

# Controllability Under Positive Constraints for Quasilinear Parabolic PDEs

Miguel R. NUÑEZ-CHÁVEZ \*

## Abstract

This paper deals with the analysis of the internal control with constraint of positive kind of a parabolic PDE with nonlinear diffusion when the time horizon is large enough. The minimal controllability time will be strictly positive.

We prove a global steady state constrained controllability result for a quasilinear parabolic with nonlinearity in the diffusion term. Then, under suitable dissipative assumption in the system and local controllability results, we conclude the result to any initial datum and any target trajectory.

**Mathematics Subject Classification:** 35B37, 35k51, 93C20.

**Key words and phrases:** Quasilinear parabolic PDE, local controllability, positive constraints, iterative method, positive minimal time.

Mention to my colleagues Dario Pighin and Borjan Geshkovski from DeustoTech for their collaboration in some suggestions to this article.

Special mention to PhD. Enrique Zuazua, for his advice and support in my stay of the year 2018 in DeustoTech, Bilbao.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper we mainly focus on the controllability problem for quasilinear heat equations under unilateral constraints. In other words, our aim is to analyse if the parabolic equation under consideration can be driven to a desired final target by means of the control action, but preserving some constraints on the control and/or the state. To fix ideas we focus on nonnegativity constraints.

As it is well known by now, a wide class of linear, semilinear and quasilinear parabolic systems, in the absence of constraints, is controllable in any positive time (see [8], [12], [3] and [13]). And, often times, norm-optimal controls

---

\*Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, UFF, RJ, Brasil, miguelnunez@mat.uff.br

achieving the target at the final time are restrictions of solutions of the adjoint system. Accordingly these controls experience large oscillations in the proximity of the final time. In particular, when the time horizon is too short, these oscillations prevent the control to fulfill the positivity constraint.

Therefore, the question of controlling the system by means of nonnegative controls requires further investigation. This question has been addressed in [14] where, in the context of the linear heat equation, the constrained controllability in large time was proved, showing also the existence of a minimal controllability or waiting time.

In [15] the authors worked with a semilinear equation with  $C^1$  nonlinearity, without sign or globally Lipschitz assumptions on the nonlinear term. In [17] the authors worked with reaction-diffusion equations about the same question.

There are more papers about controllability under constraint, for instance [11], here the author worked with a nonlinear system  $4 \times 4$ ; and [19], in this paper the author worked with the boundary control problem.

In the present paper, inspired by [14] and [15], we prove a more general result, this is, the nonlinearity in the diffusion term. The method of proof, that uses a "stair-case argument", that consists in moving from one steady state to a neighbouring one, using small amplitude controls, in a recursive manner, so to reach the final target after a number of iterations and preserving the constraints on the control imposes a priori.

This iterative method, though, leads to constrained control results only when the time of control is large enough, and this time horizon increases when the distance between the initial and final steady states increases.

Once the control property has been achieved with nonnegative controls, the classical comparison or maximum principle for parabolic equations allows proving that the same property holds under positivity constraints on the state.

But all previous techniques and results require the control time to be long enough. It is then natural to analyse whether constrained controllability can be achieved in an arbitrarily small time. In [14] and [15] it was shown, for the linear and semilinear heat equations, that constrained controllability does not hold when the time horizon is too short. As we shall see, under some assumptions on the nonlinearity, the same occurs for quasilinear parabolic equations so that, the minimal constrained controllability time  $T_{\min}$ , is necessarily strictly positive, showing a waiting time phenomenon.

## 1.1 Statements of the Main Results

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  ( $N \geq 1$  is an integer) be a non-empty bounded connected open set, with regular boundary  $\partial\Omega$ . We fix  $T > 0$  and set  $Q := \Omega \times (0, T)$  and  $\Sigma := \partial\Omega \times (0, T)$ .

The symbol  $C$  is used to designate a generic positive constant.

Let  $\omega, \omega_1 \subset \Omega$  be non-empty open sets, such that  $\omega_1 \subset\subset \omega$ . We deal with

the exact controllability to trajectories for the quasilinear system

$$\begin{cases} y_t - \nabla \cdot (a(y)\nabla y) = v\rho_\omega & \text{in } Q, \\ y(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ y(x, 0) = y_0(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $y$  is the associated state,  $v$  is the control and  $\rho_\omega \in C_0^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ , such that  $\rho_\omega = 0$  in  $\Omega \setminus \omega$  and  $\rho_\omega = 1$  in  $\omega_1$ .

