

## CONTROL OF HARMONIC MAP HEAT FLOW WITH AN EXTERNAL FIELD

YUNING LIU

ABSTRACT. We investigate the control problem of harmonic map heat flow by means of an external magnetic field. In contrast to the situation of a parabolic system with internal or boundary control, the magnetic field acts as the coefficients of lower order terms of the equation. We show that for initial data whose image stays in a hemisphere, with one control acting on a subset of the domain plus one that only depends on time, the state of the system can be steered to any ground state, i.e. any given unit vector, within any short time. To achieve this, in the first step a control is applied to steer the solution into a small neighborhood of the peak of the hemisphere. Then under stereographic projection, the original system is reduced to an internal parabolic control system with initial data sufficiently close to 0 so that the existing method for local controllability can be applied. The key process is to give an explicit solution of an underdetermined algebraic system such that the affine type control can be converted into an internal control.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We investigate the controllability of the following system with Neumann boundary condition

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{d} - \Delta \mathbf{d} = |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \mathbf{d} + (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d}) \mathbf{H} - (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d})^2 \mathbf{d}, & \text{in } Q = \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{d}}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \Sigma = \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  is an open set with  $C^2$  convex boundary  $\partial\Omega$ , and  $\nu$  denotes the inner unit normal vector to  $\partial\Omega$ . The work is motivated by the analysis and optimal control of a simplified Ericksen–Leslie system describing the dynamics of a liquid crystal (see [13], [16] and [1]) when the hydrodynamic effects are neglected. We recall that the mathematical description of the static configuration of liquid crystal material under a magnetic field is to consider the Oseen–Frank model [10]. In the simplest case, the energy functional of such model has the form (see [14])

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{d}) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 - (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d})^2) dx, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $\mathbf{d} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$  describes the local orientation of the liquid crystal molecules, and  $\mathbf{H} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  denotes the external magnetic field. Here we omit the diamagnetic susceptibility constant in front of the term  $(\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d})^2$ . The orientation  $\mathbf{d}$  tends to align along the magnetic field  $\mathbf{H}$  for the sake of minimizing the total energy (1.2). By introducing a Lagrange multiplier to penalize the constraint  $|\mathbf{d}| = 1$ , we can derive the Euler–Lagrange equation of (1.2)

$$-\Delta \mathbf{d} = |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \mathbf{d} + (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d}) \mathbf{H} - (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d})^2 \mathbf{d}, \quad (1.3)$$

and thus (1.1) is the corresponding gradient flow.

To clarify the constraint  $|\mathbf{d}(x, t)| = 1$  in (1.1), we note that in case the external field  $\mathbf{H}$  is given and is regular enough, say  $C^1$  up to the boundary, then the short time classical solution to (1.1) can be constructed using standard parabolic theory, provided the initial data  $\mathbf{d}(x, 0) : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{S}^2$  is regular enough. So the scalar function  $g(x, t) \triangleq |\mathbf{d}(x, t)|^2 - 1$  satisfies the Neumann boundary condition  $\frac{\partial g}{\partial \nu} = 0$  and the following linear parabolic equation

$$\partial_t g - \Delta g = 2(|\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 - (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d})^2)g. \quad (1.4)$$

So the constraint  $|\mathbf{d}|^2 = 1$  shall be preserved as long as the classical solution exists due to the uniqueness of solution of (1.4). However, in the control problem the vector field  $\mathbf{H}$  is part of

the unknown. In the sequel, such a constraint will be achieved through an alternative way using the stereographic projection.

Another feature of (1.1) is that it is rotationally invariant. More precisely, if  $(\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{H})$  satisfies (1.1), so does  $(\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}, \mathcal{R}\mathbf{H})$ , for any orthogonal matrix  $\mathcal{R}$ . This property will be used in the proof of the main theorem.

In the last three decades there has been an enormous amount of progresses concerning harmonic heat flow, see the comprehensive monograph [15]. A closely related work is due to Chen [2], who considers the system with another form of external field compared with (1.1), and discusses the existence of a classical solution and its large time behavior when the initial data lies in a hemisphere. However, to the best of our knowledge, there has been no result concerning the controllability of such system, neither by boundary control nor by magnetic field. On the other hand, there have been numerous advances in the controllability of nonlinear parabolic equation or system. The readers can refer to, for instance, [5, 6, 7].

The main result of this work is stated as follows.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\omega$  be an open proper subset of  $\Omega$ , and  $\alpha \in (0, 1), T > 0$  be fixed numbers. For any initial state  $\mathbf{d}_0 \in C^{2+\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{S}^2)$  satisfying  $\partial_\nu \mathbf{d}_0 = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and*

$$\inf_{x \in \Omega} \mathbf{d}_0(x) \cdot \mathbf{e} > 0 \text{ for some } \mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{S}^2, \quad (1.5)$$

*and any constant state  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{S}^2$ , there exist  $\mathbf{H}_0(x, t) \in L^\infty(Q)$  and  $\mathbf{g}(t) \in L^\infty(0, T)$  such that the system (1.1) with initial data  $\mathbf{d}|_{t=0} = \mathbf{d}_0$  and control*

$$\mathbf{H}(x, t) = \mathbf{g}(t) + \chi_\omega \mathbf{H}_0(x, t) \quad (1.6)$$

*satisfies  $\mathbf{d}|_{t=T} = \mathbf{p}$ . In (1.6)  $\chi_\omega$  denotes the characteristic function of  $\omega$ .*

**Remark 1.2.** *To steer the system (1.1) to any ground state  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{S}^2$ , we first drive it to  $\mathbf{e}$ . This can be done by first choosing  $\mathbf{H} = \lambda(t)\mathbf{e}$  with  $\lambda$  being sufficiently large such that it forces the solution  $\mathbf{d}$  to stay in a small neighborhood of  $\mathbf{e}$  within  $[0, \frac{T}{8}]$ . Then we construct  $\mathbf{H} = \chi_\omega \mathbf{H}_0$  by proving a local controllability result within  $[\frac{T}{8}, \frac{T}{4}]$  such that  $\mathbf{d}(\cdot, \frac{T}{4}) \equiv \mathbf{e}$ . Using the rotational invariance of (1.1), we can repeat the previous process to steer the system successively to two intermediate states  $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2 \in \mathbb{S}^2$  which trisect the angle between  $\mathbf{e}$  and  $\mathbf{p}$ . Finally we drive the state from  $\mathbf{p}_2$  to  $\mathbf{p}$ .*

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recast (1.1) into a semi-linear parabolic system with internal control. In Section 3, we prove the existence and uniqueness of the global in time classical solution to (1.1) with a special choice of the magnetic field, i.e.  $\mathbf{H} = \lambda\mathbf{e}$ . This result is based on a Bernstein type estimate and the novelty is that the Lipschitz norm of the solution is independent of the size of  $\lambda(t)$ . Based on the results in these two sections, we give the proof of Theorem 1.1 in the last section.

Regarding notation, we shall use bold letters to denote vectors or matrices, and use the non-bold letters with indices to denote their components. For instance,  $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, d_2, d_3) = (d_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 3}$ . We shall adopt the convention in differential geometry that the partial derivatives  $\partial_{x_i}$  of various tensors are abbreviated by adding  $_i$  to the corresponding components:  $\partial_{x_i} d_j = d_{j,i}$ . Moreover, repeated indices will be summed. The standard basis vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  are denoted by  $\mathbf{e}_i$  with  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . We shall use  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b} = a_i b_i$  for the inner product and colon for the contraction of two matrices  $\mathbf{A} : \mathbf{B} = A_{ij} B_{ij}$ .

