

# INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL PORT-HAMILTONIAN SYSTEMS WITH A STATIONARY INTERFACE\*

A. KILIAN<sup>†</sup>, B. M. MASCHKE<sup>‡</sup>, A. MIRONCHENKO<sup>†</sup>, AND F. R. WIRTH<sup>†</sup>

**Abstract.** We consider two systems of two conservation laws that are defined on complementary spatial intervals and coupled by an interface as a single port-Hamiltonian system. In case of a fixed interface position, we characterize the boundary and interface conditions for which the associated port-Hamiltonian operator generates a contraction semigroup. Furthermore, we present sufficient conditions for the exponential stability of the generated  $C_0$ -semigroup. The results are illustrated by the example of two acoustic waveguides coupled by an interface consisting of some membrane.

**Key words.** port-Hamiltonian systems, strongly continuous semigroups, stationary interface, exponential stability

**AMS subject classifications.** 35L02, 35Q93, 37L15, 35B35, 93C05

**1. Introduction.** Linear infinite-dimensional systems theory is a well-established subject [5, 26, 15], constituting a basis for analysis of broad classes of distributed parameter systems. However, *physical systems* belonging to mechanical, electric, hydraulic, thermal, and other domains share common specific structures that can be used to develop methods for modeling, analysis and control, which are more natural and easy-to-use than those available for general linear systems. The port-Hamiltonian systems theory [7, 15, 28] is a systematic framework that develops such methods. This modeling framework is an extension of the *Hamiltonian systems*, stemming from mechanics [1], to open systems in a control systems' perspective where the interaction with the environment is given by the definition of a pair of external variables called *port variables* [27, 11].

Following the semigroup approach, consider the abstract Cauchy problem of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t), \quad t > 0, \\ x(0) &= x_0 \in X, \end{aligned}$$

where  $A: D(A) \subset X \rightarrow X$  is a linear unbounded operator on some Hilbert space  $X$ . In the port-Hamiltonian framework [29, Chapter 2], [11, Section 3], [7, pp. 226-228], [3, Chapter 3], [24] the operator is assumed to be the composition

$$A = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{Q}\cdot)$$

where  $\mathcal{J}$  is a Hamiltonian operator [22], which is a formally skew-symmetric constant coefficient matrix differential operator, modeling the interdomain coupling in physical systems, and  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a symmetric coercive and bounded multiplication operator defining the energy of the physical system. Furthermore, the system is augmented with a pair

---

\*Submitted to the editors DATE.

**Funding:** A. Mironchenko is supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) via the grant MI 1886/2-2.

<sup>†</sup>Faculty of Computer Science and Mathematics, University of Passau, Germany ([alexander.kilian@uni-passau.de](mailto:alexander.kilian@uni-passau.de) (corresponding author), [andrii.mironchenko@uni-passau.de](mailto:andrii.mironchenko@uni-passau.de), [fabian.\(lastname\)@uni-passau.de](mailto:fabian.(lastname)@uni-passau.de)).

<sup>‡</sup>LAGEP, UCB Lyon 1 - CNRS UMR 5007, CPE Lyon - Bâtiment 308 G, Université Claude Bernard Lyon-1, 43, bd du 11 Novembre 1918, F-69622 Villeurbanne cedex, France ([bernhard.maschke@univ-lyon1.fr](mailto:bernhard.maschke@univ-lyon1.fr)).

of *boundary port variables* defined by a boundary port operator  $R_{\text{ext}}$ . This operator is associated with the Hamiltonian operator  $\mathcal{J}$  [11, Def. 3.5], in a very similar way as for boundary triplets [18]:

$$\begin{bmatrix} f_{\partial} \\ e_{\partial} \end{bmatrix} = R_{\text{ext}} \operatorname{tr}(\mathcal{Q}x),$$

where  $\operatorname{tr}$  denotes the trace operator. The well-documented theory of strongly continuous semigroups [5, 8, 23] may then be used to derive results on well-posedness, stability and stabilization by boundary feedback [24, section 4.4]. The most important class of semigroups in the framework of infinite-dimensional port-Hamiltonian systems are contraction semigroups, which are closely related to energy dissipation. Typically, dissipation phenomena are incorporated into the domain of the operator  $A$  by means of the port variables, and this operator is the infinitesimal generator of a contraction semigroup. For control purposes, control and conjugated observation variables may be defined as a linear combination of the port variables, leading to the definition of (port-Hamiltonian) boundary control systems [9], [26, Chapter 10]. Such systems have been extensively studied in [3, 29].

An important property of port-Hamiltonian systems is that the power-conserving interconnection of port-Hamiltonian systems again defines a port-Hamiltonian system. This interconnection is defined by the composition of the underlying (Stokes-)Dirac structures [28, Section 2.2, Section 14.1] through a number of mutually shared port variables. The internally stored energy of the interconnected system, described by the Hamiltonian on the product space, is simply the sum of the Hamiltonians of the constituting subsystems. We refer to [28, Chapter 6] for the finite-dimensional case as well as to [13], [29, Chapter 7], and the references therein for the infinite-dimensional case. In [6, Section 2.2], it has been depicted how port-Hamiltonian systems are coupled through their (fixed) boundaries.

This paper is motivated by the models of systems with an interface within their spatial domain and which may be moving as the result of non-equilibrium conditions at the interface. Such systems arise, for instance, in varying causality systems, such as extrusion processes where some parts are completely filled and some other not [20], phase transition phenomena in multiphase systems such as evaporators or condensers [31] or the celebrated Stefan problem [12].

Here we follow the frame suggested in [6] where the authors proposed the port-Hamiltonian formulation of a physical system containing a moving interface, not considering coupling two systems by a Dirac structure or a port-Hamiltonian system [19, 14] but by introducing the interface using additional variables, the *color functions* [10, 4]. These color functions are actually the characteristic functions of spatial domains separated by the interface and correspond to the so-called thin interface assumption. A motivation for this perspective is also provided by the approach by the phase field theory for multiphase systems, where the interface separating the different phases has actually a certain thickness and is characterized by a distributed variable called *phase field* [30].

**Contribution.** In this paper, we propose a mathematically rigorous definition of port-Hamiltonian systems with an interface suggested in [6] where the Hamiltonian operator depends on the color functions. Then we model such systems as abstract evolution equations and use the methods of semigroup theory to provide easy-to-check criteria for boundary and interface conditions that guarantee that the system with a *fixed* interface induces a contraction semigroup. Under somewhat stronger conditions,

we prove the exponential stability of such a system. We apply our findings to the interface coupling of two acoustic waveguides.

**Structure of the paper.** Section 2 introduces port-Hamiltonian systems with an interface. It is split into three parts. In Subsection 2.1, we consider two systems of conservation laws defined on two complementary spatial domains that we want to interconnect at the interface position, which is assumed to be fixed. The notions of interface port variables and color functions are introduced, which allows us to formalize the state variables of the aggregate system on the composed domain. In Subsection 2.2, we briefly describe the derivation of the conservation laws of the aggregate system having regard to the interface conditions. Subsection 2.3 is devoted to the port-Hamiltonian formulation of the system dynamics. We introduce the formally skew-symmetric differential operator associated with the aggregate system. Furthermore, we define the boundary and interface port variables in case of a fixed interface position, and state an energy balance equation for this class of systems. In Section 3, we characterize boundary and interface conditions for which the port-Hamiltonian operator associated with the considered port-Hamiltonian system generates a contraction semigroup on the energy space. Under stronger assumptions concerning the boundary conditions, we guarantee exponential stability of the semigroup, as we work out in Section 4. In Section 5, we apply our findings to the interface coupling of two acoustic waveguides. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper.

*Notation.* Throughout the paper  $X$  is a Hilbert space and  $\mathcal{L}(X)$  is the space of linear bounded operators on  $X$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{C}([a, b], X)$  and  $\mathcal{C}^k([a, b], X)$  the vector spaces of  $X$ -valued, continuous and  $k$ -times continuously differentiable functions  $f: [a, b] \rightarrow X$ ;  $L^2([a, b], \mathbb{R}^n)$  denotes the vector space of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued square-integrable functions on the interval  $[a, b]$ , and  $L^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{R}^n)$  is the vector space of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued essentially bounded functions on  $[a, b]$ . Moreover,  $H^1([a, b], \mathbb{R}^n)$  denotes the Sobolev space of order 1 on  $[a, b]$ . Further, the vector space of infinitely differentiable functions with compact support in  $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ , that is, the set of test functions on  $(a, b)$ , is denoted by  $\mathcal{D}(a, b)$ . The Euclidean norm in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $|\cdot|$  and  $I_n$  is the identity matrix of size  $n \times n$ .

**2. Port-Hamiltonian Systems with Interface.** In this section, we propose a port-Hamiltonian formulation for a system composed of two conservation laws, coupled by means of the interface, satisfying certain interface relations. For a detailed discussion, we refer to [6], [16, Section 5.2].

**2.1. Model Description.** The situation is as follows: Let  $a < 0 < b$ , and let  $l \in (a, b)$  be the fixed position of the interface. Consider two systems of conservation laws of the form

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} x^-(z, t) &= P_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (Q^-(z) x^-(z, t)), & z \in [a, l], & t > 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} x^+(z, t) &= P_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (Q^+(z) x^+(z, t)), & z \in (l, b], & t > 0, \end{aligned}$$

defined on the respective interval  $[a, l]$  or  $(l, b]$ , where

$$(2.2) \quad P_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2},$$

and  $Q^\pm \in L^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$  are symmetric and satisfy  $mI_2 \leq Q^\pm(z) \leq MI_2$  for almost all  $z \in [a, b]$  and for some  $0 < m \leq M$ .

