid \alpha \in [-1,1]\} \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$. In particular, the connected components of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$ are simply connected.

(iii) It is evident from the definition that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$ is an open subset of $\mathbb{C}$. On the other hand, given a time scale $\mathbb{T}$ the set $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ is at most countable, because the condition $\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ implies that the time scale $\mathbb{T}$ has infinitely many "gaps" of length $|\lambda|^{-1}$. In every such gap there exists a rational number q_λ. If there were uncountable many $\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T})$, then there would exist an uncountable number of distinct rational numbers q_λ. This is impossible.

(iv) For regressive $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$\lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1 + s\lambda|}{s} = \begin{cases} \frac{\log|1+\mu^*(t)\lambda|}{\mu^*(t)} & \text{for } \mu^*(t) > 0 \\ \Re\lambda & \text{for } \mu^*(t) = 0 \end{cases} .$$

In general, the set $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is awkward to calculate because of the limit superior involved in the definition. We therefore present some criteria which allow for an easier calculation of $\gamma(\lambda)$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a time scale which is unbounded above and let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.*

(a) *If $a := \lim_{t\to\infty} \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1+s\lambda|}{s}$ exists, then $\gamma(\lambda) = a$.*

(b) *If there are $t_0 \in \mathbb{T}$, $p > 0$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have $t_0 + kp \in \mathbb{T}$ and*

$$a_p := \frac{1}{p} \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{t_0+kp}^{t_0+(k+1)p} \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1 + s\lambda|}{s} \Delta t$$

exists, then $\gamma(\lambda) = a_p$.

(c) *Let X be a compact metric space and $T : X \to X$ be a mapping that is uniformly ergodic with ergodic measure η. Let $\rho_1 : X \to (0,\infty)$ be continuous with image $[a,b]$ and $\rho_2 : X \to [0,\infty)$ be continuous. For every $x_0 \in X$ define a time scale $\mathbb{T}(x_0)$ by*

$$\bigcup_{m \geq 0} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{m} \rho_1(T^k x_0) + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \rho_2(T^k x_0), \sum_{k=0}^{m}(\rho_1(T^k x_0) + \rho_2(T^k x_0)) \right] .$$

Then for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [-a^{-1}, -b^{-1}]$ we have

$$\gamma(\lambda) = a_e := \frac{\int_X \rho_2(x)\Re\lambda + \log|1 + \rho_1(x)\lambda| d\eta(x)}{\int_X \rho_1(x) + \rho_2(x) d\eta(x)} . \tag{3.7}$$

Remark 3.5.   (i) Other sufficient criteria for the stability of regressive linear dynamic equations in $\mathbb{R}$ can be found in [6, Corollaries 4.1, 4.2].

(ii) On a time scale, where μ^* is unbounded, but the real number a given in Lemma 3.4(a) exists, we easily obtain $\gamma(\lambda) = 0$. Now, due to Proposition 3.1, the scalar equation (3.6) cannot be exponentially stable on such a time scale. In particular this is true for so-called q-difference equations (cf. [3, p. 91, Definition 2.57]), which are defined on the time scales $\mathbb{T} = \{q^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, $q > 1$.

(iii) An illustrative interpretation of the time scale defined in Lemma 3.4(c) is that there are continuous intervals of length $\rho_2(T^k x_0)$ alternating with "gaps"

of length $\rho_1(T^k x_0)$. In particular, we can construct purely discrete time scales in this manner by choosing $\rho_2 \equiv 0$.

Proof. (a) and (b) follow from easy calculations. To show (c) we appeal to WALTERS [14, Theorem 6.19] which shows in particular that unique ergodicity implies that for every initial condition $x_0 \in X$ and every continuous function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ we have that

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} f(T^k x_0) \to \int_X f(x) d\eta(x) \,.$$

Now the function $x \mapsto \rho_2(x) \Re\lambda$ is clearly continuous for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $x \mapsto \log|1 + \rho_1(x)\lambda|$ is continuous for those $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $1 + \rho_1(x)\lambda \neq 0$ for all $x \in X$, that is in particular for $\lambda \notin [-a^{-1}, -b^{-1}]$. Then for $T_m = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1}(\rho_1(T^k x_0) + \rho_2(T^k x_0))$ we have

$$1 \frac{1}{T_m} \int_0^{T_m} \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1 + s\lambda|}{s} \Delta t =$$

$$= \frac{m}{T_m} \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \rho_2(T^k x_0) \Re\lambda + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \log|1 + \rho_1(T^k x_0)\lambda| \right) \,.$$

By continuity of $\rho_1 + \rho_2$ the expression T_m/m converges to $\int_X \rho_1 + \rho_2 \, d\eta$ and the limit is nonzero as ρ_1 is strictly positive. Thus also m/T_m converges and we obtain that the expression to the right converges to a_e for $m \to \infty$. For those $T \in \mathbb{T}(x_0)$ that are not of the form T_m we have at least that for some $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ it holds that $0 \leq T - T_m \leq \max_{x \in X} \rho_2(x)$. Using this fact an easy calculation shows that indeed $\gamma(\lambda) = a_e$. This concludes the proof. □

We note the following examples in order to show the applicability of the previous lemma.

