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#### Abstract

We consider the linear Zakharov-Kuznetsov equation on a rectangle with a left Dirichlet boundary control. Using the flatness approach, we prove the null controllability of this equation and provide a space of analytic reachable states.


Keywords: Zakharov-Kuznetsov equation; null controllability; reachable states; exact controllability; flatness approach; Gevrey functions.
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 37L50, 93B05

## 1 Introduction

The Zakharov-Kuznetsov (ZK) equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{t}+a u_{x}+\Delta u_{x}+u u_{x}=0, \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

provides a model for the propagation of nonlinear ionic-sonic waves in a plasma. In (1.1), $x, t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$ (with $d \in\{1,2\}$ ) are the independent variables, $u=u(x, y, t)$ is the unknown, $u_{t}=\partial u / \partial t, u_{x}=\partial u / \partial x, \Delta u=\partial^{2} u / \partial x^{2}+\sum_{i=1}^{d} \partial^{2} u / \partial y_{i}^{2}$, and the constant $a>0$ stands for the sound velocity. The ZK equation is, from the mathematical point of view, a natural extension to $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ of the famous Korteweg-de Vries equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
z_{t}+a z_{x}+z_{x x x}+z z_{x}=0, \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]which has been extensively studied from the control point of view (see e.g. the surveys [2, 17]). If we focus on the situation where (1.2) is supplemented with the following boundary conditions
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
z(0, t)=h(t), \quad z(L, t)=z_{x}(L, t)=0, \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

where $L>0$ is a given number and $h$ is the control input, then it was proved in [8, (16] that (1.2)-(1.3) was null controllable on the domain $(0, L)$. Due to the smoothing effect, with such a control at the left endpoint the exact controllability can only hold in a space of analytic functions.

More recently, a space of analytic reachable states was provided in [13] for the linearized KdV equation

$$
z_{t}+z_{x}+z_{x x x}=0
$$

with the same boundary conditions as in (1.3). The method of proof was based on the flatness approach, as introduced in [12] to study the reachable states of the heat equation. The aim of the paper is to extend the results given in [13] to the ZK equation.

The wellposedness of various initial boundary value problems for ZK were studied in [6, 7, 10, 11, 18, 19]. Some unique continuation property for ZK derived with a Carleman estimate was done in [3]. Exact controllability results for ZK in the same spirit as those for KdV in [15] are given in [7, 14].

Here, we limit ourselves to the case $d=1$, so that $y \in \mathbb{R}$. By a translation, we can assume without loss of generality that $x \in(-1,0)$ (this will be more convenient when using series to represent the solutions). We set $\Omega:=(-1,0) \times(0,1)$. The paper is concerned with the control properties of the system:

$$
\begin{align*}
u_{t}+u_{x x x}+u_{x y y}+a u_{x}=0, & (x, y) \in \Omega, t \in(0, T),  \tag{1.4}\\
u(0, y, t)=u_{x}(0, y, t)=0, & y \in(0,1), t \in(0, T),  \tag{1.5}\\
u(-1, y, t)=h(y, t), & y \in(0,1), t \in(0, T),  \tag{1.6}\\
u(x, 0, t)=u(x, 1, t)=0, & x \in(-1,0), t \in(0, T),  \tag{1.7}\\
u(x, y, 0)=u_{0}(x, y), & (x, y) \in \Omega, \tag{1.8}
\end{align*}
$$

where $u_{0}=u_{0}(x, y)$ is the initial data and $h=h(y, t)$ is the control input.
We shall address the following issues:

1. (Null controllability) Given any $u_{0} \in L^{2}(\Omega)$, can we find a control $h$ such that the solution $u$ of (1.4)-(1.8) satisfies $u(., T)=0$ ?
2. (Reachable states) Given any $u_{1} \in \mathcal{R}$ (a subspace of $L^{2}(\Omega)$ defined thereafter), can we find a control $h$ such that the solution $u$ of (1.4)-(1.8) with $u_{0}=0$ satisfies $u(., T)=u_{1}$ ?
We shall investigate both issues by the flatness approach and derive an exact controllability in $\mathcal{R}$ by combining our results.

To state our result, we need introduce notations. A function $u \in C^{\infty}\left(\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right]\right)$ is said to be Gevrey of order $s \geq 0$ on $\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right]$ if there exist some constant $C, R \geq 0$ such that

$$
\left|\partial_{t}^{n} u(t)\right| \leq C \frac{(n!)^{s}}{R^{n}} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall t \in\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right] .
$$

The set of functions Gevrey of order $s$ on $\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right]$ is denoted by $G^{s}\left(\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right]\right)$. A function $u \in$ $C^{\infty}\left(\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right] \times\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right] \times\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right]\right)$ is said to be Gevrey of order $s_{1}$ in $x, s_{2}$ in $y$ and $s_{3}$ in $t$ on $\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right] \times\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right] \times\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right]$ if there exist some constants $C, R_{1}, R_{2}, R_{3}>0$ such that
$\left|\partial_{x}^{n_{1}} \partial_{y}^{n_{2}} \partial_{t}^{n_{3}} u(x, y, t)\right| \leq C \frac{\left(n_{1}!\right)^{s_{1}}\left(n_{2}!\right)^{s_{2}}\left(n_{3}!\right)^{s_{3}}}{R_{1}^{n_{1}} R_{2}^{n_{2}} R_{3}^{n_{3}}} \quad \forall n_{1}, n_{2}, n_{3} \in \mathbb{N}, \forall(x, y, t) \in\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right] \times\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right] \times\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right]$.
The set of functions Gevrey of order $s_{1}$ in $x, s_{2}$ in $y$ and $s_{3}$ in $t$ on $\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right] \times\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right] \times\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right]$ is denoted by $G^{s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3}}\left(\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right] \times\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right] \times\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right]\right)$.

The first main result in this paper is a null controllability result with a control input in a Gevrey class.
Theorem 1.1. Let $u_{0} \in L^{2}(\Omega)$ and $s \in\left[\frac{3}{2}, 2\right)$. Then there exists a control input $h \in G^{\frac{s}{2}, s}([0,1] \times$ $[0, T])$ such that the solution $u$ of (1.4)-(1.8) satisfies $u(\cdot, \cdot, T)=0$. Furthermore, it holds that

$$
u \in C\left([0, T] ; L^{2}(\Omega)\right) \cap G^{\frac{s}{2}, \frac{s}{2}, s}([-1,0] \times[0,1] \times[\varepsilon, T]), \quad \forall \varepsilon \in(0, T)
$$

Introduce the differential operator

$$
P u:=\triangle u_{x}+a u_{x}
$$

and the following space
$\mathcal{R}_{R_{1}, R_{2}}:=\left\{u \in C^{\infty}([-1,0] \times[0,1]) ; \exists C>0,\left|\partial_{x}^{p} \partial_{y}^{q} u(x, y)\right| \leq C \frac{(p!)^{\frac{2}{3}}(q!)^{\frac{2}{3}}}{R_{1}^{p} R_{2}^{q}} \quad \forall p, q \in \mathbb{N}, \forall(x, y) \in \bar{\Omega}\right.$, and $\left.P^{n} u(0, y)=\partial_{x} P^{n} u(0, y)=P^{n} u(x, 0)=P^{n} u(x, 1)=0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall x \in[-1,0], \forall y \in[0,1]\right\}$.
Our second main result provides a set of reachable states for system (1.4)-(1.8).
Theorem 1.2. Let $R_{0}:=\sqrt[3]{9(a+2)} e^{(3 e)^{-1}}$, and let $R_{1}, R_{2} \in\left(R_{0},+\infty\right)$. Then for any $u_{1} \in$ $\mathcal{R}_{R_{1}, R_{2}}$, there exists a control input $h \in G^{1,2}([0,1] \times[0, T])$ such that the solution $u$ of (1.4) $-(1.8)$ with $u_{0}=0$ satisfies $u(\cdot, \cdot, T)=u_{1}$. Furthermore, $u \in G^{1,1,2}([-1,0] \times[0,1] \times[0, T])$, and the trajectory $u=u(x, y, t)$ and the control $h=h(y, t)$ can be expanded as series:

$$
\begin{align*}
u(x, y, t) & =\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} g_{i, j}(x) z_{j}^{(i)}(t) e_{j}(y)  \tag{1.9}\\
h(y, t) & =\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} g_{i, j}(-1) z_{j}^{(i)}(t) e_{j}(y) \tag{1.10}
\end{align*}
$$

We refer the reader to Section 2 for the definitions of the functions $g_{i, j}(i \geq 0, j \geq 1)$ and of the functions $e_{j}(j \geq 1)$.

Combining Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, we obtain the following result which implies the exact controllability of (1.4)-(1.8) in $\mathcal{R}_{R_{1}, R_{2}}$ for $R_{1}>R_{0}$ and $R_{2}>R_{0}$.
Corollary 1.1. Let $R_{0}:=\sqrt[3]{9(a+2)} e^{(3 e)^{-1}}$, and let $R_{1}, R_{2} \in\left(R_{0},+\infty\right)$. Let $u_{0} \in L^{2}(\Omega)$ and $u_{1} \in \mathcal{R}_{R_{1}, R_{2}}$. Then there exists $h \in G^{1,2}([0,1] \times[0, T])$ such that the solution of (1.4)-(1.8) satisfies $u(., T)=u_{1}$.

The paper is outlined as follows. Section 2 introduces the eigenfunctions $e_{j}$, the generating functions $g_{i, j}$, and provide some estimates needed in the sequel. The null controllability of ZK is established in Section 3, while the reachable states of ZK are investigated in Section 4.

## 2 Preliminaries

First we introduce the operator

$$
A u:=-P u=-\triangle u_{x}-a u_{x}
$$

with domain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}(A)= & \left\{u \in L^{2}(\Omega) ; P u \in L^{2}(\Omega), u(-1, y)=u(0, y)=u_{x}(0, y)=0 \text { for a.e. } y \in(0,1)\right. \text { and } \\
& u(x, 0)=u(x, 1)=0 \text { for a.e. } x \in(-1,0)\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

It is well-known (see e.g. [19]) that the operator $A$ generates a semigroup of contractions in $L^{2}(\Omega)$. In what follows, we denote $\|f\|_{\mathcal{D}(A)}=\|f\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}+\|A f\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}$ for all $f \in \mathcal{D}(A)$.

It would be natural to expect, as for KdV , that the domain $\mathcal{D}(A)$ coincide with the set

$$
\left\{u \in H^{3}(\Omega) \cap H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) ; \quad u_{x}(0, y)=0 \text { for a.e. } y \in(0,1)\right\},
$$

but this is not the case. The best description (up to date) of $\mathcal{D}(A)$ is given in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. We have the following inclusions:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\{u \in H^{2}(\Omega) \cap H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) ; u_{x} \in H^{2}(\Omega) \text { and } u_{x}(0, y)=0 \text { for a.e. } y \in(0,1)\right\} \subset \mathcal{D}(A),  \tag{2.1}\\
& \mathcal{D}(A) \subset\left\{u \in H^{2}(\Omega) \cap H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) ;(x+1) u_{x} \in H^{2}(\Omega) \cap H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)\right\} . \tag{2.2}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. The inclusion (2.1) is obvious. For (2.2), it follows from [19, Proposition 2] that $\mathcal{D}(A) \subset$ $H^{2}(\Omega) \cap H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$. If $u \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, then $f:=\Delta u_{x}+a u_{x} \in L^{2}(\Omega)$ and hence

$$
\Delta\left((x+1) u_{x}\right)=(x+1) \Delta u_{x}+2 u_{x x}=(x+1)\left(f-a u_{x}\right)+2 u_{x x} \in L^{2}(\Omega) .
$$

On the other hand, we claim that $(x+1) u_{x} \in H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$. Indeed, $u_{x} \in H^{1}(\Omega)$ and hence $(x+$ 1) $u_{x} \in H^{1}(\Omega)$. Moreover, $u(., 0)=u(., 1)=0$ in $H^{\frac{3}{2}}(-1,0)$ gives $u_{x}(., 0)=u_{x}(., 1)=0$ in $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(-1,0)$, and finally $\left((x+1) u_{x}\right)(-1,)=.u_{x}(0,)=$.0 in $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(0,1)$. By the classical boundary $H^{2}$ regularity result for the Dirichlet problem on a Lipschitz domain, we infer that $(x+1) u_{x} \in$ $H^{2}(\Omega) \cap H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$.