## 2. REDUCTION TO PARABOLIC SYSTEM WITH INTERNAL CONTROL

In this section we shall use the stereographic projection to remove the constraint  $|\mathbf{d}| = 1$  in (1.1) and reduce it to a parabolic system with internal control whose support lies in an open

subset  $\omega \subsetneq \Omega$ . The stereographic projection  $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \Psi_2, \Psi_3) : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{-\mathbf{e}_3\}$  is defined via

$$\Psi(v_1, v_2) \triangleq \left( \frac{2v_1}{1+v_1^2+v_2^2}, \frac{2v_2}{1+v_1^2+v_2^2}, \frac{1-v_1^2-v_2^2}{1+v_1^2+v_2^2} \right). \quad (2.1)$$

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{d}$  be a classical solution to (1.1) satisfying*

$$\inf_{\Omega \times (0, T)} |\mathbf{d}(x, t) + \mathbf{e}_3| > 0, \quad (2.2)$$

then  $\mathbf{v} = \Psi^{-1}(\mathbf{d})$  is a classical solution to the following equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{v} = \Delta \mathbf{v} - 2\nabla \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \log h + \frac{2|\nabla \mathbf{v}|^2}{h} \mathbf{v} + \frac{h^2}{4} (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d}) H_i \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \Psi_i(\mathbf{v}), & \text{in } Q, \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial \nu} = 0, & \text{on } \Sigma, \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

where  $h = 1 + |\mathbf{v}|^2$ . Conversely, if  $\mathbf{v}$  is a strong solution to (2.3), then  $\mathbf{d} = \Psi(\mathbf{v})$  is a strong solution to (1.1).

*Proof.* It follows from (2.1) and  $\mathbf{d} = \Psi(\mathbf{v})$  that  $\nabla \mathbf{d} = \left( \frac{\partial d_i}{\partial x_k} \right)_{1 \leq i, k \leq 3}$  and  $\partial_t \mathbf{d}$  can be computed by

$$\frac{\partial d_i}{\partial x_k} = \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k}, \quad \frac{\partial d_i}{\partial t} = \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial t}. \quad (2.4)$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 &= \text{tr} \left( \nabla \mathbf{d} (\nabla \mathbf{d})^T \right) = \sum_{\ell, k=1}^3 \sum_{j, s=1}^2 \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k} \left( \frac{\partial \Psi_\ell}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial \Psi_\ell}{\partial v_s} \right) \frac{\partial v_s}{\partial x_k}, \\ \Delta \mathbf{d} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial d_i}{\partial x_k} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left( \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Denote

$$A_{jk}(\mathbf{v}) \triangleq \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_k}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j, k \leq 2, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\mathbf{J} \triangleq -\partial_t \mathbf{d} + \Delta \mathbf{d} + |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \mathbf{d} + (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d}) \mathbf{H} - (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d})^2 \mathbf{d}, \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\mathbf{M} \triangleq -\partial_t \mathbf{v} + \Delta \mathbf{v} - 2\nabla \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \log h + \frac{2|\nabla \mathbf{v}|^2}{h} \mathbf{v} + \frac{h^2}{4} (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d}) H_i \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \Psi_i(\mathbf{v}), \quad (2.8)$$

with  $h = 1 + |\mathbf{v}|^2$ ,  $\mathbf{J} = \{J_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq 3}$  and  $\mathbf{M} = \{M_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq 2}$ . Then we need to show the following equivalence:

$$\mathbf{M} = 0 \iff \mathbf{J} = 0. \quad (2.9)$$

To do this, we first use (2.4) and (2.5) to write  $\mathbf{J}$  component-wise

$$J_i = -\frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left( \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k} \right) + d_i \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k} \left( \frac{\partial \Psi_\ell}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial \Psi_\ell}{\partial v_s} \right) \frac{\partial v_s}{\partial x_k} + (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d}) H_i - (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d})^2 d_i.$$

Multiplying the above equality by  $\frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell}$ , summing over  $i$  and using  $|\mathbf{d}| = 1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_i \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell} &= -\frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell} \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left( \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell} \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left( \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k} \right) + (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d}) H_i \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell} \\ &= -A_{\ell j}(v) \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial A_{\ell j}(v)}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k} + A_{\ell j}(v) \Delta v_j \\ &\quad - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left( \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k} \right) + (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d}) H_i \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

In the second equality above we employed (2.6). On the other hand, it follows from (2.1) that

$$\frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{1+v_1^2+v_2^2} - \frac{4v_1^2}{(1+v_1^2+v_2^2)^2} & -\frac{4v_1v_2}{(1+v_1^2+v_2^2)^2} \\ -\frac{4v_1v_2}{(1+v_1^2+v_2^2)^2} & \frac{2}{1+v_1^2+v_2^2} - \frac{4v_2^2}{(1+v_1^2+v_2^2)^2} \\ -\frac{4v_1}{(1+v_1^2+v_2^2)^2} & -\frac{4v_2}{(1+v_1^2+v_2^2)^2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.11)$$

Recalling that  $h = 1 + v_1^2 + v_2^2$ , we have a precise formula of (2.6),

$$A_{\ell j}(\mathbf{v}) = \frac{4}{h^2} \delta_{\ell j}. \quad (2.12)$$

This simplifies (2.10) into

$$\begin{aligned} J_i \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell} &= -\frac{4}{h^2} \delta_{\ell j} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left( \frac{4}{h^2} \right) \delta_{\ell j} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k} + \frac{4}{h^2} \delta_{\ell j} \Delta v_j \\ &\quad - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left( \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k} \right) + (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d}) H_i \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

To proceed, we denote

$$B_{j\ell s} \triangleq \frac{\partial^2 \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell \partial v_s} \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j}.$$

Notice that

$$B_{j\ell s} + B_{s\ell j} = \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial^2 \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell \partial v_s} + \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_s} \frac{\partial^2 \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell \partial v_j} = \frac{\partial A_{sj}(\mathbf{v})}{\partial v_\ell}.$$

By a permutation,

$$B_{j\ell s} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial A_{sj}(\mathbf{v})}{\partial v_\ell} + \frac{\partial A_{j\ell}(\mathbf{v})}{\partial v_s} - \frac{\partial A_{\ell s}(\mathbf{v})}{\partial v_j} \right) = -\frac{4}{h^3} (h_{,\ell} \delta_{sj} + h_{,s} \delta_{j\ell} - h_{,j} \delta_{\ell s}),$$

where  $h_{,\ell}$  is the abbreviation for  $\frac{\partial h}{\partial v_\ell} = 2v_\ell$ . Applying this formula to the fourth component of the right hand side in (2.13) gives

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left( \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k} \right) &= -B_{j\ell s} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial v_s}{\partial x_k} \\ &= \frac{4}{h^3} (h_{,\ell} v_{s,k} v_{s,k} + h_{,s} v_{\ell,k} v_{s,k} - h_{,j} v_{j,k} v_{\ell,k}) \\ &= \frac{4}{h^3} h_{,\ell} |\nabla \mathbf{v}|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

where  $v_{i,j}$  is the abbreviation for  $\frac{\partial v_i}{\partial x_j}$ . Plug (2.14) into (2.13) to get

$$J_i \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell} = -\frac{4}{h^2} \partial_t v_\ell - \frac{8}{h^3} \nabla h \cdot \nabla v_\ell + \frac{4}{h^2} \Delta v_\ell + \frac{8}{h^3} v_\ell |\nabla \mathbf{v}|^2 + (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d}) H_i \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial v_\ell}.$$

In virtue of (2.8), this is equivalent to

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \Psi_1}{\partial v_1} & \frac{\partial \Psi_2}{\partial v_1} & \frac{\partial \Psi_3}{\partial v_1} \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_1}{\partial v_2} & \frac{\partial \Psi_2}{\partial v_2} & \frac{\partial \Psi_3}{\partial v_2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} J_1 \\ J_2 \\ J_3 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{4}{h^2} \begin{pmatrix} M_1 \\ M_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that  $\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{J} \equiv 0$ , due to  $|\mathbf{d}| \equiv 1$ , the above formula is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{E}\mathbf{J} = \frac{4}{h^2} (0, M_1, M_2)^T, \quad (2.15)$$

where  $\mathbf{E}$  is the  $3 \times 3$  matrix

$$\mathbf{E} \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & d_2 & d_3 \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_1}{\partial v_1} & \frac{\partial \Psi_2}{\partial v_1} & \frac{\partial \Psi_3}{\partial v_1} \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_1}{\partial v_2} & \frac{\partial \Psi_2}{\partial v_2} & \frac{\partial \Psi_3}{\partial v_2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

As a result (2.9) is a consequence of  $\det \mathbf{E} \neq 0$ . Actually, using (2.12),

$$(\det \mathbf{E})^2 = \det(\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A_{11} & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}^2 = (2/h)^8.$$

