

GLOBAL LIPSCHITZ STABILITY FOR AN INVERSE SOURCE PROBLEM FOR THE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS

¹ OLEG Y. IMANUVILOV, AND ^{2,3,4,5} M. YAMAMOTO

ABSTRACT. For linearized Navier-Stokes equations, we consider an inverse source problem of determining a spatially varying divergence-free factor. We prove the global Lipschitz stability by interior data over a time interval and velocity field at $t_0 > 0$ over the spatial domain. The key are Carleman estimates for the Navier-Stokes equations and the operator rot .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $T > 0$, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ and A, B be sufficiently smooth as specified below. By a^T we denote the transpose of a vector a under consideration. We set

$$\partial_j = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, \quad \partial_t = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \quad \nabla = (\partial_1, \partial_2, \partial_3), \quad \nabla_{x,t} = (\nabla, \partial_t)$$

and

$$\text{div } v = \sum_{j=1}^3 \partial_j v_j \quad \text{for } v = (v_1, v_2, v_3)^T.$$

We consider

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v(x, t) - \Delta v + (A(x, t) \cdot \nabla)v + (v \cdot \nabla)B(x, t) + \nabla p = F(x, t), \\ \text{div } v = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \quad v = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T). \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

¹ Department of Mathematics, Colorado State University

101 Weber Building, Fort Collins, CO 80523-1874, USA

e-mail: oleg@math.colostate.edu

² Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Komaba, Meguro, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan

³ Honorary Member of Academy of Romanian Scientists, Ilfov, nr. 3, Bucuresti, Romania

⁴ Correspondence member of Accademia Peloritana dei Pericolanti,

Palazzo Università, Piazza S. Pugliatti 1 98122 Messina Italy

⁵ Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University) 6 Miklukho-Maklaya St, Moscow, 117198, Russian Federation e-mail: myama@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp .

In this article, we discuss the following inverse source problem when a subdomain $\omega \subset \Omega$ and $t_0 \in (0, T)$ are given.

Inverse source problem. *We assume that a source term F satisfies some conditions stated below. Then determine F by v in $\omega \times (0, T)$ and $v(\cdot, t_0)$ in Ω .*

In particular, we aim at the global Lipschitz stability for the inverse problem.

We notice that in our inverse source problem, we do not assume any data of the pressure field p , because the observation of p may be more difficult than the velocity field v . If suitable data of p are available, then the inverse problem is easily solved in the same way as Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [13], and we omit the details.

We introduce some notations. We set

$$Q := \Omega \times (0, T).$$

Let $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^3$ and $|\gamma| = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3$, and $\partial_x^\gamma = \partial_1^{\gamma_1} \partial_2^{\gamma_2} \partial_3^{\gamma_3} = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\right)^{\gamma_1} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\right)^{\gamma_2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_3}\right)^{\gamma_3}$. We further set

$$H^{2,1}(Q) = \{v \in L^2(Q); \partial_x^\gamma v \in L^2(Q), |\gamma| \leq 2, \partial_t v \in L^2(Q)\},$$

$$H := \overline{\{v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)^3 : \operatorname{div} v = 0 \text{ in } \Omega\}}^{L^2(\Omega)}$$

and

$$V := (H_0^1(\Omega))^3 \cap H.$$

In this article, for simplicity, we assume some smoothness for v, p , and not pursue the minimum regularity. More precisely, we assume

$$A \in C^2([0, T]; H^1(\Omega)), \quad B \in C^2([0, T]; H^2(\Omega)).$$

For the solution v, p , we assume the regularity:

$$\partial_t^k v \in L^2(0, T; V) \cap H^{2,1}(Q), \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \quad p \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)). \quad (1.2)$$

Let $\omega \subset \Omega$ be an arbitrarily chosen non-empty subdomain. For an arbitrarily fixed constant $M > 0$, we define an admissible set of unknown F by

$$\mathcal{F} := \{F \in H^2(0, T; H^2(\Omega)); \operatorname{div} F(x, t_0) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ |\partial_t^k F(x, t)| \leq M|F(x, t_0)| \text{ for } (x, t) \in Q \text{ and } k = 1, 2, \quad F|_\omega = F|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.\} \quad (1.3)$$

We are ready to state our main result.

Theorem 1.