Example 3.6.   (i) Consider the time scale $\mathbb{T} = h\mathbb{Z}$, $h > 0$, with $\mathcal{S}_\mathbb{R}(h\mathbb{Z}) = \{-\frac{1}{h}\}$. An application of Lemma 3.4(a) shows $\mathcal{S}(h\mathbb{Z}) = B_{\frac{1}{h}}(-\frac{1}{h})$, as expected. Moreover, for $h \to \infty$ the set $\mathcal{S}(h\mathbb{Z})$ degenerates to the point $\{0\}$.

(ii) If $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}$ we obtain $\mathcal{S}_\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{R}) = \emptyset$ and from Lemma 3.4(a) that $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \Re\lambda < 0\}$.

(iii) Consider the time scale $\mathbb{T} = \{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of so-called *harmonic numbers* $t_n := \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{k}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which is unbounded above. The graininess is given by $\mu^*(t_n) = \frac{1}{n+1}$. Using methods from elementary calculus it can be shown that $\lim_{x \to \infty} x \log\left|1 + \frac{\lambda}{x}\right| = \Re\lambda$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and consequently

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1 + s\lambda|}{s} = \lim_{n \to \infty} (n+1) \log\left|1 + \frac{\lambda}{n+1}\right| = \Re\lambda \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Now from Lemma 3.4(a) we obtain $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \Re\lambda < 0\} = \mathcal{S}_\mathbb{C}(\mathbb{T}) = \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T})$. Note that no gap occurs an infinite number of times, so that $\mathcal{S}_\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{T}) = \emptyset$.

(iv) Let $\mathbb{T}_\sigma = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} [k, k+\sigma]$, $\sigma \in (0,1)$, be a union of closed intervals. To calculate the set of exponential stability for this time scale we observe that

$$\int_k^{k+1} \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1 + s\lambda|}{s} \Delta t \quad = \quad \int_k^{k+\sigma} \Re\lambda \, dt + \log|1 + (1-\sigma)\lambda| =$$

$$= \quad \sigma\Re\lambda + \log|1 + (1-\sigma)\lambda| \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N}_0$$

and consequently by Lemma 3.4(b) with $t_0 = 0$, $p = 1$ we have

$$\mathcal{S}_\mathbb{C}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \sigma\Re\lambda + \log|1 + (1-\sigma)\lambda| < 0\} \,.$$

Also it is clear that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma) = \{(\sigma - 1)^{-1}\} \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma)$. This representation includes the limit cases $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}_0) = \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{Z})$ and $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}_1) = \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. In Figure 1 we show the stability region for the examples. In each picture the set $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma)$ is given by the hatched area. Note in particular that for the value $\sigma = 0.21$ the stability region is disconnected. Let us briefly discuss for which values of σ there are disconnected stability regions in this example. By Remark 3.3 (ii) we have that $\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma)$ implies $\Re\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma)$ so that we only have to investigate the question for which $\sigma \in (0,1)$ the set $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma) \cap (-\infty, 0)$ is disconnected.


FIGURE 1. Stability regions as described in Example 3.6(iv) for different values of σ

For $\lambda \in (-\infty, 0)$ to be in the set $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma)$ it is necessary and sufficient that $|1 + (1 - \sigma)\lambda| < e^{-\sigma\lambda}$. If $\lambda \in [(\sigma - 1)^{-1}, 0)]$ it is easy to see that this is always the case. Hence we consider the case $\lambda \in J_\sigma := (-\infty, (\sigma - 1)^{-1}]$ now. Here we have to satisfy the inequality $(\sigma - 1)\lambda - 1 < e^{-\sigma\lambda}$. It is clear that this is satisfied for negative λ with $|\lambda|$ large enough. However, by using standard calculus it is easy to see that for $\sigma \in (0, 1/2)$ there is a unique local maximum of the function $f_\sigma(\lambda) := (\sigma - 1)\lambda - 1 - e^{-\sigma\lambda}$ at $\lambda_\sigma = \sigma^{-1}\log(\sigma(1 - \sigma)^{-1})$. The requirement that $\lambda_\sigma \in J_\sigma$ or equivalently, $\sigma/(\sigma - 1) > \log(\sigma/(1 - \sigma))$ implies that $\sigma \in (0, a)$ with a constant $a \approx 0.361896$. Now we are interested in the question for which σ we have $f_\sigma(\lambda_\sigma) \geq 0$. This leads to the condition $(\sigma - 1)^{-1} \geq \log(\sigma/(1 - \sigma))$ which is true for $\sigma \in (0, b]$ with $b \approx 0.2178117$. In all we have shown that the stability region is disconnected if and only if $\sigma \in (0, b]$.

(v) It is known that for $\alpha \in [0, 1] \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ the map

$$x \mapsto x + \alpha \quad \mod 1$$

is uniquely ergodic. As the continuous functions ρ_1, ρ_2 we choose $\rho_1(x) = 1 + (x - 1/2)^2, \rho_2(x) = \sin(\pi x)$ and by Lemma 3.4(c) we have that

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T}) = \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \frac{2}{\pi}\Re\lambda + \int_0^1 \log\left|1 + \lambda + \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 \lambda\right| dx < 0 \right\}.$$

If we choose $\rho_2 \equiv 0$, then we obtain

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T}) = \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \int_0^1 \log\left|1 + \lambda + \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 \lambda\right| dx < 0 \right\}.$$

In Figure 2 a sketch of the stability regions corresponding to the different choices of ρ_2 is shown.


