

Uniqueness of Inverse Source Problems for General Evolution Equations

Yavar Kian[†] Yikan Liu[‡] Masahiro Yamamoto^{*}

January 8, 2022

Abstract In this article, we investigate inverse source problems for a wide range of PDEs of parabolic and hyperbolic types as well as time-fractional evolution equations by partial interior observation. Restricting the source terms to the form of separated variables, we establish uniqueness results for simultaneously determining both temporal and spatial components without non-vanishing assumptions at $t = 0$, which seems novel to the best of our knowledge. Remarkably, mostly we allow a rather flexible choice of the observation time not necessarily starting from $t = 0$, which fits into various situations in practice. Our main approach is based on the combination of the Titchmarsh convolution theorem with unique continuation properties and time-analyticity of the PDEs under consideration.

Keywords Inverse source problem, evolution equation, uniqueness, Titchmarsh convolution theorem, unique continuation

AMS Subject Classifications 35R11, 35R30, 35B60

1 Introduction

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d = 2, 3, \dots$) be a bounded domain whose boundary $\partial\Omega$ is of C^2 class. For $f \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$, define the elliptic operators

$$\mathcal{A}f(\mathbf{x}) := -\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x})\nabla f(\mathbf{x})) + c(\mathbf{x})f(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathcal{L}f(\mathbf{x}) := (\mathcal{A} + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla)f(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega,$$

where \cdot and $\nabla = (\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_d})$ refer to the inner product in \mathbb{R}^d and the gradient in \mathbf{x} , respectively. Here $\mathbf{a} = (a_{jk})_{1 \leq j, k \leq d} \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$, $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_d) \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $c \in L^q(\Omega)$ with $q \in (\frac{d}{2}, \infty]$ are \mathbf{x} -dependent matrix-, vector- and scalar-valued functions, respectively. Further, there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x})\boldsymbol{\xi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} \geq \kappa|\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \overline{\Omega}, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad c(\mathbf{x}) \geq \kappa \text{ a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega,$$

Manuscript last updated: January 8, 2022.

[†]Aix Marseille Université, Université de Toulon, CNRS, CPT, Marseille, France.

E-mail: yavar.kian@univ-amu.fr

[‡]Research Center of Mathematics for Social Creativity, Research Institute for Electronic Science, Hokkaido University, N12W7, Kita-Ward, Sapporo 060-0812, Japan. E-mail: ykliu@es.hokudai.ac.jp

^{*}Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan; Honorary Member of Academy of Romanian Scientists, Splaiul Independentei Street, No. 54, 050094 Bucharest, Romania; Research Center of Nonlinear Problems of Mathematical Physics, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University), 6 Miklukho-Maklaya Street, Moscow 117198, Russian Federation. E-mail: myama@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

where $|\xi|^2 := \xi \cdot \xi$. Meanwhile, for $\beta \in (0, 2]$ we denote the β -th order Caputo derivative in t by

$$\partial_t^\beta f(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\lceil \beta \rceil - \beta)} \int_0^t \frac{f^{(\lceil \beta \rceil)}(\tau)}{(t - \tau)^{\beta - \lceil \beta \rceil}} d\tau, & \beta \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2), \\ f^{(\beta)}(t), & \beta = 1, 2, \end{cases} \quad f \in C^2([0, \infty)),$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$, $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ and $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ stand for the Gamma function, the ceiling and the floor functions, respectively. In this paper, the order of the Caputo derivative is either a constant in $(0, 2]$ or an x -dependent piecewise constant function taking value in $(0, 1)$, which will be specified later in Section 2. We restrict the discussion of a variable order to $(0, 1)$ because there seems very few works on its generalization e.g. to $(0, 2)$.

Set $\mathbb{R}_+ := (0, \infty)$. In this paper, we are concerned with the following initial-boundary value problem for a (time-fractional) evolution equation

$$\begin{cases} \left(\rho(\mathbf{x}) \partial_t^{\alpha(\mathbf{x})} + \mathcal{L} \right) u(t, \mathbf{x}) = \mu(t)h(\mathbf{x}), & (t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega, \\ u(0, \mathbf{x}) = \partial_t^{\lceil \alpha \rceil - 1} u(0, \mathbf{x}) = 0, & \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \\ \mathcal{R}u(t, \mathbf{x}) = 0, & (t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where we make the following global assumptions:

$$\mu \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+) : \text{compactly supported, } \exists T_0 > 0 \text{ s.t. } \mu \not\equiv 0 \text{ in } (0, T_0), \quad (1.2)$$

$$h \in L^2(\Omega), \quad \rho \in L^\infty(\Omega), \quad \exists \underline{\rho}, \bar{\rho} > 0 \text{ s.t. } \underline{\rho} \leq \rho \leq \bar{\rho} \text{ a.e. in } \Omega. \quad (1.3)$$

Here \mathcal{R} denotes either the Dirichlet boundary condition or the Neumann boundary condition associated with the principal part \mathbf{a} of the elliptic operator \mathcal{A} , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{R}f(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{or} \quad \mathcal{R}f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}) \nabla f(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \partial\Omega,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\nu}(\mathbf{x})$ is the outward unit normal vector to $\partial\Omega$ at $\mathbf{x} \in \partial\Omega$. The solution to (1.1) is understood in the weak sense, whose precise definition will be given in Definition 2.1 (see Section 2).

This paper focuses on the uniqueness issue of the following inverse source problem concerning (1.1).

Problem 1.1 *Let u satisfy (1.1) with (1.2)–(1.3), $I \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ be a finite open interval and $\omega \subset \Omega$ a nonempty open subset. Under certain assumptions, determine h with given μ or determine h, μ simultaneously by the partial interior observation of u in $I \times \omega$.*

The governing equation in (1.1) takes the form of a rather general (time-fractional) evolution equation which includes the traditional parabolic and hyperbolic ones. Correspondingly, Problem 1.1 also covers a wide range of inverse source problems arising in several scientific areas including medical imaging, optical tomography, seismology and environmental problems. For a constant $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, Problem 1.1 corresponds to the recovery of a source in typical or anomalous diffusion processes appearing in geophysics, biology and environmental science (see e.g. [20, 40]). For $\alpha = 2$, our inverse problem can be associated with the determination of an acoustic source with applications in area such as medical imaging and seismology. For instance, Problem 1.1 with $\alpha = 2$ can be applied to some inverse diffraction and near-field holography problems (see e.g. [10, Chapter 2.2.5]). We mention also that problem (1.1) with a variable

order $\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ is considered as a model for diffusion phenomenon in some complex media, where the variation of α is due to the presence of heterogeneous regions. In that context, Problem 1.1 can be seen as the determination of a source appearing in a diffusion process associated with problems in chemistry [6], biology [11] and physics [46, 52].

Among the various formulations of inverse problems, inverse source problems have gathered consistent popularity owing to their theoretical and practical significance. The interested reader can refer to [17, 35] for an overview of these problems. For $\alpha = 1, 2$, these problems have been studied extensively in the last decades. Without being exhaustive, we refer to [7, 15, 16, 19, 26, 49–51], among which the approach of [15, 16, 51] was based on the Bukhgeim-Klibanov method introduced in [5]. For determining the temporal components in source terms of time-fractional diffusion equations and hyperbolic systems, we mention [9, 36, 37, 43] and [4, 12, 13], respectively. In the same spirit, [14, 32] were devoted to the determination of information about the support of general source terms in parabolic equations, and [3, 8] dealt with that of time-dependent point sources. It was proved in [31] that some classes of time-dependent source terms appearing in similar problems to (1.1) with a constant $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ can be reconstructed from boundary measurements when Ω is a cylindrical domain. The approach of [31] has been recently extended by [21] to similar equations with time-dependent elliptic operators. Meanwhile, in [33] the authors proved the recovery of general source terms from the full knowledge of the solution in a time interval (t_0, T) with $t_0 \in (0, T)$.

Let us emphasize that almost all above mentioned results assumed the unknown functions to be independent of either the time variable or one space variable. For the first class of source terms, the known component in the source term may depend on time. Among all these results, the strategy allowing the recovery of such classes of source terms requires the non-vanishing assumption of the known component of the source term at $t = 0$. Recently, [27] established one of the first results of recovering the source term in (1.1) without assuming $\mu(0) \neq 0$ or more generally, only requiring $\text{supp } \mu \subset [0, T)$. Moreover, [27] also proved the simultaneous determination of μ, h in (1.1) provided that the restriction of μ to a subinterval of \mathbb{R}_+ is known and admits an analytic extension. On the same direction of [27], in this paper we will demonstrate the possibility of determining μ, h simultaneously in more general settings. By the way, we restrict the source term to the form $\mu(t)h(\mathbf{x})$ of complete separated variables in view of the obstruction for this problem described e.g. in [27, §1.3.1].

Meanwhile, another highlight of Problem 1.1 is the relaxation of the observation time. In most literature on inverse source problems, the observation was assumed to start from $t = 0$. However in practice, usually the data is only available after the occurrence of some unpredictable accidents. Therefore, it is reasonable to generalize the observation time to a finite interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ not necessarily starting from $t = 0$. It turns out that such a relaxation gives affirmative answers to Problem 1.1 in most situations with unfortunate exceptions of $\alpha = 1, 2$.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we collect the preliminaries to deal with Problem 1.1 and state three main results on uniqueness according to the choices of α along with comments about these results. Then the next three sections are devoted to the proofs for different cases of α respectively. Finally, some technical details will be provided in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries and Main Results

To begin with, we first fix the frequently used notations in the sequel. Throughout this article, $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ stands for positive integers. By $H^s(\Omega)$ ($s \in \mathbb{R}$), $H_0^1(\Omega)$, $W^{1,1}(0, T)$, etc. we denote the usual Sobolev spaces (see Adams [1]). The weighted L^2 -space in Ω with the weight ρ is denoted by $L^2(\Omega; \rho d\mathbf{x})$. Given a nonempty subset $\omega \subset \Omega$, the duality pairing between $C_0^\infty(\omega)$ and the space $\mathcal{D}'(\omega)$ of Schwartz distributions is denoted by $\mathcal{D}'(\omega)\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)}$. For Banach spaces X and Y , we denote the collection of bounded linear operators from X to Y by $\mathcal{B}(X, Y)$, which is abbreviated as $\mathcal{B}(X)$ when $X = Y$. For $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$, its Laplace transform is denoted by

$$\widehat{f}(p) := \int_0^\infty e^{-pt} f(t) dt.$$

Further notations will be introduced whenever needed.

