

STABLE RECOVERY OF A NON-COMPACTLY SUPPORTED COEFFICIENT OF A SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION ON AN INFINITE WAVEGUIDE

YOSRA SOUSSI

ABSTRACT. We study the stability issue for the inverse problem of determining a coefficient appearing in a Schrödinger equation defined on an infinite cylindrical waveguide. More precisely, we prove the stable recovery of some general class of non-compactly and non periodic coefficients appearing in an unbounded cylindrical domain. We consider both results of stability from full and partial boundary measurements associated with the so called Dirichlet-to-Neumann map.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let Ω be an unbounded open connected set of \mathbb{R}^3 taking the form $\Omega := \omega \times \mathbb{R}$, with ω a \mathcal{C}^3 bounded open connected set of \mathbb{R}^2 . Let $\partial\Omega = \partial\omega \times \mathbb{R}$ be the boundary of Ω . We fix $q \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that 0 is not in the spectrum of the operator $-\Delta + q$ acting on $L^2(\Omega)$ with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition. Then, we consider the following boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + qu = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = f & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Since Ω is unbounded, for $X = \omega$ or $X = \partial\omega$ and any $r > 0$, we define the space $H^r(X \times \mathbb{R})$ by

$$H^r(X \times \mathbb{R}) := L^2(X; H^r(\mathbb{R})) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}; H^r(X)).$$

We denote also by $H^{-r}(\partial\Omega)$ the dual space of $H^r(\partial\Omega)$. Combining [14, Lemma 2.2] with some classical lifting arguments (see e.g. [36, Theorem 8.3, Chapter 1]), which can be extended to infinite cylindrical domain Ω by using arguments similar to [17, Lemma 2.2], we deduce that for $f \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$ problem (1.1) admits a unique solution $u \in H^2(\Omega)$. In the present paper, we consider the inverse problem of identifying the electric potential q from measurements on the boundary of solutions of (1.1). More precisely, our observations are given by the Dirichlet-to-Neumann (DN in short) map Λ_q which is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_q : H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega) &\longrightarrow H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega) \\ f &\longmapsto \partial_\nu u := \nabla u \cdot \nu. \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

Here ν is the outward unit normal vector on $\partial\Omega$ which takes the form

$$\nu(x', x_3) := (\nu'(x'), 0), \quad x = (x', x_3) \in \partial\Omega, \quad x' := (x_1, x_2) \in \omega,$$

with ν' is the outward unit normal vector on $\partial\omega$. Moreover, we use here the fact that the map $H^2(\Omega) \ni w \mapsto \partial_\nu w \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$ is a bounded operator which can be deduced from a combination of arguments of [36,

Date: November 16, 2021.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 35R30, Secondary: 35J15.

Key words and phrases. Inverse problem, Stability estimate; Schrödinger equation; electric potential; Dirichlet-to-Neumann map; infinite cylindrical waveguide; partial data; Carleman's estimate.

Theorem 8.3, Chapter 1] and [17, Lemma 2.2].

Let $\Gamma_0 \subset \partial\omega$ be an arbitrary open set. The restriction Λ'_q of Λ_q on $\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda'_q : H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega) &\longrightarrow H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}) \\ f &\longmapsto \partial_\nu u := \nabla u \cdot \nu|_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

Let us mention that the DN map Λ_q can also be defined as a bounded operator from $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$ to $H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$. However, since the boundary of Ω is not bounded, we consider this definition of the DN map in order to simplify some argumentation in the paper. In this paper, we study the stable recovery of q from knowledge of the full DN map Λ_q and the partial DN map Λ'_q .

1.1. Physical motivation. The problem under consideration in this paper is related to the Calderón's problem [8]. The latter can be seen as the determination of an electrical conductivity of a medium by making voltages and current measurements at the boundary of the medium. This problem is called the Electrical Impedance Tomography (EIT) problem (see [37]) which has many applications including geophysical prospection [38] and medical imaging by improving the early detection of breast cancer [39].

The statement of this problem on the infinite cylindrical domain (also called infinite waveguide) can be associated with problems of transmission to long distance, where the goal of our inverse problem is to determine an impurity that perturbs the guided propagation.

1.2. Known results. In 1980, Calderón considered in [8] the first formulation of a problem which is now called the Calderón problem (see [13, 37] for an overview). In [40], the authors provided the first positive answer to this problem stated in terms of a uniqueness result from full boundary measurements. Since then, this problem has received much attention and this result has been improved in several ways. This includes some results with partial data like [2, 7, 20, 23, 24] and some stability results stated in [1, 5, 9, 10, 12, 15]. All the above mentioned results have been stated in a bounded domain. Several authors considered also the recovery of coefficients for elliptic equations on an unbounded domain corresponding to a slab or an infinite cylindrical waveguide. For instance, we can mention the work of [31, 33, 34, 35] dealing with the unique recovery of several classes of compactly supported coefficients in a slab from boundary measurements. The stability issue for these classes of inverse problems has been addressed by [11]. For results devoted to recovery of coefficients in an infinite cylindrical domain, we can first mention the work of [16, 17] where the stable recovery of coefficients periodic along the axis of an infinite cylindrical domain has been addressed. More recently, [25, 26] obtained the first results of recovery of non-compactly supported and non-periodic coefficients appearing in an elliptic equation on infinite cylindrical domain. The results of [25, 26] seems to be the first results of unique recovery of such a general class of electromagnetic potentials in an unbounded domain. In addition, the analysis of [20, 21] extends also the results of [31, 35] to the recovery of non-compactly supported coefficients in a slab. Finally, we refer to the works [30, 4, 3, 6, 27, 29, 15, 18, 22] for the analysis of inverse problems of identifying non compactly supported coefficients and some related problems in an unbounded domain.

1.3. Statement of the main results. In this paper we consider the inverse problem of identifying the electric potential q from boundary measurements. For this purpose, we need to define a set of admissible coefficients. In order to introduce the set of admissible unknown potentials, we fix $M \in (0, +\infty)$ and $q_0 \in H^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\|q_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M$. Then, we consider the set of admissible unknown potentials $\mathcal{Q}(M, q_0)$ corresponding to the set of all $q \in H^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying the following conditions:

(i)

$$\|q - q_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|q\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \int_{\Omega} (1 + |x_3|) |(q - q_0)(x', x_3)| dx' dx_3 \leq M, \quad (1.4)$$

(ii)

$$q(x) = q_0(x), \quad x \in \partial\Omega, \quad (1.5)$$

(iii) 0 is not in the spectrum of the operator $-\Delta + q$ acting on $L^2(\Omega)$ with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition.

We start by proving the stable recovery of q from measurements on the whole boundary. Our first main result can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $M > 0$ and, for $j = 1, 2$, let $q_j \in \mathcal{Q}(M, q_0)$. Then, there exists a positive constant C depending only on M and Ω such that*

$$\|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \log \left(3 + \|\Lambda_{q_1} - \Lambda_{q_2}\|_{\mathcal{B}(H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega), H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega))}^{-1} \right)^{-\frac{1}{36}}. \quad (1.6)$$

Here and from now, for any Banach spaces X, Y , we denote by $\mathcal{B}(X, Y)$ the space of bounded operator from X to Y with the associated norm.

For $\|\Lambda_{q_1} - \Lambda_{q_2}\|_{\mathcal{B}(H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega), H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega))} = 0$, the quantity on the right hand side of (1.6) corresponds to 0.

Next, we give our partial data result with restriction of the measurement to some portion of the boundary. In contrast to the previous full data result this partial data result requires some additional definitions and assumptions that we need to recall first. Let $\mathcal{W}_0 \subset \omega$ be an arbitrary neighborhood of the boundary $\partial\omega$ such that $\partial\mathcal{W}_0 = \partial\omega \cup \Gamma^\sharp$ with $\partial\omega \cap \Gamma^\sharp = \emptyset$. We assume that Γ^\sharp is \mathcal{C}^2 . Let $\Gamma_0 \subset \partial\omega \subset \partial\mathcal{W}_0$ be an arbitrary (not empty) open set of $\partial\omega$ and let $\mathcal{O}_0 = \mathcal{W}_0 \times \mathbb{R}$. For a given $M > 0$, we introduce the admissible set of coefficients

$$\mathcal{Q}'(M, q_0, \mathcal{O}_0) = \{q \in \mathcal{Q}(M, q_0) \cap \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}^3); \|q\|_{\mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})} \leq M \text{ and } q = q_0 \text{ in } \mathcal{O}_0\}.$$

Then, our second main result can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $M > 0$ and, for $j = 1, 2$, let $q_j \in \mathcal{Q}'(M, q_0, \mathcal{O}_0)$. Then, there exists a positive constant C depending only on M and Ω such that*

$$\|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \log \left(3 + \|\Lambda'_{q_1} - \Lambda'_{q_2}\|_{\mathcal{B}(H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega), H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}))}^{-1} \right)^{-\frac{1}{36}}. \quad (1.7)$$

1.4. Comments about our results. To the best of our knowledge, Theorem 1.1 is the first result of stable recovery of coefficients appearing in an elliptic equation which are neither compactly supported nor periodic. Only some uniqueness results have been obtained so far for the recovery of this class of coefficients (see [25]). Indeed, one can only find in the mathematical literature works like [11, 16, 17] devoted to the stable recovery of compactly supported or periodic coefficients in an unbounded domain.