FIGURE 2. Two stability regions as described in Example 3.6(v) with or without continuous intervals

If we choose $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$ the map $x \mapsto x + \alpha \mod 1$ is periodic. Therefore, if we consider the time scales described in Lemma 3.4(c) given by the maps ρ_1 from above and $\rho_2 \equiv 0$ the stability region can be calculated by virtue of Lemma 3.4(b). In principle, this region now depends on the initial condition. For the choice $\alpha = 1/2$ this difference is easily noticeable and the stability regions for $x_0 = 0.0099$ and $x_0 = 0.7382$ are shown in Figure 3. For the choice $\alpha = 1/20$ however, we were not able to produce pictures that give any noticeable difference (although it exists of course).


FIGURE 3. Two stability regions as described in Example 3.6(v) with rational α.

(vi) Finally, let $\mathbb{T}$ be obtained by gluing together identical Cantor sets. That is, if M_C denotes the standard Cantor set obtained as the limit (in the Hausdorff topology) of the compact sets M_k recursively defined by

$$M_0 := [0,1], \quad M_k := M_{k-1} \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^{2^{k-1}-1} \left(\frac{6j+1}{3^k}, \frac{6j+2}{3^k} \right),$$

then we define $\mathbb{T}$ by $t \in \mathbb{T} \Leftrightarrow t - n \in M_C$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. This time scale is clearly periodic so that we may apply Lemma 3.4(b) to obtain that

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T}) = \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{k-1} \log \left| 1 + \frac{1}{3^k}\lambda \right| < 0 \right\},$$

because there are always 2^{k-1} gaps of length 3^{-k} for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$. An approximation of this set is shown in Figure 4. As the Cantor set itself has measure 0 the points $t \in \mathbb{T}$ with $\mu^*(t) = 0$ do not contribute to the definition of the set of exponential stability. Moreover, since $(-\infty, 0) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$, Remark 3.3(ii) yields $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{T}) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T}) = \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T})$.


FIGURE 4. The stability region for repeated Cantor sets

In the remainder of the article we discuss higher dimensional systems.

4. **Jordan Reducible Systems.** Let $A : \mathbb{T}^\kappa \to \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ be an rd-continuous mapping. In this section we consider d-dimensional time-varying linear systems (2.1), which are *Jordan reducible*, i.e., there exist (constant) invertible matrices $S \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ such that

$$S^{-1}A(t)S = \begin{pmatrix} J_1(t) & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & J_n(t) \end{pmatrix} =: J(t) \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{T}^\kappa, \qquad (4.8)$$

where each $J_i(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{d_i \times d_i}$, $d_1 + \ldots + d_n = d$, $1 \le i \le n \le d$, is a Jordan block

$$J_i(t) := \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_i(t) & 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ & \lambda_i(t) & 1 & \ldots & 0 \\ & & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & & & \lambda_i(t) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{T}^\kappa.$$

Evidently time-invariant systems (2.1) are Jordan reducible and in this case λ_i is a constant eigenvalue of A. We first note that Jordan reducibility allows for a block decomposition of the transition matrix.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose $A \in \mathcal{C}_{rd}\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{T}^\kappa, \mathbb{K}^{d \times d})$ is such that (2.1) is Jordan reducible. Then the transition matrix of $x^\Delta = A(t)x$ is given by*

$$\Phi_A(t, \tau) = S \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_{J_1}(t, \tau) & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \Phi_{J_n}(t, \tau) \end{pmatrix} S^{-1} \quad for\ t, \tau \in \mathbb{T}^\kappa, \qquad (4.9)$$

where we have used the notation introduced in (4.8). If A is not regressive, then the representation (4.9) holds for $t \geq \tau \in \mathbb{T}$.

Proof. For the matrix function $\Psi(t) := S\Phi_J(t, \tau)S^{-1}$ the identity

$$\Psi^\Delta(t) = SJ(t)\Phi_J(t, \tau)S^{-1} \overset{(4.8)}{=} SS^{-1}A(t)S\Phi_J(t, \tau)S^{-1} = A(t)\Psi(t)$$

for $t \in \mathbb{T}^\kappa$ holds and because of $\Psi(\tau) = I_d$ we obtain the assertion. This calculation can be performed without further assumptions on A if $t \geq \tau$, so that $\Phi_J(t, \tau)$ is well defined. This proves the second statement. $\qquad\square$

It is our goal to give an expression for the transition matrix of Jordan reducible equations. This, however, needs some preparation.

Definition 4.2 (Monomials). For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{rd}\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{T}^\kappa, \mathbb{C})$ the mappings $m_\lambda^n : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}^\kappa \to \mathbb{C}$, recursively defined by

$$m_\lambda^0(t, \tau) :\equiv 1, \qquad m_\lambda^{n+1}(t, \tau) := \int_\tau^t \frac{m_\lambda^n(s, \tau)}{1 + \mu^*(s)\lambda(s)} \Delta s \quad for\ n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \qquad (4.10)$$

are called *monomials of degree n*.

Remark 4.3. To deduce Taylor's formula for functions defined on general time scales, [3, pp. 37–46, Section 1.6] introduce so-called "polynomials" $h_n(t, \tau)$, which are related to the monomials from Definition 4.2 by the relation $h_n(t, \tau) = m_0^n(t, \tau)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{T}^\kappa$, $t \in \mathbb{T}$.

Example 4.4. On homogeneous time scales with graininess $\mu^*(t) \equiv h \geq 0$ and for regressive constants $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ we obtain $m_\lambda^n(t, \tau) = \frac{(t - \tau)^n}{n!(1 + h\lambda)^n}$ for $t, \tau \in \mathbb{T}$.