Before stating the main results, we briefly revisit the definition and the well-posedness of the governing system (1.1).

Definition 2.1 *Let the coefficients and the source term in (1.1) satisfy (1.2)–(1.3). We say that $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(\Omega))$ is a weak solution to (1.1) if it satisfies the following conditions.*

1. $p_0 := \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 \mid e^{-\varepsilon t} u \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(\Omega))\} < \infty$.
2. For all $p > p_0$, the Laplace transform $\widehat{u}(p; \cdot)$ of $u(t, \cdot)$ with respect to t solves the following boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} (\mathcal{L} + p^\alpha \rho) \widehat{u}(p; \cdot) = \widehat{\mu}(p) h & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathcal{R} \widehat{u}(p; \cdot) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

For a constant $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, the above definition of weak solutions is equivalent to that of mild solutions (see [28, 29, 31]) with smooth coefficients. For $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, we refer to [30, Theorem 2.3] (see also [29]) for the unique existence of a weak solution $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(\Omega))$ to (1.1). For $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\mathbf{b} \neq \mathbf{0}$, we refer to [23, pp.13–15] for the unique existence of a weak solution $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}_+; H^1(\Omega))$ to (1.1). For $\alpha \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, in Proposition 6.1 we prove the unique existence of a weak solution $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(\Omega))$ to (1.1). We point out that for $\alpha = 1, 2$, the weak solutions to (1.1) defined above coincide with the classical variational solution to the corresponding parabolic and hyperbolic equations, respectively.

Now we are well prepared to state our main results regarding Problem 1.1. Due to the essential difference of the problems and the corresponding results, we divide the statement into three contexts according to difference choices of α , namely

1. $\alpha \equiv 2$,
2. $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ is a constant, and
3. $\alpha : \Omega \rightarrow (0, 1)$ is a piecewise constant.

In each case, we first establish a uniqueness principle for (1.1) and then, as a direct consequence, state a uniqueness result regarding Problem 1.1

Case 1 $\alpha \equiv 2$. We denote by dist the Riemannian distance of $\overline{\Omega}$ equipped with the metric g , where $g = g(\mathbf{x})$ is the inverse of the matrix $(\rho^{-1}(\mathbf{x})a_{jk}(\mathbf{x}))_{1 \leq j, k \leq d}$.

Theorem 2.1 *Let u satisfy (1.1) with $\alpha \equiv 2$, where we assume (1.2)–(1.3) and additionally $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, $c \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $\rho \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$. For any nonempty open subset $\omega \subset \Omega$, if*

$$T \geq T_0 + \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \omega), \quad \text{where } \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \omega) := \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in \omega} \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \quad (2.2)$$

then $u = 0$ in $(0, T) \times \omega$ implies $h \equiv 0$.

An immediate application of Theorem 2.1 to Problem 1.1 indicates the unique determination of the spatial component h in the source term when the temporal component μ is known.

Corollary 2.1 *Let the conditions in Theorem 2.1 be fulfilled and u_i satisfy (1.1) with $\alpha \equiv 2$ and $h_i \in L^2(\Omega)$ ($i = 1, 2$), where $\mu \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ is known. Then $u_1 = u_2$ in $(0, T) \times \omega$ implies $h_1 = h_2$ in Ω .*

To the best of our knowledge, the uniqueness principle of Theorem 2.1 and the associated uniqueness in Corollary 2.1 are the first results on determining the spatial component h of the source term in a hyperbolic equation without assuming $\mu(0) \neq 0$ or $T = \infty$. Indeed, it seems that all other similar results required either some non-vanishing conditions at $t = 0$ (see e.g. [16, 19, 50, 51]) or infinite observation time (e.g. [12]). Especially, the non-vanishing condition in our context reads $\mu(0) \neq 0$, which restricts the problem under consideration to such a situation that the phenomenon of interest should start before observation. By removing this condition, we make the results of Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.1 more flexible to allow the measurement to start before the appearance of some unknown phenomenon.

Case 2 $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ is a constant.

Theorem 2.2 *Let u satisfy (1.1) with a constant $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, where we assume (1.2)–(1.3) and $h = 0$ in ω . Moreover, we restrict $\rho \equiv 1$ if $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{0}$ if $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. Then for any nonempty open subset $\omega \subset \Omega$,*

(1) *If $\alpha \neq 1$, then for any $T \geq T_0$ and any $T_1 \in [0, T)$, the following implication holds true.*

$$(u = 0 \text{ in } (T_1, T) \times \omega) \implies (h \equiv 0 \text{ in } \Omega). \quad (2.3)$$

(2) *If $\alpha = 1$, then the implication (2.3) holds true provided that $T_1 = 0$.*

Applying Theorem 2.2, we can prove the uniqueness for determining μ and h simultaneously in the source term of (1.1), provided that μ satisfies (1.2) and is known in $(0, T_0)$.

Corollary 2.2 *Let the conditions in Theorem 2.2 be fulfilled and u_i satisfy (1.1) with a constant $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $\mu_i \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ being compactly supported and $h_i \in L^2(\Omega)$ ($i = 1, 2$), where we assume*

$$\mu_1 \text{ satisfies (1.2), } \mu_1 = \mu_2 \text{ in } (0, T_0), \quad (2.4)$$

$$h_1 = h_2 \text{ in } \omega, \quad h_1 \not\equiv 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \quad (2.5)$$

Then

(1) *If $\alpha \neq 1$, then for any $T \geq T_0$ and any $T_1 \in [0, T_0)$, the following implication holds true.*

$$(u_1 = u_2 \text{ in } (T_1, T) \times \omega) \implies (\mu_1 \equiv \mu_2 \text{ in } (0, T) \text{ and } h_1 \equiv h_2 \text{ in } \Omega). \quad (2.6)$$

(2) *If $\alpha = 1$, then the implication (2.6) holds true provided that $T_1 = 0$.*

In [18, 27], similar results to Theorem 2.2 were established by requiring $T_1 = 0$. In this sense, Theorem 2.2 greatly improves the flexibility in the choice of the observation time. On the other hand, Theorem 2.2 extends the uniqueness principle in [27, Theorem 1.1] by removing the requirement $\text{supp } \mu \subset [0, T)$. Actually, the uniqueness principle of Theorem 2.2 even holds

true with measurement taken in $(0, T_0)$ where μ is not uniformly vanishing (see (1.2)). As a direct consequence of Theorem 2.2, Corollary 2.2 claims the uniqueness of the simultaneous determination of both temporal and spatial components of the source term under the tolerable extra assumptions (2.4)–(2.5). To the best of our knowledge, Corollary 2.2 is the first result on completely determining a source term of separated variables stated in such a general context. The only comparable result seems to be [27, Theorem 1.3], which additionally requires that the restriction of μ to $(0, T_0)$ admits a holomorphic extension to some neighborhood of \mathbb{R}_+ . In that sense, Corollary 2.2 generalizes [27, Theorem 1.3] considerably. In addition, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we also allow the presence of a convection term \mathbf{b} in (1.1), which breaks the symmetry of the elliptic part and thus any solution representation of (1.1) using the eigensystem. Therefore, instead of the method in [27], we adopt the idea in [18] to combine the time-analyticity of the solution with the unique continuation property of parabolic equations.

Case 3 $\alpha : \Omega \rightarrow (0, 1)$ is a piecewise constant. More precisely, we assume that for a fixed $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist constants $\alpha_\ell \in (0, 1)$ and open subdomains $\Omega_\ell \subset \Omega$ ($\ell = 1, 2, \dots, N$) with Lipschitz boundaries such that

$$\overline{\Omega} = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^N \overline{\Omega_\ell}, \quad \Omega_\ell \cap \Omega_m = \emptyset \quad (\ell \neq m), \quad (2.7)$$

$$\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \alpha_\ell \quad (\mathbf{x} \in \Omega_\ell, \ell = 1, \dots, N), \quad 0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \dots < \alpha_N < \min\{2\alpha_1, 1\}. \quad (2.8)$$

Theorem 2.3 *Let u satisfy (1.1) with $\alpha \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying (2.7)–(2.8), where we assume (1.2)–(1.3), $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{0}$ and there exists an open subdomain $\mathcal{O} \subset \Omega$ such that*

$$\left(\bigcup_{\ell=1}^N \partial\Omega_\ell \right) \setminus \partial\Omega \subset \mathcal{O}, \quad h = 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{O}. \quad (2.9)$$

Then for any open subset $\omega \subset \Omega$ satisfying

$$h = 0 \text{ in } \omega, \quad \omega \cap \mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset, \quad (2.10)$$

any $T \geq T_0$ and any $T_1 \in [0, T)$, the implication (2.3) holds true.

For a better understanding of the readers, in Figure 1 we illustrate a typical situation of the geometrical assumptions in Theorem 2.3.




Figure 1. A typical situation of the geometrical assumptions in Theorem 2.3 with $N = 4$. The subdomain \mathcal{O} is a connect open neighborhood of the interior boundaries of Ω_ℓ , which ω should intersect. The support of h and $\mathcal{O} \cup \omega$ are disjoint.

