

Proof of Proposition 3.1 in the paper titled “Backstepping control of a class of space-time-varying linear parabolic PDEs via time invariant kernel functions”

Qiaoling Chen¹, Jun Zheng^{1,2}, Guchuan Zhu²

¹*School of Mathematics, Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu 611756, Sichuan, China*

²*Department of Electrical Engineering, Polytechnique Montréal, P.O. Box 6079, Station Centre-Ville, Montreal, QC, Canada H3T 1J4*

Abstract

We provide a detailed proof of Proposition 3.1 in the paper titled “Backstepping control of a class of space-time-varying linear parabolic PDEs via time invariant kernel functions”.

In the paper titled “Backstepping control of a class of space-time-varying linear parabolic PDEs via time invariant kernel functions”, we addressed the problem of exponential stabilization and continuous dependence of solutions on initial data in different norms for a class of 1-D linear parabolic PDEs with space-time-varying coefficients under backstepping boundary control. In order to stabilize the system without involving a Gevrey-like condition or the event-triggered scheme, a boundary feedback controller was designed via a time invariant kernel function. By using the approximative Lyapunov method, the exponential stability of the closed-loop system was established in the spatial L^p -norm and $W^{1,p}$ -norm, respectively, whenever $p \in [1, +\infty]$. It was also shown that the solution to the considered system depends continuously on the spatial L^p -norm and $W^{1,p}$ -norm, respectively, of the initial data.

Key words: Backstepping control, parabolic PDEs, approximative Lyapunov method, exponential stabilization, continuous dependence.

1 Brief review on the considered problem

Before presenting the proof of Proposition 3.1 in the paper titled “Backstepping control of a class of space-time-varying linear parabolic PDEs via time invariant kernel functions”, i.e., [1], we would like to restate the considered problem. Specifically, given certain initial data w_0 , we study the problem of stabilization and continuous dependence of solutions on initial data in different norms for a class of linear parabolic PDEs with space and time dependent coefficients:

$$w_t(x, t) = w_{xx}(x, t) + c(x, t)w(x, t) + \int_0^x w(y, t)f(x, y)dy, (x, t) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}, \quad (1a)$$

$$w_x(0, t) = 0, t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}, \quad (1b)$$

$$w_x(1, t) = U(t), t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}, \quad (1c)$$

$$w(x, 0) = w_0(x), x \in (0, 1), \quad (1d)$$

where $c : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $f : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are given functions, and U is the control input to be determined to stabilize the system.

Email addresses: cq120202016@my.swjtu.edu.cn (Qiaoling Chen¹), zhengjun2014@aliyun.com (Jun Zheng^{1,2}), guchuan.zhu@polymtl.ca (Guchuan Zhu²).

We assume that $p \in [1, +\infty)$ is either an arbitrary constant, or $p = +\infty$, $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ is a constant, $f \in C([0, 1] \times [0, 1])$, and the reaction coefficient $c \in \mathcal{H}^{\theta, \frac{\theta}{2}}(\overline{Q_\infty})$ is given by

$$c(x, t) := c_1(x) + c_2(t) + c_3(x, t),$$

with some functions $c_1 \in C([0, 1])$, $c_2 \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$, and $c_3 \in W_2^{2,1}(Q_T)$ for all $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Assume further that

$$\sup_{(x,t) \in \overline{Q_\infty}} c(x, t) < +\infty,$$

and

$$|c_3(x, t) - c_3(y, t)| \leq L(t)\omega(|x - y|),$$

holds true for all $x, y \in [0, 1]$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, where $\omega \in C([0, 1])$ and $L \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ are nonnegative functions satisfying

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} L(t) = 0 \text{ and } \omega(s) \leq 1, \forall s \in [0, 1].$$

Let $\lambda_0 > 0$ be an arbitrary constant and satisfy $\lambda_0 > \sup_{(x,t) \in \overline{Q_\infty}} c(x, t)$. Let $D := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid 0 \leq y \leq x \leq 1\}$ and

$$\mu(x, y) := \lambda_0 - c_1(x) + c_1(y), \forall (x, y) \in D.$$

Consider the following equation defined over D :

$$k_{xx}(x, y) - k_{yy}(x, y) = \mu(x, y)k(x, y) + f(x, y) + \int_y^x k(x, z)f(z, y)dz, \quad (2a)$$

$$2 \frac{d}{dx} (k(x, x)) = \lambda_0, \quad (2b)$$

$$k_y(x, 0) = 0, \quad (2c)$$

$$k(0, 0) = 0, \quad (2d)$$

where $\frac{d}{dx} (k(x, x)) := k_x(x, y)|_{y=x} + k_y(x, y)|_{y=x}$.