In addition to the result of Theorem 1.1, we obtain a partial data result in the spirit of [5] for unbounded cylindrical domains stated in Theorem 1.2. Namely, by assuming that the coefficient under consideration is known close to the boundary, we show that the result of Theorem 1.1 remain valid with measurements restricted to any portion of $\partial\Omega$ of the form $\Gamma \times \mathbb{R}$ with Γ an arbitrary open subset of $\partial\omega$. We prove this last result by combining the tools of Theorem 1.1 with a Carleman estimate for elliptic equations on unbounded cylindrical domain. Since, in contrast to all other similar works, the Carleman estimate required for Theorem 1.2 is stated in an unbounded domain, we prove its derivation in the appendix by using a separation of variables argument. The stability estimate of Theorem 1.2 can be compared to the one obtained by [3], for dynamical Schrödinger equations, in terms of restriction of the measurements.

Let us observe that, in contrast to the uniqueness results of [25], the stability results of Theorem 1.1, 1.2 require more careful estimates and some extra restriction of the class of coefficients under consideration. Moreover, in contrast to stability results in bounded domains (see e.g. [1, 2, 11, 12]), we are not able to obtain our stability estimate from the assumption of [25] where the uniqueness for our inverse problem has

been proved. Indeed, in order to derive the stability estimates (1.6) and (1.7), we need to consider the extra assumption (1.4) which describes the behavior at infinity of the admissible coefficients.

1.5. Outline. This paper is organized as follows. As a first step, we introduce the complex geometrical optics (CGO in short) solutions of our problem in Section 2. Relying on the properties of these particular solutions and on the weak unique continuation property stated in the Appendix, we can prove that the electric potential depends stably on the global Dirichlet-to-Neumann map in the third section and on the partial one in the fourth section.

2. CONSTRUCTION OF PARTICULAR SOLUTIONS

In order to solve our inverse problem, we first borrow from [25] the construction of particular solutions called CGO solutions. Let us start by fixing some notations. Let $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$, $\xi = (\xi', \xi_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that

$$\xi' \in \theta^\perp \setminus \{0\}, \xi_3 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \text{ and } \eta \in \mathbb{S}^2 \text{ given by } \eta = \frac{\left(\xi', -\frac{|\xi'|^2}{\xi_3}\right)}{\sqrt{|\xi'|^2 + \frac{|\xi'|^4}{\xi_3^2}}}. \text{ In particular, we have}$$

$$\eta \cdot \xi = (\theta, 0) \cdot \xi = (\theta, 0) \cdot \eta = 0.$$

We consider the function $\chi \in C_0^\infty((-2, 2), [0, 1])$ such that $\chi = 1$ on $[-1, 1]$. Since we are dealing with an unbounded domain, this cut-off function is introduced by Kian [25] in order to insure the square integrability property of the CGO solutions. He also assumed that the principal part of the CGO solutions propagates along the axis of the waveguide and he used several arguments such as separation of variables and suitable Fourier decomposition of operators. By extending the work of [25] we obtain the following result.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $R > 1$, let $q \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ be such that (1.4) is fulfilled with $q = q_j$ and let $\xi = (\xi', \xi_3) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ be such that*

$$|\xi| \leq R, \quad |\xi'| > 0, \quad |\xi_3| > 0. \quad (2.1)$$

There exists $\rho_0 > 1$, depending on M and Ω , such that for any $\rho > \rho_0 R^{16}$, the equation $-\Delta u + qu = 0$ has a solution $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ given by

$$u(x', x_3) = e^{-\rho\theta \cdot x'} \left(e^{i\rho\eta \cdot x} \chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) e^{-i\xi \cdot x} + r_\rho(x) \right),$$

with $r_\rho \in H^2(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$\rho^{-1} \|r_\rho\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \rho \|r_\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq CR^2 \rho^{\frac{7}{8}}, \quad (2.2)$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on Ω and M .

In contrast to the construction of [25], in Proposition 2.1 we give also some precise estimate of the CGO by taking into account the dependency with respect to the frequency ξ . These estimates will play an important role in the proof of Theorem 1.1. By a simple computation, it is easy to check that u is a solution of $-\Delta u + qu = 0$ if and only if r_ρ solves

$$P_{-\rho} r_\rho = -q r_\rho - e^{\rho\theta \cdot x'} (-\Delta + q) e^{-\rho\theta \cdot x'} e^{i\rho\eta \cdot x} \chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) e^{-i\xi \cdot x}, \quad (2.3)$$

with $P_s := -\Delta - 2s\theta \cdot \nabla' - s^2$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Let us consider the equation

$$P_{-\rho} y(x) = F(x); \quad x \in \Omega. \quad (2.4)$$

Then we have the following lemma proved in [25].

Lemma 2.2 (Lemma 2.4, [25]). *For every $\rho > 1$ there exists a bounded operator $E_\rho : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ such that*

$$P_{-\rho} E_\rho F = F, \quad F \in L^2(\Omega), \quad (2.5)$$

$$\|E_\rho\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))} \leq C \rho^{-1}, \quad (2.6)$$

$$E_\rho \in \mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega); H^2(\Omega)) \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\|E_\rho\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega); H^2(\Omega))} \leq C \rho, \quad (2.8)$$

with $C > 0$ depending only on Ω .

Armed with this lemma we are now in position to complete the proof of Proposition 2.1.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. First, we notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & -e^{\rho\theta \cdot x'}(-\Delta + q)e^{-\rho\theta \cdot x'}e^{i\rho\eta \cdot x}\chi\left(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3\right)e^{-i\xi \cdot x} \\ &= -\left((|\xi|^2 + q)\chi\left(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3\right) - 2i\eta_3\rho^{\frac{3}{4}}\chi'\left(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3\right) + 2i\xi_3\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}\chi'\left(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3\right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}}\chi''\left(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3\right)e^{i\rho\eta \cdot x}\right)e^{-i\xi \cdot x}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

On the other hand, one can check that

$$\left\|\chi\left(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \left\|\chi'\left(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \left\|\chi''\left(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\rho^{\frac{1}{8}}, \quad (2.10)$$

with C depending only on Ω . By combining the above arguments with (2.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\|-e^{\rho\theta \cdot x'}(-\Delta + q)e^{-\rho\theta \cdot x'}e^{i\rho\eta \cdot x}\chi\left(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3\right)e^{-i\xi \cdot x}\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C\left((|\xi|^2 + \|q\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})\rho^{\frac{1}{8}} + 2|\eta_3|\rho^{\frac{7}{8}} + 2|\xi_3|\rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} + \rho^{-\frac{3}{8}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (1.4) and (2.1), we obtain

$$\left\|-e^{\rho\theta \cdot x'}(-\Delta + q)e^{-\rho\theta \cdot x'}e^{i\rho\eta \cdot x}\chi\left(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3\right)e^{-i\xi \cdot x}\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq CR^2\rho^{\frac{7}{8}}, \quad (2.11)$$

with $C > 0$ depending on Ω and M . By Lemma 2.2, (2.3) could be written as

$$r_\rho = T_\rho r_\rho + G_\rho, \quad (2.12)$$

with $T_\rho f = -E_\rho(qf)$; $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $G_\rho = -E_\rho\left(e^{\rho\theta \cdot x'}(-\Delta + q)e^{-\rho\theta \cdot x'}e^{i\rho\eta \cdot x}\chi\left(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3\right)e^{-i\xi \cdot x}\right)$.

In view of (2.6) and (2.11), we get

$$\|T_\rho h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\rho^{-1}\|h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|G_\rho\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq CR^2\rho^{-\frac{1}{8}},$$

with $C > 0$ depending on Ω and M . Therefore, fixing $\rho_0 = 2C$ for $\rho > \rho_0$, we can define

$$r_\rho = (Id - T_\rho)^{-1}G_\rho = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} T_\rho^k G_\rho$$

which satisfies (2.12). Moreover, from (2.6), (2.7) and (2.8), we deduce that, for $\rho > \rho_0 R^{16}$, $r_\rho \in H^2(\Omega)$ satisfies the decay property (2.2). \square

Henceforth, we can consider the solutions $u_j \in H^2(\Omega)$ of $-\Delta u_j + q_j u_j = 0$ taking the forms

$$u_1(x', x_3) = e^{-\rho\theta \cdot x'} \left(e^{i\rho\eta \cdot x} \chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) e^{-i\xi \cdot x} + r_1(x) \right) \quad (2.13)$$

and

$$u_2(x', x_3) = e^{\rho\theta \cdot x'} \left(e^{-i\rho\eta \cdot x} \chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) + r_2(x) \right), \quad (2.14)$$

with $r_1 \in H^2(\Omega)$ and $r_2 \in H^2(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$\rho^{-1} \|r_1\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \rho \|r_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq CR^2 \rho^{\frac{7}{8}} \quad (2.15)$$

and

$$\rho^{-1} \|r_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \rho \|r_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\rho^{\frac{7}{8}}. \quad (2.16)$$

3. STABILITY ON THE WHOLE BOUNDARY

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. For this purpose, we fix $q_j \in \mathcal{Q}(M, q_0)$, $j = 1, 2$. We recall that since $q := q_2 - q_1 = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we can extend q to a $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ vector by assigning it the value 0 outside of Ω and we will refer to the extension by q . We recall also that the Proposition 2.1 guarantees the existence of solutions $u_j \in H^2(\Omega)$ to the equation $(-\Delta + q_j)u_j = 0$ in Ω given by (2.13) and (2.14). These solutions satisfy the following property.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists $C > 0$ such that for $R > 1$, $\rho > \rho_0 R^{16}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ satisfying (2.1), the following estimates*

$$\|u_1\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq Ce^{(D+1)\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq Ce^{(D+1)\rho}$$

hold true for any solutions u_1 and u_2 given by (2.13) and (2.14).

