

Continuity of attractors of parabolic equations with nonlinear boundary conditions and rapidly varying boundaries. The case of a Lipschitz deformation

Gleiciane S. Aragão*, José M. Arrieta † and Simone M. Bruschi ‡

April 30, 2024

Abstract

In this paper we obtain the continuity of attractors for nonlinear parabolic equations with nonlinear boundary conditions when the boundary of the domain varies very rapidly as a parameter ϵ goes to zero. We want to consider the case which the boundary of the domain presents a highly oscillatory behavior as ϵ goes to zero. For the case where we have a Lipschitz deformation of the boundary with the Lipschitz constant uniformly bounded in ϵ but the boundaries do not approach in a Lipschitz sense, the solutions of these equations E -converge to the solution of a limit parabolic equation of the same type, where the boundary condition has a factor that captures the oscillations of the boundary. To address this problem, it is necessary to consider the notion of convergence of functions defined in varying domains and the convergence of a family of operators defined in different Banach spaces. Since the problems have nonlinear terms at the boundary, then it is necessary to extend these concepts to the case of spaces with negative exponents and to operators defined between these spaces.

keywords: parabolic equation; nonlinear boundary conditions; varying boundary; oscillations; Lipschitz deformation; continuity of attractors.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2020: 35K55; 34B15; 35B20; 35B27; 35B40; 35B41.

*Departamento de Ciências Exatas e da Terra, Universidade Federal de São Paulo, Rua São Nicolau, 210, Diadema-SP, Cep 09913-030, Brazil. E-mail: gleiciane.aragao@unifesp.br

†Departamento de Análisis y Matemática Aplicada, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 28040 Madrid and Instituto de Ciencias Matemáticas CSIC-UAM-UC3M-UCM, C/Nicolás Cabrera 13-15, Cantoblanco, 28049 Madrid, Spain. E-mail: arrieta@mat.ucm.es

‡Departamento de Matemática, Universidade de Brasília, Campus Universitário Darcy Ribeiro, ICC Centro, Bloco A, Asa Norte, Cep 70910-900, Brazil and Department of Mathematical Sciences, George Mason University, 4400 University Dr Fairfax-VA, 22030, USA. E-mail: sbruschi@unb.br, sbruschi@gmu.edu

1 Introduction

In this paper we are concerned with the asymptotic dynamics of parabolic problem with nonlinear Neumann boundary conditions of the type

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u_\epsilon}{\partial t} - \Delta u_\epsilon + u_\epsilon = f(x, u_\epsilon), & \text{in } \Omega_\epsilon \times (0, \infty) \\ \frac{\partial u_\epsilon}{\partial n_\epsilon} = g(x, u_\epsilon), & \text{on } \partial\Omega_\epsilon \times (0, \infty) \\ u_\epsilon(0) = u_\epsilon^0(x), & \text{in } \Omega_\epsilon \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

when the boundary of the domain varies very rapidly as a parameter $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. To describe the problem, we consider a family of uniformly bounded smooth domains $\Omega_\epsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, with $N \geq 2$ and $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ fixed, and we will look at this problem from the perturbation of the domain point of view. We will refer to $\Omega \equiv \Omega_0$ as the unperturbed domain and Ω_ϵ as the perturbed domains. We will assume that $\Omega_\epsilon \rightarrow \Omega$ and $\partial\Omega_\epsilon \rightarrow \partial\Omega$ in the sense of Hausdorff. Although the domains behave continuously as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the way in which boundary $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$ approaches $\partial\Omega$ may not be smooth. In particular, this setting includes the case where boundary $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$ presents a highly oscillatory behavior as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. In this work, we will assume that the boundary $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$ is expressed in local charts as a Lipschitz deformation of $\partial\Omega$ with the Lipschitz constant uniformly bounded in ϵ .

It is reasonable to expect that the family of solutions $\{u_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ of (1.1) will converge to the solution of an equation with a nonlinear boundary condition on $\partial\Omega$ that inherits the information about the behavior of the measure of the deformation of $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$ with respect to $\partial\Omega$. More precisely, under certain conditions, the solutions of (1.1) converge, in some sense that we will define later, to the solution of the parabolic problem with nonlinear Neumann boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial t} - \Delta u_0 + u_0 = f(x, u_0), & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, \infty) \\ \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial n} = \gamma(x)g(x, u_0), & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, \infty) \\ u_0(0) = u_0^0(x), & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

whenever the initial conditions u_ϵ^0 “converge” to u_0^0 . The function $\gamma \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega)$ is related to the behavior of the $(N - 1)$ -dimensional measure of $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$ and captures the oscillations of the boundary. We refer to Subsection 2.1 for a complete and thorough definition of the domains and in particular the function $\gamma(\cdot)$, see Definition 2.2. Indeed, we will prove the existence and continuity of the family of attractors of (1.1) and (1.2) in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ at $\epsilon = 0$.

One of the main difficulties when treating problems which are posed in different domains, like (1.1) and (1.2), is that the solutions live in different spaces, say $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ and $H^1(\Omega)$ or $L^p(\Omega_\epsilon)$ and $L^p(\Omega)$, see for instance [4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10]. So it is necessary to devise a tool to compare functions which are defined in different spaces and give a meaning to statements like $u_\epsilon \in H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ “converges” to $u \in H^1(\Omega)$.

For this, consider the linear operator $E_\epsilon : H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$, which is defined as

$$E_\epsilon = R_\epsilon \circ P, \quad (1.3)$$

where $P : H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is a linear and continuous operator that extends a function u defined in Ω to a function defined in \mathbb{R}^N , see for instance [14], and R_ϵ is the restriction operator from functions defined in \mathbb{R}^N to functions defined in Ω_ϵ , that is, $R_\epsilon w = w|_{\Omega_\epsilon}$. Observe that we also have $E_\epsilon : L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega_\epsilon)$ and $E_\epsilon : W^{1,p}(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{1,p}(\Omega_\epsilon)$, for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. As a matter of fact, denoting by $Z_\epsilon = H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ or $L^p(\Omega_\epsilon)$ or $W^{1,p}(\Omega_\epsilon)$, for $\epsilon \geq 0$, we have $E_\epsilon : Z_0 \rightarrow Z_\epsilon$. By [4] we obtain

$$\|E_\epsilon u\|_{Z_\epsilon} \rightarrow \|u\|_{Z_0}, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \|E_\epsilon\| \leq \|R_\epsilon\| \|P\| \leq \|P\|, \quad \text{independent of } \epsilon. \quad (1.4)$$

With this operator we can define a concept of convergence

Definition 1.1. *A family of elements $\{u_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$, $u_\epsilon \in H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$, is said to be E -convergent to $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ if $\|u_\epsilon - E_\epsilon u\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)} \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. We write this as $u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} u$ in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$. (Similarly we have the definition of u_ϵ E -converges to u in $L^p(\Omega_\epsilon)$, $W^{1,p}(\Omega_\epsilon)$, etc).*

The E -convergence of the solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations with nonlinear boundary conditions and rapidly varying boundaries was studied in [4], for this case of uniformly Lipschitz deformation of the boundary. The authors proved the E -convergence of the solutions in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$. In particular, if we regard these nonlinear elliptic equations as stationary equations of the parabolic evolutionary equations (1.1) and (1.2), then [4] proves the E -continuity of the set of equilibria of (1.1) in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ at $\epsilon = 0$. Moreover, the authors proved the convergence of the eigenvalues and the E -convergence of the eigenfunctions of the linearization around the equilibrium points. Also, they showed that if a equilibrium of the limit equation is hyperbolic, then the perturbed equation has one and only one equilibrium nearby. The goal of this work is to continue the analysis initiated in [4] and address the complete analysis of the asymptotic dynamics, showing that, under certain conditions of the nonlinearities and the domains, the attractor of (1.1) E -converges in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ to the attractor of (1.2).

As a matter of fact, with the concept of E -convergence we consider the following definition of E -continuity of a family of sets

Definition 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \subset H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$, $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$, and $\mathcal{A}_0 \subset H^1(\Omega)$. We have:*

(i) *We say that the family $\{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ is E -upper semicontinuous in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ at $\epsilon = 0$ if*

$$\text{dist}(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon, E_\epsilon \mathcal{A}_0) := \sup_{x_\epsilon \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon} \text{dist}(x_\epsilon, E_\epsilon \mathcal{A}_0) = \sup_{x_\epsilon \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon} \inf_{x \in \mathcal{A}_0} \|x_\epsilon - E_\epsilon x\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

(ii) *We say that the family $\{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ is E -lower semicontinuous in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ at $\epsilon = 0$ if*

$$\text{dist}(E_\epsilon \mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{A}_\epsilon) := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{A}_0} \text{dist}(E_\epsilon x, \mathcal{A}_\epsilon) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{A}_0} \inf_{x_\epsilon \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon} \|x_\epsilon - E_\epsilon x\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

(iii) *We say that the family $\{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ is E -continuous in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ at $\epsilon = 0$ if $\{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ is E -upper and E -lower semicontinuous in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ at $\epsilon = 0$.*

Let us remark that a similar definition can be stated for E -upper semicontinuity (lower semicontinuity and continuity) in $L^p(\Omega_\epsilon)$ or $W^{1,p}(\Omega_\epsilon)$.

With this definition, we can state our main result of this paper, which shows the existence of the attractors of (1.1) and (1.2), and their convergence as the parameter $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$,

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that the family of domains $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ and the nonlinearities f and g satisfy the appropriate conditions stated below in Subsection 2.1 and Subsection 2.2. Then, for each $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$, problem (1.1) has an attractor $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \subset H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ and (1.2) has an attractor $\mathcal{A}_0 \subset H^1(\Omega)$. Moreover, we have:*

- (i) *The family of attractors $\{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ is E -upper semicontinuous in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ at $\epsilon = 0$.*
- (ii) *If every equilibrium of the limit problem (1.2) is hyperbolic, then the family of attractors $\{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ is also E -lower semicontinuous in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ at $\epsilon = 0$. In particular, the attractors are E -continuous in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ at $\epsilon = 0$.*

In order to prove this result, we will use the results from Carvalho-Piskarev [16]. In this paper, the authors present an abstract result on the continuity of attractors in a similar setting as our case. Nevertheless the results from [16] cannot be applied directly to prove Theorem 1.3, but they need to be adapted properly to our situation. This adaptation is not immediate and it deserves some rather technical results.

One key point to adapt the results from [16] to our case is to extend appropriately the definition of extension operators and E -convergence to the case of fractional spaces with negative exponents. We dedicate Subsection 2.6 to this issue.

Related to this work, we would like to emphasize that in [13] the authors also study the continuity of the family of attractors associated to semilinear parabolic problems with nonlinear Neumann boundary conditions, where the domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a unit square and with \mathcal{C}^1 perturbations of this square. It is important to note that the technique used in [13] is completely different from the one used here. Actually, in this paper to deal with function spaces change with the change of the region, they perform a “change of variables” in order to bring the problem back to a fixed region, using the approach developed by D. Henry in [19]. Moreover, the technique of [19] was also applied in [21, 22].

This paper is organized as follow: in Section 2 we give the precise hypotheses and definitions about the domain perturbation and nonlinearities and we prove abstract results about embeddings and traces of fractional power space. We describe our approach to prove the continuity of the attractors, which consists in applying the setting of [16]. Moreover, we extend the concepts of extension operators and convergence to positive fractional power spaces and we define extension operators and convergence in spaces with negative exponents. In Section 3 we checked the hypotheses of [16], related to either compact convergence of the resolvent operators or convergence of the nonlinearities, to show the \mathcal{P} -continuity of the attractors. In Section 4 we prove that the notion of convergence established in an abstract way in the paper of [16] is the same as the notion of E -convergence we are using in this paper and we conclude the E -continuity of the attractors.

Acknowledgements.

G.. S. Aragão is partially supported by FAPESP 2020/14075-6, Brazil.

J. M. Arrieta is partially supported by grants PID2019-103860GB-I00, PID2022-137074NB-I00 and CEX2019-000904-S “Severo Ochoa Programme for Centres of Excellence in R&D” the three of them from MICINN, Spain. Also by “Grupo de Investigación 920894 - CADEDIF”, UCM, Spain.

2 General setting and main results

In this section we clarify the general setting of the problem. We provide hypotheses, definitions and results for the domain perturbation, nonlinearities, abstract form, and known results as well as a description of our approach and some results to implement the approach.

More precisely, in Subsection 2.1 we describe in detail the domain perturbation that we are considering, providing the appropriate definitions and hypotheses. In Subsection 2.2 we write our problem in an abstract form and describe the hypothesis on the nonlinearities. In Subsection 2.3 we review known results for this problem. These are basically taken from [3, 4, 6]. In Subsection 2.4 we describe our approach to prove the convergence of the attractors, which consists in applying the setting of Carvalho-Piskarev [16] to problems (1.1) and (1.2). In Subsection 2.5 we study the relation between the fractional power spaces and other spaces like $L^p(\Omega_\epsilon)$ and $L^p(\partial\Omega_\epsilon)$ spaces. We pay special attention to the inclusion properties among these and other spaces and obtain that the embedding constants can be chosen uniformly for the whole family of domains $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$. This is a very crucial step. In Subsection 2.6 we extend the concepts of extension operators and convergence to fractional power spaces with positive and negative exponents.

2.1 Setting of the perturbation of the domain

We consider a family of uniformly bounded smooth domains $\Omega_\epsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, with $N \geq 2$ and $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ fixed, and we regard Ω_ϵ as a perturbation of the fixed domain $\Omega \equiv \Omega_0$. As well as in [4], we consider the following hypothesis

(H) (i) For all $K \subset \Omega$, K being compact, there exists $\epsilon(K) > 0$ such that $K \subset \Omega_\epsilon$ for $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon(K)$.

(ii) There exists a finite open cover $\{U_i\}_{i=0}^m$ of Ω such that $\overline{U_0} \subset \Omega$, $\partial\Omega \subset \cup_{i=1}^m U_i$ and for each $i = 1, \dots, m$, there exists a Lipschitz diffeomorphism $\Phi_i : Q_N \rightarrow U_i$, where $Q_N = (-1, 1)^N \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, such that

$$\Phi_i(Q_{N-1} \times (-1, 0)) = U_i \cap \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_i(Q_{N-1} \times \{0\}) = U_i \cap \partial\Omega.$$

We assume that $\overline{\Omega_\epsilon} \subset \cup_{i=0}^m U_i \equiv U$, and for each $i = 1, \dots, m$, there exists a Lipschitz function $\rho_{i,\epsilon} : Q_{N-1} \rightarrow (-1, 1)$ such that $\rho_{i,\epsilon} \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, uniformly in Q_{N-1} , for each $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Moreover, we assume that $\Phi_i^{-1}(U_i \cap \partial\Omega_\epsilon)$ is the graph of $\rho_{i,\epsilon}$ this means

$$U_i \cap \partial\Omega_\epsilon = \Phi_i(\{(x', \rho_{i,\epsilon}(x')) : x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}) \in Q_{N-1}\}).$$

Note that if $\Omega \subset \Omega_\epsilon$, that is, Ω_ϵ is an exterior perturbation of Ω , then condition **(H)(i)** is satisfied.

We consider the following mappings $T_{i,\epsilon} : Q_N \rightarrow Q_N$ defined by

$$T_{i,\epsilon}(x', s) = \begin{cases} (x', s + s\rho_{i,\epsilon}(x') + \rho_{i,\epsilon}(x')), & \text{for } s \in (-1, 0) \text{ and } x' \in Q_{N-1} \\ (x', s - s\rho_{i,\epsilon}(x') + \rho_{i,\epsilon}(x')), & \text{for } s \in [0, 1) \text{ and } x' \in Q_{N-1}. \end{cases}$$

Also,

$$\Phi_{i,\epsilon} := \Phi_i \circ T_{i,\epsilon} : Q_N \rightarrow U_i,$$

and we also denote by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \phi_{i,\epsilon} : Q_{N-1} & \rightarrow & U_i \cap \partial\Omega_\epsilon \\ x' & \mapsto & \Phi_{i,\epsilon}(x', 0) \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \phi_i : Q_{N-1} & \rightarrow & U_i \cap \partial\Omega \\ x' & \mapsto & \Phi_i(x', 0). \end{array}$$

Notice that $\phi_{i,\epsilon}$ and ϕ_i are local parametrizations of $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$ and $\partial\Omega$, respectively. Furthermore, observe that all the maps above are Lipschitz. Figure 1 illustrates the parametrizations.