Here, it will be assumed that the real-valued function  $a = a(r)$  satisfies

$$a \in C^2(\mathbb{R}), \quad 0 < a_0 \leq a(r) \leq a_1 \quad \text{and} \quad |a'(r)| + |a''(r)| \leq M, \quad \forall r \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.2)$$

We need to introduce some notation, for any  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ , denote by  $C^{k,l}(\overline{Q})$  the set of all functions which have continuous derivatives up to order  $k$  with respect to the space variable and up to order  $l$  with respect to the time variable. For any  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , put

$$C^{k+\theta, l+\frac{\theta}{2}}(\overline{Q}) = \left\{ z \in C^{k,l}(\overline{Q}); \sup_{|\sigma|=k} \sup_{(x_1, t_1) \neq (x_2, t_2)} \frac{|\partial_x^\sigma \partial_t^l z(x_1, t_1) - \partial_x^\sigma \partial_t^l z(x_2, t_2)|}{(|x_1 - x_2| + |t_1 - t_2|^{1/2})^\theta} < \infty \right\}$$

and

$$C^{k+\theta}(\overline{\Omega}) = \left\{ z \in C^k(\overline{\Omega}); \sup_{|\sigma|=k} \sup_{x_1 \neq x_2} \frac{|\partial_x^\sigma z(x_1) - \partial_x^\sigma z(x_2)|}{|x_1 - x_2|^\theta} < \infty \right\}$$

both of which are Banach spaces with canonical norms.

Note that, if  $y_0 \in C^{2+1/2}(\overline{\Omega})$ ,  $v \in C^{1/2, 1/4}(\overline{Q})$ , then (1.1) possesses exactly one solution satisfying

$$y \in C^{2+1/2, 1+1/4}(\overline{Q}),$$

(see for instance [10], Chapter 5, Section 6, Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 6.2).

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $\bar{v} \in C^{1/2}(\overline{\Omega})$  be a steady control. A function  $\bar{y} \in C^{2+1/2}(\overline{\Omega})$  is said to be a steady state for (1.1) if is a solution to

$$-\nabla \cdot (a(\bar{y})\nabla \bar{y}) = \bar{v}\rho_\omega \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \bar{y} = 0 \quad \text{in } \partial\Omega. \quad (1.3)$$

We denote by  $\mathcal{S}$  the set of steady states with the  $C^{1/2}(\overline{\Omega})$  distance.

The existence of steady-states solution with non-homogeneous values (the local control) can be analysed using for the nonlinear system the fixed point methods (see [20], Theorem 9.B) and for the linear system the classical existence results (see [9], Chapter 4, Section 6, Theorem 6.4).

**Observation 1.1.** The application  $\bar{v} \mapsto \bar{y}$  shown in (1.3) is continuous and bijective, since  $a(\cdot)$  satisfies (1.2).

Let  $y_0$  be the initial condition and  $y_1$  the final target, then by Observation 1.1 there exist  $v_0$  and  $v_1$  the steady controls for  $y_0$  and  $y_1$  respectively.

We define a path-connected steady states as a path continuous

$$\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$$

such that  $\gamma(0) = y_0$  and  $\gamma(1) = y_1$ . We call  $\bar{v}^s$  the steady control of  $\gamma(s)$  for each  $s \in [0, 1]$ . (This path exists because we can choose  $\gamma(s) := \bar{y}^s$ , where  $\bar{y}^s$  is solution to (1.3) with steady control  $\bar{v}^s := (1 - s)v_0 + sv_1$ ).

Now, let us state the main result in this section is the following

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $y_0$  and  $y_1$  be path connected (in  $\mathcal{S}$ ) steady states. Assume there exists  $\eta > 0$  such that*

$$\bar{v}^s \geq \eta \tag{1.4}$$

for any  $s \in [0, 1]$ . Then there exists  $T_0 > 0$  such that for every  $T \geq T_0$ , there exists  $v \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, T))$ , a control such that the system (1.1) admits a unique solution  $y$  satisfying  $y(T) = y_1$  and  $v \geq 0$  in  $\omega \times (0, T)$ .

In the other hand, let us define a target trajectory  $\bar{y} = \bar{y}(x, t)$  as solution to

$$\begin{cases} \bar{y}_t - \nabla \cdot (a(\bar{y})\nabla\bar{y}) = \bar{v}\rho_\omega & \text{in } Q, \\ \bar{y}(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \bar{y}(x, 0) = \bar{y}_0(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

with  $\bar{y}_0 \in C^{2+1/2}(\bar{\Omega})$  and  $\bar{v} \in C^{1/2, 1/4}(\bar{Q})$ .

In the hypothesis to  $a(\cdot)$ , suppose an additional condition to  $a_0$ :

$$a_0 > MC(\Omega)\|\nabla\bar{y}\|_{L^\infty}, \tag{1.6}$$

where the constant  $C(\Omega) > 0$  satisfies  $\|\cdot\|_{L^2} \leq C(\Omega)\|\cdot\|_{H_0^1}$  and the constant  $M > 0$  satisfies (1.2).

