The cost of the control in the case of a minimal time of control: the example of the one-dimensional heat equation

Pierre Lissy *†

1er février 2017

Abstract

In this article, we consider the controllability of the one-dimensional heat equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions, internal control depending only on the time variable and an imposed profile depending on the space variable. It is well-known that in this context, there might exist a positive minimal time of null-controllability T_0, depending on the behavior of the Fourier coefficients of the profile. We prove two different results. The first one, which is surprising, is that the cost of the controllability in time $T > T_0$ close to T_0 may explode in an arbitrary way. On the other hand, we prove as a second result that for a large class of profiles, the cost of controllability at time $T > T_0$ is bounded from above by $\exp(C(T_0)/(T - T_0))$ for some constant $C(T_0) > 0$ depending on T_0. The main method used here is the moment method.

Keyworlds: null controllability; parabolic equations; minimal time; controllability cost; non-harmonic Fourier series; moment method.

AMS Classification: 35K05, 93B05, 42A70

1 Introduction

Let $T > 0$. In what follows, we will consider the following controlled heat equation on $(0, T) \times (0, \pi)$, with Dirichlet boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} y_t - y_{xx} = f(x)u(t) & \text{in } (0,T)\times(0,\pi), \\ y(0,\cdot) = y^0 & \text{in } (0,\pi), \\ y(\cdot,0) = y(\cdot,L) = 0 & \text{in } (0,T), \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $y^0 \in L^2(0,\pi)$, $u \in L^2(0,T)$ is the control and $f \in H^{-1}(0,\pi)$ is an imposed profile for this control.

It is well-known that equation (1) is well-posed in the sense that there exists a unique solution $y \in C^0([0,T], L^2(0,\pi)) \cap L^2((0,T), H^1_0(0,\pi))$ verifying moreover that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $y^0 \in L^2(0,\pi)$, every $f \in H^{-1}(0,\pi)$ and every $v \in L^2(0,T)$, we have

$$||y||_{C^0([0,T],L^2(0,\pi))} + ||y||_{L^2((0,T),H^1_0(0,\pi))} \leqslant C(||y^0||_{L^2(0,\pi)} + ||f||_{H^{-1}(0,\pi)}||v||_{L^2(0,T)}),$$

which implies in particular that the control operator $u \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto f(\cdot)u$ is admissible for the semigroup $e^{t\Delta}$ with domain $D(\Delta)$. The controllability properties of this equation have been widely studied

*lissy@ceremade.jussieu.fr

†Ceremade, Université Paris-Dauphine & CNRS UMR 7534, PSL, 75016 Paris, France

(see for instance [11], [8] and [2]). The approximate controllability can be easily characterized by the condition

$$f_k \neq 0, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}^*, \tag{2}$$

where

$$f_k := \langle f, e_k \rangle_{H^{-1}(0,\pi), H^1_0(0,\pi)}.$$

Assume from now on and until the end of the article that the condition (2) is satisfied. Concerning the study of the null-controllability of (1), one very efficient tool in the one-dimensional case is the celebrated *moment method* introduced in [10]. Let us present quickly this method. We consider the 1-D Laplace operator ∂_{xx} with domain $D(\Delta) := H^2(0,\pi) \cap H^1_0(0,\pi)$ and state space $H := L^2(0,\pi)$. It is well-known that $-\Delta : D(\Delta) \to L^2(0,\pi)$ is a positive definite operator with compact resolvent, the k-th eigenvalue is $\lambda_k = k^2$, an associated normalized eigenvector is

$$e_k(x) := \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sin(kx).$$

We decompose the initial condition y^0 on the Hilbert basis e_k:

$$y^0(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k e_k(x), \tag{3}$$

where $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}^*} \in l^2(\mathbb{N}^*)$. Then, it is classical that imposing $y(T,\cdot) = 0$ is equivalent to saying that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we have

$$\int_0^T e^{\lambda_k t} u(t)dt = -\frac{a_k}{f_k}. \tag{4}$$

Hence, u needs to be the solution of a moment problem which can be solved by finding a *biorthogonal family* to the family of exponentials $\{\exp(\lambda_k t)\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}^*}$ on $(0,T)$. We introduce the following quantities:

$$I_k(f) := -\frac{\log(|f_k|)}{k^2} \tag{5}$$

and

$$T_0 := \limsup_{k\to\infty} I_k(f) \in [0,\infty]. \tag{6}$$

It is proved in [2] that:

1. System (1) is null-controllable at any time $T > T_0$.
2. System (1) is not null-controllable at any time $T < T_0$.

Hence, there might exist a positive minimal time of controllability, depending on the action of the control through the profile f.