Here $D := \sup_{x' \in \overline{\omega}} |x'|$ and ρ_0 is the constant appearing in Proposition 2.1.

Proof. Using the expression of u_1 , we can easily deduce that

$$\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|e^{-\rho\theta \cdot x'}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|e^{i\rho\eta \cdot x} \chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) e^{-i\xi \cdot x} + r_1(x)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Setting $D := \sup_{x' \in \overline{\omega}} |x'|$, we get

$$\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq e^{D\rho} \left(\|\chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|r_1(x)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right).$$

(2.15) and (2.10) with the fact that $1 < R < \rho$ lead to the following estimate

$$\|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ce^{D\rho} \left(\rho^{\frac{1}{8}} + R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} \right) \leq C\rho^3 e^{D\rho} \leq Ce^{(D+1)\rho}.$$

By simple computations of ∇u_1 and $\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} u_1$, for $i, j = 1, 2, 3$ and by the same arguments used previously, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq e^{D\rho} \left((\rho + |\xi|) \|\chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \rho \|\chi'(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \rho \|r_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla r_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq Ce^{(D+1)\rho} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq e^{D\rho} \left((\rho^2 + |\xi|^2) \|\chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + (\rho + |\xi|) \|\chi'(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\chi''(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \rho^2 \|r_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \rho \|\nabla r_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} r_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq Ce^{(D+1)\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, we get

$$\|u_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C e^{(D+1)\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C e^{(D+1)\rho}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Now we are able to prove the first main result of this paper.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. In all this proof $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on Ω and M that may change from line to line. Fix $R > 1$, $\rho > \rho_0 R^{16}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ satisfying (2.1), with $\rho_0 > 1$ the constant appearing in Proposition 2.1. For $j = 1, 2$, consider also $u_j \in H^2(\Omega)$ a solution of $-\Delta u_j + q_j u_j = 0$ on Ω taking the form (2.13) – (2.14) with r_j satisfying (2.15) – (2.16). Consider the following boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w + q_1 w = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w = u_2 := h & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Since $q_1 \in \mathcal{Q}(M, q_0)$, we know that 0 is not in the spectrum of $-\Delta + q_1$ acting on $L^2(\Omega)$ with Dirichlet boundary condition. Therefore, (3.1) admits a unique solution $w \in H^2(\Omega)$. Fixing $u = w - u_2 \in H^2(\Omega)$, we deduce that u solves

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + q_1 u = q u_2 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

Applying Green's Formula, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} q u_2 u_1 \, dx &= \int_{\Omega} -\Delta u u_1 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} q_1 u u_1 \, dx \\ &= - \int_{\partial\Omega} \partial_{\nu} u u_1 \, d\sigma_x + \int_{\partial\Omega} \partial_{\nu} u_1 u \, d\sigma_x \\ &= - \int_{\partial\Omega} (\Lambda_{q_1} - \Lambda_{q_2}) h u_1 \, d\sigma_x. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Note that here and from now on, since Ω and $\partial\Omega$ are unbounded, we use [25, Lemma 3.1] in order to extend the usual Green's Formula to our framework. Moreover, we have

$$q u_1 u_2 = q e^{-i\xi \cdot x} \chi^2(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) + z_{\rho}, \quad (3.4)$$

with

$$z_{\rho} = q \left[e^{i\rho\eta \cdot x} e^{-i\xi \cdot x} \chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) r_2 + e^{-i\rho\eta \cdot x} \chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) r_1 + r_1 r_2 \right].$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |z_{\rho}| \, dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} |q| |\chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3)| |r_1| \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |q| |\chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3)| |r_2| \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |q| |r_1 r_2| \, dx, \\ &:= I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.2) and the fact that $\|q\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq 2M$, we get

$$I_1 \leq \|q\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \|r_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}},$$

$$I_2 \leq \|q\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \|r_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}}$$

and

$$I_3 \leq \|q\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \|r_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|r_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Thus,

$$\int_{\Omega} |z_{\rho}| \leq CR^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}}. \quad (3.5)$$

On the other hand, (3.3) and (3.4) give

$$\int_{\Omega} q \chi^2(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) e^{-i\xi \cdot x} dx = - \int_{\partial\Omega} (\Lambda_{q_1} - \Lambda_{q_2}) h u_1 d\sigma_x - \int_{\Omega} z_{\rho} dx.$$

Thus, by (3.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega} q \chi^2(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) e^{-i\xi \cdot x} dx \right| &\leq CR^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} + C \|\Lambda_{q_1} - \Lambda_{q_2}\| \|u_2\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} \|u_1\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \left(R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} + \|\Lambda_{q_1} - \Lambda_{q_2}\| \|u_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \|u_1\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq CR^2 \left(\rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} + \|\Lambda_{q_1} - \Lambda_{q_2}\| e^{2(D+1)\rho} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q(x) \chi^2(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) e^{-i\xi \cdot x} dx \right| \leq C \left(R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} + \|\Lambda_{q_1} - \Lambda_{q_2}\| e^{2D'\rho} \right), \quad (3.6)$$

with $D' = D + 1$. Since $\chi = 1$ on $[-1, 1]$ and $\text{supp}(\chi) \subset [-2, 2]$, applying the fact that

$$\int_{\Omega} (1 + |x_3|) |q_2(x', x_3) - q_1(x', x_3)| dx' dx_3 \leq 2M < \infty,$$

we can conclude that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q(x) e^{-i\xi \cdot x} dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q(x) \chi^2(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) e^{-i\xi \cdot x} dx \right| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |1 - \chi^2(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3)| |q(x)| dx.$$

As $1 - \chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) = 0$ for $|x_3| \leq \rho^{\frac{1}{4}}$ and $q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{Q}(M, q_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q(x) e^{-i\xi \cdot x} dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q(x) \chi^2(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) e^{-i\xi \cdot x} dx \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{|x_3| \geq \rho^{\frac{1}{4}}} \frac{|x_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\rho^{\frac{1}{8}}} |q(x', x_3)| dx_3 dx' \\ &\leq \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |x_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} |q(x', x_3)| dx_3 dx' \\ &\leq \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |x_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} |(q_1 - q_0)(x', x_3)| dx_3 dx' + \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |x_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} |(q_2 - q_0)(x', x_3)| dx_3 dx' \\ &\leq 2M \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

By (3.6) and (3.7), we get

$$|\hat{q}(\xi)| \leq C \left(R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} + \|\Lambda_{q_1} - \Lambda_{q_2}\| e^{2D'\rho} \right). \quad (3.8)$$

Since the constant C of the above estimate depends only on Ω and M , we deduce that this estimate holds true for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ satisfying (2.1). Combining this with the continuity of the map $\xi \mapsto \hat{q}(\xi)$, which is guaranteed by the fact that $q \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, we deduce that (3.8) holds true for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ satisfying $|\xi| < R$.

In order to simplify the notations, we set $\gamma = \|\Lambda_{q_1} - \Lambda_{q_2}\|$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|\xi| \leq R} |\hat{q}(\xi)|^2 &\leq CR^3 \left(R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} + \gamma e^{2D'\rho} \right)^2 \\ &\leq 2CR^3 \left(R^4 \rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} + \gamma^2 e^{4D'\rho} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

On the other hand, as $q \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{Q}(M, q_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|\xi| > R} |\hat{q}(\xi)|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{|\xi| > R} |\xi|^2 |\hat{q}(\xi)|^2 \leq \frac{\|q\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2}{R^2} \leq \frac{2\|q_1 - q_0\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 + 2\|q_2 - q_0\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2}{R^2} \\ &\leq \frac{4M^2}{R^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Therefore, (3.9) and (3.10) imply

$$\|q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 = \frac{\|\hat{q}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2}{(2\pi)^3} \leq C \left(R^7 \rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} + R^3 \gamma^2 e^{4D'\rho} + R^{-2} \right).$$

Using the fact that $\rho > \rho_0 R^{16}$, $\rho > 1$ and $R > 1$, we get $R^3 < R^{16} < \rho < e^\rho$. Then, we get

$$R^3 \gamma^2 e^{4D'\rho} \leq \gamma^2 e^{(4D'+1)\rho}.$$

When searching ρ such that $R^7 \rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} = R^{-2}$, we find $\rho = R^{36}$. Note that here the condition $\rho > \rho_0 R^{16}$, is still valid provided $R > 1 + \rho_0^{\frac{1}{18}}$. Then, setting $C' = 4D' + 1$, we get

$$\|q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \leq C \left(R^{-2} + \gamma^2 e^{C'R^{36}} \right). \quad (3.11)$$

Now, let us consider the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $a \in (0, 1]$ and $b > 0$. Then, there exists $C > 0$ depending only on b and ρ_0 , such that*

$$\inf_{R > 1 + \rho_0^{\frac{1}{18}}} R^{-2} + a^2 e^{bR^{36}} \leq C (\log(3 + a^{-1}))^{-\frac{1}{18}}$$

This result can be deduced by choosing $R = \left(\frac{2 \log(3 \exp(1 + \rho_0^{\frac{1}{18}})) + a^{-1}}{1 + b} \right)^{\frac{1}{36}}$ and by applying standard arguments of optimization.

