

Global Output Feedback Stabilization of Semilinear Reaction-Diffusion PDEs

Hugo Lhachemi and Christophe Prieur

Abstract—This paper addresses the topic of global output feedback stabilization of semilinear reaction-diffusion PDEs. The semilinearity is assumed to be confined into a sector condition. We consider two different types of actuation configurations, namely: bounded control operator and right Robin boundary control. The measurement is selected as a left Dirichlet trace. The control strategy is finite dimensional and is designed based on a linear version of the plant. We derive a set of sufficient conditions ensuring the global exponential stabilization of the semilinear reaction-diffusion PDE. These conditions are shown to be feasible provided the order of the controller is large enough and the size of the sector condition in which the semilinearity is confined into is small enough.

Index Terms—Semilinear reaction-diffusion PDEs, output feedback stabilization, finite-dimensional control.

I. INTRODUCTION

The topic of feedback stabilization of linear reaction-diffusion PDEs has been intensively studied in the literature [2], [18], [23] using different approaches such as backstepping [12] and spectral reduction methods [3], [4], [25]. The extension of these approaches to the stabilization of semilinear reaction-diffusion PDEs remains challenging. Among the reported contributions, one can find the study of stability by means of strict Lyapunov functionals [19], observer design [11], [20], [29], and control using quasi-static deformations [3], state-feedback [8] or network control [27], [28].

This paper addresses the topic of global output feedback stabilization of 1-D semilinear reaction-diffusion PDEs with Dirichlet/Neumann/Robin boundary conditions. We assume that the semilinearity is confined into a sector condition. We consider two different configurations for the actuation scheme: bounded control operator and right Robin boundary control. The measurement is selected as the left Dirichlet trace. The adopted output feedback control strategy is composed of a finite-dimensional observer [1], [5], [7] that leverage control architectures introduced first in [26] augmented with a LMI based procedure initially proposed in [9], [10]. In this paper, we further adopt the enhanced procedures reported in [15], [17] that allow the design in a generic and systematic manner of finite-dimensional observer-based control strategies for general 1-D reaction-diffusion PDEs with Dirichlet/Neumann/Robin boundary control and Dirichlet/Neumann boundary measurements. In particular, these procedures allow to perform the control design directly with the control input instead of its time derivative as classically done in the case of boundary control system, see [6, Sec. 3.3] for further details. This capability to work directly with the control input to perform the control design for general 1-D reaction diffusion PDEs with Dirichlet/Neumann/Robin boundary control and Dirichlet/Neumann boundary measurements is key for the systematic

extension of the control design procedure to a number of settings such as predictor-based compensation of arbitrarily long input and output delays [13], [16].

This type of approach has also been shown to be efficient for the local stabilization, with estimation of the domain of attraction, of linear reaction-diffusion PDEs in the presence of a saturation [14] (see also [21] in the context of a state-feedback feedback), as well as the global stabilization of linear-reaction-diffusion PDEs in the presence of a sector nonlinearity in the application of the boundary control [15]. Nevertheless, the possibility to successfully design in a systematic manner finite-dimensional control strategies in the presence of nonlinearities for general reaction-diffusion PDEs has only been demonstrated for linear PDEs with a nonlinearity introduced when applying the control input. In this context, the objective of this work is to demonstrate for the first time that finite-dimensional control strategies can also be designed for achieving the output feedback stabilization of semilinear reaction-diffusion PDEs (i.e., in which the nonlinearity applies to the reaction term). Assuming that the nonlinearity satisfies a sector condition, we derive a set of sufficient LMI conditions ensuring the global output feedback stabilization of the plant. We show that the derived stability conditions are always feasible when selecting the order of the observer large enough and for a size of the sector condition small enough.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Notations and preliminary properties are summarized in Section II. The control design for semilinear reaction-diffusion PDEs in the case of a bounded input operator and left Dirichlet measurement is addressed in Section III. Then, Section IV reports the case of right Robin boundary control and left Dirichlet measurement. Finally, concluding remarks are formulated in Section VI.

II. NOTATION AND PROPERTIES OF STURM-LIOUVILLE OPERATORS

A. Notation

Real spaces \mathbb{R}^n are equipped with the usual Euclidean norm denoted by $\|\cdot\|$. The associated induced norms of matrices are also denoted by $\|\cdot\|$. For any two vectors X and Y , $\text{col}(X, Y)$ represents the vector $[X^\top, Y^\top]^\top$. The space of square integrable functions on $(0, 1)$ is denoted by $L^2(0, 1)$ and is endowed with the inner product $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_0^1 f(x)g(x) dx$. The associated norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{L^2}$. For an integer $m \geq 1$, $H^m(0, 1)$ stands for the m -order Sobolev space and is endowed with its usual norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^m}$. For any symmetric matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $P \succeq 0$ (resp. $P \succ 0$) indicates that P is positive semi-definite (resp. positive definite).

B. Properties of Sturm-Liouville operators

Because reaction-diffusion PDEs are inherently related to Sturm-Liouville operators, we summarize here their key properties that will be used in the sequel.

Let $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in [0, \pi/2]$, $p \in C^1([0, 1])$, and $q \in C^0([0, 1])$ with $p > 0$ and $q \geq 0$. The Sturm-Liouville operator [24] is defined by

$$\mathcal{A} = -(pf')' + qf$$

Hugo Lhachemi is with Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, CentraleSupélec, Laboratoire des signaux et systèmes, 91190, Gif-sur-Yvette, France (e-mail: hugo.lhachemi@centralesupelec.fr).

Christophe Prieur is with Université Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Grenoble-INP, GIPSA-lab, F-38000, Grenoble, France (e-mail: christophe.prieur@gipsa-lab.fr).

The work of H. Lhachemi has been partially supported by ANR PIA funding: ANR-20-IDEE-0002. The work of C. Prieur has been partially supported by MIAI@Grenoble Alpes (ANR-19-P3IA-0003).

on the domain

$$D(\mathcal{A}) = \{f \in H^2(0, 1) : \cos(\theta_1)f(0) - \sin(\theta_1)f'(0) = 0, \\ \cos(\theta_2)f(1) + \sin(\theta_2)f'(1) = 0\}.$$

Then the eigenvalues λ_n , $n \geq 1$, of \mathcal{A} are simple, non-negative, and form an increasing sequence with $\lambda_n \rightarrow +\infty$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. The corresponding unit eigenvectors $\phi_n \in L^2(0, 1)$ form a Hilbert basis. The domain of the operator \mathcal{A} is equivalently characterized by

$$D(\mathcal{A}) = \left\{ f \in L^2(0, 1) : \sum_{n \geq 1} |\lambda_n|^2 |\langle f, \phi_n \rangle|^2 < +\infty \right\}.$$

Moreover we have $\mathcal{A}f = \sum_{n \geq 1} \lambda_n \langle f, \phi_n \rangle \phi_n$ for all $f \in D(\mathcal{A})$.