Let us mention that in [8], a comprehensive study of (1) is performed in the particular case where $f(x) := \delta_{x_0} \in H^{-1}(0,\pi)$, with $x_0 \in (0,\pi)$. In this particular case, one readily obtains that the minimal time of controllability is given by

$$T_0(x_0) := \limsup_{k\to\infty} -\frac{\log(|\sin(kx_0)|)}{k^2}.$$

The dependence with respect to x_0 of T_0 is then carefully studied and the authors proved in particular that:

1. For almost all $x_0 \in (0,\pi)$, $T_0(x_0) = 0$.

2. For every $\tau \in [0, \infty]$, $\{x_0 \in (0,\pi) | T_0(x_0) = \tau\}$ is dense in $(0,\pi)$.

It implies notably that the minimal time of controllability may take any value between 0 and ∞. Let us mention that the existence of a positive minimal time of control for parabolic equations or systems may occur in many other situations, for other examples see e.g. [1] and [2].

In the case $T > T_0$, one can easily prove (see for example [7, Chapter 2, Section 2.3]) that for every $y^0 \in L^2(0,\pi)$, there exists a unique optimal (for the $L^2(0,T)$-norm) control $u_{opt} \in L^2(0,T)$ bringing y^0 to 0, the map $y^0 \mapsto u_{opt}$ being linear continuous. The norm of this operator is called the *optimal null control cost* at time T (or in a more concise form the cost of the control), denoted by $C_H(T)$. By definition, $C_H(T)$ is the infimum of the constants $C > 0$ such that for every $y^0 \in L^2(0,\pi)$, there exists some control u driving y^0 to 0 at time T with

$$||u||_{L^2(0,T)} \leqslant C||y^0||_{L^2(0,\pi)}.$$

When the equation considered is controllable in arbitrary small time, the question of the asymptotic behavior of the constant $C_H(T)$ when $T \to 0$ is called *the cost of fast controls*. In the case where there is no minimal time of control and under appropriate conditions on the sequence $(f_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}^*}$ that should not decrease too fast (what we will call "the usual case" from now on), the cost of fast controls for linear parabolic equations or systems with distributed (or equivalently in this case boundary) control has been widely studied (see for example [14], [19], [22], [9], [16], [3] and [17]) and is now well-understood in the one-dimensional case, even if there are still some remaining open problems. It is shown that in the context of the usual case, the cost of fast controls is roughly of the form $\exp(C/T)$ as $T \to 0$, were C is some appropriate constant depending on the geometry. We mention that understanding the behavior of the cost of controllability is crucial because it can be used to deduce some results in higher dimension (see [3]) and to obtain nonlinear results (see in particular [12] and [15]). Up to the knowledge of the author, concerning all the cases studied up to now, the cost of fast controls was a purely high-frequency phenomena, depending essentially only on the asymptotic behavior of the eigenvalues at infinity (for a precise study, we refer to [16], [17] and [18]).

Let us also mention that the multi-dimensional case seems to be out of reach for the moment: there are only few results of existence of minimal time, always in particular geometries (for the case of hypoelliptic diffusions, see notably [4] or [5]) and sometimes this minimal time is not even known precisely. Concerning the cost of the control, even in the usual case of the heat equation with boundary or distributed control, there are only some partial results coming from [19], the upper bound being obtained under very strong geometric restrictions. Hence, taking into account the lack of comprehension of the multi-dimensional case, the author thinks that it is very reasonable and interesting to have a look first at the one-dimensional case, which is maybe simpler than the multi-dimensional case but cannot be considered as trivial though.