Combining (3.11) with Lemma 3.2, for $\gamma \leq 1$, we obtain

$$\|q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \leq C (\log(3 + \gamma^{-1}))^{-\frac{1}{18}} \quad (3.12)$$

In the same way, for $\gamma \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 &\leq 4M^2 \log(4)^{-\frac{1}{18}} (\log(3 + \gamma^{-1}))^{-\frac{1}{18}} \\ &\leq C (\log(3 + \gamma^{-1}))^{-\frac{1}{18}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this estimate with (3.12), we deduce that (1.6) holds true for $\gamma > 0$. For $\gamma = 0$, (3.11) implies that $\|q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq CR^{-1}$. Since $R > 1$ is arbitrary, we can send R to $+\infty$ and deduce (1.6) for $\gamma = 0$. This completes the proof. \square

4. STABILITY ON AN ARBITRARY PART OF THE BOUNDARY

In this section, inspired by the approach developed by Ben Joud [5], we will prove Theorem 1.2. Here we need to extend the arguments of [5] to unbounded cylindrical domains. For this purpose, for $j = 1, 2$, we fix $q_j \in \mathcal{Q}'(M, q_0, \mathcal{O}_0)$, we consider again CGO solutions taking the form

$$u_1(x', x_3) = e^{-\rho\theta \cdot x'} \left(e^{i\rho\eta \cdot x} \chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) e^{-i\xi \cdot x} + r_1(x) \right) \text{ and } u_2(x', x_3) = e^{\rho\theta \cdot x'} \left(e^{-i\rho\eta \cdot x} \chi(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} x_3) + r_2(x) \right),$$

with $r_1 \in H^2(\Omega)$ and $r_2 \in H^2(\Omega)$ satisfy

$$\rho^{-1} \|r_1\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \rho \|r_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq CR^2 \rho^{\frac{7}{8}} \text{ and } \rho^{-1} \|r_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \rho \|r_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \rho^{\frac{7}{8}}.$$

In view of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\|u_j\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C e^{(D+1)\rho}; \quad j = 1, 2 \quad (4.1)$$

with $D := \sup_{x' \in \overline{\omega}} |x'|$.

We recall also that since $q := q_1 - q_2 = 0$ in \mathcal{O}_0 , we can extend q to $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ vector by assigning it the value 0 outside of Ω and we denote by q this extension. In this part, We need to set \mathcal{W}_j ; $j = 1, 2, 3$ such that

$$\overline{\mathcal{W}_{j+1}} \subset \mathcal{W}_j, \quad \overline{\mathcal{W}_j} \subset \mathcal{W}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \partial\omega \subset \partial\mathcal{W}_j.$$

Let $\mathcal{O}_j = \mathcal{W}_j \times \mathbb{R}$ for $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$. The main idea of the proof of Theorem 1.2 is to combine the estimate of the Fourier transform of q and the weak unique continuation property which is given in the following lemma whose proof can be found in the Appendix .

Lemma 4.1. *Let $M > 0$, $q_1 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\|q\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M$ and let $w \in H^2(\Omega)$ solve*

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta + q_1)w(x) = F(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

where $F \in L^2(\Omega)$. Then, there exist positive constants C , α_1 , α_2 and λ_0 such that we have the following estimate:

$$\|w\|_{H^1(\mathcal{O}_2 \setminus \mathcal{O}_3)} \leq C \left(e^{-\lambda\alpha_1} \|w\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + e^{\lambda\alpha_2} \left(\|\partial_\nu w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R})} + \|F\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_0)} \right) \right) \quad (4.3)$$

for any $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$. Here, the constants C , α_1 and α_2 depend on Ω , M , λ_0 , \mathcal{O}_j and they are independent of q_1 , F , w and λ .

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $w \in H^2(\Omega)$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w + q_1 w = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w = u_2 := h & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

Then, $u = w - u_2$ solves

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + q_1 u = qu_2 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

Let Θ be a cut-off function satisfying $0 \leq \Theta \leq 1$, $\Theta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and

$$\Theta(x') = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{in } \omega \setminus \mathcal{W}_2, \\ 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{W}_3. \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

We set

$$\tilde{u}(x', x_3) = \Theta(x')u(x', x_3), \quad x' \in \omega, x_3 \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We remark that \tilde{u} solves

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta + q_1)\tilde{u}(x', x_3) = \Theta(x')q(x)u_2(x) + P_1(x', D)u(x) & x = (x', x_3) \in \Omega, \\ \tilde{u} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

with $P_1(x', D)$ is given by

$$P_1(x', D)u = [-\Delta', \Theta]u,$$

where $\Delta' = \partial_{x_1}^2 + \partial_{x_2}^2$. Moreover, for an arbitrary $\tilde{v} \in H^2(\Omega)$, an integration by parts leads to

$$\int_{\Omega} (-\Delta + q_1)\tilde{u}(x)\tilde{v}(x) dx = \int_{\Omega} (-\Delta + q_1)\tilde{v}(x)\tilde{u}(x) dx.$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\int_{\Omega} (-\Delta + q_1)\tilde{u}(x)\tilde{v}(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\omega} (\Theta(x')q(x)u_2(x) + P_1(x', D)u(x))\tilde{v}(x) dx' dx_3. \quad (4.7)$$

Choosing $\tilde{v} = u_1$, we have $(-\Delta + q_1)\tilde{v} = 0$ in Ω and we get

$$\int_{\Omega} \Theta(x')q(x)u_2(x)u_1(x) dx = - \int_{\Omega} P_1(x', D)u(x)u_1(x) dx. \quad (4.8)$$

Furthermore, recalling that

$$P_1(x', D) = -2\nabla' \cdot \Theta(x') - \Delta'\Theta(x'), \quad x' \in \omega,$$

with $\nabla' = (\partial_{x_1}, \partial_{x_2})^T$, we deduce that, for all $x' \in (\omega \setminus \mathcal{W}_2) \cup \mathcal{W}_3$, $P_1(x', D) = 0$. Thus, $P_1(x', D)u$ is supported on $\overline{\mathcal{O}_2} \setminus \mathcal{O}_3$ and we find

$$\int_{\Omega} |P_1(x', D)uu_1| dx \leq \|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{O}_2 \setminus \mathcal{O}_3)} \|u_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ce^{\rho(D+1)} \|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{O}_2 \setminus \mathcal{O}_3)}.$$

Now, we want to make the Fourier transform of q appear on the left-hand side of (4.8). For this purpose, we use (3.4) and the fact that $q = 0$ in \mathcal{O}_0 to obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} q(x)e^{-i\xi \cdot x} \chi^2(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3) dx = - \int_{\Omega} P_1(x, D)u(x)u_1(x) dx - \int_{\Omega} z_{\rho} dx. \quad (4.9)$$

By (3.5), we get

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} q(x)e^{-i\xi \cdot x} \chi^2(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3) dx \right| \leq C \left(e^{\rho D'} \|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{O}_2 \setminus \mathcal{O}_3)} + R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} \right), \quad (4.10)$$

with $D' = D + 1$. In a similar way to Theorem 1.1, we obtain

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(1 - \chi^2(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3) \right) e^{-i\xi \cdot x} q(x) dx \right| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |1 - \chi^2(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3)| |q(x)| dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{|x_3| \geq \rho^{\frac{1}{4}}} |q(x', x_3)| dx_3 dx'.$$

Then, using (1.4) in a similar way to Theorem 1.1, we can conclude that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q(x)e^{-i\xi \cdot x} dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} q(x)\chi^2(\rho^{-\frac{1}{4}}x_3)e^{-i\xi \cdot x} dx \right| \leq 2M\rho^{-\frac{1}{8}}. \quad (4.11)$$

By (4.10) and (4.11), we get

$$|\hat{q}(\xi)| \leq C \left(R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} + e^{\rho D'} \|u\|_{H^1(\mathcal{O}_2 \setminus \mathcal{O}_3)} \right). \quad (4.12)$$

Now, we have just to combine (4.12) and (4.3) (see Appendix A) to get

$$|\hat{q}(\xi)| \leq C \left[R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} + e^{D'\rho} \left(e^{-\lambda\alpha_1} \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + e^{\lambda\alpha_2} (\|\partial_\nu u\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R})} + \|F\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_0)}) \right) \right], \quad (4.13)$$

with $\lambda > \lambda_0 > 0$ arbitrary chosen and $F = -\Delta u + q_1 u$. Here λ_0 is the constant appearing in Lemma 4.1 of the Appendix A. In order to simplify the notations, we set $\gamma_1 = \|\Lambda'_{q_1} - \Lambda'_{q_2}\|_{\mathcal{B}(H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega), H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}))}$. Since $\partial_\nu w = (\Lambda_{q_1} - \Lambda_{q_2})(h)$, where h is given by (4.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_\nu u\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R})} &\leq C \|\Lambda'_{q_1} - \Lambda'_{q_2}\|_{\mathcal{B}(H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega), H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}))} \|h\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq C e^{D'\rho} \|\Lambda'_{q_1} - \Lambda'_{q_2}\|_{\mathcal{B}(H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega), H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}))}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $q_j \in \mathcal{Q}'(M, q_0, \mathcal{O}_0)$, $j = 1, 2$, we have $q_1 = q_0 = q_2$ on \mathcal{O}_0 . Therefore, we have $F = (q_1 - q_2)u_2 = 0$ on \mathcal{O}_0 and it follows

$$|\hat{q}(\xi)| \leq C \left[R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} + e^{D'\rho} \left(e^{-\lambda\alpha_1} \|u\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + e^{\lambda\alpha_2 + D'\rho} \gamma_1 \right) \right]. \quad (4.14)$$

