

On the global controllability of scalar conservation laws with boundary and source controls

Fabio Ancona⁽¹⁾ and Khai T. Nguyen⁽²⁾

⁽¹⁾ Dipartimento di Matematica “Tullio Levi-Civita”, Università di Padova,

⁽²⁾ Department of Mathematics, North Carolina State University

E-mails: ancona@math.unipd.it, khai@math.ncsu.edu

October 30, 2021

Abstract

We provide global and semi-global controllability results for hyperbolic conservation laws on a bounded domain, with a general (not necessarily convex) flux and a time-dependent source term acting as a control. The results are achieved for, possibly critical, both continuously differentiable states and BV states. The proofs are based on a combination of the return method and on the analysis of the Riccati equation for the space derivative of the solution.

Key words. conservation laws, source control, global exact controllability, return method

AMS Mathematics Subject Classification. 35L65, 35Q93, 93B05, 93C20.

1 Introduction and main results

We are concerned with the problem of controllability of a one space-dimensional scalar conservation law on a bounded domain

$$\partial_t u + \partial_x f(u) = 0, \quad t > 0, \quad x \in [a, b], \quad (1.1)$$

where $u = u(t, x)$ is the state variable and the flux function $f : I \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth map defined on some open interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Most of the literature concerning the controllability of hyperbolic partial differential equations analyzes the states $\psi \doteq u(T, \cdot)$ that can be reached at a fixed time $T > 0$, through the influence of boundary controls acting at the end points $\{a, b\}$, when an initial condition is given

$$u(0, x) = \bar{u}(x), \quad x \in [a, b]. \quad (1.2)$$

In the case of conservation laws (1.1) with a strictly convex flux f , Ancona and Marson [6, 7] and Adimurthi et al. [1] established a characterization of the reachable states with boundary controls. A similar characterization of approximately reachable states for the Burgers equation was provided by Horsin [30]. From these results it follows that, if we start with a general initial data $\bar{u} \in \mathbf{L}^\infty([a, b])$, the profiles ψ that are attainable at a time $T > 0$ with boundary controls at $x = a$ and $x = b$, are only those which satisfy suitable Olenik-type inequalities, provided that

$$T \geq \bar{T} \doteq \max \left\{ \sup_{x \in (a, b)} \frac{x - a}{[f' \circ \psi(x)]_+}, \sup_{x \in (a, b)} \frac{b - x}{[f' \circ \psi(x)]_-} \right\}, \quad (1.3)$$

where $[a]_- \doteq \max\{-a, 0\}$, $[a]_+ \doteq \max\{a, 0\}$ denote the negative and positive part, respectively, of $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

For conservation laws with general nonconvex flux, Leautaud [33] proved the attainability in finite time of constant states, employing boundary controls, while Andreianov, Donadello and Marson [10] derived sufficient conditions for the reachability of (non constant) states in the case of a nonconvex flux with a single inflection point, where one regards as controls the initial data. All these results show, in particular, that conservation laws are not exactly controllable in finite time to *critical states* (with vanishing characteristic speed).

Here, in the same spirit of Chapouly [14] and Perrollaz [38], we wish to investigate how the effect of a control acting through a time dependent source term on the right-hand side of (1.1), in combination with the boundary controls, allows to: establish global controllability results; achieve the reachability of a broader class of states (including critical states); realize the exact controllability to such states in a shorter time than the one required when employing only boundary controls.

Namely, we shall investigate the exact controllability problem for a balance law

$$\partial_t u + \partial_x f(u) = h(t), \quad t > 0, \quad x \in [a, b], \quad (1.4)$$

where we regard as controls both the boundary data acting at the end points $\{a, b\}$ of the domain, and the source term h depending only on time. We recall that there are two possible settings within which to study this problem. The first possibility is to consider classical solutions (i.e. Lipschitz continuous functions that satisfy the equation almost everywhere), assuming that the source and the boundary controls are regular functions as well. The other possibility is to consider weak (distributional) solutions which satisfy an entropy admissibility criterium, which are natural in this framework since in general classical solutions of (1.1) develop discontinuities in finite time because of the nonlinearity of the equation.

In the first setting Chapouly [14] showed that, when $f(u) = u^2/2$, for every $T > 0$ one can drive in time T any preassigned continuously differentiable initial data \bar{u} to any continuously differentiable target state ψ with a classical solution of (1.4), using suitable source $h(t)$ and boundary controls at $x = a$, $x = b$. In the same setting, for quasilinear hyperbolic systems, local [34, 35, 42, 43] and global (in the linearly degenerate case) [41] controllability results for C^1 states were established employing boundary and distributed controls on the source that depend on both (t, x) variables. In the second setting and for general strictly convex flux f , Perrollaz [38] provided sufficient conditions for the reachability (in arbitrarily small time) of a state $\psi \in BV([a, b])$ with boundary and source controls, through entropy weak solutions of (1.4). In a related result Corghi and Marson [16] established a characterization of the attainable set for scalar strictly convex balance laws evolving on the whole real line, with the source term (depending on both space and time) regarded as a control.

In this paper we will first establish the global and semi-global controllability of continuously differentiable states for a conservation law with a general smooth flux, when time dependent source and boundary controls are acting on the equation. Next, in the case of convex (non necessarily strictly convex) conservation laws, we will provide BV bounds on the smooth source control and on the C^1 solution connecting an initial datum \bar{u} to a terminal state ψ , in terms of the positive variation of ψ and of the negative variation of \bar{u} . Finally, relying on such BV bounds, we will show the reachability in finite time of states $\psi \in BV([a, b])$ that satisfies one-sided Lipschitz estimates similar to those stated in [38]. The advantage of this construction is that we obtain the source control and the corresponding solution as limit of regular solutions which are easier to handle than the piecewise constant front tracking solutions employed in [38]. In fact, we rely on the approach developed in the present paper to address similar problems of global controllability for diagonal systems of conservation laws in the forthcoming paper [8].

Control problems for conservation laws arise in many different applications including: vehicular traffic models [2, 3, 15, 19], oil reservoir simulation and sedimentation models [10], supply chain [28, 32], gas dynamics [25]. In practice a time dependent source control can be viewed as a control parameter acting on the flux function of the conservation law letting vary its flux capacity. We refer to [38] for a discussion of various models where source controls naturally appear to govern the

dynamics of the corresponding balance law.

Since we are assuming to have full control on both endpoints $\{a, b\}$ of the domain, and because boundary conditions for nonlinear hyperbolic equations are quite involved (e.g. see [11, 40]), it will be simpler to reformulate the controllability problem in an undetermined form (where the boundary data are not explicitly prescribed). Therefore, given an initial state \bar{u} and a terminal state ψ , we will rephrase the problem of steering (1.1) from \bar{u} to ψ via boundary and source controls, into the equivalent one of determining a time dependent source $h = h(t)$ and a solution of (1.4) that satisfies (1.2) together with the terminal condition

$$u(T, x) = \psi(x), \quad x \in [a, b]. \quad (1.5)$$

The corresponding boundary controls can be recovered afterwards by taking the traces of u at $x = a$ and $x = b$.

Before stating the main results, we recall the definition of entropy admissible weak solutions. An entropy/entropy flux pair for the equation (1.4) is a couple of continuously differentiable maps $(\eta, q) : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, that satisfy $D\eta(u) \cdot Df(u) = Dq(u)$ for all $u \in I$. Observe that, in particular, $(\eta, q) = (\pm Id, \pm f(u))$ provide two entropy/entropy flux pairs. Then we shall adopt the following definition.

Definition 1.1. *A function $u : [0, T] \times [a, b] \rightarrow I$ is called an entropic weak solution of (1.4), (1.2) on $[0, T] \times [a, b]$, if it is a continuous function from $[0, T]$ into $\mathbf{L}^1([a, b]; I)$, which assumes almost everywhere the initial datum (1.2), and that is an entropy admissible distributional solution of (1.4) on $(0, T) \times (a, b)$, i.e. such that for any entropy / entropy flux pair (η, q) , with η convex, there holds*

$$\int_0^T \int_a^b \left\{ \eta(u(t, x)) \partial_t \varphi(t, x) + q(u(t, x)) \partial_x \varphi(t, x) + \eta'(u(t, x)) h(t) \cdot \varphi(t, x) \right\} dx dt \geq 0,$$

for all test functions $\varphi \in C_c^1$, $\varphi \geq 0$, with compact support in $]0, T[\times]a, b[$.

Our first results concern the global controllability of continuously differentiable states. Throughout the paper, for any continuously differentiable map $\varphi : J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined on some interval $J \subset \mathbb{R}$, we shall adopt the notation

$$\|\varphi\|_{C(J)} \doteq \sup\{|\varphi(x)| : x \in J\}. \quad (1.6)$$

Moreover, to estimate the maximal speed of the characteristics with which can travel an initial data taking values in a given set $J' \subseteq J$, we introduce the quantities

$$[\|\varphi\|]_{J'} \doteq \sup_{\{k \mid J' + k \subseteq J\}} \inf_{u \in J'} |\Delta\varphi(u; k)|, \quad \Delta\varphi(u; k) \doteq \frac{\varphi(u+k) - \varphi(u)}{k}, = \frac{\int_0^k \varphi'(u+v) dv}{k}, \quad (1.7)$$

and, for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\arg \sup [\|\varphi\|]_{J', \varepsilon} \doteq \begin{cases} \inf \left\{ k \geq 0 \mid J' + k \subseteq J, \quad |\Delta\varphi(u; k)| > [\|\varphi\|]_{J'} - \varepsilon \quad \forall u \in J' \right\} \\ \text{if} \quad [\|\varphi\|]_{J'} = \sup_{\{k \geq 0 \mid J' + k \subseteq J\}} \inf_{u \in J'} |\Delta\varphi(u; k)|, \\ \sup \left\{ k \leq 0 \mid J' + k \subseteq J, \quad |\Delta\varphi(u; k)| > [\|\varphi\|]_{J'} - \varepsilon \quad \forall u \in J' \right\} \\ \text{if} \quad [\|\varphi\|]_{J'} = \sup_{\{k \leq 0 \mid J' + k \subseteq J\}} \inf_{u \in J'} |\Delta\varphi(u; k)|. \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

We will also use the notation $\text{Tot.Var.}\{\varphi; J'\}$ for the total variation of $\varphi \in \text{BV}(J)$ on an interval $J' \subseteq J$ (e.g. see [24]).