In this context, a natural question arising is the following: *for equation* (1)*, what is the behavior of $C_H(T)$ when $T \to T_0^+$?* Up to our knowledge, this question has never been investigated in the context of the existence of a minimal time on control in the parabolic case. One could expect that the cost is of the form $\exp(C(T_0)/(T - T_0))$ as $T \to T_0^+$, by analogy with the usual case. However, it is not always the case, as highlighted by the following Theorem:

Theorem 1.1 *For every increasing function $g : \mathbb{R}^{+*} \to \mathbb{R}^{+*}$ verifying moreover $g(x) \to +\infty$ as $x \to +\infty$, for every $T_0 \in [0,\infty)$, there exists $f \in H^{-1}(0,\pi)$ such that for any T close enough to T_0, one has*

$$C_H(T) \geqslant \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} g\left(\frac{1}{T - T_0}\right).$$

This theorem means that the cost of the control *can increase arbitrarily fast* as T goes to the minimal time T_0, which is very surprising. This can be explained by the fact that contrary to the usual case, the cost of the control depends not only on the behavior of $I_k(f)$ (defined in (5)) at infinity but also on *how it differs from its limit superior* T_0. The main idea (that differs from what was done in [6], [17] or [13]) is to consider the optimal control associated to an initial condition with one pure eigenfunction which is not necessarily the first one and that is adapted to the time of control T. Then f is chosen in such a way that the sequence $(f_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}^*}$ decreases "very slowly" to the minimal time T_0, the rate of convergence depending on the choice of the function g. One serious consequence of this result is that it may be hard to obtain sharp results in the semi-linear case in this context.

Our second theorem provides an upper bound on $C_H(T)$ under some adequate assumption on the sequence $(f_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}^*}$.

Theorem 1.2 *Assume that $T_0 < \infty$, where T_0 is defined in* (6)*, and that f is chosen such that*

$$I_k(f) \leqslant T_0, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}^*. \tag{7}$$

Then there exists a constant $C(T_0) > 0$, depending only on T_0, such that for every $T > T_0$ close enough to T_0, one has

$$C_H(T) \leqslant \exp\left(\frac{C(T_0)}{T - T_0}\right).$$

Here we use the moment method in the spirit of what was done in [22]. The idea is to use the Paley-Wiener strategy, the main difficulty is to "catch" precisely the minimal time of control, which requires a careful study and a new estimate on the multiplier of [22]. Let us mention that in [2], the strategy used by the authors was slightly different since it was based on an idea coming from [21], the main drawback of the argument being that we cannot estimate precisely the constants appearing, making the Schwartz's strategy useless in order to estimate precisely the cost of the control. Of course, condition (7) is likely far from being sharp to obtain the conclusion of Theorem 1.2, since condition (7) for $T_0 = 0$ does not include the usual case, where the cost of the control is always of the form $\exp(C/T)$.

Concerning some extensions and open problems arising after this study, we can mention the following:

— For a given profile f, can we obtain precise estimates on $C_H(T)$ for T close to T_0? Notably, is it possible to give a lower bound that is true for every profile f? If this lower bound exists, is it of the form $\exp(C(T_0)/(T - T_0))$?

— We chose in this paper to study a very particular case, namely the one-dimensional heat equation with internal control and imposed profile, which is of interest because of the unexpected behavior it highlights. An interesting question would be: can we generalize the study to other cases where there exist a positive minimal time of control, for instance in the case where the positive minimal time of control occurs because of the condensation of the eigenvalues as in the system presented in [2, Section 6.2]? More generally, can we extend the study in the abstract case given in [2]?

2 Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

2.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In all what follows, C will always be a positive constant independent of the parameter T. Let us fix some $T_0 \in [0, \infty)$ and we consider some $T > T_0$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ to be chosen later (depending on T). We define $y^0 \in L^2(0, \pi)$ as follows:

$$y^0(x) := \sin(nx). \tag{8}$$

One readily verifies that there exists some positive constant C (independent on n) such that

$$||y^0||_{L^2(0,\pi)} \leqslant C. \tag{9}$$

We consider the optimal control u associated to this initial condition, which verifies by definition and thanks to estimate (9)

$$||u||_{L^2(0,T)} \leqslant C_H(T)||y^0||_{L^2(0,\pi)} \leqslant CC_H(T). \tag{10}$$

Thanks to the moment problem verified by any control, we obtain that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ we have

$$f_k \int_0^T u(t) \exp\left(k^2 t\right) dt = -\int_0^\pi \sin(nx) \sin(kx)\, dx. \tag{11}$$

Applying (11) for $k = n$ notably gives

$$\int_0^T u(t) \exp\left(n^2 t\right) dt = -\frac{\pi}{2 f_n}. \tag{12}$$

We notably obtain from (12) that

$$\frac{\pi}{2|f_n|} \leqslant \exp\left(n^2 T\right) \int_0^T |u(t)| dt.$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we deduce that

$$\frac{\pi}{2|f_n|} \exp\left(-n^2 T\right) \leqslant \sqrt{T}||u||_{L^2(0,T)}.$$

