

DETERMINING A NONLINEAR HYPERBOLIC SYSTEM WITH UNKNOWN SOURCES AND NONLINEARITY

YI-HSUAN LIN, HONGYU LIU, AND XU LIU

ABSTRACT. We investigate inverse boundary problems associated with a time-dependent semilinear hyperbolic equation, where both nonlinearity and sources (including initial displacement and initial velocity) are unknown. We establish in several generic scenarios that one can uniquely determine the nonlinearity or the sources by using passive or active boundary observations. In order to exploit the nonlinearity and the sources simultaneously, we develop a new technique, which combines the observability for linear wave equations and a Runge approximation with higher order linearization for the semilinear hyperbolic equation.

Keywords: Calderón’s problem, semilinear hyperbolic equation, passive and active measurements, simultaneous recovery, higher order linearization, complex geometrical optics solutions, Runge approximation

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35R30, 35L70, 46T20, 78A05

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Statement of main results	3
3. Well-posedness of semilinear hyperbolic equations	8
3.1. Local well-posedness with small data	8
3.2. Global well-posedness of weak solutions	11
4. Unique determination of initial data	14
4.1. Controllability and observability for hyperbolic equations	14
4.2. Determination by passive measurements	15
4.3. Determination by active measurements	16
5. Simultaneous recovery of initial data and nonlinearity	18
Appendix A. Complex geometrical optics (CGO) solutions	26
References	27

1. INTRODUCTION

The inverse problems for nonlinear partial differential equations (PDEs) have received considerable attention in the literature. In [Isa93], an inverse boundary problem was proposed for a nonlinear parabolic PDE, and it was shown that the first linearization of the boundary Dirichlet-to-Neumann (DN) map associated with the nonlinear PDE agrees to the DN map of the linearized equation. Hence, results developed for inverse problems of linear PDEs can be applied to solve the inverse problems for the nonlinear PDEs. For the semilinear Schrödinger equation $\Delta u + a(x, u) = 0$, the inverse problem of determining $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ was investigated in [IS94, Sun10] for dimension $n \geq 3$, and in [IN95, Sun10, IY13] for $n = 2$. Moreover, some inverse problems have been studied for quasilinear elliptic equations in [Sun96, SU97, KN02, LW07, MU], for degenerate elliptic p -Laplacian equations in [SZ12, BHKS18], and for fractional semilinear Schrödinger equations in [LL19, LL20, Lin20].

The Calderón type inverse problems for quasilinear PDEs on Riemannian manifolds were recently investigated in [LLS20]. We refer the readers to [Sun05, Uhl09] for more relevant discussions on inverse problems of nonlinear elliptic equations related to the existing developments. Recently, a novel method was proposed to study inverse problems for semilinear elliptic equations, which is referred to as the *higher order linearization*, and this method has been applied to tackle several challenging inverse problems, while they cannot be solved in the setup with linear elliptic equations [FO20, KU20b, KU20a, LLS21, LLS20, LLST20].

The inverse problems for nonlinear hyperbolic equations have also attracted a lot of attention. It turns out that the nonlinear interaction of waves can generate new waves, which are actually beneficial in solving the related inverse problems. In [KLU18b], it was shown that the local measurements may uniquely recover the global topology and differentiable structure, and the conformal class of the metric g on a globally hyperbolic 4-dimensional Lorentzian manifold, for a scalar wave equation with a quadratic nonlinearity. In [LUW18], inverse problems were investigated for more general semilinear wave equations on Lorentzian manifolds, and in [LUW17], analogous inverse problems were studied for the Einstein-Maxwell equations. We refer to [CLOP19, dHUW18, KLOU14, WZ19, LLPMT20, LLPMT21] and rich references therein for more related studies of inverse problems for hyperbolic PDEs.

The inverse problems mentioned above are mainly concerned with recovering coefficients of the underlying nonlinear PDEs through active measurements. Here, in the physical scenario, the PDE coefficients correspond to the unknown medium parameters. The active measurements mean that one actively inputs a certain source into the underlying PDE system to generate the output for the corresponding inverse problem. The input-output pair constitutes a typical measurement data set for many inverse problems including wave probing, nondestructive testing and medical imaging. On the other hand, many inverse problems make use of *passive measurements*, where the measurement data are generated by an unknown source. Inverse problems with passive measurements are usually referred to as the inverse source problems, since the unknown sources are the target objects to be recovered. Typical inverse source problems include those ones from the hazardous radiation detection and the cosmological searching. Recently, the inverse problems by using passive measurements simultaneously to detect unknown sources and the surrounding mediums, have received considerable studies in the literature, due to their strong backgrounds of practical applications including photo-acoustic and thermo-acoustic tomography [LU15], brain imaging [DLU19], geomagnetic anomaly detection [DLL19, DLL20] and quantum mechanics [LLM19, LLM21]. In fact, in order to achieve the desired simultaneous recovery results, the use of both passive and active measurements was proposed for some of those inverse problems [LLM19, LLM21].

Motivated by the studies discussed above, we investigate in this paper inverse boundary problems associated with a time-dependent semilinear hyperbolic equation, where both nonlinearity and sources are unknown. The sources include initial displacement and initial velocity of the nonlinear wave field. It is emphasized that semilinear term considered in our study is more general than those considered in the aforementioned literature on inverse problems for nonlinear hyperbolic equations. In fact, the semilinear terms in our study may contain zero order and first order terms (with respect to the underlying wave function), and both of them may be unknown. In the physical situation, the zero order term also corresponds to a certain source of the hyperbolic system. However, in order to unify and easy the exposition, we mainly refer to the initial data as the sources in our study. We establish in several generic scenarios that one can uniquely determine the nonlinearity or the sources by using passive or/and active boundary observations. The major findings can be briefly summarized as follows:

- (1) When the nonlinearity is known, by using the passive measurement, we can establish a quantitative uniqueness result in determining the initial displacement and initial velocity of the wave field from the partial boundary measurement.
- (2) When the nonlinearity is unknown, but belonging to a certain general class, we establish the qualitative uniqueness by using active measurements in determining the initial displacement and initial velocity of the wave field.
- (3) When the initial and boundary data are small enough, and the coefficients are admissible, one can simultaneously recover the initial data as well as the nonlinear coefficients by using the active measurement.

Finally, we would like to briefly discuss the technical novelties and developments in our study. The high order linearization technique and the nonlinear wave interaction technique mentioned earlier critically rely on the small inputs for inverse problems. The nonlinearity shall successively generate higher order terms (with respect to certain asymptotically small parameters) that can provide more information for the inverse problems. We shall develop techniques following a similar spirit in tackling new inverse problems. On the other hand, it is known that one salient feature for the nonlinear hyperbolic system is the finite-time blowup of solutions. If certain conditions are fulfilled, the blowup may be avoided through boundary inputs in the context of PDE controls [DZZ08]. In this paper, we shall also make use of the controllability properties for semilinear wave equations in studying the associated inverse problems.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we state main results on inverse problems. In Section 3, the well-posedness on initial-boundary value problems of semilinear hyperbolic equations with different settings of nonlinearities are studied. Section 4 is devoted to the determination of the initial data by using control methods for hyperbolic equations. In Section 5, a Runge type approximation property for linear wave equations is established. Furthermore, the higher order linearization technique is adopted to prove the uniqueness of both nonlinear coefficients and initial data. Finally, in Appendix A, we review the known complex geometrical optics solutions for linear wave equations, which are useful in the proof of main results.

2. STATEMENT OF MAIN RESULTS

Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty bounded domain with a smooth boundary Γ , for $n \geq 2$. For any $T > 0$, set $Q = \Omega \times (0, T)$ and $\Sigma = \Gamma \times (0, T)$. Let $\sigma = (\sigma^{ij}(x))_{i,j=1}^n \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ be a symmetric uniformly positive definite matrix-valued function in $\overline{\Omega}$. Consider the following initial-boundary value problem of the semilinear hyperbolic equation:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - \nabla \cdot (\sigma \nabla u) + f(x, t, u) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ u = h & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, 0) = \varphi(x), \quad u_t(x, 0) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where $(\varphi, \psi) \in H^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$, $h \in L^2(\Sigma)$ with $\text{supp } h \subseteq \Gamma_0 \times [0, T]$, and $\sigma(\cdot) \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ in (2.1) satisfies the following condition:

- (H) *There exists a positive constant ρ_0 and a positive function $d(\cdot) \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ without any critical point in $\overline{\Omega}$, such that for any $(x, \xi^1, \dots, \xi^n) \in \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n \sum_{i',j'=1}^n \left[2\sigma^{ij'}(\sigma^{i'j} d_{x_{i'}})_{x_{j'}} - \sigma_{x_{j'}}^{ij} \sigma^{i'j'} d_{x_{i'}} \right] \xi^i \xi^j \geq \rho_0 \sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij}(x) \xi^i \xi^j. \quad (2.2)$$

Throughout this work, we denote by Δ , $\nabla \cdot$ and ∇ the laplacian operator, divergence and gradient operator with respect to the spatial variable $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, respectively. Also, define

$$\Gamma_0 = \left\{ x \in \Gamma \mid \sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij}(x) d_{x_i}(x) \nu_j(x) > 0 \right\}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$ denotes the unit outer normal vector on Γ . For example, if $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the identity matrix, choose $d(x) = |x - x_0|^2$ for a given $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. Then, (2.2) holds for $\rho_0 = 4$ and

$$\Gamma_0 = \left\{ x \in \Gamma \mid (x - x_0) \cdot \nu(x) > 0 \right\}. \quad (2.4)$$

Furthermore, assume that $f = f(x, t, z) : Q \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a given function, so that (2.1) is well-posed. The local and global well-posedness results for (2.1) will be given in Section 3, respectively.

Next, define $H_{\Gamma_0}^1(\Omega) = \left\{ \varphi \in H^1(\Omega) \mid \varphi = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma \setminus \Gamma_0 \right\}$. For any $(\varphi, \psi) \in H_{\Gamma_0}^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ and a suitable function f , which guarantees the global well-posedness of (2.1), we introduce the following hyperbolic Dirichlet-to-Neumann (DN) operator:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{\varphi, \psi, f} : \mathcal{H}_T &\rightarrow H^{-1}(\Gamma_0 \times (0, T)), \\ h &\mapsto \sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij}(x) \nu_i(x) u_{x_j}(x, t) \Big|_{\Gamma_0 \times (0, T)}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

where u is the solution to (2.1) associated to (φ, ψ) and $h \in \mathcal{H}_T$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_T &= \left\{ h \in L^2(\Sigma) \mid \text{for } (\varphi, \psi) \in H_{\Gamma_0}^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega), (2.1) \text{ has a unique solution} \right. \\ &\quad \left. u = u(\cdot; h, \varphi, \psi) \in H = C([0, T]; H^1(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{and } \sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij} \nu_i u_{x_j} \in H^{-1}(\Sigma) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

In Section 3, we will prove that under suitable conditions on f , $H^1(\Sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_T$.

Physically, (φ, ψ, f) may be regarded as unknown sources in Ω and $Q \times \mathbb{C}$, h is a boundary input, and all of them generate a wave field (u, u_t) . If $h \equiv 0$, the wave field is uniquely generated by the sources (φ, ψ, f) . Also, $\Lambda_{\varphi, \psi, f}$ encodes the boundary measurement of the wave field. In such a case,

$$\Lambda_{\varphi, \psi, f}^0 := \Lambda_{\varphi, \psi, f}(0)$$

is called the *passive measurement*. If $\Lambda_{\varphi, \psi, f}(h)$ is known for all $h \in H^1(\Sigma)$, it means that the operator $\Lambda_{\varphi, \psi, f}$ is known and $\Lambda_{\varphi, \psi, f}$ is referred to as the *active measurement*.

In this paper, we are first concerned with the following two inverse problems:

- **Inverse problem 1.** Can we identify unknown functions (φ, ψ, f) by using the passive measurement $\Lambda_{\varphi, \psi, f}^0$?
- **Inverse problem 2.** Can we identify unknown functions (φ, ψ, f) by using the active measurement $\Lambda_{\varphi, \psi, f}$?

First, for a given function f , we recover (φ, ψ) by knowing either the passive or active measurement. To begin with, introduce a set of f :

$$\mathcal{M}_T = L^\infty(Q; W^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R})). \quad (2.7)$$

Then for any $(\varphi, \psi) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$, $h = 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}_T$, (2.1) has a unique solution

$$u \in H_0 = C([0, T]; H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)).$$

The first uniqueness result of this paper on the **Inverse problem 1** is stated as follows.

