

# Stabilization of a chain of 3 hyperbolic PDEs with 2 inputs in arbitrary position\*

Adam Braun<sup>1</sup>, Jean Auriol<sup>1</sup>, and Lucas Brivadis<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, CentraleSupélec, Laboratoire des Signaux et Systèmes, 91190, Gif-sur-Yvette, France. Emails: [adam.braun@centralesupelec.fr](mailto:adam.braun@centralesupelec.fr); [jean.auriol@centralesupelec.fr](mailto:jean.auriol@centralesupelec.fr); [lucas.brivadis@centralesupelec.fr](mailto:lucas.brivadis@centralesupelec.fr)

## Abstract

This paper addresses the stabilization of a chain of three coupled hyperbolic partial differential equations actuated by two control inputs applied at arbitrary nodes of the network. With the exception of configurations where one input is located at an endpoint, cases already well studied in the literature, all admissible two-inputs configurations are treated in this paper within a unified framework. The proposed approach relies on a backstepping transformation combined with a reformulation of the closed-loop dynamics as an Integral Difference Equation (IDE). This IDE representation reveals a common structural pattern across configurations and clarifies the role played by delayed dynamics in the stability analysis. Within this formulation, the stabilization problem can be handled using existing IDE control techniques. For most configurations, the stabilization of the PDE system requires an approximate spectral controllability assumption. Remarkably, one specific configuration can be stabilized without imposing any additional spectral condition. In contrast, we also provide an explicit example of a configuration for which the required spectral controllability property fails to hold.

## 1 Introduction

The controllability and stabilization of networks of hyperbolic Partial Differential Equations (PDEs) constitute a fundamental area of research with wide-ranging applications in engineering. Hyperbolic PDEs model systems governed by wave propagation and transport phenomena, such as fluid dynamics [20, 7], electrical transmission networks [2], and mechanical or structural vibrations [1]. In many practical settings, these systems are interconnected through network structures in which the dynamics of each subsystem influence, and are influenced by, neighboring components through boundary interactions. Such configurations arise, for instance, in traffic-flow management [26], where the propagation of density and velocity waves along interconnected road segments plays a central role.

Considerable attention has been devoted to the control of cascaded hyperbolic PDE systems, including ODE–PDE–ODE configurations. Most constructive designs rely on the backstepping method [14, 15, 24, 21, 9], with recent extensions based on infinite-dimensional dynamic augmentation [18]. Backstepping has proven effective for stabilizing chains of interconnected hyperbolic PDEs, initially for scalar subsystems [14] and more recently for non-scalar ones [4]. A common feature of recent contributions is the reformulation of the closed-loop dynamics as a *time-delay system*, which serves as the basis for controller design [3].

Most existing results assume that the control input is applied at one end of the chain. This configuration covers numerous applications, such as drilling systems or UAV–cable–payload structures [24], but does not reflect scenarios where the actuator lies at an interior node of the network.

---

\*This project received funding from the Agence Nationale de la Recherche via grant PANOPLY ANR-23-CE48-0001-01.

In traffic-flow control, for instance, ramp-metering devices may be located at junctions. For the case of two hyperbolic PDEs coupled at a junction, a stabilizing controller based on Fredholm transformations was proposed in [23]. However, this approach does not scale well to chains with more than two PDEs.

To address these limitations, a recent methodology was introduced in [3, Chapter 9] and [5]. Using backstepping transformations, the PDE interconnection is reformulated as an Integral Difference Equation (IDE), which allows one to design an explicit stabilizing control law expressed in terms of integrals of the state and input histories. This approach was extended in [11] to a chain of three hyperbolic PDEs actuated by a single input. In that setting, stabilization was achieved under a spectral controllability assumption, namely the absence of common zeros between two holomorphic functions arising in the IDE representation. From a practical and cost-oriented perspective, it is important to study the stabilization of the chain under different input configurations. Indeed, the placement and number of actuators have a direct impact on implementation cost, and understanding which configurations allow for stabilization provides valuable guidance for efficient actuator design and allocation.

In this paper, we investigate the stabilization of the same three-PDE chain for all configurations involving two boundary inputs. We omit the configurations in which one input is applied at an endpoint of the chain, since this configuration has already been treated in [4]. For the remaining configurations, and even with two control inputs, the proposed stabilization methodology requires, in all but one case, a spectral controllability assumption stating that three associated holomorphic functions have no common zeros. Although it is weaker than the spectral controllability condition required in the single-input case [11], it does not hold universally; in particular, we exhibit a specific configuration for which the assumption fails.

One configuration can be straightforwardly stabilized using the methodology of [4]. For the others, using the backstepping transformation from [11], the original system is mapped to an intermediate target system of transport equations with modified boundary conditions. The intermediate target system is then rewritten as an IDE for which an explicit stabilizing control law can be constructed following the methodology of [5].

The structure of the paper follows this strategy. Section 2 introduces the problem setting, the set of two-inputs configurations, and the standing assumptions. Section 3 details the reformulation of the PDE system into an IDE for the remaining configurations. Finally, Section 4 provides a configuration for which the required spectral assumption is not satisfied.

## 2 Problem Formulation

Let  $L^2(a, b)$  for  $a < b$  be the space of real valued square integrable functions over  $(a, b)$ , and let  $H^1(0, 1) = \{f \in L^2(0, 1) : f' \in L^2(0, 1)\}$ . In this paper, we consider a chain of three subsystems interconnected through their boundaries. All configurations involving two inputs acting on the boundary of the chain are examined. However, we deliberately omit the configurations in which one input is applied at an endpoint of the chain, since this problem has already been addressed in [4]. Although the system is defined with several inputs  $\bar{U}_j$  the subsequent stability analysis is carried out under the assumption that exactly two inputs are active, with all others set to zero. Every subsystem  $i$  is represented by a set of PDEs. For all  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , the states  $u_i, v_i$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u_i(t, x) + \lambda_i \partial_x u_i(t, x) &= \sigma_i^+(x) v_i(t, x), \\ \partial_t v_i(t, x) - \mu_i \partial_x v_i(t, x) &= \sigma_i^-(x) u_i(t, x), \\ u_i(t, 0) &= \delta_{i,2} \bar{U}_4(t) + \delta_{i,3} \bar{U}_3(t) + q_{ii} v_i(t, 0) + q_{ii-1} u_{i-1}(t, 1) \\ v_i(t, 1) &= \delta_{i,1} \bar{U}_1(t) + \delta_{i,2} \bar{U}_2(t) + \rho_{ii} u_i(t, 1) + \rho_{ii+1} v_{i+1}(t, 0) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $\delta_{i,j}$  is the Kronecker symbol, and with  $q_{10} = \rho_{34} = 0$ ,  $t \geq 0$  and  $x \in [0, 1]$ . The velocities  $\lambda_i$  and  $\mu_i$  are positive real constants. The in-domain coupling terms  $\sigma_i^+$  and  $\sigma_i^-$  are continuous functions defined on  $[0, 1]$  with real values. The boundary coupling coefficients  $q_{ij}$ ,  $\rho_{ij}$  are real