Hence, taking into account (10), we deduce that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$C_H(T) \geqslant \frac{C}{|f_n|\sqrt{T}} \exp\left(-n^2 T\right). \tag{13}$$

Now, let us consider any positive and increasing function $h : \mathbb{R}^{+*} \to \mathbb{R}^{+*}$ such that $h(x) \to \infty$ as $x \to \infty$. Such a function is necessarily bijective and we call h^{-1} its inverse function. Let us consider $(f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}^*} \in l^2(\mathbb{N}^*)$ defined by

$$f_n := \exp\left(-n^2\left(T_0 + \frac{1}{h^{-1}(n^2)}\right)\right) \in l^2(\mathbb{N}^*),$$

so that we have

$$I_n(f) = T_0 + \frac{1}{h^{-1}(n^2)}.$$

In this case it is clear that (6) holds since $h^{-1}(n^2) \to +\infty$ as $n \to +\infty$. Then, we have thanks to (13)

$$C_H(T) \geqslant \frac{C}{\sqrt{T}} \exp\left(n^2\left(T_0 - T + \frac{1}{h^{-1}(n^2)}\right)\right). \tag{14}$$

Let us now explain how to choose n. We assume that T is close enough to T_0. Now, we choose n in such a way that (for example)

$$\frac{1}{2(T - T_0)} \geqslant h^{-1}(n^2) \geqslant \frac{1}{4(T - T_0)}, \tag{15}$$

which is always possible (at least for T close enough to T_0) since h^{-1} is increasing and goes to $+\infty$ at $+\infty$.

Hence, we deduce using (14) and (15) that

$$C_H(T) \geqslant \frac{C}{\sqrt{T}} \exp\left((T - T_0) h\left(\frac{1}{4(T - T_0)}\right)\right).$$

One then easily obtain the desired result by choosing h in such a way that

$$g(x) = C\exp\left(\frac{1}{x}h\left(\frac{x}{4}\right)\right), \text{i.e. } h(x) = 4x\log\left(\frac{g(4x)}{C}\right),$$

because it is clear that if g is positive, increasing and goes to $+\infty$ at $+\infty$ then h is well-defined at least for large enough x (which is sufficient for our purpose), is increasing and goes to $+\infty$ at $+\infty$. ■

2.2 Proof of Theorem 1.2

In all what follows, C will always be a positive constant independent of all parameters. We consider some time $T > T_0$. We will construct our biorthogonal family by using the celebrated Paley-Wiener Theorem. Let us recall that T_0 is given by (6).

First of all, we define

$$F(z) := \prod_{k=1}^{\infty}(1 + \frac{iz}{k^2}) = \frac{\sin(\pi\sqrt{-iz})}{\pi\sqrt{-iz}}. \tag{16}$$

F will be used in what follows for the construction of the biorthogonal family to $(e^{\lambda_k t})_{k\in\mathbb{N}^*}$.

Now, we introduce the multiplier, which is very similar to the one studied in [22]. Let $\nu > 0$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$ some parameters. From now on we call

$$\beta := \frac{T(1-\delta)}{2}. \tag{17}$$

We introduce

$$\sigma_\nu(t) := \exp\left(-\frac{\nu}{1-t^2}\right),$$

extended by 0 outside $(-1,1)$. We call

$$H_\beta(z) := C_\nu \int_{-1}^{1} \sigma_\nu(t) e^{-it\beta z} dt, \tag{18}$$

where

$$C_\nu := 1/||\sigma_\nu||_1.$$

Looking carefully at the proof of [22, Lemma 4.3], we can easily deduce

$$\frac{1}{2}e^\nu \leqslant C_\nu \leqslant \frac{3}{2}\sqrt{\nu+1}e^\nu, \tag{19}$$

$$|H_\beta(z)| \leqslant e^{\beta|Im(z)|}, \tag{20}$$

$$H_\beta(x) \leqslant C\sqrt{\nu\beta|x|}|\sqrt{\nu+1}e^{3\nu/4-\sqrt{\nu\beta|x|}}. \tag{21}$$

The main new estimate that will be of interest for us (and that differs from what is done in [22]) is the following:

Lemma 2.1 *For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and any $r \in (1/2,1)$, we have*

$$|H_\beta(ix)| \geqslant C(1-\sqrt{r})e^{-\frac{\nu}{1-r}+\beta r x}. \tag{22}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.1 Let $r \in (1/2,1)$ be some parameter destined to tend to 1, let $\eta \in (0,1)$ and $\mu \in (0,1)$ some other parameters that will be linked to r afterwards. Then, using the expression of H_β given in (18), we obtain by restricting the integral over $((1-\mu)\eta,\eta)$ that

$$|H_\beta(ix)| \geqslant \mu\eta C_\nu e^{\frac{-\nu}{1-\eta^2}+\beta x\eta(1-\mu)}. \tag{23}$$

Now, we choose $\eta = \sqrt{r} \in (0,1)$ and $\mu = 1 - \sqrt{r} \in (0,1)$, so that $\eta(1-\mu) = r$.

We obtain thanks to (23) and (19) that

$$|H_\beta(ix)| \geqslant C\sqrt{r}(1-\sqrt{r})e^{-\frac{\nu}{1-r}+\beta r x} \geqslant C(1-\sqrt{r})e^{-\frac{\nu}{1-r}+\beta r x}.$$

■

Let us now define what will be the Fourier transform of our biorthogonal family. We set

$$\Phi_k(z) := \frac{F(z)}{(z+ik^2)F'(ik^2)} \frac{H_\beta(z)}{H_\beta(ik^2)}. \tag{24}$$

Using the definition of F given in (16), it is clear that

$$\Phi_k(i\lambda_n) = \delta_{k,n}. \tag{25}$$

Let us prove that Φ_k is of exponential type $T/2$. This is the purpose of the next lemma.

Lemma 2.2 *There exists some constant $C_k > 0$ such that for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$, one has*

$$\frac{F(z)}{(z+ik^2)F'(ik^2)} \leqslant C_k e^{\pi\sqrt{|z|}}. \tag{26}$$

Consequently, Φ_k is of exponential type $T/2$.

Proof of Lemma 2.2 Since

$$z \mapsto \frac{F(z)}{(z+ik^2)F'(ik^2)} \text{ is continuous on } \mathbb{C},$$

it is enough to prove inequality (26) for $|z|$ large enough. For instance, for $|z| \geqslant 2k^2$, we have

$$\frac{|F(z)|}{|z+ik^2||F'(ik^2)|} \leqslant C|F(z)| \leqslant Ce^{\pi\sqrt{|z|}}.$$

Using (26) together with (20) and the definition of β given in (17), we deduce that Φ_k is of exponential type $T/2$, and the proof is complete.

■

Let us now give a precise estimate of $z \mapsto \frac{F(z)}{(z+ik^2)F'(ik^2)}$ on the real axis.

Lemma 2.3 *For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, one has*

$$\frac{|F(x)|}{|(z+ik^2)F'(ik^2)|} \leqslant Ce^{\pi\sqrt{\frac{|x|}{2}}}. \tag{27}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.3 Since $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\frac{|F(x)|}{|(x+ik^2)F'(i\lambda_k)|} \leqslant \frac{|F(x)|}{k^2|F'(ik^2)|}. \tag{28}$$

Let us estimate $|F(x)|$. One more time we use that we know explicitly the form of F and the fact that Re $\sqrt{i} = 1/\sqrt{2}$ to deduce that

$$|F(x)| \leqslant e^{\pi\sqrt{\frac{|x|}{2}}}.$$

It remains to estimate $|F'(i\lambda_k)|$.

From (16), one easily infer that

$$|F'(ik^2)| = \frac{1}{2k^2}$$

which enables us to conclude as wished thanks to (28).

■

Let us now give the final estimate of our multiplier.

Proposition 2.1 *For some well-chosen ν (depending on δ and T), $\Phi_k \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and*

$$||\Phi_k||_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \leqslant C \frac{\sqrt{\nu+1}}{1-\sqrt{r}} e^{(\frac{3}{4}+\frac{1}{1-r})\nu - r\beta\lambda_k}. \tag{29}$$

Proof of Proposition 2.1 Putting together (27), (21) and (22), we obtain that for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$|\Phi_k(x)| \leqslant C \frac{\sqrt{\nu+1}\sqrt{\nu\beta|x|}|}{1-\sqrt{r}} e^{\pi\sqrt{\frac{|x|}{2}}+(\frac{3}{4}+\frac{1}{1-r})\nu - \sqrt{\nu\beta|x|} - r\beta\lambda_k}.$$

Let us now choose ν. We choose ν in such a way that

$$\sqrt{\beta\nu} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + 1,$$

i.e.

