

On the asymptotic stability of wave equations coupled by velocities of anti-symmetric type

Yan Cui* Zhiqiang Wang†

Abstract

In this paper, we study the asymptotic stability of two wave equations coupled by velocities of anti-symmetric type via only one damping. We adopt the frequency domain method to prove that the system with smooth initial data is logarithmically stable, provided that the coupling domain and the damping domain intersect each other. Moreover, we show, by an example, that this geometric assumption of the intersection is necessary for 1-D case.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35L05, 49K40

Key Words. Wave equations, coupled by velocities, logarithmic stability

1 Introduction and Main Results

Let $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. We are interested in the asymptotic stability of the following system of two wave equations with Dirichlet boundary condition:

$$\begin{cases} y_{tt} - \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk}(x)y_{x_j})_{x_k} + \alpha(x)z_t + \beta(x)y_t = 0 & \text{in } (0, +\infty) \times \Omega \\ z_{tt} - \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk}(x)z_{x_j})_{x_k} - \alpha(x)y_t = 0 & \text{in } (0, +\infty) \times \Omega \\ y = z = 0 & \text{on } (0, +\infty) \times \partial\Omega \\ (y(0), y_t(0), z(0), z_t(0)) = (y^0, y^1, z^0, z^1) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Here the coefficients of elliptic operator $g^{jk}(\cdot) \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R})$ satisfy

$$g^{jk}(x) = g^{kj}(x), \quad \forall x \in \overline{\Omega}, \quad j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^n g^{jk} \xi^j \xi^k \geq a|\xi|^2, \quad \forall (x, \xi^1, \dots, \xi^n) \in \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{C}^n \quad (1.3)$$

*School of Mathematics(Zhuhai), Sun Yat-sen University, P. R. China. E-mail: cuiy27@mail.sysu.edu.cn.

†School of Mathematical Sciences and Shanghai Key Laboratory for Contemporary Applied Mathematics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, P. R. China. E-mail: wzq@fudan.edu.cn.

for some constant $a > 0$.

We assume that the coupling coefficient $\alpha \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and the damping coefficient $\beta \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ are both nonnegative, and furthermore

$$\omega_\alpha \triangleq \{x \in \Omega | \alpha(x) \neq 0\} \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_\beta \triangleq \{x \in \Omega | \beta(x) \neq 0\} \neq \emptyset. \quad (1.4)$$

It is classical to consider the system (1.1) as the following Cauchy problem in space $\mathcal{H} \triangleq H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dU}{dt} = \mathcal{A}U \\ U(0) = U_0 \triangleq (y^0, y^1, z^0, z^1) \in \mathcal{H} \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

with $U = (y, u, z, v)$ and the linear operator $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \subset \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is defined as

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{A}U = (u, \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk}(x)y_{x_j})_{x_k} - \alpha(x)z_t - \beta(x)u_t, v, \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk}(x)z_{x_j})_{x_k} + \alpha(x)y_t), \\ \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) = (H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)) \times H_0^1(\Omega) \times (H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)) \times H_0^1(\Omega), \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

It is easy to know from the theory of linear operator semigroup [21] that the system (1.5) has a unique solution $U(t) = e^{t\mathcal{A}}U_0$ in $C^0([0, +\infty), \mathcal{H})$. Then, we can define the total energy of the system of (1.1) by

$$\mathbb{E}(y, z)(t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{j,k=1}^n g^{jk} y_{x_j} \bar{y}_{x_k} + |y_t|^2 \right) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{j,k=1}^n g^{jk} z_{x_j} \bar{z}_{x_k} + |z_t|^2 \right) dx, \quad (1.7)$$

which implies immediately the equivalence

$$\mathbb{E}(y, z)(t) \sim \|(y, y_t, z, z_t)(t, \cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

Obviously, the total energy is non-increasing:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}(y, z)(t) = - \int_{\Omega} \beta(x) |y_t|^2 dx \leq 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (1.8)$$

The questions that we are interested in the following:

- Under what conditions on α and β , the system (1.1) is asymptotically stable?
- If the system (1.1) is stable, what is the decay rate of the total energy $\mathbb{E}(y, z)(t)$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$?

More precisely, the main result that we obtain is the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. Assume that (1.2)-(1.3)-(1.4) hold. Assume furthermore that there exist a constant $\delta > 0$ and a nonempty open subset $\omega_\delta \subset \omega_\alpha \cap \omega_\beta \subset \Omega$ such that

$$\inf_{\omega_\delta} \alpha \geq \delta \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\omega_\delta} \beta \geq \delta. \quad (1.9)$$

Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that for any initial data $(y^0, y^1, z^0, z^1) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$, the energy of solution to (1.1) satisfies:

$$\mathbb{E}(y, z)(t) \leq \frac{C}{\ln(t+2)} \|(y_0, y_1, z_0, z_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}^2, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (1.10)$$

Moreover, the system (1.1) is strongly stable in \mathcal{H} , i.e., for any initial data $(y^0, y^1, z^0, z^1) \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}(y, z)(t) = 0. \quad (1.11)$$

Remark 1.1. In Theorem 1.1, if we assume instead that the damping and coupling coefficients α, β are both continuous on $\overline{\Omega}$, then the assumption (1.9) can be simply replaced by the following geometric condition:

$$\omega_\alpha \cap \omega_\beta \neq \emptyset. \quad (1.12)$$

Independently, based on frequency domain method and multiplier method, Kassem-Mortada-Toufayli-Wehbe [15] proved strong stability (1.11) when two waves propagate at different speed under the assumption (1.12). One can also refer to [10, Theorem 2.1] for indirect stability results of other coupled wave system by displacements under the same geometric conditions.

Remark 1.2. We provide an example in Section 4 to show that the geometric assumption $\omega_\alpha \cap \omega_\beta \neq \emptyset$ is necessary in general, which is different from the situation with coupling by displacements. One can refer to the open problem raised in [10, Remark 2.2]. As a supplement, we also refer to reader by [13, section 5.2.1.3], some numerical examples have been provided to show that for some initial data System (1.1) seems also strongly stable when $\omega_\alpha \cap \omega_\beta = \emptyset$.

Remark 1.3. The result on logarithmical stability in Theorem 1.1 is sharp. Indeed, if $\alpha \equiv 0$, the system (1.1) is decoupled into a dissipative system for (y, y_t) which is only logarithmically stable (see [18]) and a conservative one for (z, z_t) . Hence one can not expect a faster decay rate than the logarithmical one for the coupled system (1.1) no matter what the coupling α is.

Remark 1.4. In the setting of Theorem 1.1, similar stability results still hold for system (1.1) with other types of boundary conditions, for instance, Robin conditions or mixed Dirichlet-Neumann conditions [10]. However, there are no such stability results for the system with Neumann conditions, since all the constant states are equilibrium of the system and will stay at the equilibrium all the time.

In order to prove the logarithmic stability of the system (1.1) with regular initial data in Theorem 1.1, we adopt the frequency domain approach to prove certain spectral estimates of the infinitesimal generator \mathcal{A} of the solution semigroup. One can refer to [6, 18] for the case of single wave equation and [10] for the case of wave systems.

Theorem 1.2. Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 hold. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{O}_C \triangleq \left\{ \gamma \in \mathbb{C} \mid -\frac{e^{-C|\Im \gamma|}}{C} \leq \Re \gamma \leq 0 \right\} \cap \left\{ \gamma \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\gamma| \geq \frac{2}{C} \right\} \subset \rho(\mathcal{A}) \quad (1.13)$$

and the following estimate holds

$$\|(\mathcal{A} - \gamma I)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})} \leq C e^{C|\Im \gamma|}, \quad \forall \gamma \in \mathcal{O}_C. \quad (1.14)$$

Obviously, the energy decay given by (1.11) implies directly the fact $Sp(\mathcal{A}) \subset \{\gamma \in \mathbb{C} \mid \Re \gamma < 0\}$ and in particular, the origin $0 \in Sp(\mathcal{A})$. Since $\rho(\mathcal{A})$ is an open set, then the corollary follows from (1.13), upon choosing C large enough, as a byproduct of Theorem 1.2.

