

# CONTROLLABILITY OF A SEMILINEAR SYSTEM OF PARABOLIC EQUATIONS WITH NONLOCAL TERMS

JUAN LÍMACO, RAFAEL MARTINS LOBOSCO, AND LUIS P. YAPU

**ABSTRACT.** This paper extends our previous controllability results for a class of coupled linear parabolic systems with nonlocal interactions, motivated by applications in finance such as generalized Black–Scholes models. We establish local null controllability at a fixed time  $T > 0$  for a class of semilinear, nonlocally coupled systems driven by a single internal control acting on one component. The proof combines Kakutani’s fixed-point theorem with a controllability/observability estimate for the associated linearized dynamics. In addition, we obtain controllability for a broader class of linear systems than those considered in the first article. The paper concludes with remarks on boundary controllability within the same nonlocal framework and with perspectives for future research.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For any  $T > 0$ , let us consider the spacial domain  $\Omega = (0, 1)$  and  $Q = (0, 1) \times (0, T)$ . We study the null controllability of the following systems of semilinearly coupled equations with kernel terms,

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} y_t = a_1 y_{xx} + b_1 y_x + c_1 y + \lambda_1(t) \int_0^1 J_1(\zeta - x) y(\zeta, t) d\zeta + F(y, z) + \nu 1_\omega, & \text{in } Q, \\ z_t = a_2 z_{xx} + b_2 z_x + c_2 z + \lambda_2(t) \int_0^1 J_2(\zeta - x) z(\zeta, t) d\zeta + G(y, z), & \text{in } Q, \\ y(0, t) = y(1, t) = z(0, t) = z(1, t) = 0, & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ y(x, 0) = y_0(x), \quad z(x, 0) = z_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

where  $\nu$  is a control acting on the open set  $\omega \times (0, T)$  with  $\omega \subset (0, 1)$ ,  $y$  and  $z$  are state functions, and, for  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $\lambda_i(t)$  are time dependent functions. In (1)  $a_i$ ,  $b_i$  and  $c_i$  are real constants such that  $a_i > 0$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . The precise hypothesis about the functions  $F$  and  $G$  will be stated in our main theorem.

The present system (1) aims to analyze the null controllability within a broader class of equations that extends the model below considered in the previous article of the authors [1]:

---

(A1) UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL FLUMINENSE, CEP 24210-201, NITERÓI- RJ, BRASIL

(A2) INSTITUTO FEDERAL DE EDUCAÇÃO, CIÊNCIA E TECNOLOGIA DO RIO DE JANEIRO, CEP 24425-000, SÃO GONÇALO-RJ, BRASIL

(A3) UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL FLUMINENSE, CEP 24210-201, NITERÓI- RJ, BRASIL AND FRIEDRICH-ALEXANDER UNIVERSITÄT ERLANGEN-NÜRNBERG (FAU), CHAIR OF DYNAMICS, CONTROL, MACHINE LEARNING AND NUMERICS, ERLANGEN, GERMANY

*E-mail addresses:* jlimaco@id.uff.br, rafael.lobosco@ifrrj.edu.br.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35K20, 35R09, 93B05, 93C20.

*Key words and phrases.* Generalized Black–Scholes models; controllability; nonlocal coupled parabolic systems; Kakutani fixed-point theorem; semilinear PDEs.

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} u_t = a_1 u_{xx} + b_1 u_x + c_1 u + \lambda_1 \int_0^1 J_1(z-x)u(z,t)dz + \\ \quad \quad \quad + q_{11}u + q_{12}v + \nu 1_\omega, & \text{in } Q, \\ v_t = a_2 v_{xx} + b_2 v_x + c_2 v + \lambda_2 \int_0^1 J_2(z-x)v(z,t)dz + q_{21}u + q_{22}v, & \text{in } Q, \\ u(0,t) = u(1,t) = v(0,t) = v(1,t) = 0, & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x), v(x,0) = v_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where  $\nu$  is a control acting on the open set  $\omega \times (0, T)$ ,  $u$  and  $v$  are state functions,  $\lambda_i(t)$  are time dependent functions with  $i = 1, 2$  and  $q_{ij}$ ,  $a_i$ ,  $b_i$  and  $c_i$ , with  $i, j = 1, 2$ , are real constants such that  $a_i > 0$ ;  $q_{ij}$  are transition rates;  $q_{ij} \geq 0$  if  $i \neq j$ ; and  $q_{i1} + q_{i2} = 0$ .

Problems of the type (2) were studied, for instance, when the control  $\nu$  is not considered and

$$J_i(x) = \lambda_i C_i e^{-\frac{(x-d_i)^2}{2k_i^2}},$$

with  $\lambda_i$ ,  $C_i$ ,  $d_i$  and  $k_i$  are constants. In that case, we have the model proposed by [2] for pricing of European, American and Butterfly options whose asset price dynamics follow the regime switching jump diffusion process. This model generalized the classical work [3] where the Black-Scholes equation was established for derivative pricing of European options. Due to the complexity of financial markets, that generalization became necessary in order to have the ability of efficiently interpret the economic cycles and the changes in the financial time series data due to the regime shifts, as was analysed in [2]. For other financial options pricing models, see the articles [4, 5, 6, 7].

Concerning partial differential equations with nonlocal terms (kernels) there are controllability results for one partial differential equation. In fact, for the linear equation

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + \int_0^1 K(x, z, t)u(z, t)dz + \nu 1_\omega, & \text{in } Q, \\ u(0, t) = u(1, t) = 0, & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

it is known that the equation is null controllable when the nonlocal term is independent of time and analytic [12], see also [17] for a coupled system. For a kernel independent of time and with separable variables, the controllability was established in [18]. For one equation with kernel depending on time, Biccari–Hernandez-Santamaría [9] showed the null controllability supposing an exponential decay at the ends of the interval  $[0, T]$  such as the condition (3) below. With the same decay condition, and the smallness condition (4), the authors showed in [1] the controllability of a coupled linear system. On the other hand, Nina-Huaman and the first author showed in [16] a Carleman inequality and null controllability of a parabolic PDE whose linearization about a trajectory has a non-local integral term, but with kernel  $K$  identically 1. In this case no decay condition is needed.

In the present article, we investigate whether the controllability properties established for the original system remain valid under the introduction of additional terms  $F$  and  $G$ , thereby providing a natural generalization of the earlier results. In fact, the conditions imposed in the functions  $F$  and  $G$  for the system (1) permit to include the terms of system (2) that do not appear explicitly in system (1) and to introduce nonlinearities.

We consider the case where the functions  $J_i \in L^\infty(-1, 1)$  and  $\lambda_i \in L^\infty(0, T)$  satisfy the following condition of exponential decay at the extremity points of the interval  $[0, T]$ :

$$(3) \quad \overline{K} = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \exp\left(\frac{2\sigma^-}{t(T-t)}\right) \lambda_i^2(t) \int_{-1}^1 |J_i(z)|^2 dz < +\infty$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ , where  $\sigma^-$  is a positive constant that will be defined later.

In order to get null controllability with only one control, we need the following additional hypothesis on the decay of the first kernel:

$$(4) \quad \sup_{(x,t) \in [0,1] \times [0,T]} \exp(2s\alpha^-(t)) \lambda_1^2(t) \int_0^1 |J_1(x-z)|^2 dz < \bar{\delta},$$

for  $\bar{\delta} > 0$  which will be chosen small enough and  $\alpha^-$  will be defined later.

Our main result is:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $T > 0$ . Suppose that hypothesis (3) and (4) are satisfied. Then there exists  $\delta = \delta(T) > 0$  such that, for any initial data  $y_0, z_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$  satisfying*

$$(5) \quad \|y_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < \delta,$$

and for any  $F(r, s), G(r, s) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $C^1$ -functions fulfilling

$$(6) \quad \max \left\{ \left| \frac{\partial F}{\partial r}(r, s) \right|, \left| \frac{\partial F}{\partial s}(r, s) \right|, \left| \frac{\partial G}{\partial r}(r, s) \right|, \left| \frac{\partial G}{\partial s}(r, s) \right| \right\} \leq M,$$

for all  $(r, s) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , with  $\frac{\partial G}{\partial r}(r, s) \neq 0$  in (1),  $F(0, 0) = 0$ ,  $G(0, 0) = 0$ , then there exists a control  $\nu \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$  such that the solution of the system (1) verifies  $y(x, T) = 0$  and  $z(x, T) = 0$ .

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we formulate the linear problem associated with system (1). This system differs from that in [1] as its coefficients are variable rather than constant, and the arguments from the earlier article are adapted here in detail. In Section 3 we prove the main result, Theorem 1, for our system (1), via Kakutani's fixed-point theorem. In Section 4 we present related problems and additional remarks.

Throughout the paper, we use  $C$  and  $C_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots$ ) to denote generic positive constants whose value may change from line to line. When it is necessary to emphasize parameter dependence, we indicate it explicitly; for example, we write  $C = C(\omega, T)$  to mean that  $C$  depends only on  $\omega$  and  $T$ .

## 2. ANALYSIS OF THE CONTROLLABILITY OF THE LINEARIZED SYSTEM OF (1)

Considering the hypotheses of the Theorem 1, we have  $F(0, 0) = 0$  and  $G(0, 0) = 0$ , then

$$(7) \quad F(r, s) = a(r, s)r + b(r, s)s, \quad G(r, s) = c(r, s)r + d(r, s)s,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a(r, s) &= \int_0^1 \frac{\partial F}{\partial r}(\kappa r, \kappa s) d\kappa, & b(r, s) &= \int_0^1 \frac{\partial F}{\partial s}(\kappa r, \kappa s) d\kappa, \\ c(r, s) &= \int_0^1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial r}(\kappa r, \kappa s) d\kappa, & d(r, s) &= \int_0^1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial s}(\kappa r, \kappa s) d\kappa. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account the hypothesis (6), we have

$$|a(r, s)| \leq \int_0^1 \left| \frac{\partial F}{\partial r}(\kappa r, \kappa s) \right| d\kappa \leq \int_0^1 M d\kappa = M,$$

analogously  $|b(r, s)| \leq M$ ,  $|c(r, s)| \leq M$  and  $|d(r, s)| \leq M$ .