constants. Finally, we define  $\tau_i$  as the total transport time associated with the subsystem  $i$ :

$$\tau_i = \frac{1}{\lambda_i} + \frac{1}{\mu_i}. \quad (2)$$

System (1) is represented in Figure 1. We assume that the initial conditions  $(u_0, v_0)$  belong to  $H^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^3) \times H^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^3)$  and satisfy the zero-order compatibility conditions specified [10]. Consequently, by applying a folding transformation [13] the results from [10, Appendix A], the original open loop system (1) admits a unique solution in

$$C^0([0, +\infty), H^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^3)) \times C^0([0, +\infty), H^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^3)).$$

Since the control to be designed will be admissible and continuous in time, the same reference guaranties the well-posedness of the resulting closed-loop system.

In this paper, given a configuration of two active inputs, we want to exponentially stabilize (1) in the sense of the  $L^2$ -norm. More precisely, we want to find feedback laws such that, in closed loop, for all  $(u_0, v_0) \in H^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^3) \times H^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^3)$  satisfying the zero-order compatibility conditions, the unique solution to (1) is such that, for all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\|(u(t), v(t))\|_{L^2} \leq K e^{-\omega t} \|(u_0, v_0)\|_{L^2}.$$

## 2.1 All Two-Inputs configurations

In this subsection, we give all the possible two-inputs configurations. We deliberately ignore the configurations where one input is at one end of the chain as the stabilization of such configurations has been studied in [4]. By a symmetry argument, it is sufficient to restrict the analysis to the stabilization of the four configurations in which exactly two inputs are active (the remaining inputs being set to zero):

- the active inputs are  $\bar{U}_1$  and  $\bar{U}_4$ ;
- the active inputs are  $\bar{U}_4$  and  $\bar{U}_2$ ;
- the active inputs are  $\bar{U}_4$  and  $\bar{U}_3$ ;
- the active inputs are  $\bar{U}_1$  and  $\bar{U}_3$ .

In the remainder of the article, we refer to these cases using the terminology *configuration*  $(\bar{U}_i, \bar{U}_j)$ .




Figure 1: Schematic representation of system (1)

## 2.2 Structural Assumptions

In this section we state the assumptions we use to design our stabilizing control laws.

**Assumption 1.** *If  $\sigma_i^+$  and  $\sigma_i^-$  are equal to zero for all  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , then system (1) with all inputs equal to zero is exponentially stable.*

This assumption is necessary to design robust to delay feedback control laws (see [3] and [22]). As Assumption 1 implies that the boundary coupling terms are dissipative, the presence of the in-domain coupling terms is the main difficulty for the stabilization of (1). Depending on the configuration, our control design relies on the fact that some of the boundary coupling terms are non-zero, while the other may be null. To simplify the presentation, we assume that all of them are non-zero.

**Assumption 2.** *All the coefficients  $q_{ij}, \rho_{ij}$  are non-zero.*

In every configuration except  $\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_4$ , an additional approximate spectral controllability assumption is required for the proposed approach. This assumption will be introduced in Section 3, once the necessary background has been established.

## 3 Design of a stabilizing control law in every configuration

For every configuration listed in Section 2.1, we show that a stabilizing feedback control law can be designed by reformulating the problem within a framework for which stabilizing strategies are already available.

### 3.1 Configuration $(\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_4)$

Let us define

$$\bar{U}_1(t) = U_1(t) - \rho_{12} v_2(t, 1), \quad \bar{U}_4(t) = U_4(t) - q_{21} u_1(t, 1),$$

where  $U_1, U_4$  denotes new control inputs. We now have two independent systems; system 1 actuated by  $U_1$  and the chain formed by systems 2 and 3 actuated at one end by  $U_4$ . The first system can be stabilized using the controller from [12]. The second interconnected system can be stabilized by applying the methodology developed in [4]. These choices fully decouple the first subsystem of (1) from the second and third ones.

### 3.2 Other configurations

In the remaining configurations, we show that the stabilization of the PDE system (1) is equivalent to the stabilization of an abstract IDE. The latter is achieved under an approximate spectral controllability assumption. Consider the following IDE,

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) = & ax(t - \tau) + \int_0^\tau N(\nu)x(t - \nu)d\nu + b_1 V_1(t - \theta_1) + \int_0^{\theta_1 + \delta_1} M_1(\nu)V_1(t - \nu) + b_2 V_2(t - \theta_2) \\ & + \int_0^{\theta_2 + \delta_2} M_2(\nu)V_2(t - \nu)d\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

with  $a \in (-1, 1), a \neq 0, \tau > 0$ , for all  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $b_j \neq 0, \delta_j \geq 0$ ,  $V_j$  is a control input,  $\theta_j > 0$ ,  $M_j, N$  are piecewise continuous functions. The well posedness of (3) is ensured by [19]. Consider a feedback law of the form

$$V_j(t) = \int_0^{T_0} f^j(\nu)x(t - \nu)d\nu + \int_0^{T_1} g_1^j(\nu)V_1(t - \nu)d\nu + \int_0^{T_2} g_2^j(\nu)V_2(t - \nu)d\nu, \quad j \in \{1, 2\}, \quad (4)$$

where  $f^j, g_1^j, g_2^j$  are piecewise continuous functions and  $T_i > 0$  for all  $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ . The closed-loop IDE (3)-(4) is exponentially stable if there exist  $\omega_0 > 0$ , and  $K_0 \geq 1$ , such that for all  $x_0 \in L^2(-\tau, 0)$ , the unique corresponding solution to the IDE (3) is such that, for all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\|x_t\|_{L^2(-\tau, 0)} \leq K_0 e^{-\omega_0 t} \|x_0\|_{L^2(-\tau, 0)},$$

where  $x_t(\cdot)$  is the partial trajectory associated to  $x$  defined for all  $\nu \in [-\tau, 0]$  by  $x_t(\nu) = x(t + \nu)$ .