By (4.1), we get

$$|\hat{q}(\xi)| \leq C \left(R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} + e^{2D'\rho - \lambda\alpha_1} + e^{2D'\rho + \lambda\alpha_2} \gamma_1 \right), \quad (4.15)$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $|\xi| \leq R$. Let $\lambda = \tau\rho$. Choosing τ sufficiently large, it becomes easy to find constants α_3 and α_4 such that

$$e^{2D'\rho - \lambda\alpha_1} = e^{\rho(2D' - \tau\alpha_1)} \leq e^{-\alpha_3\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad e^{2D'\rho + \lambda\alpha_2} = e^{\rho(2D' + \tau\alpha_2)} \leq e^{\alpha_4\rho}. \quad (4.16)$$

Combining (4.15) and (4.16), we conclude that, for any $\rho \geq \rho_0 R^{16}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{q}(\xi)| &\leq C \left(R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} + e^{-\alpha_3\rho} + e^{\alpha_4\rho} \gamma_1 \right) \\ &\leq C \left(R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} + e^{\alpha_4\rho} \gamma_1 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

It follows

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|\xi| \leq R} |\hat{q}(\xi)|^2 &\leq C R^3 \left(R^2 \rho^{-\frac{1}{8}} + e^{\alpha_4\rho} \gamma_1 \right)^2 \\ &\leq 2C R^3 \left(R^4 \rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} + \gamma_1^2 e^{2\alpha_4\rho} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

On the other hand, as $q \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, we have

$$\int_{|\xi| > R} |\hat{q}(\xi)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{|\xi| > R} |\xi|^2 |\hat{q}(\xi)|^2 \leq \frac{\|q\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2}{R^2} \leq \frac{M^2}{R^2}. \quad (4.19)$$

Then, (4.18) and (4.19) imply

$$\|q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 = \frac{\|\hat{q}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2}{(2\pi)^3} \leq C \left(R^7 \rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} + R^3 \gamma_1^2 e^{2\alpha_4\rho} + R^{-2} \right).$$

Since $\rho \geq \rho_0 R^{16}$, we have $R^3 \leq e^\rho$. So that, we get

$$R^3 \gamma_1^2 e^{2\alpha_4\rho} \leq \gamma_1^2 e^{(2\alpha_4+1)\rho}.$$

When searching ρ such that $R^7 \rho^{-\frac{1}{4}} = R^{-2}$, we find $\rho = R^{36}$. Then, setting $C' = 2\alpha_4 + 1$, we get

$$\|q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \leq C \left(R^{-2} + \gamma_1^2 e^{C' R^{36}} \right). \quad (4.20)$$

Then, by using Lemma 3.2 and repeating the arguments used at the end of the proof of Theorem 1.1, we can deduce (1.7) from (4.20). \square

APPENDIX A.

A.1. Carleman's estimate. Inspired by the work of Kian, Sambo and Soccorsi [28] and Bellassoued, Kian and Soccorsi [3], we prove here a Carleman estimate for the Schrödinger operator $-\Delta + q$ in an infinite cylindrical domain in order to localize the observation and derive the estimate (4.13) which is a key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.2. As known, the Carleman's estimates are weighted inequalities. So, we need to build a weight function with particular properties. The existence of such a function is guaranteed by the following lemma borrowed from [21, Lemma 2.3] (see also [19, Lemma 1.2] and [32, Theorem 2.4]).

Lemma A.1. *There exists a function $\psi_0 \in C^3(\overline{\mathcal{W}_0})$ such that:*

- (i) $\psi_0(x') > 0$ for all $x' \in \mathcal{W}_0$,
- (ii) *There exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that $|\nabla' \psi_0(x')| \geq \alpha_0$ for all $x' \in \overline{\mathcal{W}_0}$,*
- (iii) $\partial_{\nu'} \psi_0(x') \leq 0$ for all $x' \in \partial \mathcal{W}_0 \setminus \Gamma_0$,
- (iv) $\psi_0(x') = 0$ for all $x' \in \partial \mathcal{W}_0 \setminus \Gamma_0$.

Here ∇' denotes the gradient with respect to $x' \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\partial_{\nu'}$ is the normal derivative with respect to $\partial \mathcal{W}_0$, that is $\partial_{\nu'} := \nu' \cdot \nabla'$ where ν' stands for the outward normal vector to $\partial \mathcal{W}_0$. Note that the last condition (iv) can be deduced from the construction of the weight function ψ_0 in the proof of [21, Lemma 2.3] combined with properties borrowed from [21, Lemma 2.1].

Thus, putting $\psi(x) = \psi(x', x_3) := \psi_0(x')$ for all $x = (x', x_3) \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_0}$, it is apparent that the function $\psi \in C^3(\overline{\mathcal{O}_0})$ satisfies the three following conditions:

- (C1) $\psi(x) > 0$, $x \in \mathcal{O}_0$,
- (C2) $|\nabla \psi(x)| \geq \alpha_0$ for all $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_0}$,
- (C3) $\partial_\nu \psi(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in \partial \mathcal{O}_0 \setminus (\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R})$,
- (C4) $\psi(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \Gamma^\sharp \times \mathbb{R}$.

Here ν is the outward unit normal vector to the boundary $\partial \mathcal{O}_0$. Evidently $\nu = (\nu', 0)$ so we have $\partial_\nu \psi = \partial_{\nu'} \psi_0$ as the function ψ does not depend on x_3 .

Next, for $\beta \in (0, +\infty)$, we introduce the following weigh function

$$\varphi(x) = \varphi(x') = e^{\beta \psi(x)}; \quad x \in \mathcal{O}_0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Through the following Lemma, we introduce some properties of φ that will be used after.

Lemma A.2. *There exists a constant $\beta_0 \in (0, +\infty)$ depending only on ψ such that the following statements hold uniformly in \mathcal{O}_0 for all $\beta \in [\beta_0, +\infty)$.*

- (a) $|\nabla \varphi| \geq \alpha := \beta_0 \alpha_0$,
- (b) $\nabla |\nabla \varphi|^2 \cdot \nabla \varphi \geq C_0 \beta |\nabla \varphi|^3$,
- (c) $\mathcal{H}(\varphi) \xi \cdot \xi + C_1 \beta |\nabla \varphi| |\xi|^2 \geq 0 \quad ; \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$,
- (d) $|\Delta |\nabla \varphi|| \leq C_2 |\nabla \varphi|^3$,
- (e) $\Delta \varphi \geq 0$.

Here, C_0 , C_1 and C_2 are positive constants depending only on ψ and α_0 and $\mathcal{H}(\varphi)$ denotes the Hessian matrix of φ with respect to $x \in \mathcal{O}_0$.

Proof.

- (a) As we have

$$\nabla \varphi = \beta \nabla \psi e^{\beta \psi}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

we can directly deduce (a) from (C2)

(b) With reference to (A.1) and (A.2), we see that

$$\nabla|\nabla\varphi| = \beta \left(\beta e^{\beta\psi} |\nabla\psi| \nabla\psi + e^{\beta\psi} \nabla|\nabla\psi| \right) = \beta |\nabla\psi| \nabla\varphi + \frac{|\nabla\varphi|}{|\nabla\psi|} \nabla|\nabla\psi|,$$

and hence

$$\nabla|\nabla\varphi|^2 \cdot \nabla\varphi = 2 \left(\beta |\nabla\psi| |\nabla\varphi|^3 + |\nabla\varphi|^2 \frac{\nabla|\nabla\psi| \cdot \nabla\varphi}{|\nabla\psi|} \right). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

By (C₂), we have $\frac{\nabla|\nabla\psi| \cdot \nabla\varphi}{|\nabla\psi|} \leq C\alpha_0^{-1} |\nabla\varphi|$, where C is a positive constant depending only on ψ . Therefore, (A.3) yields

$$\nabla|\nabla\varphi|^2 \cdot \nabla\varphi \geq 2\beta\alpha_0 \left(1 - \frac{C}{\beta\alpha_0^2} \right) |\nabla\varphi|^3.$$

Finally, by taking $\beta_0 \in [2\alpha_0^2, +\infty)$, we get (b).

(c) For all i and $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we have

$$\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \varphi = \beta e^{\beta\psi} (\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \psi + \beta (\partial_{x_i} \psi) (\partial_{x_j} \psi)) = (\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \psi + \beta (\partial_{x_i} \psi) (\partial_{x_j} \psi)) \frac{|\nabla\varphi|}{|\nabla\psi|}.$$

Thus, using (C₂), each $|\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} \varphi|$, $i, j = 1, 2, 3$, is upper bounded by $C\beta |\nabla\varphi|$, where C is a positive constant depending only on ψ and α_0 . As a consequence, there exists $C' = C'(\psi, \alpha_0) \in (0, +\infty)$, such that

$$|\mathcal{H}(\varphi)\xi \cdot \xi| \leq C'\beta |\nabla\varphi| |\xi|^2 \quad ; \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

(d) We have

$$\Delta|\nabla\varphi| = \beta e^{\beta\psi} \left(\beta^2 |\nabla\psi|^3 + \beta (\Delta\psi) |\nabla\psi| + 2\beta \nabla\psi \cdot \nabla|\nabla\psi| + \Delta|\nabla\psi| \right)$$

As we have $|\nabla\varphi| = \beta e^{\beta\psi} |\nabla\psi|$ and by (C₂), we get

$$|\Delta|\nabla\varphi|| \leq C(\psi) \beta^3 e^{\beta\psi} \leq C(\psi) |\nabla\varphi|^3.$$

(e) We have $\Delta\varphi = e^{\beta\psi} (\beta^2 |\nabla\psi|^2 + \beta \Delta\psi)$. By (a) in Lemma A.2, we get

$$\Delta\varphi \geq \alpha_0^2 \beta^2 + \beta \Delta\psi \geq \alpha_0^2 \beta^2 - \beta \|\psi\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\mathcal{O}_0)}.$$

For $\beta \geq \frac{\|\psi\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\mathcal{O}_0)}}{\alpha_0^2}$, we get $\Delta\varphi \geq 0$.

