

Multiplicative controllability of the reaction-diffusion equation on a parallelepiped with finitely many zero hyperplanes.

A.Y. Khapalov

Department of Mathematics

Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164-3113 USA;

fax: (1 509) 335 1188; tel. (1 509) 335 3172; e-mail: khapala@math.wsu.edu

Abstract

We study the global approximate controllability of the reaction-diffusion equation in a parallelepiped $\Omega = (a_1, b_1) \times \dots \times (a_n, b_n) \subset R^n$, governed by a multiplicative control in a reaction term. It is assumed that the initial state u_0 admits zeros only on the intersections of Ω with finitely many hyperplanes, parallel to the sides of Ω , and that u_0 changes its sign after crossing such hyperplanes (we further refer to them as the “hyperplanes of change of sign” or “zero hyperplanes”). This paper can be viewed as a continuation of work presented in [2, 3] for the controllability of the one dimensional reaction-diffusion equation with solutions admitting finitely many zeros. However, the methods of [2, 3] are intrinsically one dimensional, while in this paper we introduce a novel approach to deal with the case of multiple spatial variables.

1. Introduction. The traditional linear operator methods, based on the duality pairing, developed to study controllability of linear evolution systems with additive controls, do not apply to nonlinear control problems arising in the context of multiplicative controls. The latter also represent a principally different class of applications (such as, e.g., chain-reactions, see [6] and the references therein).

Among early works on “multiplicative” controllability, let us mention a pioneering work [1] (1982) by Ball, Marsden and Slemrod, establishing the approximate controllability of the rod and wave equations, based on an implicit nonharmonic Fourier series approach, adapted for the time-dependent (only) multiplicative controls.

In turn, the multiplicative controllability of linear and semilinear parabolic equations in several spatial dimensions was originated in the series of papers by Khapalov [4]-[5], further summarized in monograph [6]. The approach of [6] makes use of explicit asymptotic qualitative

methods that employ piecewise constant-in-time multiplicative controls of both spatial and time variables.

In more recent papers [2], [3] we discussed the multiplicative controllability properties of the one dimensional reaction-diffusion equation with the initial and target states admitting finitely many “matching” changes of sign. The results were extended in [3] to a two dimensional Heat equation *on a disk* in the case when its solutions are radially symmetrical. Nonetheless, the methods of [2], [3] deal with simultaneous control of the motion of isolated zero points and are *intrinsically one dimensional* (with respect to the spatial variable) as they focus on the controlling the sign of u_t at zero points.

In the case of several spatial dimensions, the sets of points of change of sign of solutions to the pde at hand are no longer finite sets of points. Such principal change of setup demands a new methodology, which is the subject of this paper. Namely, we intend to exploit the fact that the choice of multiplicative control affects the selection of eigenfunctions of the spectral problem at hand. Respectively, our novel strategy is based on dealing with multiplicative controls for which the desirable target state becomes the first “essentially” non-zero eigenfunction in the Fourier series expansion of the resulting solution.

Controlled evolution system. In this paper we consider the following reaction-diffusion equation:

$$u_t = \Delta u + v(x, t)u \quad \text{in } Q_T = \Omega \times (0, T), \quad T > 0, \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad (1.1)$$

$$u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad t \in (0, T), \quad u|_{t=0} = u_0 \in H^2(\Omega) \bigcap H_0^1(\Omega),$$

where $\Omega = (a_1, b_1) \times \dots \times (a_n, b_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. The symbol $v \in L^\infty(Q_T)$ stands for the *multiplicative control* function, which we further assume to be piecewise constant-in-time.

It is known that, for any $T > 0$, system (1.1) admits a unique solution in $H^{2,1}(Q_T) \bigcap C([0, T]; H^2(\Omega) \bigcap H_0^1(\Omega))$. Here and below, we use the standard notations for Sobolev spaces, in particular, $H_0^1(\Omega) = \{\phi \mid \phi, \phi_{x_i} \in L^2(\Omega), \phi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, i = 1, \dots, n\}$, and $H^{2,1}(Q_T) = \{\phi \mid \phi, \phi_x, \phi_{x_i x_j}, \phi_t \in L^2(Q_T) \text{ } i, j = 1, \dots, n\}$, $H^2(\Omega) = \{\phi \mid \phi, \phi_{x_i}, \phi_{x_i x_j} \in L^2(\Omega) \text{ } i, j = 1, \dots, n\}$.

Let us remind the reader that, in the classical sense, an evolution system is called *globally approximately controllable in a given space H* at time $T > 0$, if it can be steered in H from any

initial state into any neighborhood of any desirable target state at time T by making use of a suitable available control. However, this type of controllability is out of question for boundary problem (1.1) (e.g., the zero-function is the fixed point of the right-hand side in (1.1)).

The layout of the paper is as follows. In the next section we discuss some critical “observations” exposing the principal difficulties which one can encounter in the framework of multiplicative controllability, particularly, due to the *maximum principle* for solutions of parabolic equations. In Section 3, we describe the proposed methodology and state the main results of this paper. In Sections 4-7, we prove the main results.

2. Maximum principle and multiplicative controllability of linear parabolic PDE’s: some critical observations. In the following observations and examples we assume that $\Omega = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$ (though, of course, it is just for illustratuion purposes).

Observation 1: Assume that in (1.1) $u_0(x) \geq 0$. Then, the classical maximum principle requires the respective solution to (1.1) to stay nonnegative at any moment of time $t > 0$, regardless of the choice of v . This means that system (1.1) cannot be steered from any such u_0 to a target state which is negative on a nonzero measure set in Ω . However, one can hope to approximately steer it to any non-negative state in $L^2(\Omega)$ and it was shown in [4]-[6] for a rather general class of *semilinear* parabolic equations in several spatial dimensions.

Observation 2: Let us assume now that u_0 admits changes of sign across finitely many curves, say, $S_i(0), i = 1, \dots, M$, in domain Ω , splitting Ω into N simply-connected open subdomains $A_i(0), i = 1, \dots, N$, in which u_0 does not change sign. A straightforward adaptation of reasoning in Observation 1 implies that for any control v the respective solution u to (1.1) at any moment of time $t > 0$ cannot have *more than* as many curves of sign change (while some curves of change of sign can “merge”). Furthermore, the “geometrical topology” of these evolving curves should be compatible with that of u_0 . Namely, the respective $A_i(t)$ ’s are the result of “continuous transformations” of the original $A_i(0)$ ’s, see the illustrating examples below on Figures 0-5 (the change of sign is indicated with “ \pm ” symbols).




Figure 0.

Observation 3: Due to the maximum principle of solutions to parabolic equations, *no new zero-curves of change of sign can emerge* inside any open set where, prior to that, we had $u(x, t) \geq 0$ or $u(x, t) \leq 0$ for all spatial points.

Let us illustrate the above ideas with the following two ‘hypothetical’ examples.

Example 2.1. In (1.1) with $\Omega = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$ assume that $u_0(x)$ is a function, describing the initial temperature distribution $u_0(x)$, is positive on the left of a single vertical line and

is negative on the right of it as shown on the left square on Fig. 1. The change of sign is indicated with “ \pm ” symbols.

On the following two squares we can see two *possible* positions of the zero line which moves, as indicated with arrows, to the right towards the right vertical part of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ and finally it can “merges” with it (or get arbitrarily close to it).




Figure 1.

Example 2.2. On Fig. 2 below we again consider a squared domain Ω but now with two vertical and two horizontal zero-lines of change of sign for some initial temperature distribution $u_0(x)$. The change of sign is again indicated with “ \pm ”.

On the three squares below we illustrate a possible evolution of positions of these zero lines compatible with the above-mentioned maximum principle.




Figure 2.

3. Methodology and main results. In this paper we will introduce a novel approach to multiplicative controllability exploiting the idea to employ multiplicative controls which would make the desirable target states to be co-linear to the first “essentially non-zero” eigenfunction in the Fourier series expansion of the resulting solutions.

This new strategy will become possible due to the “supporting” qualitative techniques, introduced in [4], [5] (see also [6]) in the context of multiplicative controllability, exploiting the idea of extracting various qualitative dynamics from system (1.1), namely, by making use of:

- either “long-term” static controls (i.e., not depending on the time-variable), which will drive system (1.1) to the first non-zero term in the Fourier series expansion of the respective solution (while the subsequent terms are dissipating in time),
- or static controls acting on “vanishingly small” time-intervals to ensure that *the reaction dynamics* in (1.1) will dominate over the diffusion process, when such controls are applied.