Parallel to that of Corollary 2.2, we can apply Theorem 2.3 to prove the unique determination of μ, h simultaneously in the source term of (1.1) under the same additional condition on μ .

Corollary 2.3 *Let the conditions in Theorem 2.3 be fulfilled and u_i satisfy (1.1) with $\alpha \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying (2.7)–(2.8), $\mu_i \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ being compactly supported and $h_i \in L^2(\Omega)$ ($i = 1, 2$), where we assume (2.4) and*

$$h_1 = h_2 \text{ in } \omega \cup \mathcal{O}, \quad h_1 \not\equiv 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \quad (2.11)$$

Then for any open subdomain $\omega \subset \Omega$ satisfying (2.10), any $T \geq T_0$ and any $T_1 \in [0, T_0)$, the implication (2.6) holds true.

To the best of our knowledge, Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 2.3 are the first results on the uniqueness of inverse source problems for time-fractional diffusion equations with variable orders. We restrict the order to a piecewise constant function due to its significance from the practical point of view. In that context, we obtain some uniqueness results comparable to the case of a constant order, provided that the support of spatial component in the source term does not pass through the regions where α takes different values (see condition (2.9)).

As was mentioned before, the highlight in Theorems 2.2–2.3 and Corollaries 2.2–2.3 is the relaxation of the choice of the observation time. Indeed, for $\alpha \neq 1$, all other related results required that the observation data should be taken from $t = 0$. In contrast, Theorems 2.2–2.3 and Corollaries 2.2–2.3 only assume that the measurement does not terminate earlier than T_0 in (1.2). Recalling that (1.2) means $\mu \not\equiv 0$ in $(0, T_0)$, such an assumption is the minimal necessary that one can expect. This remarkable relaxation not only allows the absence of data near the initial time, but also enables the delayed measurement carried out even after the disappearance of the source under consideration. Note that such restriction of the measurement requires the application of a result in [33], which cannot be applied to $\alpha = 1$. It is not clear whether the implication (2.3) still holds true for $\alpha = 1$ with $T_1 > 0$.

3 Proof of Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.1

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let u be the solution of (1.1) with $\alpha = 2$ and assume that the condition

$$u = 0 \quad \text{in } (0, T) \times \omega \quad (3.1)$$

is fulfilled, where T satisfies (2.2). We will show that (3.1) implies $h \equiv 0$.

According to the Duhamel's principle, it is readily seen that u takes the form of

$$u(t, \cdot) = \int_0^t \mu(t - \tau) v(\tau, \cdot) \, d\tau, \quad (3.2)$$

where v solves

$$\begin{cases} (\rho \partial_t^2 + \mathcal{A})v = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ v = 0, \quad \partial_t v = h & \text{in } \{0\} \times \Omega, \\ \mathcal{R}v = 0 & \text{on } (0, T) \times \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

By Lions and Magenes [39], we know $v \in C([0, T]; H^1(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0, T]; L^2(\Omega))$. Then for arbitrarily fixed $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\omega)$, it follows from (3.2) and (3.1) that

$$0 = {}_{\mathcal{D}'(\omega)} \langle u(t, \cdot), \psi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)} = \int_0^t \mu(t - \tau) v_\psi(\tau) \, d\tau, \quad 0 < t < T,$$

where $v_\psi(t) := \mathcal{D}'(\omega)\langle v(t, \cdot), \psi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)}$. Since $\mu \in L^1(0, T)$, we apply the Titchmarsh convolution theorem (see [48, Theorem VII]) to deduce that there exist $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in [0, T]$ satisfying $\tau_1 + \tau_2 \geq T$ such that

$$\mu \equiv 0 \text{ in } (0, \tau_1), \quad v_\psi \equiv 0 \text{ in } (0, \tau_2).$$

In view of the key assumption (1.2), we have $\tau_1 \leq T_0$. Then it follows from (2.2) that

$$\tau_2 \geq T - \tau_1 \geq T - T_0 \geq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \omega) =: T_1,$$

which implies

$$v_\psi(t) = \mathcal{D}'(\omega)\langle v(t, \cdot), \psi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)} = 0, \quad t \in [0, T_1].$$

Since in this identity, $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\omega)$ was chosen arbitrary and T_1 is independent of ψ , we deduce that

$$v = 0 \quad \text{in } (0, T_1) \times \omega. \quad (3.3)$$

On the other hand, recalling the metric g defined on $\bar{\Omega}$, we introduce the Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ_g associated with the Riemannian manifold $(\bar{\Omega}, g)$. Then there exists $\mathbf{K} \in C(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$(\partial_t^2 - \Delta_g + \mathbf{K} \cdot \nabla + \rho^{-1}c)v = (\partial_t^2 + \rho^{-1}\mathcal{A})v = 0 \quad \text{in } (0, T) \times \Omega.$$

Now we define the odd extension of v in $(-T, T) \times \Omega$, still denoted by v , by

$$v(t, \cdot) = -v(-t, \cdot) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad -T < t < 0.$$

Using the fact that $v(0, \cdot) = 0$, we see that $v \in H^1((-T, T) \times \Omega)$. Meanwhile, in view of (3.3), we see that v satisfies

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 - \Delta_g + \mathbf{K} \cdot \nabla + \rho^{-1}c)v = 0 & \text{in } (-T_1, T_1) \times \Omega, \\ v = 0 & \text{in } (-T_1, T_1) \times \omega. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, applying a global unique continuation result theorem similar to [22, Theorem 3.16] (see also [25, Theorem A.1]) derived from the local unique continuation result of [42, 47], we obtain

$$h = \partial_t v(0, \cdot) = 0 \quad \text{in } \{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega \mid \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \omega) \leq T_1\}.$$

Then it follows from the definition of T_1 that $\{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega \mid \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \omega) \leq T_1\} = \Omega$ or equivalently $h \equiv 0$ in Ω . This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.1. Introducing $u := u_1 - u_2$, it is readily seen that u satisfies

$$\begin{cases} (\rho(\mathbf{x})\partial_t^2 u + \mathcal{A})u(t, \mathbf{x}) = \mu(t)(h_1 - h_2)(\mathbf{x}), & (t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega, \\ u(0, \mathbf{x}) = \partial_t u(0, \mathbf{x}) = 0, & \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \\ \mathcal{R}u(t, \mathbf{x}) = 0, & (t, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Meanwhile, the condition $u_1 = u_2$ in $(0, T) \times \omega$ implies $u = 0$ in $(0, T) \times \omega$. Since T satisfies (1.2), Theorem 2.1 immediately implies $h_1 - h_2 \equiv 0$ or equivalently $h_1 \equiv h_2$ in Ω . \square

4 Proof of Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.2

In this section, we investigate the case of a constant $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ in (1.1). To this end, a similar solution representation to (3.2) is necessary, which requires some preparations.

In the case of $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, we specify \mathcal{L} as the unbounded elliptic operator acting on $L^2(\Omega)$ with the domain $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L}) = \{f \in H^2(\Omega) \mid \mathcal{R}f = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$. From now on, for all $s, \theta \in [0, \infty)$, we denote by $D_{s, \theta}$ the set

$$D_{s, \theta} := \{s + r e^{i\beta} \mid r > 0, \beta \in (-\theta, \theta)\}.$$

According to [2, Theorem 2.1] (see also [38, Theorem 2.5.1]), there exists $\theta_0 \in (\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi)$ and $s_0 \geq 0$ such that D_{s_0, θ_0} is in the resolvent set of \mathcal{L} . Moreover, there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending on \mathcal{L} and Ω such that

$$\|(\mathcal{L} + z)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega; \rho d\mathbf{x}))} + |z|^{-1} \|(\mathcal{L} + z)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega; \rho d\mathbf{x}); H^2(\Omega))} \leq C|z|^{-1}, \quad z \in D_{s_0, \theta_0}.$$

Here we employed the fact that $L^2(\Omega) = L^2(\Omega; \rho d\mathbf{x})$ in the sense of the norm equivalence thanks to (1.3). We fix $\theta_1 \in (\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0)$, $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and consider a contour $\gamma(\delta, \theta_1)$ in \mathbb{C} defined by

$$\gamma(\delta, \theta_1) := \gamma_-(\delta, \theta_1) \cup \gamma_0(\delta, \theta_1) \cup \gamma_+(\delta, \theta_1)$$

oriented in the counterclockwise direction, where

$$\gamma_0(\delta, \theta_1) := \{s_0 + \delta e^{i\beta} \mid \beta \in [-\theta_1, \theta_1]\}, \quad \gamma_{\pm}(\delta, \theta_1) := \{s_0 + r e^{\pm i\theta_1} \mid r \geq \delta\}$$

with double signs in the same order.

Let $\theta_2 \in (0, \theta_1 - \frac{\pi}{2})$. Applying the above properties of \mathcal{L} , for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $z \in D_{0, \theta_2}$, we can define an operator $S_1(z) \in \mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))$ by

$$S_1(z)u_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma(\delta, \theta_1)} e^{zp} (\mathcal{L} + p^\alpha)^{-1} u_0 dp, \quad u_0 \in L^2(\Omega).$$

We recall the following property of the map $z \mapsto S_1(z)$.

Lemma 4.1 (see [23, Lemma 2.4]) *For all $\beta \in [0, 1]$, the map $z \mapsto S_1(z)$ is analytic from D_{0, θ_2} to $\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega); H^{2\beta}(\Omega))$. Moreover, there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on \mathcal{L} and Ω such that*

$$\|S_1(z)\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega; \rho d\mathbf{x}); H^{2\beta}(\Omega))} \leq C|z|^{\alpha(1-\beta)-1} e^{s_0 \operatorname{Re} z}, \quad z \in D_{0, \theta_2}. \quad (4.1)$$

In addition to this property, we combine (4.1) with the arguments for [28, Theorem 1.1] and [28, Remark 1] to deduce that for $\mu \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$, (1.1) admits a unique weak solution $u \in C([0, \infty); L^2(\Omega))$ taking the form

$$u(t, \cdot) = \int_0^t \mu(t - \tau) S_1(\tau) h d\tau. \quad (4.2)$$

Using some arguments similar to that for [27, Proposition 6.1], one can show that the identity (4.2) also holds true for $\mu \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ with a compact support.