We make the following standing assumptions on the flux function f :

(H1) $f : I = (i_-, i_+) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a twice continuously differentiable map;

(H2) one of the following three conditions holds:

- (i) $\lim_{u \rightarrow i_{\pm}} |f'(u)| < +\infty$ and $\lim_{u \rightarrow \pm\alpha} |f''(u)| < +\infty$;
- (ii) $i_+ = +\infty$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow +\infty} |f'(u)| = +\infty$ and $\lim_{u \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|f'(u)|}{\sup_{z \in (i_-, u)} |f''(z)|} = +\infty$;
- (iii) $i_- = -\infty$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow -\infty} |f'(u)| = +\infty$ and $\lim_{u \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{|f'(u)|}{\sup_{z \in (u, i_+)} |f''(z)|} = +\infty$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let f be a flux satisfying the assumptions (H1), (H2)-(i), and assume that $\|f\|_{I'_1} > 0$, $\|f\|_{I'_2} > 0$ for intervals $I'_1, I'_2 \subseteq I$. Then, given any $a < b$, for every $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$ and $\psi \in C^1([a, b])$, with $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I'_1$, $\text{Im}(\psi) \subsetneq I'_2$, and such that*

$$\|\bar{u}'\|_{C^0([a, b])} < \frac{\|f\|_{I'_1}}{(b-a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}}, \quad \|\psi'\|_{C^0([a, b])} < \frac{\|f\|_{I'_2}}{(b-a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}}, \quad (1.9)$$

and for any

$$T > T^* := T_1^* + T_2^*, \quad T_1^* \doteq \frac{(b-a)}{\|f\|_{I'_1}}, \quad T_2^* \doteq \frac{(b-a)}{\|f\|_{I'_2}} \quad (1.10)$$

there exists $h \in C^0([0, T])$ so that the Cauchy problem (1.4), (1.2) admits a classical solution $u \in C^1([0, T] \times [a, b])$, that satisfies (1.5).

Remark 1.3. Notice that T_1^* is the controllability time needed to steer the initial date \bar{u} to 0 while T_2^* is the controllability time needed to steer 0 to the final state ψ . The controllability time T^* in (1.10) is in general much smaller than the boundary controllability time \bar{T} in (1.3). In particular, we observe that $T_2^* \approx \frac{1}{\sup_{u \in I} |f'(u)|}$, whereas $\bar{T} \approx \frac{1}{\inf_{u \in \text{Im}(\psi)} |f'(u)|}$. Therefore, whenever the target state ψ is close to a critical state, i.e. $\bar{T} \approx \frac{1}{\inf_{u \in \text{Im}(\psi)} |f'(u)|} \rightarrow 0$, we have $\bar{T} \rightarrow +\infty$, while this is not the case for T^* .

Theorem 1.4. *Let f be a flux satisfying the assumptions (H1) and (H2)-(ii) or (H2)-(iii). Then, given any $a < b$, and $T > 0$, for every $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$ and $\psi \in C^1([a, b])$, there exists $h \in C^0([0, T])$ so that the Cauchy problem (1.4), (1.2) admits a classical solution $u \in C^1([0, T] \times [a, b])$, that satisfies (1.5).*

Remark 1.5. Clearly the flux $f(u) = \frac{u^2}{2}$ satisfies the assumptions (H1) and (H2)-(ii). Thus, as a particular case, we recover from Theorem 1.4 the global controllability result established in [14] for the Burgers equation (by a quite different proof).

Theorem 1.6. *Let f be a convex map satisfying the assumptions (H1), (H2)-(i), and assume that $\|f\|_{I'_1} > 0$, $\|f\|_{I'_2} > 0$ for intervals $I'_1, I'_2 \subseteq I$. Then, given any $a < b$, $\rho > 0$, and $T > T^*$, with $T^* \geq 0$ as in (1.10), there exists $C_1 > 0$ depending on $b-a$, T , T^* , $\arg\sup_{I'_i, c_1} \|f\|$, $i = 1, 2$ (c_1 being a constant depending on $\rho, T - T^*$), so that the following hold. For every $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$ and $\psi \in C^1([a, b])$, with $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I'_1$, $\text{Im}(\psi) \subsetneq I'_2$, such that*

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\bar{u}'(x)]_- \leq \frac{\|f\|_{I'_1}}{(b-a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}} - \rho, \quad \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\psi'(x)]_+ \leq \frac{\|f\|_{I'_2}}{(b-a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}} - \rho, \quad (1.11)$$

there exists $h \in C^0([0, T])$, with

$$\|h\|_{C^0([0, T])} + \text{Tot.Var.}\{h; [0, T]\} \leq C_1 \cdot \left(1 + \|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a, b])} + \|\psi\|_{C^0([a, b])}\right), \quad (1.12)$$

so that the Cauchy problem (1.4), (1.2) admits a classical solution $u \in C^1([0, T] \times [a, b])$, that satisfies (1.5) and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^0([a, b])} + \text{Tot.Var.}\{u(t, \cdot); [a, b]\} \\ & \leq C_1 \cdot \left(\|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a, b])} + \|\psi\|_{C^0([a, b])} + \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\bar{u}'(x)]_- + \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\psi'(x)]_+ \right) \end{aligned} \quad (1.13)$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$.

Remark 1.7. In the case f is a convex map satisfying the assumptions (H1), (H2)-(i), and $i_+ = +\infty$, $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \arg \sup_{I', \rho} [f]_{I', \rho} = +\infty$ (or $i_- = -\infty$ and $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \arg \sup_{I', \rho} [f]_{I', \rho} = -\infty$), the constants $C_1, c_1 > 0$ provided by Theorem 1.6 have the following property: If either $T \rightarrow T^*$ or $\rho \rightarrow 0$, then $c_1 \rightarrow 0$ and $C_1 \rightarrow +\infty$.

Remark 1.8. If f is a concave map satisfying the assumptions (H1), (H2)-(i) and $[f]_{I'_1} > 0$, $[f]_{I'_2} > 0$ for $I'_1, I'_2 \subseteq I$, then the same conclusions of Theorem 1.6 hold, replacing $[\bar{u}'(x)]_-$ with $[\bar{u}'(x)]_+$ and $[\psi'(x)]_+$ with $[\psi'(x)]_-$ in the inequalities (1.11), (1.13).

Theorem 1.9. Let f be a convex or concave map satisfying the assumptions (H1) and (H2)-(ii) or (H2)-(iii). Then, given any $a < b$, and $T > 0$, for every $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$ and $\psi \in C^1([a, b])$, there exists $h \in C^0([0, T])$ so that the Cauchy problem (1.4), (1.2) admits a classical solution $u \in C^1([0, T] \times [a, b])$, that satisfies (1.5).

Remark 1.10. If $f : I = (i_-, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a map satisfying the assumptions (H1) and (H2)-(ii), and $I'_1, I'_2 \subset I$ are bounded intervals, then setting

$$[f]_{I', u} \doteq \sup_{\{k \mid I' + k \subseteq (i_-, u)\}} \inf_{v \in I'} |\Delta f(v; k)|, \quad (1.14)$$

one finds

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{[f]_{I', u}}{|f'(u)|} = 1. \quad (1.15)$$

Hence, taking the limit as $u \rightarrow \infty$ in (1.9), (1.10), (1.11) with $[f]_{I'_i, u}$ in place of $[f]_{I'_i}$, and $\|f''\|_{C^0((i_-, u))}$ in place of $\|f''\|_{C^0(I)}$, the controllability time T^* in (1.10) results to be zero and the upper bounds in (1.9), (1.11) becomes $+\infty$. Therefore, at least formally, one can deduce the conclusions of Theorem 1.4 from Theorem 1.2, and the conclusions of Theorem 1.9 from Theorem 1.6. Similar formal deductions can be carried out in the case f satisfies the assumptions (H1) and (H2)-(iii).

Relying on Theorem 1.6 we then establish a global controllability result for BV states that satisfy one-sided Lipschitz inequalities expressed in terms of Dini derivatives. We recall that

$$D^- \omega(x) = \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\omega(x+h) - \omega(x)}{h}, \quad D^+ \omega(x) = \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\omega(x+h) - \omega(x)}{h}, \quad (1.16)$$

denote, respectively, the lower and the upper Dini derivative of a function ω at x .

Theorem 1.11. Under the same assumptions of Theorem 1.6, given any $a < b$, $\rho > 0$, and $T > T^*$, with $T^* \geq 0$ as in (1.10), there exists $C_2 > 0$ depending on $b - a$, T , T^* , $\arg \sup_{I'_i, c_2} [f]_{I'_i, c_2}$, $i = 1, 2$ (c_2 being a constant depending on $\rho, T - T^*$), so that the following hold. For every $\bar{u} \in BV([a, b])$ and $\psi \in BV([a, b])$, with $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I'_1$, $\text{Im}(\psi) \subsetneq I'_2$, and such that

$$\begin{cases} d^- & \doteq \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [D^- \bar{u}(x)]_- < \frac{[f]_{I'_1}}{(b-a)\|f''\|_{C^0(I)}} - \rho, \\ d^+ & \doteq \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [D^+ \psi(x)]_+ < \frac{[f]_{I'_2}}{(b-a)\|f''\|_{C^0(I)}} - \rho, \end{cases} \quad (1.17)$$

there exists $h \in BV([0, T])$, with

$$\|h\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty([0, T])} + \text{Tot.Var.}\{h; [0, T]\} \leq C_2 \cdot \left(1 + \|\bar{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty([a, b])} + \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty([a, b])}\right), \quad (1.18)$$

so that the Cauchy problem (1.4), (1.2) admits an entropy weak solution on $[0, T] \times [a, b]$, that satisfies (1.5) and

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty([a, b])} + \text{Tot.Var.}\{u(t, \cdot); [a, b]\} \leq C_2 \cdot \left(\|\bar{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty([a, b])} + \|\psi\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty([a, b])} + d^- + d^+\right) \quad (1.19)$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$

Theorem 1.12. *Let f be a convex map satisfying the assumptions (H1) and (H2)-(ii) or (H2)-(iii). Then, given any $a < b$, and $T > 0$, for every $\bar{u} \in BV([a, b])$ and $\psi \in BV([a, b])$, with*

$$d^- \doteq \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [D^-\bar{u}(x)]_- < +\infty, \quad d^+ \doteq \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [D^+\psi(x)]_+ < +\infty, \quad (1.20)$$

there exists $h \in BV([0, T])$ so that the Cauchy problem (1.4), (1.2) admits an entropy weak solution on $[0, T] \times [a, b]$, that satisfies (1.5).