Let $p_*, p^*, q^* \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $0 < p_* \leq p(x) \leq p^*$ and $0 \leq q(x) \leq q^*$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$, then it holds that:

$$0 \leq \pi^2(n-1)^2 p_* \leq \lambda_n \leq \pi^2 n^2 p^* + q^* \quad (1)$$

for all $n \geq 1$, see e.g. [22]. Assuming further that $q > 0$, performing an integration by parts and using the continuous embedding $H^1(0, 1) \subset L^\infty(0, 1)$, we obtain the existence of constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that

$$C_1 \|f\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \sum_{n \geq 1} \lambda_n \langle f, \phi_n \rangle^2 = \langle \mathcal{A}f, f \rangle \leq C_2 \|f\|_{H^1}^2 \quad (2)$$

for all $f \in D(\mathcal{A})$. This implies that $f(0) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \langle f, \phi_n \rangle \phi_n(0)$ and $f'(0) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \langle f, \phi_n \rangle \phi_n'(0)$ hold for all $f \in D(\mathcal{A})$. Finally, if we further assume that $p \in C^2([0, 1])$, we have for any $x \in [0, 1]$ that $\phi_n(x) = O(1)$ and $\phi_n'(x) = O(\sqrt{\lambda_n})$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, see e.g. [22].

For an arbitrarily given integer $N \geq 1$, we define $\mathcal{R}_{Nf} = \sum_{n \geq N+1} \langle f, \phi_n \rangle \phi_n$.

III. DISTRIBUTED COMMAND AND DIRICHLET BOUNDARY MEASUREMENT

A. Problem setting and spectral reduction

We study first the stabilization problem of the reaction-diffusion PDE described by

$$z_t(t, x) = (p(x)z_x(t, x))_x - \tilde{q}_0(x)z(t, x) + f(t, x, z(t, x)) \\ + b(x)u(t) \quad (3a)$$

$$\cos(\theta_1)z(t, 0) - \sin(\theta_1)z_x(t, 0) = 0 \quad (3b)$$

$$\cos(\theta_2)z(t, 1) + \sin(\theta_2)z_x(t, 1) = 0 \quad (3c)$$

$$z(0, x) = z_0(x). \quad (3d)$$

for $t > 0$ and $x \in (0, 1)$. Here we have $\theta_1 \in (0, \pi/2]$, $\theta_2 \in [0, \pi/2]$, $p \in C^2([0, 1])$ with $p > 0$, and $\tilde{q}_0 \in C^0([0, 1])$. The distributed control input is $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ and acts on the system via the shape function $b \in L^2(0, 1)$. The state of the reaction-diffusion PDE is $z(t, \cdot) \in L^2(0, 1)$ while $z_0 \in L^2(0, 1)$ is the initial condition. The function $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is assumed to be globally Lipschitz continuous in z , uniformly in (t, x) , so that $f(\cdot, \cdot, 0) = 0$. Let $\tilde{q}_f \in C^0([0, 1])$ and $k_f > 0$ be such that

$$|f(t, x, z) - \tilde{q}_f(x)z| \leq k_f |z|, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0, 1], \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4)$$

Hence (3a) can be written as

$$z_t(t, x) = (p(x)z_x(t, x))_x - \tilde{q}(x)z(t, x) + g(t, x, z(t, x)) \\ + b(x)u(t)$$

where $\tilde{q} = \tilde{q}_0 - \tilde{q}_f$ and $g(t, x, z) = f(t, x, z) - \tilde{q}_f(x)z$ with

$$|g(t, x, z)| \leq k_f |z|, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0, 1], \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (5)$$

The system output takes the form of the left Dirichlet trace:

$$y(t) = z(t, 0). \quad (6)$$

In perspective of control design, recalling that $\tilde{q} = \tilde{q}_0 - \tilde{q}_f$, and without loss of generality, we pick a function $q \in C^0([0, 1])$ and a constant $q_c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\tilde{q} = q - q_c, \quad q > 0. \quad (7)$$

The projection of (3) into the Hilbert basis $(\phi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ gives

$$\dot{z}_n(t) = (-\lambda_n + q_c)z_n(t) + b_n u(t) + g_n(t) \quad (8)$$

where $z_n(t) = \langle z(t, \cdot), \phi_n \rangle$, $b_n = \langle b, \phi_n \rangle$, and $g_n(t) = \langle g(t, \cdot, z(t, \cdot)), \phi_n \rangle$. Moreover, considering classical solutions, the system output (6) is expressed as the series expansion:

$$y(t) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \phi_n(0) z_n(t). \quad (9)$$

B. Control design and truncated model for stability analysis

Let $\delta > 0$ be the desired exponential decay rate for the closed-loop system trajectories. Let an integer $N_0 \geq 1$ be such that $-\lambda_n + q_c < -\delta < 0$ for all $n \geq N_0 + 1$. We introduce an arbitrary integer $N \geq N_0 + 1$ that will be specified later. The control strategy takes the form of the following dynamics:

$$\dot{\hat{z}}_n(t) = (-\lambda_n + q_c)\hat{z}_n(t) + b_n u(t) \\ - l_n \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^N \phi_k(0) \hat{z}_k(t) - y(t) \right\}, \quad 1 \leq n \leq N_0 \quad (10a)$$

$$\dot{\hat{z}}_n(t) = (-\lambda_n + q_c)\hat{z}_n(t) + b_n u(t), \quad N_0 + 1 \leq n \leq N \quad (10b)$$

$$u(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{N_0} k_n \hat{z}_n(t) \quad (10c)$$

where $l_n, k_n \in \mathbb{R}$ are the observer and feedback gains, respectively.