□

Now, we may state the following Carleman's estimate for the operator $-\Delta + q$.

Theorem A.3. *Let $u \in H_0^1(\mathcal{O}_0) \cap H^2(\mathcal{O}_0)$, $M > 0$ and let $q \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfy $\|q\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_0)} \leq M$. Then, there exists $\beta_0 \in (0, +\infty)$ such that for every $\beta \geq \beta_0$, there is $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\beta) \in (0, +\infty)$ depending only on β , α_0 , \mathcal{O}_0 , M and Γ_0 , such that the estimate*

$$\lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} e^{2\lambda\varphi} (\lambda^2 |u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2) dx \leq C \left(\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} e^{2\lambda\varphi} |(-\Delta + q)u|^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}} e^{2\lambda\varphi} |\partial_\nu u|^2 d\sigma_x \right). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

holds for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ and some positive constant C that depends only on α_0 , ω , Γ_0 , β and λ_0 .

Proof. For the proof, as $\|q\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O}_0)} \leq M$, we can simply show the following inequality

$$\lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} e^{2\lambda\varphi} (\lambda^2 |u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2) dx \leq C \left(\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} e^{2\lambda\varphi} |\Delta u|^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}} e^{2\lambda\varphi} |\partial_\nu u|^2 d\sigma_x \right). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that u is real valued. We set $v(x) = e^{\lambda\varphi(x)} u(x)$ in such a way that

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} e^{2\lambda\varphi} |\Delta u|^2 dx = \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} | -e^{\lambda\varphi} \Delta(e^{-\lambda\varphi} v) |^2 dx.$$

We have

$$\Delta(e^{-\lambda\varphi} v) = e^{-\lambda\varphi} (\lambda^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 v - 2\lambda \nabla \varphi \nabla v - \lambda v \Delta \varphi + \Delta v).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} P_\lambda v &:= -e^{\lambda\varphi} \Delta(e^{-\lambda\varphi} v) = -\Delta v + \lambda v \Delta \varphi + 2\lambda \nabla \varphi \nabla v - \lambda^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 v \\ &= P_\lambda^- v(x) + P_\lambda^+ v(x) + Rv(x), \end{aligned}$$

with $P_\lambda^- v = 2\lambda \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla v$, $P_\lambda^+ v = -\Delta v - \lambda^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 v$ and $Rv = \lambda v \Delta \varphi$. Let $\tilde{P}_\lambda v = P_\lambda - Rv = P_\lambda^- v + P_\lambda^+ v$. With the previous notations, we have $\|\tilde{P}_\lambda v\|^2 = \|P_\lambda^+ v\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_0)}^2 + \|P_\lambda^- v\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_0)}^2 + 2\text{Re}\langle P_\lambda^+ v, P_\lambda^- v \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_0)}$. Then, as v is real valued, we compute the term $2\langle P_\lambda^+ v, P_\lambda^- v \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_0)}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} P_\lambda^+ v P_\lambda^- v &= -2\lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \Delta v \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla v dx - 2\lambda^3 \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\nabla \varphi|^2 \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla v v dx, \\ &:= K_1 + K_2. \end{aligned}$$

$$K_1 = 2\lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \nabla v \cdot \nabla (\nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla v) dx - 2\lambda \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}_0} \partial_\nu v \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla v d\sigma_x := J_1 + J_2.$$

However

$$\nabla v \cdot \nabla (\nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla v) = \mathcal{H}(\varphi)(\nabla v, \nabla v) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla (|\nabla v|^2).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= 2\lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \mathcal{H}(\varphi)(\nabla v, \nabla v) dx + \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla (|\nabla v|^2) dx \\ &= 2\lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \mathcal{H}(\varphi)(\nabla v, \nabla v) dx - \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \Delta \varphi |\nabla v|^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}_0} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nu |\nabla v|^2 d\sigma_x. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we get

$$K_1 = 2\lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \mathcal{H}(\varphi)(\nabla v, \nabla v) dx - \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \Delta \varphi |\nabla v|^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}_0} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nu |\nabla v|^2 d\sigma_x - 2\lambda \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}_0} \partial_\nu v \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla v d\sigma_x.$$

As we have $v = 0$ on $\partial \mathcal{O}_0$ and $\nabla v = (\partial_\nu v) \nu$ on $\partial \mathcal{O}_0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= 2\lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \mathcal{H}(\varphi)(\nabla v, \nabla v) dx - \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \Delta \varphi |\nabla v|^2 dx - \lambda \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}_0} \partial_\nu \varphi |\partial_\nu v|^2 d\sigma_x. \\ K_2 &= \lambda^3 \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |v|^2 (|\nabla \varphi|^2 \Delta \varphi + \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla (|\nabla \varphi|^2)) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} P_\lambda^+ v P_\lambda^- v \, dx + \lambda \int_{\partial \mathcal{O}_0} \partial_\nu \varphi |\partial_\nu v|^2 \, d\sigma_x \\ &= 2\lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \mathcal{H}(\varphi)(\nabla v, \nabla v) \, dx - \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \Delta \varphi |\nabla v|^2 \, dx + \lambda^3 \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} v^2 (|\nabla \varphi|^2 \Delta \varphi + \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla (|\nabla \varphi|^2)) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Referring to (b) and (c) in Lemma A.2 and condition (C3) which implies that $\partial_\nu \varphi(x) \leq 0$ for $x \in \partial \mathcal{O}_0 \setminus (\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R})$, we obtain for all $\beta \in [\beta_0, +\infty)$, that:

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} P_\lambda^+ v P_\lambda^- v + \lambda \int_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}} \partial_\nu \varphi |\partial_\nu v|^2 \, d\sigma_x \geq C_0 \lambda^3 \beta \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\nabla \varphi|^3 |v|^2 \, dx - 2C_1 \lambda \beta \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\nabla \varphi| |\nabla v|^2 \, dx + R_0, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

with $R_0 = \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \lambda \Delta \varphi (\lambda^2 |v|^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 - |\nabla v|^2) \, dx$. As we have $P_\lambda^+ v = -\Delta v - \lambda^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 v$, we can write $\Delta v = -P_\lambda^+ v - \lambda^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 v$, and then

$$|\Delta v|^2 = (P_\lambda^+ v + \lambda^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 v)^2 \leq 3((P_\lambda^+ v)^2 + \lambda^4 |\nabla \varphi|^4 |v|^2).$$

From (a) in Lemma A.2, we get for all $\beta \in [\beta_0, +\infty)$

$$(\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{-1} |\Delta v|^2 \leq \frac{3}{\alpha \lambda} (P_\lambda^+ v)^2 + 3\lambda^3 |\nabla \varphi|^3 |v|^2.$$

This entails that

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{-1} |\Delta v|^2 \, dx \leq \frac{3}{\alpha \lambda} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |P_\lambda^+ v|^2 \, dx + 3 \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^3 |v|^2 \, dx. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Further, as $v = 0$ on $\partial \mathcal{O}_0$, we get

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\nabla \varphi| |\nabla v|^2 \, dx = - \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\nabla \varphi| v \Delta v \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \Delta |\nabla \varphi| |v|^2 \, dx.$$

This and the estimate

$$\beta^{\frac{3}{2}} \lambda |\nabla \varphi| |v \Delta v| = ((\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\Delta v|) (\beta^{\frac{3}{2}} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{\frac{3}{2}} |v|) \leq \frac{1}{2} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{-1} |\Delta v|^2 + \frac{\beta^3}{2} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^3 |v|^2$$

lead to

$$\beta^{\frac{3}{2}} \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\nabla \varphi| |\nabla v|^2 \, dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{-1} |\Delta v|^2 \, dx + \frac{\beta^3}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^3 |v|^2 \, dx + \beta^{\frac{3}{2}} \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \Delta |\nabla \varphi| |v|^2 \, dx. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

From (A.7) and (A.8) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta^{\frac{3}{2}} \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\nabla \varphi| |\nabla v|^2 \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{-1} |\Delta v|^2 \, dx \\ & \leq \frac{3}{\alpha \lambda} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |P_\lambda^+ v|^2 \, dx + \left(3 + \frac{\beta^3}{2}\right) \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^3 |v|^2 \, dx + R_1, \end{aligned}$$

where $R_1 = \frac{\beta^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2} \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \Delta |\nabla \varphi| |v|^2 \, dx$. Therefore, upon substituting $\max(\beta_0, 6^{\frac{1}{3}})$ for β_0 , we obtain for all $\beta \in [\beta_0, +\infty)$ that

$$\beta^{\frac{3}{2}} \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\nabla \varphi| |\nabla v|^2 \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{-1} |\Delta v|^2 \, dx \leq \frac{3}{\alpha \lambda} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |P_\lambda^+ v|^2 \, dx + \beta^3 \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^3 |v|^2 \, dx + R_1.$$

