

Analysis and simulation of a variational stabilization for the Helmholtz equation with noisy Cauchy data

Vo Anh Khoa^{a,*}, Nguyen Dat Thuc^b, Ajith Gunaratne^a

^aDepartment of Mathematics, Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, FL 32307, USA

^bDepartment of Mathematics and Computer Science, VNUHCM-University of Science, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Abstract

This article considers a Cauchy problem of Helmholtz equations whose solution is well known to be exponentially unstable with respect to the inputs. In the framework of variational quasi-reversibility method, a Fourier truncation is applied to appropriately perturb the underlying problem, which allows us to obtain a stable approximate solution. The corresponding approximate problem is of a hyperbolic equation, which is also a crucial aspect of this approach. Error estimates between the approximate and true solutions are derived with respect to the noise level. From this analysis, the Lipschitz stability with respect to the noise level follows. Some numerical examples are provided to see how our numerical algorithm works well.

Keywords: Stabilization, Helmholtz equation, Ill-posed problems, Convergence, Error estimates

2010 MSC: 65J05, 65J20, 35K92

1. Introduction

1.1. Statement of the Cauchy problem

In this work, we are concerned with the reconstruction problem of electromagnetic field from its knowledge on a part of boundary of the physical region Ω . Here, $\Omega = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$ is our computational domain of interest, but it can be extended easily to $(0, a_1) \times (0, a_2)$, where a_1, a_2 are two positive numbers. Often, the propagation of the electromagnetic wave field is governed by the system of the Maxwell's equations for the electric field $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}(x, y, t)$ and the magnetic field $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}(x, y, t)$. Considering Ω as a homogeneous medium in a region with free currents and charges, this system can be reduced to the classical wave equations, cf. [1],

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{E}}{\partial t^2} - c^2 \Delta \mathbf{E} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{B}}{\partial t^2} - c^2 \Delta \mathbf{B} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \quad (1)$$

where $c > 0$ is the speed of light and $T > 0$ is the travel time. Consider the frequency $\omega > 0$. For $i = \sqrt{-1}$, we take $\mathbf{E}(x, y, t) = e^{i\omega t} \mathbf{E}(x, y)$ and $\mathbf{B}(x, y, t) = e^{i\omega t} \mathbf{B}(x, y)$. Then, setting $k = \omega/c > 0$, it follows from system (1) that

$$\Delta \mathbf{E}(x, y) + k^2 \mathbf{E}(x, y) = 0, \quad \Delta \mathbf{B}(x, y) + k^2 \mathbf{B}(x, y) = 0, \quad (2)$$

which form a system of Helmholtz equations. Since system (2) is uncoupled and linear with respect to each component of $\mathbf{E}(x, y)$ and $\mathbf{B}(x, y)$, it is pertinent to solve the following model:

$$\Delta u(x, y) + k^2 u(x, y) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (3)$$

Note that in (2), $\mathbf{E}(x, y)$ and $\mathbf{B}(x, y)$ are complex-valued components, but it is sufficient to find a real-valued function $u = u(x, y)$ in (3). Physically, fields vanish far from the axes and thus, we can assume that the electromagnetic field vanishes on the sides $\{y = 0\}$ and $\{y = 1\}$ of the computational domain Ω . Mathematically, we consider

$$u(x, 0) = u(x, 1) = 0 \quad \text{for } x \in (0, 1). \quad (4)$$

*This work was supported by the Faculty Research Awards Program (FRAP) at Florida A&M University, under the project "Approximation of a time-reversed reaction-diffusion system in cancer cell population dynamics" (007633).

*Corresponding author

Email address: anhkhao.vo@fam.u.edu (Vo Anh Khoa)

On the other hand, we assume to measure the electromagnetic Cauchy data at $\{x = 0\}$,

$$u(0, y) = u_0(y), \quad u_x(0, y) = u_1(y) \quad \text{for } y \in (0, 1). \quad (5)$$

Cf. [2], we remark that the second data (i.e. the Neumann data at $x = 0$) in (5) can be reduced to the zero boundary condition. In fact, let $U = U(x, y)$ be a solution to the following system:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta U(x, y) + k^2 U(x, y) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ U(x, 0) = U(x, 1) = 0 & \text{for } x \in (0, 1), \\ U_x(0, y) = u_1(y), U(1, y) = 0 & \text{for } y \in (0, 1). \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Next, consider $V = V(x, y)$ as a solution to the following system:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta V(x, y) + k^2 V(x, y) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ V(x, 0) = V(x, 1) = 0 & \text{for } x \in (0, 1), \\ V(0, y) = u_0(y) - U(0, y), V_x(0, y) = 0 & \text{for } y \in (0, 1). \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

With (6) and (7), it is clear that the solution u to system (3)–(5) can be computed via $u = U + V$. By [2, Lemma 1], we know that system (6) is well-posed with U in $H^2(\Omega)$ when $u_1 \in L^2(0, 1)$ and thus, $U(0, y)$ exists in $H^2(0, 1)$ by the embedding $H^2(\Omega) \subset C([0, 1]; H^2(0, 1))$. Henceforth, from (7), instead of working on the Cauchy data (5) we can assume that $u_1 = 0$ in (5) in our analysis below.

Combining (3), (4) and (5) with $u_1 = 0$ forms our Cauchy problem for the Helmholtz equation. In this scenario, we want to reconstruct the whole wave field in Ω and especially, the field at the boundary $x = 1$.

Remark 1. Cf. the appendix of [3], if the incident electric wave field has only one non-zero component, then the propagation of this component in a heterogeneous medium is governed equally well by a single Helmholtz equation. In other words, the Helmholtz equation may play an equal role as the Maxwell's system when the medium is no longer homogeneous as assumed above.

Remark 2. Mathematically, our numerical approach under investigation below can be extended easily to the nonhomogeneous case of (3)–(5). In particular, our method can solve the following system of u :

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(x, y) + k^2 u(x, y) = f(x, y) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u(x, 0) = b_0(x), \quad u(x, 1) = b_1(x) & \text{for } x \in (0, 1), \\ u(0, y) = u_0(y), \quad u_x(0, y) = u_1(y) & \text{for } y \in (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

In this context, our problem for V remains the same as in (7). The problem for U should then read as

$$\begin{cases} \Delta U(x, y) + k^2 U(x, y) = f(x, y) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ U(x, 0) = b_0(x), \quad U(x, 1) = b_1(x) & \text{for } x \in (0, 1), \\ U_x(0, y) = u_1(y), \quad U(1, y) = 0 & \text{for } y \in (0, 1), \end{cases}$$

which is a well-posed boundary value problem.

1.2. Historical remarks and our goals

The Cauchy problem for Helmholtz equations (as well as elliptic equations) is well-studied in the Inverse and Ill-posed Problems community. Suffering from the Hadamard instability, this problem is severely ill-posed as the degree of ill-posedness is infinite; see [4] for distinctive classes of ill-posed problems based on the degree of ill-posedness. To overcome the natural instability, there are many researches devoted to regularization of such a Cauchy problem. Those are essentially spectral-based and optimization-based methods. The existing literature on these two types of methods is huge. The spectral regularization method and its variants rely on suitable perturbation of the unbounded kernel involved in the explicit presentation of solution. The kernel can be stabilized by the perturbation of the original PDE or by the direct perturbation inside the kernel. The former perturbation may lead to the so-called PDE-based regularization method. The reader can be referred to the following fundamental works [5, 6, 7, 8] and references cited therein for an overview of the spectral regularization method. The optimization-based regularization method is based on the construction of Tikhonov-like cost functionals involving the (strict) convexity; cf. e.g. [9, 10, 11]. The obtained minimizer is proved to approximate the true solution in a stable manner. It is necessary to mention here the works [12, 13], where a Carleman weight is appropriately applied to "convexify" the energy functional logarithmically. Lastly,

we wish to mention that the Cauchy problem posed in unbounded domains has also been considered in, e.g., [14, 15].

Different from the above-mentioned regularization methods, we would like to study in this work a modified quasi-reversibility (QR) method, which is a PDE-based approach. The QR method was originally mentioned in the monograph by Lattès and Lions; see [16] by perturbing the unbounded operator - the main cause of the instability. The modified QR method under investigation has been commenced in the pioneering work [17], where the authors established two operators along with their conditional estimates to guarantee the strong convergence of the scheme solving quasi-linear parabolic equations backwards in time. The key ingredient of the method is that using a suitable perturbation, the ill-posed problem turns to be a forward-like problem in which we can prove its conditional well-posedness. It is, on the other hand, certain that numerical solutions for forward problems are well-studied nowadays. Recently, this modified QR method has been applied to the Cauchy problem for the Laplace system in [18]. In this regard, we regularize the Cauchy-Laplace problem by the corresponding initial-value hyperbolic problem. Using the same idea, in the present work, we verify the applicability of this method to solve the Cauchy problem for the Helmholtz equation. By the possible involvement of large frequencies k , we, however, remark that the perturbation should be chosen appropriately. Accordingly, we focus ourselves on specific perturbation and stabilized operators.

1.3. Organization of the paper

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we recall some preliminaries concerning the ill-posedness of the Cauchy problem and how we derive the modified QR scheme from the original PDE. We also specify the perturbation operator and the corresponding stabilized operator in our regularized problem. Conditional estimates of these operators are deduced accordingly. Then, we analyze the conditional well-posedness of the regularized problem and the strong convergence of the scheme in section 3. The Lipschitz stability of the scheme also follows. In section 4, we investigate the corresponding iterative scheme. Finally, some numerical examples are provided in section 5 to corroborate our theoretical analysis.

2. Preliminaries

Let A be either a Banach space or a Hilbert space. We call A' the dual space of A . For a certain Banach space A , $\|\cdot\|_A$ stands for the A -norm. When A is Hilbert, we define the A -norm of u as $\|u\|_A^2 = \langle u, u \rangle_A$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_A$ is the corresponding inner product. Throughout the paper, we will use $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ to indicate either the scalar product in $L^2(0, 1)$ or the dual pairing of a continuous linear functional and an element of a function space. We thereby denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the $L^2(0, 1)$ -norm.

The Cauchy problem of Helmholtz equation is well known to be unstable with respect to any small perturbation of the data. Based on the zero Dirichlet boundary condition (4), the Laplace operator $-\partial^2/\partial y^2$ is non-negative. According to the standard result for the Dirichlet eigenvalue problem, there exists an orthonormal basis $\{\phi_j\}$ of $L^2(0, 1)$ such that $\phi_j \in H^1(0, 1) \cap C^\infty[0, 1]$ and $-d^2/dy^2 \phi_j(y) = \mu_j \phi_j(y)$. The Dirichlet eigenvalues μ_j in this case form an infinite sequence such that $0 \leq \mu_0 < \mu_1 < \mu_2 < \dots$, and $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j = \infty$. It follows from (3) and (5) that we obtain the following initial-value differential system:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle - \lambda_{j,k} \langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle = 0, \\ \langle u(0, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle = \langle u_0, \phi_j \rangle, \quad \frac{d}{dx} \langle u(0), \phi_j \rangle = 0. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

In (8), $\lambda_{j,k} = \mu_j - k^2$. By this way, we solve system (8) in each of the following set of Fourier frequencies:

$$A_1 := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_{j,k} > 0\}, \quad A_2 := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_{j,k} = 0\}, \quad A_3 := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_{j,k} < 0\}.$$

It is also straightforward to see that $\phi_j(y) = \sqrt{2} \sin(j\pi y)$, $\mu_j = j^2\pi^2$. In addition, $\{\phi'_j/\sqrt{\mu_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(0, 1)$. Therefore, it holds that

$$\|u_y\|^2 = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \left| \left\langle u_y, \frac{\phi'_j}{\sqrt{\mu_j}} \right\rangle \right|^2 = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \left| \left\langle u, \frac{\phi''_j}{\sqrt{\mu_j}} \right\rangle \right|^2 = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mu_j |\langle u, \phi_j \rangle|^2. \quad (9)$$

Theorem 1. *The Fourier coefficient $\langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle$ has the form:*

$$\langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle = \begin{cases} \cosh(\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}x) \langle u_0, \phi_j \rangle & \text{in } A_1, \\ \cos(\sqrt{-\lambda_{j,k}}x) \langle u_0, \phi_j \rangle & \text{in } A_3. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Proof. Proof of the theorem can be proceeded as in [2]. In A_1 , solving system (8) gives

$$\langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle = C_1 e^{x\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}} + C_2 e^{-x\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}}. \quad (11)$$

Therefore, when $x = 0$, it yields

$$\langle u_0, \phi_j \rangle = \langle u(0, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle = C_1 + C_2. \quad (12)$$

On the other hand, we compute that

$$\frac{d}{dx} \langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}} (C_1 e^{x\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}} - C_2 e^{-x\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}}).$$

When $x = 0$, we arrive at

$$0 = \frac{d}{dx} \langle u(0, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}} (C_1 - C_2) \quad (13)$$