Corollary 1.1. Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 hold. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$Sp(\mathcal{A}) \subset \left\{ \gamma \in \mathbb{C} \mid \Re \gamma < -\frac{e^{-C|\Im \gamma|}}{C} \right\}. \quad (1.15)$$

Remark 1.5. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is based on Global Carleman estimates (see [11]), which is quite elementary and allowed to address many stabilization problems for the system with lower order terms. Moreover, it can be used to obtain explicit bounds on some estimates of decay rate or constants costs in terms of the coefficients. Roughly speaking, (1.14) is equivalent to an observable estimate with constant cost like $e^{C|\gamma|}$ for coupled elliptic system, which seems quite natural to adopt Global Carleman estimates to obtain these type estimates (see Lemma 3.1 in section 3.1 for more details).

Remark 1.6. We should point out that we can not directly adopt the approach in this paper to obtain the logarithmic stability of System (1.1) when two waves have different propagating speed. Roughly speaking, one key step in the proof of important Lemma 3.1 is using an easy fact that $\partial_s p \cdot [\partial_{ss} q + \partial_i(g^{ij} \partial_j q)] + \partial_s q \cdot [\partial_{ss} p + \partial_i(g^{ij} \partial_j p)] = \partial_s [\partial_s p \partial_s q + p \partial_i(g^{ij} \partial_j \partial_s q)] + \partial_i(g^{ij} \partial_s q \partial_j p) - \partial_i(g^{ij} p \partial_j \partial_s q)$, which can be used to give an estimate that L^2 norm of the coupling term with force terms can control the H^1 energy. However, this fact is invalid for the case of two waves with different propagating speed.

1.1 Previous results

There are a lot of results about asymptotic stability or stabilization of wave equations. Among them, Rauch-Taylor [24] and Bardos-Lebeau-Rauch [5] pointed out that, the single damped wave equation is exponentially stable if and (almost) only if the Geometric Control Condition (GCC) is satisfied: *There exists $T > 0$ such that every geodesic flow touches the support set of damping term before T .* If the damping acts on a small open set but the GCC is not satisfied, Lebeau[18] and Burq[6] proved that the wave equation is logarithmically stable for regular initial data. There are also many results about polynomial stability of a single

wave equation with special condition on the damping domain, cf. [7, 23, 4, 17]. Recently Jin proved in [14] the damped wave equation on hyperbolic surface with constant curvature is exponentially stable even if the damping domain is arbitrarily small.

As for the case of coupled wave equations or other reversible equations, indirect stability is an important issue both in mathematical theory or in engineering application. Indeed, it arises whenever it is impossible or too expensive to damp all the components of the state, and it is hence important to study stabilization properties of coupled systems with a reduced number of feedbacks. For finite dimensional systems, it is fully understood thanks to the Kalman rank condition. While in the case of coupled partial differential equations, the situation is much more complicated. It depends not only on the algebraic structure of coupling but also the geometric properties of the damping and coupling domain.

Alabau-Boussouira first studied indirect stability of a weakly coupled wave system where the coupling is through the displacements. In [1], she adopted multiplier method to obtain polynomial stability for wave system with anti-symmetric type coupling under stronger geometric conditions for both the coupling and damping terms. Moreover, she proved that this result was sharp for coupling with displacement. In [2], the polynomial stability results for coupled systems under an abstract framework (including wave-wave system, wave-plate system etc.) were obtained under the conditions that both coupling and damping are localized and satisfy the Piecewise Multipliers Geometric Conditions (PMGC, see [19]). For 1-D case, a sharp decay rate of polynomial stability was obtained by Riesz basis method in [20]. In [10], Fu adopted global Carleman estimates and frequency domain method to prove that system with coupling by displacement of symmetric type was logarithmically stable with the assumption that coupling domain intersects the damping domain.

The above results concern only the weakly coupled system. In [3], Alabau-Wang-Yu studied the indirect stability for wave equations coupled by velocities with a general nonlinear damping. By multiplier method, they obtained various types of stability results, including exponential stability, under strong geometric condition on the coupling and damping domains. They also points out, for the first time, that it is more efficient way to transfer the energy in case of coupling by velocities compared to the case with coupling by displacements. For 1-D case with constant coefficients, the sharp decay rate was explicitly given in [8]. In [16], Klein computes the best exponent for the stabilization of wave equations on compact manifolds. The coefficient he obtains is therefore solution of some ODE system of matrices. Kassem-Mortada-Toufayli-Wehbe [15] studied a system of two wave equations coupled by velocities with only one localized damping, the waves propagate at different speed and the positivity and smallness assumptions of the continuous coupling coefficient can be removed. They obtained a strong stability result with the assumption that coupling domain intersects the damping domain. Moreover, assuming coupling and damping coefficient belong to $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and the intersection of coupling domain and damping domain holds PMGC, based on Frequency Domain method and multiplier method, they established an exponential energy

decay when the waves propagate at the same speed and polynomial energy decay when the waves propagate at the different speed. Recently, the exponential energy decay result has been generalized by Gerbi-Kassem-Mortada-Wehbe in [13] to the case that the intersection of the coupling and the damping domain holds GCC.

To the authors' knowledge, most known indirect stability results are obtained under the geometric conditions that the damping domain intersects the coupling domain. Indeed, this guarantees effectively the energy transmission in higher space dimension. It is remarkable that Alabau-Boussouira and Léauteau [2] proved an indirect stability result in 1-D case where the damping domain and the coupling domain are two intervals which do not intersect.

1.2 Main contribution and ideas

As already pointed out in [3], the energy transition is more efficient through the first order coupling (by velocities) compared to zero order coupling (by displacements). This is natural since the first order coupling effect can be seen as a bounded perturbation to the system while the zero order coupling is a compact one. Nevertheless, one can not expect a faster decay (than logarithmical one) of the whole system (1.1) even if a first order coupling appears, because the energy of the single wave equation with damping localized in small domain only decays logarithmically. In this sense, the stability results are sharp.

Not surprisingly, the indirect stability result is obtained by assuming essentially the damping and coupling domain intersect. However, we give an example to show that this geometric condition is necessary in general for the wave system coupled by velocities. This is quite different from the system coupled by displacements, see [2].

As for the proof of the main theorems, we adopt the frequency domain approach to reduce the stability problem to an estimate on resolvent which can be obtained by global Carleman estimates of an elliptic equation as in [10]. Different from the system in [10], there are no zero order terms explicitly in the system (1.1). In order to derive the L^2 energy of the solution, we then need to make fully use of the coupling structure together with Poincaré Inequality under homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition.

1.3 Organization of the paper

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some basic facts about frequency domain method and global Carleman estimates for an elliptic equation. In Section 3, we give the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 as well as the technical Lemma 3.1, which is crucial to the proof of Theorem 1.2. Finally in Section 4, we give an example of system (1.1) with $\omega_\alpha \cap \omega_\beta = \emptyset$, which is indeed unstable.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we briefly recall the frequency domain method and global Carleman estimates for an elliptic equation.

2.1 Frequency domain method

Thanks to classical semigroup theory, \mathcal{A} generates a C_0 -semigroup operator $\{e^{t\mathcal{A}}\}_{t \geq 0}$ on \mathcal{H} such that $S(t)U_0$. It is well-known that the logarithmic stability of the system (1.1) is equivalent to a resolvent estimate [6, 18]. More precisely, we have

Lemma 2.1. Let \mathcal{A} be defined by (1.6). If

$$\|(\mathcal{A} - i\sigma I)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})} \leq Ce^{C|\sigma|}, \quad \forall \sigma \in \mathbb{R}, |\sigma| > 1 \quad (2.1)$$

then, there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $U_0 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}^2) \triangleq \{U \in \mathcal{H} | \mathcal{A}U \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})\}$,

$$\|e^{t\mathcal{A}}U_0\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \left(\frac{C}{\ln(t+2)}\right)^2 \|U_0\|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}^2)}, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (2.2)$$

Obviously, (1.14) in Theorem 1.2 implies the assumption (2.1) in Lemma 2.1. Once Theorem 1.2 is proved, the logarithmic decay estimate (1.10) in Theorem 1.1 can be easily obtained by Calderon-Lions interpolation theorem and (2.2).

