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ABSTRACT. Shell models of turbulence are representation of turbulence equations in Fourier domain. Various shell models along with numerical simulations have been studied earlier. One of the most suitable shell model of turbulence is so called sabra shell model. The existence, uniqueness and regularity property of this model are extensively studied in [18]. In this paper we have addressed stabilization problems related to sabra shell model of turbulence. We have studied internal stabilization via finite dimensional controller. Moreover we have also studied optimal robust control problem by solving an infinite time horizon max-min control problem. We first prove the $H^\infty$ stabilization of the linearized system and characterize it in terms of a feedback operator by solving an algebraic ricatti equation. Finally we show that the control will asymptotically stabilize the nonlinear system.

1. INTRODUCTION

Mathematical modeling of turbulence is very complicated. Various theories and models are proposed in literature for example [2], [32], [25], [28]. Turbulent flows show large interactions at local levels/nodes. Hence it is suitable to model them in frequency domain or commonly known as Fourier domain. Shell models of turbulence are simplified caricatures of equations of fluid mechanics in wave-vector representation. They exhibit anomalous scaling and local non-linear interactions in wave number space.

Shell models are well known as they retain certain features of Navier Stokes Equations. The spectral form of Navier Stokes Equations motivated people to study shell models. But, unlike spectral model of Navier Stokes Equations, shell models contain local interaction between the modes, that is interaction in the short range which is important in modeling turbulent phenomena. Several shell models have been proposed in literature. The form of the governing equations is derived by the necessity that the helicity and energy are conserved as in the case of Navier Stokes Equations. The most popular and well studied shell model was proposed...
by Gledzer and was investigated numerically by Yamada and Okhitani, which is referred as the Gledzer-Okhitani-Yamada or GOY model in short \cite{27}, \cite{34}. The numerical experiments performed by them showed that the model exhibits an enstrophy cascade and chaotic dynamics. This garnered lot of interest in the study of shell models and many papers investigating shell models have been published since then. For more details about the shell models, we refer to \cite{22}. In this work we would like to study stablization of one such widely accepted shell model of turbulence known as sabra shell model via finite dimensional control. Moreover we also want to study corresponding $H^\infty$ control problem.

1.1. Spectral form of NSE and shell model. The spectral form of Navier Stokes Equations is a starting point of shell models. Consider the incompressible Navier Stokes Equation which is given by

$$\frac{du}{dt} + (u \cdot \nabla)u = -\nabla p + \nu \Delta u + f$$

with the continuity equation

$$\text{div } u = 0.$$ 

in the domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ where $d = 2$ or 3. Here, $u$ denotes the velocity of the fluid, $p$ is the pressure and $f$ is the forcing term. To rewrite Navier Stokes Equations in spectral form we take Fourier transform of equation to get,

$$\frac{d}{dt} u_j(n) = -i \left( \frac{2\pi}{L} \right) n_j \sum_{n'} \left( \delta_{il} - \frac{n_i n'_l}{n^2} \right) u_i(n') u_l(n - n') - \nu k^2 u_j(n) + f_j(n)$$

where $n$ and $n'$ are vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$u_j(k) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \exp^{-ikx} u_j(x) dx$$

and the wave vectors $k(n)$ are given by $k(n) = \frac{2\pi n}{L}$ [see \cite{22}].

To describe the shell model, the spectral spaces are divided into concentric spheres of exponentially growing radius,

$$k_n = k_0 \lambda^n$$

with fixed $\lambda > 1$ and $k_0 > 0$. The one dimensional wave numbers are denoted by $k_n$'s such that $k_n-1 < |k| < k_n$. The set of wave numbers contained in the $n^{th}$ sphere is called $n^{th}$ shell and $\lambda$ is called shell spacing parameter. The spectral velocity $u_n$ is a kind of mean velocity, of the complex Fourier coefficients of the velocity in the $n^{th}$ shell. Various shell models are studied in the literature in which different types of interactions between velocities in adjacent shells are considered.

In this work we consider a model known as sabra shell model, introduced in \cite{31}. In the sabra shell model the nonlinear part of the spectral Navier - Stokes Equation \cite{1} will not only conserve energy and helicity (in the 3D case) globally but also locally that is in each triad. To derive the form of sabra shell model, the usual construction of local interactions in $k$-space, inviscid conservation of energy and fulfillment of Liouville's theorem are used apart from the demand that the momenta involved in the triad interactions must add up to zero. For more details one can refer to Chapter 3 of \cite{22}. The equations of motion for the sabra shell model are given by

$$\frac{d}{dt} u_n = i(ak_{n+1} u_{n+2} u_{n+1}^* + bk_n u_{n+1} u_{n-1}^* - ck_{n-1} u_{n-1} u_{n-2}) - \nu k^2 u_n + f_n$$
for \( n = 1, 2, 3, \cdots \), with the convention that \( u_{-1} = u_0 = 0 \). The kinematic viscosity is represented by \( \nu > 0 \) and \( f_n \)'s are the Fourier components of the forcing term. The nonlinear term defines the nonlinear interaction between the nearest nodes. The constants \( a, b, c \) are chosen such that \( a + b + c = 0 \).

The sabra shell model of turbulence describes the evolution of complex Fourier components of a scalar velocity field denoted by \( u_n \). The associated one-dimensional wavenumbers are denoted by \( k_n \), where the discrete index \( n \) is referred to as the shell index. The equations of motion for the sabra shell model are given by

\[
\frac{d u_n}{d t} = i(ak_{n+1}u_{n+2}^* + bk_n u_{n+1}^* u_{n-1}^* - c k_{n-1} u_{n-1} u_{n-2}) - \nu k_n^2 u_n + f_n
\]

for \( n = 1, 2, 3, \cdots \), with the convention that \( u_{-1} = u_0 = 0 \). The wave numbers \( k_n \) are defined as:

\[ k_n = k_0 \lambda^n. \]

The kinematic viscosity is represented by \( \nu > 0 \) and \( f_n \)'s are the Fourier components of the forcing term. The nonlinear term defines the nonlinear interaction between the nearest nodes. The constants \( a, b, c \) are chosen such that \( a + b + c = 0 \).

In [18], Constantin, Levant and Titi have studied this model analytically and have obtained existence and uniqueness of the strong and weak solutions for the equations in appropriate spaces. In [19], the same authors have studied the global existence of weak solutions of the inviscid sabra shell model and have shown that these solutions are unique for some short interval of time. Moreover, they give a Beal-Kato-Majda type criterion for the blowup of solutions of the inviscid sabra shell model and show the global regularity of the solutions in the two-dimensional parameters regime. Control problems associated with turbulence equations in general and shell models in particular, have not been studied widely. To our knowledge, there were no known results for the control problems associated with shell models of turbulence until in [15], we have studied optimal control problems and invariant subspaces for the system. Stabilization results for shell model are completely open, however stabilization via feedback controller for abstract nonlinear parabolic system and Navier-Stokes equations is well studied in literature. This motivates to study the stabilization problem for sabra shell model of turbulence.

Stabilization results for the nonlinear parabolic partial differential equations have been actively studied for the past two decades. It can be studied by finite dimensional or infinite dimensional controller. The stabilization problem for Navier-Stokes equations have been studied for the case of control acting as a distributed parameter using infinite dimensional controller in [4], [11] and using finite dimensional controllers in [10], [3], [5]. Moreover, boundary stabilization of fluid flow problems have been extensively studied in [26], [40], [41], [36] using infinite dimensional feedback controller. Following the works of [10], [3], [5], our aim is to design a finite dimensional controller in the feedback form which will exponentially stabilize sabra shell model of turbulence. The novelty of the work lies in finding finite dimensional controller which in the particular case of shell model says that only finitely many modes will suffice to stabilize the system.

Robust stabilization using frequency domain approach has been introduced in [44] for a finite dimensional system and also discussed in [24], [20]. The robust stabilization using state space approach for finite-dimensional control system are detailed in [23] and for infinite dimensional system is developed in [38], [8], [12]. The \( H^\infty \) stabilization has been studied in [14], [12], [16], [33] by taking internal
control for abstract parabolic systems and for Navier Stokes’ equations in [9]. In [21] authors study the $H^\infty$ boundary stabilization for Navier-Stokes equations. In the current work we extend results of [10] and [9] for H infinity stabilization of sabra shell model of turbulence.

The paper is organized as follows: We discuss the functional setting of the problem, important properties of the operators involved and the existence result from [18] in the next section. We are reiterating few of the properties and important theorems from [18] and [19]. In section 3, we first prove existence of solution for steady state equation corresponding to sabra shell model and later part is devoted to prove internal stabilization of sabra shell model via finite dimensional feedback controller. In section 4 we study the robust stabilization of the model. For, we first consider linearised system and prove robust stabilization of it. Further we prove for nonlinear system, results hold provided initial data and disturbance are small enough. We conclude the paper by summarizing our results and list few interesting problems which can be studied further.

2. Functional setting

In this section we consider the functional framework considered in [18] so that equation (4) can be written in operator form in infinite dimensional Hilbert space. We look at $\{u_n\}$ as an element of $H = l^2(\mathbb{C})$ and rewrite the equation (4) in the following functional form by appropriately defining operators $A$ and $B$,

$$\frac{du}{dt} + \nu Au + B(u, u) = f, \quad u(0) = u^0.$$  

For defining operators $A$ and $B$ we introduce certain functional spaces below. For every $u, v \in H$ the scalar product $(\cdot, \cdot)$ and the corresponding norm $|\cdot|$ are defined as,

$$(u, v) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n v_n^*, \quad |u| = \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |u_n|^2\right)^{1/2}.$$  

Let $(\phi_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be the standard canonical orthonormal basis of $H$. The linear operator $A : D(A) \to H$ is defined through its action on the elements of the canonical basis of $H$ as

$$A\phi_j = k_j^2\phi_j,$$

where the eigenvalues $k_j^2$ satisfy relation (2). The domain of $A$ contains all those elements of $H$ for which $|Au|$ is finite. It is denoted by $D(A)$ and is a dense subset of $H$. Moreover, it is a Hilbert space when equipped with graph norm

$$\|u\|_{D(A)} = |Au| \quad \forall u \in D(A).$$

The bilinear operator $B(u, v)$ will be defined in the following way. Let $u, v \in H$ be of the form $u = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n \phi_n$ and $v = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} v_n \phi_n$. Then,

$$B(u, v) = -i \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(ak_{n+1}u_{n+2}v_n v_{n+1}^* + bk_n v_{n+1}v_n^* + ak_{n-1}u_{n-1}v_n v_{n-2} + bk_{n-1}v_{n-1}v_n v_{n-2}\right)\phi_n.$$  

With the assumption $u^0 = u_{-1} = v_0 = v_{-1} = 0$ and together with the energy conservation condition $a + b + c = 0$, we can simplify and rewrite $B(u, v)$ as

$$B(u, u) = -i \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(ak_{n+1}u_{n+2}u_n^* v_n + bk_n u_{n+1}u_n^* v_{n-1} - ck_{n-1}u_{n-1}u_{n-2}\right)\phi_n.$$
With above definitions of $A$ and $B$, (1) can be written in the form

$$\frac{du}{dt} + \nu Au + B(u, u) = f, \quad u(0) = u^0.$$ 

We now give some properties of $A$ and $B$.

Clearly, $A$ is positive definite, diagonal operator. Since $A$ is a positive definite operator, the powers of $A$ can be defined for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$. For $u = (u_1, u_2, ...) \in H$, define $A^s u = (k_1^{2s} u_1, k_2^{2s} u_2, ...)$. Furthermore we define the spaces

$$V_s := D(A^{\hat{s}}) = \{ u = (u_1, u_2, ...) : \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} k_j^{2s} |u_j|^2 < \infty \}$$

which are Hilbert spaces equipped with the following scalar product and norm,

$$(u, v)_s = (A^{s/2} u, A^{s/2} v) \forall u, v \in V_s, \quad \| u \| = (u, u)_s \forall u \in V_s.$$ 

Using above definition of the norm we can show that $V_s \subset V_0 = H \subset V_{-s} \forall s > 0$. Moreover, it can be shown that the dual space of $V_s$ is given by $V_{-s}$. Domain of $A^{1/2}$ is denoted by $V$ and is equipped with scalar product $((u, v)) = (A^{1/2} u, A^{1/2} v) \forall u, v \in D(A^{1/2})$. Thus we get the inclusion

$$V \subset H = H' \subset V',$$

where $V'$, the dual space of $V$ which is identified with $D(A^{-1/2})$. The norm in $V$ is denoted by $\| \cdot \|$. We denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the action of the functionals from $V'$ on the elements of $V$. Hence for every $u \in V$, the $H$ scalar product of $f \in H$ and $u \in V$ is same as the action of $f$ on $u$ as a functional in $V'$.

$$\langle f, u \rangle_V = (f, u)_H \forall f \in H, \forall u \in V.$$ 

So for every $u \in D(A)$ and for every $v \in V$, we have $((u, v)) = (Au, v) = (Au, v)$. Since $D(A)$ is dense in $V$ we can extend the definition of the operator $A : V \rightarrow V'$ in such a way that $\langle Au, v \rangle = ((u, v)) \forall u, v \in V$.

