Null controllability of Grushin-type operators in dimension two

Karine Beauchard, Piermarco Cannarsa, Roberto Guglielmi

Null controllability of Grushin-type operators in dimension two

K. Beauchard [*], P. Cannarsa [†], R. Guglielmi [‡§]

Abstract

We study the null controllability of the parabolic equation associated with the Grushin-type operator $A = \partial_x^2 + |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y^2$, $(\gamma > 0)$, in the rectangle $\Omega = (-1,1) \times (0,1)$, under an additive control supported in an open subset ω of Ω. We prove that the equation is null controllable in any positive time for $\gamma < 1$ and that there is no time for which it is null controllable for $\gamma > 1$. In the transition regime $\gamma = 1$ and when ω is a strip $\omega = (a,b) \times (0,1)$, $(0 < a, b \leq 1)$, a positive minimal time is required for null controllability. Our approach is based on the fact that, thanks to the particular geometric configuration of Ω, null controllability is closely linked to the one-dimensional observability of the Fourier components of the solution of the adjoint system, uniformly with respect to the Fourier frequency.

Key words: null controllability, degenerate parabolic equations, Carleman estimates

AMS subject classifications: 35K65, 93B05, 93B07, 34B25

1 Introduction

1.1 Main result

We consider the Grushin-type equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f - \partial_x^2 f - |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y^2 f = u(t,x,y)1_\omega(x,y) & (t,x,y) \in (0,\infty) \times \Omega\,, \\ f(t,x,y) = 0 & (t,x,y) \in (0,\infty) \times \partial\Omega\,, \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $\Omega := (-1,1) \times (0,1)$, $\omega \subset \Omega$, and $\gamma > 0$. Problem (1) is a linear control system in which

[*]CMLS, Ecole Polytechnique, 91128 Palaiseau Cedex, France, email: Karine.Beauchard@math.polytechnique.fr (corresponding author)

[†]Università di Roma Tor Vergata, via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133, Roma, Italy, email: cannarsa@axp.mat.uniroma2.it

[‡]Università di Roma Tor Vergata, via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133, Roma, Italy, email: guglielm@axp.mat.uniroma2.it

[§]This research has been performed in the framework of the GDRE CONEDP. The authors wish to thank Institut Henri Poincaré (Paris, France) for providing a very stimulating environment during the "Control of Partial and Differential Equations and Applications" program in the Fall 2010. This work was started during the C.I.M.E. course 'Control of partial differential equations' (Cetraro, July 19–23, 2010). The first author was partially supported by the "Agence Nationale de la Recherche" (ANR), Projet Blanc C-QUID number BLAN-3-139579 and Projet Blanc EMAQS number ANR-2011-BS01-017-01.

- the state is f,
- the control u is supported in the subset ω.

It is a degenerate parabolic equation, since the coefficient of $\partial_y^2 f$ vanishes on the line $\{x=0\}$. We will investigate the null controllability of (1).

Definition 1 (Null controllability)**.** *Let $T>0$. System (1) is* null controllable *in time T if, for every $f_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, there exists $u \in L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)$ such that the solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f - \partial_x^2 f - |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y^2 f = u(t,x,y)1_\omega(x,y) & (t,x,y)\in(0,T)\times\Omega\,, \\ f(t,x,y)=0 & (t,x,y)\in(0,T)\times\partial\Omega\,, \\ f(0,x,y)=f_0(x,y) & (x,y)\in\Omega\,, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

satisfies $f(T,\cdot,\cdot)=0$.

System (1) is null controllable *if there exists $T>0$ such that it is null controllable in time T.*

The main result of this paper is the following one.

Theorem 1. *Let ω be an open subset of $(0,1)\times(0,1)$.*

1. *If $\gamma\in(0,1)$, then system (1) is null controllable in any time $T>0$.*
2. *If $\gamma=1$ and $\omega=(a,b)\times(0,1)$ where $0<a<b\leqslant 1$, then there exists $T^*\geqslant \frac{a^2}{2}$ such that*
   - *for every $T>T^*$ system (1) is null controllable in time T,*
   - *for every $T<T^*$ system (1) is not null controllable in time T.*
3. *If $\gamma>1$, then (1) is not null controllable.*

By duality, the null controllability of (1) is equivalent to an observability inequality for the adjoint system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t g - \partial_x^2 g - |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y^2 g = 0 & (t,x,y)\in(0,\infty)\times\Omega\,, \\ g(t,x,y)=0 & (t,x,y)\in(0,\infty)\times\partial\Omega\,. \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

Definition 2 (Observability)**.** *Let $T>0$. System (3) is* observable in ω in time T *if there exists $C>0$ such that, for every $g_0\in L^2(\Omega)$, the solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t g - \partial_x^2 g - |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y^2 g = 0 & (t,x,y)\in(0,T)\times\Omega\,, \\ g(t,x,y)=0 & (t,x,y)\in(0,T)\times\partial\Omega\,, \\ g(0,x,y)=g_0(x,y) & (x,y)\in\Omega\,, \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

satisfies

$$\int_\Omega |g(T,x,y)|^2 dxdy \leqslant C\int_0^T\int_\omega |g(t,x,y)|^2 dxdydt\,.$$

System (3) is observable in ω *if there exists $T>0$ such that it is observable in ω in time T.*

Theorem 2. *Let ω be an open subset of $(0,1)\times(0,1)$.*

1. *If $\gamma\in(0,1)$, then system (4) is observable in ω in any time $T>0$.*

2. *If $\gamma = 1$ and $\omega = (a, b) \times (0, 1)$ where $0 < a < b \leqslant 1$, then there exists $T^* \geqslant \frac{a^2}{2}$ such that*
   - *for every $T > T^*$ system (4) is observable in ω in time T,*
   - *for every $T < T^*$ system (4) is not observable in ω in time T.*
3. *If $\gamma > 1$, then system (4) is not observable in ω.*

Remark 1. When $\gamma = 1$, the geometric restriction on the control domain ω only affects our positive result. Indeed, Theorem 1 trivially implies that (1) fails to be null controllable (if $\gamma = 1$ and T is small) when ω is any connected open set at positive distance from the degeneracy region $\{x = 0\}$. It is also straightforward to observe that, if ω contains a strip containing $\{x = 0\}$, then null controllability holds for any $\gamma > 0$ thanks to standard localization arguments (see the Appendix).