Let us define the *flux variables*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}^-(x^-) &= -P_1(\mathcal{Q}^-x^-), & x^- \in X^- &= L^2((a, l), \mathbb{R}^2), \\ \mathcal{N}^+(x^+) &= -P_1(\mathcal{Q}^+x^+), & x^+ \in X^+ &= L^2((l, b), \mathbb{R}^2).\end{aligned}$$

Our objective is to interconnect these two systems to a single port-Hamiltonian system on the composed spatial domain  $[a, b]$ , where the position of the interface is assumed to be at the fixed position  $l \in (a, b)$ . To do so, we need to introduce suitable state variables defined on the composed domain, and we need to define some *interface relations* at  $z = l$ . The interface relations simultaneously constitute the *interface port variables*  $(e_I, f_I) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . These are given by

$$(2.3) \quad f_I = \mathcal{N}_1^+(x^+)(l^+) = \mathcal{N}_1^-(x^-)(l^-),$$

$$(2.4) \quad -e_I = \mathcal{N}_2^+(x^+)(l^+) - \mathcal{N}_2^-(x^-)(l^-).$$

Equation (2.3) is a continuity equation of the flux variables  $\mathcal{N}_1^\pm(x^\pm)$ , and (2.4) is a balance equation of the flux variables  $\mathcal{N}_2^\pm(x^\pm)$ . These interface relations are commonly considered, cf. [4, 10].

Next, we define the *color functions*. They are defined as the characteristic functions of the respective complementary subdomain of the considered spatial domain  $[a, b]$ , and are used to keep track of the interface position:

$$(2.5) \quad c_l^-(z) = \begin{cases} 1, & z \in [a, l), \\ 0, & z \in [l, b], \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad c_l^+(z) = \begin{cases} 0, & z \in [a, l), \\ 1, & z \in [l, b]. \end{cases}$$

Since, in this paper, we assume that the interface position is fixed, the color functions do not depend on time. However, they allow to write the state variables of the coupled system as the sum of prolongations of the variables of each subsystem to the composed domain  $[a, b]$ . By abuse of notation, for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $x(\cdot, t) \in X = L^2([a, b], \mathbb{R})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}x(z, t) &= x^-(z, t) + x^+(z, t) \\ &= c_l^-(z)x(z, t) + c_l^+(z)x(z, t).\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the flux variable of the coupled system becomes

$$\mathcal{N}(x) = c_l^-\mathcal{N}^-(x) + c_l^+\mathcal{N}^+(x), \quad x \in X,$$

which obviously satisfies

$$c_l^-\mathcal{N}(x) = c_l^-\mathcal{N}^-(x) \quad \text{and} \quad c_l^+\mathcal{N}(x) = c_l^+\mathcal{N}^+(x).$$

For the sake of brevity, for  $i = 1, 2$ , we will sometimes write  $\mathcal{N}_i^\pm(z, t)$  instead of  $\mathcal{N}_i^\pm(x)(z, t)$ , and  $\mathcal{N}_i(z, t)$  instead of  $\mathcal{N}_i(x)(z, t) = \mathcal{N}_i(x(\cdot, t))(z)$ .

**2.2. Derivation of the Balance Equations.** To define the coupled system as a port-Hamiltonian system on the state space  $X$ , we derive next the balance equations of the variables  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  having regard to the interface relations (2.3)-(2.4).

We will show this only for the state variable  $x_1$ . For further details and for the balance equation regarding  $x_2$ , we refer to [6], [16, Section 5.2].

Assume that the individual conservation laws (2.1) are satisfied in a classical sense for some  $x^- : [0, \infty) \rightarrow X^-$ ,  $x^+ : [0, \infty) \rightarrow X^+$ . This means that both  $x^- \in$

$\mathcal{C}^1([0, \infty), X^-)$  and  $x^+ \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, \infty), X^+)$  solve the respective conservation law in (2.1). Then the conservation law for  $x_1$  of the aggregate system may be formally written as

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.6) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} x_1 &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \mathcal{N}_1(x) \\
&= -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} (c_l^- \mathcal{N}_1^-(x) + c_l^+ \mathcal{N}_1^+(x)) \\
&= -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} (c_l^- \mathcal{N}_1(x) + c_l^+ \mathcal{N}_1(x)) \\
&= -\underbrace{\left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (c_l^- \cdot) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (c_l^+ \cdot) \right]}_{=: \mathbf{d}_l} \mathcal{N}_1(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Next we are going to justify the above computations.

**PROPOSITION 2.1.** *The equation (2.6) holds in a distributional sense for all  $t > 0$ , that is, for every test function  $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(a, b)$  it holds that*

$$\int_a^b [\mathbf{d}_l \mathcal{N}_1(x)(z, t)] \varphi(z) dz = \int_a^b \frac{\partial}{\partial t} x_1(z, t) \varphi(z) dz.$$

*Proof.* So let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(a, b)$  be some test function. Due to (2.1) and the continuity condition (2.3) of  $\mathcal{N}_1(x)$ , the following holds for all  $t > 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_a^b [\mathbf{d}_l \mathcal{N}_1(x)(z, t)] \varphi(z) dz &= \int_a^b - \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (c_l^-(z) \mathcal{N}_1(z, t)) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (c_l^+(z) \mathcal{N}_1(z, t)) \right] \varphi(z) dz \\
(\text{part. int.}) &= \int_a^b c_l^-(z) \mathcal{N}_1(z, t) \frac{d}{dz} \varphi(z) dz + \int_a^b c_l^+(z) \mathcal{N}_1(z, t) \frac{d}{dz} \varphi(z) dz \\
&= \int_a^l \mathcal{N}_1^-(z, t) \frac{d}{dz} \varphi(z) dz + \int_l^b \mathcal{N}_1^+(z, t) \frac{d}{dz} \varphi(z) dz \\
(\text{part. int.}) &= \mathcal{N}_1^-(l^-, t) \varphi(l) + \int_a^l -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \mathcal{N}_1^-(z, t) \varphi(z) dz \\
&\quad - \mathcal{N}_1^+(l^+, t) \varphi(l) + \int_l^b -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \mathcal{N}_1^+(z, t) \varphi(z) dz \\
&\stackrel{(2.1)}{=} \mathcal{N}_1^-(l^-, t) \varphi(l) + \int_a^l \frac{\partial}{\partial t} x_1^-(z, t) \varphi(z) dz \\
&\quad - \mathcal{N}_1^+(l^+, t) \varphi(l) + \int_l^b \frac{\partial}{\partial t} x_1^+(z, t) \varphi(z) dz \\
&\stackrel{(2.3)}{=} \int_a^b \frac{\partial}{\partial t} x_1(z, t) \varphi(z) dz.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. □

Note that for all  $t > 0$ ,  $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(a, b)$ , one computes

$$-\int_a^b \frac{d}{dz} c_l^-(z) \mathcal{N}_1(z, t) \varphi(z) dz = \int_a^l \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\mathcal{N}_1^-(z, t) \varphi(z)) dz = \mathcal{N}_1^-(l^-, t) \varphi(l),$$

and

$$-\int_a^b \frac{d}{dz} c_l^+(z) \mathcal{N}_1(z, t) \varphi(z) dz = \int_l^b \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\mathcal{N}_1^+(z, t) \varphi(z)) dz = -\mathcal{N}_1^+(l^+, t) \varphi(l).$$

This implies that, due to the continuity condition (2.3), the evaluation of the flux variables of the respective subdomain at the interface cancel each other out, and equation (2.6) becomes (when understood in a distributional sense)

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.7) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} x_1(\cdot, t) &= \mathbf{d}_l \mathcal{N}_1(x)(\cdot, t) \\
&= -c_l^-(\cdot) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \mathcal{N}_1^-(x)(\cdot, t) - \frac{d}{dz} c_l^-(\cdot) \mathcal{N}_1(x)(\cdot, t) \\
&\quad - c_l^+(\cdot) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \mathcal{N}_1^+(x)(\cdot, t) - \frac{d}{dz} c_l^+(\cdot) \mathcal{N}_1(x)(\cdot, t) \\
&= -c_l^-(\cdot) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \mathcal{N}_1^-(x)(\cdot, t) - c_l^+(\cdot) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \mathcal{N}_1^+(x)(\cdot, t).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $x_1 \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, \infty), L^2([a, b], \mathbb{R}))$  and, under certain regularity conditions on  $\mathcal{N}_1(x)$ , we have for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbf{d}_l \mathcal{N}_1(x)(\cdot, t) = -c_l^-(\cdot) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \mathcal{N}_1^-(x)(\cdot, t) - c_l^+(\cdot) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \mathcal{N}_1^+(x)(\cdot, t) \in L^2([a, b], \mathbb{R}).$$

As a consequence, we have the following result:

**PROPOSITION 2.2.** *Equation (2.7) holds in the a.e. sense.*

This motivates the definition of the operator  $\mathbf{d}_l: D(\mathbf{d}_l) \subset L^2([a, b], \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2([a, b], \mathbb{R})$  in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.8) \quad D(\mathbf{d}_l) &= \{x \in L^2([a, b], \mathbb{R}) \mid x_{|(a, l)} \in H^1((a, l), \mathbb{R}), x_{|(l, b)} \in H^1((l, b), \mathbb{R}), x \in \mathcal{C}([a, b], \mathbb{R})\} \\
&= H^1([a, b], \mathbb{R}), \\
\mathbf{d}_l x &= - \left[ \frac{d}{dz} (c_l^- x) + \frac{d}{dz} (c_l^+ x) \right], \quad x \in D(\mathbf{d}_l).
\end{aligned}$$

For a function  $x = c_l^- x^- + c_l^+ x^+ \in D(\mathbf{d}_l)$  we have in particular that

$$\mathbf{d}_l x = -c_l^- \frac{d}{dz} x^- - c_l^+ \frac{d}{dz} x^+.$$

This way, the continuity equation (2.3) of the flux variable  $\mathcal{N}_1(x)$  is incorporated into the domain of the operator  $\mathbf{d}_l$ .