Remark 2.1. It can be shown that the inclusion (2.1) is strict.
The following lemmas will be used several times thereafter.
Lemma 2.2. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$ and any $f \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{n}\right)$ with $A^{i} f \in H^{2(n-i)}(\Omega)$ for $i=0,1, \ldots, n$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{y}^{2 p} f(x, 0)=\partial_{y}^{2 p} f(x, 1)=0, \quad \forall x \in[-1,0], \forall p \in\{0, \ldots, n-1\} . \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on $n$. For $n=1$, the property (2.3) is obvious since $f \in$ $\mathcal{D}(A)$. Assume now that (2.3) is true for $n-1 \geq 1$. If $f \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{n}\right)$ with $A^{i} f \in H^{2(n-i)}(\Omega)$ for $i=0,1, \ldots, n$, then $P f=-A f \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{n-1}\right)$ with $A^{i} P f=-A^{i+1} f \in H^{2(n-i-1)}(\Omega)$ for $i=0,1, \ldots, n-1$, , so that by (2.3) applied to $P f$ and $p=n-2$

$$
\partial_{y}^{2 n-4} P f(x, 0)=\partial_{y}^{2 n-4} P f(x, 1)=0
$$

This implies

$$
\begin{align*}
& \partial_{x}^{3} \partial_{y}^{2 n-4} f(x, 0)+\partial_{x} \partial_{y}^{2 n-2} f(x, 0)+a \partial_{x} \partial_{y}^{2 n-4} f(x, 0)=0  \tag{2.4}\\
& \partial_{x}^{3} \partial_{y}^{2 n-4} f(x, 1)+\partial_{x} \partial_{y}^{2 n-2} f(x, 1)+a \partial_{x} \partial_{y}^{2 n-4} f(x, 1)=0 \tag{2.5}
\end{align*}
$$

Since (2.3) is true for $n-1$, we obtain that $\partial_{y}^{2 p} f(x, 0)=\partial_{y}^{2 p} f(x, 1)=0$ for $p=0,1, \ldots, n-2$, and hence (taking $p=n-2$ and using (2.4)-(2.5))

$$
\partial_{x} \partial_{y}^{2 n-2} f(x, 0)=\partial_{x} \partial_{y}^{2 n-2} f(x, 1)=0
$$

This means that we have for some constants $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$

$$
\partial_{y}^{2 n-2} f(x, 0)=C_{1}, \partial_{y}^{2 n-2} f(x, 1)=C_{2} \quad \forall x \in[-1,0] .
$$

Note that $\partial_{y}^{2 n-2} f \in H^{2}(\Omega) \subset C(\bar{\Omega})$. On the other hand, it follows from the assumption $f \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ that

$$
\partial_{y}^{2 n-2} f(0, y)=0 \quad \forall y \in[0,1] .
$$

Taking $y=0$ and next $y=1$, we see that $C_{1}=C_{2}=0$. The proof of Lemma2.2 is complete.
Remark 2.2. It will be proved in Proposition 2.1 (see below) that $\mathcal{D}\left(A^{n}\right) \subset H^{2 n}(\Omega)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so that the conclusion of Lemma 2.2 will be still valid when assuming solely that $f \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{n}\right)$.

The following lemma is classical. Its proof is omitted.
Lemma 2.3. Let $A^{\prime}=\partial_{y}^{2}$ with domain $\mathcal{D}\left(A^{\prime}\right)=H^{2}(0,1) \cap H_{0}^{1}(0,1)$. Then for any $m \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$, it holds

$$
\mathcal{D}\left(A^{\frac{m}{2}}\right)=\left\{g \in H^{m}(0,1) ; g^{(2 p)}(0)=g^{(2 p)}(1)=0 \text { for } 0 \leq p \leq \frac{m-1}{2}\right\} .
$$

Let $h \in L^{2}(0,1)$ be decomposed as $h(y)=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_{j} e_{j}(y)$, and let $m \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$. Then

$$
h \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{\prime \frac{m}{2}}\right) \Longleftrightarrow \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\left|\lambda_{j}^{\frac{m}{2}} c_{j}\right|^{2}<\infty .
$$

Furthermore, for any $h \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{\prime \frac{m}{2}}\right)$, we have

$$
\left\|h^{(q)}\right\|_{L^{2}(0,1)}^{2}=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{q}\left|c_{j}\right|^{2} \quad \forall q \in\{0, \ldots, m\}
$$

We are in a position to state the main result in this section.
Proposition 2.1. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds $\mathcal{D}\left(A^{n}\right) \subset H^{2 n}(\Omega)$. Furthermore, there exists a constant $B \geq 1$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u\|_{H^{2 n}(\Omega)} \leq B^{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n}\left\|P^{i} u\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{n}\right) \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $\left\{e_{j}\right\}_{j \geq 1}$ be an orthonormal basis in $L^{2}(0,1)$ such that $e_{j}$ is an eigenfunction for the Dirichlet Laplacian on $(0,1), \lambda_{j}$ being the corresponding eigenvalue; that is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -e_{j}^{\prime \prime}(y)=\lambda_{k} e_{j}(y) \\
& e_{j}(0)=e_{j}(1)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

A classical choice is $e_{j}(y)=\sqrt{2} \sin (j \pi y)$ and $\lambda_{j}=(j \pi)^{2}$ for $j \geq 1$. Following [19], we decompose any function $u \in L^{2}(\Omega)$ as

$$
u(x, y)=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \hat{u}_{j}(x) e_{j}(y)
$$

Note that $\|u\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}$, where we denote $\|h\|=\|h\|_{L^{2}(-1,0)}$ for all $h \in L^{2}(-1,0)$ for the sake of simplicity. If $u \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ and $g:=\Delta u_{x}+a u_{x}$, then for any $j \geq 1$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime \prime}+\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}=\hat{g}_{j} \text { in } L^{2}(-1,0) \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where ${ }^{\prime}=d / d x$. For $n=0$, (2.6) is obvious if we pick $C_{0} \geq 1$. Let us assume first that $n=1$. Note that $\hat{u}_{j} \in H^{3}(-1,0)$ by (2.7). Multiplying (2.7) by $\lambda_{j}(x+1) \hat{u}_{j}$, we obtain

$$
\frac{3}{2} \lambda_{j} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}\right|^{2} d x-\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \frac{\lambda_{j}}{2} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}\right|^{2} d x=\lambda_{j} \int_{-1}^{0}(x+1) \hat{u}_{j} \hat{g}_{j} d x
$$

Let $j_{0}:=\left[\frac{\sqrt{2 a}}{\pi}\right]$. Then for $j>j_{0}$, we have $a \leq \lambda_{j} / 2$ and hence $\left|a-\lambda_{j}\right| \lambda_{j} / 2 \geq \lambda_{j}^{2} / 4$. Using

$$
\left|\lambda_{j} \int_{-1}^{0}(x+1) \hat{u}_{j} \hat{g}_{j} d x\right| \leq \frac{\lambda_{j}^{2}}{8} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}\right|^{2} d x+2 \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{g}_{j}\right|^{2} d x
$$

we infer that for $j>j_{0}$

$$
\frac{3}{2} \lambda_{j} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}\right|^{2} d x+\frac{\lambda_{j}^{2}}{8} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}\right|^{2} d x \leq 2 \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{g}_{j}\right|^{2} d x
$$

and that for $1 \leq j \leq j_{0}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{3}{2} \lambda_{j} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}\right|^{2} d x+\frac{\lambda_{j}^{2}}{8} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}\right|^{2} d x \leq \Lambda \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}\right|^{2} d x+2 \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{g}_{j}\right|^{2} d x \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Lambda:=\max _{1 \leq j \leq j_{0}}\left|\frac{\lambda_{j}^{2}}{8}+\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \frac{\lambda_{j}}{2}\right|$. Obviously, (2.8) is valid for any $j \geq 1$. Summing in $j$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{3}{2} \int_{\Omega}\left|u_{x y}\right|^{2} d x d y+\frac{1}{8} \int_{\Omega}\left|u_{y y}\right|^{2} d x d y \leq \Lambda\|u\|^{2}+2\|g\|^{2} . \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Dividing in (2.8) by $\lambda_{j} \geq \pi^{2}$ and summing in $j$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{3}{2} \int_{\Omega}\left|u_{x}\right|^{2} d x d y+\frac{1}{8} \int_{\Omega}\left|u_{y}\right|^{2} d x d y \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\pi^{2}}\|u\|^{2}+\frac{2}{\pi^{2}}\|g\|^{2} \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

It remains to estimate $\int_{\Omega}\left|u_{x x}\right|^{2} d x d y$. Multiplying in (2.7) by $\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}$, we obtain

$$
-\int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}\right|^{2} d x+\left.\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime} \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}\right|_{-1} ^{0}+\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}\right|^{2} d x=\int_{-1}^{0} \hat{g}_{j} \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime} d x
$$

and hence

$$
\int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}\right|^{2} d x \leq\left|\lambda_{j}-a\right| \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}\right|^{2} d x+\left\|\hat{g}_{j}\right\|\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}\right\|+\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}(-1) \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}(-1)\right| .
$$

We are let to estimate $\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}(-1)$ and $\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}(-1)$. Multiplying in (2.7) by $\lambda_{j} \hat{u}_{j}$ results in

$$
\lambda_{j} \frac{\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}(-1)^{2}}{2}=\lambda_{j} \int_{-1}^{0} \hat{u}_{j} \hat{g}_{j} d x .
$$

Combined with (2.8), this yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\lambda_{j}}{2} \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}(-1)^{2} \leq\left\|\lambda_{j} \hat{u}_{j}\right\| \cdot\left\|\hat{g}_{j}\right\| \leq \frac{1}{4}\left\|\lambda_{j} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\hat{g}_{j}\right\|^{2} \leq 5\left\|\hat{g}_{j}\right\|^{2}+2 \Lambda\left\|\hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2} . \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying in (2.7) by $x$, we obtain

$$
-\int_{-1}^{0} \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime} d x+\left.x \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}\right|_{-1} ^{0}+\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right)\left(-\int_{-1}^{0} \hat{u}_{j} d x+\left.x \hat{u}_{j}\right|_{-1} ^{0}\right)=\int_{-1}^{0} x \hat{g}_{j} d x
$$

which yields

$$
\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}(-1)=-\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}(-1)+\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \int_{-1}^{0} \hat{u}_{j} d x+\int_{-1}^{0} x \hat{g}_{j} d x
$$

so that

$$
\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}(-1)\right|^{2} \leq 3\left(\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}(-1)\right|^{2}+2\left(a^{2}+\left|\lambda_{j}\right|^{2}\right)\left\|\hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\hat{g}_{j}\right\|^{2}\right) .
$$

Using (2.8) and (2.11), we conclude that $\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}(-1)\right|^{2}=O\left(\left\|\hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\hat{g}_{j}\right\|^{2}\right)$. The same is true for $\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2}$. Gathering together the above estimates, we arrive at

$$
\|u\|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \leq C_{1}\left(\|u\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}+\|P u\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}\right)
$$

for some constant $C_{1}=C_{1}(a)>0$.
Let us check that $\mathcal{D}\left(A^{n}\right) \subset H^{2 n}(\Omega)$ for $n \geq 2$. We proceed by induction on $n$. Assume that $\mathcal{D}\left(A^{p}\right) \subset H^{2 p}(\Omega)$ for $p=0,1, \ldots, n-1$ (with $n-1 \geq 1$ ), and pick any $u \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{n}\right)$. Then $g=A u \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{n-1}\right) \subset H^{2(n-1)}(\Omega)$. Let $h:=(-1)^{n-1} \partial_{y}^{2(n-1)} g \in L^{2}(\Omega)$. Then, using Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3, we have that for all $j \geq 1$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{j}^{n-1}\left(\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime \prime}+\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}\right)=\hat{h}_{j} . \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying in (2.12) by $\lambda_{j}^{n}(x+1) \hat{u}_{j}$, we obtain

$$
\frac{3}{2} \lambda_{j}^{2 n-1} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}\right|^{2} d x-\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \frac{\lambda_{j}^{2 n-1}}{2} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}\right|^{2} d x=\lambda_{j}^{n} \int_{-1}^{0}(x+1) \hat{u}_{j} \hat{h}_{j} d x
$$

This yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{j}^{2 n-1}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}\right\|^{2}+\lambda_{j}^{2 n}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}=O\left(\left\|\hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\hat{h}_{j}\right\|^{2}\right) \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying in (2.12) by $\lambda_{j}^{n} \hat{u}_{j}$ gives

$$
\lambda_{j}^{2 n-1} \frac{\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}(-1)^{2}}{2}=\lambda_{j}^{n} \int_{-1}^{0} \hat{u}_{j} \hat{h}_{j} d x
$$

and

$$
\lambda_{j}^{2 n-1}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}(-1)\right|^{2}=O\left(\left\|\hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\hat{h}_{j}\right\|^{2}\right) .
$$

From

$$
\lambda_{j}^{n-1} \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}(-1)=-\lambda_{j}^{n-1} \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}(-1)+\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \lambda_{j}^{n-1} \int_{-1}^{0} \hat{u}_{j} d x+\int_{-1}^{0} x \hat{h}_{j} d x
$$

we infer that

$$
\lambda_{j}^{2 n-2}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}(-1)\right|^{2}=O\left(\left\|\hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\hat{h}_{j}\right\|^{2}\right) .
$$

It follows from

$$
-\lambda_{j}^{2 n-2} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}\right|^{2} d x+\left.\lambda_{j}^{2 n-2} \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime} \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}\right|_{-1} ^{0}+\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \lambda_{j}^{2 n-2} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}\right|^{2} d x=\lambda_{j}^{n-1} \int_{-1}^{0} \hat{h}_{j} \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime} d x
$$

that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{j}^{2 n-2}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2}=O\left(\left\|\hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\hat{h}_{j}\right\|^{2}\right) . \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

So far, we have proved that

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\left(\lambda_{j}^{2 n}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\lambda_{j}^{2 n-1}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}\right\|^{2}+\lambda_{j}^{2 n-2}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2}\right)<+\infty
$$

Using Lemma 2.3, this gives that $\partial_{y}^{2 n} u, \partial_{y}^{2 n-1} \partial_{x} u$, and $\partial_{y}^{2 n-2} \partial_{x}^{2} u$ belong to $L^{2}(\Omega)$. For the other derivatives of order $2 n$, we apply the operator $\partial_{x}^{2 k}$ (for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2 k+3 \leq 2 n$ ) to each term in (2.7) to obtain

$$
\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 k+3)}+\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \hat{u}_{j}^{(2 k+1)}=\hat{g}_{j}^{(2 k)} .
$$

This yields

$$
\lambda_{j}^{(2 n-3-2 k)}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 k+3)}\right\|^{2}=O\left(\left\|\hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\hat{h}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\lambda_{j}^{2 n-3-2 k}\left\|\hat{g}_{j}^{(2 k)}\right\|^{2}\right) .
$$

On the other hand, (2.7) gives by differentiation with respect to $x$ that

$$
\hat{u}_{j}^{(4)}+\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}=\hat{g}_{j}^{\prime},
$$

and we obtain in a similar way that

$$
\lambda_{j}^{(2 n-4-2 k)}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 k+4)}\right\|^{2}=O\left(\left\|\hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\hat{h}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\lambda_{j}^{2 n-4-2 k}\left\|\hat{g}_{j}^{(2 k+1)}\right\|^{2}\right) .
$$

for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2 k+4 \leq 2 n$. Thus we conclude that

$$
\sum_{q=0}^{2 n} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{(2 n-q)}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(q)}\right\|^{2}<+\infty
$$

Using Lemma 2.3, we infer that for $q \in\{0, \ldots, 2 n\}, \partial_{x}^{q} u \in L^{2}\left(-1,0, H^{2 n-q}(0,1)\right)$, and hence that $\partial_{y}^{2 n-q} \partial_{x}^{q} u \in L^{2}(\Omega)$. We also have that $\partial_{y}^{2 n-1-q} \partial_{x}^{q} u \in L^{2}(\Omega)$ for $q \in\{0, \ldots, 2 n-1\}$. Taking into account the fact that $u \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{n-1}\right) \subset H^{2(n-1)}(\Omega)$, we conclude that $u \in H^{2 n}(\Omega)$. The proof of the inclusion $\mathcal{D}\left(A^{n}\right) \subset H^{2 n}(\Omega)$ is complete.

It remains to prove that the constant in the r.h.s. of (2.6) is indeed of the form $B^{n}$. This will require a series of lemmas.
Lemma 2.4. For any $\varepsilon_{0}>0$, there exists a constant $K=K\left(\varepsilon_{0}\right)>0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{0}\right)$ and all $f \in H^{2}(-1,0)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{-1}^{0}\left|f^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2} d t \leq K \varepsilon \int_{-1}^{0}\left|f^{\prime \prime}(t)\right|^{2} d t+K \varepsilon^{-1} \int_{-1}^{0}|f(t)|^{2} d t \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma [2.4 is a direct consequence of [1, Lemma 4.10] (which is concerned with twice continuously functions) by density of $C^{2}([-1,0])$ in $H^{2}(-1,0)$.

For any $j \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$, we define the operator $P_{j}$ by

$$
P_{j} f:=f^{\prime \prime \prime}-\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right) f^{\prime}, \quad \forall f \in H^{3}(-1,0) .
$$

Lemma 2.5. There exists a constant $C_{1} \geq 1$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|f\|_{H^{2 n}(-1,0)}^{2} \leq C_{1}^{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_{j}^{2 n-2 i}\left\|P_{j}^{i} f\right\|^{2}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}^{*}, \forall f \in H^{3 n}(-1,0) \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. For $n=0$, (2.16) is obvious. For $n=1$, it follows from the definition of $P_{j}$ and Lemma 2.4 that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|f\|_{H^{2}(-1,0)}^{2} & =\|f\|^{2}+\left\|f^{\prime}\right\|^{2}+\left\|f^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq C\left(\|f\|^{2}+\left\|f^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2}\right) \\
& \leq C\left(\|f\|^{2}+\frac{1}{\lambda_{j}}\left\|f^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|^{2}+\lambda_{j}\left\|f^{\prime}\right\|^{2}\right) \\
& \leq C\left(\|f\|^{2}+\frac{1}{\lambda_{j}}\left\|P_{j} f\right\|^{2}+\lambda_{j}\left\|f^{\prime}\right\|^{2}\right) \\
& \leq C\left(\|f\|^{2}+\left\|P_{j} f\right\|^{2}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left\|f^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2}+C \lambda_{j}^{2}\|f\|^{2} \\
& \leq C\left(\lambda_{j}^{2}\|f\|^{2}+\left\|P_{j} f\right\|^{2}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left\|f^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

This shows that we can find a constant $C_{2} \geq 1$ such that

$$
\|f\|_{H^{2}(-1,0)}^{2} \leq C_{2}\left(\lambda_{j}^{2}\|f\|^{2}+\left\|P_{j} f\right\|^{2}\right)
$$

Let us prove (2.16) for $n \geq 2$ by induction on $n$. Assume (2.16) to be true for $n-1 \geq 0$. It
follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|f\|_{H^{2 n}(-1,0)}^{2} & =\|f\|_{H^{2 n-2}(-1,0)}^{2}+\left\|f^{(2 n-1)}\right\|^{2}+\left\|f^{(2 n)}\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq\|f\|_{H^{2 n-2}(-1,0)}^{2}+\left\|f^{(2 n-2)}\right\|_{H^{2}(-1,0)}^{2} \\
& \leq\|f\|_{H^{2 n-2}(-1,0)}^{2}+C_{2}\left(\lambda_{j}^{2}\left\|f^{(2 n-2)}\right\|^{2}+\left\|P_{j} f^{(2 n-2)}\right\|^{2}\right) \\
& \leq 2 C_{2} \lambda_{j}^{2}\|f\|_{H^{2 n-2}(-1,0)}^{2}+C_{2}\left\|P_{j} f\right\|_{H^{2 n-2}(-1,0)}^{2} \\
& \leq 2 C_{2} \lambda_{j}^{2} C_{1}^{n-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{j}^{2 n-2-2 i}\left\|P_{j}^{i} f\right\|^{2}+C_{2} C_{1}^{n-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{j}^{2 n-2-2 i}\left\|P_{j}^{i+1} f\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq 2 C_{2} C_{1}^{n-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{j}^{2 n-2 i}\left\|P_{j}^{i} f\right\|^{2}+C_{2} C_{1}^{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{j}^{2 n-2 i}\left\|P_{j}^{i} f\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq 3 C_{2} C_{1}^{n-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_{j}^{2 n-2 i}\left\|P_{j}^{i} f\right\|^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

If we pick $C_{1}=3 C_{2}$, (2.16) is true for $n$.
Lemma 2.6. There exists a positive constant $C_{3}$ such that

$$
\|u\|_{H^{2 n}(\Omega)}^{2} \leq C_{3} \sum_{m=0}^{n} \sum_{k=0}^{m}\left\|\partial_{x}^{2 k} \partial_{y}^{2 m-2 k} u\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{n}\right) .
$$

Proof. For any $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we set

$$
I_{p}:=\sum_{a, b \in \mathbb{N}, a+b=p}\left\|\partial_{x}^{a} \partial_{y}^{b} u\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} .
$$

Decompose $u$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(x, y)=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \hat{u}_{j}(x) e_{j}(y) . \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us go back to the proof of Lemma 2.6. Pick any $u \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{n}\right)$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Using Lemma 2.2 and applying Lemma 2.3 to the functions $\partial_{x}^{2 m+1-k} u(x$, .) for $0 \leq m \leq n-1$,
$0 \leq k \leq 2 m+1$, and $x \in(-1,0)$, we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{2 m+1} & =\sum_{k=0}^{2 m+1}\left\|\partial_{x}^{2 m+1-k} \partial_{y}^{k} u\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \\
& =\sum_{k=0}^{2 m+1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{k}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 m+1-k)}\right\|^{2} \\
& =\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 m+1)}\right\|^{2}+\sum_{k=1}^{2 m+1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{k}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 m+1-k)}\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 m+1)}\right\|^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{2 m+1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{k-1}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 m+1-k)}\right\|^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{2 m+1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{k+1}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 m+1-k)}\right\|^{2} \\
& =\left\|\partial_{x}^{2 m+1} \partial_{y} u\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{2 m+1}\left\|\partial_{x}^{2 m+1-k} \partial_{y}^{k-1} u\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{2 m+1}\left\|\partial_{x}^{2 m+1-k} \partial_{y}^{k+1} u\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \\
& \leq \frac{3}{2} I_{2 m+2}+\frac{1}{2} I_{2 m},
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used Young's estimate. Thus, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\|u\|_{H^{2 n}(\Omega)}^{2} & =\sum_{m=0}^{n} I_{2 m}+\sum_{m=0}^{n-1} I_{2 m+1} \\
& \leq \sum_{m=0}^{n} I_{2 m}+\sum_{m=0}^{n-1}\left(\frac{3}{2} I_{2 m+2}+\frac{1}{2} I_{2 m}\right)  \tag{2.18}\\
& \leq 3 \sum_{m=0}^{n} I_{2 m} .
\end{align*}
$$

Next, we consider $I_{2 m}$. For $m=0, I_{0}=\|u\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}$. For $m \geq 1$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{2 m}=\sum_{k=0}^{m}\left\|\partial_{x}^{2 k} \partial_{y}^{2 m-2 k} u\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}+\sum_{k=0}^{m-1}\left\|\partial_{x}^{2 k+1} \partial_{y}^{2 m-2 k-1} u\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}, \tag{2.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

and it remains to estimate the second term in the r.h.s. of (2.19). Applying Lemma 2.4 we
obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\sum_{k=0}^{m-1}\left\|\partial_{x}^{2 k+1} \partial_{y}^{2 m-2 k-1} u\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} & =\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{2 m-2 k-1}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 k+1)}\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq C\left(\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{2 m-2 k-2}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 k+2)}\right\|^{2}+\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{2 m-2 k}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 k)}\right\|^{2}\right) \\
& =C\left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{2 m-2 k}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 k)}\right\|^{2}+\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{2 m-2 k}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 k)}\right\|^{2}\right) \\
& \leq C \sum_{k=0}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{2 m-2 k}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 k)}\right\|^{2} \\
& =C \sum_{k=0}^{m}\left\|\partial_{x}^{2 k} \partial_{y}^{2 m-2 k} u\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \tag{2.20}
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (2.18)-(2.20), the conclusion of Lemma 2.6 follows.
Lemma 2.7. There exists a constant $C_{4} \geq 1$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{j}^{2 m}\left\|P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2} \leq C_{4}^{m} \sum_{l=0}^{m}\binom{m}{l}\left\|P_{j}^{i+l} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}, \quad \forall m, i \in \mathbb{N}, \forall j \in \mathbb{N}^{*}, \forall u \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{m+i}\right) \tag{2.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\hat{u}_{j}$ is the Fourier coefficients of $u$ as in (2.17).
Proof. The proof is by induction on $m$. For $m=0,(2.21)$ is obvious for any $C_{4} \geq 1$.
For $m=1$ and $u \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{1+i}\right)$, we have that $P^{i} u \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ and, by [19, Lemma 4.1],

$$
\left(P^{i} u\right)(x, y)=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\left(P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right)(x) e_{j}(y)
$$

where the function $P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}$ satisfies for each $j \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\left(P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right)^{\prime \prime \prime}-\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right)\left(P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right)^{\prime}=P_{j}^{i+1} \hat{u}_{j},  \tag{2.22}\\
\left(P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right)(-1)=\left(P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right)(0)=\left(P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right)^{\prime}(0)=0 .
\end{array}\right.
$$