Figure 1: The parametrizations.

In order to give the hypothesis to deal with the deformation $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$ we need the following definition

Definition 2.1. Let $\eta : A \subset \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ almost everywhere differentiable, we define the $(N-1)$ -dimensional Jacobian of η as

$$J_{N-1}\eta \equiv \left| \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial x_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial x_{N-1}} \right| = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N (\det(\text{Jac } \eta)_j)^2},$$

where $v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_{N-1}$ is the exterior product of the $(N-1)$ vectors $v_1, \dots, v_{N-1} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $(\text{Jac } \eta)_j$ is the $(N-1)$ -dimensional matrix obtained by deleting the j -th row of the Jacobian matrix of η .

We use J_N for the absolute value of the N -dimensional Jacobian determinant.

Now, to deal with the interaction between the nonlinear boundary condition and the oscillatory behavior of $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$ we consider the hypothesis

(F) (i) $\|\nabla \rho_{i,\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty(Q_{N-1})} \leq C$, with $C > 0$ independent of ϵ , $i = 1, \dots, m$.

(ii) For each $i = 1, \dots, m$, there exists a function $\gamma_i \in L^\infty(Q_{N-1})$ such that

$$J_{N-1}\phi_{i,\epsilon} \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \gamma_i \quad \text{in } L^1(Q_{N-1}).$$

Considering hypotheses **(H)** and **(F)**, let $\gamma : \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function which measures the limit of the deformation of $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$ relatively to $\partial\Omega$. More precisely, we have

Definition 2.2. For $x \in U_i \cap \partial\Omega$, let $(x', 0) = \Phi_i^{-1}(x) \in Q_N$, we define $\gamma : \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\gamma(x) = \frac{\gamma_i(x')}{J_{N-1}\phi_i(x')}.$$

The function γ is independent of $\phi_{i,\epsilon}$ and also on the choice of the charts U_i and the maps Φ_i , that is, γ is independent of the parameterization chosen, and therefore it is unique. Moreover $\gamma \geq 1$. This was proved in [4, Corollary 5.1].

In order to deal also with non exterior perturbations, we consider a family K_ϵ of smooth interior perturbations of Ω satisfying the following hypothesis

(I) For each $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$, for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ fixed, there exists $K_\epsilon \subset \Omega \cap \Omega_\epsilon$ such that $U_0 \subset K_{\epsilon_0}$, $K_{\epsilon_1} \subset K_{\epsilon_2}$ if $\epsilon_1 > \epsilon_2$, $\theta_\epsilon : \Omega \rightarrow K_\epsilon$ is a diffeomorphism such that $\theta_{\epsilon|_{K_{\epsilon_0}}}$ is the identity in K_{ϵ_0} , ∂K_ϵ is diffeomorphic to $\partial\Omega$ and $D\theta_\epsilon$ converges to I in $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^N))$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ and, for each $i = 1, \dots, m$, there exists $\hat{\rho}_{i,\epsilon} : Q_{N-1} \rightarrow (-1, 1)$ such that

$$U_i \cap \partial K_\epsilon = \Phi_i(\{(x', \hat{\rho}_{i,\epsilon}(x')) : x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}) \in Q_{N-1}\}).$$

We also suppose that $J_{N-1}\hat{\phi}_{i,\epsilon} \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} 1$ in $L^1(Q_{N-1})$, where $\hat{\phi}_{i,\epsilon}(x') = \Phi_i(x', \hat{\rho}_{i,\epsilon}(x'))$ for $x' \in Q_{N-1}$, and

$$\int_{\Omega \setminus K_\epsilon} u = \int_0^\epsilon \int_{\partial K_\sigma} u \, d\sigma.$$

If Ω_ϵ is an exterior perturbation of Ω , then we can consider $K_\epsilon = \Omega$ and this hypothesis is satisfied.

We observe that if Ω is a C^2 domain then it satisfies this hypothesis, see [7, 19]. There are also some examples of $C^{0,1}$ domains that satisfies this hypothesis, for examples squares with particular perturbations, see [13].

2.2 Setting of the equations and hypotheses on the nonlinearities

For $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, consider the linear operator $A_\epsilon : D(A_\epsilon) \subset L^2(\Omega_\epsilon) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)$ defined by

$$A_\epsilon u_\epsilon = -\Delta u_\epsilon + u_\epsilon$$

with domain

$$D(A_\epsilon) = \left\{ u_\epsilon \in H^2(\Omega_\epsilon) : \frac{\partial u_\epsilon}{\partial n_\epsilon} = 0 \text{ in } \partial\Omega_\epsilon \right\},$$

where we identify $\Omega \equiv \Omega_0$. Let us denote by $X_\epsilon^0 = L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)$ and $X_\epsilon^1 = D(A_\epsilon)$, endowed with the graph norm. Since this operator turns out to be sectorial in X_ϵ^0 , associated to it there is a scale of Banach spaces (the fractional power spaces) X_ϵ^α , $\alpha \geq 0$, denoting the domain of the fractional power operators associated with A_ϵ , that is, $X_\epsilon^\alpha := D(A_\epsilon^\alpha)$ for $\alpha \geq 0$, where X_ϵ^α endowed with the graph norm $\|x\|_{X_\epsilon^\alpha} = \|A_\epsilon^\alpha x\|_{X_\epsilon^0}$, $\alpha \geq 0$, with $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$, see [18]. Since we are going to deal with a nonlinear boundary conditions problem, we also consider spaces of negative exponents by taking $X_\epsilon^{-\alpha} = (X_\epsilon^\alpha)'$, for $\alpha > 0$, with $X_\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} = (H^1(\Omega_\epsilon))'$ denoted by $H^{-1}(\Omega_\epsilon)$.

Denoting by $A_{\epsilon,\alpha}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the realizations of A_ϵ in this scale we have that the operator $A_{\epsilon,-\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}, X_\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ is given by

$$\langle A_{\epsilon,-\frac{1}{2}} u_\epsilon, v_\epsilon \rangle = \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} (\nabla u_\epsilon \nabla v_\epsilon + u_\epsilon v_\epsilon), \quad \text{for } u_\epsilon, v_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

With some abuse of notation we will identify all different realizations of this operator and we will write them all as A_ϵ . Moreover, we will denote $X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \equiv X_0^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ and $X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \equiv X_0^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$.

We can rewrite (1.1) and (1.2) in an abstract form as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}_\epsilon(t) + A_\epsilon u_\epsilon(t) = h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon(t)), & t > 0 \\ u_\epsilon(0) = u_\epsilon^0 \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where $h_\epsilon : X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, with $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ and $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha \leq 1$, is defined by

$$\langle h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon), \psi_\epsilon \rangle = \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} f(x, u_\epsilon) \psi_\epsilon + \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} g(x, u_\epsilon) \psi_\epsilon, \quad \text{for } u_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } \psi_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \quad (2.2)$$

And $h_0 : X^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, with $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha \leq 1$, is defined by

$$\langle h_0(u), \psi \rangle = \int_{\Omega} f(x, u)\psi + \int_{\partial\Omega} \gamma(x)g(x, u)\psi, \quad \text{for } u \in X^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } \psi \in X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \quad (2.3)$$

With respect to the nonlinearities $f : U \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : U \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we will assume they are continuous in both variables, C^2 in the second one and satisfy

$$|f(x, u)| + |\partial_u f(x, u)| + |\partial_{uu} f(x, u)| \leq C, \quad \text{for all } x \in U \text{ and } u \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.4)$$

$$|g(x, u)| + |\partial_u g(x, u)| + |\partial_{uu} g(x, u)| \leq C, \quad \text{for all } x \in U \text{ and } u \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.5)$$

Remark 2.3. *Although conditions (2.4) and (2.5) do not look rather general, note that if f and g are functions satisfying appropriate growth and sign conditions, we can prove global existence and uniqueness of mild solutions of (1.1) and (1.2) or (2.1), for $u_\epsilon^0 \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, see [11, Theorem 1.2] and [12, Theorems 2.1 and 2.2]. Assuming also a dissipativeness condition and proceeding in a similar way to [12, Proposition 3.2], we can obtain that the solutions of the equations (1.1) and (1.2) are bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega_\epsilon)$, uniformly in ϵ , so we may perform a cut off in the nonlinearities f and g in such a way that they become bounded with bounded derivatives up to second order without changing the solutions of the equations in a large bounded set in $L^\infty(\Omega_\epsilon)$. After these considerations, without loss of generality, we can assume that the nonlinearities satisfy (2.4) and (2.5).*

2.3 Known results

In this subsection we include some important definitions on E -convergence and we summarize some results on spectral convergence, convergence of equilibria and their linearizations which are taken mainly from [3, 4, 6].

Some definitions related to E -convergence. We include here some definitions that we will use throughout the paper. We recall the definition of the concept of compactness and of convergence of a family of operators $T_\epsilon : Z_\epsilon \rightarrow W_\epsilon$ acting between two families of Banach spaces W_ϵ and Z_ϵ , $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$. For each of this family we have the appropriate family of “extension” operators $E_\epsilon^W : W \rightarrow W_\epsilon$ and $E_\epsilon^Z : Z \rightarrow Z_\epsilon$. Notice that with some abuse of notation we will denote by E_ϵ the extension operators for both families of Banach spaces. These concepts follow [4]. We also refer to [4, 8, 10, 15] and references therein, for a detailed study of these notions and its applications to differential equations.

Definition 2.4. *A sequence of elements $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, with $u_n \in Z_{\epsilon_n}$ and $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, is said to be E -precompact if for any subsequence $\{u_{n'}\}$ there exist a subsequence $\{u_{n''}\}$ and $u \in Z$ such that $u_{n''} \xrightarrow{E} u$ as $n'' \rightarrow \infty$. A family $\{u_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$, $u_\epsilon \in Z_\epsilon$, is said to be E -precompact if each sequence $\{u_{\epsilon_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, with $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, is E -precompact.*

Definition 2.5. We say that a family of operators $T_\epsilon : Z_\epsilon \rightarrow W_\epsilon$, $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$, E -converges to $T : Z \rightarrow W$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, if $T_\epsilon u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} T u \in W$, whenever $u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} u \in Z$. We denote this by $T_\epsilon \xrightarrow{EE} T$.

Definition 2.6. We say that a family of compact operators $T_\epsilon : Z_\epsilon \rightarrow W_\epsilon$, $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$, converges compactly to a compact operator $T : Z \rightarrow W$ if for any family $\{u_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ with $\|u_\epsilon\|_{Z_\epsilon}$ bounded, the family $\{T_\epsilon u_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ is E -precompact and $T_\epsilon \xrightarrow{EE} T$. We denote this by $T_\epsilon \xrightarrow{CC} T$.

Spectral convergence. The kind of domain perturbation that we are considering and that has been detailed in Subsection 2.1 guarantees the spectral convergence of the Laplace operator with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions in Ω_ϵ to the same operator in the limiting domain Ω . We refer to [3, 6] for this result. In particular, this means that if we denote by μ_n^ϵ the eigenvalues of the operator $-\Delta + I$ in Ω_ϵ with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions and by μ_n the eigenvalues in Ω also with Neumann boundary conditions, then we have $\mu_n^\epsilon \rightarrow \mu_n$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. A similar statement is obtained for the eigenfunctions.

Equilibria behavior. The first step in the proof of the continuity of the attractors is to study the simplest elements from the attractor, the equilibrium solutions. The equilibrium solutions of (1.1) and (1.2) are those solutions which are independent of time and therefore they are the solutions of the following nonlinear elliptic problems

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta e_\epsilon + e_\epsilon = f(x, e_\epsilon), & \text{in } \Omega_\epsilon \\ \frac{\partial e_\epsilon}{\partial n_\epsilon} = g(x, e_\epsilon), & \text{on } \partial\Omega_\epsilon \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta e_0 + e_0 = f(x, e_0), & \text{in } \Omega \\ \frac{\partial e_0}{\partial n} = \gamma(x)g(x, e_0), & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

For each $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$, we denote by $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon \subset X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ the set of solutions of (2.6) and (2.7). Notice first that from (2.4) and (2.5) we easily obtain the uniform boundedness in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ of all equilibria, that is, there exists a $C > 0$ independent of $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$ so that $\|e_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C$ for all $e_\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$ and for all $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$. Moreover, in [4], by using E -convergence in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, it was studied the E -continuity of the equilibrium points. It was proved the E -upper semicontinuity of the family \mathcal{E}_ϵ at $\epsilon = 0$ and, by assuming the hyperbolicity of the equilibrium points in \mathcal{E}_0 (and therefore there are only a finite number of them) it was proved the E -lower semicontinuity at $\epsilon = 0$. Moreover, the authors also proved that there exist $0 < \delta < 1$ and $M > 0$ such that $\|e_\epsilon\|_{C^\delta(\Omega_\epsilon)} \leq M$ and if $\|e_\epsilon - E_\epsilon e_0\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow 0$ then $\|e_\epsilon - E_\epsilon e_0\|_{C^\beta(\Omega_\epsilon)} \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, $0 < \beta < \delta$, see [4, Proposition 5.3].

Spectral convergence of the linearizations around the equilibrium solutions. The spectra of the linearization of (1.1) around e_ϵ^* equilibrium solution of (1.1) is given by the

eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w_\epsilon + w_\epsilon - \partial_u f(x, e_\epsilon^*) w_\epsilon = \lambda^\epsilon w_\epsilon, & \text{in } \Omega_\epsilon \\ \frac{\partial w_\epsilon}{\partial n_\epsilon} + \partial_u g(x, e_\epsilon^*) w_\epsilon = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega_\epsilon. \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

Similarly, if e_0^* is an equilibrium solution of (1.2), then the spectra of its linearization is given by the eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w_0 + w_0 - \partial_u f(x, e_0^*) w_0 = \lambda^0 w_0, & \text{in } \Omega \\ \frac{\partial w_0}{\partial n} + \gamma(x) \partial_u g(x, e_0^*) w_0 = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

Notice that both problems, (2.8) and (2.9), are selfadjoint and of compact resolvent. Hence, the eigenvalues of (2.8) are given by a sequence $\{\lambda_n^\epsilon\}_{n=1}^\infty$, ordered and counting their multiplicity, with $\lambda_n^\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly the eigenvalues of (2.9) are also given by a sequence $\{\lambda_n^0\}_{n=1}^\infty$ with $\lambda_n^0 \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

In [4, Theorem 2.2], the authors proved if $\|e_\epsilon^* - E_\epsilon e_0^*\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow 0$ then the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of (2.8) converge to the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of (2.9). That is, for each fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda_n^\epsilon \rightarrow \lambda_n^0$, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, if we denote by $\{\varphi_n^\epsilon\}_{n=1}^\infty$ a set of orthonormal eigenfunctions associated to $\{\lambda_n^\epsilon\}_{n=1}^\infty$, then for each sequence $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ there is another subsequence, that we still denote by ϵ_k , and a set of orthonormal eigenfunctions $\{\varphi_n^0\}_{n=1}^\infty$ associated to $\{\lambda_n^0\}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\|\varphi_n^{\epsilon_k} - E_\epsilon \varphi_n^0\|_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$.

Notice also that if λ_n^0 is a simple eigenvalue, then λ_n^ϵ is also simple for ϵ small enough and, via subsequences, we always have that $\varphi_n^{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} \varphi_n^0$ or $\varphi_n^{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} -\varphi_n^0$ as $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$.

2.4 Our approach to prove the convergence of the attractors

As we have mentioned in the introduction, an important ingredient in our proof is the results from [16]. We recall now the setting, hypotheses and main results in this paper.