There exists a constant $C > 0$, depending on \mathcal{F} , such that

$$\|F\|_{H^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))} \leq C(\|v\|_{H^2(0, T; H^1(\omega))} + \|v(\cdot, t_0)\|_{H^2(\Omega)})$$

for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$.

Theorem 1 asserts the global Lipschitz stability over Ω for the inverse problem. Theorem 1 immediately implies the uniqueness within \mathcal{F} . In general we can prove the uniqueness within more generous admissible set than F defined by (1.3). For better uniqueness, we need different arguments, especially another type of Carleman estimate, and we omit the details.

In Choulli, Imanuvilov, Puel and Yamamoto [5], a similar stability estimate for the same type of the inverse source problem was proved. Theorem 1 provides the global Lipschitz stability under conditions on R and ω which are more natural and easier to be verified.

The condition

$$\operatorname{div} F(x, t_0) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad (1.4)$$

is essential for the uniqueness in determining F without data of p , as the following example shows.

Obstruction to the uniqueness:

We consider a simple case

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v(x, t) - \Delta v + \nabla p = f(x), \\ \operatorname{div} v = 0, \quad (x, t) \in Q := \Omega \times I, \\ v(x, t_0) = 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \quad \operatorname{supp} v \subset \Omega \times (0, T). \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

Here f is an \mathbb{R}^3 -valued smooth function. It is trivial that $(v, p) = (0, 0)$ satisfies (1.5) with $f = 0$. Let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. Then $(v, p) := (0, \psi)$ satisfies (1.5) with $f := \nabla \psi$. In other words, by the appearance of the pressure field p in the Navier-Stokes equations, there is no possibility for the uniqueness in determining f given by a scalar potential.

We notice that if $F(x, t_0)$ is given by a vector potential:

$$F(x, t_0) = \operatorname{rot} q(x), \quad x \in \Omega$$

with smooth q , then (1.4) holds automatically.

Next we examine the condition

$$|\partial_t^k F(x, t)| \leq M |F(x, t_0)| \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in Q \text{ and } k = 1, 2. \quad (1.6)$$

Examples.

(i) Let $R(x, t)$ be a smooth 3×3 matrix such that $\det R(x, t_0) \neq 0$ for $x \in \overline{\Omega}$. Then (1.6) is satisfied.

(ii) Let $r(x, t) = (r_1(x, t), r_2(x, t), r_3(x, t))^T$ and $f(x) = (f_1(x), f_2(x), 0)^T$ be smooth functions satisfying

$$\operatorname{rot} f(x) = (-\partial_3 f_2(x), \partial_3 f_1(x), \partial_1 f_2(x) - \partial_2 f_1(x))^T = 0, \quad \operatorname{rot} r(\cdot, t_0) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Then $F(x, t) := r(x, t) \times f(x)$ satisfies (1.4). Indeed, as is directly seen,

$$\operatorname{div} F(x, t_0) = \operatorname{div} (r(x, t_0) \times f(x)) = f(x) \cdot \operatorname{rot} r(x, t_0) - r(x, t_0) \cdot \operatorname{rot} f(x) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

If we assume $r_3(x, t_0) \neq 0$ for $x \in \overline{\Omega}$, then (1.6) is satisfied. indeed, by

$$r \times f = (-r_3 f_2, r_3 f_1, r_1 f_2 - r_2 f_1)^T \quad \text{in } Q,$$

we have

$$|\partial_t^k (r \times f)(x, t)| \leq C(|f_1(x)| + |f_2(x)|), \quad (x, t) \in Q, \quad k = 1, 2$$

and

$$|r(x, t_0) \times f(x)| \geq |r_3(x, t_0)|(|f_1(x)| + |f_2(x)|) \geq C(|f_1(x)| + |f_2(x)|), \quad x \in \Omega$$

by $r_3(x, t_0) \neq 0$ for $x \in \overline{\Omega}$.

Our proof is based on Bukhgeim and Klibanov [4] for single partial differential equations. The work relies essentially on an L^2 -weighted estimate called a Carleman estimate. For the Navier-Stokes equations, we need such a Carleman estimate and we here modify the Carleman estimate proved in Choulli, Imanuvilov, Puel and Yamamoto [5].