Then, by means of such a kernel function k , we define the boundary feedback control law as

$$U(t) := -k(1, 1)w(1, t) - \int_0^1 k_x(1, y)w(y, t)dy. \quad (3)$$

The existence, regularity and maximum estimate of a solution k to the equation (2) is guaranteed by the following proposition, which is Proposition 3.1 of [1]. The proof will be given in Section 2.

Proposition 1 ([1, Proposition 3.1]) *The equation (2) admits a unique solution k that belongs to $C^2(D)$ and satisfies*

$$|k(x, y)| \leq M e^{2M}, \forall (x, y) \in D, \quad (4)$$

where $M := \frac{\overline{f} + \overline{\Lambda}}{2}$ with $\overline{f} := \max_{(x,y) \in [0,1] \times [0,1]} |f(x, y)|$, and $\overline{\Lambda} := \max\{\lambda_0, \max_{(x,y) \in D} |\mu(x, y)|\}$.

Now, we define the set

$$W_0 := \left\{ w \mid w \in \mathcal{H}^{2+\theta}([0, 1]), w_x(0) = 0, w_x(1) = -k(1, 1)w(1) - \int_0^1 k_x(1, y)w(y)dy \right\},$$

for the initial data of system (1), and denote $\lambda(x, t) := \lambda_0 - c(x, t)$, and $\underline{\lambda} := \inf_{(x,t) \in \overline{Q_\infty}} \lambda(x, t)$.

The main result obtained in [1] is the following theorem, whose proof is given in [1].

Theorem 2 Given initial data $w_0 \in W_0$ and considering system (1) under the boundary feedback control law (3), the following statements hold true:

- (i) The system (1) admits a unique classical solution w , which belongs to $C^{2,1}(\overline{Q}_T)$ for any $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.
- (ii) The system (1) is exponentially stable in the spatial L^p -norm, having the estimate for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$:

$$\|w[t]\|_{L^p(0,1)} \leq C_0 e^{-\sigma_0 t} \|w_0\|_{L^p(0,1)}, \quad (5)$$

where σ_0 and C_0 are positive constants depending only on $\underline{\lambda}, k$ and $\max_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} L(t)$ whenever $p \in [1, +\infty]$.

In addition, the solution to system (1) is continuously dependent on the spatial L^p -norm of the initial data, having the estimate for all $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$:

$$\|w_1 - w_2\|_{C([0,T];L^p(0,1))} \leq C_0 \|w_{01} - w_{02}\|_{L^p(0,1)},$$

where w_i denotes the solution to system (1) corresponding to the initial data $w_{0i} \in W_0$ ($i = 1, 2$).

- (iii) Assume further that $c_1 \in C^1([0, 1])$ and

$$\omega(s) = s^{\gamma_0}, \forall s \in [0, 1],$$

with some constant $\gamma_0 \geq 1$. Then, system (1) is exponentially stable in the spatial $W^{1,p}$ -norm, having the estimate for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$:

$$\|w[t]\|_{W^{1,p}(0,1)} \leq C_0 e^{-\frac{\sigma_0}{2} t} \|w_0\|_{W^{1,p}(0,1)},$$

where σ_0 is the same as in (5), and C_0 is a positive constant depending only on $p, c_x, \underline{\lambda}, k$ and $\max_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} L(t)$ for $p \in [1, +\infty)$, and only on $c_x, \underline{\lambda}$ and k for $p = +\infty$, respectively.

In addition, the solution to system (1) is continuously dependent on the spatial $W^{1,p}$ -norm of the initial data, having the estimate for all $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$:

$$\|w_1 - w_2\|_{C([0,T];W^{1,p}(0,1))} \leq C_0 \|w_{01} - w_{02}\|_{W^{1,p}(0,1)},$$

where w_i denotes the solution to system (1) corresponding to the initial data $w_{0i} \in W_0$ ($i = 1, 2$).