Likewise, in the case of $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ with $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, we turn to the eigensystem $\{(\lambda_n, \varphi_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of the self-adjoint operator $A = \rho^{-1} \mathcal{A}$ acting on $L^2(\Omega; \rho d\mathbf{x})$, with the boundary condition $\mathcal{R}u = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$, to define an operator $S_2(t)$ for $t > 0$ by

$$S_2(t)u_0 = t^{\alpha-1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E_{\alpha, \alpha}(-t^\alpha \lambda_n) (u_0, \varphi_n)_\rho \varphi_n, \quad u_0 \in L^2(\Omega),$$

where $(\cdot, \cdot)_\rho$ denotes the inner product of $L^2(\Omega; \rho d\mathbf{x})$. Here $E_{\alpha, \alpha}(\cdot)$ is the Mittag-Leffler function defined by

$$E_{\alpha, \alpha}(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{\Gamma(\alpha k + \alpha)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Similarly as before, applying [41, Theorem 1.6] and following the arguments used in [29, Theorem 1.1], one can check that S_2 is well-defined as an element of $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega)))$. Moreover, we can show that (1.1) admits a unique weak solution $u \in C(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(\Omega))$ taking the form

$$u(t, \cdot) = \int_0^t \mu(t - \tau) S_2(\tau) h d\tau. \quad (4.3)$$

For the proof of Theorem 2.2, we also invoke the Riemann-Liouville integral operator I^β and the Riemann-Liouville derivative D_t^β for $\beta \in (0, 2]$:

$$I^\beta f(t) := \begin{cases} f(t), & \beta = 0, \\ \frac{1}{\Gamma(\beta)} \int_0^t \frac{f(\tau)}{(t - \tau)^{1-\beta}} d\tau, & \beta > 0 \end{cases} \quad (f \in C([0, \infty))), \quad D_t^\beta := \frac{d^{[\beta]}}{dt^{[\beta]}} \circ I^{[\beta]-\beta},$$

where \circ denotes the composite. We need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 4.2 *Let $h \in L^1(0, T)$, $\beta \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2)$, $\lambda > 0$ and $w \in L^1(0, T)$ be given by*

$$w(t) := \int_0^t (t - \tau)^{\beta-1} E_{\beta, \beta}(-\lambda(t - \tau)^\beta) h(\tau) d\tau.$$

Then

$$(D_t^\beta + \lambda)w(t) = h(t), \quad t \in (0, T)$$

holds true in the sense of distributions.

The result of Lemma 4.2 is rather classical for smooth function h . However, we have not found a clear proof of such result for $h \in L^1(0, T)$. For this reason, we provide its full proof here.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Let $\beta \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2)$ and fix a sequence $\{h_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C_0^\infty(0, T)$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|h_k - h\|_{L^1(0, T)} = 0.$$

One can check that, for $\{w_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by

$$w_k(t) := \int_0^t (t - \tau)^{\beta-1} E_{\beta, \beta}(-\lambda(t - \tau)^\beta) h_k(\tau) d\tau,$$

there holds

$$(D_t^\beta + \lambda)w_k(t) = h_k(t), \quad t \in (0, T). \quad (4.4)$$

Moreover, applying [41, Theorem 1.6] and Young's convolution inequality, we get

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|w_k - w\|_{L^1(0, T)} \leq C \|t^{\beta-1}\|_{L^1(0, T)} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|h_k - h\|_{L^1(0, T)} = 0.$$

In the same way, we obtain

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|I^\beta w_k - I^\beta w\|_{L^1(0, T)} \leq C \|t^{[\beta]-\beta}\|_{L^1(0, T)} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|w_k - w\|_{L^1(0, T)} = 0. \quad (4.5)$$

Therefore, fixing $\chi \in C_0^\infty(0, T)$ and applying (4.5), we find

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}'(0, T) \langle D_t^\beta w_k, \chi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(0, T)} &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}'(0, T) \langle \partial_t^{[\beta]} I^{[\beta]-\beta} w_k, \chi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(0, T)} \\
 &= (-1)^{[\beta]} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}'(0, T) \langle I^{[\beta]-\beta} w_k, \chi^{([\beta])} \rangle_{C_0^\infty(0, T)} \\
 &= (-1)^{[\beta]} \mathcal{D}'(0, T) \langle I^{[\beta]-\beta} w, \chi^{([\beta])} \rangle_{C_0^\infty(0, T)} \\
 &= \mathcal{D}'(0, T) \langle D_t^\beta w, \chi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(0, T)}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

In the same way, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}'(0, T) \langle w_k, \chi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(0, T)} &= \mathcal{D}'(0, T) \langle w, \chi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(0, T)}, \\
 \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}'(0, T) \langle h_k, \chi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(0, T)} &= \mathcal{D}'(0, T) \langle h, \chi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(0, T)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining these identities with (4.6) and (4.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{D}'(0, T) \langle h, \chi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(0, T)} &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}'(0, T) \langle h_k, \chi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(0, T)} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}'(0, T) \langle (D_t^\beta + \lambda) w_k, \chi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(0, T)} \\
 &= \mathcal{D}'(0, T) \langle (D_t^\beta + \lambda) w, \chi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(0, T)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let u be the solution of (1.1) with a constant $\alpha \in (0, 2)$. Without loss of generality, we only investigate the case of $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ with $\rho \equiv 1$ because the case of $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ with $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{0}$ can be treated in the same manner. For clarity, we divide the proof into three steps.

Step 1 Let us fix $T \geq T_0$ and define

$$v(t, \cdot) := I^{1-\alpha} u(t, \cdot), \quad t > 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Using the fact that $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(\Omega))$, we deduce that $v \in L^1(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$. In this step we will prove that actually $v \in W^{1,1}(0, T; H^{-2}(\Omega))$. Following Definition 2.1 of weak solutions, we recall that for $p > p_0$, the Laplace transform $\widehat{u}(p; \cdot)$ of $u(t, \cdot)$ with respect to t solves the following boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} (p^\alpha + \rho^{-1} \mathcal{A}) \widehat{u}(p; \cdot) = -\rho^{-1} \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \widehat{u}(p; \cdot) + \widehat{\mu}(p) \rho^{-1} h & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathcal{R} \widehat{u}(p; \cdot) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, for all $p > p_0$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$((\rho^{-1} \mathcal{A} + p^\alpha) \widehat{u}(p; \cdot), \varphi_n)_\rho = -(\rho^{-1} \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \widehat{u}(p; \cdot), \varphi_n)_\rho + \widehat{\mu}(p) (\rho^{-1} h, \varphi_n)_\rho.$$

Integrating by parts, we obtain

$$((p^\alpha + \rho^{-1} \mathcal{A}) \widehat{u}(p; \cdot), \varphi_n)_\rho = (\widehat{u}(p; \cdot), (p^\alpha + \rho^{-1} \mathcal{A}) \varphi_n)_\rho = (\lambda_n + p^\alpha) (\widehat{u}(p; \cdot), \varphi_n)_\rho$$

and it follows

$$(\widehat{u}(p; \cdot), \varphi_n)_\rho = \frac{-(\rho^{-1} \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \widehat{u}(p; \cdot), \varphi_n)_\rho}{\lambda_n + p^\alpha} + \frac{\widehat{\mu}(p) (\rho^{-1} h, \varphi_n)_\rho}{\lambda_n + p^\alpha}.$$

In the same way, fixing

$$w(t, \cdot) := \int_0^t S_2(t-\tau) [-\rho^{-1}\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla u(\tau, \cdot) + \mu(\tau)\rho^{-1}h] d\tau, \quad t > 0,$$

we have

$$(w(t, \cdot), \varphi_n)_\rho = \int_0^t (t-\tau)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha, \alpha}(-\lambda_n(t-\tau)^\alpha) (-\rho^{-1}\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla u(\tau, \cdot) + \mu(\tau)\rho^{-1}h, \varphi_n)_\rho d\tau, \quad t > 0$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, applying the Laplace transform in time for $p > p_0$ to the expression above, we get

$$(\widehat{w}(p; \cdot), \varphi_n)_\rho = \frac{-(\rho^{-1}\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla \widehat{u}(p; \cdot), \varphi_n)_\rho}{\lambda_n + p^\alpha} + \frac{\widehat{\mu}(p) (\rho^{-1}h, \varphi_n)_\rho}{\lambda_n + p^\alpha} = (\widehat{u}(p; \cdot), \varphi_n)_\rho$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then it follows that

$$\widehat{w}(p; \cdot) = \widehat{u}(p; \cdot), \quad p > p_0,$$

and the uniqueness of the Laplace transform in time implies that

$$u(t, \cdot) = w(t, \cdot) = \int_0^t S_2(t-\tau) [-\rho^{-1}\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla u(\tau, \cdot) + \mu(\tau)\rho^{-1}h] d\tau, \quad t > 0. \quad (4.8)$$

In view of (4.8), fixing

$$f_n(t) = (-\rho^{-1}\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla u(t, \cdot) + \mu(t)\rho^{-1}h, \varphi_n)_\rho, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (4.9)$$

we deduce that

$$u_n(t) := (u(t, \cdot), \varphi_n)_\rho = \int_0^t (t-\tau)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha, \alpha}(-\lambda_n(t-\tau)^\alpha) f_n(\tau) d\tau, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad t > 0. \quad (4.10)$$