As for inverse problems by Carleman estimates after [4], we refer to very limited works: Beilina and Klibanov [1], Bellassoued and Yamamoto [3], Huang, Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [9], Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [13], [15], Isakov [17], Klibanov [18], Klibanov and Timonov [19], Yamamoto [21]. Epecially for related works on inverse problems for the incompressible fluid equations, see Bellassoued, Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [2], Choulli, Imanuvilov, Puel and Yamamoto [5], Fan, Di Cristo, Jiang and Nakamura [6], Fan, Jiang and Nakamura [7], Imanuvilov, Lorenzi and Yamamoto [11], Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [14]. Except for [2] and [11], all these articles use the same type of Carleman estimate whose weight has singularities at both ends of the time interval. See Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [16] for compressible fluid equations, and also Fernández-Cara, Guerrero, Imanuvilov and Puel [8] for some exact controllability problem for the Navier-Stokes equations.

The article is composed of five sections. In Section 2, as Lemmata 1 and 2, we show two key Carleman estimates for the Navier-Stokes equations and for stationary Maxwell's equations. In Section 3, we complete the proof of Theorem 1. Sections 4 and 5 are devoted respectively to concluding remarks and the derivation of the first key Carleman estimate with general powers.

2. KEY CARLEMAN ESTIMATES

For a non-empty subdomain ω_0 with $\overline{\omega_0} \subset \omega$, we know (e.g., Imanuvilov [10]) that there exists $\eta \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfying

$$\eta|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad \eta > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad |\nabla\eta| > 0 \quad \text{on } \overline{\Omega \setminus \omega_0}. \quad (2.1)$$

Henceforth we set

$$t_0 = \frac{T}{2}.$$

Let $\ell \in C^\infty[0, T]$ satisfy $\ell(t) = \ell(T - t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq T$, and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \ell(t) > 0, \quad 0 < t < T, \\ \ell(t) = t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq \frac{T}{4}, \\ \ell(t_0) > \ell(t), \quad t \in (0, T) \setminus \{t_0\}. \end{array} \right. \quad (2.2)$$

We set

$$Q_\omega := \omega \times (0, T),$$

recall that $Q = \Omega \times (0, T)$, and

$$\varphi(x, t) := \frac{e^{\lambda\eta(x)}}{\ell^8(t)}, \quad \alpha(x, t) := \frac{e^{\lambda\eta(x)} - e^{2\lambda\|\eta\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})}}}{\ell^8(t)}, \quad (x, t) \in Q. \quad (2.3)$$

Here we fix a sufficiently large constant $\lambda > 0$.

Henceforth $C > 0$, $C_j > 0$ denote generic constants which are dependent on Ω , T , λ , but independent of s . A Carleman estimate for the Navier-Stokes equations is stated as:

Lemma 1.

Let $F \in L^2(0, T; H)$, $v(\cdot, t) \in V$, $0 \leq t \leq T$ and $v \in L^2(0, T; V) \cap H^{2,1}(Q)$ satisfy (1.1). Let $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Then there exist constants $C > 0$ and $s_0 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q (s^m \varphi^m |\nabla v|^2 + s^{m+1} \varphi^{m+1} |\operatorname{rot} v|^2 + s^{m+2} \varphi^{m+2} |v|^2) e^{2s\alpha} dxdt \\ & \leq C \int_Q s^m \varphi^m |F|^2 e^{2s\alpha} dxdt \\ & + C \int_{Q_\omega} (s^{m+1} \varphi^{m+1} |\operatorname{rot} v|^2 + s^{m+2} \varphi^{m+2} |v|^2 + s^{m+1} \varphi^{m+1} |\nabla v|^2) e^{2s\alpha} dxdt \end{aligned}$$

for all $s \geq s_0$.

For the case of $m = 0$, the proof is found e.g., Theorem 2 in Choulli, Imanuvilov, Puel and Yamamoto [5]. In Section 5, for completeness we derive the lemma with general $m \in \mathbb{N}$ from the case $m = 0$.

Next let $\psi \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfy

$$\psi > c_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \psi = c_0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad |\nabla\psi| > 0 \quad \text{on } \overline{\Omega \setminus \omega}, \quad (2.4)$$

where c_0 is a given constant. With sufficiently large fixed $\lambda > 0$, we set

$$\varphi_0(x) := e^{\lambda\psi(x)}, \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Then we show

Lemma 2.

Let $w \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ satisfy $w|_\omega = 0$, and

$$\operatorname{rot} w = g, \quad \operatorname{div} w = h \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (2.5)$$

Then there exist constants $C > 0$ and $s_1 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{s} |\nabla w|^2 + s|w|^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi_0(x)} dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} (|g|^2 + |h|^2) e^{2s\varphi_0(x)} dx$$

for all $s \geq s_1$.