2.2 Global Carleman estimates

To obtain resolvent estimates (1.14), we need to introduce the global Carleman estimates for elliptic equation, see [9, 10, 12].

Let ω_0 be an open set such that $\omega_0 \subset\subset \omega_\delta \subset \omega_\alpha \cap \omega_\beta$. There exists $\hat{\psi} \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\hat{\psi} > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \hat{\psi} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla \hat{\psi}| > 0 \text{ in } \overline{\Omega \setminus \omega_0}. \quad (2.3)$$

Next, we introduce some weight functions:

$$\theta = e^l, \quad l = \lambda\phi, \quad \phi = e^{\mu\psi} \quad (2.4)$$

with

$$\psi = \psi(s, x) \triangleq \frac{\hat{\psi}(x)}{\|\hat{\psi}\|_{L^\infty}} + b^2 - s^2, \quad s \in [-b, b], x \in \overline{\Omega}. \quad (2.5)$$

Here $b > 0$ and $\lambda, \mu, s \in \mathbb{R}$ are all constants.

Let's consider a single elliptic equation:

$$\begin{cases} w_{ss} + \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} w_{x_j})_{x_k} = f, & \text{in } (-b, b) \times \Omega, \\ w = 0, & \text{on } (-b, b) \times \partial\Omega, \\ w(\pm b, \cdot) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

where $g^{jk}(\cdot) \in C^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ satisfy (1.2)-(1.3). Then for every $f \in L^2((-b, b) \times \Omega)$, the elliptic system (2.6) has a unique solution $w \in H_0^1((-b, b) \times \Omega)$. Then we have the following global Carleman estimates of solution.

Theorem 2.1 ([10]). Let $b \in (1, 2]$ and $\theta, \phi \in C^2([-b, b] \times \overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R})$ be defined by (2.4)-(2.5). Then there exists $\mu_0 > 0$, such that for any $\mu \geq \mu_0$, there exist $C = C(\mu) > 0$ and $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\mu)$ such that for any $f \in L^2((-b, b) \times \Omega)$, the solution w to system (2.6) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda \mu^2 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi (a |\nabla w|^2 + |w_s|^2 + \lambda^2 \mu^2 \phi^2 |w|^2) dx ds \\ & \leq C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 |f|^2 dx ds + C \lambda \mu^2 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_0} \theta^2 \phi (|\nabla w|^2 + |w_s|^2 + \lambda^2 \mu^2 \phi^2 |w|^2) dx ds, \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0(\mu)$.

3 Proofs of main theorems

In this section, we give the proofs of the main theorems, i.e., Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. First in Subsection 3.1, we prove Theorem 1.2, particularly the resolvent estimates (3.16), based on some interpolation estimates on elliptic equations. Then by Theorem 1.2 and **Calderon**-Lions interpolation inequality, we conclude Theorem 1.1 in Subsection 3.2. Finally in Subsection 3.3, we prove Lemma 3.1 concerning an interpolation inequality of coupled elliptic equations, which is crucial to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Throughout this subsection, we use $C = C(\Omega, \alpha, \beta)$ to denote generic positive constants which may vary from line to line (unless otherwise stated).

Let $F = (f^0, f^1, g^0, g^1) \in \mathcal{H}$ and $U_0 = (y^0, y^1, z^0, z^1) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ be such that

$$(\mathcal{A} - \gamma I)U_0 = F, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$ and \mathcal{A} be given by (1.6). Then (3.1) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} -\gamma y^0 + y^1 = f^0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} y_{x_j}^0)_{x_k} - \alpha(x) z^1 - (\beta(x) + \gamma) y^1 = f^1 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\gamma y^0 + y^1 = g^0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} z_{x_j}^0)_{x_k} - \gamma y^1 + \alpha(x) y^1 = g^1 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ y^0 = z^0 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

or furthermore

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} y_{x_j}^0)_{x_k} - \gamma^2 y^0 - \gamma \alpha(x) z^0 - \gamma \beta(x) y^0 = F^0 \triangleq (\beta(x) + \gamma) f^0 + f^1 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} z_{x_j}^0)_{x_k} - \gamma^2 z^0 + \gamma \alpha(x) z^0 = F^1 \triangleq \gamma g^0 + g^1 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ y^0 = z^0 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ y^1 = f^0 + \gamma y^0, z^1 = g^0 + \gamma z^0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

In order to prove (1.14), it suffices to prove that there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\|(y^0, y^1, z^0, z^1)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C e^{C|\Im \gamma|} \|(f^0, f^1, g^0, g^1)\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \forall \gamma \in \mathcal{O}_C. \quad (3.3)$$

For this purpose, we set

$$p(s, x) = e^{i\gamma s} y^0(x), \quad q(s, x) = e^{i\gamma s} z^0(x), \quad (s, x) \in (-2, 2) \times \Omega. \quad (3.4)$$

Then p and q satisfy the following coupled elliptic equation

$$\begin{cases} p_{ss} + \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} p_{x_j})_{x_k} + i\alpha(x) q_s + i\beta(x) p_s = G^0 \triangleq F^0 e^{i\gamma s}, & \text{in } (-2, 2) \times \Omega, \\ q_{ss} + \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} q_{x_j})_{x_k} - i\alpha(x) p_s = G^1 \triangleq F^1 e^{i\gamma s}, & \text{in } (-2, 2) \times \Omega, \\ p = q = 0, & \text{on } (-2, 2) \times \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

Note that there are no boundary conditions on $s = \pm 2$ in the above system (3.5). We have the following lemma on interpolation estimate, while its proof is left in Subsection 3.3.

Lemma 3.1. Under the assumption of Theorem 1.1, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $\lambda > 0$ big enough, the solution (p, q) to (3.5) with form (3.4) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|p\|_{H^1(Y)} + \|q\|_{H^1(Y)} &\leq C e^{C\lambda} (\|G^0\|_{L^2(X)} + \|G^1\|_{L^2(X)} + \|p\|_{H^1(-2,2;L^2(\omega_\delta))}) \\ &\quad + C e^{-2\lambda} (\|p\|_{H^1(X)} + \|q\|_{H^1(X)}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$X \triangleq (-2, 2) \times \Omega, \quad Y \triangleq (-1, 1) \times \Omega, \quad Z \triangleq (-2, 2) \times \omega_\delta. \quad (3.7)$$

On the other hand, by (3.4), we have

$$\begin{cases} \|y^0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} + \|z^0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \leq C e^{C|\Im \gamma|} (\|p\|_{H^1(-1,1;H_0^1(\Omega))} + \|q\|_{H^1(-1,1;H_0^1(\Omega))}), \\ \|p\|_{H^1(-2,2;H_0^1(\Omega))} + \|q\|_{H^1(-2,2;H_0^1(\Omega))} \leq C e^{C|\Im \gamma|} (|\gamma| + 1) (\|y^0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} + \|z^0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}), \\ \|p\|_{H^1(-2,2;L^2(\omega_\delta))} \leq C e^{C|\Im \gamma|} |\gamma| \|y^0\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Combining (3.8) and (3.6), we get

$$\|y^0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} + \|z^0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \leq C e^{C|\Im \gamma|} (\|f^0, f^1, g^0, g^1\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|y^0\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}). \quad (3.9)$$

Next, we turn to estimate $\|y^0\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}$. Let $\zeta \in C_0^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ be a cutoff function such that

$$0 \leq \zeta(x) \leq 1 \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta(x) \equiv 1 \quad \text{in } \omega_\delta \subset \omega_\alpha \cap \omega_\beta. \quad (3.10)$$