1.2 Motivation and bibliographical comments

1.2.1 Null controllability of the heat equation

The null and approximate controllability of the heat equation are essentially well understood subjects for both linear and semilinear equations, and for bounded or unbounded domains (see, for instance, [15], [19], [21], [22], [23], [27], [31], [32], [36], [39], [40], [45], [46]). Let us summarize one of the existing main results. Consider the linear heat equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f - \Delta f = u(t,x) 1_\omega(x) & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \Omega\,, \\ f(t,x) = 0 & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \partial\Omega\,, \\ f(0,x) = f_0(x) & x \in \Omega\,, \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

where Ω is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$, and ω is a subset of Ω. The following theorem is due, for the case $d = 1$, to H. Fattorini and D. Russell [20, Theorem 3.3], and, for $d \geqslant 2$, to O. Imanuvilov [29], [30] (see also the book [25] by A. Fursikov and O.Imanuvilov) and G. Lebeau and L. Robbiano [32] (see also [33]).

Theorem 3. *Let Ω be a bounded connected open set with boundary of class C^2 and ω be a nonempty open subset of Ω. Then the control system (5) is null controllable in any time $T > 0$.*

So, the heat equation on a smooth bounded domain is null controllable

- in arbitrarily small time;
- with an arbitrarily small control support ω.

Recently, null controllability results have also been obtained for uniformly parabolic operators with discontinuous (see, e.g. [16], [4], [5], [42]) or singular ([43] and [18]) coefficients.

It is then natural to wonder whether null controllability also holds for degenerate parabolic equations such as (1). Let us compare the known results for the heat equation with the results proved in this article. The first difference concerns the geometry of Ω: a more restrictive configuration is assumed in

Theorem 1 than in Theorem 3. The second difference concerns the structure of the controllability results. Indeed, while the heat equation is null controllable in arbitrarily small time, the same result holds for the Grushin equation only when degeneracy is not too strong (i.e. $\gamma \in (0,1)$). On the contrary, when degeneracy is too strong (i.e. $\gamma > 1$), null controllability does not hold any more. Of special interest is the transition regime ($\gamma = 1$), where the 'classical' Grushin operator appears: here, both behaviors live together, and a positive minimal time is required for the null controllability.

1.2.2 Boundary-degenerate parabolic equations

The null controllability of parabolic equations degenerating on the boundary of the domain in one space dimension is well-understood, much less so in higher dimension. Given $0 < a < b < 1$ and $\gamma > 0$, let us consider the 1D equation

$$\partial_t w + \partial_x(x^{2\gamma}\partial_x w) = u(t,x)1_{(a,b)}(x)\,, \qquad (t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times (0,1)\,,$$

with suitable boundary conditions. Then, it can be proved that null controllability holds if and only if $\gamma \in (0,1)$ (see [12, 13]), while, for $\gamma \geq 1$, the best result one can show is "regional null controllability"(see [11]), which consists in controlling the solution within the domain of influence of the control. Several extensions of the above results are available in one space dimension, see [1, 37] for equations in divergence form, [10, 9] for nondivergence form operators, and [8, 24] for cascade systems. Fewer results are available for multidimensional problems, mainly in the case of two dimensional parabolic operators which simply degenerate in the normal direction to the boundary of the space domain, see [14]. Note that, similarly to the above references, also for the Grushin equation null controllability holds if and only if the degeneracy is not too strong.

1.2.3 Parabolic equations degenerating inside the domain

In [38], the authors study linearized Crocco type equations

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f + \partial_x f - \partial_{vv} f = u(t,x,v)1_\omega(x,v) & (t,x,v) \in (0,T) \times (0,L) \times (0,1)\,, \\ f(t,x,0) = f(t,x,1) = 0 & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,L)\,, \\ f(t,0,v) = f(t,L,v) & (t,v) \in (0,T) \times (0,1)\,. \end{cases}$$

For a given open subset ω of $(0,L) \times (0,1)$, they prove regional null controllability. Notice that, in the above equation, diffusion (in v) and transport (in x) are decoupled.

In [3], the authors study the Kolmogorov equation

$$\partial_t f + v\partial_x f - \partial_{vv} f = u(t,x,v)1_\omega(x,v)\,, \quad (x,v) \in (0,1)^2\,, \tag{6}$$

with periodic type boundary conditions. They prove null controllability in arbitrarily small time, when the control region ω is a strip, parallel to the x-axis. We note that the above Kolmogorov equation degenerates on the whole space domain, unlike Grushin's equation. However, differently from the linearized Crocco equation, transport (in x at speed v) and diffusion (in v) are coupled. This is why the null controllability results are also different for these equations.

1.2.4 Unique continuation and approximate controllability

It is well-known that, for evolution equations, approximate controllability can be equivalently formulated as unique continuation (see [44]). The unique continuation problem for the elliptic Grushin-type operator

$$A = \partial_x^2 + |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y^2$$

has been widely investigated. In particular, in [26] (see also the references therein) unique continuation is proved for every $\gamma > 0$ and every open set ω. For the parabolic Grushin-type operator studied in this paper, unique continuation holds for every $\gamma > 0$, $T > 0$, and any open set $\omega \subset \Omega$ (see Proposition 3).

1.2.5 Null controllability and hypoellipticity

It could be interesting to analyze the connections between null controllability and hypoellipticity. We recall that a linear differential operator P with C^∞ coefficients in an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is called hypoelliptic if, for every distribution u in Ω, we have

$$\text{sing supp} u = \text{sing supp} Pu\,,$$

that is, u must be a C^∞ function in every open set where so is Pu. The following sufficient condition (which is also essentially necessary) for hypoellipticity is due to Hörmander (see [28]).

Theorem 4. *Let P be a second order differential operator of the form*

$$P = \sum_{j=1}^{r} X_j^2 + X_0 + c\,,$$

where $X_0, ..., X_r$ denote first order homogeneous differential operators in an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with C^∞ coefficients, and $c \in C^\infty(\Omega)$. Assume that there exists n operators among

$$X_{j_1}\,,\ [X_{j_1}, X_{j_2}]\,,\ [X_{j_1}, [X_{j_2}, X_{j_3}]]\,, \ldots,\ [X_{j_1}, [X_{j_2}, [X_{j_3}, [..., X_{j_k}]...]]]\,,$$

where $j_i \in \{0, 1, ..., r\}$, which are linearly independent at any given point in Ω. Then, P is hypoelliptic.