In our main results below we will use the following definition detailing the concept of change of sign of a function in a domain $\Omega \subset R^n, n = 2, \dots$ that of our interest in this paper.

Definition 3.1. *Everywhere in this paper, when we talk about “finitely many $(n - 1)$ -dimensional surfaces of change of sign” or “zero-surfaces/hyperplanes” for a given function,*

we mean that the total measure of these surfaces is zero and that they can split Ω into finitely many subdomains (simply-connected open sets) $S_i^+, i = 1, \dots, l$ and $S_j^-, j = 1, \dots, m$, bounded by the respective aforementioned surfaces and, possibly, by parts of boundary $\partial\Omega$. In addition, they are such that the function at hand is positive inside of any of $S_i^+, i = 1, \dots, l$ and is negative inside of any of $S_j^-, j = 1, \dots, m$ (except, possibly, on sets of zero measure). We also assume that this function must change its sign (in the above sense, that is, almost everywhere) across these surfaces.

Main methodological question. In the previous section we pointed out at some principal restrictions on the target states which can be reached from a given initial state u_0 along the dynamics of (1.1). Respectively, in this paper, we intend to attack this problem from the “opposite direction”, namely, we ask:

From what initial states u_0 system (1.1) can be steered to a given desirable target state u_1 ?

Our first result deals with a special case when curves of change of sign do not need to be moved.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that the initial state $u_0 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ in (1.1) and the desirable target states $u_1 \in L^2(\Omega)$ have the same surfaces of change of sign (see Definition 3.1). Then system (1.1) can be steered from the former to the latter as close as we wish in $L^2(\Omega)$ at some time $T > 0$.*

Theorem 3.1 is proven in Appendix. It is instrumental for the proofs of Theorems 3.3-3.6, particularly, due to the following remark.

Remark 3.1. *In Theorem 3.1 the steering is achieved as $T \rightarrow 0+$.*

Remark 3.2. *We assume that solutions of all introduced below spectral problems are orthonormalized in the respective L^2 -spaces.*

Let $\{\lambda_k, \omega_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ denote the eigenelements of the spectral problem associated with (1.1):

$$\Delta\omega_k + v_0(x)\omega_k = \lambda_k\omega_k, \quad \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots, \quad \lambda_k \rightarrow -\infty \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.1)$$

Then, the solution to (1.1) with $v = v_0$ admits the following Fourier series representation:

$$u(x, t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\int_{\Omega} u_0 \omega_k dx \right) e^{\lambda_k t} \omega_k(x). \quad (3.2)$$

For each positive integer k_* introduce the following “ k_* -momentum problem”.

k_* - Momentum problem. *Let in (3.1) $\lambda_{k_*} > \lambda_{k_*+1}$. Find u_0^* such that:*

$$\int_{\Omega} u_0^* \omega_k dx = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, k_* - 1, \quad (3.3a)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} u_0^* \omega_{k_*} dx = c_0 \neq 0 \quad (3.3b)$$

for some c_0 .

Remark 3.3. *We would like to emphasize here the strict nature of the inequality $\lambda_{k_*} > \lambda_{k_*+1}$.*

The next result, Theorem 3.2, describes one of the central ideas of our controllability strategy in this paper.

Theorem 3.2. *Consider any $v_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and a positive integer $k_* > 1$. Let, for this v_0 $\lambda_{k_*} > \lambda_{k_*+1}$ in (3.1). Assume that the k_* - momentum problem (3.3a-b) admits a solution for some $u_0 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, that is,*

$$u_0 = \sum_{k=k_*}^{\infty} a_k \omega_k, \quad a_{k_*} \neq 0.$$

Then any of the target states $\alpha \omega_{k_}, \alpha > 0$ can be approximately reached in $L^2(\Omega)$ from this u_0 at some time $T \geq T_1$ along the dynamics of (1.1) with $v = v_0(x)$.*

Remark 3.4 *If $k_* = 1$, then the first eigenfunction is ω_{k_*} is not multiple (due to the aforementioned classical maximum principle for solutions of parabolic equations) and it does not change its sign in Ω , say, is non-negative). Hence, the respective $k_* = 1$ - momentum problem (3.4a-b) becomes trivial. In this case, with the help of Theorem 3.1, the result of Theorem 3.2 holds for any non-negative target state and, thus, we have the “non-negative” approximate controllability (to all non-negative target states) in $L^2(\Omega)$ as it was shown earlier in [4]-[5].*

Remark 3.5. *Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 do not use the specific geometric structure of Ω and, thus, apply to general domains.*

Let us assume that our initial state $u_0(x), x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ changes its sign in Ω on $k_i - 1 \geq 1$ hyperplanes Q_{ij} perpendicular to the x_i -axis

$$Q_{ij} = \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \mid x_i = x_{ij}^0\}, \quad a_i < x_{i1}^0 < \dots < x_{ik_i-1}^0 < b_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, k_i - 1. \quad (3.4a)$$

Select any set of functions $u_i(x_i) \in L^2(a_i, b_i), i = 1, \dots, n$ such that:

- each $u_i(x_i)$ has exactly $k_i - 1$ points of change of sign at $a_i < x_{i1} < \dots < x_{ik_i-1}^0 < b_i$
- and the function

$$u^*(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n u_i(x_i) \quad (3.5a)$$

has the same sequence of change sign as u_0 .

In the above and below, if $k_i = 1$, then there is no zero-hyperplane perpendicular the the i -dimension.

In turn, assume that our target state $u_1(x), x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ changes its sign in Ω on $k_i - 1 \geq 0$ hyperplanes P_{ij} (or “zero-hyperplanes”) perpendicular to the x_i -axis

$$P_{ij} = \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \mid x_i = x_{ij}\}, \quad a_i < x_{i1} < \dots < x_{ik_i-1} < b_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, k_i - 1. \quad (3.4b)$$

Select a set of functions $w_i(x_i), i = 1, \dots, n$ such that they are either constant (say, identically equal to 1) or:

•

$$w_i(x_i) \in H^2(a_i, b_i) \bigcap H_0^1(a_i, b_i) \bigcap C^2[a_i, b_i], \quad i = 1, \dots, n;$$

- each $w_i(x_i)$ has exactly $k_i - 1$ points of change of sign at $a_i < x_{i1} < \dots < x_{ik_i-1} < b_i$;
- selection of $w_i(x_i) \equiv 1$ takes place if there are no zero-hyperplanes perpendicular to the i -th axis,

- and the function

$$w(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n w_i(x_i) \quad (3.5b)$$

has the same sequence of change sign as u_1 in (3.4b);

- each w_i is linear near x_{ij} 's (whence, $w_{ix_ix_i} = 0$ near these points).

Select control $v = v_0$ for (1.1) as follows:

$$v_0(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i(x_i), \quad v_i(x_i) = -\frac{w_{ix_ix_i}(x_i)}{w_{ix_i}} \in C[0, 1], \quad (3.6)$$

at finitely many points (see Remark 5.2) where the denominator is not zero, and set $v_i = 0$ otherwise.

Denote by ω_{ij} 's and λ_{ij} 's the (orthonormalized) solutions of the following spectral problem in $H^2(a_i, b_i) \cap H_0^1(a_i, b_i) \cap C^2[a_i, b_i]$:

$$\omega_{ijx_ix_i}(x_i) + v_i(x_i)\omega_{ij}(x) = \lambda_{ij}\omega_{ij}(x_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad j = 1, \dots \quad (3.7a)$$

Remark 3.6: Instrumental observations.

- All “one-dimensional” eigenvalues λ_{ij} 's are simple:

$$\lambda_{i1} < \lambda_{i2} < \dots, \lambda_{ij} \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } j \rightarrow -\infty, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

- Note that $w_i(x_i)$ is co-linear to $\omega_{ik_i}(x_i)$ and $\lambda_{ik_i} = 0$ (see (3.6)). Indeed, $\omega_{ik_i}(x_i)$ has $k_i - 1$ zeros in (a_i, b_i) , $\omega_{ik_i-1}(x_i)$ has $k_i - 2$ zeros and so forth ... (see Remark 5.2 below).

Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 do not use the specific geometric structure of Ω and, thus, apply to general domains. However, our next result fully exploits the fact that Ω is a parallelepiped in order to apply the method of separation of variables to reduce the multidimensional moment problem in (3.3a-b) to a set of one dimensional moment problems. It also combines the results of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $u_0 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ have zero-hyperplanes (of change of sign) as in (3.4a) and $u_1 \in L^2(\Omega)$ have zero-hyperplanes as in (3.4b). Let $w_i(x_i), i = 1, \dots, n$ be any set of functions as in (3.5b) (there are infinitely many sets like that). Assume that there exist functions $u_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ from the closure in $L^2(\Omega)$ of the set of functions as in (3.5a) such that:*

•

$$\int_{a_i}^{b_i} u_i(x_i) \omega_{ij}(x_i) dx_i = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, k_i - 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (3.7b)$$

or, alternatively, we can find sequences $\{u_i^s \in L^2(a_i, b_i)\}_{s=1}^\infty, i = 1, \dots, n$ as in (3.5a) such that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \int_{a_i}^{b_i} u_i^s(x_i) \omega_{ij}(x_i) dx_i = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, k_i - 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (3.7c)$$

• while

$$\Pi_{i=1, \dots, n} \left| \int_{a_i}^{b_i} u_i(x_i) \omega_{ik_i}(x_i) dx_i \right| = 1, \quad (3.8a)$$

or, respectively,

$$\Pi_{i=1, \dots, n} \left| \int_{a_i}^{b_i} u_i^s(x_i) \omega_{ik_i}(x_i) dx_i \right| = 1, \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.8b)$$

independently of the choice of the “degree of closedness to zero” of terms in (3.7c).

Then, system (1.1) can be steered from u_0 to u_1 as close as we wish in $L^2(\Omega)$ at some time $T > 0$.

Discussion of conditions (3.7b)-(3.8b). These conditions form a set of moment problems in one spatial dimension for each $i = 1, \dots$ on a cone (that is, these are **not** standard linear moment problems in a Hilbert space), derived from the moment problem (3.3a-b). Namely, for each dimension i we want to find a sequence of functions $\{u_i^s\}_{s=1}^\infty$ which:

1. in general, “approaches” a subspace of $L^2(a_i, b_i)$ perpendicular to the span of $\{\omega_{ij}\}_{j=1}^{k_{i*}-1}$ (it may **not** be a converging sequence), namely, containing functions of the form

$$\sum_{k=k_{i*}}^{\infty} a_k \omega_{ij}(x_i).$$

In other words, u_i^s ’s tend to become “perpendicular to the aforementioned span (see (3.7b-c));

2. but **not** to become perpendicular to ω_{ik*} (see (3.8a-b));
3. functions u_i^s ’s should *all have the same zeros in the dimension i as the given initial condition u_0 in (1.1) with the same sequence of change of sign.*

4. If (3.7b-c)-(3.8a-b) hold, then the first “essentially non-zero” terms in the Fourier series representations of respective solutions to (1.1), (3.6), with any of the initial conditions described in Theorem 3.3, have the same sequence of zero-hyperplanes as any of the targets in this theorem, that is, as u_1 .

We will show below that Theorem 3.3, in particular, implies following straightforward implication in the case when (3.7b-c)-(3.8a-b) become trivial.

Theorem 3.4. *System (1.1) can be steered from any initial state $u_0 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, with at most one, per each dimension i , hyperplane of change of sign as in (3.4a), to any target state $u_1 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, which has a respectively equal amount of hyperplanes of change of sign, that is, as in (3.4b), as close as we wish in $L^2(\Omega)$ at some time $T > 0$.*

In the general case of finitely many hyperplanes of change of sign we have the following two results.

Theorem 3.5. *Consider any target state $u_1 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ with given finitely many hyperplanes of change of sign (as in (3.4b)). Then system (1.1) can be steered to u_1 , as close as we wish in $L^2(\Omega)$, from any initial state $u_0 \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, which has respectively the same amount of similarly oriented hyperplanes of change of sign (as in (3.4a)), provided that the points x_{ij}^0 ’s in (3.4a) are selected arbitrarily in their respective segments (a_i, b_i) , except for, possibly, a set of at most countably many points.*

The proof of Theorem 3.5 deals with the following two assumptions.

Assumption 3.1. *The following sets of vectors are linear independent in the respective space R^{k_i-1} :*

$$\{(\omega_{ij}(x_{i1}^0), \dots, \omega_{ij}(x_{ik_i-1}^0))\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad j = 1, \dots, k_i - 1, \quad (3.9)$$

where x_{ij}^0 are from (3.4a).

Assumption 3.2. *If Assumption 3.1 does not hold for some (dimension) i , that is, the respective set in (3.9) is linear dependent, assume that*

$$\{(\omega_{ik_i}(x_{i1}^0), \dots, \omega_{ik_i-1}(x_{ik_i}^0))\} \notin \text{span} \{ \{(\omega_{ij}(x_{i1}^0), \dots, \omega_{ij}(x_{ik_i-1}^0))\} \mid j = 1, \dots, k_i - 1 \}. \quad (3.10)$$

Theorem 3.6. *The statements of Theorem 3.5 hold under Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2.*

Discussion of Assumptions 3.1. Note that in case of Theorem 3.4, Assumption 3.1 holds in a trivial way for $k_i - 1 = 1$ - we just have one non-zero vector in (3.9).

Let us assume that Assumption 3.1 does not hold for some dimension i . We claim that the set of x_i 's for which it fails cannot have interior points in (a_i, b_i) . To this end, we will investigate the linear dependence of vectors forming the columns of matrix generated by the vectors in (3.9).

Let, for some $\alpha_j, j = 1, \dots, k_i - 1$, in some open interval $(c, d) \subset (a_i, b_i)$ we have:

$$g(x_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{k_i-1} \alpha_j \omega_{ij}(x_i) \equiv 0. \quad (3.11)$$

Apply the elliptic operator in (3.7a) to (3.11) $k_i - 1$ times to obtain the following linear algebraic system in $\alpha_j \omega_{ij}(x_i), j = 1, \dots, k_i - 1$ with Vandermonde matrix:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_i-1} \alpha_j \omega_{ij}(x_i) \equiv 0, \dots, \sum_{j=0}^{k_i-1} \lambda_{ij}^{k_i-1} \alpha_j \omega_{ij}(x_i) \equiv 0$$

Since all λ_{ij} 's are single, it has only the trivial solution in (c, d) , that is,

$$\alpha_j \omega_{ij}(x_i), j \equiv 0, \dots, k_i - 1, x_i \in (c, d).$$

However, $\omega_{ij}(x_i)$'s can have only finitely many zero's in (a_i, b_i) (see Remark 5.1). Hence, all $\alpha_j = 0$. Contradiction.

Thus, the set of x_i 's for which Assumption 3.1 fails, at most, consists of points that are separated by open segments of points for which Assumption 3.1 holds. In other words, the set of x_i 's, for which Assumption 3.1 fails, is *at most countable*.

Furthermore, if the functions $\omega_{ij}(z)$'s are analytic in $[a_i, b_i]$, then the set of x_i 's, for which Assumption 3.1 fails, is *finite*. Indeed, otherwise, the analytic function $g(x_i)$ in (3.11) would be vanishing on a set of real points that have a limit point in $[a_i, b_i]$. Hence, $g(x) \equiv 0$ in $[a_i, b_i]$, which contradicts to Remark 5.1.

Example to Theorems 3.5-3.6: The case of two zero-hyperplanes. Let the initial state u_0 and target state u_1 have two hyperplanes of change of sign perpendicular to the x_1 -axis, as described, respectively, in (3.4a) and (3.4b). Then, according to Remark 5.1, we have the following layout of the zero-points po change of sign for ω_{11}, ω_{12} and ω_{13} (in the notattions of (3.4b)):

$$a_1 < x_{11} < x_1^{12} < x_{12} < b_1,$$

where x_{11} and x_{12} are zeros of $u_1(x_1)$ and $\omega_{13}(x_1)$, x_1^{12} is the only zero-point of change of sign of $\omega_{12}(x_1)$, while $\omega_{11}(x_1)$ does not have such zero-points. Without loss of generality, we can assume that immediately on the right of a_1 , the above eigenfunctions are positive.

Then, Assumption 3.1 holds if, e.g., the zeros of u_0 in (3.4a) are located as follows:

$$x_{11}^0 \in (a_i, x_1^{12}), \quad x_{12}^0 \in (x_1^{12}, b_1).$$

Indeed, in this case components of vector $(\omega_{11}(x_{11}^0), \omega_{11}(x_{12}^0))$ are of the same sign, while components of vector $(\omega_{12}(x_{11}^0), \omega_{12}(x_{12}^0))$ have the opposite signs.