Theorem 2.1 (Stability of initial data by passive measurement). *There exists a $T^* > 0$, depending only on σ , Ω and n , such that for any $T > T^*$, $f \in \mathcal{M}_T$ and $(\varphi_j, \psi_j) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ ($j = 1, 2$), if $\Lambda_{\varphi_j, \psi_j, f}^0$ is the (passive) DN map of the following hyperbolic equation:*

$$\begin{cases} u_{j,tt} - \nabla \cdot (\sigma \nabla u_j) + f(x, t, u_j) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ u_j = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u_j(x, 0) = \varphi_j(x), \quad u_{j,t}(x, 0) = \psi_j(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

the following quantitative stability estimate holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2, \psi_1 - \psi_2)\|_{H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C(f, u_1, u_2, n, T, \Omega, \Sigma, \Gamma_0) \|\Lambda_{\varphi_1, \psi_1, f}^0 - \Lambda_{\varphi_2, \psi_2, f}^0\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma_0))}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

where u_j is the solution to (2.8) associated to (φ_j, ψ_j) , and $C(f, u_1, u_2, n, T, \Omega, \Sigma, \Gamma_0)$ denotes a positive constant depending on f , u_1 , u_2 , n , T , Ω , Σ and Γ_0 .

For the **Inverse problem 2**, introduce the following increasing condition on a function f :

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_s(x, t, s)}{\ln^{1/2}|s|} = 0, \quad \text{uniformly for } (x, t) \in \overline{\Omega} \times [0, T]. \quad (2.10)$$

For any two positive constants T and T^* with $T^* < T$, introduce the following set of f :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{T, T^*} = \{ & f : Q \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid f(x, t, \cdot) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}) \text{ a.e. } (x, t) \in Q \text{ and } f(\cdot, \cdot, 0) \in L^2(Q), \\ & f(x, t, s) = f_0(x, t, s) \chi_{[0, T^* + \epsilon]}(t) + g(x, t, s) \chi_{[T^* + \epsilon, T]}(t) \\ & \text{for some } \epsilon > 0 \text{ and a function } f_0 \text{ satisfying (2.10),} \\ & \text{where } g \in L^\infty(Q_\epsilon; W^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R})) \text{ and } g(x, t, 0) = 0 \text{ in } Q_\epsilon \}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

where $\chi_E(\cdot)$ denotes the characteristic function on a set $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $Q_\epsilon := \Omega \times [T^* + \epsilon, T]$.

The second uniqueness result on the **Inverse problem 2** is stated as follows.

Theorem 2.2 (Uniqueness of initial data by active measurement). *There exists a $T^* > 0$, depending only on σ , Ω and n , such that for any $T > T^*$, $f_j \in \mathcal{C}_{T, T^*}$ and $(\varphi_j, \psi_j) \in H_{\Gamma_0}^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ ($j = 1, 2$), if $\Lambda_{\varphi_j, \psi_j, f_j}$ is the (active) DN map of the following hyperbolic equation:*

$$\begin{cases} u_{j,tt} - \nabla \cdot (\sigma \nabla u_j) + f_j(x, t, u) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ u_j = h & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u_j(x, 0) = \varphi_j(x), \quad u_{j,t}(x, 0) = \psi_j(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.12)$$

and for any $h \in \mathcal{H}_T$ with $\text{supph} \subseteq \Gamma_0 \times [0, T]$,

$$\Lambda_{\varphi_1, \psi_1, f_1}(h) = \Lambda_{\varphi_2, \psi_2, f_2}(h) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_0 \times (0, T), \quad (2.13)$$

it holds that

$$(\varphi_1, \psi_1) = (\varphi_2, \psi_2) \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (2.14)$$

Hence, the map $\Lambda_{\varphi, \psi, f}$ uniquely determines (φ, ψ) , independent of functions f in \mathcal{C}_{T, T^*} .

Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 show that one may use either passive or active measurement to determine initial data $(u(0), u_t(0)) = (\psi, \psi)$, respectively, for functions $f \in \mathcal{M}_T$ or $f \in \mathcal{C}_{T,T^*}$, where \mathcal{M}_T and \mathcal{C}_{T,T^*} are given in (2.7) and (2.11).

Furthermore, we will determine coefficients and initial data simultaneously in a semilinear wave equation by the active measurement under the appropriate assumptions. To our best knowledge, this simultaneously recovering inverse problem is the first result to be considered in the field. For an $x_0 \notin \overline{\Omega}$, set

$$T_* = 2 \max_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} |x - x_0|. \quad (2.15)$$

Assume that m is a positive integer and introduce the following energy space E^m as in [LLPMT20, Section 1] and [CB08, Definition 3.5 in page 596]:

$$E^m = \bigcap_{k=0}^m C^k([0, T]; H^{m-k}(\Omega)), \quad (2.16)$$

which is equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{E^m}$ as

$$\|u\|_{E^m} = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sum_{k=0}^m \left\| \partial_t^k u(\cdot, t) \right\|_{H^{m-k}(\Omega)}, \quad \forall u \in E^m.$$

Inspired by [LLPMT20, Definition 1], we impose the following conditions on functions \tilde{f} .

Definition 2.1 (Admissible coefficients). *Suppose that $T > T_*$ and a function $\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}(x, t, z): Q \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ satisfies:*

(1) *Analyticity:*

$$\begin{cases} \text{the map } z \mapsto \tilde{f}(\cdot, \cdot, z) \text{ is holomorphic on } \mathbb{C} \text{ with values in } E^{m+1}, \\ \tilde{f}(x, t, 0) = 0, \text{ in } Q. \end{cases} \quad (2.17)$$

This means that \tilde{f} may be written as the Taylor expansion at any $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$:

$$\tilde{f}(x, t, z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \tilde{f}^{(k)}(x, t, z_0) \frac{(z - z_0)^k}{k!},$$

where $\frac{\tilde{f}^{(k)}(x, t, z_0)}{k!} = \frac{\partial_z^k \tilde{f}(x, t, z_0)}{k!}$ are Taylor's coefficients at $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

(2) *Compact support: For each $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$,*

$$\text{supp} \tilde{f}(\cdot, \cdot, z_0) \subseteq \overline{\Omega} \times [t_1, t_2],$$

where t_1 and t_2 are two positive constants with $T_ < t_1 < t_2 < T$.*

In order to investigate the inverse problem of recovering the initial data and coefficient simultaneously, we adapt the method based on the higher order linearization. Consider the following semilinear wave equation:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - \Delta u + \tilde{f}(x, t, u) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ u = h & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, 0) = \varphi(x), \quad u_t(x, 0) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.18)$$

where \tilde{f} is an admissible coefficient. We aim to determine $\tilde{f}(x, t, u)$, $\varphi(x)$ and $\psi(x)$ simultaneously.

Remark 2.2. *It is worth mentioning that:*

- (1) The definition of admissible coefficients (Definition 2.1) is inspired by the need to guarantee the well-posedness of (2.18) in E^{m+1} and the application of the complex geometrical optics solutions (see Section 5). Throughout this paper, when a function \tilde{f} is said to be an admissible coefficient, it satisfies the conditions in Definition 2.1.
- (2) When the initial data and boundary data are zero, via the condition that $\tilde{f}(x, t, 0) = 0$ in Q , one can easily see that $u = 0$ is a trivial solution to (2.18).

Next, for a positive integer m , define the following function space:

$$\mathcal{N}_m = \left\{ h \in H^m(\Sigma) \mid h \in H_0^{m-k}(0, T; H^k(\Gamma)), \forall k = 0, 1, \dots, m-1 \right\}. \quad (2.19)$$

Due to the local well-posedness of the semilinear hyperbolic equation (2.18) (see Section 3), for any integer $m > \frac{n}{2}$, there exists a $\delta > 0$, when initial data $(\varphi, \psi) \in H_0^{m+1}(\Omega) \times H_0^m(\Omega)$ and boundary data $h \in \mathcal{N}_{m+1}$ satisfy

$$\|(\varphi, \psi)\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega) \times H^m(\Omega)} + \|h\|_{H^{m+1}(\Sigma)} < \delta,$$

(2.18) has a unique solution $u \in E^{m+1}$ and its outer normal derivative $\partial_\nu u \in H^m(\Sigma)$.

For any $(\varphi, \psi) \in H_0^{m+1}(\Omega) \times H_0^m(\Omega)$ with $\|(\varphi, \psi)\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega) \times H^m(\Omega)} < \frac{\delta}{2}$ and an admissible coefficient \tilde{f} , introduce the *input-output map*¹ by

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{\varphi, \psi, \tilde{f}}^T : E_\delta &\rightarrow H^m(\Sigma) \times H^{m+1}(\Omega) \times H^m(\Omega), \\ h &\mapsto (\partial_\nu u|_\Sigma, u(\cdot, T), u_t(\cdot, T)), \end{aligned}$$

where $E_\delta = \left\{ h \in \mathcal{N}_{m+1} \mid \|h\|_{H^{m+1}(\Sigma)} < \frac{\delta}{2} \right\}$. Then we are ready to study the following inverse problem:

- **Inverse problem 3.** Can we identify unknown initial data and coefficient $(\varphi, \psi, \tilde{f})$ by using the active measurement $\Lambda_{\varphi, \psi, \tilde{f}}^T$?

Under the admissible and smallness conditions for coefficient and initial boundary data at hand, respectively, we give an answer to **Inverse problem 3** as follows.

Theorem 2.3 (Simultaneous recovery by active measurement). *Let $T > T_*$ (see (2.15)) and m be an integer with $m > \frac{n}{2}$. Assume that \tilde{f}_1 and \tilde{f}_2 are admissible coefficients. Then there exists a $\delta > 0$, such that for any $(\varphi_j, \psi_j) \in H_0^{m+1}(\Omega) \times H_0^m(\Omega)$ ($j = 1, 2$) with $\|(\varphi_j, \psi_j)\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega) \times H^m(\Omega)} < \delta/2$, if $\Lambda_{\varphi_j, \psi_j, \tilde{f}_j}^T$ are the input-output map of the semilinear hyperbolic equation:*

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - \Delta u + \tilde{f}_j(x, t, u) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ u = h & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, 0) = \varphi_j(x), \quad u_t(x, 0) = \psi_j(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

and

$$\Lambda_{\varphi_1, \psi_1, \tilde{f}_1}^T(h) = \Lambda_{\varphi_2, \psi_2, \tilde{f}_2}^T(h), \quad \text{for any } h \in E_\delta,$$

then

$$\varphi_1 = \varphi_2, \quad \psi_1 = \psi_2 \text{ in } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{f}_1 = \tilde{f}_2 \text{ in } Q \times \mathbb{C}.$$

The proof of Theorem 2.3 is mainly based on the higher order linearization method, which was initiated in [KLU18a] for some nonlinear hyperbolic equations. Recently, this method has been extended to many other different problems, such as [KU20b, KU20a, LLLS21, LLLS20] and references therein.

¹Here we use the notation $\Lambda_{\varphi, \psi, \tilde{f}}^T$ to denote the full input-output map, which includes the final time observations. $\Lambda_{\varphi, \psi, \tilde{f}}^T$ is different from our earlier DN map.

Remark 2.3. *Now, we explain the main differences between Theorems 2.1-2.2 and Theorem 2.3.*

- (1) *Any initial value (φ, ψ) of the initial boundary value problem (2.1) can be determined uniquely, by utilizing either passive or (partial) active measurements, under suitable assumptions on coefficients f .*
- (2) *By using the active measurement, one can determine small initial data (φ, ψ) and admissible coefficient \tilde{f} simultaneously in the initial boundary value problem (2.18).*
- (3) *The smallness conditions in Theorem 2.3 are mainly used to prove the local well-posedness. In the determination of initial data and coefficients, the smallness conditions are not essential.*

3. WELL-POSEDNESS OF SEMILINEAR HYPERBOLIC EQUATIONS

This section is devoted to investigating the well-posedness of the semilinear hyperbolic equations (2.1) and (2.18). The global well-posedness for (2.1) under the superlinear increasing condition (2.10) and local well-posedness for (2.18) under admissible coefficients and suitable smallness conditions are established, respectively.

3.1. Local well-posedness with small data. This subsection is devoted to the well-posedness of the semilinear hyperbolic equation (2.18). Similar result has been investigated in [NVW20] with different structures on \tilde{f} .

To begin with, for any integer $m > \frac{n}{2}$, recall the definition of the following energy space:

$$E^m = \bigcap_{k=0}^m C^k([0, T]; H^{m-k}(\Omega)).$$

By [CB08], the above space E^m is an algebra, due to

$$\|\phi\psi\|_{E^m} \leq C_m \|\phi\|_{E^m} \|\psi\|_{E^m}, \quad \forall \phi, \psi \in E^m.$$

Indeed, the algebra property of function spaces plays an essential role in the study of well-posedness for many nonlinear partial differential equations. For example, in [FO20, KU20a, LLLS21, LLLS20], suitable Hölder continuous spaces were utilized to prove the well-posedness for semilinear elliptic equations.