In particular it follows that

$$\| Au \|_{V'} = \| u \|_V \forall u \in V.$$

**Theorem 2.1. (Properties of bilinear operator $B$)**

1. $B : H \times V \rightarrow H$ and $B : V \times H \rightarrow H$ are bounded, bilinear operators. Specifically
   (a) $|B(u, v)| \leq C_1 \| u \| \| v \| \forall u \in H, v \in V$
   (b) $|B(u, v)| \leq C_2 \| v \| \| u \| \forall u \in V, v \in H$

   where
   $C_1 = (|a|\lambda^{-1} + |b|\lambda^{-1} + 1)$
   $C_2 = (2|a| + 2\lambda|b|)$.

2. $B : H \times H \rightarrow V'$ is a bounded bilinear operator and
   $\| B(u, v) \|_{V'} \leq C_1 \| u \| \| v \| \forall u, v \in H$.

3. $B : H \times D(A) \rightarrow V$ is a bounded bilinear operator and for every $u \in H$ and $v \in D(A)$
   $\| B(u, v) \| \leq C_3 \| u \| \| Av \|$.
\[ C_3 = (|a| (λ^3 + λ^{-3}) + |b| (λ + λ^{-2})). \]

(4) For every \( u \in H \) and \( v \in V \), \( \text{Re}(B(u,v),v) = 0 \).

(5) Let \( u,v,w \in V \). Denote \( b(u,v,w) = \langle B(u,v),w \rangle \). Then

(a) \( b(u,v,w) = -b(v,u,w) \)
(b) \( b(v,u,w) = -b(v,w,u) \).
(c) \( b(u,v,v) = 0 \).

(6) Let us denote \( B(u) = B(u,u) \). Then the map \( B : V \rightarrow V' \) which takes \( u \mapsto B(u) \) is Gateaux differentiable. Moreover, for each \( u \in V \) the Gateaux derivative of \( B \) in the direction of \( v \in V \) is denoted by \( B'(u)v : V \rightarrow V' \) and is given by

\[ B'(u)v = B(u,v) + B(v,u), \quad \forall v \in V, \]

and \( \langle B'(u)v,w \rangle_{(V',V)} = b(u,v,w) + b(v,u,w) \quad \forall u,v,w \in V. \)

(7) Let \( B'(u)^* \) denote the adjoint of \( B'(u) \). Therefore for each \( v \in V \), we have

\[ \langle B'(u)^*v,w \rangle_{(V,V')} = \langle v,B'(u)v \rangle_{(V',V')} \quad \forall w \in V. \]

Hence, \( B'(u)^*w : V \rightarrow V' \) is given by

\[ B'(u)^*w = -B(u,w) - B(w,u) \quad \forall w \in V. \]


**Theorem 2.2.** Let \( f \in L^2(0,T;V') \) and \( u^0 \in H \). Then there exists a unique weak solution \( u \in L^\infty([0,T],H) \cap L^2([0,T],V) \) to (5). Moreover the weak solution \( u \in C((0,T],H) \).

**Theorem 2.3.** Let \( f \in L^\infty([0,T],H) \) and \( u^0 \in V \). Then there exists a unique strong solution \( u \in C([0,T],V) \cap L^2([0,T],D(A)) \) to (5).

3. **INTERNAL STABILIZATION**

Consider the controlled sabra shell model of turbulence

\[ \frac{du}{dt} + \nu Au + Bu = f + B_1u, \quad u(0) = u^0, \]

where \( A, B \) are as defined in the previous section and \( B_1 \in L(H,H) \) and \( U \) is the control variable. Further we have \( A \) and \( B \) satisfy the following properties,

**Assumption 3.1.**

1. \(-A \) generates a \( C_0\)-semigroup on \( H \).
2. \( B \) is Gateaux differentiable on \( D(A) \), i.e.,

\[ B'(u)z = \lim_{\lambda \to 0} \frac{B(u + \lambda z) - B(u)}{\lambda} \]

exist in \( H \) for all \( u, z \in D(A) \). [see 7 of Theorem (2.1)]
Now we will study the internal stabilization of (7) via finite dimensional feedback controller. For that let us consider the steady state equation given by
\begin{equation}
\nu A u_e + B(u_e, u_e) = f. \tag{8}
\end{equation}
We prove the following existence theorem of the steady state system (8).

**Theorem 3.2.** Let $f \in V'$. Then there exists a weak solution $u_e \in V$ for the steady state system (8) with the weak formulation
\begin{equation}
\nu \langle Au_e, v \rangle + \langle B(u_e, u_e), v \rangle = \langle f, v \rangle. \tag{9}
\end{equation}
for all $v \in V$.

Moreover if we take $f \in H$, then $u_e \in D(A)$.

**Proof.** The proof follows as in the case of steady state Navier-Stokes equations by using Galerkin approximation technique, see [39]. We construct an approximate solution of (8) and then pass to the limit.

Let $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be the eigen functions of the operator $A$, as a Galerkin basis of $V$. Let us take the $m$-dimensional subspace $V_m$ as the span of $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^{m}$. Consider the orthogonal projector of $V_m$ in $H$ as $P_m = P \nu$. Then we can write $u^m_e = P_m u_e$ in the form
\begin{equation}
u^m_e = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \alpha_j e_j,
\end{equation}
which satisfies the following $m$-dimensional ordinary differential equation
\begin{equation}
\nu^m_e = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \alpha_j e_j, \tag{10}
\end{equation}

The existence of solution to (10) will follow from the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.3** ([39], Lemma 1.4). Let $X$ be a finite dimensional Hilbert space with scalar product $[,]$ and norm $[,]$ and let $T$ be a continuous mapping $X$ into itself such that
\begin{equation}
|T(\xi), \xi| > 0 \text{ for } |\xi| = k > 0.
\end{equation}
Then there exists $\xi \in X$, $|\xi| \leq k$, such that
\begin{equation}
T(\xi) = 0.
\end{equation}
In our problem let us take $X = V_m$ and $T$ defined as
\begin{equation}
|T(u^m_e), u^m_e| = \nu A^{1/2} u^m_e, A^{1/2} u^m_e + \langle P_m B(u^m_e, u^m_e), v \rangle - \langle P_m f, v \rangle.
\end{equation}

Therefore,
\begin{align*}
|T(u^m_e), u^m_e| &= \nu |A^{1/2} u^m_e|^2 + \langle P_m B(u^m_e, u^m_e), u^m_e \rangle - \langle P_m f, u^m_e \rangle \\
&\geq \nu \|u^m_e\|^2 - \|f\|_V \|u^m_e\| \\
&\geq \|u^m_e\| (\nu \|u^m_e\| - \|f\|_V).
\end{align*}
So if we choose $k = \|u^m_e\| > \frac{1}{\nu} \|f\|_V$, we will get $|T(u_e), u^m_e| > 0$.

Thus by the Lemma (3.3), we prove that there exists a solution of the Galerkin approximated system (10). Now let us take $v = u^m_e$ in (10) to get
\begin{align*}
\nu \|u^m_e\|^2 &\leq \frac{\nu}{2} \|f\|_V^2 + \frac{1}{2
\nu} \|u^m_e\|^2 \\
\|u^m_e\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{\nu^2} \|f\|_V^2.
\end{align*}
Since \( u^m_e \) is uniformly bounded in \( V \), using Banach-Alaoglu theorem, we can extract a subsequence, still denoted by \( u^m_e \) such that
\[
(11) \quad u^m_e \rightharpoonup u_e \text{ in } V,
\]
and by using compact embedding of \( V \) in \( H \) we get
\[
(12) \quad u^m_e \to u_e \text{ in } H.
\]

Now we have to show that \( u_e \) solves the weak formulation (9). By using (11) we get \( \langle Au^m_e, v \rangle \to \langle Au_e, v \rangle, \ \forall v\in V \).

To show \( \langle P_m B(u^m_e, u^m_e), v \rangle \to \langle P_m B(u_e, u_e), v \rangle \), let us denote \( P'_m = (I - P_m) \).

We have
\[
|\langle P_m B(u^m_e, u^m_e), v \rangle - \langle P_m B(u_e, u_e), v \rangle| = | - i \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} (ak_{n+1} u_{e,n+2} u^*_{e,n+2} v_n + bk_{n+1} u_{e,n} u^*_{e,n} v_n - ck_{n} u_{e,n-1} u_{e,n-1} u^*_{e,n-1} v_n) \phi_n |
\]
\[
\leq \|P'_m v\| \|P'_m u_e\|^2 \leq \|v\| \|u_e - P_m u_e\|^2 \to 0.
\]

Thus we have convergence of each term in (9) which implies \( u^e \) satisfies weak formulation (9).

Now if we take \( f \in H \). By taking \( v \) as \( Au_e \) in (9) we can derive
\[
\nu|Au_e|^2 = -b(u_e, u_e, Au_e) + \langle f, Au_e \rangle
\]
\[
\leq C_1 \|u_e\|\|u_e\|\|Au_e\| + |f|\|Au_e\|
\]
\[
\leq \frac{\nu}{4} |Au_e|^2 + \frac{2C_1^2}{\nu} \|u_e\|^2 |u_e|^2 + \frac{\nu}{4} |Au_e|^2 + \frac{2}{\nu} |f|^2
\]

Therefore we get
\[
|Au_e|^2 \leq \frac{4C_1^2}{\nu^2} \|u_e\|^2 |u_e|^2 + \frac{4}{\nu^2} |f|^2 < \infty.
\]

For the uniqueness let us define \( \tilde{u} = u^1_e - u^2_e \), where \( u^1_e \) and \( u^2_e \) are the solution of (9). So \( \tilde{u} \) satisfies
\[
(13) \quad \nu A\tilde{u} + B(u^1_e, u^1_e) - B(u^2_e, u^2_e) = 0.
\]

Now taking inner product of (13) with \( \tilde{u} \) we get
\[
\nu||\tilde{u}||^2 + b(u^1_e, u^1_e, \tilde{u}) + b(u^2_e, u^2_e, \tilde{u}) = 0
\]
\[
\nu||\tilde{u}||^2 + b(u^1_e, \tilde{u}, \tilde{u}) + b(u, u^2_e, \tilde{u}) = 0
\]
\[
\nu||\tilde{u}||^2 + b(u, u^2_e, \tilde{u}) = 0.
\]

For any solution of (9) by taking duality with \( u_e \) we get
\[
\|u_e\| \leq \frac{1}{\nu} \|f\|_{V'},
\]
which implies
\[
\nu||\tilde{u}||^2 \leq C_1 \|u^2_e\||\tilde{u}\|^2
\]
\[
(\nu^2 - C_1 \|f\|_{V'})||\tilde{u}\|^2 \leq 0.
\]

So we can conclude that if \( \nu^2 > C_1 \|f\|_{V'} \), then the stationary solution is unique. \( \square \)
Now let us linearize the system (7) around the solution $u_\epsilon$ of steady state system. The linearized system is given by

$$
\frac{du}{dt} + Au = B_1U, \quad u(0) = u^0.
$$

Here for each $u \in D(A)$, the operator

$$
\mathcal{A} = A + B'(u_\epsilon), \quad \text{with } D(A) = D(A)
$$

is closed, densely defined and $-\mathcal{A}$ generates a $C_0$-semigroup on $H$.

**Lemma 3.4.** $-\mathcal{A}$ generates a $C_0$-analytic semigroup and the resolvant $(\lambda I - \mathcal{A})^{-1}$ of the operator $\mathcal{A}$ is compact in $H$.

**Proof.** Since $\mathcal{A}$ is a densely defined linear operator, so from Hille-Yosida Theorem (see Theorem 1.4, [43]) we can say that $-\mathcal{A}$ generates a $C_0$-analytic semigroup and the resolvant $(\lambda I - \mathcal{A})^{-1}$ of the operator $\mathcal{A}$ is compact in $H$. \hfill $\Box$

Therefore by Fredholm-Riesz Theorem, $\mathcal{A}$ has a countable set of eigenvalues $\lambda_j$ and corresponding eigenvectors $\varphi_j$, i.e.

$$
\mathcal{A}\varphi_j = \lambda_j \varphi_j, \quad j = 1, 2, \cdots.
$$

We know $Au = Au + B'(u_e)u = Au + B(u, u_e) + B(u_e, u)$ where the linear operator $A : D(A) \to H$ is defined through its action on the elements of the canonical basis of $H$ as

$$
A\phi_j = k_j^2 \phi_j
$$

where the eigenvalues $k_j^2$ satisfy relation (2).