**Lemma 3.** *Under Assumptions 1, 2, there exists  $a \in (-1, 1), a \neq 0, \tau > 0, \delta_j \geq 0, b_j \neq 0, \theta_j > 0, M_j, N$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2\}$  and a feedback law of the form (4) such that, the exponential stability of the IDE (3)-(4) (with  $\delta_1 = 0$ ) implies the exponential stabilizability of the PDE (1) in configurations  $(\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_3), (\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_3)$  and  $(\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_2)$ . Moreover, for configurations  $(\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_3), (\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_3), \delta_1 = 0$  in the IDE (3). The  $V_j$  in the IDE (3) for  $j \in \{1, 2\}$  are derived from the active inputs in each configuration.*

The proof of Lemma 3 is postponed to Appendix A for configurations  $\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_3$  and  $\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_3$  and to Appendix B for configuration  $\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_2$ . Our objective is now to stabilize the IDE (3). As  $|a| < 1$ , the principal part of the IDE (i.e., the difference equation  $x(t) = ax(t - \tau)$ ) is exponentially stable [19]. Hence,  $\int_0^\tau N(\nu)x(t - \nu)d\nu$  is the main destabilizing term. The proposed control strategy relies on the following assumption that corresponds to a spectral approximate controllability condition [16], [17], as in [3, Chapter 9]. This condition can also be related to an approximated controllability condition for the PDE system [6].

**Assumption 4** (Spectral Assumption). *For all  $s \in \mathbb{C}$ ,*

$$\text{rank}[F_0(s), F_1(s), F_2(s)] = 1,$$

where, for all  $j \in \{1, 2\}$

$$F_0(s) = 1 - ae^{-\tau s} - \int_0^\tau N(\nu)e^{-\nu s}d\nu, \quad F_j(s) = b_j e^{-\theta_j s} + \int_0^{\theta_j + \delta_j} M_j(\nu)e^{-\nu s}d\nu.$$

In Section 4, we will construct an example of a configuration where this assumption is not satisfied. In the configuration in which only  $\bar{U}_1$  acts as an input for the PDE system (1), a stabilizing controller has been designed in [11] under the stronger spectral controllability condition, for all  $s \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\text{rank}[F_0(s), F_1(s)] = 1$ .

**Theorem 5.** *Under Assumptions 1, 2, and, 4 there exists state-feedback control laws that ensure the exponential stability of the PDE system (1) in configurations  $(\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_3), (\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_3)$  and  $(\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_2)$ .*

*Proof.* According to Lemma 3, we just have to exponentially stabilize the IDE (3). Our goal will be to rewrite the system in the framework proposed in [5]. Taking the Laplace transform of the IDE (3), we obtain for all  $s \in \mathbb{C}$ ,

$$F_0(s)x(s) = F_1(s)V_1(s) + F_2(s)V_2(s),$$

where  $x(s), V_j(s)$  are the Laplace transforms of  $x$ , respectively  $V_j$ . As  $b_j \neq 0$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $F_0, F_1, F_2$  are not identically equal to zero. From this point, we treat configurations  $\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_3$  and  $\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_3$  separately from configuration  $\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_2$ .

### 3.2.1 Configurations $(\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_3)$ and $(\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_3)$ .

The following proof holds for configurations  $\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_3$  and  $\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_3$ . Recall that in these configurations,  $\delta_1 = 0$  in the IDE (3). By Lemma 7, there exists  $\alpha$  such that, for all  $s \in \mathbb{C}$

$$\text{rank} \left[ F_0(s) - \alpha \int_0^\tau e^{-\nu s} d\nu F_2(s), F_1(s) \right] = 1, \quad (5)$$

Then, choosing,

$$V_2(t) := \alpha \int_0^\tau x(t-\nu) d\nu, \quad (6)$$

the IDE (3) becomes (in Laplace space),

$$\left(F_0(s) - \alpha \int_0^\tau e^{-\nu s} d\nu F_2(s)\right) x(s) = F_1(s) V_1(s). \quad (7)$$

which equivalently rewrites, for all  $t > \tau + \theta_2 + \delta_2 + \theta_1$ ,

$$x(t) = ax(t-\tau) + \int_0^{\tau+\theta_2+\delta_2} \tilde{N}(\nu) x(t-\nu) d\nu + b_1 V_1(t-\theta_1) + \int_0^{\theta_1} M_1(\nu) V_1(t-\nu) d\nu, \quad (8)$$

with  $\tilde{N}$  a piecewise continuous function. Because of Condition (5), the IDE (8) falls within the framework of [5], the only difference being that the distributed delay exceeds the pointwise delay appearing in the state. However, the method proposed in [5] extends straightforwardly.<sup>1</sup> More precisely, we can design an auto-regressive stabilizing feedback control law, defined as

$$V_1(t) = \int_0^{\tau+\theta_2+\delta_2} g(\nu) x(t-\nu) d\nu + \int_0^{\theta_1} f(\nu) V_1(t-\nu) d\nu, \quad (9)$$

where the gains  $g$  and  $f$  are piecewise continuously differentiable. As shown in [5], they can be computed by solving a set of Fredholm equations.