This is a Carleman estimate for stationary Maxwell's equations and we can refer to Vogelsang [20]. Here we prove by means of a Carleman estimate for $-\Delta$, not by [20].

Proof of Lemma 2.

Setting $\tilde{\psi}(x) = \psi(x) - c_0$, $x \in \Omega$, we see that $\tilde{\psi} > 0$ in Ω , $\psi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $|\nabla\tilde{\psi}| > 0$ on $\overline{\Omega \setminus \omega}$. We set $\tilde{\varphi}_0(x) := e^{\lambda\tilde{\psi}(x)} = e^{-\lambda c_0} \varphi_0(x)$, $x \in \Omega$.

Since

$$\operatorname{rot} \operatorname{rot} w = -\Delta w + \nabla(\operatorname{div} w)$$

by $w \in H^2(\Omega)$, we see

$$-\Delta w = \operatorname{rot} g - \nabla h \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad (2.6)$$

by (2.5). In terms of $w|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ and $w|_\omega = 0$, we apply an H^{-1} -Carleman estimate (e.g., Theorem 2.2 in Imanuvilov and Puel [12]) to (2.6), and we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{s} |\nabla w|^2 + s|w|^2 \right) e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}_0(x)} dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} (|g|^2 + |h|^2) e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}_0(x)} dx$$

for all $s \geq \tilde{s}_1$: some constant. Setting $\tilde{s} := se^{\lambda c_0}$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{s}} |\nabla w|^2 + \tilde{s}|w|^2 \right) e^{2\tilde{s}\tilde{\varphi}_0(x)} dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} (|g|^2 + |h|^2) e^{2\tilde{s}\tilde{\varphi}_0(x)} dx$$

for $\tilde{s} \geq \tilde{s}_1$. By $\tilde{s}\tilde{\varphi}_0(x) = se^{\lambda c_0} e^{-\lambda c_0} \varphi_0(x) = s\varphi_0(x)$ for $x \in \Omega$ and $se^{\lambda c_0} \geq s$, we see

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{e^{-\lambda c_0}}{s} |\nabla w|^2 + s|w|^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi_0(x)} dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} (|g|^2 + |h|^2) e^{2s\varphi_0(x)} dx$$

for $s \geq \tilde{s}_1 e^{-\lambda c_0}$. Setting $s_1 := \tilde{s}_1 e^{-\lambda c_0}$ and replacing C by $C e^{\lambda c_0}$, we complete the proof of Lemma 2. ■

We conclude this section with a lemma which constitutes a technical part of the proof of Theorem 1, but the proof is elementary.

Lemma 3.

Let $g \in L^1(\Omega)$. Then

$$\int_Q \varphi(x, t) |g(x)| e^{2s\alpha(x, t)} dx dt \leq C \int_\Omega |g(x)| e^{2s\alpha(x, t_0)} dx,$$

where α and φ are defined by (2.3).

Proof of Lemma 3.

We set

$$\widehat{\varphi}(t) = \frac{1}{\ell^8(t)}, \quad 0 < t < T. \quad (2.7)$$

Then, as can be directly verified, fixing $\lambda > 0$, we can choose a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$C^{-1} \varphi(x, t) \leq \widehat{\varphi}(t) \leq C \varphi(x, t), \quad (x, t) \in Q. \quad (2.8)$$

By (2.8), it is sufficient to prove

$$\int_Q \widehat{\varphi}(t) |g(x)| e^{2s\alpha(x, t)} dx dt \leq C \int_\Omega |g(x)| e^{2s\alpha(x, t_0)} dx.$$

First

$$\int_Q \widehat{\varphi}(t) |g(x)| e^{2s\alpha(x, t)} dx dt = \int_\Omega |g(x)| e^{2s\alpha(x, t_0)} \left(\int_0^T \widehat{\varphi}(t) e^{2s(\alpha(x, t) - \alpha(x, t_0))} dt \right) dx.$$