Combining (12) and (13), we have $C_1 = C_2 = \frac{1}{2} \langle u_0, \phi_j \rangle$. By back-substitution of these C_1 and C_2 into (11), the Fourier coefficient of u is formulated by

$$\langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle = \cosh(\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}x) \langle u_0, \phi_j \rangle. \quad (14)$$

In A_3 , we do the same way and obtain $\langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle = \cos(\sqrt{-\lambda_{j,k}}x) \langle u_0, \phi_j \rangle$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Now, we show a very important relation of these Fourier frequencies in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Taking into account set A_1 , the Fourier coefficient of u satisfies the following relation:*

$$\lambda_{j,k} e^{(1-x)\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}} \left(\langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}} \langle u_x(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \right) = \lambda_{j,k} \langle u(1, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle + \sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}} \langle u_x(1, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle. \quad (15)$$

Proof. From (14), we can compute that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}} \langle u_x(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle = \sinh(\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}x) \langle u_0, \phi_j \rangle. \quad (16)$$

Thus, we take $x = 1$ in (16) and in (14) and then combine the resulting formulations to obtain (15). We complete the proof of the theorem. \square

Practically, the data u_0 in (5) always contain noise of measurement. Therefore, we assume to have $u_0^\varepsilon \in H^1(0, 1)$ as the noisy data such that for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0\|_{H^1(0,1)} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (17)$$

By Theorem 1, our Cauchy problem is exponentially unstable in A_1 due to the natural growth of the hyperbolic cosine function. Any small perturbation of the initial data u_0 may cause a huge error when computing solution u of the Cauchy problem. In this work, we then adapt our recent modified quasi-reversibility method (cf. [18] for elliptic operators and [17] for parabolic operators) to solve our system (3)–(5). To do so, we rewrite (3) as

$$u_{xx} - u_{yy} + 2u_{yy} + 2k^2u = k^2u. \quad (18)$$

We then perturb (18) by a linear mapping \mathbf{Q} and take $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{Q} + 2\partial^2/\partial y^2 + 2k^2$. Henceforth, we arrive at

$$u_{xx} - u_{yy} + \mathbf{P}u = k^2u \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (19)$$

It is worth mentioning that together with the boundary condition (4) and the Cauchy data (5) with measurement u_0^ε , (19) forms a system of linear wave equation. Herewith, x becomes a parametric time variable. Since the noise level ε is involved, we then seek a sequence of $\{u^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ satisfying the following system:

$$\begin{cases} u_{xx}^\varepsilon - u_{yy}^\varepsilon + \mathbf{P}u^\varepsilon = k^2u^\varepsilon & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u^\varepsilon(x, 0) = u^\varepsilon(x, 1) = 0 & \text{for } x \in (0, 1), \\ u^\varepsilon(0, y) = u_0^\varepsilon(y), \quad u_x^\varepsilon(0, y) = 0 & \text{for } y \in (0, 1). \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Cf. [18, 17], \mathbf{Q} is called *perturbation* as it is to “absorb” high Fourier frequencies in the Laplace operator, and \mathbf{P} is called *stabilized operator* as it only contains large enough Fourier frequencies serving for the convergence of the scheme. Let $\gamma > 1$. Consider $B := \{j \in A_1 : \lambda_{j,k} > \log^2(\gamma)\}$. We choose the following truncation operator:

$$\mathbf{Q}u(x, \cdot) = 2 \sum_{j \in B} \lambda_{j,k} \langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \phi_j + 2 \sum_{j \in A_3} \lambda_{j,k} \langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \phi_j := \mathbf{Q}_1 u(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{Q}_2 u(x, \cdot). \quad (21)$$

As to the corresponding stabilized operator \mathbf{P} , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}u(x, \cdot) &= 2 \sum_{j \in B \cup A_3} \lambda_{j,k} \langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \phi_j - 2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_j \langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \phi_j + 2k^2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \phi_j \\ &= 2 \sum_{j \in B \cup A_3} (\lambda_{j,k} - \mu_j) \langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \phi_j - 2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus (B \cup A_3)} \mu_j \langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \phi_j + 2k^2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \phi_j \\ &= -2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus (B \cup A_3)} \lambda_{j,k} \langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \phi_j. \end{aligned}$$

In view of Parseval’s identity, we now estimate that

$$\|\mathbf{Q}_1 u(x, \cdot)\|^2 = 4 \sum_{j \in B} e^{-2\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}} \lambda_{j,k}^2 e^{2\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}} |\langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle|^2 \leq 4\gamma^{-2} \sum_{j \in B} \lambda_{j,k}^2 e^{2\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}} |\langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle|^2. \quad (22)$$

By using (15) obtained in Theorem 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{x \in [0,1]} \sum_{j \in B} \lambda_{j,k}^2 e^{2\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}} |\langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle|^2 \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in [0,1]} \left[\sum_{j \in B} \lambda_{j,k}^2 e^{2(1-x)\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}} \left(\langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}}} \langle u_x(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in B} \left(\lambda_{j,k} \langle u(1, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle + \sqrt{\lambda_{j,k}} \langle u_x(1, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \right)^2 \leq 2 \|u(1, \cdot)\|_{H^2(0,1)}^2 + 2 \|u_x(1, \cdot)\|_{H^1(0,1)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

by means of $\langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \langle u_x(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \geq 0$; cf. (14) and (16). Now we estimate $\mathbf{Q}_2 u$ as follows. Observe that if $\log(\gamma) \geq k$, then $\mu_i - k^2 \geq k^2 - \mu_j > 0$ for $i \in B$ and $j \in A_3$. This means that $\lambda_{i,k} \geq |\lambda_{j,k}|$ for $i \in B$ and $j \in A_3$. Therefore, we estimate that

$$\|\mathbf{Q}_2 u(x, \cdot)\|^2 = 4 \sum_{j \in A_3} |\lambda_{j,k}|^2 |\langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle|^2 \leq 4 \sum_{j \in B} |\lambda_{j,k}|^2 |\langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle|^2 = \|\mathbf{Q}_1 u(x, \cdot)\|^2. \quad (23)$$

Henceforth, we can assume that the true solution satisfies $u(1, \cdot) \in H^2(0, 1)$ and $u_x(1, \cdot) \in H^1(0, 1)$ to gain the strong convergence of the scheme. Note now that \mathbf{P} is computable, which is relevant to our numerical simulation, compared to many other modified kernel regularization methods. Moreover, since in $\mathbb{N} \setminus (B \cup A_3)$ it holds that $0 \leq \lambda_{j,k} \leq \log^2(\gamma)$, we, according to Parseval’s identity and using (9), get that

$$\|\mathbf{P}u(x, \cdot)\|^2 \leq 4 \log^2(\gamma) \|u_y(x, \cdot)\|^2. \quad (24)$$

Remark 3. In section 3 below, we will prove that the approximate solution u^ε approaches u under an appropriate choice of γ dependent of the noise level ε . Complying with that, we below denote our operators by \mathbf{Q}_ε and \mathbf{P}_ε in lieu of, as above, \mathbf{Q} and \mathbf{P} , respectively.

3. Analysis of the regularization scheme

We now formulate theorems for the weak solvability of system (20) and convergence analysis of the corresponding regularization scheme. When doing so, we provide the definition of weak solution as follows.

Definition 1 (Weak solution). *For each $\varepsilon > 0$, a function $u^\varepsilon : [0, 1] \rightarrow H_0^1(0, 1)$ is said to be a weak solution to system (20) if*

- $u^\varepsilon \in C([0, 1]; H_0^1(0, 1)), \partial_x u^\varepsilon \in C([0, 1]; L^2(0, 1)), \partial_{x^2}^2 u^\varepsilon \in L^2(0, 1; (H^1(0, 1))')$;

- For every test function $\psi \in H_0^1(0, 1)$, it holds that

$$\left\langle \frac{\partial^2 u^\varepsilon}{\partial x^2}, \psi \right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} \right\rangle + \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon u^\varepsilon, \psi \rangle = k^2 \langle u^\varepsilon, \psi \rangle \quad \text{for a.e. in } (0, 1); \quad (25)$$

- $u^\varepsilon(0) = u_0^\varepsilon \in H^1(0, 1)$, $\partial_x u^\varepsilon(0) = 0$.

Theorem 3 (Existence and uniqueness of a weak regularized solution). *For each $\varepsilon > 0$, system (20) admits a unique weak solution in the sense of Definition 1. Moreover, it holds that $u^\varepsilon \in C([0, 1]; H_0^1(0, 1))$ and $\partial_x u^\varepsilon \in C([0, 1]; L^2(0, 1))$.*

Proof. To prove this theorem, we employ the standard Galerkin approximation. Consider the n -dimensional of $H_0^1(0, 1)$ generated by $\phi_0, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_n$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we take into account the following Galerkin projection for approximation of (20):

$$u_n^\varepsilon(x, y) = \sum_{j=0}^n U_{jn}^\varepsilon(x) \phi_j(y). \quad (26)$$

This function u_n^ε is hereby the solution of the following approximate equation:

$$\left\langle \frac{\partial^2 u_n^\varepsilon}{\partial x^2}, \psi \right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{\partial u_n^\varepsilon}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} \right\rangle + \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon u_n^\varepsilon, \psi \rangle = k^2 \langle u_n^\varepsilon, \psi \rangle \quad \text{for } \psi \in \mathbb{S}_n \text{ and a.e. in } (0, 1). \quad (27)$$

This Galerkin equation is endowed with the initial data $\partial_x u_n^\varepsilon(0, y) = 0$ and

$$u_n^\varepsilon(0, y) = \sum_{j=0}^n (U_0^\varepsilon)_{jn} \phi_j(y) \xrightarrow{\text{strongly in } H^1(0, 1)} u_0^\varepsilon \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (28)$$

Now, let $\psi = \phi_j$, where recall that $\{\phi_j\}$ is the orthonormal basis of $L^2(0, 1)$. Then functions U_{jn}^ε are solutions to the Cauchy problem for the system of n vectorial ordinary differential equations:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} U_{jn}^\varepsilon + (\mu_j - k^2) U_{jn}^\varepsilon + \sum_{i=0}^n U_{in}^\varepsilon \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon \phi_i, \phi_j \rangle = 0, \\ U_{jn}^\varepsilon(0) = (U_0^\varepsilon)_{jn}, \frac{d}{dx} U_{jn}^\varepsilon(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we put $Z_{jn}^\varepsilon = dU_{jn}^\varepsilon/dx$. It then deduces from (29) that

$$\frac{d}{dx} \begin{bmatrix} U_{jn}^\varepsilon \\ Z_{jn}^\varepsilon \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ k^2 - \mu_j & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U_{jn}^\varepsilon \\ Z_{jn}^\varepsilon \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\sum_{i=0}^n U_{in}^\varepsilon \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon \phi_i, \phi_j \rangle \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} U_{jn}^\varepsilon(0) \\ Z_{jn}^\varepsilon(0) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (U_0^\varepsilon)_{jn} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $z_{jn}^\varepsilon = [U_{jn}^\varepsilon, Z_{jn}^\varepsilon]^T$. Then solving the above closed-form initial-value differential problem, we obtain the following integral equation:

$$z_{jn}^\varepsilon(x) = z_{jn}^\varepsilon(0) + A_j^k \int_0^x z_{jn}^\varepsilon(s) ds + \int_0^x F_j(z^\varepsilon)(s) ds. \quad (30)$$

In (30), we denote by

$$A_j^k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ k^2 - \mu_j & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad F_j(z^\varepsilon) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\sum_{i=0}^n U_{in}^\varepsilon \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon \phi_i, \phi_j \rangle \end{bmatrix}.$$

We now define $z^\varepsilon = [z_{0n}^\varepsilon, z_{1n}^\varepsilon, \dots, z_{nn}^\varepsilon] \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n+1)}$ and denote $H_j[z^\varepsilon]$ by the right-hand side of (30). This results in the fixed-point form $z^\varepsilon(x) = H[z^\varepsilon](x)$ where $H[z^\varepsilon] = [H_0[z^\varepsilon], H_1[z^\varepsilon], \dots, H_n[z^\varepsilon]]$. Define the norm of $Y = C([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^{2(n+1)})$ as

$$\|c\|_Y = \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} \sum_{j=0}^n |c_j(x)|, \quad c(x) = [c_0(x), c_1(x), \dots, c_n(x)] \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n+1)}. \quad (31)$$