### 3.2.2 Configuration $(\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_2)$ .

Due to Lemma 7, there exists  $\alpha$  such that, for all  $s \in \mathbb{C}$

$$\text{rank} \left[ F_0(s), F_1(s) - \alpha \int_0^{\theta_1+\delta_1} e^{-\nu s} d\nu F_2(s) \right] = 1, \quad (10)$$

Then, choosing,

$$V_2(t) := -\alpha \int_0^{\theta_1+\delta_1} V_1(t-\nu) d\nu, \quad (11)$$

the IDE (3) becomes (in Laplace space),

$$F_0(s) x(s) = \left( F_1(s) - \alpha \int_0^{\theta_1+\delta_1} e^{-\nu s} d\nu F_2(s) \right) V_1(s). \quad (12)$$

which equivalently rewrites, for all  $t > \tau + \theta_2 + \theta_1 + \delta_1 + \delta_2$ ,

$$x(t) = ax(t-\tau) + \int_0^\tau N(\nu) x(t-\nu) d\nu + b_1 V_1(t-\theta_1) + \int_0^{\theta_1+\theta_2+\delta_1+\delta_2} \tilde{M}_1(\nu) V_1(t-\nu) d\nu, \quad (13)$$

with  $\tilde{M}$  a piecewise continuous function. Due to Condition (10), the IDE (13) falls within the framework of [5], the only difference being that the distributed delay exceeds the pointwise delay appearing in the input. In this setting, the method introduced in [5] extends straightforwardly. More precisely, we can design an auto-regressive stabilizing feedback control law, defined as

$$V_1(t) = \int_0^\tau g(\nu) x(t-\nu) d\nu + \int_0^{\theta_1+\theta_2+\delta_1+\delta_2} f(\nu) V_1(t-\nu) d\nu, \quad (14)$$

where the gains  $g$  and  $f$  are piecewise continuously differentiable. As shown in [5], they can be computed by solving a set of Fredholm equations. This concludes the proof.  $\square$

<sup>1</sup>This would not be the case for configuration  $\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_2$ , hence the dissociation.

## 4 A non trivial example where the Spectral Assumption is not satisfied

In this section we construct a non trivial example where the IDE formulation does not satisfy Assumption 4. This configuration constitutes a non-degenerate case for which our approach does not apply. In system (1), we choose Configuration  $(\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_3)$ , we take  $\lambda_i > 0, \mu_i > 0, \sigma_1^- = \sigma_2^+ = \sigma_3^+ = 0$ . The degrees of freedom available to us are the choice of  $\sigma_1^+, \sigma_2^-, \sigma_3^-$ , together with the choice of the boundary coupling coefficients  $q_{ij}$  and  $\rho_{ij}$ . The coefficients  $q_{21}$  and  $\rho_{23}$  must be nonzero in order to satisfy Assumption 2, and all coefficients are selected so that Assumption 1 holds. Using the method of characteristics, we will rewrite our problem (1) as a IDE (no backstepping is needed in this special decoupled case). Then, we will choose the boundary coupling coefficients  $q_{ij}, \rho_{ij}$  and the coupling terms  $\sigma_1^+, \sigma_2^-, \sigma_3^-$  such that Assumption 4 is not satisfied. Set  $x(t) := u_2(t, 0)$ , using the method of characteristics,  $x$  is solution of, for all  $t > \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) = & q_{22}\rho_{23}\rho_{33}U_3(t - (\tau_3 + 1/\mu_2)) + q_{22}\rho_{23}\sigma_3^- \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\mu_3}{\lambda_3}} \int_{\frac{1}{\mu_2}}^{\frac{1}{\mu_2} + \tau_3} U_3(t - \nu) d\nu + q_{22}\rho_{22}x(t - \tau_2) \\ & + q_{22}\sigma_2^- \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\mu_2}{\lambda_3}} \int_0^{\tau_2} x(t - \nu) d\nu + q_{21}q_{11}U_1(t - \tau_1) + q_{21}\sigma_1^+ \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}} \int_0^{\tau_1} U_1(t - \nu) d\nu. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Taking the Laplace transform of (15), we obtain for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}$

$$F_0(z)x(z) = F_2(z)U_3(z) + F_1(z)U_1(z),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} F_0(z) = & 1 - q_{22}\rho_{22}e^{-\tau_2 z} - q_{22}\sigma_2^- \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\mu_2}{\lambda_3}} \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\nu z} d\nu, \\ F_1(z) = & q_{21}q_{11}e^{-\tau_1 z} + q_{21}\sigma_1^+ \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}} \int_0^{\tau_1} e^{-\nu z} d\nu, \end{aligned}$$

and,

$$F_2(z) = q_{22}\rho_{23}\rho_{33}e^{-(\tau_3 + 1/\mu_2)z} + q_{22}\rho_{23}\sigma_3^- \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\mu_3}{\lambda_3}} \int_{\frac{1}{\mu_2}}^{\frac{1}{\mu_2} + \tau_3} e^{-\nu z} d\nu.$$

Now fix,

$$\rho_{22} = 1/2, \quad q_{22} = \rho_{23} = \rho_{33} = q_{21} = q_{11} = 1, \quad (16)$$

and choose the in domain couplings terms to normalize the integral terms, i.e,

$$\sigma_2^- = \frac{1 + \frac{\mu_2}{\lambda_3}}{2\tau_2}, \quad \sigma_1^+ = -\frac{1 + \frac{\lambda_1}{\mu_1}}{\tau_1}, \quad \sigma_3^+ = -\frac{1 + \frac{\mu_3}{\lambda_3}}{\tau_3}. \quad (17)$$

Then, the principal part of the IDE (15) (i.e the IDE without the integral terms and with  $U_1 = U_2 \equiv 0$ ) is exponentially stable because  $\rho_{22} = 0$ , and,

$$F_0(0) = F_1(0) = F_2(0) = 0.$$

We may therefore state the following theorem.

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $\lambda_i > 0$  and  $\mu_i > 0$  be arbitrary transport speeds, for all  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Then there exist coupling coefficients  $q_{ij}$  and  $\rho_{ij}$ , as well as constant boundary coupling terms  $\sigma_i^+$  and  $\sigma_i^-$ , such that the following holds. In configuration  $\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_3$ , Assumptions 1, 2 stand. However, the IDE reformulation (15) of the original system (1) does not satisfy Assumption 4.*

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have addressed the stabilization of a chain of three hyperbolic PDEs for all two-inputs boundary configurations. The methodology builds on the framework introduced in [3, Chapter 9] and extended in [11]. Because the control design relies on the cancellation of boundary reflection terms, the resulting feedback law may lack robustness to input delays. However, robustness properties can be recovered by applying an appropriately tuned low-pass filter, as shown in [9].

With two inputs, stabilization of the three-PDE chain is always achievable when one input is applied at an endpoint of the chain or when two inputs fully control a single node, as in configuration  $(\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_4)$ . For the remaining configurations, an additional spectral assumption 4 is required to apply the proposed approach. This assumption, which asserts that three associated holomorphic functions do not vanish simultaneously, is weaker than the spectral controllability condition used in the single-input case [11]. Nevertheless, as demonstrated in the final section, there exist configurations in which this assumption fails, thereby revealing intrinsic limitations of the methodology.