Concerning the boundary condition, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \partial_\nu d_1 \\ \partial_\nu d_2 \\ \partial_\nu d_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \Psi_1}{\partial v_1} & \frac{\partial \Psi_1}{\partial v_2} \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_2}{\partial v_1} & \frac{\partial \Psi_2}{\partial v_2} \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_3}{\partial v_1} & \frac{\partial \Psi_3}{\partial v_2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_\nu v_1 \\ \partial_\nu v_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \Psi_1}{\partial v_1} & \frac{\partial \Psi_1}{\partial v_2} & d_1 \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_2}{\partial v_1} & \frac{\partial \Psi_2}{\partial v_2} & d_2 \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_3}{\partial v_1} & \frac{\partial \Psi_3}{\partial v_2} & d_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_\nu v_1 \\ \partial_\nu v_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This together with  $\det \mathbf{E} \neq 0$  implies the equivalence between boundary conditions  $\partial_\nu \mathbf{d} = 0$  and  $\partial_\nu \mathbf{v} = 0$ . So we complete the proof.  $\square$

In order to reduce (1.1) to an internal control system, we write the last component of (2.3) as  $\chi_\omega \mathbf{f}$ , where  $\chi_\omega$  is the characteristic function of an open subset  $\omega \subsetneq \Omega$ :

$$\frac{h^2}{4} (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d}) H_i \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \Psi_i(\mathbf{v}) = \chi_\omega \mathbf{f}. \quad (2.16)$$

In view of (2.11), this amounts to solving the following algebraic equations of  $\mathbf{H}$  for given  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2)$  and  $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, f_2)$ :

$$\frac{2v_1 H_1 + 2v_2 H_2 + (1 - v_1^2 - v_2^2) H_3}{1 + v_1^2 + v_2^2} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(1 + v_2^2 - v_1^2) H_1 - v_1 v_2 H_2 - v_1 H_3 \\ -v_1 v_2 H_1 + \frac{1}{2}(1 + v_1^2 - v_2^2) H_2 - v_2 H_3 \end{pmatrix} = \chi_\omega \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.17)$$

**Lemma 2.2.** *For every  $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{f}) \in C(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^4)$ , equation (2.17) has a solution  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v})$  which depends analytically on  $\mathbf{v}$  and  $\mathbf{f}$  such that  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{H}) \subset \omega$ .*

*Proof.* The equation (2.17) is underdetermined and might have multiple solutions. We look for a special solution by setting

$$2v_1 H_1 + 2v_2 H_2 + (1 - v_1^2 - v_2^2) H_3 = (1 + v_1^2 + v_2^2) \chi_\omega.$$

Then (2.17) can be reduced to the following linear equation about  $H_i$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(1+v_2^2-v_1^2)H_1 - v_1v_2H_2 - v_1H_3 \\ -v_1v_2H_1 + \frac{1}{2}(1+v_1^2-v_2^2)H_2 - v_2H_3 \\ -v_1H_1 - v_2H_2 + \frac{1}{2}(-1+v_1^2+v_2^2)H_3 \end{pmatrix} = \chi_\omega \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \\ -\frac{1}{2}(1+v_1^2+v_2^2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.18)$$

Denote

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(1+v_2^2-v_1^2) & -v_1v_2 & -v_1 \\ -v_1v_2 & \frac{1}{2}(1+v_1^2-v_2^2) & -v_2 \\ -v_1 & -v_2 & \frac{1}{2}(-1+v_1^2+v_2^2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Its eigenvalues are

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= -\frac{1}{2}(1+v_1^2+v_2^2), \\ \lambda_2 &= \lambda_3 = \frac{1}{2}(1+v_1^2+v_2^2), \end{aligned}$$

and its cofactor matrix consists of entries that are polynomials of  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ . Thus  $\mathbf{A}$  is invertible, and  $\mathbf{A}^{-1}$  depends analytically on  $(v_1, v_2)$ . This shows that (2.18) has a unique analytic solution and the lemma is proved.  $\square$

Thanks to Proposition 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, the controllability of (1.1) is reduced to the following system with internal control:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{v} - \Delta \mathbf{v} &= -2\nabla \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \log(1+|\mathbf{v}|^2) + \frac{2|\nabla \mathbf{v}|^2}{1+|\mathbf{v}|^2} \mathbf{v} + \chi_\omega \mathbf{f}, & \text{in } Q, \\ \mathbf{v}|_{t=0} &= \mathbf{v}_0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \mathbf{v} &= 0, & \text{on } \Sigma. \end{cases} \quad (2.19)$$

The local controllability of (2.19) is actually a consequence of [6]. For the convenience of the readers, we give the proof based on the following result:

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{a}(x, t) \in L^\infty(Q; \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$  and  $\mathbf{y}_0 \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ . For every  $T > 0$ , the system*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{y} - \Delta \mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{a}(x, t) \mathbf{y} + \chi_\omega \mathbf{u}, & \text{in } Q, \\ \mathbf{y}|_{t=0} &= \mathbf{y}_0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \mathbf{y} &= 0, & \text{on } \Sigma, \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

*is null-controllable at  $t = T$ . Moreover, the control  $\mathbf{u} \in L^\infty(Q; \mathbb{R}^2)$  satisfies*

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq e^{c_0(\Omega, \omega)K(T, \|\mathbf{a}\|_{L^\infty(Q)})} \|\mathbf{y}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad (2.21)$$

*where  $c_0(\Omega, \omega) > 0$  is a generic constant and  $K(T, \|\mathbf{a}\|_{L^\infty(Q)}) > 0$  is non-decreasing on its second argument.*

The scalar version of the above result is proved in [6] using Carleman estimate. The proof can be directly adapted to the above vectorial case because the control is applied to every component of the system in (2.20). To proceed, we need the Kakutani's fixed point theorem. See for instance [8, Chapter 2, Section 5.8] or [17, pp. 126] for the proof.

**Proposition 2.4** (Kakutani's fixed point theorem). *Let  $\mathcal{Z}$  be a non-empty, compact and convex subset of a Hausdorff locally convex topological vector space  $\mathcal{Y}$ , and  $2^{\mathcal{Z}}$  be its power set, i.e. the set of all subsets of  $\mathcal{Z}$ . Let  $\Phi : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{Z}}$  be upper semi-continuous and  $\Phi(x)$  is non-empty, compact, and convex for all  $x \in \mathcal{Z}$ . Then  $\Phi$  has a fixed point in the sense that there exists  $x \in \mathcal{Z}$  such that  $x \in \Phi(x)$ .*

We also need a few results concerning parabolic regularity:

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $N$  be the dimension of  $\Omega$  and  $u$  be a solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u = g, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \partial_\nu u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T). \end{cases} \quad (2.22)$$

Then for any  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , we have

$$\|u\|_{L^p(0, T; W^{2, p}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_t u\|_{L^p(0, T; L^p(\Omega))} \leq C(\Omega, p) (\|u|_{t=0}\|_{W^{2, p}(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L^p(\Omega \times (0, T))}), \quad (2.23)$$

and

$$\|u\|_{C([0, T]; W^{1, \infty}(\Omega))} \leq C(\Omega, p) (\|u|_{t=0}\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L^p(\Omega \times (0, T))}), \quad \forall p \in (N + 2, \infty). \quad (2.24)$$

*Proof.* Estimate (2.23) follows from parabolic theory, see for instance [4]. Note that the regularity needed for the initial data is far from being optimal but is sufficient for later use. Regarding estimate (2.24), the case when  $u|_{t=0} = 0$  is a consequence of (2.23) and Sobolev embedding. The case when  $g = 0$  follows from the following estimate of the analytic semigroup  $e^{t\Delta}$  generated by the Neumann-Laplacian

$$\|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leq C(p, q) t^{-\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})} \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad \forall 1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty; t \in (0, 1). \quad (2.25)$$

For the proof of (2.25), we first recall from [3, page 90] or [12] that the heat kernel  $K(t, x, y)$  of the Neumann-Laplacian satisfies

$$C_1 t^{-\frac{N}{2}} e^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{4t}} \leq K(t, x, y) \leq C_2 t^{-\frac{N}{2}} e^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{8t}}, \quad \forall x, y \in \Omega \text{ and } t \in (0, 1). \quad (2.26)$$

Since  $e^{t\Delta} f(x) = \int_{\Omega} K(t, x, y) f(y) dy$ , the inequality (2.26) together with the Young's inequality of convolution leads to (2.25).  $\square$

The combination of the previous results leads to the local controllability of (2.19).