**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\omega \subset\subset (0, 1)$  be a non empty open set. Then there exists a function  $\eta_0 \in C^2([0, 1])$  such that  $\eta_0 > 0$  in the interval  $(0, 1)$ , with  $\eta_0 = 0$  at the boundary  $\{0\} \cup \{1\}$  and  $|(\eta_0)_x| > 0$  in  $[0, 1] \setminus \omega$ .*

For some parameter  $\kappa > 0$ , we define

$$\sigma(x) = e^{4\kappa\|\eta_0\|_\infty} - e^{\kappa(2\|\eta_0\|_\infty + \eta_0(x))},$$

and the weight functions

$$\alpha(x, t) = \frac{\sigma(x)}{t(T-t)} \quad \text{and} \quad \xi(x, t) = \frac{e^{\kappa(2\|\eta_0\|_\infty + \eta_0(x))}}{t(T-t)}.$$

We also use the notations

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} \sigma^+ &= \max_{x \in [0, 1]} \sigma(x), & \sigma^- &= \min_{x \in [0, 1]} \sigma(x), \\ \alpha^+(t) &= \max_{x \in [0, 1]} \alpha(x, t), & \alpha^-(t) &= \min_{x \in [0, 1]} \alpha(x, t). \end{aligned}$$

We use the notation

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} I(z) &:= s^{-1} \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^{-1} (|z_t|^2 + |z_{xx}|^2) dx dt + s\kappa^2 \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{-2s\alpha} \xi |z_x|^2 dx dt + \\ &\quad + s^3 \kappa^4 \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |z|^2 dx dt, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha(x, t)$  and  $\xi(x, t)$  are the Carleman weights defined above blowing-up at  $t = 0$  and  $t = T$ .

In this article we use the following Carleman inequality.

**Proposition 1.** *Consider the adjoint system (10) with  $\tilde{c} \in W^{2,\infty}(Q)$ ,  $\tilde{c}(x, t) \neq 0$  in  $\bar{\omega} \times (0, T)$  and  $\phi_T \in L^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\psi_T \in L^2(\Omega)$ . Moreover assume that the kernels  $\lambda_i(t)J_i(x)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , satisfy (3) and suppose that the kernel  $\lambda_1(t)J_1(x)$  satisfies (4). Then, there exist constants  $C = C(\omega, a_1, a_2, b_1, c_1, T, \tilde{c}, \tilde{a})$ ,  $\kappa_1 = C(\omega, M, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2)$  and  $s_1 = C(\omega)(aT + (aT)^2 + \bar{K}^{\frac{2}{3}}T^2)$ , where  $\bar{K}$  was defined in (3) and  $a = \max(a_1, a_2)$ , such that the solution  $\phi, \psi$  of the system (10) satisfy*

$$(13) \quad I(\phi) + I(\psi) \leq Cs^7\kappa^8 \left( \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^7 |\phi|^2 dx dt \right),$$

for any constants  $\kappa > \kappa_1$  and  $s > s_1$ .

To prove this proposition, we will need some intermediate results.

We have the following Carleman estimate which is straightforwardly adapted from [11]. For more about Carleman's estimates, we refer to the important works [13, 19, 20, 21] and [22].

**Proposition 2** ([11]). *There exist positive constants  $C = C(\Omega, \omega, a)$ ,  $s_1 = C(\Omega, \omega)(aT + (aT)^2)$  and  $\kappa_1 = C(\Omega, \omega)$  such that, for any  $s > s_1$ ,  $\kappa > \kappa_1$ ,  $F \in L^2(Q)$ ,  $z_T \in L^2(\Omega)$  and  $a > 0$  being a positive constant, the solution of the equation*

$$(14) \quad \begin{cases} z_t + a\Delta z = F, & \text{in } 0 < x < 1, \ 0 < t < T, \\ z(0, t) = z(1, t) = 0, & \text{in } 0 < t < T, \\ z(x, T) = z_T(x), & \text{in } 0 < x < 1, \end{cases}$$

satisfy

$$(15) \quad I(z) \leq C \left[ s^3 \kappa^4 \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |z|^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{-2s\alpha} |F|^2 dx dt \right].$$

*Proof.* Set  $\tau = at$  and  $w(x, \tau) = z(x, t)$ . Then  $z_t(x, t) = a w_\tau(x, \tau)$ ,  $\Delta z(x, t) = \Delta w(x, \tau)$  and  $adt = d\tau$ . Equation (14) becomes

$$w_\tau + \Delta w = \frac{1}{a} F\left(x, \frac{\tau}{a}\right) \quad \text{in } 0 < x < 1, 0 < \tau < aT.$$

In [11], the inequality (15) holds for  $w$  on the time interval  $t \in (0, aT)$ , with positive constants  $C = C(\Omega, \omega)$ ,  $s_1 = C(\Omega, \omega)(aT + (aT)^2)$ , and  $\kappa_1 = C(\Omega, \omega)$ . In this inequality, the Carleman weights  $\alpha$  and  $\xi$  are defined on  $(0, aT)$ . That is,

$$\alpha(x, t) = \frac{\sigma(x)}{t(aT - t)} \quad \text{and} \quad \xi(x, t) = \frac{e^{\kappa(2\|\eta_0\|_\infty + \eta_0(x))}}{t(aT - t)}.$$

The inequality (15) holds for  $w$  in the following form.

$$(16) \quad I_{aT}(w) \leq C \left( s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{\omega \times (0, aT)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |w|^2 dx d\tau + \int_0^1 \int_0^{aT} e^{-2s\alpha} \left| \frac{1}{a} F\left(x, \frac{\tau}{a}\right) \right|^2 dx d\tau \right).$$

Here, we use  $I_{aT}(w)$  to specify that the terms are integrated in  $\int_0^1 \int_0^{aT}$  and not in  $\int_0^1 \int_0^T$  like in  $I(z)$ .

Using a simple change of variables  $\tau = at$ , we obtain the relation

$$\min\left(\frac{1}{a}, a\right) I(z) \leq I_{aT}(w),$$

and the relation

$$\begin{aligned} & s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{\omega \times (0, aT)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |w|^2 dx d\tau + \int_0^1 \int_0^{aT} e^{-2s\alpha} \left| \frac{1}{a} F\left(x, \frac{\tau}{a}\right) \right|^2 dx d\tau \\ & \leq \max\left(\frac{1}{a}, a\right) \left( s^3 \lambda^4 \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |z|^2 dx dt + \int_0^1 \int_0^T e^{-2s\alpha} |F(x, t)|^2 dx dt \right). \end{aligned}$$

However, the coefficients  $\alpha(x, \tau)$  and  $\xi(x, \tau)$  that appears in the terms with the function  $w$  are replaced by functions  $\alpha(x, at)$  and  $\xi(x, at)$ . Readapting these Carleman estimates and inserting these relations into (16) we obtain

$$(17) \quad I(z) \leq C \max\left(\frac{1}{a^2}, a^2\right) \left[ s^3 \kappa^4 \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |z|^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{-2s\alpha} |F|^2 dx dt \right].$$

□

In what follows we will use the following proposition.

**Proposition 3** ([9]). *For any  $k > 0$ ,  $s > 1$  and  $t \in (0, T)$ , it holds that*

$$(18) \quad \exp\left(-\frac{(1+s)\sigma^-}{t(T-t)}\right) < \exp\left(-\frac{s\sigma^+}{t(T-t)}\right),$$

where  $\sigma^-$  and  $\sigma^+$  are given in (11).

We can apply Proposition 2, the estimate of Proposition 3 and hypothesis (3) to obtain the following intermediate Carleman estimate for our linearized system.

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $\phi_T, \psi_T \in L^2(\Omega)$  be given and assume that the kernels  $\lambda_i(t)J_i(x)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , satisfy (3). Then, there exist constants  $C = C(\Omega, \omega, a_1, a_2)$ ,  $\kappa_1 = C(\Omega, \omega, M, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2)$  and  $s_1 = C(\Omega, \omega)(aT + (aT)^2 + \bar{K}^{\frac{2}{3}}T^2)$ , where  $\bar{K}$  was defined in (3) and  $a = \max(a_1, a_2)$ , such that a solution  $\phi, \psi$  of the system (10) with final conditions  $\phi_T$  and  $\psi_T$ , satisfy*

$$(19) \quad I(\phi) + I(\psi) \leq Cs^3\kappa^4 \left( \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\phi|^2 dxdt + \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\psi|^2 dxdt \right)$$

for any constants  $\kappa > \kappa_1$  and  $s > s_1$ .

*Proof.* The proof is very similar to [9] (part of Proposition 2.4) and [1] (Proposition 2.3). We only need to observe that in the intermediate estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I(\phi) + I(\psi) \leq C & \left[ s^3\kappa^4 \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\phi|^2 dxdt + s^3\kappa^4 \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\psi|^2 dxdt \right. \\ & + \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{-2s\alpha} |C_1\phi_x + C_2\phi + C_3\psi - \lambda_1(t) \int_0^1 J_1(x-z)\phi(z, t)dz|^2 dxdt \\ & \left. + \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{-2s\alpha} |C_4\psi_x + C_5\psi + C_6\phi - \lambda_2(t) \int_0^1 J_2(x-z)\psi(z, t)dz|^2 dxdt \right], \end{aligned}$$

the coefficients of the system (10) appear as  $C_1 = b_1$ ,  $C_2 = -c_1 - \tilde{a}(x, t)$ ,  $C_3 = -\tilde{c}(x, t)$ ,  $C_4 = b_2$ ,  $C_5 = -c_2 - \tilde{d}(x, t)$  and  $C_6 = -\tilde{b}(x, t)$ .

We use that the function  $\xi$  has a minimum value. Then, for  $\kappa_1$  sufficiently big we get

$$\begin{aligned} s\kappa^2\xi/2 &> Cb_1^2, & s\kappa^2\xi/2 &> Cb_2^2, \\ s^3\kappa^4\xi^3/2 &> C(c_1 + \tilde{a}(x, t))^2, & s^3\kappa^4\xi^3/2 &> C(\tilde{c}(x, t))^2, \\ s^3\kappa^4\xi^3/2 &> C(c_2 + \tilde{d}(x, t))^2 & \text{and} & s^3\kappa^4\xi^3/2 > C(\tilde{b}(x, t))^2, \end{aligned}$$

because  $\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{c}$  and  $\tilde{d}$  are bounded functions. In particular, we get the dependences of the constant  $\kappa_1 = C(\Omega, \omega, \tilde{a}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{c}, \tilde{d}, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2) = C(\Omega, \omega, M, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2)$ .