We claim that there exists $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that the operator $H^{m_0} := H[H^{m_0-1}] : Y \rightarrow Y$ is a contraction mapping. Indeed, by induction we can prove that

$$|H_j^m[z_1^\varepsilon](x) - H_j^m[z_2^\varepsilon](x)| \leq \left[\sqrt{1 + (k^2 - \mu_j)^2} + 2 \log(\gamma) \right]^m \frac{x^m}{m!} \|z_1^\varepsilon - z_2^\varepsilon\|_Y \quad (32)$$

for $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and for any $z_1^\varepsilon, z_2^\varepsilon \in Y$. Observe that the inductive hypothesis is true when $m = 1$. In particular, in view of the fact that

$$\langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon \phi_i, \phi_j \rangle = \begin{cases} -2\lambda_{i,k} & \text{if } i = j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus (B \cup A_3), \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere,} \end{cases}$$

we can estimate that

$$\begin{aligned} |H_j[z_1^\varepsilon](x) - H_j[z_2^\varepsilon](x)| &\leq \int_0^x \left(\sqrt{1 + (k^2 - \mu_j)^2} |z_{1j}^\varepsilon(s) - z_{2j}^\varepsilon(s)| + \sum_{i=0}^n |U_{1i}^\varepsilon - U_{2i}^\varepsilon| |\langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon \phi_i, \phi_j \rangle| \right) ds \\ &\leq \int_0^x \left(\sqrt{1 + (k^2 - \mu_j)^2} |z_{1j}^\varepsilon(s) - z_{2j}^\varepsilon(s)| + \sum_{i=0}^n 2|\lambda_{i,k}| |U_{1j}^\varepsilon - U_{2j}^\varepsilon| \right) ds \\ &\leq \left[\sqrt{1 + (k^2 - \mu_j)^2} + 2 \log(\gamma) \right] x \|z_1^\varepsilon - z_2^\varepsilon\|_Y. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

For $m = m_0 > 1$, we assume that

$$|H_j^{m_0}[z_1^\varepsilon](x) - H_j^{m_0}[z_2^\varepsilon](x)| \leq \left[\sqrt{1 + (k^2 - \mu_j)^2} + 2 \log(\gamma) \right]^m \frac{x^{m_0}}{m_0!} \|z_1^\varepsilon - z_2^\varepsilon\|_Y.$$

We then want to prove that (32) also holds true for $m = m_0 + 1$. Using the same token as in (33), we estimate that

$$\begin{aligned} |H_j^{m_0+1}[z_1^\varepsilon](x) - H_j^{m_0+1}[z_2^\varepsilon](x)| &\leq \int_0^x \left[\sqrt{1 + (k^2 - \mu_j)^2} + 2 \log(\gamma) \right] |H_j^{m_0}[z_1^\varepsilon](s) - H_j^{m_0}[z_2^\varepsilon](s)| ds \\ &\leq \int_0^x \left[\sqrt{1 + (k^2 - \mu_j)^2} + 2 \log(\gamma) \right]^{m_0+1} \frac{s^{m_0}}{m_0!} \|z_1^\varepsilon - z_2^\varepsilon\|_Y ds \\ &= \left[\sqrt{1 + (k^2 - \mu_j)^2} + 2 \log(\gamma) \right]^{m_0+1} \frac{x^{m_0+1}}{(m_0+1)!} \|z_1^\varepsilon - z_2^\varepsilon\|_Y \end{aligned}$$

Henceforth, our inductive hypothesis (32) is true for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$. It also leads to the following estimate in the norm of Y :

$$\|H^m[z_1^\varepsilon] - H^m[z_2^\varepsilon]\|_Y \leq \sum_{j=0}^n \left[\sqrt{1 + (k^2 - \mu_j)^2} + 2 \log(\gamma) \right]^m \frac{x^m}{m!} \|z_1^\varepsilon - z_2^\varepsilon\|_Y.$$

Since the following limit holds true

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^n \left[\sqrt{1 + (k^2 - \mu_j)^2} + 2 \log(\gamma) \right]^m \frac{x^m}{m!} = 0$$

we then can find $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \left[\sqrt{1 + (k^2 - \mu_j)^2} + 2 \log(\gamma) \right]^{m_0} \frac{x^{m_0}}{m_0!} < 1.$$

This clearly indicates the existence of a constant $K \in [0, 1)$ satisfies $\|H^{m_0}[z_1^\varepsilon] - H^{m_0}[z_2^\varepsilon]\|_Y \leq K \|z_1^\varepsilon - z_2^\varepsilon\|_Y$. In other words, H^{m_0} is a contraction mapping from Y onto itself. By the Banach fixed-point theorem, there exists a unique $z^\varepsilon \in Y$ such that $H^{m_0}[z^\varepsilon] = z^\varepsilon$. As $H^{m_0}[H[z^\varepsilon]] = H[H^{m_0}[z^\varepsilon]] = H[z^\varepsilon]$, the integral equation $z^\varepsilon = H[z^\varepsilon]$ admits a unique solution in Y . Hence, this results in the existence and uniqueness of $U_{jn}^\varepsilon \in C^1([0, 1])$ solutions to system (29) for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

By $U_{jn}^\varepsilon \in C^1([0, 1])$, we have $\partial_x u_n^\varepsilon \in C([0, 1]; \mathbb{S}_n)$. Multiply both sides of (27) by e^{-rx} and then put $v_n^\varepsilon = e^{-rx} u_n^\varepsilon$. Therefore, we obtain the Galerkin equation for v_n^ε as follows:

$$\left\langle \frac{\partial^2 v_n^\varepsilon}{\partial x^2}, \psi \right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{\partial v_n^\varepsilon}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} \right\rangle + 2r \left\langle \frac{\partial v_n^\varepsilon}{\partial x}, \psi \right\rangle + \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon v_n^\varepsilon, \psi \rangle = (k^2 - r^2) \langle v_n^\varepsilon, \psi \rangle \quad \text{for } \psi \in \mathbb{S}_n \text{ and a.e. in } (0, 1). \quad (34)$$

Thus, we choose $\psi = \partial_x v_n^\varepsilon$ in (34) and $r > k$ to get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dx} \left[\|\partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 + (r^2 - k^2) \|v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 \right] \\ &= -2 \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot) \rangle - 4r \|\partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 \leq 2 \log(\gamma) \|\partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 + 2 \log(\gamma) \|\partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

By integrating the estimate (35) with respect to x , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 + (r^2 - k^2) \|v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 &\leq \|\partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)\|^2 + (r^2 - k^2) \|v_n^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \log(\gamma) \int_0^x \left(\|\partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(s, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(s, \cdot)\|^2 \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

By using Gronwall's inequality, we thus get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 + (r^2 - k^2) \|v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 \\ \leq \left(\|\partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)\|^2 + (r^2 - k^2) \|v_n^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)\|^2 \right) \gamma^{2x}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Since $v_n^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) = u_n^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)$ and $\partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) = -r v_n^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) + \partial_x u_n^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of n such that $\|\partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)\|^2 + (r^2 - k^2) \|v_n^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)\|^2 \leq C$; cf. (28) and (17). Therefore, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v_n^\varepsilon \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0, 1; H^1(0, 1)), \\ \partial_x v_n^\varepsilon \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0, 1; L^2(0, 1)). \end{aligned}$$

By the Banach–Alaoglu theorem, we can extract a subsequence of v_n^ε (which we still denote by $\{v_n^\varepsilon\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$) such that for each $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_n^\varepsilon &\rightarrow v^\varepsilon \text{ weakly-* in } L^\infty(0, 1; H^1(0, 1)), \\ \partial_x v_n^\varepsilon &\rightarrow \partial_x v^\varepsilon \text{ weakly-* in } L^\infty(0, 1; L^2(0, 1)). \end{aligned}$$

Let \mathbb{S}_n^\perp is a closed subspace of $H_0^1(0, 1)$ such that $H_0^1(0, 1) = \mathbb{S}_n \oplus \mathbb{S}_n^\perp$. For all $\psi \in H_0^1(0, 1)$, we can write ψ of the form $\psi = \psi_n + \psi_n^\perp$ where $\psi_n \in \mathbb{S}_n$ and $\psi_n^\perp \in \mathbb{S}_n^\perp$. Using the Galerkin equation (34), we can show that $\partial_{x^2}^2 v_n^\varepsilon \in L^2(0, 1; \mathbb{S}_n)$. In particular, for $\psi_n \in \mathbb{S}_n$, we have

$$\langle \partial_{x^2}^2 v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi_n \rangle = -\langle \partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \partial_y \psi_n \rangle - 2r \langle \partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi_n \rangle - \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi_n \rangle + (k^2 - r^2) \langle v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi_n \rangle.$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and the fact that $\|\psi_n\|_{H_0^1(0, 1)} \leq \|\psi\|_{H_0^1(0, 1)}$ with $\psi = \psi_n + \psi_n^\perp$, we have

$$|\langle \partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \partial_y \psi_n \rangle| \leq \|\partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\| \|\partial_y \psi_n\| \leq \|\partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\| \|\psi\|_{H_0^1(0, 1)}, \quad (37)$$

$$|\langle \partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi_n \rangle| \leq \|\partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\| \|\psi_n\| \leq \|\partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\| \|\psi\|_{H_0^1(0, 1)}, \quad (38)$$

$$|\langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi_n \rangle| \leq \|\mathbf{P}_\varepsilon v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\| \|\psi_n\| \leq 2 \log(\gamma) \|\partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\| \|\psi\|_{H_0^1(0, 1)}, \quad (39)$$

$$|\langle v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi_n \rangle| \leq \|v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\| \|\psi_n\| \leq \|v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\| \|\psi\|_{H_0^1(0, 1)}. \quad (40)$$

Thus, combining the above four estimates (37), (38), (39) and (40), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_{x^2}^2 v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|_{H^{-1}(0, 1)} &= \sup_{\psi \in H^1(0, 1) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\langle \partial_{x^2}^2 v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi \rangle}{\|\psi\|_{H_0^1(0, 1)}} \\ &= \sup_{\psi \in H^1(0, 1) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{-\langle \partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \partial_y \psi_n \rangle - 2r \langle \partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi_n \rangle - \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi_n \rangle + (k^2 - r^2) \langle v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi_n \rangle}{\|\psi\|_{H_0^1(0, 1)}} \\ &\leq C \left[\|\partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\| + \|\partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\| + (r^2 - k^2) \|v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Henceforth, we can find a constant $C > 0$ independent of n to bound the H^{-1} norm of $\partial_{x^2}^2 v_n^\varepsilon$ in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_{x^2}^2 v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|_{H^{-1}(0, 1)} &= \sup_{\psi \in H^1(0, 1) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\langle \partial_{x^2}^2 v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi \rangle}{\|\psi\|_{H_0^1(0, 1)}} \\ &= \sup_{\psi \in H^1(0, 1) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{-\langle \partial_y v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \partial_y \psi_n \rangle - 2r \langle \partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi_n \rangle - \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi_n \rangle + (k^2 - r^2) \langle v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \psi_n \rangle}{\|\psi\|_{H_0^1(0, 1)}} \\ &\leq C \left(\|\partial_x v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\| + \|v_n^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|_{H^1(0, 1)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Square the above estimate, integrate the resulting estimate with respect to x and then apply (36). By the Banach–Alaoglu theorem, we can choose a subsequence of v_n^ε so that

$$\partial_{x^2}^2 v_n^\varepsilon \rightarrow \partial_{x^2}^2 v^\varepsilon \text{ weakly in } L^2(0, 1; H^{-1}(0, 1)).$$

Now, we combine the above weak-star and weak limits to conclude that the limit function v^ε satisfies

$$v^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(0, 1; H_0^1(0, 1)), \quad \partial_x v^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(0, 1; L^2(0, 1)), \quad \partial_{x^2}^2 v^\varepsilon \in L^2(0, 1; H^{-1}(0, 1)), \quad (42)$$

which, by back-substitution $u_n^\varepsilon = e^{rx} v_n^\varepsilon$, leads to

$$u^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(0, 1; H_0^1(0, 1)), \quad \partial_x u^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(0, 1; L^2(0, 1)), \quad \partial_{x^2}^2 u^\varepsilon \in L^2(0, 1; H^{-1}(0, 1)). \quad (43)$$

Note that the first and second properties in (43) are obtained directly from (42). Meanwhile, the last property in (43) can be deduced from (27) using the same token as in (41). Moreover, using the Aubin-Lions lemma and the Rellich-Kondrachov embedding theorem $H_0^1(0, 1) \subset L^2(0, 1)$ for the first and second properties in (43), we find that

$$u_n^\varepsilon \rightarrow u^\varepsilon \text{ strongly in } L^2(0, 1; H_0^1(0, 1)). \quad (44)$$