For $u, u_e \in H$ of the form $u = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n \phi_n$ and $u_e = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} v_n \phi_n$, the bilinear operator $B(u, u_e)$ is defined as

$$
B(u, u_e) = -i \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (ak_{n+1}v_{n+2}u_n^* + bk_nv_{n+1}u_{n-1}^* + ak_{n-1}u_{n-1}v_{n-2} + bk_{n-1}v_{n-1}u_{n-2})\phi_n,
$$

with the assumption $u_0 = u_{-1} = v_0 = v_{-1} = 0$.

Therefore it can be seen easily that the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}$ are given by

$$
\lambda_j = k_j^2 - i(ak_{n+1}v_{n+2}u_n^* + bk_nv_{n+1}u_{n-1}^* + ak_{n-1}u_{n-1}v_{n-2} + bk_{n-1}v_{n-1}u_{n-2})
$$

(16)

$$
- i(ak_{n+1}u_{n+2}v_n^* + bk_{n+1}u_{n+1}v_{n-1}^* + ak_{n-1}v_{n-1}u_{n-2} + bk_{n-1}v_{n-1}u_{n-2}).
$$

Observe that for each $j = 1, 2, \cdots$, the $k_j^2$ are distinct and hence $\lambda_j$ are distinct too and $\sigma(A)$ is semisimple. Moreover we denote the distinct eigenvectors $\phi_j$ corresponding to $\lambda_j$ as $\varphi_j$.

Let $\mathcal{A}^*$ be the dual operator of $\mathcal{A}$. The eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}^*$ are $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$. As before $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ are distinct and the corresponding eigenvectors are

$$
\mathcal{A}^*\varphi_j^* = \lambda_j \varphi_j^*, \quad j = 1, 2, \cdots.
$$

Since $\lambda_j$ are distinct, for a given $\beta > 0$, there exist only finite number of eigenvalues such that

$$
\cdots > Re\lambda_{N+1} > \beta > Re\lambda_N \geq \cdots \geq Re\lambda_2 \leq Re\lambda_1.
$$

(17)

Thus above discussion leads to following proposition.
Proposition 3.5. Since the spectrum $\sigma(A)$ is semisimple, so there exist a biorthogonal system of eigenfunctions $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$, $\{\varphi_j^*\}_{j=1}^\infty$ such that

$$\langle \varphi_j, \varphi_i^* \rangle = \delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, \ldots,$$

and

$$A\varphi_j = \lambda_j \varphi_j, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, \quad A^* \varphi_j^* = \overline{\lambda_j} \varphi_j^*, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots.$$

Proof. From the properties of the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $A$ and $A^*$ proved above, proposition follows.

In the next section our aim is to show that there exists a finite dimensional controller in the feedback form which will stabilize the linearized system.

3.1. Internal Stabilization of linearized system. Let us denote by $C$ the following $N \times N$ matrix

$$C = [(B_1 \varphi_j^*, \varphi_i^*)]_{i=1}^{N} {j=1}^{N},$$

which will be useful in the proof of next Theorem. The precise characterisation of finite dimensional controller which stabilizes the system is proved in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.6. Let $u^0 \in H$. Then there exist a controller $U(t)$ of the form

$$U(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} a_j(t) \varphi_j^*,$$

which stabilizes the system (14) with the exponent decay $-\beta$. Moreover the controller $a = \{a_j\}_{j=1}^{N}$ can be chosen in the feedback form

$$a_j(t) = -\langle B_1 \varphi_j^*, R_0 u^*(t) \rangle, \quad j = 1, \ldots, N, t \geq 0,$$

where $R_0 : D(R_0) \subset H \rightarrow H$ is a riccati operator such that $R_0 = R_0^*$, $R_0 \geq 0$ and solves the riccati equation given in Theorem 3.5.

Proof. Since the eigen values of $A$ are semisimple and distinct, so we can easily show that $det C = \| (B_1 \varphi_j^*, \varphi_i^*) \|_{i=1}^{N} {j=1}^{N} \neq 0$. So by Theorem 2.1 of [5] we conclude that there exists a controller of the form (21).

Let $\Sigma$ be the set of all eigen values of $A$ and $\Sigma_N = \{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{N}$. Now we decompose the system (14) into two systems, one related to the unstable modes $\Sigma_N$ and the other to the stable modes $\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_N$. For, we write the space $H$ as the direct sum of two invariant subspaces of $A$ related to $\Sigma_N$ and $\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_N$. Let $\Gamma_N$ be a positively oriented curve enclosing $\Sigma_N$ but no other point of the spectrum of $A$. Now let us take,

$$H_N = lin span \{ \varphi_j \}_{j=1}^{N}.$$

The operator

$$P_N : H \rightarrow H_N$$

is defined by

$$P_N = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_N} (\lambda I - A)^{-1} d\lambda.$$

We write the solution of the system (14) as $u = u_N + u_N^\perp$, where $u_N = P_N u$, $u_N^\perp = (I - P_N) u$ and the operator $A$ as $A_N = P_N A, A_N^\perp = (I - P_N) A$ (see chapter
Now we rewrite the solution of the finite dimensional system (23) as
\[
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d u_N}{dt} + A_N u_N &= \sum_{j=1}^{N} a_j(t) P_N B_1 \varphi_j^*, \quad u_N(0) = P_N u^0, \\
\text{and on its orthogonal compliment as infinite dimensional part}
\end{aligned}
\]
\[
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d u_j}{dt} + A_N u_j &= \sum_{j=1}^{N} a_j(t)(I - P_N) B_1 \varphi_j^*, \quad u_j(0) = (I - P_N)u^0.
\end{aligned}
\]
Since the spaces \( H_N = P_H \) and \( H_N = (I - P_N)H \) are invariant under \( A \), we have \( \sigma(A_N) = \{ \lambda_j \}_{j=1}^{N} \) and \( \sigma(A_N^-) = \{ \lambda_j \}_{j=N+1}^{\infty} \).

We know from (17) that \( -A_N \) generates a \( C_0 \)-analytic semigroup on \( H_N \) and \( \sigma(A_N) = \{ \lambda : \text{Re} \lambda > \beta \} \). This implies that
\[
\|e^{-A_N t}\|_{L(H,H)} \leq Ce^{-\beta t}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.
\]
Now we write the solution of the finite dimensional system (23) as
\[
u_N(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_j(t) \varphi_j.
\]
Therefore by taking duality pairing with \( \varphi_i^* \) for \( i = 1, \cdots, N \) with all the terms of the system (23) we get, for \( i = 1, \cdots, N \),
\[
\begin{aligned}
\langle \frac{d u_i(t)}{dt}, \varphi_i^* \rangle &+ \langle (A u(t)), \varphi_i^* \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{N} a_j(t) \langle B_1 \varphi_j^*, \varphi_i^* \rangle, \quad u_i^0(0) = \langle u^0, \varphi_i^* \rangle,
\end{aligned}
\]
where \( A \) is the diagonal matrix
\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
(\lambda_1, \varphi_i^*) \\
\vdots \\
(0, \varphi_i^*)
\end{bmatrix}_{i=1}^{N} = \\
\begin{pmatrix}
\lambda_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \lambda_2 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \lambda_N
\end{pmatrix}.
\]
So we have
\[
\begin{aligned}
\frac{dv}{dt} + Av(t) &= Ca(t), \quad v(0) = v^0,
\end{aligned}
\]
where \( v(t) = \{ u_i(t) \}_{i=1}^{N}, v_0 = \{ u_i^0 \}_{i=1}^{N} \), \( a(t) = \{ a_i(t) \}_{i=1}^{N} \) and \( C = [\langle B_1 \varphi_j^*, \varphi_i^* \rangle]_{i,j=1}^{N} \).

In the next Lemma we will show that (28) is exactly null controllable which implies it is exponentially stable i.e.
\[
|u_N(t)| \leq Ce^{-\beta t}|P_N(u^0)| \leq Ce^{-\beta t}|u^0|, \quad \forall t \geq 0.
\]
Hence by Kalman controllability Theorem (see Theorem 2.1, [13]) there exists a vector \( a = \{ a_i \}_{i=1}^{N} \subset L^2(0, T; \mathbb{C}^N) \) such that
\[
u_N(T) = 0,
\]
where \( T > 0 \) is a fixed time. Without loss of generality, we can assume that \( a_j(t) = 0, \forall \ t \geq T \). Now, from (24) by substituting the controller \( U(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} a_j(t) \varphi_j^* \) and
Finally we obtain

\[ |u_N(t)| \leq |e^{-A_N t}|(I - P_N)u^0| + \int_0^T |e^{-A_N(t-s)}|(\sum_{j=1}^N |a_j(s)|) \, ds \]

\[ \leq C e^{-\beta t}|u^0| + C \int_0^T e^{-\beta(t-s)}(\sum_{j=1}^N |a_j(s)|) \, ds \]

\[ \leq C e^{-\beta t}|u^0| + C e^{-\beta t}|a||L^2(0,T;\mathbb{C}^N), \quad \forall t \geq 0, \]

which can be made less than \( C e^{-\beta t}|u^0| \) by choosing the controller

\[ \int_0^T |u(t)|^2 \, dt \leq C|P_N u^0|^2 \leq C|u^0|^2. \]

Finally we obtain

\[ |u_N(t)| \leq C e^{-\beta t}|u^0|, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \]

Therefore from (28) and (30) by adding the finite dimensional and infinite dimensional system we get

\[ |u(t)| \leq C e^{-\beta t}|u^0|, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \]

\[ \square \]

Now we will prove the lemma which we have used in the proof of the Theorem (3.4).

**Lemma 3.7.** The system (27) is exactly null controllable, i.e. there exists a controller \( a = \{a_j\}_{j=1}^N \subset L^2(0,T;\mathbb{C}^N) \) such that \( u_i(T) = 0, \ i = 1, \cdots, N \) for a fixed \( T > 0 \).

**Proof.** We know that by the Kalman controllability Theorem (Theorem 2.1, [13]) finite dimensional system (28) is exactly controllable iff

\[ C^* e^{A t} z = 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0 \Rightarrow z = 0. \]

From the definition of \( C \) in (20) we have \( C^* = [\varphi_j^*, B_1 \varphi_i^*]_{i,j=1}^N \) and

\[ e^{A t} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\lambda_1 t} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\lambda_2 t} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & e^{\lambda_N t} \end{pmatrix}, \quad z = \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ \vdots \\ z_N \end{bmatrix}_{1 \times N}. \]

Therefore from (32) we get for each \( i = 1, \cdots, N, \)

\[ c_{i1} e^{\lambda_1 t} z_1 + c_{i2} e^{\lambda_2 t} z_2 + \cdots + c_{iN} e^{\lambda_N t} z_N = 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \]

where \( c_{ij} = \langle \varphi_i^*, B_1 \varphi_j^* \rangle \). This implies for each \( i = 1, \cdots, N, \)

\[ c_{i1} z_1 + c_{i2} z_2 + \cdots + c_{iN} z_N = 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \]

Since we know that \( C \) is a diagonal matrix we get \( c_{ii} z_i = 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \cdots, N. \) Therefore we can conclude that \( z_i = 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \cdots, N, \) which implies \( z = 0. \)

Now our aim is to write the controller in a feedback form which will stabilize the system (14).
Theorem 3.8. Let $\beta > 0$ and $N$ be as defined in Theorem (3.6). Then there exists a linear self-adjoint operator $R_0 : D(R_0) \subset H \to H$ where $R_0 = R_0^*$, $R_0 \geq 0$ such that

$$ b_1 |u^0|^2 \leq (R_0 u^0, u^0) \leq b_2 |u^0|^2, \quad \forall u^0 \in H,$$

for some constants $b_1, b_2 > 0$. Moreover

$$ |R_0 u| \leq C \|u\|, \quad \forall u \in V,$$

(33)

$$ (Au - \beta u, R_0 u) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N (B_1 \varphi_j^*, R_0 u)^2 = \frac{1}{2} |A^{1/2} u|^2, \quad u \in D(A).$$

The feedback controller

$$ U(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N (B_1 \varphi_j^*, R_0 u(t)) \varphi_j^*$$

exponentially stabilizes the linearized system (14), i.e., the solution $u$ to corresponding closed loop system satisfies

$$ \int_0^\infty e^{2\beta t} |A^{1/2} u(t)|^2 dt \leq C |u^0|^2.$$\n
Moreover

$$ |u(t)| \leq C e^{-\beta t} |A^{1/4} u_0|, \quad u^0 \in H.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to [3, 10] which deals with stabilization of Navier Stokes equations. We associate an infinite time horizon minimization problem as following:

$$ \varphi(u^0) = \inf_{u \in L^2(0, \infty; C^N)} \int_0^\infty |A^{1/2} u(t)|^2 + |U(t)|_N^2 dt$$

subject to,$$ \frac{du}{dt} + Au - \beta u = \sum_{j=1}^N U_j B_1 \varphi_j^*, \quad u(0) = u^0,$$

where $a_j$ is denoted by $U_j$ for $j = 1, \cdots, N$.

