Abstract

In this paper, we recover the boundary null controllability for the degenerate heat equation by analyzing the asymptotic behavior of an eligible family of state-control pairs \( ((u_\varepsilon, h_\varepsilon))_{\varepsilon > 0} \) solving corresponding singularly perturbed internal null controllability problems. As in other situations studied in the literature, our approach relies on Carleman estimates and meticulous weak convergence results. However, for the degenerate parabolic case, some specific trace operator inequalities must be obtained, in order to justify correctly the passage to the limit argument.

Keywords: heat equation, degenerate parabolic equations, controllability, observability, singular perturbations in context of PDEs, asymptotic behavior of solutions to PDEs.

2020 MSC: 35K05, 35K65, 93B05, 93B07, 35B25, 35B40.

1. Introduction and Statement of the main result

Take \( T > 0, \alpha \in (0, 2) \) and \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \). Let us set

\[
Q := (0, T) \times (0, 1), \quad \omega_\varepsilon := (1 - \varepsilon, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_\varepsilon := (0, T) \times \omega_\varepsilon.
\]

In this paper, we prove the existence of a family \( (u_\varepsilon, h_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0} \), solving

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
\begin{split}
&u_\varepsilon t - (x^\alpha u_\varepsilon x)_x = h_\varepsilon \chi_{\omega_\varepsilon}, \\
&u_\varepsilon(t, 1) = 0,
\end{split} \\
\text{or}
\begin{split}
&u_\varepsilon(t, 0) = 0, \quad \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 1), \\
&(x^\alpha u_\varepsilon x)(t, 0) = 0, \quad \text{if } \alpha \in [1, 2),
\end{split}
\end{cases}
& \quad (t, x) \in Q, \\
& t \in (0, T), \\
x \in (0, 1),
\end{align*}
\]

(1.1)

with the following property: \( (u_\varepsilon, h_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0} \) converges to \((u, g)\), as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \), where \((u, g)\) solves

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
\begin{split}
&u_t - (x^\alpha u_x)_x = 0, \\
&u(t, 1) = g(t),
\end{split} \\
\text{or}
\begin{split}
&u(t, 0) = 0, \quad \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 1), \\
&(x^\alpha u_x)(t, 0) = 0, \quad \text{if } \alpha \in [1, 2),
\end{split}
\end{cases}
& \quad (t, x) \in Q, \\
& t \in (0, T), \\
x \in (0, 1),
\end{align*}
\]

(1.2)
where $u_0$ is an initial data taken in a functional space associated to $\alpha$. In other words, we will build a suitable family of distributed state-control pairs for the degenerate parabolic equation (1.1), showing that, in some sense, the limiting pair provides the related boundary null controllability, described in (1.2). Above, the systems (1.1) and (1.2) are said weakly degenerate, when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and strongly degenerate, when $\alpha \in [1, 2)$ (see [1] and Remark 1.2).

In [24], Zuazua used Lion’s Hilbert uniqueness method in order to obtain the internal exact controllability for the wave equation, when the distributed control acts on an appropriate $\varepsilon$-neighborhood of some portion $\Gamma_0$ of the boundary. Based on it, in [19], Fabre proved the exact boundary controllability of the wave equation as the limit of internal controllability, which means that, in the passage to the limit, when $\varepsilon \to 0$, the $\varepsilon$-neighborhood of $\Gamma_0$ shrinks to itself. Recently, in [16], Chaves-Silva et al. obtained a similar result for the heat equation. In this current work, we are focused on an analogous investigation about the degenerate heat equation case.

Due to the scope we have chosen, we would like to have a brief talk about the controllability of one-dimensional degenerate problems. To start the discussion, many applied phenomena are closely related to degenerate parabolic equations, calling a notorious attention to their mathematical point of view. In this case, motivated by the properties already known for the uniformly parabolic case, a more complete qualitative literature for degenerate operators is also welcome (see a well-posedness result in [6], for instance). It certainly includes the Control Theory, where much more development is still desired. In one dimension, it seems to us that [11] and [12] are the two first articles dealing with the controllability of degenerate parabolic equations, which clearly inspired much relevant work since then (see [3, 4, 8, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 23] and the references therein). Up to now, it is undeniable the strength of the Carleman estimate method, because it provides a refined technique that makes the one-dimensional degenerate controllability field well-understood (see [1, 7, 9, 10, 22] and the references aforementioned). This paper intends to contribute in this field of degenerate parabolic PDEs by providing some singular perturbation result like those proved in [19] and [16].

Next, we consider some important functional spaces, introduced in [1], which are closely related to the initial data $u_0$ in (1.1) and (1.2).

**Definition 1.1** (Weighted Sobolev spaces). Consider $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, for the weakly degenerate case (WDC), or $\alpha \in [1, 2)$, for the strongly degenerate case (SDC).

(I) For the (WDC), we set

$$H^1_\alpha := \left\{ u \in L^2(0, 1); \ u \text{ is absolutely continuous in } [0, 1], x^{\alpha/2}u_x \in L^2(0, 1) \text{ and } u(1) = u(0) = 0 \right\},$$

equipped with the natural norm

$$\|u\|_{H^1_\alpha} := \left( \|u\|^2_{L^2(0, 1)} + \|x^{\alpha/2}u_x\|^2_{L^2(0, 1)} \right)^{1/2};$$

(II) For the (SDC),

$$H^1_\alpha := \left\{ u \in L^2(0, 1); \ u \text{ is absolutely continuous in } (0, 1], x^{\alpha/2}u_x \in L^2(0, 1) \text{ and } u(1) = 0 \right\},$$

and the norm keeps the same;

(III) In both situations, the (WDC) and the (SDC),

$$H^2_\alpha := \left\{ u \in H^1_\alpha; \ x^{\alpha/2}u_x \in H^1(0, 1) \right\}$$

with the norm $\|u\|_{H^2_\alpha} := \left( \|u\|^2_{H^1_\alpha} + \|(x^{\alpha/2}u_x)x\|^2_{L^2(0, 1)} \right)^{1/2}.$

**Remark 1.2.** We use Dirichlet boundary conditions for the (WDC), while the natural boundary conditions for the (SDC) are Neumann type conditions. The reason is because the notion of trace at the boundary is unavailable for strongly degenerate spaces, as proved in [14, Section 17.1].
At this moment, we are supposed to specify which kind of solution for (1.1) and (1.2) we are dealing with.

**Definition 1.3.** Consider $u_0 \in L^2(0, 1)$, $h_0 \in L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)$ and $g \in L^2(0, T)$.

(a) We say that $u_\varepsilon \in L^2(Q)$ is a **solution by transposition of** (1.1) if, for each $(F, z^T) \in L^2(Q) \times L^2(0, 1)$ given, we have
\[
\int_0^T \int_0^1 uF \, dx \, dt = \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 hz \, dx \, dt + \int_0^1 u_0(x)z(0, x) \, dx,
\]
where $z$ solves
\[
\begin{cases}
-z_t - (x^\alpha z_x)_x = F, & (t, x) \in Q, \\
z(t, 1) = 0, & \text{in } (0, T), \\
z(t, 0) = 0, & \text{(Weak)} \text{, } t \in (0, T), \\
(x^\alpha z_x)(t, 0) = 0, & \text{(Strong)} \text{, } x \in (0, 1).
\end{cases}
\]

(b) Analogously, we say $u \in L^2(Q)$ is a **solution by transposition of** (1.2) if, for every $(F, z^T) \in L^2(Q) \times L^2(0, 1)$, we have
\[
\int_0^T \int_0^1 uF \, dx \, dt = -\int_0^T g(t)z_+(t, 1) \, dt + \int_0^1 u_0(x)z(0, x) \, dx,
\]
where $z$ solves (1.3).

The aim of this paper is to prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.4.** Consider $T > 0$ and $u_0 \in H^1_0$. Then, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exist
\[
u_\varepsilon \in H^1(0, T; L^2(0, 1)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^2_\alpha) \cap C^0([0, T]; H^1_0) \text{ and } h_\varepsilon \in L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)
\]
such that:

(a) $(u_\varepsilon, h_\varepsilon)$ solves the distributed null controllability problem (1.1), in the sense of Definition 1.3(a);

(b) $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u$, weakly in $L^2(\Omega)$, and $h_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup g$, weakly in $L^2(0, T; H^2_\alpha)$, as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Moreover,
\[
u \in C^0([0, T]; (H^1_\alpha)^') \cap L^2(Q),
\]
\[g \in L^2(0, T)
\]
and $(u, g)$ solves the boundary null controllability problem (1.2), in the sense of Definition 1.3(b).

**Remark 1.5.** Theorem 1.4 means that the boundary null controllability of the degenerate heat equation can be seen as the limit of some proper family of internal controllability problems. However, it seems to us that the same asymptotic behavior is not expected for arbitrary families solving (1.1).