$$\nu := \frac{(1+\sqrt{2})^2}{(1-\delta)T}. \tag{30}$$

We deduce that

$$|\Phi_k(x)| \leqslant C \frac{\sqrt{\nu+1}\sqrt{|x|}|}{1-\sqrt{r}} e^{(\frac{3}{4}+\frac{1}{1-r})\nu - \sqrt{|x|} - r\beta\lambda_k}.$$

Hence, we have that $\Phi_k \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and

$$||\Phi_k||_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \leqslant C \frac{\sqrt{\nu+1}}{1-\sqrt{r}} e^{(\frac{3}{4}+\frac{1}{1-r})\nu - r\beta\lambda_k}.$$

■

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We are now able to construct the control. Using the version of the Paley-Wiener Theorem given in [20, Th. 19.3, p. 370], we can state that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, Φ_k is the Fourier transform of a function $w_k \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with compact support $[-T/2, T/2]$. Moreover, by construction $\{w_k\}$ is biorthogonal to the family $\{e^{-k^2 t}\}$ on $[-T/2, T/2]$. Then, one can create the control thanks to the family $\{h_k\}$. Going back to expression (4), we consider a control u defined by

$$u(t) := -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_k}{f_k} \exp\left(-\frac{Tk^2}{2}\right) w_k\left(t - \frac{T}{2}\right). \tag{31}$$

Let us remark that going back to the expression of T_0 given in (6), the expression of u is meaningful as soon as δ is small enough and r is close enough to 1 (depending on $T - T_0$), thanks to (17) and (29), which will be assumed from now on.

By construction, the corresponding solution y of (1) verifies $y(T, \cdot) \equiv 0$. Moreover, one easily verifies that $u \in C^0([0,T], \mathbb{R})$. Using (31), (17) and inequality (29), we obtain

$$||u(t)||_{L^\infty(0,T)} \leqslant C \frac{\sqrt{\nu+1}}{1-\sqrt{r}} e^{(\frac{3}{4}+\frac{1}{1-r})\nu} \sum_k \frac{|a_k|}{|f_k|} e^{-k^2(\frac{rT(1-\delta)}{2}+\frac{T}{2})},$$

that we rewrite as

$$||u(t)||_{L^\infty(0,T)} \leqslant C \frac{\sqrt{\nu+1}}{1-\sqrt{r}} e^{(\frac{3}{4}+\frac{1}{1-r})\nu} \sum_k |a_k| e^{k^2\left(I_k(f) - \frac{rT(1-\delta)}{2} - \frac{T}{2}\right)}.$$

Hence, using condition (7), we deduce

$$||u(t)||_{L^\infty(0,T)} \leqslant C\frac{\sqrt{\nu+1}}{1-\sqrt{r}}e^{(\frac{3}{4}+\frac{1}{1-r})\nu}\sum_k |a_k|e^{k^2\left(T_0-\frac{rT(1-\delta)}{2}-\frac{T}{2}\right)}. \tag{32}$$

The equation (in the variable r)

$$T_0-\frac{rT(1-\delta)}{2}-\frac{T}{2}=-\frac{T-T_0}{2}$$

has a unique solution $r_0\in(0,1)$ given by

$$r_0:=\frac{T_0}{T(1-\delta)}, \tag{33}$$

as soon as

$$0<\delta<\frac{T-T_0}{T}. \tag{34}$$

Going back to (32) and using the particular value of r given in (33) together with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we obtain that

$$||u(t)||_{L^\infty(0,T)} \leqslant \frac{C}{\sqrt{T-T_0}}\frac{\sqrt{\nu+1}}{1-\sqrt{r_0}}e^{(\frac{3}{4}+\frac{1}{1-r_0})\nu}(\sum_k |a_k|^2)^{1/2}. \tag{35}$$

We now choose $\delta=\frac{T-T_0}{2T}$, which verifies condition (34), so that by (33) we obtain

$$r_0=\frac{2T_0}{T+T_0}. \tag{36}$$

Hence, for T close enough to T_0, taking into account (35), the definition of ν given in (30), (36), and the fact that all the terms appearing in the right-hand side of (35) in front of the exponential are at most powers of $T-T_0$, we obtain

$$||u(t)||_{L^\infty(0,T)} \leqslant e^{\frac{C(T_0)}{T-T_0}}||y^0||_H.$$

$\blacksquare$

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Franck Boyer for having pointed out a significant simplification in the proof of inequality (13).