Now, we multiply both sides of the Galerkin equation (27) by an x -dependent test function $\tilde{w} \in C_c^\infty(0, 1)$, then by integrate the resulting equation with respect to x to get

$$\int_0^1 \left\langle \frac{\partial^2 u_n^\varepsilon}{\partial x^2}, \nu \right\rangle dx + \int_0^1 \left\langle \frac{\partial u_n^\varepsilon}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial y} \right\rangle dx + \int_0^1 \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon u_n^\varepsilon, \nu \rangle dx = k^2 \int_0^1 \langle u_n^\varepsilon, \nu \rangle dx.$$

where we have denoted by $\nu = \nu(x, y) = \tilde{w}(x)\psi(y)$ for $\psi \in \mathbb{S}_n$. Henceforth, we pass the limit of this equation as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and obtain

$$\int_0^1 \left\langle \frac{\partial^2 u^\varepsilon}{\partial x^2}, \nu \right\rangle dx + \int_0^1 \left\langle \frac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial y} \right\rangle dx + \int_0^1 \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon u^\varepsilon, \nu \rangle dx = k^2 \int_0^1 \langle u^\varepsilon, \nu \rangle dx. \quad (45)$$

The convergence of the second, third and fourth terms in the limit equation (45) is deduced using (44). We remark that the limit equation (45) holds for $\nu = \tilde{w}\psi$ with $\psi \in H_0^1(0, 1)$. In addition, since $\tilde{w} \in C_c^\infty(0, 1)$ is arbitrary, our function u^ε obtained from approximate solutions u_n^ε satisfies the weak formulation (27) for every test function $\psi \in H_0^1(0, 1)$. Besides, exploiting the Aubin-Lions lemma and the Gelfand triple $H_0^1(0, 1) \subset L^2(0, 1) \subset H^{-1}(0, 1)$, (43) gives

$$u^\varepsilon \in C([0, 1]; H_0^1(0, 1)), \quad \partial_x u^\varepsilon \in C([0, 1], L^2(0, 1)). \quad (46)$$

Next, we verify the initial data by the following arguments. We take an arbitrary x -dependent function $\kappa \in C^1([0, 1])$ satisfying $\kappa(0) = 1$ and $\kappa(1) = 0$. By the second argument in (43), we have

$$\int_0^1 \langle \partial_x u_n^\varepsilon, \psi \rangle \kappa(x) dx \rightarrow \int_0^1 \langle \partial_x u^\varepsilon, \psi \rangle \kappa(x) dx \text{ for } \psi \in L^2(0, 1).$$

Then using integration by parts, we arrive at

$$-\langle u_n^\varepsilon(0), \psi \rangle \kappa(0) - \int_0^1 \langle u_n^\varepsilon, \psi \rangle \kappa_x dx \rightarrow -\langle u^\varepsilon(0), \psi \rangle \kappa(0) - \int_0^1 \langle u^\varepsilon, \psi \rangle \kappa_x dx.$$

Henceforth, by the first argument in (43), we obtain the limit $\langle u_n^\varepsilon(0), \psi \rangle \rightarrow \langle u^\varepsilon(0), \psi \rangle$ for all $\psi \in H_0^1(0, 1)$. By the strong H^1 convergence of u_n^ε designated in (28), we obtain $\langle u_n^\varepsilon(0), \psi \rangle \rightarrow \langle u_0^\varepsilon, \psi \rangle$ for all $\psi \in H^1(0, 1)$. By the uniqueness of limit, it holds true that $\langle u^\varepsilon(0), \psi \rangle = \langle u_0^\varepsilon, \psi \rangle$ for all $\psi \in H^1(0, 1)$. Thus, $u^\varepsilon(0) = u_0^\varepsilon$ for a.e. in $(0, 1)$. We complete the existence result for system (20).

Now, let u_1^ε and u_2^ε be two weak solutions to system (20) that we have obtained in the above part. Consider $d^\varepsilon = e^{-rx}(u_1^\varepsilon - u_2^\varepsilon)$. Similar to (34), d^ε satisfies the following wave equation:

$$\left\langle \frac{\partial^2 d^\varepsilon}{\partial x^2}, \psi \right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{\partial d^\varepsilon}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} \right\rangle + 2r \left\langle \frac{\partial d^\varepsilon}{\partial x}, \psi \right\rangle + \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon d^\varepsilon, \psi \rangle = (k^2 - r^2) \langle d^\varepsilon, \psi \rangle \quad \text{for } \psi \in H_0^1(0, 1). \quad (47)$$

Taking in (47) $\psi = \partial_x d^\varepsilon$, we follow the same process of getting (36). Thus, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_x d^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\partial_y d^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 + (r^2 - k^2) \|d^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 \\ & \leq \left(\|\partial_x d^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)\|^2 + \|\partial_y d^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)\|^2 + (r^2 - k^2) \|d^\varepsilon(0, \cdot)\|^2 \right) \gamma^{2x}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Since u_1^ε and u_2^ε have the same boundary and initial data, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} d^\varepsilon(0, y) &= u_1^\varepsilon(0, y) - u_2^\varepsilon(0, y) = 0, \\ \partial_x d^\varepsilon(0, y) &= -r d^\varepsilon(0, y) + \partial_x u_1^\varepsilon(0, y) - \partial_x u_2^\varepsilon(0, y) = 0, \\ \partial_y d^\varepsilon(0, y) &= \partial_y u_1^\varepsilon(0, y) - \partial_y u_2^\varepsilon(0, y) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the left-hand side of (48) is non-positive for $r > k$, which indicates the uniqueness result for system (20). Hence, we complete the proof of the theorem. \square

It is worth mentioning that the weight e^{-rx} is employed in the proof of Theorem 3. Commonly, this is called *Carleman weight*, playing a vital role not only in prove the existence and uniqueness results, but also in convergence estimates of regularization schemes for inverse and ill-posed problems. This is manifested in the present PDE-approach as well as its variant for ill-posed parabolic problems; cf. [17, 18]. In the so-called convexification method, which is a Tikhonov-like regularization technique, the Carleman weight is used to “convexify” nonlinear cost functionals to obtain a unique minimizer; cf. e.g. [19, 20, 21, 22]. The use of the smooth weight e^{-rx} in the present work is based on the following reasons. First, it maximizes the presence of initial data since the weight is exponentially decreasing. Second, it helps to control large stability estimate of the stabilized operator (i.e. the term $\log(\gamma)$ as $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$) as well as the presence of terms involving k that negatively affect the energy estimates. Below, we continue to apply the Carleman weight to prove the distance between regularized solution u^ε and true solution u in Theorem 4. Then, convergence results follow.

Theorem 4 (Rigorous mixed error estimates). *Let $u \in C([0, 1]; H^2(0, 1)) \cap C^1([0, 1]; H^1(0, 1))$ be a unique solution of the Cauchy problem (3)–(5). Let $M > 0$ independent of ε and k be such that the true solution satisfies $\|u\|_{C([0, 1]; H^2(0, 1)) \cap C^1([0, 1]; H^1(0, 1))} \leq M$. Let u^ε be a unique weak solution of system (20) as defined in Definition 1 and analyzed in Theorem 3. Assume that $\log(\gamma) \geq k$ holds true. Then, the following mixed L^2 - H^1 error estimates hold true for any $\rho > k$:*

$$\|u^\varepsilon(x, \cdot) - u(x, \cdot)\|^2 \leq \left[\frac{(\rho^2 + 1)\varepsilon^2}{\rho^2 - k^2} + \varepsilon^2 + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\rho x})\rho^{-1}M^2\gamma^{-2}}{8k(\rho^2 - k^2)} \right] \gamma^{2x} e^{2\rho x}, \quad (49)$$

$$\|u_y^\varepsilon(x, \cdot) - u_y(x, \cdot)\|^2 \leq \left[(\rho^2 + 1)\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^2(\rho^2 - k^2) + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\rho x})\rho^{-1}M^2\gamma^{-2}}{8k} \right] \gamma^{2x} e^{2\rho x}, \quad (50)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_x^\varepsilon(x, \cdot) - u_x(x, \cdot)\|^2 \\ & \leq \left[(\rho^2 + 1)\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^2(\rho^2 - k^2) + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\rho x})\rho^{-1}M^2\gamma^{-2}}{8k} \right] \gamma^{2x} e^{2\rho x} \left[e^{\rho x} + \frac{\rho}{\rho^2 - k^2} \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Proof. Let $w = e^{-\rho x}(u^\varepsilon - u)$ where $\rho > 0$ is a constant needed to be chosen latter. From (18) and (20), we are capable of computing the difference equation. In particular, the diffence function w satisfies the following damped wave equation:

$$w_{xx} - w_{yy} + 2\rho w_x + (\rho^2 - k^2)w = -\mathbf{P}_\varepsilon w - e^{-\rho x}\mathbf{Q}_\varepsilon u. \quad (52)$$

This equation is associated with the Dirichlet boundary condition and the initial conditions

$$\begin{cases} w(x, 0) = w(x, 1) = 0 & \text{for } x \in [0, 1], \\ w(0, y) = u_0^\varepsilon(y) - u_0(0), \quad \partial_x w(0, y) = -\rho w(0, y) & \text{for } x \in [0, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

Multiplying both sides of (52) by w_x and integrating the resulting equation with respect to y from 0 to 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dx} \|w_x(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \frac{d}{dx} \|w_y(x, \cdot)\|^2 + 4\rho \|w_x(x, \cdot)\|^2 \\ & + (\rho^2 - k^2) \frac{d}{dx} \|w(x, \cdot)\|^2 = -2 \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon w(x, \cdot), w_x(x, \cdot) \rangle - 2e^{-\rho x} \langle \mathbf{Q}_\varepsilon u(x, \cdot), w_x(x, \cdot) \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

or equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\rho^2 - k^2} \frac{d}{dx} \left(\|w_x(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \|w_y(x, \cdot)\|^2 \right) + \frac{4\rho}{\rho^2 - k^2} \|w_x(x, \cdot)\|^2 \\ & + \frac{d}{dx} \|w(x, \cdot)\|^2 = -\frac{2}{\rho^2 - k^2} \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon w(x, \cdot), w_x(x, \cdot) \rangle - \frac{2e^{-\rho x}}{\rho^2 - k^2} \langle \mathbf{Q}_\varepsilon u(x, \cdot), w_x(x, \cdot) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Now, we use the energy estimates of the perturbing and stabilized operator deduced in (22), (23), (24). Then applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we estimate two terms in the right-hand side of (55) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2}{\rho^2 - k^2} |\langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon w(x, \cdot), w_x(x, \cdot) \rangle| \leq \frac{2}{\rho^2 - k^2} \|\mathbf{P}_\varepsilon w(x, \cdot)\| \|w_x(x, \cdot)\| \leq \frac{4\log(\gamma)}{\rho^2 - k^2} \|w_y(x, \cdot)\| \|w_x(x, \cdot)\| \\ & \leq \frac{2\log(\gamma)}{\rho^2 - k^2} \|w_y(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \frac{2\log(\gamma)}{\rho^2 - k^2} \|w_x(x, \cdot)\|^2, \\ & \frac{2e^{-\rho x}}{\rho^2 - k^2} |\langle \mathbf{Q}_\varepsilon u(x, \cdot), w_x(x, \cdot) \rangle| \leq \frac{2e^{-\rho x}}{\rho^2 - k^2} \|\mathbf{Q}_\varepsilon u(x, \cdot)\| \|w_x(x, \cdot)\| \leq \frac{e^{-2\rho x} M^2 \gamma^{-2}}{4k(\rho^2 - k^2)} + \frac{4k \|w_x(x, \cdot)\|^2}{\rho^2 - k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating (52) with respect to x from 0 to ξ , then the left-hand side of (55) is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\rho^2 - k^2} \left(\|w_x(\xi, \cdot)\|^2 + \|w_y(\xi, \cdot)\|^2 \right) + \|w(\xi, \cdot)\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\rho^2 - k^2} \left(\|w_x(0, \cdot)\|^2 + \|w_y(0, \cdot)\|^2 \right) + \|w(0, \cdot)\|^2 \\ & + \int_0^\xi \left[\frac{2 \log(\gamma)}{\rho^2 - k^2} \|w_y(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \frac{2 \log(\gamma)}{\rho^2 - k^2} \|w_x(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \frac{e^{-2\rho x} M^2 \gamma^{-2}}{4k(\rho^2 - k^2)} \right] dx + \int_0^\xi \frac{4k - 4\rho}{\rho^2 - k^2} \|w_x(x, \cdot)\|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

In (56), we choose ρ arbitrarily such that $\rho > k$. Furthermore, at $x = 0$, the difference function w and its gradients are bounded, according to (17), by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\rho^2 - k^2} \left(\|w_x(0, \cdot)\|^2 + \|w_y(0, \cdot)\|^2 \right) + \|w(0, \cdot)\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\rho^2 - k^2} \left(\rho^2 \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0\|^2 + \|\partial_y u_0^\varepsilon - \partial_y u_0\|^2 \right) + \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0\|^2 \leq \frac{(\rho^2 + 1) \varepsilon^2}{\rho^2 - k^2} + \varepsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