Future work will focus on extending these results to the stabilization of an chain composed on  $N$  systems under arbitrary configurations of  $k < N$  boundary inputs. It would also be of great interest to compare the control effort and closed-loop performance the proposed stabilizing controllers in each configuration.

## A Proof of Lemma 3

*Proof.* (for Configuration  $\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_3$ ).

We use the *invertible* backstepping transformation  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$  that maps  $(u_i, v_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \in H^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^6)$  to  $(\alpha_i, \beta_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \in H^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^6)$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_1(x) &= u_1(x) - \int_0^x \begin{pmatrix} K_1^{uu}(x, y) \\ K_1^{uv}(x, y) \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} u_1(y) \\ v_1(y) \end{pmatrix} dy, \\ \beta_1(x) &= v_1(x) - \int_0^x \begin{pmatrix} K_1^{vu}(x, y) \\ K_1^{vv}(x, y) \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} u_1(y) \\ v_1(y) \end{pmatrix} dy, \\ \alpha_2(x) &= u_2(x) - \int_x^1 \begin{pmatrix} K_2^{uu}(x, y) \\ K_2^{uv}(x, y) \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} u_2(y) \\ v_2(y) \end{pmatrix} dy, \\ \beta_2(x) &= v_2(x) - \int_x^1 \begin{pmatrix} K_2^{vu}(x, y) \\ K_2^{vv}(x, y) \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} u_2(y) \\ v_2(y) \end{pmatrix} dy, \\ \alpha_3(x) &= u_3(x) - \int_x^1 \begin{pmatrix} K_3^{uu}(x, y) \\ K_3^{uv}(x, y) \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} u_3(y) \\ v_3(y) \end{pmatrix} dy, \\ \beta_3(x) &= v_3(x) - \int_x^1 \begin{pmatrix} K_3^{vu}(x, y) \\ K_3^{vv}(x, y) \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} u_3(y) \\ v_3(y) \end{pmatrix} dy,\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

where  $K_i^{uu}$ ,  $K_i^{uv}$ ,  $K_i^{vu}$ ,  $K_i^{vv}$ ,  $Q^\alpha$ ,  $Q^\beta$ ,  $R^\alpha$  and  $R^\beta$  are piecewise continuous kernels defined the same way as in [11] and  $^\top$  denotes the transpose operator. The transformation  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$  maps the original system (1) (with  $\bar{U}_2 = \bar{U}_4 \equiv 0$ ) into the following system:  $\forall i \in \{1, 3\}$ , for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t \alpha_2(t, x) + \lambda_2 \partial_x \alpha_2(t, x) &= -\mu_2 K_2^{uv}(x, 1) \rho_{23} v_3(t, 0), \\ \partial_t \beta_2(t, x) - \mu_2 \partial_x \beta_2(t, x) &= -\mu_2 K_2^{vv}(x, 1) \rho_{23} v_3(t, 0), \\ \partial_t \alpha_i(t, x) + \lambda_i \partial_x \alpha_i(t, x) &= 0, \\ \partial_t \beta_i(t, x) - \mu_i \partial_x \beta_i(t, x) &= 0.\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

The map  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$  is known to be continuously invertible as a Volterra transform (see, e.g., [25]). Moreover, using the inverse transform  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}$  (that has the same structure as  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$  we obtain the boundary



conditions

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_1(t, 0) &= q_{11}\beta_1(t, 0), \\
\beta_1(t, 1) &= U_1(t) \\
\alpha_2(t, 0) &= q_{22}\beta_2(t, 0) + q_{21}\alpha_1(t, 1) \int_0^1 \sum_{i=1}^2 \alpha_i(t, y) P_{2i}(y) + \beta_i(t, y) W_{2i} dy \\
\beta_2(t, 1) &= \rho_{22}\alpha_2(t, 1) + \rho_{23}\beta_3(t, 0) + \int_0^1 \alpha_3(t, y) J_{23}(y) + \beta_3(t, y) C_{23} dy, \\
\alpha_3(t, 0) &= U_3(t), \\
\beta_3(t, 1) &= \rho_{33}\alpha_3(t, 1),
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where we chose  $\bar{U}_1$  and  $\bar{U}_3$  such that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{U}_1(t) &= U_1(t) - \rho_{12}\beta_2(t, 0) - \rho_{11}\alpha_1(t, 1) - \int_0^1 \sum_{i=1}^2 \alpha_i(t, y) J_{1i}(y) + \beta_i(t, y) C_{1i} dy, \\
\bar{U}_3(t) &= U_3(t) - q_{32}\alpha_2(t, 1) - q_{33}\beta_3(t, 0) - \int_0^1 \alpha_3(t, y) P_{33}(y) + \beta_3(t, y) W_{33}(y) dy,
\end{aligned}$$

with  $U_1$  and  $U_3$  being the new control inputs. The kernels  $J_{ij}, C_{ij}, P_{ij}, W_{ij}$  are piecewise continuous functions defined using the inverse transform  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}$ . Set  $x(t) := \alpha_2(t, 1)$ , using the method of characteristics by following the method introduced in [3, Chapter 9] and used in [11], we show that  $x$  is solution to the following IDE, defined for all  $t > \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3$  by

$$\begin{aligned}
x(t) &= q_{22}\rho_{22}x(t - \tau_2) + q_{22}\rho_{23}\rho_{33}U_3(t - (\tau_3 + 1/\mu_2)) + q_{21}q_{11}U_1(t - \tau_1) \\
&+ \int_0^{\tau_1} U_1(t - \nu) M_1(\nu) d\nu + \int_0^{\tau_3 + \frac{1}{\mu_2}} U_3(t - \nu) M_3(\nu) d\nu + \int_0^{\tau_2} x(t - \nu) N(\nu) d\nu,
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where  $M_1, N, M_3$  are piecewise continuous functions depending on the kernels of the inverse transform  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}$ . Using [3, Theorem 6.1.3], the exponential stability of the PDE system (1) in configuration  $\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_3$  is equivalent to the exponential stability of the IDE (21). Moreover, as shown in [11], Assumption 1, together with the method of characteristics and [3, Theorem 6.1.3], ensures that  $|q_{11}\rho_{11}| < 1$ . Hence, the principal part of the IDE (33) is exponentially stable (see [19]). In this configuration, under Assumption 2 and with  $V_1 = U_1, V_2 = U_3$  the IDE (21) takes the same form as (3).  $\square$

*Configuration  $\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_3$ .* The proof follows the same structure as in the previous configuration. We apply the same backstepping transformation  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$  to map the PDE system (1) in configuration  $(\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_3)$  to the target system (20), with only minor changes in the boundary conditions.