Taking the balance equation (2.4) into consideration, the conservation law of the state variable  $x_2$  can be defined with respect to an operator closely related to  $\mathbf{d}_l$ . Once again, we refer to [6], [16, Section 5.2] for a detailed discussion. This admits a port-Hamiltonian formulation of these conservation laws, as we will see in the following section.

**2.3. Port-Hamiltonian Formulation.** Let  $X = L^2([a, b], \mathbb{R}^2)$  be the state space and  $l \in (a, b)$  be the position of the interface. Consider the system

$$(2.9) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} x(z, t) = \mathcal{J}_l(\mathcal{Q}_l(z)x(z, t)), \quad z \in [a, b] \setminus \{l\}, \quad t > 0,$$

where  $\mathcal{J}_l$  is defined below, and  $\mathcal{Q}_l = c_l^- \mathcal{Q}^- + c_l^+ \mathcal{Q}^+ \in \mathcal{L}(X)$  is a coercive matrix multiplication operator. In particular, the matrix functions  $\mathcal{Q}^\pm \in L^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$  are point-wise symmetric a.e., and there exist constants  $0 < m \leq M$  such that

$mI_2 \leq \mathcal{Q}^\pm(z) \leq MI_2$  for a.e.  $z \in [a, b]$ . The functions  $c_l^-$  and  $c_l^+$  are the color functions defined in (2.5).

We endow  $X$  with the inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}_l} = \frac{1}{2} \langle \cdot, \mathcal{Q}_l \cdot \rangle_{L^2}$ , i.e.,

$$(2.10) \quad \langle x, y \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}_l} = \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b y^\top(z) \mathcal{Q}_l(z) x(z) dz, \quad x, y \in X,$$

with associated norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q}_l}$ . Note that  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}_l}$  is equivalent to the standard inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L^2}$  on  $X$ . The Hamiltonian  $H: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on the energy space  $(X, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q}_l})$  is defined as

$$(2.11) \quad H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b x^\top(z) \mathcal{Q}_l(z) x(z) dz = \|x\|_{\mathcal{Q}_l}^2, \quad x \in X.$$

The operator  $\mathcal{J}_l: D(\mathcal{J}_l) \subset X \rightarrow X$  is given by

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{aligned} D(\mathcal{J}_l) &= \{x = (x_1, x_2) \in X \mid x_1 \in D(\mathbf{d}_l^*), x_2 \in D(\mathbf{d}_l)\}, \\ \mathcal{J}_l x &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{d}_l \\ -\mathbf{d}_l^* & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}_l x_2 \\ -\mathbf{d}_l^* x_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad x \in D(\mathcal{J}_l), \end{aligned}$$

where the operator  $\mathbf{d}_l$  has been defined in (2.8), and its formal adjoint<sup>1</sup>  $\mathbf{d}_l^*$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathbf{d}_l^*) &= \{y \in L^2([a, b], \mathbb{R}) \mid y_{|(a, l)} \in H^1((a, l), \mathbb{R}), y_{|(l, b)} \in H^1((l, b), \mathbb{R})\}, \\ \mathbf{d}_l^* y &= \left( -\mathbf{d}_l - \left[ \frac{d}{dz} c_l^- + \frac{d}{dz} c_l^+ \right] \right) y, \quad y \in D(\mathbf{d}_l^*). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the operator  $\mathbf{d}_l$ , for a function  $y = c_l^- y^- + c_l^+ y^+ \in D(\mathbf{d}_l^*)$  it holds that

$$\mathbf{d}_l^* y = c_l^- \frac{d}{dz} y^- + c_l^+ \frac{d}{dz} y^+.$$

For all  $x \in D(\mathbf{d}_l)$ ,  $y \in D(\mathbf{d}_l^*)$ , we have the following relation between the operators  $\mathbf{d}_l$  and  $\mathbf{d}_l^*$ :

$$(2.13) \quad \langle \mathbf{d}_l x, y \rangle_{L^2} = -[x(z)y(z)]_a^b + x(l) [y(l^+) - y(l^-)] + \langle x, \mathbf{d}_l^* y \rangle_{L^2}.$$

In particular, equation (2.13) describes the formal adjointness of  $\mathbf{d}_l$  and  $\mathbf{d}_l^*$ , that is, adjointness up to boundary and interface evaluations.

Note that on any subinterval of  $[a, b]$  not containing the interface position  $l \in (a, b)$ , the operator  $\mathcal{J}_l$  simply acts as the matrix differential operator  $P_1 \frac{d}{dz}$ , where  $P_1$  is defined in (2.2). Thus, (2.9) is a reformulation of (2.1). Next we reveal the port-Hamiltonian structure of (2.9).

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we introduce the matrix  $\Sigma_{2n}$ , which will be used extensively in the following sections:

$$(2.14) \quad \Sigma_{2n} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_n \\ I_n & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}.$$

In the framework of port-Hamiltonian systems, it is crucial that the associated differential operator is formally skew-symmetric. It describes the power-conserving

<sup>1</sup>For a definition of formally adjoint operators, see [2, Chapter 13].

interconnection of the system components, see, e.g., [11]. As a first step, we show that the operator  $\mathcal{J}_l$  defined in (2.12) is *formally skew-symmetric*, i.e.,

$$\langle \mathcal{J}_l x, y \rangle_{L^2} = -\langle x, \mathcal{J}_l y \rangle_{L^2}$$

for all  $x, y \in D(\mathcal{J}_l)$  vanishing both at the boundary and at the interface position.

LEMMA 2.3. *The operator  $\mathcal{J}_l: D(\mathcal{J}_l) \subset X \rightarrow X$  defined in (2.12) is formally skew-symmetric.*

*Proof.* Applying the relation (2.13) between the operators  $\mathbf{d}_l$  and  $\mathbf{d}_l^*$ , for  $x = (x_1, x_2)$ ,  $y = (y_1, y_2) \in D(\mathcal{J}_l)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathcal{J}_l x, y \rangle_{L^2} + \langle x, \mathcal{J}_l y \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= \langle \mathbf{d}_l x_2, y_1 \rangle_{L^2} - \langle \mathbf{d}_l^* x_1, y_2 \rangle_{L^2} + \langle x_1, \mathbf{d}_l y_2 \rangle_{L^2} - \langle x_2, \mathbf{d}_l^* y_1 \rangle_{L^2} \\ (2.15) \quad &= -[y_1(z)x_2(z)]_a^b + x_2(l)[y_1(l^+) - y_1(l^-)] \\ &\quad - [x_1(z)y_2(z)]_a^b + y_2(l)[x_1(l^+) - x_1(l^-)] \\ &= [x^\top(z)P_1 y(z)]_a^b + x_2(l)[y_1(l^+) - y_1(l^-)] + y_2(l)[x_1(l^+) - x_1(l^-)], \end{aligned}$$

with  $P_1$  defined in (2.2). This proves the claim.  $\square$

Next, we augment the system (2.9) with boundary and interface port variables. Port variables are used to express the previously mentioned power-conserving interconnection between the system components ([28, Chapter 2], [29, Chapter 2]). Ports consist of physical quantities whose (inner) product yields power. As the operator  $\mathcal{J}_l$  is skew-symmetric up to boundary and interface evaluations, see (2.15), we allow for a power flow both at the spatial boundary (hence, an interaction with the system's physical environment), and at the interface position. Thus, by introducing boundary and interface port variables, we can express the power flow of the system at these positions.

Since the interface position lies in the interior of the spatial domain  $[a, b]$ , we may define the trace operator  $\text{tr}_l: D(\mathcal{J}_l) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$  as follows:

$$\text{tr}_l(x) = \begin{bmatrix} x(b) \\ x(a) \end{bmatrix}, \quad x \in D(\mathcal{J}_l).$$

For all  $x \in X$  such that  $\mathcal{Q}_l x \in D(\mathcal{J}_l)$ , the boundary flow  $f_\partial = f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_l x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and the boundary effort  $e_\partial = e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_l x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$  are defined as

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{bmatrix} f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_l x} \\ e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_l x} \end{bmatrix} = R_{\text{ext}} \text{tr}_l(\mathcal{Q}_l x) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(P_1(\mathcal{Q}_l x)(b) - P_1(\mathcal{Q}_l x)(a)) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}((\mathcal{Q}_l x)(b) + (\mathcal{Q}_l x)(a)) \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$(2.17) \quad R_{\text{ext}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & -P_1 \\ I_2 & I_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4}.$$

Now, we define the interface port variables  $e_I = e_{I, \mathcal{Q}_l x}$ ,  $f_I = f_{I, \mathcal{Q}_l x} \in \mathbb{R}$ . For all  $x \in X$  such that  $\mathcal{Q}_l x \in D(\mathcal{J}_l)$ , the interface flow and the interface effort are given as follows:

$$(2.18) \quad f_{I, \mathcal{Q}_l x} = (\mathcal{Q}_l x)_2(l^+) = (\mathcal{Q}_l x)_2(l^-),$$

$$(2.19) \quad -e_{I, \mathcal{Q}_l x} = (\mathcal{Q}_l x)_1(l^+) - (\mathcal{Q}_l x)_1(l^-).$$



For all  $\mathcal{Q}_l x, \mathcal{Q}_l y \in D(\mathcal{J}_l)$ , we may write the last line of (2.15) with respect to the boundary and interface port variables as follows:

$$(2.20) \quad \begin{aligned} & [(\mathcal{Q}_l x)^\top(z) P_1(\mathcal{Q}_l y)(z)]_a^b + (\mathcal{Q}_l x)_2(l) [(\mathcal{Q}_l y)_1(l^+) - (\mathcal{Q}_l y)_1(l^-)] \\ & + (\mathcal{Q}_l y)_2(l) [(\mathcal{Q}_l x)_1(l^+) - (\mathcal{Q}_l x)_1(l^-)] \\ & = \langle e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_l y}, f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_l x} \rangle + \langle e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_l x}, f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_l y} \rangle - f_{I, \mathcal{Q}_l x} e_{I, \mathcal{Q}_l y} - f_{I, \mathcal{Q}_l y} e_{I, \mathcal{Q}_l x}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we simply substitute the relation (2.20) into equation (2.15). This yields for all  $\mathcal{Q}_l x, \mathcal{Q}_l y \in D(\mathcal{J}_l)$ ,

$$(2.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle \mathcal{J}_l(\mathcal{Q}_l x), \mathcal{Q}_l y \rangle_{L^2} + \langle \mathcal{Q}_l x, \mathcal{J}_l(\mathcal{Q}_l y) \rangle_{L^2} \\ & = \langle e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_l y}, f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_l x} \rangle + \langle e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_l x}, f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_l y} \rangle - f_{I, \mathcal{Q}_l x} e_{I, \mathcal{Q}_l y} - f_{I, \mathcal{Q}_l y} e_{I, \mathcal{Q}_l x}. \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to state a (power) balance equation for classical solutions  $x \in C^1([0, \infty), X)$  of the first-order system (2.9) by means of the boundary and interface port variables.

