

NOTE ON STABILITY OF AN ABSTRACT COUPLED HYPERBOLIC-PARABOLIC SYSTEM: SINGULAR CASE

KAÏS AMMARI, FARHAT SHEL, AND ZHUANGYI LIU

ABSTRACT. In this paper we try to complete the stability analysis for an abstract system of coupled hyperbolic and parabolic equations

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} + Au - A^\alpha w = 0, \\ w_t + A^\alpha u_t + A^\beta w = 0, \\ u(0) = u_0, u_t(0) = u_1, w(0) = w_0, \end{cases}$$

where A is a self-adjoint, positive definite operator on a complex Hilbert space H , and $(\alpha, \beta) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$, which is considered in [1], and after, in [4]. Our contribution is to identify a fine scale of polynomial stability of the solution in the region $S_3 := \{(\alpha, \beta) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]; \beta < 2\alpha - 1\}$ taking into account the presence of a singularity at zero.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Stabilization	4
3.	Application	7
	References	8

1. Introduction

In this paper, we study the stability of the following system :

$$(1.1) \quad u_{tt} + Au - A^\alpha w = 0,$$

$$(1.2) \quad w_t + A^\alpha u_t + A^\beta w = 0,$$

$$(1.3) \quad u(0) = u_0, u_t(0) = u_1, w(0) = w_0,$$

where A is a self-adjoint, positive definite operator on a complex Hilbert space H , and $(\alpha, \beta) \in S_3 = \{(a, b) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]; b < 2a - 1\}$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B65, 35K90, 47D03.

Key words and phrases. Hyperbolic-parabolic system, stability.

By denoting $U = (u, u_t, w)^T$, $U_0 = (u_0, u_1, w_0)^T$, system (1.1)-(1.3) can be written as an abstract linear evolution equation on the space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{D}(A^{\frac{1}{2}}) \times H \times H$,

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{dU}{dt}(t) = \mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \beta} U(t), & t \geq 0, \\ U(0) = U_0, \end{cases}$$

where the operator $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \beta} : \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \beta}) \subset \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \beta} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I & 0 \\ -A & 0 & A^\alpha \\ 0 & -A^\alpha & -A^\beta \end{pmatrix},$$

with the domain

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \beta}) = \mathcal{D}(A) \times \mathcal{D}(A^\alpha) \times \mathcal{D}(A^\alpha),$$

Firstly, we give a detailed review about the well-posedness of the problem (1.4). The operator $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \beta}$ is densely defined and dissipative, we will prove that its closure generates a C_0 -semigroup of contractions. Using a Lumer-Phillips theorem [6], it suffices to prove that the adjoint operator $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \beta}^*$ is also dissipative.

The operator $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \beta}^*$ is a closed extension of the operator

$$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \beta} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I & 0 \\ A & 0 & -A^\alpha \\ 0 & A^\alpha & -A^\beta \end{pmatrix},$$

with domain

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \beta}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \beta}) = \mathcal{D}(A) \times \mathcal{D}(A^\alpha) \times \mathcal{D}(A^\alpha).$$

The operator $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \beta}$ is densely defined and dissipative, then it is closable and its $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\alpha, \beta}$ is also dissipative. To conclude, it suffices to prove that $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha, \beta}^* = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\alpha, \beta}$. For this we use the following lemma [2, 1].

Lemma 1.1. [2] *We consider on the Hilbert spaces G and H_1 the operators*

$$\begin{aligned} A : \mathcal{D}(A) \subset G &\rightarrow G, & B : \mathcal{D}(B) \subset H_1 &\rightarrow G, \\ B^* : \mathcal{D}(B^*) \subset G &\rightarrow H_1, & \mathcal{C} : \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{C}) \subset H_1 &\rightarrow H_1. \end{aligned}$$

and we consider the operator matrix \mathcal{M} on $G \times H_1$ defined by

$$\mathcal{M} := \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ -B^* & \mathcal{C} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}) := (\mathcal{D}(A) \cap \mathcal{D}(B^*)) \times (\mathcal{D}(B) \cap \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{C})).$$

Assume that \mathcal{C} is boundedly invertible, that $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{C}), G)$ and that $\mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{B}^*$ extends to a bounded linear operator (we denote its closure with the same symbol). Then \mathcal{M} is closed if and only if $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{B}^*$ is closed and one has