Hörmander's condition is satisfied by the Grushin operator $A = \partial_x^2 + |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y^2$ for every $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^*$ (for other values of γ, the coefficients are not C^∞). Indeed, set

$$X_1(x,y) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad X_2(x,y) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x^\gamma \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then,

$$[X_1, X_2](x,y) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \gamma x^{\gamma-1} \end{pmatrix},\ [X_1, [X_1, X_2]](x,y) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \gamma(\gamma-1)x^{\gamma-2} \end{pmatrix},\ \ldots$$

Thus, if $\gamma = 1$, Hörmander's condition is satisfied with X_1 and $[X_1, X_2]$. In general, if $\gamma \geq 1$, γ iterated Lie brackets are required.

Theorem 1 emphasizes that hypoellipticity is not sufficient for null controllability: Grushin's operator is hypoelliptic $\forall \gamma \in \mathbb{N}^*$, but null controllability holds only when $\gamma = 1$.

A general result which relates null controllability to the number of iterated Lie brackets that are necessary to satisfy Hörmander's condition would be very interesting, but remains—for the time being—a challenging open problem.

1.2.6 Sensitivity to singular lower order terms

In [7], the authors study the Laplace Beltrami operator on a 2D-compact manifold endowed with a 2D almost Riemannian structure. Under very general assumptions, they prove that this operator is essentially selftadjoint. In the particular case of the Grushin metric, their result implies that any solution of

$$\partial_t f - \partial_x^2 f - x^2 \partial_y^2 f - \frac{1}{x}\partial_x f = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{T}$$

such that $f(0,.,.)$ is supported in $\mathbb{R}_+^* \times \mathbb{T}$ stays supported in this set. As a consequence, with a distributed control as a source term in the right hand side, supported in $\mathbb{R}_+^* \times \mathbb{T}$, this system is not null controllable. This example shows that the control result studied in this article is sensitive to the addition of singular lower order terms.

1.3 Structure of the article

Section 2 is devoted to general results about Grushin's equation: well posedness in Section 2.1, Fourier decomposition of solutions and unique continuation in Section 2.2, dissipation rate of the Fourier components in Section 2.3.

Section 3 is devoted to the proof of the negative statements of Theorem 2, (and, equivalently, of Theorem 1), when $\gamma > 1$ or $\gamma = 1$ and T is small. In Section 3.1 we present the strategy for the proof, which relies on uniform observability estimates with respect to Fourier frequencies. Then, we show the negative statements of Theorem 2, thanks to appropriate test functions to falsify uniform observability, in Section 3.2 for $\gamma < 1$ and in Section 3.3 for $\gamma = 1$.

Section 4 is devoted to the proof of the positive statements of Theorem 1, (and equivalently of Theorem 2) when $\gamma \in (0,1)$ or $\gamma = 1$ and T is large. In Section 4.1 we prove a useful Carleman inequality for 1D heat equations with parameters. In Section 4.2, we obtain observability for such equations, uniformly with respect to the parameter. In Section 4.3, we prove Theorem 2 when $\gamma > 1$. Then, in Section 4.4, we conclude the proof of Theorem 2.

Finally, in Section 5, we shortly outline some open problems related to this paper. An appendix devoted to the case of $\{x = 0\} \subset \omega$ completes the analysis.

2 Well posedness and Fourier decomposition

2.1 Well posedness of the Cauchy-problem

Let $H := L^2(\Omega)$, and denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\| \cdot \|_H$, respectively, the scalar product and norm in H. Define the product

$$(f, g) := \int_\Omega \left(f_x g_x + |x|^{2\gamma} f_y g_y \right) dxdy \tag{7}$$

for every f, g in $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, and set $V = \overline{C_0^\infty(\Omega)}^{|\cdot|_V}$, where $|f|_V := (f,f)^{1/2}$.

Observe that $H_0^1(\Omega) \subset V \subset H$, thus V is dense in H. Consider the bilinear form a on V defined by

$$a(f, g) = -(f, g) \quad \forall f,\, g \in V\,. \tag{8}$$

Moreover, set

$$D(A) = \{f \in V : \exists\, c > 0 \text{ such that } |a(f,h)| \le c\|h\|_H \ \forall h \in V\}\,, \tag{9}$$

$$\langle Af, h\rangle = a(f,h) \qquad \forall h \in V\,. \tag{10}$$

Then, we can apply a result by Lions [35] (see also Theorem 1.18 in [44]) to conclude that $(A, D(A))$ generates an analytic semigroup $S(t)$ of contractions on H. Note that A is selfadjoint on H, and (10) implies that

$$Af = \partial_x^2 f + |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y^2 f \qquad \text{a.e. in } \Omega\,.$$

So, system (2) can be recast in the form

$$\begin{cases} f'(t) = Af(t) + u(t) & t \in [0,T]\,,\\ f(0) = f_0\,, \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

where $T > 0$, $u \in L^2(0,T;H)$ and $f_0 \in H$.

Let us now recall the definition of weak solutions to (11).

Definition 3 (Weak solution)**.** *Let $T > 0$, $u \in L^2(0,T;H)$ and $f_0 \in H$. A function $f \in C([0,T];H) \cap L^2(0,T;V)$ is a weak solution of (11) if for every $h \in D(A)$ the function $\langle f(t), h\rangle$ is absolutely continuous on $[0,T]$ and for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle f(t), h\rangle = \langle f(t), Ah\rangle + \langle u(t), h\rangle\,. \tag{12}$$

Note that, as showed in [34], condition (12) is equivalent to the definition of solution by transposition, that is,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega [f(t^*,x,y)\varphi(t^*,x,y) - f_0(x,y)\varphi(0,x,y)]dxdy\\ &= \int_0^{t^*}\int_\Omega \left\{f\left(\partial_t\varphi + \partial_x^2\varphi + |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y^2\varphi\right) + u1_\omega\varphi\right\}dxdydt\end{aligned}$$

for every $\varphi \in C^2([0,T]\times\Omega)$ and $t^* \in (0,T)$.

Let us recall that, for every $T > 0$ and $u \in L^2(0,T;H)$, the mild solution of (11) is defined as

$$f(t) = S(t)f_0 + \int_0^t S(t-s)u(s)ds\,, \quad t \in [0,T]\,. \tag{13}$$

From [2], we have that the mild solution to (11) is also the unique weak solution in the sense of Definition 3. The following existence and uniqueness result follows.

Proposition 1. *For every $f_0 \in H$, $T > 0$ and $u \in L^2(0,T;H)$, there exists a unique weak solution of the Cauchy problem (11). This solution satisfies*

$$\|f(t)\|_H \leqslant \|f_0\|_H + \sqrt{T}\|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H)} \quad \forall t \in [0,T]\,. \tag{14}$$

Moreover, $f(t) \in D(A)$ and $f'(t) \in H$ for a.e. $t \in (0,T)$.