Since $u \in L^1(0, T; H^1(\Omega))$ by [23, pp.13–15], we deduce that $-\rho^{-1}\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla u + \mu\rho^{-1}h \in L^1(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ and thus $f_n \in L^1(0, T)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by (4.9). Then in view of Lemma 4.2, we know that

$$D_t^\alpha u_n(t) = -\lambda_n u_n(t) + f_n(t), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad t \in (0, T) \quad (4.11)$$

holds in the sense of distributions. Since $-\rho^{-1}\mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla u + \mu\rho^{-1}h \in L^1(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$, we deduce that the sequence

$$\sum_{n=1}^N f_n(t) \varphi_n \quad (N \in \mathbb{N})$$

converges in the sense of $L^1(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$. In the same way, we can prove that the sequence

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \lambda_n u_n(t) \varphi_n \quad (N \in \mathbb{N})$$

converges in the sense of $L^1(0, T; \mathcal{D}(A^{-1}))$, where we recall that $A = \rho^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ acts on $L^2(\Omega; \rho d\mathbf{x})$ with the boundary condition $\mathcal{R}u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. This proves that

$$\sum_{n=1}^N D_t^\alpha u_n(t) \varphi_n = \sum_{n=1}^N [-\lambda_n u_n(t) + f_n(t)] \varphi_n \quad (N \in \mathbb{N})$$

converges in the sense of $L^1(0, T; \mathcal{D}(A^{-1}))$. Thus, $D_t^\alpha u$ is well defined and

$$D_t^\alpha u = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D_t^\alpha u_n(t) \varphi_n \in L^1(0, T; \mathcal{D}(A^{-1})).$$

Let $H_0^2(\Omega)$ be the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in $H^2(\Omega)$. It is clear that $H_0^2(\Omega)$ is embedded continuously into $\mathcal{D}(A)$ and by duality, we deduce that $\mathcal{D}(A^{-1})$ embedded continuously into $H^{-2}(\Omega)$. It follows that $D_t^\alpha u \in L^1(0, T; H^{-2}(\Omega))$. On the other hand, the function v given by (4.7) satisfies $\partial_t v = D_t^\alpha u \in L^1(0, T; H^{-2}(\Omega))$, and using the fact that $v \in L^1(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$, we get $v \in W^{1,1}(0, T; H^{-2}(\Omega))$.

Step 2 We fix $T_1 \in [0, T)$. In this step, we will show that the condition

$$u = 0 \text{ in } (T_1, T) \times \omega \quad (4.12)$$

implies

$$u = 0 \text{ in } (0, T) \times \omega. \quad (4.13)$$

Similarly to the proof of Theorem 2.1, we set $u_\psi(t) := \mathcal{D}'(\omega) \langle u(t, \cdot), \psi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)}$ ($0 < t < T$) with arbitrarily fixed $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\omega)$. According to Step 1, the function v defined by (4.7) lies in $W^{1,1}(0, T; H^{-2}(\Omega))$ and thus

$$I^{1-\alpha} u_\psi = \mathcal{D}'(\omega) \langle v(t, \cdot), \psi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)} \in W^{1,1}(0, T). \quad (4.14)$$

Moreover, in view of (4.11) and the fact that the sequence

$$\sum_{n=1}^N D_t^\alpha u_n(t) \varphi_n = \sum_{n=1}^N [-\lambda_n u_n(t) + f_n(t)] \varphi_n, \quad N \in \mathbb{N},$$

converge in the sense of $L^1(0, T; \mathcal{D}(A^{-1}))$ to $D_t^\alpha u$, we deduce that for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_t^\alpha u(t, \cdot) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D_t^\alpha u_n(t) \varphi_n = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} [-\lambda_n u_n(t) + f_n(t)] \varphi_n \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-\rho^{-1} \mathcal{A} u(t, \cdot) - \rho^{-1} \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla u(t, \cdot) + \mu(t) \rho^{-1} h, \varphi_n)_\rho \varphi_n \\ &= -\rho^{-1} \mathcal{A} u(t, \cdot) - \rho^{-1} \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla u(t, \cdot) + \mu(t) \rho^{-1} h. \end{aligned}$$

Here we recall that f_n and u_n were given by (4.9) and (4.10), respectively. On the other hand, from (4.12) we deduce that $-\rho^{-1} \mathcal{A} u - \rho^{-1} \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla u = 0$ in $(T_1, T) \times \omega$. Combining this with the fact that $h = 0$ in ω , we obtain

$$D_t^\alpha u = -\rho^{-1} \mathcal{A} u - \rho^{-1} \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla u + \mu h = 0 \text{ in } (T_1, T) \times \omega. \quad (4.15)$$

In the same way, using the fact that the function v given by (4.7) lies in $W^{1,1}(0, T; H^{-2}(\Omega))$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D_t^\alpha u_\psi(t) &= \frac{d}{dt} I^{1-\alpha} u_\psi(t) = \frac{d}{dt} (\mathcal{D}'(\omega) \langle v(t, \cdot), \psi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)}) \\ &= \mathcal{D}'(\omega) \langle \partial_t v(t, \cdot), \psi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)} = \mathcal{D}'(\omega) \langle D_t^\alpha u(t, \cdot), \psi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)} \end{aligned}$$

for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$, and (4.15) implies $D_t^\alpha u_\psi = 0$ in (T_1, T) . Therefore, we have $u_\psi = D_t^\alpha u_\psi = 0$ in (T_1, T) . Combining this with condition (4.14) and applying [33, Theorem 1] yields

$$u_\psi(t) = \mathcal{D}'(\omega) \langle u(t, \cdot), \psi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)} = 0, \quad 0 < t < T,$$

which implies (4.13) since $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\omega)$ was chosen arbitrarily.

Step 3 In this step, we show that (4.13) implies $h \equiv 0$ in Ω . We deal with the cases of $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ separately.

Case 1 We first study the case of $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ with $\rho \equiv 1$. In the same manner as before, for arbitrarily fixed $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\omega)$, it follows from (4.13) and the solution representation (4.2) that

$$0 = {}_{\mathcal{D}'(\omega)}\langle u(t, \cdot), \psi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)} = \int_0^t \mu(t - \tau) v_\psi(\tau) d\tau, \quad 0 < t < T,$$

where $v_\psi(t) := {}_{\mathcal{D}'(\omega)}\langle S_1(t)h, \psi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)} \in L^1(0, T)$ by Lemma 4.1. Therefore, parallel to the proof of Theorem 2.1, the Titchmarsh convolution theorem guarantees the existence of constants $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in [0, T]$ satisfying $\tau_1 + \tau_2 \geq T$ such that

$$\mu \equiv 0 \text{ in } (0, \tau_1), \quad v_\psi \equiv 0 \text{ in } (0, \tau_2).$$

Since $\mu \not\equiv 0$ in $(0, T_0)$ by the key assumption (1.2), we conclude $\tau_1 < T_0$ and thus

$$\tau_2 \geq T - \tau_1 > T - T_0 \geq 0.$$

In other words, we obtain

$$v_\psi(t) = {}_{\mathcal{D}'(\omega)}\langle S_1(t)h, \psi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)} = 0, \quad 0 < t < \tau_2,$$

which implies

$$v(t, \cdot) := S_1(t)h = 0 \quad \text{in } \omega, \quad 0 < t < \tau_2 \quad (4.16)$$

again since $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\omega)$ was chosen arbitrarily. On the other hand, similarly to the proofs of [28, Theorem 1.1] and [34, Theorem 1.4], we deduce that the map $t \mapsto S_1(t)h$ admits an analytic extension from \mathbb{R}_+ to $L^2(\Omega)$. Therefore, (4.16) implies

$$v = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \omega. \quad (4.17)$$

In view of Lemma 4.1, the Laplace transform $\widehat{v}(p; \cdot)$ of v with respect to t is well-defined for all $p > s_0$. Further, following [23] (see also [28, Theorem 1.1]), we see that $\widehat{v}(p; \cdot)$ solves the boundary value problem for an elliptic equation

$$\begin{cases} (p^\alpha + \mathcal{L})\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = h & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathcal{R}\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad \forall p > s_0.$$

Meanwhile, (4.17) implies

$$\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = 0 \quad \text{in } \omega, \quad p > s_0. \quad (4.18)$$

On the other hand, let us introduce an initial-boundary value problem for a parabolic equation

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + \mathcal{L})w = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega, \\ w = h & \text{in } \{0\} \times \Omega, \\ \mathcal{R}w = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

as well as the Laplace transform $\widehat{w}(p; \cdot)$ of w with respect to t for $p > p_0$, where $p_0 \geq s_0^\alpha$ is sufficiently large. Then straightforward calculation yields that for all $p > p_0$, there holds

$\widehat{v}(p^{1/\alpha}; \cdot) = \widehat{w}(p; \cdot)$. Combining this with (4.18) and applying the uniqueness of the Laplace transform, we obtain

$$w = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \omega.$$

Consequently, the unique continuation property of parabolic equations (e.g. [45, Theorem 1.1]) implies $w \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega$ and thus $h = w(0, \cdot) \equiv 0$ in Ω . This completes the proof of Theorem 2.2 for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$.

Case 2 Now we turn to the case of $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ with $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{0}$. Combining the solution representation (4.3) with the above arguments, again we can conclude (4.16) with $v(t, \cdot) := S_2(t)h$ in this case. On the other hand, applying again [41, Theorem 1.6] and utilizing arguments similar to those used in the proof of [24, Proposition 3.1], one can check that the map $t \mapsto v(t, \cdot)$ admits an analytic extension as a function from \mathbb{R}_+ to $L^2(\Omega)$. Therefore, again (4.16) implies (4.17).