Funding

The author is partially supported by the project IFSMACS funded by the french Agence Nationale de la Recherche, 2015-2019 (Reference: ANR-15-CE40-0010).

References

[1] Ammar-Khodja, F., Benabdallah A., Gonzalez-Burgos M. and L. de Teresa, L., The Kalman condition for the boundary controllability of coupled parabolic systems. Bounds on biorthogonal families to complex matrix exponentials, J. Math. Pures Appl. 96 (2011), 555–590.

[2] Ammar-Khodja, F., Benabdallah A., Gonzalez-Burgos M. and de Teresa, L., Minimal time for the null controllability of parabolic systems: the effect of the condensation index of complex sequences. (English summary) J. Funct. Anal. 267 (2014), no. 7, 2077–2151.

[3] Benabdallah, A., Boyer, F., González-Burgos, M. and Olive, G., Sharp estimates of the one-dimensional boundary control cost for parabolic systems and application to the N-dimensional boundary null controllability in cylindrical domains. (SIAM J. Control Optim. 52 (2014), no. 5, 2970–3001.

[4] Beauchard, K., Helffer, B., Henry, R. and Robbiano, L., Degenerate parabolic operators of Kolmogorov type with a geometric control condition. ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var., 21(2):487?512, 2015.

[5] Beauchard, K., Miller, L. and Morancey, Morgan, 2D Grushin-type equations: minimal time and null controllable data. J. Differential Equations, 259(11):5813?5845, 2015.

[6] Coron, J.-M. and Guerrero, S., Singular optimal control: A linear 1-D parabolic-hyperbolic example, Asymptotic Analysis 44 (2005), 237–257.

[7] Coron, J.-M., Control and nonlinearity, Volume 136 of Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, Providence (2007).

[8] Dolecki, S., Observability for the one-dimensional heat equation, Studia Math. 48 (1973), 291–305.

[9] Ervedoza, S. and Zuazua, E., Sharp observability estimates for the heat equations, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. Volume 202 (2011), no. 3, 975–1017.

[10] Fattorini, H. O., and Russell, D. L., Exact controllability theorems for linear parabolic equations in one space dimension, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., Volume 43 (1971), Issue 4, pp 272-292.

[11] Fattorini, H. O.; Russell, D. L., Uniform bounds on biorthogonal functions for real exponentials with an application to the control theory of parabolic equations. Quart. Appl. Math. 32 (1974/75), 45–69.

[12] Fernández-Cara, E. and Zuazua, E., Null and approximate controllability for weakly blowing up semilinear heat equations. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 17 (2000), no. 5, 583–616.

[13] Gueye, M. and Lissy, P., Singular Optimal Control of a 1-D Parabolic-Hyperbolic Degenerate Equation, to appear at ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations.

[14] Güichal, E., A lower bound of the norm of the control operator for the heat equation, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 110(2):519–527, 1985.

[15] Liu, Y., Takahashi, T. and Tucsnak, M., Single input controllability of a simplified fluid-structure interaction model. ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. 19 (2013), no. 1, 20-42.

[16] Lissy, P., On the Cost of Fast Controls for Some Families of Dispersive or Parabolic Equations in One Space Dimension SIAM J. Control Optim., 52(4), 2651–2676.

[17] Lissy, P., Explicit lower bounds for the cost of fast controls for some 1-D parabolic or dispersive equations, and a new lower bound concerning the uniform controllability of the 1-D transport-diffusion equation. J. Differential Equations 259 (2015), no. 10, 5331–5352.

[18] Lissy, P., Construction of Gevrey functions with compact support using the Bray-Mandelbrojt iterative process and applications to the moment method in control theory, submitted, 2015.

[19] Miller, L., Geometric bounds on the growth rate of null-controllability cost for the heat equation in small time, J. Differential Equations, 204 (2004), pp. 202–226.

[20] Rudin, W., Real and complex analysis. Third edition. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1987. xiv+416 pp. ISBN: 0-07-054234-1.

[21] Schwartz, L., Étude des Sommes d'Exponentielles, 2ième éd., Publications de l-Institut de Mathématiques de l'Université de Strasbourg, V. Actualités Sci. Ind., Hermann, Paris, 1959

[22] Tenenbaum, G. and Tucsnak, M., New blow-up rates of fast controls for the Schrödinger and heat equations, Journal of Differential Equations, 243 (2007), 70–100.