The other steps of the proof are very similar to [1] and we omit them.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** *With this proposition we can easily obtain the null controllability with one control in each equation. For obtaining the same result using a single control in only one equation, we need the additional hypothesis (4).*

*Proof.* (Proposition 1)

We adapt the steps of the demonstration in article [1], Proposition 2.4. The general method was developed by Gonzales-Burgos and de Teresa [14]. Because of the non-constant coefficients, we see how some changes arise and the changes they imply in the hypothesis of our Proposition 1.

Using the last proposition applied to a set  $\omega_0 \subset \omega$ ,

$$(20) \quad I(\phi) + I(\psi) \leq Cs^3\kappa^4 \left( \iint_{\omega_0 \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\phi|^2 dxdt + \iint_{\omega_0 \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\psi|^2 dxdt \right).$$

Here, we have that  $C = C(\Omega, \omega, a_1, a_2)$ ,  $\kappa > \kappa_1$  and  $s > s_1$  with  $\kappa_1 = C(\Omega, \omega, M, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2)$  and  $s_1 = C(\Omega, \omega)(aT + (aT)^2 + \bar{K}^{\frac{2}{3}}T^2)$ .

We analyse the last term. Let us consider a smooth function  $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\omega)$  with  $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$  in  $\omega$  and  $\chi \equiv 1$  in  $\omega_0$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 \iint_{\omega_0 \times (0,T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 |\psi|^2 dx dt &\leq \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi |\psi|^2 dx dt \\
 &= \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \psi \frac{1}{\tilde{c}} (-\phi_t - a_1 \phi_{xx} + b_1 \phi_x - c_1 \phi - \\
 &\quad - \lambda_1 \int_0^1 J_1(x-z) \phi(z,t) dz - \tilde{a} \phi) dx dt \\
 (21) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= M_1 + M_2 + M_3 + M_4 + M_5 + M_6,
 \end{aligned}$$

where the terms  $M_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 6$ , are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_1 &= - \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \frac{\psi}{\tilde{c}} \phi_t dx dt \\
 M_2 &= - \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \frac{\psi}{\tilde{c}} a_1 \phi_{xx} dx dt \\
 M_3 &= \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \frac{\psi}{\tilde{c}} b_1 \phi_x dx dt \\
 M_4 &= - \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \frac{\psi}{\tilde{c}} c_1 \phi dx dt \\
 M_5 &= - \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \frac{\psi}{\tilde{c}} \lambda_1 \int_0^1 J_1(x-z) \phi(z,t) dz dx dt \\
 M_6 &= - \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \frac{\psi}{\tilde{c}} \tilde{a} \phi dx dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

Considering  $\tilde{c} \in W^{2,\infty}(Q)$ ,  $\tilde{c}(x,t) \neq 0$  in  $\bar{\omega} \times (0,T)$ , we have that the terms  $M_i$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ , are well defined.

The term  $M_3$  is estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 |M_3| &= \left| \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \frac{\psi}{\tilde{c}} b_1 \phi_x dx dt \right| \\
 &\leq \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} \left| (e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \frac{\psi}{\tilde{c}} b_1)_x \right| |\phi| dx dt \\
 &\leq \kappa^4 s^3 \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} \left( e^{-2s\alpha} (2s|\alpha_x|) \xi^3 \chi |\psi| \frac{|b_1|}{|\tilde{c}|} |\phi| + e^{-2s\alpha} 3\xi^2 \xi_x \chi |\psi| \frac{|b_1|}{|\tilde{c}|} |\phi| + \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\chi_x| |\psi| \frac{|b_1|}{|\tilde{c}|} |\phi| + e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 \chi |\psi| \frac{|b_1 \tilde{c}_x|}{|\tilde{c}|^2} |\phi| + e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 \chi |\psi_x| \frac{|b_1|}{|\tilde{c}|} |\phi| \right) dx dt \\
 &\leq C \kappa^4 s^3 \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} \left( e^{-2s\alpha} (2s|\alpha_x|) \xi^3 \chi |\psi| |\phi| + e^{-2s\alpha} 3\xi^2 \xi_x \chi |\psi| |\phi| + \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\chi_x| |\psi| |\phi| + e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 \chi |\psi| |\phi| + e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 \chi |\psi_x| |\phi| \right) dx dt,
 \end{aligned}$$



where  $C = C(b_1, \tilde{c}) = \max\{\frac{|b_1|}{|\tilde{c}|}, \frac{|b_1 \tilde{c}_x|}{|\tilde{c}|^2}\}$ . Because  $\tilde{c} \in W^{2,\infty}(Q)$ ,  $\tilde{c}(x, t) \neq 0$  in  $\bar{\omega} \times (0, T)$ , we have that the maximum is well defined.

Using the estimates  $|\xi_x| \leq C(\omega)\kappa|\xi|$ ,  $|\alpha_x| \leq C(\omega)\kappa|\xi|$  and  $|\chi_x| \leq C(\omega)$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 |M_3| &\leq C\kappa^5 s^4 \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^4 |\psi| |\phi| dx dt + C\kappa^5 s^3 \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\psi| |\phi| dx dt + \\
 &\quad + C\kappa^4 s^3 \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 |\psi| |\phi| dx dt + \\
 (22) \quad &\quad + C \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} (s^{1/2} \xi^{1/2} k |\psi_x|) (k^3 s^{5/2} \xi^{5/2} |\phi|) dx dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

Above, the constant  $C$  has its dependence on  $C = C(\omega, b_1, \tilde{c})$ .

The last term of the equation above (without the factor  $C$ ) is estimated by

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} (s^{1/2} \xi^{1/2} k |\psi_x|) (k^3 s^{5/2} \xi^{5/2} |\phi|) dx dt \\
 &\leq \varepsilon \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^2 s \xi |\psi_x|^2 dx dt + C_\varepsilon \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^6 s^5 \xi^5 |\phi|^2 dx dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

A similar estimate for the first three integrals in (22) give

$$\begin{aligned}
 |M_3| &\leq \varepsilon C \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 |\psi|^2 dx dt + \varepsilon C \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^2 s \xi |\psi_x|^2 dx dt + \\
 (23) \quad &\quad + C C_\varepsilon \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^6 s^5 \xi^5 |\phi|^2 dx dt,
 \end{aligned}$$

with  $C = C(\omega, b_1, \tilde{c})$ .

If we choose  $\varepsilon_2 > 0$  such that  $\varepsilon C \leq \varepsilon_2$ , then the first and second term of the right hand side of (23) can be absorbed by  $I(\psi)$  and we get

$$(24) \quad |M_3| \leq \varepsilon_2 I(\psi) + C_{\varepsilon_2} \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^6 s^5 \xi^5 |\phi|^2 dx dt.$$

Here,  $C_{\varepsilon_2} = C(\omega, b_1, \tilde{c})$ .

For the term  $M_5$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |M_5| &= \left| \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \frac{\psi}{\tilde{c}} \lambda_1(t) \int_0^1 J_1(x-z) \phi(z, t) dz dx dt \right| \\
 &\leq \varepsilon C \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 |\psi|^2 dx dt \\
 &\quad + C_\varepsilon \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \left( \int_0^1 \lambda_1(t) J_1(x-z) \phi(z, t) dz \right)^2 dx dt,
 \end{aligned}$$

with  $C = C(\tilde{c})$ .

For an appropriate  $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ , the first term of the right hand side can be absorbed by  $I(\psi)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 |M_5| &\leq \varepsilon_2 I(\psi) \\
 &\quad + C_{\varepsilon_2} \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \left( \int_0^1 \lambda_1(t) J_1(x-z) \phi(z, t) dz \right)^2 dx dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$(25) \quad |M_5| \leq \varepsilon_2 I(\psi) + C_{\varepsilon_2} \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \left( \int_0^1 \lambda_1(t)^2 J_1(x-z)^2 dz \right) \left( \int_0^1 |\phi(z, t)|^2 dz \right) dx dt.$$

Here,  $C_{\varepsilon_2} = C(\tilde{c})$ .

Carleman weights are so that,

$$(26) \quad \alpha^+(t) < 2\alpha^-(t).$$

In fact, using the notations in (11),

$$(27) \quad \alpha^+(t) = \max_{x \in [0, 1]} \frac{\sigma(x)}{t(T-t)} < 2 \min_{x \in [0, 1]} \frac{\sigma(x)}{t(T-t)} = 2\alpha^-(t)$$

with  $\sigma(x) = e^{4k\|\eta_0\|_\infty} - e^{k(2\|\eta_0\|_\infty + \eta_0(x))}$ .

So, equivalently,

$$(28) \quad \frac{e^{4k\|\eta_0\|_\infty} - e^{2k\|\eta_0\|_\infty}}{t(T-t)} < 2 \frac{e^{4k\|\eta_0\|_\infty} - e^{3k\|\eta_0\|_\infty}}{t(T-t)}.$$

This estimate is always true, since the following always holds

$$(29) \quad e^{4k\|\eta_0\|_\infty} - e^{2k\|\eta_0\|_\infty} < 2(e^{4k\|\eta_0\|_\infty} - e^{3k\|\eta_0\|_\infty}).$$

Moreover, we denote  $\xi^-(t) = \min_{x \in [0, 1]} \xi(x, t)$  and  $\xi^+(t) = \max_{x \in [0, 1]} \xi(x, t)$ .

Using the conditions (4) and (26) in (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |M_5| &\leq \varepsilon_2 I(\psi) + C_{\varepsilon_2} \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \delta e^{-2s\alpha^-(t)} \int_0^1 |\phi(z, t)|^2 dz dx dt \\ &\leq \varepsilon_2 I(\psi) + C_{\varepsilon_2} \delta \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha^-(t)} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^{+3}(t) e^{-s\alpha^+(t)} \int_0^1 |\phi(z, t)|^2 dz dx dt \\ &\leq \varepsilon_2 I(\psi) + C_{\varepsilon_2} |\omega| \delta \int_0^T e^{-2s\alpha^-(t) - s\alpha^+(t)} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^{+3}(t) \int_0^1 |\phi(z, t)|^2 dz dt, \end{aligned}$$

where  $|\omega|$  denotes the measure of  $\omega$ .