Then for $p > 0$, it follows from [28, Theorem 1.1] that the Laplace transform $\widehat{v}(p; \cdot)$ of v with respect to t solves the boundary value problem for an elliptic equation

$$\begin{cases} (p^\alpha \rho + \mathcal{A})\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = h & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathcal{R}\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Meanwhile, (4.17) implies (4.18) again. Therefore, repeating the above arguments (see also Step 2 in the proof of [27, Theorem 1.1]), again we arrive at $h \equiv 0$ in Ω . This completes the proof of Theorem 2.2 for $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.2. Since the proofs for the cases of $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ are again similar, we only deal with the former one without loss of generality.

Introducing the auxiliary function $u := u_1 - u_2$, we see that u satisfies

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t^\alpha + \mathcal{L})u = F := \mu_1 h_1 - \mu_2 h_2 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \{0\} \times \Omega, \\ \mathcal{R}u = 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \partial\Omega \end{cases} \quad (4.19)$$

along with the additional condition $u = 0$ in $(T_1, T) \times \omega$. Especially, thanks to the assumption $T_1 < T_0$ in (2.6), we have

$$u = 0 \quad \text{in } (T_1, T_0) \times \omega. \quad (4.20)$$

On the other hand, it follows from (2.4)–(2.5) that

$$F = \begin{cases} \mu_1(h_1 - h_2) & \text{in } (0, T_0) \times \Omega, \\ (\mu_1 - \mu_2)h_1 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \omega \end{cases} \quad (4.21)$$

and in particular,

$$F = 0 \quad \text{in } (0, T_0) \times \omega. \quad (4.22)$$

Therefore, repeating the argument used in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 2.2, we utilize (4.20) and (4.22) to conclude $u \equiv 0$ in $(0, T_0) \times \omega$. Then a direct application of Theorem 2.2 implies $h_1 - h_2 \equiv 0$ or equivalently $h_1 = h_2$ in Ω .

From now on we can write $F = \mu h_1$ in (4.19) with $\mu := \mu_1 - \mu_2$ in $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega$ and it remains to show $\mu \equiv 0$ in $(0, T)$. Now that $u = 0$ in $(0, T) \times \omega$, we can take advantage of the solution

representation (4.2) to obtain

$$0 = \mathcal{D}'(\omega) \langle u(t, \cdot), \psi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)} = \int_0^t \mu(t - \tau) v_\psi(\tau) d\tau, \quad 0 < t < T$$

with arbitrarily fixed $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\omega)$, where $v_\psi(t) := \mathcal{D}'(\omega) \langle S_1(t)h_1, \psi \rangle_{C_0^\infty(\omega)}$. Again by the Titchmarsh convolution theorem, there exist constants $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in [0, T]$ satisfying $\tau_1 + \tau_2 \geq T$ such that

$$\mu \equiv 0 \text{ in } (0, \tau_1), \quad v_\psi \equiv 0 \text{ in } (0, \tau_2).$$

Now it suffices to show $\tau_2 = 0$ by contradiction. If $\tau_2 > 0$, then we obtain $S_1(t)h_1 = 0$ in ω for $0 < t < \tau_2$. By the same argument used in Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 2.2, we can conclude $h_1 = 0$ in Ω , which contradicts with the assumption $h_1 \not\equiv 0$. Then there should hold $\tau_2 = 0$ and thus $T \geq \tau_1 \geq T - \tau_2 = T$, that is, $\mu \equiv 0$ in $(0, T)$. This completes the proof of Corollary 2.2. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 2.3

In this section, we assume that $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{0}$ and $\alpha \in L^\infty(\Omega; (0, 1))$ fulfills (2.7)–(2.8). We fix $\theta \in (\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi)$, $\delta > 0$ and we define the contour in \mathbb{C} ,

$$\gamma(\delta, \theta) := \gamma_-(\delta, \theta) \cup \gamma_0(\delta, \theta) \cup \gamma_+(\delta, \theta),$$

oriented in the counterclockwise direction with

$$\gamma_0(\delta, \theta) := \{\delta e^{i\beta} \mid \beta \in [-\theta, \theta]\}, \quad \gamma_\pm(\delta, \theta) := \{s e^{\pm i\theta} \mid s \in [\delta, \infty)\}, \quad (5.1)$$

with double signs in the same order. Then, following [28], we define the operator

$$S(t)\psi := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma(\delta, \theta)} e^{tp} (p^\alpha \rho + A)^{-1} \psi dp, \quad t > 0 \quad (5.2)$$

Recall that here $A = \rho^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ acts on $L^2(\Omega; \rho d\mathbf{x})$, with the boundary condition $\mathcal{R}u = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$. Moreover, according to [28, Theorem 1.1], the operator S is independent of the choice of $\theta \in (\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi)$, $\delta > 0$. In light of [28, Theorem 1.1] and [28, Remark 1], for $\mu \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ compactly supported, problem (1.1) admits a unique weak solution (in the sense of Definition 2.1) given by

$$u(t, \cdot) = \int_0^t \mu(t - \tau) S(\tau)(\rho^{-1}h) d\tau, \quad t > 0.$$

We prove in Proposition 6.1 that the result of [28] can be extended to problem (1.1) with $\mu \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ compactly supported. Using the representation (5.2) of the weak solution of (1.1), we are now in position to complete the proof of Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 2.3.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Let u be the solution of (1.1) with a variable α satisfying (2.7)–(2.8) and $\omega \subset \Omega$ satisfy (2.10). Similarly to the proof of Theorem 2.2, we divide the proof into two steps.

Step 1 First we prove that, for any $T \geq T_0$ and $T_1 \in [0, T)$, the condition (4.12) implies (4.13). For this purpose, we investigate each subdomain Ω_ℓ ($\ell = 1, \dots, N$), on which $\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \alpha_\ell$ reduces to a constant. If $\omega \cap \Omega_\ell \neq \emptyset$, then obviously $\mathcal{A}u = 0$ in $(T_1, T) \times (\omega \cap \Omega_\ell)$. Meanwhile,

the assumption (2.10) implies $h = 0$ in $\omega \cap \Omega_\ell$. Then in view of the governing equation in (1.1), we obtain

$$\partial_t^{\alpha_\ell} u = -\rho^{-1}(\mathcal{A}u + \mu h) = 0 \quad \text{in } (T_1, T) \times (\omega \cap \Omega_\ell).$$

Repeating the argument used in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 2.2, we can deduce $u = 0$ in $(0, T) \times (\omega \cap \Omega_\ell)$, which indicates (4.13) by collecting all nonempty $\omega \cap \Omega_\ell$ ($\ell = 1, \dots, N$).

Step 2 We show that (4.13) implies $h \equiv 0$ in Ω in this step. According to Proposition 6.1, u takes the form

$$u(t, \cdot) = \int_0^t \mu(t - \tau) v(\tau, \cdot) d\tau$$

with $v(t, \cdot) := S(t)\rho^{-1}h$. Applying condition (2.8) and Lemma 6.1, we deduce that $v \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(\Omega))$ with

$$\|v(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\|\rho^{-1}h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \max(t^{2\alpha_N - \alpha_1 - 1}, t^{2\alpha_1 - \alpha_N - 1}, 1), \quad t > 0. \quad (5.3)$$

Combining this result with the arguments of Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 2.2, we can show that (4.13) implies the existence of a constant $\tau_2 > 0$ such that

$$v = 0 \quad \text{in } (0, \tau_2) \times \omega. \quad (5.4)$$

Following [28, Theorem 1.1], we deduce that the map $t \mapsto v(t, \cdot)$ admits an analytic extension from \mathbb{R}_+ to $L^2(\Omega)$. Therefore, the condition (5.4) implies

$$v = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \omega. \quad (5.5)$$

On the other hand, the estimate (5.3) implies

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-pt} \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} dt < \infty, \quad p > 0$$

and applying the properties of the operator S borrowed from [28, Theorem 1.1], we obtain

$$\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = (p^\alpha + A)^{-1}(\rho^{-1}h), \quad p > 0.$$

Thus, $\widehat{v}(p; \cdot)$ solves the boundary value problem for an elliptic equation

$$\begin{cases} (p^\alpha \rho + \mathcal{A})\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = h & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathcal{R}\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Simultaneously, (5.5) implies that

$$\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = 0 \quad \text{in } \omega, \quad p > 0.$$

Combining this with (2.9) and (2.10), we deduce that for all $p > 0$, the restriction of $\widehat{v}(p; \cdot)$ to \mathcal{O} satisfy

$$\begin{cases} (p^\alpha \rho + \mathcal{A})\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \\ \widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \omega \cap \mathcal{O}. \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

Therefore, applying the unique continuation property of elliptic equations (see e.g. [44, Theorem 1]) yields

$$\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \quad p > 0. \quad (5.7)$$

This, together with the fact that $\mathcal{R}\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\partial\Omega_\ell \subset \partial\Omega \cup \mathcal{O}$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, N$ by (2.9), leads to

$$\mathcal{R}\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_\ell, \quad p > 0, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, N.$$

Therefore, combining this boundary condition with (5.6) and (5.7), we find that the restriction of $\widehat{v}(p; \cdot)$ to Ω_ℓ ($\ell = 1, \dots, N$) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} (p^{\alpha_\ell} \rho + \mathcal{A})\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = h & \text{in } \Omega_\ell, \\ \mathcal{R}\widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega_\ell, \\ \widehat{v}(p; \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_\ell \cap \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad p > 0.$$

Here we notice that $\Omega_\ell \cap \mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset$ by (2.9). Thus, utilizing the arguments used in Step 3 of the proof of [27, Theorem 1.1], we conclude $h = 0$ in Ω_ℓ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, N$ and consequently $h \equiv 0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.3. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.3. Similarly to the proof of Corollary 2.2, the auxiliary function $u := u_1 - u_2$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} (\rho \partial_t^\alpha + \mathcal{A})u = F := \mu_1 h_1 - \mu_2 h_2 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \{0\} \times \Omega, \\ \mathcal{R}u = 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

with $u = 0$ in $(T_1, T) \times \omega$, where F satisfies (4.21). Especially, we have $F = \mu_1(h_1 - h_2)$ in $(0, T_0) \times \omega$, where $h_1 - h_2 = 0$ in $\omega \cup \mathcal{O}$ by (2.11). Repeating the argument used in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 2.3, we can conclude $u = 0$ in $(0, T_0) \times \omega$, which further implies $h_1 - h_2 \equiv 0$ or equivalently $h_1 = h_2$ in Ω by Theorem 2.3.