Since $\widehat{\varphi}(t) \geq 0$ for $0 < t < T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \widehat{\varphi}(t) e^{2s(\alpha(x, t) - \alpha(x, t_0))} dt \leq \int_0^T \widehat{\varphi}(t) \exp \left(-2sC \frac{\ell^8(t_0) - \ell^8(t)}{\ell^8(t_0)\ell^8(t)} \right) dt \\ & \leq \int_0^T \widehat{\varphi}(t) \exp \left(-\mu_1 s \frac{\ell^8(t_0) - \ell^8(t)}{\ell^8(t)} \right) dt, \end{aligned}$$

with some constant $\mu_1 > 0$. We fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \widehat{\varphi}(t) e^{2s(\alpha(x, t) - \alpha(x, t_0))} dt \\ & \leq \left(\int_0^\varepsilon + \int_{T-\varepsilon}^T + \int_\varepsilon^{T-\varepsilon} \right) \frac{1}{\ell^8(t)} \exp \left(-\mu_1 s \frac{\ell^8(t_0) - \ell^8(t)}{\ell^8(t)} \right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have

$$\int_0^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\ell^8(t)} \exp\left(-\mu_1 s \frac{\ell^8(t_0) - \ell^8(t)}{\ell^8(t)}\right) dt \leq \int_0^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\ell^8(t)} e^{-\frac{c}{\ell^8(t)}} dt < \infty$$

for $s \geq 1$ for example. Moreover

$$\int_\varepsilon^{T-\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\ell^8(t)} \exp\left(-\mu_1 s \frac{\ell^8(t_0) - \ell^8(t)}{\ell^8(t)}\right) dt \leq \int_\varepsilon^{T-\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\ell^8(t)} dt < \infty.$$

Thus the proof of Lemma 3 is complete.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

With loss of generality, we can assume that $t_0 = \frac{T}{2}$. Indeed, for arbitrary $t_0 \in (0, T)$, we choose small $\delta > 0$ such that $0 < t_0 - \delta < t_0 + \delta < T$. Then, in place of $(0, T)$, we can continue the proof over the time interval $(t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta)$. We set

$$D := \|v\|_{H^2(0,T;H^1(\omega))} + \|v(\cdot, t_0)\|_{H^2(\Omega)}.$$

Applying Lemma 1 with $m = 1$ to $\partial_t v$ and $\partial_t^2 v$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q s^2 \varphi^2 (|\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v|^2 + |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v|^2) e^{2s\alpha} dx dt \leq C \int_Q s \varphi \sum_{k=1}^2 |\partial_t^k F|^2 e^{2s\alpha} dx dt \\ & + CD^2 \int_{Q_\omega} s^3 \varphi^3 e^{2s\alpha} dx dt \end{aligned}$$

for all $s \geq s_0$. Since $\int_Q s^3 \varphi^3 e^{2s\alpha} dx dt \leq C$ and $\sum_{k=1}^2 |\partial_t^k F(x, t)|^2 \leq M |F(x, t_0)|$ for $(x, t) \in Q$, we obtain

$$\int_Q s \varphi^2 (|\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v|^2 + |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v|^2) e^{2s\alpha} dx dt \leq C \int_Q \varphi |F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\alpha(x,t)} dx dt + CD^2. \quad (3.1)$$

By (1.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, t_0) &= \partial_t v(x, t_0) - \Delta v(x, t_0) \\ &+ (A(x, t_0) \cdot \nabla) v(x, t_0) + (v(x, t_0) \cdot \nabla) B(x, t_0) + \nabla p(x, t_0). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\operatorname{rot} \nabla = 0$, we obtain

$$\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0) = \operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0) + \operatorname{rot} a(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$a(x) := -\Delta v(x, t_0) + (A(x, t_0) \cdot \nabla) v(x, t_0) + (v(x, t_0) \cdot \nabla) B(x, t_0), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Hence, using that $\alpha(x, 0) = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \alpha(x, t) = 0$ for $x \in \Omega$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\alpha(x, t_0)} dx &= \int_0^{t_0} \partial_t \left(\int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t)|^2 e^{2s\alpha(x, t)} dx \right) dt \\ &= 2 \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\Omega} ((\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v \cdot \operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v) + |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t)|^2 s(\partial_t \alpha)) e^{2s\alpha(x, t)} dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Henceforth we write $\ell'(t) = \frac{d\ell}{dt}(t)$. Since

$$\partial_t \alpha(x, t) = \frac{-8}{\ell^8(t)} \frac{\ell'(t)}{\ell(t)} (e^{\lambda\eta(x)} - e^{\lambda\|\eta\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})}})$$