LEMMA 2.4. *Let  $x \in C^1([0, \infty), X)$  be a classical solution of the system (2.9) with Hamiltonian (2.11). Then we have for all  $t \geq 0$ ,*

$$(2.22) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|x(t)\|_{\mathcal{Q}_l}^2 = \frac{d}{dt} H(x(t)) = \langle e_{\partial}(t), f_{\partial}(t) \rangle - e_I(t) f_I(t),$$

where  $e_{\partial}(t) = e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_l x(t)}$ ,  $f_{\partial}(t) = f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_l x(t)}$ ,  $e_I(t) = e_{I, \mathcal{Q}_l x(t)}$ , and  $f_I(t) = f_{I, \mathcal{Q}_l x(t)}$ .

*Proof.* By exploiting the fact that  $x$  satisfies (2.9) and by using (2.21), we get for all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} H(x(t)) &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \langle x(t), \mathcal{Q}_l x(t) \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathcal{J}_l(\mathcal{Q}_l x(t)), \mathcal{Q}_l x(t) \rangle_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathcal{Q}_l x(t), \mathcal{J}_l(\mathcal{Q}_l x(t)) \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= \langle e_{\partial}(t), f_{\partial}(t) \rangle - e_I(t) f_I(t). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Equation (2.22) states that the change of energy is equal to the power flow both at the boundary and at the interface position.

*Remark 2.5* (Dirac structure of (2.9)). Note that the existence of an underlying, power-conserving interconnection structure, called a (Stokes-)Dirac structure, is constitutive for port-Hamiltonian systems [11], [28, Chapter 2], [29, Chapter 2]. It allows us to geometrically specify the dynamics of the associated system by means of its constituting port variables. However, in this work, we will not address this topic. The underlying Dirac structure of the system (2.9) has been defined in [16, Subsection 5.4.1].

Now that we have established the port-Hamiltonian formulation of the system (2.9), we want to discuss under which conditions this system is well-posed. In the subsequent sections, we will assume (without loss of generality) that the fixed interface position is given by  $l = 0$ .

**3. Generation of a Contraction Semigroup.** In this section, we characterize the boundary and interface conditions, under which the system (2.9) generates a contraction semigroup. In particular, this guarantees well-posedness in the sense of [8, Definition II.6.8]. To this end, we investigate the port-Hamiltonian operator

associated with the system (2.9) with Hamiltonian (2.11). In [11, Section 4], it has been shown that suitable boundary conditions in terms of the boundary port variables can be used to characterize those boundary conditions for which the associated port-Hamiltonian operator generates a contraction semigroup. With this approach in mind, we will introduce interface conditions and boundary condition, which are specified by the interface respectively boundary port variables. These conditions will be incorporated into the definition of the domain of the port-Hamiltonian operator. It will then turn out that the problem admits a reformulation as a pure boundary port-Hamiltonian system of the type studied in [15]. Using this reformulation, we show in Theorem 3.4 that the port-Hamiltonian operator from (2.9) generates a contraction semigroup if and only if certain passivity conditions both at the spatial boundary and at the interface position hold. Furthermore, criteria are presented that guarantee the generation of an isometric semigroup by the port-Hamiltonian operator.

**3.1. Boundary and Interface Conditions.** We begin by introducing boundary conditions for the system (2.9). Following [11, Section 4], we impose linear boundary conditions of the form

$$(3.1) \quad \tilde{W}_B \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{Q}_0 x)(b) \\ (\mathcal{Q}_0 x)(a) \end{bmatrix} = 0$$

for some  $\tilde{W}_B \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 4}$ . Since the matrix  $R_{\text{ext}}$  defined in (2.17) is invertible, we may write (3.1) equivalently in terms of the boundary port variables (2.16) as

$$(3.2) \quad W_B \begin{bmatrix} f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} \\ e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} \end{bmatrix} = 0, \quad W_B = \tilde{W}_B R_{\text{ext}}^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 4}.$$

Next, we impose an *interface condition* upon the interface port variables (2.18)-(2.19). For a fixed  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ , it is given by

$$(3.3) \quad f_{I, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} = r e_{I, \mathcal{Q}_0 x}.$$

Recall that the interface port variables are defined by

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{I, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} &= (\mathcal{Q}^+ x)_2(0^+) = (\mathcal{Q}^- x)_2(0^-), \\ -e_{I, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} &= (\mathcal{Q}^+ x)_1(0^+) - (\mathcal{Q}^- x)_1(0^-). \end{aligned}$$

With these boundary and interface conditions, we denote by  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0} : D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}) \subset X \rightarrow X$  the port-Hamiltonian operator associated with the system (2.9) with Hamiltonian (2.11). It is given by

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}) &= \left\{ x \in X \mid \mathcal{Q}_0 x \in D(\mathcal{J}_0), f_{I, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} = r e_{I, \mathcal{Q}_0 x}, W_B \begin{bmatrix} f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} \\ e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} \end{bmatrix} = 0 \right\}, \\ A_{\mathcal{Q}_0} x &= \mathcal{J}_0(\mathcal{Q}_0 x), \quad x \in D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}). \end{aligned}$$

We wish to characterize the boundary and interface conditions (i.e., those  $W_B$  and  $r$ ) for which  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  generates a contraction semigroup  $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$  on the energy space  $(X, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q}_0})$ . In particular, such conditions guarantee the well-posedness of the abstract Cauchy problem

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= A_{\mathcal{Q}_0} x(t), \quad t > 0, \\ x(0) &= x_0 \in D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}), \end{aligned}$$

associated with the operator  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$ .

**3.2. A Reformulation as a Boundary Port-Hamiltonian System.** To characterize well-posedness of our port-Hamiltonian system with interface, we reformulate it in terms of a system without interface in the framework of [15]. This allows to use the well-posedness criteria for port-Hamiltonian systems developed in [15] for the analysis of our model. We continue to assume  $l = 0$ .

Let  $\eta := -a/b > 0$  and consider the transformation  $w_1(\zeta, t) := x^-(\eta\zeta + a, t)$ ,  $\zeta \in [0, b]$ . With the transformation  $z = \eta\zeta + a$ , the differential equation for  $x^-$  on  $[a, 0]$  given by

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} x^-(z, t) = P_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\mathcal{Q}^-(z) x^-(z, t)), \quad z \in (a, 0), \quad t > 0$$

transforms to the equation on  $(0, b)$  given by

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} w_1(\zeta, t) = P_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \left( \frac{1}{\eta} \mathcal{Q}^-(\eta\zeta + a) w_1(\zeta, t) \right), \quad \zeta \in (0, b), \quad t > 0.$$

We now introduce a system of four first-order PDEs on  $[0, b]$  that consists of copies of the original system on  $[a, 0]$  (in a transformed form) and  $[0, b]$ . The system is given by

$$(3.9) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} w(\zeta, t) = \hat{P}_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} (\mathcal{H}_0 w)(\zeta, t), \quad t > 0, \quad \zeta \in (0, b),$$

where  $\hat{P}_1 := \text{diag}(P_1, P_1) \in \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4}$ , and

$$\mathcal{H}_0(\zeta) := \text{diag}(\eta^{-1} \mathcal{Q}^-(\eta\zeta + a), \mathcal{Q}^+(\zeta)), \quad \zeta \in [0, b].$$

Let  $\hat{X} := L^2([0, b], \mathbb{R}^4)$  be endowed with the scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0}$  (defined analogously to (2.10)) and consider the map

$$(3.10a) \quad S : \hat{X} \rightarrow X, \quad S : w = \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix} \mapsto x := \frac{1}{\eta} c^- w_1 (\eta^{-1} \cdot + b) + c^+ w_2,$$

$$(3.10b) \quad S^{-1} : X \rightarrow \hat{X}, \quad S^{-1} : x = c^- x^- + c^+ x^+ \mapsto w := \begin{bmatrix} \eta x^-(\eta \cdot + a) \\ x^+ \end{bmatrix}.$$

The relation between  $X$  and  $\hat{X}$  is established via the following lemma:

**LEMMA 3.1.**  *$S$  induces an isometric isomorphism of the Hilbert spaces  $(X, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q}_0})$  and  $(\hat{X}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_0})$ .*