Finally, in a similar way to the end of the proof of Corollary 2.2, we arrive at $\mu_1 \equiv \mu_2$ in $(0, T)$, which completes the proof of Corollary 2.3. \square

6 Appendix

Let $\alpha \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ be such that there exist two constants $\alpha_0, \alpha_M \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$0 < \alpha_0 \leq \alpha \leq \alpha_M < 1, \quad \alpha_M < 2\alpha_0. \quad (6.1)$$

In this section, we prove the unique existence of a weak solution to the problem (1.1) when $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, $\alpha \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfies (6.1) and $\mu \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ is compactly supported. We start with the following intermediate result.

Lemma 6.1 *Let $\theta \in (\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi)$. The map $t \mapsto S(t)$ defined by (5.2) lies in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega)))$ and there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $\mathcal{A}, \rho, \theta, \Omega$ such that*

$$\|S(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))} \leq C \max(t^{2\alpha_M - \alpha_0 - 1}, t^{2\alpha_0 - \alpha_M - 1}, 1), \quad t > 0. \quad (6.2)$$

Proof. Throughout this proof, by $C > 0$ we denote generic constants depending only on $\mathcal{A}, \rho, \theta, \Omega$, which may change from line to line. In light of [28, Proposition 2.1], for all $\beta \in (0, \pi)$, we have

$$\left\| (A + (r e^{i\beta_1})^\alpha)^{-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))} \leq C \max(r^{\alpha_0 - 2\alpha_M}, r^{\alpha_M - 2\alpha_0}), \quad r > 0, \quad \beta_1 \in (-\beta, \beta), \quad (6.3)$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on $\mathcal{A}, \rho, \Omega$ and β . Using the fact that the operator S is independent of the choice of $\delta > 0$ (see the discussion at the beginning of Section 5), we can decompose

$$S(t) = S_-(t) + S_0(t) + S_+(t), \quad t > 0,$$

where

$$S_m(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_m(t^{-1}, \theta)} e^{tp} (p^\alpha + A)^{-1} dp, \quad m = 0, \mp, t > 0.$$

Here we recall that the contours $\gamma_m(\delta, \theta)$ for $m = 0, \mp$ and $\delta > 0$ were given by (5.1).

In order to complete the proof of the lemma, it suffices to prove

$$\|S_m(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))} \leq C \max(t^{2\alpha_M - \alpha_0 - 1}, t^{2\alpha_0 - \alpha_M - 1}, 1), \quad t > 0, \quad m = 0, \mp. \quad (6.4)$$

Indeed, it follows from (6.1) that $2\alpha_0 - \alpha_M - 1 > -1$ and $2\alpha_M - \alpha_0 - 1 > \alpha_M - 1 > -1$. Thus, applying the estimates (6.4), we can easily deduce that $S \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega)))$ satisfies the estimate (6.2).

For $m = 0$, using (6.3), we find

$$\|S_0(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))} \leq C \int_{-\theta}^{\theta} t^{-1} \left\| (A + (t^{-1} e^{i\beta})^\alpha)^{-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))} d\beta \leq C \max(t^{2\alpha_M - \alpha_0 - 1}, t^{2\alpha_0 - \alpha_M - 1}),$$

which implies (6.4) for $m = 0$. For $m = \mp$, again we employ (6.3) to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_\mp(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))} &\leq C \int_{t^{-1}}^{\infty} e^{rt \cos \theta} \left\| (A + (r e^{i\theta})^\alpha)^{-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))} dr \\ &\leq C \int_{t^{-1}}^{\infty} e^{rt \cos \theta} \max(r^{\alpha_0 - 2\alpha_M}, r^{\alpha_M - 2\alpha_0}) dr. \end{aligned}$$

For $t > 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_\mp(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))} &\leq C \int_1^{\infty} e^{rt \cos \theta} r^{\alpha_M - 2\alpha_0} dr + C \int_{t^{-1}}^1 r^{\alpha_0 - 2\alpha_M} dr \\ &\leq C \int_0^{\infty} e^{rt \cos \theta} r^{\alpha_M - 2\alpha_0} dr + C (t^{2\alpha_M - \alpha_0 - 1} + 1) \\ &\leq C t^{-1} \int_0^{\infty} e^{r \cos \theta} \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^{\alpha_M - 2\alpha_0} dr + C (t^{2\alpha_M - \alpha_0 - 1} + 1) \\ &\leq C \max(t^{2\alpha_0 - \alpha_M - 1}, t^{2\alpha_M - \alpha_0 - 1}, 1). \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, for $t \in (0, 1]$, we get

$$\|S_\mp(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))} \leq C \int_1^{\infty} e^{rt \cos \theta} r^{\alpha_M - 2\alpha_0} dr \leq C t^{2\alpha_0 - \alpha_M - 1}.$$

Combining these two estimates, we obtain

$$\|S_\mp(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))} \leq C \max(t^{2\alpha_0 - \alpha_M - 1}, t^{2\alpha_M - \alpha_0 - 1}, 1), \quad t > 0.$$

This proves that (6.4) also holds true for $m = \mp$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Using Lemma 6.1, we will show that [28, Theorem 1.1] can be extended to $\mu \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ with a compact support.

Proposition 6.1 *Let $h \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\alpha \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfy (6.1) and $\mu \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ be compactly supported. Then there exists a unique weak solution $u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ to (1.1).*

Proof. Suppose that $\text{supp } \mu \subset [0, T]$ for some $T > 0$ and choose a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C_0^\infty(0, T+1)$ satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mu_n - \mu\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)} = 0. \quad (6.5)$$

In light of Lemma 6.1, for $t \geq 0$ we can introduce

$$\begin{aligned} u_n(t, \cdot) &:= \int_0^t \mu_n(t - \tau) S(\tau)(\rho^{-1}h) \, d\tau, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \\ u(t, \cdot) &:= \int_0^t \mu(t - \tau) S(\tau)(\rho^{-1}h) \, d\tau \end{aligned}$$

as elements of $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(\Omega))$. We prove that for all $p > 0$, the Laplace transform $\widehat{u}(p)$ of u is well-defined in $L^2(\Omega)$ and we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\widehat{u}_n(p) - \widehat{u}(p)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0. \quad (6.6)$$

Applying estimate (6.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{-pt}u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \int_0^t e^{-p\tau} \|S(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))} \|\rho^{-1}h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} e^{-p(t-\tau)} |\mu(t-\tau)| \, d\tau \\ &\leq C (e^{-pt} \max(t^{2\alpha_0 - \alpha_M - 1}, t^{2\alpha_M - \alpha_0 - 1}, 1)) * (e^{-pt} |\mu(t)|) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t > 0$ and $p > 0$, where $*$ denotes the convolution in \mathbb{R}_+ . Therefore, applying Young's convolution inequality and condition (6.1), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{u}(p)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \int_0^\infty \|e^{-pt}u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \, dt \\ &\leq C \left(\int_0^\infty e^{-pt} \max(t^{2\alpha_0 - \alpha_M - 1}, t^{2\alpha_M - \alpha_0 - 1}, 1) \, dt \right) \left(\int_0^\infty e^{-pt} |\mu(t)| \, dt \right) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

for all $p > 0$. This proves the well-posedness of $\widehat{u}(p)$ for all $p > 0$ in the sense of $L^2(\Omega)$. In the same way, for all $t > 0$, $p > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{-pt}(u_n - u)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \int_0^t e^{-p\tau} \|S(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))} \|\rho^{-1}h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} e^{-p(t-\tau)} |(\mu_n - \mu)(t-\tau)| \, d\tau \\ &\leq C (e^{-pt} \max(t^{2\alpha_0 - \alpha_M - 1}, t^{2\alpha_M - \alpha_0 - 1}, 1)) * (e^{-pt} |(\mu_n - \mu)(t)|). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, applying Young's convolution inequality again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{u}_n(p) - \widehat{u}(p)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \int_0^\infty \|e^{-pt}(u_n - u)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \, dt \\ &\leq C \left(\int_0^\infty e^{-pt} \max(t^{2\alpha_0 - \alpha_M - 1}, t^{2\alpha_M - \alpha_0 - 1}, 1) \, dt \right) \left(\int_0^\infty e^{-pt} |\mu_n(t) - \mu(t)| \, dt \right) \\ &\leq C \|\mu_n - \mu\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)} \end{aligned}$$

for all $p > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and (6.5) implies (6.6). On the other hand, in view of [28, Theorem 1.1 and Remark 1], since $\mu_n \in L^\infty(0, T)$, we have

$$(p^\alpha + A)\widehat{u}_n(p) = \left(\int_0^\infty e^{-pt} \mu_n(t, \cdot) \, dt \right) \rho^{-1}h, \quad p > 0$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In addition, (6.5) implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\mu}_n(p) = \widehat{\mu}(p), \quad p > 0.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \widehat{u}_n(p) - \widehat{\mu}(p)(A + p^\alpha)^{-1}(\rho^{-1}h) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0$$

and (6.6) implies that $\widehat{u}(p) = (A + p^\alpha)^{-1}\widehat{\mu}(p)\rho^{-1}h$, $p > 0$. From the definition of the operator A , we deduce that $\widehat{u}(p)$ solves the boundary value problem (2.1) for all $p > 0$. Therefore, we conclude that u is the unique weak solution of (1.1) and the proof is completed. \square

Acknowledgement This paper has been supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (S) 15H05740, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS). The work of Y. Kian is partially supported by the French National Research Agency ANR (project MultiOnde) grant ANR-17 CE40-0029. Y. Liu is supported by Grant-in-Aid for Early Career Scientists 20K14355, JSPS. M. Yamamoto is supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (A) 20H00117, JSPS and by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 11771270, 91730303).