In preparation for stability analysis, we need to build a truncated model capturing the N first modes of the PDE (3) as well as the dynamics of the controller (10). To do so, let us define the error of observation $e_n = z_n - \hat{z}_n$, the scaled error of observation $\tilde{e}_n = \sqrt{\lambda_n} e_n$, and the vectors $\hat{Z}^{N_0} = [\hat{z}_1 \dots \hat{z}_{N_0}]^\top$, $E^{N_0} = [e_1 \dots e_{N_0}]^\top$, $\hat{Z}^{N-N_0} = [\hat{z}_{N_0+1} \dots \hat{z}_N]^\top$, $\tilde{E}^{N-N_0} = [\tilde{e}_{N_0+1} \dots \tilde{e}_N]^\top$, $R_1 = [g_1 \dots g_{N_0}]^\top$, $\tilde{R}_2 = [\sqrt{\lambda_{N_0+1}} g_{N_0+1} \dots \sqrt{\lambda_N} g_N]^\top$, and $R = \text{col}(R_1, \tilde{R}_2)$. We also introduce the matrices defined by $A_0 = \text{diag}(-\lambda_1 + q_c, \dots, -\lambda_{N_0} + q_c)$, $A_1 = \text{diag}(-\lambda_{N_0+1} + q_c, \dots, -\lambda_N + q_c)$, $B_0 = [b_1 \dots b_{N_0}]^\top$, $B_1 = [b_{N_0+1} \dots b_N]^\top$, $C_0 = [\phi_1(0) \dots \phi_{N_0}(0)]$, $\tilde{C}_1 = \left[\frac{\phi_{N_0+1}(0)}{\sqrt{\lambda_{N_0+1}}} \dots \frac{\phi_N(0)}{\sqrt{\lambda_N}} \right]$, $K = [k_1 \dots k_{N_0}]$, and $L = [l_1 \dots l_{N_0}]^\top$. Therefore, we obtain from (8-9) and (10) that

$$u = K \hat{Z}^{N_0} \quad (11a)$$

$$\dot{\hat{Z}}^{N_0} = (A_0 + B_0 K) \hat{Z}^{N_0} + L C_0 E^{N_0} + L \tilde{C}_1 \tilde{E}^{N-N_0} + L \zeta \quad (11b)$$

$$\dot{E}^{N_0} = (A_0 - L C_0) E^{N_0} - L \tilde{C}_1 \tilde{E}^{N-N_0} - L \zeta + R_1 \quad (11c)$$

$$\dot{\hat{Z}}^{N-N_0} = A_1 \hat{Z}^{N-N_0} + B_1 K \hat{Z}^{N_0} \quad (11d)$$

$$\dot{\tilde{E}}^{N-N_0} = A_1 \tilde{E}^{N-N_0} + \tilde{R}_2. \quad (11e)$$

with $\zeta = \sum_{n \geq N+1} \phi_n(0) z_n$. Introducing the state vector

$$X = \text{col} \left(\hat{Z}^{N_0}, E^{N_0}, \hat{Z}^{N-N_0}, \tilde{E}^{N-N_0} \right), \quad (12)$$

we infer that the following truncated dynamics hold

$$\dot{X} = FX + L\zeta + GR \quad (13)$$

where

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} A_0 + B_0K & LC_0 & 0 & L\tilde{C}_1 \\ 0 & A_0 - LC_0 & 0 & -L\tilde{C}_1 \\ B_1K & 0 & A_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & A_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}$$

and $\mathcal{L} = \text{col}(L, -L, 0, 0)$. Defining $\tilde{K} = [K \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]$, we also have that

$$u = \tilde{K}X. \quad (14)$$

We finally define the matrices

$$\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_{N_0+1}, \dots, \lambda_N), \quad \Omega = \begin{bmatrix} I & I & 0 & 0 \\ I & I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I & \Lambda^{-1/2} \\ 0 & 0 & \Lambda^{-1/2} & \Lambda^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

and $\tilde{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(I, \Lambda)$. In particular, we have that $\Omega \preceq 2 \max(1, 1/\lambda_{N_0+1})I$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}^{-1} \succeq \min(1, 1/\lambda_N)I$.

C. Stability result

Theorem 1: Let $\theta_1 \in (0, \pi/2]$, $\theta_2 \in [0, \pi/2]$, $p \in \mathcal{C}^2([0, 1])$ with $p > 0$, $\tilde{q}_0 \in \mathcal{C}^0([0, 1])$, and $b \in L^2(0, 1)$. Let $f : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be globally Lipschitz continuous in z , uniformly in (t, x) , so that $f(\cdot, \cdot, 0) = 0$. Let $\tilde{q}_f \in \mathcal{C}^0([0, 1])$ and $k_f > 0$ be so that (4) holds. Let $q \in \mathcal{C}^0([0, 1])$ and $q_c \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that (7) holds. Let $\delta > 0$ and $N_0 \geq 1$ be such that $-\lambda_n + q_c < -\delta$ for all $n \geq N_0 + 1$. Assume that¹ $b_n \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq n \leq N_0$. Let $K \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times N_0}$ and $L \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0}$ be such that $A_0 + B_0K$ and $A_0 - LC_0$ are Hurwitz with eigenvalues that have a real part strictly less than $-\delta < 0$. For a given $N \geq N_0 + 1$, assume that there exist a symmetric positive definite $P \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2N}$, positive real numbers $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 1$ and $\beta, \gamma > 0$ such that

$$\Theta_1 \preceq 0, \quad \Theta_2 \preceq 0 \quad (15)$$

where

$$\Theta_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \Theta_{1,1,1} & P\mathcal{L} & PG \\ \mathcal{L}^\top P & -\beta & 0 \\ G^\top P & 0 & -\alpha_2 \gamma \tilde{\Lambda}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\Theta_{1,1,1} = F^\top P + PF + 2\delta P + \alpha_1 \gamma \|\mathcal{R}_N b\|_{L^2}^2 \tilde{K}^\top \tilde{K} + \alpha_2 \gamma k_f^2 \Omega$$

$$\Theta_2 = 2\gamma \left\{ - \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \right) \right] \lambda_{N+1} + q_c + \delta \right\} + \beta M_\phi + \frac{\alpha_2 \gamma k_f^2}{\lambda_{N+1}}$$

with $M_\phi = \sum_{n \geq N+1} \frac{\phi_n(0)^2}{\lambda_n}$. Then, considering the closed-loop system composed of the plant (3) with the system output (6) and the controller (10), there exists $M > 0$ such that for any initial conditions $z_0 \in H^2(0, 1)$ and $\hat{z}_n(0) \in \mathbb{R}$ so that $\cos(\theta_1)z_0(0) - \sin(\theta_1)z_0'(0) = 0$ and $\cos(\theta_2)z_0(1) + \sin(\theta_2)z_0'(1) = 0$, the system trajectory satisfies

$$\|z(t, \cdot)\|_{H^1}^2 + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{z}_n(t)^2 \leq M e^{-2\kappa t} \left(\|z_0\|_{H^1}^2 + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{z}_n(0)^2 \right)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Moreover, when selecting N to be sufficiently large, there exists $k_f > 0$ (small enough) so that the constraints (15) are feasible.