Now, we will extend Theorem 1.1 in the following Theorem:

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let us consider a target trajectory  $\bar{y}$  which control  $\bar{v}$  verifies the positivity condition*

$$\bar{v} \geq \eta \text{ in } \omega \times (0, T). \tag{1.7}$$

Under assumption (1.6), for any  $y_0 \in C^{2+1/2}(\bar{\Omega})$  initial datum, there exists  $T_0 > 0$  such that for every  $T \geq T_0$ , we can find a control  $v \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, T))$  such that the unique solution  $y$  to (1.1) satisfies  $y(T) = \bar{y}(T)$  and  $v \geq 0$  in  $\omega \times (0, T)$ .

Furthermore, if  $y_0 \neq \bar{y}_0$  there exists a minimal controllability time  $T_{\min}$  that is strictly positive.

The paper is organized as follows.

- Section 2 is devoted to prove of Theorem 1.1 using the local controllability result and stair-case method.

- In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.2 using the dissipative property and comparison principle.
- In Section 4, we prove the positivity of the minimal controllability time.
- Section 5 deals with some additional comments and open questions.
- In Appendix, we will prove the local exact controllability to trajectories and the regularization property for system (1.1).

## 2 Steady-state controllability

In this Section, we deal with Theorem 1.1, we use two ingredients:

1. Local null controllability with controls  $C^{1/2,1/4}$  (see Appendix).
2. The stair-case method to obtain the desired global control.

Now, to prove the Theorem 1.1, we will proceed as in [15]. Thus:

### Step 1: Consequences of Local Controllability

Taking  $T = 1$ . For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , let  $R = \sup_{s \in [0,1]} \|\gamma(s)\|_{C^{1/2,1/4}}$  and by the continuity of  $\gamma(\cdot)$  we get

$$\|y_0\| \leq R, \quad \|y_1\| \leq R, \quad \|y_1 - y_0\|_{C^{2+1/2}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq \delta_\epsilon. \quad (2.1)$$

Applying Lemma 6.1 (see Appendix), there exists a state-control  $(z, v)$  such that

$$v \in C^{1/2,1/4}(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, 1]), \quad (2.2)$$

with  $y(1) = \bar{y}(1)$  and

$$\|v - \bar{v}\|_{C^{1/2,1/4}} \leq C \|y_1 - y_0\|_{C^{2+1/2}}, \quad (2.3)$$

this is,

$$\|v - \bar{v}\|_{C^{1/2,1/4}(\bar{\omega} \times [0,1])} \leq \epsilon. \quad (2.4)$$

### Step 2: Stepwise Method

The initial data  $y_0$  and the final target  $y_1$  to be controlled along a continuous arc  $\gamma$ . Let

$$\bar{y}_k := \gamma\left(\frac{k}{\bar{n}}\right), \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \bar{n}.$$

be a finite sequence of steady states. Let  $\bar{u}_k$  be the steady control of  $\bar{y}_k$ .

Taking  $\bar{n}$  large enough,

$$\|\bar{y}_k - \bar{y}_{k-1}\|_{C^{2+1/2}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C_\eta$$

where  $C_\eta$  is given by (2.1) with  $\epsilon = \eta$ .

Then, for any  $1 \leq k \leq \bar{n}$ , we can find a control  $u_k$  joining the steady states  $\bar{y}_{k-1}$  and  $\bar{y}_k$  in time 1 such that

$$\|u_k\|_{C^{1/2,1/4}(\bar{\omega} \times [0,1])} \leq \eta.$$

This is,  $v_k := u_k + \bar{v}_k$  satisfies

$$v_k \geq -|u_k| + \bar{v}_k \geq -\|u_k\|_{C^{1/2,1/4}(\bar{\omega} \times [0,1])} + \bar{v}_k \geq -\eta + \eta = 0, \text{ a.e. } \omega \times (0, 1). \quad (2.5)$$

### Step 3: Construction of the global control

For  $T \geq \bar{n}$ , let us define  $v : (0, T) \rightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)$  as

$$v(t) := \begin{cases} v_k(t - (k - 1)) & , \text{ if } t \in (k - 1, k) \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, \bar{n} \\ 0 & , \text{ if } t \in [\bar{n}, T). \end{cases}$$

We obtain that  $v \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, T))$  is the desired control.

## 3 Control to trajectories

In this section, we will prove the Theorem 1.2.

Let  $\bar{y}$  be a fixed trajectory solution to (1.5) with control  $\bar{v} \in C^{1/2,1/4}(\bar{Q})$  and initial datum  $\bar{y}_0 \in C^{2+1/2}(\bar{\Omega})$ .

### Step 1: Stabilization

Let  $\tau > 0$  be fixed and  $T > 2\tau$  be large enough. In the time interval  $[0, T - \tau]$  we control  $y$  by means  $v = \bar{v}$ .