**Proposition 2.6.** *For every  $T > 0$ , there exists a constant  $\epsilon_2 = \epsilon_2(T) > 0$  such that if*

$$\|\mathbf{v}_0\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)} \leq \min\{1, \epsilon_2\} \text{ and } \mathbf{v}_0 \in W^{2, p}(\Omega), \text{ for some fixed } p > 5, \quad (2.27)$$

then the system (2.19) is null-controllable at time  $T$ .

*Proof.* Since we are only concerned with short time controllability, without loss of generality, we assume  $T \in (0, 1)$ . We shall employ the Kakutani's fixed point theorem (in Proposition 2.4) to show the null-controllability. To proceed, we choose  $R > 1$  and introduce

$$\mathcal{Z} \triangleq \{\mathbf{z} \in C([0, T]; W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)) \mid \|\mathbf{z}\|_{C([0, T]; W^{1, \infty}(\Omega))} \leq R, \mathbf{z}(x, 0) = \mathbf{v}_0(x)\}. \quad (2.28)$$

Then it follows from (2.27) that  $\mathcal{Z}$  is a nonempty convex and compact subset of some negative Sobolev space, say  $H^{-1}(Q)$ . Given  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}$ , consider the linear control system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{v} - \Delta \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \nabla \mathbf{z}) \mathbf{v} + \chi_\omega \mathbf{f}, & \text{in } Q, \\ \mathbf{v}|_{t=0} = \mathbf{v}_0, & \text{on } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \mathbf{v} = 0, & \text{on } \Sigma, \end{cases} \quad (2.29)$$

where  $\mathbf{g}$  is a  $2 \times 2$  matrix-valued function

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{v}, \nabla \mathbf{v}) \triangleq \left\{ \frac{-4 \nabla v_i \cdot \nabla v_j + 2 |\nabla \mathbf{v}|^2 \delta_{ij}}{1 + |\mathbf{v}|^2} \right\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2}.$$

In view of (2.28), we have  $\|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \nabla \mathbf{z})\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq 8R^2$ . (Here the precise bound is not important.) So we can solve the linear system (2.29) and obtain a control  $\mathbf{f}$  in the class

$$\mathcal{F} \triangleq \left\{ \mathbf{f} \in L^\infty(Q) \mid \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq e^{c_0(\Omega, \omega) K(T, 8R^2)} \|\mathbf{v}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right\}, \quad (2.30)$$

where the constants  $c_0$  and  $K$  above were first introduced in Lemma 2.3. It follows from Lemma 2.3 that, for every  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}$ , there exists  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$  such that the system (2.29) satisfies  $\mathbf{v}(\cdot, T) = 0$ . In other words, for every  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}$ , the following set is not empty:

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{z}) \triangleq \left\{ \mathbf{f} \mid \begin{array}{l} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq e^{c_0(\Omega, \omega)K(T, 8R^2)} \|\mathbf{v}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \\ \text{such that the solution to (2.29) satisfies } \mathbf{v}(\cdot, T) = 0 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (2.31)$$

Moreover, combining (2.30),  $\|\mathbf{z}\|_{L^\infty(0, T; W^{1, \infty}(\Omega))} \leq R$  and Proposition 2.5, we infer that there are two positive constants  $C_1, C_2$  depending on  $\Omega$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{C([0, T]; W^{1, \infty}(\Omega))} &\leq C_1 (\|\mathbf{v}_0\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^p(Q)}) \\ &\leq C_1 \left( \|\mathbf{v}_0\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)} + e^{c_0(\Omega, \omega)K(T, 8R^2)} \|\mathbf{v}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

with  $p > 5$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^p(0, T; W^{2, p}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_t \mathbf{v}\|_{L^p(0, T; L^p(\Omega))} &\leq C_2 (\|\mathbf{v}_0\|_{W^{2, p}(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^p(Q)}) \\ &\leq C(\omega, \Omega, R, \mathbf{v}_0). \end{aligned} \quad (2.33)$$

So for fixed  $R > 1$ , by choosing a sufficiently small  $\epsilon_2 > 0$  in (2.27), we infer from (2.32) that

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{C([0, T]; W^{1, \infty}(\Omega))} < R. \quad (2.34)$$

Thanks to (2.27) and (2.34), we can define a multi-valued map  $\Phi : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{Z}}$  by

$$\Phi(\mathbf{z}) \triangleq \{\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{v} \text{ is a solution of (2.29) for some } \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{z})\}.$$

It remains to verify the hypothesis of Kakutani's fixed point theorem for  $\Phi$ . It is clear that  $\mathcal{Z}$  is a closed, compact, convex subset of a negative Sobolev space. With  $p > 5$ , the compactness of  $\Phi(\mathbf{z})$  follows from (2.33) and the compact embedding

$$L^p(0, T; W^{2, p}(\Omega)) \cap W^{1, p}(0, T; L^p(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow C([0, T]; W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)),$$

see e.g. [18]. The continuity of  $\Phi(\mathbf{z})$  follows from the linearity of (2.29) and local continuity of operator  $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \nabla \mathbf{z}) : W^{1, \infty}(\Omega) \mapsto L^\infty(\Omega)$ . This completes the proof of the result.  $\square$

### 3. CLASSICAL SOLUTION TO HARMONIC MAP HEAT FLOW

In this section we consider (1.1) with  $\mathbf{H} = \lambda(t)\mathbf{e}$  for some  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{S}^2$  and  $\lambda(t) \in C^1([0, T])$ , i.e.

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{d} - \Delta \mathbf{d} = |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \mathbf{d} + \partial V(\mathbf{d}), & \text{in } Q, \\ \partial_\nu \mathbf{d} = 0, & \text{on } \Sigma, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where we denote

$$\partial V(\mathbf{d}) \triangleq (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d})\mathbf{H} - (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d})^2 \mathbf{d} = \lambda^2(t)(\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{d})\mathbf{e} - \lambda^2(t)(\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{d})^2 \mathbf{d}. \quad (3.2)$$

Note that (3.2) is the variation of  $V(\mathbf{d}) \triangleq -(\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{d})^2/2$  under the constraint  $|\mathbf{d}| = 1$ . With the notation  $\mu(x, t) \triangleq \mathbf{d}(x, t) \cdot \mathbf{e}$ , we have  $V(\mathbf{d}) = -\lambda^2(t)\mu^2/2$ .

The main result of this section is given below, which is essentially due to [11] and [2]. The small but crucial novelty we made is to show that the gradient estimate is independent of  $\lambda(t)$ . Then choosing  $\lambda(t)$  sufficiently large will force the solution  $\mathbf{d}$  to approach  $\mathbf{e}$  within any short time. Recall that we assume  $\partial\Omega$  to be convex. This will be used to handle the boundary conditions when applying the maximum principle.

**Proposition 3.1.** *For arbitrary  $T > 0$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , assume  $\mathbf{d}_0 \in C^{2+\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{S}^2)$  fulfills  $\partial_\nu \mathbf{d}_0 = 0$  on the boundary  $\partial\Omega$  and*

$$\epsilon_0 \triangleq \inf_{x \in \Omega} \mathbf{d}_0(x) \cdot \mathbf{e} > 0. \quad (3.3)$$



Then (3.1) has a unique solution  $\mathbf{d}(x, t) \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, T], \mathbb{S}^2)$  with initial data  $\mathbf{d}_0$ . Moreover,  $\mathbf{d}$  satisfies

$$\sup_{\Omega \times [0, T]} |\nabla \mathbf{d}(x, t)| \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon_0} \sup_{x \in \Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{d}_0|, \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$\mathbf{d}(x, t) \cdot \mathbf{e} \geq \epsilon_0, \quad \forall (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]. \quad (3.5)$$

We start with a lemma saying that the projection of equation (1.1) to direction  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{S}^2$  satisfies a parabolic equation where the maximum principle applies:

**Lemma 3.2.** *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.1, if  $\mathbf{d} \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\overline{Q}, \mathbb{S}^2)$  is a solution to (3.1) with initial data  $\mathbf{d}_0$ , then (3.5) holds.*