¹This implies that (A_0, B_0) satisfies the Kalman condition. Note that (A_0, C_0) satisfies the Kalman condition by arguments from [15].

Proof. Consider the Lyapunov functional defined for $X \in \mathbb{R}^{2N}$ and $z \in D(\mathcal{A})$ by (see, e.g., [3])

$$V(X, z) = X^\top P X + \gamma \sum_{n \geq N+1} \lambda_n z_n^2.$$

The computation of the time derivative of V along the system trajectories (8) and (13) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} + 2\delta V &= X^\top \{F^\top P + PF + 2\delta P\} X + 2X^\top P L \zeta + 2X^\top P G R \\ &\quad + 2\gamma \sum_{n \geq N+1} \lambda_n (-\lambda_n + q_c + \delta) z_n^2 + 2\gamma \sum_{n \geq N+1} \lambda_n (b_n u + g_n) z_n. \end{aligned}$$

We define $\tilde{X} = \text{col}(X, \zeta, R)$. Noting that $\zeta^2 \leq M_\phi \sum_{n \geq N+1} \lambda_n z_n^2$ and using Young's inequality and (14), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} + 2\delta V &\leq \tilde{X}^\top \begin{bmatrix} F^\top P + PF + 2\delta P + \alpha_1 \gamma \|\mathcal{R}_N b\|_{L^2}^2 \tilde{K}^\top \tilde{K} & P\mathcal{L} & PG \\ & \mathcal{L}^\top P & -\beta & 0 \\ & G^\top P & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tilde{X} \\ &\quad + 2\gamma \sum_{n \geq N+1} \lambda_n \left\{ -\lambda_n + q_c + \delta + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \right) \lambda_n \right\} z_n^2 \\ &\quad + \beta M_\phi \sum_{n \geq N+1} \lambda_n z_n^2 + \alpha_2 \gamma \|\mathcal{R}_N g(t, \cdot, z)\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for any $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$. Owing to the sector condition (5), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}_N g(t, \cdot, z)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \|g(t, \cdot, z)\|_{L^2}^2 - \sum_{n=1}^N g_n^2 \\ &\leq k_f^2 \|z\|_{L^2}^2 - \|R_1\|^2 - \sum_{n=N_0+1}^N \frac{1}{\lambda_n} (\sqrt{\lambda_n} g_n)^2 \\ &\leq k_f^2 \sum_{n=1}^N z_n^2 + k_f^2 \sum_{n \geq N+1} z_n^2 - R^\top \tilde{\Lambda}^{-1} R. \quad (16) \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $e_n = z_n - \hat{z}_n$ and $\tilde{e}_n = \sqrt{\lambda_n} e_n$, we deduce that $\sum_{n=1}^{N_0} z_n^2 = \hat{z}_n^2 + 2\hat{z}_n e_n + e_n^2$ and $\sum_{n=N_0+1}^N z_n^2 = \hat{z}_n^2 + \frac{2}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \hat{z}_n \tilde{e}_n + \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \tilde{e}_n^2$, hence $\sum_{n=1}^N z_n^2 = X^\top \Omega X$. This implies that

$$\dot{V} + 2\delta V \leq \tilde{X}^\top \Theta_1 \tilde{X} + \sum_{n \geq N+1} \lambda_n \Gamma_n z_n^2$$

where $\Gamma_n = 2\gamma \left\{ - \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \right) \right] \lambda_n + q_c + \delta \right\} + \beta M_\phi + \frac{\alpha_2 \gamma k_f^2}{\lambda_n} \leq \Theta_2$ for all $n \geq N+1$ where we have used that $1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \right) > 0$ because $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 1$. Owing to (15), we infer that $\dot{V} + 2\delta V \leq 0$. Using the definition of V along with (2), we deduce that the claimed exponential stability estimate holds true.

It remains to show that the constraints (15) are feasible when N is large enough and $k_f > 0$ is small enough. First, we observe that (i) $A_0 + B_0K + \delta I$ and $A_0 - LC_0 + \delta I$ are Hurwitz; (ii) $\|e^{(A_1 + \delta I)t}\| \leq e^{-\kappa_0 t}$ for all $t \geq 0$ with the positive constant $\kappa_0 = \lambda_{N_0+1} - q_c - \delta > 0$ independent of N ; (iii) $\|L\tilde{C}_1\| \leq \|L\| \|\tilde{C}_1\|$ and $\|B_1K\| \leq \|b\|_{L^2} \|K\|$ where $\|L\|$ and $\|K\|$ are independent of N while $\|\tilde{C}_1\| = O(1)$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Hence, the application of the Lemma in appendix of [17] to the matrix $F + \delta I$ shows that the unique solution $P \succ 0$ to the Lyapunov equation $F^\top P + PF + 2\delta P = -I$ is such that $\|P\| = O(1)$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. We fix $\alpha_1 > 1$ and $\gamma > 0$ arbitrarily. We also fix $\beta = N$, $\alpha_2 = N^3$, and $k_f = 1/N^2$. Hence it can be seen that $\Theta_2 \rightarrow -\infty$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Moreover, since $\|\tilde{K}\| = \|K\|$, $\|\tilde{L}\| = \sqrt{2}\|L\|$, and $\|G\| = 1$ are constants independent of N , $\|P\| = O(1)$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$, and $\Omega \preceq 2 \max(1, 1/\lambda_{N_0+1})I$ and $-\tilde{\Lambda}^{-1} \preceq -\min(1, 1/\lambda_N)I$, the Schur complement shows that