We want to absorb this by the second last term in  $I(\phi)$ , which is

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{-2s\alpha(z, t)} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3(z, t) |\phi(z, t)|^2 dz dt.$$

In order to do that, it is enough to show that, for a small  $\varepsilon_3 > 0$ ,

$$(30) \quad C_{\varepsilon_2} |\omega| \delta \int_0^T e^{-2s\alpha^-(t) - s\alpha^+(t)} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^{+3}(t) \int_0^1 |\phi(z, t)|^2 dz dt \leq \varepsilon_3 \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{-2s\alpha(z, t)} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3(z, t) |\phi(z, t)|^2 dz dt.$$

In particular, this inequality can be obtained if we prove that

$$(31) \quad C_{\varepsilon_2} |\omega| \delta \frac{e^{-2s\alpha^-(t) - s\alpha^+(t)} \xi^{+3}(t)}{e^{-2s\alpha(z, t)} \xi^3(z, t)} \leq \varepsilon_3,$$

for  $(z, t) \in [0, 1] \times [0, T]$ .

First,  $\frac{\xi^{+3}(t)}{\xi^3(z,t)} \leq \frac{\xi^{+3}(t)}{\xi^{-3}(t)} = \beta$ , for the constant  $\beta = e^{\kappa\|\eta_0\|_\infty} > 1$ , then (31) is bounded by

$$C_{\varepsilon_2}|\omega|\delta\frac{e^{-2s\alpha^-(t)-s\alpha^+(t)}\xi^{+3}(t)}{e^{-2s\alpha(z,t)}\xi^3(z,t)} \leq C_{\varepsilon_2}|\omega|\delta\beta\frac{e^{-2s\alpha^-(t)-s\alpha^+(t)}}{e^{-2s\alpha(z,t)}} \leq \varepsilon_3,$$

Observe, using (26), that

$$-2\alpha^-(t) - \alpha^+(t) + 2\alpha(z,t) < -2\alpha^+(t) + 2\alpha(z,t) \leq 0,$$

then  $C_{\varepsilon_2}|\omega|\delta\beta e^{-s(2\alpha^-(t)+\alpha^+(t)-2\alpha(z,t))} < C_{\varepsilon_2}|\omega|\delta\beta$ , and we can choose  $\delta$  depending only of  $\omega$ ,  $\tilde{c}$  and  $\kappa$  such that

$$(32) \quad |M_5| \leq \varepsilon_2 I(\psi) + \varepsilon_3 I(\phi).$$

The other terms we have the similar estimates as in [23]. For completeness we recall the main steps. We estimate the term  $M_1$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |M_1| \leq & \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} |(e^{-2s\alpha}(-2s\alpha_t)\kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \frac{\psi}{\tilde{c}} \phi + e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 3\xi^2 \xi_t \chi \frac{\psi}{\tilde{c}} \phi + \\ & -e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \frac{\tilde{c}_t}{\tilde{c}^2} \psi \phi + e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \frac{\psi_t}{\tilde{c}} \phi)| dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Using that  $|\alpha_t| \leq C(T)\xi^2$ ,  $|\xi_t| \leq C(T)\xi^2$ ,  $\frac{1}{|\tilde{c}(x,t)|} < C(\tilde{c})$  and that  $\frac{|\tilde{c}_t|}{|\tilde{c}^2|} < C(\tilde{c})$

$$\begin{aligned} (33) \quad |M_1| \leq & C \left( \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^4 \xi^5 |\psi| |\phi| dx dt + \right. \\ & \left. + \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 |\psi_t| |\phi| dx dt \right) \\ \leq & \varepsilon I(\psi) + C_\varepsilon \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^8 s^7 \xi^7 |\phi|^2 dx dt \end{aligned}$$

with  $C_\varepsilon = C(T, \tilde{c})$ .

For the term  $M_2$ , we use the identity

$$\left( e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 \chi \frac{\psi}{\tilde{c}} \right)_{xx} = \left( e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 \chi \frac{1}{\tilde{c}} \right)_{xx} \psi + 2 \left( e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 \chi \frac{1}{\tilde{c}} \right)_x \psi_x + e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 \chi \frac{1}{\tilde{c}} \psi_{xx}.$$

We have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left( e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 \chi \frac{1}{\tilde{c}} \right)_{xx} \right| &= \left| e^{-2s\alpha} \left[ 4s^2 \alpha_x^2 \xi^3 \frac{\chi}{\tilde{c}} - 2s \alpha_{xx} \xi^3 \frac{\chi}{\tilde{c}} - 4s \alpha_x \left( 3\xi^2 \xi_x \frac{\chi}{\tilde{c}} + \xi^3 \left( \frac{\chi_x}{\tilde{c}} - \chi \frac{\tilde{c}_x}{\tilde{c}^2} \right) \right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 3(2\xi \xi_x^2 + \xi^2 \xi_{xx}) \frac{\chi}{\tilde{c}} + 6\xi^2 \xi_x \left( \frac{\chi_x}{\tilde{c}} - \chi \frac{\tilde{c}_x}{\tilde{c}^2} \right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \xi^3 \left[ \frac{\chi_{xx}}{\tilde{c}} - 2 \frac{\chi_x \tilde{c}_x}{\tilde{c}^2} - \chi \left( \frac{\tilde{c}_{xx}}{\tilde{c}^2} - 2 \frac{\tilde{c}_x^2}{\tilde{c}^3} \right) \right] \right] \right| \\ &\leq C e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^2 s^2 \xi^5, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(\omega, \tilde{c})$ , because we use the estimates  $|\xi_x| \leq C(\omega)\kappa|\xi|$ ,  $|\alpha_x| \leq C(\omega)\kappa|\xi|$ ,  $|\chi_x| \leq C(\omega)$ ,  $|\alpha_{xx}| \leq C(\omega)\kappa^2|\xi|$  and  $|\xi_{xx}| \leq C(\omega)\kappa^2|\xi|$ .

Similarly, we have the estimate

$$\left| \left( e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 \chi \frac{1}{\tilde{c}} \right)_x \right| \leq C e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa s \xi^4$$

with  $C = C(\omega, \tilde{c})$ .

Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 |M_2| &= \left| \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} \left( e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \frac{\psi}{\tilde{c}} a_1 \right)_{xx} \phi dx dt \right| \\
 &\leq C \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} (\kappa^6 (s\xi)^5 |\psi| + \kappa^5 (s\xi)^4 |\psi_x| + \kappa^4 (s\xi)^3 |\psi_{xx}|) \phi dx dt \\
 (34) \quad &\leq \varepsilon I(\psi) + C_\varepsilon \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^8 (s\xi)^7 |\phi|^2 dx dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have that  $C_\varepsilon = C(\omega, \tilde{c}, a_1)$ .

Finally, the terms  $M_4$  and  $M_6$  are estimated straightforwardly, e.g.

$$(35) \quad |M_4| \leq \varepsilon I(\psi) + C_\varepsilon \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 (s\xi)^3 |\phi|^2 dx dt,$$

with  $C_\varepsilon = C(\tilde{c}, c_1)$ . Similarly for the term  $M_6 = - \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 \chi \tilde{a} \frac{\psi}{\tilde{c}} \phi dx dt$  with  $\chi$  a smooth function  $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\omega)$  and  $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |M_6| &\leq C \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} (\kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3)^{1/2} (\kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3)^{1/2} |\psi| |\phi| dx dt \\
 (36) \quad &\leq \varepsilon I(\psi) + C_\varepsilon \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \kappa^4 s^3 \xi^3 |\phi|^2 dx dt,
 \end{aligned}$$

with  $C_\varepsilon = C(\tilde{a}, \tilde{c})$ .

Using (33), (34), (24), (35), (32) and (36) in (21), we finished the proof of the Carleman inequality (13).  $\square$

As a consequence of the Carleman estimate, we prove now the observability inequality.

**Proposition 5.** *Consider the adjoint system (10) with  $\tilde{c} \in W^{2,\infty}(Q)$ ,  $\tilde{c}(x, t) \neq 0$  in  $\bar{\omega} \times (0, T)$  and  $\phi_T \in L^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\psi_T \in L^2(\Omega)$ . Moreover, assume that the kernels  $\lambda_i(t)J_i(x)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , satisfy (3) and suppose that the kernel  $\lambda_1(t)J_1(x)$  satisfies (4). Then, there exist constants  $C = C(M, \Omega, \omega, a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2, T, \tilde{c}, \bar{K})$ , where  $\bar{K}$  was defined in (3), such that the solution  $\phi, \psi$  of the system (10) satisfy*

$$(37) \quad \|\phi(0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\psi(0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\phi|^2 dx dt.$$

*Proof.* Using Carleman inequality (13) of Proposition 1 we have

$$s^3 \kappa^4 \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 (|\phi|^2 + |\psi|^2) dx dt \leq C s^7 \kappa^8 \left( \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^7 |\phi|^2 dx dt \right),$$

and, fixing  $\kappa > \kappa_1$ ,  $s > s_1$ ,

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^3 (|\phi|^2 + |\psi|^2) dx dt \leq C \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^7 |\phi|^2 dx dt.$$

The function  $e^{-2s\alpha}\xi^m$  with  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  is bounded by a positive constant  $C_0$  from below in the interval  $[T/4, 3T/4]$ , thus

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} C_0 \int_{T/4}^{3T/4} \int_0^1 (|\phi|^2 + |\psi|^2) dx dt &\leq C \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} e^{-2s\alpha} \xi^7 |\phi|^2 dx dt \\ &\leq C \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\phi|^2 dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, multiplying the first equation of the adjoint system (10) by  $\phi$  and the second by  $\psi$ , integrating in  $[0, 1]$  and adding both equations we get

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|\phi\|^2 + \|\psi\|^2) + C_1 (\|\phi_x\|^2 + \|\psi_x\|^2) &\leq C_2 (\|\phi\|^2 + \|\psi\|^2) + \\ &+ \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (\lambda_1(t) J_1(x-z) \phi(z, t) \phi(x, t)) dz dx \\ &+ \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (\lambda_2(t) J_2(x-z) \psi(z, t) \psi(x, t)) dz dx, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the  $L^2$ -norm on  $\Omega$ .