Setting  $x(t) := \beta_1(t, 1)$  and proceeding as in the previous configuration, we obtain that the exponential stability of the PDE system (1) is equivalent to the exponential stability of the IDE

$$\begin{aligned}
x(t) &= q_{11}\rho_{11}x(t - \tau_1) + \rho_{22}\rho_{12}U_4(t - \tau_2) + \rho_{33}\rho_{23}\rho_{12}U_3(t - \tau_3 - 1/\mu_2) \\
&+ \int_0^{\tau_2} M_4(\nu) U_4(t - \nu) d\nu + \int_0^{\tau_2 + \tau_3} M_3(\nu) U_3(t - \nu) d\nu + \int_0^{\tau_1} N(\nu) x(t - \nu) d\nu,
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

valid for all  $t > \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3$ . Here,  $M_4, M_3$ , and  $N$  are piecewise continuous functions. Moreover, as shown in [11], Assumption 1, together with the method of characteristics and [3, Theorem 6.1.3], ensures that  $|q_{11}\rho_{11}| < 1$ . Hence, the principal part of the IDE (33) is exponentially stable, hence (see [19]).

Finally, under Assumption 2, and with the identifications

$$V_2 := U_3, \quad V_1 := U_4,$$

the IDE (22) is of the same form as the abstract IDE (3). This completes the proof.  $\square$

## B Proof of Lemma 3 second part

*Configuration  $\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_2$ .* We use the *invertible* backstepping transformation  $\mathcal{F}$  defined in [11], to map the original system (1) into the following target system: for all  $i \in \{1, 3\}$ , for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t \alpha_i(t, x) + \lambda_i \partial_x \alpha_i(t, x) &= 0, \\ \partial_t \beta_i(t, x) - \mu_i \partial_x \beta_i(t, x) &= 0, \\ \partial_t \alpha_2(t, x) + \lambda_2 \partial_x \alpha_2(t, x) &= -\mu_2 K_2^{uv}(x, 1) \bar{U}_2(t), \\ \partial_t \beta_2(t, x) - \mu_2 \partial_x \beta_2(t, x) &= -\mu_2 K_2^{vv}(x, 1) \bar{U}_2(t).\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

The functions  $K_i^{uu}$ ,  $K_i^{uv}$ ,  $K_i^{vu}$ ,  $K_i^{vv}$ ,  $Q^\alpha$ ,  $Q^\beta$ ,  $R^\alpha$  are the kernels of the backstepping transform  $\mathcal{F}$  defined in [11]. Originally, the kernels  $Q^\alpha$ ,  $Q^\beta$ ,  $R^\alpha$  and  $R^\beta$  were defined in [11] with an added artificial boundary condition necessary for well-posedness, namely for all  $y \in [0, 1]$ ,  $Q^\alpha(1, y) = Q^\beta(1, y) = R^\alpha(1, y) = R^\beta(1, y) = 0$ . These boundary conditions can be freely chosen (see [8, Lemma 8]); in this context, because  $q_{32} \neq 0$  (under Assumption 2) we can choose,

$$\begin{aligned}R^\alpha(1, y) &= \frac{1}{q_{32}} (K_3^{uv}(0, y) - q_{33} K_3^{vv}(0, y)), \\ Q^\alpha(1, y) &= \frac{1}{q_{32}} (K_3^{uu}(0, y) - q_{33} K_3^{vu}(0, y)), \\ R^\beta(1, y) &= \rho_{22} R^\alpha(1, y) + \rho_{23} K_3^{vv}(0, y), \\ Q^\beta(1, y) &= \rho_{22} Q^\alpha(1, y) + \rho_{23} K_3^{vu}(0, y).\end{aligned}$$

This choice enables us to cancel the integral terms that could appear at the boundaries  $\alpha_3(t, 0)$  and  $\beta_2(t, 1)$ . Hence, using the inverse transform  $\mathcal{F}^{-1}$  (that has the same structure as  $\mathcal{F}$ ) we obtain the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_1(t, 0) &= q_{11} \beta_1(t, 0), \\ \beta_1(t, 1) &= \rho_{12} \beta_2(t, 0) + \rho_{11} \alpha_1(t, 1) + \int_0^1 \sum_{i=1}^3 \alpha_i(t, y) J_{1i}(y) + \beta_i(t, y) C_{1i} dy, \\ \alpha_2(t, 0) &= U_4(t) \\ \beta_2(t, 1) &= \bar{U}_2(t) + \rho_{22} \alpha_2(t, 1) + \rho_{23} \beta_3(t, 0) \\ \alpha_3(t, 0) &= q_{32} \alpha_2(t, 1) + q_{33} \beta_3(t, 0) \\ \beta_3(t, 1) &= \rho_{33} \alpha_3(t, 1),\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

where we chose  $\bar{U}_4$  such that,

$$\bar{U}_4(t) = U_4(t) - q_{22} \beta_2(t, 0) - q_{21} \alpha_1(t, 1) - \int_0^1 \left( \sum_{i=1}^3 \alpha_i(t, y) P_{2i}(y) + \beta_i(t, y) W_{2i} \right) dy,$$

where  $U_4$  is a new input. The kernels  $J_{ij}$ ,  $C_{ij}$ ,  $P_{ij}$ ,  $W_{ij}$  are piecewise continuous functions defined in [11] that depend on the coupling terms  $\sigma_i^+$ ,  $\sigma_i^-$ . In order to exponentially stabilize the PDE system (1) in this configuration, we propose to rewrite the intermediate target system (23), (24) as two IDEs. Set  $x_3(t) := \alpha_3(t, 0)$  and  $x_1(t) = \beta_1(t, 1)$ , using the method of characteristics and following the method proposed in [3] and used in [11], we show that, for all  $t > \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3$ ,