*Proof.* For  $x, y \in X$ , denote  $w = S^{-1}y, v = S^{-1}x$ , where  $S^{-1}$  is given by (3.10b). We have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\langle x, y \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}_0} &= \int_a^b y^\top(z) \mathcal{Q}_0(z) x(z) dz \\ &= \int_a^0 y^{-, \top}(z) \mathcal{Q}^-(z) x^-(z) dz + \int_0^b y^{+, \top}(z) \mathcal{Q}^+(z) x^+(z) dz. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting  $z = \eta\zeta + a$ ,  $dz = \eta d\zeta$  in the first integral and writing  $\zeta := z$  in the

second integral, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
2\langle x, y \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}_0} &= \int_0^b y^{-,\top}(\eta\zeta + a) \mathcal{Q}^-(\eta\zeta + a) x^-(\eta\zeta + a) \eta d\zeta + \int_0^b y^{+,\top}(\zeta) \mathcal{Q}^+(\zeta) x^+(\zeta) d\zeta \\
&= \int_0^b \begin{bmatrix} y^{-,\top}(\eta\zeta + a) & y^{+,\top}(\zeta) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \eta \mathcal{Q}^-(\eta\zeta + a) & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{Q}^+(\zeta) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x^-(\eta\zeta + a) \\ x^+(\zeta) \end{bmatrix} d\zeta \\
&= \int_0^b \begin{bmatrix} w_1(\zeta) \\ w_2(\zeta) \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \eta^{-1} \mathcal{Q}^-(\eta\zeta + a) & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{Q}^+(\zeta) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_1(\zeta) \\ v_2(\zeta) \end{bmatrix} d\zeta = 2 \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0} \blacksquare
\end{aligned}$$

Recall  $r$  from the interface condition (3.3) and define the auxiliary matrices

$$(3.11) \quad U_1 := \begin{bmatrix} -r & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad U_2 := \begin{bmatrix} r & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

With (3.4), it is easy to see that the conditions (2.18) and (2.19) together with the interface condition  $f_I = r e_I$  are equivalent to

$$U_1(\mathcal{Q}^- x^-)(0^-) + U_2(\mathcal{Q}^+ x^+)(0^+) = 0.$$

For  $\tilde{W}_B \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 4}$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ , introduce the boundary condition matrix  $\tilde{W}_{B,c}$  by

$$(3.12) \quad \tilde{W}_{B,c} = \begin{bmatrix} U_1 & 0_{2 \times 4} & U_2 \\ 0_{2 \times 2} & \tilde{W}_B & 0_{2 \times 2} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 8}.$$

Note that with this definition and the relation  $w = S^{-1}x$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{W}_{B,c} \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{H}_0 w)(b) \\ (\mathcal{H}_0 w)(0) \end{bmatrix} &= \tilde{W}_{B,c} \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{H}_0 w)_1(b) \\ (\mathcal{H}_0 w)_2(b) \\ (\mathcal{H}_0 w)_1(0) \\ (\mathcal{H}_0 w)_2(0) \end{bmatrix} = \tilde{W}_{B,c} \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{Q}^- x^-)(0^-) \\ (\mathcal{Q}^+ x^+)(b) \\ (\mathcal{Q}^- x^-)(a) \\ (\mathcal{Q}^+ x^+)(0^+) \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} U_1(\mathcal{Q}^- x^-)(0^-) + U_2(\mathcal{Q}^+ x^+)(0^+) \\ \tilde{W}_B \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{Q}^+ x^+)(b) \\ (\mathcal{Q}^- x^-)(a) \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, the boundary condition  $\tilde{W}_{B,c} \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{H}_0 w)(b) \\ (\mathcal{H}_0 w)(0) \end{bmatrix} = 0$  is equivalent to the conditions (2.18), (2.19),  $f_I = r e_I$ , and  $\tilde{W}_B \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{Q}^+ x^+)(b) \\ (\mathcal{Q}^- x^-)(a) \end{bmatrix} = 0$  under the transformation  $S$ .

The transformation  $\hat{R}_{\text{ext}}$  associated to  $\hat{P}_1$  is given as before by

$$(3.13) \quad \hat{R}_{\text{ext}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{P}_1 & -\hat{P}_1 \\ I_4 & I_4 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{8 \times 8}.$$

Again, we define  $W_{B,c} := \tilde{W}_{B,c} \hat{R}_{\text{ext}}^{-1}$ . A direct computation shows that  $\hat{R}_{\text{ext}}^{-1} = \hat{R}_{\text{ext}}^\top$ . Also, in view of [15, Lemma 7.2.2], it holds that

$$(3.14) \quad \hat{R}_{\text{ext}}^\top \Sigma_8 \hat{R}_{\text{ext}} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{P}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & -\hat{P}_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The following observation is required for the final result.

LEMMA 3.2. *The following two statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $W_B \Sigma_4 W_B^\top \geq 0$  and  $r \geq 0$ .
- (ii)  $W_{B,c} \Sigma_8 W_{B,c}^\top \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* Using (3.14), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} W_{B,c} \Sigma_8 W_{B,c}^\top &= \tilde{W}_{B,c} \hat{R}_{\text{ext}}^{-1} \Sigma_8 (\hat{R}_{\text{ext}}^{-1})^\top \tilde{W}_{B,c}^\top = \tilde{W}_{B,c} \hat{R}_{\text{ext}}^\top \Sigma_8 \hat{R}_{\text{ext}} \tilde{W}_{B,c}^\top \\ &= \tilde{W}_{B,c} \text{diag}(P_1, P_1, -P_1, -P_1) \tilde{W}_{B,c}^\top \text{diag}(U_1 P_1 U_1^\top - U_2 P_1 U_2^\top, W_B \Sigma_4 W_B^\top). \end{aligned}$$

The assertion thus depends on the definiteness of

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 P_1 U_1^\top - U_2 P_1 U_2^\top &= \begin{bmatrix} -r & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -r & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} r & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} r & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 2r & r \\ r & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -r \\ -r & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The latter matrix is clearly positive semidefinite if and only if  $r \geq 0$ .  $\square$

We will now study the  $C_0$ -semigroups associated to the operators  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  introduced in (3.5):

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}) &= \left\{ x \in X \mid \mathcal{Q}_0 x \in D(\mathcal{J}_0), f_{I, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} = r e_{I, \mathcal{Q}_0 x}, W_B \begin{bmatrix} f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} \\ e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} \end{bmatrix} = 0 \right\}, \\ A_{\mathcal{Q}_0} x &= \mathcal{J}_0(\mathcal{Q}_0 x), \quad x \in D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}), \end{aligned}$$

and  $A_{\mathcal{H}_0}$  defined next:

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} D(A_{\mathcal{H}_0}) &= \left\{ x \in \hat{X} \mid \mathcal{H}_0 x \in H^1([0, b], \mathbb{R}^4), W_{B,c} \begin{bmatrix} f_{\partial, \mathcal{H}_0 x} \\ e_{\partial, \mathcal{H}_0 x} \end{bmatrix} = 0 \right\}, \\ A_{\mathcal{H}_0} x &= P_1 \frac{d}{d\zeta}(\mathcal{H}_0 x), \quad x \in D(A_{\mathcal{H}_0}). \end{aligned}$$

We note the following simple observation, which follows directly from the previous arguments in this section:

LEMMA 3.3. *The operators  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  and  $A_{\mathcal{H}_0}$  are similar via the isometric isomorphism  $S$ , i.e.,  $SD(A_{\mathcal{H}_0}) = D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0})$  and for all  $x \in D(A_{\mathcal{H}_0})$  we have  $S^{-1}A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}Sx = A_{\mathcal{H}_0}x$ .*

With this in mind, we can show the following result.

THEOREM 3.4. *Consider the port-Hamiltonian operator  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0} : D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}) \subset X \rightarrow X$  defined in (3.15) with a full rank matrix  $W_B \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 4}$ . Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

1.  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  is the infinitesimal generator of a contraction semigroup on  $X$  endowed with the scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}_0} = \frac{1}{2} \langle \cdot, \mathcal{Q}_0 \cdot \rangle_{L^2}$ .
2.  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  is dissipative.
3.  $r \geq 0$  and with  $\Sigma_4$  defined in (2.14) we have

$$(3.17) \quad W_B \Sigma_4 W_B^\top \geq 0.$$

*Proof.* The assumptions imply that  $\hat{P}_1$  is Hermitian and invertible. Furthermore, we have that  $\mathcal{H}_0 \in L^\infty([0, b], \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4})$  is pointwise a.e. symmetric and positive definite, bounded and bounded away from 0. Also, the matrix  $W_{B,c}$  has full rank 4, as  $W_B$  has

full rank. Thus,  $A_{\mathcal{H}_0}$  meets the assumption of Theorem 7.2.4 in [15] and therefore for  $A_{\mathcal{H}_0}$  we have the equivalence of the statements: (i)  $A_{\mathcal{H}_0}$  generates a contraction semigroup  $(T_{\mathcal{H}_0}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ , (ii)  $A_{\mathcal{H}_0}$  is dissipative, and (iii)  $W_{B,c} \Sigma_8 W_{B,c}^\top \geq 0$ . By Lemma 3.3, the operators  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  and  $A_{\mathcal{H}_0}$  are similar through an isometric isomorphism. By this similarity, the items 1. and 2. of the assertion and (i), resp. (ii) are equivalent. Finally, by Lemma 3.2, item 3. of the claim is equivalent to (iii). This shows the assertion.  $\square$

Theorem 3.4 characterizes the boundary and interface conditions for which the port-Hamiltonian model of two systems of conservation laws coupled by a fixed interface induces a contraction semigroup. The fact that for all  $x_0 \in D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0})$ , the abstract Cauchy problem (3.6) has a unique classical solution  $x: [0, \infty) \rightarrow X$ , depending continuously on the initial data, follows immediately from [8, Corollary II.6.9].

Similarly to Theorem 3.4, we can characterize the boundary and interface conditions for which the internally stored energy of the system is conserved. Indeed, we see from the proof of Lemma 3.2 that  $W_B \Sigma_4 W_B^\top = 0$  together with  $r = 0$  is equivalent to  $W_{B,c} \Sigma_8 W_{B,c}^\top = 0$ . We thus obtain the following result from an application of [11, Theorem 4.1].