Next, recall the known well-posedness result for the following wave equation:

$$\begin{cases} v_{tt} - \Delta v = g & \text{in } Q, \\ v = h & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ v(x, 0) = \varphi(x), \quad v_t(x, 0) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where $\varphi \in H^{m+1}(\Omega)$, $\psi \in H^m(\Omega)$, $h \in H^{m+1}(\Sigma)$ and g satisfies that for any $k = 0, 1, \dots, m$, $\partial_t^k g \in L^1(0, T; H^{m-k}(\Omega))$. Also, the compatibility conditions up to order m hold, which are given by

$$\begin{cases} h(x, 0) = \varphi(x)|_{\Gamma}, \quad h_t(x, 0) = \psi(x)|_{\Gamma}, \\ h_{tt}(x, 0) = \Delta\varphi(x) + g(x, 0)|_{\Gamma}, \end{cases}$$

and similarly for the higher order derivatives up to order m^2 .

By [KKL01, Theorem 2.45], the following well-posedness result holds for (3.1).

²One needs to check the compatible conditions for $\partial_t^k h(x, 0)$ for $x \in \Gamma$ and for $k = 0, 1, \dots, m$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let m be a positive integer and $T > 0$. For any $\varphi \in H^{m+1}(\Omega)$, $\psi \in H^m(\Omega)$, $h \in H^{m+1}(\Sigma)$ and $g \in L^1(0, T; H^m(\Omega))$ with $\partial_t^k g \in L^1(0, T; H^{m-k}(\Omega))$ for any $k = 0, \dots, m$, if the compatibility conditions up to order m hold, (3.1) has a unique solution $v \in E^{m+1}$ and $\partial_\nu v \in H^m(\Sigma)$.*

The main result of this subsection is stated as follows.

Theorem 3.1 (Local well-posedness). *Let m be an integer with $m > \frac{n}{2}$ and $T > 0$. Assume that \tilde{f} is admissible. Then there exists a $\delta > 0$, such that for any (h, φ, ψ) in the set*

$$U_\delta = \left\{ (h, \varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{N}_{m+1} \times H_0^{m+1}(\Omega) \times H_0^m(\Omega) \mid \|h\|_{H^{m+1}(\Sigma)} + \|\varphi\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega)} + \|\psi\|_{H^m(\Omega)} < \delta \right\},$$

(2.18) admits a unique solution $u \in E^{m+1}$ satisfying that $\partial_\nu u \in H^m(\Sigma)$ and

$$\|u\|_{E^{m+1}} + \|u\|_{C(\bar{Q})} + \|\partial_\nu u\|_{H^m(\Sigma)} \leq C \left(\|h\|_{H^{m+1}(\Sigma)} + \|\varphi\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega)} + \|\psi\|_{H^m(\Omega)} \right), \quad (3.2)$$

where C is a positive constant independent of u, h, φ and ψ . Moreover, the following solution map is C^∞ Fréchet differentiable:

$$S : U_\delta \rightarrow E^{m+1}, \quad (h, \varphi, \psi) \mapsto u.$$

Proof. Similar to arguments in [LLLS21, KU20a], we will prove the well-posedness of (2.18) by the implicit function theorem in Banach spaces.

First, consider the following linear hyperbolic equation:

$$\begin{cases} w_{tt} - \Delta w + qw = g_1 & \text{in } Q, \\ w = h & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ w(x, 0) = \varphi(x), \quad w_t(x, 0) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

where $\varphi \in H_0^{m+1}(\Omega)$, $\psi \in H_0^m(\Omega)$, $h \in \mathcal{N}_{m+1}$, $q \in E^m$ and $g_1 \in E^m$ with $\partial_t^k g_1(\cdot, 0) \in H_0^{m-k}(\Omega)$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, m-2$. By Lemma 3.1, it is easy to show that (3.1) has a unique solution

$$w \in E^{m+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_\nu w \in H^m(\Sigma).$$

Next, set

$$X_1 = \mathcal{N}_{m+1} \times H_0^{m+1}(\Omega) \times H_0^m(\Omega),$$

$$X_2 = \left\{ u \in E^{m+1} \mid u|_\Sigma \in \mathcal{N}_{m+1}, \partial_\nu u \in H^m(\Sigma), u(\cdot, 0) \in H_0^{m+1}(\Omega), u_t(\cdot, 0) \in H_0^m(\Omega), \right.$$

$$\left. u_{tt} - \Delta u \in E^m, \partial_t^k (u_{tt} - \Delta u)(\cdot, 0) \in H_0^{m-k}(\Omega), k = 0, 1, \dots, m-2 \right\},$$

$$\text{with } \|u\|_{X_2} = \|u\|_{E^{m+1}} + \|\partial_\nu u\|_{H^m(\Sigma)} + \|u\|_{H^{m+1}(\Sigma)} + \|u_{tt} - \Delta u\|_{E^m},$$

$$X_3 = \left\{ g \in E^m \mid \partial_t^k g(\cdot, 0) \in H_0^{m-k}(\Omega), \forall k = 0, 1, \dots, m-2 \right\} \times X_1.$$

Consider the following map:

$$F : X_1 \times X_2 \rightarrow X_3,$$

$$F(h, \varphi, \psi, u) = \left(u_{tt} - \Delta u + \tilde{f}(x, t, u), u|_\Sigma - h, u(\cdot, 0) - \varphi, u_t(\cdot, 0) - \psi \right), \quad (3.4)$$

where $(h, \varphi, \psi) \in X_1$ and $u \in X_2$. By the condition (2.17) for \tilde{f} , for any positive integer k and any positive constant R ,

$$\|\tilde{f}^{(k)}\|_{E^{m+1}} \leq \frac{k!}{R^k} \sup_{|z|=R} \|\tilde{f}(\cdot, \cdot, z)\|_{E^{m+1}}. \quad (3.5)$$

Since E^{m+1} is an algebra, it follows that for any $u \in X_2$,

$$\|\tilde{f}(\cdot, \cdot, u(\cdot, \cdot))\|_{E^{m+1}} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \|\tilde{f}^{(k)}\|_{E^{m+1}} \|u\|_{E^{m+1}}^k \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{R^k} \|u\|_{E^{m+1}}^k \sup_{|z|=R} \|\tilde{f}(\cdot, \cdot, z)\|_{E^{m+1}}.$$

Choose $R = 2(\|u\|_{E^{m+1}} + 1)$. Then, $\tilde{f}(\cdot, \cdot, u(\cdot, \cdot)) \in E^{m+1}$ and

$$\|\tilde{f}(\cdot, \cdot, u(\cdot, \cdot))\|_{E^{m+1}} \leq C \sup_{|z|=2(\|u\|_{E^{m+1}}+1)} \|\tilde{f}(\cdot, \cdot, z)\|_{E^{m+1}}.$$

Also, by the admissible condition on \tilde{f} ,

$$\partial_t^k \tilde{f}(\cdot, \cdot, u(\cdot, \cdot)) \Big|_{t=0} = 0, \quad \forall k = 0, 1, \dots, m-2 \text{ and } u \in X_2.$$

Hence, the definition of F is reasonable.

It is easy to see that F is locally bounded and we will verify the weak holomorphy of it (see [Pos87, p.133]), that is, for any $(h_0, \varphi_0, \psi_0, u_0), (h, \varphi, \psi, u) \in X_1 \times X_2$, the map

$$\lambda \mapsto F((h_0, \varphi_0, \psi_0, u_0) + \lambda(h, \varphi, \psi, u))$$

is holomorphic in a neighborhood of the origin in \mathbb{C} with values in X_3 . It suffices to check that the map

$$\lambda \mapsto \tilde{f}(x, t, u_0(x, t) + \lambda u(x, t))$$

is holomorphic in a neighborhood of the origin in \mathbb{C} with values in E^m . This follows from the convergence of the series

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{f}^{(k)}(x, t)}{k!} [u_0(x, t) + \lambda u(x, t)]^k$$

in E^{m+1} , locally uniformly in $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Hence, F is holomorphic in $X_1 \times X_2$.

Moreover, notice that $F(0, 0, 0, 0) = 0$ and $F_u(0, 0, 0, 0) : X_2 \rightarrow X_3$ defined by

$$F_u(0, 0, 0, 0)w = \left(w_{tt} - \Delta w + \tilde{f}_u(\cdot, \cdot, 0)w, w|_{\Sigma}, w(\cdot, 0), w_t(\cdot, 0) \right), \quad \forall w \in X_2.$$

Indeed, for any $w \in X_2$, $w \in E^{m+1}$ and $w_{tt} - \Delta w \in E^m$. Since $\tilde{f}_u(\cdot, \cdot, 0) \in E^{m+1}$, it holds that $w_{tt} - \Delta w + \tilde{f}_u(\cdot, \cdot, 0)w \in E^m$. Also, by the admissibility of \tilde{f} ,

$$\partial_t^k [w_{tt} - \Delta w + \tilde{f}_u(\cdot, \cdot, 0)w](\cdot, 0) \in H_0^{m-k}(\Omega), \quad \forall k = 0, 1, \dots, m-2.$$

Hence, the definition of $F_u(0, 0, 0, 0)$ is reasonable. Furthermore, by the well-posedness of the linear hyperbolic equation (3.1) with

$$q = \tilde{f}_u(\cdot, \cdot, 0) \text{ and } g_1 \in \left\{ g \in E^m \mid \partial_t^k g(\cdot, 0) \in H_0^{m-k}(\Omega), \forall k = 0, 1, \dots, m-2 \right\},$$

$F_u(0, 0, 0, 0)$ is a linear isomorphism from $X_2 \rightarrow X_3$.

By the implicit function theorem in Banach spaces, there exists a $\delta > 0$ and a C^∞ map $S : U_\delta \rightarrow E^{m+1}$, such that for any $(h, \varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{N}_{m+1} \times H_0^{m+1}(\Omega) \times H_0^m(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$\|h\|_{H^{m+1}(\Sigma)} + \|\varphi\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega)} + \|\psi\|_{H^m(\Omega)} < \delta,$$

we have that

$$F(h, \varphi, \psi, S(h, \varphi, \psi)) = (0, 0, 0, 0).$$

Since S is locally Lipschitz continuous and $S(0, 0, 0) = 0$, $u = S(h, \varphi, \psi)$ satisfies that

$$\|u\|_{E^{m+1}} + \|\partial_\nu u\|_{H^m(\Sigma)} \leq C (\|h\|_{H^{m+1}(\Sigma)} + \|\varphi\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega)} + \|\psi\|_{H^m(\Omega)}).$$

This, combined with the Sobolev embedding theorem, this proves the local well-posedness of (2.18) and the estimate (3.2). \square

Notice that one may extend Theorem 3.1 to more general hyperbolic equations:

$$u_{tt} - \nabla \cdot (\sigma \nabla u) + \tilde{f}(x, t, u) = 0,$$

where σ is either isotropic or anisotropic. However, in the application of a density result of products of solutions, we simply consider the classical wave equation to demonstrate ideas of this approach (see Section 5).

3.2. Global well-posedness of weak solutions. This subsection is devoted to the well-posedness of weak solutions to the following semilinear hyperbolic equation:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - \nabla \cdot (\sigma \nabla u) + f(x, t, u) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ u = h & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, 0) = \varphi(x), \quad u_t(x, 0) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

where $\sigma(\cdot) = (\sigma^{ij}(\cdot))_{i,j=1}^n \in C^2(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ is a symmetric uniformly positive definite matrix-valued function, and f satisfies (2.10) and the following conditions:

$$f(x, t, \cdot) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}), \text{ a.e. } (x, t) \in Q \quad \text{and} \quad f(\cdot, \cdot, 0) \in L^2(Q).$$

Under the above assumptions, we have the following global well-posedness result for (3.6).