Henceforth, we continue to estimate the left-hand side of (56) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\rho^2 - k^2} \left(\|w_x(\xi, \cdot)\|^2 + \|w_y(\xi, \cdot)\|^2 \right) + \|w(\xi, \cdot)\|^2 \leq \frac{(\rho^2 + 1) \varepsilon^2}{\rho^2 - k^2} + \varepsilon^2 + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\rho\xi}) \rho^{-1} M^2 \gamma^{-2}}{8k(\rho^2 - k^2)} \\ & + 2 \log(\gamma) \int_0^\xi \left[\frac{1}{\rho^2 - k^2} \left(\|w_x(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \|w_y(x, \cdot)\|^2 \right) + \|w(x, \cdot)\|^2 \right] dx. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Thus, using Gronwall's inequality we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\rho^2 - k^2} \left(\|w_x(\xi, \cdot)\|^2 + \|w_y(\xi, \cdot)\|^2 \right) + \|w(\xi, \cdot)\|^2 \leq \left[\frac{(\rho^2 + 1) \varepsilon^2}{\rho^2 - k^2} + \varepsilon^2 + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\rho\xi}) \rho^{-1} M^2 \gamma^{-2}}{8k(\rho^2 - k^2)} \right] \gamma^{2\xi}. \quad (58)$$

We are now in a great position to deduce the error estimate by back-substitution $w = e^{-\rho x} (u^\varepsilon - u)$. Dropping the gradient terms in the left-hand side of (58), we arrive at

$$\|u^\varepsilon(\xi, \cdot) - u(\xi, \cdot)\|^2 \leq \left[\frac{(\rho^2 + 1) \varepsilon^2}{\rho^2 - k^2} + \varepsilon^2 + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\rho\xi}) \rho^{-1} M^2 \gamma^{-2}}{8k(\rho^2 - k^2)} \right] \gamma^{2\xi} e^{2\rho\xi}. \quad (59)$$

Similarly, dropping the first and third terms in the left-hand side of (58), we get

$$\|u_y^\varepsilon(\xi, \cdot) - u_y(\xi, \cdot)\|^2 \leq \left[(\rho^2 + 1) \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^2 (\rho^2 - k^2) + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\rho\xi}) \rho^{-1} M^2 \gamma^{-2}}{8k} \right] \gamma^{2\xi} e^{2\rho\xi}.$$

In view of the fact that $w_x = -\rho w + e^{-\rho x} (u_x^\varepsilon - u_x)$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\rho\xi} \|u_x^\varepsilon(\xi, \cdot) - u_x(\xi, \cdot)\| - \rho \|w(\xi, \cdot)\| \leq \|w_x(\xi, \cdot)\| \\ & \leq \left[(\rho^2 + 1) \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^2 (\rho^2 - k^2) + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\rho\xi}) \rho^{-1} M^2 \gamma^{-2}}{8k} \right]^{1/2} \gamma^\xi e^{\rho\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (59) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_x^\varepsilon(\xi, \cdot) - u_x(\xi, \cdot)\| \\ & \leq \left[(\rho^2 + 1) \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^2 (\rho^2 - k^2) + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\rho\xi}) \rho^{-1} M^2 \gamma^{-2}}{8k} \right]^{1/2} \gamma^\xi e^{2\rho\xi} + \rho \|u^\varepsilon(\xi, \cdot) - u(\xi, \cdot)\| \\ & \leq \left[(\rho^2 + 1) \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^2 (\rho^2 - k^2) + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\rho\xi}) \rho^{-1} M^2 \gamma^{-2}}{8k} \right]^{1/2} \gamma^\xi e^{\rho\xi} \left[e^{\rho\xi} + \frac{\rho}{\rho^2 - k^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_x^\varepsilon(\xi, \cdot) - u_x(\xi, \cdot)\|^2 \\ & \leq \left[(\rho^2 + 1) \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^2 (\rho^2 - k^2) + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\rho\xi}) \rho^{-1} M^2 \gamma^{-2}}{8k} \right] \gamma^{2\xi} e^{2\rho\xi} \left[e^{\rho\xi} + \frac{\rho}{\rho^2 - k^2} \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we complete the proof of the theorem. \square

As a consequence of the above theorem, one can obtain the Lipschitz stability of u^ε . Indeed, let v^ε be a solution to the same system as (20), i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} v_{xx}^\varepsilon - v_{yy}^\varepsilon + \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon v^\varepsilon = k^2 v^\varepsilon & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v^\varepsilon(x, 0) = v^\varepsilon(x, 1) = 0 & \text{for } x \in (0, 1), \\ v^\varepsilon(0, y) = v_0^\varepsilon(y), \quad v_x^\varepsilon(0, y) = 0 & \text{for } y \in (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

Then, proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 4 (without the presence of \mathbf{Q}_ε), we can prove the following Lipschitz stability estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^\varepsilon(x, \cdot) - v^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 &\leq \left[\frac{\rho^2 \|u_0^\varepsilon - v_0^\varepsilon\|^2 + \|\partial_y u_0^\varepsilon - \partial_y v_0^\varepsilon\|^2}{\rho^2 - k^2} + \|u_0^\varepsilon - v_0^\varepsilon\|^2 \right] \gamma^{2x} e^{2\rho x}, \\ \|u_y^\varepsilon(x, \cdot) - v_y^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 &\leq \left[\rho^2 \|u_0^\varepsilon - v_0^\varepsilon\|^2 + \|\partial_y u_0^\varepsilon - \partial_y v_0^\varepsilon\|^2 + (\rho^2 - k^2) \|u_0^\varepsilon - v_0^\varepsilon\|^2 \right] \gamma^{2x} e^{2\rho x}, \\ \|u_x^\varepsilon(x, \cdot) - v_x^\varepsilon(x, \cdot)\|^2 &\leq \left[\rho^2 \|u_0^\varepsilon - v_0^\varepsilon\|^2 + \|\partial_y u_0^\varepsilon - \partial_y v_0^\varepsilon\|^2 + (\rho^2 - k^2) \|u_0^\varepsilon - v_0^\varepsilon\|^2 \right] \gamma^{2x} e^{2\rho x} \left[e^{\rho x} + \frac{\rho}{\rho^2 - k^2} \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

The estimates are valid for any γ satisfying $\log(\gamma) \geq k$. Now, to prove the convergence of u^ε toward u , we below rely on a suitable choice of γ . In this regard, γ is appropriately dependent of the noise level ε . Since Theorem 5 below is a direct consequence of Theorem 4, its proof is omitted.

Theorem 5 (Interior convergence estimates). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4, if we choose $\gamma = \varepsilon^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\varepsilon \leq e^{-k/\alpha}$, then the following Hölder rates of convergence hold true:*

$$\|u^\varepsilon(x, \cdot) - u(x, \cdot)\|^2 \leq \left[\frac{(\rho^2 + 1) \varepsilon^{2(1-\alpha x)}}{\rho^2 - k^2} + \varepsilon^{2(1-\alpha x)} + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\rho x}) \rho^{-1} M^2 \varepsilon^{2\alpha(1-x)}}{8k(\rho^2 - k^2)} \right] e^{2\rho x}, \quad (60)$$

$$\|u_y^\varepsilon(x, \cdot) - u_y(x, \cdot)\|^2 \leq \left[(\rho^2 + 1) \varepsilon^{2(1-\alpha x)} + (\rho^2 - k^2) \varepsilon^{2(1-\alpha x)} + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\rho x}) \rho^{-1} M^2 \varepsilon^{2\alpha(1-x)}}{8k} \right] e^{2\rho x}, \quad (61)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_x^\varepsilon(x, \cdot) - u_x(x, \cdot)\|^2 &\leq \left[(\rho^2 + 1) \varepsilon^{2(1-\alpha x)} + (\rho^2 - k^2) \varepsilon^{2(1-\alpha x)} + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\rho x}) \rho^{-1} M^2 \varepsilon^{2\alpha(1-x)}}{8k} \right] e^{2\rho x} \left[e^{\rho x} + \frac{\rho}{\rho^2 - k^2} \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

It is straightforward that regardless of the choice of γ , we do not have the convergence at $x = 1$ due to the term γ^{2-2x} in (49)–(51). The same can be manifested in (60)–(62). For the interior points $x \in (0, 1)$, we obtain the Hölder rate of convergence in mixed L^2 – H^1 norms. We also remark that even though convergence result (60) is point wise in the frequency k , the corresponding uniform-in- k estimate can be obtained by a suitable choice of ρ . Observing the exponential growth (in ρ) of the inverse Carleman weight, ρ should be close to k to “optimize” that growth. However, the closeness should also ensure the L^2 convergence in ε . Thus, one possibility is taking $\rho = k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta}))$ for $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and ε being sufficiently small such that $\log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})) \geq \sqrt{2}$. By this way, $1 < \rho^2 \leq 2(\rho^2 - k^2)$ and thus, it follows from $\varepsilon^{2\alpha(1-x)} \geq \varepsilon^{2(1-\alpha x)}$ that

$$\|u^\varepsilon(x, \cdot) - u(x, \cdot)\|^2 \leq C^2 \varepsilon^{2\alpha(1-x)} \log^{2kx}(\varepsilon^{-\beta}), \quad (63)$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on M .

Theorem 6 (Boundary convergence estimates). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4, we can always find $x_\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} x_\varepsilon = 0$ and $u^\varepsilon(1 - x_\varepsilon, \cdot)$ approximates well $u(1, \cdot)$. In particular, we can find a constant $C(\rho, k, M) > 0$ depending on ρ, k, M such that the following logarithmic convergence estimate holds true:*

$$\|u^\varepsilon(1 - x_\varepsilon, \cdot) - u(1, \cdot)\| \leq \frac{C(\rho, k, M)}{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha})}}. \quad (64)$$

Moreover, for ε being sufficiently small such that $\log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})) \geq \sqrt{2}$, the corresponding uniform-in- k error estimate can be rigorously obtained in the following form:

$$\|u^\varepsilon(1 - x_\varepsilon, \cdot) - u(1, \cdot)\| \leq \frac{C(M)}{1 - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})) + \sqrt{(1 - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})))^2 + 4k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})) + 4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha})}}, \quad (65)$$

where $C(M) > 0$ is a constant depending only on M .

Proof. We, for brevity, can find some constant $C(\rho, k, M) > 0$ such that for $x \in (0, 1)$,

$$\|u^\varepsilon(x, \cdot) - u(x, \cdot)\|^2 \leq C^2(\rho, k, M) \varepsilon^{2\alpha(1-x)},$$

deduced from (60). Thereby, using the triangle inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^\varepsilon(1 - x_\varepsilon, \cdot) - u(1, \cdot)\| &\leq \|u^\varepsilon(1 - x_\varepsilon, \cdot) - u(1 - x_\varepsilon, \cdot)\| + \|u(1 - x_\varepsilon, \cdot) - u(1, \cdot)\| \\ &\leq C(\rho, k, M) \varepsilon^{\alpha x_\varepsilon} + x_\varepsilon \|u_x\|_{C([0,1];L^2(0,1))}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, to prove the target estimate (64), we seek the infimum $\frac{1}{2} \inf_{x_\varepsilon > 0} (\varepsilon^{2\alpha x_\varepsilon} + x_\varepsilon)$. When doing so, we solve the following algebraic equation:

$$\varepsilon^{\alpha x_\varepsilon} = x_\varepsilon, \quad (66)$$

expecting that $x_\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ is sufficiently small. In terms of x_ε , we see that the left-hand side of (66) is decreasing, while the right-hand side grows linearly. Thus, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a unique solution $x_\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ to (66). Taking now the logarithm on both sides of (66) and using the standard inequality $\log(a) > 1 - a^{-1}$ for any $a > 0$, we arrive at the following quadratic inequality:

$$\alpha \log(\varepsilon) x_\varepsilon^2 - x_\varepsilon + 1 > 0.$$

Since the discriminant is positive, i.e. $1 + 4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha}) > 0$, and $\log(\varepsilon) < 1$, we find that

$$x_\varepsilon \in \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha})}}{2\alpha \log(\varepsilon)}, \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 + 4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha})}}{2\alpha \log(\varepsilon)} \right).$$

By the rationalizing technique, it is clear that $x_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In particular, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{1 + 4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha})}}{2\alpha \log(\varepsilon)} \right) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{-4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha})}{2\alpha \log(\varepsilon) (1 + \sqrt{1 + 4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha})})} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{2}{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha})}} = 0,$$

and similarly,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha})}}{2\alpha \log(\varepsilon)} \right) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{-4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha})}{2\alpha \log(\varepsilon) (1 - \sqrt{1 + 4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha})})} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{2}{1 - \sqrt{1 + 4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha})}} = 0.$$

Henceforth, we obtain the following error estimate point-wise in k :

$$\|u^\varepsilon(1 - x_\varepsilon, \cdot) - u(1, \cdot)\| \leq \frac{2(C(\rho, k, M) + M)}{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha})}}.$$

We can prove the uniform-in- k error estimate (65) using the same vein. To do so, we rely on the estimate we have briefly analyzed in (63). In this case, we have

$$\|u^\varepsilon(1 - x_\varepsilon, \cdot) - u(1, \cdot)\| \leq C \varepsilon^{\alpha x_\varepsilon} \log^{k(1-x_\varepsilon)}(\varepsilon^{-\beta}) + x_\varepsilon \|u_x\|_{C([0,1];L^2(0,1))}. \quad (67)$$