Multiplying the first equation in (2.22) by $\lambda_{j}(x+1) P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}$ and integrating over $(-1,0)$ results in

$$
\frac{3}{2} \lambda_{j} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\left(P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right)^{\prime}\right|^{2} d x+\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right) \frac{\lambda_{j}}{2} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right|^{2} d x=\lambda_{j} \int_{-1}^{0}(x+1)\left(P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right)\left(P_{j}^{i+1} \hat{u}_{j}\right) d x
$$

After some elementary calculations, we can find a constant $C_{4}=C_{4}(a) \geq 1$ such that

$$
\lambda_{j}\left\|\left(P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right)^{\prime}\right\|^{2}+\lambda_{j}^{2}\left\|P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2} \leq C_{4}\left(\left\|P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\left\|P_{j}^{i+1} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}\right)
$$

Therefore, (2.21) holds for $m=1$. Pick now any $m \geq 2$, and assume that (2.21) is true for $m-1 \geq 0$. For any $u \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{m+i}\right)$, we have

$$
\lambda_{j}^{2 m}\left\|P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}=\lambda_{j}^{2} \lambda_{j}^{2 m-2}\left\|P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2} \leq \lambda_{j}^{2} C_{4}^{m-1} \sum_{l=0}^{m-1}\binom{m-1}{l}\left\|P_{j}^{i+l} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}
$$

Since $u \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{m+i}\right)$, for any $l=0,1, \ldots, m-1$, system (2.22) is satisfied with $P_{j}^{i+l} \hat{u}_{j}$ substituted to $P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}$, and it follows as above that

$$
\lambda_{j}^{2}\left\|P_{j}^{i+l} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2} \leq C_{4}\left(\left\|P_{j}^{i+l} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\left\|P_{j}^{i+l+1} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}\right) .
$$

We infer that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{j}^{2 m}\left\|P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2} & \leq C_{4}^{m} \sum_{l=0}^{m-1}\binom{m-1}{l}\left(\left\|P_{j}^{i+l} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\left\|P_{j}^{i+l+1} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}\right) \\
& =C_{4}^{m}\left(\left\|P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\sum_{l=1}^{m-1}\binom{m-1}{l}\left\|P_{j}^{i+l} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\sum_{l=1}^{m-1}\binom{m-1}{l-1}\left\|P_{j}^{i+l} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\left\|P_{j}^{i+m} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}\right) \\
& =C_{4}^{m}\left(\left\|P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\sum_{l=1}^{m-1}\binom{m}{l}\left\|P_{j}^{i+l} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}+\left\|P_{j}^{i+m} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}\right) \\
& =C_{4}^{m} \sum_{l=0}^{m}\binom{m}{l}\left\|P_{j}^{i+l} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used Pascal's Rule. The proof of Lemma 2.7 is achieved.
We are in a position to complete the proof of Proposition 2.1. The estimate (2.6) is obvious for $n=0$. Let $n \geq 1$. Using Lemmas 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7, we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{H^{2 n}(\Omega)}^{2} & \leq C_{3} \sum_{m=0}^{n} \sum_{k=0}^{m}\left\|\partial_{x}^{2 k} \partial_{y}^{2 m-2 k} u\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \\
& =C_{3} \sum_{m=0}^{n} \sum_{k=0}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{2 m-2 k}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(2 k)}\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq C_{3} \sum_{m=0}^{n} \sum_{k=0}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{2 m-2 k} C_{1}^{k} \sum_{i=0}^{k} \lambda_{j}^{2 k-2 i}\left\|P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq C_{3} C_{1}^{n} \sum_{m=0}^{n} \sum_{k=0}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{k} \lambda_{j}^{2 m-2 i}\left\|P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the fact that $i \leq k \leq m \leq n$ in the sum above, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{H^{2 n}(\Omega)}^{2} & \leq C_{3} C_{1}^{n} \sum_{m=0}^{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_{j}^{2 n-2 i}\left\|P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq C_{3} C_{1}^{n}(n+1)^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_{j}^{2 n-2 i}\left\|P_{j}^{i} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq C_{3} C_{1}^{n}(n+1)^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{n} C_{4}^{n-i} \sum_{l=0}^{n-i}\binom{n-i}{l}\left\|P_{j}^{i+l} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq C_{3} C_{1}^{n}(n+1)^{2} C_{4}^{n} 2^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{n} \sum_{l=i}^{n}\left\|P_{j}^{l} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq C_{3} C_{1}^{n}(n+1)^{2} C_{4}^{n} 2^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{n} \sum_{l=0}^{n}\left\|P_{j}^{l} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq C_{3} C_{1}^{n}(n+1)^{3} C_{4}^{n} 2^{n} \sum_{l=0}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\left\|P_{j}^{l} \hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq B^{n} \sum_{l=0}^{n}\left\|P^{l} u\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

with $B:=16 C_{1} C_{3} C_{4}$. Indeed, it is easy to see that $(n+1)^{3} \leq 8^{n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The proof of Proposition 2.1 is achieved.

Recall that $\lambda_{j}=(j \pi)^{2}$ for $j \geq 1$. For any $j \geq 1$, we consider a sequence of generating functions $g_{i, j}(i \geq 0)$, where $g_{0, j}$ is the solution of the Cauchy problem

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
g_{0, j}^{\prime \prime \prime}(x)-\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right) g_{0, j}^{\prime}(x)=0,  \tag{2.23}\\
g_{0, j}(0)=g_{0, j}^{\prime}(0)=0, \quad g_{0, j}^{\prime \prime}(0)=1,
\end{array} \quad x \in(-1,0),\right.
$$

while $g_{i, j}$ for $i \geq 1$ is defined inductively as the solution of the Cauchy problem

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
g_{i, j}^{\prime \prime \prime}(x)-\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right) g_{i, j}^{\prime}(x)=-g_{i-1, j}(x), \quad x \in(-1,0),  \tag{2.24}\\
g_{i, j}(0)=g_{i, j}^{\prime}(0)=g_{i, j}^{\prime \prime}(0)=0 .
\end{array}\right.
$$

Proposition 2.2. For any $i \geq 0, j \geq 1$ and $x \in[-1,0]$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|g_{i, j}(x)\right| \leq e^{\sqrt{\lambda_{j}}} \frac{3^{i} i!}{(3 i+2)!} \tag{2.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. It follows from (2.23) and (2.24) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_{i, j}(x) & =-\int_{0}^{x} g_{0, j}(x-\xi) g_{i-1, j}(\xi) d \xi \\
& =-\int_{0}^{x} g_{0, j}^{\prime \prime}(x-\xi)\left(\int_{0}^{\xi}\left(\int_{0}^{\zeta} g_{i-1, j}(\sigma) d \sigma\right) d \zeta\right) d \xi, \quad i, j \geq 1 .
\end{aligned}
$$

(1) if $\lambda_{j} \leq a$, it is not difficult to obtain that

$$
g_{0, j}(x)= \begin{cases}\frac{1}{a-\lambda_{j}}\left(1-\cos \left(\sqrt{a-\lambda_{j}} x\right)\right), & \lambda_{j}<a \\ \frac{1}{2} x^{2}, & \lambda_{j}=a\end{cases}
$$

this implies

$$
0 \leq g_{0, j}(x) \leq \frac{x^{2}}{2}, \quad \forall j \geq 1, x \in[-1,0]
$$

Then it follows from [13, Lemma 2.1] that

$$
\left|g_{i, j}(x)\right| \leq \frac{|x|^{3 i+2}}{(3 i+2)!} \leq e^{\sqrt{\lambda_{j}}} \frac{3^{i} i!}{(3 i+2)!}, \quad \forall i \geq 0, \forall j \geq 1, \forall x \in[-1,0]
$$

(2) if $\lambda_{j}>a$, we claim that

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{i, j}(x) \leq \cosh \left(\sqrt{\lambda_{j}-a} x\right) \frac{(-x)^{3 i+2} 3^{i} i!}{(3 i+2)!}, \quad \forall i \geq 0, \quad \forall j \geq 1, \quad \forall x \in[-1,0] \tag{2.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies (2.25).
Let us prove (2.26) by induction on $i$. For $i=0$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 \leq g_{0, j}(x) & =\frac{1}{\lambda_{j}-a}\left(\cosh \left(\sqrt{\lambda_{j}-a} x\right)-1\right) \\
& =\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right)^{q-1} x^{2 q}}{(2 q)!} \\
& \leq \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right)^{q-1} x^{2 q-2}}{(2 q-2)!} \frac{x^{2}}{2!} \\
& =\cosh \left(\sqrt{\lambda_{j}-a} x\right) \frac{x^{2}}{2!}
\end{aligned}
$$

so that (2.26) is true for $i=0$.
Assume now that (2.26) is true for $i-1 \geq 0$. We can deduce that for $x \in[-1,0]$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|g_{i, j}(x)\right| & \leq-\int_{0}^{x} g_{0, j}^{\prime \prime}(x-\xi)\left(\int_{0}^{\xi}\left(\int_{0}^{\zeta}\left|g_{i-1, j}(\sigma)\right| d \sigma\right) d \zeta\right) d \xi \\
& \leq-\int_{0}^{x} \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right)^{p}(x-\xi)^{2 p}}{(2 p)!}\left(\int_{0}^{\xi}\left(\int_{0}^{\zeta} 3^{i-1}(i-1)!\sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right)^{q}(-\sigma)^{3 i-1+2 q}}{(2 q)!(3 i-1)!} d \sigma\right) d \zeta\right) d \xi \\
& =-3^{i-1}(i-1)!\int_{0}^{x} \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right)^{p}(x-\xi)^{2 p}}{(2 p)!} \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right)^{q}(-\xi)^{3 i+1+2 q}}{(2 q)!(3 i-1)!(3 i+2 q)(3 i+2 q+1)} d \xi \\
& =-3^{i-1}(i-1)!\int_{0}^{x} \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right)^{p+q}(x-\xi)^{2 p}(-\xi)^{3 i+1+2 q}}{(2 p)!(2 q)!(3 i-1)!(3 i+2 q)(3 i+2 q+1)} d \xi .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, integrating by parts $2 p$ times, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|g_{i, j}(x)\right| & \leq-3^{i-1}(i-1)!\int_{0}^{x} \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right)^{p+q}(-\xi)^{3 i+1+2 q+2 p}(3 i+2 q-1)!}{(2 q)!(3 i-1)!(3 i+1+2 q+2 p)!} d \xi \\
& =3^{i-1}(i-1)!\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right)^{p+q}(-x)^{3 i+2+2 q+2 p}(3 i+2 q-1)!}{(2 q)!(3 i-1)!(3 i+2+2 q+2 p)!} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Next, we will show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{3^{i-1}(i-1)!(3 i+2 q-1)!}{(2 q)!(3 i-1)!(3 i+2+2 q+2 p)!} \leq \frac{3^{i} i!}{p+q+1} \frac{1}{(2 p+2 q)!(3 i+2)!} \quad \forall p, q \geq 0, i \geq 1 . \tag{2.27}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easy to see that (2.27) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{(3 i+2 q-1)!}{(2 q)!(3 i-1)!} & \leq \frac{3 i}{p+q+1} \frac{(3 i+2+2 q+2 p)!}{(2 p+2 q)!(3 i+2)!} \\
& =6 i \frac{(2 p+2 q+1)(2 p+2 q+3)(2 p+2 q+4) \cdots(2 p+2 q+3 i+2)}{(3 i+2)!} . \tag{2.28}
\end{align*}
$$

Since the left hand side of (2.28) is independent of $p$ and the right hand side of (2.28) is increasing in $p$, we only need to prove (2.27) for $p=0$, namely, we need to show that

$$
\frac{(3 i+2 q-1)!}{(3 i-1)!} \leq \frac{3 i}{q+1} \frac{(3 i+2+2 q)!}{(3 i+2)!} \quad \forall q \geq 0, \quad \forall i \geq 1,
$$

this is obvious due to the fact that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{(3 i+2)!(3 i+2 q-1)!}{3 i(3 i-1)!(3 i+2+2 q)!} & =\frac{(3 i+1)(3 i+2)}{(3 i+2 q)(3 i+2 q+1)(3 i+2 q+2)} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{3 i+2 q} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{q+1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying (2.27), we infer that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|g_{i, j}(x)\right| & \leq \frac{(-x)^{3 i+2} 3^{i} i!}{(3 i+2)!} \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right)^{p+q} x^{2 p+2 q}}{(p+q+1)(2 p+2 q)!} \\
& =\frac{(-x)^{3 i+2} 3^{i} i!}{(3 i+2)!} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right)^{k} x^{2 k}}{(2 k)!} \\
& =\cosh \left(\sqrt{\lambda_{j}-a} x\right) \frac{(-x)^{3 i+2} 3^{i} i!}{(3 i+2)!},
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used the fact that for any function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{+}$, it holds

$$
\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} f(p+q)=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k+1) f(k) .
$$

This ends the proof of Proposition 2.2.