References

- [1] R. A. Adams, Sobolev Spaces, Academic Press, New York, 1975.
- [2] S. Agmon, On the eigenfunctions and the eigenvalues of general elliptic boundary value problems, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **15**, 1962, 119–147.
- [3] M. Andrieu and A. El Badia, Identification of multiple moving pollution sources in surface waters or atmospheric media with boundary observations, *Inverse Problems*, **28**, 2012, 075009.
- [4] G. Bao, G. Hu, Y. Kian and T. Yin, Inverse source problems in elastodynamics, *Inverse Problems*, **34**, 2018, 045009.
- [5] A. Bukhgeim and M. Klivanov, Global uniqueness of a class of multidimensional inverse problem, *Sov. Math. Dokl.*, **24**, 1981, 244–247.
- [6] W. Chen, J. Zhang and J. Zhang, Variable-order time-fractional derivative model for chloride ions sub-diffusion in concrete structures, *Fract. Calc. Appl. Anal.*, **13**, 2013, 76–84.
- [7] M. Choulli and M. Yamamoto, Some stability estimates in determining sources and coefficients, *J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl.*, **14**, 2006, 355–373.
- [8] A. El Badia and A. Hamd, Inverse source problem in an advection-dispersion reaction system: application to water pollution, *Inverse Problems*, **23**, 2007, 2103–2120.
- [9] K. Fujishiro and Y. Kian, Determination of time dependent factors of coefficients in fractional diffusion equations, *Math. Control Relat. Fields*, **6**, 2016, 251–269.
- [10] D. N. Ghosn Roy and L. S. Couchman, Inverse Problems and Inverse Scattering of Plane Waves, Academic Press, San Diego, 2001.
- [11] W. G. Glöckle and T. F. Nonnenmacher, A fractional calculus approach to self-similar protein dynamics, *Biophys. J.*, **68**, 1995, 46–53.
- [12] G. Hu and Y. Kian, Uniqueness and stability for the recovery of a time-dependent source in elastodynamics, *Inverse Probl. Imaging*, **14**, 2020, 463–487.
- [13] G. Hu, Y. Kian, P. Li and Y. Zhao, Inverse moving source problems in electrodynamics, *Inverse Problems*, **35**, 2019, 075001.
- [14] M. Ikehata, An inverse source problem for the heat equation and the enclosure method, *Inverse Problems*, **23**, 2006, 183–202.
- [15] O. Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Lipschitz stability in inverse parabolic problems by the Carleman estimate, *Inverse Problems*, **14**, 1998, 1229–1245.
- [16] O. Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Global Lipschitz stability in an inverse hyperbolic problem by interior observations, *Inverse Problems*, **17**, 2001, 717–728.

- [17] V. Isakov, *Inverse Source Problems*, AMS, Providence, 1990.
- [18] D. Jiang, Z. Li, Y. Liu and M. Yamamoto, Weak unique continuation property and a related inverse source problem for time-fractional diffusion-advection equations, *Inverse Problems*, **33**, 2017, 055013.
- [19] D. Jiang, Y. Liu and M. Yamamoto, Inverse source problem for the hyperbolic equation with a time-dependent principal part, *J. Differential Equations*, **262**, 2017, 653–681.
- [20] B. Jin and W. Rundell, A tutorial on inverse problems for anomalous diffusion processes, *Inverse Problems*, **31**, 2015, 035003.
- [21] B. Jin, Y. Kian, Z. Zhou, Reconstruction of a space-time dependent source in subdiffusion models via a perturbation approach, preprint, arXiv:2102.03041.
- [22] A. Katchalov, Y. Kurylev and M. Lassas, *Inverse Boundary Spectral Problems*, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, 2001.
- [23] Y. Kian, Simultaneous determination of coefficients and internal source of a diffusion equation from a single measurement, preprint, arXiv:2007.08947.
- [24] Y. Kian, Z. Li, Y. Liu and M. Yamamoto, The uniqueness of inverse problems for a fractional equation with a single measurement, *Math. Ann.*, to appear.
- [25] Y. Kian, M. Morancey and L. Oksanen, Application of the boundary control method to partial data Borg-Levinson inverse spectral problem, *Math. Control Relat. Fields*, **9**, 2019, 289–312.
- [26] Y. Kian, D. Sambou and É. Soccorsi, Logarithmic stability inequality in an inverse source problem for the heat equation on a waveguide, *Appl. Anal.*, **99**, 2020, 2210–2228.
- [27] Y. Kian, É. Soccorsi, Q. Xue and M. Yamamoto, Identification of time-varying source term in time-fractional diffusion equations, preprint, arXiv:1911.09951.
- [28] Y. Kian, É. Soccorsi and M. Yamamoto, On time-fractional diffusion equations with space-dependent variable order, *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, **19**, 2018, 3855–3881.
- [29] Y. Kian and M. Yamamoto, On existence and uniqueness of solutions for semilinear fractional wave equations, *Fract. Calc. Appl. Anal.*, **20**, 2017, 117–138.
- [30] Y. Kian and M. Yamamoto, Well-posedness for weak and strong solutions of non-homogeneous initial boundary value problems for fractional diffusion equations, *Fract. Calc. Appl. Anal.*, **24**, 2021, 168–201.
- [31] Y. Kian and M. Yamamoto, Reconstruction and stable recovery of source terms and coefficients appearing in diffusion equations, *Inverse Problems*, **35**, 2019, 115006.
- [32] S. Kusiak and J. Weatherwax, Identification and characterization of a mobile source in a general parabolic differential equation with constant coefficients, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, **68**, 2008, 784–805.
- [33] N. Kinash and J. Janno, An inverse problem for a generalized fractional derivative with an application in reconstruction of time- and space-dependent sources in fractional diffusion and wave equations, *Mathematics*, **7**, 2019, 1138.
- [34] Z. Li, Y. Kian, and É. Soccorsi, Initial-boundary value problem for distributed order time-fractional diffusion equations, *Asymptot. Anal.*, **115**, 2019, 95–126.
- [35] Y. Liu, Z. Li and M. Yamamoto, Inverse problems of determining sources of the fractional partial differential equations, in: *Handbook of Fractional Calculus with Applications. Volume 2: Fractional Differential Equations*, De Gruyter, Berlin, 2019, 431–442.
- [36] Y. Liu, W. Rundell and M. Yamamoto, Strong maximum principle for fractional diffusion equations and an application to an inverse source problem, *Fract. Calc. Appl. Anal.*, **19**, 2016, 888–906.
- [37] Y. Liu and Z. Zhang, Reconstruction of the temporal component in the source term of a (time-fractional) diffusion equation, *J. Phys. A*, **50**, 2017, 305203.
- [38] L. Lorenzi, A. Lunardi, G. Metafuno and D. Pallara, Analytic semigroups and reaction-diffusion problems, *Internet Seminar 2004–2005*.
- [39] J. L. Lions, E. Magenes, *Non-Homogeneous Boundary Value Problems and Applications*, Vol. I, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972.
- [40] J. Nakagawa, K. Sakamoto and M. Yamamoto, Overview to mathematical analysis for fractional diffusion equations — new mathematical aspects motivated by industrial collaboration, *J. Math-for-Industry*, **2**, 2010, 99–108.
- [41] I. Podlubny, *Fractional Differential Equations*, Academic Press, San Diego, 1999.
- [42] L. Robbiano and C. Zuily, Uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for operators with partially holomorphic coefficients, *Invent. Math.*, **131**, 1998, 493–539.
- [43] K. Sakamoto and M. Yamamoto, Initial value/boundary value problems for fractional diffusion-wave equations and applications to some inverse problems, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **382**, 2011, 426–447.

- [44] J. C. Saut and B. Scheurer, Sur l'unicité du problème de Cauchy et le prolongement unique pour des équations elliptiques à coefficients non localement bornés, *J. Differential Equations*, **43**, 1982, 28–43.
- [45] J. C. Saut and B. Scheurer, Unique continuation for some evolution equations, *J. Differential Equations*, **66**, 1987, 118–139.
- [46] B. A. Stickler and E. Schachinger, Continuous time anomalous diffusion in a composite medium, *J. Phys. E*, **84**, 2011, 021116.
- [47] D. Tataru, Unique continuation for solutions to PDE; between Hörmander's theorem and Holmgren's theorem, *Commun. Partial Diff. Eqns.*, **20**, 1995, 855–884.
- [48] E. C. Titchmarsh, The zeros of certain integral functions, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, **25**, 1926, 283–302.
- [49] M. Yamamoto, Conditional stability in the determination of force terms of heat equations in a rectangle, *Math. Comput. Modelling*, **18**, 1993, 79–88.
- [50] M. Yamamoto, Stability, reconstruction formula and regularization for an inverse source hyperbolic problem by control method, *Inverse Problems*, **11**, 1995, 481–496.
- [51] M. Yamamoto, Uniqueness and stability in multidimensional hyperbolic inverse problems, *J. Math. Pure Appl.*, **78**, 1999, 65–98.
- [52] H. Zhang, G.-H. Li and M.-K. Luo, Fractional Feynman-Kac equation with space-dependent anomalous exponent, *J. Stat. Phys.*, **152**, 2013, 1194–1206.