Lemma 4.5. *Consider a mapping $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{rd}\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{T}^\kappa, \mathbb{C})$ which is uniformly regressive, i.e., there exists a $\gamma > 0$ such that*

$$\gamma^{-1} \leq |1 + \mu^*(t)\lambda(t)| \quad for\ t \in \mathbb{T}^\kappa. \qquad (4.11)$$

Then the estimate $|m_\lambda^n(t, \tau)| \leq \gamma^n(t - \tau)^n$ holds for $t \geq \tau$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Proof. The proof is obtained using an easy induction argument. Trivially the desired estimate holds for $n = 0$. The induction step $n \to n + 1$ follows from

$$|m_\lambda^{n+1}(t, \tau)| \overset{(4.10)}{\leq} \int_\tau^t \left| \frac{m_\lambda^n(s, \tau)}{1 + \mu^*(s)\lambda(s)} \right| \Delta s \leq \int_\tau^t \frac{\gamma^n(s - \tau)^n}{|1 + \mu^*(s)\lambda(s)|} \Delta s \leq$$

$$\overset{(4.11)}{\leq} \gamma^{n+1} \int_\tau^t (s - \tau)^n \Delta s \leq \gamma^{n+1} \int_\tau^t (t - \tau)^n \Delta s =$$

$$= \gamma^{n+1}(t - \tau)^{n+1} \quad for\ t \geq \tau,$$

as desired. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 4.6. *If* $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{rd}\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{T}^\kappa, \mathbb{C})$ *and if* $J_\lambda : \mathbb{T}^\kappa \to \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$,

$$J_\lambda(t) := \begin{pmatrix} \lambda(t) & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ & \lambda(t) & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ & & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & & & \lambda(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

denotes a mapping with values in (complex) Jordan canonical form, then the transition matrix of $x^\Delta = J_\lambda(t)x$ *is given by*

$$\Phi_{J_\lambda}(t,\tau) = e_\lambda(t,\tau) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & m_\lambda^1(t,\tau) & \dots & m_\lambda^{d-1}(t,\tau) \\ & 1 & \dots & m_\lambda^{d-2}(t,\tau) \\ & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad for \ t, \tau \in \mathbb{T}^\kappa.$$

Proof. Obviously $\Phi_{J_\lambda}(\tau,\tau) = I_d$ by Definition 4.2, and for arbitrary $\tau \in \mathbb{T}^\kappa$ an elementary calculation using the product rule (cf. [9, Theorem 2.6(ii)]) yields the identity $\Phi_{J_\lambda}(\cdot,\tau)^\Delta(t) = J(t)\Phi_{J_\lambda}(t,\tau)$ for $t \in \mathbb{T}^\kappa$. □

Lemma 4.7. *Consider mappings* $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_{rd}^+\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$, $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{rd}\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{C})$ *on a time scale* $\mathbb{T}$ *with bounded graininess and which is unbounded above. Under the assumption*

$$\exists T \in \mathbb{T} : 0 < \inf_{t \in [T,\infty)} \left[\alpha(t) - (\hat{\Re}\lambda)(t) \right]$$

it holds that

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} m_\lambda^n(t,\tau) e_{\lambda \ominus \alpha}(t,\tau) = 0 \quad for \ \tau \in \mathbb{T}, \ n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Proof. Using the decomposition from [9, Theorem 7.4(ii)] it suffices to show that $\lim_{t \to \infty} m_\lambda^n(t,\tau) e_{\hat{\Re}\lambda \ominus \alpha}(t,\tau) = 0$. To this end we proceed by mathematical induction over $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. For $n = 0$ we have $m_\lambda^0(t,\tau) = 1$ (cf. (4.10)) and the assertion follows by [8, p. 59, Satz 9.2], namely

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} e_{\hat{\Re}\lambda \ominus \alpha}(t,\tau) = 0 \quad for \ \tau \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Now keeping $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ fixed, by assumption the relation

$$0 \le \left| \frac{m_\lambda^n(t,\tau) e_{\hat{\Re}\lambda \ominus \alpha}(t,\tau)}{(\alpha \ominus \hat{\Re}\lambda)(t)(1 + \mu^*(t)\lambda(t))} \right| = \left| \frac{m_\lambda^n(t,\tau) e_{\hat{\Re}\lambda \ominus \alpha}(t,\tau)}{\alpha(t) - (\hat{\Re}\lambda)(t)} \right| \le$$

$$\le \left| \frac{m_\lambda^n(t,\tau) e_{\hat{\Re}\lambda \ominus \alpha}(t,\tau)}{\inf_{t \in [T,\infty)}\left[\alpha(t) - (\hat{\Re}\lambda)(t)\right]} \right| \xrightarrow[t \to \infty]{} 0 \quad for \ \tau \in \mathbb{T}$$

holds. Therefore the Theorem of de l'Hospital (cf. [3, p. 48, Theorem 1.120]), applied separately to the real and imaginary part, leads to