**COROLLARY 3.5.** *Consider the port-Hamiltonian operator  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}: D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}) \subset X \rightarrow X$  defined in (3.5) with  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  and with a full rank matrix  $W_B \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 4}$ . Then  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  is the infinitesimal generator of an isometric semigroup on the energy space  $(X, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q}_0})$  if and only if  $r = 0$  and  $W_B$  satisfies  $W_B \Sigma_4 W_B^\top = 0$ .*

**4. Exponential Stability.** In this section, we present conditions that guarantee exponential stability of the abstract Cauchy problem (3.6) associated with the port-Hamiltonian operator  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  defined in (3.5). Recall that a  $C_0$ -semigroup  $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$  on  $X$  is called (uniformly) exponentially stable if there exist constants  $M \geq 1$  and  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $\|T(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \leq M e^{-\alpha t}$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , see, e.g., [8, Definition 3.11]. Throughout this section, we impose the following assumptions:

- (A1) The matrix operators  $\mathcal{Q}^\pm$  defining the coercive operator  $\mathcal{Q}_0 \in \mathcal{L}(X)$  satisfy  $\mathcal{Q}^\pm \in C^1([a, b], \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$ .
- (A2)  $r \geq 0$ ,  $\text{rank}(W_B) = 2$ , and  $W_B$  satisfies (3.17). In other words, the port-Hamiltonian operator  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  generates a contraction semigroup (see Theorem 3.4).

Exponential stability of boundary port-Hamiltonian systems is already discussed in [15, Chapter 9] and as we have shown in Lemma 3.3 that our system is similar via an isometric isomorphism to a system of the type discussed in that reference, of course, the results there are immediately applicable. However, the respective conditions translate into estimates on the boundary values of  $w$ , that is in terms of the original system in conditions on the boundary variables as well as the interface variables. In the context of the systems discussed here, this may be undesirable and we will show that sufficient conditions can be formulated exclusively in terms of evaluations at the boundary points at  $a$  and  $b$ .

We begin by showing an essential property that helps to verify the exponential stability of the port-Hamiltonian system (3.6). The following lemma is an extension of the energy estimates in [15, Lemma 9.1.2], which in our setting removes the necessity to evaluate at the interface. In the case  $r = 0$  the difference is that, due to the jump discontinuity at the interface position, we need to introduce two auxiliary functions defined on two complementary subintervals to exploit the system dynamics. However, the case  $r > 0$  yields an improved energy estimate that only requires the evaluation at

one of the boundary points. The result is similar in appearance to [15, Lemma 9.1.2] for boundary port-Hamiltonian systems without an interface and the proof technique relies in a substantial manner on the tools developed there.

LEMMA 4.1. *Let the assumptions (A1)-(A2) hold. Denote by  $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$  the contraction semigroup generated by  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$ .*

(i) *If  $r = 0$ , then there exist constants  $\tau > 0$  and  $C > 0$  such that for every initial value  $x_0 \in D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0})$ , the trajectory  $x(\cdot) = T(\cdot)x_0$  satisfies*

$$(4.1) \quad \|x(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{Q}_0}^2 \leq C \int_0^\tau |\mathcal{Q}^-(a)x(a,t)|^2 + |\mathcal{Q}^+(b)x(b,t)|^2 dt.$$

(ii) *If  $r > 0$ , then there exist constants  $\tau > 0$  and  $C > 0$  such that for every initial value  $x_0 \in D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0})$ , the trajectory  $x(\cdot) = T(\cdot)x_0$  satisfies both*

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \|x(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{Q}_0}^2 &\leq C \int_0^\tau |\mathcal{Q}^+(b)x(b,t)|^2 dt \quad \text{and} \\ \|x(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{Q}_0}^2 &\leq C \int_0^\tau |\mathcal{Q}^-(a)x(a,t)|^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The proof of (i) can be found in [16, pp. 120-122] and we will concentrate on the second assertion. We will prove the first inequality in (4.2); the proof of the second being similar.

Since (4.2) is clear for  $x_0 = 0$ , assume that  $0 \neq x_0 \in D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0})$  and let  $x(\cdot, \cdot)$  be the corresponding solution. Choose  $\gamma > 0$ ,  $\tau > 0$  such that  $\tau > 2\gamma(b-a)$  and define the function  $F: [a, b] \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  by

$$(4.3) \quad F(z) := \int_{\gamma(b-z)}^{\tau-\gamma(b-z)} x^\top(z, t) \mathcal{Q}_0(z) x(z, t) dt, \quad z \in [a, b] \setminus \{0\}.$$

In general,  $F$  does not have a continuous extension to  $[a, b]$ , as  $F(0^-) \neq F(0^+)$ .

Recall that on domains not containing the interface position, the operator  $\mathcal{J}_0$  defined in (2.12) acts as the differential operator  $P_1 \frac{d}{dz}$ , where  $P_1$  is given in (2.2). Following the proof of [15, Lemma 9.1.2], it can be shown that if  $\gamma$  and  $\tau$  are sufficiently large, then there is a  $\kappa > 0$  such that

$$\frac{d}{dz} F(z) \geq -\kappa F(z), \quad z \in [a, b] \setminus \{0\}.$$

Applying Grönwall's Lemma (see, e.g., [25, Section 2.4]), the following holds on the respective subdomain:

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} F(z) &\leq F(b) e^{\kappa(b-z)}, \quad z \in (0, b], \\ F(z) &\leq F(0^-) e^{-\kappa z}, \quad z \in [a, 0). \end{aligned}$$

We want to show that there is some  $\tilde{C} > 0$  such that for all  $z \in [a, b] \setminus \{0\}$  we have

$$(4.5) \quad F(z) \leq \tilde{C} F(b) e^{\kappa(b-a)}.$$

Using the notation (cf. (3.4))  $f_I := f_{I, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} = (\mathcal{Q}^- x)_2(0^-)$ , continuity of  $\mathcal{Q}^-$ , as well as the fact that  $\mathcal{Q}^-(0)$  is symmetric, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} F(0^-) &= \int_{\gamma b}^{\tau-\gamma b} x^\top(0^-, t) \mathcal{Q}^-(0) x(0^-, t) dt \\ &= \int_{\gamma b}^{\tau-\gamma b} \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{Q}^-(0)x(0^-, t))_1 \\ f_I \end{bmatrix}^\top (\mathcal{Q}^-(0))^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{Q}^-(0)x(0^-, t))_1 \\ f_I \end{bmatrix} dt. \end{aligned}$$

As  $mI \leq \mathcal{Q}^\pm(z) \leq MI$  for all  $z \in [a, b]$ , it follows for all  $t \geq 0$  that

$$\frac{1}{M} \int_{\gamma b}^{\tau-\gamma b} \left| \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{Q}^-(0)x(0^-, t))_1 \\ f_I \end{bmatrix} \right|^2 dt \leq F(0^-) \leq \frac{1}{m} \int_{\gamma b}^{\tau-\gamma b} \left| \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{Q}^-(0)x(0^-, t))_1 \\ f_I \end{bmatrix} \right|^2 dt.$$

Analogously, using  $f_I = (\mathcal{Q}^+x)_2(0^+)$ , see (3.4),

$$\frac{1}{M} \int_{\gamma b}^{\tau-\gamma b} \left| \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{Q}^+(0)x(0^+, t))_1 \\ f_I \end{bmatrix} \right|^2 dt \leq F(0^+) \leq \frac{1}{m} \int_{\gamma b}^{\tau-\gamma b} \left| \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{Q}^+(0)x(0^+, t))_1 \\ f_I \end{bmatrix} \right|^2 dt.$$

For  $t \geq 0$ , define  $\alpha(t) := [(\mathcal{Q}^-(0)x(0^-, t))_1 \quad (\mathcal{Q}^+(0)x(0^+, t))_1]^\top$ . Then the interface condition (3.3) can be rewritten as

$$f_I = re_I = r \left( (\mathcal{Q}^-(0)x(0^-, t))_1 - (\mathcal{Q}^+(0)x(0^+, t))_1 \right) = r(\alpha_1(t) - \alpha_2(t)).$$

Now consider the quadratic norms  $|\cdot|_{V_1}$  and  $|\cdot|_{V_2}$  defined via the quadratic forms given by the symmetric, positive definite matrices

$$V_1 := \begin{bmatrix} 1+r^2 & -r^2 \\ -r^2 & r^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad V_2 := \begin{bmatrix} r^2 & -r^2 \\ -r^2 & 1+r^2 \end{bmatrix},$$

and let  $k_1 \geq 1$  be such that always  $|\alpha|_{V_1}^2 \leq k_1 |\alpha|_{V_2}^2$ . With this we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(0^-) &\leq \frac{1}{m} \int_{\gamma b}^{\tau-\gamma b} \alpha_1(t)^2 + r^2(\alpha_1(t) - \alpha_2(t))^2 dt = \frac{1}{m} \int_{\gamma b}^{\tau-\gamma b} |\alpha(t)|_{V_1}^2 dt \\ &\leq k_1 \frac{M}{m} \frac{1}{M} \int_{\gamma b}^{\tau-\gamma b} |\alpha(t)|_{V_2}^2 dt \leq k_1 \frac{M}{m} F(0^+). \end{aligned}$$

Reversing the roles of  $F(0^-)$  and  $F(0^+)$  there also exists a  $k_2 \geq 1$  such that  $F(0^+) \leq k_2(M/m)F(0^-)$ . In particular,  $F(0^-) = 0$  if and only if  $F(0^+) = 0$ .

We will now consider different instances concerning the choice of the initial state.

**Case 1:**  $x_0$  is chosen such that  $F(b) = 0$ . Then (4.4) yields  $F(0^-) = F(0^+) = 0$ , and so  $F \equiv 0$ . Hence, the estimate (4.5) is trivially satisfied.