Proof: (14) follows from (13). Moreover, since $S(\cdot)$ is analytic, $t \mapsto S(t)f_0$ belongs to $C^1((0,T];H) \cap C^0((0,T];D(A))$, and $t \mapsto \int_0^t S(t-s)u(s)ds$ belongs to $H^1(0,T;H) \cap L^2(0,T;D(A))$. In particular $f(t) \in D(A)$ and $f'(t) \in H$ for a.e. $t \in (0,T)$ (see, e.g., [6]). □

2.2 Fourier decomposition and unique continuation

Let us consider the solution of (4) in the sense of Definition 3, that is, the solution of system (11) with $u = 0$. Since g belongs to $C([0,T];L^2(\Omega))$, the function $y \mapsto g(t,x,y)$ belongs to $L^2(0,1)$ for a.e. $(t,x) \in (0,T) \times (-1,1)$, thus it can be developed in Fourier series with respect to y as follows

$$g(t,x,y) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} g_n(t,x)\varphi_n(y)\,, \tag{15}$$

where

$$\varphi_n(y) := \sqrt{2}\sin(n\pi y) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}^*$$

and

$$g_n(t,x) := \int_0^1 g(t,x,y)\varphi_n(y)dy \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}^*\,. \tag{16}$$

Proposition 2. *For every $n \geq 1$, g_n is the unique weak solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t g_n - \partial_x^2 g_n + (n\pi)^2 |x|^{2\gamma} g_n = 0 & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (-1,1)\,, \\ g_n(t,\pm 1) = 0 & t \in (0,T)\,, \\ g_n(0,x) = g_{0,n}(x) & x \in (-1,1)\,, \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

where $g_{0,n} \in L^2(-1,1)$ is given by $g_{0,n}(x) := \int_0^1 g_0(x,y)\varphi_n(y)dy$.

For the proof we need the following characterization of the elements of V. We denote by $L^2_\gamma(\Omega)$ the space of all square-integrable functions with respect to the measure $d\mu = |x|^{2\gamma}dxdy$.

Lemma 1. *For every $g \in V$ there exist $\partial_x g \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\partial_y g \in L^2_\gamma(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Omega \big(g(x,y)\partial_x\phi(x,y) + |x|^{2\gamma} g(x,y)\partial_y\phi(x,y)\big)\,dxdy \\ &\qquad = -\int_\Omega \big(\partial_x g(x,y) + |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y g(x,y)\big)\,\phi(x,y)dxdy \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

for every $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$.

Proof: Let $g \in V$, and consider a sequence $(g^n)_{n\geq 1}$ in $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $g^n \to g$ in V, that is

$$\int_\Omega \left[(g^n - g)_x^2 + |x|^{2\gamma}(g^n - g)_y^2\right] dxdy \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to +\infty\,.$$

Thus, $(\partial_x g^n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\Omega)$ and $(\partial_y g^n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2_\gamma(\Omega)$. So, there exist $h \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $k \in L^2_\gamma(\Omega)$ such that $\partial_x g^n \to h$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ and $\partial_y g^n \to k$ in $L^2_\gamma(\Omega)$. Hence,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \displaystyle\int_\Omega \left(g^n \partial_x\phi + |x|^{2\gamma} g^n \partial_y\phi\right) dxdy & = & \displaystyle -\int_\Omega \left(\partial_x g^n \phi + |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y g^n \phi\right) dxdy \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \displaystyle\int_\Omega \left(g\partial_x\phi + |x|^{2\gamma} g\partial_y\phi\right) dxdy & = & \displaystyle -\int_\Omega \left(h\phi + |x|^{2\gamma} k\phi\right) dxdy \end{array}$$

as $n \to +\infty$. This yields the conclusion with $\partial_x g = h$ and $\partial_y g = k$. $\square$

For any $n \geq 1$, system (17) is a first order Cauchy problem, that admits the unique weak solution

$$\tilde{g}_n \in C^0([0,T]; L^2(-1,1)) \cap L^2(0,T; H_0^1(-1,1))$$

which satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\int_{-1}^{1} \tilde{g}_n(t,x)\psi(x)dx\right) + \int_{-1}^{1} \Big[\tilde{g}_{n,x}(t,x)\psi_x(x) + (n\pi)^2|x|^{2\gamma}\tilde{g}_n(t,x)\psi(x)\Big]dx = 0 \quad (19)$$

for every $\psi \in H_0^1(-1,1)$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 2: In order to verify that the nth Fourier coefficient of g, defined by (16), satisfies system (17), observe that

$$g_n(0,\cdot) = g_{0,n}(\cdot)\,, \qquad g_n(t,\pm 1) = 0 \quad \forall t \in (0,T)$$

and

$$g_n \in C^0([0,T]; L^2(-1,1)) \cap L^2(0,T; H_0^1(-1,1))\,.$$

Thus, it is sufficient to prove that g_n fulfills condition (19). Indeed, using the identity (16), for all $\psi \in H_0^1(-1,1)$ we obtain, for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\int_{-1}^{1} g_n\psi dx\right) + \int_{-1}^{1}\left(g_{n,x}\psi_x + (n\pi)^2|x|^{2\gamma}g_n\psi\right)dx = \int_{-1}^{1}\int_{0}^{1}\left\{g_t\varphi_n\psi + g_x\varphi_n\psi_x + (n\pi)^2|x|^{2\gamma}g\varphi_n\psi\right\}dydx\,. \quad (20)$$

Observe that Proposition 1 ensures $g_t(t,\cdot) \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $g(t,\cdot) \in D(A)$ for a.e. $t \in (0,T)$. So, multiplying $g_t - Ag$ by $h(x,y) = \psi(x)\varphi_n(y) \in V$ and integrating over Ω we obtain, for a.e. $t \in (0,T)$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_0^1\int_{-1}^{1}(g_t - Ag)\psi\varphi_n dxdy \\ &= \int_0^1\int_{-1}^{1} g_t\psi\varphi_n dxdy + \int_0^1\int_{-1}^{1}\left(g_x\psi_x\varphi_n + |x|^{2\gamma}g_y\psi\varphi_{n,y}\right)dxdy \\ &= \int_0^1\int_{-1}^{1} g_t\psi\varphi_n dxdy + \int_0^1\int_{-1}^{1}\left(g_x\psi_x\varphi_n + (n\pi)^2|x|^{2\gamma}g\psi\varphi_n\right)dxdy\,, \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

where (in the last identity) we have used Lemma 1. Combining (20) and (21) completes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 3. *Let $T > 0$, $\gamma > 0$, let ω be a bounded open subset of $(0,1) \times (0,1)$, and let $g \in C([0,T]; H) \cap L^2(0,T; V)$ be a weak solution of (3). If $g \equiv 0$ on $(0,T) \times \omega$, then $g \equiv 0$ on $(0,T) \times \Omega$.*