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} m_\lambda^{n+1}(t,\tau) e_{\hat{\Re}\lambda \ominus \alpha}(t,\tau) =$$

$$\overset{(4.10)}{=} \lim_{t \to \infty} \left[\int_\tau^t \Re \frac{m_\lambda^n(s,\tau)}{1 + \mu^*(s)\lambda(s)} \Delta s + \int_\tau^t \Im \frac{m_\lambda^n(s,\tau)}{1 + \mu^*(s)\lambda(s)} \Delta s \right] e_{\alpha \ominus \hat{\Re}\lambda}(t,\tau)^{-1} =$$

$$= \lim_{t \to \infty} \left[\Re \frac{m_\lambda^n(t,\tau)}{1 + \mu^*(t)\lambda(t)} + \Im \frac{m_\lambda^n(t,\tau)}{1 + \mu^*(t)\lambda(t)} \right] \frac{e_{\hat{\Re}\lambda \ominus \alpha}(t,\tau)}{(\alpha \ominus \hat{\Re}\lambda)(t)} =$$

$$= \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{m_\lambda^n(t,\tau) e_{\hat{\Re}\lambda \ominus \alpha(t,\tau)}}{(\alpha \ominus \hat{\Re}\lambda)(t)(1 + \mu^*(t)\lambda(t))} = 0 \quad for \ \tau \in \mathbb{T},$$

which proves our lemma. □

In the following theorem and in certain subsequent results we require that the time scale $\mathbb{T}$ has bounded graininess μ^*. Beyond the standard examples $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{T} = h\mathbb{Z}$, this is satisfied for time scales occurring in many applications ranging from population dynamics (cf. [3, p. 15, Example 1.39]) to discretization theory (cf. [11, pp. 93ff]). A prominent example of a time scale with unbounded μ^* is given by $\mathbb{T} = \{q^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, $q > 1$. Nevertheless, Remark 3.5(ii) indicates that in general one cannot expect exponential stability of (3.5) on this time scale.

Theorem 4.8. *Suppose $A \in \mathcal{C}_{rd}\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{K}^{d \times d})$ and that (2.1) is Jordan reducible on a time scale $\mathbb{T}$ with bounded graininess and which is bounded above. If there exists an $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_{rd}^+\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ such that*

$$\exists T \in \mathbb{T} : \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} : 0 < \inf_{t \in [T, \infty)} \left[\alpha(t) - (\hat{\Re}\lambda_i)(t) \right] \tag{4.12}$$

holds, then the transition matrix of (2.1) satisfies

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} e_\alpha(t, \tau)\Phi_A(t, \tau) = 0 \quad \text{for } \tau \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Proof. By Theorem 4.1 and in particular by the representation (4.9) we only have to show $\lim_{t \to \infty} e_\alpha(t, \tau)\Phi_{J_i}(t, \tau) = 0$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. This is immediate from Lemma 4.6, since the assumption (4.12) allows for the application of Lemma 4.7. $\square$

Remark 4.9. Theorem 4.8 can be used to show the stability of linear time-varying systems using time-dependent eigenvalues. Here the assumption of a Jordan reducible mapping A is essential as classical examples for ODEs show (cf. [7, p. 307]).

Example 4.10. Consider an asymptotically homogeneous time scale $\mathbb{T}$ with $h := \lim_{t \to \infty} \mu^*(t) > 0$ and assume that $A \in \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ is a regressive matrix such that $\sigma(A) \subset B_{\frac{1}{h}}\left(-\frac{1}{h}\right)$. Then for the time-invariant system $x^\Delta = Ax$ the inequality $\frac{|1 + h\lambda| - 1}{h} < 0$ holds for $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ and there exists a $T \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $0 < \inf_{t \in [T, \infty)} \left[-(\hat{\Re}\lambda)(t) \right]$. Therefore $\Phi_A(t, t_0)$, $t_0 \in \mathbb{T}$, tends to 0 as $t \to \infty$.

5. The Regressive Case.
In this section we assume that $A \in \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ is regressive, so that we may freely use all the results obtained in Section 4. Moreover the eigenvalues $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ are regressive (see [3, Exercise 5.6, p. 190]).

Theorem 5.1 (Characterization of exponential stability). *Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a time scale which is unbounded above and let $A \in \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ be regressive. Then the following holds:*

  (a) *If the system (3.5) is exponentially stable, then $\sigma(A) \subset \mathcal{S}_\mathbb{C}(\mathbb{T})$.*

  (b) *If (4.11) holds for all eigenvalues λ of A and if $\sigma(A) \subset \mathcal{S}_\mathbb{C}(\mathbb{T})$, then (3.5) is exponentially stable.*

Proof. To begin with, we choose an invertible matrix $S \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ such that $J := S^{-1}AS$ is in Jordan canonical form and let the matrix A have the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$, $n \le d$. Throughout this proof we use the induced matrix norm

$$\|A\| := \max_{i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}} \sum_{j=1}^{d} |a_{ij}| \tag{5.13}$$

of $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}}$; since all norms on $\mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ are equivalent, this is sufficient for our purpose. Now suppose $t_0 \in \mathbb{T}$ is fixed.

  (a) Assume that (3.5) is exponentially stable. Then, if $v \in \mathbb{C}^d$ is an eigenvector corresponding to $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$, by [3, p. 198, Theorem 5.30], we have that

$$|e_\lambda(t, \tau)| \|v\| = \|\Phi_A(t, \tau)v\| \le K_\tau e^{-\alpha(t-\tau)} \|v\|, \quad t \ge \tau,$$

for suitable constants $K_\tau, \alpha > 0$. This shows that $|e_\lambda(t, \tau)| \leq K_\tau e^{-\alpha(t-\tau)}$ and Proposition 3.1 implies that $\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$. As $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ was arbitrary, this completes the proof.