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}} = \begin{pmatrix} I & \mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^{-1} \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{B}^*} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{C} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -\mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{B}^* & I \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{B}^*}) \times H_1, -\mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{B}^*u + v \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{C}) \right\}.$$

By taking $G = \mathcal{D}(A^{1/2})$, $H_1 = H \times H$, $\mathcal{A} = 0$, $\mathcal{B} = (-I \ 0) : \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{D}(A^\alpha) \times \mathcal{D}(A^\alpha) \subset H \times H \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(A^{1/2})$, $\mathcal{C} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -A^\alpha \\ A^\alpha & -A^\beta \end{pmatrix}$, with $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{D}(A^\alpha) \times \mathcal{D}(A^\alpha)$, it appears that $\mathcal{B}^* = \begin{pmatrix} -A \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{B}^* = \begin{pmatrix} A^{1+\beta-2\alpha} \\ A^{1-\alpha} \end{pmatrix}$, $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{B}^* = -A^{\beta+1-2\alpha}$ (with domain $\mathcal{D}(A)$), and that $\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^{-1}\mathcal{B}^*}) = \mathcal{D}(A^{1/2})$. Furthermore, the operators \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} satisfies the hypothesis in Lemma 1.1, then

$$\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\alpha,\beta}) = \{(u, v, \theta)^T \in \mathcal{H}, -A^{1+\beta-2\alpha}u + v \in \mathcal{D}(A^\alpha), -A^{1-\alpha}u + \theta \in \mathcal{D}(A^\alpha)\}.$$

But a direct calculation, gives

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}^*) \subset \{(u, v, \theta)^T \in \mathcal{H}, -A^{1+\beta-2\alpha}u + v \in \mathcal{D}(A^\alpha), -A^{1-\alpha}u + \theta \in \mathcal{D}(A^\alpha)\}.$$

Hence $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}^* = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{A}}_{\alpha,\beta}$ generates a C_0 -semigroup of contractions.

Now, concerning the stability of the semigroup $e^{t\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}}$, recall that Ammar-Khodja et al. [1], are firstly proved that for every $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$, $e^{t\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}}$ is exponentially stable if and only if $\max(1 - 2\alpha, 2\alpha - 1) < \beta < 2\alpha$. Later on, a stability analysis has been performed by J. Hao and Z. Liu in [5] for $(\alpha, \beta) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$. They divided the unit square $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ into four regions S , S_1 , S_2 , S_3 where

$$S := \{(\alpha, \beta) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]; \max(1 - 2\alpha, 2\alpha - 1) \leq \beta \leq 2\alpha\},$$

$$S_1 := \left\{ (\alpha, \beta) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]; 0 < \beta - 2\alpha, \alpha \geq 0, \frac{1}{2} \leq \beta \leq 1 \right\},$$

$$S_2 := \left\{ (\alpha, \beta) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]; \beta < 1 - 2\alpha, \alpha \geq 0, 0 \leq \beta \leq \frac{1}{2} \right\}$$

and S_3 as defined below. We summarize the main results in the following theorem (see also [4]).

Theorem 1.2. *The semigroup $e^{t\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}}$ has the following stability properties:*

- (i) In S , it is exponentially stable;
- (ii) In S_1 , it is polynomially stable of order $\frac{1}{2(\beta-2\alpha)}$;
- (iii) In S_2 , it is polynomially stable of order $\frac{1}{2-2(\beta+2\alpha)}$;

(iv) In S_3 , it is not asymptotically stable.

To justify the non asymptotic stability in region S_3 , they proved that $0 \in \sigma(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})$, where $\sigma(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})$ is the spectrum of $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}$. Moreover, it can be shown that $\sigma(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}) \cap i\mathbb{R} = \{0\}$ in the region S_3 .

The main result of this paper then concerns the precise asymptotic behaviour of the solutions of (1.1)-(1.3) for (α, β) in the region S_3 , with initial condition in a special subspace of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})$. Precisely, we will estimate $\|e^{t\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta} (I - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})^{-1}\|$ when $t \rightarrow \infty$. Our technique is a special frequency and spectral analysis of the corresponding operator.