Remark 1.13. *By the proofs of Theorem 1.11 it follows that, in its setting, we obtain an approximate controllability result for classical solutions. Namely, if \bar{u}, ψ are BV states that satisfy conditons (1.17), then for any $T > T^*$, and for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $h \in C^0([0, T])$ and a classical solution $u \in C^1([0, T] \times [a, b])$ of (1.4) that satisfies*

$$\|u(0, \cdot) - \bar{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^1([a, b])} < \varepsilon, \quad \|u(T, \cdot) - \psi\|_{\mathbf{L}^1([a, b])} < \varepsilon. \quad (1.21)$$

On the other hand, in the setting of Theorem 1.12 the same type of approximate controllability result holds for any pair of initial and terminal data $\bar{u} \in BV([a, b])$, $\psi \in BV([a, b])$. In fact, in this case we can approximate \bar{u}, ψ with $\bar{u}_\varepsilon, \psi_\varepsilon \in C^1([a, b])$ so that $\|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathbf{L}^1} < \varepsilon$, $\|\psi - \psi_\varepsilon\|_{\mathbf{L}^1} < \varepsilon$. Then, for any $T > 0$, and for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, applying Theorem 1.9 we deduce the existence of $h \in C^0([0, T])$ and of a classical solution $u \in C^1([0, T] \times [a, b])$ of (1.4) that satisfies (1.21).

Remark 1.14. *If f is a concave map satisfying the assumptions (H1), (H2)-(i) and $\|f\|_{I'} > 0$ for $I' \subseteq I$, or (H1) and (H2)-(ii), or (H1) and (H2)-(iii), then the same conclusions of Theorem 1.11 and of Theorem 1.12 hold, replacing $[D^-\bar{u}(x)]_-$ with $[D^+\bar{u}(x)]_+$ and $[D^+\psi(x)]_+$ with $[D^-\psi(x)]_-$ in the inequalities (1.11), (1.13).*

Remark 1.15. *Theorem 1.12 shows that, for conservation laws with convex or concave fluxes satisfying the assumptions (H1) and (H2)-(ii) or (H2)-(iii), by choosing a suitable source term h in (1.4) we can steer in any arbitrarily small time $T > 0$, every initial BV state \bar{u} which does not admit shock discontinuities to every BV target state ψ which does not admit discontinuities generating a rarefaction wave. This result is included in the ones established in [38], but here we obtain the solution u as limit of smooth solutions, which are easier to handle both for numeric schemes and for treating similar problems in the case of diagonal systems of conservation laws.*

The general strategy adopted in Section 2 to establish the main results of the paper is basically an application of the so-called *return method* introduced by Coron (see [17]) in combination with the analysis of the Riccati equation governing the evolution of the space derivative of the solutions. In fact, exploiting the a-priori bounds on the solutions of the Riccati equation, we construct a source control which steers in a minimal time the initial data \bar{u} to some constant state, say w_1 , that can be quite far from the initial and terminal states \bar{u}, ψ . Similarly, one can produce a source control that steers in minimal time some constant states, say w_2 (far away from \bar{u}, ψ), to the terminal state ψ . Then, it's straightforward to see that we can connect w_1 and w_2 in an arbitrarily small time τ , taking h so that $\int_0^\tau h(t)dt = w_2 - w_1$. In the case of convex flux f , the explicit construction of the source control allows to provide a-priori estimates on the control and on the solution of (1.4) in terms of the \mathbf{L}^∞ norm of \bar{u}, ψ , of the negative variation of \bar{u} , and of the positive variation of ψ . In turn, such a-priori bounds are crucial to establish in Section 3 the corresponding controllability results in the BV-setting. Some exemplifying applications for traffic flow and sedimentation models are illustrated in Section 4.

2 Global controllability of C^1 states

2.1 Reduction to null controllability

Since classical solutions of (1.4) are time reversible, we can recover the global controllability of C^1 states provided by Theorems 1.2-1.4-1.6-1.9 from the null controllability of (1.4). Thus, it will be sufficient to prove:

Proposition 2.1. *In the same setting and with the same assumptions of Theorem 1.2, for any $T > T_1^*$ with $T_1^* \geq 0$ as in (1.10), and for every $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$ with $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I'_1$, and satisfying*

$$\|\bar{u}'\|_{C^0([a, b])} < \frac{\|f\|_{I'_1}}{(b-a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}}, \quad (2.22)$$

there exists $h \in C^0([0, T])$ vanishing at $t = 0, T$, so that the Cauchy problem (1.4), (1.2) admits a classical solution $u \in C^1([0, T] \times [a, b])$ that satisfies

$$u(T, x) = 0 \quad x \in [a, b]. \quad (2.23)$$

Proposition 2.2. *In the same setting and with the same assumptions of Theorem 1.4, for any $T > 0$, and for every $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$, there exists $h \in C^0([0, T])$ vanishing at $t = 0, T$, so that the Cauchy problem (1.4), (1.2) admits a classical solution $u \in C^1([0, T] \times [a, b])$ that satisfies (2.23).*

Proposition 2.3. *In the same setting and with the same assumptions of Theorem 1.6, given any $a < b$, $\rho > 0$, and $T > T_1^*$, with $T_1^* \geq 0$ as in (1.10), there exists $C_1 > 0$ depending on $b-a$, T , T_1^* , $\arg \sup \|f\|_{I'_{1, c_1}}$ (c_1 being a constant depending on $\rho, T - T_1^*$), so that the following hold. For every $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$, with $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I'_1$, and satisfying*

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\bar{u}'(x)]_- \leq \frac{\|f\|_{I'_1}}{(b-a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}} - \rho, \quad (2.24)$$

there exists $h \in C^0([0, T])$ vanishing at $t = 0, T$, with

$$\|h\|_{C^0([0, T])} + \text{Tot.Var.}\{h; [0, T]\} \leq C_1 \cdot \left(1 + \|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a, b])}\right), \quad (2.25)$$

so that the Cauchy problem (1.4), (1.2) admits a classical solution $u \in C^1([0, T] \times [a, b])$ that satisfies (2.23) and

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^0([a, b])} + \text{Tot.Var.}\{u(t, \cdot); [a, b]\} \leq C_1 \cdot \left(\|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a, b])} + \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\bar{u}'(x)]_-\right) \quad \forall t \in (0, T). \quad (2.26)$$

Proposition 2.4. *In the same setting and with the same assumptions of Theorem 1.9, given any $a < b$ and $T > 0$, for every $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$ there exists $h \in C^0([0, T])$ vanishing at $t = 0, T$, so that the Cauchy problem (1.4), (1.2) admits a classical solution $u \in C^1([0, T] \times [a, b])$ that satisfies (2.23).*

The following lemmas show that Theorems 1.2-1.4-1.6-1.9 are indeed a consequence of Proposition 2.1-2.2-2.3-2.4.

Lemma 2.1. *Proposition 2.1 \implies Theorem 1.2, Proposition 2.2 \implies Theorem 1.4.*

Proof. We provide only a proof of the first implication, the second being entirely similar. Let $T > T^*$ and, given $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$, $\psi \in C^1([a, b])$, with $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I'_1$, $\text{Im}(\psi) \subsetneq I'_2$, which satisfy (1.9), set

$$\bar{u}_1(x) \doteq \bar{u}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{u}_2(x) \doteq \psi(a + b - x) \quad x \in [a, b]. \quad (2.27)$$

Observe that \bar{u}_1, \bar{u}_2 satisfy the assumptions (2.22) (with I'_2 in place of I'_1 for \bar{u}_2). Hence, by Theorem 2.1 there exist $h_i \in C^0([0, T_i])$, $T_i > T_i^*$, $i = 1, 2$, vanishing at $t = 0, T_i$, and $u_i \in C^1([0, T_i] \times [a, b])$, $i = 1, 2$, with $T = T_1 + T_2$, that satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u_i + \partial_x f(u_i) &= h_i(t), \quad t \in [0, T_i], \quad x \in [a, b], \\ u_i(0, x) &= \bar{u}_i(x), \quad u_i(T_i, x) = 0, \quad x \in [a, b]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

Consider the function

$$u(t, x) = \begin{cases} u_1(t, x) & \text{if } t \in [0, T_1], \quad x \in [a, b], \\ u_2(T - t, a + b - x) & \text{if } t \in [T_1, T], \quad x \in [a, b], \end{cases} \quad (2.29)$$

and define

$$h(t) = \begin{cases} h_1(t) & \text{if } t \in [0, T_1], \\ -h_2(T - t) & \text{if } t \in [T_1, T]. \end{cases} \quad (2.30)$$

Then, relying on (2.28), by a direct computation it follows that $u(t, x)$ is a solution of (1.4). Moreover, since (2.28) together with $h_1(T_1) = h_2(T_2) = 0$ imply that $u_1(T_1, \cdot) = u_2(T_2, \cdot) = \partial_t u_1(T_1, \cdot) = \partial_t u_2(T_2, \cdot) \equiv 0$, we deduce that u is a continuously differentiable map on $[0, T] \times [a, b]$. Finally, observe that (2.27), (2.28), (2.29) yield $u(0, \cdot) = \bar{u}_1 = \bar{u}$, $u(T, \cdot) = \bar{u}_2(a + b - \cdot) = \psi$, which shows that u is a C^1 classical solution of (1.4) steering the equation from \bar{u} to ψ . \square

Lemma 2.2. *Proposition 2.3 \implies Theorem 1.6, Proposition 2.4 \implies Theorem 1.9.*