$$x_3(t) = q_{33} \rho_{33} x_3(t - \tau_3) + q_{32} U_4(t - 1/\lambda_2) + \int_0^{\frac{1}{\lambda_2}} M_{32}(\nu) \bar{U}_2(t - \nu) d\nu,\tag{25}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
x_1(t) &= \rho_{11}q_{11}x_1(t - \tau_1) + \int_0^{\tau_1} N_1(\nu)x_1(t - \nu)d\nu + \rho_{33}\rho_{23}\rho_{12}x_3(t - \tau_3 - 1/\mu_2) \\
&+ \int_0^{\tau_3 + \frac{1}{\mu_2}} N_{13}(\nu)x_3(t - \nu)d\nu + \rho_{22}\rho_{12}U_4(t - \tau_2) + \int_0^{\tau_2} M_{14}(\nu)U_4(t - \nu)d\nu \\
&+ \rho_{12}\bar{U}_2(t - 1/\mu_2) + \int_0^{\tau_2} M_{12}(\nu)\bar{U}_2(t - \nu)d\nu,
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where  $M_{34}, N_1, N_{13}, M_{14}, M_{12}$  are piecewise continuous functions. Using [3, Theorem 6.1.3], the exponential stability of the PDE system (1) in configuration  $\bar{U}_4, \bar{U}_3$  is equivalent to the exponential stability of the IDEs (26), (25). Furthermore, using Assumption 1, [3, Theorem 6.1.3], and the method of characteristics, we have  $|q_{33}\rho_{33}| < 1$  and  $|\rho_{11}q_{11}| < 1$ . Hence the difference equations

$$x_3(t) = q_{33}\rho_{33}x_3(t - \tau_3) \tag{27}$$

$$x_1(t) = \rho_{11}q_{11}x_1(t - \tau_1) \tag{28}$$

are exponentially stable [19]. From this point onward, the objective is to reduce the stabilizability analysis of the IDEs (25) and (26) to the analysis of a single IDE of the form (3). The strategy is to first eliminate the integral term in (25), and then remove the pointwise delayed  $U_4$  term in (26). Finally we will inject (25) in (26). To do so, we apply the following change of variable,

$$\bar{x}_3(t) = x_3(t) - \int_0^{\frac{1}{\lambda_2}} M_{32}(\nu)\bar{U}_2(t - \nu)d\nu. \tag{29}$$

Hence the IDE (25) becomes,

$$\bar{x}_3(t) = q_{33}\rho_{33}\bar{x}_3(t - \tau_3) + U_4(t - 1/\lambda_2) + q_{33}\rho_{33} \int_0^{\frac{1}{\lambda_2}} M_{32}(\nu)\bar{U}_2(t - \nu - \tau_3)d\nu$$

Let us assume here that  $\tau_3 > 1/\lambda_2$  without loss of generality. If  $\tau_3 \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_2}$  then one should first iterate  $n$  times the change of variable (29), with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n\tau_3 > 1/\lambda_2$ . Hence, we can choose  $U_4$  such that,

$$U_4(t) = \tilde{U}_4(t) - \frac{q_{33}\rho_{33}}{q_{32}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{\lambda_2}} M_{32}(\nu)\bar{U}_2(t - \nu - \tau_3 + 1/\lambda_2)d\nu,$$

with  $\tilde{U}_4$  being the new control input. We obtain the following IDE,

$$\bar{x}_3(t) = q_{33}\rho_{33}\bar{x}_3(t - \tau_3) + q_{32}\tilde{U}_4(t - 1/\lambda_2) \tag{30}$$

Moreover, the IDE (26) becomes,

$$\begin{aligned}
x_1(t) &= \rho_{11}q_{11}x_1(t - \tau_1) + \int_0^{\tau_1} N_1(\nu)x_1(t - \nu)d\nu + \rho_{33}\rho_{23}\rho_{12}\bar{x}_3(t - \tau_3 - 1/\mu_2) \\
&+ \int_0^{\tau_3 + \frac{1}{\mu_2}} N_{13}(\nu)\bar{x}_3(t - \nu)d\nu + \rho_{22}\rho_{12}\tilde{U}_4(t - \tau_2) + \int_0^{\tau_2} M_{14}(\nu)\tilde{U}_4(t - \nu)d\nu \\
&+ \rho_{12}\bar{U}_2(t - 1/\mu_2) + \int_0^{\tau_2 + \tau_3} \tilde{M}_{12}(\nu)\bar{U}_2(t - \nu)d\nu,
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

with  $\tilde{M}_{12}$  a piecewise continuous function. Then, we choose,

$$\bar{U}_2(t) = U_2(t) - \rho_{22}\tilde{U}_4(t - 1/\lambda_2),$$

with  $U_2$  being a new control input. Hence, the IDE (31) becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1(t) = & \rho_{11}q_{11}x_1(t - \tau_1) + \int_0^{\tau_1} N_1(\nu)x_1(t - \nu)d\nu + \rho_{33}\rho_{23}\rho_{12}\bar{x}_3(t - \tau_3 - 1/\mu_2) \\ & + \int_0^{\tau_3 + \frac{1}{\mu_2}} N_{13}(\nu)\bar{x}_3(t - \nu)d\nu + \int_0^{\tau_2 + \tau_3 + \frac{1}{\lambda_2}} \tilde{M}_{14}(\nu)\tilde{U}_4(t - \nu)d\nu \\ & + \rho_{12}U_2(t - 1/\mu_2) + \int_0^{\tau_2 + \tau_3} \tilde{M}_{12}(\nu)U_2(t - \nu)d\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

with  $\tilde{M}_{14}$  a piecewise continuous function. Then, defining the new input,

$$\bar{\bar{U}}_4(t) = \tilde{U}_4(t) - q_{33}\rho_{33}\tilde{U}_4(t - \tau_3),$$

we obtain for all  $t > 2\tau_2 + \tau_3 + \tau_1 + 1/\lambda_2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) = & \rho_{11}q_{11}x(t - \tau_1) + \int_0^{\tau_1} N_1(\nu)x(t - \nu)d\nu + \rho_{33}\rho_{23}\rho_{12}q_{32}\tilde{U}_4(t - \tau_3 - \tau_2) \\ & + \int_0^{2\tau_3 + \tau_2 + \frac{1}{\lambda_2}} \tilde{M}_4(\nu)\bar{\bar{U}}_4(t - \nu)d\nu + \rho_{12}\tilde{U}_2(t - 1/\mu_2) \\ & + \int_0^{\tau_2 + \tau_3} \tilde{M}_{12}(\nu)\tilde{U}_2(t - \nu)d\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

with  $x(t) = x_1(t) - q_{33}\rho_{33}x_1(t - \tau_3)$ , and  $\tilde{M}_4$  a piecewise continuous function.  $\square$