2. Stabilization

We will justify that the resolvent has only a singularity (at zero) on the imaginary axis (Lemma 2.3 below), and that $(i\lambda - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})^{-1}$ is bounded outside a neighborhood of zero in \mathbb{R} (Lemma 2.4 below). then we apply a result due to Batty, Chill and Tomilov ([3, Theorem 7.6]) which relate the decay of $\|e^{t\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta} (I - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})^{-1}\|$ to the growth of $(i\lambda - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})^{-1}$ near zero.

So, first we recall the corresponding result

Theorem 2.1. ([3], Theorem 7.6.) *Let $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$ be a bounded C_0 -semigroup on a Hilbert space X , with generator \mathcal{A} . assume that $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) \cap i\mathbb{R} = \{0\}$, and let $\gamma \geq 1$. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\|(is - \mathcal{A})^{-1}\| = \begin{cases} O(|s|^{-\gamma}), & s \rightarrow 0, \\ O(1), & |s| \rightarrow \infty, \end{cases}$
- (ii) $\|T(t)A^\gamma(I - A)^{-\gamma}\| = O\left(\frac{1}{t}\right), \quad t \rightarrow \infty,$
- (iii) $\|T(t)A(I - A)^{-1}\| = O\left(\frac{1}{t^{1/\gamma}}\right), \quad t \rightarrow \infty.$

Hence, our main result is the following

Theorem 2.2. *We have the following decay in the region S_3*

$$(2.1) \quad \|e^{t\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta} (I - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})^{-1}\| = O\left(\frac{1}{t}\right), \quad t \rightarrow \infty.$$

In particular, the decay of $e^{t\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta} x$ to zero is uniform with respect to $x \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})$.

It follows also that, for every $z \in \text{Ran}(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})$ we have

$$\|e^{t\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}} z\| = O\left(\frac{1}{t}\right), \quad t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. In view of Theorem 2.1, the proof is a direct consequence of the following three lemmas.

Lemma 2.3. *In the region S_3 , the operator $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}$ satisfies*

$$\sigma(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}) \cap \mathbf{i}\mathbb{R} = \{0\}.$$

Proof. It has been proved in [5], at the third section that $\{0\} \subset \sigma(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}) \cap \mathbf{i}\mathbb{R}$.

Conversely, to show that there is no nonzero spectrum point on the imaginary axis, we use a contradiction argument. In fact, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda \neq 0$ such that $\mathbf{i}\lambda \in \sigma(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})$. Then, there exists a sequence $(U_n) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})$, with $\|U_n\| = 1$ for all n , such that

$$(2.2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(\mathbf{i}\lambda I - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}) U_n\| = 0$$

or there exists a sequence $(U_n) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})$, with $\|U_n\| = 1$ for all n , such that

$$(2.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(\mathbf{i}\lambda I + \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}) U_n\| = 0.$$

Setting $U_n = (u_n, v_n, \theta_n)$, then (2.2) is equivalent to

$$(2.4) \quad \mathbf{i}\lambda A^{1/2} u_n - A^{1/2} v_n = o(1), \quad \text{in } H,$$

$$(2.5) \quad \mathbf{i}\lambda v_n + A u_n - A^\alpha \theta_n = o(1), \quad \text{in } H,$$

$$(2.6) \quad \mathbf{i}\lambda \theta_n + A^\alpha v_n + A^\beta \theta_n = o(1), \quad \text{in } H.$$

First, since

$$\operatorname{Re} \langle (\mathbf{i}\lambda I - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}) U_n, U_n \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \|A^{\beta/2} \theta_n\|^2$$

we obtain

$$(2.7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A^{\beta/2} \theta_n\| = 0,$$

and in particular

$$(2.8) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\theta_n\| = 0.$$

Second, taking inner product of (2.4) with $\frac{1}{\lambda} A^{1/2} u_n$, (2.5) with $\frac{1}{\lambda} v_n$ and (2.6) with $\frac{1}{\lambda} \theta_n$, taking into account (2.7) and (2.8), we get

$$(2.9) \quad \mathbf{i} \|A^{1/2} u_n\|^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda} \langle v_n, A u_n \rangle = o(1),$$

$$(2.10) \quad \mathbf{i} \|v_n\|^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda} \langle A u_n, v_n \rangle - \frac{1}{\lambda} \langle A^\alpha \theta_n, v_n \rangle = o(1),$$

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{1}{\lambda} \langle A^\alpha v_n, \theta_n \rangle = o(1).$$