Let us define $SU := \sum_{j=1}^N U_j B_1 \varphi_j^*$. Now we will first show that $\forall u^0 \in H, \varphi(u^0) < \infty$. From the Theorem (3.6) there exists an admissible pair $(u, U) \in (C([0, \infty); H) \cap L^2_\text{loc}(0, \infty; D(A))) \times L^2(0, \infty; C^N)$ which solves above optimal control problem.

By taking inner product of (10) with $u$ and using the fact that $Au = \nu Au + B(u, u_c) + B(u_c, u)$ we get

$$ \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} |u|^2 + \nu |A^{1/2} u|^2 \leq \beta |u|^2 - b(u, u_c, u) + (SU, u)$$

$$ \leq \beta |u|^2 + C_3 |u||A u_c||A^{1/2} u| + \frac{1}{2} |U(t)|_N^2 + \frac{1}{2} |u|^2.$$

Integrating over $0$ to $t$ we get

$$ |u(t)|^2 + \nu \int_0^t |A^{1/2} u(s)|^2 ds$$

$$ \leq |u^0|^2 + \int_0^t \left( 2\beta + C_3^2 |A u_c|^2 + 1 \right) |u(s)|^2 ds + \int_0^t |U(s)|_N^2 ds.$$
By using Gronwall inequality we get
\[ |u(t)|^2 + \nu \int_0^t |A^{1/2}u(s)|^2 ds \leq e^{\nu t} |u(0)|^2 + e^{\nu t} \left( 2\beta + \frac{2\nu}{\beta} |A u_0|^2 + |A u_0|^2 \right) \int_0^t |U(s)|^2 ds\]
\[ \leq e^{\beta t} |u(0)|^2 + e^\beta \int_0^t |U(s)|^2 ds, \]
for all \( t \in [0, T] \) where \( T > 0 \) arbitrary. Therefore \( u \in L^2(0, \infty; D(A^{1/2})) \) if \( u^0 \in H \). So we have
\[ \varphi(u^0) \leq b_2 |u^0|^2, \quad \forall u^0 \in H. \]
Moreover from the last inequality it follows that
\[ |u^0|^2 \leq \int_0^\infty (|A^{1/2}u(t)|^2 + |U(t)|^2) dt. \]
Thus,
\[ b_1 |u^0|^2 \leq \varphi(u^0), \quad \forall u^0 \in H. \]
Combining (41) and (42) we conclude
\[ b_1 |u^0|^2 \leq \varphi(u^0) \leq b_2 |u^0|^2, \quad \forall u^0 \in H. \]
Therefore by using Theorem 3.1, [13] we can conclude that there exists a linear self adjoint operator \( \mathcal{R}_0 : D(\mathcal{R}_0) \subset H \rightarrow H \) which is the Gateaux derivative of the function \( \varphi(u^0) \) on \( H \) such that
\[ \varphi(u^0) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{R}_0 u^0, u^0), \quad \forall u^0 \in H. \]
Let us take \( u^0 \in V \). So we have by Theorem 4, [18] the solution \( u \in C([0, T]; V) \cap L^2(0, T; D(A)) \) for any \( T > 0 \). By dynamic programming principle (see Barbu [8], Theorem 2.1), we know that for each \( T > 0 \), the solution of (39)-(40) i.e. \( (u^*, U^*) \) is also the optimal solution to the optimization problem
\[ \inf_{u \in L^2(0, T; \mathbb{C}^N)} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T (|A^{1/2}u(t)|^2 + |U(t)|^2) dt + \varphi(u(T)) \right\}, \text{subject to (40)}. \]
Therefore by Pontryagin maximum principle we get
\[ U^*(t) = \{(p_T(t), B_1\varphi_j^*)\}_{j=1}^N, \quad \text{a.e.} \ t \in (0, T), \]
where \( p_T \) is the solution of
\[ -\frac{dz}{dt} + A^* z - \beta z = -Au^*, \quad z(T) = -\mathcal{R}_0 u^*(T). \]
Since \( T \) is arbitrary we further conclude that
\[ \mathcal{R}_0 u^*(t) = -p_T(t), \quad \forall t \geq 0. \]
Hence from (45)
\[ U^*(t) = -\{(\mathcal{R}_0 u^*(t), B_1\varphi_j^*)\}_{j=1}^N, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \]
Now we will prove (54). For, if we take \( u^0 \in V \) then by existence theorem (see [18], Theorem 4) we can conclude that the optimal control \( U^* \in L^2(0, T; H) \) and \( u^* \in C([0, T]; V) \cap L^2(0, \infty; D(A)) \). Notice that (40) is a linear system. So an easy
calculation gives that \( z \in C([0, T]; H) \cap L^\infty(0, \infty; V) \). Thus \( z(0) = R_0 u^0 \in H \).

Therefore by closed graph theorem we get
\[
|R_0 u| \leq ||u||, \quad u \in V.
\]

Now it is left to show that the operator \( R_0 \) satisfies the algebraic riccati equation (35). By dynamic programming principle and (44) we have
\[
\frac{1}{2}(R_0 u^*(t), u^*(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (|A^{1/2} u^*(s)|^2 + |U^*(s)|_N^2) ds, \quad \forall t \geq 0,
\]
where \( u^*(t) \in H \). Now differentiating (49) and using self adjoint property of \( R_0 \) on \( H \) we get
\[
(R_0 u^*(t), \frac{du^*(t)}{dt}) = -\frac{1}{2} |A^{1/2} u^*(t)|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |U^*(t)|_N^2.
\]

Using (40) and (45) we get
\[
(R_0 u^*(t), -Au^* + \beta u^* + U^*) + \frac{1}{2} |A^{1/2} u^*(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |U^*(t)|_N^2 = 0
\]
\[
(R_0 u^*(t), -Au^* + \beta u^* + U^*) + \frac{1}{2} |A^{1/2} u^*(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N (R_0 u^*(t), B_1 \varphi_j^*)^2 = 0
\]
(50) \( (R_0 u^*(t), A u^* - \beta u^*) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N (R_0 u^*(t), B_1 \varphi_j^*)^2 = \frac{1}{2} |A^{1/2} u^*(t)|^2 ds, \)

for all \( t \geq 0 \). To prove (37) and (38) let us take the closed loop system
\[
\frac{du}{dt} + Au + \sum_{j=1}^N (R_0 u, B_1 \varphi_j^*) B_1 \varphi_j^* = 0, \quad u(0) = u^0.
\]

Taking inner product of (51) with \( R_0 u \) and using the riccati equation (50) we get
\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (R_0 u, u) = (R_0 u, \frac{du}{dt})
\]
\[
= -\beta (R_0 u, u) - (B(u), R_0 u) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N (R_0 u, B_1 \varphi_j^*)^2 - \frac{1}{2} |A^{1/2} u|^2.
\]

This implies
\[
\frac{d}{dt} (R_0 u, u) + 2\beta (R_0 u, u) + |A^{1/2} u|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^N (R_0 u, B_1 \varphi_j^*)^2 \leq 0.
\]

Integrating over 0 to \( t \) we get
\[
e^{2\beta t} (R_0 u(t), u(t)) + \int_0^t e^{2\beta s} |A^{1/2} u(s)|^2 dt \leq (R_0 u^0, u^0) \leq b_2 |u^0|^2.
\]

Therefore we conclude
\[
\int_0^\infty e^{2\beta s} |A^{1/2} u(s)|^2 dt \leq C |u^0|^2.
\]

From (53) we further get
\[
|u(t)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{b_1} (R_0 u(t), u(t)) \leq C e^{-2\beta t} |u^0|^2.
\]
This completes the proof. □

3.2. Internal stabilization of Nonlinear system.

**Theorem 3.9.** The feedback controller

$$U(t) = -\sum_{j=1}^{N} (B_1 \varphi_j^*, R_0 (u - u_e)) \varphi_j^*$$

will exponentially stabilize the steady state system \(8\) in a neighbourhood

$$\mathcal{X} = \{ u^0 \in H : |u^0| < \rho \}$$

of \(u_e\) for some \(\rho > 0\). Moreover \(\rho\) is sufficiently small, then for each \(u^0 \in \mathcal{X}\), the solution \(u \in C([0, \infty); H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V)\) to corresponding closed loop system

$$\frac{du}{dt} + Au + B(u) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} (R_0 u, B_1 \varphi_j^*) B_1 \varphi_j^* = f, \ u(0) = u^0$$

satisfies

$$\int_0^\infty e^{2\beta t} |A^{1/2} (u(t) - u_e)|^2 dt \leq C |(u^0 - u_e)|^2,$$

and

$$|(u(t) - u_e)| \leq Ce^{-\delta t} |(u^0 - u_e)|, \quad u^0 \in H.$$

**Proof.** The proof is similar to Theorem 3.3 [5], Theorem 2.2 [10]. The system satisfied by \((u - u_e, u^0 - u_e)\) still denoted by \((u, u^0)\) we get

$$\frac{du}{dt} + \nu Au + B'(u_e)u + B(u) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} (R_0 u, B_1 \varphi_j^*) B_1 \varphi_j^* = 0, \ u(0) = u^0.$$

The problem reduces to proving the stability of the null solution of the closed loop system \(61\). Next our aim is to show that \(\varphi(u) = \frac{1}{2} (R_0 u, u)\) is a Lyapunov function for the system \(61\) in a neighborhood of the origin.

By the Theorem 1.18, [5] the system \(61\) has at least one weak solution \(u\) which is the limit of the strong solution \(u_N\) to the system

$$\frac{du_N}{dt} + \nu A u_N + B'(u_e)u_N + B_N(u_N) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} (R_0 u_N, B_1 \varphi_j^*) B_1 \varphi_j^* = 0, \ u_N(0) = u^0,$$

where \(B_N\) is the truncated operator \(B_N(\cdot) : V \to V'\),

$$B_N(\cdot) := \begin{cases} B(u) & \text{if } \|u\| \leq N \\ \left( \frac{N}{\|u\|} \right)^2 B(u) & \text{if } \|u\| > N. \end{cases}$$

Similarly from Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 of [14] we can show that if \(u^0 \in D(A)\) then \(u_N \in \cap W^{1,\infty}_{\text{loc}} (0, \infty; H) \cap L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(0, \infty; D(A))\) and if \(u^0 \in V\) then \(u_N \in W^{1,2}_{\text{loc}} (0, \infty; H) \cap L^2_{\text{loc}}(0, \infty; D(A)) \cap C([0, T]; V)\).
Now from Theorem 1.18, \[5\] we conclude \(u_N \to u\) strongly in \(L^2(0, T; H)\) and weakly in \(L^2(0, T; V)\). Using the riccati equation \([55]\) in \([62]\) we obtain

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\mathcal{R}_0 u_N, u_N) = \langle \mathcal{R}_0 u_N, \frac{du_N}{dt} \rangle
\]

(63)

\[
= -\beta (\mathcal{R}_0 u_N, u_N) - (B_N(u_N), \mathcal{R}_0 u_N) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (\mathcal{R}_0 u_N, B \varphi_j^*)^2 - \frac{1}{2} |A^{1/2} u_N|^2.
\]

Now we have

\[
(B_N(u_N), \mathcal{R}_0 u_N) = b(u_N, u_N, \mathcal{R}_0 u_N) \leq \inf \left(1, \frac{N^2}{\|u_N\|^2}\right) C_1 \|u_N\| \|u_N\| \|\mathcal{R}_0 u_N\|
\]

\[
\leq C \|u_N\| \|u_N\|^2.
\]

(64)

By using \([53]\) we have

\[
(B_N(u_N), \mathcal{R}_0 u_N) \leq C (\mathcal{R}_0 u_N, u_N)^{1/2} \|u_N\|^2.
\]

(65)

using \([63]\) in \([66]\) we get

\[
\frac{d}{dt} (\mathcal{R}_0 u_N, u_N) + 2\beta (\mathcal{R}_0 u_N, u_N) + \frac{1}{2} |A^{1/2} u_N|^2 \leq \left( C (\mathcal{R}_0 u_N, u_N)^{1/2} - \frac{1}{2} \right) |A^{1/2} u_N|^2.
\]

(66)

Now if we take \((\mathcal{R}_0 u_N, u_N) < \rho\) i.e. \(\rho \leq \left( \frac{1}{2C} \right)^2\), from \([33]\) it implies \(|A^{1/2} u_0|^2 < \rho\), and we get from \([66]\)

\[
\frac{d}{dt} (\mathcal{R}_0 u_N, u_N) + 2\beta (\mathcal{R}_0 u_N, u_N) + \frac{1}{2} |A^{1/2} u_N|^2 \leq 0.
\]

(67)

By integrating over \(0\) to \(t\) we have

\[
2\beta (\mathcal{R}_0 u_N(t), u_N(t)) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t e^{2\beta s} |A^{1/2} u_N(s)|^2 dt \leq (\mathcal{R}_0 u_0^0, u_0^0) \leq C |u_0|^2.
\]

(68)

for all \(t \geq 0\). So we have

\[
\int_0^\infty e^{2\beta t} |A^{1/2} u_N(t)|^2 \leq C |u_0|^2 < \rho.
\]

(69)

So we will get a convergent subsequence \(u_{N,n}\) such that \(u_{N,n} \to u\) in \(L^2(0, \infty; D(A^{1/2}))\). By using the fact that \(u_N \to u\) strongly in \(L^2(0, T; H)\), we can say \(A^{1/2} u_{N,n} \to A^{1/2} u\). Therefore we have

\[
\int_0^\infty e^{2\beta t} |A^{1/2} u(t)|^2 \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} e^{2\beta t} |A^{1/2} u_{N,n}(t)|^2 \leq C |u_0|^2.
\]

(70)

Further from \([68]\) and \([63]\) we get for all \(t \geq 0\)

\[
(\mathcal{R}_0 u(t), u(t)) \leq C e^{-2\beta t} |u_0|^2
\]

\[
|u(t)| \leq C e^{-\beta t} |u_0|.
\]

\(\square\)
4. \( H^\infty \) Stabilization

In this section we study the \( H^\infty \) stabilization problem corresponding to the following system,

\[
\frac{du}{dt} + \nu Au + B(u) = B_1 U + B_2 w, \quad u(0) = u^0,
\]

in a Hilbert space \( H \). The linear operator \( A \) on \( H \) is closed and densely defined with domain \( D(A) \) and \( B : H \to H \) is a nonlinear operator. Let us assume \( B_1 \in L(H, H) \) and \( B_2 \in L(H, H) \). The linearised system around the steady state system \( u_e \) is given by

\[
\frac{du}{dt} + Au = B_1 U + B_2 w, \quad u(0) = u^0.
\]

In this work our aim is to study the \( H^\infty \) control problem corresponding to \( (71) \) which can be defined as finding a feedback operator \( K \in L(H, H) \) such that \( A + KB_1 \) is the infinitesimal generator of an exponentially stable semigroup on \( H \).