In order to prove Theorem 1.4, our approach is based on the strategies of [16]. In fact, from a Carleman estimate at the boundary, we obtain the optimal observability constant $C = O(\varepsilon^{-3})$ (see Remark 2.2 of [16]). This is a meticulous and crucial point, which makes the passage to the limit in (1.1) possible. We notice that it involves some weak convergences related to specific trace operator inequalities in degenerate Sobolev spaces (see Proposition 2.5 and Corollary 2.6).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we present notations and preliminary results, like improved Carleman estimates and some trace operator inequalities. In Section 3, we construct a suitable family of state-control pairs $((u_\varepsilon, h_\varepsilon))_{\varepsilon > 0}$ for which we will study the asymptotic behavior. In Section 4, we rigorously pass to the limit in (1.1), describing all needed weak convergence results. As a consequence, we achieve our main result (Theorem 1.4). In Section 5, we present additional comments involving some possible extensions and open questions. In Section A, we complement the proof of Proposition 2.4, giving technical details omitted in Section 2.
2. Preliminaries

In this section, we reunite definitions and results which will support the proof of our main result (Theorem 1.4). We should emphasize that the whole discussion presented in this paper arises from the well-posedness of (1.1), obtained in [1], whose statement is given below:

**Proposition 2.1.** Given $u_0 \in L^2(0,1)$ and $h \in L^2(Q\varepsilon)$, there exists a unique weak solution $u$ of

\[
\begin{cases}
  u_t - (x^\alpha u_x)_x = h\chi_{Q\varepsilon}, & (t, x) \in Q, \\
  u(t, 1) = 0, & \text{in } (0, T), \\
  u(t, 0) = 0, & \text{(Weak)} \\
  or \quad (x^\alpha u_x)(t, 0) = 0, & \text{(Strong)} \\
  u(0, x) = u_0(x), & x \in (0, 1),
\end{cases}
\]

such that $u \in C^0([0, T]; L^2(0,1)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1_{\alpha})$. In addition, if $u_0 \in H^1_{\alpha}$, then

\[ u \in H^1(0, T; L^2(0,1)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^2_{\alpha}) \cap C^0([0, T]; H^1_{\alpha}), \]

and there exists a positive constant $C_T$ such that

\[
\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left( \|u(t)\|_{H^1_{\alpha}}^2 \right) + \int_0^T \left( \|u_t\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} + \|(x^\alpha u_x)_x\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} \right) \leq C_T \left( \|u_0\|_{H^1_{\alpha}}^2 + \|h\|_{L^2(Q\varepsilon)}^2 \right). \tag{2.1}
\]

We will also state a result of well-posedness for the problem (1.2), which the proof is given in [21] for $\alpha \in (0,1)$, but the same argument works for $\alpha \in (0,2)$.

**Proposition 2.2.** Given $u_0 \in (H^1_{\alpha})'$ and $g \in L^2(0, T)$, there exists a unique weak solution $u$ of

\[
\begin{cases}
  u_t - (x^\alpha u_x)_x = 0, & (t, x) \in Q, \\
  u(t, 1) = g(t), & \text{in } (0, T), \\
  u(t, 0) = 0, & \text{(Weak)} \\
  or \quad (x^\alpha u_x)(t, 0) = 0, & \text{(Strong)} \\
  u(0, x) = u_0(x), & x \in (0, 1),
\end{cases}
\]

such that $u \in C^0([0, T]; (H^1_{\alpha})')$. In addition, there exists a positive constant $C$ such that

\[
\|u\|_{L^\infty([0, T];(H^1_{\alpha})')} \leq C \left( \|u_0\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \|g\|_{L^2(0, T)} \right). \tag{2.2}
\]

At this point, we will structure the presentation in three parts regarding the Carleman estimate method and some trace operator inequalities.

### 2.1. A first Carleman estimate

We start this discussion presenting a key Carleman inequality for solutions of

\[
\begin{cases}
  v_t + (x^\alpha v_x)_x = F, & (t, x) \in Q, \\
  v(t, 1) = 0, & t \in (0, T), \\
  v(t, 0) = 0, & \text{(Weak)} \\
  or \quad (x^\alpha v_x)(t, 0) = 0, & \text{(Strong)} \\
  v(T, x) = v_T(x), & x \in (0, 1),
\end{cases} \tag{2.3}
\]
where \( F \in L^2(Q) \) and \( v_T \in L^2(0,1) \). We recall that (2.3) is the adjoint system associated to (1.1). Let us set \( \psi : [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \theta : (0,T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) and \( \varphi : (0,T) \times [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \), given by
\[
\psi(x) = \frac{x^{2-\alpha} - 3}{2-\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad \theta(t) := \frac{1}{[t(T-t)]^2}, \quad \varphi(t,x) := \theta(t)\psi(x),
\]
for any \((t,x) \in (0,T) \times [0,1]\). We observe that \( \psi, \theta, \) and \( \varphi \) compose the weight functions which appear in (2.6). Before, we state a Hardy-Poincaré type inequality, proved in [1], which will be a very important ingredient from now on:

**Proposition 2.3.** Assume \( \alpha \in (0,2) \) and \( \alpha \neq 1 \). Let \( w : [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) be a locally absolutely continuous in \((0,1]\), with
\[
\int_0^1 x^\alpha |w_x|^2 \, dx < +\infty.
\]
Then, the following inequality holds
\[
\int_0^1 x^{\alpha-2} |w|^2 \, dx \leq \frac{4}{(1-\alpha)^2} \int_0^1 x^\alpha |w_x|^2 \, dx,
\]
provided that either \( \alpha \in (0,1) \) and \( \lim_{x \to 0^+} w(x) = 0 \) or \( \alpha \in (1,2) \) and \( \lim_{x \to 1^-} w(x) = 0 \).

**Proposition 2.4** (Carleman Inequality). There exist \( C > 0 \) and \( s_0 > 0 \) such that, if \( s \geq s_0 \), then every solution \( v \) of (2.3) satisfies
\[
\int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi} \left[ (s\theta)^{-1}(|v_t|^2 + |(x^\alpha v_x)_x|^2) + (s\theta)x^\alpha |v_x|^2 + (s\theta)^3 x^{2-\alpha} v^2 \right] \, dx dt \\
\leq C \left( \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi} F^2 \, dx dt + s \int_0^T e^{2s\varphi(t,1)} \theta(t) |v_x(t,1)|^2 \, dt \right).
\]

**Proof.** In [1], the terms
\[
\int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi(s\theta)x^\alpha |v_x|^2} \, dx dt \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi(s\theta)^3 x^{2-\alpha} v^2} \, dx dt
\]
have already been estimated as in (2.6).

In order to deal with the remaining terms, let us define
\[
w(t,x) := e^{s\varphi(t,x)} v(t,x),
\]
where \( v \) is the solution of (2.3). In Appendix A, we prove that there exists \( C > 0 \) such that
\[
\int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}(w_t^2 + |(x^\alpha w_x)_x|^2) \, dx dt \leq C \left( \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi} F^2 \, dx dt + s \int_0^T \theta(t) w_x^2(t,1) \, dt \right).
\]
for any \( s > 0 \) sufficiently large (see Lemma A.1). For the next computations, observe that
\[
\begin{cases}
  v_x = (-s\theta x^{1-\alpha} w + w_x) e^{-s\varphi}, \\
  v_t = (-s\theta w + w_t) e^{-s\varphi}.
\end{cases}
\]
Firstly, since \(\theta^{-1}\theta_2^2s^2 \leq C\theta^2\), we apply (A.6) to get
\[
\int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi}(s\theta)^{-1}s_2^2 dx dt = \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}(-s\theta_1\psi w + w_1)^2 dx dt
\]
\[
= \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}s^2\theta_1^2\psi^2 w_2^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}s_2^2 w_1^2 dx dt - 2 \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}s\theta_1\psi w w_1 dx dt
\]
\[
\leq C \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^2 w_2^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}s_2^2 w_1^2 dx dt - 2 \int_0^T \int_0^1 \theta^{-1}s\theta_1\psi w w_1 dx dt
\]
\[
\leq C \left( \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}w_1^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^3 x^{2-\alpha} w^2 dx dt \right)
\]
\[
+ \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}s_2^2 w_1^2 dx dt - 2 \int_0^T \int_0^1 \theta^{-1}s\theta_1\psi w w_1 dx dt.
\] (2.8)