The authors consider an abstract semilinear parabolic evolution equation of the type $\dot{u} = Au + h(u)$ with $A : D(A) \subset Y \rightarrow Y$ a closed linear operator with compact resolvent in the Banach space Y . Moreover, $-A$ is a sectorial operator satisfying

$$\|(\lambda I - A)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(Y)} \leq \frac{M}{1 + |\lambda|}, \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \text{ with } \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0.$$

We denote by $Y^0 = Y$, $Y^1 = D(-A)$ endowed with the graph norm and $Y^\beta = D((-A)^\beta)$, for $0 < \beta < 1$, the fractional power spaces endowed with the graph norm $\|x\|_{Y^\beta} = \|(-A)^\beta x\|_Y$. We assume there exists $0 \leq \beta < 1$ such that $h : Y^\beta \rightarrow Y$ is a globally Lipschitz, bounded and continuously Fréchet differentiable function.

They also consider a family of semilinear parabolic problems which are regarded as a perturbation of the above equation. As a matter of fact they consider a sequence but to adapt

their statements to our setting, we will consider a one parameter family of problems indexed by ϵ . For each $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, we express these problems as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}_\epsilon + A_\epsilon u_\epsilon = h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon), & t > 0 \\ u_\epsilon(0) = u_\epsilon^0 \in Y_\epsilon^\beta, \end{cases}$$

where Y_ϵ are Banach spaces, $A_\epsilon : D(A_\epsilon) \subset Y_\epsilon \rightarrow Y_\epsilon$ are operators as above satisfying

$$\|(\lambda I - A_\epsilon)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(Y_\epsilon)} \leq \frac{M}{1 + |\lambda|}, \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \text{ with } \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0 \text{ and for all } 0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0,$$

$Y_\epsilon^0 = Y_\epsilon$, $Y_\epsilon^1 = D(-A_\epsilon)$, Y_ϵ^β are the fractional power spaces and $h_\epsilon : Y_\epsilon^\beta \rightarrow Y_\epsilon$, where $0 \leq \beta < 1$, are globally Lipschitz, bounded and continuously Fréchet differentiable functions.

In order to relate the unperturbed problem and the perturbed ones they assume that there exist linear bounded operators $p_\epsilon : Y \rightarrow Y_\epsilon$ satisfying

$$\|p_\epsilon y\|_{Y_\epsilon} \rightarrow \|y\|_Y, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0 \text{ for any } y \in Y. \quad (2.10)$$

With this sequence of linear bounded operators, they construct the operators $p_\epsilon^\beta : Y^\beta \rightarrow Y_\epsilon^\beta$ given by

$$p_\epsilon^\beta := (-A_\epsilon)^{-\beta} p_\epsilon (-A)^\beta,$$

which are linear bounded operators satisfying

$$\|p_\epsilon^\beta y\|_{Y_\epsilon^\beta} \rightarrow \|y\|_{Y^\beta}, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0 \text{ for any } y \in Y^\beta.$$

The notions of convergences established in [16] are defined as follows.

Definition 2.7. Let $0 \leq \beta < 1$, a family of elements $\{y_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$, $y_\epsilon \in Y_\epsilon^\beta$, is said to be \mathcal{P}^β -convergent to $y \in Y^\beta$ if $\|y_\epsilon - p_\epsilon^\beta y\|_{Y_\epsilon^\beta} \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. We denote this convergence by $y_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}^\beta} y$. If $\beta = 0$ then we simply write this as $y_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} y$.

Definition 2.8. A family of bounded linear operators $T_\epsilon : Y_\epsilon^\beta \rightarrow Y_\epsilon$, $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$, is said to be \mathcal{P} -convergent to the bounded linear operator $T : Y^\beta \rightarrow Y$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, if $T_\epsilon y_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} T y \in Y$ whenever $y_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}^\beta} y \in Y^\beta$. We denote this by $T_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}} T$.

Under all above assumptions, the authors showed the existence of attractors $\mathcal{A} \subset Y^\beta$ and $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon \subset Y_\epsilon^\beta$, for each $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, see [16, Theorem 1.6]. Moreover, in order to show that the attractors \mathcal{A}_ϵ “converge” in certain sense to \mathcal{A} , they explicit the following two assumptions (see [16, Section 1]):

$$[\mathbf{A1}] \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bullet \text{ } A \text{ is a closed linear operator with compact resolvent and} \\ \quad \|(\lambda I - A)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(Y)} \leq \frac{M}{1 + |\lambda|} \text{ for all } \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0; \\ \bullet \text{ } \exists M_2 > 0, w_2 \in \mathbb{R} : \|(\lambda I - A_\epsilon)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(Y_\epsilon)} \leq \frac{M_2}{|\lambda - w_2|} \text{ for all } \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > w_2, \epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]; \\ \bullet \text{ The region } \Delta_{cc} \text{ of compact convergence of the resolvents is non-empty and} \\ \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \Delta_{cc}, \text{ the resolvents } (\lambda I - A_\epsilon)^{-1} \text{ compactly converge to } (\lambda I - A)^{-1}; \\ \bullet \text{ } h_\epsilon(y_\epsilon) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} h(y) \text{ whenever } y_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}^\beta} y. \end{array} \right.$$

$$[\mathbf{A2}] \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bullet \quad h'_\epsilon(y_\epsilon) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{PP}} h'(y) \text{ whenever } y_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}^\beta} y; \\ \bullet \quad \text{If } y_\epsilon^* \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}^\beta} y^* \text{ then } \sup_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]} \sup_{\|z_\epsilon\|_{Y_\epsilon^\beta} \leq \rho} \|h'_\epsilon(z_\epsilon + y_\epsilon^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(Y_\epsilon^\beta, Y^\beta)} < \infty, \text{ for some } \rho > 0. \end{array} \right.$$

In [16] they authors proved that if $[\mathbf{A1}]$ holds, then the family $\{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ is \mathcal{P}^β -upper semicontinuous in Y_ϵ^β at $\epsilon = 0$ (see [16, Theorem 5.4]). Moreover, if $[\mathbf{A1}]$ and $[\mathbf{A2}]$ hold and each equilibrium of the limiting problem is hyperbolic, then the family $\{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ is \mathcal{P}^β -lower semicontinuous in Y_ϵ^β at $\epsilon = 0$ (see [16, Theorem 5.15]).

We want to apply the results from [16] to our problem. But to do this, we need to state clearly our choice of space Y_ϵ , our choice of β and show that hypotheses $[\mathbf{A1}]$ and $[\mathbf{A2}]$ hold. Notice that since we have a nonlinearity acting on the boundary of the domain, we will need to choose Y_ϵ as a function space with negative exponent say $X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ with the property that the functions in the space $X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ have traces at the boundary. This imposes some restrictions on α . Moreover, since we want to obtain convergence of the solutions, attractors, etc. in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ we would like to choose β so that $Y_\epsilon^\beta = X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$, that is, $\beta = \frac{1+\alpha}{2}$. That is, the nonlinearity $h_\epsilon : Y_\epsilon^\beta \rightarrow Y_\epsilon$, or equivalently $h_\epsilon : X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$.

Notice also that we need an extension operator $p_\epsilon : Y \rightarrow Y_\epsilon$, that is, $p_\epsilon : X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ and it is not completely straightforward how to choose these operators. Moreover, once this operators are choosen, following [16] we construct $p_\epsilon^\beta : H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ and we will obtain statements on \mathcal{P}^β -convergence. But we would like to relate this convergence to the E -convergence defined in the introduction where the operator E is a “standard” extension and restriction operator in H^1 . We will actually show that these two convergences are equivalent.

2.5 Fractional power space, uniform equivalence and traces

Before getting into the proof of our result we need to clarify the relation between the fractional power spaces, the Bessel potential spaces and its dependence with respect to the domain. Notice that we are perturbing the boundary of the domain in a non very smooth way and we want to understand how the norms of the spaces and the norm of the inclusions depend on ϵ .

So, let us denote by $[Z, W]_\theta$ the θ -complex interpolation space of Banach spaces Z and W , for $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, see [1, 27] for more details on interpolation theory.

Keeping the notation from Subsection 2.2, we start proving that the fractional power spaces X_ϵ^α , the Bessel potential spaces $H^{2\alpha}(\Omega_\epsilon)$ and the α -complex interpolation spaces indeed are the same spaces with equivalent norms for α in certain range of values. Moreover, and very important, the constants appearing in the inequalities of the equivalence of the norms can be chosen uniformly with respect to $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$, for some values of α . Notice that by using this, we will be able to prove that the constants of the embeddings of X_ϵ^α into the space $L^p(\Omega_\epsilon)$ and of the trace operators into $L^q(\partial\Omega_\epsilon)$ (for appropriate p and q) can be chosen uniformly in ϵ .

Let us start with the following

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family of domains satisfying conditions **(H)** and **(F)(i)**. Then for $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$, we have*

$$X_\epsilon^\alpha = [X_\epsilon^0, X_\epsilon^1]_\alpha = [X_\epsilon^0, X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}]_{2\alpha} = [L^2(\Omega_\epsilon), H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)]_{2\alpha} = H^{2\alpha}(\Omega_\epsilon),$$

with equivalent norms uniformly with respect to ϵ .

Proof. As we have mentioned in Subsection 2.3, we have the spectral convergence of A_ϵ to A_0 as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. In this case, since A_ϵ are self-adjoint, $A_\epsilon = A_\epsilon^* \geq c > 0$ uniformly in ϵ . Then, by [1, Example 4.7.3 (a)], the purely imaginary powers are bounded by 1, that means,

$$\|A_\epsilon^{it}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega_\epsilon))} \leq 1, \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } 0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0.$$

Therefore, by [27, Subsection 1.15.3], the fractional power space X_ϵ^α is characterized by the complex interpolation space

$$X_\epsilon^\alpha = [X_\epsilon^0, X_\epsilon^1]_\alpha = [X_\epsilon^0, X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}]_{2\alpha},$$

with equivalent norms independent of ϵ . Since $X_\epsilon^0 = L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)$ and $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$, then

$$X_\epsilon^\alpha = [X_\epsilon^0, X_\epsilon^1]_\alpha = [X_\epsilon^0, X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}]_{2\alpha} = [L^2(\Omega_\epsilon), H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)]_{2\alpha} = H^{2\alpha}(\Omega_\epsilon), \quad \text{for } 0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Observe that, by [29, Theorem 16.1], $X_\epsilon^\alpha = D(A_\epsilon^\alpha) = [X_\epsilon^0, X_\epsilon^1]_\alpha$ with isometry. \blacksquare

Remark 2.10. *In view of this lemma, we can always consider that the norm in $H^\alpha(\Omega_\epsilon)$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, is given by the norm of the interpolation between $L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)$ and $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$.*

Following the same notation as [4, Lemma 4.1], we obtain

Lemma 2.11. *Let $\{S_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family of Lipschitz bounded domains in \mathbb{R}^N . Assume there exists a family of Lipschitz, one-to-one mappings F_ϵ from S_0 onto S_ϵ such that the inverse is Lipschitz, $\|DF_\epsilon\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^\infty(S_0), N \times N)} \leq K$ and $\|DF_\epsilon^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^\infty(S_\epsilon), N \times N)} \leq K$, with $K > 0$ independent of ϵ . Then $u \in H^\alpha(S_\epsilon)$ if, and only if, $u \circ F_\epsilon \in H^\alpha(S_0)$, for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. Moreover, there exist constants $C, D > 0$ independent of ϵ such that*

$$C\|u \circ F_\epsilon\|_{H^\alpha(S_0)} \leq \|u\|_{H^\alpha(S_\epsilon)} \leq D\|u \circ F_\epsilon\|_{H^\alpha(S_0)}.$$

Proof. By considering the pull-back operator F_ϵ^* (that is $F_\epsilon^*(u) = u \circ F_\epsilon$), we know by [4, Lemma 4.1] that $H^1(S_\epsilon) \xrightarrow{F_\epsilon^*} H^1(S_0)$ and $L^2(S_\epsilon) \xrightarrow{F_\epsilon^*} L^2(S_0)$, satisfying the inequalities

$$C\|u \circ F_\epsilon\|_{H^1(S_0)} \leq \|u\|_{H^1(S_\epsilon)} \leq D\|u \circ F_\epsilon\|_{H^1(S_0)}$$

and

$$C\|u \circ F_\epsilon\|_{L^2(S_0)} \leq \|u\|_{L^2(S_\epsilon)} \leq D\|u \circ F_\epsilon\|_{L^2(S_0)},$$

with C, D independent of ϵ . Since $H^\alpha(S_\epsilon) = [L^2(S_\epsilon), H^1(S_\epsilon)]_\alpha$ and $H^\alpha(S_0) = [L^2(S_0), H^1(S_0)]_\alpha$, for $0 < \alpha < 1$, then by definition of complex interpolation and its norms, we obtain $u \in H^\alpha(S_\epsilon)$ if, and only if, $u \circ F_\epsilon \in H^\alpha(S_0)$ and there exist constants $C, D > 0$ independent of ϵ such that

$$C\|u \circ F_\epsilon\|_{H^\alpha(S_0)} \leq \|u\|_{H^\alpha(S_\epsilon)} \leq D\|u \circ F_\epsilon\|_{H^\alpha(S_0)}.$$

■

Lemma 2.12. *Let $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family of domains satisfying conditions **(H)** and **(F)(i)**. We have*

$$X_\epsilon^\alpha \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega_\epsilon), \quad \text{for } 0 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } 1 \leq p \leq \frac{2N}{N-4\alpha},$$

$$X_\epsilon^\alpha \hookrightarrow X_\epsilon^\beta, \quad \text{for } 0 < \beta < \alpha < \frac{1}{2},$$

with embeddings constants independent of ϵ . Moreover, the norm of the trace operator

$$T : X_\epsilon^\alpha \longrightarrow L^q(\partial\Omega_\epsilon), \quad \text{for } \frac{1}{4} < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } 1 \leq q \leq \frac{2(N-1)}{N-4\alpha},$$

can be chosen uniformly for all $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$.

Proof. First, the case $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ follows from [4, Propositions 4.2 and 4.3]. Now, we observe that $X_\epsilon^\alpha \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega_\epsilon)$, $1 \leq p \leq 2$ is trivially satisfied. Now, observe that

$$\|u_\epsilon\|_{L^p(\Omega_\epsilon)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \|u_\epsilon\|_{L^p(\Omega_\epsilon \cap U_i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_\epsilon\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega_\epsilon)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \|u_\epsilon\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega_\epsilon \cap U_i)}.$$

In the Lemma 2.11, for each $i = 1, \dots, m$, consider $\Omega_\epsilon \cap U_i$ and $\Phi_{i,\epsilon} : Q_N^- \rightarrow \Omega_\epsilon \cap U_i$, where $Q_N^- = Q_{N-1} \times (-1, 0) \subset Q_N$. Then, using Lemma 2.11 and the standard embeddings for a fixed domain, for $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$ and $1 \leq p \leq \frac{2N}{N-4\alpha}$, we obtain

$$\|u_\epsilon\|_{L^p(\Omega_\epsilon \cap U_i)} \leq D\|u_\epsilon \circ \Phi_{i,\epsilon}\|_{L^p(Q_N^-)} \leq \tilde{D}\|u_\epsilon \circ \Phi_{i,\epsilon}\|_{H^{2\alpha}(Q_N^-)} \leq \hat{D}\|u_\epsilon\|_{H^{2\alpha}(\Omega_\epsilon \cap U_i)} \leq \hat{D}\|u_\epsilon\|_{H^{2\alpha}(\Omega_\epsilon)}.$$

Now, using [4, Lemma 4.1] and the continuity of the trace operator for a fixed domain, we have

$$\|u_\epsilon\|_{L^q(\partial\Omega_\epsilon \cap U_i)} \leq D\|u_\epsilon \circ \Phi_{i,\epsilon}\|_{L^q(Q_{N-1})} \leq \tilde{D}\|u_\epsilon \circ \Phi_{i,\epsilon}\|_{H^{2\alpha}(Q_N^-)} \leq \hat{D}\|u_\epsilon\|_{H^{2\alpha}(\Omega_\epsilon \cap U_i)} \leq \hat{D}\|u_\epsilon\|_{H^{2\alpha}(\Omega_\epsilon)},$$

for $\frac{1}{4} < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$ and $1 \leq q \leq \frac{2(N-1)}{N-4\alpha}$. And the results follows from Lemma 2.9. ■

2.6 Extension operators and convergence in spaces with negative exponents

As we have mentioned in the introduction, since we are dealing with the family of domains $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$, we need to devise a way to compare functions defined in the different domains and give a meaning to the fact that a family of functions u_ϵ defined in Ω_ϵ converges to a function u defined in Ω . An effective way to accomplish this is with the concept of convergence mediated via an extension operator, as considered in [16, 24, 25, 26, 28] and applied to some problems in [4, 5, 10, 15]. Here, we will extend the concepts of extension operators and convergence to positive fractional power spaces and we will define extension operators and convergence in spaces with negative exponents.