Using that the kernels are bounded, the last two integrals are bounded by a term of the form  $C_3 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (\phi(z, t)^2 + \phi(x, t)^2 + \psi(z, t)^2 + \psi(x, t)^2) dz dx$ , thus

$$-\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|\phi\|^2 + \|\psi\|^2) + C_1 (\|\phi_x\|^2 + \|\psi_x\|^2) \leq C_4 (\|\phi\|^2 + \|\psi\|^2),$$

and

$$-\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|\phi\|^2 + \|\psi\|^2) - C_4 (\|\phi\|^2 + \|\psi\|^2) \leq 0.$$

Using Gronwall's inequality we get

$$\|\phi(0)\|^2 + \|\psi(0)\|^2 \leq e^{2C_4 T} (\|\phi(t)\|^2 + \|\psi(t)\|^2).$$

From the last inequality and (38),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{T}{2} (\|\phi(0)\|^2 + \|\psi(0)\|^2) &= \int_{T/4}^{3T/4} (\|\phi(0)\|^2 + \|\psi(0)\|^2) dt \\ &\leq e^{2C_4 T} \int_{T/4}^{3T/4} (\|\phi(t)\|^2 + \|\psi(t)\|^2) dt \\ &\leq e^{2C_4 T} C \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\phi|^2 dx dt, \end{aligned}$$

and this is the observability inequality.  $\square$

As a consequence of the observability, we obtain the null controllability of the linear system (8) stated in Theorem 2. The proof is like in [1]. Because of this, we present here just a few extra details.

**Proof. (Proof of Theorem 2.)**

For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any  $\nu \in L^2(Q)$  we consider the functional

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(\nu) = \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\nu|^2 dx dt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^1 (|y_\nu(T)|^2 + |z_\nu(T)|^2) dx,$$

where  $y_\nu$  and  $z_\nu$  are solutions of (8) associated to the control  $\nu$  and fixed initial conditions  $y_0$  and  $z_0$ .

It is not difficult to check that  $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$  is strictly convex, continuous and coercive in  $L^2(Q)$ , then it has a unique minimizer  $\nu_\varepsilon \in L^2(Q)$ .

**1.  $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$  is strictly convex.**

Let  $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in L^2(Q)$  with  $\nu_1 \neq \nu_2$  and fix  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ . Define

$$\nu_\theta = \theta \nu_1 + (1 - \theta) \nu_2.$$

By linearity of the system (8) in the control  $\nu$ , the corresponding solutions satisfy

$$(y_{\nu_\theta}, z_{\nu_\theta}) = \theta (y_{\nu_1}, z_{\nu_1}) + (1 - \theta) (y_{\nu_2}, z_{\nu_2}).$$

The value of  $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$  at  $\nu_\theta$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(\nu_\theta) &= \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\theta \nu_1 + (1 - \theta) \nu_2|^2 dx dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^1 \left| \theta y_{\nu_1}(T) + (1 - \theta) y_{\nu_2}(T) \right|^2 + \left| \theta z_{\nu_1}(T) + (1 - \theta) z_{\nu_2}(T) \right|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

We have de strictly convexity of squares:

$$|\theta a + (1 - \theta) b|^2 < \theta |a|^2 + (1 - \theta) |b|^2$$

for  $a \neq b$ . Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\theta \nu_1 + (1 - \theta) \nu_2|^2 dx dt &< \theta \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\nu_1|^2 dx dt + (1 - \theta) \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\nu_2|^2 dx dt, \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^1 |\theta y_1(T) + (1 - \theta) y_2(T)|^2 dx &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left[ \theta \int_0^1 |y_1(T)|^2 dx + (1 - \theta) \int_0^1 |y_2(T)|^2 dx \right] \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for the  $z$ -term.

Then, we have that  $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$  is strictly convex

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(\theta \nu_1 + (1 - \theta) \nu_2) < \theta \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(\nu_1) + (1 - \theta) \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(\nu_2).$$

**2.  $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$  is continuous.**

Let  $\{\nu_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$  be a sequence converging strongly to  $\nu$  in  $L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$ .

Since  $\nu \mapsto \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\nu|^2 dx dt$  is continuous on  $L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$ , we have

$$\iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\nu|^2 dx dt = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\nu_n|^2 dx dt.$$

By standard energy estimates for the linear PDE system (8), there is a constant  $C > 0$  such that for every control  $\nu \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$  and initial conditions  $y_0$  and  $z_0 \in L^2(0, 1)$ , we have

$$\|y_\nu\|_{C([0, T]; L^2(0, 1))} + \|z_\nu\|_{C([0, T]; L^2(0, 1))} \leq C (\|\nu\|_{L^2(\omega \times (0, T))} + \|y_0\|_{L^2(0, 1)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(0, 1)}).$$

Hence

$$y_{\nu_n}(T) \rightarrow y_\nu(T) \quad \text{and} \quad z_{\nu_n}(T) \rightarrow z_\nu(T) \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega).$$

In other words,

$$\int_\Omega |y_\nu(T)|^2 dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_\Omega |y_{\nu_n}(T)|^2 dx, \quad \int_\Omega |z_\nu(T)|^2 dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_\Omega |z_{\nu_n}(T)|^2 dx.$$

Putting together,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(\nu) &= \int_Q |\nu|^2 dx dt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_\Omega (|y_\nu(T)|^2 + |z_\nu(T)|^2) dx \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_Q |\nu_n|^2 dx dt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_\Omega (|y_{\nu_n}(T)|^2 + |z_{\nu_n}(T)|^2) dx \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(\nu_n).\end{aligned}$$

This shows  $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$  is continuous.

### 3. $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ is coercive.

Coercivity is evident, due to the term  $\int_{\omega \times (0,T)} |\nu|^2 dx dt$ .

Then,  $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$  has a unique minimizer  $\nu_\varepsilon \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$ . We will denote  $y_\varepsilon$  and  $z_\varepsilon$  the associated solutions of (8). The Gâteaux derivative of the functional  $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$  at the direction  $\mu \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$  is given by

$$\mathcal{J}'_\varepsilon(\nu_\varepsilon)(\mu) = 2 \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} \nu_\varepsilon \mu dx dt + \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \int_\Omega (y_\varepsilon(T) \hat{y}(T) + z_\varepsilon(T) \hat{z}(T)) dx,$$

where  $(\hat{y}, \hat{z})$  are solutions of the system (8) associated to  $\nu = \mu$  and initial conditions  $y_0(x) = z_0(x) = 0$ . More precisely,

$$(39) \quad \begin{cases} \hat{y}_t = a_1 \hat{y}_{xx} + b_1 \hat{y}_x + c_1 \hat{y} + \lambda_1 \int_0^1 J_1(\zeta - x) \hat{y}(\zeta, t) d\zeta + \tilde{a}(x, t) \hat{y} + \tilde{b}(x, t) \hat{z} + \mu 1_\omega, & \text{in } Q, \\ \hat{z}_t = a_2 \hat{z}_{xx} + b_2 \hat{z}_x + c_2 \hat{z} + \lambda_2 \int_0^1 J_2(\zeta - x) \hat{z}(\zeta, t) d\zeta + \tilde{c}(x, t) \hat{y} + \tilde{d}(x, t) \hat{z}, & \text{in } Q, \\ \hat{y}(0, t) = \hat{y}(1, t) = \hat{z}(0, t) = \hat{z}(1, t) = 0, & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ \hat{y}(x, 0) = 0, \hat{z}(x, 0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

If the minimum is reached at  $\nu_\varepsilon$ , the Gateaux derivative at this point is zero for any  $\mu \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$ .

$$(40) \quad 0 = 2 \iint_{\omega \times (0,T)} \nu_\varepsilon \mu dx dt + \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \int_\Omega (y_\varepsilon(T) \hat{y}(T) + z_\varepsilon(T) \hat{z}(T)) dx.$$

We use the adjoint equation (10) with final conditions

$$(41) \quad \phi_T = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} u_\varepsilon(T), \quad \psi_T = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} v_\varepsilon(T).$$

For simplicity, we will call the associated solution  $(\phi, \psi)$ .

Multiplying the first equation of (39) by  $\phi$ , the second by  $\psi$ , integrating in  $Q$  and adding both equations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}& \int_Q \left( \hat{y}_t - a_1 \hat{y}_{xx} - b_1 \hat{y}_x - c_1 \hat{y} - \lambda_1 \int_0^1 J_1(\zeta - x) \hat{y}(\zeta, t) d\zeta - \tilde{a}(x, t) \hat{y} - \tilde{b}(x, t) \hat{z} \right) \phi dx dt + \\ & + \int_Q \left( \hat{z}_t - a_2 \hat{z}_{xx} - b_2 \hat{z}_x - c_2 \hat{z} - \lambda_2 \int_0^1 J_2(\zeta - x) \hat{z}(\zeta, t) d\zeta - \tilde{c}(x, t) \hat{y} - \tilde{d}(x, t) \hat{z} \right) \psi dx dt \\ & = \int_Q \mu \phi 1_\omega dx dt.\end{aligned}$$

Integrating by parts and using that  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  verify the adjoint system (10) and the final conditions (41),

$$\int_{\Omega} \hat{y}(T) \left(-\frac{1}{\varepsilon} y_{\varepsilon}(T)\right) dx + \int_{\Omega} \hat{z}(T) \left(-\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z_{\varepsilon}(T)\right) dx = \int_Q \mu \phi_{\varepsilon} 1_{\omega} dx dt.$$

Thus, using (40),

$$\iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} \nu_{\varepsilon} \mu dx dt = \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} \mu \phi_{\varepsilon} 1_{\omega} dx dt,$$

for any  $\mu \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$ . This implies that

$$(42) \quad \nu_{\varepsilon} = \phi_{\varepsilon} 1_{\omega}.$$

On the other hand, considering the linearized system (8) associated with  $y_{\varepsilon}$ ,  $z_{\varepsilon}$  and  $\nu_{\varepsilon}$ , multiplying the first equation of (8) by  $\phi_{\varepsilon}$ , the second equation of (8) by  $\psi_{\varepsilon}$ , integrating in  $Q$ , adding and using (42), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q (y_{\varepsilon, t} - a_1 y_{\varepsilon, xx} - b_1 y_{\varepsilon, x} - c_1 y_{\varepsilon} - \\ & - \lambda_1 \int_0^1 J_1(\zeta - x) y_{\varepsilon}(\zeta, t) dz - \tilde{a}(x, t) y_{\varepsilon} - \tilde{b}(x, t) z_{\varepsilon}) \phi_{\varepsilon} dx dt + \\ & + \int_Q (z_{\varepsilon, t} - a_2 z_{\varepsilon, xx} - b_2 z_{\varepsilon, x} - c_2 z_{\varepsilon} - \\ & - \lambda_2 \int_0^1 J_2(\zeta - x) z_{\varepsilon}(\zeta, t) dz - \tilde{c}(x, t) y_{\varepsilon} - \tilde{d}(x, t) z_{\varepsilon}) \psi_{\varepsilon} dx dt = \\ & = \int_Q |\phi_{\varepsilon}|^2 1_{\omega} dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating by parts, we obtain

$$(y_{\varepsilon}, \phi_{\varepsilon})_{L^2(Q)}|_0^T + (z_{\varepsilon}, \psi_{\varepsilon})_{L^2(Q)}|_0^T = \int_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\phi_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx dt.$$