Remark 2.3. Compared with the result in [13. Lemma 2.1], it seems that a more natural estimate of $g_{i, j}$ is

$$
\left|g_{i, j}(x)\right| \leq \cosh \left(\sqrt{\lambda_{j}-a}\right) \frac{R^{i}(-x)^{3 i+2}}{(3 i+2)!}
$$

for some constant $R>0$. According to the proof of Proposition 2.2. to prove this result, we need to obtain that

$$
\frac{(3 i+2 q-1)!}{(3 i-1)!} \leq \frac{R}{q+1} \frac{(3 i+2+2 q)!}{(3 i+2)!} \quad \forall q \geq 0, \quad \forall i \geq 1 .
$$

This is equivalent to

$$
\frac{(q+1)(3 i)(3 i+1)(3 i+2)}{(3 i+2 q)(3 i+2 q+1)(3 i+2 q+2)} \leq R \quad \forall q \geq 0, \forall i \geq 1 .
$$

However, this is impossible if we pick $q=3 i$.
Using Proposition 2.2, we can obtain the following corollary which will be used in the proof of the main results.
Corollary 2.1. For any $i \geq 0, j \geq 1$ and $x \in[-1,0]$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|g_{i, j}(x)\right| \leq C e^{\sqrt{\lambda_{j}}} \frac{1}{(2 i)!}, \tag{2.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the constant $C$ is independent of $i$ and $j$.
Proof. By Stirling's formula $i!\sim(i / e)^{i} \sqrt{2 \pi i}$, and it follows from (2.25) that for $i \geq 1$ and $j \geq 1$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|g_{i, j}(x)\right| & \leq e^{\sqrt{\lambda_{j}}} \frac{3^{i} i!}{(3 i+2)!} \\
& \leq C e^{\sqrt{\lambda_{j}}} \frac{3^{i} i!}{(3 i+1)(3 i+2) \frac{3^{3 i}}{2^{2 i}} \frac{\sqrt{6 \pi i}}{\sqrt{2 \pi i} \sqrt{4 \pi i}}(2 i)!i!} \\
& \leq C e^{\sqrt{\lambda_{j}}} \frac{1}{(2 i)!} .
\end{aligned}
$$

## 3 Null controllability

Proposition 3.1. Let $s \in[0,2), 0<t_{1}<t_{2} \leq T$ and $z_{j} \in G^{s}\left(\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right]\right)$ satisfy

$$
\left|z_{j}^{(i)}(t)\right| \leq M_{j} \frac{(i!)^{s}}{R^{i}}
$$

where $R$ is a positive constant and the positive constants $M_{j}$ are such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} M_{j} e^{\sqrt{\lambda_{j}}}<\infty \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then the function $u$ defined by (1.9) solves system (1.4)-(1.8) and $u \in G^{\frac{s}{2}, \frac{,}{2}, s}([-1,0] \times[0,1] \times$ $\left.\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right]\right)$.

Proof. As the proof is similar to that of [13, Proposition 2.1], it is only sketched.
Let $m, p, q \in \mathbb{N}$. By applying Proposition 2.1 and (1.9), we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\partial_{t}^{m} \partial_{x}^{p} \partial_{y}^{q} u(x, y, t)\right| & \leq C\left\|\partial_{t}^{m} u(\cdot, \cdot, t)\right\|_{H^{p+q+2}(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C B^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \sum_{n=0}^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1}\left\|P^{n} \partial_{t}^{m} u(\cdot, \cdot, t)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C B^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \sum_{n=0}^{\left[\frac{p++2+2}{2}\right]+1} \sup _{(x, y) \in \Omega}\left|\partial_{t}^{m} P^{n} u(x, y, t)\right| \\
& \leq C B^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \sum_{n=0}^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \sup _{(x, y) \in \Omega} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\left|\partial_{t}^{m} P^{n}\left(g_{i, j}(x) z_{j}^{(i)}(t) e_{j}(y)\right)\right| .
\end{aligned}
$$

By the definitions of $g_{i, j}$ and $e_{j}$, it is clear that

$$
\partial_{t}^{m} P^{n}\left(g_{i, j}(x) z_{j}^{(i)}(t) e_{i}(y)\right)= \begin{cases}z_{j}^{(i+m)}(t)(-1)^{n} g_{i-n, j}(x) e_{j}(y), & i \geq n \\ 0, & i<n\end{cases}
$$

Setting $k=i-n$ and $N=n+m$, arguing as in [13, Proposition 2.1], we infer from Corollary 2.1 that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\left|\partial_{t}^{m} P^{n}\left(g_{i, j}(x) z_{j}^{(i)}(t) e_{i}(y)\right)\right| & =\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=n}^{\infty}\left|z_{j}^{(i+m)}(t) g_{i-n, j}(x) e_{j}(y)\right| \\
& \leq C \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} M_{j} \frac{(k+N)!^{s}}{R^{k+N}} e^{\sqrt{\lambda_{j}}} \frac{1}{(2 k)!} \\
& \leq C \frac{(N!)^{s}}{\left(\frac{R}{2^{s}}\right)^{N}} \\
& \leq C \frac{(n!)^{s}(m!)^{s}}{R_{1}^{n} R_{2}^{m}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $R_{1}=R_{2}=R / 4^{s}$.
Gathering the above estimates together, we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\partial_{t}^{m} \partial_{x}^{p} \partial_{y}^{q} u(x, y, t)\right| & \leq C B^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \sum_{n=0}^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \sup _{(x, y) \in \Omega} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\left|\partial_{t}^{m} P^{n}\left(g_{i, j}(x) z_{j}^{(i)}(t) e_{i}(y)\right)\right| \\
& \leq C B^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \sum_{n=0}^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \frac{(n!)^{s}(m!)^{s}}{R_{1}^{n} R_{2}^{m}} \\
& \leq C \frac{(p!)^{\frac{s}{2}}(q!)^{\frac{s}{2}}(m!)^{s}}{\bar{R}_{1}^{p} \bar{R}_{2}^{q} \bar{R}_{3}^{m}}
\end{aligned}
$$

for some positive constants $\bar{R}_{1}, \bar{R}_{2}, \bar{R}_{3}$. Finally, it is easily seen that $u$ is indeed a solution of the ZK system.

Let $\bar{u}$ denote the solution of the free evolution for the ZK system:

$$
\begin{cases}\bar{u}_{t}+a \bar{u}_{x}+\triangle \bar{u}_{x}=0, & (x, y) \in(-1,0) \times(0,1), t \in(0, T),  \tag{3.2}\\ \bar{u}(-1, y, t)=\bar{u}(0, y, t)=\bar{u}_{x}(0, y, t)=0, & y \in(0,1), t \in(0, T), \\ \bar{u}(x, 0, t)=\bar{u}(x, 1, t)=0, & x \in(-1,0), t \in(0, T), \\ \bar{u}(x, y, 0)=u_{0}(x, y), & x \in(-1,0), y \in(0,1) .\end{cases}
$$

As for KdV, we have a Kato smoothing effect.
Proposition 3.2. Let $u_{0} \in L^{2}(\Omega)$.

1. System (3.2) admits a unique solution $\bar{u} \in C\left([0, T] ; L^{2}(\Omega)\right) \cap L^{2}\left(0, T ; H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)\right)$ and we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{t \in[0, T]}\|\bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}+\int_{0}^{T}\|\bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)}^{2} d t \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} . \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

2. If, in addition, $u_{0} \in \mathcal{D}(A) \cap H^{3}(\Omega)$, then $\bar{u} \in C\left([0, T] ; H^{3}(\Omega)\right) \cap L^{2}\left(0, T ; H^{4}(\Omega)\right)$ and we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{t \in[0, T]}\|\bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{H^{3}(\Omega)}^{2}+\int_{0}^{T}\|\bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{H^{4}(\Omega)}^{2} d t \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{H^{3}(\Omega)}^{2} . \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. (i) comes from [19. Let us proceed with the proof of (ii). For any $u_{0} \in \mathcal{D}(A) \cap H^{3}(\Omega)$, we have that $\bar{u} \in C([0, T] ; \mathcal{D}(A))$ by the semigroup theory, and hence $\bar{u} \in C\left([0, T] ; H^{2}(\Omega) \cap H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)\right)$. Let $w_{0}=A u_{0}$ and $w=A \bar{u}$. It is well known that $w$ is the solution of (3.2) with initial value $w_{0} \in L^{2}(\Omega)$. According to (i), we have

$$
-\triangle \bar{u}_{x}-a \bar{u}_{x}=A \bar{u}=w \in C\left([0, T] ; L^{2}(\Omega)\right) \cap L^{2}\left(0, T ; H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)\right) .
$$

Therefore $\triangle \bar{u}_{x} \in C\left([0, T] ; L^{2}(\Omega)\right) \cap L^{2}\left(0, T ; H^{1}(\Omega)\right)$. Assume finally that $u_{0} \in \mathcal{D}(A) \cap H^{3}(\Omega)$, and let us prove that $u \in C\left([0, T], H^{3}(\Omega)\right) \cap L^{2}\left(0, T, H^{4}(\Omega)\right)$. Decompose $u$ as $u(x, y, t)=$ $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \hat{u}_{j}(x, t) e_{j}(y)$. Then for $j \geq 1, \hat{u}_{j}$ solves

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{d \hat{u}_{j}}{d t}+\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime \prime}+\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}=0  \tag{3.5}\\
& \hat{u}_{j}(-1, t)=\hat{u}_{j}(0, t)=\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}(0, t)=0  \tag{3.6}\\
& \hat{u}_{j}(., 0)=\hat{u}_{j}^{0} \tag{3.7}
\end{align*}
$$

where $u_{0}(x, y)=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \hat{u}_{j}^{0}(x) e_{j}(y)$. Multiplying in (3.5) by $\hat{u}_{j}$ (resp. by $\left.(x+1) \hat{u}_{j}\right)$ and integrating over $(-1,0)_{x} \times(0, T)_{t}$, we obtain respectively

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}(x, T)\right|^{2} d x+\int_{0}^{T}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}(-1, t)\right|^{2} d t=\int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{0}(x)\right|^{2} d x  \tag{3.8}\\
& \int_{-1}^{0}(x+1)\left|\hat{u}_{j}(x, T)\right|^{2} d x+3 \int_{0}^{T} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}\right|^{2} d x d t+\left(\lambda_{j}-a\right) \int_{0}^{T} \int_{-1}^{0}\left|\hat{u}_{j}\right|^{2} d x d t
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\int_{-1}^{0}(x+1)\left|\hat{u}_{j}^{0}(x)\right|^{2} d x \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows from (3.8) that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{k}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}(., t)\right\|^{2} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{k}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{0}\right\|^{2}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{+} \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