Alternatively, Assumption 3.1 can (theoretically) fail in the areas where two aforementioned vectors have both coordinates of the same sign, *while these vectors have to be co-linear*, say,

$$x_{11}^0, x_{12}^0 \in (a_1, x_1^{12}).$$

In this case, if

$$x_{11}^0 \in (a_i, x_{11}), \quad x_{12}^0 \in (x_{11}, x_1^{12}),$$

then vector $(\omega_{13}(x_{11}^0), \omega_{13}(x_{12}^0))$ has coordinates of the opposite sign and condition (3.10) hods, i.e., Assumption 3.2 holds.

Remark 3.7: Selection of zero-hyperplanes for u_0 in Theorem 3.5. *From the above discussion it follows that, for each dimension i , we can select the zero points $x_{ij}^0, j = 1, \dots, k_i - 1$ for u_o in Theorem 3.5 as follows;*

- *Select x_{i1}^0 on (3.4a) arbitrarily in (a_i, b_i) ;*
- *in order to make vectors*

$$\{(\omega_{ij}(x_{ij}^0), \dots, \omega_{ij}(x_{ij}^0))\}, \quad j = 1, 2,$$

linear independent we can select the point x_{i2}^0 everywhere in (a_i, b_i) except of a set of at most countably many points;

- and so on ...

Remark 3.8: About extension of Theorem 3.5. *At a first glance, it may seem that one can apply some “density argument” to get rid of Assumption 3.1 in Theorems 3.5 and 3.6. However, if we select a sequence of auxiliary u_{0s} , satisfying Assumption 3.1, to approximate the actual u_0 , not satisfying this assumption, we may have a divergent sequence of controls associated with each u_{0s} , that is, in the framework of our methods used to prove Theorem 3.6. These methods determine a suitable sequence of controls as solutions to a suitable linear algebraic system, with matrices constructed out of vectors in (3.9), i.e., with non-zero determinants, guaranteed by Assumption 3.1. In a “conventional density argument”, if zeros of u_{0s} approximate those of u_0 , these determinants may converge to a degenerate one, associated with zeros of u_0 in (3.9).*

Remark 3.9: Geomentry of sero surfaces during the steering. *For the one dimensional case, the method of his paper can be viewed as an alternative method to proof the main results in [2]-[3] under the Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2. These assumptions are not required in the aforementioned works. The main results in [2]-[3] were achieved by finitely many (continuous) incremental moves of zero points. In particular, this fact be used to move zero points into open sets for which Assumption 3.1 holds, which would allow one to assume Assumption 3.1 without loss of generality. In the multidimensional case, considered in this paper, an analogous approach would be to move the zero-hyperplanes, which would also need to somehow maintain the strict geometry of these hyperplanes at every moment of time. In the arguments of this paper we only require the zero surfaces to be hyperplanes perpendicular to the respective axes at the initial and final moments of steering.*

The following two figures illustrate Theorems 3.5 and 3.6 for the case of $\Omega = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$.




Figure 3.




Figure 4.

4. Proof of Theorem 3.1. Consider any target state $u_1 = \alpha \omega_{k_*}$, where $\alpha > 0$ is fixed.

Solution to (1.1) with $v = v_0(x)$ and u_0 solving the k_* -momentum problem admits the following Fourier series representation as in (3.2):

$$\begin{aligned}
 u(x, t) &= \sum_{k=1}^{k_*-1} \left(\int_{\Omega} u_0 \omega_k dx \right) e^{\lambda_k t} \omega_k(x) \\
 &+ \left(\int_{\Omega} u_0 \omega_{k_*} dx \right) e^{\lambda_{k_*} t} \omega_{k_*}(x) + \sum_{k=k_*+1}^{\infty} \left(\int_{\Omega} u_0 \omega_k dx \right) e^{\lambda_k t} \omega_k(x)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$= \left(\int_{\Omega} u_0 \omega_{k*} dx \right) e^{\lambda_{k*} t} \omega_{k*}(x) + \sum_{k=k*+1}^{\infty} \left(\int_{\Omega} u_0 \omega_k dx \right) e^{\lambda_k t} \omega_k(x).. \quad (4.1)$$

In the definition of k_* -momentum problem we assumed that $\lambda_{k*} > \lambda_{k*+1}$. Therefore, we can select a control of the following form:

$$v(x) = v_0(x) - \lambda_{k*} + a,$$

where $a > 0$ will be selected below in (4.4).

With this new control, the solution to (1.1) will take the form similar to (4.1), with the same eigenfunctions and the eigenvalues shifted by $\lambda_{k*} - a$ units to the right:

$$u(x, t) = e^{at} \left(\int_{\Omega} u_0^* \omega_{k*} dx \right) \omega_{k*}(x) + e^{at} \sum_{k=k*+1}^{\infty} \left(\int_{\Omega} u_0^* \omega_k dx \right) e^{(\lambda_k - \lambda_{k*})t} \omega_k(x). \quad (4.2)$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that

$$0 < \alpha \neq \int_{\Omega} u_0 \omega_{k*} dx = c_0 > 0, \quad (4.3)$$

see (3.3b) for c_0 . (Alternatively, we would select $a = 0$ in (4.2)).

Select an arbitrary sequence of $0 < T_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and set

$$a = a_i = \frac{1}{T_i} \ln \left(\frac{\alpha}{\int_{\Omega} u_0 \omega_{k*} dx} \right) \rightarrow 0 + \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty \quad (4.4)$$

in which case:

$$e^{aT_i} = \frac{\alpha}{\int_{\Omega} u_0 \omega_{k*} dx}.$$

In view of (4.3), the respective sequence of solutions to (1.1) at times T_i 's will converge to $u_1 = \alpha \omega_{k*}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

This ends the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Remark 4.1. *Note that, in the above proof, the result of Theorem 3.2 is achieved as the time of steering tends to zero.*

5. Proof of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4: The case of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and a single line of change of sign. Without loss of generality (and for the sake of simplicity of notations), we can assume that

$$\Omega = (0, 1) \times (0, 1).$$

Let u_0 have just one vertical line of change of sign. We intend to show how one can steer system (1.1) in $L^2(\Omega)$ from any such u_0 to any state u_1 , which also has a single vertical line of change of sign at any desirable position within Ω , e.g., as shown, e.g., on Fig. 5:




Figure 5.

Let u_1 have a sign change on a vertical line positioned at $x_1 = x_{11}$ ($x = (x_1, x_2)$), while u_0 changes its sign on a vertical line positioned at $x_1 = x_{11}^0 \neq x_{11}$ (otherwise, we can apply Theorem 3.1). The plan of proof is as follows:

- In **Step 1** we select a stationary control $v(x) = v_0(x_1)$ such that one of the eigenfunctions ω_{k_*} of the respective spectral problem as in (3.1) has a single vertical line of sign change at $x_1 = x_{11}$, the same as the desirable target state $u_1(x)$.
- In **Step 2**, making use of Theorem 3.1, we will steer (1.1) on some $(0, T_*)$, where T_* can be selected as small as we wish, to some intermediate auxiliary target state $u_*(x)$, which can “approximately” solve the k_* -momentum problem (3.2)-(3.3a-b) for the eigenfunctions associated with $v(x) = v_0(x_1)$. Thus, u_* will have the same zero-line as u_0 .

The aforementioned steering in Step 2 will ensure that, for $t > T_*$, the term containing ω_{k_*} will be the first “substantially nonzero, dominating” term in the respective expansion of solution to system (1.1), *if control $v_0(x_1)$ from Step 1 is engaged*.

- In **Step 3**, making use of the argument of Theorem 3.2, we will show that we can steer

system (1.1) from u_* to a state co-linear with ω_{k_*} as close as we wish in $L^2(\Omega)$.

- In **Step 4** we will apply Theorem 3.1 again to further (approximately in $L^2(\Omega)$) steer system (1.1) to the target state $u_1(x)$ without change of the position of the zero-line at x_{11} .

Step 1: Selection of an auxiliary target state $w(x_1)$ and associated control $v = v_0(x)$.