To define properly these concepts, we need to consider operators transforming functions defined in Ω to functions defined in Ω_ϵ and also the other way around, operators transforming functions defined in Ω_ϵ to functions defined in Ω . Following the same notation as in Section 1, we consider first the linear operator $E_\epsilon : Z_0 \rightarrow Z_\epsilon$ given by (1.3) and satisfying (1.4), where $Z_\epsilon = H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$ or $L^p(\Omega_\epsilon)$ or $W^{1,p}(\Omega_\epsilon)$, for $\epsilon \geq 0$ and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.

On the other hand, we also need to define a family of operators $\hat{E}_\epsilon : Z_\epsilon \rightarrow Z_0$. At first sight one is tempted to follow a similar procedure as in the case of E_ϵ , that is, consider the extension operator from Ω_ϵ to \mathbb{R}^N and then the restriction to Ω . But since we may want to consider oscillations at the boundary in Ω_ϵ , the norm of the extension operators from Ω_ϵ to \mathbb{R}^N may not be very well controlled. Therefore, we proceed in a different direction, following the ideas of [5, 6].

We go to hypothesis **(I)** and consider the family K_ϵ of interior smooth perturbation of Ω with $K_\epsilon \subset \Omega \cap \Omega_\epsilon$ and $\theta_\epsilon : \Omega \rightarrow K_\epsilon$ a diffeomorphism satisfying this hypothesis **(I)**. Using K_ϵ and θ_ϵ , we define

$$\hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon = u_\epsilon|_{K_\epsilon} \circ \theta_\epsilon,$$

that is, if $x \in \Omega$ then $(\hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon)(x) = u_\epsilon(\theta_\epsilon(x))$. If $\Omega \subset \Omega_\epsilon$, that is, Ω_ϵ is an exterior perturbation of Ω , then we can consider $K_\epsilon = \Omega$, θ_ϵ the identity and $\hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon = u_\epsilon|_\Omega$.

Using now that $D(A_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}) = X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} = [L^2(\Omega_\epsilon), H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)]_\alpha$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, we can extend the definitions of E_ϵ and \hat{E}_ϵ to the scale of positive fractional power spaces via interpolation. Indeed, we obtain

$$E_\epsilon : X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{E}_\epsilon : X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1,$$

where $X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \equiv X_0^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ and they satisfy

$$\|E_\epsilon u\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq k \|u\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \quad \|E_\epsilon u\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow \|u\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.11)$$

and

$$\|\hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq \hat{k} \|u_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \quad \|\hat{E}_\epsilon\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}})} \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.12)$$

where $k, \hat{k} > 0$ are independent of ϵ .

We note that for $x \in K_{\epsilon_0}$ and $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, we have $(\hat{E}_\epsilon E_\epsilon u)(x) = u(x)$ and $(E_\epsilon \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon)(x) = u_\epsilon(x)$, for all $u \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ and $u_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$.

In the following, we prove a lemma that allows us to compare $E_\epsilon \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon$ and u_ϵ in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$.

Lemma 2.13. *Let $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family of domains satisfying conditions **(H)**, **(F)(i)** and **(I)**. Then there exists a function $c(\epsilon)$ with $c(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ such that, for any $u_\epsilon \in H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$, we have:*

$$(i) \int_{\partial K_\sigma} |u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon \circ \theta_\epsilon| \leq c(\epsilon) \|u_\epsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)}, \quad \text{for } \sigma > \epsilon;$$

$$(ii) \int_{K_\epsilon} |u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon \circ \theta_\epsilon| \leq c(\epsilon) \|u_\epsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)}.$$

Proof. (i) By considering the parameterization ϕ_i and θ_σ , we have

$$\int_{\partial K_\sigma} |u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon \circ \theta_\epsilon| \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{Q_{N-1}} |u_\epsilon \circ \theta_\sigma \circ \phi_i(x') - u_\epsilon \circ \theta_\epsilon \circ \theta_\sigma \circ \phi_i(x')| J_{N-1}(\theta_\sigma \circ \phi_i)(x') dx'.$$

Considering $\theta_\epsilon \circ \theta_\sigma = \theta_{\sigma(\epsilon)}$ and using similar arguments as [4, Lemma 4.2], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial K_\sigma} |u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon \circ \theta_\epsilon| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{Q_{N-1}} |u_\epsilon \circ \Phi_i(x', \hat{\rho}_{i,\sigma}(x')) - u_\epsilon \circ \Phi_i(x', \hat{\rho}_{i,\sigma(\epsilon)}(x'))| J_{N-1}(\theta_\sigma \circ \phi_i)(x') dx' \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{Q_{N-1}} \left| \int_{\hat{\rho}_{i,\sigma}(x')}^{\hat{\rho}_{i,\sigma(\epsilon)}(x')} \frac{\partial(u_\epsilon \circ \Phi_i)}{\partial x_N}(x', y) dx_N \right| J_{N-1}(\theta_\sigma \circ \phi_i)(x') dx' \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \|\hat{\rho}_{i,\sigma(\epsilon)} - \hat{\rho}_{i,\sigma}\|_{L^\infty(Q_{N-1})}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot \int_{Q_{N-1}} \left(\int_{\hat{\rho}_{i,\sigma}(x')}^{\hat{\rho}_{i,\sigma(\epsilon)}(x')} \left| \frac{\partial(u_\epsilon \circ \Phi_i)}{\partial x_N}(x', y) \right|^2 dx_N \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} J_{N-1}(\theta_\sigma \circ \phi_i)(x') dx' \\ &\leq c(\epsilon) \|u_\epsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)}, \end{aligned}$$

with $c(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ since $\hat{\rho}_{i,\sigma(\epsilon)} \rightarrow \hat{\rho}_{i,\sigma}$.

(ii) Since $\theta_\epsilon|_{K_{\epsilon_0}} = id$, then $\int_{K_{\epsilon_0}} |u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon \circ \theta_\epsilon| = 0$. Thus,

$$\int_{K_\epsilon} |u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon \circ \theta_\epsilon| = \int_{K_\epsilon \setminus K_{\epsilon_0}} |u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon \circ \theta_\epsilon| = \int_\epsilon^{\epsilon_0} \int_{\partial K_\sigma} |u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon \circ \theta_\epsilon| d\sigma \leq c(\epsilon) \|u_\epsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)}.$$

■

Lemma 2.14. *Let $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family of domains satisfying conditions **(H)**, **(F)(i)** and **(I)**. If $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $u_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ such that $\|u_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq K$, for some $K > 0$ independent of ϵ , then*

$$\|E_\epsilon \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. By [5, Lemma 3.4], the interpolation's constants are uniformly bounded in ϵ , and using Lemma 2.9, we have

$$\|E_\epsilon \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq C \|E_\epsilon \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon\|_{H^\alpha(\Omega_\epsilon)} \leq \tilde{K} \|E_\epsilon \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)}^{1-\alpha} \|E_\epsilon \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)}^\alpha.$$

Since $E_\epsilon \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon = u_\epsilon \circ \theta_\epsilon$ in $K_\epsilon \subset \Omega$, then

$$\|E_\epsilon \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)}^2 = \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |E_\epsilon \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon|^2 = \int_{\Omega_\epsilon \setminus K_\epsilon} |E_\epsilon \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon|^2 + \int_{K_\epsilon} |u_\epsilon \circ \theta_\epsilon - u_\epsilon|^2.$$

Thus, using Holder Inequality, $|\Omega_\epsilon \setminus K_\epsilon| \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ and Lemma 2.13, the result follows. \blacksquare

If $\Omega \subset \Omega_\epsilon$, that is, Ω_ϵ is an exterior perturbation of Ω , then $\hat{E}_\epsilon E_\epsilon u = u$. In the general case, we obtain

Lemma 2.15. *Let $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family of domains satisfying conditions **(H)**, **(F)(i)** and **(I)**. If $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $u \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ such that $\|u\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq K$, for some $K > 0$, then*

$$\|\hat{E}_\epsilon E_\epsilon u - u\|_{X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Using Lemma 2.9 and interpolation properties (see [27, Theorem 1.11.3] and [29, pag. 15]), we have

$$\|\hat{E}_\epsilon E_\epsilon u - u\|_{X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq C \|\hat{E}_\epsilon E_\epsilon u_\epsilon - u_\epsilon\|_{H^\alpha(\Omega)} \leq C \|\hat{E}_\epsilon E_\epsilon u - u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-\alpha} \|\hat{E}_\epsilon E_\epsilon u - u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^\alpha.$$

Since $\hat{E}_\epsilon E_\epsilon u = u \circ \theta_\epsilon$ in Ω and $\theta_\epsilon|_{K_{\epsilon_0}} = id$, then

$$\int_{\Omega} |\hat{E}_\epsilon E_\epsilon u - u|^2 = \int_{\Omega} |u \circ \theta_\epsilon - u|^2 = \int_{\Omega \setminus K_{\epsilon_0}} |u \circ \theta_\epsilon - u|^2 \leq c(\epsilon) \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2,$$

with $c(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, where in the last inequality we use the same arguments of Lemma 2.13.

Therefore,

$$\|\hat{E}_\epsilon E_\epsilon u - u\|_{X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq c(\epsilon, K) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

This concludes the proof of the lemma. \blacksquare

The concepts of E -convergence and E -weak convergence in positive fractional power spaces are defined as follows.

Definition 2.16. *Let $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, $u_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ and $u \in X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. We have:*

(i) *The family $\{u_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ E -converges to u if $\|u_\epsilon - E_\epsilon u\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. We denote this convergence by $u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} u$;*

(ii) *The family $\{u_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ E -weak converges to u if $(w_\epsilon, u_\epsilon)_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow (w, u)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, for any sequence $w_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} w$ in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, where $(\cdot, \cdot)_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ and $(\cdot, \cdot)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ denote the inner product in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $X^{\frac{1}{2}}$, respectively. We denote this convergence by $u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} u$.*

Once we have established the concept of E -convergence in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, we are going to extend appropriately this concept to spaces $X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ with $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. We define the following “extension” and “restriction” operators in spaces with negative exponents by duality.

Definition 2.17. For $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} E_\epsilon^* &: X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \\ \varphi &\mapsto E_\epsilon^* \varphi : X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

where $\langle E_\epsilon^* \varphi, u_\epsilon \rangle = \langle \varphi, \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon \rangle$ for all $u_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. On the other hand, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{E}_\epsilon^* &: X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \\ \varphi_\epsilon &\mapsto \hat{E}_\epsilon^* \varphi_\epsilon : X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

where $\langle \hat{E}_\epsilon^* \varphi_\epsilon, u \rangle = \langle \varphi_\epsilon, E_\epsilon u \rangle$ for all $u \in X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$.

We note that these operators satisfy

$$\|E_\epsilon^* \varphi\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq k^* \|\varphi\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{E}_\epsilon^* \varphi_\epsilon\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq \hat{k}^* \|\varphi_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}},$$

where $k^*, \hat{k}^* > 0$ are independent of ϵ .

Again, if $\Omega \subset \Omega_\epsilon$ then $\hat{E}_\epsilon^* E_\epsilon^* \varphi = \varphi$ for all $\varphi \in X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. In the general case,

Lemma 2.18. Let $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family of domains satisfying conditions **(H)**, **(F)(i)** and **(I)**. If $0 < \alpha < 1$ then

$$\langle \hat{E}_\epsilon^* E_\epsilon^* \varphi, u \rangle \rightarrow \langle \varphi, u \rangle, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

uniformly for u in bounded sets of $X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and φ in bounded sets of $X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$.

Proof. In fact, from Definition 2.17, we have

$$|\langle \hat{E}_\epsilon^* E_\epsilon^* \varphi, u \rangle - \langle \varphi, u \rangle| = |\langle E_\epsilon^* \varphi, E_\epsilon u \rangle - \langle \varphi, u \rangle| = |\langle \varphi, \hat{E}_\epsilon E_\epsilon u \rangle - \langle \varphi, u \rangle| \leq \|\varphi\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \|\hat{E}_\epsilon E_\epsilon u - u\|_{X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}},$$

and the convergence follows using Lemma 2.15. \blacksquare

The following result proves that E^* satisfies the condition as defined in (2.10) and that we will also see in Section 4.1.

Lemma 2.19. Let $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family of domains satisfying conditions **(H)**, **(F)(i)** and **(I)**, then

$$\|E_\epsilon^* \varphi\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow \|\varphi\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0 \text{ for any } \varphi \in X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

Proof. In fact, for each $\varphi \in X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_\epsilon^* \varphi\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} &= \sup_{\substack{u_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \\ \|u_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} = 1}} |\langle E_\epsilon^* \varphi, u_\epsilon \rangle| = \sup_{\substack{u_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \\ \|u_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} = 1}} |\langle \varphi, \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon \rangle| \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{u_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \\ \|u_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} = 1}} \|\varphi\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \|\hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon\|_{X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq \|\varphi\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \|\hat{E}_\epsilon\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}})} \rightarrow \|\varphi\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we are using that $\|\hat{E}_\epsilon\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}})} \rightarrow 1$, see (2.12).

On the other hand, we note $|\langle E_\epsilon^* \varphi, u_\epsilon \rangle| \leq \|E_\epsilon^* \varphi\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \|u_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}$. Now, using the definition of $\|\varphi\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}$ we obtain for each $\eta > 0$ there exist $u \in X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ and $\epsilon = \epsilon(\eta)$ such that

$$\|\varphi\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} - \eta < \frac{\langle \varphi, \hat{E}_\epsilon u \rangle}{\|u\|_{X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}} \leq \|E_\epsilon^* \varphi\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}.$$

Thus,

$$\|\varphi\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} - \eta < \frac{|\langle E_\epsilon^* \varphi, u_\epsilon \rangle|}{\|u_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}} \leq \|E_\epsilon^* \varphi\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \quad \text{for } u_\epsilon = E_\epsilon u, \quad \epsilon \leq \epsilon(\eta).$$

Therefore,

$$\|E_\epsilon^* \varphi\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow \|\varphi\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

■

We also note that $\hat{E}_\epsilon^* \neq \hat{E}_\epsilon$ if $\alpha = 0$, even in the case where the Ω_ϵ is an exterior perturbation of Ω . In fact, since $\langle \hat{E}_\epsilon^* u_\epsilon, v \rangle = \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} u_\epsilon E_\epsilon v$ and $\hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon = u_\epsilon|_{\Omega}$ that means, $\hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon$ as a functional in $L^2(\Omega)$ is given by $\langle \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon, v \rangle = \int_{\Omega} u_\epsilon v$.

Now, we define the concepts of E^* -convergence and E^* -weak convergence in negative fractional power spaces, using the operator E_ϵ^* .