$\Theta_1 \preceq 0$ for N selected to be large enough. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 1: For a fixed order $N \geq N_0 + 1$ of the observer and for a given value of $k_f > 0$, the constraints (15) are nonlinear w.r.t. the decision variables $P > 0$, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 1$, and $\gamma, \beta > 0$. In order to obtain a LMI formulation of the constraints, we first fix arbitrarily the value of the decision variable $\gamma > 0$. Following the last part of the proof of Theorem 1, the obtained constraints remain feasible for N large enough and $k_f > 0$ small enough. Now $\Theta_1 \preceq 0$ takes the form of a LMI w.r.t. the decision variables $P, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta$ while, using Schur complement, $\Theta_2 \preceq 0$ is equivalent to the LMI formulation:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{\gamma\lambda_{N+1}}} & \sqrt{\gamma\lambda_{N+1}} & \sqrt{\gamma\lambda_{N+1}} \\ \sqrt{\gamma\lambda_{N+1}} & -\alpha_1 & 0 \\ \sqrt{\gamma\lambda_{N+1}} & 0 & -\alpha_2 \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0$$

with $\mu = 2\gamma\{-\lambda_{N+1} + q_c + \delta\} + \beta M_\phi + \alpha_2 \gamma k_f^2 / \lambda_{N+1}$. A similar remark applies to the constraints of Theorem 2. \circ

IV. ROBIN BOUNDARY CONTROL AND DIRICHLET BOUNDARY MEASUREMENT

A. Problem setting and spectral reduction

We now consider the boundary stabilization of the reaction-diffusion PDE described by

$$z_t(t, x) = (p(x)z_x(t, x))_x - \tilde{q}_0(x)z(t, x) + f(t, x, z(t, x)) \quad (17a)$$

$$\cos(\theta_1)z(t, 0) - \sin(\theta_1)z_x(t, 0) = 0 \quad (17b)$$

$$\cos(\theta_2)z(t, 1) + \sin(\theta_2)z_x(t, 1) = u(t) \quad (17c)$$

$$z(0, x) = z_0(x). \quad (17d)$$

for $t > 0$ and $x \in (0, 1)$ where $p \in \mathcal{C}^2([0, 1])$ and $\theta_1 \in (0, \pi/2]$. The boundary measurement is selected as the left Dirichlet trace (6). We still assume that there exist $\tilde{q}_f \in \mathcal{C}^0([0, 1])$ and $k_f > 0$ so that (4) holds. Hence we define $\tilde{q} = \tilde{q}_0 - \tilde{q}_f$ and $g(t, x, z) = f(t, x, z) - \tilde{q}_f(x)z$.

Due to the boundary control u , the PDE (17) is non-homogeneous. Hence we introduce the change of variable

$$w(t, x) = z(t, x) - \frac{x^2}{\cos\theta_2 + 2\sin\theta_2}u(t) \quad (18)$$

so that, introducing $v = \dot{u}$, the PDE (17) is equivalently rewritten under the following homogeneous representation:

$$\dot{u}(t) = v(t) \quad (19a)$$

$$w_t(t, x) = (p(x)w_x(t, x))_x - \tilde{q}(x)w(t, x) + g(t, x, z(t, x)) + a(x)u(t) + b(x)v(t) \quad (19b)$$

$$\cos(\theta_1)w(t, 0) - \sin(\theta_1)w_x(t, 0) = 0 \quad (19c)$$

$$\cos(\theta_2)w(t, 1) + \sin(\theta_2)w_x(t, 1) = 0 \quad (19d)$$

$$w(0, x) = w_0(x). \quad (19e)$$

where $a(x) = \frac{1}{\cos\theta_2 + 2\sin\theta_2}\{2p(x) + 2xp'(x) - x^2\tilde{q}(x)\}$, $b(x) = -\frac{x^2}{\cos\theta_2 + 2\sin\theta_2}$, and $w_0(x) = z_0(x) - \frac{x^2}{\cos\theta_2 + 2\sin\theta_2}u(0)$. Note that we kept in (19b) the nonlinear term $g(t, x, z(t, x))$ expressed in original coordinate z . We introduce $q \in \mathcal{C}^0([0, 1])$ and $q_c \in \mathbb{R}$ so that (7) holds. Finally, we define the coefficients of projection $z_n(t) = \langle z(t, \cdot), \phi_n \rangle$, $w_n(t) = \langle w(t, \cdot), \phi_n \rangle$, $a_n = \langle a, \phi_n \rangle$, $b_n = \langle b, \phi_n \rangle$, and $g_n(t) = \langle g(t, \cdot, z(t, \cdot)), \phi_n \rangle$. From (18) we deduce that

$$w_n(t) = z_n(t) + b_n u(t), \quad n \geq 1. \quad (20)$$

Moreover, the projection of (19) into the Hilbert basis $(\phi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ gives

$$\dot{u}(t) = v(t) \quad (21a)$$

$$\dot{w}_n(t) = (-\lambda_n + q_c)w_n(t) + a_n u(t) + b_n v(t) + g_n(t) \quad (21b)$$

with $w(t, \cdot) = \sum_{n \geq 1} w_n(t)\phi_n$. The convergence of the latter series holds in L^2 norm for mild solutions and in H^2 norm for classical solutions. Inserting (20) into (21), the projection of (17) gives

$$\dot{z}_n(t) = (-\lambda_n + q_c)z_n(t) + \beta_n u(t) + g_n(t) \quad (22)$$

where $\beta_n = a_n + (-\lambda_n + q_c)b_n = p(1)\{-\cos(\theta_2)\phi'_n(1) + \sin(\theta_2)\phi_n(1)\} = O(\sqrt{\lambda_n})$. In particular we have $z(t, \cdot) = \sum_{n \geq 1} z_n(t)\phi_n$ with convergence of the series in L^2 norm. Finally, considering classical solutions, the system output (6) is expressed by the series expansion

$$y(t) = z(t, 0) = w(t, 0) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \phi_n(0)w_n(t). \quad (23)$$

B. Control design and truncated model for stability analysis

Let $\delta > 0$ be the desired exponential decay rate for the closed-loop system trajectories. Let an integer $N_0 \geq 1$ be such that $-\lambda_n + q_c < -\delta < 0$ for all $n \geq N_0 + 1$. For an arbitrary integer $N \geq N_0 + 1$, the control strategy reads:

$$\hat{w}_n(t) = \hat{z}_n(t) + b_n u(t) \quad (24a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{z}}_n(t) &= (-\lambda_n + q_c)\hat{z}_n(t) + \beta_n u(t) \\ &\quad - l_n \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^N \phi_k(0)\hat{w}_k(t) - y(t) \right\}, \quad 1 \leq n \leq N_0 \end{aligned} \quad (24b)$$

$$\dot{\hat{z}}_n(t) = (-\lambda_n + q_c)\hat{z}_n(t) + \beta_n u(t), \quad N_0 + 1 \leq n \leq N \quad (24c)$$

$$u(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{N_0} k_n \hat{z}_n(t) \quad (24d)$$

where $l_n, k_n \in \mathbb{R}$ are the observer and feedback gains, respectively.