Select, in notations of (3.5b), any function $w_1 \in H^2(0, 1) \cap H_0^1(0, 1) \cap C^2[0, 1]$, $w_2(x_2) \equiv 1$, (see (3.5b)) such that

$$w_1(x_1) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{for } x = 0, x_{11}, 1, \\ \neq 0, & \text{for } x \neq 0, x_{11}, 1, \end{cases} \quad \|w\|_{L^2(0,1)} = 1,$$

whence:

$$w(x) = w_1(x_1)w_2(x_2) = w_1(x_1). \quad (5.1a)$$

Select (as in (3.6):

$$\begin{aligned} v_0(x) = v_0(x_1) &= v_1(x_1) + v_2(x_2) = -\frac{w_{1x_1x_1}(x_1)}{w_1(x_1)} - \frac{w_{2x_2x_2}(x_2)}{w_2(x_2)} \\ &= -\frac{w_{1x_1x_1}(x_1)}{w_1(x_1)} + 0, x \neq 0, x_{11}, 1, \quad v_0 \in L^\infty(0, 1). \end{aligned} \quad (5.1b)$$

This can be achieved if, for example, we select w such that is linear near the boundary and x_{11} , where it vanishes.

Note that $w_1(x_1)$, satisfying to (5.1b), also solves the following one dimensional Dirichlet spectral problem in $H^2(0, 1) \cap H_0^1(0, 1)$ (*with simple eigenvalues*):

$$\omega_{1k_{x_1x_1}}(x_1) + v_0(x_1)\omega_{1k}(x_1) = \lambda_{1k}\omega_{1k}(x_1), \quad k = 1, \dots, \quad \lambda_{11} > \lambda_{12} > \dots \quad (5.2)$$

$$\|\omega_{1k}\|_{L^2(0,1)} = 1, \quad k = 1, \dots$$

and for some $k = k^*$ we have

$$\lambda_{1k^*} = 0, \quad \omega_{1k^*} = w_1 = w, \quad \lambda_k > 0, k = 1, \dots, k^* - 1.$$

The choice of w_1 in (5.1a-b) implies that

$$w(x_{11}, x_2) = w_1(x_{11}) = \omega_{1k^*}(x_{11}) = 0,$$

and thus, without loss of generality, $\omega_{1k^*}(x_1)$ is positive on the left of x_{10} and negative on the right of it (it also vanishes at $x_1 = 0, 1$).

Remark 5.1: Instrumental properties of solutions to Sturm-Liouville problem.

Let us recall along these lines ([8], page 272) that all eigenvalues of the Sturm-Liouville problem of our interest below, namely:

$$z_{ix_1x_1} + q(x_1)z_i(x_1) = \beta_i z_i(x_1) \quad x \in (0, 1), t > 0, z_i|_{x_1=0,1} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots,$$

where $\beta_1 < \beta_2 < \dots$, $q \in C[0, 1]$, can have only finitely many zeros and $z_i(x_1)$ has exactly $i - 1$ zeros. Furthermore, between two successive zeros of z_i and also between $x_1 = 0$ and its first zero and between its last zero and $x_1 = 1$ there is exactly one zero of z_{i+1} .

Due to Remark 5.1, $\omega_{12}(x_1) = w_1(x_1) = w(x)$ is the 2nd eigenfunction for the spectral problem (5.2) (indeed, the first eigenfunction does not have zeros in $(0, 1)$ and the next eigenfunction has one zero in $(0, 1)$), and

$$\lambda_{1k^*} = \lambda_{12}. \tag{5.3}$$

The form of eigenelements of (1.1). The eigenvalues and orthonormalized (in $L^2(0, 1)$) eigenfunctions of the respective spectral Dirichlet problem for (1.1) with $v(x_1, x_2) = v_0(x_1)$, namely:

$$\Delta \omega_l(x) + v_0(x_1) \omega_l(x) = \lambda_l \omega_l(x), \tag{5.4}$$

will be of the following form:

$$\omega_l(x) = \omega_{1k}(x_1) \sqrt{2} \sin \pi m x_2, \quad \lambda_l = \lambda_{1k} - (\pi m)^2, \quad l, k, m = 1, \dots, \quad \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \tag{5.5}$$

Step 2: Auxiliary steering to u_* . In terms of the momentum problem in (3.3a-b), we want to have:

$$\omega_{k_*}(x) = \sqrt{2} \sin \pi x_2 \omega_{12}(x_1), \quad \lambda_{k_*} = \lambda_{12} - (\pi)^2 = -(\pi)^2. \tag{5.6}$$

Due to (5.5) and Remark 5.2,

- ω_{k_*} is the only eigenfunction from (5.4) which has a single, more precisely, *vertical* line of change of sign and no horizontal lines of change of sign.
- In turn, there is only one eigenfunction in (5.4) with a single *horizontal* zero-line, namely:

$$\sqrt{2}\omega_{11}(x_1)\sin 2\pi x_2,$$

- while $\omega_1(x) = \omega_{11}(x_1)\sin \pi x_2$ does not have internal zero lines in Ω .

We intend, in this Step 2, to apply the method of Theorem 3.1 to approximately steer system (1.1), on some $(0, T_*)$, to a state $u|_{t=T_*} = u_*(x)$ that “approximately” solves the momentum problem in (3.3a-b) for k_* as in (5.6), that is, with control v as in (5.1). We will to show below that it is possible.

Description of desirable u^* in (3.5a) and u_* . If the aforementioned desirable u_* is chosen as the new initial condition for (1.1), (5.1) on (T_*, ∞) , it will “approximately” eliminate (on some (T_*, T^*)) all the terms in the respective generalized Fourier series representation (5.7) of solution to (1.1), (5.1), $u|_{t=T_*} = u_*$, preceding (in order of decrease of λ_l ’s) the term containing the eigenfunction ω_{k_*} , namely:

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, t) = & \sum_{m=1}^{m_*} \left(\int_{\Omega} u_* \omega_{11}(x_1) \sqrt{2} \sin \pi m x_2 dx \right) e^{-(\pi m)^2 + \lambda_{11}}(t-T_*) \omega_{11}(x_1) \sqrt{2} \sin \pi m x_2 \\ & + \left(\int_{\Omega} u_* \omega_{k_*} dx \right) e^{-\pi^2(t-T_*)} \omega_{k_*}(x) + \dots, \quad t > T_* \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

for some $m_* \geq 1$ such (if exists) that

$$-(\pi m)^2 + \lambda_{11} = \lambda_l > \lambda_{k_*} = -(\pi)^2 + \lambda_{12} = -\pi^2, l = 1, \dots, l_* - 1.$$

The other terms, not explicitly present in (5.7), in view of (5.5) are associated with eigenvalues strictly smaller than $-(\pi)^2$.

Therefore, if u_* is such that it “approximately eliminates” the 1st sum on the right of (5.7), that is, if, e.g.,

$$\int_{\Omega} u_*(x_1, x_2) \omega_{11}(x_1) dx_1$$

can be made “as small as we wish” in $L^2(0, 1)$ by applying Theorem 3.1, while satisfying a respective condition of type (3.3b), then we will be in a position to apply Theorem 3.2 to steer system (1.1), (5.1) to a term in (5.7) containing ω_{k_*} at some $t = T^*$.

Ideally, this would be the case, if, for example, $u_* \in L^2(\Omega)$ is such that it has the same zero-line as u_0 (this can be achieved by Theorem 3.3) and, simultaneously, in notations of (3.5b)

$$u_*(x) = u^*(x) = u_1(x_1)u_2(x_2), \quad u_2(x_2) \equiv 1, \quad \int_{\Omega} u_1 \omega_{11} dx_1 = 0, \quad \int_{\Omega} u_1 \omega_{12} dx_1 = c^0 \neq 0,$$

or, which is the same, u_* formally solves the k_* -momentum problem (3.3a-b) for our v_0 in (5.1). Unfortunately, Theorem 3.1 deals with approximate steering in $L^2(\Omega)$ only.

Nonetheless, we can use Theorem 3.1 to get rid of the 1st sum in (5.7) with any *pre-assigned accuracy*.