**Case 2:**  $x_0$  is chosen such that  $F(b) \neq 0$  and  $F(0^-) = 0$ . Then (4.4) yields that  $F(z) = 0$  holds for all  $z \in [a, 0)$ , and for the choice  $\tilde{C} = 1$  the estimate (4.5) is satisfied.

**Case 3:**  $x_0$  is chosen such that  $F(b) \neq 0$  and  $F(0^-) \neq 0$ . Then we also have  $F(0^+) \neq 0$ . From our previous considerations we have

$$F(0^-) \leq k_1 \frac{M}{m} F(0^+),$$

and (4.4) yields

$$F(0^-) \leq k_1 \frac{M}{m} F(0^+) \leq k_1 \frac{M}{m} F(b) e^{\kappa b}.$$

In summary, we have shown

$$\begin{aligned} F(z) &\leq F(b) e^{\kappa(b-z)}, \quad z \in (0, b], \\ F(z) &\leq k_1 \frac{M}{m} F(b) e^{\kappa(b-z)}, \quad z \in [a, 0). \end{aligned}$$



Choosing  $\tilde{C} = k_1 \frac{M}{m}$ , we conclude that (4.5) holds for all  $z \in [a, b] \setminus \{0\}$ .

Now, we are able to verify the first estimate in (4.2). Following the proof of [15, Lemma 9.1.2] and using the estimate (4.5), it may be shown that

$$2(\tau - 2\gamma(b-a))\|x(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{Q}_0}^2 \leq \frac{(b-a)\tilde{C}}{m} e^{\kappa(b-a)} \int_0^\tau |\mathcal{Q}^+(b)x(b,t)|^2 dt.$$

Letting  $C = \frac{(b-a)\tilde{C}e^{\kappa(b-a)}}{2m(\tau-2\gamma(b-a))}$ , we conclude that the first inequality in (4.2) holds. The second estimate in (4.2) can be shown in a similar fashion by defining

$$\tilde{F}(z) = \int_{\gamma(z-a)}^{\tau-\gamma(z-a)} x^\top(z,t)\mathcal{Q}_0(z)x(z,t) dt, \quad z \in [a, b] \setminus \{0\}. \quad \square$$

*Remark 4.2.* It can be shown that the uniform bound  $k_1$  in the above proof has to be chosen such that  $k_1 > \frac{r^2+1}{r^2}$ .

Lemma 4.1 shows that there exists some time  $\tau > 0$  such that the energy of a state can be bounded by the sum of the accumulated energies at both boundaries during the time interval  $[0, \tau]$ , and in the case  $r > 0$ , it can be bounded by the accumulated energy at either boundary. This result allows us to prove the following sufficient condition for exponential stability of the semigroup generated by  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$ .

**THEOREM 4.3.** *Let the assumptions (A1)-(A2) hold. Assume there exists some  $k > 0$  such that*

$$(4.6) \quad \langle A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}x_0, x_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}_0} \leq -k(|(\mathcal{Q}_0x_0)(a)|^2 + |(\mathcal{Q}_0x_0)(b)|^2)$$

*holds for all  $x_0 \in D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0})$ . Then  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  generates an exponentially stable  $C_0$ -semigroup. In addition, if  $r > 0$ , then exponential stability of the  $C_0$ -semigroup generated by  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  follows if one of the following estimates holds for all  $x_0 \in D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0})$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}x_0, x_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}_0} &\leq -k|(\mathcal{Q}_0x_0)(b)|^2, \\ \langle A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}x_0, x_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}_0} &\leq -k|(\mathcal{Q}_0x_0)(a)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* This follows immediately from the energy estimates in Lemma 4.1 and from Theorem 9.1.3 in [15].  $\square$

Lastly, we want to present another sufficient condition for the exponential stability of the port-Hamiltonian system (2.9). To prove the following theorem, one follows the exposition of Lemma 9.1.4 in [15] and exploits the passivity relation at the interface, as elaborated in [16, Theorem 5.19]. The proof relies on the fact that the estimate (9.25) in [15] has been shown with respect to the evaluation at both spatial boundaries.

**THEOREM 4.4.** *Let the assumptions (A1)-(A2) hold. If the matrix  $W_B$  satisfies  $W_B \Sigma_4 W_B^\top > 0$ , then  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  generates an exponentially stable  $C_0$ -semigroup.*

In this section, we have shown that if we impose certain boundary conditions, then we can ensure that the contraction semigroup  $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$  generated by the port-Hamiltonian operator  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  is of type  $C_0(1, -\alpha)$  for some  $\alpha > 0$ , i.e.,

$$\|T(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(X, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q}_0})} \leq e^{-\alpha t}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

As opposed to the boundary conditions, the interface condition plays a minor role in the proof of Theorem 4.4. It is only required that there is no power inflow at the interface position.

**5. Example: Coupled Acoustic Waveguides.** In this section, we show how the results developed so far may be applied to specific situations. We consider the example of two acoustic waveguides coupled by an interface consisting in some membrane which acts as a local acoustic impedance as it appears, for instance, in [21].

Let  $a < 0 < b$ . Consider two acoustic waveguides on the spatial intervals  $[a, 0)$  and  $(0, b]$ , respectively. On each subdomain, the model of the acoustic wave is given by the coupled system of linear balance equations consisting in the mass balance equation and in the momentum balance equation. One may choose as energy variables the condensation  $s$ , which is the relative change of mass density of the air, and the momentum  $\pi$ . Then the system of balance equation may be expressed on each subdomain by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{bmatrix} s^\pm(z, t) \\ \pi^\pm(z, t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \\ -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} p^\pm(z, t) \\ v^\pm(z, t) \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $s^\pm(z, t) \in \mathbb{R}$  is the condensation and  $p^\pm(z, t) \in \mathbb{R}$  is the relative pressure at time  $t \geq 0$ , and  $\pi^\pm(z, t) \in \mathbb{R}$  denotes the momentum and  $v^\pm(z, t) \in \mathbb{R}$  denotes the velocity at the positions  $z \in [a, 0)$  and  $z \in (0, b]$ , respectively. The variables  $e^\pm = (p^\pm, v^\pm)$  are related to the state variables  $x^\pm = (s^\pm, \pi^\pm)$  by the linear map defined by the coercive multiplication operators  $\mathcal{Q}^\pm$  as follows:

$$e^\pm(\cdot) = (\mathcal{Q}^\pm x^\pm)(\cdot) = \begin{bmatrix} B^\pm(\cdot) & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\rho_0^\pm(\cdot)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} s^\pm(\cdot) \\ \pi^\pm(\cdot) \end{bmatrix}, \quad x^\pm \in X^\pm,$$

where  $\rho_0^\pm(z) > 0$  and  $B^\pm(z) > 0$  are the mean mass density and the adiabatic bulk modulus at  $z$ , respectively. We assume that  $\frac{1}{\rho_0^-}, B^- \in L^\infty((a, l), \mathbb{R})$ , and  $\frac{1}{\rho_0^+}, B^+ \in L^\infty((l, b), \mathbb{R})$ .

The mechanical energy of the corresponding system is given by the following Hamiltonian functionals:

$$H^-(x^-) = \int_a^0 \mathcal{H}^-(x^-(z)) dz = \frac{1}{2} \langle x^-, \mathcal{Q}^- x^- \rangle_{L^2(a, 0)}, \quad x^- \in X^- = L^2((a, 0), \mathbb{R}^2),$$

$$H^+(x^+) = \int_0^b \mathcal{H}^+(x^+(z)) dz = \frac{1}{2} \langle x^+, \mathcal{Q}^+ x^+ \rangle_{L^2(0, b)}, \quad x^+ \in X^+ = L^2((0, b), \mathbb{R}^2).$$

The two acoustic waveguides are coupled at  $z = 0$  by an acoustic impedance which we assume to be of resistive type with resistance  $R_I > 0$ . Furthermore, we set the (relative) pressure at  $z = a$  to zero, and we put another resistive impedance with resistance  $R_b > 0$  at  $z = b$ .

We want to show by means of our results that the coupled system is well-posed and exponentially stable.

**Well-posedness.** The model of the coupling is precisely given by the system (2.9) (with  $l = 0$ ) defined on the state space  $X = L^2([a, b], \mathbb{R}^2)$ , where  $[a, b]$  is the composed spatial domain. Defining the coercive matrix operator  $\mathcal{Q}_0 = c_0^- \mathcal{Q}^- + c_0^+ \mathcal{Q}^+ \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ , we may endow  $X$  with the inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  defined in (2.10).

Due to the resistive acoustic impedance placed at the interface, we expect a pressure drop, and therefore have a discontinuity of the pressure  $p = c_0^- p^- + c_0^+ p^+$ , whereas the velocity is continuous at the interface  $v = c_0^- v^- + c_0^+ v^+$ . Thus, the

interface port variables are given by

$$\begin{aligned} f_{I, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} &= v(0^+) = v(0^-), \\ -e_{I, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} &= p(0^+) - p(0^-), \end{aligned}$$

and are related by the passivity relation

$$f_I(t) = \frac{1}{R_I} e_I(t), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Furthermore, we have the boundary conditions

$$p(a, t) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad p(b, t) = R_b v(b, t), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Using the definition of the boundary port variables (2.16) (and neglecting the time-dependence), we may write equivalently

$$0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & R_b & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} p(b) \\ v(b) \\ p(a) \\ v(a) \end{bmatrix} = \tilde{W}_B \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{Q}_0 x)(b) \\ (\mathcal{Q}_0 x)(a) \end{bmatrix} = W_B \begin{bmatrix} f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} \\ e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} \end{bmatrix},$$

with  $W_B = \tilde{W}_B R_{\text{ext}}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ -R_b & 1 & -1 & R_b \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 4}$ . Note that  $\text{rank}(W_B) = 2$ . Furthermore, one computes that

$$W_B \Sigma_4 W_B^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2R_b \end{bmatrix} \geq 0.$$

Summing up, the port-Hamiltonian operator  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  with domain specified by  $W_B$  defined above for the coupled acoustic waves, satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3.4. Hence,  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  generates a contraction semigroup on the energy space  $(X, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q}_0})$ . In particular, this system is well-posed.