Proof. We provide only a proof of the first implication, the second being entirely similar. Let $T > T^*$ and, given $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$, $\psi \in C^1([a, b])$, with $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I'_1$, $\text{Im}(\psi) \subsetneq I'_2$, which satisfy (1.11), adopting the same setting (2.27) we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{u}_1\|_{C^0([a, b])} &= \|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a, b])}, \quad \|\bar{u}_2\|_{C^0([a, b])} = \|\psi\|_{C^0([a, b])}, \quad \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\bar{u}'_1(x)]_- = \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\bar{u}'(x)]_-, \\ \text{and} \quad \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\bar{u}'_2(x)]_- &= \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [-\psi'(a + b - x)]_- = \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\psi'(x)]_+. \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

Hence, relying on Proposition 2.3 and following the same arguments of the proof of Lemma 2.1 we deduce that the function u defined in (2.29) is a C^1 classical solution of (1.4), with h as in (2.30), steering the equation from \bar{u} to ψ . Moreover, by Theorem 2.3 we are assuming that

$$\|h_i\|_{C^0([0, T])} + \text{Tot.Var.}\{h_i; [0, T]\} \leq C_1 \cdot \left(1 + \|\bar{u}_i\|_{C^0([a, b])}\right), \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (2.32)$$

and

$$\|u_i(t, \cdot)\|_{C^0([a, b])} + \text{Tot.Var.}\{u_i(t, \cdot); [a, b]\} \leq C_1 \cdot \left(\|\bar{u}_i\|_{C^0([a, b])} + \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\bar{u}'_i(x)]_-\right) \quad (2.33)$$

for all $t \in (0, T_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. Observe that, by (2.29)-(2.30), there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|h\|_{C^0([0, T])} &\leq \max_i \|h_i\|_{C^0([0, T_i])}, \quad \text{Tot.Var.}\{h; [0, T]\} \leq \sum_i \text{Tot.Var.}\{h_i; [0, T_i]\}, \\ \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^0([a, b])} &\leq \begin{cases} \|u_1(t, \cdot)\|_{C^0([a, b])} & \text{if } t \in [0, T_1], \\ \|u_2(T - t, \cdot)\|_{C^0([a, b])} & \text{if } t \in [T_1, T], \end{cases} \\ \text{Tot.Var.}\{u(t, \cdot); [a, b]\} &\leq \begin{cases} \text{Tot.Var.}\{u_1(t, \cdot); [a, b]\} & \text{if } t \in [0, T_1], \\ \text{Tot.Var.}\{u_2(T - t, \cdot); [a, b]\} & \text{if } t \in [T_1, T]. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

Thus, from (2.32)-(2.33) we deduce that the functions h, u defined in (2.30), (2.29), respectively, satisfy the bounds (1.12)-(1.13) stated in Theorem 1.6 (with a constant C_1 different from the one provided by Proposition 2.3). \square




Figure 1: Extension of the initial data

2.2 Null controllability

Proof of Proposition 2.1.

1. Given $T > T_1^*$ with $T_1^* \geq 0$ as in (1.10), and $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$ with $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I'_1$, satisfying (2.22), let $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ be such that

$$T > T_0 \doteq \frac{(b-a)}{\|f\|_{I'_1}} \cdot (1 + 2\varepsilon_1), \quad (2.35)$$

$$\|\bar{u}'\|_{C^0([a,b])} < \frac{\|f\|_{I'_1}}{(b-a) \cdot (1 + 3\varepsilon_1) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}}. \quad (2.36)$$

Then, we extend \bar{u} to a continuously differentiable function on the entire line \mathbb{R} , that we still denote \bar{u} , so that

$$\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I'_1, \quad \|\bar{u}'\|_{C^0(\mathbb{R})} < \frac{\|f\|_{I'_1}}{(b-a) \cdot (1 + 3\varepsilon_1) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}}, \quad (2.37)$$

$$\bar{u}(x) = \begin{cases} \alpha_- & \text{if } x \leq a - \varepsilon_1 \cdot (b-a), \\ \alpha_+ & \text{if } x \geq b + \varepsilon_1 \cdot (b-a), \end{cases} \quad (2.38)$$

for some constants $\alpha_-, \alpha_+ \in \mathbb{R}$.

Observe that, for any $h \in C^0([0, +\infty])$, the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u + \partial_x f(u) &= h(t), \quad t > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ u(0, x) &= \bar{u}(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.39)$$

admits a classical solution $u(t, x)$ defined on some maximal interval $[0, T^h)$. Given any fixed $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, let $x(\cdot)$ denote the unique forward characteristics of (2.39) starting from x_0 , i.e. the unique solution of

$$\dot{x}(t) = f'(u(t, x(t))), \quad t \in [0, T^h), \quad (2.40)$$

satisfying $x(0) = x_0$. Then, $z_0(t) \doteq u(t, x(t))$ is a Carathéodory solution of

$$\dot{z}_0(t) = h(t), \quad t \in [0, T^h), \quad z_0(0) = \bar{u}(x_0).$$

On the other hand, observe that the function $w(t, x) = \partial_x u(t, x)$ is a broad solution on $[0, T^h) \times \mathbb{R}$ of the semilinear equation

$$\partial_t w(t, x) + f'(u(t, x)) \cdot \partial_x w(t, x) = -f''(u(t, x)) \cdot w^2(t, x). \quad (2.41)$$

Hence, relying on (2.41) we deduce that $z_1(t) \doteq \partial_x u(t, x(t))$ is a Carathéodory solution of

$$\dot{z}_1(t) = -f''(u(t, x(t))) \cdot z_1^2(t), \quad t \in [0, T^h], \quad z_1(0) = \bar{u}'(x_0). \quad (2.42)$$

Then, a direct computation yields

$$z_0(t) = \bar{u}(x_0) + \int_0^t h(\tau) d\tau, \quad (2.43)$$

$$x(t) = x_0 + \int_0^t f'(z_0(\tau)) d\tau = x_0 + \int_0^t f' \left(\bar{u}(x_0) + \int_0^\tau h(s) ds \right) d\tau, \quad (2.44)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{z_1(t)} = \frac{1}{\bar{u}'(x_0)} + \int_0^t f''(z_0(\tau)) d\tau, \quad (2.45)$$

for all $t \in [0, T^h]$.

2. Consider the continuous function

$$\begin{aligned} h(t) = & \frac{t \cdot \bar{h}}{\tau_1} \cdot \chi_{[0, \tau_1]} + \bar{h} \cdot \chi_{[\tau_1, T_0]} + \frac{(T_1 - t) \cdot \bar{h}}{\tau_1} \cdot \chi_{[T_0, T_1]} \\ & - \frac{16(t - T_1) \cdot (\alpha + T_0 \cdot \bar{h})}{3(T - T_1)^2} \cdot \chi_{\left[T_1, \frac{T + 3T_1}{4}\right]} - \frac{4(\alpha + T_0 \cdot \bar{h})}{3(T - T_1)} \cdot \chi_{\left[\frac{T + 3T_1}{4}, \frac{3T + T_1}{4}\right]} \\ & + \left[-\frac{4(\alpha + T_0 \cdot \bar{h})}{3(T - T_1)} + \frac{4(4t - 3T - T_1) \cdot (\alpha + T_0 \cdot \bar{h})}{3(T - T_1)^2} \right] \cdot \chi_{\left[\frac{3T + T_1}{4}, T\right]}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.46)$$

where χ_J denotes the characteristic function of an interval $J \subset \mathbb{R}$, T_0 is the time defined in (2.35), while $\alpha \in \{\alpha_-, \alpha_+\}$, and the constants $0 < \tau_1 < T - T_0$, $\bar{h} \in \mathbb{R}$, will be chosen later so that

$$T_1 \doteq T_0 + \tau_1 < T^h \quad (2.47)$$

(T^h being the maximal time of existence of a classical solution to (2.39)), and such that there holds

$$u(T_1, x) = \alpha + T_0 \cdot \bar{h} \quad x \in [a, b]. \quad (2.48)$$

Notice that the definition of (2.46), together with (2.48), then implies

$$u(t, x) = \alpha + T_0 \cdot \bar{h} + \int_{T_1}^t h(s) ds \quad t \in [T_1, T], \quad x \in [a, b], \quad (2.49)$$

which in turn, by a direct computation, yields

$$u(T, x) = \alpha + T_0 \cdot \bar{h} - \alpha - T_0 \cdot \bar{h} = 0 \quad x \in [a, b], \quad (2.50)$$

thus showing that condition (2.23) is verified. Hence, in order to conclude the proof of the theorem we need only to establish (2.47)-(2.48), with $\alpha = \alpha_-$ or $\alpha = \alpha_+$. To this end, relying on (2.43)-(2.45), we find

$$z_0(t) = \bar{u}(x_0) + \frac{t^2 \cdot \bar{h}}{2\tau_1} \cdot \chi_{[0, \tau_1]} + \left(t - \frac{\tau_1}{2}\right) \cdot \bar{h} \cdot \chi_{[\tau_1, T_0]} + \left(T_0 - \frac{(T_1 - t)^2}{2\tau_1}\right) \cdot \bar{h} \cdot \chi_{[T_0, T_1]} \quad (2.51)$$




Figure 2: The source control

for all $t \in [0, T_1]$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
x(T_1) &= x_0 + \int_0^{\tau_1} f'(z_0(s))ds + \int_{\tau_1}^{T_0} f'(\bar{u}(x_0) + \frac{\tau_1 \cdot \bar{h}}{2} + (s - \tau_1) \cdot \bar{h}) ds + \int_{T_0}^{T_1} f'(z_0(s))ds \\
&= x_0 + \int_0^{\tau_1} f'(z_0(s))ds + \frac{1}{\bar{h}} \cdot \left[f(\bar{u}(x_0) + (T_0 - \frac{\tau_1}{2}) \cdot \bar{h}) - f(\bar{u}(x_0) + \frac{\tau_1 \bar{h}}{2}) \right] + \int_{T_0}^{T_1} f'(z_0(s))ds \\
&= x_0 + \int_0^{\tau_1} f'(z_0(s))ds + T_0 \cdot \Delta f(\bar{u}(x_0); T_0 \cdot \bar{h}) \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau_1}{2} \cdot \left[\Delta f(\bar{u}(x_0) + T_0 \cdot \bar{h}; -\frac{\tau_1 \bar{h}}{2}) - \Delta f(\bar{u}(x_0); \frac{\tau_1 \bar{h}}{2}) \right] + \int_{T_0}^{T_1} f'(z_0(s))ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.52}$$