Theorem 3.2 (Global well-posedness). *For any $T > 0$, $(\varphi, \psi) \in H^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ and $h \in H^1(\Sigma)$ with the compatibility condition $h|_{t=0} = \varphi|_{\Gamma}$, the semilinear hyperbolic equation (3.6) admits a unique solution u in the class of*

$$u \in H = C([0, T]; H^1(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)).$$

Moreover, $\sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij} \nu_i u_{x_j} \Big|_{\Sigma} \in L^2(\Sigma)$ and

$$\|u\|_H + \left\| \sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij} \nu_i u_{x_j} \right\|_{L^2(\Sigma)} \leq C (\|(\varphi, \psi)\|_{H^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)}, \|h\|_{H^1(\Sigma)}, \|f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(Q)}).$$

Proof. The proof is based on the method of the Schauder fixed point theorem. First, assume that $n \geq 3$. Set

$$g(x, t, s) = \begin{cases} \frac{f(x, t, s) - f(x, t, 0)}{s} & \text{for } s \neq 0, \\ \partial_s f(x, t, 0) & \text{for } s = 0, \end{cases} \quad \forall (x, t, s) \in Q \times \mathbb{R},$$

and for any $z \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$, consider the following linear hyperbolic equation:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - \nabla \cdot (\sigma \nabla u) + a_z(x, t)u + f(x, t, 0) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ u = h & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, 0) = \varphi(x), \quad u_t(x, 0) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

where $a_z(x, t) = g(x, t, z(x, t))$. It is easy to check that $a_z \in L^\infty(0, T; L^n(\Omega))$. Indeed, by the condition (2.10), for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there is a $C_\epsilon > 0$, such that

$$|g(x, t, s)|^2 \leq \epsilon \ln(1 + |s|) + C_\epsilon, \quad \forall (x, t, s) \in Q \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Therefore, for any $z \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\Omega} e^{Ca_z^2(x, t)} dx &= \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\Omega} e^{C|g(x, t, z(x, t))|^2} dx \\
 &\leq \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\Omega} e^{C[\epsilon \ln(1 + |z(x, t)|) + C\epsilon]} dx \\
 &\leq C(\epsilon) \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\Omega} [1 + |z(x, t)|]^\epsilon dx \\
 &\leq C(\epsilon) \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\Omega} [1 + |z(x, t)|]^2 dx < \infty.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

By [LZ00], it is easy to show that

$$e^{\|a_z\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^{n+1}(\Omega))}^2} + e^{\|a_z\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^n(\Omega))}^2} \leq C \left(1 + \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\Omega} e^{Ca_z^2(x, t)} dx \right). \tag{3.9}$$

Combining (3.9) with (3.8), one has that $a_z \in L^\infty(0, T; L^n(\Omega))$.

Define a map

$$\mathcal{L} : L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega)) \rightarrow L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega)) \quad \text{by} \quad \mathcal{L}(z) = u,$$

for all $z \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$, where $u \in H$ is the solution to (3.7) associated to $a_z(x, t) = g(x, t, z(x, t))$. In the following, we will prove that the map \mathcal{L} has a unique fixed point in a set $V \subseteq L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$. To this aim, for any $t \in [0, T]$, set

$$E(t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} [u_t^2(x, t) + (\sigma \nabla u) \cdot \nabla u + u^2(x, t)] dx.$$

Multiplying both sides of the first equation in (3.7) by u_t and integrating them in Ω , one has

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_t(t) &= \int_{\Gamma} (\sigma \nabla u) \cdot \nu u_t dx - \int_{\Omega} [a_z u u_t + f(x, t, 0) u_t] dx + \int_{\Omega} u u_t dx \\
 &\leq C \int_{\Gamma} |u_t(x, t)| |\nabla u(x, t)| dx + \|a_z(\cdot, t)\|_{L^n(\Omega)} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\frac{2n}{n-2}}(\Omega)} \|u_t(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
 &\quad + \|f(\cdot, t, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|u_t(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|u_t(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

This implies

$$E_t(t) \leq C \int_{\Gamma} |u_t| |\nabla u| dx + C \|a_z(\cdot, t)\|_{L^n(\Omega)} E(t) + \|f(\cdot, t, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} E^{\frac{1}{2}}(t) + E(t).$$

Hence, by the above estimate, (3.8) and (3.9), for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|u\|_H^2 &\leq CE(t) \\
 &\leq C \left[E(0) + \|h\|_{H^1(\Sigma)}^2 + \|f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \right] e^{C(1 + \|a_z\|_{L^1(0, T; L^n(\Omega))})} \\
 &\leq C \left[\|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|h\|_{H^1(\Sigma)}^2 + \|f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \right] e^{C(1 + \|a_z\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^n(\Omega))}^2)} \\
 &\leq C \left[\|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|h\|_{H^1(\Sigma)}^2 + \|f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \right] \left(1 + \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\Omega} e^{Ca_z(x, t)^2} dx \right) \\
 &\leq C \left[\|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|h\|_{H^1(\Sigma)}^2 + \|f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \right] \left(1 + \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\Omega} |z(x, t)|^\epsilon dx \right) \\
 &\leq C \left[\|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|h\|_{H^1(\Sigma)}^2 + \|f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \right] \left(1 + \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \|z(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^\epsilon \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))}^2 \leq \|u\|_H^2 \\ & \leq C \left[\|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|h\|_{H^1(\Sigma)}^2 + \|f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \right] \left(1 + \|z\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))}^\epsilon \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exists a positive constant C_* , depending only on $\|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$, $\|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, $\|h\|_{H^1(\Sigma)}$ and $\|f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(Q)}$, such that

$$\mathcal{L}(V) \subseteq V, \quad \text{with } V = \left\{ u \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega)) \mid \|u\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))} \leq C_* \right\}.$$

Also, \mathcal{L} is compact. Hence, by the Schauder fixed point technique, it is easy to show that \mathcal{L} has a fixed point u in V , which is the solution to the semilinear hyperbolic equation (3.6) and satisfies

$$\|u\|_H \leq C \left(\|(\varphi, \psi)\|_{H^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)}, \|h\|_{H^1(\Sigma)}, \|f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(Q)} \right). \quad (3.11)$$

On the other hand, we will prove that $\sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij} \nu_i u_{x_j} \in L^2(\Sigma)$ and give its estimate. Since the solution $u \in H$ is a fixed point of the map \mathcal{L} , it satisfies the following hyperbolic equation:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - \nabla \cdot (\sigma \nabla u) + a_u(x, t)u + f(x, t, 0) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ u = h & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, 0) = \varphi(x), \quad u_t(x, 0) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (3.12)$$

Choosing a $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n) \in C^1(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $w = \nu$ on Γ . Multiplying both sides of the first equation in (3.12) by $(\sigma \nabla u) \cdot w$ and integrating them in Q , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Sigma} \left| \sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij} u_{x_i} \nu_j \right|^2 dx dt \\ & = \sum_{k,l=1}^n \int_Q u_{tt} \sigma^{kl} u_{x_k} w_l dx dt + \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^n \int_Q \sigma^{ij} u_{x_i} (\sigma^{kl} u_{x_k} w_l)_{x_j} dx dt \\ & \quad + \sum_{k,l=1}^n \int_Q \sigma^{kl} w_l u_{x_k} a_u u dx dt + \sum_{k,l=1}^n \int_Q \sigma^{kl} u_{x_k} w_l f(x, t, 0) dx dt \\ & = \sum_{k,l=1}^n \int_{\Omega} \sigma^{kl} u_{x_k} w_l u_t dx \Big|_0^T - \sum_{k,l=1}^n \int_Q \sigma^{kl} u_{x_k} u_t w_l dx dt \\ & \quad + \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^n \int_Q \sigma^{ij} u_{x_i} u_{x_k} (\sigma^{kl} w_l)_{x_j} dx dt + \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^n \int_Q \sigma^{ij} u_{x_i} u_{x_k} w_l \sigma^{kl} dx dt \\ & \quad + \sum_{k,l=1}^n \int_Q \sigma^{kl} w_l u_{x_k} a_u u dx dt + \sum_{k,l=1}^n \int_Q \sigma^{kl} u_{x_k} w_l f(x, t, 0) dx dt \\ & \leq C[E(T) + E(0)] + C\|h\|_{H^1(\Sigma)}^2 + C \int_0^T E(t) dt + \|f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \\ & \quad + C \int_0^T \|a_u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^n(\Omega)} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 dt \\ & \leq C \left(1 + \|a_u\|_{L^1(0,T;L^n(\Omega))} \right) \max_{t \in [0,T]} E(t) + C \left(\|h\|_{H^1(\Sigma)}^2 + \|f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By (3.8), (3.9) and (3.11), it holds that

$$\int_{\Sigma} \left| \sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij} u_{x_i} \nu_j \right|^2 dx dt \leq C \left(\|(\varphi, \psi)\|_{H^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)}, \|h\|_{H^1(\Sigma)}, \|f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(Q)} \right).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.2 in the case of $n \geq 3$.

If $n = 2$, the proof is similar to the above arguments. It suffices that in (3.10), the estimate on $\int_{\Omega} a_z u u_t dx dt$ is replaced by

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} a_z u u_t dx \right| \leq \|a_z(\cdot, t)\|_{L^3(\Omega)} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|u_t(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Also, $\|a_z(\cdot, t)\|_{L^n(\Omega)}$, $\|a_z(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^1(0,T;L^n(\Omega))}$ and $\|a_z(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^n(\Omega))}$, respectively, are replaced by $\|a_z(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{n+1}(\Omega)}$, $\|a_z(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^1(0,T;L^{n+1}(\Omega))}$ and $\|a_z(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^{n+1}(\Omega))}$. \square

4. UNIQUE DETERMINATION OF INITIAL DATA

In this section, we prove the first two results on inverse problems of this paper and determine initial data for a class of semilinear hyperbolic equations by passive or active measurements. As preliminaries, recall the following controllability and observability results for hyperbolic equations.

4.1. Controllability and observability for hyperbolic equations. Consider the following linear hyperbolic equation:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - \nabla \cdot (\sigma \nabla u) + a(x, t)u = K(x, t) & \text{in } Q, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, 0) = \varphi(x), \quad u_t(x, 0) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where σ satisfies the same conditions as those in (2.1), $a \in L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\Omega))$ with $p \geq n$, $K \in L^2(Q)$ and $(\varphi, \psi) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$.

Similar to [DZZ08] and [Lü13], one has the following observability result.

Lemma 4.1. *There exists a $T^* > 0$, depending only on n , Ω and σ , such that for any $T > T^*$, any solution $u \in C([0, T]; H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0, T]; L^2(\Omega))$ to (4.1) satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\varphi, \psi)\|_{H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C(T, \Omega, n, \sigma, \Gamma_0) e^{C\|a\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^p(\Omega))}^{\frac{1}{3/2-n/p}}} \left(\left\| \sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij} \nu_i u_{x_j} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma_0))} + \|K\|_{L^2(Q)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where Γ_0 is given in (2.3).

Also, similar to [FYZ07], the above observability estimate (4.2) implies the following exact controllability result for the semilinear hyperbolic equation (2.1), if f satisfies the superlinear increasing condition (2.10).

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that f satisfies the condition (2.10). Then there exists a $T^* > 0$, depending only on n and σ , such that for any $T > T^*$ and $(\varphi, \psi), (\varphi^*, \psi^*) \in H_{\Gamma_0}^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$, one always may find an $h \in L^2(\Sigma)$ with $\text{supp } h \subseteq \Gamma_0 \times [0, T]$, so that the associated solution u to (2.1) satisfies*

$$u(\cdot, T) = \varphi^* \quad \text{and} \quad u_t(\cdot, T) = \psi^* \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Remark 4.3. By Lemma 4.1, the observability result (4.2) holds for the following wave equation:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - \Delta u + au = K & \text{in } Q, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, 0) = \varphi(x), \quad u_t(x, 0) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

More precisely, for any $T > T_*$ (see (2.15)) and Γ_0 in (2.4), the estimate (4.2) holds for any solution to (4.3) associated to $(\varphi, \psi) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$. Similarly, the exact controllability result in Lemma 4.2 holds for the following wave equation:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} - \Delta u + au = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ u = h & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u(x, 0) = \varphi(x), \quad u_t(x, 0) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

That is, for any $T > T_*$ and $(\varphi, \psi), (\varphi^*, \psi^*) \in H_{\Gamma_0}^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$, one always may find an $h \in L^2(\Sigma)$ with $\text{supph} \subseteq \Gamma_0 \times [0, T]$, so that the associated solution u to (4.4) satisfies

$$u(\cdot, T) = \varphi^* \quad \text{and} \quad u_t(\cdot, T) = \psi^* \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

4.2. Determination by passive measurements. We first prove Theorem 2.1 under the condition that $f \in \mathcal{M}_T$ (see (2.7)) is known a priori.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. For any $f \in \mathcal{M}_T$, $h = 0$ and initial values $(\varphi_1, \psi_1), (\varphi_2, \psi_2) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$, denote by u_1 and u_2 , respectively, the corresponding solutions to (2.8) in H_0 . Set $\tilde{u} = u_1 - u_2$. Then it is easy to show that $\tilde{u} \in H_0$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}_{tt} - \nabla \cdot (\sigma \nabla \tilde{u}) + f(x, t, u_1) - f(x, t, u_2) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \tilde{u} = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \tilde{u}(x, t) = \varphi_1(x) - \varphi_2(x), \quad \tilde{u}_t(x, 0) = \psi_1(x) - \psi_2(x) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

By the mean value theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} & f(x, t, u_1(x, t)) - f(x, t, u_2(x, t)) \\ &= \int_0^1 f_u(x, t, su_1(x, t) + (1-s)u_2(x, t)) ds \cdot [u_1(x, t) - u_2(x, t)]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\tilde{u}_{tt} - \nabla \cdot (\sigma \nabla \tilde{u}) + a(x, t)\tilde{u}(x, t) = 0,$$

where

$$a(x, t) = \int_0^1 f_u(x, t, su_1(x, t) + (1-s)u_2(x, t)) ds \in L^\infty(Q).$$

By Lemma 4.1, for any $p \geq n$,

$$\|(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2, \psi_1 - \psi_2)\|_{H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)} \leq C e^{C \|a\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^p(\Omega))}^{\frac{1}{3/2 - n/p}}} \left\| \sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij} \nu_i \tilde{u}_{x_j} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma_0))},$$

for some positive constant C depending only on T, Ω, n, σ and Γ_0 . This implies that the following quantitative stability result:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2, \psi_1 - \psi_2)\|_{H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C(f, u_1, u_2, n, T, \Omega, \Gamma_0, \Sigma) \cdot \|\Lambda_{\varphi_1, \psi_1, f}^0 - \Lambda_{\varphi_2, \psi_2, f}^0\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma_0))}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C(f, u_1, u_2, \Omega, n, T, \Gamma_0, \sigma)$ is a positive constant depending on $n, T, \Omega, \Gamma_0, \sigma, u_1, u_2$ and f , but independent of (φ_j, ψ_j) , for $j = 1, 2$. \square

On the other hand, there is a counterexample showing that if f is unknown, the passive measurement cannot uniquely determine all unknowns.