As a special case of Theorem 2, the following result indicates that, for certain parabolic PDEs with time-varying coefficients, a boundary feedback control can be designed via modified Bessel functions, which are often used to design boundary controls for stabilizing parabolic PDEs with constant coefficients. The proof is also given in [1].

Corollary 3 Let $c(x, t) \equiv c_2(t)$ and $f(x, y) \equiv 0$. Under the following boundary control law¹

$$U(t) := -\frac{\lambda_0}{2} w(1, t) - \lambda_0 \int_0^1 \frac{\mathcal{I}_1\left(\sqrt{\lambda_0(1-y^2)}\right)}{\sqrt{\lambda_0(1-y^2)}} w(y, t) dy - \lambda_0 \int_0^1 \frac{\mathcal{I}_2\left(\sqrt{\lambda_0(1-y^2)}\right)}{1-y^2} w(y, t) dy, \quad (6)$$

system (1) is exponentially stable in the spatial L^p -norm (and $W^{1,p}$ -norm under the further assumption that $c_2 \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$), where \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2 are modified Bessel functions (see, e.g., [7]) of order one and order two, respectively.

2 Proof of Proposition 1

In this section we provide a detailed proof for Proposition 1, i.e., [1, Proposition 3.1].

We prove by using the method of successive approximations as in, e.g., [2,3,4,5,6,7,8]. Indeed, let $\xi := x + y$ and $\eta := x - y$. It follows that $\eta \in [0, 1]$ and $\xi \in [\eta, 2 - \eta]$. Let

$$G(\xi, \eta) := k(x, y) = k\left(\frac{\xi + \eta}{2}, \frac{\xi - \eta}{2}\right).$$

¹ Note that $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{I}_1(s)}{s} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{I}_2(s)}{s^2} = \frac{1}{8}$; thus (6) is well-defined.

Then (2) is changed into

$$4G_{\xi\eta}(\xi, \eta) = \tilde{\mu}(\xi, \eta)G(\xi, \eta) + f\left(\frac{\xi+\eta}{2}, \frac{\xi-\eta}{2}\right) + \int_{\frac{\xi-\eta}{2}}^{\frac{\xi+\eta}{2}} \tilde{G}(z, \xi, \eta)dz, \quad (7a)$$

$$G(\xi, 0) = \frac{\lambda_0}{4}\xi, \quad (7b)$$

$$G_{\xi}(\xi, \xi) = G_{\eta}(\xi, \xi), \quad (7c)$$

$$G(0, 0) = 0, \quad (7d)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}(\xi, \eta) &:= \mu(x, y) = \lambda_0 - c_1 \left(\frac{\xi+\eta}{2}\right) + c_1 \left(\frac{\xi-\eta}{2}\right), \\ \tilde{G}(z, \xi, \eta) &:= f\left(z, \frac{\xi-\eta}{2}\right) G\left(\frac{\xi+\eta}{2} + z, \frac{\xi+\eta}{2} - z\right). \end{aligned}$$

Integrating (7a) w.r.t. η from 0 to η and differentiating (7b) w.r.t. ξ give

$$G_{\xi}(\xi, \eta) = \frac{\lambda_0}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \int_0^{\eta} \tilde{\mu}(\xi, s)G(\xi, s)ds + \frac{1}{4} \int_0^{\eta} f\left(\frac{\xi+s}{2}, \frac{\xi-s}{2}\right) ds + \frac{1}{4} \int_0^{\eta} \int_{\xi}^{\xi+\eta-s} \widehat{G}(\tau, s, \xi) d\tau ds, \quad (8)$$

where $\widehat{G}(\tau, s, \xi) := f\left(\frac{\tau-s}{2}, \xi - \frac{\tau+s}{2}\right) G(\tau, s)$.