We have the stabilization property of  $L^2$  in  $[0, T - 2\tau]$ , this is

$$\|y(t) - \bar{y}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C e^{-((a_0 - MC(\Omega)\|\nabla\bar{y}\|_{L^\infty})/C(\Omega))t} \|y_0 - \bar{y}_0\|_{L^2}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T - 2\tau]. \quad (3.1)$$

Indeed, making (1.1) – (1.5) and multiplying by  $y - \bar{y}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (y - \bar{y})_t (y - \bar{y}) dx - \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot (a(y) \nabla (y - \bar{y})) (y - \bar{y}) dx \\ - \int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot ((a(y) - a(\bar{y})) \nabla \bar{y}) (y - \bar{y}) dx = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|y - \bar{y}\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_{\Omega} a(y) |\nabla (y - \bar{y})|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} (a(y) - a(\bar{y})) \nabla \bar{y} \cdot \nabla (y - \bar{y}) dx = 0$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega} (a(y) - a(\bar{y})) \nabla \bar{y} \cdot \nabla (y - \bar{y}) dx \right| &\leq M \|\nabla \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty} \int_{\Omega} |y - \bar{y}| |\nabla (y - \bar{y})| dx \\ &\leq M \|\nabla \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty} \|y - \bar{y}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla (y - \bar{y})\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq MC(\Omega) \|\nabla \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla (y - \bar{y})\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, joining the previous results, we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|y - \bar{y}\|_{L^2}^2 + a_0 \|\nabla(y - \bar{y})\|_{L^2}^2 \leq MC(\Omega) \|\nabla \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla(y - \bar{y})\|_{L^2}^2$$

Denoting  $\lambda_0 := \frac{a_0 - MC(\Omega) \|\nabla \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty}}{C(\Omega)} > 0$ , we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|y - \bar{y}\|_{L^2}^2 + \lambda_0 \|y - \bar{y}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 0$$

Integrating in time from 0 to  $t$ , with  $t \in [0, T - 2\tau]$ , we prove (3.1).

We realize that  $z := y - \bar{y}$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} z_t - \nabla \cdot (\alpha_z(x, t) \nabla z) + \nabla \cdot (\beta_z(x, t) \nabla \bar{y} z) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \times (T - 2\tau, T - \tau), \\ z(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (T - 2\tau, T - \tau), \\ z(x, T - 2\tau) = y(x, T - 2\tau) - \bar{y}(x, T - 2\tau) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$\alpha_z(x, t) := a(z(x, t) + \bar{y}(x, t))$$

and

$$\beta_z(x, t) := \begin{cases} -\frac{a(z(x, t) + \bar{y}(x, t)) - a(\bar{y}(x, t))}{z(x, t)}, & \text{if } z(x, t) \neq 0, \\ -a'(\bar{y}(x, t)) & \text{if } z(x, t) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Now, applying Lemma 6.2 (see Appendix) in  $(t - 2\tau, T - \tau]$  and using (3.1) in  $t = T - 2\tau$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|y(T - \tau) - \bar{y}(T - \tau)\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C e^{C\tau} \tau^{-\frac{N}{4}} \|y(T - 2\tau) - \bar{y}(T - 2\tau)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(\tau) e^{-C(T - 2\tau)} \|y_0 - \bar{y}_0\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

### Step 2: Local control

Now, we construct the local control in final time  $T$ .

Since

$$\|y(T - \tau) - \bar{y}(T - \tau)\|_{L^2} \leq C \|y(T - \tau) - \bar{y}(T - \tau)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\tau) e^{-C(T - 2\tau)} \|y_0 - \bar{y}_0\|_{L^2}$$

then, for each  $T > 0$ , we apply Lemma 6.1 (see Appendix), this is, there exist a control  $\tilde{v} \in C^{1/2, 1/4}(\bar{\Omega} \times [t - \tau, T])$ , such that  $y(T) = \bar{y}(T)$  in time  $\tau$ .

Furthermore,

$$\|\tilde{v} - \bar{v}\|_{C^{1/2, 1/4}} \leq C \|y(T - \tau) - \bar{y}(T - \tau)\|_{L^2} \leq C(\tau) e^{-C(T - 2\tau)} \|y_0 - \bar{y}_0\|_{L^2}.$$

Therefore, taking  $T$  large enough, we get  $\|\tilde{v} - \bar{v}\|_{C^{1/2, 1/4}} \leq \eta$ .

On the other hand, we have

$$\tilde{v} \geq -|\tilde{v} - \bar{v}| + \bar{v} \geq -\|\tilde{v} - \bar{v}\|_{C^{1/2, 1/4}} + \bar{v} \geq -\eta + \eta = 0.$$

### Step 3: Construction of the global control

Finally, we define the control

$$v := \begin{cases} \bar{v} & \text{in } (0, T - \tau), \\ \tilde{v} & \text{in } (T - \tau, T). \end{cases}$$

and this conclude the proof.