To build the truncated model, we adopt the notations of Subsection III-B except that we introduce the notations $\tilde{z}_n = \hat{z}_n / \lambda_n$ along with the vector $\tilde{Z}^{N-N_0} = [\tilde{z}_{N_0+1} \ \dots \ \tilde{z}_N]^\top$ and the matrices $\mathfrak{B}_0 = [\beta_1 \ \dots \ \beta_{N_0}]^\top$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{N_0+1} & \dots & \beta_N \\ \lambda_{N_0+1} & \dots & \lambda_N \end{bmatrix}^\top$. Hence, introducing the state vector

$$X = \text{col} \left(\hat{Z}^{N_0}, E^{N_0}, \tilde{Z}^{N-N_0}, \tilde{E}^{N-N_0} \right), \quad (25)$$

we deduce similarly to the developments of Subsection III-B that the following truncated dynamics hold

$$\dot{X} = FX + L\zeta + GR \quad (26)$$

where

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} A_0 + \mathfrak{B}_0 K & LC_0 & 0 & L\tilde{C}_1 \\ 0 & A_0 - LC_0 & 0 & -L\tilde{C}_1 \\ \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_1 K & 0 & A_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & A_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}$$

and $\mathcal{L} = \text{col}(L, -L, 0, 0)$. We define the matrices

$$\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_{N_0+1}, \dots, \lambda_N), \quad \Omega = \begin{bmatrix} I & I & 0 & 0 \\ I & I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \Lambda^2 & \Lambda^{1/2} \\ 0 & 0 & \Lambda^{1/2} & \Lambda^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

and $\tilde{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(I, \Lambda)$ which are such that $\Omega \preceq 2 \max(1, 1/\lambda_{N_0+1}, \lambda_N^2)I$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}^{-1} \succeq \min(1, 1/\lambda_N)I$. Finally, introducing $\tilde{X} = \text{col}(X, \zeta, R)$, we have

$$v = \dot{u} = K\dot{Z}^{N_0} = E\tilde{X} \quad (27)$$

where $E = K [A_0 + \mathfrak{B}_0 K \quad LC_0 \quad 0 \quad L\tilde{C}_1 \quad L \quad 0]$.

C. Stability result

Theorem 2: Let $\theta_1 \in (0, \pi/2]$, $\theta_2 \in [0, \pi/2]$, $p \in \mathcal{C}^2([0, 1])$ with $p > 0$, and $\tilde{q}_0 \in \mathcal{C}^0([0, 1])$. Let $f: \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be globally Lipschitz continuous in z , uniformly in (t, x) , so that $f(\cdot, \cdot, 0) = 0$. Let $\tilde{q}_f \in \mathcal{C}^0([0, 1])$ and $k_f > 0$ be so that (4) holds. Let $q \in \mathcal{C}^0([0, 1])$ and $q_c \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that (7) holds. Let $\delta > 0$ and $N_0 \geq 1$ be such that $-\lambda_n + q_c < -\delta$ for all $n \geq N_0 + 1$. Let $K \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times N_0}$ and $L \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0}$ be such that² $A_0 + \mathfrak{B}_0 K$ and $A_0 - LC_0$ are Hurwitz with eigenvalues that have a real part strictly less than $-\delta < 0$. For a given $N \geq N_0 + 1$, assume that there exist a symmetric positive definite $P \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2N}$, positive real numbers $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 > 3/2$ and $\beta, \gamma > 0$ such that

$$\Theta_1 \preceq 0, \quad \Theta_2 \leq 0 \quad (28)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} \Theta_{1,1,1} & P\mathcal{L} & PG \\ \mathcal{L}^\top P & -\beta & 0 \\ G^\top P & 0 & -\alpha_3 \gamma \tilde{\Lambda}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} + \alpha_2 \gamma \|\mathcal{R}_{Nb}\|_{L^2}^2 E^\top E \\ \Theta_{1,1,1} &= F^\top P + PF + 2\delta P + \alpha_1 \gamma \|\mathcal{R}_{Na}\|_{L^2}^2 \tilde{K}^\top \tilde{K} \\ &\quad + 2\alpha_3 \gamma k_f^2 \|\mathcal{R}_{Nb}\|_{L^2}^2 \tilde{K}^\top \tilde{K} + \alpha_3 \gamma k_f^2 \Omega \\ \Theta_2 &= 2\gamma \left\{ - \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{1}{\alpha_2} + \frac{1}{\alpha_3} \right) \right] \lambda_{N+1} + q_c + \delta \right\} \\ &\quad + \beta M_\phi + \frac{2\alpha_3 \gamma k_f^2}{\lambda_{N+1}} \end{aligned}$$

with $M_\phi = \sum_{n \geq N+1} \frac{\phi_n(0)^2}{\lambda_n}$. Then, considering the closed-loop system composed of the plant (17) with the system output (6) and the controller (24), there exists $M > 0$ such that for any initial conditions $z_0 \in H^2(0, 1)$ and $\hat{z}_n(0) \in \mathbb{R}$ so that $\cos(\theta_1)z_0(0) - \sin(\theta_1)z_0'(0) = 0$ and $\cos(\theta_2)z_0(1) + \sin(\theta_2)z_0'(1) = K\hat{Z}^{N_0}(0)$, the system trajectory satisfies

$$\|z(t, \cdot)\|_{H^1}^2 + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{z}_n(t)^2 \leq M e^{-2\kappa t} \left(\|z_0\|_{H^1}^2 + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{z}_n(0)^2 \right)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Moreover, when selecting N to be sufficiently large, there exists $k_f > 0$ (small enough) so that the constraints (28) are feasible.