**Exponential stability.** Theorem 4.3 may be used to infer exponential stability. By virtue of the power balance (2.22), the associated port-Hamiltonian operator  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_0}$  satisfies

$$2\langle A_{\mathcal{Q}_0} x, x \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}_0} = \langle e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x}, f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} \rangle - e_{I, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} f_{I, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} \leq \langle e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x}, f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} \rangle$$

for all  $x \in D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0})$ . Using the boundary conditions, simple computations yield that

$$\langle e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x}, f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} \rangle = -R_b v(b)^2.$$

Furthermore,

$$|(\mathcal{Q}^+ x)(b)|^2 = p(b)^2 + v(b)^2 = (1 + R_b^2) v(b)^2.$$

In summary, we have

$$\langle A_{\mathcal{Q}_0} x, x \rangle_{\mathcal{Q}_0} \leq \frac{1}{2} \langle e_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x}, f_{\partial, \mathcal{Q}_0 x} \rangle = \frac{-R_b}{2(1 + R_b^2)} |(\mathcal{Q}^+ x)(b)|^2$$

for all  $x \in D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_0})$ . Hence, by Theorem 4.3, this system is exponentially stable.

**6. Conclusions.** Based on the port-Hamiltonian model of systems with moving interfaces suggested in [6], we have given a mathematically rigorous definition of the nonlinear Hamiltonian operator, depending on the color functions, appearing in such models. For given color functions, we have derived the balance equation of the Hamiltonian functional in terms of interface variables at the boundary of the spatial domain and at the interface. For the case that the interface position is fixed, a set of tools is provided that fully characterize contractivity and give conditions for exponential stability of such systems. We have worked out necessary and sufficient conditions that guarantee that the associated port-Hamiltonian operator generates a contraction semigroup on the respective energy space. These passivity conditions have been defined with respect to the interface and boundary port variables and are easy to check in practice. Moreover, we have presented criteria for exponential stability of the  $C_0$ -semigroup generated by the associated port-Hamiltonian operator. The study can be seen as a first step towards the development of the theory for the case of moving interfaces. At the time of writing this, there are still a number of notable obstacles towards this goal. It is tempting to let  $l(\cdot)$  as a function of  $t$  denote the moving interface and to consider the operators  $A_{\mathcal{Q}_{l(t)}}$  as a family of operators that should generate an evolution family. Standard tools in this direction fail immediately, however, most notably because there is no subspace  $Y$  dense in  $L^2([a, b], \mathbb{R}^2)$  in the intersection of the domains  $D(A_{\mathcal{Q}_{l(t)}})$ , compare, e.g., [23, Chapter 5]. Clearly, the energy flow generated by the moving interface has to be taken into account here as it has been done in [6] by defining an additional pair of port variables. A route towards the generation of evolution families could be provided by using these additional port variables and using passivity properties. A very special case of this problem will be discussed in [17].

## REFERENCES

- [1] V. I. ARNOL'D, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*, vol. 60 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, New York, 1978.
- [2] J.-P. AUBIN, *Applied Functional Analysis*, Wiley Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics, John Wiley & Sons, New York, second ed., 2000.
- [3] B. AUGNER, *Stabilisation of infinite-dimensional port-Hamiltonian systems via dissipative boundary feedback*, PhD thesis, Department of Mathematics and Informatics, University of Wuppertal, 2016.
- [4] B. BOUTIN, F. COQUEL, AND E. GODLEWSKI, *Dafermos Regularization for Interface Coupling of Conservation Laws*, in *Hyperbolic Problems: Theory, Numerics, Applications*, S. Benzoni-Gavage and D. Serre, eds., Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008, pp. 567–575.
- [5] R. F. CURTAIN AND H. J. ZWART, *Introduction to Infinite-Dimensional Linear Systems Theory*, vol. 71 of Texts in Applied Mathematics, Springer, New York, first ed., 2020.
- [6] M. DIAGNE AND B. M. MASCHKE, *Port Hamiltonian formulation of a system of two conservation laws with a moving interface*, *European Journal on Control*, 19 (2013), pp. 495–504.
- [7] V. DUINDAM, A. MACCHELLI, S. STRAMIGIOLI, AND H. BRUYNINCKX, eds., *Modeling and Control of Complex Physical Systems*, Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, first ed., 2009.
- [8] K.-J. ENGEL AND R. NAGEL, *One-Parameter Semigroups for Linear Evolution Equations*, vol. 194 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, New York, first ed., 2000.
- [9] H. O. FATTORINI, *Boundary control systems*, *SIAM Journal on Control*, 6 (1968), pp. 349–385.
- [10] E. GODLEWSKI AND P.-A. RAVIART, *The numerical interface coupling of nonlinear hyperbolic systems of conservation laws*, *Numer. Math.*, 97 (2004), pp. 81–130.
- [11] Y. L. GORREC, H. J. ZWART, AND B. M. MASCHKE, *Dirac structures and boundary control systems associated with skew-symmetric differential operators*, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 44 (2005), pp. 1864–1892.
- [12] S. C. GUPTA, *The Classical Stefan Problem*, vol. 45 of North-Holland Series in Applied Mathematics and Mechanics, Elsevier, Amsterdam, first ed., 2003.
- [13] B. HAMROUN, A. DIMOFTE, L. LEFÈVRE, AND E. MENDES, *Control by interconnection and*

- energy-shaping methods of port-Hamiltonian models - Application to the shallow water equations*, European Journal of Control, 16 (2010), pp. 545–563.
- [14] B. JACOB, K. MORRIS, AND H. ZWART, *C 0-semigroups for hyperbolic partial differential equations on a one-dimensional spatial domain*, Journal of Evolution Equations, 15 (2015), pp. 493–502.
- [15] B. JACOB AND H. J. ZWART, *Linear Port-Hamiltonian Systems on Infinite-dimensional Spaces*, vol. 223 of Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, first ed., 2012.
- [16] A. KILIAN, *Infinite-Dimensional Port-Hamiltonian Systems with a Moving Interface*, master's thesis, Chair of Dynamical Systems, University of Passau, 2022.
- [17] A. KILIAN, B. MASCHKE, A. MIRONCHENKO, AND F. WIRTH, *A case study of port-Hamiltonian systems with a moving interface*, in Proc. 62nd IEEE Conf. Dec. Control (CDC2023), 2023, in preparation.
- [18] M. KURULA AND H. ZWART, *Linear wave systems on n-d spatial domains*, International Journal of Control, 88 (2015), pp. 1063–1077.
- [19] M. KURULA, H. ZWART, A. VAN DER SCHAFT, AND J. BEHRNDT, *Dirac structures and their composition on Hilbert spaces*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 372 (2010), pp. 402 – 422.
- [20] F. LOTERO, F. COUENNE, B. MASCHKE, AND D. SBARBARO, *Distributed parameter bi-zone model with moving interface of an extrusion process and experimental validation*, Mathematical and Computer Modelling of Dynamical Systems, 23 (2017), pp. 504–522.
- [21] E. OGAM, Z. EL ABIDDINE FELLAH, G. OGAM, N. ONGWEN, AND N. ODUOR, *Investigation of long acoustic waveguides for the very low frequency characterization of monolayer and stratified air-saturated poroelastic materials*, Applied Acoustics, 182 (2021), p. 108200.
- [22] P. OLVER, *Applications of Lie Groups to Differential Equations*, vol. 107 of Graduate texts in mathematics, Springer, New-York, ii ed., 1993. ISBN 0-387-94007-3.
- [23] A. PAZY, *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*, vol. 44 of Applied Mathematical Sciences, Springer, New York, first ed., 1983.
- [24] F. RASHAD, R. AND CALIFANO, A. VAN DER SCHAFT, AND S. STRAMIGIOLI, *Twenty years of distributed port-Hamiltonian systems: a literature review*, IMA Journal of Mathematical Control and Information, (2020).
- [25] G. TESCHL, *Ordinary Differential Equations and Dynamical Systems*, vol. 140 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, Providence, first ed., 2012.
- [26] M. TUCSNAK AND G. WEISS, *Observation and Control for Operator Semigroups*, Birkhäuser Advanced Texts Basler Lehrbücher, Birkhäuser, Basel, first ed., 2009.
- [27] A. VAN DER SCHAFT AND B. MASCHKE, *Hamiltonian formulation of distributed parameter systems with boundary energy flow*, J. of Geometry and Physics, 42 (2002), pp. 166–174.
- [28] A. J. VAN DER SCHAFT AND D. JELTSEMA, *Port-Hamiltonian systems theory: an introductory overview*, Foundations and Trends® in Systems and Control, 1 (2014), pp. 173–378.
- [29] J. A. VILLEGAS, *A port-Hamiltonian approach to distributed parameter systems*, PhD thesis, Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Twente, Enschede, 2007.
- [30] B. VINCENT, F. COUENNE, L. LEFÈVRE, AND B. MASCHKE, *Port Hamiltonian systems with moving interface: a phase field approach*, IFAC-PapersOnLine, 53 (2020), pp. 7569–7574. 21th IFAC World Congress.
- [31] M. WILLATZEN, N. PETTIT, AND L. PLOUG-SØRENSEN, *A general dynamic simulation model for evaporators and condensers in refrigeration. Part I: Moving-boundary formulation of two-phase flows with heat exchange*, International Journal of Refrigeration, 21 (1998), pp. 398–403.