Integrating (8) w.r.t. ξ from η to ξ gives

$$\begin{aligned} G(\xi, \eta) &= G(\eta, \eta) + \frac{\lambda_0}{4}(\xi - \eta) + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \tilde{\mu}(\tau, s)G(\tau, s)dsd\tau + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} f\left(\frac{\tau+s}{2}, \frac{\tau-s}{2}\right) dsd\tau \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \int_z^{z+\eta-s} \widehat{G}(\tau, s, z) d\tau ds dz. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

By (7c), we have

$$\frac{d}{d\xi} (G(\xi, \xi)) = 2G_{\xi}(\xi, \xi). \quad (10)$$

Substituting $\eta = \xi$ into (8), then integrating it over $[0, \xi]$ and applying (7d) and (10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G(\xi, \xi) &= \frac{\lambda_0}{2}\xi + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\xi} \int_0^{\tau} \tilde{\mu}(\tau, s)G(\tau, s)dsd\tau + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\xi} \int_0^{\tau} f\left(\frac{\tau+s}{2}, \frac{\tau-s}{2}\right) dsd\tau \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\xi} \int_0^z \int_z^{2z-s} \widehat{G}(\tau, s, z) d\tau ds dz, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} G(\eta, \eta) &= \frac{\lambda_0}{2}\eta + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^{\tau} \tilde{\mu}(\tau, s)G(\tau, s)dsd\tau + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^{\tau} f\left(\frac{\tau+s}{2}, \frac{\tau-s}{2}\right) dsd\tau \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^z \int_z^{2z-s} \widehat{G}(\tau, s, z) d\tau ds dz. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We deduce by (9) and (11) that

$$G(\xi, \eta) = \frac{\lambda_0}{4}(\xi + \eta) + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} f\left(\frac{\tau+s}{2}, \frac{\tau-s}{2}\right) dsd\tau + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^{\tau} f\left(\frac{\tau+s}{2}, \frac{\tau-s}{2}\right) dsd\tau$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \tilde{\mu}(\tau, s) G(\tau, s) \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}\tau + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^{\tau} \tilde{\mu}(\tau, s) G(\tau, s) \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}\tau + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \int_z^{z+\eta-s} \widehat{G}(\tau, s, z) \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^z \int_z^{2z-s} \widehat{G}(\tau, s, z) \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z.
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

We rewrite the integral equation (12) as

$$G(\xi, \eta) = G_0(\xi, \eta) + \Phi_G(\xi, \eta), \tag{13}$$

where we defined

$$G_0(\xi, \eta) := \frac{\lambda_0}{4} (\xi + \eta) + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} f\left(\frac{\tau+s}{2}, \frac{\tau-s}{2}\right) \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}\tau + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^{\tau} f\left(\frac{\tau+s}{2}, \frac{\tau-s}{2}\right) \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}\tau,$$

and $\Phi_G(\xi, \eta)$ via

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_H(\xi, \eta) & := \frac{1}{4} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \tilde{\mu}(\tau, s) H(\tau, s) \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}\tau + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^{\tau} \tilde{\mu}(\tau, s) H(\tau, s) \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}\tau + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \int_z^{z+\eta-s} \widehat{H}(\tau, s, z) \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^z \int_z^{2z-s} \widehat{H}(\tau, s, z) \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z, \\
\widehat{H}(\xi, \eta, z) & := f\left(\frac{\xi-\eta}{2}, z - \frac{\xi+\eta}{2}\right) H(\xi, \eta),
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

for any $\eta \in [0, 1]$, $\xi \in [\eta, 2 - \eta]$, $z \in [\eta, 2 - \eta]$, and any function H .

Define the sequence $\{G_n(\xi, \eta)\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ via

$$G_{n+1}(\xi, \eta) := G_0(\xi, \eta) + \Phi_{G_n}(\xi, \eta), \tag{15}$$

and let $\Delta G_n(\xi, \eta) := G_{n+1}(\xi, \eta) - G_n(\xi, \eta)$. It holds that

$$\Delta G_{n+1}(\xi, \eta) = \Phi_{\Delta G_n}(\xi, \eta)$$

and

$$G_{n+1}(\xi, \eta) = G_0(\xi, \eta) + \sum_{j=0}^n \Delta G_j(\xi, \eta). \tag{16}$$