Theorem 4.1 (Non-uniqueness). *Suppose that $\sigma = (\sigma^{ij}(x))_{i,j=1}^n \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ is a symmetric uniformly positive definite matrix-valued function in $\overline{\Omega}$, $f_j \in \mathcal{M}_T$ and $(\varphi_j, \psi_j) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ for $j = 1, 2$. Denote by $\Lambda_{\varphi_j, \psi_j, f_j}^0$ the DN map of the following semilinear hyperbolic equation:*

$$\begin{cases} u_{j,tt} - \nabla \cdot (\sigma \nabla u_j) + f_j(x, t, u_j) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ u_j = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u_j(x, 0) = \varphi_j(x), \quad u_{j,t}(x, 0) = \psi_j(x) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

Then there exist two groups of unknown sources $(\varphi_1, \psi_1, f_1), (\varphi_2, \psi_2, f_2) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \times \mathcal{M}_T$, such that

$$(\varphi_1, \psi_1, f_1) \neq (\varphi_2, \psi_2, f_2),$$

but

$$\Lambda_{\varphi_1, \psi_1, f_1}^0 = \Lambda_{\varphi_2, \psi_2, f_2}^0.$$

Proof. Assume that two functions $u_1, u_2 \in C^\infty(\overline{Q})$ satisfy that

$$u_1(\cdot, 0) \neq u_2(\cdot, 0) \text{ in a measurable set of } \Omega \text{ with positive measure,}$$

$$\text{and } u_1(x, t) = u_2(x, t) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_\epsilon \times [0, T],$$

where $\Omega_\epsilon = \{x \in \Omega \mid \text{dist}(x, \Gamma) < \epsilon\}$. Set

$$F_j(x, t) = -u_{j,tt}(x, t) + \nabla \cdot (\sigma \nabla u_j(x, t)), \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2 \text{ and } (x, t) \in Q.$$

It is easy to show that u_j ($j = 1, 2$) are solutions to (2.3) associated to

$$\varphi_j(x) = u_j(x, 0), \quad \psi_j(x) = u_{j,t}(x, 0) \text{ and } f_j(x, t, u_j) = F_j(x, t).$$

Then,

$$(\varphi_1, \psi_1, f_1) \neq (\varphi_2, \psi_2, f_2),$$

but

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij} \nu_i u_{1,x_j} \Big|_{\Gamma_0 \times (0,T)} = \Lambda_{\varphi_1, \psi_1, f_1}^0 = \Lambda_{\varphi_2, \psi_2, f_2}^0 = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij} \nu_i u_{2,x_j} \Big|_{\Gamma_0 \times (0,T)} = 0.$$

□

4.3. Determination by active measurements. This subsection is devoted to proving Theorem 2.2 under the condition that $f \in \mathcal{C}_{T,T^*}$ (see (2.11)).

Proof of Theorem 2.2. For the T^* in Lemma 4.2 and any $T > T^*$, assume that $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{T,T^*}$. Then, for $j = 1, 2$,

$$f_j(x, t, s) = f_0(x, t, s) \chi_{[0, T^* + \epsilon]}(t) + g_j(x, t, s) \chi_{[T^* + \epsilon, T]}(t),$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ with $T^* + \epsilon < T$, f_0 satisfies the condition (2.10) and $g_j \in L^\infty(Q_\epsilon; W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}))$ with $g_1(x, t, 0) = g_2(x, t, 0) = 0$ in Q_ϵ .

By the assumptions in Theorem 2.2, for any $(\varphi_j, \psi_j) \in H_{\Gamma_0}^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ ($j = 1, 2$), it holds that

$$\Lambda_{\varphi_1, \psi_1, f_1}(h) = \Lambda_{\varphi_2, \psi_2, f_2}(h), \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}_T \text{ with } \text{supp} h \subseteq \Gamma_0 \times [0, T]. \quad (4.6)$$

Let u_1 and u_2 be, respectively, the solutions to (2.12) associated to the above mentioned $(\varphi_1, \psi_1, f_1, h)$ and $(\varphi_2, \psi_2, f_2, h)$. Set

$$\tilde{u} = u_1 - u_2.$$

It is straightforward to see that

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}_{tt} - \nabla \cdot (\sigma \nabla \tilde{u}) + f_1(x, t, u_1(x, t)) - f_2(x, t, u_2(x, t)) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \tilde{u} = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij} \nu_i \tilde{u}_{x_j} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_0 \times (0, T), \\ \tilde{u}(x, 0) = \tilde{\varphi}(x), \quad \tilde{u}_t(x, 0) = \tilde{\psi}(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

where $\tilde{\varphi} = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2$ and $\tilde{\psi} = \psi_1 - \psi_2$.

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & f_1(x, t, u_1(x, t)) - f_2(x, t, u_2(x, t)) \\ &= \left[f_1(x, t, u_1(x, t)) - f_1(x, t, u_2(x, t)) \right] + \left[f_1(x, t, u_2(x, t)) - f_2(x, t, u_2(x, t)) \right] \\ &= \int_0^1 f_{1,u}(x, t, su_1(x, t) + (1-s)u_2(x, t)) ds \cdot \tilde{u}(x, t) \\ & \quad + f_1(x, t, u_2(x, t)) - f_2(x, t, u_2(x, t)). \end{aligned}$$

From the fact that $f_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{T, T^*}$, $\int_0^1 f_{1,u}(x, t, su_1(x, t) + (1-s)u_2(x, t)) ds \in L^\infty(0, T; L^n(\Omega))$.
Indeed, by (2.10), for $u_1, u_2 \in H$ and any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} A(x, t) &:= \left| \frac{f_1(x, t, u_1(x, t)) - f_1(x, t, u_2(x, t))}{u_1(x, t) - u_2(x, t)} \right| \\ &\leq \epsilon^{1/2} \ln^{1/2} \left(|u_1(x, t)| + |u_2(x, t)| \right) + C_\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (3.8) and (3.9), this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\|A\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^n(\Omega))}^2} &\leq C \left(1 + \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\Omega} e^{CA^2(x, t)} dx \right) \\ &\leq C + C \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\Omega} e^{C[\epsilon \ln(|u_1(x, t)| + |u_2(x, t)|) + 1]} dx \\ &\leq C \left[1 + \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\Omega} \left(1 + |u_1(x, t)| + |u_2(x, t)| \right)^\epsilon dx \right] \\ &\leq C \left[1 + \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \int_{\Omega} \left(1 + |u_1(x, t)| + |u_2(x, t)| \right)^2 dx \right] \\ &\leq C \left(1 + \|u_1\|_H^2 + \|u_2\|_H^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the observability estimate in Lemma 4.1, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{\psi})\|_{H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(n, \Omega, T, \Gamma_0, \sigma, u_1, u_2, f_1) \int_Q |f_1(x, t, u_2(x, t)) - f_2(x, t, u_2(x, t))|^2 dx dt \\ &= C(n, \Omega, T, \Gamma_0, \sigma, u_1, u_2, f_1) \int_{T^* + \epsilon}^T \int_{\Omega} |g_1(x, t, u_2(x, t)) - g_2(x, t, u_2(x, t))|^2 dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Notice that (4.8) holds for any $h \in \mathcal{H}_T$ with $\text{supp } h \subseteq \Gamma_0 \times [0, T]$ and the associated solution $u_2 = u_2(\cdot, \cdot; h)$ to the semilinear hyperbolic equation (2.12). By the controllability result in

Lemma 4.2, for $(\varphi_2, \psi_2) \in H_{\Gamma_0}^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$, there always exists an $h^* \in L^2(\Gamma_0 \times (0, T^* + \epsilon))$, such that (2.12) (with T replaced by $T^* + \epsilon$) has a unique solution

$$u_2 = u_2(\cdot, \cdot; h^*) \in C([0, T^* + \epsilon]; H^1(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0, T^* + \epsilon]; L^2(\Omega))$$

with

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n \sigma^{ij}(x) \nu_i(x) u_{2,x_j}(x, t) \in H^{-1}(\Gamma_0 \times (0, T^* + \epsilon))$$

and

$$u_2(\cdot, T^* + \epsilon; h^*) = u_{2,t}(\cdot, T^* + \epsilon; h^*) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Choose

$$h_2(x, t) = \begin{cases} h^*(x, t) & \text{on } \Gamma_0 \times [0, T^* + \epsilon) \\ 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_0 \times [T^* + \epsilon, T] \end{cases} \in L^2(\Gamma_0 \times (0, T)).$$

By the fact that $g_1(\cdot, \cdot, 0) = g_2(\cdot, \cdot, 0) \equiv 0$ in Q_ϵ , the solution $u_2 = u_2(\cdot, \cdot; \varphi_2, \psi_2, h_2) \in H$ to (2.12) associated to h_2 satisfies that

$$u_2(x, t) \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times [T^* + \epsilon, T].$$

Combining the above result with (4.8), one readily obtains

$$\tilde{\varphi} = \tilde{\psi} \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

which proves the assertion in Theorem 2.2. \square

5. SIMULTANEOUS RECOVERY OF INITIAL DATA AND NONLINEARITY

In this section, the higher order linearization technique will be used to determine unknown initial value and nonlinear function in the semilinear wave equation (2.18) simultaneously. As preliminaries, based on the observability result in Lemma 4.1, a Runge type approximation for wave equations is given.

First, for any $T > T_*$ (see (2.15)), choose two constants t_1 and t_2 , such that

$$T_* < t_1 < t_2 < T. \quad (5.1)$$

Then one has the following approximation result.

Theorem 5.1 (Runge approximation). *Assume that (5.1) holds and $q \in E^{m+1}$ with $\text{supp} q \subseteq \overline{\Omega} \times [t_1, t_2]$ for an integer $m > n/2$. Then for any solution $v \in C([t_1, t_2]; L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1([t_1, t_2]; H^{-1}(\Omega))$ to*

$$v_{tt} - \Delta v + qv = 0 \quad \text{in } Q,$$

and any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a solution $V \in C^2(\overline{Q})$ to

$$\begin{cases} V_{tt} - \Delta V + qV = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ V(x, 0) = V_t(x, 0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

such that

$$\|V - v\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (t_1, t_2))} < \epsilon.$$

Proof. In order to prove the desired approximation result, it is equivalent to show that

$$X = \left\{ w = V \Big|_{\Omega \times (t_1, t_2)} \mid V \in C^2(\overline{Q}) \text{ is a solution to (5.2)} \right\}$$

is dense in

$$Y = \left\{ v \in C([t_1, t_2]; L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1([t_1, t_2]; H^{-1}(\Omega)) \mid v_{tt} - \Delta v + qv = 0 \text{ in } \Omega \times (t_1, t_2) \right\}$$

in terms of $L^2(\Omega \times (t_1, t_2))$. By the Hahn-Banach theorem, it suffices to prove the following statement: if $f \in L^2(\Omega \times (t_1, t_2))$ satisfies

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} f w \, dx dt = 0, \quad \forall w \in X, \quad (5.3)$$

it follows that

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} f v \, dx dt = 0, \quad \forall v \in Y. \quad (5.4)$$

To this aim, let $f \in L^2(\Omega \times (t_1, t_2))$ satisfy (5.3) and set

$$\tilde{f}(x, t) = \begin{cases} f(x, t) & \text{in } \Omega \times (t_1, t_2), \\ 0 & \text{in } \Omega \times ((0, t_1] \cup [t_2, T)). \end{cases}$$