Therefore, we study the infimum $\frac{1}{2} \inf_{x_\varepsilon > 0} (\varepsilon^{\alpha x_\varepsilon} \log^{k(1-x_\varepsilon)}(\varepsilon^{-\beta}) + x_\varepsilon)$ by solving the following algebraic equation: $\varepsilon^{\alpha x_\varepsilon} \log^{k(1-x_\varepsilon)}(\varepsilon^{-\beta}) = x_\varepsilon$. Taking the logarithm on both sides of this equation and then using the logarithmic inequality $\log(a) > 1 - a^{-1}$ for any $a > 0$, we obtain

$$\alpha x_\varepsilon \log(\varepsilon) + k(1 - x_\varepsilon) \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})) = \log(x_\varepsilon) > 1 - \frac{1}{x_\varepsilon},$$

or equivalently,

$$[\alpha \log(\varepsilon) - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta}))] x_\varepsilon^2 - (1 - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta}))) x_\varepsilon + 1 > 0. \quad (68)$$

In view of the facts that $\alpha \log(\varepsilon) - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})) < 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} D_\varepsilon &:= (1 - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})))^2 - 4[\alpha \log(\varepsilon) - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta}))] \\ &= (1 - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})))^2 + 4k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})) + 4 \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha}) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

the above quadratic inequality (68) admits the following solution:

$$x_\varepsilon \in \left(\frac{1 - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})) + \sqrt{D_\varepsilon}}{2(\alpha \log(\varepsilon) - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})))}, \frac{1 - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})) - \sqrt{D_\varepsilon}}{2(\alpha \log(\varepsilon) - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})))} \right).$$

By the rationalizing technique, we show the zero limit of x_ε as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\frac{1 - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})) - \sqrt{D_\varepsilon}}{2(\alpha \log(\varepsilon) - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})))} \right] \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{[1 - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta}))]^2 - D_\varepsilon}{2(\alpha \log(\varepsilon) - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta}))) (1 - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})) + \sqrt{D_\varepsilon})} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{2}{1 - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})) + \sqrt{D_\varepsilon}} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it follows from (67) that

$$\|u^\varepsilon(1 - x_\varepsilon, \cdot) - u(1, \cdot)\| \leq \frac{2C + 2M}{1 - k \log(\log(\varepsilon^{-\beta})) + \sqrt{D_\varepsilon}}.$$

Therefore, we complete the proof of the theorem. \square

4. Iterative scheme

In the previous section, we have studied the strong convergence of u^ε toward the exact solution u . Observe that by the choice of the perturbation and stabilization in our regularization problem (20) is not really computable, albeit the problem is linear in terms of its solution and the series is truncated appropriately in ε . For each $\varepsilon > 0$, we construct an iterative sequence $\{u^{\varepsilon, q}\}_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ to approximate u^ε of (20) in the following sense.

$$\begin{cases} u_{xx}^{\varepsilon, q+1} - u_{yy}^{\varepsilon, q+1} + \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon u^{\varepsilon, q} = k^2 u^{\varepsilon, q} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u^{\varepsilon, q+1}(x, 0) = u^{\varepsilon, q+1}(x, 1) = 0 & \text{for } x \in (0, 1), \\ u^{\varepsilon, q+1}(0, y) = u_0^\varepsilon(y), \quad u_x^{\varepsilon, q+1}(0, y) = 0 & \text{for } y \in (0, 1). \end{cases} \quad (69)$$

In the above iteration scheme, we choose the initial guess $u^{\varepsilon, 0}$ (i.e. $q = 0$) is chosen to be $u_0^\varepsilon(y)$. We choose this initial guess because it is a unique function that contains close information of our sought u^ε under stabilization. Even though proposing this iterative scheme can be a curse of dimensionality, our previous work [18] shows numerically that we only need a very small amount of iteration steps (about $q = 2$) to obtain a fine approximation.

For every ε , we can divide the interval $[0, 1]$ of x into many finite subintervals. Our convergence result below shows that the mesh-width in x should be dependent of the noise level ε for local approximation of the regularized solution u^ε . It is sufficient to analyze the convergence of the linearization in a subinterval $[0, \bar{x}] \subset [0, 1]$ since we can repeat the linearization procedure in every subinterval. Below, we prove the strong convergence of the scheme in a suitable topology involving the space $\Upsilon_{\bar{x}} = C([0, \bar{x}]; L^2(0, 1))$.

Theorem 7 (Convergence of linearization). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4, the approximate solution $u^{\varepsilon, q}$ defined in (69) is strongly convergent in $\Upsilon_{\Delta x}$. Moreover, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a sufficiently small $\eta_\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that for $\sigma \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_y^{\varepsilon, q} - u_y^\varepsilon\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} + \sigma \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha}) \|u^{\varepsilon, q} - u^\varepsilon\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} \leq \frac{\eta_\varepsilon^q}{1 - \eta_\varepsilon} \left(\|u_y^{\varepsilon, 1} - u_y^{\varepsilon, 0}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} + k \|u^{\varepsilon, 1} - u^{\varepsilon, 0}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} \right), \\ & \|u_x^{\varepsilon, q} - u_x^\varepsilon\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} \leq \frac{\eta_\varepsilon^q}{1 - \eta_\varepsilon} \left(\|u_y^{\varepsilon, 1} - u_y^{\varepsilon, 0}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} + k \|u^{\varepsilon, 1} - u^{\varepsilon, 0}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We proceed as in the proof of Theorem 4, scrutinizing energy estimates under the Carleman weight of the form $e^{-\kappa x}$. Let $W^{q+1} = e^{-\kappa x} (u^{\varepsilon, q+1} - u^{\varepsilon, q})$ where $\kappa > 0$ is a constant chosen later. Thus, W^{q+1} satisfies the following system:

$$\begin{cases} W_{xx}^{q+1} - W_{yy}^{q+1} + 2\kappa W_x^{q+1} + \kappa^2 W^{q+1} = -\mathbf{P}_\varepsilon W^q + k^2 W^q & \text{in } \Omega \\ W^{q+1}(x, 0) = W^{q+1}(x, 1) = 0 & \text{for } x \in (0, 1), \\ W^{q+1}(0, y) = 0, \quad W_x^{q+1}(0, y) = 0 & \text{for } y \in (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

Multiplying the difference equation by W_x^{k+1} and then integrating the resulting equation from 0 to 1, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dx} \|W_x^{q+1}(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \frac{d}{dx} \|W_y^{q+1}(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \kappa^2 \frac{d}{dx} \|W^{q+1}(x, \cdot)\|^2 \\ &= -2 \langle \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon W^q, W_x^{q+1} \rangle + 2k^2 \langle W^q, W_x^{q+1} \rangle - 4\kappa \|W_x^{q+1}(x, \cdot)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating the above equation from 0 to x and choosing $\kappa = \sigma \log(\gamma) \geq k$ for $\sigma \geq 1$, we estimate that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|W_x^{q+1}(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \|W_y^{q+1}(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \kappa^2 \|W^{q+1}(x, \cdot)\|^2 \\ & \leq \int_0^x \left[\log(\gamma) \|W_y^q(s, \cdot)\|^2 + k^2 \|W^q(s, \cdot)\|^2 + (4 \log(\gamma) + 1) \|W_x^{q+1}(s, \cdot)\|^2 - 4\kappa \|W_x^{q+1}(s, \cdot)\|^2 \right] ds \\ & \leq \bar{x} \left(\log(\gamma) \|W_y^q\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 + k^2 \|W^q\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 \right) + \int_0^x \|W_x^{q+1}(s, \cdot)\|^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

By the Gronwall inequality, we have

$$\|W_x^{q+1}(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \|W_y^{q+1}(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \kappa^2 \|W^{q+1}(x, \cdot)\|^2 \leq \bar{x} \left(\log(\gamma) \|W_y^q\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 + k^2 \|W^q\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 \right) e^{\bar{x}}. \quad (70)$$

Dropping the first term on the left-hand side of (70), we, after back-substitution, get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_y^{\varepsilon, q+1}(x, \cdot) - u_y^{\varepsilon, q}(x, \cdot)\|^2 + \kappa^2 \|u^{\varepsilon, q+1}(x, \cdot) - u^{\varepsilon, q}(x, \cdot)\|^2 \\ & \leq \bar{x} \log(\gamma) e^{\bar{x}} \left(\|u_y^{\varepsilon, q} - u_y^{\varepsilon, q-1}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 + k \|u^{\varepsilon, q} - u^{\varepsilon, q-1}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 \right) e^{2\kappa x}. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$\|u_y^{\varepsilon, q+1} - u_y^{\varepsilon, q}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 + \kappa^2 \|u^{\varepsilon, q+1} - u^{\varepsilon, q}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 \leq \bar{x} \log(\gamma) e^{\bar{x}} \gamma^{2\sigma \bar{x}} \left(\|u_y^{\varepsilon, q} - u_y^{\varepsilon, q-1}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 + k \|u^{\varepsilon, q} - u^{\varepsilon, q-1}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 \right). \quad (71)$$

Next, by the standard inequality $(a - b)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}a^2 - b^2$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|u_x^{\varepsilon, q+1}(x, \cdot) - u_x^{\varepsilon, q}(x, \cdot)\|^2 - \kappa^2 \|u^{\varepsilon, q+1}(x, \cdot) - u^{\varepsilon, q}(x, \cdot)\|^2 \\ & \leq \|u_x^{\varepsilon, q+1}(x, \cdot) - u_x^{\varepsilon, q}(x, \cdot) - \kappa [u^{\varepsilon, q+1}(x, \cdot) - u^{\varepsilon, q}(x, \cdot)]\|^2 = e^{2\kappa x} \|W_x^{q+1}(x, \cdot)\|^2 \\ & \leq \gamma^{2\sigma x} \bar{x} \left(\log(\gamma) \|u_y^{\varepsilon, q} - u_y^{\varepsilon, q-1}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 + k^2 \|u^{\varepsilon, q} - u^{\varepsilon, q-1}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 \right) e^{\bar{x}}. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where we have used dropping the second and third terms on the left-hand side of (70). It now follows from (72) and (70) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_x^{\varepsilon, q+1} - u_x^{\varepsilon, q}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 \leq 2\kappa^2 \|u^{\varepsilon, q+1} - u^{\varepsilon, q}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 + 2\gamma^{2\sigma \bar{x}} \bar{x} \left(\log(\gamma) \|u_y^{\varepsilon, q} - u_y^{\varepsilon, q-1}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 + k^2 \|u^{\varepsilon, q} - u^{\varepsilon, q-1}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 \right) e^{\bar{x}} \\ & \leq 4\bar{x} e^{\bar{x}} \gamma^{2\sigma \bar{x}} \left(\log(\gamma) \|u_y^{\varepsilon, q} - u_y^{\varepsilon, q-1}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 + k^2 \|u^{\varepsilon, q} - u^{\varepsilon, q-1}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 \right) \\ & \leq 4\bar{x} e^{\bar{x}} \gamma^{2\sigma \bar{x}} \log(\gamma) \left(\|u_y^{\varepsilon, q} - u_y^{\varepsilon, q-1}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 + k \|u^{\varepsilon, q} - u^{\varepsilon, q-1}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

Therefore, we choose \bar{x} small enough such that

$$\eta_\gamma^2 := 4\bar{x} e^{\bar{x}} \gamma^{2\sigma \bar{x}} \log(\gamma) < 1. \quad (74)$$