*Proof.* By the assumption (3.3) and the continuity of the solution  $\mathbf{d}$ , we know that

$$\mu(x, t) = \mathbf{d}(x, t) \cdot \mathbf{e} > 0, \quad \forall (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, \delta]$$

for some  $\delta > 0$ . Since  $\mu \in (0, 1]$ , it follows from (3.2) that

$$\partial_t \mu - \Delta \mu = |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \mu + \lambda^2(t)(\mu - \mu^3) \geq 0.$$

This together with the maximum principle leads to the lower bound (3.5) for  $t \in [0, \delta]$ . Now using  $\mu(\cdot, \delta)$  as initial data, and by the same argument, we deduce that (3.5) holds for  $t \in [0, 2\delta]$ . This process can be carried out as long as the solution exists. Let  $m$  be the first integer such that  $m\delta \geq T$ . After repeating this argument  $m$  times, we show that (3.5) holds for  $t \in [0, T]$ .  $\square$

The next result is concerned with the gradient estimate of the solution to (3.1), which follows from a Bernstein type estimate.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Under the assumptions of Proposition 3.1, if  $\mathbf{d} \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\overline{Q}, \mathbb{S}^2)$  is a solution to (3.1) with initial data  $\mathbf{d}_0$ , then (3.4) holds.*

*Proof.* We choose an arbitrary number  $\delta_0 \in (0, \epsilon_0)$  and denote

$$A(x, t) \triangleq \frac{e(\mathbf{d})}{f^2(\mathbf{d})}, \quad \text{where} \quad e(\mathbf{d}) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \mathbf{d}(x, t)|^2, \quad f(\mathbf{d}) \triangleq \mathbf{d}(x, t) \cdot \mathbf{e} - \delta_0.$$

We shall show that  $A$  satisfies a parabolic inequality to which the maximum principle applies and yields a bound on the gradient of  $\mathbf{d}$ . We first deduce from Lemma 3.2 that

$$f(\mathbf{d}) \geq \epsilon_0 - \delta_0 > 0. \quad (3.6)$$

On the other hand, using (3.1) and the constraint  $|\mathbf{d}| = 1$ , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\partial_t - \Delta)e(\mathbf{d}) \\ &= \nabla(\mathbf{d}_t - \Delta \mathbf{d}) : \nabla \mathbf{d} - |\nabla^2 \mathbf{d}|^2 \\ &= \nabla |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \mathbf{d} : \nabla \mathbf{d} + |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \nabla \mathbf{d} : \nabla \mathbf{d} + \nabla \partial V(\mathbf{d}) : \nabla \mathbf{d} - |\nabla^2 \mathbf{d}|^2 \\ &= |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^4 + \nabla \partial V(\mathbf{d}) : \nabla \mathbf{d} - |\nabla^2 \mathbf{d}|^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)f(\mathbf{d}) = \mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{e} |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 + \partial V(\mathbf{d}) \cdot \mathbf{e}.$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\partial_t - \Delta)A(x, t) \\
&= \frac{(\partial_t - \Delta)e(\mathbf{d})}{f^2} - \frac{2e(\mathbf{d})(\partial_t - \Delta)f}{f^3} + \frac{4\nabla e(\mathbf{d}) \cdot \nabla f}{f^3} - \frac{6e(\mathbf{d})|\nabla f|^2}{f^4} \\
&= \frac{|\nabla \mathbf{d}|^4 + \nabla \partial V(\mathbf{d}) : \nabla \mathbf{d} - |\nabla^2 \mathbf{d}|^2}{f^2} - \frac{|\nabla \mathbf{d}|^4(\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{e}) + |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \partial V(\mathbf{d}) \cdot \mathbf{e}}{f^3} \\
&\quad + \frac{4\nabla e(\mathbf{d}) \cdot \nabla f}{f^3} - \frac{6e(\mathbf{d})|\nabla f|^2}{f^4} \\
&= -\frac{\delta_0 |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^4}{f^3} + \frac{\nabla \partial V(\mathbf{d}) : \nabla \mathbf{d}}{f^2} - \frac{|\nabla^2 \mathbf{d}|^2}{f^2} - \frac{|\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \partial V(\mathbf{d}) \cdot \mathbf{e}}{f^3} \\
&\quad + \frac{4\nabla e(\mathbf{d}) \cdot \nabla f}{f^3} - \frac{6e(\mathbf{d})|\nabla f|^2}{f^4} \triangleq I_1 + I_2,
\end{aligned}$$

or simply

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)A(x, t) = I_1 + I_2, \quad (3.7)$$

where

$$I_1 = -\frac{|\nabla^2 \mathbf{d}|^2}{f^2} + \frac{4\nabla e(\mathbf{d}) \cdot \nabla f}{f^3} - \frac{6e(\mathbf{d})|\nabla f|^2}{f^4}, \quad (3.8a)$$

$$I_2 = -\frac{\delta_0 |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^4}{f^3} + \frac{\nabla \partial V(\mathbf{d}) : \nabla \mathbf{d}}{f^2} - \frac{|\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \partial V(\mathbf{d}) \cdot \mathbf{e}}{f^3}. \quad (3.8b)$$

It remains to treat  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= -\frac{|\nabla^2 \mathbf{d}|^2}{f^2} + \frac{2\nabla e(\mathbf{d}) \cdot \nabla f}{f^3} - \frac{2e(\mathbf{d})|\nabla f|^2}{f^4} + \frac{2\nabla e(\mathbf{d}) \cdot \nabla f}{f^3} - \frac{4e(\mathbf{d})|\nabla f|^2}{f^4} \\
&\leq -\frac{|\nabla^2 \mathbf{d}|^2}{f^2} + \frac{2|\nabla \mathbf{d}||\nabla^2 \mathbf{d}||\nabla f|}{f^3} - \frac{|\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2|\nabla f|^2}{f^4} + \frac{2\nabla A \cdot \nabla f}{f} \\
&= -\left(\frac{|\nabla^2 \mathbf{d}|}{f} - \frac{|\nabla \mathbf{d}||\nabla f|}{f^2}\right)^2 + \frac{2\nabla A \cdot \nabla f}{f} \leq \frac{2\nabla A \cdot \nabla f}{f}.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

To treat  $I_2$ , we employ (3.2) and deduce

$$\partial V(\mathbf{d}) \cdot \mathbf{e} = \lambda^2(\mu - \mu^3) \geq 0, \quad (3.10)$$

since  $\mu = \mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{e} \in [0, 1]$ . As  $\lambda = \lambda(t)$ , we have

$$\nabla \partial V(\mathbf{d}) : \nabla \mathbf{d} = \lambda^2 |\nabla \mu|^2 - \lambda^2 \mu^2 |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2. \quad (3.11)$$

So it follows from (3.11), (3.10) and  $|\nabla \mu| \leq |\nabla \mathbf{d}|$  that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= \frac{(\mu - \delta_0)\lambda^2 |\nabla \mu|^2 + (\delta_0 \mu - 1)\mu \lambda^2 |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 - \delta_0 |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^4}{f^3} \\
&\leq \frac{\delta_0(\mu^2 - 1)\lambda^2 |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 - \delta_0 |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^4}{f^3} \leq 0.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Now plugging (3.9) and (3.12) into (3.7) leads to

$$(\partial_t - \Delta)A(x, t) \leq \frac{2\nabla A \cdot \nabla f}{f}. \quad (3.13)$$

If the maximum of  $A(x, t)$  is achieved at  $(x_1, t_1) \in \Sigma = \partial\Omega \times (0, T)$ , then by the strong maximum principle,

$$\partial_\nu A(x_1, t_1) < 0.$$

On the other hand, since  $\partial\Omega$  is convex, it follows from [9, pp. 162] that

$$\partial_\nu |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma.$$

As a result

$$\partial_\nu A(x, t) = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\nu |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 |\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{e} - \delta_0|^{-2} + \frac{|\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2}{2} \partial_\nu |\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{e} - \delta_0|^{-2} \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma.$$

So we obtain a contradiction, and thus the maximum must be achieved on  $\Omega \times \{0\}$ :

$$A(x, t) \leq \sup_{x \in \Omega} \frac{|\nabla \mathbf{d}_0|^2}{2f^2(\mathbf{d}_0)} \leq \frac{1}{2(\epsilon_0 - \delta_0)^2} \sup_{x \in \Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{d}_0|^2.$$

This implies the desired result by choosing  $\delta_0 = \epsilon_0/2$ .  $\square$

With the aid of the above lemmas, we can give the proof of Proposition 3.1:

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* Since (3.1) is a semi-linear parabolic system, the existence and uniqueness of the local in time solution follow from standard theory (see e.g. [19, Chapter 15]): there exists  $T_0 > 0$  such that

$$\|\mathbf{d}\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, T_0), \mathbb{S}^2)} \leq C(T_0, \mathbf{d}_0, \lambda).$$

Applying Lemma 3.2 gives

$$\mu(x, t) = \mathbf{d}(x, t) \cdot \mathbf{e} \geq \epsilon_0 > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T_0). \quad (3.14)$$

In order to extend the solution to every  $T > 0$ , we need to bound  $\|\mathbf{d}\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\overline{Q})}$  in terms of  $\|\mathbf{d}_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})}$  up to a constant that is independent of  $T$ , and this is a consequence of Lemma 3.3. More precisely, the right hand side of (3.1) is bounded in  $L^\infty(\overline{Q})$  by a constant depending on  $\sup_{x \in \Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{d}_0|$ ,  $\epsilon_0$ ,  $\lambda$  and  $\Omega$  but not on  $T$ . So parabolic regularity theory implies  $\|\mathbf{d}\|_{C^{1+\alpha, 1/2+\alpha/2}(\overline{Q})}$  is bounded by a constant that is independent of  $T$ . Consequently the right hand side of (3.1) lies in  $C^{\alpha, \alpha/2}(\overline{Q})$ , and thus the Schauder's estimate implies

$$\|\mathbf{d}\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\overline{Q})} \leq C,$$

where  $C$  is independent of  $T$ . This completes the proof of existence of global in time classical solution to (3.1). The uniqueness of the solution follows from the standard energy method and (3.4) follows from Lemma 3.3.  $\square$

Now we turn to the estimate of the time derivative:

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2 : \Omega \times (0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$  be classical solutions of (3.1) and*

$$\psi = 1 - \mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \mathbf{d}_2, \quad \psi_i = 1 - \mathbf{d}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}, \quad w(t) = -\log(1 - t), \quad (3.15a)$$

$$\Phi = \sum_{i=1}^2 w \circ \psi_i = -\sum_{i=1}^2 \log(1 - \psi_i). \quad (3.15b)$$

Then the operator

$$L(f) \triangleq \nabla \cdot (e^{-\Phi} \nabla f) - e^{-\Phi} \partial_t f \quad (3.16)$$

satisfies

$$L(e^\Phi \psi) \geq 0. \quad (3.17)$$

*Proof.* Since  $|\mathbf{d}_i| = 1$ , the following formula will be frequently employed in the sequel:

$$2\psi = 2(1 - \mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \mathbf{d}_2) = |\mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{d}_2|^2. \quad (3.18)$$

We first prove the following inequality:

$$L(e^\Phi \psi) \geq \begin{cases} -\partial_t \psi + \Delta \psi, & x \in \psi^{-1}(0), \\ -\partial_t \psi + \Delta \psi - \frac{|\nabla \psi|^2}{2\psi} + \psi \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{-\partial_t \psi_i + \Delta \psi_i}{1 - \psi_i}, & x \in \Omega \setminus \psi^{-1}(0). \end{cases} \quad (3.19)$$

Direct computation shows

$$\begin{aligned} L(e^\Phi \psi) &= -\partial_t \Phi \psi - \partial_t \psi + \nabla \cdot (\nabla \Phi \psi + \nabla \psi) \\ &= (-\partial_t \Phi + \Delta \Phi) \psi + \nabla \Phi \cdot \nabla \psi - \partial_t \psi + \Delta \psi. \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

On  $\psi^{-1}(0)$ , it holds  $\mathbf{d}_1 = \mathbf{d}_2$  and thus

$$\nabla \psi = (\mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{d}_2) \cdot \nabla (\mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{d}_2) = 0 \quad \text{in } \psi^{-1}(0). \quad (3.21)$$

These together with (3.23) below and (3.2) imply

$$L(e^\Phi \psi) = -\partial_t \psi + \Delta \psi \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \psi^{-1}(0). \quad (3.22)$$

It remains to consider the case when  $x \in \Omega \setminus \psi^{-1}(0)$ . It follows from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the identity  $w'' = (w')^2$  that

$$\begin{aligned} &(-\partial_t \Phi + \Delta \Phi) \psi + \nabla \Phi \cdot \nabla \psi \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^2 [\psi(-\partial_t \psi_i + \Delta \psi_i) w' \circ \psi_i + \psi |\nabla \psi_i|^2 w'' \circ \psi_i + \nabla \psi_i \cdot \nabla \psi w' \circ \psi_i] \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[ \psi \left( \frac{-\partial_t \psi_i + \Delta \psi_i}{1 - \psi_i} + |\nabla \psi_i|^2 w'' \circ \psi_i \right) - \psi (w' \circ \psi_i)^2 |\nabla \psi_i|^2 - \frac{|\nabla \psi|^2}{4\psi} \right] \\ &= \psi \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{-\partial_t \psi_i + \Delta \psi_i}{1 - \psi_i} - \frac{|\nabla \psi|^2}{2\psi} \end{aligned}$$

This together with (3.20) implies (3.19).

To proceed, we shall compute  $-\partial_t \psi + \Delta \psi$  using the first equation in (3.1)

$$\begin{aligned} &-\partial_t \psi + \Delta \psi \\ &= (\partial_t \mathbf{d}_1 - \Delta \mathbf{d}_1) \cdot \mathbf{d}_2 + \mathbf{d}_1 \cdot (\partial_t \mathbf{d}_2 - \Delta \mathbf{d}_2) - 2\nabla \mathbf{d}_1 : \nabla \mathbf{d}_2 \\ &= (|\nabla \mathbf{d}_1|^2 + |\nabla \mathbf{d}_2|^2) \mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \mathbf{d}_2 + \partial V(\mathbf{d}_1) \cdot \mathbf{d}_2 + \partial V(\mathbf{d}_2) \cdot \mathbf{d}_1 - 2\nabla \mathbf{d}_1 : \nabla \mathbf{d}_2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

We also have

$$\psi \sum_{i=1}^2 |\nabla \mathbf{d}_i|^2 = (1 - \mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \mathbf{d}_2) (|\nabla \mathbf{d}_1|^2 + |\nabla \mathbf{d}_2|^2). \quad (3.24)$$

Adding up the above two formulae and using (3.18) yield:

$$\begin{aligned} -\partial_t \psi + \Delta \psi + \psi \sum_{i=1}^2 |\nabla \mathbf{d}_i|^2 &= \partial V(\mathbf{d}_1) \cdot \mathbf{d}_2 + \partial V(\mathbf{d}_2) \cdot \mathbf{d}_1 + |\nabla(\mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{d}_2)|^2 \\ &\geq \partial V(\mathbf{d}_1) \cdot \mathbf{d}_2 + \partial V(\mathbf{d}_2) \cdot \mathbf{d}_1 + \frac{|\nabla(\mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{d}_2)|^2}{4|\mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{d}_2|^2} \\ &= \partial V(\mathbf{d}_1) \cdot \mathbf{d}_2 + \partial V(\mathbf{d}_2) \cdot \mathbf{d}_1 + \frac{|\nabla \psi|^2}{2\psi}. \end{aligned}$$

By a similar calculation, we obtain

$$\psi \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{-\partial_t \psi_i + \Delta \psi_i}{1 - \psi_i} = \psi \sum_{i=1}^2 |\nabla \mathbf{d}_i|^2 + \psi \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\partial V(\mathbf{d}_i) \cdot \mathbf{e}}{\mathbf{d}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}}.$$

Adding up the above two inequalities and then using (3.2) lead to

$$\begin{aligned} & -\partial_t \psi + \Delta \psi - \frac{|\nabla \psi|^2}{2\psi} + \psi \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{-\partial_t \psi_i + \Delta \psi_i}{1 - \psi_i} \\ & \geq \partial V(\mathbf{d}_1) \cdot \mathbf{d}_2 + \partial V(\mathbf{d}_2) \cdot \mathbf{d}_1 + \psi \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\partial V(\mathbf{d}_i) \cdot \mathbf{e}}{\mathbf{d}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}} \\ & = \lambda^2 (\mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{d}_2)^2 - \lambda^2 (\mathbf{e} \cdot (\mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{d}_2))^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (3.19) leads to the desired result.  $\square$

The above lemma implies the estimate of the time derivative of (3.1).