From (15), we see that if $\{G_n(\xi, \eta)\}$ converges uniformly w.r.t. (ξ, η) when $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $G(\xi, \eta) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_n(\xi, \eta)$ is the solution to the integral equation (13), and therefore the existence of a kernel function k given by (2) is guaranteed. In addition, in view of (16), the convergence of $\{G_n(\xi, \eta)\}$ is equivalent to the convergence of the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta G_n(\xi, \eta)$. Therefore, it suffices to show that the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta G_n(\xi, \eta)$ is uniformly convergent w.r.t. (ξ, η) . Furthermore, recalling the Weierstrass M-test, it suffices to show that the following inequality

$$|\Delta G_n(\xi, \eta)| \leq \frac{M^{n+2}}{(n+1)!} (\xi + \eta)^{n+1} \tag{17}$$

holds true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, where

$$M := \frac{\overline{f} + \overline{\lambda}}{2}, \overline{f} := \max_{(x,y) \in [0,1] \times [0,1]} |f(x, y)|, \overline{\lambda} := \max \left\{ \lambda_0, \max_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{D}} |\lambda_0 - c_1(x) + c_1(y)| \right\}.$$

Now we prove (17) by induction. First of all, since

$$|G_0(\xi, \eta)| \leq \frac{\lambda_0}{4} (\xi + \eta) + \frac{\overline{f}}{4} (\xi \eta - \eta^2) + \frac{\overline{f}}{4} \eta^2 \leq M, \tag{18}$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta G_0(\xi, \eta)| &= |\Phi_{G_0}(\xi, \eta)| \\
&\leq \frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{4} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} M \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}\tau + \frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{2} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^{\tau} M \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}\tau + \frac{\bar{f}}{4} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \int_z^{z+\eta-s} M \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z + \frac{\bar{f}}{2} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^z \int_z^{2z-s} M \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z \\
&= M \left(\frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{4} \xi \eta + \frac{\bar{f}}{8} \xi \eta^2 - \frac{\bar{f}}{24} \eta^3 \right) \\
&\leq M^2 (\xi + \eta),
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

which shows that (17) holds true for $n = 0$.

Supposing that the inequality (17) holds true for a general $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we need to show that (17) also holds true for $n + 1$. Indeed, we get

$$|\Delta G_{n+1}(\xi, \eta)| = |\Phi_{\Delta G_n}(\xi, \eta)| = |I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4|,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &:= \frac{1}{4} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \tilde{\mu}(\tau, s) \Delta G_n(\tau, s) \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}\tau, \\
I_2 &:= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^{\tau} \tilde{\mu}(\tau, s) \Delta G_n(\tau, s) \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}\tau, \\
I_3 &:= \frac{1}{4} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \int_z^{z+\eta-s} \widehat{\Delta G_n}(\tau, s, z) \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z, \\
I_4 &:= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^z \int_z^{2z-s} \widehat{\Delta G_n}(\tau, s, z) \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z,
\end{aligned}$$

with $\widehat{\Delta G_n}$ defined via (14).

Since (17) holds true for n , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_1| &\leq \frac{\bar{\Lambda} M^{n+2}}{4(n+1)!} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} (\tau + s)^{n+1} \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}\tau \leq \frac{\bar{\Lambda} M^{n+2}}{4(n+1)!} \frac{1}{(n+2)(n+3)} ((\xi + \eta)^{n+3} - (2\eta)^{n+3}), \\
|I_2| &\leq \frac{\bar{\Lambda} M^{n+2}}{2(n+1)!} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^{\tau} (\tau + s)^{n+1} \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}\tau \leq \frac{\bar{\Lambda} M^{n+2}}{4(n+1)!} \frac{1}{(n+2)(n+3)} (2\eta)^{n+3}, \\
|I_3| &\leq \frac{\bar{f} M^{n+2}}{4(n+1)!} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \int_z^{z+\eta-s} (\tau + s)^{n+1} \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z \leq \frac{\bar{f} M^{n+2}}{4(n+1)!} \frac{1}{(n+2)(n+3)} ((\xi + \eta)^{n+3} - (2\eta)^{n+3}), \\
|I_4| &\leq \frac{\bar{f} M^{n+2}}{2(n+1)!} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^z \int_z^{2z-s} (\tau + s)^{n+1} \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z \leq \frac{\bar{f} M^{n+2}}{2(n+1)!} \frac{1}{(n+2)(n+3)} (2\eta)^{n+3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta G_{n+1}(\xi, \eta)| &\leq (|I_1| + |I_2|) + (|I_3| + |I_4|) \\
&\leq \frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{4(n+3)} \frac{M^{n+2}}{(n+2)!} (\xi + \eta)^{n+3} + \frac{\bar{f}}{2(n+3)} \frac{M^{n+2}}{(n+2)!} (\xi + \eta)^{n+3} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{2(n+3)} + \frac{\bar{f}}{n+3} \right) \frac{M^{n+2}}{(n+2)!} (\xi + \eta)^{n+2} \\
&\leq \frac{M^{n+3}}{(n+2)!} (\xi + \eta)^{n+2},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that (17) holds for $n + 1$. Therefore, (17) holds true for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