(that is, $\left\|\partial_{y}^{k} u(., ., t)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \leq\left\|\partial_{y}^{k} u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{+}$), and from (3.9) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\left(\lambda_{j}^{k}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}(., t)\right\|^{2}+\lambda_{j}^{k+1}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}(., t)\right\|^{2}\right) d t \leq(1+a T) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{k}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{0}\right\|^{2}, \quad \forall T>0 \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

(that is, $\int_{0}^{T}\left\|\nabla \partial_{y}^{k} u(., ., t)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} d t \leq(1+a T)\left\|\partial_{y}^{k} u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}$ for all $\left.T>0\right)$. We need the following lemma.
Lemma 3.1. Let $a \geq 0$ and $\lambda>0$ be given. Let $H^{k}(k \in \mathbb{N})$ denote the Sobolev space $H^{k}(-1,0)$, and let $\mathcal{H}^{3}:=\left\{u \in H^{3}(-1,0) ; u(-1)=u(0)=u^{\prime}(0)=0\right\}$. Let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^{2}(-1,0)}$. 1. There exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{k=0}^{3} \lambda^{k}\left\|\partial_{x}^{3-k} y\right\|^{2} \leq C\left(\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}+(a-\lambda) y^{\prime}\right\|^{2}+\lambda^{3}\|y\|^{2}\right) \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{H}^{3}, \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_{0} \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

2. There exists a constant $C^{\prime}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\sum_{k=0}^{4} \lambda^{k}\left\|\partial_{x}^{4-k} y\right\|^{2} \leq C^{\prime}\left(\left\|y^{(4)}+(a-\lambda) y^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2}+\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}+(a-\lambda) y^{\prime}\right\|^{2}+\lambda^{4}\|y\|^{2}\right) \\
\forall y \in \mathcal{H}^{3} \cap H^{4}, \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_{0} \tag{3.13}
\end{array}
$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1; 1. Pick any $y \in \mathcal{H}^{3}$ and any $\lambda \geq 0$. By the Interpolation Theorem and Young inequality, we have that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\lambda^{2}\left\|y^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leq C \lambda^{2}\|y\|^{\frac{4}{3}}\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|^{\frac{2}{3}} \leq \varepsilon\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|^{2}+C_{\varepsilon} \lambda^{3}\|y\|^{2}, \\
\lambda\left\|y^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2} \leq C \lambda\|y\|^{\frac{2}{3}}\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|^{\frac{4}{3}} \leq \varepsilon\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|^{2}+C_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \lambda^{3}\|y\|^{2} .
\end{array}
$$

We infer that if $\lambda \geq \lambda_{0}>0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|^{2} & \leq 2\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}+(a-\lambda) y^{\prime}\right\|^{2}+2(a-\lambda)^{2}\left\|y^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq 2\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}+(a-\lambda) y^{\prime}\right\|^{2}+2 \varepsilon\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|^{2}+2 C_{\varepsilon}|a-\lambda|^{3}\|y\|^{2} \\
& \leq 2\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}+(a-\lambda) y^{\prime}\right\|^{2}+2 \varepsilon\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|^{2}+C_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \lambda^{3}\|y\|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

and (3.12) follows by picking $\varepsilon<1 / 4$.
2. Pick now any $y \in \mathcal{H}^{3} \cap H^{4}$ and any $\lambda \geq 0$. Then we have

$$
\lambda^{3}\left\|y^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leq C \lambda^{3}\|y\|^{\frac{3}{2}}\|y\|_{H^{4}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \varepsilon\left(\left\|y^{(4)}\right\|^{2}+\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|^{2}\right)+C_{\varepsilon} \lambda^{4}\|y\|^{2},
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda^{2}\left\|y^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2} & \leq C \lambda^{2}\|y\|\|y\|_{H^{4}} \leq \varepsilon\left(\left\|y^{(4)}\right\|^{2}+\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|^{2}\right)+C_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \lambda^{4}\|y\|^{2} \\
\lambda\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|^{2} & \leq C \lambda\|y\|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|y\|_{H^{4}}^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq \varepsilon\left(\left\|y^{(4)}\right\|^{2}+\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|^{2}\right)+C_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \lambda^{4}\|y\|^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, we have that for $\lambda \geq \lambda_{0}>0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|y^{(4)}\right\|^{2} & \leq 2\left\|y^{(4)}+(a-\lambda) y^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2}+2(a-\lambda)^{2}\left\|y^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq 2\left\|y^{(4)}+(a-\lambda) y^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2}+2 \varepsilon\left(\left\|y^{(4)}\right\|^{2}+\left\|y^{\prime \prime \prime}\right\|^{2}\right)+C_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime \prime} \lambda^{4}\|y\|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

and (3.13) follows by picking $\varepsilon<1 / 4$ and by using (3.12).
Assuming that $u_{0} \in \mathcal{D}(A) \cap H^{3}(\Omega)$ and using (3.10) and (3.12), we obtain that for any $t \in[0, T]$ (with a constant $C$ that may vary from line to line)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|u(., ., t)\|_{H^{3}(\Omega)}^{2} & =\|u(., ., t)\|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}+\sum_{k=0}^{3}\left\|\partial_{y}^{k} \partial_{x}^{3-k} u(., ., t)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \\
& \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{\mathcal{D}(A)}^{2}+\sum_{k=0}^{3} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{k}\left\|\partial_{x}^{3-k} \hat{u}_{j}(., t)\right\|^{2} \\
& \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{\mathcal{D}(A)}^{2}+C \sum_{k=0}^{3} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\left(\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime \prime}(., t)+\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}(., t)\right\|^{2}+\lambda_{j}^{3}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}(., t)\right\|^{2}\right) \\
& \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{\mathcal{D}(A)}^{2}+C\left\|\partial_{y}^{3} u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \\
& \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{H^{3}(\Omega)}^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand $\|u(., ., t)\|_{H^{4}(\Omega)}^{2}=\|u(., ., t)\|_{H^{3}(\Omega)}^{2}+\sum_{k=0}^{4}\left\|\partial_{y}^{k} \partial_{x}^{4-k} u(., ., t)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}$ and it is clear that $\int_{0}^{T}\|u(., ., t)\|_{H^{3}(\Omega)}^{2} d t \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{H^{3}(\Omega)}^{2}$. Using (3.13), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{0}^{T} & \sum_{k=0}^{4}\left\|\partial_{y}^{k} \partial_{x}^{4-k} u(., ., t)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} d t \\
& =\int_{0}^{T} \sum_{k=0}^{4} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j}^{k}\left\|\partial_{x}^{4-k} \hat{u}_{j}(., t)\right\|^{2} d t \\
& \leq C \int_{0}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\left(\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{(4)}+\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\hat{u}_{j}^{\prime \prime \prime}+\left(a-\lambda_{j}\right) \hat{u}_{j}^{\prime}\right\|^{2}+\lambda_{j}^{4}\left\|\hat{u}_{j}\right\|^{2}\right) d t \\
& \leq C \int_{0}^{T}\left(\|A u(., ., t)\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)}^{2}+\left\|\partial_{y}^{4} u(., ., t)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}\right) d t \\
& \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{H^{3}(\Omega)}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used (3.11) with $k=3$. This completes the proof of the proposition.

Interpolating between (3.3) and (3.4), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sup _{t \in[0, T]}\|\bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)}^{2}+\int_{0}^{T}\|\bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} d t \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{H^{1}(\Omega)}^{2}, \\
& \sup _{t \in[0, T]}\|\bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}+\int_{0}^{T}\|\bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{H^{3}(\Omega)}^{2} d t \leq C\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

This gives

$$
\|\bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{H^{n+1}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{t}}\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{H^{n}(\Omega)}, \quad \text { for } n \in\{0,1,2,3\}
$$

Proceeding as in [13, Proposition 2.2], we can show that if $u_{0} \in L^{2}(\Omega)$, then $\bar{u}(t) \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{n}\right)$ for any $t \in(0, T]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and it holds

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|A^{n} \bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{C^{n}}{t^{\frac{3 n}{2}}} n^{\frac{3 n}{2}}\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $T=1$. Then for any $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$, we infer from Proposition 2.1 that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\partial_{x}^{p} \partial_{y}^{q} \bar{u}(x, y, t)\right| & \leq\|\bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\|_{H^{p+q+2}(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C_{0} B^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \sum_{n=0}^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1}\left\|P^{n} \bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C_{0} B^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \sum_{n=0}^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \frac{C^{n}}{t^{\frac{3 n}{2}}} n^{\frac{3 n}{2}}\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C t^{-\frac{3}{2}\left[\frac{p+q}{2}\right]-3} \frac{(p!)^{\frac{3}{4}}(q!)^{\frac{3}{4}}}{R_{1}^{p} R_{2}^{q}}
\end{aligned}
$$

for some $R_{1}, R_{2}>0$. This means that $\bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t) \in G^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{3}{4}([-1,0] \times[0,1])$ for any $t \in(0, T]$.
Let

$$
f_{j}(t):=\int_{0}^{1} e_{j}(y) \partial_{x}^{2} \bar{u}(0, y, t) d y
$$

Lemma 3.2. For any $j \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$, there exist positive constants $R_{1}, R_{2}$ and $C$ such that

$$
\left|f_{j}^{(n)}(t)\right| \leq \frac{C}{(j \pi)^{j}} t^{-\frac{3}{2}\left(n+\left[\frac{j}{2}\right]+3\right)} \frac{(n!)^{\frac{3}{2}}(j!)^{\frac{3}{4}}}{R_{1}^{n} R_{2}^{j}}
$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $T=1$. Since $\bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t) \in \mathcal{D}\left(A^{n}\right)$ for any $t \in(0, T]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that

$$
\partial_{x}^{2} \partial_{y}^{2 n} \bar{u}(x, 0, t)=\partial_{x}^{2} \partial_{y}^{2 n} \bar{u}(x, 1, t)=0, \quad \forall x \in[-1,0], \forall t \in(0, T], \forall n \in \mathbb{N}
$$

Then, integrating by parts $j$-times, we deduce that

$$
\begin{align*}
f_{j}(t) & =\sqrt{2} \int_{0}^{1} \sin (j \pi y) \partial_{x}^{2} \bar{u}(0, y, t) d y \\
& =\frac{\sqrt{2}}{j \pi} \int_{0}^{1} \cos (j \pi y) \partial_{x}^{2} \partial_{y} \bar{u}(0, y, t) d y \\
& =\frac{\sqrt{2}}{(j \pi)^{2}} \int_{0}^{1} \sin (j \pi y) \partial_{x}^{2} \partial_{y}^{2} \bar{u}(0, y, t) d y  \tag{3.15}\\
& = \begin{cases}\frac{\sqrt{2}}{(j \pi)^{j}} \int_{0}^{1} \sin (j \pi y) \partial_{x}^{2} \partial_{y}^{j} \bar{u}(0, y, t) d y, & \text { if } j \text { is even; } \\
-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{(j \pi)^{j}} \int_{0}^{1} \cos (j \pi y) \partial_{x}^{2} \partial_{y}^{j} \bar{u}(0, y, t) d y, & \text { if } j \text { is odd. }\end{cases}
\end{align*}
$$