Proof: Let $\epsilon > 0$ be such that $\omega \subset (\epsilon,1) \times (0,1)$. By unique continuation for uniformly parabolic 2D equation, we deduce that $g \equiv 0$ on $(0,T) \times (\epsilon,1) \times (0,1)$. Thus, $g_n \equiv 0$ on $(0,T) \times (\epsilon,1)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Then, by unique continuation for the uniformly parabolic 1D equation (17), we deduce that $g_n \equiv 0$ on $(0,T) \times (-1,1)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. $\square$

2.3 Dissipation speed

Let us introduce, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^*, \gamma > 0$, the operator $A_{n,\gamma}$ defined on $L^2(-1,1)$ by

$$D(A_{n,\gamma}) := H^2 \cap H_0^1(-1,1)\,, \quad A_{n,\gamma}\varphi := -\varphi'' + (n\pi)^2|x|^{2\gamma}\varphi\,. \tag{22}$$

The smallest eigenvalue of $A_{n,\gamma}$ is given by

$$\lambda_{n,\gamma} = \min\left\{ \frac{\int_{-1}^{1}\left[v'(x)^2 + (n\pi)^2|x|^{2\gamma}v(x)^2\right]dx}{\int_{-1}^{1}v(x)^2dx}; v \in H_0^1(-1,1),\ v \neq 0 \right\}. \tag{23}$$

We are interested in the asymptotic behavior (as $n \to +\infty$) of $\lambda_{n,\gamma}$, which quantifies the dissipation speed of the solution of (17).

Lemma 2. *Problem*

$$\begin{cases} -v''_{n,\gamma}(x) + (n\pi)^2|x|^{2\gamma}v_{n,\gamma}(x) = \lambda_{n,\gamma}v_{n,\gamma}(x) & x \in (-1,1)\,, \\ v_{n,\gamma}(\pm 1) = 0\,, \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

admits a unique positive solution with $L^2(-1,1)$-norm one. Moreover, $v_{n,\gamma}$ is even.

Proof: Since (24) is a Sturm-Liouville problem, it is well-known that its first eigenvalue is simple, and the associated eigenfunction has no zeros. Thus, we can choose $v_{n,\gamma}$ to be strictly positive everywhere. Moreover, by normalization, we can find a unique positive solution satisfying the condition $\|v_{n,\gamma}\|_{L^2(-1,1)} = 1$. Finally, $v_{n,\gamma}$ is even. Indeed, if not so, let us consider the function $w(x) = v_{n,\gamma}(|x|)$. Then, w still belongs to $H_0^1(-1,1)$, it is a weak solution of (24) and it does not increase the functional in (23), i.e.

$$\frac{\int_{-1}^{1}\left[w'(x)^2 + (n\pi)^2|x|^{2\gamma}w(x)^2\right]dx}{\int_{-1}^{1}w(x)^2dx} \leq \frac{\int_{-1}^{1}\left[v'_{n,\gamma}(x)^2 + (n\pi)^2|x|^{2\gamma}v_{n,\gamma}(x)^2\right]dx}{\int_{-1}^{1}v_{n,\gamma}(x)^2dx}\,.$$

The coefficients of the equation in (24) being regular, we deduce that w is a classical solution of (24). Since $\lambda_{n,\gamma}$ is simple, it follows $v_{n,\gamma}(x) = v_{n,\gamma}(|x|)$. □

The following result turns out to be a key point of the proof of Theorem 1.

Proposition 4. *For every $\gamma > 0$, there are constants $c_* = c_*(\gamma), c^* = c^*(\gamma) > 0$ such that*

$$c_* n^{\frac{2}{1+\gamma}} \leqslant \lambda_{n,\gamma} \leqslant c^* n^{\frac{2}{1+\gamma}} \qquad \forall\, n \in \mathbb{N}^*\,.$$

Proof: First, we prove the lower bound. Let $\tau_n := n^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}}$. With the change of variable $\phi(x) = \sqrt{\tau_n}\varphi(\tau_n x)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{n,\gamma} &= \inf\left\{ \int_{-1}^{1}\left(\phi'(x)^2 + (n\pi)^2|x|^{2\gamma}\phi(x)^2\right)dx; \phi \in C_c^\infty(-1,1), \|\phi\|_{L^2(-1,1)} = 1 \right\} \\
&= \tau_n^2 \inf\left\{ \int_{-\tau_n}^{\tau_n}\left(\varphi'(y)^2 + \pi^2|y|^{2\gamma}\varphi(y)^2\right)dy; \varphi \in C_c^\infty(-\tau_n,\tau_n), \|\varphi\|_{L^2(-\tau_n,\tau_n)} = 1 \right\} \\
&\geqslant c_*\tau_n^2
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$c_* := \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\varphi'(y)^2 + \pi^2 |y|^{2\gamma} \varphi(y)^2 \right) dy; \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}), \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 1 \right\}$$

is positive (see [41] for the case of $\gamma = 1$).

Now, we prove the upper bound in Proposition 4. For every $k > 1$ let us consider the function $\varphi_k(x) := (1 - k|x|)^+$, that belongs to $H_0^1(-1, 1)$. Easy computations show that

$$\int_{-1}^{1} \varphi_k(x)^2 dx = \frac{2}{3k}\,, \quad \int_{-1}^{1} \varphi_k'(x)^2 dx = 2k\,, \quad \int_{-1}^{1} |x|^{2\gamma} \varphi_k(x)^2 dx = 2c(\gamma) k^{-1-2\gamma}\,,$$

where

$$c(\gamma) := \left(\frac{1}{2\gamma + 1} - \frac{1}{\gamma + 1} + \frac{1}{2\gamma + 3} \right).$$

Thus, $\lambda_{n,\gamma} \leqslant f_{n,\gamma}(k) := 3[k^2 + (\pi n)^2 c(\gamma) k^{-2\gamma}]$ for all $k > 1$. Since $f_{n,\gamma}$ attains its minimum at $\bar{k} = \tilde{c}(\gamma) n^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}$, we have $\lambda_{n,\gamma} \leqslant f_{n,\gamma}(\bar{k}) = C(\gamma) n^{\frac{2}{\gamma+1}}$. □

3 Proof of the negative statements of Theorem 2

The goal of this section is the proof of the following results:

- if $\gamma = 1$, $\omega \subset (a, 1) \times (0, 1)$ for some $a > 0$ and $T < \frac{a^2}{2}$, then system (4) is not observable in ω in time T,
- if $\gamma > 1$ and $T > 0$, then system (4) is not observable in ω in time T.