Assume that $\tilde{v} \in H_0$ is the solution to the following backward wave equation:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{v}_{tt} - \Delta \tilde{v} + q\tilde{v} = \tilde{f} & \text{in } Q, \\ \tilde{v} = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \tilde{v}(x, T) = \tilde{v}_t(x, T) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.5)$$

Then for any solution $V \in C^2(\overline{Q})$ to (5.2) and $w = V|_{\Omega \times (t_1, t_2)}$, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} f w \, dx dt = \int_Q \tilde{f} V \, dx dt \\ &= \int_Q (\tilde{v}_{tt} - \Delta \tilde{v} + q\tilde{v}) V \, dx dt = \int_{\Sigma} \partial_{\nu} \tilde{v} \cdot V \, dS dt. \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Since $V|_{\Sigma}$ can be any arbitrary function in $C_0^{\infty}(0, T; C^{\infty}(\Gamma))$, we conclude that the associated solution V to (5.2) satisfies $V \in E^{m+2}$ and therefore, $\partial_{\nu} \tilde{v} = 0$ on Σ . This implies that the solution $\tilde{v} \in H_0$ to (5.5) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{v}_{tt} - \Delta \tilde{v} + q\tilde{v} = \tilde{f} & \text{in } Q, \\ \tilde{v} = \partial_{\nu} \tilde{v} = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \tilde{v}(x, T) = \tilde{v}_t(x, T) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

In particular, in the domain $\Omega \times ((0, t_1) \cup (t_2, T))$, \tilde{v} satisfies the following wave equation:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{v}_{tt} - \Delta \tilde{v} + q\tilde{v} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \times ((0, t_1) \cup (t_2, T)), \\ \tilde{v} = \partial_{\nu} \tilde{v} = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \tilde{v}(x, T) = \tilde{v}_t(x, T) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

By Remark 4.3 and the uniqueness of solutions to wave equations, we have that

$$\tilde{v} \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times ((0, t_1) \cup (t_2, T)).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{v}(\cdot, t_1) = \tilde{v}_t(\cdot, t_1) = \tilde{v}(\cdot, t_2) = \tilde{v}_t(\cdot, t_2) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \tilde{v} = \partial_{\nu} \tilde{v} = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma. \end{cases}$$

It follows that

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} f v \, dx dt = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} (\tilde{v}_{tt} - \Delta \tilde{v} + q\tilde{v}) v \, dx dt = 0,$$

for any $v \in C([t_1, t_2]; L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1([t_1, t_2]; H^{-1}(\Omega))$ with $v_{tt} - \Delta v + qv = 0$ in $\Omega \times (t_2, t_2)$ as desired. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.1. \square

Remark 5.1. *By the proof of Theorem 5.1, the Runge approximation still holds for the following more general hyperbolic equation:*

$$v_{tt} - \nabla \cdot (\sigma \nabla v) + qv = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (t_1, t_2),$$

where $\sigma = (\sigma^{ij}(x))_{i,j=1}^n \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ is a symmetric uniformly positive definite matrix-valued function in $\overline{\Omega}$ and (2.2) holds. Also, t_1 and t_2 satisfy $T^* < t_1 < t_2 < T$ for the T^* in Lemma 4.1.

Finally, we give a proof of Theorem 2.3.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. The whole proof is divided into five parts.

Step 1. Initiation

For $m > \frac{n}{2}$, consider the following (lateral) boundary data

$$h(x, t; \epsilon) = \sum_{\ell=1}^M \epsilon_{\ell} g_{\ell} \quad \text{on } \Sigma, \quad (5.7)$$

where $M \in \mathbb{N}$, $g_1, \dots, g_M \in \mathcal{N}_{m+1}$ and $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_M)$ is a parameter vector in \mathbb{R}^M with $|\epsilon| = \sum_{\ell=1}^M |\epsilon_{\ell}|$ sufficiently small, such that

$$\left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^M \epsilon_{\ell} g_{\ell} \right\|_{H^{m+1}(\Sigma)} < \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad \text{for the } \delta > 0 \text{ in Theorem 3.1.}$$

For $j = 1, 2$, let $u_j = u_j(x, t; \epsilon) \in E^{m+1}$ be solutions to

$$\begin{cases} u_{j,tt} - \Delta u_j + \tilde{f}_j(x, t, u_j) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ u_j = \sum_{\ell=1}^M \epsilon_{\ell} g_{\ell} & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ u_j(x, 0) = \varphi_j(x), \quad u_{j,t}(x, 0) = \psi_j(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

where $(\varphi_j, \psi_j) \in H_0^{m+1}(\Omega) \times H_0^m(\Omega)$ with $\|(\varphi_j, \psi_j)\|_{H_0^{m+1}(\Omega) \times H_0^m(\Omega)} < \delta/2$ and \tilde{f}_j are admissible coefficients. In particular, when $\epsilon = 0$, let $\tilde{u}_j = u_j(\cdot, \cdot; 0)$ be the solutions to

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}_{j,tt} - \Delta \tilde{u}_j + \tilde{f}_j(x, t, \tilde{u}_j) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \tilde{u}_j = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \tilde{u}_j(x, 0) = \varphi_j, \quad \tilde{u}_{j,t}(x, 0) = \psi_j & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.9)$$

We will apply the higher order linearization to the initial-boundary value problem (5.8) around the solution \tilde{u}_j to (5.9) in order to determine informations on \tilde{f}_j for $j = 1, 2$.

Step 2. The first order linearization ($M = 1$)

First, we linearize the equation (5.8) around \tilde{u}_j , where $\tilde{u}_j \in E^{m+1}$ is the solution to (5.9), for $j = 1, 2$. It is easy to show that for $j = 1, 2$ and $\ell = M = 1$ ³,

$$v_j^{(\ell)}(x, t) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{u_j(x, t) - \tilde{u}_j(x, t)}{\epsilon_{\ell}}$$

³In fact, the arguments hold for all $\ell = 1, \dots, M$, where we will use in steps 2-5.

satisfies the following wave equation:

$$\begin{cases} v_j^{(\ell)} - \Delta v_j^{(\ell)} + \tilde{q}_j v_j^{(\ell)} = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ v_j^{(\ell)} = g_\ell & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ v_j^{(\ell)}(x, 0) = v_{j,t}^{(\ell)}(x, 0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (5.10)$$

where

$$\tilde{q}_j(x, t) = \tilde{f}_{j,u}(x, t, \tilde{u}_j(x, t)) \quad \text{in } Q \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{q}_j \in E^{m+1}.$$

It is worth noting that both \tilde{u}_j and $v_j^{(\ell)}$ in (5.9) and (5.10) are still unknown, respectively, since they involve unknown coefficients and initial data. In this step, we will show that

$$\tilde{f}_{1,u}(x, t, \tilde{u}_1(x, t)) = \tilde{f}_{2,u}(x, t, \tilde{u}_2(x, t)) \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T). \quad (5.11)$$

Recall that we have the same input-output maps

$$\Lambda_{\varphi_1, \psi_1, \tilde{f}_1}^T(h) = \Lambda_{\varphi_2, \psi_2, \tilde{f}_2}^T(h), \quad \text{for any } h \in E_\delta.$$

Hence, with the same boundary data at hand, one has

$$\begin{aligned} v_1^{(\ell)}(x, 0) &= v_2^{(\ell)}(x, 0), & v_{1,t}^{(\ell)}(x, 0) &= v_{2,t}^{(\ell)}(x, 0), \\ v_1^{(\ell)}(x, T) &= v_2^{(\ell)}(x, T), & v_{1,t}^{(\ell)}(x, T) &= v_{2,t}^{(\ell)}(x, T), \\ v_1^{(\ell)}|_\Sigma &= v_2^{(\ell)}|_\Sigma, & \partial_\nu v_1^{(\ell)}|_\Sigma &= \partial_\nu v_2^{(\ell)}|_\Sigma, \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

for $\ell = M = 1$.

Now, subtracting (5.10) with $j = 1, 2$, we have

$$\begin{cases} v_{tt}^{(\ell)} - \Delta v^{(\ell)} + \tilde{q}_1 v^{(\ell)} = (\tilde{q}_2 - \tilde{q}_1) v_2^{(\ell)} & \text{in } Q, \\ v^{(\ell)} = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ v^{(\ell)}(x, 0) = v_t^{(\ell)}(x, 0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (5.13)$$

where $v^{(\ell)} := v_1^{(\ell)} - v_2^{(\ell)}$. Let $\tilde{v}_1^{(\ell)}$ be a solution to

$$\tilde{v}_{1,tt}^{(\ell)} - \Delta \tilde{v}_1^{(\ell)} + \tilde{q}_1 \tilde{v}_1^{(\ell)} = 0 \quad \text{in } Q. \quad (5.14)$$

Multiplying both sides of the first equation in (5.13) by $\tilde{v}_1^{(\ell)}$, by (5.12) and an integration by parts, yields that

$$\int_Q (\tilde{q}_2 - \tilde{q}_1) \tilde{v}_1^{(\ell)} v_2^{(\ell)} dx dt = 0. \quad (5.15)$$

With the admissible conditions in Definition 2.1, (5.15) is equivalent to

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_\Omega (\tilde{q}_2 - \tilde{q}_1) \tilde{v}_1^{(\ell)} v_2^{(\ell)} dx dt = 0. \quad (5.16)$$

In fact, by the above arguments, the equality (5.16) still holds for complex-valued solutions $\tilde{v}_1^{(\ell)}$ and $v_2^{(\ell)}$, respectively, to (5.10) with $j = 2$ and (5.14).

On the other hand, let \mathbf{v}_j ($j = 1, 2$) be the complex geometrical optics (CGO) solutions to

$$\mathbf{v}_{j,tt} - \Delta \mathbf{v}_j + \tilde{q}_j \mathbf{v}_j = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (t_1, t_2)$$

in the form in Appendix A:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_1(x, t) &= e^{-i\tau[\eta(x)+t]} a_1(x, t) + R_1^{(\tau)}(x, t), \\ \mathbf{v}_2(x, t) &= e^{i\tau[\eta(x)+t]} a_2(x, t) + R_2^{(\tau)}(x, t), \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

where i denotes the imaginary unit, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\tau| > 1$, $\eta(x) = |x - x_0|$ for an $x_0 \in \overline{\Omega}$ and $a_j(\cdot, \cdot)$ has the form (A.7). Also, $R_j^{(\tau)} \in L^2(Q)$ is the remainder term, which fulfills the conditions (A.1) and (A.2), for $j = 1, 2$.

By the Runge approximation (Theorem 5.1), there are two sequences of complex-valued functions $\{v_k^1\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{v_k^2\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that for $j = 1, 2$, $v_k^j \in C^2(\overline{Q}; \mathbb{C})$ is the solution to

$$\begin{cases} v_{k,tt}^j - \Delta v_k^j + \tilde{q}_j v_k^j = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ v_k^j(x, 0) = v_{k,t}^j(x, 0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (5.18)$$

and

$$v_k^j \rightarrow v_j \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega \times (t_1, t_2); \mathbb{C}), \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.19)$$

Choosing $\tilde{v}_1^{(\ell)} = v_k^1$ and $v_2^{(\ell)} = v_k^2$ in (5.16), and taking limit, as k tends to ∞ , one obtains

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} (\tilde{q}_2 - \tilde{q}_1) \mathbf{v}_1 \mathbf{v}_2 \, dx dt = 0. \quad (5.20)$$

It remains to analyze the product $\mathbf{v}_1 \mathbf{v}_2$ of CGO solutions.