## 4 Positivity of the minimal controllability time

We consider the system (1.1) and the target trajectory  $\bar{y}$  solution (1.5) with control  $\bar{v} \in C^{2+1/2, 1/4}(\bar{Q})$  and initial datum  $\bar{y}_0 \in C^{2+1/2}(\bar{\Omega})$ , such that  $\bar{v} \geq \eta$ , where  $\eta > 0$ . Then, we define

$$T_{\min} := \inf \{T > 0; \exists v \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, T))^+ \text{ such that } y(T) = \bar{y}(T)\} \quad (4.1)$$

We formulate the following result

**Theorem 4.1.** *We suppose that  $y_0 \neq \bar{y}_0$ . Then  $T_{\min} > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Case 1: If  $y_0 \not\leq \bar{y}_0$ . By assumptions  $y_0 > \bar{y}_0$  in a set of positive measure. Then, there exists a nonnegative  $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$\int_{\Omega} (y_0 - \bar{y}_0) \varphi \, dx > 0.$$

Let  $z$  be the solution to (1.1) with initial datum  $y_0$  and null control. Since  $z - \bar{y} \in C^0([0, T]; H^{-1}(\Omega))$  and  $\langle z(\cdot, 0) - \bar{y}(\cdot, 0), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle > 0$ . We conclude that

$$\langle z(T, \cdot) - \bar{y}(T, \cdot), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle > 0, \quad \forall T \in [0, T_0], \quad (4.2)$$

with  $T_0 > 0$  small enough.

We will show that  $T_{\min} \geq T_0$ . Indeed, let  $T \in (0, T_0)$  and  $v \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, T))$  be a nonnegative control such that (1.1) admits a solution  $y$  with initial datum  $y_0$  and control  $v$ . Then, by the comparison principle, we have  $y \geq z$ . Joining this result with (4.2), we have

$$\langle y(\cdot, T), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle \geq \langle z(\cdot, T), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle > \langle \bar{y}(\cdot, T), \varphi(\cdot) \rangle.$$

Hence  $y(\cdot, T) \neq \bar{y}(\cdot, T)$ .

Case 2: If  $y_0 < \bar{y}_0$ .

We take  $z$  the unique solution to (1.1) with initial datum  $y_0$  and null control. Then  $\xi := y - z$  solves

$$\begin{cases} \xi_t - \Delta(\Phi(\xi + z) - \Phi(z)) = v \varrho_\omega & \text{in } Q, \\ \xi(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \xi(x, 0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

where  $\Phi(r) := \int_0^r a(s)ds$ .

Besides,  $\bar{\xi} := \bar{y} - z$  solves (4.3) with initial datum  $\bar{y}_0 - y_0$  and control  $\bar{v}$ . The problem is reduced to prove the existence of  $T_0 > 0$  such that, for any  $T \in (0, T_0)$  and for any nonnegative  $v \in L^\infty(\omega_1 \times (0, T))$ , we obtain  $\xi(\cdot, T) \neq \bar{\xi}(\cdot, T)$ . Clearly, this implies  $y(\cdot, T) \neq \bar{y}(\cdot, T)$ .

Suppose by contradiction, for any  $T_0 > 0$  there exists  $T \in (0, T_0)$  such that  $\xi(\cdot, T) = \bar{\xi}(\cdot, T)$ .

$\xi$  is characterized by the duality identity

$$\langle \xi(\cdot, T), \varphi^T(\cdot) \rangle = \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} v \varrho_\omega \varphi dx dt, \quad (4.4)$$

where  $\varphi$  is the solution to the adjoint problem

$$\begin{cases} -\varphi_t - \Psi_\xi(z)\Delta\varphi = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \varphi(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \varphi(x, T) = \varphi^T(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

with  $\Psi_\xi$  satisfying

$$\Psi_\xi(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{\Phi(\xi + s) - \Phi(\xi)}{s} & \text{if } s \neq 0, \\ \Phi'(\xi) & \text{if } s = 0. \end{cases}$$

Let  $\phi_1$  be the first eigenfunction of the Dirichlet Laplacian in  $\Omega$ , which is strictly positive in  $\Omega$ . For any  $r > 0$ , define the set

$$E_r := \{x \in \Omega \setminus \omega \mid \text{dist}(x, \partial\omega) < r\}$$

We consider  $\theta > 0$  such that

$$\int_{\Omega \setminus (\omega \cup E_d)} (-\phi_1)(\bar{y}_0 - y_0) dx \leq -\theta < 0,$$

where  $d := \text{dist}(\partial\omega, \partial\Omega)/2$ , then we define

$$C_\theta := \frac{\theta}{3\|\phi_1\|_{L^\infty}\|\bar{y}_0 - y_0\|_{L^1}} > 0.$$

Let us consider the cut-off function  $\zeta \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$  such that

$$\zeta := \begin{cases} -1 & , x \in \Omega \setminus (\omega \cup E_\delta), \\ -1 \leq \zeta(x) \leq C_\theta & , x \in E_\delta, \\ C_\theta & , x \in \omega. \end{cases}$$

for some  $\delta > 0$ .