Putting this together with (A.6), we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{3}{\alpha\lambda} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |P_\lambda^+ v|^2 dx + \frac{2}{C_0} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} P_\lambda^+ v P_\lambda^- v dx + \frac{2\lambda}{C_0} \int_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}} \partial_\nu \varphi |\partial_\nu v|^2 d\sigma_x \\ & \geq (\beta^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{4C_1}{C_0}) \beta \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\nabla \varphi| |\nabla v|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^3 |v|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{-1} |\Delta v|^2 dx + R_2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

with $R_2 = \frac{2R_0}{C_0} - R_1$. Then enlarging β_0 in such a way that $\beta_0^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{4C_1}{C_0}$ is lower bounded by $C_2 > 0$, we infer from (A.9) that for all $\beta \in [\beta_0, +\infty)$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{3}{\alpha\lambda} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (P_\lambda^+ v)^2 dx + \frac{2}{C_0} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} P_\lambda^+ v P_\lambda^- v dx + \frac{2\lambda}{C_0} \int_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}} |\partial_\nu \varphi| |\partial_\nu v|^2 d\sigma_x \\ & \geq C_2 \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\nabla \varphi| |\nabla v|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^3 |v|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{-1} |\Delta v|^2 dx + R_2. \end{aligned}$$

Further, since $P_\lambda^- v = 2\lambda \nabla \varphi \nabla v$, by (a) in Lemma A.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{3}{\alpha\lambda} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |P_\lambda^+ v|^2 dx + \frac{2}{C_0} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} P_\lambda^+ v P_\lambda^- v dx + \frac{1}{4\alpha^2 \lambda^2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |P_\lambda^- v|^2 dx + \frac{2\lambda}{C_0} \int_{\Gamma_0} \partial_\nu \varphi |\partial_\nu v|^2 d\sigma_x \\ & \geq C_2 \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\nabla \varphi| |\nabla v|^2 dx + \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\nabla v|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^3 |v|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{-1} |\Delta v|^2 dx + R_2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, bearing in mind that $\tilde{P}_\lambda = P_\lambda^+ + P_\lambda^-$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{C_0} \left(\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\tilde{P}_\lambda v|^2 dx + 2\lambda \int_{\Gamma_0} \partial_\nu \varphi |\partial_\nu v|^2 d\sigma_x \right) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{-1} |\Delta v|^2 dx + C_2 \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\nabla \varphi| |\nabla v|^2 dx + \beta \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^3 |v|^2 dx + R_2, \end{aligned}$$

provided $\lambda \in \left[\frac{4C_0}{\alpha}, +\infty \right)$. We have

$$R_2 = \frac{2}{C_0} R_0 - R_1 = \frac{2}{C_0} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \lambda \Delta \varphi (\lambda^2 |v|^2 |\nabla \varphi|^2 - |\nabla v|^2) dx - \frac{\beta^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2} \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \Delta |\nabla \varphi| |v|^2 dx.$$

By (d) and (e) in Lemma A.2 and for $\beta > 1$ sufficiently large, we get $|R_2| \leq C_2 \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^3 v^2 dx$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{C_0} \left(\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\tilde{P}_\lambda v|^2 dx + 2\lambda \int_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}} \partial_\nu \varphi |\partial_\nu v|^2 d\sigma_x \right) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{-1} |\Delta v|^2 dx + C_2 \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\nabla \varphi| |\nabla v|^2 dx + C_2 \beta \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^3 |v|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Next, since $v = e^{\lambda\varphi}u$, we have $e^{2\lambda\varphi}|\nabla u|^2 \leq 2(|\nabla v|^2 + \lambda^2|\nabla\varphi|^2|v|^2)$. So it follows from (A.10) and point (a) in Lemma A.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{C_0} \left(\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\tilde{P}_\lambda v|^2 dx + 2\lambda \int_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}} \partial_\nu \varphi |\partial_\nu v|^2 d\sigma_x \right) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{-1} |\Delta v|^2 dx + \frac{C_2 \lambda}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} e^{2\lambda\varphi} |\nabla \varphi| |\nabla u|^2 dx + \lambda^3 C_2 (\beta - \alpha^{-1}) \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (|\nabla \varphi|)^3 |v|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get upon possibly substituting $C_2(\alpha^{-1} + 1)$ for β_0 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{C_0} \left(\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\tilde{P}_\lambda v|^2 dx + 2\lambda \int_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}} \partial_\nu \varphi |\partial_\nu v|^2 d\sigma_x \right) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (\lambda |\nabla \varphi|)^{-1} |\Delta v|^2 dx + \frac{C_2 \lambda}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} e^{2\lambda\varphi} |\nabla \varphi| |\nabla u|^2 dx + \lambda^3 \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} (|\nabla \varphi|)^3 |v|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Further, due to (A.1) and (C2), the estimate $|\partial_\nu \varphi| \leq C_4$ holds true in \mathcal{O}_0 with C_4 depending only on β , ψ and α_0 . Therefore, there exists a positive constant C_5 that depend only on β , ψ and α_0 such that

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\tilde{P}_\lambda v|^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}} |\partial_\nu v|^2 d\sigma_x \geq C_5 \left(\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} \lambda^{-1} |\Delta v|^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} e^{2\lambda\varphi} |\nabla u|^2 dx + \lambda^3 \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |v|^2 dx \right).$$

Finally, the Carleman's estimate follows immediately from this upon remembering that $v = e^{\lambda\varphi}u$, $v = 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{O}_0$, $|P_\lambda v|^2 = e^{2\lambda\varphi}|\Delta u|^2$ and $\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |Rv|^2 dx \leq C\lambda^2 \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |v|^2 dx$. \square

A.2. Weak unique continuation property. Armed with the Carleman's estimate that has just been proven, we can return now to the proof of the weak unique continuation property which is a standard and important tool for the proof of the stability estimate (see [3, 29]).

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Let ψ_0 be the function defined in Lemma A.1. Since $\psi_0(x') > 0$ for all $x' \in \mathcal{W}_0$, there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\psi_0(x') \geq 2\kappa; \quad x' \in \mathcal{W}_2 \setminus \mathcal{W}_3. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Moreover, as $\psi_0(x') = 0$, $x' \in \Gamma^\sharp$, there exist \mathcal{W}^\sharp a small neighborhood of Γ^\sharp such that

$$\psi_0(x') \leq \kappa; \quad x' \in \mathcal{W}^\sharp, \quad \mathcal{W}^\sharp \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}_1} = \emptyset. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}^\sharp \subset \mathcal{W}^\sharp$ be an arbitrary neighborhood of Γ^\sharp . To apply (A.4), it is necessary to introduce a function Θ satisfying $0 \leq \Theta \leq 1$, $\Theta \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and

$$\Theta(x') = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{in } \mathcal{W}_0 \setminus \mathcal{W}^\sharp, \\ 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\mathcal{W}}^\sharp. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Let w be a solution to (4.2). Setting

$$w_1(x', x_3) = \Theta(x')w(x', x_3), \quad x' \in \omega, \quad x_3 \in \mathbb{R},$$

we get

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta + q_1)w_1(x) = \Theta(x)F(x) + Q_1(x, D)w & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_0, \\ w_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{O}_0, \end{cases}$$

where $Q_1(x, D)$ is a first order operator supported in $\overline{\mathcal{W}^\sharp} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{W}}^\sharp$ and given by

$$Q_1(x, D)w = [\Delta', \Theta]w.$$

By applying Carleman estimate (A.4) to w_1 , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} e^{2\lambda\varphi} (\lambda^2 |w_1|^2 + |\nabla w_1|^2) dx \\ \leq C \left(\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} e^{2\lambda\varphi} (|Q_1(x, D)w|^2 + |F(x)|^2) dx + \lambda \int_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}} |\partial_\nu w_1|^2 e^{2\lambda\varphi} d\sigma_x \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Let $\mathcal{O}^\sharp = \mathcal{W}^\sharp \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\sharp = \tilde{\mathcal{W}}^\sharp \times \mathbb{R}$. Using the fact that $Q_1(x, D)$ is a first order operator supported in $\overline{\mathcal{O}^\sharp} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\sharp$ and by (A.12), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} e^{2\lambda\varphi} |Q_1(x, D)w|^2 dx &\leq \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} e^{2\lambda e^{\beta\psi(x)}} |Q_1(x, D)w|^2 dx \\ &\leq e^{2\lambda e^{\beta\kappa}} \int_{\mathcal{O}^\sharp \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\sharp} |Q_1(x, D)w|^2 dx \\ &\leq C e^{2\lambda e^{\beta\kappa}} \int_{\mathcal{O}^\sharp \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\sharp} (|w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2) dx. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by using the definition of Θ given by (A.13), the estimate (A.14) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_0 \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\sharp} e^{2\lambda\varphi} (\lambda^2 |w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2) dx &\leq C \left(e^{2\lambda e^{\beta\kappa}} \int_{\mathcal{O}^\sharp \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\sharp} (|w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2) dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} e^{2\lambda\varphi} |F(x)|^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}} |\partial_\nu w|^2 e^{2\lambda\varphi} d\sigma_x \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by the fact that $\mathcal{O}_2 \setminus \mathcal{O}_3 \subset \mathcal{O}_0 \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\sharp$ and by (A.11), we easily obtain that:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{2\lambda e^{2\beta\kappa}} \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_2 \setminus \mathcal{O}_3} (\lambda^2 |w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2) dx &\leq C \left(e^{2\lambda e^{\beta\kappa}} \int_{\mathcal{O}^\sharp \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\sharp} (|w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2) dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathcal{O}_0} e^{2\lambda\varphi} |F(x)|^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}} |\partial_\nu w|^2 e^{2\lambda\varphi} d\sigma_x \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_2 \setminus \mathcal{O}_3} (\lambda^2 |w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2) dx &\leq C \left(e^{-2\lambda(e^{2\beta\kappa} - e^{\beta\kappa})} \int_{\mathcal{O}^\sharp \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\sharp} (|w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2) dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + e^{2\lambda(e^{2\beta\|\psi_0\|_\infty} - e^{2\beta\kappa})} \left(\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |F(x)|^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}} |\partial_\nu w|^2 d\sigma_x \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\alpha_1 = (e^{2\beta\kappa} - e^{\beta\kappa}) > 0$ and $\alpha_2 = (e^{2\beta\|\psi_0\|_\infty} - e^{2\beta\kappa}) > 0$. We conclude that for any $\lambda > \lambda^*$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \int_{\mathcal{O}_2 \setminus \mathcal{O}_3} (\lambda^2 |w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2) dx &\leq C \left(e^{-2\lambda\alpha_1} \int_{\mathcal{O}^\sharp \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^\sharp} (|w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2) dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + e^{2\lambda\alpha_2} \left(\int_{\mathcal{O}_0} |F(x)|^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R}} |\partial_\nu w|^2 d\sigma_x \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$\|w\|_{H^1(\mathcal{O}_2 \setminus \mathcal{O}_3)}^2 \leq C \left(e^{-2\lambda\alpha_1} \|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + e^{2\lambda\alpha_2} \left(\|F\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O}_0)}^2 + \|\partial_\nu w\|_{L^2(\Gamma_0 \times \mathbb{R})}^2 \right) \right)$$

which completes the demonstration.