By a direct computation, we have that

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} (\tilde{q}_2 - \tilde{q}_1) \mathbf{v}_1 \mathbf{v}_2 \, dx dt = \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I}_{\tau},$$

where

$$\mathbb{I} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} (\tilde{q}_2 - \tilde{q}_1) a_1 a_2 \, dx dt$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}_{\tau} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} (\tilde{q}_2 - \tilde{q}_1) & \left\{ e^{-i\tau[\eta(x)+t]} a_1(x, t) R_2^{(\tau)}(x, t) \right. \\ & \left. + e^{i\tau[\eta(x)+t]} a_2(x, t) R_1^{(\tau)}(x, t) + R_1^{(\tau)}(x, t) R_2^{(\tau)}(x, t) \right\} dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{q}_1, \tilde{q}_2, a_1$ and a_2 are uniformly bounded in Q , and $\|R_j^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (t_1, t_2))} \rightarrow 0$, as $|\tau| \rightarrow \infty$, for $j = 1, 2$, it follows that $\mathbb{I}_{\tau} \rightarrow 0$, as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, by taking limit, the integral identity (5.20) becomes

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} (\tilde{q}_2 - \tilde{q}_1) a_1(x, t) a_2(x, t) \, dx dt = 0. \quad (5.21)$$

It remains to prove that (5.21) implies $\tilde{q}_1 = \tilde{q}_2$ in Q . Since $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a compact smooth Riemannian manifold, by applying the similar arguments in [KO19, Section 2], we conclude that $\tilde{q}_1 = \tilde{q}_2$ in Q as desired. Meanwhile, set

$$q(x, t) = \tilde{q}_1(x, t) = \tilde{q}_2(x, t) \quad \text{in } Q. \quad (5.22)$$

By the uniqueness of solutions to (5.10), one has that

$$v^{(\ell)} := v_1^{(\ell)} = v_2^{(\ell)} \quad \text{in } Q, \quad \text{for } \ell = 1. \quad (5.23)$$

Step 3. The second order linearization ($M = 2$)

For $m = 2$, we differentiate (5.8) with respect to different parameters ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 . It is easy to show that the derivatives $w_j^{(2)}$ ($j = 1, 2$) satisfy

$$\begin{cases} w_{j,tt}^{(2)} - \Delta w_j^{(2)} + q(x,t)w_j^{(2)} + \tilde{f}_{j,uu}(x,t,\tilde{u}_j)v^{(1)}v^{(2)} = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ w_j^{(2)} = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ w_j^{(2)}(x,0) = w_{j,t}^{(2)}(x,0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (5.24)$$

where $q, \tilde{f}_{j,uu}(\cdot, \cdot, \tilde{u}_j) \in E^{m+1}$ and $v^{(1)}, v^{(2)} \in E^{m+1}$ satisfy

$$\begin{cases} v_{tt}^{(\ell)} - \Delta v^{(\ell)} + q(x,t)v^{(\ell)} = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ v^{(\ell)} = g_\ell & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ v^{(\ell)}(x,0) = v_t^{(\ell)}(x,0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

here $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{N}_{m+1}$ are arbitrarily given.

Next, we will prove that

$$\tilde{f}_{1,uu}(x,t,\tilde{u}_1(x,t)) = \tilde{f}_{2,uu}(x,t,\tilde{u}_2(x,t)) \quad \text{in } Q. \quad (5.25)$$

Similar to the arguments in the first order linearization, with the equal input-output maps at hand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} w_1^{(2)}(x,0) &= w_2^{(2)}(x,0), & w_{1,t}^{(2)}(x,0) &= w_{2,t}^{(2)}(x,0), \\ w_1^{(2)}(x,T) &= w_2^{(2)}(x,T), & w_{1,t}^{(2)}(x,T) &= w_{2,t}^{(2)}(x,T), \\ w_1^{(2)}\Big|_\Sigma &= w_2^{(2)}\Big|_\Sigma, & \partial_\nu w_1^{(2)}\Big|_\Sigma &= \partial_\nu w_2^{(2)}\Big|_\Sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

Let $v^{(0)}$ be any solution to

$$\begin{cases} v_{tt}^{(0)} - \Delta v^{(0)} + qv^{(0)} = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ v^{(0)}(x,0) = v_t^{(0)}(x,0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.27)$$

By subtracting the equations (5.24) associated to $j = 1, 2$, an integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_Q \left[\tilde{f}_{1,uu}(x,t,\tilde{u}_1(x,t)) - \tilde{f}_{2,uu}(x,t,\tilde{u}_2(x,t)) \right] v^{(0)}v^{(1)}v^{(2)} dxdt \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_\Omega \left[\tilde{f}_{1,uu}(x,t,\tilde{u}_1(x,t)) - \tilde{f}_{2,uu}(x,t,\tilde{u}_2(x,t)) \right] v^{(0)}v^{(1)}v^{(2)} dxdt = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

where we have used the admissible conditions for the coefficients.

As in the first step, we consider the CGO solutions \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 of the form (5.17). By using the Runge approximation again, similar to the arguments in the step 2, we have that

$$\left[\tilde{f}_{1,uu}(x,t,\tilde{u}_1(x,t)) - \tilde{f}_{2,uu}(x,t,\tilde{u}_2(x,t)) \right] v^{(0)}(x,t) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (t_1, t_2).$$

Hence, for any solution $v_{(0)}$ to (5.27),

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_\Omega \left[\tilde{f}_{1,uu}(x,t,\tilde{u}_1(x,t)) - \tilde{f}_{2,uu}(x,t,\tilde{u}_2(x,t)) \right] v^{(0)}v_{(0)} dxdt = 0.$$

By choosing the CGO solutions again, we have (5.25) as desired. Furthermore, by the uniqueness of solutions to (5.24), one can immediately obtain

$$w_1^{(2)} = w_2^{(2)} \quad \text{in } Q.$$

Step 4. The higher order linearization ($M > 2$)

By the higher order linearization and the method of induction, we may find M -th order derivative of (5.8) and prove that

$$\partial_u^M \tilde{f}_1(x, t, \tilde{u}_1(x, t)) = \partial_u^M \tilde{f}_2(x, t, \tilde{u}_2(x, t)) \quad \text{in } Q, \quad (5.29)$$

for any $M = 3, 4, \dots$. First, assume that

$$\partial_u^k \tilde{f}_1(x, t, \tilde{u}_1(x, t)) = \partial_u^k \tilde{f}_2(x, t, \tilde{u}_2(x, t)) \quad \text{in } Q, \quad \text{for any } k = 1, \dots, M-1.$$

Similar to previous steps, by differentiating (5.8) with respect to $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{M-1}$ and ϵ_M , one can obtain

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \left[\partial_u^M \tilde{f}_1(x, t, \tilde{u}_1(x, t)) - \partial_u^M \tilde{f}_2(x, t, \tilde{u}_2(x, t)) \right] v^{(0)} v^{(1)} \dots v^{(M)} dx dt = 0,$$

where $v^{(\ell)}$ ($\ell = 0, 1, \dots, M$) are solutions to (5.27).

Applying the similar approximation properties in Step 3, we have that

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\Omega} \left[\partial_u^M \tilde{f}_1(x, t, u_1^{(0)}(x, t)) - \partial_u^M \tilde{f}_2(x, t, u_2^{(0)}(x, t)) \right] v^{(0)} \mathbf{v}_1 \mathbf{v}_2 v^{(3)} \dots v^{(M)} dx dt = 0, \quad (5.30)$$

where \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 are CGO solutions of the form (5.17). This implies that

$$\left[\partial_u^M \tilde{f}_1(x, t, u_1^{(0)}(x, t)) - \partial_u^M \tilde{f}_2(x, t, u_2^{(0)}(x, t)) \right] v^{(0)} v^{(3)} \dots v^{(M)} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (t_1, t_2).$$

Similar to Step 3, if M is odd, we take successively CGO solutions $v^{(0)}$ and $v^{(3)}, \dots, v^{(M-1)}$ and $v^{(M)}$. Otherwise, we add a CGO solution to this equality, in order to guarantee even solutions to be multiplied together. It follows that

$$\partial_u^M \tilde{f}_1(x, t, \tilde{u}_1(x, t)) = \partial_u^M \tilde{f}_2(x, t, \tilde{u}_2(x, t)) \quad \text{in } Q. \quad (5.31)$$

Step 5. The determination of initial data and coefficients

Recall that \tilde{u}_j ($j = 1, 2$) are the solutions to the following semilinear wave equation:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}_{j,tt} - \Delta \tilde{u}_j + \tilde{f}_j(x, t, \tilde{u}_j) = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \tilde{u}_j = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \tilde{u}_j(x, 0) = \varphi_j, \quad \tilde{u}_{j,t}(x, 0) = \psi_j & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

By the admissible property of \tilde{f}_1 and \tilde{f}_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{f}_1(x, t, \tilde{u}_1(x, t)) - \tilde{f}_2(x, t, \tilde{u}_2(x, t)) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\partial_u^k \tilde{f}_2(x, t, \tilde{u}_2(x, t))}{k!} \left[-\tilde{u}_2(x, t) \right]^k - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\partial_u^k \tilde{f}_1(x, t, \tilde{u}_1(x, t))}{k!} \left[-\tilde{u}_1(x, t) \right]^k \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\partial_u^k \tilde{f}_1(x, t, \tilde{u}_1(x, t)) (-1)^k}{k!} \left\{ \left[\tilde{u}_2(x, t) \right]^k - \left[\tilde{u}_1(x, t) \right]^k \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

Since both \tilde{u}_1 and \tilde{u}_2 are bounded, set $R = \|\tilde{u}_1\|_{L^\infty(Q)} + \|\tilde{u}_2\|_{L^\infty(Q)}$. Then, for any $L > 0$ and $(x, t) \in Q$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{\tilde{f}_1(x, t, \tilde{u}_1(x, t)) - \tilde{f}_2(x, t, \tilde{u}_2(x, t))}{\tilde{u}_1(x, t) - \tilde{u}_2(x, t)} \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\partial_u^k \tilde{f}_1(x, t, \tilde{u}_1(x, t))}{k!} (-1)^{k+1} \left\{ [\tilde{u}_1(x, t)]^{k-1} + [\tilde{u}_1(x, t)]^{k-2} \tilde{u}_2(x, t) + \cdots \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \tilde{u}_1(x, t) [\tilde{u}_2(x, t)]^{k-2} + [\tilde{u}_2(x, t)]^{k-1} \right\} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left| \partial_u^k \tilde{f}_1(x, t, \tilde{u}_1(x, t)) \right| \frac{R^{k-1}}{(k-1)!} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{kR^{k-1}}{L^k} \sup_{|z - \tilde{u}_1(x, t)| = L} |\tilde{f}_1(x, t, z)|. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $L = 2(R + 1)$. By the admissibility of \tilde{f}_1 and \tilde{f}_2 ,

$$G(\cdot, \cdot) = \frac{\tilde{f}_1(\cdot, \cdot, \tilde{u}_1(\cdot, \cdot)) - \tilde{f}_2(\cdot, \cdot, \tilde{u}_2(\cdot, \cdot))}{\tilde{u}_1(\cdot, \cdot) - \tilde{u}_2(\cdot, \cdot)} \in L^\infty(Q).$$

Set $w = \tilde{u}_1 - \tilde{u}_2$. It is easy to see that

$$\begin{cases} w_{tt} - \Delta w + Gw = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ w = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ w(x, 0) = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2, \quad w_t(x, 0) = \psi_1 - \psi_2 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

By $\Lambda_{\varphi_1, \psi_1, \tilde{f}_1}^T(0) = \Lambda_{\varphi_2, \psi_2, \tilde{f}_2}^T(0)$ and the observability result in Lemma 4.1,

$$\varphi_1 = \varphi_2, \quad \psi_1 = \psi_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{u}_1 = \tilde{u}_2.$$

By (5.32),

$$\tilde{f}_1(x, t, \tilde{u}_1(x, t)) = \tilde{f}_2(x, t, \tilde{u}_2(x, t)) \quad \text{in } Q.$$

Furthermore, notice that for $j = 1, 2$ and any $(x, t, z) \in Q \times \mathbb{C}$,

$$\tilde{f}_j(x, t, z) = \tilde{f}_j(x, t, \tilde{u}_j(x, t)) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\partial_u^k \tilde{f}_j(x, t, \tilde{u}_j(x, t))}{k!} (z - \tilde{u}_j(x, t))^k.$$

This implies that $\tilde{f}_1(x, t, z) = \tilde{f}_2(x, t, z)$ in $Q \times \mathbb{C}$. \square

Remark 5.2. *It is worth mentioning that the boundedness of CGO solutions plays an essential role in the proof of Theorem 2.3. With the higher order linearization technique at hand, one can expect the integral identity (5.30) holds, with products of M solutions of the (linear) wave equation.*

- (1) *In the elliptic case, one may choose $v^{(1)}$ and $v^{(2)}$ as suitable CGO solutions, such that $\{v^{(1)}v^{(2)}\}$ forms a dense subset in $L^1(Q)$. Meanwhile, by applying the maximum principle for the second order linear elliptic equations, it is not hard to construct bounded positive solutions $v^{(3)}, \dots, v^{(M)}$, such that one can easily derive the global uniqueness result.*
- (2) *In the hyperbolic case, we do not have the maximum principle and therefore, we do not know the sign and boundedness of certain solutions $v^{(3)}, \dots, v^{(M)}$ in the integral identity (5.30). Hence, we seek for the CGO solutions. Indeed, when the CGO solutions are of the form (5.17), they are bounded in Q . We refer the readers to Appendix A for more details about CGO solutions used in our work.*

• **Conclusion.**

In this work, we use different measurements to study related inverse problems.

- (1) By using the passive measurement, we are able to determine the initial data, whenever zeroth order coefficients are known a priori.
- (2) By using the (partial) active measurement, we can determine the initial data, even if coefficients are unknown (under suitable assumptions of coefficients, see Section 4).
- (3) By posing the admissible conditions on the coefficients, one can recover the initial data and coefficients simultaneously via the hyperbolic type Runge approximation and the completeness products of solutions for wave equations.
- (4) The nonlinearity helps us to study the simultaneous recovery inverse problem. In our approach, when we used the first linearization, the unknown initial data disappeared in the first linearized wave equation (5.10). However, to our best knowledge, for the linear counterpart, Theorem 2.3 stays open whenever $\tilde{f}(x, t, u)$ is replaced by $q(x, t)u$ ⁴.