Moreover for a given \( \gamma > 0 \) and for all \( w \in L^2(0, \infty; H) \) the solution to the closed loop system

\[
\frac{du}{dt} + Au + B(u) = B_1 K u + B_2 w, \quad u(0) = u^0
\]

obeys,

\[
\int_0^\infty (\|u\|^2 + \|Ku\|^2) \, dt \leq \gamma \int_0^\infty \|w\|^2 \, dt + \epsilon
\]

for a given \( \gamma > 0 \) and for all \( w \in L^2(0, \infty; H) \).

4.1. Robust stabilization of the linearized equation: To study the robust feedback stabilization for the nonlinear system \( (71) \), we are first going to study robust feedback stabilization of corresponding linearized system \( (72) \). To find robust feedback law for \( (72) \) we have to solve following control problem,

\[
\sup_{w \in L^2(0, \infty; H)} \inf_{u \in L^2(0, \infty; H)} \{ J(u, U, w) \mid (u, U, w) \text{ satisfies } (72) \}
\]

where

\[
J(u, U, w) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \|u\|^2 \, dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \|U\|^2 \, dt - \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_0^\infty \|w\|^2 \, dt.
\]

We divide our problem in two steps, first we study the problem for a fixed \( w \in L^2(0, \infty; H) \). We denote this minimization problem with initial condition \( u^0 \) and with \( w \) as disturbance, by \( P(u^0, w) \) i.e.

\[
\inf_{w \in L^2(0, \infty; H)} \{ J(u, U, w) \mid (u, U, w) \text{ satisfies } (72) \}
\]

and then varying \( w \), we take supremum over \( w \). In particular if we take \( w = 0 \), we have the following theorem from the previous section.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let \( w = 0 \) and \( u^0 \in H \). Then there exists a controller \( U(t) \) which stabilizes the system \( (14) \) with the exponent decay \(-\beta\). Moreover the controller can be chosen in the feedback form

\[
U(t) = -R_0 u(t), \quad \forall t \geq 0,
\]
where there exist a riccati operator $R_0 : D(R_0) \subset H \to H$ such that $R_0 = R_0^*, R_0 \geq 0$. The operator $R_0$ is the solution to the algebraic riccati equation

$$A^*R_0 + R_0A - R_0B_1B_1^*R_0 + I = 0.$$  

Furthermore, The optimal cost is given by

$$P(u^0, 0) = \frac{1}{2} \left( u^0, R_0u^0 \right).$$

Let us denote the optimal pair for the problem $P(u^0, 0)$ by $(u_0, U_0)$ and recall $U_0 = -B_1^*R_0u_0$. Now we want to study the problem $P(u^0, w)$ for a fixed $w$.

**Theorem 4.2.** Let the initial data $u^0 \in H$ and $w \in L^2(0, T; H)$. Then there exists a unique optimal pair $(u_{w,u^0}, U_{w,u^0})$ such that the functional $J(u, U, w)$ attains its minimum at $(u_{w,u^0}, U_{w,u^0})$.

**Proof.** We can easily prove it with arguments similar as in section 4 of [15].

To characterize the control $U_{w,u^0}$ we proceed as follows:

**Theorem 4.3.** Let us define the operator $A_{R_0} : D(A_{R_0}) \subset H \to H$ by

$$D(A_{R_0}) = \{ u \in H | (A - B_1B_1^*R_0)u \in H \},$$

$$A_{R_0}u = Au - B_1B_1^*R_0u, \forall u \in D(A_{R_0}).$$

Then $A_{R_0}$ is the infinitesimal generator of an exponentially stable semigroup. The adjoint operator $(A_{R_0})^*, D((A_{R_0})^*)$ is given by,

$$D((A_{R_0})^*) = D(A^*) \text{ and } (A_{R_0})^*u = A^*u - R_0B_1B_1^*u \forall u \in D(A^*).$$

**Proof.** Since from Lemma 3.4 we know that $A$ generates a $C_0$ analytic semigroup and $B_1$ is a linear operator, using Proposition 10 of [3] we have $A_{R_0}$ is the infinitesimal generator of an exponentially stable semigroup.

Further we also get from Proposition 2.4, Part2. [13] that $A_{R_0}^*$ is the infinitesimal generator of an exponentially stable semigroup.

Now let us consider the coupled system,

$$\frac{du}{dt} + A_{R_0}u = B_1B_1^*p + B_2w, \; u(0) = u^0,$$  
$$-\frac{dp}{dt} + A_{R_0}^*p = R_0B_2w, \; p(\infty) = 0.$$  

We prove the existence and uniqueness of the system (82)-(83).

**Theorem 4.4.** For all $u^0 \in H$, the system (82)-(83) has a unique solution $(u_{w}, p_{w}) \in L^2(0, \infty; V) \cap C([0, \infty); H)$.

**Proof.** $A_{R_0}^*$ generates a exponentially stable $C_0$ semigroup and $R_0 \in L(H, H)$, $B_2 \in L^2(0, T; H)$, so using Proposition 3.1 of [13] we get

$$\|w\|_{L^2(0, \infty; \cap C([0, \infty); H))} \leq C\|R_0B_2w\|_{L^2(0, T; H)} \leq C\|w\|_{L^2(0, T; H)}.$$  

Therefore using the fact that $A_{R_0}$ generates $C_0$ analytic semigroup, we conclude solution $u_{w}$ to (82) satisfies

$$\|u_{w}\|_{L^2(0, \infty; \cap C([0, \infty); H))} \leq C\|u^0\| + \|w\|_{L^2(0, T; H)}.$$
Adding (83) and (84) we get

\[ \|u_w\|_{L^2(0,\infty;V)} + \|p_w\|_{L^2(0,\infty;C(0,\infty);H)} \leq C(|u^0| + \|w\|_{L^2(0,T;H)}). \]

Moreover it can be easily seen that the solution is unique.

Now we will study the problem \( P(u^0, w) \) given by (77) for a fixed \( w \in L^2(0,\infty;H) \). Our aim is to prove that \( (B_1^*\mathcal{R}_0u_w + B_1^*p_w) \) will be the minimiser of the problem \( P(u^0, w) \).

**Theorem 4.5.** Let, \((u_w, p_w)\) be the solution of the system (82) - (85). Then the solution of the optimal control problem (77) is given by \((u_w, B_1^*\mathcal{R}_0u_w + B_1^*p_w)\).

Moreover \( r_{u,w} = \mathcal{R}_0u_w + p_w \) satisfies the system,

\[ -\frac{dr}{dt} + A^*r = u_w, \quad r(\infty) = 0. \]

**Proof.** Let us consider all pairs \((u, U)\) that satisfy,

\[ \frac{du}{dt} + Au = B_1U + B_2w, \quad u(0) = u^0. \]

Using algebraic riccati equation (79) in the cost functional (76) we get,

\[
2\mathcal{J}(u, U) = \int_0^\infty \|u\|^2 + \|U\|^2 - \gamma\|w\|^2 dt
\]

\[ = \int_0^\infty (u, -A^*\mathcal{R}_0u - \mathcal{R}_0Au) dt + \int_0^\infty \|B_1^*\mathcal{R}_0u\|^2 dt + \int_0^\infty \|U\|^2 dt - \int_0^\infty \gamma\|w\|^2 dt
\]

\[ = -\int_0^\infty 2(\mathcal{R}_0u, Au) dt + \int_0^\infty \|B_1^*\mathcal{R}_0u\|^2 + \int_0^\infty \|U\|^2 dt - \int_0^\infty \gamma\|w\|^2 dt.
\]

From (83) we have

\[
2\mathcal{J}(u, U) = \int_0^\infty 2(\mathcal{R}_0u, u') dt + \int_0^\infty 2(\mathcal{R}_0u, -B_1U - B_2w) dt + \int_0^\infty \|B_1^*\mathcal{R}_0u\|^2
\]

\[ + \int_0^\infty \|U\|^2 dt - \int_0^\infty \gamma\|w\|^2 dt
\]

\[ = 2(\mathcal{R}_0u^0, u^0) - 2\int_0^\infty (\mathcal{R}_0u, B_1U) - 2\int_0^\infty (\mathcal{R}_0u, B_2w) + \int_0^\infty \|B_1^*\mathcal{R}_0u\|^2
\]

\[ + \int_0^\infty \|U\|^2 dt - \int_0^\infty \gamma\|w\|^2 dt
\]

\[ = 2(\mathcal{R}_0u^0, u^0) - 2\int_0^\infty (B_1^*\mathcal{R}_0u, U) - 2\int_0^\infty (u, \mathcal{R}_0B_2w) + \int_0^\infty \|B_1^*\mathcal{R}_0u\|^2
\]

\[ + \int_0^\infty \|U\|^2 dt - \int_0^\infty \gamma\|w\|^2 dt.
\]

From (83), putting the value of \( \mathcal{R}_0B_2w \) we get

\[
2\mathcal{J}(u, U) = 2(\mathcal{R}_0u^0, u^0) - 2\int_0^\infty (B_1^*\mathcal{R}_0u, U) - 2\int_0^\infty (u, -p_w + A^*_\mathcal{R}_0p_w) + \int_0^\infty \|B_1^*\mathcal{R}_0u\|^2
\]

\[ + \int_0^\infty \|U\|^2 dt - \int_0^\infty \gamma\|w\|^2 dt
\]
Now by integration by parts we get

\[
2 \mathcal{J}(u, U) = 2(\mathcal{R}_0 u^0, u^0) - 2 \int_0^\infty (B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u, U) + 2 \int_0^\infty (u, p_w') - 2 \int_0^\infty (u, A_{\mathcal{R}_0} p_w)
+ \int_0^\infty \|B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u\|^2 + \int_0^\infty \|U\|^2 dt - \int_0^\infty \gamma \|w\|^2 dt
= 2(\mathcal{R}_0 u^0, u^0) - 2 \int_0^\infty (B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u, U) - 2 \int_0^\infty (U, \mathcal{R}_0 p_w) - 2 \int_0^\infty (u', p_w) - \int_0^\infty (u, A_{\mathcal{R}_0} p_w)
+ \int_0^\infty \|B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u\|^2 + \int_0^\infty \|U\|^2 dt - \int_0^\infty \gamma \|w\|^2 dt
(91)
\]

Using the fact that \(A_{\mathcal{R}_0} = A - B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0\) and (SS) we have

\[
= 2(\mathcal{R}_0 u^0, u^0) - 2 \int_0^\infty (B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u, U) - (u^0, p_w(0)) - 2 \int_0^\infty (U, B_1^* p_w) - 2 \int_0^\infty (u', p_w) - \int_0^\infty (u, B_1^* p_w)
+ \int_0^\infty \|B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u\|^2 + \int_0^\infty \|U\|^2 dt - \int_0^\infty \gamma \|w\|^2 dt
\]

Now,

\[
\int_0^\infty \|U - B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u - B_1^* p_w\|^2 dt - \int_0^\infty \|B_1^* p_w\|^2 dt = -2 \int_0^\infty (U, B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u) - 2 \int_0^\infty (U, B_1^* p_w)
+ 2 \int_0^\infty (B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u, B_1^* p_w) + \int_0^\infty \|U\|^2 dt + \int_0^\infty \|B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u\|^2
(92)
\]