Proof. Consider the Lyapunov functional defined for $X \in \mathbb{R}^{2N}$ and $w \in D(A)$ by

$$V(X, w) = X^\top P X + \gamma \sum_{n \geq N+1} \lambda_n w_n^2.$$

The computation of the time derivative of V along the system trajectories (21) and (26) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} + 2\delta V &= X^\top \{F^\top P + PF + 2\delta P\} X + 2X^\top P\mathcal{L}\zeta + 2X^\top PGR \\ &\quad + 2\gamma \sum_{n \geq N+1} \lambda_n (-\lambda_n + q_c + \delta) w_n^2 \\ &\quad + 2\gamma \sum_{n \geq N+1} \lambda_n (a_n u + b_n v + g_n) w_n. \end{aligned}$$

With $\tilde{X} = \text{col}(X, \zeta, R)$, noting that $\zeta^2 \leq M_\phi \sum_{n \geq N+1} \lambda_n z_n^2$, and using Young's inequality, (14), and (27), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} + 2\delta V &\leq \tilde{X}^\top \begin{bmatrix} F^\top P + PF + 2\delta P + \alpha_1 \gamma \|\mathcal{R}_{Na}\|_{L^2}^2 \tilde{K}^\top \tilde{K} & P\mathcal{L} & PG \\ \mathcal{L}^\top P & -\beta & 0 \\ G^\top P & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tilde{X} \end{aligned}$$

²Note that (A_0, \mathfrak{B}_0) and (A_0, C_0) satisfy the Kalman condition by arguments from [15].

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \alpha_2 \gamma \|\mathcal{R}_{Nb}\|_{L^2}^2 \tilde{X}^\top E^\top E \tilde{X} + \beta M_\phi \sum_{n \geq N+1} \lambda_n w_n^2 \\ &+ 2\gamma \sum_{n \geq N+1} \lambda_n \left\{ -\lambda_n + q_c + \delta + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{1}{\alpha_2} + \frac{1}{\alpha_3} \right) \lambda_n \right\} w_n^2 \\ &+ \alpha_3 \gamma \|\mathcal{R}_{Ng}(t, \cdot, z)\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

for any $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 > 0$. Using the sector condition (5) we infer that (16) holds. Recalling that $e_n = z_n - \hat{z}_n$, $\tilde{e}_n = \sqrt{\lambda_n} e_n$, and $\tilde{z}_n = \hat{z}_n / \lambda_n$, we deduce that $\sum_{n=1}^{N_0} z_n^2 = \tilde{z}_n^2 + 2\tilde{z}_n e_n + e_n^2$ and $\sum_{n=N_0+1}^N z_n^2 = \lambda_n^2 \tilde{z}_n^2 + 2\sqrt{\lambda_n} \tilde{z}_n \tilde{e}_n + \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \tilde{e}_n^2$, hence $\sum_{n=1}^N z_n^2 = X^\top \Omega X$. Moreover, we infer from (20) and using (14) that $\sum_{n \geq N+1} z_n^2 \leq 2 \sum_{n \geq N+1} w_n^2 + 2 \|\mathcal{R}_{Nb}\|_{L^2}^2 X^\top \tilde{K}^\top \tilde{K} X$. This implies that

$$\dot{V} + 2\delta V \leq \tilde{X}^\top \Theta_1 \tilde{X} + \sum_{n \geq N+1} \lambda_n \Gamma_n z_n^2$$

with $\Gamma_n = 2\gamma \left\{ - \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{1}{\alpha_2} + \frac{1}{\alpha_3} \right) \right] \lambda_n + q_c + \delta \right\} + \beta M_\phi + \frac{2\alpha_3 \gamma k_f^2}{\lambda_n} \leq \Theta_2$ for all $n \geq N + 1$ where we have used that $1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{1}{\alpha_2} + \frac{1}{\alpha_3} \right) > 0$ because $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 > 3/2$. Owing to (28), we infer that $\dot{V} + 2\delta V \leq 0$. Using the definition of V and (2), we deduce that the claimed exponential stability estimate holds true.

It remains to show that the constraints (28) are feasible when N is large enough and $k_f > 0$ is small enough. Since $\|\tilde{C}_1\| = O(1)$ and $\|\mathfrak{B}_1\| = O(1)$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$, the same approach as in the proof of Theorem 1 shows that the unique solution $P \succ 0$ to the Lyapunov equation $F^\top P + PF + 2\delta P = -I$ is such that $\|P\| = O(1)$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. We fix $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 3/2$ and $\gamma > 0$ arbitrarily. We also fix $\beta = N$, $\alpha_3 = N^3$, and $k_f = 1/N^4$. Hence it can be seen that $\Theta_2 \rightarrow -\infty$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Moreover, since $\|\tilde{K}\| = \|K\|$, $\|\tilde{L}\| = \sqrt{2}\|L\|$, and $\|G\| = 1$ are constants independent of N , $\|P\| = O(1)$ and $\|E\| = O(1)$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$, and $\Omega \preceq 2 \max(1, 1/\lambda_{N_0+1}, \lambda_N^2) I$ and $-\tilde{\Lambda}^{-1} \preceq -\min(1, 1/\lambda_N) I$, the Schur complement shows that $\Theta_1 \preceq 0$ for N selected to be large enough. This completes the proof. \square

V. NUMERICAL ILLUSTRATION

For numerical illustration, we consider $p = 1$, $\tilde{q}_0 = -2$, $\tilde{q}_f = 3$, and $\theta_1 = \pi/5$, and $\theta_2 = 0$. Hence the open-loop reaction diffusion PDEs (3) and (17) are unstable in the case of $k_f = 0$, i.e. for $f(t, x, z) = \tilde{q}_f z = 3z$. In the case of the reaction-diffusion PDE with bounded control input (3), we consider the shape function $b(x) = \cos(x)1|_{[1/10, 3/10]}$.

The feedback gain K and the observer gain L are computed to achieve the same pole placement in the different studied settings. In the case of Theorem 1, corresponding to a bounded input operator and a left Dirichlet measurement, the gains are set as $K = -25.9768$ and $L = 5.9341$. In the case of Theorem 2, corresponding to a right boundary control and a left Dirichlet measurement, the gains are set as $K = -2.3307$ and $L = 5.9341$.