Without loos of generality, one may assume that $\omega = (a, b) \times (0, 1)$ with $0 < a < b < 1$.

3.1 Strategy for the proof

Let g be the solution of (4). Then, g can be represented as in (15), and we emphasize that, for a.e. $t \in (0, T)$ and every $-1 \leqslant a_1 < b_1 \leqslant 1$,

$$\int_{(a_1, b_1) \times (0,1)} |g(t, x, y)|^2 dx dy = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{a_1}^{b_1} |g_n(t, x)|^2 dx$$

(Bessel-Parseval equality). Thus, in order to prove Theorem 2, it is sufficient to study the observability of system (17) uniformly with respect to $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

Definition 4 (Uniform observability)**.** *Let* $0 < a < b \leqslant 1$ *and* $T > 0$*. System (17) is* observable in (a, b) in time T uniformly with respect to $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ *if there exists* $C > 0$ *such that, for every* $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$*,* $g_{0,n} \in L^2(-1, 1)$*, the solution of (17) satisfies*

$$\int_{-1}^{1} |g_n(T, x)|^2 dx \leqslant C \int_0^T \int_a^b |g_n(t, x)|^2 dx\,.$$

System (17) is observable in (a, b) uniformly with respect to $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ *if there exists* $T > 0$ *such that it is observable in* (a, b) *in time* T *uniformly with respect to* $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$*.*

The negative parts of the conclusion of Theorem 2 follow from the result below.

Theorem 5. *Let $0 < a < b \leqslant 1$.*

1. *If $\gamma = 1$ and $T < \frac{a^2}{2}$, then system (17) is not observable in (a, b) in time T uniformly with respect to $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$.*

2. *If $\gamma > 1$, then system (17) is not observable in (a, b) uniformly with respect to $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$.*

The proof of Theorem 5 relies on the use of appropriate test functions that falsify uniform observability. This is proved thanks to a well adapted maximum principle (see Lemma 3) and explicit supersolutions (see (28)) for $\gamma > 1$, and thanks to direct computations for $\gamma = 1$.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 5 for $\gamma > 1$

Let $\gamma \in [1, +\infty)$ be fixed and $T > 0$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we denote by λ_n (instead of $\lambda_{n,\gamma}$) the first eigenvalue of the operator $A_{n,\gamma}$ defined in Section 2.3, and by v_n the associated positive eigenvector of norm one, which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -v_n''(x) + [(n\pi)^2|x|^{2\gamma} - \lambda_n]v_n(x) = 0\,, \quad x \in (-1, 1)\,,\ n \in \mathbb{N}^*\,, \\ v_n(\pm 1) = 0\,, \quad v_n \geq 0\,, \\ \|v_n\|_{L^2(-1,1)} = 1\,. \end{cases}$$

Then, for every $n \geq 1$, the function

$$g_n(t, x) := v_n(x)e^{-\lambda_n t} \qquad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times (-1, 1)\,,$$

solves the adjoint system (17). Let us note that

$$\int_{-1}^{1} g_n(T, x)^2 dx = e^{-2\lambda_n T}\,,$$

$$\int_0^T \int_a^b g_n(t, x)^2 dx dt = \frac{1 - e^{-2\lambda_n T}}{2\lambda_n} \int_a^b v_n(x)^2 dx\,.$$

So, in order to prove that uniform observability fails, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{e^{2\lambda_n T}}{\lambda_n} \int_a^b v_n(x)^2 dx \to 0 \text{ when } n \to +\infty\,. \tag{25}$$

The above convergence will be obtained comparing v_n with an explicit supersolution of the problem on a suitable subinterval of $[-1, 1]$.

Lemma 3. *Let $0 < a < b < 1$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, set*

$$x_n := \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{(n\pi)^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma}} \tag{26}$$

and let $W_n \in C^2([x_n, 1], \mathbb{R})$ be a solution of

$$\begin{cases} -W_n''(x) + [(n\pi)^2 x^{2\gamma} - \lambda_n]W_n(x) \geqslant 0\,, \quad x \in (x_n, 1)\,, \\ W_n(1) \geqslant 0\,, \\ W_n'(x_n) < -\sqrt{x_n}\lambda_n\,. \end{cases} \tag{27}$$

Then there exists $n_* \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that, for every $n \geqslant n_*$,

$$\int_a^b v_n(x)^2 dx \leqslant \int_a^b W_n(x)^2 dx\,.$$

Proof: First, observe that, thanks to Proposition 4, $x_n \to 0$ as $n \to +\infty$. In particular, there exists $n_* \geqslant 1$ such that $x_n \leqslant a$ for every $n \geqslant n_*$. Now, let us prove that $|v_n'(x_n)| \leqslant \sqrt{x_n}\lambda_n$ for all $n \geqslant n_*$. Indeed, by Lemma 2, we have $v_n(x) = v_n(-x)$, thus $v_n'(0) = 0$. Hence, thanks to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the relation $\|v_n\|_{L^2(-1,1)} = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}|v_n'(x_n)| &= \Big|\int_0^{x_n} v_n''(s)ds\Big| = \Big|\int_0^{x_n} [(n\pi)^2|s|^{2\gamma} - \lambda_n]v_n(s)ds\Big| \\ &\leqslant \left(\int_0^{x_n} [(n\pi)^2|s|^{2\gamma} - \lambda_n]^2 ds\right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^{x_n} v_n(s)^2 ds\right)^{1/2} \leqslant \sqrt{x_n}\lambda_n\,.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we claim that $v_n(x) \leqslant W_n(x)$ for every $x \in [x_n, 1]$, $n \geqslant n_*$. Indeed, if not, there would exist $x_* \in [x_n, 1]$ such that

$$(W_n - v_n)(x_*) = \min\{(W_n - v_n)(x); x \in [x_n, 1]\} < 0\,.$$

Since $(W_n - v_n)(1) \geqslant 0$ and $(W_n - v_n)'(x_n) < 0$, we have $x_* \in (x_n, 1)$. Moreover, the function $W_n - v_n$ has a minimum at x_*, thus $(W_n - v_n)'(x_*) = 0$ and $(W_n - v_n)''(x_*) \geqslant 0$. Therefore,

$$-(W_n - v_n)''(x_*) + [(n\pi)^2|x_*|^{2\gamma} - \lambda_n](W_n - v_n)(x_*) < 0\,,$$

which is a contradiction. Our claim follows and the proof is complete. $\square$

In order to apply Lemma 3, we need an explicit supersolution W_n of (27) of the form

$$W_n(x) = C_n e^{-\mu_n x^{\gamma+1}}\,, \tag{28}$$

where $C_n, \mu_n > 0$. Notice that, in particular, $W_n(1) \geqslant 0$.