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Mr Mourad BELLASSOUED and Mr Yavar KIAN for their valuable and constructive suggestions during the planning and development of this research work and for the huge time spent to read carefully this manuscript.

The author would like also to thank the editor and the referees for the careful reading of the paper and for their insightful comments on which substantially helped improving the quality of the paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Alessandrini, *Stable determination of conductivity by boundary measurements*, Appl. Anal., **27** (1988), no. 1-3, 153-172.
- [2] H. Ammari and G. Uhlmann, *Reconstruction from partial Cauchy data for the Schrödinger equation*, Indiana University Math J., **53** (2004), 169-184.
- [3] M. Bellassoued, Y. Kian and E. Soccorsi, *An inverse stability result for non compactly supported potentials by one arbitrary lateral Neumann observation*, J. Differential Equations, **260** (2016), 7535-7562.
- [4] M. Bellassoued, Y. Kian and E. Soccorsi, *An inverse problem for the magnetic Schrödinger equation in infinite cylindrical domains*, Publ. Research Institute Math. Sci., **54** (2018), 679-728.
- [5] H. Ben Joud, *A stability estimate for an inverse problem for the Schrödinger equation in a magnetic field from partial boundary measurements*, Inverse Problems, **25** (2009) 045012.
- [6] J. Behrndt and J. Rohleder, *Inverse problems with partial data for elliptic operators on unbounded Lipschitz domains*, to appear in Inverse Problems, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6420/ab603d>.
- [7] A. L. Bukhgeim and G. Uhlmann, *Recovering a potential from partial Cauchy data*, Comm. PDE, **27** (2002), no 3-4, 653-668.
- [8] A.P. Calderón, *On an inverse boundary value problem*, Seminar on Numerical Analysis and its Applications to Continuum Physics, Rio de Janeiro, Sociedade Brasileira de Matematica, 65-73, (1980).
- [9] P. Caro, D. Dos Santos Ferreira and A. Ruiz, *Stability estimates for the Radon transform with restricted data and applications*, Advances in Math., **267** (2014), 523-564.
- [10] P. Caro, D. Dos Santos Ferreira and A. Ruiz, *Stability estimates for the Calderón problem with partial data*, J. Diff. Equat., **260** (2016), 2457-2489.
- [11] P. Caro and K. Marinov, *Stability of inverse problems in an infinite slab with partial data*, Commun. Partial Diff. Eqns., **41** (2016), 683-704.
- [12] P. Caro and V. Pohjola, *Stability Estimates for an Inverse Problem for the Magnetic Schrödinger Operator*, IMRN, **2015** (2015), 11083-11116.
- [13] M. Choulli, *Une introduction aux problèmes inverses elliptiques et paraboliques*, Mathématiques et Applications, Vol. 65, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009.
- [14] M. Choulli, Y. Kian and E. Soccorsi, *Stable determination of time-dependent scalar potential from boundary measurements in a periodic quantum waveguide*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **47** (2015), no. 6, 4536-4558.
- [15] M. Choulli, Y. Kian and E. Soccorsi, *Double logarithmic stability estimate in the identification of a scalar potential by a partial elliptic Dirichlet-to-Neumann map*, Bulletin of the South Ural State University, Ser. Mathematical Modelling, Programming and Computer Software (SUSUMMCS), **8** (3) (2015), 78-94.
- [16] M. Choulli, Y. Kian and E. Soccorsi, *On the Calderón problem in periodic cylindrical domain with partial Dirichlet and Neumann data*, Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences, **40** (2017), 5959-5974.
- [17] M. Choulli, Y. Kian and E. Soccorsi, *Stability result for elliptic inverse periodic coefficient problem by partial Dirichlet-to-Neumann map*, J. Spec. Theory, **8** (2) (2018), 733-768.
- [18] M. Choulli and E. Soccorsi, *An inverse anisotropic conductivity problem induced by twisting a homogeneous cylindrical domain*, J. Spec. Theory, **5** (2015), 295-329.
- [19] O. Imanuvilov, *Controllability of evolution equations*, Sb. Math., **186** (1995), 186-879.
- [20] O. Imanuvilov, G. Uhlmann and M. Yamamoto, *The Calderón problem with partial data in two dimensions*, Journal American Math. Society, **23** (2010), 655-691.
- [21] O. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, *Lipschitz stability in inverse parabolic problems by the Carleman estimate*, Inverse Problems, **14** (1998), no. 5, 1229-1245.
- [22] O. Kavian, Y. Kian and E. Soccorsi, *Uniqueness and stability results for an inverse spectral problem in a periodic waveguide*, J. Math. Pures Appl., **104** (2015), 1160-1189.

- [23] C.E. Kenig and M. Salo, *The Calderón problem with partial data on manifolds and applications*, Analysis & PDE, **6** (2013), no. 8, 2003-2048.
- [24] C.E. Kenig, J. Sjöstrand and G. Uhlmann, *The Calderon problem with partial data*, Ann. of Math., **165** (2007), 567-591.
- [25] Y. Kian, *Recovery of non-compactly supported coefficients of elliptic equations on an infinite waveguide*, to appear in Journal of the Institute of Mathematics of Jussieu, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1474748018000488>.
- [26] Y. Kian, *Determination of non-compactly supported electromagnetic potentials in an unbounded closed waveguide*, to appear in Revista Matemática Iberoamericana, DOI: 10.4171/rmi/1143.
- [27] Y. Kian, *Stability of the determination of a coefficient for wave equations in an infinite waveguide*, Inverse Probl. Imaging, **8** (3) (2014), 713-732.
- [28] Y. Kian, D. Sambou and E. Soccorsi, *Logarithmic stability inequality in an inverse source problem for the heat equation on a waveguide*, to appear in Applicable Analysis, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036811.2018.1557324>.
- [29] Y. Kian, Q.S. Phan and E. Soccorsi, *Carleman estimate for infinite cylindrical quantum domains and application to inverse problems*, Inverse Problems, **30** (2014), 055016.
- [30] Y. Kian, Q.S. Phan and E. Soccorsi, *Hölder stable determination of a quantum scalar potential in unbounded cylindrical domains*, Jour. Math. Anal. Appl., **426** (2015), 194-210.
- [31] K. Krupchyk, M. Lassas and G. Uhlmann, *Inverse Problems with Partial Data for a Magnetic Schrödinger Operator in an Infinite Slab or Bounded Domain*, Comm. Math. Phys., **312** (2012), 87-126.
- [32] K. Krupchyk and G. Uhlmann, *Stability estimates for partial data inverse problems for Schrödinger operators in the high frequency limit*, J. Math. Pures Appl., **126** (2019), 273-291.
- [33] X. Li, *Inverse boundary value problems with partial data in unbounded domains*, Inverse Problems, **28** (2012), 085003.
- [34] X. Li, *Inverse problem for Schrödinger equations with Yang-Mills potentials in a slab*, J. Diff. Equat., **253** (2012), 694-726.
- [35] X. Li and G. Uhlmann, *Inverse Problems on a Slab*, Inverse Problems and Imaging, **4** (2010), 449-462.
- [36] J-L. Lions and E. Magenes, *Non-homogeneous boundary value problems and applications*, Vol I, Dunod, Paris, 1968.
- [37] G.Uhlmann, *Electrical impedance tomography and Calderón's problem*, Inverse problems, **25** (2009), 123011.
- [38] M.S.Zhdanov and G.V.Keller, *The geoelectrical methods in geophysical exploration*, Methods in Geochemistry and Geophysics vol 31 (Amsterdam: Elsevier), (1994).
- [39] Y. Zou and Z. Guo, *A review of electrical impedance techniques for breast cancer detection*, Med. Eng. Phys. **25** (2003), 79-90.
- [40] J. Sylvester and G. Uhlmann, *A global uniqueness theorem for an inverse boundary value problem*, Ann. of Math., **125** (1987), 153-169.

UNIVERSITÉ DE TUNIS EL MANAR, ECOLE NATIONALE D'INGÉNIEURS DE TUNIS, ENIT-LAMSIN, B.P. 37, 1002 TUNIS, TUNISIA

AIX MARSEILLE UNIVERSITÉ, UNIVERSITÉ DE TOULON, CNRS, CPT, MARSEILLE, FRANCE

Email address: yosra.soussi@enit.utm.tn