Then, using the Minkowski inequality $(a + b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and triangle inequality, we deduce from (71) that for $l \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_y^{\varepsilon, q+l} - u_y^{\varepsilon, q}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} + \kappa \|u^{\varepsilon, q+l} - u^{\varepsilon, q}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} \\ & \leq \sum_{j=1}^l \left(\|u_y^{\varepsilon, q+j} - u_y^{\varepsilon, q+j-1}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} + \kappa \|u^{\varepsilon, q+j} - u^{\varepsilon, q+j-1}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{j=1}^l \eta_\gamma^{q+j-1} \left(\|u_y^{\varepsilon, 1} - u_y^{\varepsilon, 0}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} + k \|u^{\varepsilon, 1} - u^{\varepsilon, 0}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} \right) = \frac{\eta_\gamma^q (1 - \eta_\gamma^l)}{1 - \eta_\gamma} \left(\|u_y^{\varepsilon, 1} - u_y^{\varepsilon, 0}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} + k \|u^{\varepsilon, 1} - u^{\varepsilon, 0}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Henceforth, $\{u^{\varepsilon,q}\}_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{u_y^{\varepsilon,q}\}_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ are Cauchy sequences in $\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}$, respectively. Thus, there exists uniquely $u^\varepsilon \in \Upsilon_{\bar{x}}$ such that $u^{\varepsilon,q} \rightarrow u^\varepsilon$ strongly in $\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, we obtain a unique $u_y^\varepsilon \in \Upsilon_{\bar{x}}$ such that $u_y^{\varepsilon,q} \rightarrow u_y^\varepsilon$ strongly in $\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. By (73), we also obtain that $\{u_x^{\varepsilon,q}\}_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}$ and thus, there exists a unique limit u_x^ε that converges strongly to $u_x^{\varepsilon,q}$ in $\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}$. Moreover, taking $l \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_y^{\varepsilon,q} - u_y^\varepsilon\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} + \kappa \|u^{\varepsilon,q} - u^\varepsilon\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} &\leq \frac{\eta_\gamma^q}{1 - \eta_\gamma} \left(\|u_y^{\varepsilon,1} - u_y^{\varepsilon,0}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} + k \|u^{\varepsilon,1} - u^{\varepsilon,0}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} \right), \\ \|u_x^{\varepsilon,q} - u_x^\varepsilon\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} &\leq \frac{\eta_\gamma^q}{1 - \eta_\gamma} \left(\|u_y^{\varepsilon,1} - u_y^{\varepsilon,0}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} + k \|u^{\varepsilon,1} - u^{\varepsilon,0}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we obtain the strong convergence (as $q \rightarrow \infty$) $\mathbf{P}_\varepsilon u^{\varepsilon,q}$ in the following manner:

$$\|\mathbf{P}_\varepsilon u^{\varepsilon,q} - \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon u^\varepsilon\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} \leq 2 \log(\gamma) \|u_y^{\varepsilon,q} - u_y^\varepsilon\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} \leq \frac{2 \log(\gamma) \eta_\gamma^q}{1 - \eta_\gamma} \left(\|u_y^{\varepsilon,1} - u_y^{\varepsilon,0}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} + k \|u^{\varepsilon,1} - u^{\varepsilon,0}\|_{\Upsilon_{\bar{x}}} \right).$$

Hence, the limit $u^\varepsilon \in \Upsilon_{\bar{x}}$ found above is the solution of the regularized system (20) in the subinterval $[0, \bar{x}]$. We complete the proof of the theorem. \square

Remark 4. *It is not hard to see that we do not really need to linearize the term $k^2 u$ on the right-hand side of (20), while the convergence is still guaranteed from the theoretical standpoint. However, numerical observations show that linearization of the term $k^2 u$ give better numerical results. This mainly explains why we choose the current linearization procedure.*

5. Numerical examples

5.1. Finite difference settings

Given $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider uniform grids of mesh-points $x_m = (m-1)\Delta x$, $y_n = (n-1)\Delta y$ for $1 \leq m \leq M+1$, $1 \leq n \leq N+1$ with $\Delta x, \Delta y$ being the mesh-widths in x and y , respectively. For any function $u(x, y)$, we denote by $u_{m,n} \approx u(x_m, y_n)$ the corresponding discrete function. To generate the data, we apply the central finite difference method (FDM) to solve the Helmholtz equation (3) with the Dirichlet boundary conditions imposed on four sides of $\Omega = (0, 1)^2$, viz.

$$u(0, y) = u_0(y), \quad u(1, y) = g(y), \quad u(x, 0) = 0, \quad u(x, 1) = 0. \quad (75)$$

In our numerical performance of the stabilization scheme below, we do not choose the true solution of the Helmholtz equation (3). Instead, we choose its boundary data u_0, g in (75) so that our choice is more flexible. This is relevant because (3) with full data (75) is a well-posed problem and the central FDM is well known to be stable and convergent with respect to the refinement of x and y . In this circumstance, one can consider the discrete function $u_{m,n}$ obtained from that well-posed problem as a reliable true solution. The Neumann data u_1 in (5) can be generated using the fact that

$$u_0(y_n) \approx u_1(y_n)\Delta x + u(x_2, y_n).$$

The same FDM is applied when we solve $U(x, y)$ of system (6). For ease of presentation, we only detail below this FDM for $U(x, y)$, while the scheme for u can be established in the same manner. The center approximation for partial derivatives with respect to x and y is given by

$$U_{xx}(x_m, y_n) \approx \frac{U_{m+1,n} - 2U_{m,n} + U_{m-1,n}}{(\Delta x)^2}, \quad U_{yy}(x_m, y_n) \approx \frac{U_{m,n+1} - 2U_{m,n} + U_{m,n-1}}{(\Delta y)^2}, \quad (76)$$

Thus, the PDE in (6) is discretized as follows:

$$\frac{U_{m+1,n} - 2U_{m,n} + U_{m-1,n}}{(\Delta x)^2} + \frac{U_{m,n+1} - 2U_{m,n} + U_{m,n-1}}{(\Delta y)^2} + k^2 U_{m,n} = 0.$$

Put $r = \Delta x / \Delta y$. We obtain

$$U_{m+1,n} + U_{m-1,n} + r^2 U_{m,n+1} + \left[(k\Delta x)^2 - 2 - 2r^2 \right] U_{m,n} + r^2 U_{m,n-1} = 0. \quad (77)$$

Denote the unknown $\mathbf{U}_m = (U_{m,2}, U_{m,3}, U_{m,4}, \dots, U_{m,N})^T$. We rewrite (77) in the following matrix form:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{K}_1 & \mathbf{I}_{N-1} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{I}_{N-1} & \mathcal{K}_2 & \mathbf{I}_{N-1} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_{N-1} & \mathcal{K}_2 & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathcal{K}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_2 \\ \mathbf{U}_3 \\ \mathbf{U}_4 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{U}_M \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F}_2 \\ \mathbf{F}_3 \\ \mathbf{F}_4 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{F}_M \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{I}_{N-1} \in \mathbb{M}^{(N-1) \times (N-1)}$ stands for the identity matrix, the block matrices $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2 \in \mathbb{M}^{(N-1) \times (N-1)}$ are defined with $T_k = (k\Delta x)^2 - 2 - 2r^2$, as follows:

$$\mathcal{K}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} T_k + 1 & r^2 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ r^2 & T_k + 1 & r^2 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & r^2 & T_k + 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & T_k + 1 \end{bmatrix}, \mathcal{K}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} T_k & r^2 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ r^2 & T_k & r^2 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & r^2 & T_k & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & T_k \end{bmatrix},$$

and vectors \mathbf{F}_m are denoted by

$$\mathbf{F}_2 = \Delta x (u_1(y_2), u_1(y_3), u_1(y_4), \dots, u_1(y_N))^T, \quad \mathbf{F}_m = (0, 0, 0, \dots, 0)^T, \quad 3 \leq m \leq M.$$

Solving (77) allows us to find a numerical solution of $U(x, y)$ to system (6). Thereby, it follows that an approximation of $U(0, y)$ can be obtained for the Dirichlet data in (7). To solve for $V(x, y)$ in (7) numerically, we accordingly apply the iterative scheme investigated in section 4. That means we construct a sequence of $\{V^{\varepsilon, q}\}_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} V_{xx}^{\varepsilon, q+1} - V_{yy}^{\varepsilon, q+1} + \mathbf{P}V^{\varepsilon, q} - k^2V^{\varepsilon, q} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ V^{\varepsilon, q+1}(x, 0) = V^{\varepsilon, q+1}(x, 1) = 0 & \text{for } x \in (0, 1), \\ V^{\varepsilon, q+1}(0, y) = u_0^\varepsilon(y) - U(0, y), \quad V_x^{\varepsilon, q+1}(0, y) = 0 & \text{for } y \in (0, 1). \end{cases} \quad (78)$$

In (78), we recall that

$$\mathbf{P}u(x, \cdot) = -2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus (B \cup A_3)} \lambda_{j,k} \langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \phi_j = -2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus (B \cup A_3)} (\mu_j - k^2) \langle u(x, \cdot), \phi_j \rangle \phi_j,$$

and the initial guess $V^{\varepsilon, 0}$ (i.e. $q = 0$) is chosen to be $u_0^\varepsilon(y) - U(0, y)$. As mentioned in section 4, we choose this initial guess because it is a unique function that contains many information of our sought V^ε under stabilization. Let $V^{\varepsilon, q}(x_i, y_j) \approx V_{i,j}^{\varepsilon, q}$, and the same difference operators in (76) are applied to the PDE of (78). It yields that

$$V_{xx}^{\varepsilon, q+1}(x_m, y_n) \approx \frac{V_{m+1,n}^{\varepsilon, q+1} - 2V_{m,n}^{\varepsilon, q+1} + V_{m-1,n}^{\varepsilon, q+1}}{(\Delta x)^2}, \quad V_{yy}^{\varepsilon, q+1}(x_m, y_n) \approx \frac{V_{m,n+1}^{\varepsilon, q+1} - 2V_{m,n}^{\varepsilon, q+1} + V_{m,n-1}^{\varepsilon, q+1}}{(\Delta y)^2}.$$

Combining these with the standard Riemann sum approximating the inner product in \mathbf{P} , we seek $V_{m,n}^{\varepsilon, q}$ satisfying the following approximate equation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{V_{m+1,n}^{\varepsilon, q+1} - 2V_{m,n}^{\varepsilon, q+1} + V_{m-1,n}^{\varepsilon, q+1}}{(\Delta x)^2} - \frac{V_{m,n+1}^{\varepsilon, q+1} - 2V_{m,n}^{\varepsilon, q+1} + V_{m,n-1}^{\varepsilon, q+1}}{(\Delta y)^2} \\ & - 2\Delta y \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus (B \cup A_3)} (\mu_j - k^2) \sum_{l=1}^{N+1} V_{m,l}^{\varepsilon, q} \phi_j(y_l) \phi_j(y_n) = k^2 V_{m,n}^{\varepsilon, q}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $r = \Delta x / \Delta y$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} V_{m+1,n}^{\varepsilon, q+1} &= r^2 V_{m,n}^{\varepsilon, q+1} + (2 - 2r^2) V_{m,n}^{\varepsilon, q+1} + r^2 V_{m,n-1}^{\varepsilon, q+1} - V_{m-1,n}^{\varepsilon, q+1} \\ &+ 2(\Delta x)^2 \Delta y \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus (B \cup A_3)} (\mu_j - k^2) \sum_{l=1}^{N+1} V_{m,l}^{\varepsilon, q} \phi_j(y_l) \phi_j(y_n) + k^2 (\Delta x)^2 V_{m,n}^{\varepsilon, q}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{V}_m^{\varepsilon, q} = (V_{m,2}^{\varepsilon, q}, V_{m,3}^{\varepsilon, q}, V_{m,4}^{\varepsilon, q}, \dots, V_{m,N}^{\varepsilon, q})^T$. The above equation can be rewritten in the following matrix form:

$$\mathbf{V}_{m+1}^{\varepsilon, q+1} = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{V}_m^{\varepsilon, q+1} - \mathbf{V}_{m-1}^{\varepsilon, q+1} + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{V}_m^{\varepsilon, q}) + k^2 (\Delta x)^2 \mathbf{V}_m^{\varepsilon, q}, \quad (79)$$

where we have denoted by

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{bmatrix} 2-2r^2 & r^2 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ r^2 & 2-2r^2 & r^2 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & r^2 & 2-2r^2 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 2-2r^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{V}_m^{\varepsilon,q}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{V}_m^{\varepsilon,q})(y_2) \\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{V}_m^{\varepsilon,q})(y_3) \\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{V}_m^{\varepsilon,q})(y_4) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{V}_m^{\varepsilon,q})(y_N) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Herewith, elements in $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{V}_m^{\varepsilon,q})$ are understood as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{V}_m^{\varepsilon,q})(y_n) &= 2(\Delta x)^2 \Delta y \sum_{\frac{k^2}{\pi^2} \leq j^2 \leq \frac{k^2 + \log^2(\gamma)}{\pi^2}} (\mu_j - k^2) \sum_{l=1}^{N+1} V_{m,l}^{\varepsilon,q} \phi_j(y_l) \phi_j(y_n) \\ &= 2(\Delta x)^2 \Delta y \sum_{\frac{k^2}{\pi^2} \leq j^2 \leq \frac{k^2 + \log^2(\gamma)}{\pi^2}} (\mu_j - k^2) \begin{bmatrix} \phi_j(y_2) \\ \phi_j(y_3) \\ \phi_j(y_4) \\ \vdots \\ \phi_j(y_N) \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} V_{m,2}^{\varepsilon,q} \\ V_{m,3}^{\varepsilon,q} \\ V_{m,4}^{\varepsilon,q} \\ \vdots \\ V_{m,N}^{\varepsilon,q} \end{bmatrix} \phi_j(y_n). \end{aligned}$$