3. Since we are assuming that $\|f\|_{I'_1} > 0$, and because $\text{Im}(\bar{u})$ is a closed interval, recalling definition (1.7) and (2.37) there will be some \bar{k} such that, either

$$\Delta f(u; \bar{k}) > \|f\|_{I'_1} - \frac{\varepsilon_1 \cdot (b - a)}{2T_0} \quad \forall u \in \text{Im}(\bar{u}), \tag{2.53}$$

or

$$\Delta f(u; \bar{k}) < -\|f\|_{I'_1} + \frac{\varepsilon_1 \cdot (b - a)}{2T_0} \quad \forall u \in \text{Im}(\bar{u}), \tag{2.54}$$

with ε_1 as in (2.35)-(2.36). To fix the ideas, assume that (2.53) holds and that $\bar{k} > 0$. Then, choosing

$$\bar{h} = \frac{\bar{k}}{T_0}, \tag{2.55}$$

we find

$$\Delta f(\bar{u}(x_0); T_0 \cdot \bar{h}) > \|f\|_{I'_1} - \frac{\varepsilon_1 \cdot (b - a)}{2T_0}. \tag{2.56}$$

Hence, if $x(T_1) \in [a, b]$, and we choose

$$\tau_1 < \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_1 \cdot (b - a)}{6 \cdot \|f'\|_{C^0(I)}}, T - T_0 \right\}, \tag{2.57}$$

combining (2.52) with (2.56), and recalling (2.35), we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
x_0 &\leq x(T_1) + 3\tau_1 \cdot \|f'\|_{C^0(I)} - T_0 \cdot \Delta f(\bar{u}(x_0); T_0 \cdot \bar{h}) \\
&\leq b - T_0 \cdot \|f\|_{I'_1} + 3\tau_1 \cdot \|f'\|_{C^0(I)} + \frac{\varepsilon_1 \cdot (b - a)}{2} \\
&< b - T_0 \cdot \|f\|_{I'_1} + \varepsilon_1 \cdot (b - a) = a - \varepsilon_1 \cdot (b - a).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.58}$$

Because of (2.38), (2.51), the inequality (2.58) implies that $u(T_1, x(T_1)) = \bar{u}(x_0) + T_0 \cdot \bar{h} = \alpha_- + T_0 \cdot \bar{h}$, which proves (2.48), choosing

$$\alpha = \alpha_- . \quad (2.59)$$

On the other hand, relying on (2.35), (2.37), (2.45), and taking

$$\tau_1 < \frac{\varepsilon_1 \cdot (b-a)}{2 \cdot \|f\|_{I'_1}}, \quad (2.60)$$

we deduce that, if $\bar{u}'(x_0) \neq 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|z_1(t)|} &\geq \frac{1}{|\bar{u}'(x_0)|} - \left| \int_0^t f''(z_0(\tau)) d\tau \right| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\|\bar{u}'\|_{C^0(\mathbb{R})}} - t \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)} \\ &> \frac{(b-a) \cdot (1+3\varepsilon_1) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}}{\|f\|_{I'_1}} - T_1 \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)} \\ &> \frac{(b-a) \cdot \varepsilon_1 \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}}{2 \cdot \|f\|_{I'_1}} \quad \forall t \in [0, T_1]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.61)$$

Therefore, choosing

$$\tau_1 < \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_1 \cdot (b-a)}{6 \cdot \|f'\|_{C^0(I)}}, \frac{\varepsilon_1 \cdot (b-a)}{\|f\|_{I'_1}}, T - T_0 \right\}, \quad (2.62)$$

and observing that $z_1(t) \equiv 0$ if $\bar{u}'(x_0) = 0$, we deduce from (2.61) that, for every solution $x(t)$ of (2.40) starting at $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, the function $z_1(t) = \partial_x u(t, x(t))$ satisfies

$$|z_1(t)| < +\infty \quad \forall t \in [0, T_1], \quad (2.63)$$

which yields (2.47). This completes the proof of the theorem with the choice of \bar{h} , α and τ_1 in (2.46) according with (2.55), (2.59), (2.62), respectively.

□

Proof of Proposition 2.2.

To fix the ideas assume that the flux f satisfies the assumptions **(H1)** and **(H2)-(ii)**. Given $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$, set $I'_1 \doteq \text{Im}(\bar{u})$ and $I_u \doteq (i_-, u)$. Observe that, because of **(H2)-(ii)** and (1.15), we have

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{(b-a)}{\|f\|_{I'_{1,u}}} = \lim_{u \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{(b-a)}{|f'(u)|} = 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\|f\|_{I'_{1,u}}}{(b-a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I_u)}} = \lim_{u \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\|f'\|_{C^0(I_u)}}{(b-a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I_u)}} = +\infty,$$

where $\|f\|_{I'_{1,u}}$ is defined as in (1.14). Then, given any $T > 0$, there will be $u_0 > i_-$ such that

$$T > \frac{(b-a)}{\|f\|_{I'_{1,u_0}}}, \quad \|\bar{u}'\|_{C^0([a,b])} < \frac{\|f\|_{I'_{1,u_0}}}{(b-a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I_{u_0})}}. \quad (2.64)$$

Now, applying Theorem 2.1 to the flux $f : I_{u_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and to the initial data $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$, which satisfy the assumptions **(H1)**, **(H2)-(i)**, $\|f\|_{I'_{1,u_0}} > 0$, and (2.22), respectively, we deduce the conclusion of Proposition 2.2. □

Proof of Proposition 2.3.

1. Given $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$ satisfying $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I'_1$ and (2.24), let $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ (depending on $T - T_1^*$ and ρ) be such that $T > T_0$, with T_0 as in (2.35), and

$$\frac{[f]_{I'_1}}{(b-a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}} - \rho < \frac{[f]_{I'_1}}{(b-a) \cdot (1+3\varepsilon_1) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}}. \quad (2.65)$$

Then, in view of (2.24), (2.65), we extend \bar{u} to a continuously differentiable function on \mathbb{R} , that we still denote \bar{u} , so that

$$\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I'_1, \quad \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} [\bar{u}'(x)]_- < \frac{[f]_{I'_1}}{(b-a) \cdot (1+3\varepsilon_1) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}}, \quad (2.66)$$

$$\|\bar{u}\|_{C^0(\mathbb{R})} \leq 2 \cdot \|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a,b])}, \quad \text{Tot.Var.}\{\bar{u}; \mathbb{R}\} \leq 2 \cdot \text{Tot.Var.}\{\bar{u}; [a, b]\}, \quad (2.67)$$

$$\bar{u}(x) = \begin{cases} \alpha_- & \text{if } x \leq a - \varepsilon_1 \cdot (b-a), \\ \alpha_+ & \text{if } x \geq b + \varepsilon_1 \cdot (b-a), \end{cases} \quad (2.68)$$

for some constants

$$\alpha_-, \alpha_+ \in \text{Im}(\bar{u}). \quad (2.69)$$

Next observe that, if we show that the Cauchy problem (2.39), with h defined as in (2.46), admits a classical solution u on $[0, T_1] \times \mathbb{R}$, with T_0 as in (2.35), and $\tau_1 > 0$ satisfying (2.57), then by the same arguments of the proof of Theorem 2.1 we deduce that (2.48), (2.50) hold. Hence, in order to complete the proof that u is a classical solution of (1.4), (1.2) satisfying (2.23), it remains to prove that (2.47) is also true. To this end notice that, since $f''(u)$ is nonnegative (being f a convex map), by (2.42) it follows that z_1 is a decreasing map on $[0, T^h]$. Moreover, if $\bar{u}'(x_0) > 0$ from (2.45) it follows that $z_1(t) > 0$ for all $t \in [0, T^h]$. On the other hand, in the case where $\bar{u}'(x_0) < 0$, relying on (2.35), (2.45), (2.66), and taking τ_1 as in (2.60), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{z_1(t)} &\leq \frac{1}{\bar{u}'(x_0)} + \left| \int_0^t f''(z_0(\tau)) d\tau \right| \\ &\leq \frac{-1}{\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} [\bar{u}'(x)]_-} + t \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)} \\ &< -\frac{(b-a) \cdot (1+3\varepsilon_1) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}}{[f]_{I'_1}} + T_1 \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)} \\ &< -\frac{(b-a) \cdot \varepsilon_1 \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}}{2 \cdot [f]_{I'_1}} \quad \forall t \in [0, T_1]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.70)$$

Thus, choosing τ_1 as in (2.62), we derive

$$-\infty < z_1(t) \leq \bar{u}'(x_0) \quad \forall t \in [0, T_1], \quad x_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.71)$$

which shows that (2.47) is verified.