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $\mathbf{d} \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\overline{Q})$  be a solution of (3.1) with*

$$\epsilon_1 \triangleq \inf_{x \in \Omega} \mathbf{d}(x, T_1) \cdot \mathbf{e} > 0, \quad (3.25)$$

for some  $T_1 \in (0, T)$ . Then for any  $T_2 \in (T_1, T)$ , the following inequality holds:

$$\sup_{\Omega \times [T_1, T_2]} |\partial_t \mathbf{d}(x, t)| \leq \epsilon_1^{-1} \sup_{\Omega} |\partial_t \mathbf{d}(x, T_1)|. \quad (3.26)$$

*Proof.* For any  $t_0 \in (T_1, T_2)$ , there exists  $h_0 > 0$  such that  $t_0 + h_0 < T_2$ . For any  $h \in (0, h_0)$ , the functions  $\mathbf{d}_1(x, t) \triangleq \mathbf{d}(x, t)$  and  $\mathbf{d}_2(x, t) \triangleq \mathbf{d}(x, t + h)$  are well defined on  $\Omega \times [T_1, t_0]$  and are both solutions to (3.1). The boundary condition of (3.1) implies

$$\sup_{\partial \Omega \times [T_1, t_0]} \partial_\nu (e^\Phi \psi(x, t)) = 0.$$

So (3.17) in Lemma 3.4 together with the maximum principle imply

$$\sup_{\Omega \times (T_1, t_0)} e^\Phi \psi(x, t) \leq \sup_{\Omega \times \{T_1\}} e^\Phi \psi(x, t). \quad (3.27)$$

Moreover Lemma 3.2 implies

$$0 < \epsilon_1^2 \leq e^{-\Phi} = (\mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \mathbf{e})(\mathbf{d}_2 \cdot \mathbf{e}) \leq 1.$$

Consequently,

$$\sup_{\Omega \times (T_1, t_0)} |\mathbf{d}(x, t + h) - \mathbf{d}(x, t)|^2 \leq \epsilon_1^{-2} \sup_{\Omega} |\mathbf{d}(x, T_1 + h) - \mathbf{d}(x, T_1)|^2.$$

Dividing the above estimate by  $h^2$  and taking  $h \rightarrow 0$  lead to the desired estimate since  $t_0$  is arbitrary.  $\square$

We end this section by studying the regularizing effect of (3.1) when  $\lambda(t) \equiv 0$ :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{d} - \Delta \mathbf{d} = |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \mathbf{d}, & \text{in } \Omega \times [0, T], \\ \partial_\nu \mathbf{d} = 0, & \text{on } \partial \Omega \times [0, T]. \end{cases} \quad (3.28)$$

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $\mathbf{d}$  be a classical solution of (3.28) with*

$$\|(\partial_t \mathbf{d}, \nabla \mathbf{d})\|_{L^\infty([0, T] \times \Omega)} \leq M, \quad (3.29)$$

then there exists a constant  $C = C(M, \Omega) > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{d}(\cdot, T_2) - \mathbf{e}\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C \left( \frac{1}{T_2 - T_1} + 1 \right) \|\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}\|_{L^\infty([T_1, T_2] \times \Omega)}, \quad \forall 0 \leq T_1 < T_2 \leq T. \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we can just work with the case when  $T_1 = 0, T_2 = T$ . We shall estimate the difference  $\bar{\mathbf{d}} \triangleq \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}$ , which fulfills

$$\partial_t \bar{\mathbf{d}} - \Delta \bar{\mathbf{d}} = |\nabla \bar{\mathbf{d}}|^2 (\bar{\mathbf{d}} + \mathbf{e}). \quad (3.31)$$

We first deduce from (3.29) that

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{d}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, T))} \leq \|\partial_t \mathbf{d}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, T))} + \| |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \mathbf{d} \|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, T))} \leq M + M^2. \quad (3.32)$$

This together with elliptic regularity leads to

$$\|\mathbf{d}\|_{L^\infty(0, T; W^{2, p}(\Omega))} \leq C(M, p), \quad \forall p > 3. \quad (3.33)$$

As a result, we obtain the following estimate of the nonlinear terms:

$$\| |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \mathbf{d} \|_{L^\infty(0, T; W^{1, p}(\Omega))} \leq C(M, p), \quad \forall p > 3. \quad (3.34)$$

Moreover, we infer from (3.33) and the Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation inequality that

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{d}}\|_{L^\infty(0, T; W^{1, p}(\Omega))} \leq C(M, p) \|\bar{\mathbf{d}}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}^{1/2}, \quad \forall p > 3. \quad (3.35)$$

To proceed, we write (3.31) in terms of the heat semigroup

$$\bar{\mathbf{d}}(\cdot, t) = e^{t\Delta} \bar{\mathbf{d}}(\cdot, 0) + \int_0^t e^{(t-\tau)\Delta} (|\nabla \bar{\mathbf{d}}|^2 (\bar{\mathbf{d}} + \mathbf{e}))(\cdot, \tau) d\tau. \quad (3.36)$$

The first term on the right hand side above can be estimated by Sobolev embedding and semi-group property

$$\|e^{t\Delta} \bar{\mathbf{d}}(\cdot, 0)\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)} \leq C \|e^{t\Delta} \bar{\mathbf{d}}(\cdot, 0)\|_{W^{2, 4}(\Omega)} \leq Ct^{-1} \|\bar{\mathbf{d}}|_{t=0}\|_{L^4(\Omega)}. \quad (3.37)$$

Regarding the second term on the right hand side of (3.36), we employ (2.24) and (3.35) to yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int_0^t e^{(t-\tau)\Delta} (|\nabla \bar{\mathbf{d}}|^2 (\bar{\mathbf{d}} + \mathbf{e}))(\cdot, \tau) d\tau \right\|_{C([0, T]; W^{1, \infty}(\Omega))} \\ & \leq \| |\nabla \bar{\mathbf{d}}|^2 (\bar{\mathbf{d}} + \mathbf{e}) \|_{L^p(\Omega \times (0, T))} \leq C(M, p) \|\bar{\mathbf{d}}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, T))}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

with  $p > 5$ . So we prove (3.30).  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We first observe that for any  $\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{S}^2$ , there exists  $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2 \in \mathbb{S}^2$  such that

$$\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{p}_1 > 0, \quad \mathbf{p}_1 \cdot \mathbf{p}_2 > 0, \quad \mathbf{p}_2 \cdot \mathbf{p} > 0. \quad (4.1)$$

Actually, we can simply choose  $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2$  which trisect the angle  $\theta \in [0, \pi]$  expanded by  $\mathbf{e}$  and  $\mathbf{p}$ . We shall show that for any initial state  $\mathbf{d}_0 \in C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}, \mathbb{S}^2)$  satisfying (1.5), there is a control of form (1.6) such that  $\mathbf{d}(\cdot, \frac{T}{4}) = \mathbf{e}$ . Once this special case is done, we can apply it on the interval  $[\frac{T}{4}, \frac{T}{2}]$  to have  $\mathbf{d}(\cdot, \frac{T}{2}) = \mathbf{p}_1$ . Then again on  $[\frac{T}{2}, \frac{3T}{4}]$ , we can achieve  $\mathbf{d}(\cdot, \frac{3T}{4}) = \mathbf{p}_2$  and finally  $\mathbf{d}(\cdot, T) = \mathbf{p}$ . This process is feasible due to the rotational invariance of (1.1). More precisely, if  $(\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{H})$  satisfies (1.1), so does  $(\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}, \mathcal{R}\mathbf{H})$  for every orthogonal matrix  $\mathcal{R}$ .

To show the controllability to  $\mathbf{e}$  in  $[0, \frac{T}{4}]$ , we denote  $T_0 = \frac{T}{24}$  and choose the control

$$\mathbf{H}(x, t) = \mathbf{g}(t) \triangleq \lambda(t)\mathbf{e}, \quad \forall t \in [0, 5T_0], \quad (4.2)$$

where  $\lambda(t) \in C^1([0, 5T_0])$  is non-negative so that

$$\lambda(t) = \begin{cases} \Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+ & \text{when } t \in [2T_0, 3T_0], \\ 0 & \text{when } t \in [0, T_0] \cup [4T_0, 5T_0]. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

By choosing the constant  $\Lambda$  sufficiently large, the initial data can be driven to a neighborhood of the ground state  $\mathbf{e}$  within  $[0, 5T_0]$  such that Proposition 2.6 can be applied for  $t \in [5T_0, 6T_0]$ .