Hence, using (2.7), (A.6) and the estimate
\[
\left| \int_0^T \int_0^1 \theta^{-1}s\theta_1\psi w w_1 dx dt \right| \leq C \int_0^T \int_0^1 \theta^{-1/4} |\omega_1| dx dt
\]
\[
\leq C \int_0^T \int_0^1 |\theta^{-3/4}s^{-1/2}|\theta^{-1/2}s^{-1/2} w_1|s\theta w| dx dt
\]
\[
\leq C \left( \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}|w_1|^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^2|w|^2 dx dt \right)
\]
\[
\leq C \left( \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}|w_1|^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)|x^\alpha| w_2^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^3 x^{2-\alpha}|w|^2 dx dt \right),
\]
it is clear that
\[
\int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi}(s\theta)^{-1}s_2^2 dx dt \leq C \left( \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi}|F|^2 dx dt + s \int_0^T \theta(t) w_2^2(t,1) dt \right)
\]
\[
= C \left( \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi}|F|^2 dx dt + s \int_0^T \theta(t) w_2^2(t,1)e^{2s\varphi(t,1)} dt \right),
\] (2.9)

recalling that
\[
w_2(t,1) = (s\varphi_x e^{s\varphi} v + v_x e^{s\varphi})|_{x=1} = (s\varphi_x w + v_x e^{s\varphi})|_{x=1} = v_x(t,1)e^{s\varphi(t,1)}.
\]

Secondly, before dealing with \(\int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi}(s\theta)^{-1} |(x^\alpha v_x)_x|^2 dx dt\), we notice that
\[
(x^\alpha v_x)_x = (-s\theta w - s\theta x w_x + (x^\alpha w)_x + (s\theta)^2 x^{2-\alpha} w - s\theta w_x)e^{-s\varphi}.
\]

Thus, from (A.6), (2.7) and Lemma A.1, we readily get
\[
\int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}e^{2s\varphi}|(x^\alpha v_x)_x|^2 dx dt \leq \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}|e^{s\varphi}(x^\alpha v_x)_x|^2 dx dt
\]
\[
\leq C \left( \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}s^2\theta_1^2 w_2^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}s^2\theta_2^2 w_2^2 dx dt \right)
\]
\[
+ \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1} |(x^\alpha w_x)_x|^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}(s\theta)^4 x^{4-2\alpha} w^2 dx dt
\]
Proposition 2.5. (a) There exists \( A_\alpha > 0 \) such that

\[
|u(1)| \leq A_\alpha \|u\|_{H^1_{\alpha}}
\]

for any \( u \in H^1_{\alpha} \).
(b) There exists $B_\alpha > 0$ such that
\[ |u_x(1)| \leq B_\alpha \|u\|_{H^2_\alpha} \]
for any $u \in H^2_\alpha$.

**Proof.** (a) Let us take $u \in H^2_\alpha$. For each $a \in (0, 1)$, we notice that
\[ u' = \frac{1}{x^{\alpha/2}} x^\alpha u' \leq \frac{1}{a^{\alpha/2}} x^\alpha u', \]
for any $x \in [a, 1]$. In this case,
\[ \|u'\|^2_{L^2(a,1)} \leq \frac{1}{a^\alpha} \|x^\alpha u'\|^2_{L^2(a,1)} \leq \frac{1}{a^\alpha} \|u\|_{H^1_\alpha}^2 \tag{2.12} \]
and, consequently, we can use (2.11) in order to get
\[ |u(1)| \leq (1 - a)^{-1/2} \|u\|_{L^2(a,1)} + (1 - a)^{1/2} \|u'\|_{L^2(a,1)} \leq \left[ \frac{1}{(1 - a)^{1/2}} + \frac{(1 - a)^{1/2}}{a^{\alpha/2}} \right] \|u\|_{H^1_\alpha}. \]

Since $f : \lambda \in (0,1) \mapsto \left[ \frac{1}{(1 - \lambda)^{1/2}} + \frac{(1 - \lambda)^{1/2}}{\lambda^{\alpha/2}} \right] \in (0, +\infty)$ is a continuous function satisfying $\lim_{\lambda \to 0^+} f(\lambda) = +\infty$ and $\lim_{\lambda \to 1^-} f(\lambda) = +\infty$, there exists $a \in (0, 1)$ such that $0 < f(a) \leq \min_{\lambda \in (0,1)} f(\lambda)$. In particular, taking $A_\alpha = f(a)$, the desired inequality follows.

(b) For the second statement, we firstly fix $a \in (0, 1]$ and observe that
\[ u'' = \frac{1}{x^\alpha} (x^\alpha u')' - \frac{\alpha}{x} u' \]
implies $|u''|^2 \leq 4 \left( \frac{1}{x^{2\alpha}} |(x^\alpha u')'|^2 + \frac{\alpha^2}{x^2} |u'|^2 \right)$. Hence, using (2.12), we get
\[ \|u''\|^2_{L^2(a,1)} \leq \frac{4}{a^{2\alpha}} \|u\|_{H^2_\alpha}^2 + \frac{4\alpha^2}{a^2} \|u'\|^2_{H^1_\alpha} \leq \left( \frac{4}{a^{2\alpha}} + \frac{4\alpha^2}{a^2 + \alpha} \right) \|u\|_{H^2_\alpha}^2 \tag{2.13} \]
As a consequence, (2.11) and (2.12) allow us to obtain
\[ |u'(1)| \leq (1 - a)^{-1/2} \|u'\|_{L^2(a,1)} + (1 - a)^{1/2} \|u''\|_{L^2(a,1)} \leq \left[ \frac{1}{a^{\alpha/2} (1 - a)^{1/2}} + (1 - a)^{1/2} \left( \frac{4}{a^{2\alpha}} + \frac{4\alpha^2}{a^2 + \alpha} \right)^{1/2} \right] \|u\|_{H^2_\alpha}. \]
Arguing as before, we can take
\[ B_\alpha = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda^{\alpha/2} (1 - \lambda)^{1/2}} + (1 - \lambda)^{1/2} \left( \frac{4}{\lambda^{2\alpha}} + \frac{4\alpha^2}{\lambda^{2\alpha} + \alpha} \right)^{1/2} : \lambda \in (0, 1) \right\} > 0 \]
in order to complete the proof.
Next, we deduce some consequences from the previous result:

**Corollary 2.6.** Let $A_\alpha$ and $B_\alpha$ be those two positive constants obtained in Proposition 2.5. Then:

(a) $\|u(t,1)\|_{L^2(0,T)} \leq A_\alpha \|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1_\alpha)}$ for any $u \in L^2(0,T;H^1_\alpha)$;

(b) $\|u_n(t,1)\|_{L^2(0,T)} \leq B_\alpha \|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha)}$ for any $u \in L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha)$.

**Proposition 2.7.** Let $(u_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence in $L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha)$ which weakly converges to $u \in L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha)$. Then

$$u_n(t,1) \rightharpoonup u(t,1) \text{ and } u_{n\alpha}(t,1) \rightharpoonup u_x(t,1)$$

weakly in $L^2(0,T)$.

**Proof.** Let us set $\Gamma_1 : L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha) \rightarrow L^2(0,T)$, with $i \in \{1,2\}$, given by

$$\Gamma_1(u) = u(\cdot,1) \text{ and } \Gamma_2(u) = u_x(\cdot,1),$$

for each $u \in L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha)$. Notice that Proposition 2.6 mean that $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$ are two continuous linear mappings. In this case, for each $T \in (L^2(0,T))'$, $T \circ \Gamma_1$ and $T \circ \Gamma_2$ belong to $(L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha))'$. Hence,

$$T(u_n(\cdot,1)) = (T \circ \Gamma_1)(u_n) \rightarrow (T \circ \Gamma_1)(u) = T(u(\cdot,1))$$

and

$$T(u_{n\alpha}(\cdot,1)) = (T \circ \Gamma_2)(u_n) \rightarrow (T \circ \Gamma_2)(u) = T(u_x(\cdot,1))$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It ends the proof. \hfill \square

**Remark 2.8.** Given $a \in (a,1)$, we recall the continuous embedding $H^1(a,1) \hookrightarrow C^0([a,1])$. Thus, for each $v \in L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha)$, we can apply (2.10) to obtain

$$v_x(t,s) = v_x(t,1) - \int_s^1 v_{rr}(r,s)dr,$$

where $s \in [a,1]$ and $t \in (0,T)$. Integrating from $x \in [a,s]$ to $1$, with respect to $s$, we readily get

$$v(t,x) = -(1-x)v_x(t,1) + \int_x^1 \int_s^1 v_{rr}(t,r)drds.$$  \hfill (2.14)

for any $(t,x) \in (0,T) \times [a,1)$. The relation (2.14) will be crucial later.