Definition 2.20. Let $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $\varphi_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ and $\varphi \in X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. We have:

(i) The family $\{\varphi_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ E^* -converges to φ if $\|\varphi_\epsilon - E_\epsilon^* \varphi\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. We denote this convergence by $\varphi_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E^*} \varphi$;

(ii) The family $\{\varphi_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ E^* -weak converges to φ if $\langle \varphi_\epsilon, u_\epsilon \rangle \rightarrow \langle \varphi, u \rangle$ whenever $u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} u$ in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. We denote this convergence by $\varphi_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E^*} \varphi$.

Lemma 2.21. Let $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family of domains satisfying conditions **(H)**, **(F)(i)** and **(I)**. If $v_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $v_0 \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ with $v_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} v_0$ in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, then $v_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E^*} v_0$ in $X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, for $0 < \alpha \leq 1$.

Proof. Initially, for $\alpha = 1$, we have

$$\|v_\epsilon - E_\epsilon^* v_0\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}} = \sup_{\substack{u_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \|u_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} = 1}} |\langle v_\epsilon - E_\epsilon^* v_0, u_\epsilon \rangle|.$$

Since

$$|\langle v_\epsilon - E_\epsilon^* v_0, u_\epsilon \rangle| = |\langle v_\epsilon, u_\epsilon \rangle - \langle v_0, \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon \rangle| \leq |\langle v_\epsilon, u_\epsilon \rangle - \langle E_\epsilon v_0, u_\epsilon \rangle| + |\langle E_\epsilon v_0, u_\epsilon \rangle - \langle v_0, \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon \rangle|. \quad (2.15)$$

We have,

$$|\langle v_\epsilon, u_\epsilon \rangle - \langle E_\epsilon v_0, u_\epsilon \rangle| \leq \|v_\epsilon - E_\epsilon v_0\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)} \|u_\epsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.16)$$

uniformly in u_ϵ such that $\|u_\epsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)} = 1$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle E_\epsilon v_0, u_\epsilon \rangle - \langle v_0, \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon \rangle| &= \left| \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} \nabla E_\epsilon v_0 \nabla u_\epsilon + \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} E_\epsilon v_0 u_\epsilon - \int_{\Omega} \nabla v_0 \nabla \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon - \int_{\Omega} v_0 \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\Omega_\epsilon \setminus K_\epsilon} (\nabla E_\epsilon v_0 \nabla u_\epsilon + E_\epsilon v_0 u_\epsilon) + \int_{K_\epsilon} (\nabla E_\epsilon v_0 \nabla u_\epsilon + E_\epsilon v_0 u_\epsilon) - \int_{\Omega} (\nabla v_0 \nabla \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon + v_0 \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

Since

$$\left| \int_{\Omega_\epsilon \setminus K_\epsilon} (\nabla E_\epsilon v_0 \nabla u_\epsilon + E_\epsilon v_0 u_\epsilon) \right| \leq \|u_\epsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)} \|E_\epsilon v_0\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon \setminus K_\epsilon)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.18)$$

uniformly in u_ϵ such that $\|u_\epsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)} = 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{K_\epsilon} (\nabla E_\epsilon v_0 \nabla u_\epsilon + E_\epsilon v_0 u_\epsilon) - \int_{\Omega} (\nabla v_0 \nabla \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon + v_0 \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon) \\ &= \int_{K_\epsilon} (\nabla E_\epsilon v_0 \nabla u_\epsilon + E_\epsilon v_0 u_\epsilon) (1 - J_N \theta_\epsilon^{-1}) + \int_{K_\epsilon} (\nabla E_\epsilon v_0 \nabla u_\epsilon + E_\epsilon v_0 u_\epsilon) J_N \theta_\epsilon^{-1} \\ & \quad - \int_{\Omega} \nabla v_0 \nabla \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon - \int_{\Omega} v_0 \hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon \\ &= (I) + (II) - (III) - (IV). \end{aligned}$$

We have,

$$(III) = \int_{K_\epsilon} \nabla v_0(\theta_\epsilon^{-1}(x)) \nabla u_\epsilon(x) D\theta_\epsilon(\theta_\epsilon^{-1}(x)) J_N \theta_\epsilon^{-1}(x) dx$$

and

$$(IV) = \int_{K_\epsilon} v_0(\theta_\epsilon^{-1}(x)) u_\epsilon(x) J_N \theta_\epsilon^{-1}(x) dx.$$

Since $J_N \theta_\epsilon^{-1} \rightarrow 1$ in $L^\infty(K_\epsilon)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, then

$$(I) = \int_{K_\epsilon} (\nabla E_\epsilon v_0 \nabla u_\epsilon + E_\epsilon v_0 u_\epsilon) (1 - J_N \theta_\epsilon^{-1}) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.19)$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
(II) - (III) - (IV) &= \int_{K_\epsilon} [\nabla v_0(x) \nabla u_\epsilon(x) - \nabla v_0(\theta_\epsilon^{-1}(x)) \nabla u_\epsilon(x) D\theta_\epsilon(\theta_\epsilon^{-1}(x))] J_N \theta_\epsilon^{-1}(x) dx \\
&+ \int_{K_\epsilon} [v_0(x) - v_0(\theta_\epsilon^{-1}(x))] u_\epsilon(x) J_N \theta_\epsilon^{-1}(x) dx \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

From (2.18), (2.19) and (2.20), we have $\|v_\epsilon - E_\epsilon^* v_0\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow 0$, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Finally, using Lemma 2.9 and interpolation properties, we have

$$\|v_\epsilon - E_\epsilon^* v_0\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq C \|v_\epsilon - E_\epsilon^* v_0\|_{H^{-\alpha}(\Omega_\epsilon)} \leq C \|v_\epsilon - E_\epsilon^* v_0\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega_\epsilon)}^{1-\alpha} \|v_\epsilon - E_\epsilon^* v_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)}^\alpha,$$

and since $\|v_\epsilon - E_\epsilon^* v_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)}$ is uniformly bounded, we obtain the convergence in $X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. \blacksquare

Lemma 2.22. *Let $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family of domains satisfying conditions **(H)**, **(F)(i)** and **(I)**. Let $u_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ such that $\|u_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq K$, for some $K > 0$ independent of ϵ . Then, there exist a subsequence denoted by u_{ϵ_k} and $u_0 \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ such that $u_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} u_0$ and $\hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} u_{\epsilon_k} \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $X^{\frac{1}{2}}$.*

Proof. If $\|u_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq K$ then $\|\hat{E}_\epsilon u_\epsilon\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \tilde{K}$. Thus, there exist a subsequence $\hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} u_{\epsilon_k}$ and $u_0 \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ such that $\hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} u_{\epsilon_k} \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $X^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Using [4, Proposition 3.1], to prove that $u_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} u_0$ it is enough to prove that

$$(E_{\epsilon_k} v, u_{\epsilon_k})_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow (v, u_0)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \text{for all } v \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For each $v \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we have

$$|(E_{\epsilon_k} v, u_{\epsilon_k})_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}} - (v, u_0)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}| \leq |(E_{\epsilon_k} v, u_{\epsilon_k})_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}} - (v, \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} u_{\epsilon_k})_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}| + |(v, \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} u_{\epsilon_k})_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} - (v, u_0)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}|.$$

Since $\hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} u_{\epsilon_k} \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ then $|(v, \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} u_{\epsilon_k})_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} - (v, u_0)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}| \rightarrow 0$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
|(E_{\epsilon_k} v, u_{\epsilon_k})_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}} - (v, \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} u_{\epsilon_k})_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}| &= \left| \int_{\Omega_{\epsilon_k}} \nabla E_{\epsilon_k} v \nabla u_{\epsilon_k} + \int_{\Omega_{\epsilon_k}} E_{\epsilon_k} v u_{\epsilon_k} - \int_{\Omega} \nabla v \nabla \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} u_{\epsilon_k} - \int_{\Omega} v \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} u_{\epsilon_k} \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{\Omega_{\epsilon_k} \setminus K_{\epsilon_k}} (\nabla E_{\epsilon_k} v \nabla u_{\epsilon_k} + E_{\epsilon_k} v u_{\epsilon_k}) + \int_{K_{\epsilon_k}} (\nabla E_{\epsilon_k} v \nabla u_{\epsilon_k} + E_{\epsilon_k} v u_{\epsilon_k}) - \int_{\Omega} (\nabla v \nabla \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} u_{\epsilon_k} + v \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} u_{\epsilon_k}) \right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

Notice that (2.21) is the same as (2.17). Thus, the proof follows analogously to the Lemma 2.21. \blacksquare

3 \mathcal{P} -continuity of the attractors

We have seen in Subsection 2.4 that the hypotheses [A1] and [A2] imply the \mathcal{P}^β -continuity of the attractors in Y_ϵ^β , for some $0 \leq \beta < 1$. In this section we are going to define clearly the choice of our space Y_ϵ and Y_ϵ^β and prove that for this choice, the hypotheses [A1] and [A2] hold. This will imply the \mathcal{P}^β -continuity of the attractors of our problems (1.1) and (1.2) or (2.1).

If we fix a value $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and we choose $Y_\epsilon = X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$, where $Y_0 = Y$ and $X_0^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} = X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, and consider them as the base spaces of the operators A_ϵ .

We define the operator $p_\epsilon : Y \rightarrow Y_\epsilon$, that is, $p_\epsilon : X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ as $p_\epsilon = E_\epsilon^*$, where $E_\epsilon^* : X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ is given by (2.13). Moreover, choosing $\beta = \frac{1+\alpha}{2} \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ then we have $Y_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} = X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$, $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$, and $p_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} : Y^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow Y_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ given by

$$p_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} x = (A_\epsilon)^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} E_\epsilon^*(A_0)^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} x, \quad \text{for } x \in Y^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}.$$

In particular, if $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ then $X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \equiv H^\alpha(\Omega_\epsilon)$ and therefore the trace operator from $X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ to $L^2(\partial\Omega_\epsilon)$ is well defined and continuous for $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$, see Lemmas 2.9 and 2.12. This is necessary in Subsection 3.2 to deal with the nonlinearity at the boundary in the problems (1.1) and (1.2).

We can distinguish within [A1] and [A2] hypotheses related to either resolvents or nonlinearities. So, in the next two subsections organized by those focus we are going to prove now several results which will conclude with a proof that hypotheses [A1] and [A2] hold with our notions of convergence and operators defined in Subsection 2.6. Later, in Subsection 4.1, we will show the concepts of $\mathcal{P}^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ -convergence (see Definition 2.7) and E -convergence (see Definition 2.16) are equivalent and consequently we will conclude the E -continuity of the attractors.

3.1 Checking hypothesis [A1] related to resolvent operators

Initially, we note the operators A_ϵ , $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$, defined in Subsection 2.2 are sectorial. We will prove that the resolvent operators are compact. Moreover, we will prove the compact convergence of A_ϵ^{-1} to A_0^{-1} (see Definition 2.6).

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family of domains satisfying conditions (H), (F)(i) and (I). If $0 < \alpha < 1$ then the family $\{A_\epsilon^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}) : \epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]\}$ compactly converges to $A_0^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}(X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, X^{\frac{1}{2}})$, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, that is, $A_\epsilon^{-1} \xrightarrow{CC} A_0^{-1}$.*

Proof. We are going to prove that:

1. $A_\epsilon^{-1} : X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a compact operator, for $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$;
2. $\{A_\epsilon^{-1} h_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ is an E -precompact family whenever $\|h_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}$ is bounded;
3. If $h_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E^*} h_0$ then $A_\epsilon^{-1} h_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} A_0^{-1} h_0$.

Let us show each of the three points above.

1. Since $X_\epsilon^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \hookrightarrow X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is compact, for $\alpha < 1$, and $A_\epsilon^{-1} : X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ is continuous then $A_\epsilon^{-1} : X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is compact.

2. Let $\{h_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family in $X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ such that $\|h_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq K$, for some $K > 0$ independent of ϵ , we will prove that there exists a subsequence of $\{A_\epsilon^{-1}h_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ which is E -convergent in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

For each $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$, denote by $v_\epsilon = A_\epsilon^{-1}h_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, that is $A_\epsilon v_\epsilon = h_\epsilon$. Note that $v_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\|v_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2$ is uniformly bounded. In fact, using Lemma 2.12 to ensure that $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \hookrightarrow X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, with embedding constant $c > 0$ independent of ϵ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 &= \|v_\epsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)}^2 = \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |\nabla v_\epsilon|^2 + \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |v_\epsilon|^2 = \langle A_\epsilon v_\epsilon, v_\epsilon \rangle = \langle h_\epsilon, v_\epsilon \rangle \\ &\leq \|h_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \|v_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq c \|h_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \|v_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq cK \|v_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Moreover, $\|\hat{E}_\epsilon v_\epsilon\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C$, with $C > 0$ independent of ϵ . Thus, by Lemma 2.22, we have that there exist a subsequence denoted by v_{ϵ_k} and $v_0 \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ such that

$$\hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} v_{\epsilon_k} \rightharpoonup v_0 \quad \text{in } X^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} v_{\epsilon_k} \rightarrow v_0 \quad \text{in } X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad v_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} v_0 \quad \text{in } X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We need to prove that $A_{\epsilon_k}^{-1}h_{\epsilon_k} = v_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} v_0$. Since $v_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} v_0$ then it is sufficient to prove that $\|v_{\epsilon_k}\|_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow \|v_0\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Note that $\|h_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq K$ implies $\|\hat{E}_\epsilon^* h_\epsilon\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq \tilde{K}$. Using Banach-Alaouglu-Bourbaki Theorem, there exist $h_0 \in X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ and a subsequence $\hat{E}_{\epsilon_n}^* h_{\epsilon_n}$ such that, for all $\phi \in X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$,

$$\langle \hat{E}_{\epsilon_n}^* h_{\epsilon_n}, \phi \rangle \rightarrow \langle h_0, \phi \rangle, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.2)$$

Now, we are going to prove that:

$$\text{If } \phi_n \in X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \text{ with } \phi_n \rightarrow \phi \text{ in } X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \text{ then } \langle \hat{E}_{\epsilon_n}^* h_{\epsilon_n}, \phi_n \rangle \rightarrow \langle h_0, \phi \rangle, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.3)$$

In fact, using (3.2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \hat{E}_{\epsilon_n}^* h_{\epsilon_n}, \phi_n \rangle - \langle h_0, \phi \rangle| &\leq |\langle \hat{E}_{\epsilon_n}^* h_{\epsilon_n}, \phi_n \rangle - \langle \hat{E}_{\epsilon_n}^* h_{\epsilon_n}, \phi \rangle| + |\langle \hat{E}_{\epsilon_n}^* h_{\epsilon_n}, \phi \rangle - \langle h_0, \phi \rangle| \\ &\leq \|\hat{E}_{\epsilon_n}^* h_{\epsilon_n}\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \|\phi_n - \phi\|_{X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} + |\langle \hat{E}_{\epsilon_n}^* h_{\epsilon_n}, \phi \rangle - \langle h_0, \phi \rangle| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Taking subsequences and considering $\phi_k = \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} v_{\epsilon_k}$ and $\phi = v_0$, we have $\phi_k \rightarrow \phi$ in $X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. Thus, by (3.3) we obtain

$$\langle \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k}^* h_{\epsilon_k}, \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} v_{\epsilon_k} \rangle \rightarrow \langle h_0, v_0 \rangle, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Now, since $\langle \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k}^* h_{\epsilon_k}, \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} v_{\epsilon_k} \rangle = \langle h_{\epsilon_k}, E_{\epsilon_k} \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} v_{\epsilon_k} \rangle$ and, by Lemma 2.14, $\|E_{\epsilon_k} \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} v_{\epsilon_k} - v_{\epsilon_k}\|_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow 0$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle h_{\epsilon_k}, v_{\epsilon_k} \rangle - \langle h_0, v_0 \rangle| &\leq |\langle h_{\epsilon_k}, v_{\epsilon_k} \rangle - \langle h_{\epsilon_k}, E_{\epsilon_k} \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} v_{\epsilon_k} \rangle| + |\langle \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k}^* h_{\epsilon_k}, \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} v_{\epsilon_k} \rangle - \langle h_0, v_0 \rangle| \\ &\leq \|h_{\epsilon_k}\|_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \|E_{\epsilon_k} \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} v_{\epsilon_k} - v_{\epsilon_k}\|_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} + |\langle \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k}^* h_{\epsilon_k}, \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k} v_{\epsilon_k} \rangle - \langle h_0, v_0 \rangle| \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\langle h_{\epsilon_k}, v_{\epsilon_k} \rangle \rightarrow \langle h_0, v_0 \rangle, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