Selection of $u^*(x)$ as in (3.5a) and u_* . Indeed, since $\omega_{11}(x_1)$ does not change sign in $(0, 1)$, and $\omega_{12}(x_1)$ admits only one change of sign in $(0, 1)$, we can easily select a function $u_1 \in L^2(0, 1)$ with the same order of change of sign along the x_1 -axis as u_0 in (1.1) such that

$$\int_{\Omega} u_1(x_1) \omega_{11}(x_1) dx = 0, \quad \int_{\Omega} u_1(x_1) \omega_{12}(x_1) dx = c^0 > 0. \quad (5.8)$$

In terms of (3.5a), we set

$$u^*(x) = u_1(x_1) \times 1 = w_1(x_1)w_2(x_2).$$

Let us consider any sequence $\{T_{*i}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ (it will be further defined in more detail) such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow 0} T_{*i} = 0.$$

Theorem 3.1 allows us to steer system (1.1) on each of the intervals $(0, T_{i*})$ to states $u_{i*} = u(\cdot, T_{i*})$, with the same single line of change of sign as the original u_0 , such that desirable u_{i*} 's admit the following presentation:

$$u_{i*}(x) = u(x, T_{i*}) = u^*(x) + r(x, T_{i*}) = u_1(x_1) + r(x, T_{i*}), \quad (5.8')$$

where

$$\|r(\cdot, T_{i*})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } T_{i*} \rightarrow 0+. \quad (5.9)$$

For $t > T_{i*}$, in view of (5.7), if we will use control $v(x) = v_0(x_1)$, the respective solution to system (1.1) will have the following representation:

$$u(x, t) = \left(\int_{\Omega} u_1(x_1) \omega_{k_*} dx \right) e^{-\pi^2(t-T_{i*})} \left(\int_0^1 \sqrt{2} \sin \pi x_2 dx_2 \right) \omega_{k_*}(x)$$

$$+ \sum_{\lambda_l < -(\pi)^2} \left(\int_{\Omega} u_1(x_1) \omega_l(x) dx \right) e^{\lambda_l(t-T_{i*})} \omega_l(x) + p(x, t - T_{i*}), \quad t > T_{i*}, \quad (5.10a)$$

where ω_l 's do not contain ω_{11} , due to (5.8), and ω_l 's and λ_l 's are defined in (5.5) and

$$p(x, t - T_{i*}) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left(\int_{\Omega} r(x, T_{i*}) \omega_l(x) dx \right) e^{\lambda_l(t-T_{i*})} \omega_l(x), \quad (5.10b)$$

$$\| p(\cdot, t - T_{i*}) \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq e^{\lambda_1(t-T_{i*})} \| r(\cdot, T_{i*}) \|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \quad (5.10c)$$

Step 3: Steering to ω_{k*} . Now we apply the argument of Theorem 3.2 in Section 4 for $t \in (T_{i*}, T_i)$, where $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is any monotone increasing sequence such that $T_i > T_{i*}$ and

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_i = \infty,$$

with control

$$v(x) = v_0(x_1) - \lambda_{k*} + a_i = v_0(x_1) + \pi^2 + a_i, i = 1, \dots,$$

and with

$$a_i = \frac{1}{T_i - T_{i*}} \ln \left(\frac{1}{\int_{\Omega} u_1(x_1) \omega_{k*} dx} \right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5.11)$$

see (5.1a-b) and (4.4). Note that (5.11) implies that

$$\lambda_l - \lambda_{k*} + a_i < 0, \quad \lambda_l < \lambda_{k*} \quad \text{when} \quad T_i - T_{i*} \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.12)$$

This will result in the following formula in place of (4.2) and (5.10a-c):

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, T_i) &= \omega_{k*}(x) + \sum_{\lambda_l < -\pi^2} \left(\int_{\Omega} u_1(x_1) \omega_l dx \right) e^{(\lambda_l - \lambda_{k*} + a_i)(T_i - T_{i*})} \omega_l(x) \\ &+ \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left(\int_{\Omega} r(x, T_{i*}) \omega_l dx \right) e^{(\lambda_l - \lambda_{k*} + a_i)(T_i - T_{i*})} \omega_l(x), \quad i = 1, \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

where, again ω_l 's do not contain ω_{11} , due to (5.8).

In view of (5.11)-(5.12), the 1st series on the right in (5.13) tends to zero in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $T_i - T_{i*} \rightarrow \infty$.

The same, by the same reasoning, will happen to the tail of the 2nd series beginning for $\lambda_l < -\pi^2$, see (5.9). In turn, for finitely many other terms for the 2nd series in (5.13) (namely, $k_* - 1$ terms) we have the following estimate:

$$\left\| \sum_{\lambda_l > -\pi^2} \left(\int_{\Omega} r(x, T_{i*}) \omega_l dx \right) e^{(\lambda_l - \lambda_{k*} + a_i)(T_i - T_{i*})} \omega_l \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

$$\leq (k_* - 1)e^{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_{k_*} + a_i)T_i} \| r(\cdot, T_{*i}) \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty,$$

if (for a selected sequence of T_i 's) T_{i*} 's are, additionally to their convergence to zero, selected to ensure the rate of convergence to zero in (5.9) to be higher than that of convergence of $e^{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_{k_*} + a_i)T_i}$ to ∞ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Combining the above yields that $u(\cdot, T_i) \rightarrow \omega_{k_*}(\cdot)$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Step 4: “Magnitude adjustment” steering. This can be achieved by applying Theorem 3.1 to system (1.1) on some intervals $(T_i, T^{(i)})$ to steer it to a sequence of states converging to u_1 .

This ends the proof of Theorems 3.3-3.4 in the case of squared domain and a single line of change of sign.

6. Proof of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 in the general case: “Separation of variables”.

To this end, we only need to modify the arguments in Steps 1-2 from Section 5, while the Steps 3 and 4 would be nearly identical. Namely, we need to achieve an auxiliary steering, on some $(0, T_*)$, from the original initial state to an intermediate state $u_*(x)$ with the same zero-hyperplanes as u_0 such that the term containing the desirable ω_{k_*} (that is, with the same zero-hyperplanes as the target state $u_1(x)$) will be the 1st “substantially nonzero” term in the respective expansion of solution like in (5.7) after T_* when a suitable control applied.

Without loss of generality and for simplicity of notations, we can assume that Ω is a unit n -dimensional cube.

Separation of variables. Let us assume that our target state $u_1(x)$ has $k_* - 1$ hyperplanes of change of sign $P_{ij}, i = 1, \dots, n, j = 0, \dots, k_i - 1$ as given in (3.4b).

Select functions $u_i(x_i)$'s, u^* , $w_i(x_i)$'s, w , and control v_0 as in (3.4a) -(3.6). In turn, in this general case, instead of (5.5)-(5.6), we have (see (3.7a) for notations):

$$\omega_{k_*}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \omega_{ik_i}(x_i). \quad (6.1)$$

Respectively, to make the term with $\omega_{k_*}(x)$ be the first (in the order of decrease of λ_i 's) essentially non-zero terms, making use of Theorem 3.1, we need to steer (1.1) on some $(0, T_*)$

($T_* \rightarrow 0+$ as in Step 2 in Section 5) to

$$u_*(x) = \prod_{i=1, \dots, n, j_i=1, \dots} u_i(x_i), \quad (6.2)$$

which has the same zero-hyperplanes as the initial state u_0 , such that (3.7b)-(3.8b) holds, as it is assumed in Theorem 3.4. This can be achieved by dealing separately with each i -th one dimensional problem, $i = 1, \dots, n$ (similar to how it was done in Section 5 for $i = 1$) and with the same $T_*(\rightarrow 0+)$ for all i 's. Note that the latter conditions are straightforward for Theorem 3.3 as we discussed it in Section 5.

This ends the proof of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4.

7. Proof of Theorems 3.5 and 3.6. Let us show how one can find $u_i(x_i)$'s, satisfying (3.7b)-(3.8b).

7.1. Conversion of (3.7b)-(3.8b) to a problem associated with a system of linear algebraic equations. For simplicity of notation assume again that $\Omega = (0, 1) \times \dots \times (0, 1)$.

Pick any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Without loss of generality we can further assume that $i = 1$ and $k_1 - 1 \geq 1$, that is, there is at least one zero-hyperplane perpendicular to the x_1 -axis. Select one more point s in $(0, 1)$ different from x_{1j}^0 's in (3.4a) (we will refine this selection later).

Next, select $u_1(x_1)$ in (3.4a) to be a piecewise constant function defined by $2k_1 + 1$ real values $S, l_j, m_j, j = 1, \dots, k_1$ as follows:

$$u_1(x_1) = \begin{cases} l_j, & x_1 \in (x_{1j}^0 - h, x_{1j}^0), \\ m_j, & x_1 \in (x_{1j}^0, x_{1j}^0 + h), \\ S, & x_1 \in (s, s + h), \\ 0, & \text{elsewhere in } (0, 1). \end{cases} \quad (7.1)$$

This $u_1(x_1)$ can be reached for (1.1) as close as we wish in $L^2(0, 1)$ due to Theorem 3.1.