Thus, replacing the initial and final conditions,

$$\int_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\phi_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx dt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} |y_{\varepsilon}(T)|^2 dx + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} |z_{\varepsilon}(T)|^2 dx = -(y_0, \phi_{\varepsilon}(0)) - (z_0, \psi_{\varepsilon}(0)).$$

That is,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\phi_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx dt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} |y_{\varepsilon}(T)|^2 dx + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} |z_{\varepsilon}(T)|^2 dx \leq \\ & \leq (\|y_0\|^2 + \|z_0\|^2)^{1/2} (\|\phi_{\varepsilon}(0)\|^2 + \|\psi_{\varepsilon}(0)\|^2)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the observability inequality, and the elementary inequality  $ab \leq \varepsilon a^2 + \frac{b^2}{4\varepsilon}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\phi_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx dt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} |y_{\varepsilon}(T)|^2 dx + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} |z_{\varepsilon}(T)|^2 dx \leq \\ & \leq \frac{C}{2} (\|y_0\|^2 + \|z_0\|^2) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\phi_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using (42),

$$(43) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{\omega \times (0, T)} |\nu_{\varepsilon}|^2 dx dt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} |y_{\varepsilon}(T)|^2 dx + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} |z_{\varepsilon}(T)|^2 dx \leq \frac{C}{2} (\|y_0\|^2 + \|z_0\|^2).$$



Kakutani's compactness theorem implies that there exists a subnet of  $\nu_\varepsilon$ , with  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , denoted with the same symbol, such that  $\nu_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \nu$  (weakly) in  $L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$ .

We use the energy estimates

$$\begin{aligned} & \|y_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(0,T,H_0^1(\Omega))} + \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(0,T,H_0^1(\Omega))} + \|y_{\varepsilon,t}\|_{L^2(0,T,H^{-1}(\Omega))} + \|z_{\varepsilon,t}\|_{L^2(0,T,H^{-1}(\Omega))} \\ & \leq C_1(\|y_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nu_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(Q)}), \end{aligned}$$

and, using (43), we have

$$(44) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|y_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(0,T,H_0^1(\Omega))} + \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(0,T,H_0^1(\Omega))} + \|y_{\varepsilon,t}\|_{L^2(0,T,H^{-1}(\Omega))} + \|z_{\varepsilon,t}\|_{L^2(0,T,H^{-1}(\Omega))} \\ & \leq C_2(\|y_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get the weak convergence of the subnets  $y_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup y$ ,  $z_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup z$  in  $L^2(0, T, H_0^1(\Omega))$  and  $y_{\varepsilon,t} \rightharpoonup y_t$ ,  $z_{\varepsilon,t} \rightharpoonup z_t$  in  $L^2(0, T, H^{-1}(\Omega))$ .

Moreover, (44) implies by [24] (Sec 5.9, Thm 3) that, after a possible redefinition on a set of measure zero,  $y_\varepsilon$ ,  $z_\varepsilon$  belong to  $C([0, T], L^2(\Omega))$  and

$$\|y_\varepsilon\|_{C([0,T],L^2(\Omega))} + \|z_\varepsilon\|_{C([0,T],L^2(\Omega))} \leq C_3(\|y_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}).$$

Let us recall the following result:

**Proposition 1.** [10] (Prop A.2.46(i)) *Let  $X \hookrightarrow Y$  be two Banach spaces and let  $f_n$  be a bounded sequence of  $L^\infty(I, X) \cap W^{1,r}(I, Y)$ , for some  $r > 1$ . If  $X$  is reflexive and if  $I$  is bounded, then the following hold: there exists  $f \in L^\infty(I, X)$ ,  $f : \bar{I} \rightarrow X$  being weakly continuous, and a subsequence  $n_k$  such that  $f_{n_k}(t) \rightharpoonup f(t)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , for every  $t \in \bar{I}$ . In particular,*

$$\int_I f_n(t) \phi(t) dt \rightharpoonup \int_I f(t) \phi(t) dt$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $\phi \in C_c(I)$ .

Using this for  $X = L^2(\Omega)$ ,  $Y = H^{-1}(\Omega)$  and  $r = 2$ , we get the existence of  $y \in L^\infty(0, T, L^2(\Omega))$  and  $z \in L^\infty(0, T, L^2(\Omega))$  such that, for a subnet,  $y_\varepsilon(t) \rightharpoonup y(t)$  and  $z_\varepsilon(t) \rightharpoonup z(t)$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$  for every  $t \in [0, T]$ . In particular we have that  $y_\varepsilon(T) \rightharpoonup y(T)$  and  $z_\varepsilon(T) \rightharpoonup z(T)$  weakly in  $L^2(\Omega)$ .

As a consequence, there exist subnets such that

$$(45) \quad y_{\varepsilon,t} \rightharpoonup y_t, \quad z_{\varepsilon,t} \rightharpoonup z_t, \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T, H^{-1}(\Omega))$$

$$(46) \quad y_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup y, \quad z_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup z, \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T, H_0^1(\Omega))$$

$$(47) \quad y_\varepsilon(T) \rightharpoonup y(T), \quad z_\varepsilon(T) \rightharpoonup z(T), \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega),$$

and from (43),

$$(48) \quad y_\varepsilon(T) \rightarrow 0, \quad z_\varepsilon(T) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega), \text{ because } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

From unicity of the weak limit, we have  $u(T) = 0$  and  $v(T) = 0$ .

Using (45)-(48), we can pass to the limit in the weak form of the approximate system. Thus, the limit functions  $y$ ,  $z$  satisfy the weak form of the original system (8), with  $y(T) = 0$  and  $z(T) = 0$  and with  $y$ ,  $z \in L^2(0, T, H_0^1(\Omega))$  and  $y_t$ ,  $z_t \in L^2(0, T, H^{-1}(\Omega))$ .

The estimate (9) follows immediately from (43).  $\square$

## 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

To prove the main theorem we will use the following version of Kakutani's theorem:

**Theorem 3.** (*Kakutani's fixed point theorem*) *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a complete Hausdorff locally convex linear topological space. Let  $B \subset \mathcal{X}$  be nonempty, convex and compact. Let  $\Phi : B \rightarrow 2^B$  be a multivalued map that has closed graph and such that for any  $(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) \in B$ ,  $\Phi(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$  is nonempty, convex and compact. Then, the set of fixed points of  $\Phi$  is nonempty.*

This theorem can be easily derived from the Theorem 11.9 (page 138) of the book [15]. In our context, the graph of the multivalued map  $\Phi$  is defined by

$$\text{Graph}(\Phi) = \{((\bar{y}, \bar{z}), (u, v)) \in B \times B : (u, v) \in \Phi(\bar{y}, \bar{z})\}.$$

In the present article the specific functional spaces are defined as follows:

$$(49) \quad \mathcal{X} := L^2(Q) \times L^2(Q), \quad W' := \{u \in L^2(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega)) : u_t \in L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\Omega))\},$$

and denote by  $\|\cdot\|_{W'}$  the natural norm of  $W'$ .

$$\|u\|_{W'}^2 := \|u\|_{L^2(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega))}^2 + \|u_t\|_{L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\Omega))}^2.$$

We also introduce the ball

$$(50) \quad B := B_{W'}(0, R) := \{(y, z) \in W' \times W' : \|y\|_{W'}^2 + \|z\|_{W'}^2 \leq R^2\},$$

where  $R > 0$  will be chosen later and the norm of  $W' \times W'$  is defined by

$$\|(y, z)\|_{W' \times W'}^2 = \|y\|_{L^2(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega))}^2 + \|y_t\|_{L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\Omega))}^2 + \|z\|_{L^2(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega))}^2 + \|z_t\|_{L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\Omega))}^2.$$

The multivalued map is defined on  $B \subset \mathcal{X}$  by

$$\Phi : B \rightarrow 2^B,$$

such that for fixed initial conditions in system (8) and for the constant  $C$  of estimate (9), we have:

$$(51) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) &= \{(y, z) \in \mathcal{X} \mid \text{there exists } \nu \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T)) \text{ such that } (y, z) \text{ is solution of (8)} \\ &\quad \text{with } y(T) = 0, z(T) = 0, \|\nu\|_{L^2(\omega \times (0, T))} \leq C(\|y_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, it is crucial that the constant  $C$  does not depend on the element  $(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$  since this uniformity of the constant will be crucial in the proof.

If  $(y, z)$  is fixed point of  $\Phi$ , i.e.  $(y, z) \in \Phi(y, z)$ , then  $(y, z)$  is a solution of

$$(52) \quad \begin{cases} y_t = a_1 y_{xx} + b_1 y_x + c_1 y + \lambda_1 \int_0^1 J_1(\zeta - x) y(\zeta, t) d\zeta + a(y, z) y + b(y, z) z + \nu 1_\omega, & \text{in } Q, \\ z_t = a_2 z_{xx} + b_2 z_x + c_2 z + \lambda_2 \int_0^1 J_2(\zeta - x) z(\zeta, t) d\zeta + c(y, z) y + d(y, z) z, & \text{in } Q, \\ y(0, t) = y(1, t) = z(0, t) = z(1, t) = 0, & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ y(x, 0) = y_0(x), z(x, 0) = z_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

which, from the decomposition (7), is our original system (1). Therefore, the system will be null controllable.

*Proof.* (Theorem 1)

Since  $H_0^1(\Omega) \subset L^2(\Omega)$  compactly, and  $L^2(\Omega) \subset H^{-1}(\Omega)$  continuously, then by the theorem of Aubin-Lions,  $W' \subset L^2(0, T, L^2(\Omega))$  compactly. As a product space, we also get that  $W' \times W' \subset L^2(Q) \times L^2(Q)$  compactly. Thus, **B is compact in  $\mathcal{X}$** , i.e. if  $(y_n, z_n) \in B$  is a bounded sequence then there exist a subsequence, denoted also by  $(y_n, z_n)$ , such that

$$(y_n, z_n) \rightarrow (y, z) \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{X}.$$

Furthermore **B is convex**. Indeed, if  $(y_1, z_1)$  and  $(y_2, z_2)$  belong to  $B$ , we have

$$\|(y_1, z_1)\|_{W' \times W'} \leq R, \quad \|(y_2, z_2)\|_{W' \times W'} \leq R,$$

and then, by the properties of the norm,

$$\|\lambda(y_1, z_1) + (1 - \lambda)(y_2, z_2)\|_{W' \times W'} \leq \lambda\|(y_1, z_1)\|_{W' \times W'} + (1 - \lambda)\|(y_2, z_2)\|_{W' \times W'} \leq R.$$

Obviously **B is non-empty**.