Multiplying y -equation in (3.2) by $2\zeta\bar{y}^0$ and integrating by parts on Ω yield that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \left(- \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} y_{x_j}^0)_{x_k} + \gamma^2 y^0 + \gamma \alpha(x) z^0 + \gamma \beta(x) y^0 \right) \cdot 2\zeta \bar{y}^0 dx \\ &= 2\gamma^2 \int_{\Omega} \zeta |y^0|^2 dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} \zeta \sum_{j,k=1}^n g^{jk} y_{x_j}^0 \bar{y}_{x_k}^0 dx - \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} \zeta_{x_j})_{x_k} |y^0|^2 dx \\ & \quad + 2\gamma \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) \zeta \bar{y}^0 z^0 dx + 2\gamma \int_{\Omega} \beta(x) \zeta |y^0|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} F^0 \cdot 2\zeta \bar{y}^0 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Similarly, multiplying z -equation in (3.2) by $2\zeta\bar{z}^0$ and integrating by parts on Ω yield that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \left(- \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} z_{x_j}^0)_{x_k} + \gamma^2 z^0 - \gamma \alpha(x) y^0 \right) \cdot 2\zeta \bar{z}^0 dx \\ &= 2\gamma^2 \int_{\Omega} \zeta |z^0|^2 dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} \zeta \sum_{j,k=1}^n g^{jk} z_{x_j}^0 \bar{z}_{x_k}^0 dx - \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} \zeta_{x_j})_{x_k} |z^0|^2 dx \\ & \quad - 2\gamma \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) \zeta y^0 \bar{z}^0 dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} F^1 \cdot 2\zeta \bar{z}^0 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Note that

$$\Im(\gamma \bar{y}^0 z^0 - \gamma y^0 \bar{z}^0) = \Im[\gamma(\bar{y}^0 z^0 - y^0 \bar{z}^0)] = \Re \gamma \cdot 2\Im(\bar{y}^0 z^0).$$

Adding (3.11) to (3.12) and taking the imaginary part result in

$$\begin{aligned} 4\Re \gamma \Im \gamma \int_{\Omega} \zeta (|z^0|^2 + |y^0|^2) dx + 2\Im \gamma \int_{\Omega} \zeta \beta(x) |y^0|^2 dx + 2\Re \gamma \int_{\Omega} \alpha \zeta \Im(\bar{y}^0 z^0) dx \\ = \int_{\Omega} 2\zeta \cdot \Im(F^0 \bar{y}^0 + F^1 \bar{z}^0) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then it follows by Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the definition of β, F^0, F^1 that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Im \gamma| \int_{\omega_\delta} \beta(x) |y^0|^2 dx &\leq |\Im \gamma| \int_{\Omega} \zeta \beta(x) |y^0|^2 dx \\ &\leq C |\Re \gamma| (|\Im \gamma| + 1) (\|y^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|z^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2) \\ &\quad + C (\|F^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|F^1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2) \\ &\leq C |\Re \gamma| (|\Im \gamma| + 1) (\|y^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|z^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2) \\ &\quad + C (|\gamma| + 1) \|(f^0, f^1, g^0, g^1)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by (3.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\Im \gamma| \int_{\omega_\delta} \beta(x) |y^0|^2 dx &\leq C |\Re \gamma| (|\Im \gamma| + 1) e^{C|\Im \gamma|} \|y^0\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)}^2 \\ &\quad + C (|\Re \gamma| |\Im \gamma| + |\gamma| + 1) e^{C|\Im \gamma|} \|(f^0, f^1, g^0, g^1)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

By definition of \mathcal{O}_C , we take $C > 0$ large enough such that

$$C|\Re\gamma|(|\Im\gamma| + 1)e^{C|\Im\gamma|} \leq \frac{\delta|\Im\gamma|}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \Im\gamma > \frac{1}{C} \quad (3.14)$$

for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}_C$. Note also the fact $\beta(x) \geq \delta$ a.e. in ω_δ . Then it follows from (3.13) and (3.14) that

$$\|y^0\|_{L^2(\omega_\delta)} \leq Ce^{C|\Im\gamma|}\|(f^0, f^1, g^0, g^1)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \quad (3.15)$$

for some $C > 0$ large enough. Combining (3.9) and (3.15) gives

$$\|y^0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} + \|z^0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \leq Ce^{C|\Im\gamma|}\|(f^0, f^1, g^0, g^1)\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Since $y^1 = f^0 + \gamma y^0$, $z^1 = g^0 + \gamma z^0$, we have also

$$\begin{aligned} \|y^1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z^1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \|f^0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} + \|g^0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} + |\gamma|(\|y^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) \\ &\leq Ce^{C|\Im\gamma|}\|(f^0, f^1, g^0, g^1)\|_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the desired estimate (3.3) indeed holds for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}_C$.

Consequently, $\mathcal{A} - \gamma I$ is a bijection from $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ to \mathcal{H} which satisfies the resolvent estimate (1.14). We conclude the proof of Theorem 1.2.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

As a corollary of Theorem 1.2, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\|(\mathcal{A} - i\sigma I)^{-1}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{H})} \leq Ce^{C|\sigma|}, \quad \forall \sigma \in \mathbb{R}, |\sigma| > 1. \quad (3.16)$$

Then by Lemma 2.1, we have for $U_0 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}^2)$ that

$$\|e^{t\mathcal{A}}U_0\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \left(\frac{C}{\ln(t+2)}\right)^2 \|U_0\|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}^2)}, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (3.17)$$

On the other hand, the contraction of the semigroup $e^{t\mathcal{A}}$ implies that

$$\|e^{t\mathcal{A}}U_0\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|U_0\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (3.18)$$

Note that $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ is an interpolate space between $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}^2)$ and \mathcal{H} . Combing (3.17)-(3.18) and using Calderon-Lions interpolation theorem (see [25, p. 38, Example 1 and p. 44, Proposition 8]), we conclude for all $U_0 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ that

$$\|e^{t\mathcal{A}}U_0\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \frac{C}{\ln(t+2)} \|U_0\|_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (3.19)$$

which is equivalent to the logarithmical decay estimate (1.10).

Finally we conclude by (3.19) and density argument that the system (1.1) is strongly stable, i.e., for all $U_0 \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|e^{t\mathcal{A}}U_0\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is complete.

3.3 Proof of Lemma 3.1

In this subsection, we give the proof of Lemma 3.1 which plays a key role in proving Theorem 1.2. The proof is divided into 6 steps. In this subsection, we denote $C > 0$ various constants independent of λ which can be different from one line to another.

◦ **Step 1.** We derive a weighted estimate (3.28) for (p, q) , the solution of (3.5).

Note that there are no boundary conditions on $p(\pm 2, \cdot), q(\pm 2, \cdot)$ in (3.5). Let us introduce a cutoff function $\varphi = \varphi(s) \in C_0^3((-b, b); \mathbb{R})$ (see for instance [22]) such that

$$0 \leq \varphi(s) \leq 1 \text{ in } [-b, b] \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(s) \equiv 1 \text{ in } [-b_0, b_0]. \quad (3.20)$$

where the constants b_0, b are given by:

$$b \triangleq \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{\mu} \ln(2 + e^\mu)}, \quad b_0 \triangleq \sqrt{b^2 - \frac{1}{\mu} \ln\left(\frac{1 + e^\mu}{e^\mu}\right)}, \quad \forall \mu > 0. \quad (3.21)$$

Obviously, if $\mu > \ln 2$, then

$$1 < b_0 < b < 2. \quad (3.22)$$

Let

$$\hat{p}(s, x) = \varphi(s)p(s, x), \quad \hat{q}(s, x) = \varphi(s)q(s, x), \quad (s, x) \in (-b, b) \times \Omega. \quad (3.23)$$

then, we consider the elliptic equations that \hat{p}, \hat{q} satisfy in $(-b, b) \times \Omega$:

$$\begin{cases} \hat{p}_{ss} + \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} \hat{p}_{x_j})_{x_k} = \hat{G}^0, & \text{in } (-b, b) \times \Omega, \\ \hat{q}_{ss} + \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} \hat{q}_{x_j})_{x_k} = \hat{G}^1, & \text{in } (-b, b) \times \Omega, \\ \hat{p} = \hat{q} = 0, & \text{on } (-b, b) \times \partial\Omega \\ \hat{p}(\pm b, \cdot) = \hat{q}(\pm b, \cdot) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.24)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{G}^0 &\triangleq \varphi_{ss}p + 2\varphi_s p_s + \varphi G^0 + i\alpha(x)(\varphi_s q - \hat{q}_s) + i\beta(x)(\varphi_s p - \hat{p}_s), \\ \hat{G}^1 &\triangleq \varphi_{ss}q + 2\varphi_s q_s + \varphi G^1 - i\alpha(x)(\varphi_s p - \hat{p}_s). \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