We conclude that the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta G_n(\xi, \eta)$ converges absolutely and uniformly in $\eta \in [0, 1]$ and $\xi \in [\eta, 2 - \eta]$, and that

$$G(\xi, \eta) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_n(\xi, \eta) \quad (20)$$

is a solution to (13). Moreover, $G(\xi, \eta)$ is continuous in (ξ, η) . Furthermore, in view of (12) with $f \in C([0, 1] \times [0, 1])$ and $c_1 \in C([0, 1])$, we deduce that G is C^2 -continuous. By using the change of variables, we deduce that the problem (2) admits a solution $k \in C^2(D)$.

Regarding the uniqueness of solution to (2), which is equivalent to the uniqueness of solution to the integral equation (12), it suffices to show that any twice continuously differentiable solution of (12) can be approximated by the sequence $\{G_n(\xi, \eta)\}$ constructed via (15). More precisely, for any twice continuously differentiable solution $\overline{G}(\xi, \eta)$ of (12), we intend to show that the estimate

$$|G_n(\xi, \eta) - \overline{G}(\xi, \eta)| \leq \frac{\delta M^n}{n!} (\xi + \eta)^n \quad (21)$$

holds true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, where

$$\delta := \max_{\eta \in [0, 1], \xi \in [\eta, 2 - \eta]} |\Phi_{\overline{G}}(\xi, \eta)|.$$

This is because (21) implies the uniform convergence of $\{G_n(\xi, \eta)\}$ to $\overline{G}(\xi, \eta)$, while the uniqueness of $G(\xi, \eta) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_n(\xi, \eta)$ leads to $\overline{G}(\xi, \eta) \equiv G(\xi, \eta)$. Thus, the solution to (12) is unique, and consequently, the solution to (2) is also unique.

Now we prove (21) by induction. First, since $\overline{G}(\xi, \eta)$ is a solution to (12), using the definition of $\Phi_{\overline{G}}$, we obtain

$$|G_0(\xi, \eta) - \overline{G}(\xi, \eta)| = |G_0(\xi, \eta) - (G_0(\xi, \eta) + \Phi_{\overline{G}}(\xi, \eta))| = |\Phi_{\overline{G}}(\xi, \eta)| \leq \delta,$$

which shows that (21) holds true for $n = 0$.

Suppose that (21) holds true for a general $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, by this assumption and the linearity of $\Phi_H(\xi, \eta)$ w.r.t. H , we have

$$|G_{n+1}(\xi, \eta) - \overline{G}(\xi, \eta)| = |\Phi_{G_n}(\xi, \eta) - \Phi_{\overline{G}}(\xi, \eta)| = \left| \Phi_{G_n - \overline{G}}(\xi, \eta) \right| \leq I_5 + I_6 + I_7 + I_8,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_5 &:= \delta \frac{\overline{\Lambda} M^n}{4n!} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} (\tau + s)^n \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}\tau, \\ I_6 &:= \delta \frac{\overline{\Lambda} M^n}{2n!} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^{\tau} (\tau + s)^n \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}\tau, \\ I_7 &:= \delta \frac{\overline{f} M^n}{4n!} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \int_z^{z+\eta-s} (\tau + s)^n \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z, \\ I_8 &:= \delta \frac{\overline{f} M^n}{2n!} \int_0^{\eta} \int_0^z \int_z^{2z-s} (\tau + s)^n \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}z. \end{aligned}$$