After having $V^{\varepsilon,q}$ from (79), we obtain an approximation of u^ε via $u_{m,n}^\varepsilon = U_{m,n} + V_{m,n}^{\varepsilon,q}$. As to the measured data u_0^ε in (78), we apply the additive noise in the following sense: $u_0^\varepsilon(y) = u_0(y) + \varepsilon \text{rand}(y)$, where rand is a uniformly distributed random number such that $\max_{y \in [0,1]} |\text{rand}(y)| \leq 1/(2N)$. At the discretization level, the gradient of u_0^ε is then approximated by

$$\partial_y u_0^\varepsilon(y_n) \approx \frac{u_0^\varepsilon(y_{n+1}) - u_0^\varepsilon(y_n)}{\Delta y} \approx \partial_y u_0(y_n) + \varepsilon N (\text{rand}(y_{n+1}) - \text{rand}(y_n)).$$

Therefore, we can see that assumption (17) is fulfilled. The (local) convergence of the linerization scheme for (78) has been studied in section 4. In this regard, we, according to (74), condition that

$$\eta_\varepsilon^2 = 4\Delta x e^{\Delta x} \varepsilon^{-2\alpha \Delta x} \log(\varepsilon^{-\alpha}) < 1 \quad (80)$$

indicating $\sigma = 1$ is taken. Henceforth, a suitable fine mesh for variable x should be applied. Below, we fix $\alpha = 1$ and $N = 40$ when enjoying the numerical performance of the QR scheme for different noise levels. Moreover, we choose $q = 1$ in our iterative procedure for the QR scheme. The choice of M will be specified in each example since cf. (80), it depends on values of ε . Also, for simplicity, we take $g(y) = 0$ for all examples below, while varying $u_0(y)$ in (75). Last but not least, we below consider the following relative error:

$$E = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{m=0}^M \sum_{n=0}^N |u_{m,n}^\varepsilon - u_{m,n}|^2}}{\sqrt{\sum_{m=0}^M \sum_{n=0}^N |u_{m,n}|^2}} \times 100\%.$$

5.2. Numerical performance for variable noise levels

Example 1: Low frequency

We begin this section by a numerical example with a low frequency profile. In this test, we particularly choose $k = 5$ and

$$u_0(y) = -e^{-2(0.5^4 + (y-0.5)^4)} + 0.5^4 + (y-0.5)^4.$$

Such k is suitable in the context of landmine detection; cf. e.g. [20]. In this low frequency profile, we observe numerically that the scheme works well with intermediate noise levels. Therefore, in this test the numerical results are taken into account with $\varepsilon = 10^{-1}$ and 10^{-2} . Note that cf. (80), η_ε^2 increases when ε decreases, and it decreases when M becomes larger. Henceforth, for our comparison purpose, to keep η_ε unchanged when decreasing ε , we need different values of M . In particular, when $\varepsilon = 10^{-1}$, we take $M = 40$, which gives $\eta_\varepsilon^2 \approx 0.26$. When $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$, we choose $M = 80$.

Depicted in Figure 1 are the graphical illustrations of the true solution and its reconstructed with intermediate noise ($\varepsilon = 10^{-1}$) and small noise ($\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$). When ε is smaller, the computed solution is very close to the true one in terms of the value and, furthermore, the shape and location of the yellow circular protrusion; see Figures 1a and 1c. On the other hand, the relative error reduces from 34.703% for $\varepsilon = 10^{-1}$ to 3.481% for $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$, which shows that the regularized solution obtained from solving (78) approximates well the true solution in this low frequency profile.




Figure 1: Numerical results of Example 1 (low-frequency problem). (a) Graphical illustration of the true solution with $M = 80$ and $N = 40$. (b) and (c) Illustrations of the reconstructed solution with $\varepsilon = 10^{-1}$ and $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$, respectively.




Figure 2: Numerical results of Example 2 (intermediate-frequency problem). (a) Graphical illustration of the true solution with $M = 80$ and $N = 40$. (b) and (c) Illustrations of the reconstructed solution with $\varepsilon = 10^{-1}$ and $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$, respectively.

Example 2: Intermediate frequency

In this test, we take into account an intermediate frequency problem with $k = 15$. We choose that

$$u_0(y) = \frac{1}{0.1 + 0.1(y - 0.5)^2}.$$

We verify the numerical performance of the iterative QR scheme with $\varepsilon = 10^{-1}$ and $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$. For each ε , we use the same parameters as taken in Example 1. Similar to the previous example, we observe numerically that the scheme reconstructs well the inclusions inside of the computational domain. The true solution and the reconstructed ones with $\varepsilon = 10^{-1}$ and $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$ are reported in Figure 2. Graphically, all yellow and blue inclusions are visible in Figure 2b when the reconstruction is proceeded with $\varepsilon = 10^{-1}$ – an intermediate noise. Their locations are also quite accurate, while only the values should be improved. Taking ε smaller ($\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$), we can see the values in Figure 2c are very close to the true ones in Figure 2a. We also report that the relative error in this test reduces from 30.614% (for $\varepsilon = 10^{-1}$) to 3.205% (for $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$).

Example 3: High frequency

In this test, we consider a high frequency problem with $k = 50$ and

$$u_0(y) = \frac{-\sin\left(7\sqrt{0.001 + (y - 0.5)^2}\right)}{7\sqrt{1 + (y - 0.5)^2}}.$$

High frequency problems are usually challenging. Our numerical results for the well-posed problem (6) of U report that M should be large enough for better resolution. In the regularized problem (78), this also corresponds to choosing smaller values of ε . Thus, in this test, we report our numerical results with $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$ and $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$. When $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$, we illustrate the reconstructed solution with $M = 80$. When $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$, we take $M = 160$. Doing so ensures the same value of η_ε^2 discussed in the previous example.

Similar to Examples 1 and 2, we can see the reconstruction becomes better when ε decreases, in this case, from 10^{-2} to 10^{-4} ; see Figure 3. Especially, when $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$, the computed solution, cf. Figure 3c, shows




Figure 3: Numerical results of Example 3 (high-frequency problem). (a) Graphical illustration of the true solution with $M = 160$ and $N = 40$. (b) and (c) Illustrations of the reconstructed solution with $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$ and $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$, respectively.




Figure 4: Numerical results of Example 4 (extremely high-frequency problem). (a) Graphical illustration of the true solution with $M = 160$ and $N = 40$. (b) and (c) Illustrations of the reconstructed solution with $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$ and $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$, respectively.

exactly the same shape and location of all yellow bands in the true solution (Figure 3). As can be seen from Figure 3b for $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$, those bands are not even visible, and the value of the computed solution still undergoes the blow-up phenomenon due to the natural Hadamard instability. This graphical observation is not captured well in Example 1; see Figures 1b and 1c. This also explains why regularization of high frequency problems is rather challenging. We finally report that the relative error E in this case reduces significantly from 1687.3% to 7.212%, when ε decreases from 10^{-2} to 10^{-4} .

Example 4: Extremely high frequency

In this last numerical example, we would like to see the performance of the scheme with a very large frequency. In particular, we choose $k = 150$ and

$$u_0(y) = 50 \sin(2\pi y) \cos(4\pi y).$$

Similar to Example 3, we observe numerically that the scheme works with small noise levels. In this test, we verify the scheme when $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$ and 10^{-4} , and the same parameters are taken as in Example 3. In Figure 4b, our reconstruction when $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$ shows a slight accuracy in terms of shape and location of yellow bands within $x \in (0, 0.2)$. When being far away from the “initial” data u_0 , the reconstructed solution is pretty much inaccurate. This causes a huge relative error of 70.731%. When ε is down to $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$, this error reduces substantially to 1.153%. The fine accuracy of the computed solution with $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$ can also be seen in Figure 4c, compared with the true one in Figure 4a. Note that as compared to the previous examples reconstructing a few inclusions, this last example indicates the efficiency of the method. It is, in fact, challenging if one wants to reconstruct several inclusions.

Acknowledgment

V.A.K. thanks Prof. Dr. Roselyn Williams (Tallahassee, USA) for her support during the time V.A.K. working at Florida A&M University. N.D.T. acknowledges Dr. Nguyen Thanh Long for the wholehearted guidance during his study at University of Science, and thanks Mr. Pham Truong Hoang Nhan for helpful discussions.

Declarations

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

- [1] M. Born, E. Wolf, Principles of Optics, Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [2] N. H. Tuan, V. A. Khoa, M. N. Minh, T. Tran, Reconstruction of the electric field of the Helmholtz equation in three dimensions, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* 309 (2017) 56–78. doi:10.1016/j.cam.2016.05.021.
- [3] M. V. Klibanov, D.-L. Nguyen, L. H. Nguyen, A coefficient inverse problem with a single measurement of phaseless scattering data, *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* 79 (1) (2019) 1–27. doi:10.1137/18m1168303.
- [4] M. Karimi, Regularization of ill-posed problems involving constant-coefficient pseudo-differential operators, *Inverse Problems* 38 (5) (2022) 055001. doi:10.1088/1361-6420/ac5ac8.
- [5] A. Leitão, An iterative method for solving elliptic cauchy problems, *Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization* 21 (5-6) (2000) 715–742. doi:10.1080/01630560008816982.
- [6] Z. Qian, C.-L. Fu, Z.-P. Li, Two regularization methods for a Cauchy problem for the Laplace equation, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 338 (1) (2008) 479–489. doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2007.05.040.
- [7] N. H. Tuan, D. D. Trong, P. H. Quan, A note on a Cauchy problem for the Laplace equation: Regularization and error estimates, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 217 (7) (2010) 2913–2922. doi:10.1016/j.amc.2010.09.019.
- [8] L. Eldén, V. Simoncini, A numerical solution of a Cauchy problem for an elliptic equation by Krylov subspaces, *Inverse Problems* 25 (6) (2009) 065002. doi:10.1088/0266-5611/25/6/065002.
- [9] D. N. Hào, D. Lesnic, The Cauchy problem for laplace's equation via the conjugate gradient method, *IMA Journal of Applied Mathematics* 65 (2) (2000) 199–217. doi:10.1093/imamat/65.2.199.
- [10] M. V. Klibanov, Carleman estimates for the regularization of ill-posed Cauchy problems, *Applied Numerical Mathematics* 94 (2015) 46–74. doi:10.1016/j.apnum.2015.02.003.
- [11] H.-J. Reinhardt, H. Han, D. N. Hào, Stability and regularization of a discrete approximation to the Cauchy problem for Laplace's equation, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 36 (3) (1999) 890–905. doi:10.1137/s0036142997316955.
- [12] R. S. Falk, P. B. Monk, Logarithmic convexity for discrete harmonic functions and the approximation of the Cauchy problem for Poisson's equation, *Mathematics of Computation* 47 (175) (1986) 135. doi:10.2307/2008085.
- [13] L. Eldén, F. Berntsson, A stability estimate for a Cauchy problem for an elliptic partial differential equation, *Inverse Problems* 21 (5) (2005) 1643–1653. doi:10.1088/0266-5611/21/5/008.
- [14] M. Karimi, A. Rezaee, Regularization of the Cauchy problem for the Helmholtz equation by using Meyer wavelet, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* 320 (2017) 76–95. doi:10.1016/j.cam.2017.02.005.
- [15] C.-Y. Qiu, C.-L. Fu, Wavelets and regularization of the Cauchy problem for the Laplace equation, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 338 (2) (2008) 1440–1447. doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2007.06.035.
- [16] R. Lattès, J. L. Lions, Méthode de Quasi-réversibilité et Applications, Dunod, Paris, 1967.
- [17] H. T. Nguyen, V. A. Khoa, V. A. Vo, Analysis of a quasi-reversibility method for a terminal value quasi-linear parabolic problem with measurements, *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 51 (1) (2019) 60–85. doi:10.1137/18m1174064.
- [18] V. A. Khoa, P. T. H. Nhan, Constructing a variational quasi-reversibility method for a Cauchy problem for elliptic equations, *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences* 44 (5) (2020) 3334–3355. doi:10.1002/mma.6945.
- [19] M. V. Klibanov, Carleman estimates for global uniqueness, stability and numerical methods for coefficient inverse problems, *Journal of Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems* 21 (4) (2013). doi:10.1515/jip-2012-0072.
- [20] V. A. Khoa, G. W. Bidney, M. V. Klibanov, L. H. Nguyen, L. H. Nguyen, A. J. Sullivan, V. N. Astratov, Convexification and experimental data for a 3D inverse scattering problem with the moving point source, *Inverse Problems* 36 (8) (2020) 085007. doi:10.1088/1361-6420/ab95aa.
- [21] M. Klibanov, L. H. Nguyen, H. V. Tran, Numerical viscosity solutions to Hamilton-Jacobi equations via a Carleman estimate and the convexification method, *Journal of Computational Physics* 451 (2022) 110828. doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2021.110828.
- [22] T. T. Le, M. V. Klibanov, L. H. Nguyen, A. Sullivan, L. Nguyen, Carleman contraction mapping for a 1D inverse scattering problem with experimental time-dependent data, *Inverse Problems* 38 (4) (2022) 045002. doi:10.1088/1361-6420/ac50b8.