Therefore we get,

\[
2 \mathcal{J}(u, U) = (\mathcal{R}_0 u^0, u^0) + \int_0^\infty \|U - B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u - B_1^* p_w\|^2 dt - \int_0^\infty \|B_1^* p_w\|^2 dt - 2(u^0, p_w(0))
- 2 \int_0^\infty (B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u, B_1^* p_w) - \int_0^\infty \|U\|^2 dt + \int_0^\infty \|B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u\|^2
(93)
\]

So we get the optimal control for the problem (77) as \(U = B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u + B_1^* p_w\) (see Part 4, Lemma 4.4, [43]).
Let us take \(r_{w^0, w} = \mathcal{R}_0 u + p_w\), then easy calculation shows that \(r_{w^0, w}\) solves

\[
- \frac{dr}{dt} + A^* r = u_w, \quad r(\infty) = 0.
(94)
\]

By substituting the value of the optimal control and optimal state from the Theorem 13 in (79), we can write optimal cost corresponding to fixed \(w\) as,

\[
P(u^0, w) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \|u_w\|^2 dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \|B_1^* \mathcal{R}_0 u + B_1^* p_w\|^2 dt - \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_0^\infty \|w\|^2 dt
- \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \|u_w\|^2 dt - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \|B_1^* r_{w^0, w}\|^2 dt - \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_0^\infty \|w\|^2 dt
(95)
\]

The equations satisfied by \(u_w\) and \(r_{w^0, w}\), lead to following lemma.
Lemma 4.6. For all \( w \in L^2(0, \infty; H) \),
\[
\int_0^\infty \|u_w\|^2 dt + \int_0^\infty \|B^*_1 r_{a,w}\|^2 dt = \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, r_{a,w}) + (u_0, r_{a,w}(0)).
\]

Proof. We know that
\[
\int_0^\infty (u'_w, r_{a,w}) + \int_0^\infty (u_w, r'_{a,w}) = -(u_0, r_{a,w}(0)).
\]
If we put \( r_{a,w} = R_0 u_w + p_w \) in (92) we get
\[
\frac{du_w}{dt} + Au_w = B_1 B^*_1 r_{a,w} + B_2 w, \quad u_w(0) = u_0.
\]
From (98) we can write
\[
\int_0^\infty (u'_w, r_{a,w}) = -\int_0^\infty (Au_w, r_{a,w}) + \int_0^\infty (B_1 B^*_1 r_{a,w}, r_{a,w}) + \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, r_{a,w}).
\]
From (91) we have
\[
\int_0^\infty (u_w, r'_{a,w}) = \int_0^\infty (u_w, A^* r_{a,w}) - \int_0^\infty (u_w, u_w).
\]
Therefore using (99) and (100) in (97) we get,
\[
\int_0^\infty \|u_w\|^2 dt + \int_0^\infty \|B^*_1 r_{a,w}\|^2 dt = \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, r_{a,w}) + (u_0, r_{a,w}(0)).
\]

We now split \( u_w \) in two parts, one solves homogeneous uncontrolled problem without disturbance with initial data \( u^0 \) and other solves inhomogeneous equation with non zero disturbance but zero initial data. Let us denote \( u_w = y_0 + y_w \) where \( y_0 \) solves
\[
\frac{dy}{dt} + A R_0 y = 0, \quad y(0) = u_0,
\]
and \( y_w \) solves
\[
\frac{dy}{dt} + A R_0 y = B_1 B^*_1 p_w + B_2 w, \quad y(0) = 0,
\]
where \( p_w \) is the solution of (83). Let us set \( \varphi_0 = R_0 y_0 \) and \( \varphi_w = R_0 y_w + p_w \). Therefore from (91) we can write \( r_{a,w} = \varphi_0 + \varphi_w \). Now above notation along with (95) and lemma 4.6 gives,
\[
P(u^0, w) = \frac{1}{2} (u^0, r_{a,w}(0)) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, r_{a,w}) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_0^\infty \|w\|^2 dt
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2} (u^0, \varphi_0(0)) + \frac{1}{2} (u^0, \varphi_w(0)) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, \varphi_0) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, \varphi_w) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_0^\infty \|w\|^2 dt.
\]

Our aim is to write this optimal cost as addition of optimal cost for problem with non zero initial data plus optimal cost for problem with zero initial data. Towards this aim, to estimate second and third term in the above equation we use the following lemma.
Lemma 4.7. For all $w \in L^2(0, \infty; H)$ we have
\begin{equation}
(u^0, \varphi_w(0)) = \int_0^\infty (w, B^*_2 \varphi_0),
\end{equation}
where $\varphi_0$ solves
\begin{equation}
-\frac{dz}{dt} + A^*_z = y_0, z(\infty) = 0.
\end{equation}

Proof. We have from (83) and (101)
\begin{align*}
\int_0^\infty (\varphi', y_0)dt &= \int_0^\infty (A^*_z \varphi_w, y_0)dt - \int_0^\infty (\mathcal{R}_0 B_2 w, y_0) \\
&= \int_0^\infty (\varphi_w, A \mathcal{R}_0 y_0)dt - \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, \varphi_0) \\
&= -\int_0^\infty (\varphi_w, \gamma')dt - \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, \varphi_0).
\end{align*}
Therefore integration by parts gives,
\begin{equation}
(u^0, \varphi_w(0)) = \int_0^\infty (w, B^*_2 \varphi_0).
\end{equation}

Let us define the operator $T : H \times L^2(0, \infty; H) \to \mathbb{C}$ as
\begin{equation}
T(u^0, w) = \frac{1}{2}(u^0, \varphi_w(0)) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (w, B^*_2 \varphi_0).
\end{equation}
Therefore by Lemma 4.7 we can write $T(u^0, w) = (u^0, \varphi_w(0)) = \int_0^\infty (w, B^*_2 \varphi_0)$.

Lemma 4.8. The operator $w \to T(u^0, w)$ is linear and we have
\begin{equation}
|T(u^0, w)| \leq C|u^0||w|_{L^2(0, \infty; H)}.
\end{equation}

Proof. Recall that from Theorem 4.1 we know that $\phi_0 = \mathcal{R}_0 y_0$ and the map from the initial data $u_0$ to the solution of (82) is continuous i.e. $y_0$ is continuous function of initial data. Therefore we have
\begin{equation}
|T(u^0, w)| \leq \int_0^\infty |(w, B^*_2 \varphi_0)| \leq \int_0^\infty |w||B^*_2 \mathcal{R}_0 y_0| \leq \int_0^\infty |w||y_0|
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\leq C|u^0||w|_{L^2(0, T; H)}.
\end{equation}

Therefore we can rewrite $P(u^0, w)$ in (103) from Lemma 4.7 and above definition of operator $T$ as
\begin{equation}
P(u^0, w) = \frac{1}{2}(u^0, \varphi_0(0)) + T(u^0, w) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (w, B^*_2 \varphi_w) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_0^\infty \|w\|^2dt.
\end{equation}
Moreover, note that, $\varphi_0(0) = \mathcal{R}_0 u^0$ and our characterisation in theorem 4.1 allows us to write,
\begin{equation}
P(u^0, w) = P(u^0, 0) + T(u^0, w) + P(0, w),
\end{equation}
where, $P(0, w) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (w, B^*_2 \varphi_w) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_0^\infty \|w\|^2dt$.

Now we characterise $P(0, w)$. For, let us define the operator $Q : L^2(0, \infty; H) \to L^2(0, \infty; H)$ by
\begin{equation}
Q(w) = B^*_2 \varphi_w, \quad \forall w \in L^2(0, \infty; H).
\end{equation}
Lemma 4.9. [Properties of $Q$]

(1) The operator $Q$ is linear and continuous.

(2) The operator $Q$ is positive and symmetric.

Proof. (1) Since $\varphi_w$ satisfies the linear system (83). So from Theorem 4.4, it follows that $Q$ is linear and continuous. Moreover,

$$\|B_2^2\varphi_w\|_{L^2(0, \infty; H)} \leq \|\varphi_w\|_{L^2(0, \infty; H)} \leq \|w\|_{L^2(0, \infty; H)}.$$  \hfill (110)

Therefore $Q$ is a bounded operator.

(2) Let us define $\gamma_0 = \sup_{\|w\|_{L^2(0, \infty; H)} = 1} (w, Qw)$.

Observe that the term $P(0, w)$ can be written as

$$P(0, w) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (w, Qw) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_0^\infty \|w\|^2.$$ \hfill (111)

First we will show that $Q$ is positive. If we take $u^0 = 0$, then (104) implies that $y_0 = 0$ and hence $\varphi_0 = R u_0 = 0$. Thus by putting $u^0 = 0$ in the Lemma 4.3, we get,

$$\int_0^\infty (w, Qw) = \int_0^\infty (w, B_2^2 \varphi_w) = \int_0^\infty \|u_w\|^2 dt + \int_0^\infty \|B_1 \varphi_w\|^2 dt \geq 0. \hfill (112)$$

Next to show that $Q$ is symmetric, let us take $w, v \in L^2(0, \infty; H)$ and $\varphi_w, \varphi_v$ be the corresponding solution of (83). We have

$$\int_0^\infty (w, Qv) = \int_0^\infty (w, B_2^2 \varphi_v) = \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, \varphi_v)$$

$$= \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, R_0 u_v + p_v) = \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, R_0 u_v) + \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, p_v)$$

$$= \int_0^\infty (R_0 B_2 w, u_v) + \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, u_v)$$

$$= \int_0^\infty (B_1 B_1^* p_v, p_v) + \int_0^\infty (B_1 B_1^* p_w, p_v) + \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, p_v)$$

$$= \int_0^\infty (p_w, B_2 v) + \int_0^\infty (B_1^* p_w, B_1^* p_v) + \int_0^\infty (B_2 w, p_v). \hfill (113)$$

Interchanging $v$ and $w$ we get

$$\int_0^\infty (v, Qw) = \int_0^\infty (p_v, B_2 w) + \int_0^\infty (B_1^* p_v, B_1^* p_w) + \int_0^\infty (B_2 v, p_w). \hfill (114)$$

Therefore we get from (113) and (114)

$$\int_0^\infty (w, Qv) = \int_0^\infty (v, Qw).$$

Hence $Q$ is symmetric. \hfill $\Box$

Now we will study the problem by taking supremum over $w$ of $P(u^0, w)$ i.e.

$$P(u^0) = \sup_{w \in L^2(0, \infty; H)} P(u^0, w). \hfill (115)$$
First we will prove the existence of optimal $w$ and characterize the $w$ in terms of $\varphi_0$.

**Theorem 4.10.** There exists $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that if $\gamma > \gamma_0$, then the problem (115) admits a unique solution. If $\gamma < \gamma_0$, then we have

$$\sup_{w \in L^2(0, \infty; H)} P(u^0, w) = \infty.$$ 

**Proof.** If $w = 0$, then by Theorem 4.1, there exists an optimal control for the problem $I(u^0, w)$. Therefore the set $\{I(u^0, w) | w \in L^2(0, \infty; H)\}$ is nonempty.

Let us recall $\gamma_0 = \sup\{\|w\|_{L^2(0, \infty; H)} = 1 (w, Qw)\}$.

Therefore using Lemma 4.8 and Lemma 4.9 in (108) we have

$$P(u^0, w) \leq C|u^0|^2 + C|w^0|\|w\|_{L^2(0, \infty; H)} + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_0 \int_0^\infty |w|^2 dt - \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_0^\infty |w|^2 dt$$

$$\leq C|u^0|^2 + C|w^0|\|w\|_{L^2(0, \infty; H)} + \frac{(\gamma_0 - \gamma)}{2} \int_0^\infty |w|^2 dt.$$ 

Let us choose $\gamma > \gamma_0$ then we get $P(u^0, w)$ goes to $-\infty$ as $\|w\|_{L^2(0, \infty; H)} \to \infty$.

Also we can see that as a function of $w$, $P(u^0, w)$ is a concave function and hence supremum over $w$ exists. This ensures the existence of solution of the problem (115), when $\gamma > \gamma_0$.

Let us consider $\gamma < \gamma_0$. Then by the definition of $\gamma_0 = \sup\{\|w\|_{L^2(0, \infty; H)} = 1 (w, Qw)\}$, there exists $w \in L^2(0, \infty; H)$ such that

$$\frac{\gamma + \gamma_0}{2} < (w, Qw) < \gamma_0.$$

Now set $w_n = nw, \forall n \geq 1$. Using Lemma 4.8 and Lemma 4.9 we deduce

$$P(u^0, w_n) = P(u^0, 0) + T(u^0, w_n) + P(0, w_n)$$

$$= P(u^0, 0) + T(u^0, w_n) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\infty (w_n, Qw_n) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_0^\infty \|w_n(t)\|^2 dt$$

$$= P(u^0, 0) + T(u^0, w_n) + \frac{n^2}{2} \int_0^\infty (w, Qw) - \frac{n^2\gamma}{2} \int_0^\infty \|w(t)\|^2 dt$$

$$\geq -C|u^0|^2 - nC|u^0|\|w\|_{L^2(0, \infty; H)} + \frac{n^2(\gamma_0 - \gamma)}{2} \int_0^\infty |w|^2 dt.$$ 

From (117) as $n \to \infty$ we can conclude that $P(u^0, w_n)$ goes to $\infty$. □

Next our aim is to characterize the optimal disturbance.