To estimate $\left|f_{j}^{(n)}(t)\right|(n \in \mathbb{N})$, it remains to estimate $\left|\partial_{t}^{n} \partial_{x}^{2} \partial_{y}^{j} \bar{u}(0, y, t)\right|$. Let

$$
l=\left[\frac{j+4}{2}\right]+1 .
$$

Taking (2.6) (with $u=P^{i} \bar{u}$ ) and (3.14) into account, we obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\partial_{t}^{n} \partial_{x}^{2} \partial_{y}^{j} \bar{u}(x, y, t)\right| & =\left|P^{n} \partial_{x}^{2} \partial_{y}^{j} \bar{u}(x, y, t)\right| \\
& \leq C\left\|P^{n} \bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\right\|_{H^{j+4}(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C B^{l} \sum_{k=0}^{l}\left\|P^{n+k} \bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C B^{l} \sum_{k=0}^{n+l}\left\|P^{k} \bar{u}(\cdot, \cdot, t)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}  \tag{3.16}\\
& \leq C B^{l} \sum_{k=0}^{n+l} \frac{C^{k} k^{\frac{3}{2} k}}{t^{\frac{3}{2} k}}\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C B^{l} \frac{C^{n+l}(n+l+1)(n+l)^{\frac{3}{2}(n+l)}}{t^{\frac{3}{2}(n+l)}}\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C t^{-\frac{3}{2}\left(n+\left[\frac{j}{2}\right]+3\right)} \frac{(n!)^{\frac{3}{2}}(j!)^{\frac{3}{4}}}{R_{1}^{n} R_{2}^{j}}\left\|u_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}
\end{align*}
$$

for some $R_{1}, R_{2}>0$.
Combining (3.15) and (3.16), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|f_{j}^{(n)}(t)\right| & \leq \frac{C}{(j \pi)^{j}} \sup _{y \in[0,1]}\left|\partial_{t}^{n} \partial_{x}^{2} \partial_{y}^{j} \bar{u}(0, y, t)\right| \\
& \leq \frac{C}{(j \pi)^{j}} t^{-\frac{3}{2}\left(n+\left[\frac{j}{2}\right]+3\right)} \frac{(n!)^{\frac{3}{2}}(j!)^{\frac{3}{4}}}{R_{1}^{n} R_{2}^{j}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, we can prove the first main result in this paper.
Proof of Theorem 1.1. Pick any $\tau \in(0, T), s \in[3 / 2,2)$ and let

$$
z_{j}(t)=\phi_{s}\left(\frac{t-\tau}{T-\tau}\right) f_{j}(t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T
$$

where

$$
\phi_{s}(\rho)= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } \rho \leq 0, \\ 0 & \text { if } \rho \geq 1, \\ \frac{e^{-\frac{M}{(1-\rho)^{\sigma}}}}{e^{-\frac{M}{\rho^{\sigma}}}+e^{-\frac{M}{(1-\rho)^{\sigma}}}} & \text { if } \rho \in(0,1)\end{cases}
$$

with $M>0$ and $\sigma=(s-1)^{-1}$. As $\phi_{s}$ is Gevrey of order $s$, there exist $R_{\phi}>0$ such that

$$
\left|\phi_{s}^{(p)}(\rho)\right| \leq C \frac{(p!)^{s}}{R_{\phi}^{p}} \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{N}, \rho \in \mathbb{R}
$$

Then, applying Lemma 3.2, for any $\varepsilon \in(0, T)$ and $t \in[\varepsilon, T]$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|z_{j}^{(i)}(t)\right| & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{i}\binom{i}{n}\left|\partial_{t}^{i-n}\left[\phi_{s}\left(\frac{t-\tau}{T-\tau}\right)\right]\right|\left|f_{j}^{(n)}(t)\right| \\
& \leq C \sum_{n=0}^{i}\binom{i}{n} \frac{(i-n)!^{s}}{R_{\phi}^{i-n}}\left(\frac{1}{T-\tau}\right)^{i-n} \frac{1}{(j \pi)^{j}} t^{-\frac{3}{2}\left(n+\left[\frac{j}{2}\right]+3\right)} \frac{(n!)^{\frac{3}{2}}\left(j!!^{\frac{3}{4}}\right.}{R_{1}^{n} R_{2}^{j}} \\
& \leq C \frac{1}{(j \pi)^{j}} \varepsilon^{-\frac{3}{2}\left(\left(\frac{j}{2}\right]+3\right)} \frac{(j!)^{\frac{3}{4}}}{R_{2}^{j}} \sum_{n=0}^{i}\binom{i}{n} \frac{(i-n)!^{s}}{R_{\phi}^{i-n}}\left(\frac{1}{T-\tau}\right)^{i-n} \varepsilon^{-\frac{3}{2} n} \frac{(n!)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{R_{1}^{n}} \\
& \leq C \frac{1}{(j \pi)^{j}} \varepsilon^{-\frac{3}{2}\left(\left(\frac{j}{2}\right]+3\right)} \frac{(j!)^{\frac{3}{4}}}{R_{2}^{j}} \frac{(i!)^{s}}{\min \left\{R_{\phi}, R_{1}\right\}^{i}} \sum_{n=0}^{i}\binom{i}{n}\left(\frac{1}{T-\tau}\right)^{i-n} \varepsilon^{-\frac{3}{2} n} \\
& \leq M_{j} \frac{(i!)^{s}}{\widehat{R}^{i}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $M_{j}$ satisfies (3.1). Let

$$
u(x, y, t)= \begin{cases}u_{0}(x, y) & \text { if } x \in[-1,0], y \in[0,1], t=0 \\ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} g_{i, j}(x) z_{j}^{(i)}(t) e_{j}(y) & \text { if } x \in[-1,0], y \in[0,1], t \in(0, T]\end{cases}
$$

Then, it is easy to see that $u(\cdot, \cdot, T)=0$. By Proposition 3.1, $u \in G^{\frac{s}{2}, \frac{s}{2}, s}([-1,0] \times[0,1] \times[\varepsilon, T])$ for any $\varepsilon \in(0, T)$. Furthermore, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& u_{t}+a u_{x}+\Delta u_{x}=0=\bar{u}_{t}+a \bar{u}_{x}+\Delta \bar{u}_{x} \quad \text { in } \Omega \times(0, T), \\
& u(0, y, t)=0=\bar{u}(0, y, t), \quad \forall y \in[0,1], \forall t \in(0, \tau), \\
& \partial_{x} u(0, y, t)=0=\partial_{x} \bar{u}(0, y, t), \quad \forall y \in[0,1], \quad \forall t \in(0, \tau), \\
& \partial_{x}^{2} u(0, y, t)=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} z_{j}(t) e_{j}(y)=\partial_{x}^{2} \bar{u}(0, y, t), \quad \forall y \in[0,1], \quad \forall t \in(0, \tau) .
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows from Holmgren theorem that $u(x, y, t)=\bar{u}(x, y, t)$ for any $(x, y, t) \in[-1,0] \times[0,1] \times$ $(0, \tau)$. In particular, $u \in C\left([0, T] ; L^{2}(\Omega)\right)$ and $h=0$ for $t \in[0, \tau)$, so that $h \in G^{\frac{s}{2}, s}([0,1] \times[0, T])$. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete.

## 4 Reachable states

Proposition 4.1. For any $j \geq 1$, assume that $z_{j} \in G^{2}([0, T])$ is such that

$$
\left|z_{j}^{(i)}(t)\right| \leq M_{j} \frac{(2 i)!}{R^{2 i}}, \quad \forall i \geq 0, t \in[0, T]
$$

where $R>1$ and $M_{j}$ satisfies (3.1). Then the function $u$ defined by (1.9) solves system (1.4)(1.8) and $u \in G^{1,1,2}([-1,0] \times[0,1] \times[0, T])$.

Proof. According to the proof of Proposition 3.1, for any $m, p, q \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$
\left|\partial_{t}^{m} \partial_{x}^{p} \partial_{y}^{q} u(x, y, t)\right| \leq C B^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \sum_{n=0}^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \sup _{(x, y) \in \Omega} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=n}^{\infty}\left|z_{j}^{(i+m)}(t) g_{i-n, j}(x) e_{j}(y)\right| .
$$

Let $k=2 i-2 n$ and $N=2 n+2 m$. We can obtain by the same arguments as in [13, Proposition 3.1] that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=n}^{\infty}\left|z_{j}^{(i+m)}(t) g_{i-n, j}(x) e_{j}(y)\right| & \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} M_{j} \frac{(2 i+2 m)!}{R^{2 i+2 m}} \frac{C e^{\sqrt{\lambda_{j}}}}{(2 i-2 n)!} \\
& =\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} C M_{j} e^{\sqrt{\lambda_{j}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(k+N)!}{R^{k+N} k!} \\
& \leq C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(k+N)!}{R^{k+N} k!} \\
& =C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(k+1) \cdots(k+N)}{R^{k+N}} \\
& \leq C\left(\frac{\alpha e}{R^{\sigma}}\right)^{N} N!\sqrt{N} \\
& \leq C \frac{(2 n)!(2 m)!}{R_{1}^{n} R_{2}^{m}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $R_{1}, R_{2}$ are two positive constants, $\sigma \in(0,1)$ and

$$
\alpha=\sup _{k \geq 0} \frac{k+2}{\left(R^{1-\sigma}\right)^{k+1}} .
$$

It follows from the above estimates that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\partial_{t}^{m} \partial_{x}^{p} \partial_{y}^{q} u(x, y, t)\right| & \leq C B^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \sum_{n=0}^{\left[\frac{p+q+2}{2}\right]+1} \frac{(2 n)!(2 m)!}{R_{1}^{n} R_{2}^{m}} \\
& \leq C \frac{p!q!(m!)^{2}}{\widehat{R}_{1}^{p} \widehat{R}_{2}^{q} \widehat{R}_{3}^{m}}
\end{aligned}
$$

for some positive constants $\widehat{R}_{1}, \widehat{R}_{2}$ and $\widehat{R}_{3}$. This ends the proof of Proposition 4.1.
As a particular case of [12, Proposition 3.6] (with $a_{0}=1, a_{p}=[2 p(2 p-1)]^{-1}$ for $p \geq 1$ ), we have the following result.

Proposition 4.2. Let $\left\{d_{q}\right\}_{q \geq 0}$ be a sequence of real numbers such that

$$
\left|d_{q}\right| \leq C H^{q}(2 q)!\quad \forall q \geq 0
$$

for some $H>0$ and $C>0$. Then for all $\widetilde{H}>e^{e^{-1}} H$, there exists a function $f \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f^{(q)}(0)=d_{q} \quad \forall q \geq 0, \\
& \left|f^{(q)}(x)\right| \leq C \widetilde{H}^{q}(2 q)!\quad \forall q \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{X}:= & \left\{u \in C^{\infty}([-1,0] \times[0,1]) ;\right. \\
& \left.P^{n} u(0, y)=\partial_{x} P^{n} u(0, y)=P^{n} u(x, 0)=P^{n} u(x, 1)=0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall x \in[-1,0], \forall y \in[0,1]\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

A result similar to Lemma 2.2 can be derived.
Lemma 4.1. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial_{y}^{2 n} f(x, 0)=\partial_{y}^{2 n} f(x, 1)=0, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{X}, \forall x \in[-1,0] . \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on $n$. For $n=0$, (4.1) is obvious since $f \in \mathcal{X}$. Assume now that (4.1) is true for $n-1 \geq 0$. If $f \in \mathcal{X}$, then $\operatorname{Pf} \in \mathcal{X}$, so that by the induction hypothesis

$$
\partial_{y}^{2 n-2} P f(x, 0)=\partial_{y}^{2 n-2} P f(x, 1)=0 .
$$

This implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \partial_{x}^{3} \partial_{y}^{2 n-2} f(x, 0)+\partial_{x} \partial_{y}^{2 n} f(x, 0)+a \partial_{x} \partial_{y}^{2 n-2} f(x, 0)=0 \\
& \partial_{x}^{3} \partial_{y}^{2 n-2} f(x, 1)+\partial_{x} \partial_{y}^{2 n} f(x, 1)+a \partial_{x} \partial_{y}^{2 n-2} f(x, 1)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

Since (4.1) is true for $n-1$, we obtain that

$$
\partial_{x} \partial_{y}^{2 n} f(x, 0)=\partial_{x} \partial_{y}^{2 n} f(x, 1)=0
$$

This means that for some constants $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$,

$$
\partial_{y}^{2 n} f(x, 0)=C_{1}, \partial_{y}^{2 n} f(x, 1)=C_{2} \quad \forall x \in[-1,0] .
$$

On the other hand, we infer from the assumption $f \in \mathcal{X}$ that

$$
\partial_{y}^{2 n} f(0, y)=0 \quad \forall y \in[0,1] .
$$

Taking $y=0$ and next $y=1$, we see that $C_{1}=C_{2}=0$. The proof of Lemma.4is complete.

Lemma 4.2. If $f \in \mathcal{X}$ is such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) P^{n} f(0, y) d y=\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \partial_{x} P^{n} f(0, y) d y=\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \partial_{x}^{2} P^{n} f(0, y) d y=0 \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $l \geq 1$ and any $n \geq 0$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \partial_{x}^{m} f(0, y) d y=0 \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds for any $l \geq 1$ and any $m \geq 0$.
Proof. To prove that (4.3) holds for any $l \geq 1$ and any $m \geq 0$, it is sufficient to show that for any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, (4.3) holds for any $l \geq 1$ and any $m \leq 3 M+2$. We proceed by induction on $M$.