By (3.1) we have $\|v_{\epsilon_k}\|_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 = \langle h_{\epsilon_k}, v_{\epsilon_k} \rangle$, then

$$\|v_{\epsilon_k}\|_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \rightarrow \langle h_0, v_0 \rangle. \quad (3.4)$$

Finally, we will prove that $\langle h_0, v_0 \rangle = \|v_0\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2$ and $v_0 = A_0^{-1}h_0$. We note

$$\|v_0\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 = \|v_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_0|^2 + \int_{\Omega} |v_0|^2 = \langle A_0 v_0, v_0 \rangle. \quad (3.5)$$

On the one hand, $v_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} v_0$, then

$$(v_{\epsilon_k}, E_{\epsilon_k} w)_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow (v_0, w)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \text{for all } w \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

On the other hand, by (3.2) we have

$$(v_{\epsilon_k}, E_{\epsilon_k} w)_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}} = (A_{\epsilon_k}^{-1} h_{\epsilon_k}, E_{\epsilon_k} w)_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \langle h_{\epsilon_k}, E_{\epsilon_k} w \rangle = \langle \hat{E}_{\epsilon_k}^* h_{\epsilon_k}, w \rangle \rightarrow \langle h_0, w \rangle, \quad \text{for all } w \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence and the uniqueness of the limit, we have

$$\langle h_0, w \rangle = (v_0, w)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \langle A_0 v_0, w \rangle, \quad \text{for all } w \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Thus,

$$v_0 = A_0^{-1}h_0 \quad \text{or} \quad A_0 v_0 = h_0. \quad (3.6)$$

By (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6), we obtain

$$\|v_{\epsilon_k}\|_{X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \rightarrow \|v_0\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2.$$

3. Since $h_{\epsilon} \xrightarrow{E^*} h_0$ then $\|h_{\epsilon}\|_{X_{\epsilon}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq K$, for some $K > 0$ independent of ϵ . Thus, for any sequence $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$, we can extract another subsequence, which we denote also as ϵ_k , such that following the argument made above to prove item 2, we have $A_{\epsilon_k}^{-1} h_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} A_0^{-1} h_0$. Since this has been proved for any sequence, we obtain the E -convergence for the whole family, that is, $A_{\epsilon}^{-1} h_{\epsilon} \xrightarrow{E} A_0^{-1} h_0$. \blacksquare

Now, we verify that the resolvents $(\mu I + A_{\epsilon})^{-1}$ compactly converge to $(\mu I + A_0)^{-1}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family of domains satisfying conditions **(H)**, **(F)(i)** and **(I)**. If $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\mu \in \rho(-A_0)$, then there exists $\epsilon_\mu > 0$ such that $\mu \in \rho(-A_\epsilon)$, for all $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_\mu]$, and there exists a constant $M_\mu > 0$ independent of ϵ such that*

$$\|(\mu I + A_\epsilon)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})} \leq M_\mu, \quad \text{for all } \epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_\mu]. \quad (3.7)$$

Furthermore, $(\mu I + A_\epsilon)^{-1} \xrightarrow{CC} (\mu I + A_0)^{-1}$.

Proof. Since $\mu \in \rho(-A_0)$ then

$$(\mu I + A_0)^{-1} = [(\mu A_0^{-1} + I)A_0]^{-1} = A_0^{-1}(\mu A_0^{-1} + I)^{-1} = A_0^{-1}(I + \mu A_0^{-1})^{-1}.$$

Thus, $(I + \mu A_0^{-1})^{-1}$ exists and $(I + \mu A_0^{-1})$ is one-to-one and onto, thus $\ker(I + \mu A_0^{-1}) = \{0\}$. By Lemma 3.1, $A_\epsilon^{-1} \xrightarrow{CC} A_0^{-1}$, then using [4, Lemma 3.1], we obtain that there exist $\epsilon_\mu > 0$ and constants $\tilde{M}_\mu, C > 0$ independent of ϵ such that for all $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_\mu]$, $\|A_\epsilon^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})} \leq C$, $\mu \in \rho(-A_\epsilon)$ and

$$\|(I + \mu A_\epsilon^{-1})^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})} \leq \tilde{M}_\mu. \quad (3.8)$$

Therefore, $A_\epsilon^{-1}(I + \mu A_\epsilon^{-1})^{-1}$ is well defined from $X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ to $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and it is bounded. In fact,

$$\|A_\epsilon^{-1}(I + \mu A_\epsilon^{-1})^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})} \leq \|A_\epsilon^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})} \|(I + \mu A_\epsilon^{-1})^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})} \leq C\tilde{M}_\mu.$$

Note that

$$A_\epsilon^{-1}(I + \mu A_\epsilon^{-1})^{-1} = A_\epsilon^{-1}(\mu A_\epsilon^{-1} + I)^{-1} = [(\mu A_\epsilon^{-1} + I)A_\epsilon]^{-1} = (\mu I + A_\epsilon)^{-1}.$$

Thus, there exist $\epsilon_\mu > 0$ and $M_\mu > 0$ independent of ϵ such that, for all $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_\mu]$, $\mu \in \rho(-A_\epsilon)$ and (3.7) holds.

In order to show $(\mu I + A_\epsilon)^{-1} \xrightarrow{CC} (\mu I + A_0)^{-1}$, we need to prove that:

1. $(\mu I + A_\epsilon)^{-1} : X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a compact operator, for $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$;
2. $\{(\mu I + A_\epsilon)^{-1}h_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ is an E -precompact family whenever $\|h_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}$ is bounded;
3. If $h_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E^*} h_0$ then $(\mu I + A_\epsilon)^{-1}h_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} (\mu I + A_0)^{-1}h_0$.

Let us show each of the three points above.

1. The proof is similar to the item 2 that we will prove below.
2. Let $\{h_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family in $X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ such that $\|h_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq K$, for some $K > 0$ independent of ϵ . Note that

$$(\mu I + A_\epsilon)^{-1}h_\epsilon = A_\epsilon^{-1}(I + \mu A_\epsilon^{-1})^{-1}h_\epsilon.$$

Using (3.8) we obtain $\{(I + \mu A_\epsilon^{-1})^{-1}h_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ is a family in $X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ which is uniformly bounded in ϵ . Hence, from Lemma 3.1, we get that $\{A_\epsilon^{-1}(I + \mu A_\epsilon^{-1})^{-1}h_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ is an E -precompact family in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Consequently, $\{(\mu I + A_\epsilon)^{-1}h_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ is an E -precompact family in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

3. If $h_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E^*} h_0$ then $\|h_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq K$, for some $K > 0$ independent of ϵ . Now, from item 2. for any subsequence of $\{(\mu I + A_\epsilon)^{-1}h_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]}$ there exist a subsequence $\{(\mu I + A_{\epsilon_k})^{-1}h_{\epsilon_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $y \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ such that $(\mu I + A_{\epsilon_k})^{-1}h_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} y$ in $X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Taking $z_{\epsilon_k} = (I + \mu A_{\epsilon_k}^{-1})^{-1}A_{\epsilon_k}^{-1}h_{\epsilon_k}$ we have

$$z_{\epsilon_k} = (I + \mu A_{\epsilon_k}^{-1})^{-1}A_{\epsilon_k}^{-1}h_{\epsilon_k} = (\mu I + A_{\epsilon_k})^{-1}h_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} y, \quad \text{in } X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.9)$$

Using again Lemma 3.1, we have

$$A_{\epsilon_k}^{-1}h_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} A_0^{-1}h_0, \quad \text{in } X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.10)$$

On the other hand, since $z_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} y$ in $X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}$, then by Lemma 2.21 $z_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E^*} y$ in $X_{\epsilon_k}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. Using again Lemma 3.1, we obtain

$$A_{\epsilon_k}^{-1}z_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} A_0^{-1}y, \quad \text{in } X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.11)$$

Note that $A_{\epsilon_k}^{-1}h_{\epsilon_k} = (I + \mu A_{\epsilon_k}^{-1})z_{\epsilon_k} = z_{\epsilon_k} + \mu A_{\epsilon_k}^{-1}z_{\epsilon_k}$. Now, from (3.9) and (3.11), we have

$$A_{\epsilon_k}^{-1}h_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} y + \mu A_0^{-1}y = (I + \mu A_0^{-1})y, \quad \text{in } X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.12)$$

Using (3.10), (3.12) and uniqueness of the limit, we have $A_0^{-1}h_0 = (I + \mu A_0^{-1})y$. Thus, $y = (\mu I + A_0)^{-1}h_0$ and

$$(\mu I + A_{\epsilon_k})^{-1}h_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{E} (\mu I + A_0)^{-1}h_0, \quad \text{in } X_{\epsilon_k}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In particular, y is independent of the subsequence chosen. This implies that the whole sequence $(\mu I + A_\epsilon)^{-1}h_\epsilon$ E -converges to $y = (\mu I + A_0)^{-1}h_0$. Thus $(\mu I + A_\epsilon)^{-1} \xrightarrow{CC} (\mu I + A_0)^{-1}$. \blacksquare

Moreover, we can obtain that the boundedness (3.7) in Lemma 3.2 is uniform.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family of domains satisfying conditions **(H)**, **(F)(i)** and **(I)**. Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ and K be a compact set, $K \subset \rho(-A_0)$, then there exists $\epsilon_K > 0$ such that $K \subset \rho(-A_\epsilon)$, for all $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_K]$, and*

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0, 1)} \sup_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_K]} \sup_{\mu \in K} \|(\mu I + A_\epsilon)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})} < \infty. \quad (3.13)$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.1 we have that $A_\epsilon^{-1} \xrightarrow{CC} A_0^{-1}$. Hence, by [4, Proposition 3.3], there exists $\epsilon_K > 0$ such that $K \subset \rho(-A_\epsilon)$, for all $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_K]$, and by [4, Lemma 3.1], we obtain that there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of ϵ such that $\|A_\epsilon^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})} \leq C$. Since $(\mu I + A_\epsilon)^{-1} = A_\epsilon^{-1}(I + \mu A_\epsilon^{-1})^{-1}$ then, in order to prove the uniformly boundedness (3.13) it is sufficient to prove

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0, 1)} \sup_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_K]} \sup_{\mu \in K} \|(I + \mu A_\epsilon^{-1})^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})} < \infty. \quad (3.14)$$

Suppose that (3.14) is not uniformly bounded, thus there exist sequences $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\mu_n \in K$ such that $\mu_n \rightarrow \bar{\mu} \in K$ and

$$\|(I + \mu_n A_{\epsilon_n}^{-1})^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_{\epsilon_n}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since $\mu_n A_{\epsilon_n}^{-1} \xrightarrow{CC} \bar{\mu} A_0^{-1}$ then using again [4, Lemma 3.1], we obtain that there exist $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and a constant $M > 0$ such that $\|(I + \mu_n A_{\epsilon_n}^{-1})^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_{\epsilon_n}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})} \leq M$, for all $\epsilon_n \in [0, \epsilon_0]$, which is a contradiction. \blacksquare

Therefore, the results above imply the conditions on the resolvent in the hypothesis [A1] hold.

3.2 Checking hypotheses [A1] and [A2] related to nonlinearities

In order to prove the $\mathcal{P}^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ -continuity of the attractors, we need to prove the hypotheses [A1] and [A2] in Subsection 2.4 related to nonlinearities.

Initially, we will prove that the abstract nonlinearities given by (2.2) and (2.3) are bounded and globally Lipschitz.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that f and g satisfy (2.4) and (2.5) and $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha \leq 1$. Then there exists $K > 0$ independent of ϵ such that*

$$\|h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq K, \quad \text{for all } u_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } 0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0.$$

Proof. Initially, for each $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$ we have

$$\|h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} = \sup_{\substack{\psi_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \\ \|\psi_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} = 1}} |\langle h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon), \psi_\epsilon \rangle|.$$

Since that f and g satisfy (2.4) and (2.5), then there exists $C > 0$ independent of ϵ such that

$$\|f(\cdot, u_\epsilon(\cdot))\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\epsilon)} \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad \|g(\cdot, u_\epsilon(\cdot))\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\epsilon)} \leq C, \quad \text{for all } \epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]. \quad (3.15)$$

For $\epsilon = 0$, using (3.15), $\gamma \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega)$, Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and Lemma 2.12, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle h_0(u_0), \psi_0 \rangle| &\leq \int_{\Omega} |f(x, u_0)| |\psi_0| + \int_{\partial\Omega} |\gamma(x)| |g(x, u_0)| |\psi_0| \\ &\leq C |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\psi_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C \|\gamma\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)} |\partial\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\psi_0\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq (C_1 |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_2 |\partial\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\gamma\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}) \|\psi_0\|_{X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $\psi_0 \in X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. Thus, there exists $K_1 > 0$ such that

$$\|h_0(u_0)\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq K_1. \quad (3.16)$$

Now for $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$, using (3.15), Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, Lemma 2.12 and uniformly bounded of domains, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon), \psi_\epsilon \rangle| &\leq \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |f(x, u_\epsilon)| |\psi_\epsilon| + \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} |g(x, u_\epsilon)| |\psi_\epsilon| \\ &\leq C|\Omega_\epsilon|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\psi_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)} + C|\partial\Omega_\epsilon|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\psi_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_\epsilon)} \\ &\leq (\tilde{C}_1|\Omega_\epsilon|^{\frac{1}{2}} + \tilde{C}_2|\partial\Omega_\epsilon|^{\frac{1}{2}}) \|\psi_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $\psi_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. Thus, there exists $K_2 > 0$ independent of ϵ such that

$$\|h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq K_2. \quad (3.17)$$

Therefore, the result follows from (3.16) and (3.17). \blacksquare

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that f and g satisfy (2.4) and (2.5) and $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha \leq 1$. Then, for each $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, the map $h_\epsilon : X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ is globally Lipschitz, that is, there exists $L > 0$ independent of ϵ such that*

$$\|h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) - h_\epsilon(v_\epsilon)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq L \|u_\epsilon - v_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \text{for all } u_\epsilon, v_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } 0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0.$$

Proof. Initially, for each $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$ we have

$$\|h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) - h_\epsilon(v_\epsilon)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} = \sup_{\substack{\psi_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \\ \|\psi_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} = 1}} |\langle h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) - h_\epsilon(v_\epsilon), \psi_\epsilon \rangle|.$$

For each $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$, using Mean Value Theorem, we can write

$$f(x, u_\epsilon(x)) - f(x, v_\epsilon(x)) = \partial_u f(x, \tilde{w}_\epsilon(x)u_\epsilon(x) + (1 - \tilde{w}_\epsilon(x))v_\epsilon(x)) [u_\epsilon(x) - v_\epsilon(x)], \quad x \in \Omega_\epsilon,$$

and

$$g(x, u_\epsilon(x)) - g(x, v_\epsilon(x)) = \partial_u g(x, \hat{w}_\epsilon(x)u_\epsilon(x) + (1 - \hat{w}_\epsilon(x))v_\epsilon(x)) [u_\epsilon(x) - v_\epsilon(x)], \quad x \in \partial\Omega_\epsilon,$$

where $\tilde{w}_\epsilon(x) \in [0, 1]$ for all $x \in \Omega_\epsilon$ and $\hat{w}_\epsilon(x) \in [0, 1]$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega_\epsilon$.