By applying Theorem 2.1 to both \hat{p} and \hat{q} , there exists $\mu_0 > \ln 2$ such that for any $\mu \geq \mu_0$, there exist $C = C(\mu) > 0$ and $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\mu)$ such that for any $\lambda \geq \lambda_0(\mu)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda \mu^2 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi (a |\nabla \hat{p}|^2 + |\hat{p}_s|^2 + \lambda^2 \mu^2 \phi^2 |\hat{p}|^2) dx ds \\ &\leq C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 |\hat{G}^0|^2 dx ds + C \lambda \mu^2 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_0} \theta^2 \phi (|\nabla \hat{p}|^2 + |\hat{p}_s|^2 + \lambda^2 \mu^2 \phi^2 |\hat{p}|^2) dx ds \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda \mu^2 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi (a |\nabla \hat{q}|^2 + |\hat{q}_s|^2 + \lambda^2 \mu^2 \phi^2 |\hat{q}|^2) dx ds \\ &\leq C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 |\hat{G}^1|^2 dx ds + C \lambda \mu^2 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_0} \theta^2 \phi (|\nabla \hat{q}|^2 + |\hat{q}_s|^2 + \lambda^2 \mu^2 \phi^2 |\hat{q}|^2) dx ds, \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

where \hat{G}^0, \hat{G}^1 are given by (3.25) and $\omega_0 \subset \subset \omega_\delta \subset \omega_\alpha \cap \omega_\beta$. Adding (3.26) to (3.27) gives

$$I_0 \leq I_1 + I_2 \quad (3.28)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_0 &\triangleq \lambda \mu^2 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi (a |\nabla \hat{p}|^2 + |\hat{p}_s|^2 + \lambda^2 \mu^2 \phi^2 |\hat{p}|^2 + a |\nabla \hat{q}|^2 + |\hat{q}_s|^2 + \lambda^2 \mu^2 \phi^2 |\hat{q}|^2) dx ds \\ I_1 &\triangleq C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 (|\hat{G}^0|^2 + |\hat{G}^1|^2) dx ds \\ I_2 &\triangleq C \lambda \mu^2 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_0} \theta^2 \phi (|\nabla \hat{p}|^2 + |\hat{p}_s|^2 + \lambda^2 \mu^2 \phi^2 |\hat{p}|^2 + |\nabla \hat{q}|^2 + |\hat{q}_s|^2 + \lambda^2 \mu^2 \phi^2 |\hat{q}|^2) dx ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

◦ **Step 2.** We estimate I_0 in (3.29) from below.

By the choice of θ, l, ϕ in (2.4) and b, b_0 in (3.21), we have

$$\theta \geq e^{\lambda(2+e^\mu)}, \quad \forall |s| \leq 1, x \in \Omega. \quad (3.30)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} I_0 &\geq \lambda \mu^2 \int_{-b_0}^{b_0} \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi (a |\nabla p|^2 + |p_s|^2 + \lambda^2 \mu^2 \phi^2 |p|^2 + a |\nabla q|^2 + |q_s|^2 + \lambda^2 \mu^2 \phi^2 |q|^2) dx ds \\ &\geq \lambda e^{2\lambda(2+e^\mu)} C(\mu) \int_{-1}^1 \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla p|^2 + |p_s|^2 + |p|^2 + |\nabla q|^2 + |q_s|^2 + |q|^2) dx ds \\ &= \lambda e^{2\lambda(2+e^\mu)} C(\mu) (\|p\|_{H^1(Y)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^1(Y)}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

◦ **Step 3.** We estimate I_1 in (3.29) from above.

Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get easily

$$I_1 \leq I_{11} + I_{12} + I_{13} \quad (3.32)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{11} &\triangleq C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 (|\hat{G}_1^0|^2 + |\hat{G}_1^1|^2) dx ds, \\ &\quad \text{with } \hat{G}_1^0 = \varphi_{ss} p + 2\varphi_s p_s + i\alpha(x)\varphi_s q + i\beta(x)\varphi_s p, \quad \hat{G}_1^1 = \varphi_{ss} q + 2\varphi_s q_s - i\alpha(x)\varphi_s p|^2, \\ I_{12} &\triangleq C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 (|i\alpha(x)\hat{q}_s + i\beta(x)\hat{p}_s|^2 + |i\alpha(x)\hat{p}_s|^2) dx ds, \\ I_{13} &\triangleq C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^2 (|G^0|^2 + |G^1|^2) dx ds \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

Here we denote \hat{G}_1^0, \hat{G}_1^1 some terms concerning the derivatives of φ in \hat{G}^0, \hat{G}^1 , which are useful for the estimation below.

By the choice of θ, l, ϕ in (2.4) and b, b_0 in (3.21), we have

$$\theta \leq e^{\lambda(1+e^\mu)}, \quad \forall b_0 \leq |s| \leq b, x \in \Omega. \quad (3.34)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{11} &= C \int_{(-b, -b_0) \cup (b_0, b)} \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 (|\varphi_{ss}p + 2\varphi_s p_s + i\alpha(x)\varphi_s q + i\beta(x)\varphi_s p|^2 \\
&\quad + |\varphi_{ss}q + 2\varphi_s q_s - i\alpha(x)\varphi_s p|^2) dx ds \\
&\leq e^{2\lambda(1+e^\mu)} C(\mu) \int_{(-b, -b_0) \cup (b_0, b)} \int_{\Omega} (|p|^2 + |p_s|^2 + |q|^2 + |q_s|^2) dx ds \\
&\leq e^{2\lambda(1+e^\mu)} C(\mu) (\|p\|_{H^1(X)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^1(X)}^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

Obviously,

$$I_{12} \leq C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 (|\hat{p}_s|^2 + |\hat{q}_s|^2) dx ds \leq \frac{C(\mu)}{\lambda} I_0 \leq \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} I_0, \tag{3.36}$$

which can be absorbed by I_0 if λ is large enough.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq e^{2\lambda(1+e^\mu)} C(\mu) (\|p\|_{H^1(X)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^1(X)}^2) + \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} I_0 \\
&\quad + C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \varphi^2 (|G^0|^2 + |G^1|^2) dx ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

◦ **Step 4.** We estimate the localized term I_2 in (3.29) from above.

We write it as

$$I_2 = I_{21} + I_{22} + I_{23} + I_{24}, \tag{3.38}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{21} &\triangleq C\lambda\mu^2 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_0} \theta^2 \phi (|\nabla \hat{p}|^2 + |\hat{p}_s|^2) dx ds, & I_{22} &\triangleq C\lambda^3\mu^4 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_0} \theta^2 \phi^3 |\hat{p}|^2 dx ds, \\
I_{23} &\triangleq C\lambda\mu^2 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_0} \theta^2 \phi (|\nabla \hat{q}|^2 + |\hat{q}_s|^2) dx ds, & I_{24} &\triangleq C\lambda^3\mu^4 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_0} \theta^2 \phi^3 |\hat{q}|^2 dx ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall the definitions \hat{p}, \hat{q} in (3.23), φ in (3.20) and θ, l, ϕ in (2.3)-(2.5). It's easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned}
l_s &= -2\lambda\mu s\phi, & l_{x_j} &= \lambda\mu\phi\psi_{x_j}, & l_{x_j s} &= -2\lambda\mu^2 s\phi\psi_{x_j}, \\
l_{ss} &= 4\lambda\mu^2 s^2\phi - 2\lambda\mu\phi, & l_{x_j x_k} &= \lambda\mu^2\phi\psi_{x_j}\psi_{x_k} + \lambda\mu\phi\psi_{x_j x_k}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.39}$$

Denote ω_k ($k = 1, 2, 3$) some open subsets in Ω such that $\omega_0 \subset\subset \omega_1 \subset\subset \omega_2 \subset\subset \omega_3 \subset\subset \omega_\delta$. Let $\eta_j \in C_0^3(\omega_j; \mathbb{R})$ ($j = 1, 2, 3$) be suitable cut-off functions such that

$$\eta_j(x) \equiv 1 \text{ in } \omega_{j-1}, \quad 0 \leq \eta_j(x) \leq 1 \text{ in } \omega_j, \quad \eta_j(x) \equiv 0 \text{ in } \Omega \setminus \omega_j. \tag{3.40}$$

Moreover, we choose further η_2 such that

$$|(\eta_2)_{x_j}(\eta_2)_{x_k}| \leq C\eta_2, \quad \forall x \in \omega_2. \tag{3.41}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. The existence of η_2 is shown at the end of the proof.