First step: *let us prove that, for an appropriate choice of μ_n, the first inequality of (27) holds.* Since

$$W_n'(x) = -\mu_n(\gamma+1)x^\gamma W_n(x)\,,$$
$$W_n''(x) = [-\mu_n\gamma(\gamma+1)x^{\gamma-1} + \mu_n^2(\gamma+1)^2x^{2\gamma}]W_n(x)\,,$$

the first inequality of (27) holds if and only if, for every $x \in (x_n, 1)$,

$$[(n\pi)^2 - \mu_n^2(\gamma+1)^2]x^{2\gamma} + \mu_n\gamma(\gamma+1)x^{\gamma-1} \geqslant \lambda_n\,. \tag{29}$$

In particular, it holds when

$$\mu_n \leqslant \frac{n\pi}{\gamma+1} \tag{30}$$

and

$$[(n\pi)^2 - \mu_n^2(\gamma+1)^2]x_n^{2\gamma} + \mu_n\gamma(\gamma+1)x_n^{\gamma-1} \geqslant \lambda_n\,. \tag{31}$$

Indeed, in this case, the left hand side of (29) is an increasing function of x. In view of (26), and after several simplifications, inequality (31) can be recast as

$$\mu_n \leqslant \frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1}\left(\frac{(n\pi)^2}{\lambda_n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2\gamma}}\,.$$

So, recalling (30), in order to satisfy the first inequality of (27) we can take

$$\mu_n := \min \left\{ \frac{n\pi}{\gamma+1} ; \frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1} \left(\frac{(n\pi)^2}{\lambda_n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2\gamma}} \right\} . \tag{32}$$

For the following computations, it is important to notice that, thanks to (32) and Proposition 4, for n large enough μ_n is of the form

$$\mu_n = C_1(\gamma) n \,. \tag{33}$$

Second step: *let us prove that, for an appropriate choice of C_n, the third inequality of (27) holds.* Since

$$W_n'(x_n) = -C_n \mu_n (\gamma+1) x_n^{\gamma} e^{-\mu_n x_n^{\gamma+1}} ,$$

the third inequality of (27) is equivalent to

$$C_n > \frac{\lambda_n e^{\mu_n x_n^{\gamma+1}}}{(\gamma+1)\mu_n x_n^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}} .$$

Therefore, it is sufficient to choose

$$C_n := \frac{2\lambda_n e^{\mu_n x_n^{\gamma+1}}}{(\gamma+1)\mu_n x_n^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}} . \tag{34}$$

Third step: *let us prove condition (25).* Thanks to Lemma 3, (28), (33) and (34), for every $n \geqslant n_*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{e^{2\lambda_n T}}{\lambda_n} \int_a^b v_n(x)^2 dx &\leqslant \frac{e^{2\lambda_n T}}{\lambda_n} \int_a^b W_n(x)^2 dx \leqslant \frac{e^{2\lambda_n T}}{\lambda_n} W_n(a)^2 \\ &\leqslant \frac{e^{2\lambda_n T}}{\lambda_n} C_n^2 e^{-2\mu_n a^{1+\gamma}} \leqslant \frac{e^{2\lambda_n T}}{\lambda_n} \frac{4\lambda_n^2 e^{2\mu_n x_n^{\gamma+1}}}{(\gamma+1)^2 \mu_n^2 x_n^{2\gamma-1}} e^{-2\mu_n a^{1+\gamma}} . \end{aligned}$$

By identities (26), (33) and Proposition 4, we have

$$\mu_n x_n^{\gamma+1} \leqslant C_2(\gamma) \qquad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}^* ,$$

thus

$$\frac{e^{2\lambda_n T}}{\lambda_n} \int_a^b v_n(x)^2 dx \leqslant e^{2n\left(\frac{\lambda_n}{n} T - C_1(\gamma) a^{1+\gamma}\right)} \frac{4\lambda_n e^{2C_2(\gamma)}}{(\gamma+1)^2 \mu_n^2 x_n^{2\gamma-1}} . \tag{35}$$

Since $\gamma > 1$, we deduce from Proposition 4 that

$$\frac{\lambda_n}{n} \to 0 \quad \text{ as } \quad n \to +\infty .$$

So, for every $T > 0$, there exists $n_\sharp \geqslant n_*$ such that, for every $n \geqslant n_\sharp$,

$$\frac{\lambda_n}{n} T - C_1(\gamma) a^{1+\gamma} < -\frac{1}{2} C_1(\gamma) a^{1+\gamma} . \tag{36}$$

Then, inequality (35) yields condition (25) (since the term that multiplies the exponential behaves like a rational fraction of n).

3.3 Proof of Theorem 5 for $\gamma = 1$

In this section, we take $\gamma = 1$ and keep the abbreviated forms λ_n, v_n for $\lambda_{n,\gamma}$, $v_{n,\gamma}$ introduced in Section 2.3. Moreover, given two real sequences $\alpha_n \geqslant 0$ and $\beta_n > 0$, we write $\alpha_n \sim \beta_n$ to mean that $\lim_n \alpha_n/\beta_n = 1$.

With the above notation in mind, we have the following result.

Lemma 4. *Let a and b be real numbers such that $0 < a < b \leqslant 1$. Then*

$$\lambda_n \sim n\pi \tag{37}$$

and

$$\int_a^b v_n(x)^2 dx \sim \frac{e^{-a^2 n\pi}}{2a\pi\sqrt{n}}. \tag{38}$$

as $n \to +\infty$.