### 2.3. A refined Carleman estimate

At this place, following the ideas presented in [16], we will improve that Carleman estimate proved in Proposition 2.4 by emphasizing the influence of the control domain in (1.1). Precisely, we aim the following result:

**Theorem 2.9.** There exist positive constants $C > 0$ and $s_0 > 0$, only depending on $T$, such that, if $s \geq s_0$, then every solution $v$ of (2.3) verifies

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi} \left[ (s\theta)^{-1}|v_t|^2 + |(x^\alpha v_x)_x|^2 + (s\theta)x^\alpha |v_x|^2 + (s\theta)^3 x^{2-\alpha}v^2 \right] dxdt$$

$$\leq C \left( \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi}|F|^2 dxdt + \frac{1}{e^s \theta} \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi} \theta^{2-\alpha}|v|^2 dxdt \right).$$  \hfill (2.15)
Proof. Firstly, let us take a cut-off function \( \zeta \in C^{\infty}([0, 1]) \) such that \( \zeta = 1 \) in \((1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, 1)\), \( \zeta = 0 \) in \([0, 1 - \varepsilon]\), with

\[
\zeta' = O(\varepsilon^{-1}), \quad \zeta'' = O(\varepsilon^{-2}) \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta''' = O(\varepsilon^{-3}).
\]

By a standard density argument, we can consider \( v \) as a solution of (2.3) which is sufficiently regular. Thus, a simple computation gives

\[
[s\phi(t)e^{-2s\psi(t,x)}|v_x(t, x)|^2]_{x=1} = s\int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} \frac{d}{dx}[\theta(t)e^{-2s\psi(t,x)}x^{2\alpha}\zeta(x)|v_x(t, x)|^2] dx
\]

\[
= -2s^2\int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} \theta(t)^2 e^{-2s\psi(t,x)}x^{2\alpha}\zeta(x)|v_x(t, x)|^2 dx
\]

\[
+ s\int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} \theta(t)e^{-2s\psi(t,x)}x^{2\alpha}\zeta'(x)|v_x(t, x)|^2 dx
\]

\[
+ 2s\int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} \theta(t)e^{-2s\psi(t,x)}\zeta(x)x^\alpha v_x(t, x)(x^\alpha v_x(t, x)) dx.
\]

Integrating over \([0, T]\), we obtain

\[
s\int_{0}^{T} \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} e^{-2s\psi} |v_x|^2 dx dt \leq s\int_{0}^{T} \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} e^{-2s\psi} \theta e^{2\alpha} |v_x|^2 dx dt + Cs^3\int_{0}^{T} \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} e^{-2s\psi} \theta^3 x^\alpha |v_x|^2 dx dt
\]

\[
+ \delta s^{-1}\int_{0}^{T} \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} e^{-2s\psi} e^{-1} (x^\alpha v_x)|x|^2 dx dt, \quad (2.16)
\]

where \( \delta > 0 \) must be chosen later and \( C > 0 \) may depend on \( T \) and \( \delta \).

On the other hand, integrating by parts, we see that

\[
s\int_{0}^{T} \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} e^{-2s\psi} \theta \zeta' x^{2\alpha} |v_x|^2 dx dt = 2s^2\int_{0}^{T} \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} e^{-2s\psi} \theta^2 \zeta' x^\alpha v_x^2 dx dt
\]

\[
- s\int_{0}^{T} \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} e^{-2s\psi} \theta \zeta'' x^{2\alpha} v_x dx dt
\]

\[
- s\int_{0}^{T} \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} e^{-2s\psi} \theta \zeta' x^\alpha v_x dx dt
\]

\[
- s\int_{0}^{T} \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} e^{-2s\psi} \zeta v(x^\alpha v_x)_x dx dt =: A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4
\]

and

\[
s^3\int_{0}^{T} \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} e^{-2s\psi} \theta^3 x^\alpha |v_x|^2 dx dt = 2s^4\int_{0}^{T} \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} e^{-2s\psi} \theta^4 x v^2 v_x dx dt
\]

\[
- s^3\int_{0}^{T} \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} e^{-2s\psi} \theta^3 \zeta' x^\alpha v_x dx dt
\]

\[
- s^3\int_{0}^{T} \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} e^{-2s\psi} \theta^3 v(x^\alpha v_x)_x dx dt =: B_1 + B_2 + B_3
\]

(2.17)
In order to estimate the terms $A_i$ and $B_j$, with $i \in \{1,2,3,4\}$ and $j \in \{1,2,3\}$, we can use standard inequalities, as follows:

\[
A_1 \leq \delta s \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta x^\alpha |x_x|^2} dx \, dt + C e^{-2s^3} \int_0^T e^{-2s\varphi \theta^3 x^{2-\alpha} |v|^2} dx \, dt,
\]

\[
A_2 = s^2 \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta \xi'' |x_x|^2} \frac{d}{dx} (|v|^2) dx \, dt
\]

\[
= s^2 \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta^2 x^{\alpha+1} \xi'' |v|^2} dx \, dt - s^2 \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta \xi'' x^{2\alpha} |v|^2} dx \, dt
\]

\[
- \alpha s \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta \xi'' x^{2\alpha-1} |v|^2} dx \, dt
\]

\[
\leq C s^2 \varepsilon^{-3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta^2 |v|^2} dx \, dt,
\]

\[
A_3 \leq s \delta \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta \alpha |x_x|^2} dx \, dt + C s e^{-2} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta |v|^2} dx \, dt,
\]

\[
A_4 = s^{-1} \delta \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta^{-1} (x^\alpha v_x)_x^2} dx \, dt + C s^3 e^{-2} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta^3 |v|^2} dx \, dt,
\]

\[
B_1 \leq \delta \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta \alpha |x_x|^2} dx \, dt + C s^7 e^{-2} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta^7 |v|^2} dx \, dt,
\]

\[
B_2 \leq s \delta \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta \alpha |x_x|^2} dx \, dt + C s^5 e^{-2} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta^5 |v|^2} dx \, dt,
\]

\[
B_3 \leq s^{-1} \delta \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta^{-1} (x^\alpha v_x)_x^2} dx \, dt + C s^7 e^{-3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{-2s\varphi \theta^7 |v|^2} dx \, dt.
\]

Combining (2.16)-(2.18) and the last seven inequalities, the result is obtained from Theorem 2.4 by taking $\delta$ sufficiently small. \qed

3. Internal null Controllability for the degenerate problem

The aim of this section is to obtain a family $(\hat{u}_c, \hat{h}_c)_{c>0}$ of solutions to the null distributed control problem (1.1). In order to do that, we will first define some weights that do not vanish at $t = 0$, then we will prove an observability inequality with these weights, which will allow us to solve the control problem (1.1).

Indeed, consider a function $m \in C^\infty([0,T])$ satisfying

\[
\begin{cases}
  m(t) \geq t^4(T-t)^4, & t \in (0,T/2); \\
  m(t) = t^4(T-t)^4, & t \in [T/2,T]; \\
  m(0) > 0,
\end{cases}
\]

and define

\[
\tau(t) := \frac{1}{m(t)}, \quad A(t,x) := \tau(t) \psi(x),
\]

\[
A^*(t) = \max_{0 \leq x \leq 1} A(t,x), \quad \hat{A}(t,x) = \min_{0 \leq x \leq 1} A(t,x) \text{ and } \hat{A}(t) = 2A^* - \hat{A},
\]

where $(t, x) \in [0,T] \times [0,1]$ and note that $\hat{A} < 0$.  
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Lemma 3.1. There exists $C > 0$ such that

$$
\|v(0)\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 + \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2sA} \left[ \tau^{-1}(|v_1|^2 + |(x^\alpha v_x)_x|^2) + \tau x^\alpha |v_x|^2 + \tau^3 x^{2-\alpha} |v|^2 \right] \, dx \, dt \\
\leq C \left( e^{-3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA} \tau^{-7} x^{2-\alpha} |v|^2 \, dx \, dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2sA} |F|^2 \, dx \, dt \right),
$$

(3.2)

for every $v$ solution of (2.3).

Proof. First of all, since $\varphi \leq A$, $\varphi = A$ in $[T/2, T]$ and $e^{2sA} \tau^7 \geq C > 0$ in $[0, T/2]$, we notice that

$$
\int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi} |F|^2 \, dx \, dt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \tau^7 \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2s\varphi} \theta^{-7} x^{2-\alpha} |v|^2 \, dx \, dt \\
\leq \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2sA} |F|^2 \, dx \, dt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \tau^7 \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA} \tau^{-7} x^{2-\alpha} |v|^2 \, dx \, dt.
$$

(3.3)

As usual, we will divide the proof into two different cases, namely, $t \in [0, T/2]$ or $t \in [T/2, T]$. The second case follows immediately from Carleman inequality (2.15) and the last inequality (3.3), since $A = \varphi$ and $\theta = \tau$ in $[T/2, T]$.

In order to obtain the inequality in $[0, T/2]$, let us consider a cut-off function $\xi \in C^\infty([0, T])$ such that $0 \leq \xi \leq 1$, $\xi = 1 \in [0, T/2]$ and $\xi = 0 \in [3T/4, T]$.