The maximal value of $k_f > 0$ (corresponding to the size of the sector condition (4) in which the nonlinearity $f(t, x, z)$ is confined into) for which the stability of the closed-loop system is ensured by applying the theorems of this paper is detailed in Tab. I for the two studied configurations and for different values of the order of the observer.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper discussed the topic of output feedback stabilization of semilinear reaction-diffusion PDEs for which the semilinearity

Dimension of the observer	$N = 2$	$N = 3$	$N = 4$	$N = 5$	$N = 6$
Theorem 1	$k_f = 1.99$	$k_f = 2.32$	$k_f = 2.45$	$k_f = 2.54$	$k_f = 2.59$
Theorem 2	$k_f = 1.93$	$k_f = 2.14$	$k_f = 2.21$	$k_f = 2.25$	$k_f = 2.27$

TABLE I

MAXIMUM VALUE OF k_f FOR THE SECTOR CONDITION (4) OBTAINED FOR DIFFERENT DIMENSIONS N OF THE OBSERVER.

is assumed to be confined into a sector condition. We addressed multiple actuation configurations, including bounded input operators and Robin boundary control. The measurement was selected as a Dirichlet boundary measurement. The adopted control design procedure is systematic in the sense that the derived stability conditions are always feasible provided the order of the controller is selected large enough and the size of the sector condition is small enough.

It is worth noting that even if the developments of this paper have been focused on a Dirichlet boundary measurement, the case of a Neumann boundary measurement can also be handled using the framework of this paper augmented with the scaling procedure reported in [15], [17].

Future research directions may be concerned with the extension of the method to more stringent nonlinearities such as memory based nonlinearity maps.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. J. Balas, "Finite-dimensional controllers for linear distributed parameter systems: exponential stability using residual mode filters," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 133, no. 2, pp. 283–296, 1988.
- [2] D. M. Boskovic, M. Krstic, and W. Liu, "Boundary control of an unstable heat equation via measurement of domain-averaged temperature," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 46, no. 12, pp. 2022–2028, 2001.
- [3] J.-M. Coron and E. Trélat, "Global steady-state controllability of one-dimensional semilinear heat equations," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 549–569, 2004.
- [4] —, "Global steady-state stabilization and controllability of 1D semilinear wave equations," *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics*, vol. 8, no. 04, pp. 535–567, 2006.
- [5] R. Curtain, "Finite-dimensional compensator design for parabolic distributed systems with point sensors and boundary input," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 98–104, 1982.
- [6] R. F. Curtain and H. Zwart, *An introduction to infinite-dimensional linear systems theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012, vol. 21.
- [7] C. Harkort and J. Deutscher, "Finite-dimensional observer-based control of linear distributed parameter systems using cascaded output observers," *International journal of control*, vol. 84, no. 1, pp. 107–122, 2011.
- [8] I. Karafyllis, "Lyapunov-based boundary feedback design for parabolic PDEs," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 94, no. 5, pp. 1247–1260, 2021.
- [9] R. Katz and E. Fridman, "Constructive method for finite-dimensional observer-based control of 1-D parabolic PDEs," *Automatica*, vol. 122, p. 109285, 2020.
- [10] —, "Delayed finite-dimensional observer-based control of 1-D parabolic PDEs," *Automatica*, vol. 123, p. 109364, 2021.
- [11] C. Kitsos, G. Besançon, and C. Prieur, "High-gain observer design for some semilinear reaction-diffusion systems: a transformation-based approach," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 629–634, 2020.
- [12] M. Krstic and A. Smyshlyaev, *Boundary control of PDEs: A course on backstepping designs*. SIAM, 2008.
- [13] H. Lhachemi and C. Prieur, "Boundary output feedback stabilization of reaction-diffusion PDEs with delayed boundary measurement," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.13637*, 2021.
- [14] —, "Local output feedback stabilization of a reaction-diffusion equation with saturated actuation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.16523*, 2021.
- [15] —, "Nonlinear boundary output feedback stabilization of reaction diffusion PDEs," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.08418*, 2021.
- [16] —, "Predictor-based output feedback stabilization of an input delayed parabolic PDE with boundary measurement," *Automatica*, in press, 2021.
- [17] —, "Finite-dimensional observer-based boundary stabilization of reaction-diffusion equations with either a Dirichlet or Neumann boundary measurement," *Automatica*, vol. 135, p. 109955, 2022.
- [18] W. Liu, "Boundary feedback stabilization of an unstable heat equation," *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 1033–1043, 2003.
- [19] F. Mazenc and C. Prieur, "Strict Lyapunov functions for semilinear parabolic partial differential equations," *Mathematical Control and Related Fields*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 231–250, 2011.
- [20] T. Meurer, "On the extended Luenberger-type observer for semilinear distributed-parameter systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 1732–1743, 2013.
- [21] A. Mironchenko, C. Prieur, and F. Wirth, "Local stabilization of an unstable parabolic equation via saturated controls," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 5, pp. 2162–2176, 2021.
- [22] Y. Orlov, "On general properties of eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of a Sturm–Liouville operator: comments on "ISS with respect to boundary disturbances for 1-D parabolic PDEs"," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 11, pp. 5970–5973, 2017.
- [23] C. Prieur and J. J. Winkin, "Boundary feedback control of linear hyperbolic systems: Application to the Saint-Venant–Exner equations," *Automatica*, vol. 89, pp. 44–51, 2018.
- [24] M. Renardy and R. C. Rogers, *An introduction to partial differential equations*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006, vol. 13.
- [25] D. L. Russell, "Controllability and stabilizability theory for linear partial differential equations: recent progress and open questions," *SIAM Review*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 639–739, 1978.
- [26] Y. Sakawa, "Feedback stabilization of linear diffusion systems," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 667–676, 1983.
- [27] A. Selivanov and E. Fridman, "Distributed event-triggered control of diffusion semilinear PDEs," *Automatica*, vol. 68, pp. 344–351, 2016.
- [28] H.-N. Wu, Z.-P. Wang, and H.-X. Li, "Improved H_∞ sampled-data control for semilinear parabolic PDE systems," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 1872–1892, 2019.
- [29] X.-W. Zhang and H.-N. Wu, "Switching state observer design for semilinear parabolic PDE systems with mobile sensors," *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, vol. 357, no. 2, pp. 1299–1317, 2020.