2. By the definition of h in (2.46), and because of (2.69), a direct computation yields

$$\text{Tot.Var.}\{h; [0, T]\} = \frac{2 \cdot |\bar{k}|}{T_0} + \frac{8 \cdot |\alpha_{\pm} + \bar{k}|}{3 \cdot (T - T_1)} \leq \left(\frac{6T + 2T_0 - 6\tau_1}{3T_0 \cdot (T - T_1)} \right) \cdot |\bar{k}| + \frac{8}{3(T - T_1)} \cdot \|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a,b])}, \quad (2.72)$$

$$\|h\|_{C^0([0, T])} \leq \frac{\text{Tot.Var.}\{h; [0, T]\}}{2} \leq \left(\frac{3T + T_0 - 3\tau_1}{3T_0 \cdot (T - T_1)} \right) \cdot |\bar{k}| + \frac{4}{3(T - T_1)} \cdot \|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a,b])}, \quad (2.73)$$

$$\left| \int_0^t h(s) ds \right| \leq |\bar{k}| + |\alpha_{\pm}| \leq |\bar{k}| + \|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a,b])} \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad (2.74)$$

where $\bar{k} = T_0 \cdot \bar{h}$ is a constant choosen so that (2.53) holds which, recalling (1.8), (2.35), can be taken so that

$$|\bar{k}| \leq \arg \sup[|f|]_{I'_1, c_1} + 1, \quad c_1 \leq \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2(1+2\varepsilon_1)} \cdot [|f|]_{I'_1}. \quad (2.75)$$

Then, choosing

$$\tau_1 < \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_1 \cdot (b-a)}{6 \cdot \|f'\|_{C^0(I)}}, \frac{\varepsilon_1 \cdot (b-a)}{[|f|]_{I'_1}}, \frac{T-T_0}{2} \right\}, \quad (2.76)$$

(2.72), (2.73) imply

$$\|h\|_{C^0([0,T])} + \text{Tot.Var.}\{h; [0, T]\} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{6T+3T_0}{T_0 \cdot (T-T_0)}, \frac{8}{T-T_0} \right\} \cdot \left(|\bar{k}| + \|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a,b])} \right), \quad (2.77)$$

while from (2.43), (2.66), (2.74), we deduce

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{C^0([a,b])} \leq |\bar{k}| + 4 \cdot \|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a,b])}. \quad (2.78)$$

Next, observe that, letting $\text{Tot.Var.}^-\{\bar{u}; [a, b]\}$ denote the negative variation of \bar{u} on $[a, b]$ (e.g. see [24]), one has

$$\text{Tot.Var.}\{\bar{u}; [a, b]\} \leq 2 \left(\|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a,b])} + \text{Tot.Var.}^-\{\bar{u}; [a, b]\} \right). \quad (2.79)$$

Thus, we have

$$\text{Tot.Var.}\{\bar{u}; [a, b]\} \leq 2 \cdot (1 + (b-a)) \cdot \left(\|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a,b])} + \sup_{x \in [a,b]} [\bar{u}'(x)]_- \right). \quad (2.80)$$

On the other hand, notice that a classical solution of (2.39) is also the unique entropic weak solutions of (2.39). Hence, since scalar balance laws as in (2.39), with a source term h only depending on time, admit entropic weak solutions with total variation nonincreasing in time (e.g. obtained by an operator splitting algorithm, see [18]), relying also on (2.67) we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tot.Var.}\{u(t, \cdot); [a, b]\} &\leq \text{Tot.Var.}\{u(t, \cdot); \mathbb{R}\} \\ &\leq \text{Tot.Var.}\{\bar{u}; \mathbb{R}\} \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \text{Tot.Var.}\{\bar{u}; [a, b]\} \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.81)$$

Then, combinig (2.80), (2.81), we obtain

$$\text{Tot.Var.}\{u(t, \cdot); [a, b]\} \leq 4 \cdot (1 + (b-a)) \cdot \left(\|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a,b])} + \sup_{x \in [a,b]} [\bar{u}'(x)]_- \right). \quad (2.82)$$

Hence, (2.77), (2.78), (2.82) show that the estimates (2.25), (2.26) are satisfied with

$$C_1 = \max \left\{ \frac{(6T+3T_0) \cdot (1 + |\bar{k}|)}{T_0 \cdot (T-T_0)}, \frac{8(1 + |\bar{k}|)}{T-T_0}, 4(2 + (b-a)) + |\bar{k}| \right\}, \quad (2.83)$$

where \bar{k} satisfies the bound (2.75). This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.4.

The conclusions of Proposition 2.4 follow from Proposition 2.3 with the same arguments of the proof of Proposition 2.2. \square

3 Controllability of BV states

Proof of Theorem 1.11.

Given $\bar{u} \in BV([a, b])$ and $\psi \in BV([a, b])$, with $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I'_1$, $\text{Im}(\psi) \subsetneq I'_2$, and such that (1.17) holds, relying on Lemma 5.1 in the Appendix there will be sequences $\{\bar{u}_n\}_{n \geq 1}, \{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset C^1([a, b])$, with $\text{Im}(\bar{u}_n) \subsetneq I'_1$, $\text{Im}(\psi_n) \subsetneq I'_2$ such that

$$\bar{u}_n \rightarrow \bar{u}, \quad \psi_n \rightarrow \psi \quad \text{in } \mathbf{L}^1([a, b]), \quad (3.84)$$

and

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\bar{u}'_n(x)]_- \leq \frac{[f]_{I'_1}}{(b-a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}} - \rho, \quad \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\psi'_n(x)]_+ \leq \frac{[f]_{I'_2}}{(b-a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}} - \rho. \quad (3.85)$$

Then, applying Theorem 1.6 for each pair $\bar{u}_n, \psi_n \in C^1([a, b])$, we deduce the existence of $\{h_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset C^0([0, T])$, with $T > T^*$, and $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset C^0([a, b] \times [0, T])$ that are classical solutions of

$$\partial_t u_n + \partial_x f(u_n) = h_n(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in [a, b], \quad (3.86)$$

$$u_n(0, x) = \bar{u}_n(x) \quad x \in [a, b], \quad (3.87)$$

$$u_n(T, x) = \psi_n(x) \quad x \in [a, b], \quad (3.88)$$

which satisfy the estimates

$$\|h_n\|_{C^0([0, T])} + \text{Tot.Var.}\{h_n; [0, T]\} \leq C_1 \cdot \left(1 + \|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a, b])} + \|\psi\|_{C^0([a, b])}\right), \quad (3.89)$$

and

$$\|u_n(t, \cdot)\|_{C^0([a, b])} + \text{Tot.Var.}\{u_n(t, \cdot); [a, b]\} \leq C_1 \cdot \left(\|\bar{u}\|_{C^0([a, b])} + \|\psi\|_{C^0([a, b])} + \frac{[f]_{I'_1} + [f]_{I'_2}}{(b-a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}}\right) \quad (3.90)$$

for all $n \geq 1$, $t \in (0, T)$.

Observe that each u_n is also a weak entropic solution of (3.86) and that, since (3.90) provides a uniform bound on the total variation of $u_n(t, \cdot)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, applying [18, Theorem 4.3.1] we deduce that $t \rightarrow u_n(t, \cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous in $\mathbf{L}^1([a, b])$ on $[0, T]$. Moreover, by (3.90) $\{u_n(t, \cdot)\}_{n \geq 1}$ are uniformly bounded for all $t \in [0, T]$. Therefore, invoking a consequence of Helly's compactness Theorem (e.g. see [13, Theorem 2.4]), we deduce the existence of a function $u \in \mathbf{L}^1([0, T] \times [a, b]; I)$, which is Lipschitz continuous from $[0, T]$ into $\mathbf{L}^1([a, b]; I)$, and such that, up to a subsequence, there holds

$$u_n(t, \cdot) \rightarrow u(t, \cdot) \quad \text{in } \mathbf{L}^1([a, b]) \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.91)$$

On the other hand (3.89) provides a uniform bound on $\{h_n\}_n$ and on their total variation. Hence, by Helly's compactness Theorem there will be a function $h \in BV([0, T])$ so that, up to a subsequence, there holds

$$h_n \rightarrow h \quad \text{in } \mathbf{L}^1([0, T]). \quad (3.92)$$

Hence, relying on (3.91)-(3.92), and on the fact that each u_n is an entropic weak solution of (3.86), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_a^b \left\{ \eta(u(t, x)) \partial_t \varphi(t, x) + q(u(t, x)) \partial_x \varphi(t, x) + \eta'(u(t, x)) h(t) \cdot \varphi(t, x) \right\} dx dt \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_a^b \left\{ \eta(u_n(t, x)) \partial_t \varphi(t, x) + q(u_n(t, x)) \partial_x \varphi(t, x) + \eta'(u_n(t, x)) h_n(t) \cdot \varphi(t, x) \right\} dx dt \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.93)$$

for every entropy / entropy flux pair (η, q) , with η convex. Thus (3.93), together with (3.84), (3.87), (3.91), proves that u is an entropic weak solution of the Cauchy problem (1.4), (1.2), while (3.84), (3.88), (3.91) show that the terminal condition (1.5) is satisfied. Finally, we observe that, by the lower semicontinuity of the total variation with respect to the \mathbf{L}^1 convergence, and because of (3.91), (3.92), we recover the estimates (1.18), (1.19), from (3.89) and (3.90), respectively. This concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.12.

To fix the ideas assume that the flux f satisfies the assumptions **(H1)** and **(H2)-(ii)**. Then, given $\bar{u} \in BV([a, b])$, $\psi \in BV([a, b])$ satisfying (1.20), and $T > 0$, setting $I'_1 \doteq \text{Im}(\bar{u})$, $I'_2 \doteq \text{Im}(\psi)$, $I_u \doteq (i_-, u)$, by the same arguments, and with the same notations, of the proof of Theorem 2.2, we deduce that there will be $u_0 > i_-$ such that

$$T > (b - a) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\|f\|_{I'_1, u_0}} + \frac{1}{\|f\|_{I'_2, u_0}} \right),$$

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b]} [D^- \bar{u}(x)]_- < \frac{\|f\|_{I'_1, u_0}}{(b - a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}} - \rho, \quad \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [D^+ \bar{u}(x)]_- < \frac{\|f\|_{I'_2, u_0}}{(b - a) \cdot \|f''\|_{C^0(I)}} - \rho, \quad (3.94)$$

for some $\rho > 0$. Hence, according to Lemma 5.1 there exist sequences $\{\bar{u}_n\}_{n \geq 1}, \{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset C^1([a, b])$, with $\text{Im}(\bar{u}_n) \subsetneq \text{Im}(\bar{u})$, $\text{Im}(\psi_n) \subsetneq \text{Im}(\psi)$, which satisfy (3.84), (3.85). Now, applying Theorem 1.6 to the flux $f : I_{u_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which satisfy the assumptions **(H1)**, **(H2)-(i)**, $\|f\|_{I'_1, u_0} > 0$, $\|f\|_{I'_2, u_0} > 0$, and to each pair $\bar{u}_n, \psi_n \in C^1([a, b])$, that satisfy the estimates (1.11), by the same arguments of the proof of Theorem 1.11 we deduce the conclusions of Theorem 1.12. \square

4 Some applications

In this section we discuss the application of the controllability results established in the paper to some examples of conservation laws describing vehicular traffic and sedimentation processes. Traffic source control can be implemented in a variety of ways so to modulate the flux capacity of the road, e.g. using route recommendation panels, variable speed limit regulation [26], employing integrated vehicular and roadside sensors [23] or autonomous vehicles [27]. Control strategies adopted in the process of continuous sedimentation taking place in a clarifier-thickener unit, or settler (used, for example, in waste water treatment), usually consist in modulating the inflow and outflow of the settler containing solid particles dispersed in a liquid [20, 21].