Define $w = \xi v$ and note that $w$ a solution to the problem

$$
\begin{aligned}
-w_t - (x^\alpha w_x)_x &= \xi F - \xi v \quad (t, x) \in Q \\
w(t, 1) &= 0, \quad t \in (0, T) \\
w(t, 0) &= 0 \quad (t \in (0, T)) \\
(x^\alpha w_x)(t, 0) &= 0 \\
w(T, x) &= 0 \quad x \in (0, 1).
\end{aligned}
$$

The regularity result for this problem can be found [1]. Namely we have

$$
w \in H^1(0, T; L^2(0, 1)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^2_x) \cap C^0([0, T]; H^1_x),
$$

where

$$
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|w(t)\|_{H^1_x}^2 + \|w_t\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 + \|(x^\alpha w_x)_x\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \leq C \left( \|\xi F - \xi v\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \right).
$$

As a consequence,

$$
\|w(0)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \leq C \left( \|\xi F - \xi v\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \right),
$$

$$
\|w\|_{L^2(0, T; H^2_x)}^2 \leq C \left( \|\xi F - \xi v\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \right).
$$

Hence, since $v = w$ in $[0, T/2]$, we have that

$$
\|v(0)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 + \|v\|_{L^2(0, T; H^2_x)}^2 + \|v_t\|_{L^2(0, T/2; L^2(Q))}^2 \leq C \left( \|\xi F - \xi v\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \right).
$$

Now, we will estimate the right hand side of this last inequality. Recall $e^{2sA}$ is bounded from below in $[0, T/2]$. Thus,

$$
\|\xi F\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \leq \int_0^{T/2} \int_0^1 e^{2sA} |F|^2 \, dx \, dt \\
\leq C \left( e^{-3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA} \tau^{-7} x^{2-\alpha} |v|^2 \, dx \, dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2sA} |F|^2 \, dx \, dt \right).
$$
It is a consequence of Carleman inequality (3.2) that
\[ a L^2 \leq C \left( \int_{T/2}^{3T/4} \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi} (s\theta)^3 x^{2-\alpha} |w|^2 \, dx \, dt + \int_{T/2}^{3T/4} \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi} (s\theta)x^\alpha |v_x|^2 \, dx \, dt \right) \]
\[ \leq C \left( e^{-3} \int_0^1 \int_{1-\varepsilon} e^{2s\varphi} x^{2-\alpha} |v|^2 \, dx \, dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi} |F|^2 \, dx \, dt \right). \]
Finally, these last three estimates together and the boundedness of \( e^{2sA} \), for \( k \in \mathbb{Z} \), in \([0,T/2]\), gives us
\[ \|v(0)\|_{L^2_{(0,1)}}^2 + \int_0^{T/2} \int_0^1 e^{2sA} \left[ \tau^{-1} \left( \|v_t\|^2 + \|v^alpha_v\|^2 + \|x^alpha_x\|^2 + \|x^3 x^{2-\alpha}\|^2 \right) \right] \, dx \, dt \]
\[ \leq C \left( e^{-3} \int_0^1 \int_{1-\varepsilon} e^{2sA} x^{2-\alpha} |v|^2 \, dx \, dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2sA} |F|^2 \, dx \, dt \right). \]

Now, in order to obtain a family of solution to the control problem (1.1), let us define the operator \( L^* = -w_t - (x^\alpha w_x)_x \), the linear space
\[ P_\alpha = \{ w \in C^2(\bar{Q}); \ w(t,1) = 0, \ \text{and} \ w(t,0) = 0, \ \forall t \in (0,T) \}, \quad \text{if} \ \alpha \in (0,1) \]
\[ P_\alpha = \{ w \in C^2(\bar{Q}); \ w(t,1) = 0, \ \text{and} \ x^\alpha w(t,0) = 0, \ \forall t \in (0,T) \}, \quad \text{if} \ \alpha \in [1,2) \]
and the bilinear form
\[ a_\varepsilon(w_1, w_2) = \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2sA} L^* w_1 L^* w_2 \, dx \, dt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon} e^{2sA} x^\tau w_1 w_2 \, dx \, dt. \]
It is a consequence of Carleman inequality (3.2) that \( a_\varepsilon \) is a symmetric, positive definite bilinear form, therefore it defines a scalar product. Let us denote by \( \| \cdot \|_{\varepsilon} \) its norm and by \( P_\varepsilon \) the completion of \( P_\alpha \) with respect to this norm.

Now, let \( \ell : P_\varepsilon \to \mathbb{R} \) be the linear form given by
\[ \langle \ell, \varphi \rangle = \int_0^1 u_0(x) \varphi(0,x) \, dx. \]
From Carleman inequality (3.2) we can see that
\[ |\langle \ell, \varphi \rangle| \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2_{(0,1)}} \|\varphi(0)\|_{L^2_{(0,1)}} \leq C \|u_0\|_{L^2_{(0,1)}} a_\varepsilon(\varphi, \varphi) = C \|u_0\|_{L^2_{(0,1)}} \|\varphi\|_{\varepsilon}, \]
where \( C \) does not depend on \( \varepsilon \).

By Riesz-Fisher representation Theorem, there exists a unique \( \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon \in P_\varepsilon \) such that
\[ a_\varepsilon(\hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon, \varphi) = \langle \ell, \varphi \rangle, \ \forall \varphi \in P_\varepsilon, \]
that is,
\[ \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2sA} L^* \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon L^* \varphi \, dx \, dt + \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} e^{2sA} x^\tau \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon \varphi \, dx \, dt = \int_0^1 u_0(x) \varphi(0,x) \, dx, \ \forall \varphi \in P_\varepsilon. \]
As a consequence,

\[ \hat{u}_\varepsilon := e^{2sA} \mathcal{L}^* \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon \]  

and \( \hat{h}_\varepsilon := -\frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} e^{2sA^* \tau^7 \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon} \) are the family of solutions to the distributed null control problem (1.1) we are looking for. Indeed, for any \( (F, z^T) \in L^2(Q) \times L^2(0, 1) \), if \( z \) is a solution of (1.3), we have that \( z \in P_\varepsilon \) and then

\[
\int_0^T \int_0^1 \hat{u}_\varepsilon F \, dx dt = \int_0^T \int_1^{1-\varepsilon} \hat{h}_\varepsilon z \, dx dt + \int_0^1 u_0(x) z(0, x) \, dx, \tag{3.4}
\]

that is, \( \hat{u}_\varepsilon := e^{2sA} \mathcal{L}^* \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon \) is a solution by transposition to the problem (1.1). Furthermore,

\[
\| \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon \|_{P_\varepsilon}^2 = a_\varepsilon(\hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon, \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon) = \langle \ell, \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon \rangle \leq C\|u_0\|_{L^2(0, 1)} \| \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon \|_{P_\varepsilon} \Rightarrow \| \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon \|_{P_\varepsilon} \leq C\|u_0\|_{L^2(0, 1)},
\]

On the other hand, since \( \mathcal{L}^* \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon = e^{-2sA} \hat{u}_\varepsilon \) and \( \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon = -\varepsilon^3 e^{-2sA^* \tau^7} \hat{h}_\varepsilon \), we have that

\[
\| \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon \|_{P_\varepsilon}^2 = \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{-2sA} |\hat{u}_\varepsilon|^2 \, dx dt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^T \int_1^{1-\varepsilon} e^{-2sA^* \tau^7} |\hat{h}_\varepsilon|^2 \, dx dt,
\]

whence,

\[
\int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{-2sA} |\hat{u}_\varepsilon|^2 \, dx dt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^T \int_1^{1-\varepsilon} e^{-2sA^* \tau^7} |\hat{h}_\varepsilon|^2 \, dx dt \leq C\|u_0\|_{L^2(0, 1)}.
\]

Therefore, we have the following estimates

\[
\| e^{-sA^* \tau^{-7/2}} \hat{h}_\varepsilon \|_{L^2((0, T) \times \omega_\varepsilon)} \leq C\|u_0\|_{L^2(0, 1)},
\]

\[
\| e^{-sA} \hat{u}_\varepsilon \|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C\|u_0\|_{L^2(0, 1)}, \tag{3.5}
\]

where \( C \) does not depend on \( \varepsilon \). This, together with (3.4), gives us that \( (\hat{u}_\varepsilon, \hat{h}_\varepsilon) \) is a solution to the distributed control problem (1.1).

4. Proof of the main result

In this section, in addition to prove the theorem, we make it clear how the convergence of the distributed control problem (1.1) to the boundary control problem (1.2) works.

In the previous section we have obtained a family \( (\hat{u}_\varepsilon, \hat{h}_\varepsilon) \) of solutions to problem (1.1) in the sense of Definition 1.3, that is to say that \( (\hat{u}_\varepsilon, \hat{h}_\varepsilon) \) satisfies (3.4). In order to obtain a solution to the boundary null control problem (1.2), we need to pass limits in that equation and obtain \( (u, h) \) that satisfies equation (1.4).

The convergence of the left hand side of (3.4) is an immediate consequence of estimate (3.5). Next, we will prove two Lemmas that will guarantee the convergence of the right hand side.