(b) Since the eigenvalues of $A \in \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ are assumed to be uniformly regressive, there exists a $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\gamma^{-1} \leq |1 + \mu^*(t)\lambda_i| \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{T}, \, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}.$$

Then for arbitrary $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ it follows as above

$$|e_{\lambda_i}(T, t_0)| = \exp\left(\int_{t_0}^T \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1 + s\lambda_i|}{s} \Delta t \right) \quad \text{for } T \geq t_0$$

and with $\alpha := \frac{1}{2} \min\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\}$, where

$$\alpha_i := -\limsup_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T - t_0} \int_{t_0}^T \lim_{s \searrow \mu^*(t)} \frac{\log|1 + s\lambda_i|}{s} \Delta t > 0,$$

we obtain the estimate

$$|e_{\lambda_i}(t, t_0)| \leq K_1 e^{-\alpha(t-t_0)} \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0$$

with some real $K_1 = K_1(t_0) \geq 1$. On the other hand our Theorem 4.1 implies $\|\Phi_A(t, t_0)\| \leq \|S\| \, \|S^{-1}\| \, \|\Phi_J(t, t_0)\|$. Now, since all the non-zero entries of the matrix $\Phi_J(t, t_0)$ are of the type $m_{\lambda_i}^{j_i}(t, t_0)e_{\lambda_i}(t, t_0)$ for some integer $j_i \in \{0, \ldots, d_i - 1\}$, and since λ_i satisfies (4.11) by assumption, Lemma 4.5 implies

$$\left| m_{\lambda_i}^{j_i}(t, t_0)e_{\lambda_i}(t, t_0) \right| \leq K_1 \gamma^{j_i}(t - t_0)^{j_i} e^{-\alpha(t-t_0)} \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0.$$

Elementary calculus leads to the existence of some $K_2 = K_2(K_1, \alpha, t_0, j_i) \geq 1$ such that

$$\left| m_{\lambda_i}^{j_i}(t, t_0)e_{\lambda_i}(t, t_0) \right| \leq K_2 e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}(t-t_0)} \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0.$$

As each non-zero entry of the matrix $\Phi_J(t, t_0)$ satisfies such an estimate, we have also that $\Phi_J(t, t_0)$ is norm-wise exponentially bounded, i.e., we have $\|\Phi_J(t, t_0)\| \leq K_3 e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}(t-t_0)}$ for all $t \geq t_0$ and some $K_3 \geq 1$ depending in particular on d. $\qquad \square$

An immediate consequence of the previous result is the following characterization of robust exponential stability.

Corollary 5.2. *Let* $A \in \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ *be regressive. Then the following holds:*

(a) *If the system (3.5) is robustly exponentially stable, then* $\sigma(A) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$,

(b) *if (4.11) holds for all eigenvalues* λ *of* A *on a time scale with bounded graininess, and if* $\sigma(A) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$, *then (3.5) is robustly exponentially stable.*

Proof. (a) If (3.5) is robustly exponentially stable, then it is in particular exponentially stable, hence $\sigma(A) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$.

(b) The set $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$ is clearly open and by the continuous dependence of the spectrum of a matrix on its entries (cf. e.g. STEWART and SUN [13, Theorem IV.1.1]), there is a neighborhood $V \subset \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ of $A \in \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ such that $\sigma(B) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$ for $B \in V$. It remains to show that each $\lambda \in \sigma(B)$ satisfies (4.11). By assumption there exists a $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\gamma^{-1} \leq |1 + \mu^*(t)\mu| \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{T}, \, \mu \in \sigma(A)$$

and we may choose V small enough so that for each $\lambda \in \sigma(B)$ there exists a $\mu \in \sigma(A)$ with $|\mu - \lambda| < \frac{1}{2H\gamma}$, where we abbreviate $H := \sup_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \mu^*(t)$. Now the estimate

$$\gamma^{-1} \leq |1 + \mu^*(t)\lambda| + \mu^*(t)\,|\mu - \lambda| < |1 + \mu^*(t)\lambda| + (2\gamma)^{-1} \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{T}$$

leads to $(2\gamma)^{-1} \leq |1 + \mu^*(t)\lambda|$ and therefore $\lambda \in \sigma(B)$ is uniformly regressive. As λ was arbitrary, this completes the proof. $\qquad\square$

6. The General Case. In this section we treat the case of not necessarily regressive matrices $A \in \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$. We are therefore not able to use the results of Section 4. The following lemma provides an alternative way to conclude for exponential stability of Jordan blocks. This will be used in the proof of the main result of this section (Theorem 6.2).

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a time scale which is unbounded above and with bounded graininess. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ consider the Jordan block $J_\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ given by*

$$J_\lambda := \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ & \lambda & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ & & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & & & \lambda \end{pmatrix}.$$

If the scalar equation

$$x^\Delta = \lambda x \qquad (6.14)$$

is uniformly exponentially stable, then the system

$$x^\Delta = J_\lambda x \qquad (6.15)$$

is exponentially stable.

Proof. We show the assertion by constructing explicit bounds for individual solutions with initial condition $x(\tau) = \xi \in \mathbb{K}^d$, $\tau \in \mathbb{T}$. Again we will use without loss of generality the norm $\|x\| := \max\{|x_1|, \dots, |x_d|\}$ for $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{K}^d$ in our considerations.