We define  $\varphi^T := \zeta\phi_1$  and we have

$$\varphi^T(x) \geq \tilde{\theta}, \text{ for any } x \in \omega.$$

for some  $\tilde{\theta} > 0$ .

We will prove that  $\langle \bar{\xi}(T, \cdot), \varphi^T \rangle < 0$ . Indeed,

$$\int_{\Omega} (\bar{y}_0 - y_0) \varphi^T dx = \int_{\Omega \setminus (\omega \cup E_{\delta})} (\bar{y}_0 - y_0) \varphi^T dx + \int_{E_{\delta}} (\bar{y}_0 - y_0) \varphi^T dx + \int_{\omega} (\bar{y}_0 - y_0) \varphi^T dx$$

For  $\delta > 0$  small enough, we get, on the one hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega \setminus (\omega \cup E_{\delta})} (\bar{y}_0 - y_0) \varphi^T dx &= \int_{\Omega \setminus (\omega \cup E_{\delta})} (\bar{y}_0 - y_0) (-\phi_1) dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega \setminus (\omega \cup E_{\delta})} (\bar{y}_0 - y_0) (-\phi_1) dx \leq -\theta. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\left| \int_{E_{\delta}} (\bar{y}_0 - y_0) \varphi^T dx \right| \leq C \|\bar{y}_0 - y_0\|_{L^{\infty}} \|\phi_1\|_{L^{\infty}} |E_{\delta}| \leq \frac{\theta}{3}.$$

Finally

$$\left| \int_{\omega} (\bar{y}_0 - y_0) \varphi^T dx \right| = \left| \int_{\omega} (\bar{y}_0 - y_0) C_{\theta} \phi_1 dx \right| \leq C_{\theta} \|\phi_1\|_{L^{\infty}} \|\bar{y}_0 - y_0\|_{L^1} = \frac{\theta}{3}.$$

Then

$$\int_{\Omega} (\bar{y}_0 - y_0) \varphi^T dx \leq -\frac{\theta}{3} < 0. \quad (4.6)$$

By transposition results,  $\bar{\xi} \in C^0([0, T]; H^{-1}(\Omega))$ . Hence, choosing  $T_0 > 0$  small enough, from (4.6) we conclude

$$\langle \bar{\xi}(T, \cdot), \varphi^T(\cdot) \rangle < 0, \quad \forall T \in (0, T_0]. \quad (4.7)$$

We will prove that  $\varphi_- = 0$  in  $\omega \times (0, T_0)$ . Indeed, since  $\varphi^T \geq \tilde{\theta} > 0$  in  $\omega$ , by regularity results, we have that  $\varphi \in C(\Omega \times [0, T_0])$ , then by continuity for  $T_0$  small enough, we get  $\varphi(x, t) \geq \tilde{\theta} > 0$  in  $(x, t) \in \omega \times (0, T_0)$ , thus

$$\varphi_- = 0, \quad \text{in } \omega \times (0, T_0). \quad (4.8)$$

Substituting (4.7), (4.8) in (4.4), for  $T \in (0, T_0)$ , we get

$$0 > \langle \xi(T, \cdot), \varphi^T \rangle = \iint_{(0, T) \times \omega} v_{\varrho \omega} \varphi dx dt \geq 0.$$

This is a contradiction, hence  $\xi(T, \cdot) \neq \bar{\xi}(T, \cdot)$ .  $\square$

## 5 Additional comments and results

### 5.1 Open Problems

- The condition (1.6) is fundamental in this paper, we need this inequality to prove the control to trajectories and the stabilization property, it would be very important to prove the same results without this inequality. This question doesn't seem easy because we would need new especial estimates to control this problem.
- It is interesting to study the constraint controllability for more quasi-linear parabolic equations, for instance, when the nonlinearity  $a(y)$  is replaced by the nonlinearity  $a(\nabla y)$  in (1.1), it seems that the techniques applied in this paper is not enough. We need more regularity for the coefficient of principal part.

## 6 Appendix

### 6.1 Local Controllability Result

We will prove a local controllability result, thus:

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $T > 0$  and  $R > 0$ . Then, there exist a positive constants  $C$  and  $\epsilon$ , depending on  $R$  and  $T$  such that, for all targets  $\bar{y} \in C^{2+1/2, 1+1/4}(\bar{Q})$  solution to (1.5) with initial datum  $\bar{y}_0$  and control  $\bar{v}$  and for each initial datum  $y_0 \in C^{2+1/2}(\bar{\Omega})$  such that*

$$\|y_0\|_{C^{2+1/2}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq R, \quad \|\bar{y}\|_{C^{2+1/2, 1+1/4}(\bar{Q})} \leq R \quad \text{and} \quad \|y_0 - \bar{y}_0\|_{C^{2+1/2}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq \epsilon \quad (6.1)$$

we can find a control  $v \in C^{1/2, 1/4}(\bar{Q})$  such that

- $y(T) = \bar{y}(T)$ ,
- $\|v - \bar{v}\|_{C^{1/2, 1/4}(\bar{Q})} \leq C \|y_0 - \bar{y}_0\|_{C^{2+1/2}(\bar{\Omega})}$ .