**Lemma 4.1.** We have that \( e^{sA^* \tau^{-1/2}} \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon \in L^2(0, T; H^2_\alpha) \) with

\[
\| e^{sA^* \tau^{-1/2}} \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon \|_{L^2(0, T; H^2_\alpha)} \leq C\|u_0\|_{L^2(0, 1)},
\]

where \( C \) does not depend on \( \varepsilon \). Moreover, there exists a function \( \varphi \) such that, up to a subsequence,

\[
e^{sA^* \tau^{-1/2}} \hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup e^{sA^* \tau^{-1/2}} \varphi \text{ weakly in } L^2(0, T; H^2_\alpha).
\]

As a consequence,

\[
e^{2sA^* \tau^7} \hat{\varphi}_{ex}(t, 1) \rightharpoonup e^{2sA^* \tau^7} \varphi_{ex}(t, 1) \text{ weakly in } L^2(0, T)
\]
Proof. Firstly, since $\tau \geq C > 0$, we have that $e^{2sA^*\tau^{-1}} \leq C e^{2sA^*\tau^k}$, $\forall k \geq -1$. From Hardy-Poincaré (2.5) and Lemma 3.1, we have

$$
\|e^{sA^*\tau^{-1}/2}\hat{\varphi_\tau}\|_{L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha)} = \int_0^T e^{2sA^*\tau^{-1}} \left( \|\varphi_\tau(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} + \|x^{\alpha/2}\varphi_\tau(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} + \|x^{\alpha}\varphi_\tau(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} \right) dt \\
\leq C \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2sA^*\tau^{-1}} \left( |\varphi_\tau(t)|^2 + \tau |\varphi'_{\tau}(t)|^2 + \tau^3 x^{2-\alpha} |\varphi_{\tau}(t)|^2 \right) dx dt \\
\leq C \left( \varepsilon^{-3} \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2sA^*\tau^{-1}} x^{2-\alpha} |\varphi_\tau(t)|^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2sA^*\tau^{-1}} |L\varphi_\tau(t)|^2 dx dt \right) \\
\leq a(\varphi_\tau, \varphi_\tau) \leq C \|u_0\|_{L^2(0,1)}.
$$

Therefore, up to a subsequence, we have that

$$
e^{sA^*\tau^{-1}/2}\hat{\varphi_\tau} \rightharpoonup e^{sA^*\tau^{-1}/2}\varphi \text{ weakly in } L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha).
$$

From Proposition 2.7, we get

$$
e^{sA^*\tau^{-1}/2}\hat{\varphi_{\tau xx}}(t,1) \rightharpoonup e^{sA^*\tau^{-1}/2}\varphi_x(t,1) \text{ in } L^2(0,T). \tag{4.1}
$$

In order to prove the last convergence, note that $e^{2sA^*\tau^{-1}} = e^{sA^*\tau^{-1}/2} (e^{sA^*\tau^{1/2}}) = e^{sA^*\tau^{-1/2}} w(t)$, where $w(t)$ is bounded. Thus, given $v \in L^2(0,T)$, we have that $wv \in L^2(0,T)$. Therefore, from the weak convergence (4.1), we have

$$
\int_0^T e^{2sA^*\tau^{-1}} (\varphi_{\tau xx} - \varphi_x)(t,1)v(t) dt = \int_0^T e^{sA^*\tau^{-1/2}} (\varphi_{\tau xx} - \varphi_x)(t,1)w(t)v(t) dt \to 0,
$$

which proves the result. \hfill $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** For each $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, the linear operator $L_\varepsilon : L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha) \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$
L_\varepsilon v := - \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 h_{\varepsilon} v dx dt = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA^*\tau^{-1}} \varphi_{\tau xx} v dx dt,
$$

is bounded and weakly converges, up to a subsequence, as $\varepsilon \to 0^+$, to the linear operator $L : L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha) \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$
Lv := \frac{1}{3} \int_0^T e^{2sA^*\tau^{-1}} \varphi_{\tau xx}(t,1)v_{\tau xx}(t,1) dt.
$$

**Proof.** First, let us prove the boundedness of $L_\varepsilon$. Given $v \in L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha)$, from (3.5), we can see that

$$
|L_\varepsilon v|^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^3} \left( \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA^*\tau^{-1}} v_x^2 dx dt \right) \|u_0\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2. \tag{4.2}
$$

In order to estimate the integral in the last inequality, let us set $a = 1 - \varepsilon$ in (2.14) and note that,

$$
\int_0^1 \int_a^1 v_{\tau r}(t,r) dr ds \leq \int_0^1 \int_a^1 |v_{\tau r}(t,r)| dr ds \leq (1 - x) \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 |v_{\tau r}(t,r)| dr.
$$

As a consequence, from Jensen’s inequality, we can get the following estimate for $v$.

$$
|v(t,x)|^2 \leq 4 \left[ (1 - x)^2 |v_x(t,1)|^2 + \varepsilon (1 - x)^2 \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 |v_{\tau r}(t,r)|^2 dr \right]
$$
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Hence, using this estimate in (4.2), we have
\[
|L_\varepsilon v|^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^3} \left( \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA_\varepsilon \tau^7} (1-x)^2 |v_x(t,1)|^2 \, dx \, dt \right) + \frac{C}{\varepsilon^2} \left( \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA_\varepsilon \tau^7} (1-x)^2 \left[ \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 |v_{rr}(t,r)|^2 \, dr \right] \, dx \, dt \right) \leq I_1 + I_2.
\]

Recall $e^{2sA_\varepsilon \tau^7}$ is bounded, from Corollary 2.5, we have
\[
I_1 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 (1-x)^2 |v_x(t,1)|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C \int_0^T |v_x(t,1)|^2 \, dt \leq C_\alpha \|v\|^2_{L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha)}.
\]

In order to estimate $I_2$, we note that we can consider $\varepsilon \leq 1/2$, since it will go to zero. Thus, from (2.13), we have
\[
I_2 \leq 4C \left( \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)^{2\alpha}} + \left( \frac{\alpha}{1-\varepsilon} \right)^2 \right) \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA_\varepsilon \tau^7} |v(t)||v_x(t,1)|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C\varepsilon \left( \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)^{2\alpha}} + \left( \frac{\alpha}{1-\varepsilon} \right)^2 \right) \int_0^T e^{2sA_\varepsilon \tau^7} |v(t)||v_x(t,1)|^2 \, dt \leq C_\alpha \|v\|^2_{L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha)}.
\]

And this conclude the boundedness of $L_\varepsilon$. Therefore, there exists $L \in (L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha))'$ such that, up to a subsequence,
\[
L_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup L \text{ weakly in } L^2(0,T;H^2_\alpha).
\]

It remains to prove that
\[
Lv = \frac{1}{3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA_\varepsilon \tau^7} \hat{\varphi}_x(t,1)v_x(t,1) \, dx \, dt. \tag{4.3}
\]

Indeed, if we define $V(t,x) = \frac{1}{1-x} \int_x^1 v_{rr}(t,r) \, dr \, ds$ we can rewrite (2.14) as
\[
v(t,x) = -(1-x)v_x(t,1) + (1-x)V(t,x).
\]

Thus,
\[
L_\varepsilon v = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA_\varepsilon \tau^7} \hat{\varphi}(1-x)v_x(t,1) \, dx \, dt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA_\varepsilon \tau^7} \hat{\varphi}(1-x)V(t,x) \, dx \, dt = A_\varepsilon + B_\varepsilon.
\]