and

$$\left| \frac{\ell'(t)}{\ell(t)} \right| \leq \frac{C}{\ell^8(t)}, \quad 0 < t < T,$$

we can verify that $|\partial_t \alpha(x, t)| \leq C\varphi(x, t)^2$ for $(x, t) \in Q$. Hence, applying $|ab| \leq \frac{1}{2}(|a|^2 + |b|^2)$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\alpha(x, t_0)} dx &\leq C \int_Q (|\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v| |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v| + s\varphi^2 |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v|^2) e^{2s\alpha(x, t)} dx dt \\ &\leq C \int_Q (|\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v|^2 + |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v|^2 + s\varphi^2 |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v|^2) e^{2s\alpha(x, t)} dx dt \end{aligned}$$

for all large $s > 0$. Since $\varphi > 0$ on \bar{Q} , choosing $s > 0$ large, we can estimate

$$|\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v|^2 \leq Cs\varphi^2 |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v|^2$$

in Q . Therefore, application of (3.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\alpha(x, t_0)} dx &\leq C \int_Q (|\operatorname{rot} \partial_t^2 v|^2 + s\varphi^2 |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t)|^2) e^{2s\alpha(x, t)} dx dt \\ &\leq C \int_Q \varphi(x, t) |F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\alpha(x, t)} dx dt + CD^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all large $s > 0$. Applying Lemma 3 to the first term on the right-hand side, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} \partial_t v(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\alpha(x, t_0)} dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} |F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\alpha(x, t_0)} dx + CD^2.$$

Therefore (3.2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\alpha(x, t_0)} dx \\ &\leq C \int_{\Omega} |F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\alpha(x, t_0)} dx + CD^2 + C \int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} a(x)|^2 e^{2s\alpha(x, t_0)} dx \\ &\leq C \int_{\Omega} |F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\alpha(x, t_0)} dx + CD^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all large $s > 0$. Applying Lemma 2 to $F(x, t_0)$ in view of $\operatorname{div} F(x, t_0) = 0$ for $x \in \Omega$ and $F|_{\partial\Omega} = F|_{\omega} = 0$, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} s|F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\alpha(x, t_0)} dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{rot} F(x, t_0)|^2 e^{2s\alpha(x, t_0)} dx.$$

for all large $s > 0$. Choosing $s > 0$ large, we can complete the proof of Theorem 1. ■

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

4.1. Nonlinear case.

In this article, we mainly consider linearized Navier-Stokes equations. For the original Navier-Stokes equations

$$\partial_t v - \Delta v + (v \cdot \nabla)v + \nabla p = F, \quad \operatorname{div} v = 0 \quad \text{in } Q, \quad (4.1)$$

assuming suitable smoothness of v, p and taking the difference $v_1 - v_2$ where v_1 and v_2 are solutions to (4.1) respectively with F_1 and F_2 , we can reduce the inverse source problem to the one for the linearized Navier-Stokes equations. We omit the details.

4.2. Case of $t_0 = 0$.

We do not assume any initial value but we are given $v(\cdot, t_0)$ with $t_0 > 0$. In other words, our inverse problem does not correspond to an initial boundary value problem for the Navier-Stokes equations. The formulation of inverse problems with $t_0 > 0$ is standard for parabolic equations (e.g., [2], [5], [6], [7], [9], [11], [13], [17], [21]).

On the other hand, for the case of $t_0 = 0$, inverse problems of the type discussed here for equations of parabolic type including the Navier-Stokes equations, are open, and even the uniqueness is unknown in general. In some special cases, we can prove the uniqueness (e.g., Theorem 4.7 in [18]).

4.3. Arbitrariness of observation time interval.

We consider the inverse problem in the time interval $(0, T)$, when the Navier-Stokes equations (1.1) hold. As is seen by the proof, in view of the parabolicity of the equations, it is not necessary to take data over the same time interval, but sufficient over a smaller time interval I such that $\bar{I} \subset (0, T)$. Thus for the inverse problem, it suffices that we are concerned with the smoothness of the solution v, p for $t > 0$, and not to exploit the regularity at $t = 0$ which is more delicate for $t > 0$.

4.4. Choices of the weight functions of Carleman estimates.

Our key is a Carleman estimate. We have two kinds of Carleman estimates according to the weight functions:

- Regular weight function:

$$\varphi(x, t) := e^{\lambda(d(x) - \beta(t-t_0)^2)}, \quad (x, t) \in Q. \quad (4.2)$$

- Singular weight function:

$$\varphi(x, t) = \frac{e^{\lambda\eta(x)} - e^{2\lambda\|\eta\|_C(\bar{\Omega})}}{h(t)}, \quad (x, t) \in Q, \quad (4.3)$$

where $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} h(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow T} h(t) = 0$.