Then, by combining (2.9)-(2.11) and using that $\|U_n\| = 1$, it yields

$$(2.12) \quad \|A^{1/2} u_n\| = \frac{1}{2} + o(1), \quad \|v_n\| = \frac{1}{2} + o(1).$$

Now, since in the region S_3 , $1 - \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{3}{2} - 2\alpha + \beta < \frac{1}{2}$, then using the boundedness of $\|A^{1/2} u_n\|$ we get, by interpolation,

$$(2.13) \quad \|A^{1-\alpha} u_n\| = O(1), \quad \|A^{1-2\alpha+\beta} u_n\| = O(1).$$

Then, replacing $\mathbf{i}v_n$ by λu_n in (2.5), due to (2.4) and interpolation, next taking the inner product of the obtained equation with $\frac{1}{\lambda}A^{1-2\alpha+\beta}u_n$ to get

$$(2.14) \quad -\lambda\|A^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha+\frac{\beta}{2}}u_n\|^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\|A^{1-\alpha+\frac{\beta}{2}}u_n\|^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda}\langle A^\alpha\theta_n, A^{1-2\alpha+\beta}u_n\rangle = o(1).$$

Taking the inner product of (2.6) with $\frac{1}{\lambda}A^{1-\alpha}u_n$, we get

$$(2.15) \quad \mathbf{i}\langle\theta_n, A^{1-\alpha}u_n\rangle + \frac{1}{\lambda}\langle A^{1/2}v_n, A^{1/2}u_n\rangle + \frac{1}{\lambda}\langle A^\alpha\theta_n, A^{1-2\alpha+\beta}u_n\rangle = o(1).$$

By (2.8) and (2.13), the first term in (2.14) converge to zero. Moreover, using (2.4), we can replace $\frac{1}{\lambda}A^{1/2}v_n$ in the second term in (2.15) by $\mathbf{i}A^{1/2}u_n$. Consequently, the sum of (2.14) and (2.15) yields

$$(2.16) \quad -\lambda\|A^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha+\frac{\beta}{2}}u_n\|^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\|A^{1-\alpha+\frac{\beta}{2}}u_n\|^2 + \mathbf{i}\|A^{\frac{1}{2}}u_n\|^2 = o(1).$$

Hence, $\|A^{\frac{1}{2}}u_n\|^2 = o(1)$, which contradict the first estimate in (2.12).

The same approach applied to (2.3) leads to the same conclusion without any difficulty. \square

Lemma 2.4. *In the region S_3 ,*

$$\|(\mathbf{i}s - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})^{-1}\| = O(1), \quad s \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. It is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.3 in [5], since $\limsup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda \rightarrow \infty} |\lambda|^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} \|(\mathbf{i}\lambda - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})^{-1}\| < \infty$. \square

Lemma 2.5. *In the region S_3 ,*

$$\|(\mathbf{i}s - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})^{-1}\| = O(|s|^{-1}), \quad s \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. By contradiction, suppose that $\limsup_{s \in \mathbb{R}, s \rightarrow 0} \|s(\mathbf{i}sI - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})^{-1}\| = \infty$.

Putting $s = \frac{1}{w}$, this is equivalent to $\limsup_{w \in \mathbb{R}, |w| \rightarrow \infty} \|w^{-1}(\mathbf{i}w^{-1}I - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})^{-1}\| = \infty$. Then, there exists a sequence (w_n) of real numbers with $|w_n| \rightarrow \infty$, and a sequence $(U_n) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})$, with $\|U_n\| = 1$ for all n such that

$$(2.17) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |w_n| \|(\mathbf{i}w_n^{-1}I - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})U_n\| = 0.$$

Setting $U_n = (u_n, v_n, \theta_n)$, then (2.17) is rewretten explicitly as follows

$$(2.18) \quad \mathbf{i}w_n^{-1}|w_n|A^{1/2}u_n - |w_n|A^{1/2}v_n = o(1), \quad \text{in } H,$$

$$(2.19) \quad \mathbf{i}w_n^{-1}|w_n|v_n + |w_n|Au_n - |w_n|A^\alpha\theta_n = o(1), \quad \text{in } H,$$

$$(2.20) \quad \mathbf{i}w_n^{-1}|w_n|\theta_n + |w_n|A^\alpha v_n + |w_n|A^\beta\theta_n = o(1), \quad \text{in } H.$$