## C A Lemma about common zeros of holomorphic functions

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $f_0, f_1, f_2$  be non identically zero holomorphic functions on  $\mathbb{C}$ . Assume, for all  $s \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\text{rank}[f_0(s), f_1(s), f_2(s)] = 1$ . Then, for all  $T > 0$ , there exists  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $s \in \mathbb{C}$*

$$\text{rank} \left[ f_0(s) - \alpha \int_0^T e^{-\nu s} d\nu f_2(s), f_1(s) \right] = 1.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\tilde{f}_2(s) := \int_0^T e^{-\nu s} d\nu f_2(s)$  and

$$Z := \{s \in \mathbb{C} : f_1(s) = 0\}.$$

If the complement in  $\mathbb{R}$  of the set

$$Q := \{f_0(s)/\tilde{f}_2(s) : s \in Z, \tilde{f}_2(s) \neq 0\} \cap \mathbb{R}$$

is non-empty, we can conclude using Assumption 4 by choosing  $\alpha$  in this complement. Let us show the complement of  $Q$  is non-empty. By the theorem on isolated zeros of holomorphic functions, the set  $Z$  is discrete, hence countable. Thus, so is  $Q$ . Therefore,  $\mathbb{R} \setminus Q$  is nonempty.  $\square$

## References

- [1] U. Aarsnes and R. Shor. Torsional vibrations with bit off bottom: Modeling, characterization and field data validation. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*, 163:712–721, 2018.
- [2] J. Arrillaga. *High Voltage Direct Current Transmission*. The Institution of Engineering and Technology, 2nd edition, 1998.

- [3] J. Auriol. *Contributions to the robust stabilization of networks of hyperbolic systems*. Automatic, Université Paris Saclay, 2024.
- [4] J. Auriol. Output-feedback stabilization of an underactuated network of  $N$  interconnected  $n + m$  hyperbolic PDE systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2024.
- [5] J. Auriol. Stabilization of Integral Delay Equations by Solving Fredholm Equations. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 8:676–681, 2024.
- [6] J. Auriol. State-feedback stabilization of  $2 \times 2$  hyperbolic systems with distributed actuation. Preprint., 2025.
- [7] J. Auriol, A. Braun, M. Ouidir Amirat, and M. Bajodek. Underactuated boundary control of a linearized saint-venant equation. *IMA Journal of Mathematical Control and Information*, 42(2):dnaf012, 05 2025.
- [8] J. Auriol and D. Bresch-Pietri. Robust state-feedback stabilization of an underactuated network of interconnected  $n + m$  hyperbolic PDE systems. *Automatica*, 2021.
- [9] J. Auriol, F. Bribiesca Argomedo, and F. Di Meglio. Robustification of stabilizing controllers for ODE-PDE-ODE systems: A filtering approach. *Automatica*, 147:110724, 2023.
- [10] G. Bastin and J.-M. Coron. *Stability and Boundary Stabilization of 1-D Hyperbolic Systems*. Springer, 2016.
- [11] A. Braun, J. Auriol, and L. Brivadis. Stabilization of a Chain of Three Hyperbolic PDEs using a Time-Delay Representation. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 59(13):64–69, 2025. 19th IFAC Workshop on Time Delay Systems TDS 2025.
- [12] J.-M. Coron, R. Vazquez, M. Krstic, and G. Bastin. Local exponential  $H^2$  stabilization of a  $2 \times 2$  quasilinear hyperbolic system using backstepping. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 51(3):2005–2035, 2013.
- [13] G. de Andrade, R. Vazquez, and D. Pagano. Backstepping-based estimation of thermoacoustic oscillations in a Rijke tube with experimental validation. *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, 65(12):5336–5343, 2020.
- [14] J. Deutscher and J. Gabriel. A backstepping approach to output regulation for coupled linear wave–ODE systems. *Automatica*, 123:109338, 2021.
- [15] J. Deutscher, N. Gehring, and R. Kern. Output Feedback Control of General Linear Heterodirectional Hyperbolic ODE–PDE–ODE Systems. *Automatica*, 95:472–480, 2018.
- [16] H. Fattorini. Some remarks on complete controllability. *SIAM Journal on Control*, 4(4):686–694, 1966.
- [17] S. Fueyo.  $L^q$  approximate controllability frequency criterion for linear difference delay equations with distributed delays, 2025.
- [18] N. Gehring, J. Deutscher, and A. Irscheid. Using dynamic extensions for the backstepping control of hyperbolic systems. *Automatica*, 173:112032, 2025.
- [19] J. Hale and S. Verduyn Lunel. *Introduction to functional differential equations*. Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [20] A. Hayat and P. Shang. Exponential Stability of Density-Velocity Systems with Boundary Conditions and Source Term for the  $H^2$  Norm. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 153:187–212, 2021.

- [21] A. Irscheid, J. Deutscher, N. Gehring, and J. Rudolph. Output regulation for general heterodirectional linear hyperbolic PDEs coupled with nonlinear ODEs. *Automatica*, 148:110748, 2023.
- [22] H. Logemann, R. Rebarber, and G. Weiss. Conditions for robustness and nonrobustness of the stability of feedback systems with respect to small delays in the feedback loop. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 34(2):572–600, 1996.
- [23] J. Redaud, J. Auriol, and S.-I. Niculescu. Stabilizing output-feedback control law for hyperbolic systems using a Fredholm transformation. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, pages 1–16, 2022.
- [24] J. Wang and M. Krstic. Delay-compensated control of sandwiched ODE–PDE–ODE hyperbolic systems for oil drilling and disaster relief. *Automatica*, 120:109131, 2020.
- [25] K. Yoshida. *Lectures on differential and integral equations*, volume 10. Interscience Publishers, 1960.
- [26] H. Yu and M. Krstic. *Traffic Congestion Control by PDE Backstepping*. Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications. Springer International Publishing, Birkhäuser, 2023.