Here $d, \eta \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ are chosen suitably.

The Carleman estimate with the weight (4.3) was proved firstly by Imanuvilov [10] for a parabolic equation. As for related inverse problems for the Navier-Stokes equations, Choulli, Imanuvilov, Puel and Yamamoto [5], Fan, Di Cristo, Jiang and Nakamura [6], Fan, Jiang and Nakamura [7] used Carleman estimates with (4.3), while Bellassoued, Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [2], Imanuvilov, Lorenzi and Yamamoto [11] and the current article rely on (4.2).

The Carleman estimate with (4.2) is relevant for considering inverse problems locally in x in the case where we are not given the boundary condition on the whole $\partial\Omega$, while the Carleman estimate with (4.3) is more convenient for deriving the global stability in inverse problems.

5. APPENDIX. PROOF OF LEMMA 1

We derive the lemma from the case of $m = 0$ which is proved in [5]. We recall that $\widehat{\varphi}$ is defined by (2.7). We set

$$w(x, t) := \widehat{\varphi}^{\frac{m}{2}}(t)v(x, t), \quad (x, t) \in Q.$$

Then

$$\partial_t w = \widehat{\varphi}^{\frac{m}{2}} \partial_t v + \frac{m}{2} \widehat{\varphi}^{\frac{m}{2}-1} \widehat{\varphi}'(t)v(x, t) = \widehat{\varphi}^{\frac{m}{2}} \partial_t v + q(t)\widehat{\varphi} w$$

with some $q \in L^\infty(0, T)$, by noting

$$\widehat{\varphi}^{\frac{m}{2}-1} \widehat{\varphi}'(t)v = \widehat{\varphi}^{-1} \widehat{\varphi}'(t)w = \widehat{\varphi}(\widehat{\varphi}^{-2} \widehat{\varphi}'(t))w = -8\ell'(t)\ell^7 \widehat{\varphi} w$$

and $\ell'\ell^7 \in L^\infty(0, T)$.

For simplicity, we set

$$L(v, p) := \partial_t v - \Delta v + (A \cdot \nabla)v + (v \cdot \nabla)B + \nabla p.$$

Then

$$L(w, \widehat{\varphi}^{\frac{m}{2}} p)(x, t) = \widehat{\varphi}^{\frac{m}{2}} F + q(t) \widehat{\varphi} w \quad \text{in } Q.$$

Therefore Lemma 1 with $m = 0$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q (|\nabla w|^2 + s\varphi|\operatorname{rot} w|^2 + s^2\varphi^2|w|^2)e^{2s\alpha} dxdt = \int_Q (\widehat{\varphi}^m |\nabla v|^2 + s\widehat{\varphi}^m \varphi |\operatorname{rot} v|^2 + s^2\widehat{\varphi}^m \varphi^2 |v|^2) e^{2s\alpha} dxdt \\ & \leq C \int_Q |\widehat{\varphi}^{\frac{m}{2}} F + q\widehat{\varphi} w|^2 e^{2s\alpha} dxdt + C \int_{Q_\omega} (s\varphi|\operatorname{rot} w|^2 + s^2\varphi^2|w|^2 + s\varphi|\nabla w|^2) e^{2s\alpha} dxdt \\ & \leq C \int_Q \widehat{\varphi}^m |F|^2 e^{2s\alpha} dxdt + C \int_Q \widehat{\varphi}^{m+2} |v|^2 e^{2s\alpha} dxdt \\ & + C \int_{Q_\omega} (s\widehat{\varphi}^{m+1} |\operatorname{rot} v|^2 + s^2\widehat{\varphi}^{m+2} |v|^2 + s\widehat{\varphi}^{m+1} |\nabla v|^2) e^{2s\alpha} dxdt \end{aligned}$$

for all large $s > 0$. Choosing $s > 0$ large, in view of (2.8), we can absorb the second term on the right-hand side into the left-hand side, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q (\widehat{\varphi}^m |\nabla v|^2 + s\widehat{\varphi}^{m+1} |\operatorname{rot} v|^2 + s^2\widehat{\varphi}^{m+2} |v|^2) e^{2s\alpha} dxdt \\ & \leq C \int_Q \widehat{\varphi}^m |F|^2 e^{2s\alpha} dxdt + C \int_{Q_\omega} (s\widehat{\varphi}^{m+1} |\operatorname{rot} v|^2 + s^2\widehat{\varphi}^{m+2} |v|^2 + s\widehat{\varphi}^{m+1} |\nabla v|^2) e^{2s\alpha} dxdt \end{aligned}$$

for all large $s > 0$. In terms of (2.8), we complete the proof of Lemma 1 with each $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