*Proof.* We will use arguments of [2] and [13] because the linearized problems are very similar. Note that in this system appear a new term " $\beta_z$ " that depends of the regularity of  $\bar{y}$ .

Taking  $z = y - \bar{y}$ , the problem is reduced to prove the local null controllability of the system

$$\begin{cases} z_t - \nabla \cdot (\alpha_z(x, t) \nabla z) + \nabla \cdot (\beta_z(x, t) \nabla \bar{y} z) = u \rho_\omega & \text{in } Q, \\ z(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ z(x, 0) = y_0(x) - \bar{y}_0(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

where

$$\alpha_z(x, t) := a(z(x, t) + \bar{y}(x, t))$$

and

$$\beta_z(x, t) := \begin{cases} -\frac{a(z(x, t) + \bar{y}(x, t)) - a(\bar{y}(x, t))}{z(x, t)} & , \text{ if } z(x, t) \neq 0, \\ -a'(\bar{y}(x, t)) & , \text{ if } z(x, t) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Let us fix  $w \in C^{1+1/2, 1+1/4}(\bar{Q})$  and we consider the linear system

$$\begin{cases} z_t - \nabla \cdot (\alpha_w(x, t) \nabla z) + \nabla \cdot (\beta_w(x, t) \nabla \bar{y} z) = u_{\varrho_w} & \text{in } Q, \\ z(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ z(x, 0) = z_0(x) := y_0(x) - \bar{y}_0(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (6.3)$$

where

$$\alpha_w(x, t) \in C^{1/2, 1/4}(\bar{Q}) \quad (6.4)$$

and

$$\beta_w(x, t) \nabla \bar{y} \in C^{1/2, 1/4}(\bar{Q}). \quad (6.5)$$

We denote

$$B := \left( 1 + \|w\|_{C^{1,1}(\bar{Q})}^2 + \|\bar{y}\|_{C^{2+1/2, 1+1/4}(\bar{Q})}^2 \right). \quad (6.6)$$

Finally, following the ideas in [13] (using the Kakutani Fixed-Point Theorem), we can conclude the proof of Lemma 6.1.  $\square$

## 6.2 Stabilization property $L^2$ - $L^\infty$

The proof of Theorem 1.2 will need the following result:

**Lemma 6.2.** *There exist a constant  $C = C(\Omega, \|\bar{y}\|, a_0, a_1, M)$  such that, for any  $t \in (0, T]$ :*

$$\|y(\cdot, t) - \bar{y}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C e^{CT} t^{-\frac{N}{4}} (\|y_0 - \bar{y}_0\|_{L^2} + \|v - \bar{v}\|_{L^\infty}) \quad (6.7)$$

*Proof.* We present the proof in two steps.

### Step 1: Reduction to the linear case

Let  $\psi$  be the solution to

$$\begin{cases} \psi_t - \nabla \cdot (\alpha_{y-\bar{y}}(x, t) \nabla \psi) + \beta_{y-\bar{y}}(x, t) \nabla \bar{y} \cdot \nabla \psi - C_{y-\bar{y}} \psi = |v - \bar{v}|_{\varrho_w} & \text{in } Q, \\ \psi(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \psi(x, 0) = |y_0(x) - \bar{y}_0(x)| & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (6.8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{y-\bar{y}}(x, t) &:= a(y(x, t)), \\ \beta_{y-\bar{y}}(x, t) &:= \begin{cases} -\frac{a(y(x, t)) - a(\bar{y}(x, t))}{y - \bar{y}} & , \text{ if } y(x, t) \neq \bar{y}(x, t), \\ -a'(\bar{y}(x, t)) & , \text{ if } y(x, t) = \bar{y}(x, t). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$C_{y-\bar{y}} := M(\|\nabla(y - \bar{y})\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\Delta \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty}),$$

Then, by comparison argument in system (6.8), for each  $t \in [0, T]$ :

$$|y(\cdot, t) - \bar{y}(\cdot, t)| \leq \psi(\cdot, t), \quad \text{a. e. } \Omega. \quad (6.9)$$

### Step 2: Regularization effect in the linear case

We split  $\psi := \xi + \chi$ , where  $\xi$  solves:

$$\begin{cases} \xi_t - \nabla \cdot (\alpha_{y-\bar{y}}(x, t) \nabla \xi) + \beta_{y-\bar{y}}(x, t) \nabla \bar{y} \cdot \nabla \xi - C_{y-\bar{y}} \xi = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \xi(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \xi(x, 0) = |y_0(x) - \bar{y}_0(x)| & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (6.10)$$

while  $\chi$  satisfies:

$$\begin{cases} \chi_t - \nabla \cdot (\alpha_{y-\bar{y}}(x, t) \nabla \chi) + \beta_{y-\bar{y}}(x, t) \nabla \bar{y} \cdot \nabla \chi - C_{y-\bar{y}} \chi = |v - \bar{v}|_{\varrho_\omega} & \text{in } Q, \\ \chi(x, t) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \chi(x, 0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (6.11)$$