Analogous to the estimates of I_1, I_2, I_3 and I_4 , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} I_5 &\leq \delta \frac{\overline{\Lambda} M^n}{4n!} \frac{1}{(n+1)(n+2)} ((\xi + \eta)^{n+2} - (2\eta)^{n+2}), \\ I_6 &\leq \delta \frac{\overline{\Lambda} M^n}{4n!} \frac{1}{(n+1)(n+2)} (2\eta)^{n+2}, \\ I_7 &\leq \delta \frac{\overline{f} M^n}{4n!} \frac{1}{(n+1)(n+2)} ((\xi + \eta)^{n+2} - (2\eta)^{n+2}), \end{aligned}$$

$$I_8 \leq \delta \frac{\bar{f} M^n}{2n!} \frac{1}{(n+1)(n+2)} (2\eta)^{n+2}.$$

Then, we obtain

$$|G_{n+1}(\xi, \eta) - \bar{G}(\xi, \eta)| \leq \delta \left(\frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{2(n+2)} + \frac{\bar{f}}{n+2} \right) \frac{M^n}{(n+1)!} (\xi + \eta)^{n+1} \leq \frac{\delta M^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} (\xi + \eta)^{n+1},$$

which implies that (21) holds true for $n+1$. Thus, (21) holds true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We conclude that the solution to (2) is unique.

Finally, the estimate (4) follows immediately from (20), (18), (16), (17) and the change of variables. The proof is completed.

Remark 1 For the stabilization problem of linear parabolic PDEs with time invariant coefficients, the “uniqueness of kernel functions” was claimed in [7] and proved by estimating

$$|\Delta G(\xi, \eta)| := |G'(\xi, \eta) - G''(\xi, \eta)| \leq \frac{C_0}{n!} (\xi + \eta)^n \quad (22)$$

with some constant $C_0 > 0$, where G', G'' are two kernel functions; see (39) and (40) of [7].

It is worth noting that a gap exists in the proof given in [7]. On one hand, if G' and G'' are given by (see (39) of [7])

$$G'(\xi, \eta) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} G_n(\xi, \eta), \quad G''(\xi, \eta) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} G_n(\xi, \eta), \quad (23)$$

as indicated in [7], the estimate (22) can be obtained in the same way as in (38) of [7]. Therefore the equality of $G' = G''$ can be concluded by letting $n \rightarrow \infty$. However, since the limit of $\sum_{i=0}^n G_i(\xi, \eta)$ is unique, which is known in the limit theory, due to (23), the equality of $G' = G''$ holds true trivially. Therefore, the proof presented in [7] is essentially for the uniqueness of the limit of $\{G_n\}$ rather than the uniqueness of the solution.

On the other hand, if G' and G'' are not given by (23), without imposing more conditions, the estimate (22) cannot be obtained in the same way as in (38) of [7].

In order to address the aforementioned issues, as presented in this paper, a feasible idea for proving the uniqueness of kernel functions is to prove that all solutions to integral equations (e.g., (12) or (13)) can be approximated by the sequence $\{G_n\}$. That is to say, G' and G'' in [7] have to be with a form of (23). Then the uniqueness of the solution is determined by the uniqueness of the limit of $\{G_n\}$. Note that, by using this method, the estimate considered in this paper (see (21)) is different from (22). In particular, (21) implies (22).

References

- [1] Q. Chen, J. Zheng, and G. Zhu. *Backstepping control of a class of space-time-varying linear parabolic PDEs via time invariant kernel functions*. 2023.
- [2] D. Colton. The solution of initial-boundary value problems for parabolic equations by the method of integral operators. *J. Diff. Equat.*, 26(2):181–190, 1977.
- [3] M. Krstic and A. Smyshlyaev. *Boundary Control of PDEs: A Course on Backstepping Designs*. SIAM, 2008.
- [4] W. Liu. Boundary feedback stabilization of an unstable heat equation. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 42(3):1033–1043, 2003.
- [5] T. Meurer and A. Kugi. Tracking control for boundary controlled parabolic PDEs with varying parameters: Combining backstepping and differential flatness. *Automatica*, 45(5):1182–1194, 2009.
- [6] Y. Si, C. Xie, and N. Zhao. Boundary control for a class of reaction-diffusion systems. *Int. J. Autom. Comput.*, 15(1):94–102, 2018.
- [7] A. Smyshlyaev and M. Krstic. Closed-form boundary state feedbacks for a class of 1-D partial integro-differential equations. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, 34(12):435–443, 2004.
- [8] A. Smyshlyaev and M. Krstic. On control design for PDEs with space-dependent diffusivity or time-dependent reactivity. *Automatica*, 41(9):1601–1608, 2005.