Remark 7.1: Values of $(l_j + m_j)$'s and of S . Note that $l_j m_j \leq 0, j = \dots, k_1$ as x_{1j}^0 's are points of change of sign for $u_1(x_1)$. The signs of S, l_j 's and m_j 's are defined by the sequence of change of sign of $u_1(x_1)$, or, which is the same, of $u_0(x)$ along the x_1 -axis. Hence, the range of available $(l_j + m_j)$'s in (7.1) is R , while S cannot change its sign.

Our goal below is to investigate (7.1) when h tends to zero. Therefore, without loss of generality, we can assume that intervals $(x_{1j}^0 - h, x_{1j}^0 + h)$ do not overlap.

The use of (7.1) will generate the following linear algebraic system of $k_1 - 1$ equations in l_j, m_j out of conditions (3.7b)-(3.7c) in Theorem 3.4:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k_1-1} A_{kj} l_j + \sum_{j=1}^{k_1-1} B_{kj} m_j + C_k S = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, k_1 - 1, \quad (7.2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{kj} &= \int_{x_{1j}^0 - h}^{x_{1j}^0} \omega_{1k}(x_1) dx_1, \\ B_{kj} &= \int_{x_{1j}^0}^{x_{1j}^0 + h} \omega_{1k}(x_1) dx_1, \\ C_k &= \int_s^{s+h} \omega_{1k}(x_1) dx_1, \quad k = 1, \dots, k_1 - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\omega_{1k}(x_1) = \omega_{1k}(x_{1j}^0) + \omega'_{1k}(x_{1j}^0)(x_1 - x_{1j}^0) + O((x_1 - x_{1j}^0)^2)$$

in $(x_{1j}^0 - h, x_{1j}^0 + h)$ as $h \rightarrow 0$, and

$$\omega_{1k}(x_1) = \omega_{1k}(s) + \omega'_{1k}(s)(x_1 - s) + O((x_1 - s)^2)$$

in $(s, s + h)$, $k = 1, \dots, k_1 - 1$, we can re-write (7.2) as follows:

$$h \sum_{j=1}^{k_1-1} (l_j + m_j) \omega_{1k}(x_{1j}^0) + h S \omega_{1k}(s) = +O(h^2) [\max |l_j| + |m_j| + |S|], \quad j = 1, \dots, k_1 - 1. \quad (7.3)$$

An auxiliary linear algebraic system on a cone. Let us consider the following “limit” system (7.4) of $(k_1 - 1)$ linear algebraic equations in k_1 real-valued variables $(V_1, \dots, V_{k_1-1}, P)$:

- P of certain sign only, defined by the location of s between x_{1j}^0 's and the sequence of change of sign of u_0 along the x_1 -axis,
- and $V_j \in R, j = 1, \dots, k_1 - 1$ (see Remark 7.1),

generated by (7.3) as $h \rightarrow 0$:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k_1-1} V_j \omega_{1k}(x_{1j}^0) + P \omega_{1k}(s) = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, k_1 - 1, \quad (7.4)$$

Since the number of equations exceeds the number of variables, without loss of generality, we can say that (7.4) admits non-trivial solutions under the above restrictions of variables forming a cone in R^{k_1} . Furthermore, under Assumption 3.1 we can consider P to be a free parameter, while under Assumption 3.2 we can set $P = 0$.

Indeed, we can solve this system in R^{k_1} , and then if it gives solution $(V_1, \dots, V_{k_1-1}, P)$ with P of a “wrong” sign, we can replace (7.4) with:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k_1-1} V_j^* \omega_{1k}(x_{1j}^0) + P^* \omega_{1k}(s) = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, k_1 - 1, \quad (7.4)'$$

and further deal with solution $(V_1^* = -V_1, \dots, V_{k_1-1}^* = -V_{k_1-1}, P^* = -P)$, where $P^* = -P$ will be of a “correct” sign.

Construction of $u_1^h(x_1)$ in (3.7c). Consider any solution $(V_1, \dots, V_{k_1-1}, P)$ to (7.4) with “correct sign” of P and **fix it**. Then set:

$$S = \frac{P}{h}, V_j = \frac{l_j}{h}, m_j = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad V_j = \frac{m_j}{h}, l_j = 0 \quad j = 1, \dots, k_1 - 1,$$

depending on the sign of V_j ’s.

Construct next $u_1(x_1)$ as in (7.1) with the just described choice of S and l_j ’s and m_j ’s. This will give us, due to (7.3), (7.4) the relation in (3.7c) for u_1^h in the following form:

$$\int_0^1 u_1^h(x_1) \omega_{1j}(x_i) dx_1 = O(h), \quad j = 1, \dots, k_1 - 1 \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0. \quad (7.5)$$

Remark 7.2 *Note that relation (7.5) will hold uniformly of any aforementioned $(V_1, \dots, V_{k_1-1}, P)$ lying in a fixed bounded set, e.g., in a fixed ball intrersected with a cone describing the restriction on sign of S .*

Discussion of condition in (3.8b). To ensure a suitable “contribution of $u_1^h(x_1)$ ’s in (3.8b), it suffices to show that we can ensure that we can find a sequence $\{h_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$ such that for $u_1^{h_l}(x_1)$ satisfying (7.5) we can have:

$$\left| \int_0^1 u_1^{h_l}(x_i) \omega_{1k_1}(x_1) dx_1 \right| = 1, \quad \text{as } h_l \rightarrow 0, \quad l = 1, \dots \quad (7.6)$$

In view of Remark 7.1, to achieve (7.6), it is sufficient to show that vector

$$(\omega_{1k_1}(x_{11}^0), \dots, \omega_{1k_1}(x_{1k_1-1}^0), \omega_{1k_1}(s)) \quad (7.7)$$

does not belong to the span of vectors

$$(\omega_{1k}(x_{11}^0), \dots, \omega_{1k}(x_{1k_1-1}^0), \omega_{1k}(s)), \quad k \leq k_1 - 1, \quad (7.8a)$$

that is,

$$(\omega_{1k_1}(x_{11}^0), \dots, \omega_{1k_1}(x_{1k_1-1}^0), \omega_{1k_1}(s)) \notin \text{span} \{(\omega_{1k}(x_{11}^0), \dots, \omega_{1k}(x_{1k_1-1}^0), \omega_{1k}(s)) \mid k \leq k_1 - 1\}. \quad (7.8b)$$

If this is true for the “cut-off” vectors composed of the vectors in (7.7) and (7.8), by removing the the last coordinates, as in Assumption 3.2, then we are done.

If Assumption 3.2 does not hold, then, under Assumption 3.1, the vector in (7.7) would be a unique linear combination of the vectors in (7.8) because the vectors

$$(\omega_{1k}(x_{11}^0), \dots, \omega_{1k}(x_{1k_1-1}^0)), \quad k = 1, \dots, k_1 - 1, \quad (7.9)$$

composed of the first $k_1 - 1$ coordinates in (7.8), are linear independent.

Recall now that we are free to select a point s to avoid (7.8b). Indeed, if this is not possible for any s in $(0, 1)$, then the last coordinate in (7.7) or (7.8), namely, $\omega_{1k_1}(x_1)$ will be a unique linear combination of the functions $\omega_{1k}(x_1), k = 1, \dots, k_1 - 1$ when x_1 ranges over all $(0, 1)$ (see the previous paragraph). But $\omega_{1k}(x_1), k = 1, \dots, k_1$ are orthonormal to each other in $L^2(0, 1)$ and, hence, are linear independent. Moreover, the set of such “bad” points s for which (7.8b) does not hold, can at most be countable as we discussed it after Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 in Section 3.

This completes the proof of Theorems 3.5 and 3.6.

Appendix: Proof of Theorem 3.1. We intend to adapt the scheme, previously used for system (1.1) in [6] (Chapter 3) in several spatial dimension, assuming that its solutions do not change sign, or in [3] in the case in one spatial dimension, assuming that system’s solutions can change sign finitely many times. Our goal here is to apply a suitable static control $v = v(x)$ which will steer system (1.1) from a given u_0 to any desirable state $u(\cdot, T)$ (satisfying conditions stated in Theorem 3.1) as close in $L^2(\Omega)$ to u_1 as we wish. We split the proof into two cases.

Step 1. A special case. In this step we assume the following condition:

Assumption A.1. Suppose that $|u_1(x)| < |u_0(x)|$ in the sets S_i^+ 's and S_i^- 's in Definition 3.1, and the function

$$v_0(x) = \begin{cases} \ln\left(\frac{u_1(x)}{u_0(x)}\right), & \text{where } u_0(x) \neq 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ 0, & \text{elsewhere in } \Omega, \text{ that is, on some sets of measure zero} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

lies in $L^\infty(\Omega)$.