More precisely, by the assumption (1.5) and Proposition 3.1, there exists a unique solution  $\mathbf{d} \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, 5T_0])$  to (3.1) with initial data  $\mathbf{d}_0$  such that

$$\sup_{\Omega \times [0, 5T_0]} |\nabla \mathbf{d}(x, t)| \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon_0} \sup_{x \in \Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{d}_0|, \quad (4.4a)$$

$$\mu(x, t) = \mathbf{d}(x, t) \cdot \mathbf{e} \geq \epsilon_0 > 0, \quad \forall (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, 5T_0]. \quad (4.4b)$$

By our choice of  $\lambda(t)$ , no control is applied in  $[0, T_0]$ . So Proposition 3.1 implies

$$\sup_{\Omega \times \{T_0\}} |\partial_t \mathbf{d}(x, t)| \leq C(\mathbf{d}_0). \quad (4.5)$$

Thanks to Proposition 3.5,  $\|\partial_t \mathbf{d}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$  will not increase in  $t$  due to the presence of the control (4.3) with a large  $\Lambda$ . So the combination of (4.5) and (4.4a) leads to

$$\sup_{\Omega \times [T_0, 5T_0]} (|\nabla \mathbf{d}(x, t)| + |\partial_t \mathbf{d}(x, t)|) \leq C(\mathbf{d}_0, \epsilon_0, \Omega), \quad (4.6)$$

where  $C(\cdot)$  is independent of  $\Lambda$ . Since no control is applied in  $[4T_0, 5T_0]$ , we employ Proposition 3.6 and deduce

$$\|\mathbf{d}(\cdot, 5T_0) - \mathbf{e}\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)} \leq C(\mathbf{d}_0, \epsilon_0, \Omega) T_0^{-1} \|\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}\|_{L^\infty([4T_0, 5T_0] \times \Omega)}. \quad (4.7)$$

On the other hand, it follows from (4.4b) and (4.3) that  $\mu$  satisfies

$$\partial_t \mu - \Delta \mu = |\nabla \mathbf{d}|^2 \mu + \Lambda^2 (\mu - \mu^3), \quad \text{for } t \in [2T_0, 3T_0]. \quad (4.8)$$

If we denote  $\phi = 1 - \mu$ , since  $\mu \in [\epsilon_0, 1]$  with  $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\partial_t \phi - \Delta \phi \leq -\Lambda^2 (1 - \phi) \phi (2 - \phi) \leq -\Lambda^2 \epsilon_0 \phi, \quad \text{for } t \in [2T_0, 3T_0]. \quad (4.9)$$

Applying the comparison principle yields the decay

$$1 - \mathbf{d}(x, t) \cdot \mathbf{e} = \phi(x, t) \leq e^{-\Lambda^2 \epsilon_0 (t - 2T_0)}, \quad \forall t \in [2T_0, 3T_0].$$

For any  $T_0 > 0$  and  $\Lambda > 0$ , we set

$$\epsilon_4 = e^{-\Lambda^2 \epsilon_0 T_0}. \quad (4.10)$$

Then there holds

$$0 \leq 1 - \mathbf{d}(x, 3T_0) \cdot \mathbf{e} \leq \epsilon_4, \quad \forall x \in \Omega. \quad (4.11)$$

For  $t \in [3T_0, 5T_0]$ , instead of having (4.9), we have  $\partial_t \phi - \Delta \phi \leq 0$ , and thus the maximum principle implies

$$0 \leq 1 - \mathbf{d}(x, t) \cdot \mathbf{e} \leq \sup_{\Omega} (1 - \mathbf{d}(x, 3T_0) \cdot \mathbf{e}) \leq \epsilon_4, \quad \forall t \in [3T_0, 5T_0]. \quad (4.12)$$

This combined with (4.7) leads to

$$\|\mathbf{d}(\cdot, 5T_0) - \mathbf{e}\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)} \leq C(\mathbf{d}_0, \epsilon_0, \Omega) T_0^{-1} \epsilon_4. \quad (4.13)$$

So for any  $T_0 \in (0, 1)$ , by choosing a sufficiently large  $\Lambda$  in (4.10), we shall have  $\epsilon_4$  being sufficiently small so that  $\mathbf{v}_0(x) \triangleq \Psi^{-1}(\mathbf{d}(x, 5T_0))$  will satisfy (2.27) where  $\Psi$  is the stereographic projection defined by (2.1). Then we consider the control system (2.19) on  $[5T_0, 6T_0]$ . This is the second stage of the control process, where we can apply Proposition 2.6 to obtain a control  $\mathbf{f} \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (5T_0, 6T_0))$  such that  $\mathbf{v}(\cdot, 6T_0) \equiv 0$ . According to Proposition 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we have  $\mathbf{d} = \Psi(\mathbf{v})$ ,  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v})$  satisfying (1.1) on  $\Omega \times (5T_0, 6T_0)$ , and  $\mathbf{d}(\cdot, 6T_0) = \mathbf{e}$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Professor Xu Zhang for helpful discussions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] C. Cavaterra, E. Rocca, and H. Wu. Optimal boundary control of a simplified Ericksen-Leslie system for nematic liquid crystal flows in 2D. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 224(3):1037–1086, 2017.
- [2] Q. Chen. Maximum principles, uniqueness and existence for harmonic maps with potential and Landau-Lifshitz equations. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 8(2):91–107, 1999.
- [3] E. B. Davies. *Heat kernels and spectral theory*, volume 92 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [4] R. Denk, M. Hieber, and J. Prüss. Optimal  $L^p$ - $L^q$ -estimates for parabolic boundary value problems with inhomogeneous data. *Math. Z.*, 257(1):193–224, 2007.
- [5] A. Doubova, E. Fernández-Cara, M. González-Burgos, and E. Zuazua. On the controllability of parabolic systems with a nonlinear term involving the state and the gradient. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 41(3):798–819, 2002.
- [6] E. Fernández-Cara, M. González-Burgos, S. Guerrero, and J.-P. Puel. Exact controllability to the trajectories of the heat equation with Fourier boundary conditions: the semilinear case. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 12(3):466–483, 2006.
- [7] E. Fernández-Cara and S. Guerrero. Global Carleman inequalities for parabolic systems and applications to controllability. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 45(4):1399–1446, 2006.
- [8] A. Granas and J. Dugundji. *Fixed point theory*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.
- [9] R. S. Hamilton. *Harmonic maps of manifolds with boundary*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 471. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1975.
- [10] R. Hardt, D. Kinderlehrer, and F.-H. Lin. Existence and partial regularity of static liquid crystal configurations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 105(4):547–570, 1986.
- [11] W. Jäger and H. Kaul. Uniqueness and stability of harmonic maps and their Jacobi fields. *manuscripta mathematica*, 28(1-3):269–291, 1979.
- [12] P. Li and S.-T. Yau. On the parabolic kernel of the Schrödinger operator. *Acta Math.*, 156(3-4):153–201, 1986.
- [13] F. Lin, J. Lin, and C. Wang. Liquid crystal flows in two dimensions. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 197(1):297–336, 2010.
- [14] F. Lin and X.-B. Pan. Magnetic field-induced instabilities in liquid crystals. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 38(5):1588–1612, 2007.
- [15] F. Lin and C. Wang. *The analysis of harmonic maps and their heat flows*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2008.
- [16] F. Lin and C. Wang. Global existence of weak solutions of the nematic liquid crystal flow in dimension three. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 69(8):1532–1571, 2016.
- [17] W. Rudin. *Functional analysis*. International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics. McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, second edition, 1991.
- [18] J. Simon. Compact sets in the space  $L^p(0, T; B)$ . *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 146:65–96, 1987.
- [19] M. E. Taylor. *Partial differential equations III. Nonlinear equations*, volume 117 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, New York, second edition, 2011.

NYU SHANGHAI, 1555 CENTURY AVENUE, SHANGHAI 200122, CHINA, AND NYU-ECNU INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AT NYU SHANGHAI, 3663 ZHONGSHAN ROAD NORTH, SHANGHAI, 200062, CHINA  
*E-mail address:* y167@nyu.edu