For $\epsilon = 0$, using that f and g satisfy (2.4) and (2.5), $\gamma \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega)$, Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and Lemma 2.12, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle h_0(u_0) - h_0(v_0), \psi_0 \rangle| &\leq \int_{\Omega} |f(x, u_0) - f(x, v_0)| |\psi_0| + \int_{\partial\Omega} |\gamma(x)| |g(x, u_0) - g(x, v_0)| |\psi_0| \\ &\leq C \|u_0 - v_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\psi_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C \|\gamma\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)} \|u_0 - v_0\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \|\psi_0\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq (C_1 + C_2 \|\gamma\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}) \|u_0 - v_0\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|\psi_0\|_{X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $\psi_0 \in X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. Thus, there exists $L_1 > 0$ such that

$$\|h_0(u_0) - h_0(v_0)\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq L_1 \|u_0 - v_0\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \quad (3.18)$$

Now for $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$, using that f and g satisfy (2.4) and (2.5), Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and Lemma 2.12, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) - h_\epsilon(v_\epsilon), \psi_\epsilon \rangle| &\leq \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |f(x, u_\epsilon) - f(x, v_\epsilon)| |\psi_\epsilon| + \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} |g(x, u_\epsilon) - g(x, v_\epsilon)| |\psi_\epsilon| \\ &\leq C \|u_\epsilon - v_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)} \|\psi_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_\epsilon)} + C \|u_\epsilon - v_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_\epsilon)} \|\psi_\epsilon\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_\epsilon)} \\ &\leq (\tilde{C}_1 + \tilde{C}_2) \|u_\epsilon - v_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|\psi_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $\psi_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. Thus, there exists $L_2 > 0$ independent of ϵ such that

$$\|h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) - h_\epsilon(v_\epsilon)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq L_2 \|u_\epsilon - v_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \quad (3.19)$$

Therefore, the result follows from (3.18) and (3.19). \blacksquare

To simplify the proof of results, from now on we will assume that the nonlinearities depend only on u_ϵ , $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$, that is, we will consider $f(u_\epsilon)$ and $g(u_\epsilon)$ in the problems (1.1) and (1.2) instead of $f(x, u_\epsilon)$ and $g(x, u_\epsilon)$.

We need to verify the E^* -convergence of the nonlinearities h_ϵ given by (2.2) and (2.3). For this, we need the following result

Lemma 3.6. *Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open bounded set and $\psi_\epsilon, \psi \in L^p(Q)$, $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, such that $\|\psi_\epsilon\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq K$ and $\|\psi\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq K$, for some $K > 0$ independent of ϵ . If $\psi_\epsilon \rightarrow \psi$ in $L^p(Q)$ then*

$$\left| \int_Q \vartheta_\epsilon(x) (\psi_\epsilon(x) - \psi(x)) dx \right| = c(\epsilon, \vartheta_\epsilon) \rightarrow 0,$$

uniformly for ϑ_ϵ in compact sets of $L^{p'}(Q)$, where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$.

Proof. Suppose that the convergence is not uniform in compact sets of $L^{p'}(Q)$. Therefore, there exist a compact set C of $L^{p'}(Q)$, $\eta_0 > 0$ and a sequence $\vartheta_\epsilon \in C$ such that

$$\left| \int_R \vartheta_\epsilon(x) (\psi_\epsilon(x) - \psi(x)) dx \right| = c(\epsilon, \vartheta_\epsilon) \geq \eta_0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.20)$$

We are going to prove that (3.20) is not possible.

In fact, since $\vartheta_\epsilon \in C$, if necessary there exists a subsequence of ϑ_ϵ and a function $\vartheta \in C$ such that $\vartheta_\epsilon \rightarrow \vartheta$ in $L^{p'}(Q)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. We have,

$$\left| \int_R \vartheta_\epsilon(x) (\psi_\epsilon(x) - \psi(x)) dx \right| \leq \int_R |\vartheta_\epsilon(x) - \vartheta(x)| |\psi_\epsilon(x) - \psi(x)| dx + \left| \int_R \vartheta(x) (\psi_\epsilon(x) - \psi(x)) dx \right|.$$

By using Holder inequality,

$$\int_R |\vartheta_\epsilon(x) - \vartheta(x)| |\psi_\epsilon(x) - \psi(x)| dx \leq \|\vartheta_\epsilon - \vartheta\|_{L^{p'}(Q)} \|\psi_\epsilon - \psi\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq 2K \|\vartheta_\epsilon - \vartheta\|_{L^{p'}(Q)} \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $\psi_\epsilon \rightarrow \psi$ in $L^p(Q)$ then

$$\left| \int_R \vartheta(x) (\psi_\epsilon(x) - \psi(x)) dx \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

and we obtain a contradiction to (3.20). \blacksquare

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose that f and g satisfy (2.4) and (2.5) and let $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha \leq 1$, then*

$$\|h_\epsilon(E_\epsilon u) - E_\epsilon^* h_0(u)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow 0,$$

uniformly for u in bounded sets of $X^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Proof. We first consider $\alpha = 1$. Since

$$\|h_\epsilon(E_\epsilon u) - E_\epsilon^* h_0(u)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}} = \sup_{\substack{v_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \|v_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} = 1}} |\langle h_\epsilon(E_\epsilon u), v_\epsilon \rangle - \langle E_\epsilon^* h_0(u), v_\epsilon \rangle|.$$

Let $v_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle h_\epsilon(E_\epsilon u), v_\epsilon \rangle - \langle E_\epsilon^* h_0(u), v_\epsilon \rangle| = |\langle h_\epsilon(E_\epsilon u), v_\epsilon \rangle - \langle h_0(u), \hat{E}_\epsilon v_\epsilon \rangle| \\ & \leq \left| \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} f(E_\epsilon u) v_\epsilon - \int_{\Omega} f(u) \hat{E}_\epsilon v_\epsilon \right| + \left| \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} g(E_\epsilon u) v_\epsilon - \int_{\partial\Omega} \gamma(x) g(u) \hat{E}_\epsilon v_\epsilon \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Using (2.4), Lemma 2.13, $|\Omega_\epsilon \setminus K_\epsilon| \rightarrow 0$ and $|\Omega \setminus K_\epsilon| \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} f(E_\epsilon u) v_\epsilon - \int_{\Omega} f(u) \hat{E}_\epsilon v_\epsilon \right| \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega_\epsilon \setminus K_\epsilon} |f(E_\epsilon u) v_\epsilon| + \int_{\Omega \setminus K_\epsilon} |f(u) \hat{E}_\epsilon v_\epsilon| + \int_{K_\epsilon} |f(u) (v_\epsilon - \hat{E}_\epsilon v_\epsilon)| \leq c_1(\epsilon) \|v_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

with $c_1(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Consider the finite cover $\{U_i\}_{i=0}^m$ such that $\bar{\Omega}_\epsilon \subset \cup_{i=0}^m U_i \equiv U$, the local parametrizations $\phi_{i,\epsilon}$ and ϕ_i of $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$ and $\partial\Omega$, respectively. By Definition 2.2, we have $\gamma(\phi_i(x')) J_{N-1} \phi_i(x') = \gamma_i(x')$ for $x' \in Q_{N-1}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{U_i \cap \partial\Omega_\epsilon} g(E_\epsilon u) v_\epsilon - \int_{U_i \cap \partial\Omega} \gamma(x) g(u) \hat{E}_\epsilon v_\epsilon \right| \\ & = \left| \int_{Q_{N-1}} g((E_\epsilon u)(\phi_{i,\epsilon}(x'))) v_\epsilon(\phi_{i,\epsilon}(x')) J_{N-1} \phi_{i,\epsilon}(x') dx' \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \int_{Q_{N-1}} g(u(\phi_i(x')))(\hat{E}_\epsilon v_\epsilon)(\phi_i(x')) \gamma_i(x') dx' \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(E_\epsilon u)|_\Omega = u$ and $\phi_i(x') \in U_i \cap \partial\Omega$, then $g((E_\epsilon u)(\phi_i(x'))) = g(u(\phi_i(x')))$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{Q_{N-1}} g((E_\epsilon u)(\phi_{i,\epsilon}(x'))) v_\epsilon(\phi_{i,\epsilon}(x')) J_{N-1} \phi_{i,\epsilon}(x') dx' \right. \\
& - \left. \int_{Q_{N-1}} g(u(\phi_i(x'))) (\hat{E}_\epsilon v_\epsilon)(\phi_i(x')) \gamma_i(x') dx' \right| \\
& \leq \int_{Q_{N-1}} |g((E_\epsilon u)(\phi_{i,\epsilon}(x'))) - g((E_\epsilon u)(\phi_i(x')))| |v_\epsilon(\phi_{i,\epsilon}(x'))| J_{N-1} \phi_{i,\epsilon}(x') dx' \\
& + \int_{Q_{N-1}} |g(u(\phi_i(x')))| |v_\epsilon(\phi_{i,\epsilon}(x')) - (\hat{E}_\epsilon v_\epsilon)(\phi_i(x'))| J_{N-1} \phi_{i,\epsilon}(x') dx' \\
& + \left| \int_{Q_{N-1}} g(u(\phi_i(x'))) (\hat{E}_\epsilon v_\epsilon)(\phi_i(x')) (J_{N-1} \phi_{i,\epsilon}(x') - \gamma_i(x')) dx' \right| = (I) + (II) + (III).
\end{aligned}$$

Using Mean Value Theorem, (2.5) and [4, Lemma 4.2], there exists $c_2(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\|g((E_\epsilon u)(\phi_{i,\epsilon})) - g((E_\epsilon u)(\phi_i))\|_{L^2(Q_{N-1})} \leq c_2(\epsilon) \|u\|_{H^1(U)},$$

By similar arguments as [4, Lemma 4.2], there exists $c_3(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\|v_\epsilon(\phi_{i,\epsilon}) - (\hat{E}_\epsilon v_\epsilon)(\phi_i)\|_{L^2(Q_{N-1})} \leq c_3(\epsilon) \|v_\epsilon\|_{H^1(U)}.$$

Thus, using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and (2.5), we have

$$(I) \leq c_2(\epsilon) \|J_{N-1} \phi_{i,\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty(Q_{N-1})} \|u\|_{H^1(U)} \|v_\epsilon(\phi_{i,\epsilon})\|_{L^2(Q_{N-1})},$$

$$(II) \leq \tilde{c}_3(\epsilon) \|J_{N-1} \phi_{i,\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty(Q_{N-1})} \|v_\epsilon\|_{H^1(U)},$$

with $\tilde{c}_3(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Also, by hypothesis **(F)(ii)**, $J_{N-1} \phi_{i,\epsilon} \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \gamma_i$ in $L^p(Q_{N-1})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and by Lemma 3.6,

$$(III) \leq c_4(\epsilon, v_\epsilon),$$

with $c_4(\epsilon, v_\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, uniformly for v_ϵ in bounded sets of $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Therefore, there exists $c(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\|h_\epsilon(E_\epsilon u) - E_\epsilon^* h_0(u)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq c(\epsilon). \quad (3.22)$$

Now, fix $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha_0 < 1$, by Lemma 3.4 we have that there exists $K > 0$ independent of ϵ such that

$$\|h_\epsilon(E_\epsilon u) - E_\epsilon^* h_0(u)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha_0}{2}}} \leq K. \quad (3.23)$$

Then for any α such that $-1 < -\alpha < -\alpha_0 < -\frac{1}{2}$, using Lemma 2.9 and interpolation properties (see [27, Theorem 1.11.3] and [29, pag. 15]), (3.22) and (3.23), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|h_\epsilon(E_\epsilon u) - E_\epsilon^* h_0(u)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq C \|h_\epsilon(E_\epsilon u) - E_\epsilon^* h_0(u)\|_{H^{-\alpha}(\Omega_\epsilon)} \\ & \leq C \|h_\epsilon(E_\epsilon u) - E_\epsilon^* h_0(u)\|_{H^{-\alpha_0}(\Omega_\epsilon)}^\theta \|h_\epsilon(E_\epsilon u) - E_\epsilon^* h_0(u)\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega_\epsilon)}^{1-\theta} \leq c(\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

for some $0 < \theta < 1$ and $c(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. \blacksquare

Now, we are in condition to verify completely the hypothesis **[A1]**, that is, $h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) \xrightarrow{E^*} h_0(u_0)$ whenever $u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} u_0$.

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose that f and g satisfy (2.4) and (2.5) and let $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha \leq 1$. If $u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} u_0$ in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, then*

$$\|h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) - E_\epsilon^* h_0(u_0)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. By Lemmas 3.5 and 3.7, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) - E_\epsilon^* h_0(u_0)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} & \leq \|h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) - h_\epsilon(E_\epsilon u_0)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} + \|h_\epsilon(E_\epsilon u_0) - E_\epsilon^* h_0(u_0)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \\ & \leq L \|u_\epsilon - E_\epsilon u_0\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \|h_\epsilon(E_\epsilon u_0) - E_\epsilon^* h_0(u_0)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

\blacksquare

Now, we will verify the properties in **[A2]** related to the derivatives of nonlinearities (2.2) and (2.3). For this, we define $h'_\epsilon : X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}, X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})$, with $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ and $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha \leq 1$, by

$$\langle h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)v_\epsilon, z_\epsilon \rangle = \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} f'(e_\epsilon)v_\epsilon z_\epsilon + \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} g'(e_\epsilon)v_\epsilon z_\epsilon, \quad \text{for } e_\epsilon, v_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } z_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \quad (3.24)$$

and

$$\langle h'_0(e_0)v, z \rangle = \int_{\Omega} f'(e_0)vz + \int_{\partial\Omega} \gamma(x)g'(e_0)vz, \quad \text{for } e_0, v \in X^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } z \in X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \quad (3.25)$$

First, by definition of h'_ϵ in (3.24) and (3.25) and the hypotheses (2.4) and (2.5), we can proceed in a similar way to Lemma 3.4 and we can obtain

$$\sup_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]} \sup_{\|v_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \rho} \|h'_\epsilon(v_\epsilon + e_\epsilon)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}, X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}})} \leq K, \quad (3.26)$$

for some $\rho > 0$ and $K > 0$ independent of ϵ .

The following lemmas prove the E^* -convergence of $h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)$ to $h'_0(e_0)$ whenever $e_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} e_0$.