Since $Re(\langle |w_n|(\mathbf{i}w_n^{-1}I - \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})U_n, U_n \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) = -|w_n|\|A^{\beta/2}\theta_n\|^2$, it yields

$$(2.21) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |w_n|^{1/2}\|A^{\beta/2}\theta_n\| = 0,$$

and in particular

$$(2.22) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\theta_n\| = 0.$$

Then, applying $|w_n|^{-1}A^{-\alpha}$ to (2.20), we get, (by taking into account (2.22)),

$$(2.23) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|v_n\| = 0.$$

Now, taking inner product of (2.18) with $A^{1/2}u_n$, (2.19) with v_n and (2.20) with θ_n , taking into account (2.21), (2.22) and (2.23), we have

$$(2.24) \quad \mathbf{i}w_n^{-1}|w_n|\|A^{1/2}u_n\|^2 - |w_n|\langle v_n, Au_n \rangle = o(1),$$

$$(2.25) \quad |w_n|\langle Au_n, v_n \rangle - |w_n|\langle A^\alpha \theta_n, v_n \rangle = o(1),$$

$$(2.26) \quad |w_n|\langle A^\alpha \theta_n, v_n \rangle = o(1).$$

By combining (2.24)-(2.26), it yields

$$(2.27) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A^{1/2}u_n\| = 0.$$

The promised contradiction follows from (2.22), (2.23) and (2.27). Thus, the proof of Lemma 2.5 is completed. \square

Which ends the proof of theorem. \square

Remark 2.6. In S_3 , the semigroup $e^{t\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta}}$ is of Gevrey class $\delta > \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ and in particular, it is infinitely differentiable [5]. Thus, for $z \in \text{Ran}(\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})$, we not only has polynomial stability, but also have instantaneous smoothness.

3. Application

As application of Theorem 2.2, we consider the following thermoplate system:

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt} + \Delta^2 u - (-\Delta)^\alpha w = 0, \Omega \times (0, +\infty), \\ w_t + (-\Delta)^\alpha u_t - \Delta w = 0, \Omega \times (0, +\infty), \\ u = \Delta u = w = 0, \Gamma \times (0, +\infty), \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), u_t(x, 0) = u_1(x), w(x, 0) = w_0(x), \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n with smooth boundary Γ , $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ and $3/4 < \alpha \leq 1$.

Here, $H = L^2(\Omega)$, $A = \Delta^2$ avec $\mathcal{D}(A) = \{u \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega); \Delta u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma\}$.

Then, according to Theorem 2.2 the corresponding semigroup satisfies the estimate (2.1) for all $\alpha \in (3/4, 1]$.

References

- [1] F. Ammar-Khodja, A. Bader and A. Benabdallah, Dynamic stabilization of systems via decoupling techniques, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, **4** (1999), 577–593.
- [2] F. V. Atkinson, H. Langer, R. Mennicken and A. A. Shkalikov, The essential spectrum of some matrix operators. *Math. Nachr.*, **167** (1994), 5–20.
- [3] C. J. K. Batty, R. Chill and Y. Tomilov, Fine scales of decays of operator semigroups. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, **18** (2016), 853–929.
stability of linear dynamical systems in Hilbert space, *Ann. Differential Equations*, **1** (1985), 43–56.
- [4] J. Hao and Z. Liu, Stability of an abstract system of coupled hyperbolic and parabolic equations, *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, **64** (2013), 1145–1159.
- [5] J. Hao, Z. Liu and J. Yong, Regularity analysis for an abstract system of coupled hyperbolic and parabolic equations, *Journal of Differential Equations*, **259** (2015), 4763–4798.
- [6] G. Lumer and R. S. Phillips, Dissipative operators in a Banach space, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, **11** (1961), 679–698.

LR ANALYSIS AND CONTROL OF PDES, LR 22ES03, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCES OF MONASTIR, UNIVERSITY OF MONASTIR, TUNISIA

Email address: `kais.ammari@fsm.rnu.tn`

LR ANALYSIS AND CONTROL OF PDES, LR 22ES03, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCES OF MONASTIR, UNIVERSITY OF MONASTIR, TUNISIA

Email address: `farhat.shel@fsm.rnu.tn`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, DULUTH, MN 55812-3000, UNITED STATES

Email address: `zliu@d.umn.edu`