In the following, we will prove that $B_\varepsilon \to 0$ and $A_\varepsilon$ converges to the right hand side of (4.3). In fact, since $e^{sA_\varepsilon \tau^7}$ is bounded, we can see that
\[
|B_\varepsilon| \leq \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA_\varepsilon \tau^7} |\hat{\varphi}(x)|^2 \, dx \, dt \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA_\varepsilon \tau^7} (1-x)^2 V(t,x)^2 \, dx \, dt \right)^{1/2} \leq C\|\hat{\varphi}\|_P \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 (1-x)^2 V(t,x)^2 \, dx \, dt \right)^{1/2} \leq C\|\hat{\varphi}\|_P \sup_{x \in [1-\varepsilon,1]} \|V(t,x)\|_{L^2(0,T)} \to 0, \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0^+.
\]
Now, let us obtain the convergence of $A_\varepsilon$. Since $\tilde{\varphi}_\varepsilon(t,\cdot) \in H^2(1-\varepsilon,1)$, we have that
\[
A_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA^*} \tau^7 (1-x)v_x(t,1) \left( \int_x^1 \tilde{\varphi}_{xx}(t,s) \, ds \right) \, dx dt
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA^*} \tau^7 (1-x)v_x(t,1) \left( \int_x^1 \tilde{\varphi}_{xx}(t,s) - \tilde{\varphi}_{xx}(t,1) \, ds \right) \, dx dt
\]
\[
+ \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA^*} \tau^7 (1-x)^2v_x(t,1)\tilde{\varphi}_{xx}(t,1) \, dx dt
\]
\[
= A_1^1 + A_1^2.
\]
Hence, from Proposition 4.1,
\[
A_1^2 = \frac{1}{3} \int_0^T e^{2sA^*} \tau^7 v_x(t,1) \tilde{\varphi}_{xx}(t,1) \, dt \to \frac{1}{3} \int_0^T e^{2sA^*} \tau^7 v_x(t,1) \tilde{\varphi}_\varepsilon(t,1) \, dt.
\]
In order to prove $A_1^2 \to 0$, first we recall the definition of $\tilde{A}$ given in (3.1) and note that $e^{2sA^*} \tau^5$ is bounded. In the following, we observe that $\tilde{\varphi}_{xx} \in H^2(1-\varepsilon,1)$, hence we can apply (2.10). Finally, we use Corollary 2.5, inequality (2.13) and Proposition 4.1 to obtain
\[
|A_1^2| \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA^*} \tau^7 (1-x)|v_x(t,1)| \left( \int_x^1 \int_s^1 |\tilde{\varphi}_{xx}(t,\xi)| \, d\xi ds \right) \, dx dt
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \left( \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA^*} \tau^7 (1-x)^2 \left( \int_x^1 \int_s^1 |\tilde{\varphi}_{xx}(t,\xi)| \, d\xi ds \, dx \right) \right)^{1/2}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \left( \int_0^T |v_x(t,1)|^2 \, dt \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA^*} \tau^7 (1-x)^2 \left( \int_x^1 \int_s^1 |\tilde{\varphi}_{xx}(t,\xi)| \, d\xi ds \right) \, dx \right)^{1/2}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{C_\alpha}{\varepsilon^3} \left\| v_x \right\|_{L_2(0,T;H^2_\varepsilon)} \left( \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA^*} \tau^7 (1-x)^2 \left( \int_x^1 \int_s^1 |\tilde{\varphi}_{xx}(t,\xi)| \, d\xi ds \right) \, dx \right)^{1/2}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{C_\alpha}{\varepsilon^3} \left\| v_x \right\|_{L_2(0,T;H^2_\varepsilon)} \left( \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)^{2\alpha}} + \frac{\alpha^2}{(1-\varepsilon)^{2+\alpha}} \right) \left( \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA^*} \tau^7 (1-x)^2 \left\| \tilde{\varphi}_\varepsilon(t) \right\|^2_{H^2_\varepsilon} \, dx \right)^{1/2}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{C_\alpha}{\varepsilon^3} \left\| v_x \right\|_{L_2(0,T;H^2_\varepsilon)} \left( \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)^{2\alpha}} + \frac{\alpha^2}{(1-\varepsilon)^{2+\alpha}} \right) \left( \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA^*} \tau^7 (1-x)^2 \left\| \tilde{\varphi}_\varepsilon(t) \right\|^2_{H^2_\varepsilon} \, dx \right)^{1/2}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{C_\alpha}{\varepsilon^3} \left\| v_x \right\|_{L_2(0,T;H^2_\varepsilon)} \left( \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)^{2\alpha}} + \frac{\alpha^2}{(1-\varepsilon)^{2+\alpha}} \right) \left\| u_0 \right\|_{L_2(0,1)} \to 0, \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0^+.
\]
And this conclude the result.

Finally, the proof of our main result is a consequence of the previous Lemma.

**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** Recall $(u_\varepsilon, \tilde{h}_\varepsilon) = (e^{2sA^*}L^\alpha, -e^{-3}e^{2sA^*} \tau^7 \tilde{\varphi}_\varepsilon)$ is the solution of the distributed null control problem (1.1) in the sense of Definition 1.3. From (3.4), for every $(F, z^2) \in L_1^1(\Omega) \times L^2(0,1)$ one has
\[
\int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 \tilde{u}_x F \, dx \, dt = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_0^T \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 e^{2sA^*} \tau^7 \tilde{\varphi}_\varepsilon z \, dx \, dt + \int_0^1 u_0(x) z(x,0) \, dx,
\]
where \( z \) is the associated solution to (1.3). Estimate (3.5) gives us that \( \hat{u}_x \rightharpoonup u \) in \( L^2(Q) \) and, together with Lemma 4.2, we pass to limits in the previous equation to obtain
\[
\int_0^T \int_0^1 uF \, dx \, dt = \frac{1}{3} \int_0^T e^{2sA^*} \tau_7 \varphi_x(t,1)z_x(t,1) \, dt + \int_0^1 u_0(x)z(x,0) \, dx,
\]
which means that the pair \( (u, \frac{1}{3} e^{2sA^*} \tau_7 \varphi_x(\cdot,1)) \) solves the boundary null control problem (1.2).

5. Further extensions and open questions

In this section we will present some additional comments on the main result and the open questions left for future work.

5.1. A more general degenerate operator

In most works published on null control of degenerate parabolic equations, the authors deal with the following base system distributed control problem:
\[
\begin{aligned}
&u_t - (a(x)u_x)_x = h\chi_\omega, \quad (t,x) \in Q, \\
&u(t,1) = 0, \quad (t,x) \in (0,T), \\
&u(t,0) = 0, \quad (t,x) \in (0,T), \\
&(a(x)u_x)(t,0) = 0, \quad (t,x) \in (0,T), \\
&u(0,x) = u_0(x),
\end{aligned}
\]

\[(5.1)\]

where \( a \) is a positive continuous function on \([0,1]\) that satisfies the following hypothesis

**Weak**:
\[
(i) \quad a \in C([0,1]) \cap C^1((0,1]), \quad a > 0 \text{ in } [0,1] \text{ and } a(0) = 0; \\
(ii) \quad \exists K \in [0,1) \text{ such that } xa'(x) \leq Ka(x) \forall x \in [0,1].
\]

**Strong**:
\[
(i) \quad a \in C^1([0,1]), \quad a > 0 \text{ in } [0,1] \text{ and } a(0) = 0; \\
(ii) \quad \exists K \in [1,2) \text{ such that } xa'(x) \leq Ka(x) \forall x \in [0,1]; \\
(iii) \quad \exists \kappa \in (1,K]:x \rightarrow \frac{a(x)}{x^{\kappa}} \text{ is nondecreasing near } 0, \text{ if } K > 1; \\
\quad \exists \kappa \in (0,1]:x \rightarrow \frac{a(x)}{x^{\kappa}} \text{ is nondecreasing near } 0, \text{ if } K = 1.
\]

In this work we deal with the particular case where \( a(x) = x^\alpha \), but there are no significant changes to adapt our computations to deal with problem (5.1). So, Theorem 1.4 can be extend naturally to problem (5.1).

5.2. The problem in space dimension 2

There is a lot of ways to extend the system (1.1) to space dimension 2. One of the simplest ways is to consider the following system
\[
\begin{aligned}
&u_t - \text{div}(A\nabla u) = h\chi_\omega, \quad (t,x) \in Q, \\
&B.C. \quad \text{on } \Sigma, \\
&u(\cdot,0) = u_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,
\end{aligned}
\]

\[(5.2)\]

where \( \Omega := (0,1) \times (0,1), \, \Gamma := \partial \Omega, \, T > 0, \, Q := \Omega \times (0,T), \, \Sigma := \Gamma \times (0,T), \, \omega \subset \Omega \) is a non-empty open set and \( \chi_\omega \) is the corresponding characteristic function, \( h \in L^2(Q), \, u_0 \in L^2(\Omega), \) the matrix-valued function \( A : \Omega \mapsto M_{2 \times 2}(\mathbb{R}) \) is given by
\[
A(x) = \text{diag}(x_1^a, x_2^a),
\]

\[a\]
the boundary conditions are

\[
B.C. := \begin{cases} 
  u = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma & \text{if } \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in [0, 1), \\
  u = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma_{3,4} & \text{if } \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in [1, 2), \\
  u = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma_{1,3,4} & \text{if } \alpha_1 \in [0, 1) \text{ and } \alpha_2 \in [1, 2), \\
  u = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma_{2,3,4} & \text{if } \alpha_1 \in [1, 2) \text{ and } \alpha_2 \in [0, 1),
\end{cases}
\]

with \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in [0,2) \times [0,2) \). \( \Sigma_{i,j,l} := (\Gamma_i \cup \Gamma_j \cup \Gamma_l) \times (0,T) \), \( \nu = \nu(x) \) being the outward unit normal to \( \Omega \) at the point \( x \in \Gamma \) and, finally,

\[
\Gamma_1 := \{0\} \times [0,1], \; \Gamma_2 := [0,1] \times \{0\}, \; \Gamma_3 := \{1\} \times [0,1], \; \Gamma_4 := [0,1] \times \{1\}.
\]

In [2] the authors establish the null controllability of (5.2) by using of a internal Carleman estimate. To adapt the ideas in this work to deal with system (5.2) we need a boundary Carleman estimate and, to our best knowledge, an such estimate does not exist. However, this doesn’t mean that we can’t try to get a such estimate. So, this can be a goal of a future work.