◦ **Step 4.1.** We estimate a weighted energy for $(\nabla \hat{q}, \hat{q}_s)$, i.e., $\int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_0} \theta^2 \phi (|\nabla \hat{q}|^2 + |\hat{q}_s|^2) dx ds$.

By definition of η_1 , it suffices to estimate $\int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2 (a|\nabla \hat{q}|^2 + |\hat{q}_s|^2) dx ds$. To do this, we multiply \hat{q} -equation in (3.24) by $\theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2 \bar{\hat{q}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2 \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{G}^1 &= \theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2 \bar{\hat{q}} \cdot \left[\hat{q}_{ss} + \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} \hat{q}_{x_j})_{x_k} \right] \\ &= (\theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2 \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{q}_s)_s - \theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2 |\hat{q}_s|^2 - (\theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2)_s \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{q}_s + \sum_{k=1}^n \left[\theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2 \sum_{j=1}^n g^{jk} \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{q}_{x_j} \right]_{x_k} \\ &\quad - \theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2 \sum_{j,k=1}^n g^{jk} \hat{q}_{x_j} \bar{\hat{q}}_{x_k} - \sum_{j,k=1}^n g^{jk} (\theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2)_{x_j} \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{q}_{x_j}. \end{aligned}$$

It reduces equivalently to

$$\begin{aligned} &\theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2 \cdot \left[|\hat{q}_s|^2 + \sum_{j,k=1}^n g^{jk} \hat{q}_{x_j} \bar{\hat{q}}_{x_k} \right] \\ &= \theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2 \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{G}^1 + (\theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2 \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{q}_s)_s - (\theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2)_s \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{q}_s + \sum_{k=1}^n \left[\theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2 \sum_{j=1}^n g^{jk} \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{q}_{x_j} \right]_{x_k} \\ &\quad - \sum_{j,k=1}^n g^{jk} (\theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2)_{x_j} \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{q}_{x_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating (3.3) over $(-b, b) \times \Omega$, we obtain, upon using (3.24), (1.2), (1.3) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_0} \theta^2 \phi (a|\nabla \hat{q}|^2 + |\hat{q}_s|^2) dx ds &\leq \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi \eta_1^2 (a|\nabla \hat{q}|^2 + |\hat{q}_s|^2) dx ds \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\lambda \mu^2} \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 |\hat{G}^1|^2 dx ds + C \lambda^2 \mu^2 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_1} \theta^2 \phi^3 |\hat{q}|^2 dx ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.42)$$

The factor $\frac{C}{\lambda \mu^2}$ is important for the estimate of I_2 , see (3.57).

◦ **Step 4.2.** We estimate a weighted energy for \hat{q} , i.e., $\int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_1} \theta^2 \phi^3 |\hat{q}|^2 dx ds$.

By definition of η_2 , it suffices to find an up bound for $\int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}|^2 dx ds$. We claim that there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}|^2 dx ds \leq C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}_s|^2 dx ds. \quad (3.43)$$

Indeed, in view of (3.4), we have

$$|\hat{q}| = |\varphi z^0|, \quad |\hat{q}_s| = |\varphi_s + i\gamma\varphi| |z^0|, \quad \forall (s, x) \in [-b, b] \times \Omega.$$

Notice that

$$|\varphi_s + i\gamma\varphi| = |\gamma||\varphi| \geq C|\varphi|, \quad \forall s \in (-b_0, b_0), \gamma \in \mathcal{O}_C,$$

then

$$\int_{-b_0}^{b_0} \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}|^2 dx ds \leq C \int_{-b_0}^{b_0} \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}_s|^2 dx ds \leq C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}_s|^2 dx ds. \quad (3.44)$$

Recalling (3.30) and (3.34), we can obtain from the choice of φ , b , b_0 in (3.20) and (3.22), that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{(-b, -b_0) \cup (b_0, b)} \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}|^2 dx ds &= \int_{(-b, -b_0) \cup (b_0, b)} \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \varphi^2 \eta_2^2 |z^0|^2 dx ds \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \eta_2^2 |z^0|^2 \int_{(-b, -b_0) \cup (b_0, b)} \theta^2 \phi^3 \varphi^2 ds dx \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} \eta_2^2 |z^0|^2 \int_{(-b, -b_0) \cup (b_0, b)} e^{2\lambda(1+e^\mu)} e^{3\mu\psi(\pm 1, x)} ds dx \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} \eta_2^2 |z^0|^2 \int_{-1}^1 e^{2\lambda(2+e^\mu)} e^{3\mu\psi(\pm 1, x)} ds dx \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} \eta_2^2 |z^0|^2 \int_{-1}^1 \theta^2 \phi^3 \varphi^2 ds dx \\
&\leq \int_{-b_0}^{b_0} \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}|^2 dx ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.45}$$

Combing (3.44) and (3.45) yields (3.43) immediately.

◦ **Step 4.3.** We estimate $\int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}_s|^2 dx ds$ by using the coupling relation in (3.24). Multiplying \hat{p} -equation in (3.24) by $i\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 \bar{\hat{q}}_s$, and arranging the terms, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(x) \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}_s|^2 &= i\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 \bar{\hat{q}}_s \left[\hat{p}_{ss} + \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} \hat{p}_{x_j})_{x_k} \right] \\
&\quad - i\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 \bar{\hat{q}}_s [\hat{G}_1^0 + \varphi G^0 - i\beta(x) \hat{p}_s],
\end{aligned} \tag{3.46}$$

where \hat{G}_1^0 is given in (3.33) and it only concerns the terms with derivatives of φ .

Direct computations yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 \bar{\hat{q}}_s \left[\hat{p}_{ss} + \sum_{j,k=1}^n (g^{jk} \hat{p}_{x_j})_{x_k} \right] \\
&= (\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 \bar{\hat{q}}_s \hat{p}_s)_s - (\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_s \bar{\hat{q}}_s \hat{p}_s - \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 \bar{\hat{p}}_s \left[\bar{\hat{q}}_{ss} + \sum_{j,k} (g^{jk} \bar{\hat{q}}_{x_k})_{x_j} \right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{j,k} (\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 \bar{\hat{q}}_s g^{jk} \hat{p}_{x_j})_{x_k} - \sum_{j,k} (\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_k} \bar{\hat{q}}_s g^{jk} \hat{p}_{x_j} - \sum_{j,k} (\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 \bar{\hat{q}}_{x_k} g^{jk} \hat{p}_{x_j})_s \\
&\quad + \sum_{j,k} (\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_s \bar{\hat{q}}_{x_k} g^{jk} \hat{p}_{x_j} + \sum_{j,k} (\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 g^{jk} \bar{\hat{q}}_{x_k} \hat{p}_s)_{x_j} - \sum_{j,k} (\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk} \bar{\hat{q}}_{x_k} \hat{p}_s
\end{aligned} \tag{3.47}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j,k} (\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk} \bar{\hat{q}}_{x_k} \hat{p}_s &= \sum_{j,k} [(\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk} \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{p}_s]_{x_k} - \sum_{j,k} [(\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk} \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{p}_{x_k}]_s \\
&\quad - \sum_{j,k} [(\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk}]_{x_k} \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{p}_s + \sum_{j,k} [(\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk}]_s \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{p}_{x_k} \\
&\quad + \sum_{j,k} (\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk} \bar{\hat{q}}_s \hat{p}_{x_k}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.48}$$