Lemma 3.9. *Suppose that f and g satisfy (2.4) and (2.5) and let $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha \leq 1$. If $e_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} e_0$ in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, then there exists a positive function $C(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ such that*

$$\|h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v) - E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq C(\epsilon) \|v\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \text{for all } v \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. Initially, for each $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$ and $\alpha = 1$, we have

$$\|h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v) - E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}} = \sup_{\substack{z_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \|z_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} = 1}} |\langle h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v), z_\epsilon \rangle - \langle E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v), z_\epsilon \rangle|.$$

We note

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v), z_\epsilon \rangle - \langle E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v), z_\epsilon \rangle| = |\langle h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v), z_\epsilon \rangle - \langle h'_0(e_0)(v), \hat{E}_\epsilon z_\epsilon \rangle| \\ &= \left| \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} f'(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v) z_\epsilon - \int_{\Omega} f'(e_0)(v) \hat{E}_\epsilon z_\epsilon + \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} g'(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v) z_\epsilon - \int_{\partial\Omega} \gamma(x) g'(e_0)(v) \hat{E}_\epsilon z_\epsilon \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} f'(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v) z_\epsilon - \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} f'(E_\epsilon e_0)(E_\epsilon v) z_\epsilon \right| + \left| \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} f'(E_\epsilon e_0)(E_\epsilon v) z_\epsilon - \int_{\Omega} f'(e_0)(v) \hat{E}_\epsilon z_\epsilon \right| \\ &+ \left| \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} g'(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v) z_\epsilon - \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} g'(E_\epsilon e_0)(E_\epsilon v) z_\epsilon \right| + \left| \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} g'(E_\epsilon e_0)(E_\epsilon v) z_\epsilon - \int_{\partial\Omega} \gamma(x) g'(e_0)(v) \hat{E}_\epsilon z_\epsilon \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Using Mean Value Theorem, we can write

$$f'(e_\epsilon(x)) - f'((E_\epsilon e_0)(x)) = f''(\tilde{e}_\epsilon(x) e_\epsilon(x) + (1 - \tilde{e}_\epsilon(x))(E_\epsilon e_0)(x)) [e_\epsilon(x) - (E_\epsilon e_0)(x)], \quad x \in \Omega_\epsilon,$$

and

$$g'(e_\epsilon(x)) - g'((E_\epsilon e_0)(x)) = g''(\hat{e}_\epsilon(x) e_\epsilon(x) + (1 - \hat{e}_\epsilon(x))(E_\epsilon e_0)(x)) [e_\epsilon(x) - (E_\epsilon e_0)(x)], \quad x \in \partial\Omega_\epsilon,$$

where $\tilde{e}_\epsilon(x) \in [0, 1]$ for all $x \in \Omega_\epsilon$ and $\hat{e}_\epsilon(x) \in [0, 1]$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega_\epsilon$. Hence and using (2.4) and (2.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v), z_\epsilon \rangle - \langle E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v), z_\epsilon \rangle| \\ &\leq C \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} |e_\epsilon - E_\epsilon e_0| |E_\epsilon v| |z_\epsilon| + \int_{\Omega_\epsilon \setminus K_\epsilon} |f'(E_\epsilon e_0)| |E_\epsilon v| |z_\epsilon| + \int_{\Omega \setminus K_\epsilon} |f'(e_0)| |v| |\hat{E}_\epsilon z_\epsilon| \\ &+ \int_{K_\epsilon \setminus K_{\epsilon_0}} |f'(e_0)| |v| |z_\epsilon - z_\epsilon \circ \theta_\epsilon| + C \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} |e_\epsilon - E_\epsilon e_0| |E_\epsilon v| |z_\epsilon| \\ &+ \left| \int_{\partial\Omega_\epsilon} g'(E_\epsilon e_0)(E_\epsilon v) z_\epsilon - \int_{\partial\Omega} \gamma(x) g'(e_0)(v) \hat{E}_\epsilon z_\epsilon \right| = (I) + (II) + (III) + (IV) + (V) + (VI). \end{aligned}$$

For the last term (VI), we use the parametrizations ϕ_i and $\phi_{i,\epsilon}$ of the boundaries $\partial\Omega$ and $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$ respectively, then with similar arguments to Lemma 3.7 and considering that $J_{N-1} \phi_{i,\epsilon} \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \gamma_i$ in $L^p(Q_{N-1})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$. Applying Lemma 2.13 we get that term (IV) goes to zero as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Using $e_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} e_0$, $|\Omega_\epsilon \setminus K_\epsilon| \rightarrow 0$ and $|\Omega \setminus K_\epsilon| \rightarrow 0$, we have that terms (I), (II), (III) and (V) goes to zero as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Thus, there exists a positive function $\tilde{C}(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\|h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v) - E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \tilde{C}(\epsilon) \|v\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \quad (3.27)$$

Now, fix $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha_0 < 1$, by similar arguments to (3.26), we have that there exists $K > 0$ independent of ϵ such that

$$\|h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v) - E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha_0}{2}}} \leq K \|v\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \text{for all } v \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.28)$$

Finally, for any α such that $-1 < -\alpha < -\alpha_0 < -\frac{1}{2}$, using Lemma 2.9, interpolation properties (see [27, Theorem 1.11.3] and [29, pag. 15]), (3.27) and (3.28), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v) - E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \leq C \|h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v) - E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v)\|_{H^{-\alpha}(\Omega_\epsilon)} \\ & \leq C \|h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v) - E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v)\|_{H^{-\alpha_0}(\Omega_\epsilon)}^\theta \|h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v) - E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v)\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega_\epsilon)}^{1-\theta} \leq C(\epsilon) \|v\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $v \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and for some $0 < \theta < 1$ and $C(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. \blacksquare

Now, we are in condition to verify completely the hypothesis [A2], that is, $h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon) \xrightarrow{EE} h'_0(e_0)$, whenever $e_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} e_0$.

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose that f and g satisfy (2.4) and (2.5) and let $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha \leq 1$. If $e_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} e_0$ and $v_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} v$ in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, then*

$$\|h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(v_\epsilon) - E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Using (3.26), similar arguments to Lemma 3.5, and Lemma 3.9, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(v_\epsilon) - E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \\ & \leq \|h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(v_\epsilon) - h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} + \|h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v) - E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \\ & \leq L \|v_\epsilon - E_\epsilon v\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \|h'_\epsilon(e_\epsilon)(E_\epsilon v) - E_\epsilon^* h'_0(e_0)(v)\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

for some $L > 0$ independent of ϵ . \blacksquare

Remark 3.11. *The results of Subsections 3.1 and 3.2 imply that the hypotheses [A1] and [A2] hold. Consequently, there exists a family of attractors $\{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ for our problems (1.1) and (1.2) or (2.1) in $Y_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ and we obtain the $\mathcal{P}^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ -continuity of this family in $Y_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ at $\epsilon = 0$.*

4 E -Continuity of the attractors

We have shown in Section 3 the $\mathcal{P}^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ -continuity of the attractors. For this we have applied the abstract results from [16]. Now, we want to obtain the E -continuity of the attractors. In order to accomplish this, we need to show the equivalence between the concepts of $\mathcal{P}^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ -convergence and E -convergence.

4.1 E -convergence vs \mathcal{P} -convergence

The purpose of this subsection is to prove that the notion of \mathcal{P} -convergence established in an abstract way in the paper of [16] is the same as the notion of E -convergence we are using in this paper.

Based on the notations in Subsection 2.4, if we fix a value $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and we choose $Y_\epsilon = X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$, where $Y_0 = Y$ and $X_0^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} = X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, and consider them as the base spaces of the operators A_ϵ . Analogously to Section 3, we define the operator $p_\epsilon : Y \rightarrow Y_\epsilon$, that is, $p_\epsilon : X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ as $p_\epsilon = E_\epsilon^*$, where $E_\epsilon^* : X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ is given by (2.13), then we have $Y_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} = X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$, $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]$, and $p_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} : Y^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} \rightarrow Y_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ given by $p_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} x = (A_\epsilon)^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} E_\epsilon^*(A_0)^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} x$, for $x \in Y^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$.

So we have two concepts of convergence, one given by Definition 2.16 using the family of linear operators $E_\epsilon : X^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in (1.3) and another given by Definition 2.7 using the family of operators $p_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} : X^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$. We are going to prove that these two concepts of convergence are equivalents.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\{\Omega_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0]}$ be a family of domains satisfying conditions **(H)**, **(F)(i)** and **(I)**. If $u_\epsilon \in X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $u \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}$, then $u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} u$ if, and only if, $u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}} u$.*

Proof. We first prove that given $u \in X^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega)$, the sequence $\{p_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} u\}$ E -converges to u in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega_\epsilon) = Y_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, that means,

$$\|p_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} u - E_\epsilon u\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.1)$$

In fact, let $u \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $v \in X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ such that $u = A_0^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} v$, then taking $v_\epsilon = E_\epsilon^* v$ and $u_\epsilon = A_\epsilon^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} v_\epsilon$, we have $u_\epsilon = p_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} u$.

Now, let $\{(\lambda_i, \varphi_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $A_0 : X^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow X^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\{(\lambda_{i,\epsilon}, \varphi_{i,\epsilon})\}_{i=1}^\infty$ the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of $A_\epsilon : X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow X_\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Let $u \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ then

$$u = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (u, \varphi_i)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} \varphi_i \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (u, \varphi_i)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}^2 \lambda_i < \infty.$$

So, $v = A_0^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} u = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (u, \varphi_i)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} A_0^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} \varphi_i = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (u, \varphi_i)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} \lambda_i^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} \varphi_i$. On the other hand,

$$E_\epsilon^* v = v_\epsilon = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (v_\epsilon, \varphi_{i,\epsilon})_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \varphi_{i,\epsilon} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} v_{i,\epsilon} \varphi_{i,\epsilon},$$

where, by definition of E_ϵ^* ,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{i,\epsilon} &= (v_\epsilon, \varphi_{i,\epsilon})_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} = (E_\epsilon^* v, \varphi_{i,\epsilon})_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} = (v, \hat{E}_\epsilon \varphi_{i,\epsilon})_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \\ &= (v, \hat{E}_\epsilon \varphi_{i,\epsilon} - \varphi_i)_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} + (v, \varphi_i)_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.1 we have that $A_\epsilon^{-1} \xrightarrow{CC} A_0^{-1}$. Hence, using [4, Proposition 3.3], we have $\lambda_{i,\epsilon} \rightarrow \lambda_i$ and $\varphi_{i,\epsilon} \xrightarrow{E} \varphi_i$ in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$. So, from Lemma 2.21 we obtain that $\varphi_{i,\epsilon} \xrightarrow{E^*} \varphi_i$ in $X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. Moreover, as consequence of the Lemma 2.15, $\hat{E}_\epsilon \varphi_{i,\epsilon}$ converges to φ_i in $X^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Thus,

$$v_{i,\epsilon} = (v_\epsilon, \varphi_{i,\epsilon})_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow (v, \varphi_i)_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} = v_i, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Also, by Lemma 2.19, $\|E_\epsilon^* v\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow \|v\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}$. Thus,

$$\|u_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \|v_\epsilon\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} = \|E_\epsilon^* v\|_{X_\epsilon^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \rightarrow \|v\|_{X^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} = \|u\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.2)$$

Now, we prove that $u_\epsilon = A_\epsilon^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} v_\epsilon = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} v_{i,\epsilon} \lambda_{i,\epsilon}^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} \varphi_{i,\epsilon}$ E -converges to $u = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (u, \varphi_i)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} \varphi_i$, that means, (4.1) holds. For this, considering (4.2) and [4, Propositions 3.1 and 3.2], it is sufficient to prove $u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} u$, that is,

$$(u_\epsilon, E_\epsilon w)_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow (u, w)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \text{for all } w \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In fact,

$$(u_\epsilon, E_\epsilon w)_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} v_{i,\epsilon} \lambda_{i,\epsilon}^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} (\varphi_{i,\epsilon}, E_\epsilon w)_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} v_i \lambda_i^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} (\varphi_i, w)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}} = (u, w)_{X^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Finally, let $\{w_\epsilon\}$ be a family in $X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $w \in X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ such that $w_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} w$, then using (4.1), we obtain

$$\|w_\epsilon - p_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} w\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \|w_\epsilon - E_\epsilon w\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \|E_\epsilon w - p_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} w\|_{X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, $w_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}} w$. Using similar arguments, if $w_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}} w$ then $w_\epsilon \xrightarrow{E} w$. ■

Remark 4.2. Notice that once we have established the equivalence of $\mathcal{P}^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ -convergence and E -convergence in Lemma 4.1 and since we have proven in Subsection 3 the $\mathcal{P}^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$ -continuity of the attractors in $Y_\epsilon^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} = X_\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} = H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$, then we obtain the E -continuity of the attractors in $H^1(\Omega_\epsilon)$. Therefore, the main result given by Theorem 1.3 is proved.

References

- [1] H. Amann, *Linear and quasilinear parabolic problems. Volume I. Abstract linear theory*, Monographs in Mathematics, vol. 89, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1995.

- [2] G. S. Aragão and S. M. Bruschi, *Concentrated terms and varying domains in elliptic equations: Lipschitz case*, Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences **39** (2016), 3450-3460.
- [3] J. M. Arrieta, *Neumann eigenvalue problems on exterior perturbations of the domain*, Journal of Differential Equations **118** (1995), no. 1, 54-103
- [4] J. M. Arrieta and S. M. Bruschi, *Rapidly varying boundaries in equations with nonlinear boundary conditions. The case of a Lipschitz deformation*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences **17** (2007), no. 10, 1555-1585.
- [5] J. M. Arrieta and S. M. Bruschi, *Very rapidly varying boundaries in equations with nonlinear boundary conditions. The case of a non uniformly Lipschitz deformation*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems Series B **14** (2010), no. 2, 327-351.
- [6] J. M. Arrieta and A. N. Carvalho *Spectral convergence and nonlinear dynamics of reaction-diffusion equations under perturbations of the domain*, Journal of Differential Equations **199** (2004), 143-178.
- [7] J. M. Arrieta, A. Jimenez-Casas and A. Rodriguez-Bernal, *Flux terms and Robin boundary conditions as limit of reactants and potentials concentrating at the boundary*, Revista Matemática Iberoamericana **24** (2008), 183-211.
- [8] J. M. Arrieta, A. N. Carvalho and G. Lozada-Cruz, *Dynamics in Dumbbell domains I. Continuity of the set of equilibria*, Journal of Differential Equations **231** (2006), 551-597.
- [9] J. M. Arrieta, A. N. Carvalho and G. Lozada-Cruz, *Dynamics in Dumbbell domains II. The limiting problem*, Journal of Differential Equations **247** (2009), 174-202.
- [10] J. M. Arrieta, A. N. Carvalho and G. Lozada-Cruz, *Dynamics in Dumbbell domains III. Continuity of Attractors*, Journal of Differential Equations **247** (2009), 225-259.
- [11] J. M. Arrieta, A. N. Carvalho and A. Rodríguez-Bernal, *Parabolic problems with nonlinear boundary conditions and critical nonlinearities*, Journal of Differential Equations **156** (1999), 376-406.
- [12] J. M. Arrieta, A. N. Carvalho and A. Rodríguez-Bernal, *Attractors of parabolic problems with nonlinear boundary conditions. Uniform bounds*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations **25** (2000), no. 1-2, 1-37.
- [13] P. S. Barbosa, A. L. Pereira and M. C. Pereira, *Continuity of attractors for a family of C^1 perturbations of the square*, Annali Di Matematica Pura Ed Applicata **196** (2017), 1365-1398.

- [14] H. Brezis, *Functional analysis, sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2011.
- [15] V. L. Carbone, A. N. Carvalho and K. Schiabel-Silva, *Continuity of the dynamics in a localized large diffusion problem with nonlinear boundary conditions*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications **356** (2009), 69-85.
- [16] A. N. Carvalho and S. Piskarev, *A General approximation scheme for attractors of abstract parabolic problems*, Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization **27** (2006), no. 7-8, 785-829.
- [17] J. K. Hale, *Asymptotic behavior of dissipative system*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, no. 25, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1988.
- [18] D. Henry, *Geometric theory of semilinear parabolic equations*, Lectures Notes in Mathematics, vol. 840, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1981.
- [19] D. Henry, *Perturbation of the boundary in boundary-value problems of partial differential equations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005
- [20] E. S. Martin, *Distance of attractors of evolutionary equations*, Thesis UCM Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 2013.
- [21] L. A. F. Oliveira, A. L. Pereira and M. C. Pereira, *Continuity of attractors for a reaction-diffusion problem with respect to variations of the domain*, Electronic Journal of Differential Equations **2005** (2005), no. 100, 1-18.
- [22] A. L. Pereira and M. C. Pereira, *Continuity of attractors for a reaction-diffusion problem with nonlinear boundary conditions with respect to variations of the domain*, Journal of Differential Equations **239** (2007), no. 2, 343-370.
- [23] R. Seeley, *Norms and domains of the complex power*, American Journal of Mathematics **93** (1971), no. 2, 299-309.
- [24] F. Stummel, *Diskrete Konvergenz linearer Operatoren I*, Mathematische Annalen **190** (1970), 45-92.
- [25] F. Stummel, *Diskrete Konvergenz linearer Operatoren II*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **120** (1971), 231-264.
- [26] F. Stummel, *Diskrete Konvergenz linearer Operatoren III*, Linear Operators and Approximation (Proc. Conf., Oberwolfach, 1971), International Series of Numerical Mathematics **20** (1972), 196-216.

- [27] H. Triebel, *Interpolation theory, function spaces, differential operators*, North-Holland Publishing, Amsterdam, 1978.
- [28] G. Vainikko, *Approximative methods for nonlinear equations (two approaches to the convergence problem)*, *Nonlinear Analysis, Theory, Methods & Applications* **2** (1978), 647-687.
- [29] A. Yagi, *Abstract parabolic evolution equations and their applications*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2010.