Assume that for the solutions of (6.14) we have bounds of the form $\|x(t)\| \leq Ke^{-\alpha(t-\tau)}\|\xi\|$ for suitable constants $\alpha > 0, K \geq 1$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{T}$. Fix $\tau \in \mathbb{T}$ and $-\alpha < \beta < 0$. Now choose a sequence $-\alpha = \beta_d < \beta_{d-1} < \dots < \beta_2 < \beta_1 = \beta$. We will prove by induction on $j = d, \dots, 1$ that there exists constants K_j such that the j-th component of the solution of (6.15) is exponentially bounded by

$$|x_j(t)| \leq K_j e^{\beta_j(t-\tau)}\|\xi\|.$$

For $j = d$ the assertion follows from the assumption as the d-th entry of $x(t)$ is a solution of (6.14) and hence

$$|x_d(t)| \leq Ke^{-\alpha(t-\tau)}|\xi_d| = Ke^{\beta_d(t-\tau)}|\xi_d| \leq Ke^{\beta_d(t-\tau)}\|\xi\|.$$

So assume the assertion is shown for some index $d \geq (j+1) \geq 2$. By construction the j-th component of the solution satisfies the equation

$$x_j^\Delta(t) = \lambda x_j(t) + x_{j+1}(t) \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Thus by the variation of constants formula (which is shown in the general non-regressive case in [12, p. 56, Satz 1.3.11]) we have the representation

$$x_j(t, \tau) = e_\lambda(t, \tau)\xi_j + \int_\tau^t e_\lambda(t, s + \mu^*(s))x_{j+1}(s)\Delta s.$$

Using the exponential bound on $e_\lambda(t, \tau)$ and denoting by H the bound on the graininess of $\mathbb{T}$ we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
|x_j(t)| &\leq |e_\lambda(t, \tau)\xi_j| + \int_\tau^t |e_\lambda(t, s + \mu^*(s))x_{j+1}(s)|\Delta s \leq \\
&\leq Ke^{-\alpha(t-\tau)}|\xi_j| + \int_\tau^t Ke^{-\alpha(t-s)}e^{\alpha\mu^*(s)}K_{j+1}e^{\beta_{j+1}(s-\tau)}\Delta s \, \|\xi\| \leq \\
&\leq Ke^{\beta_{j+1}(t-\tau)}|\xi_j| + \int_\tau^t Ke^{\beta_{j+1}(t-s)}e^{\alpha H}K_{j+1}e^{\beta_{j+1}(s-\tau)}\Delta s \, \|\xi\| = \\
&= Ke^{\beta_{j+1}(t-\tau)}|\xi_j| + KK_{j+1}e^{\alpha H}(t-\tau)e^{\beta_{j+1}(t-\tau)} \, \|\xi\|
\end{aligned}
$$

and choosing K_j large enough and using $\beta_{j+1} < \beta_j$ we obtain

$$
|x_j(t)| \leq K_j e^{\beta_j(t-\tau)} \, \|\xi\| \quad \text{for } t \geq \tau,
$$

as desired. As we have exponential decay of all components of the solution $x(t)$ this implies the assertion. $\qquad\square$

The main result of this section is now the following. Recall that an eigenvalue is called *defective* if it is not semi-simple, i.e., if geometric and algebraic multiplicity do not coincide.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a time scale which is unbounded above. Let $A \in \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ and consider the linear system (3.5). Then the following assertions hold:*

(a) *If (3.5) is exponentially stable, then $\sigma(A) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T})$.*

(b) *If $\sigma(A) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T})$, the time scale $\mathbb{T}$ has bounded graininess and for all defective $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ the scalar equation (3.6) is uniformly exponentially stable, then system (3.5) is exponentially stable.*

(c) *If A is diagonalizable, then system (3.5) is exponentially stable if and only if $\sigma(A) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T})$.*

Proof. (a) Let $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ and choose an associated eigenvector v. Then we have for $t \geq \tau \in \mathbb{T}$ that (cf. [3, p. 198, Theorem 5.30])

$$
|e_\lambda(t, \tau)|\|v\| = \|\Phi_A(t, \tau)v\| \leq K_\tau e^{-\alpha(t-\tau)}\|v\| \quad \text{for } t \geq \tau,
$$

for suitable constants $K_\tau, \alpha > 0$. This shows that $|e_\lambda(t, \tau)| \leq K_\tau e^{-\alpha(t-\tau)}$ and Proposition 3.1 implies that $\lambda \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T})$. As $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ was arbitrary, this completes the proof of (a).

(b) Let $S \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ be such that $J := S^{-1}AS$ is in Jordan canonical form with Jordan blocks $J_i, i = 1, \ldots, n \leq d$. If for some i the Jordan block J_i is one dimensional the assumption on the spectrum of A and Proposition 3.1 immediately imply exponential stability of

$$
x^\Delta = J_i x. \tag{6.16}
$$

If $\dim J_i > 1$, that is, if the associated eigenvalue is defective, then exponential stability of (6.16) is a consequence of the assumptions and Lemma 6.1. In total, we have exponential stability in each of the Jordan blocks and the assertion easily follows using Theorem 4.1.