We integrate (3.46) on $(-b, b) \times \Omega$. Then we derive from (3.47)-(3.48) and particularly the

facts that $\hat{p}_s = \hat{q}_s = 0$ on the boundary of $(-b, b) \times \Omega$ and $\nabla \hat{p}(\pm b, \cdot) = \nabla \hat{q}_s(\pm b, \cdot) = 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \alpha(x) \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}_s|^2 dx ds \\
& \leq \frac{\delta}{2} \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}_s|^2 dx ds + C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_2} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 (|\hat{G}_1^0|^2 + |G^0|^2 + |\hat{G}_1^1|^2 + |G^1|^2) dx ds \\
& \quad + C \lambda^2 \mu^2 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_3} \theta^2 \phi^5 (|\hat{p}|^2 + |\hat{p}_s|^2 + |\nabla \hat{p}|^2) dx ds \\
& \quad + \left| \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j,k} [(\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk}]_s \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{p}_{x_k} dx ds \right| + \left| \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j,k} [(\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk}]_{x_k} \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{p}_s dx ds \right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.49}$$

Since $\alpha(x) \geq \delta > 0$ on ω_δ , the first term on the right hand side of (3.49) can be absorbed by the left hand side. Moreover, by direct computations, we have the following two facts:

$$\begin{aligned}
[(\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk}]_{x_k} &= (\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j, x_k} g^{jk} + (\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g_{x_k}^{jk} \\
&= g^{jk} [2\theta_{x_j, x_k} \theta \phi^3 \eta_2^2 + 2\theta_{x_j} \theta_{x_k} \phi^3 \eta_2^2 + 6\theta_{x_j} \theta \phi^2 \phi_{x_k} \eta_2^2 \\
& \quad + 4\theta_{x_j, x_k} \theta \phi^3 (\eta_2)_{x_k} \eta_2 + 6\theta_{x_k} \theta \phi_{x_j} \phi^2 \eta_2^2 + 3\theta^2 \phi_{x_j, x_k} \phi^2 \eta_2^2 \\
& \quad + 6\theta^2 \phi_{x_j} \phi \phi_{x_k} \eta_2^2 + 6\theta^2 \phi_{x_j} \phi^2 \eta_2 (\eta_2)_{x_k} + 2(\eta_2)_{x_j, x_k} \eta_2 \theta^2 \phi^3 \\
& \quad + 2(\eta_2)_{x_j} (\eta_2)_{x_k} \theta^2 \phi^3 + 4(\eta_2)_{x_j} \eta_2 \theta_{x_k} \theta \phi^3 + 6(\eta_2)_{x_j} \eta_2 \theta^2 \phi^2 \phi_{x_k}] \\
& \quad + [2\theta_{x_j} \theta \phi^3 \eta_2^2 + 3\theta^2 \phi_{x_j} \phi^2 \eta_2^2 + 2(\eta_2)_{x_j} \eta_2 \theta^2 \phi^3] g_{x_k}^{jk}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.50}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
[(\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk}]_s &= g^{jk} [2\theta_{x_j, s} \theta \phi^3 \eta_2^2 + 2\theta_{x_j} \theta_s \phi^3 \eta_2^2 + 6\theta_{x_j} \theta \phi_s \phi^2 \eta_2^2 \\
& \quad + 6\theta_s \theta \phi_{x_j} \phi^2 \eta_2^2 + 3\theta^2 \phi_{x_j, s} \phi^2 \eta_2^2 + 6\theta^2 \phi_{x_j} \phi_s \phi \eta_2^2 \\
& \quad + 2(\eta_2)_{x_j} \eta_2 \theta_s \theta \phi^3 + 6(\eta_2)_{x_j} \eta_2 \theta^2 \phi^2 \phi_s].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.51}$$

By definition of η_2, θ, ϕ , in particular (3.41), (3.39) and $g^{jk}(\cdot) \in C^1(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R})$, one can obtain the following estimate:

$$|[(\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk}]_s| + |[(\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk}]_{x_k}| \leq C \lambda^2 \mu^2 \eta_2 \theta^2 \phi^5. \tag{3.52}$$

Thus by above estimate (3.52) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get for all $\varepsilon > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j,k} [(\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk}]_s \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{p}_{x_k} dx ds \right| + \left| \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j,k} [(\theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2)_{x_j} g^{jk}]_{x_k} \bar{\hat{q}} \hat{p}_s dx ds \right| \\
& \leq \varepsilon \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}|^2 dx ds + \frac{C \lambda^4 \mu^4}{\varepsilon} \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_3} \theta^2 \phi^7 (|\hat{p}_s|^2 + |\nabla \hat{p}|^2) dx ds,
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain from (3.43) and by choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ small that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}_s|^2 dx ds &\leq C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 (|\hat{G}_1^0|^2 + |G^0|^2 + |\hat{G}_1^1|^2 + |G^1|^2) dx ds \\
&\quad + C \lambda^4 \mu^4 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_3} \theta^2 \phi^7 (|\hat{p}|^2 + |\hat{p}_s|^2 + |\nabla \hat{p}|^2) dx ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.53}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 |\hat{q}|^2 dx ds &\leq C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 (|\hat{G}_1^0|^2 + |G^0|^2 + |\hat{G}_1^1|^2 + |G^1|^2) dx ds \\ &\quad + C \lambda^4 \mu^4 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_3} \theta^2 \phi^7 (|\hat{p}|^2 + |\hat{p}_s|^2 + |\nabla \hat{p}|^2) dx ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.54)$$

◦ **Step 4.4.** We estimate $\int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_3} \theta^2 \phi^7 (|\nabla \hat{p}|^2 + |\hat{p}_s|^2) dx ds$.

Similar to (3.42), we can derive

$$\int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_3} \theta^2 \phi^7 (|\nabla \hat{p}|^2 + |\hat{p}_s|^2) dx ds \leq \frac{C}{\lambda^7 \mu^8} \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 |\hat{G}^0|^2 dx ds + C \lambda^7 \mu^8 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_\delta} \theta^2 \phi^{14} |\hat{p}|^2 dx ds. \quad (3.55)$$

The factor $\frac{C}{\lambda^7 \mu^8}$ is important for the estimate of I_2 , see (3.57).

◦ **Step 4.5.** We summarize the estimate of I_2 from above.

Applying (3.42), (3.53), (3.54), (3.55) for I_{23}, I_{24}, I_{21} in (3.38), we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= I_{21} + I_{22} + I_{23} + I_{24} \\ &\leq C \lambda^3 \mu^4 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 (|\hat{G}_1^0|^2 + |\hat{G}_1^1|^2) dx ds + C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 (|\hat{G}^0|^2 + |\hat{G}^1|^2) dx ds \\ &\quad + C \lambda^3 \mu^4 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 (|G^0|^2 + |G^1|^2) dx ds + C \lambda^{14} \mu^{16} \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_\delta} \theta^2 \phi^{14} |\hat{p}|^2 dx ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.56)$$

Similar to the estimate of I_{11} in (3.35), we have

$$C \lambda^3 \mu^4 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 (|\hat{G}_1^0|^2 + |\hat{G}_1^1|^2) dx ds \leq \lambda^3 e^{2\lambda(1+e^\mu)} C(\mu) (\|p\|_{H^1(X)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^1(X)}^2).$$

Note that $C \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 (|\hat{G}^0|^2 + |\hat{G}^1|^2) dx ds$ is the same as I_1 and the estimate has been given by (3.37). Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq C I_1 + \lambda^3 e^{2\lambda(1+e^\mu)} C(\mu) (\|p\|_{H^1(X)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^1(X)}^2) \\ &\quad + C \lambda^3 \mu^4 \int_{-b}^b \int_{\Omega} \theta^2 \phi^3 \eta_2^2 (|G^0|^2 + |G^1|^2) dx ds + C \lambda^{14} \mu^{16} \int_{-b}^b \int_{\omega_\delta} \theta^2 \phi^{14} |\hat{p}|^2 dx ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.57)$$

◦ **Step 5.** We derive the estimate (3.6) based on Step 1-4.

Letting λ be large enough, we finally obtain from (3.28), (3.31), (3.37) and (3.57), the desired interpolation estimate (3.6).