Now, we prove that for any  $(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) \in B$  the set  $\Phi(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$  is convex.

Let  $(y_1, z_1)$  and  $(y_2, z_2)$  belong to  $\Phi(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$ . Thus, for  $i = 1, 2$ ,

$$\begin{cases} y_{i,t} = a_1 y_{i,xx} + b_1 y_{i,x} + c_i y_i + \lambda_1 \int_0^1 J_1(\zeta - x) y_i(\zeta, t) d\zeta + a(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) y_i + b(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) z_i + \nu_i 1_\omega, & \text{in } Q, \\ z_{i,t} = a_2 z_{i,xx} + b_2 z_{i,x} + c_2 z_i + \lambda_2 \int_0^1 J_2(\zeta - x) z_i(\zeta, t) d\zeta + c(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) y_i + d(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) z_i, & \text{in } Q, \\ y_i(0, t) = y_i(1, t) = z_i(0, t) = z_i(1, t) = 0, & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ y_i(x, 0) = y_0(x), z_i(x, 0) = z_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

and

$$y_i(T) = 0, \quad z_i(T) = 0,$$

$$\nu_i \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T)), \quad \|\nu_i\| \leq C(\|y_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}).$$

The convex combination  $(y, z) = \lambda(y_1, z_1) + (1 - \lambda)(y_2, z_2)$  is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} y_t = a_1 y_{xx} + b_1 y_x + c_1 y + \lambda_1 \int_0^1 J_1(\zeta - x) y(\zeta, t) d\zeta + a(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) y + b(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) z = (\lambda \nu_1 + (1 - \lambda) \nu_2) 1_\omega, & \text{in } Q, \\ z_t = a_2 z_{xx} + b_2 z_x + c_2 z + \lambda_2 \int_0^1 J_2(\zeta - x) z(\zeta, t) d\zeta + c(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) y + d(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) z = 0, & \text{in } Q, \\ y(0, t) = y(1, t) = z(0, t) = z(1, t) = 0, & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ y(x, 0) = y_0(x), z(x, 0) = z_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

and

$$y(T) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad z(T) = 0.$$

Taking  $\nu = \lambda \nu_1 + (1 - \lambda) \nu_2 \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$ , we have

$$\|\nu\|_{L^2(\omega \times (0, T))} \leq \lambda \|\nu_1\| + (1 - \lambda) \|\nu_2\| \leq C(\|y_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}).$$

This implies that  **$\Phi(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$  is convex**.

Now we show that for every  $(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) \in B$  we have that  $\Phi(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$  is compact. Let  $(y_n, z_n)$  denote a sequence in  $\Phi(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$ . Then,  $(y_n, z_n)$  is a solution of

$$(53) \quad \begin{cases} y_{n,t} = a_1 y_{n,xx} + b_1 y_{n,x} + c_i y_n + \lambda_1 \int_0^1 J_1(\zeta - x) y_n(\zeta, t) d\zeta + a(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) y_n + b(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) z_n + \nu_n 1_\omega, & \text{in } Q, \\ z_{n,t} = a_2 z_{n,xx} + b_2 z_{n,x} + c_2 z_n + \lambda_2 \int_0^1 J_2(\zeta - x) z_n(\zeta, t) d\zeta + c(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) y_n + d(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) z_n, & \text{in } Q, \\ y_n(0, t) = y_n(1, t) = z_n(0, t) = z_n(1, t) = 0, & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ y_n(x, 0) = y_0(x), z_n(x, 0) = z_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

and

$$y_n(T) = 0, \quad z_n(T) = 0,$$

$$\nu_n \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T)), \quad \|\nu_n\| \leq C(\|y_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}).$$

We have to show that there exists a subsequence, denoted also  $(y_n, z_n)$  such that  $(y_n, z_n) \rightarrow (y, z)$  strongly in  $\mathcal{X}$ .

By the estimate of  $\nu_n$  and by the energy estimates like (44) of the linear system (53), there is a subsequence, denoted also  $(y_n, z_n)$ , such that

$$(54) \quad \begin{aligned} y_n &\rightharpoonup y, \quad z_n \rightharpoonup z, \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0, T, H_0^1(\Omega)), \\ y_{n,t} &\rightharpoonup y_t, \quad z_{n,t} \rightharpoonup z_t, \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0, T, H^{-1}(\Omega)), \\ \nu_n &\rightharpoonup \nu, \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\omega \times (0, T)). \end{aligned}$$

With an argument analogous to the proof of Theorem 2, we can pass to the limit in (53) and get

$$\begin{cases} y_t = a_1 y_{xx} + b_1 y_x + c_1 y + \lambda_1 \int_0^1 J_1(\zeta - x) y(\zeta, t) d\zeta + a(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) y + b(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) z + \nu 1_\omega, & \text{in } Q, \\ z_t = a_2 z_{xx} + b_2 z_x + c_2 z + \lambda_2 \int_0^1 J_2(\zeta - x) z(\zeta, t) d\zeta + c(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) y + d(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) z, & \text{in } Q, \\ y(0, t) = y(1, t) = z(0, t) = z(1, t) = 0, & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ y(x, 0) = y_0(x), z(x, 0) = z_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

with  $y(T) = 0$ ,  $z(T) = 0$  and  $\|\nu\| \leq C(\|y_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)})$ .

In the present case, we complete the demonstration using the Theorem of Aubin-Lions. We have  $W \subset L^2(Q)$  compactly, and there is a subsequence  $(y_n, z_n)$ , such that

$$(y_n, z_n) \rightarrow (y, z), \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(Q) \times L^2(Q) = \mathcal{X},$$

i.e.  $(y, z) \in \Phi(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$  and  $\Phi(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$  is compact.

By the Theorem 2, we have that  $\Phi(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$  is nonempty.

Now we prove that  $\Phi(B) \subset B$ . If  $R > 0$  is fixed, let  $(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) \in B$  and  $(y, z) \in \Phi(B)$ . If we choose  $\delta > 0$  sufficiently small, depending on  $T$ , such that  $\|y_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < \delta$ , then **we get that**  $\Phi(B) \subset B$ , by the energy estimates (44).

Now we prove that that graph of  $\Phi$  is closed. Let us consider the sequence  $((\bar{y}_n, \bar{z}_n), (y_n, z_n)) \in \text{Graph}(\Phi)$ , such that  $((\bar{y}_n, \bar{z}_n), (y_n, z_n)) \rightarrow ((\bar{y}, \bar{z}), (y, z))$  in  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ . That is, the functions satisfy the system below:

$$(55) \quad \begin{cases} y_{n,t} = a_1 y_{n,xx} + b_1 y_{n,x} + c_1 y_n + \lambda_1 \int_0^1 J_1(\zeta - x) y_n(\zeta, t) d\zeta + a(\bar{y}_n, \bar{z}_n) y_n + b(\bar{y}_n, \bar{z}_n) z_n + \nu_n 1_\omega, & \text{in } Q, \\ z_{n,t} = a_2 z_{n,xx} + b_2 z_{n,x} + c_2 z_n + \lambda_2 \int_0^1 J_2(\zeta - x) z_n(\zeta, t) d\zeta + c(\bar{y}_n, \bar{z}_n) y_n + d(\bar{y}_n, \bar{z}_n) z_n, & \text{in } Q, \\ y_n(0, t) = y_n(1, t) = z_n(0, t) = z_n(1, t) = 0, & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ y_n(x, 0) = y_0(x), z_n(x, 0) = z_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

and we have that  $\nu_n \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$ ,  $(y_n, z_n)$  is solution of the system with  $y_n(T) = 0$ ,  $z_n(T) = 0$  and  $\|\nu_n\|_{L^2(\omega \times (0, T))} \leq C(\|y_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)})$ .

As above we have the energy estimate (44), because the initial conditions of the system are fixed for every sequence of solutions and the controls are uniformly limited by the norm of these initial conditions. Thus, there is a subsequence also denoted  $(y_n, z_n)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} y_n &\rightharpoonup y, \quad z_n \rightharpoonup z, \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0, T, H_0^1(\Omega)), \\ y_{n,t} &\rightharpoonup y_t, \quad z_{n,t} \rightharpoonup z_t, \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0, T, H^{-1}(\Omega)). \end{aligned}$$

We also have for a subsequence, due to  $((\bar{y}_n, \bar{z}_n), (y_n, z_n)) \rightarrow ((\bar{y}, \bar{z}), (y, z))$  in  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ ,

$$\bar{y}_n \rightarrow \bar{y}, \quad y_n \rightarrow y, \quad \bar{z}_n \rightarrow \bar{z}, \quad z_n \rightarrow z.$$

almost everywhere in  $Q$ . So, considering that  $a$  is a continuous function, we have:

$$a(\bar{y}_n, \bar{z}_n) y_n \rightarrow a(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) y, \quad \text{almost everywhere in } \Omega \times (0, T).$$

On the other hand, we have that  $\int_Q |a(\bar{y}_n, \bar{z}_n)y_n|^2 \leq M^2 \int_Q |y_n|^2 \leq C$ . Thus, by the Lemma of Lions, we have

$$a(\bar{y}_n, \bar{z}_n)y_n \rightarrow a(\bar{y}, \bar{z})y \quad \text{in } L^2(Q).$$

We estimate analogously the other terms.

$$b(\bar{y}_n, \bar{z}_n)y_n \rightarrow b(\bar{y}, \bar{z})y \quad \text{in } L^2(Q).$$

$$c(\bar{y}_n, \bar{z}_n)y_n \rightarrow c(\bar{y}, \bar{z})y \quad \text{in } L^2(Q).$$

$$d(\bar{y}_n, \bar{z}_n)y_n \rightarrow d(\bar{y}, \bar{z})y \quad \text{in } L^2(Q).$$

Moreover, observing that  $\|\nu_n\|_{L^2(\omega \times (0, T))} \leq C(\|y_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)})$ , we also have  $\nu_n \rightharpoonup \nu$  weakly in  $L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$ .