**Theorem 4.11.** Let us assume that $\gamma > \gamma_0$. Let $\hat{w}$ be an optimal disturbance for the problem (115), then $\hat{w}$ can be characterized as

$$-B_2\hat{w} + \gamma\hat{w} + B_2^*\varphi_0 = 0,$$

where $\varphi_0$ is the solution of the adjoint system

$$-\frac{dz}{dt} + A^*z = 0, \quad z(\infty) = 0.$$
Proof. Let \( \hat{w} \) be the optimal value for \( P(u^0) \). Then, for \( \lambda \in [0, 1] \), we can deduce
\[
P(u^0, \hat{w} + \lambda w) - P(u^0, \hat{w}) = \frac{1}{2} (u^0, \phi_0(0)) + T(u^0, \hat{w} + \lambda w) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (\hat{w} + \lambda w, Q(\hat{w} + \lambda w))
\]
\[
- \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_0^\infty \| \hat{w} + \lambda w \|^2 dt - \frac{1}{2} (u^0, \phi_0(0)) - T(u^0, \hat{w})
\]
\[
- \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (\hat{w}, Q\hat{w}) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_0^\infty \| \hat{w} \|^2 dt
\]
\[
= T(u^0, \lambda w) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (\lambda w, Q(\hat{w} + \lambda w)) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (\hat{w}, Q\lambda w)
\]
\[
+ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (\hat{w}, Q\lambda w) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (\hat{w}, Q\hat{w})
\]
\[
- \frac{\gamma \lambda^2}{2} \int_0^\infty \| w \|^2 dt - \gamma \int_0^\infty (\hat{w}, \lambda w),
\]
which implies
\[
P(u^0, \hat{w} + \lambda w) - P(u^0, \hat{w}) = T(u^0, \lambda w) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (\lambda w, Q(\hat{w} + \lambda w)) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (\hat{w}, Q\lambda w)
\]
\[
- \frac{\gamma \lambda^2}{2} \int_0^\infty \| w \|^2 dt - \gamma \int_0^\infty (\hat{w}, \lambda w),
\]
dividing by \( \lambda \) and taking limit as \( \lambda \) goes to zero we get,
\[
\lim_{\lambda \to 0} \frac{P(u^0, \hat{w} + \lambda w) - P(u^0, \hat{w})}{\lambda} \geq 0
\]
\[
\Rightarrow T(u^0, w) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (w, Q\hat{w}) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty (\hat{w}, Qw) - \gamma \int_0^\infty (\hat{w}, \hat{w}) \geq 0
\]
\[
\Rightarrow \int_0^\infty (w, B_2^* \phi_0) + \int_0^\infty (w, Q\hat{w}) - \gamma \int_0^\infty (w, \hat{w}) \geq 0,
\]
where we have used the fact that the operator \( Q \) is symmetric. Now by taking the Gateaux derivative in the direction of \( -w \) we further get
\[
\int_0^\infty (w, B_2^* \phi_0) + \int_0^\infty (w, Q\hat{w}) - \gamma \int_0^\infty (w, \hat{w}) \leq 0.
\]
Combining (119) and (120) we get
\[
\int_0^\infty (w, B_2^* \phi_0) + \int_0^\infty (w, Q\hat{w}) - \gamma \int_0^\infty (w, \hat{w}) = 0.
\]
Since (119) is true for all \( w \in L^2(0, \infty; H) \) we get
\[
-Q\hat{w} + \gamma \hat{w} = B_2^* \phi_0.
\]
Let us define the operator \( L : L^2(0, \infty; H) \to L^2(0, \infty; H) \) by
\[
Lw = -Qw + \gamma w, \quad \forall w \in L^2(0, \infty; H).
\]
Since,
\[
(w, Lw) = (w, -Qw + \gamma w) \geq (-\gamma_0 + \gamma) \| w \|^2_{L^2(0, \infty; H)} \geq 0,
\]
\( L \) is an isomorphism. Therefore from (122) the optimal disturbance is given by \( \hat{w} \) as
\[
\hat{w} = L^{-1}(B_2^* \phi_0),
\]
where $\varphi_0$ solves (118).

Now if we substitute $\hat{w}$ in the system (52)-(53), we get the solution $(u_{\hat{w}}, p_{\hat{w}})$. The corresponding optimal control is given by $\hat{U} = B_1^*(R_0 u_{\hat{w}} + p_{\hat{w}}) = B_1^* r_{u_0} \hat{w}$. Let us denote $r_{u_0, \hat{w}}$ as $r_{u_0}$ for simplicity, since it only depends on the system with $w = 0$. Therefore we get $\hat{U} = B_1^* r_{u_0}$ and $\hat{w} = -B_2^* (\varphi_0 + \varphi_{u_0}) = -B_2^* r_{u_0}$.

Let us introduce the operator $R \in L(H)$ defined by $R : u^0 \rightarrow r_{u_0}(0)$.

Moreover, the optimal cost maximised over all disturbances is given by

$$P(u^0, \hat{w}) = \frac{1}{2}(u^0, Ru^0).$$

Lemma 4.12. The operator $R \in L(H,H)$ is symmetric and positive.

Proof. To prove that $R$ is positive we need to show that $\forall u^0 \in H$, $(Ru^0, u^0) \geq 0$. But we have from (125) that $(Ru^0, u^0) = 2P(u^0, \hat{w})$. Since $\hat{w}$ is the solution of the supremum problem (118), we have $P(u^0, \hat{w}) \geq 0$. Hence $R$ is positive.

Now we will prove that $R$ is symmetric. Let $r_{u_0}$ and $r_{v_0}$ be the solutions of (58) corresponding to initial conditions $u^0$ and $v^0$. From the definition of $R$ we get,

$$(Ru^0, v^0) = (R_0 u^0, v^0) + (r_{u_0}(0), v^0) = (u^0, R_0 v^0) + (r_{u_0}(0), v^0),$$

since $R_0$ is symmetric. We know that,

$$(r_{u_0}(0), v^0) = -\int_0^\infty (r_{u_0}', u_{v_0}) dt - \int_0^\infty (r_{u_0}, u_{v_0}) dt = \int_0^\infty (-A_{R_0} r_{u_0} + R_0 B_2 w_{v_0}, u_{v_0}) dt + \int_0^\infty (r_{u_0}, A_{R_0} u_{v_0}) dt = \int_0^\infty (R_0 B_2 w_{v_0}, u_{v_0}) dt = \int_0^\infty (B_2 w_{v_0}, R_0 u_{v_0}) dt = \int_0^\infty (w_{v_0}, B_2^* p_{v_0}) dt$$

(126)

Since $Q$ is symmetric we get

$$(r_{u_0}(0), v^0) = \int_0^\infty (B_2^* p_{v_0}, w_{v_0}) dt = (u^0, r_{v_0}(0))$$

Thus $R$ is positive and symmetric.

Lemma 4.13. For all $t \geq 0$ we have

$$r_{u_0}(t) = R\hat{u}(t).$$

Proof. The proof follows from Theorem 6.11.1 and Theorem 6.12.1 of [30].

Now onwards, for simplicity let us denote, $(u_{u_0}, r_{u_0})$ by $(u, r)$.
Theorem 4.14. Let \( u^0 \in H \). Then the following system
\[
\frac{du}{dt} + Au = B_1^*r - \frac{1}{\gamma}B_2^*r, \quad u(0) = u^0
\]
\[
-\frac{dr}{dt} + A^*r = u, \quad r(\infty) = 0
\]
\[r(t) = Ru(t), \quad \forall t \geq 0,
\]
has a unique solution \((u, r) \in (L^\infty(0, \infty; H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V)) \times (C([0, \infty]; H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V))\).
It satisfies
\[
\|u\|_{L^\infty(0, \infty; H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V)} + \|r\|_{C([0, \infty]; H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V)} \leq C|u^0|.
\]

Proof. By substituting the optimal control and the optimal disturbance in (82)-(83), the theorem follows. □

Theorem 4.15. For \( u^0 \in H \) the following equation
\[
\frac{du}{dt} + Au = B_1B_1^*Ru - \frac{1}{\gamma}B_2B_2^*Ru, \quad u(0) = u^0
\]
admits a unique solution in \( L^\infty(0, \infty; H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V) \).

Next we have the following lemma where we will show that \( R \) satisfies the algebraic riccati equation.

Lemma 4.16. The operator \( R \in L(H) \) is the unique solution of the following algebraic riccati equation
\[
R^* = R,
\]
for all \( u^0 \in H \) we have \( Ru^0 \in H \) and \( |Ru^0| \leq C|u^0| \),
\[
A^*R + RA + RB_1B_1^*R - \frac{1}{\gamma}RB_2B_2^*R - I = 0
\]
(130)

Proof. We have shown in Lemma 4.12 that \( R \) is symmetric.
Next we show the second condition. From (125) we get
\[
\|u\|^2_{L^2([0,T],H)} + \|U\|^2_{L^2([0,T],H)} - \gamma\|w\|^2_{L^2([0,T],H)} \leq C|u^0|^2
\]
\[
\|u\|^2_{L^2([0,T],H)} + \|U\|^2_{L^2([0,T],H)} \leq \gamma\|w\|^2_{L^2([0,T],H)} + C|u^0|^2
\]
\[
\|u\|^2_{L^2([0,T],H)} + \|U\|^2_{L^2([0,T],H)} \leq C|u^0|^2.
\]
The last inequality follows from the fact that optimal disturbance is linearly dependent on \( u^0 \). The riccati equation satisfied by \( R \) follows from Theorem 4.14. □

Now we consider the unbounded operator \((A_R, D(A_R))\) defined by
\[
D(A_R) = \{u | Au - B_1B_1^*Ru \in H\},
\]
\[A_Ru = Au - B_1B_1^*Ru \quad \text{for all } u \in D(A_R).
\]

Proposition 4.17. The linear operator \((A_R, D(A_R))\) generates an analytic and exponentially stable semigroup on \( H \).
Proof. Let us take the derivative of \((RU(t), u(t))\) and integrating from 0 to \(T\), we have
\[
(RU(T), u(T)) - (RU^0, u^0) = \int_0^T (RU(t), u(t)) dt + \int_0^T (u(t), A^*RU(t)) dt \\
+ 2 \int_0^T (RB_1U(t), u(t)) + 2 \int_0^T (RB_2w(t), u(t)) dt.
\]
Using the fact that \(R\) satisfies the algebraic ricatti equation (130) we get
\[
(RU(T), u(T)) - (RU^0, u^0) = - \int_0^T (RB_1B_1^*RU(t), u(t)) dt + \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_0^T (RB_2B_2^*RU(t), u(t)) dt \\
+ \int_0^T |u(t)|^2 dt + 2 \int_0^T (RB_1U(t), u(t)) \\
+ 2 \int_0^T (RB_2w(t), u(t)) dt.
\]
We obtain
\[
(RU(T), u(T)) - (RU^0, u^0) = \int_0^T |U(t) - B_1^*RU(t)|^2 dt + \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_0^T |B_2^*RU(t)|^2 dt \\
- \int_0^T |u(t)|^2 dt - \int_0^T |U(t)|^2 dt + \gamma \int_0^T |w(t)|^2 dt.
\]
Let us choose \(U = B_1^*RU\) and \(w = 0\), therefore we can see that \(u\) is the solution of
\[
\frac{du}{dt} = Au - B_1B_1^*RU \quad \text{on} \quad (0, T) \times \Omega, \quad u(0) = u^0,
\]
and we have
\[
(RU(T), u(T)) + \int_0^T |B_1^*RU(t)|^2 dt - \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_0^T |B_2^*RU(t)|^2 dt + \int_0^T |u(t)|^2 dt = (RU^0, u^0).
\]
Now taking the limit \(T\) goes to \(\infty\) we finally obtain,
\[
\int_0^\infty |B_1^*RU(t)|^2 dt - \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_0^\infty |B_2^*RU(t)|^2 dt + \int_0^\infty |u(t)|^2 dt \leq C|u^0|^2.
\]
This completes the proof. \(\square\)

**Theorem 4.18.** Let \(u^0 \in H\). Then the following system
\[
\frac{du}{dt} + A_Ru = -\frac{1}{\gamma} B_2B_2^*RU, \quad u(0) = u^0
\]
\[
- \frac{dr}{dt} + A^*r = u, \quad r(\infty) = 0
\]
has a unique solution
\[
(u, r) \in L^\infty(0, \infty; H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V) \times (C([0, \infty], H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V)).
\]
It satisfies
\[
\|u\|_{L^2(0, \infty; V)} + \|r\|_{L^2(0, \infty; V)} \leq C|u^0|.
\]
Proof. Observe that

\[ \| - \frac{1}{\gamma} B_2 B_2^* R u \|_{L^2(0,\infty; H)} \leq C_\gamma \| u \|_{L^2(0,\infty; V)}. \]