4.1 LWR traffic flow models

Consider the Lighthill, Whitham [36] and Richards [39] (LWR) model describing the evolution of unidirectional traffic flow along a stretch of road, say parametrized by $x \in [a, b]$, given by the conservation law

$$\partial_t \rho_t + \partial_x f(\rho) = 0, \quad (4.95)$$

where $\rho(t, x)$ denotes the (normalized) traffic density, taking values in the interval $[0, 2]$, and $f(\rho) = \rho v(\rho)$ is the flux (the so-called fundamental diagram) depending on the average traffic speed $v(\rho)$. We first assume that, according with the Greenshields' relationship, $v(\rho) = 2 - \rho$ which leads to the strictly concave flux

$$f_1(\rho) = \rho(2 - \rho) \quad \rho \in [0, 2]. \quad (4.96)$$

Then, in connection with the sets $I_{1,1} = [0, \frac{3}{4}]$, $I_{1,2} = [\frac{3}{4}, \frac{5}{4}]$, $I_{1,3} = [\frac{3}{2}, 2]$ (see Figure 3), by a direct computation we find

$$\|f_1\|_{I_{1,1}} = f'_1\left(\frac{3}{4}\right) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \|f_1\|_{I_{1,2}} = \left| \frac{f_1\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) - f_1\left(\frac{3}{4}\right)}{\frac{3}{4}} \right| = \frac{1}{4}, \quad \|f_1\|_{I_{1,3}} = \left| f'_1\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) \right| = 1. \quad (4.97)$$




Figure 3: Flux $f_1(\rho) = \rho(2 - \rho)$




Figure 4: Flux $f_2(\rho) = \rho e^{-\frac{\rho}{(2-\rho)}}$

On the other hand, we have $f_1''(\rho) = -2$. Hence, invoking Remark 1.8 for the equation (4.95) with $f(\rho) = f_1(\rho)$, we deduce that we can produce a source control $h(t)$ which steers any $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$ to any target profile $\psi \in C^1([a, b])$:

- in a time $T > T_{1,1}^* + T_{1,2}^* = 6(b - a)$, provided that $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I_{1,1}$, $\text{Im}(\psi) \subsetneq I_{1,2}$, and

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\bar{u}'(x)]_+ < \frac{1}{4(b - a)}, \quad \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\psi'(x)]_- < \frac{1}{8(b - a)};$$

- in a time $T > T_{1,3}^* + T_{1,1}^* = 3(b - a)$, provided that $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I_{1,3}$, $\text{Im}(\psi) \subsetneq I_{1,1}$, and

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\bar{u}'(x)]_+ < \frac{1}{2(b - a)}, \quad \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\psi'(x)]_- < \frac{1}{4(b - a)}.$$

Observe that in the first case we are controlling a state \bar{u} to a target state ψ with possibly vanishing characteristics since $f_1'(1) = 0$ and $1 \in I_{1,2}$. Notice that the choice of the intervals $I_{1,1}, I_{1,2}, I_{1,3}$ is made only to simplify the computation, but one can derive similar results for any pair of interval $I'_1, I'_2 \subsetneq [0, 2]$ such that $[[f_1]]_{I'_1} > 0$, $[[f_1]]_{I'_2} > 0$ by first solving the optimization problem related to the definition (1.7) of $[[f_1]]_{I'_i}$, $i = 1, 2$, and then carrying out similar computations as above. On the other hand, relying on Remark 1.14 we can produce a source control $h(t)$ which steers any $\bar{u} \in BV([a, b])$ to any target profile $\psi \in BV([a, b])$:

- in a time $T > T_{1,1}^* + T_{1,2}^* = 6(b - a)$, provided that $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I_{1,1}$, $\text{Im}(\psi) \subsetneq I_{1,2}$, and

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b]} [D^+ \bar{u}(x)]_+ < \frac{1}{4(b - a)}, \quad \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [D^- \psi(x)]_- < \frac{1}{8(b - a)};$$

- in a time $T > T_{1,3}^* + T_{1,1}^* = 3(b - a)$, provided that $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I_{1,3}$, $\text{Im}(\psi) \subsetneq I_{1,1}$, and

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b]} [D^+ \bar{u}(x)]_+ < \frac{1}{2(b - a)}, \quad \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [D^- \psi(x)]_- < \frac{1}{4(b - a)}.$$

Next, we assume that the traffic speed has the expression $v(\rho) = e^{-\frac{\rho}{(2-\rho)}}$ according with the Bonzani and Mussone's model [12], which leads to the (non concave) bell-shaped flux

$$f_2(\rho) = \rho e^{-\frac{\rho}{(2-\rho)}} \quad \rho \in [0, 2]. \quad (4.98)$$

Then, in connection with the set $I_{2,1} = [\frac{4}{3}, 2]$, $I_{2,2} = [\frac{3}{5}, 1]$ (see Figure 4), by a direct computation we find

$$[f_2]_{I_{2,1}} \approx \left| \frac{f_2(\frac{4}{3}) - f_2(\frac{4}{3} - 0, 717)}{0, 717} \right| \approx 0, 298 \quad [f_2]_{I_{2,2}} = \left| f_2(\frac{8}{5}) - f_2(\frac{3}{5}) \right| \approx 0, 361. \quad (4.99)$$

On the other hand, we have $\|f_2''\|_{C^0([0,2])} = f_2''(\frac{11+\sqrt{13}}{9}) \approx 2, 323$, and thus $\frac{[f_2]_{I_{2,1}}}{\|f_2''\|_{C^0([0,2])}} \approx 0, 128$, $\frac{[f_2]_{I_{2,2}}}{\|f_2''\|_{C^0([0,2])}} \approx 0, 155$. Hence, invoking Remark 1.8 for the equation (4.95) with $f(\rho) = f_2(\rho)$, we can produce a source control $h(t)$ which steers any $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$ to any target profile $\psi \in C^1([a, b])$:

– in a time $T > T_{2,1}^* + T_{2,2}^* \approx 6, 125(b - a)$, provided that $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I_{2,1}$, $\text{Im}(\psi) \subsetneq I_{2,2}$, and

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\bar{u}'(x)]_+ < \frac{0, 128}{(b - a)}, \quad \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [\psi'(x)]_- < \frac{0, 155}{(b - a)}.$$

Similarly, relying on Remark 1.14, we can produce a source control $h(t)$ which steers any $\bar{u} \in BV([a, b])$ to any target profile $\psi \in BV([a, b])$:

– in a time $T > T_{2,1}^* + T_{2,2}^* \approx 6, 125(b - a)$, provided that $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I_{2,1}$, $\text{Im}(\psi) \subsetneq I_{2,2}$, and

$$\sup_{x \in [a, b]} [D^+ \bar{u}(x)]_+ < \frac{0, 128}{(b - a)}, \quad \sup_{x \in [a, b]} [D^- \psi(x)]_- < \frac{0, 155}{(b - a)}.$$

Again, we observe that these results guarantee the controllability of possibly critical states since $f_2'(3 - \sqrt{5}) = 0$ and $3 - \sqrt{5} \in I_{2,2}$.

4.2 Kynch's sedimentation model

According with the solid-flux theory by Kynch [31], the sedimentation of a suspension of small particles dispersed in a viscous fluid can be described by a conservation law

$$\partial_t u_t + \partial_x f(u) = 0, \quad (4.100)$$

where $u(t, x)$ denotes the solid fraction, taking values in the interval $[0, 1]$, and the flux function (also called drift-flux) has the same type of expression of the LWR flux, i.e. $f(u) = u v(u)$, with $v(u)$ denoting the local settling velocity of the particles. Typically f is a concave-convex map with one inflection point. Here we consider the sedimentation of a solid substance suspended in a cylindrical batch of height L , parametrized so that the bottom is located at $x = 0$ and the top at $x = L$, with the drift-flux function proposed in [37] which, up to normalization, in this case can be written as

$$f_3(u) = -u(1 - u)^2 \quad u \in [0, 1]. \quad (4.101)$$

Then, in connection with the set $I_{3,1} = [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$, $I_{3,2} = [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]$ (see Figure 5), by a direct computation we find

$$[f_3]_{I_{3,1}} = [f_3]_{I_{3,2}} = \left| \frac{f_3(1) - f_3(\frac{2}{3})}{\frac{1}{3}} \right| = \left| \frac{f_3(\frac{2}{3}) - f_3(\frac{1}{3})}{\frac{1}{3}} \right| = \frac{2}{9} \approx 0, 222. \quad (4.102)$$

On the other hand, we have $\|f_3''\|_{C^0([0,1])} = |f_3''(0)| = 4$, and thus $\frac{[f_3]_{I_{3,1}}}{\|f_3''\|_{C^0([0,1])}} = \frac{[f_3]_{I_{3,2}}}{\|f_3''\|_{C^0([0,1])}} \approx 0, 055$. Hence, invoking Remark 1.8 for the equation (4.100) with $f(u) = f_3(u)$, we can produce a source control $h(t)$ which steers any $\bar{u} \in C^1([a, b])$ to any target profile $\psi \in C^1([a, b])$:




Figure 5: Flux $f_3(u) = -u(1-u)^2$

- in a time $T > T_{3,1}^* + T_{3,2}^* = 9(b-a)$, provided that $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I_{3,1}$, $\text{Im}(\psi) \subsetneq I_{3,2}$, and

$$\sup_{x \in [a,b]} [\bar{u}'(x)]_+ < \frac{1}{2(b-a)}, \quad \sup_{x \in [a,b]} [\psi'(x)]_- < \frac{1}{2(b-a)}.$$

Similarly, relying on Remark 1.14, we can produce a source control $h(t)$ which steers any $\bar{u} \in BV([a,b])$ to any target profile $\psi \in BV([a,b])$:

- in a time $T > T_3^* = 9(b-a)$, provided that $\text{Im}(\bar{u}) \subsetneq I_{3,1}$, $\text{Im}(\psi) \subsetneq I_{3,2}$, and

$$\sup_{x \in [a,b]} [D^+ \bar{u}(x)]_+ < \frac{1}{2(b-a)}, \quad \sup_{x \in [a,b]} [D^- \psi(x)]_- < \frac{1}{2(b-a)}.$$

Again, we observe that these results guarantee the controllability of possibly critical states since $f_3'(\frac{1}{3}) = 0$ and $\frac{1}{3} \in I_{3,1}$.