Then, we can pass the limit in the system (55). We have

$$y_n(x, 0) = y_0(x), \quad z_n(x, 0) = z_0(x), \quad y_n(x, T) = 0, \quad z_n(x, T) = 0.$$

With the same argument as at the end of the proof of Theorem 2 we have

$$y(x, 0) = y_0(x), \quad z(x, 0) = z_0(x), \quad y(x, T) = 0, \quad z(x, T) = 0.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{cases} y_t = a_1 y_{xx} + b_1 y_x + c_1 y + \lambda_1 \int_0^1 J_1(\zeta - x)y(\zeta, t)d\zeta + a(\bar{y}, \bar{z})y + b(\bar{y}, \bar{z})z + \nu 1_\omega, & \text{in } Q, \\ z_t = a_2 z_{xx} + b_2 z_x + c_2 z + \lambda_2 \int_0^1 J_2(\zeta - x)z(\zeta, t)d\zeta + c(\bar{y}, \bar{z})y + d(\bar{y}, \bar{z})z, & \text{in } Q, \\ y(0, t) = y(1, t) = z(0, t) = z(1, t) = 0, & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ y(x, 0) = y_0(x), z(x, 0) = z_0(x), & \text{in } 0 < x < 1, \end{cases}$$

and  $\|\nu\|_{L^2(\omega \times (0, T))} \leq \liminf \|\nu_n\| \leq C(\|y_0\|_{L^2(Q)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(Q)})$ .

This shows that  $(y, z) \in \Phi(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$ , i.e.,  **$\Phi$  has closed graph.**

Thus, by Kakutani's theorem, there exists a fixed point  $(y, z) \in \Phi(y, z)$  that satisfies the system (52) and  $y(T) = 0, z(T) = 0$ , with control  $\nu \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$  such that

$$\|\nu\|_{L^2(\omega \times (0, T))} \leq C_1(\|y_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}).$$

□

#### 4. RELATED PROBLEMS AND ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- As pointed in Remark 1, the intermediate Carleman solves the problem with two controls.
- The adaptation of the case of boundary controls is standard. For instance, for the system (1) we look for boundary controls  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  such that the system

$$\begin{cases} u_t = a_1 u_{xx} + b_1 u_x + c_1 u + \lambda_1 \int_0^1 J_1(z - x)u(z, t)dz + F(u, v), & \text{in } Q, \\ v_t = a_2 v_{xx} + b_2 v_x + c_2 v + \lambda_2 \int_0^1 J_2(z - x)v(z, t)dz + G(u, v), & \text{in } Q, \\ u(0, t) = v(0, t) = 0, & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ u(1, t) = h_1(t), \quad v(1, t) = h_2(t), & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

is locally null controllable, where the other parameters are the same as in the original system (1). We solve the problem with interior control  $\bar{\nu}$  in the extended interval  $\Omega_\varepsilon = (0, 1 + \varepsilon)$  where the control is acting in an open set  $\bar{\omega} \subset (1, 1 + \varepsilon)$ . Then, the boundary controls are given by  $h_1(t) = \bar{u}(1, t)$  and  $h_2(t) = \bar{v}(1, t)$ , where  $(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$  denote the solutions given by

Theorem 1 in the extended interval. Let us recall that the case with only one boundary control is open, even for a system of coupled heat equations.

- The authors are working on the following generalization: for the domains  $\Omega = (0, 1)$  and  $Q = \Omega \times (0, T)$  we consider the null controllability of the following system of semilinearly coupled equations with kernel terms,

$$\begin{cases} y_t = a_1 y_{xx} + b_1 y_x + c_1 y + \lambda_1(t) \int_0^1 J_1(\zeta - x) y(\zeta, t) d\zeta + P(y, z, y_x) + \nu 1_\omega, & \text{in } Q, \\ z_t = a_2 z_{xx} + b_2 z_x + c_2 z + \lambda_2(t) \int_0^1 J_2(\zeta - x) z(\zeta, t) d\zeta + Q(y, z, z_x), & \text{in } Q, \\ y(0, t) = y(1, t) = z(0, t) = z(1, t) = 0, & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ y(x, 0) = y_0(x), z(x, 0) = z_0(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where  $\nu$  is a control acting on an open set  $\omega \subset \Omega$ .

- Let us consider  $\Omega = (0, 1)$  and  $Q := \Omega \times (0, T)$ . We consider the null controllability of the following system of semilinearly coupled equations with kernel terms,

$$\begin{cases} y_t = a_1 y_{xx} + b_1 y_x + c_1 y + \lambda_1(t) \int_0^1 J_1(\zeta - x) y(\zeta, t) d\zeta + P(y, z, y_x, z_x) + \nu 1_\omega, & \text{in } Q, \\ z_t = a_2 z_{xx} + b_2 z_x + c_2 z + \lambda_2(t) \int_0^1 J_2(\zeta - x) z(\zeta, t) d\zeta + Q(y, z, y_x, z_x), & \text{in } Q, \\ y(0, t) = y(1, t) = z(0, t) = z(1, t) = 0, & \text{for } 0 < t < T, \\ y(x, 0) = y_0(x), z(x, 0) = z_0(x), & \text{in } 0 < x < 1, \end{cases}$$

where  $\nu$  is a control acting on an open set  $\omega \subset (0, 1)$ . This problem is more difficult because there are only few results and Carleman estimates in the generic case where the linearized system contains terms with both  $y$  and  $y_x$  or  $z$  and  $z_x$  and it is not possible to isolate  $y$  or  $z$  from one of the equations. In that case we mention [8] where for a linear system, under stronger hypothesis on the coefficients and the geometry of the control set, a null controllability result was proved.

- From both a mathematical and an applied perspective, an interesting open problem is to establish controllability for systems of  $n$  equations using only  $n - m$  controls, with  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $n > m > 0$ . Such coupled systems also arise in financial mathematics.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Límaco Ferrel, Juan; Martins Lobosco, Rafael; Yapu, Luis P. On the controllability of a system of parabolic equations with nonlocal terms. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, v. 23, n. 4, p. 959-973, 2025. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [7](#), [13](#)
- [2] Rambeerich, Nisha and Pantelous, Athanasios A, *A high order finite element scheme for pricing options under regime switching jump diffusion processes*, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 300: 83–96, 2016. [2](#)
- [3] Black, Fischer and Scholes, Myron, *The pricing of options and corporate liabilities*, *Journal of political economy*, 81(3):637–654, 1973. [2](#)
- [4] Sakthivel, Kumarasamy and Balachandran, Krishnan and Sowrirajan, Rangarajan and Kim, Jeong-Hoon, *On exact null controllability of Black-Scholes equation*, *Kybernetika*, 44(5):685–704, 2008. [2](#)
- [5] Ankudinova, Julia and Ehrhardt, Matthias, *On the numerical solution of nonlinear Black-Scholes equations*, *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 56(3):799–812, 2008. [2](#)
- [6] Sakthivel, K and Devipriya, G and Balachandran, K and Kim, J-H, *Exact null controllability of a semilinear parabolic equation arising in finance*, *Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid Systems*, 3(4):565–577, 2009. [2](#)
- [7] Muthuraman, Kumar, *A moving boundary approach to American option pricing*, *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 32(11):3520–3537, 2008. [2](#)
- [8] Benadallah Assia, Cristofol Michel, Gaitan Patricia and de Teresa Luz; Controllability to trajectories for some parabolic systems of three and two equations by one control force. *Mathematical Control and Related Fields*, v. 4, n. 1, p. 17-44, 2014. [22](#)

- [9] Biccari Umberto and Hernández-Santamaría Víctor. Null controllability of linear and semilinear nonlocal heat equations with an additive integral kernel. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, v. 57, n. 4, p. 2924–2938, 2019. [2](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [10] Brezis, Haim and Cazenave, Thierry, *Linear semigroup of contractions; the Hille-Yosida theory and some applications*, Preprint of laboratory of numerical analysis, vol.6, pp.1992-1993 [17](#)
- [11] Fernandez-Cara E. and S. Guerrero S. Global Carleman inequalities for parabolic systems and applications to controllability. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 45.4 (2006): 1395-1446 [4](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [12] Fernández-Cara Enrique, Lu Qi and Zuazua Enrique. Null controllability of linear heat and wave equations with nonlocal spatial terms. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, v.54, n.4, p. 2009–2019, 2016. [2](#)
- [13] Fursikov A.V. and Imanuvilov O. Yu., *Controllability of Evolution Equations*, Lecture Note Series 34, Research Institute of Mathematics, Seoul National University, Seoul, 1996. [4](#), [5](#)
- [14] González-Burgos M. and de Teresa L. Controllability results for cascade systems of m coupled parabolic PDEs by one control force. *Port. Math.*, 67(1):91–113, 2010. [7](#)
- [15] Agarwal, Ravi P and Meehan, Maria and O'regan, Donal. *Fixed point theory and applications*. Cambridge university press, vol. 141, 2001. [18](#)
- [16] Límaco Juan and Nina-Huaman Dany, Exact controllability to trajectories for a parabolic PDE with local and nonlocal nonlinearities, Submitted. [2](#)
- [17] Lissy Pierre and Zuazua Enrique. Internal controllability for parabolic systems involving analytic non-local terms. *Chinese Annals of Mathematics, Series B*, v.39, p.281–296, 2018. [2](#)
- [18] Micu Sorin and Takahashi Takéo. Local controllability to stationary trajectories of a one-dimensional simplified model arising in turbulence. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 2018. [2](#)
- [19] Imanuvilov, Oleg Yu, *Controllability of parabolic equations*, Sbornik: Mathematics, 186(6):879, 1995. [5](#)
- [20] Imanuvilov, Oleg Yu, *Remarks on exact controllability for the Navier-Stokes equations*, ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations, 6:39–72, 2001. [5](#)
- [21] Chen, Goong and Lasiecka, Irena and Zhou, Jianxin, *Carleman estimate for a parabolic equation in a Sobolev space of negative order and its applications*, Control of nonlinear distributed parameter systems, 137–162, 2001. [5](#)
- [22] Zuazua, Enrique, *Exact boundary controllability for the semilinear wave equation*, Nonlinear partial differential equations and their applications, 10:357–391, 1991. [5](#)
- [23] Clark, Haroldo R and Fernández-Cara, Enrique and Limaco, Juan and Medeiros, Luis Adauto, *Theoretical and numerical local null controllability for a parabolic system with local and nonlocal nonlinearities*, Applied Mathematics and Computation, 223:483–505, 2013. [11](#)
- [24] Evans, Lawrence C. *Partial differential equations*. American mathematical society, 2022. [17](#)