■

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The first author was supported partly by NSF grant DMS 1312900. The second author was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (S) 15H05740 and Grant-in-Aid (A) 20H00117 of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, The National Natural Science Foundation of China (no. 11771270, 91730303), and the RUDN University Strategic Academic Leadership Program.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Beilina and M.V. Klibanov, *Approximate Global Convergence and Adaptivity for Coefficient Inverse Problems*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2012.
- [2] M. Bellassoued, O.Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Carleman estimate for the Navier-Stokes equations and an application to a lateral Cauchy problem, *Inverse Problems* **32** (2016) 025001.
- [3] M. Bellassoued and M. Yamamoto, Masahiro, *Carleman Estimates and Applications to Inverse Problems for Hyperbolic Systems*, Springer-Japan, Tokyo, 2017.
- [4] A.L. Bukhgeim and M.V. Klibanov, Global uniqueness of a class of multidimensional inverse problems, *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **24** (1981) 244-247.
- [5] M. Choulli, O. Y. Imanuvilov, J.-P. Puel and M. Yamamoto, Inverse source problem for linearized Navier-Stokes equations with data in arbitrary sub-domain, *Appl. Anal.* **92** (2013) 2127-2143.
- [6] J. Fan, M. Di Cristo, Y. Jiang, and G. Nakamura, Inverse viscosity problem for the Navier-Stokes equation, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **365** (2010) 750-757.
- [7] J. Fan, Y. Jiang, and G. Nakamura, Inverse problems for the Boussinesq system, *Inverse Probl.* **25** (2009), 085007 (10pp).
- [8] E. Fernández-Cara, S. Guerrero, O.Y. Imanuvilov and J.-P. Puel, Local exact controllability of the Navier-Stokes system, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **83** (2004), 1501-1542.
- [9] X. Huang, O.Y. Imanuvilov, and M. Yamamoto, Stability for inverse source problems by Carleman estimates, *Inverse Problems* **36** (2020) 125006.
- [10] O.Y. Imanuvilov, Controllability of parabolic equations, *Sbornik Math.* **186** (1995), 879-900.
- [11] O.Y. Imanuvilov, L. Lorenzi and M. Yamamoto, Carleman estimate for the Navier-Stokes equations and applications, preprint.
- [12] O.Y. Imanuvilov and J.-P. Puel, Global Carleman estimates for weak solutions of elliptic nonhomogeneous Dirichlet problems, *International Mathematics Research Notices* **16** (2003), 883-913.
- [13] O. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Lipschitz stability in inverse parabolic problems by the Carleman estimate, *Inverse Problems* **14** (1998) 1229-1245.
- [14] O.Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Inverse source problem for the Stokes system, *Direct and inverse problems of mathematical physics (Newark, DE, 1997)*, *Int. Soc. Anal. Appl. Comput.*, 5, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, pp. 441-451, 2000.
- [15] O. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Global Lipschitz stability in an inverse hyperbolic problem by interior observations, *Inverse Problems* **17** (2001) 717-728.
- [16] O. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Inverse problems for a compressible fluid system, *Inverse Problems and Related Topics*, Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics 310, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, pp. 101-148, 2020.
- [17] V. Isakov, *Inverse Source Problems*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1990.
- [18] M.V. Klibanov, Inverse problems and Carleman estimates, *Inverse Problems* **8** (1992) 575-596.

- [19] M.V. Klibanov and A.A. Timonov, Carleman Estimates for Coefficient Inverse Problems and Numerical Applications, VSP, Utrecht, 2004.
- [20] V. Vogelsang, On the strong unique continuation principle for inequalities of Maxwell type, Math. Ann. **289** (1991) 285-295.
- [21] M. Yamamoto, Carleman estimates for parabolic equations and applications, Inverse Problems **25** (2009) 123013 (75pp).