5.3. The boundary control acting at 0

A natural question that this work left is if the Theorem 1.4 works with the boundary control \( g \) acting at 0 instead of 1. This is a non trivial question. First of all, the boundary null controllibility problem (1.2) with the control \( g \) acting at 0 instead of 1 seems to be much more complicated to deal with. Indeed, to our best knowledge, (1.2) with the control \( g \) acting at 0, was only solved for the weak degenerate case in [21] by using of the momentum method instead of Carleman estimates. One of the main difficulties to deal with the strong degenerate case is the fact that there are no trace results at 0 for \( \alpha \geq 1 \). So, if we want to use the ideas in this work to get a similar result with the control acting at 0 instead of 1, the best bet is to consider only the weak degenerate case. But even in this case, to use the ideas of this work, we would need to establish a boundary Carleman estimate with the control acting a 0 and this may be a hard task.

A. Appendix

At this place, we will complete the proof of Proposition 2.4. To be more precise, we will give detailed explanations about (2.7). As in Section 2, let us consider

\[
w(t,x) := e^{s\varphi(t,x)}w(t,x),
\]

for each \((0,T) \times (0,1)\), where \( v \) is a solution of (2.3). Putting

\[
Lv := v_t + (x^\alpha \varphi_x)_x \quad \text{and} \quad L_s w := e^{s\varphi}L(e^{-s\varphi}w), \; \text{with} \; s > 0,
\]

we notice that \( w \) satisfies

\[
\begin{align*}
  L_s w &= e^{s\varphi}F(t,x), \quad (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,1), \\
  w(t,0) &= w(t,1) = 0, \quad t \in (0,T), \\
  w(T,x) &= w(0,x) = 0, \quad x \in (0,1).
\end{align*}
\]

(A.1)

Besides, decomposing \( L_s w \) as

\[
L_s w := L_s^+ w + L_s^- w,
\]

where

\[
L_s^+ w := (x^\alpha \varphi_x)_x - s \varphi_t w + s^2 x^\alpha \varphi_x^2 w
\]

and

\[
L_s^- w := w_t - 2s x^\alpha \varphi_x w + s (x^\alpha \varphi_x)_x w,
\]

we certainly get

\[
\|L_s^+ w\|^2 + \|L_s^- w\|^2 + 2\langle L_s^+ w, L_s^- w \rangle = \|Fe^{s\varphi}\|^2.
\]

Under these notations, we are ready to obtain the next result.
Lemma A.1. Let $T > 0$ be given. Then, there exist $C > 0$ and $s_0 > 0$, both independent of $w$, such that

$$
\int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}(w_0^2 + |(x^a w_x)_x|^2) \, dx \, dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta x^a w_x^2 + (s\theta)^3 x^{2-a} w^2) \, dx \, dt \leq C \left( \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi} |F|^2 + s \int_0^T \theta w_z^2(t,1) \, dx \, dt \right). \tag{A.2}
$$

for any $s \geq s_0$. In particular, (2.7) holds.

Proof. In [1], the authors have obtained the following estimate involving the scalar product $(L^+_w, L^-_w)$:

$$
\int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta x^a w_x^2 + (s\theta)^3 x^{2-a} w^2) \, dx \, dt \leq C \left( 2(L^+_w, L^-_w) + s \int_0^T \theta w_z^2(t,1) \, dt \right). \tag{A.3}
$$

In order to obtain the desired inequality (A.2), we will estimate

$$
\int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}|(x^a w_x)_x|^2 \, dx \, dt \text{ and } \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}|w_t|^2 \, dx \, dt. \tag{A.4}
$$

in terms of $\|L^+_w\|^2$ and $\|L^-_w\|^2$. Since

$$
|(x^a w_x)_x|^2 \leq 3(|L^+_w|^2 + s^2|\varphi_t|^2|w|^2 + s^4 x^{2a} \varphi_x^4 w^2),
$$

we get

$$
\int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}|(x^a w_x)_x|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq 3 \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}|L^+_w|^2 \, dx \, dt
$$

$$
+ 3 \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}s^2|\varphi_t|^2|w|^2 \, dx \, dt
$$

$$
+ 3 \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}s^4 x^{2a} \varphi_x^4 w^2 \, dx \, dt
$$

$$
=: 3 \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}|L^+_w|^2 \, dx \, dt + I + J. \tag{A.5}
$$

Let us estimate $I$ and $J$ separately. Firstly, since $|\theta^{-1}\theta_t^2\psi|^2 \leq C\theta^2$ and $s \leq Cs^2$ for some $C > 0$, Hardy-Poincaré inequality yields

$$
I = 3 \int_0^T \int_0^1 s|\theta^{-1}\theta_t^2\psi|^2|w|^2 \, dx \, dt
$$

$$
\leq C \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^2 w^2 \, dx \, dt
$$

$$
= C \int_0^T \int_0^1 \left( (s\theta)^{1/2} x^{\frac{2-a}{2}} w \right) \left( (s\theta)^{3/2} x^{\frac{2-a}{2}} w \right) \, dx \, dt
$$

$$
\leq C \left( \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta) x^{a-2} w^2 \, dx \, dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^3 x^{2-a} w^2 \, dx \, dt \right)
$$

$$
\leq C \left( \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta) x^a w_x^2 \, dx \, dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^3 x^{2-a} w_x^2 \, dx \, dt \right). \tag{A.6}
$$
Secondly, to deal with $\mathcal{J}$, we recall $\varphi_x = \theta x^{1-\alpha}$ and $x^{2-\alpha} \leq 1$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{J} = \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1} s^4 x^{2\alpha}(\theta^4 x^{4-4\alpha}) w^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^3 x^{2-\alpha} w^2 \, dx \, dt. \quad (A.7)$$

As a result, we can combine (A.5), (A.6) and (A.7) to obtain

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1} |(x^\alpha w_x)|^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C \left( \|L_x^4 w\|^2 + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta) x^\alpha w^2_x \, dx \, dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^3 x^{2-\alpha} w^2 \, dx \, dt \right). \quad (A.8)$$

Next, we will focus on the second integral mentioned in (A.4). Notice that

$$w^2 \leq 3 \left( |L_x^4 w|^2 + 4s^2 x^{2\alpha} \varphi_x^2 w^2_x + s^2 x^{2\alpha} \varphi^4 w^2 \right)$$

implies

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1} w^2 \, dx \, dt = 3 \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1} |L_x^4 w|^2 \, dx \, dt + 12 \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1} s^2 x^{2\alpha} \varphi_x^2 w^2_x \, dx \, dt + 3 \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1} s^2 x^{2\alpha} \varphi^4 w^2 \, dx \, dt$$

$$= 3 \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1} |L_x^4 w|^2 \, dx \, dt + \mathcal{K} + \mathcal{M}. \quad (A.9)$$

Clearly, using twice the relation $x^2 \leq x^\alpha$, we have

$$\mathcal{K} = 12 \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1} s^2 x^{2\alpha}(\theta^2 x^{2-2\alpha}) w^2_x \, dx \, dt \leq C \int_0^T \int_0^1 s\theta x^\alpha w^2_x \, dx \, dt \quad (A.10)$$

and

$$\mathcal{M} = \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1} s^2 x^{2\alpha}(\theta^4 x^{4-4\alpha}) w^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^3 x^{2-\alpha} w^2 \, dx \, dt, \quad (A.11)$$

following

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1} w^2 \, dx \, dt \leq C \left( \|L_x^4 w\|^2 + \int_0^T \int_0^1 s\theta x^\alpha w^2_x \, dx \, dt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^3 x^{2-\alpha} w^2 \, dx \, dt \right). \quad (A.12)$$

As in (A.8), we have also used in (A.12) that $(s\theta)^{-1}$ is bounded.

Therefore, from (A.3), (A.8) and (A.12), we conclude that

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta)^{-1}(w^2 + |(x^\alpha w_x)|^2) \, dx \, dt \leq C \left( \|L_x^4 w\|^2 + \|L_x^4 w\|^2 + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta x^\alpha w^2_x + (s\theta)^3 x^{2-\alpha} w^2 \, dx \, dt \right)$$

$$\leq C \left( \|L_x^4 w\|^2 + \|L_x^4 w\|^2 + \int_0^T \int_0^1 (s\theta x^\alpha w^2_x + (s\theta)^3 x^{2-\alpha} w^2 \, dx \, dt \right)$$

$$\leq C \left( \|L_x^4 w\|^2 + \|L_x^4 w\|^2 + 2(L_x^4 w, L_x^4 w) + s \int_0^T \theta(t) w^2_x(t, 1) \, dt \right)$$

$$\leq C \left( \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2ax} |F|^2 \, dx \, dt + s \int_0^T \theta(t) w^2_x(t, 1) \, dt \right),$$
as expected.
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