◦ **Step 6.** We provide an example of the cut-off function $\eta_2 \in C_0^3(\omega_2)$ such that (3.40)-(3.41) hold.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $\omega_1 \subset B(0, \frac{r}{2}) \subset B(0, r) \subset \omega_2$. Set

$$\eta_2(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } |x| < \frac{r}{2}, \\ \frac{128}{81r^{10}} [r^2 - |x|^2]^3 [16|x|^4 - 2r^2|x|^2 + r^4], & \text{if } \frac{r}{2} \leq |x| \leq r, \\ 0, & \text{if } |x| > r. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to check that $\eta_2 \in C_0^3(\omega_2)$ and

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow r} \frac{|(\eta_2)_{x_k} (\eta_2)_{x_j}|}{\eta_2} = 0, \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \frac{r}{2}} \frac{|(\eta_2)_{x_k} (\eta_2)_{x_j}|}{\eta_2} < \infty.$$

Then it follows the property (3.41).

This finally concludes the proof of Lemma 3.1. \square

4 An example with $\omega_\alpha \cap \omega_\beta = \emptyset$

In this section, we show, by an example, that the geometric assumption $\omega_\alpha \cap \omega_\beta \neq \emptyset$ is necessary in general for asymptotic stability of the coupled system (1.1).

More precisely, we consider the following 1-D coupled wave equations

$$\begin{cases} y_{tt} - y_{xx} + \alpha(x)z_t + \beta(x)y_t = 0, & \text{in } (0, +\infty) \times (0, 2\pi), \\ z_{tt} - z_{xx} - \alpha(x)y_t = 0, & \text{in } (0, +\infty) \times (0, 2\pi), \\ u(-\pi) = u(\pi) = v(-\pi) = v(\pi) = 0, & \text{in } (0, +\infty), \\ (y(0), y_t(0), z(0), z_t(0)) = (y^0, y^1, z^0, z^1), & \text{in } (0, 2\pi), \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where the coefficients α and β are given by

$$\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \in (\pi, 2\pi), \\ \frac{24}{5}, & \text{if } x \in [0, \pi), \end{cases} \quad \beta(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \in (\pi, 2\pi), \\ 0, & \text{if } x \in [0, \pi) \end{cases}$$

such that $\omega_\alpha \cap \omega_\beta = \emptyset$.

Let the initial data be the following

$$y^0(x) = 0, \quad \text{if } x \in (0, 2\pi), \quad y^1(x) = \begin{cases} 7\sin x - \sin 7x, & \text{if } x \in (0, \pi), \\ 0, & \text{if } x \in [\pi, 2\pi), \end{cases}, \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$z^0(x) = \begin{cases} -7\sin x - \sin 7x, & \text{if } x \in (0, \pi), \\ -\frac{14}{5}\sin 5x, & \text{if } x \in [\pi, 2\pi), \end{cases}, \quad z^1(x) = 0, \quad \text{if } x \in (0, 2\pi), \quad (4.3)$$

Clearly, one can see that $(y^0, y^1, z^0, z^1) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$, the solution of the system (4.1)-(4.2) can be obtained

$$y(t, x) = \begin{cases} \sin(5t)(7\sin x - \sin 7x), & \text{if } x \in (0, \pi), \\ 0, & \text{if } x \in [\pi, 2\pi), \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$z(t, x) = \begin{cases} -\cos(5t)(7\sin x + \sin(7x)), & \text{if } x \in (0, \pi), \\ -\frac{14}{5}\cos(5t)\sin(5x), & \text{if } x \in [\pi, 2\pi), \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

In contrast to (1.11) in Theorem 1.1, the energy of the system (4.1) is conserved :

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}(y, z)(t) = - \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \beta(x) |y_t|^2 dx = 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

therefore the system is not asymptotically stable. Furthermore, decay rate estimate (1.10) is invalid for some initial data $(y^0, y^1, z^0, z^1) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$.

Acknowledgements: The first author is partially supported by the fund of the Shanghai Key Laboratory for Contemporary Applied Mathematics at Fudan University (No. 74120-42080001). The second author is partially supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11971119).

References

- [1] Fatiha Alabau-Boussouira. Indirect boundary stabilization of weakly coupled hyperbolic systems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 41(2):511–541 (electronic), 2002.
- [2] Fatiha Alabau-Boussouira and Matthieu Léautaud. Indirect stabilization of locally coupled wave-type systems. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 18(2):548–582, 2012.
- [3] Fatiha Alabau-Boussouira, Zhiqiang Wang, and Lixin Yu. A one-step optimal energy decay formula for indirectly nonlinearly damped hyperbolic systems coupled by velocities. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 23(2):721–749, 2017.
- [4] Nalini Anantharaman and Matthieu Léautaud. Sharp polynomial decay rates for the damped wave equation on the torus. *Anal. PDE*, 7(1):159–214, 2014. With an appendix by Stéphane Nonnenmacher.
- [5] Claude Bardos, Gilles Lebeau, and Jeffrey Rauch. Sharp sufficient conditions for the observation, control, and stabilization of waves from the boundary. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 30(5):1024–1065, 1992.
- [6] Nicolas Burq. Décroissance de l’énergie locale de l’équation des ondes pour le problème extérieur et absence de résonance au voisinage du réel. *Acta Math.*, 180(1):1–29, 1998.
- [7] Nicolas Burq and Michael Hitrik. Energy decay for damped wave equations on partially rectangular domains. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 14(1):35–47, 2007.
- [8] Yan Cui and Zhiqiang Wang. Asymptotic stability of wave equations coupled by velocities. *Math. Control Relat. Fields*, 6(3):429–446, 2016.
- [9] Xiaoyu Fu. Logarithmic decay of hyperbolic equations with arbitrary small boundary damping. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 34(9).
- [10] Xiaoyu Fu. Sharp decay rates for the weakly coupled hyperbolic system with one internal damping. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 50(3):1643–1660, 2012.
- [11] Xiaoyu Fu, Qi L  , and Xu Zhang. *Carleman Estimates for Second Order Partial Differential Operators and Applications, a Unified Approach*. SpringerBriefs in Mathematics. Springer, Cham., 2019.
- [12] A. V. Fursikov and O. Yu. Imanuvilov. *Controllability of evolution equations*, volume 34 of *Lecture Notes Series*. Seoul National University, Research Institute of Mathematics, Global Analysis Research Center, Seoul, 1996.
- [13] S. Gerbi, C. Kassem, A. Mortada, and A. Wehbe. Exact controllability and stabilization of locally coupled wave equations. *arXiv:2003.14001*, 2020.

- [14] Long Jin. Damped Wave Equations on Compact Hyperbolic Surfaces. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 373(3):771–794, 2020.
- [15] Chiraz Kassem, Amina Mortada, Layla Toufayli, and Ali Wehbe. Local indirect stabilization of n-d system of two coupled wave equations under geometric conditions. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 357(6), 2019.
- [16] Guillaume Klein. Best exponential decay rate of energy for the vectorial damped wave equation. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 56:3432–3453, 2017.
- [17] Matthieu Léautaud and Nicolas Lerner. Sharp polynomial energy decay for locally undamped waves. In *Séminaire Laurent Schwartz—Équations aux dérivées partielles et applications. Année 2014–2015*, pages Exp. No. XXI, 13. Ed. Éc. Polytech., Palaiseau, 2016.
- [18] G. Lebeau. équation des ondes amorties. In *Algebraic and geometric methods in mathematical physics (Kaciveli, 1993)*, volume 19 of *Math. Phys. Stud.*, pages 73–109. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1996.
- [19] Kangsheng Liu. Locally distributed control and damping for the conservative systems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 35(5):1574–1590, 1997.
- [20] Zhuangyi Liu and Bopeng Rao. Frequency domain approach for the polynomial stability of a system of partially damped wave equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 335(2):860–881, 2007.
- [21] Amnon Pazy. *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*, volume 44 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.
- [22] K.-D. Phung and Xu Zhang. Time reversal focusing of the initial state for kirchoff plate. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, pages 1535–1556, 2008.
- [23] Kim Dang Phung. Polynomial decay rate for the dissipative wave equation. *J. Differential Equations*, 240(1):92–124, 2007.
- [24] Jeffrey Rauch and Michael Taylor. Exponential decay of solutions to hyperbolic equations in bounded domains. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 24:79–86, 1974.
- [25] Michael Reed and Barry Simon. *Methods of modern mathematical physics. I. Functional analysis*. Academic Press, New York-London, 1972.