For $M=0$, we can take $n=0$ in (4.2) to see that (4.3) holds for any $l \geq 1$ and $m \leq 2$.
Assume that (4.3) is true for any $l \geq 1$ and any $m \leq 3 M-1$. We claim that (4.3) holds for any $l \geq 1$ and $m=3 M, 3 M+1,3 M+2$. Indeed, taking $n=M$ in (4.2), we have

$$
\begin{align*}
0= & (-1)^{M} \int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) P^{M} f(0, y) d y \\
= & \int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y)\left(\partial_{x}^{2}+\partial_{y}^{2}+a\right)^{M} \partial_{x}^{M} f(0, y) d y \\
= & \int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \partial_{x}^{3 M} f(0, y) d y \\
& \quad+\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \sum_{k=0}^{M-1}\binom{M}{k} \sum_{i=0}^{M-k}\binom{M-k}{i} a^{M-k-i} \partial_{x}^{2 k+M} \partial_{y}^{2 i} f(0, y) d y \tag{4.4}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $f \in \mathcal{X}$, it follows from Lemma 4.1 that

$$
\partial_{y}^{2 n} f(x, 0)=\partial_{y}^{2 n} f(x, 1)=0, \quad \forall x \in[-1,0], \forall n \in \mathbb{N} .
$$

Then, we obtain by integrations by parts that for $k \in\{0, \ldots, M-1\}$ and $i \in\{0, \ldots, M-k\}$

$$
\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \partial_{x}^{2 k+M} \partial_{y}^{2 i} f(0, y) d y=(-1)^{i}(l \pi)^{2 i} \int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \partial_{x}^{2 k+M} f(0, y) d y=0
$$

In the last step, we used the fact that $2 k+M \leq 3 M-1$. Thus, we infer from (4.4) that

$$
\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \partial_{x}^{3 M} f(0, y) d y=0, \quad \forall l \geq 1
$$

We can show in the same way that (4.3) is true for $m=3 M+1,3 M+2$ by using the fact that

$$
\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \partial_{x} P^{M} f(0, y) d y=\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \partial_{x}^{2} P^{M} f(0, y) d y=0, \quad \forall l \geq 1
$$

The proof of Lemma 4.2 is complete.
Now, we are in a position to prove the second main result in this paper.

Proof of Theorem [1.2. Assume that $R:=\min \left\{R_{1}, R_{2}\right\}>R_{0}=\sqrt[3]{9(a+2)} e^{(3 e)^{-1}}$ and pick any $u_{1} \in \mathcal{R}_{R_{1}, R_{2}}$. We intend to expand $u_{1}$ in the following form:

$$
u_{1}(x, y)=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} b_{i, j} g_{i, j}(x) e_{j}(y),
$$

where

$$
b_{i, j}=(-1)^{i} \int_{0}^{1} e_{j}(y) \partial_{x}^{2} P^{i} u_{1}(0, y) d y
$$

Since $u_{1} \in \mathcal{R}_{R_{1}, R_{2}} \subset \mathcal{X}$, we have that $P^{i} u_{1} \in \mathcal{X}$ for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 4.1, we infer that

$$
\partial_{y}^{2 n} P^{i} u_{1}(x, 0)=\partial_{y}^{2 n} P^{i} u_{1}(x, 1)=0, \quad \forall x \in[-1,0] .
$$

Then, by integration by parts, we have

$$
\left|b_{i, j}\right|=\left|\int_{0}^{1} e_{j}(y) \partial_{x}^{2} P^{i} u_{1}(0, y) d y\right| \leq \frac{C}{(j \pi)^{j}} \sup _{(x, y) \in \Omega}\left|\partial_{x}^{2} \partial_{y}^{j} P^{i} u_{1}(x, y)\right| .
$$

Next, we estimate $\left|\partial_{x}^{2} \partial_{y}^{j} P^{i} u_{1}(x, y)\right|$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\partial_{x}^{2} \partial_{y}^{j} P^{i} u_{1}(x, y)\right| & =\left|\partial_{x}^{2} \partial_{y}^{j} \sum_{n=0}^{i}\binom{i}{n}\left(\partial_{x}^{2}+\partial_{y}^{2}\right)^{n} \partial_{x}^{n}\left(a \partial_{x}\right)^{i-n} u_{1}(x, y)\right| \\
& =\left|\partial_{x}^{i+2} \partial_{y}^{j} \sum_{n=0}^{i}\binom{i}{n} a^{i-n}\left(\partial_{x}^{2}+\partial_{y}^{2}\right)^{n} u_{1}(x, y)\right| \\
& =\left|\partial_{x}^{i+2} \partial_{y}^{j} \sum_{n=0}^{i}\binom{i}{n} a^{i-n} \sum_{m=0}^{n}\binom{n}{m} \partial_{x}^{2 m} \partial_{y}^{2 n-2 m} u_{1}(x, y)\right| \\
& \leq \sum_{n=0}^{i} \sum_{m=0}^{n}\binom{i}{n}\binom{n}{m} a^{i-n}\left|\partial_{x}^{2 m+i+2} \partial_{y}^{2 n-2 m+j} u_{1}(x, y)\right| \\
& \leq C \sum_{n=0}^{i} \sum_{m=0}^{n}\binom{i}{n}\binom{n}{m} a^{i-n} \frac{(2 m+i+2)!^{\frac{2}{3}}(2 n-2 m+j)!^{\frac{2}{3}}}{R_{1}^{2 m+i+2} R_{2}^{2 n-2 m+j}} \\
& \leq C \sum_{n=0}^{i} \sum_{m=0}^{n}\binom{i}{n}\binom{n}{m} a^{i-n} \frac{(2 m+i+2)!^{\frac{2}{3}}(2 n-2 m+j)!^{\frac{2}{3}}}{R^{2 n+i+j+2}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We notice that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(2 m+i+2)!(2 n-2 m+j)! & =\binom{2 m+i+2}{2}\binom{2 n-2 m+j}{j} 2!j!(2 m+i)!(2 n-2 m)! \\
& \leq\binom{ 2 m+i+2}{2}\binom{2 n-2 m+j}{j} 2!j!(2 n+i)!,
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used the fact that

$$
\binom{2 n+i}{2 m+i}=\frac{(2 n+i)!}{(2 m+i)!(2 n-2 m)!} \geq 1 .
$$

According to [9, Lemma A.1], we have

$$
\binom{2 m+i+2}{2}\binom{2 n-2 m+j}{j} \leq\binom{ 2 n+i+j+2}{j+2} .
$$

This implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
(2 m+i+2)!(2 n-2 m+j)! & \leq\binom{ 2 n+i+j+2}{j+2} 2!j!(2 n+i)! \\
& =\frac{(2 n+i+j+2)!2!j!(2 n+i)!}{(j+2)!(2 n+i)!} \\
& \leq(2 n+i+j+2)!.
\end{aligned}
$$

Combining the above estimates, we infer that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|b_{i, j}\right| & \leq \frac{C}{(j \pi)^{j}} \sum_{n=0}^{i} \sum_{m=0}^{n}\binom{i}{n}\binom{n}{m} a^{i-n} \frac{(2 n+i+j+2)!^{\frac{2}{3}}}{R^{2 n+i+j+2}} \\
& \leq \frac{C}{(j \pi)^{j}} \sum_{n=0}^{i}\binom{i}{n} 2^{n} a^{i-n} \frac{(3 i+j+2)!^{\frac{2}{3}}}{R^{3 i+j+2}} \\
& =\frac{C}{(j \pi)^{j}} \frac{(3 i+j+2)!^{\frac{2}{3}}}{R^{3 i+j+2}}(2+a)^{i} \\
& \leq \frac{C 2^{\frac{2}{3}}(3 i+j+2)(3 i)!^{\frac{2}{3}}(j+2)!^{\frac{2}{3}}(2+a)^{i}}{(j \pi)^{j} R^{3 i+j+2}} \\
& \leq \frac{C 2^{\frac{2}{3}(j+2)}(j+2)!^{\frac{2}{3}}}{(j \pi)^{j} R^{j+2}} \frac{2^{2 i}(3 i)!^{\frac{2}{3}}(2+a)^{i}}{R^{3 i}} \\
& \leq \frac{C 2^{\frac{2}{3}(j+2)}(j+2)!^{\frac{2}{3}}}{(j \pi)^{j} R^{j+2}} \frac{3^{2 i}(6 \pi i)^{\frac{1}{3}}(4 \pi i)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(2 i)!(2+a)^{i}}{R^{3 i}} \\
& \leq \frac{C 2^{\frac{2}{3}(j+2)}(j+2)!^{\frac{2}{3}}}{(j \pi)^{j} R^{j+2}} \frac{[9(2+a)]^{i}(2 i)!}{R^{3 i}} \\
& =M_{j} \frac{[9(2+a)]^{i}(2 i)!}{R^{3 i}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $M_{j}$ satisfies (3.1).
By Proposition 4.2, for any $j \geq 1$, there exists a function $h_{j} \in G^{2}([0, T])$ and a number $\tilde{R}>1$ such that

$$
\begin{align*}
& h_{j}^{(i)}(T)=b_{i, j} \quad \forall i \geq 0, \\
& \left|h_{j}^{(i)}(t)\right| \leq M_{j} \frac{(2 i)!}{\tilde{R}^{2 i}} \quad \forall i \geq 0, t \in[0, T] . \tag{4.5}
\end{align*}
$$

Pick any $\tau \in(0, T), s \in(1,2)$ and let

$$
g(t)=1-\phi_{s}\left(\frac{t-\tau}{T-\tau}\right) \quad \text { for } t \in[0, T] .
$$

Setting

$$
z_{j}(t)=h_{j}(t) g(t) \quad \forall t \in[0, T],
$$

following the method developed in [12, Theorem 3.2], and taking into account the fact that $s<2$, we see that $z_{j}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{align*}
& z_{j}^{(i)}(T)=b_{i, j} \quad \forall j \geq 1, i \geq 0 \\
& z_{j}^{(i)}(0)=0 \quad \forall j \geq 1, \quad i \geq 0  \tag{4.6}\\
& \left|z_{j}^{(i)}(t)\right| \leq C M_{j} \frac{(2 i)!}{\tilde{R}^{2 i}} \quad \forall j \geq 1, i \geq 0, t \in[0, T]
\end{align*}
$$

where $\tilde{R}$ is the same as in (4.5) and $C$ is a positive constant independent of $i$ and $j$.
Let $u$ be as in (1.9). According to (4.6), we have $u_{0}=0$ and

$$
u(x, y, T)=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} g_{i, j}(x) z_{j}^{(i)}(T) e_{j}(y)=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} b_{i, j} g_{i, j}(x) e_{j}(y)
$$

By Proposition 4.1, $u$ solves system (1.4)-(1.8) and $u \in G^{1,1,2}([-1,0] \times[0,1] \times[0, T])$. Let

$$
h(y, t)=u(-1, y, t) \quad \forall y \in[0,1], \forall t \in[0, T] .
$$

Then $h \in G^{1,2}([0,1] \times[0, T])$.
Finally, for any $l \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) P^{n} u(0, y, T) d y=\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} b_{i, j}(-1)^{n} g_{i-n, j}(0) e_{j}(y) d y=0 \\
& =\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) P^{n} u_{1}(0, y) d y \\
& \int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \partial_{x} P^{n} u(0, y, T) d y=\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} b_{i, j}(-1)^{n} g_{i-n, j}^{\prime}(0) e_{j}(y) d y=0 \\
& =\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \partial_{x} P^{n} u_{1}(0, y) d y, \\
& \int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \partial_{x}^{2} P^{n} u(0, y, T) d y=\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} b_{i, j}(-1)^{n} g_{i-n, j}^{\prime \prime}(0) e_{j}(y) d y=b_{n l} \\
& =\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y) \partial_{x}^{2} P^{n} u_{1}(0, y) d y .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $u(\cdot, \cdot, T), u_{1} \in \mathcal{X}$, it follows from Lemma 4.2 that

$$
\int_{0}^{1} e_{l}(y)\left[\partial_{x}^{m} u(0, y, T)-\partial_{x}^{m} u_{1}(0, y)\right] d y=0 \quad \forall l \geq 1, \forall m \geq 0
$$

and hence

$$
\partial_{x}^{m} u(0, y, T)-\partial_{x}^{m} u_{1}(0, y)=0 \quad \forall m \geq 0, \forall y \in[0,1] .
$$

Since the map $x \rightarrow u(x, y, T)-u_{1}(x, y)$ is in $G^{1}([-1,0])$ (i.e. is analytic) for any $y \in[0,1]$, we infer that

$$
u(x, y, T)=u_{1}(x, y) \quad \forall(x, y) \in[-1,0] \times[0,1] .
$$

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is complete.
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