We know that from Proposition \(4.1\) that \( A \) generates a exponentially stable semigroup. It yields

\[ u(t) = e^{-A \gamma t} u^0 - \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_0^\infty e^{-A \gamma (t-s)} B_2 B_2^* R u(s) ds. \]

Therefore from the first equation of \(132\), using Proposition 3.1 of \(13\) we get

\[ \| u \|_{C([0,\infty], H) \cap L^2(0,\infty; V)} \leq C_\gamma \| u \|_{L^2(0,\infty; V)} \leq C \| u \|^0. \]

Similarly we get from \(138\)

\[ \| r \|_{C([0,\infty], H) \cap L^2(0,\infty; V)} \leq C \| u \|^0. \]

Adding \(138\) and \(139\) we get

\[ \| u \|_{L^2(0,\infty; V)} + \| r \|_{L^2(0,\infty; V)} \leq C \| u \|^0. \]

\[ \square \]

4.2. Robust stabilization of the linearized system. Consider the following system

\[ \frac{du}{dt} + A u = B_2 v, \quad u(0) = u^0. \]

**Theorem 4.19.** If \( w \in L^2(0,\infty; H) \) and \( u^0 \in H \), then the unique solution of \(140\) satisfies the following inequality,

\[ \int_0^\infty |u(t)|^2 dt + \int_0^\infty |B_2^* R u(t)|^2 dt \leq C \| u \|^0 + \gamma |w|^2. \]

**Proof.** Let us take the derivative of \((R u(t), u(t))\) and integrating from 0 to \(\infty\), we have

\[- (R u^0, u^0) = \int_0^\infty (A R u(t), u(t)) dt + \int_0^\infty (u(t), A^* R u(t)) dt - 2 \int_0^\infty |B_2^* R u(t)|^2 dt + 2 \int_0^\infty (B_2 w(t), u(t)) dt. \]

Using the algebraic riccati equation of \( R \), we obtain

\[- (R u^0, u^0) = - \int_0^\infty |B_2^* R u(t)|^2 dt - \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_0^\infty |B_2 u|^2 dt - \int_0^\infty |u(t)|^2 dt + 2 \int_0^\infty (w(t), B_2^* R u(t)) dt. \]

Further we obtain,

\[(R u^0, u^0) = \int_0^\infty |B_2^* R u(t)|^2 dt + \gamma \int_0^\infty |w - \frac{1}{\gamma} B_2^* R u(t)|^2 dt + \int_0^\infty |u(t)|^2 dt - \gamma \int_0^\infty |w(t)|^2 dt. \]
Finally we can deduce that,
\[ \int_0^\infty |u(t)|^2 dt + \int_0^\infty |B_1^\gamma R u(t)|^2 dt \leq C|u_0|^2 + \gamma |w|^2. \]

\[ \square \]

4.3. Robust stabilization of the nonlinear system. Next our aim is to show that the optimal control \( \hat{U} \) will stabilize the nonlinear system (71). We will first prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.20.** Let us take \( g \in L^2(0, \infty; H) \). The system
\[
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\mu}{dt} + A_\Omega \mu &= B_2 w + g, \ u(0) = u_0 \\
&= -\frac{d}{dt} + A^* r = u, \ r(\infty) = 0
\end{aligned}
\]  
has a unique solution \((u, r) \in (L^\infty(0, \infty; H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V)) \times (C([0, \infty], H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V))\),
for all \( u^0 \in H \) and \( w \in L^2(0, \infty; H) \). Moreover it satisfies
\[
\|u\|_{L^\infty(0, \infty; H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V)} + \|r\|_{L^\infty(0, \infty; H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V)} \leq C(|u_0| + \|w\|_{L^2(0, \infty; H)} + \|g\|_{L^2(0, \infty; H)}).
\]

**Proof.** It follows from the Theorem [4.18]

**Theorem 4.21.** There exist \( \kappa_0 > 0 \) and a nondecreasing function \( \pi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \) such that if \( 0 < \kappa < \kappa_0 \) and \( |y_0| + \|w\|_{L^2(0, \infty; H)} \leq \pi(\kappa) \), then the nonlinear system
\[
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\mu}{dt} + A_\Omega \mu + B(\mu) &= B_2 w, \ u(0) = u_0
\end{aligned}
\]  
has a unique solution
\[
\begin{aligned}
\mu \in (C([0, \infty], H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V)).
\end{aligned}
\]  
and the solution \( \mu \in \Sigma_{\mu} = \left\{ \mu \in L^\infty(0, \infty; H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V); \|\mu\|_{L^\infty(0, \infty; H)} \leq \kappa, \|\mu\|_{L^2(0, \infty; V)} \leq \kappa \right\}, \ \forall t \geq 0.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( u^0 \in H \) be arbitrary. Let us denote \( \Upsilon : L^2(0, \infty; H) \rightarrow L^2(0, \infty; H) \) and defined by
\[ \Upsilon(g) = u, \]
where \( u \) is the solution of the system (142). From the Theorem [4.20] we know that \( \Upsilon \) is Lipschitz function from \( L^2(0, \infty; H) \) to \( (C([0, \infty], H) \cap L^2(0, \infty; V)) \). We can write the solution of the nonlinear system (71) as
\[ u = \Upsilon(-B(\mu)). \]

Let us set
\[ \Gamma(\mu) = -B(\mu), \quad \Lambda = \Upsilon \circ \Gamma. \]

Now our aim is to show that \( \Lambda \) maps \( \Sigma_{\mu} \) to itself and it is a contraction map. We have
\[
\begin{aligned}
|B(\mu)| &\leq C_1 |\mu|, \quad \forall \mu \in V, \\
|B(\mu) - B(\nu)| &\leq C_1 (|\mu||u - v| + \|u - v||v|), \quad \forall u, v \in V.
\end{aligned}
\]  

(145)
Integrating (145) over 0 to ∞ we get,
\[
|B(u) - B(v)|_{L^2(0, ∞; H)} \leq C_1 \left( \|u\|_{L^∞(0, ∞; H)} \|u\|_{L^2(0, ∞; V)} + \|v\|_{L^∞(0, ∞; H)} \|v\|_{L^2(0, ∞; V)} \right)
\]
(146)
\[
\|u - v\|_{L^∞(0, ∞; H)} \|u - v\|_{L^2(0, ∞; V)}.
\]
Therefore from (146) we get
\[
\|\Gamma(u) - \Gamma(v)\|_{L^2(0, ∞; H) \times L^2(0, ∞; H)} \leq C_1 \left( \|u\|_{L^∞(0, ∞; H)} \|u\|_{L^2(0, ∞; V)} + \|v\|_{L^∞(0, ∞; H)} \|v\|_{L^2(0, ∞; V)} \right)
\]
(147)
\[
\|u - v\|_{L^∞(0, ∞; H)} \|u - v\|_{L^2(0, ∞; V)},
\]
for all \( u, v \in L^∞(0, ∞; H) \cap L^2(0, ∞; V) \). Moreover we have
\[
\|\Gamma(u)\|_{L^2(0, ∞; H)} \leq C_1 \|u\|_{L^∞(0, ∞; H)} \|u\|_{L^2(0, ∞; V)},
\]
for all \( u \in L^∞(0, ∞; H) \cap L^2(0, ∞; V) \). Now let us take \( X = (L^∞(0, ∞; H) \cap L^2(0, ∞; V)) \), it implies
\[
\Sigma_κ = \{u \in X; \|u\|_{L^∞(0, ∞; H)} \leq κ, \|u\|_{L^2(0, ∞; V)} \leq κ\}.
\]
Let us choose \( π(κ) = \frac{κ}{κ_0} \) and \( κ < κ_0 \) where \( κ_0 = \frac{1}{2C_1} \). Using the Lemma 4.20 and (148) we derive
\[
\|\Lambda(u)\|_{L^2(0, ∞; H)} \leq C\|u\|_{L^2(0, ∞; H)} + \|\Gamma(u)\|_{L^2(0, ∞; H)}
\]
\[
\leq C\|u\|_{L^2(0, ∞; H)} + C_1 \|u\|_{L^∞(0, ∞; H)} \|u\|_{L^2(0, ∞; V)}
\]
\[
\leq C\pi(κ) + CC_1 \|u\|_{L^∞(0, ∞; H)} \|L^∞(0, ∞; H) \cap L^2(0, ∞; V)}
\]
\[
\leq C\pi(κ) + CC_1 κ^2 \leq κ.
\]
So we proved that \( Λ \) maps \( Σ_κ \) to itself. Now we are left to show that \( Λ \) is a contraction map.

From the Lemma 4.20 and (147) we get
\[
\|\Lambda(u) - \Lambda(v)\|_{L^2(0, ∞; H)} \leq C\|\Gamma(u) - \Gamma(v)\|_{L^2(0, ∞; H)}
\]
\[
\leq CC_1 \left( \|u\|_{L^∞(0, ∞; H)} \|u\|_{L^2(0, ∞; V)} + \|v\|_{L^∞(0, ∞; H)} \|v\|_{L^2(0, ∞; V)} \right)
\]
(149)
\[
\leq 2CC_1 κ^2 \|u - v\|_{L^∞(0, ∞; H) \cap L^2(0, ∞; V)}.
\]
The operator \( Λ \) is a contradiction in \( Σ_κ \). Therefore the system (143) has a unique solution \( u \in Σ_κ \).

**Theorem 4.22.** If \( w \in L^2(0, ∞; H) \) and \( u^0 \in H \), then the unique solution of (143) satisfies the following inequality,
\[
\int_0^∞ |u|^2 dt + \int_0^∞ |B_1^* R u(t)|^2 dt \leq C|u^0|^2 + γ|w|^2 + 2C_1 κ^3.
\]
(151)

**Proof.** We know that \( u \) is the solution of
\[
\frac{du}{dt} = AR u + B_2 w + B(u), \quad \text{in} \ (0, ∞), \ u(0) = u^0.
\]
(152)
Let us take the derivative of \( (R u(t), u(t)) \) and integrating from 0 to ∞, we have
\[
-(R u^0, u^0) = \int_0^∞ (AR u(t), u(t)) dt + \int_0^∞ (u(t), R A^* u(t)) dt - 2 \int_0^∞ |B_1^* R u(t)|^2 dt
\]
\[
+ 2 \int_0^∞ (B_2 w(t), u(t)) dt + 2 \int_0^∞ (B(u)(t), u(t)) dt.
\]
Using the algebraic Riccati equation of $\mathcal{R}$, we obtain
\begin{align*}
-(\mathcal{R}u^0, u^0) &= -\int_0^\infty |B_1^* \mathcal{R}u(t)|^2 dt - \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_0^\infty |B_2^* u|^2 dt - \int_0^\infty |u(t)|^2 dt \\
&\quad + 2 \int_0^\infty (w(t), B_2^* \mathcal{R}u(t)) dt + 2 \int_0^\infty (B(u)(t), u(t)) dt.
\end{align*}
Further we obtain,
\begin{align*}
(\mathcal{R}u^0, u^0) &= \int_0^\infty |B_1^* \mathcal{R}u(t)|^2 dt + \gamma \int_0^\infty |w - \frac{1}{\gamma} B_2^* \mathcal{R}u(t)|^2 dt + \int_0^\infty |u(t)|^2 dt \\
&\quad - \gamma \int_0^\infty |w(t)|^2 dt + 2 \int_0^\infty (B(u)(t), u(t)) dt.
\end{align*}
We have
\begin{align*}
\int_0^\infty |B_1^* \mathcal{R}u(t)|^2 dt + \gamma \int_0^\infty |w - \frac{1}{\gamma} B_2^* \mathcal{R}u(t)|^2 dt + \int_0^\infty |u(t)|^2 dt - \gamma \int_0^\infty |w(t)|^2 dt
\leq \|\mathcal{R}\|_{L^2(H)} |u^0|^2 + 2 \int_0^\infty |(B(u)(t), u(t))| dt.
\end{align*}
Finally we can deduce that,
\begin{align*}
\int_0^\infty |u(t)|^2 dt + \int_0^\infty |B_1^* \mathcal{R}u(t)|^2 dt &\leq C|u^0|^2 + \gamma |w|^2 + 2 \int_0^\infty |(B(u)(t), u(t))| dt \\
&\leq C|u^0|^2 + \gamma |w|^2 + 2C_1 |u|_{L^\infty(0, \infty; H)} \|u\|_{L^2(0, \infty; V)}^2 \\
&\leq C|u^0|^2 + \gamma |w|^2 + 2C_1 \kappa^3.
\end{align*}
This completes the proof. \hfill \square
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