In system (6.11), by the comparison principle (see [18]), for each  $t \in [0, T]$ , we have that  $\chi \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  and there exists a constant  $C = C(\Omega, |a|, M, \|\bar{y}\|) > 0$  such that:

$$\|\chi(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq e^{CT} \|v - \bar{v}\|_{L^\infty}.$$

On the other hand, system (6.10) enjoy the  $L^2 - L^\infty$  regularization effect (see [16], Theorem 1.7), this is,  $\xi(\cdot, t) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ , for any  $t \in [0, T]$ . Moreover, there exists a constant  $C = C(\Omega, |a|, M, \|\bar{y}\|) > 0$  such that, for any  $t \in [0, T]$ :

$$\|\xi(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C e^{CT} t^{\frac{N}{4}} \|y_0 - \bar{y}_0\|_{L^2}.$$

This yields the conclusion of  $\psi$ . The comparison result (6.9) finishes the proof.  $\square$

## References

- [1] V. M. Alekseev, V. M. Tikhomorov and S. V. Formin, *Optimal Control*, Consultants Bureau, New York, (1987).
- [2] M. Beceanu, *Local Exact Controllability of the Diffusion Equation in one dimension*, Abstract and Applied Analysis, 2003 (14), (2003), 793-811.
- [3] E. Fernández-Cara, D. Nina-Huaman, M. R. Nuñez-Chávez and F. B. vieira, *On the Theoretical and Numerical Control of a One-Dimensional Nonlinear Parabolic Partial Differential Equation*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 175(3), 2017, 652-682.
- [4] E. Fernández-Cara and E. Zuazua, *The Cost of Approximate Controllability for Heat Equations: The Linear Case*, Advances in Differential Equations, 5(4-6), (2000), 465-514.

- [5] A. V. Fursikov and O. Yu. Imanuvilov, *Controllability of Evolution Equations*, Lecture Notes Series, vol. 34, Seoul National University, Research Institute of Mathematics, Global Analysis Research Center, Seoul, (1996).
- [6] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Springer, (2015).
- [7] O. Yu. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, *Carleman Inequalities for Parabolic Equations in Sobolev Spaces of Negative Order and Exact Controllability for Semilinear Parabolic Equations*, Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, 39(2), (2003), 227–274.
- [8] O. Yu. Imanuvilov, *Controllability of Parabolic Equations*, Sbornik: Mathematics, 186(6), (1995), 879-900.
- [9] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya, V. A. Solonnikov and N. N. Ural'ceva, *Linear and Quasilinear Elliptic Equations*, Translations by Scripta Technica, Inc, Academy Press, New York and London (1968).
- [10] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya, V. A. Solonnikov and N. N. Ural'ceva, *Linear and Quasilinear Equations of Parabolic Type*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, vol. 23, AMS, Providence, RI, (1968).
- [11] K. Le Balc'h, *Controllability of a  $4 \times 4$  quadratic reaction-diffusion system*, Journal of Differential Equations, 266(5), (2019), 3100-3188.
- [12] G. Lebeau and L. Robbiano, *Contrôle exact de l'équation de la chaleur*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations, 20, (1995), 335-356.
- [13] Xu Liu and Xu Zhang, *Local Controllability of Multidimensional Quasi-Linear Parabolic Equations*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 50(4), (2012), 2046-2064.
- [14] J. Lohac, E. Trelat and E. Zuazua, *Minimal controllability time for the heat equation under unilateral state or control constraints*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 27(9), (2017), 1587-1644.
- [15] D. Pighin and E. Zuazua, *Constrained Control of Semilinear Heat Equations*, Mathematical Control and Related Fields, 8(34), (2018), 935-964.
- [16] A. Porreta, *Local Existence and Uniqueness of Weak Solution for Nonlinear Parabolic Equations with Superlinear Growth and Unbounded Initial Data*, Advances in Differential Equations, 6(1), (2001), 73-128.
- [17] C. Pouchol, E. Trélat and E. Zuazua, *Phase Portrait Control for 1D Monostable and Bistable Reaction-Diffusion Equations*, Nonlinearity, London Mathematical Society, 32(3), (2019), 884-909.
- [18] M. Protter and H. Weinberger, *Maximum Principles in Differential Equations*, Springer, New York, (2012).

- [19] E.J.P. G. Schmidt, *Boundary control for the heat equation with steady-state targets*, *Journal of Differential Equations*, 78(1), (1989), 89-121.
- [20] E. Zeidler, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis and its Applications I: Fixed-Point Theorems*, Springer-Verlag, New York, Berlin, Heidelberg, Tokio, (1986).