Step 1.1: Selection of bilinear control. Note that the function $v_0(x)$ in (A.1) satisfies $v_0(x) \leq 0$ in Ω . Let

$$v(x, t) = \frac{1}{T} v_0(x). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Then, the corresponding solution to (1.1), treated as an ordinary differential equation in time in a respective Banach space, admits the following representation a.e. in Ω :

$$u(x, t) = e^{v_0(x)\frac{t}{T}} u_0(x) + \int_0^t e^{v_0(x)\frac{(t-\tau)}{T}} \Delta u(x, \tau) d\tau.$$

At time $t = T$ we have a.e. in Ω :

$$u(x, T) = u_1(x) + \int_0^T e^{v_0(x)\frac{(T-t)}{T}} \Delta u(x, t) dt. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Step 1.2: Evaluation of $\|\Delta u\|_{L^2(Q_T)}$. Let us show that the 2-nd term in the right-hand side of (A.3) tends to zero in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $T \rightarrow 0+$, which would mean that $u(\cdot, T) \rightarrow u_1$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ at the same time. Note first that, since $v_0(x)$ is nonpositive,

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\int_0^T e^{v_0(x)\frac{(T-\tau)}{T}} \Delta u(x, \tau) d\tau \right)^2 dx \leq T \|\Delta u\|_{L^2(Q_T)}^2. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Without loss of generality, we can further assume that $v_0 \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$.

Remark A.1. Indeed, if $v_0 \notin C^2(\bar{\Omega})$, then we could consider instead a sequence of uniformly bounded controls $\{v_{0l}\}_{l=1}^\infty$, $v_{0l} \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$, approximating v_0 in $L^2(\Omega)$, making use of the following limit relation:

$$e^{v_{0l}(x)t/T} u_0(x) |_{t=T} \rightarrow e^{v_0(x)t/T} u_0(x) |_{t=T} = u_1(x) \text{ in } L^2(\Omega) \text{ as } l \rightarrow \infty.$$

Multiplying (1.1) by u_{xx} with $v = \frac{1}{T}v_0 \leq 0$ and integrating by parts over Q_T , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\| \Delta u \|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T))}^2 &= \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} u_t \Delta u \, dx dt - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} v_0 u \Delta u \, dx dt \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \| \nabla u \|_t^2 \, dx dt + \frac{1}{2T} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \nabla v_0 \cdot \nabla \| u \|^2 \, dx dt + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} v_0 \| \nabla u \|^2 \, dx dt \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \| \nabla u \|_t^2 \, dx dt - \frac{1}{2T} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \Delta v_0 u^2 \, dx dt + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} v_0 \| \nabla u \|^2 \, dx dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\| \Delta u \|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T))}^2 &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \| \nabla u(x, t) \|^2 \, dx - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} v_0 \| \nabla u \|^2 \, dx dt \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \| \nabla u(x, 0) \|^2 \, dx - \frac{1}{2T} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \Delta v_0 u^2 \, dx dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

In particular, recalling that $v_0(x) \leq 0$,

$$\| \Delta u \|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T))}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \| \nabla u_0 \|^2 \, dx + \frac{1}{2T} \max_{x \in \Omega} | \Delta v_0 | \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} u^2 \, dx dt.$$

Now, since $v_0(x) \leq 0$, multiplication of (1.1) by u and integration by parts over Q_T yield:

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} u^2(x, t) \, dx dt \leq T \int_{\Omega} u_0^2(x) \, dx.$$

Hence, combining this with (A.5), we derive that

$$\| \Delta u \|_{L^2(\Omega \times (0,T))}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \| \nabla u_0 \|^2 \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \max_{x \in \Omega} | \Delta v_0 | \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} u_0^2 \, dx. \tag{A.6}$$

In turn, making use of (A.4) and (A.6), we further obtain that

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\int_0^T e^{v_0(x) \frac{(T-\tau)}{T}} \Delta u(x, \tau) \, d\tau \right)^2 \, dx \leq \frac{T}{2} \int_{\Omega} \| \nabla u_0 \|^2 \, dx + \frac{T}{2} \max_{x \in \Omega} | \Delta v_0 | \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} u_0^2 \, dx. \tag{A.7}$$

Note now that the right-hand side in (A.7) tends to zero as $T \rightarrow 0$, which combined with (A.3) and (A.4) yields the desirable approximate controllability result under Assumption A.1.

Step 2: Assumption A.1 does not hold. In this case, we will apply, first, an auxiliary constant control $v(x, t) = m > 0$ on some interval $(0, t_*)$, which generates the following solution to (1.1):

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, t_*) &= e^{mt_*} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2e^{-(\pi k)^2 t_*} \left(\int_0^1 u_0(r) \omega_k(r) dr \right) \omega_k(x) \\ &= e^{mt_*} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2(e^{-(\pi k)^2 t_*} - 1) \left(\int_0^1 u_0(r) \omega_k(r) dr \right) \omega_k(x) + e^{mt_*} u_0(x). \end{aligned}$$

Consider any $L > 1$. Then, by selecting $m = (\ln L)/t_*$, $t_* > 0$, we have that

$$e^{mt_*} = L,$$

and $u(\cdot, t_*) \rightarrow Lu_0$ in $L^2(Q_T)$ as $t_* \rightarrow 0+$.

Hence, for any positive integer i we can find a suitably large parameter L_i and respective moment $t_i > 0$ such that the inequality in the first line of Assumption A.1 will hold for $u(x, t_i)$, regarded as a new initial condition for a future action as in Step 1, everywhere except, possibly, some some (measurable) set $A_i \subset \Omega$ whose measure tends to zero as n increases.

Now, in place of the control in (A.2), we can select its modified version $v_{0n} \in L^\infty(0, 1)$ as follows:

$$v_{0n}(x) = \begin{cases} \ln \left(\frac{u_1(x)}{u(x, t_n)} \right), & x \in \Omega \setminus A_i, \\ 0, & x \in A_i, \end{cases} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots \quad (\text{A.8})$$

The argument of Step 1 yields (see (A.3) and (A.7)) that we can steer the solution of (1.1) from $u(\cdot, t_i)$ to an auxiliary target state

$$u_{1i}(x) = \begin{cases} u_1, & x \in \Omega \setminus A_i, \\ 0, & x \in A_i, \end{cases} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots$$

as close in $L^2(\Omega)$ as we wish at some moment $t_{i*} > t_i$ (see the formula between (A.2) and (A.3), and (A.6)). Since $u_1 \in L^2(Q_T)$ (and is fixed), selecting appropriately large value for i will provide that same approximate controllability result as in Step 1.

This ends the proof of Theorem 3.1.

References

- [1] J.M. Ball, J.E. Marsden, and M. Slemrod, Controllability for distributed bilinear systems, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 1982, pp. 575-597. lity of a quantum partucle in a moving potential well,*J. Funct. Anal.*, **232** (2006), pp. 328-389.
- [2] P. Cannarsa and A.Y. Khapalov, Multiplicative controllability for the one dimensional parabolic equation with target states admitting finitely many changes of sign, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-Ser. B*, 14 (2010), pp. 1293-1311.
- [3] P. Cannarsa and A.Y. Khapalov, Multiplicative controllability for semilinear reaction-diffusion equations with finitely many changes of sign (with P. Cannarsa and G. Floridia), *J. Math. pures et appl. (JMPA)*, v. 108, issue 4, pp. 425-458, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpur.2017.07.002>.
- [4] A.Y. Khapalov, Global non-negative controllability of the semilinear parabolic equation governed by bilinear control, *ESAIM: Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, **7** (2002), pp. 269-283.
- [5] A.Y. Khapalov, Controllability of the semilinear parabolic equation governed by a multiplicative control in the reaction term: A qualitative approach, *SIAM J. Control. Optim.*, **41** (2003), pp. 1886-1900.
- [6] A.Y. Khapalov, *Controllability of partial differential equations governed by multiplicative controls*, *Research Monograph, Lecture Notes in Mathematics Series*, volume 1995, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg-Dordrecht-London-New York, 284p., 2010.
- [7] O.H. Ladyzhenskaya, V.A. Solonikov and N.N. Ural'ceva, *Linear and Quasi-linear Equations of Parabolic Type*, AMS, Providence, Rhode Island, 1968.
- [8] W. Walter, *Ordinary differential equations*. Translated from the sixth German (1996) edition by Russell Thompson. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 182. Readings in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998. xii+380 pp.