APPENDIX A. COMPLEX GEOMETRICAL OPTICS (CGO) SOLUTIONS

In this section, let us review the known complex geometrical optics (CGO) solutions for wave equations with potential. We follow the ideas of Kian-Oksanen [KO19] and give exponential type solutions to a wave equation.

Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary Γ , for $n \geq 2$ and t_1, t_2 be two positive numbers with $t_1 < t_2$ ⁵. For any $q \in E^{m+1}$, consider the wave equation:

$$v_{tt} - \Delta v + qv = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (t_1, t_2)$$

and its CGO solutions of the form

$$v(x, t) = a(x, t)e^{i\tau[\eta(x)+t]} + R^{(\tau)}(x, t) \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (t_1, t_2),$$

where τ is a real number with $|\tau| > 1$, $\eta(x) = |x - x_0|$ for an $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{\Omega}$, and $R^{(\tau)}$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} R_{tt}^{(\tau)} - \Delta R^{(\tau)} + qR^{(\tau)} = -e^{i\tau(|x-x_0|+t)}(a_{tt} - \Delta a + qa) & \text{in } \Omega \times (t_1, t_2), \\ R^{(\tau)} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma \times (t_1, t_2), \\ R^{(\tau)}(x, t_1) = R_t^{(\tau)}(x, t_1) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and

$$\lim_{|\tau| \rightarrow \infty} \|R^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (t_1, t_2))} = 0. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Furthermore, $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies

$$2a_t - 2\nabla\eta \cdot \nabla a - \Delta\eta a = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (t_1, t_2). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x_0 = 0$ in the following arguments. By (A.3), $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies the following equation:

$$a_t - \frac{x}{|x|} \cdot \nabla a - \frac{n-1}{2|x|} a = 0. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

As in [KO19], we write $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in terms of the polar coordinate $(r, \theta) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and (A.4) becomes

$$a_t - a_r - \frac{b_r}{4b} \cdot a = 0, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

⁴It seems hard to develop some technique to separate the coefficients and initial data into different equations.

⁵In the applications, the numbers t_1, t_2 are given by Definition 2.1.

where

$$b(r, \theta) = \det g_0(r, \theta) \text{ and the metric takes the form } g(r, \theta) = dr^2 + g_0(r, \theta). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

For any $h = h(\theta) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, $\chi(\cdot) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mu > 0$, set

$$a(r, \theta, t) = e^{-\frac{\mu(r+t)}{2}} \chi(r+t) h(\theta) b(r, \theta)^{-\frac{1}{4}}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Then a in (A.7) is the desired solution to the transport equation (A.5). Similarly, $v(x, t) = a(x, t)e^{-i\tau[\eta(x)+t]} + R^{(\tau)}(x, t)$ is also the CGO solution to the wave equation.

Acknowledgment. The work of Y.-H. Lin is partially supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology Taiwan, under the Columbus Program: MOST-110-2636-M-009-007. The work of H. Liu is supported by a startup fund from City University of Hong Kong and the Hong Kong RGC General Research Funds (projects 12301420, 12302919 and 12301218).

REFERENCES

- [BHKS18] Tommi Brander, Bastian Harrach, Manas Kar, and Mikko Salo. Monotonicity and enclosure methods for the p -Laplace equation. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 78(2):742–758, 2018.
- [CB08] Yvonne Choquet-Bruhat. *General relativity and the Einstein equations*. OUP Oxford, 2008.
- [CLOP19] Xi Chen, Matti Lassas, Lauri Oksanen, and Gabriel P Paternain. Detection of Hermitian connections in wave equations with cubic non-linearity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.05711*, 2019.
- [dHUW18] Maarten de Hoop, Gunther Uhlmann, and Yiran Wang. Nonlinear interaction of waves in elastodynamics and an inverse problem. *Mathematische Annalen*, pages 1–31, 2018.
- [DLL19] Youjun Deng, Jinhong Li, and Hongyu Liu. On identifying magnetized anomalies using geophysical monitoring. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 231(1):153–187, 2019.
- [DLL20] Youjun Deng, Jinhong Li, and Hongyu Liu. On identifying magnetized anomalies using geophysical monitoring within a magnetohydrodynamic model. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 235(1):691–721, 2020.
- [DLU19] Youjun Deng, Hongyu Liu, and Gunther Uhlmann. On an inverse boundary problem arising in brain imaging. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 267(4):2471–2502, 2019.
- [DZZ08] Thomas Duyckaerts, Xu Zhang, and Enrique Zuazua. On the optimality of the observability inequalities for parabolic and hyperbolic systems with potentials. In *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, volume 25, pages 1–41. Elsevier, 2008.
- [FO20] Ali Feizmohammadi and Lauri Oksanen. An inverse problem for a semi-linear elliptic equation in Riemannian geometries. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 269(6):4683–4719, 2020.
- [FYZ07] Xiaoyu Fu, Jiongmin Yong, and Xu Zhang. Exact controllability for multidimensional semilinear hyperbolic equations. *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, 46(5):1578–1614, 2007.
- [IN95] Victor Isakov and A Nachman. Global uniqueness for a two-dimensional elliptic inverse problem. *Trans. of AMS*, 347:3375–3391, 1995.
- [IS94] Victor Isakov and John Sylvester. Global uniqueness for a semilinear elliptic inverse problem. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 47(10):1403–1410, 1994.
- [Isa93] Victor Isakov. On uniqueness in inverse problems for semilinear parabolic equations. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 124(1):1–12, 1993.
- [IY13] Oleg Imanuvilov and Masahiro Yamamoto. Unique determination of potentials and semilinear terms of semilinear elliptic equations from partial Cauchy data. *J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl.*, 21(1):85–108, 2013.
- [KKL01] Alexander Kachalov, Yaroslav Kurylev, and Matti Lassas. *Inverse boundary spectral problems*. CRC Press, 2001.
- [KLOU14] Yaroslav Kurylev, Matti Lassas, Lauri Oksanen, and Gunther Uhlmann. Inverse problem for einstein-scalar field equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.4776*, 2014.
- [KLU18a] Yaroslav Kurylev, Matti Lassas, and G. Uhlmann. Inverse problems for Lorentzian manifolds and non-linear hyperbolic equations. *Invent. Math.*, 212(3):781–857, 2018.
- [KLU18b] Yaroslav Kurylev, Matti Lassas, and Gunther Uhlmann. Inverse problems for Lorentzian manifolds and non-linear hyperbolic equations. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 212(3):781–857, 2018.
- [KN02] Hyeonbae Kang and Gen Nakamura. Identification of nonlinearity in a conductivity equation via the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map. *Inverse Problems*, 18(4):1079, 2002.

- [KO19] Yavar Kian and Lauri Oksanen. Recovery of time-dependent coefficient on Riemannian manifold for hyperbolic equations. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2019(16):5087–5126, 2019.
- [KU20a] Katya Krupchyk and Gunther Uhlmann. Partial data inverse problems for semilinear elliptic equations with gradient nonlinearities. *Mathematical Research Letters*, to appear, 2020.
- [KU20b] Katya Krupchyk and Gunther Uhlmann. A remark on partial data inverse problems for semilinear elliptic equations. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 148(2):681–685, 2020.
- [Lin20] Yi-Hsuan Lin. Monotonicity-based inversion of fractional semilinear elliptic equations with power type nonlinearities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.07163*, 2020.
- [LL19] Ru-Yu Lai and Yi-Hsuan Lin. Global uniqueness for the fractional semilinear Schrödinger equation. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 147(3):1189–1199, 2019.
- [LL20] Ru-Yu Lai and Yi-Hsuan Lin. Inverse problems for fractional semilinear elliptic equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.00549*, 2020.
- [LLLS20] Matti Lassas, Tony Liimatainen, Yi-Hsuan Lin, and Mikko Salo. Partial data inverse problems and simultaneous recovery of boundary and coefficients for semilinear elliptic equations. *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana*, 37(4):1553–1580, 2020.
- [LLLS21] Matti Lassas, Tony Liimatainen, Yi-Hsuan Lin, and Mikko Salo. Inverse problems for elliptic equations with power type nonlinearities. *Journal de mathématiques pures et appliquées*, 145:44–82, 2021.
- [LLM19] Jingzhi Li, Hongyu Liu, and Shiqi Ma. Determining a random Schrödinger equation with unknown source and potential. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 51(4):3465–3491, 2019.
- [LLM21] Jingzhi Li, Hongyu Liu, and Shiqi Ma. Determining a random Schrödinger operator: both potential and source are random. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 381(2):527–556, 2021.
- [LLPMT20] Matti Lassas, Tony Liimatainen, Leyter Potenciano-Machado, and Teemu Tyni. Uniqueness and stability of an inverse problem for a semi-linear wave equation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.13193*, 2020.
- [LLPMT21] Matti Lassas, Tony Liimatainen, Leyter Potenciano-Machado, and Teemu Tyni. Stability estimates for inverse problems for semi-linear wave equations on Lorentzian manifolds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.12257*, 2021.
- [LLS20] Matti Lassas, Tony Liimatainen, and Mikko Salo. The Poisson embedding approach to the Calderón problem. *Mathematische Annalen*, 377(1):19–67, 2020.
- [LLST20] Tony Liimatainen, Yi-Hsuan Lin, Mikko Salo, and Teemu Tyni. Inverse problems for elliptic equations with fractional power type nonlinearities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.04944*, 2020.
- [Lü13] Qi Lü. Observability estimate and state observation problems for stochastic hyperbolic equations. *Inverse Problems*, 29(9):095011, 2013.
- [LU15] Hongyu Liu and Gunther Uhlmann. Determining both sound speed and internal source in thermo-and photo-acoustic tomography. *Inverse Problems*, 31(10):105005, 2015.
- [LUW17] Matti Lassas, Gunther Uhlmann, and Yiran Wang. Determination of vacuum space-times from the Einstein-Maxwell equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.10704*, 2017.
- [LUW18] Matti Lassas, Gunther Uhlmann, and Yiran Wang. Inverse problems for semilinear wave equations on Lorentzian manifolds. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 360:555–609, 2018.
- [LW07] Xiaosheng Li and Jenn-Nan Wang. Determination of viscosity in the stationary Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 242(1):24–39, 2007.
- [LZ00] Liangyu Li and Xu Zhang. Exact controllability for semilinear wave equations. *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications*, 250(2):589–597, 2000.
- [MU] Claudio Munoz and Gunther Uhlmann. The Calderón problem for quasilinear elliptic equations. *arXiv:1806.09586*.
- [NVW20] Gen Nakamura, Manmohan Vashisth, and Michiyuki Watanabe. Inverse initial boundary value problem for a non-linear hyperbolic partial differential equation. *Inverse Problems*, 37(1):015012, 2020.
- [Pos87] Jurgen Poschel. *Inverse spectral theory*. Academic Press, 1987.
- [SU97] Ziqi Sun and Gunther Uhlmann. Inverse problems in quasilinear anisotropic media. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 119(4):771–797, 1997.
- [Sun96] Ziqi Sun. On a quasilinear inverse boundary value problem. *Math. Z.*, 221(2):293–305, 1996.
- [Sun05] Ziqi Sun. Conjectures in inverse boundary value problems for quasilinear elliptic equations. *Cubo*, 7(3):65–73, 2005.

- [Sun10] Ziqi Sun. An inverse boundary-value problem for semilinear elliptic equations. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations (EJDE)[electronic only]*, 37:1–5, 2010.
- [SZ12] Mikko Salo and Xiao Zhong. An inverse problem for the p-Laplacian: boundary determination. *SIAM journal on mathematical analysis*, 44(4):2474–2495, 2012.
- [Uhl09] Gunther Uhlmann. Electrical impedance tomography and Calderón’s problem. *Inverse Problems*, 25:123011, 2009.
- [WZ19] Yiran Wang and Ting Zhou. Inverse problems for quadratic derivative nonlinear wave equations. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 44(11):1140–1158, 2019.

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL YANG MING CHIAO TUNG UNIVERSITY, HSINCHU 30050, TAIWAN

Email address: `yihuanlin3@gmail.com`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CITY UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG, KOWLOON, HONG KONG SAR, CHINA

Email address: `hongyu.liuip@gmail.com`, `hongyliu@cityu.edu.hk`

KEY LABORATORY OF APPLIED STATISTICS OF MOE, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, NORTHEAST NORMAL UNIVERSITY, CHANGCHUN, CHINA

Email address: `liux216@nenu.edu.cn`