(c) This is immediate from (a) and (b). $\qquad\square$

Corollary 6.3. *Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a time scale which is unbounded above. Let $A \in \mathbb{K}^{d \times d}$ and consider the linear system (3.5). Then the following assertions hold:*

(a) *If (3.5) is robustly exponentially stable, then $\sigma(A) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$.*

(b) *If $\sigma(A) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$, the time scale $\mathbb{T}$ has bounded graininess and for all multiple eigenvalues $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ the scalar equation (3.6) is uniformly exponentially stable, then system (3.5) is robustly exponentially stable.*

(c) *If A has d distinct eigenvalues, then system (3.5) is robustly exponentially stable if and only if $\sigma(A) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$.*

Proof. (*a*) By Theorem 6.2(a) the assumption implies $\sigma(B) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T})$ for all matrices B in a neighborhood of A. Again using [13, Theorem IV.1.1] this is equivalent to the statement that for a suitable neighborhood U of $\sigma(A)$ we have $U \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T})$. This implies that $\sigma(A) \subset \mathrm{int}\, \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}) = \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$.

(*b*) As $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$ is open and by continuous dependence of the eigenvalues on the entries of a matrix we have $\sigma(B) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$ for all matrices B in a neighborhood V of A. If $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ has algebraic multiplicity greater than 1 we have by assumption that the scalar equations (3.6) is uniformly exponentially stable. By arguments similar to [12, Abschnitt 1.3] this implies that the scalar equation

$$x^{\Delta} = \eta x \tag{6.17}$$

is uniformly exponentially stable for all $|\eta - \lambda| < \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. Now [13, Theorem IV.1.4] guarantees that by choosing a sufficiently small neighborhood U of A we can ensure that any defective eigenvalue of a matrix $B \in U$ has to satisfy $|\eta - \lambda| < \varepsilon$ for some multiple eigenvalue $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$. Thus for all $B \in U \cap V$ the assumptions of Theorem 6.2(b) are satisfied which shows robust exponential stability of A.

(*c*) This is immediate from (*a*) and (*b*). $\qquad\square$

7. Conclusion.

We have presented a domain of exponential stability which completely characterizes exponential stability of scalar equations. This immediately implies a characterization of the (generic) case of matrices with distinct eigenvalues. For the case of (defective) multiple eigenvalues we obtain some criteria in the regressive case under a uniform regressivity assumption on the eigenvalues of A. If the assumption of regressivity is dropped this can be replaced by a uniform exponential stability assumption on the scalar equations defined by defective eigenvalues.

The topic warrants further investigation. In particular, it should be examined if uniform exponential stability of certain $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ is really necessary to prove Theorem 6.2(b). Also it would be interesting to know conditions for uniform exponential stability. Finally, the set of exponential stability is not completely understood. It seems clear, that it can have many connected components. It should be possible to construct examples of that type using some modification of Example 3.6(iv) by introducing gaps of varying sizes. What is unclear is, if there are conditions that imply unboundedness of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{T})$. One could conjecture that for this to happen sufficiently many times $t \in \mathbb{T}$ with $\mu^*(t) < \varepsilon$ are needed for any $\varepsilon > 0$. But a precise statement remains obscure to us for the moment.

Concluding this paper we remark that all statements remain true with obvious modifications if one replaces the time scale $\mathbb{T}$ by an arbitrary measure chain (cf. [8, 9]).

REFERENCES

[1] Agarwal, R.P. (1992): *Difference Equations and Inequalities*, Marcel Dekker Inc., New York

[2] Aulbach, B.; Hilger, S. (1990): Linear dynamic processes with inhomogeneous time scale, *Nonlinear Dynamics and Quantum Dynamical Systems* (G.A. Leonov, V. Reitmann, W. Timmermann; eds.), 9–20. Mathematical Research **59**, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin

[3] Bohner, M.; Peterson, A. (2001): *Dynamic Equations on Time Scales*, Birkhäuser, Boston

[4] Cesari, L. (1971): *Asymptotic Behavior and Stability Problems in Ordinary Differential Equations*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin 3rd edition.

[5] Daleckii, J.L.; Krein, M.G. (1974): *Stability of Solutions of Differential Equations in Banach Spaces*. Translations of Mathematical Monographs 43. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island

[6] Gard, T.; Hoffacker, J. (to appear): Asymptotic behavior of natural growth on time scales, Dynamic Systems and Applications

[7] Hahn, W. (1967): *Stability of Motion*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, 138, Springer-Verlag, New York

[8] Hilger, S. (1988): *Ein Maßkettenkalkül mit Anwendung auf Zentrumsmannigfaltigkeiten*, Ph.D. thesis, Universität Würzburg, Germany

[9] Hilger, S. (1990): Analysis on measure chains — A unified approach to continuous and discrete calculus, Results in Mathematics **18**, 18–56.

[10] Hilger, S.; Kloeden, P.E. (1994): Comparative time grainyness and asymptotic stability of dynamical systems, Autom. Remote Control **55**, 1293–1298.

[11] Keller, S. (1999): *Asymptotisches Verhalten invarianter Faserbündel bei Diskretisierung und Mittelwertbildung im Rahmen der Analysis auf Zeitskalen*, Ph.D. thesis, Augsburger Mathematische Schriften **36**, Wißner Verlag, Augsburg

[12] Pötzsche, C. (2002): *Langsame Faserbündel dynamischer Gleichungen auf Maßketten*, Ph.D. thesis, Logos Verlag, Berlin

[13] Stewart, G.W.; Sun, J. (1990): *Matrix perturbation theory*, Computer Science and Scientific Computing. Academic Press, Boston

[14] Walters, P. (1982): *An Introduction to Ergodic Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York