5 Appendix

The approximation of BV function satisfying a one-sided Lipschitz condition in terms of smooth functions satisfying the same Lipschitz condition (used in the proof of Theorem 1.11) is guaranteed by the following lemma. The result is standard, but we provide a proof for completeness.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\varphi \in BV([a,b])$, with $\text{Im}(\varphi) \subsetneq I$, satisfy*

$$D^+ \varphi(x) < M \quad \forall x \in [a,b], \quad (5.103)$$

for some $M > 0$. Then, there exists $\{\varphi_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset C^1([a,b])$, with $\text{Im}(\varphi_n) \subseteq I$, for all n sufficiently large, and satisfying

$$\varphi_n'(x) < M \quad \forall x \in [a,b], \quad \forall n \geq 1, \quad (5.104)$$

such that

$$\varphi_n \rightarrow \varphi \quad \text{in } \mathbf{L}^1([a,b]). \quad (5.105)$$

Proof. Observe that, because of (5.103), the map $x \mapsto \psi(x) = \varphi(x) - Mx$ is strictly decreasing on $[a,b]$. Let $\rho_n \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $n > 0$, be a standard mollifier, i.e.

$$\rho_n \geq 0, \quad \text{supp}(\rho_n) \subseteq (-\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}), \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_n(x) dx = 1.$$

Then, we have that $\psi_n = \rho_n * \psi \in C^\infty([a,b])$, with $\text{Im}(\psi_n) \subsetneq I$ for all n sufficiently large, and

$$\psi_n \rightarrow \psi \quad \text{in } \mathbf{L}^1([a,b]).$$

Moreover, for every $x_1 < x_2$, there holds

$$\psi_n(x_2) - \psi_n(x_1) = \int [\psi(x_2 - y) - \psi(x_1 - y)] \cdot \rho_n(y) dy < 0.$$

Thus, one has $D^+ \psi_n(x) < 0$ for all n , and the sequence $\varphi_n = \psi_n + Mx$ does the job. \square

References

- [1] Adimurthi, S.S. Ghoshal, and G.D.V. Gowda, *Exact controllability of scalar conservation laws with strict convex flux*, Math. Control Relat. Fields, **4** (2014), 401–449, <https://doi.org/10.3934/mcrf.2014.4.401>.
- [2] F. Ancona, A. Cesaroni, G. M. Coclite, and M. Garavello, *On the optimization of conservation law models at a junction with inflow and flow distribution controls*, SIAM J. Control Optim., **56** (2018), pp. 3370–3403.
- [3] F. Ancona, A. Cesaroni, G. M. Coclite, and M. Garavello, *On optimization of traffic flow performance for conservation laws on networks*, Minimax Theory Appl., (2021), to appear, pp. 119.
- [4] F. Ancona, O. Glass and K. T. Nguyen, *Lower compactness estimates for scalar balance laws*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **65** (2012), no. 9, pp. 1303–1329.
- [5] F. Ancona, O. Glass and K. T. Nguyen, *On Kolmogorov entropy compactness estimates for scalar conservation laws without uniform convexity*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **51** (2019), no. 4, pp. 3020–3051.
- [6] F. Ancona and A. Marson, *On the attainable set for scalar non-linear conservation laws with boundary control*, SIAM J. Control Optim. **36** (1998), no. 1, pp. 290–312.
- [7] F. Ancona and A. Marson, *Scalar non-linear conservation laws with integrable boundary data*, Nonlinear Anal. **35** (1999), 687–710.
- [8] F. Ancona and K.T. Nguyen, *On the controllability of rich systems of hyperbolic conservation laws with boundary and source controls*. in preparation (2020).
- [9] B. Andreianov, C. Donadello, S.S. Ghoshal and U. Razafison, *On the attainable set for a class of triangular systems of conservation laws*. J. Evol. Equ. **15** (2015), no. 3, 503–532.
- [10] B. Andreianov, C. Donadello and A. Marson, *On the attainable set for a scalar nonconvex conservation law*. SIAM J. Control Optim. **55** (2017), no. 4, 2235–2270.
- [11] S. Bianchini and L. Spinolo, *An overview on the approximation of boundary Riemann problems through physical viscosity*, Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **47** (2016), no. 1, 131–142.
- [12] I. Bonzani and L. Mussone, *From experiments to hydrodynamic traffic flow models. I. Modelling and parameter identification*, Math. Comput. Modelling **37** (2003), no. 12–13, 1435–1442.
- [13] A. Bressan, *Hyperbolic systems of conservation laws. The one-dimensional Cauchy problem. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and Its Applications*, **20**. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000.
- [14] M. Chapouly, *Global controllability of nonviscous and viscous Burgers-type equations*. SIAM J. Control Optim. **48** (2009), no. 3, 1567–1599.
- [15] R. M. Colombo, P. Goatin and M. D. Rosini, *On the modelling and management of traffic*, ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal., **45**, (2011), 853–872.
- [16] M. Corgi and A. Marson, *On the attainable set for scalar balance laws with distributed control*. ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **22** (2016), no. 1, 236–266.
- [17] J.-M. Coron, *Control and Nonlinearity, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs* **136**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2007.
- [18] C. M. Dafermos, *Hyperbolic conservation laws in continuum physics*. Fourth edition. *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*, **325**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2016.

- [19] M.L. Delle Monache, B. Piccoli and F. Rossi, *Traffic regulation via controlled speed limit*, SIAM J. Control Optim. 55 (2017), no. 5, 2936–2958.
- [20] S. Diehl, *Dynamic and steady-state behavior of continuous sedimentation*. SIAM J. Appl. Math. 57 (1997), no. 4, 991–1018.
- [21] S. Diehl S and S. Farås, *Control of an ideal activated sludge process in wastewater treatment via an ODE-PDE model*, J. Process Control 23 (2013), 359–81.
- [22] F. Dubois and P. G. LeFloch, *Boundary conditions for nonlinear hyperbolic systems of conservation laws*. J. Differential Equations 71 (1988), 93–122.
- [23] Yu B. Gaididei, C. Gorria, R. Berkemer, A. Kawamoto, T. Shiga, P.L. Christiansen, M.P. Sørensen, J. Starke, *Controlling traffic jams by time modulating the safety distance*, Physical Review E, 88 (4), (2013), 042803-1–042803-13.
- [24] G. B. Folland, Real analysis. Modern techniques and their applications. Second edition. *Pure and Applied Mathematics* (New York). A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1999. xvi+386 pp.
- [25] O. Glass, *An introduction to controllability problems for entropy solutions of one-dimensional systems of conservation laws* in: One-dimensional hyperbolic conservation laws and their applications, 161–224, Ser. Contemp. Appl. Math. CAM, 21, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2019.
- [26] P. Goatin, S. Gttlich, and O. Kolb, *Speed limit and ramp meter control for traffic flow networks*, Eng. Optim., 48 (2016), pp. 1121–1144.
- [27] M. Garavello, P. Goatin, T. Liard, B. Piccoli, *A multiscale model for traffic regulation via autonomous vehicles*. J. Differential Equations 269 (2020), no. 7, 60886124.
- [28] S. Gttlich, M. Herty, A. Klar, *Modelling and optimization of supply chains on complex networks*. Commun. Math. Sci. 4 (2006), no. 2, 315–330.
- [29] L. Hörmander, Lectures on Nonlinear Hyperbolic Differential Equations. *Mathématiques and Application* 26, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.
- [30] T. Horsin, *On the controllability of the Burgers equation*, ESAIM - Control, Optim. Calc. Var. 3 (1998), pp. 83–95.
- [31] G. J. Kynch, *A theory of sedimentation*, Trans. Faraday Soc. 48 (1952), 166–76.
- [32] M. La Marca, D. Armbruster, M. Herty, C. Ringhofer, *Control of continuum models of production systems*. IEEE Trans. Automat. Control 55 (2010), no. 11, 2511–2526.
- [33] M. Léautaud, *Uniform controllability of scalar conservation laws in the vanishing viscosity limit*. SIAM J. Control Optim. 50 (2012), no. 3, 1661–1699.
- [34] T. Li and B. Rao, *Exact controllability for first order quasilinear hyperbolic systems with vertical characteristics*. Acta Math. Sc. 29B (2009), no. 4, 980–990.
- [35] T. Li and L. Yu, *Exact controllability for first-order quasilinear hyperbolic systems with zero eigenvalues*, Chin. Ann. Math., 24B(4) (2003), 415–422.
- [36] M. J. Lighthill and G. B. Whitham, *On kinematic waves. II. A theory of traffic flow on long crowded roads*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A, 229 (1955), pp. 317–345.
- [37] A.D. Maude, R.L. Whitmore, *A generalized theory of sedimentation*, Br. J. Appl. Phys. 9 (1958) 477–482.
- [38] V. Perrollaz, *Exact controllability of scalar conservation laws with an additional control in the context of entropy solutions*. SIAM J. Control Optim. 50 (2012), no. 4, 2025–2045.

- [39] P. I. Richards, *Shock waves on the highway*, Operations Res., 4 (1956), pp. 4251.
- [40] D. Serre, Systèmes de lois de conservation. II. *Fondations*. Diderot Editeur, Paris, 1996.
- [41] Z. Q. Wang, *Global exact controllability for quasilinear hyperbolic systems of diagonal form with linearly degenerate characteristics*, Nonlinear Anal., **69** (2008), 510–522.
- [42] K. Zhuang, *Exact controllability with internal controls for first-order quasilinear hyperbolic systems with zero eigenvalues*, Chin. Ann. Math., **37B**(4) (2016), 503–514.
- [43] K. Zhuang, T. Li and B. Rao, *Exact controllability for first order quasilinear hyperbolic systems with internal controls*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **36** (2016), no. 2, 1105–1124.