When $T < \frac{a^2}{2}$, we can easily deduce from the above lemma that (25) holds; thus, system (17) is not observable in (a, b) uniformly with respect to $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

Proof of Lemma 4: The proof relies on the explicit expression

$$G(x) := \frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}}{\sqrt[4]{\pi}}$$

of the first eigenvector of the harmonic oscillator on the whole line, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} -G''(x) + x^2 G(x) = G(x) & x \in \mathbb{R} \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x)^2 dx = 1. \end{cases}$$

First step: *Let us construct an explicit approximation, k_n, of v_n.* Fix $\epsilon > 0$ with

$$1 + (1-\epsilon)^2 > 2a^2, \tag{39}$$

and let $\theta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be such that

$$\theta(\pm 1) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{supp}(\theta) \subset (-1-\epsilon, -1+\epsilon) \cup (1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon). \tag{40}$$

Define

$$k_n(x) = \frac{\sqrt[4]{n\pi}\, G(\sqrt{n\pi}x) - \sqrt[4]{n} e^{-\frac{n\pi}{2}} \theta(x)}{C_n}, \qquad x \in [-1, 1],$$

where $C_n > 0$ is such that $\|k_n\|_{L^2(-1,1)} = 1$. Note that $C_n^2 = C_{n,1} + C_{n,2} + C_{n,3}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} C_{n,1} &= \sqrt{n} \int_{-1}^1 e^{-n\pi x^2 dx} = 1 + O\left(\frac{e^{-n\pi}}{\sqrt{n}}\right), \\ C_{n,2} &= \sqrt{n} e^{-n\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \theta(x)^2 dx \\ C_{n,3} &= -2\sqrt{n} e^{-\frac{n\pi}{2}} \int_{-1}^1 e^{-\frac{n\pi x^2}{2}} \theta(x) dx = O(\sqrt{n} e^{-\frac{n\pi}{2}\left(1+(1-\epsilon)^2\right)}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$C_n = 1 + O(\sqrt{n} e^{-\frac{n\pi}{2}[1+(1-\epsilon)^2]}). \tag{41}$$

We have

$$\begin{cases} -k_n''(x) + (n\pi x)^2 k_n(x) = n\pi k_n(x) + E_n(x), & x \in (-1, 1), \\ k_n(\pm 1) = 0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$E_n(x) := \frac{\sqrt[4]{n}e^{-\frac{n\pi}{2}}}{C_n}\left[\theta''(x) - (n\pi x)^2\theta(x) + n\pi\theta(x)\right].$$

Second step: *Let us prove (37).* As in the proof of Proposition 4, we have $\lambda_n \geqslant n\pi$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_n &\leqslant \int_{-1}^{1}\left[k_n'(x)^2 + (n\pi x)^2 k_n(x)^2\right]dx = n\pi + \int_{-1}^{1} k_n(x)E_n(x)dx \\ &\leqslant n\pi + O(n^{\frac{9}{4}}e^{-\frac{n\pi}{2}}),\end{aligned}$$

which proves (37).

Third step: *Let us prove that*

$$\int_a^b k_n(x)^2 dx \sim \frac{e^{-a^2 n\pi}}{2a\pi\sqrt{n}}. \tag{42}$$

Indeed, the left-hand side of (42) is the sum of three terms $(I_j)_{1\leqslant j\leqslant 3}$, that satisfy, thanks to (41)

$$\begin{aligned}I_1 &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}C_n^2}\int_{a\sqrt{n\pi}}^{b\sqrt{n\pi}} e^{-y^2}dy = \frac{e^{-a^2n\pi}}{2a\pi\sqrt{n}} + O\left(\frac{e^{-a^2n\pi}}{n^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right), \\ I_2 &:= \frac{\sqrt{n}e^{-n\pi}}{C_n^2}\int_a^b \theta(x)^2dx = O(\sqrt{n}e^{-n\pi}), \\ I_3 &:= -\frac{2\sqrt{n}e^{-\frac{n\pi}{2}}}{C_n^2}\int_a^b e^{-n\pi x^2}\theta(x)dx = O(\sqrt{n}e^{-\frac{n\pi}{2}[1+(1-\epsilon)^2]}).\end{aligned}$$

So, (42) follows thanks to (39).

Fourth step: *Let us prove that*

$$\|v_n - k_n\|^2_{L^2(-1,1)} = O(n^{\frac{9}{2}}e^{-n\pi}), \tag{43}$$

which ends the proof of (38). Let A_n be the operator defined by

$$D(A_n) = H^2 \cap H_0^1(-1,1), \quad A_n\varphi(x) =: -\varphi''(x) + (n\pi x)^2\varphi(x),$$

and let $(\lambda_n^j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}^*}$ be its eigenvalues, with associated eigenvectors $(v_n^j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}^*}$, that is, $A_nv_n^j = \lambda_n^j v_n^j$. We have $k_n = \sum_{j=1}^\infty z_j v_n^j$ where $z_j = \langle E_n, v_n^j\rangle/(\lambda_n^j - n\pi)$ for all $j \geqslant 2$. Thus,

$$\sum_{j=2}^{\infty} z_j^2 \leqslant C\|E_n\|^2_{L^2(-1,1)} = O(n^{\frac{9}{2}}e^{-n\pi})$$

and

$$z_1 = \sqrt{1 - \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} z_j^2} = 1 + O(n^{\frac{9}{2}}e^{-n\pi}).$$

We can then recover (43) since $\|v_n - k_n\|^2_{L^2(-1,1)} = (1-z_1)^2 + \sum_{j=2}^\infty z_j^2$. □

4 Proof of the positive statements of Theorem 1

The goal of this section is the proof of the following results:

- if $\gamma \in (0,1)$, then system (1) is null controllable in any time $T > 0$,
- if $\gamma = 1$ and $\omega = (a,b) \times (0,1)$, with $0 < a < b \leqslant 1$, then there exists $T_1 > 0$ such that system (1) is null controllable in any time $T > T_1$ or, equivalently, system (3) is observable in ω in any time $T > T_1$.

The proof of these results relies on a new global Carleman estimate for solutions of (17), stated and proved in the next section.

4.1 A global Carleman estimate

For $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we introduce the operator

$$\mathcal{P}_n g := \frac{\partial g}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x^2} + (n\pi)^2 |x|^{2\gamma} g.$$

Proposition 5. *Let $\gamma \in (0,1]$ and let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $0 < a < b \leqslant 1$. Then there exist a weight function $\beta \in C^1([-1,1]; \mathbb{R}_+^*)$ and positive constants $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $T > 0$, and $g \in C^0([0,T]; L^2(-1,1)) \cap L^2(0,T; H_0^1(-1,1))$ the following inequality holds*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{C}_1 \int_0^T \int_{-1}^1 \left(\tfrac{M}{t(T-t)} \left| \tfrac{\partial g}{\partial x}(t,x) \right|^2 + \tfrac{M^3}{(t(T-t))^3} \left| g(t,x) \right|^2 \right) e^{-\frac{M\beta(x)}{t(T-t)}} dx dt \\ &\leqslant \int_0^T \int_{-1}^1 |\mathcal{P}_n g|^2 e^{-\frac{M\beta(x)}{t(T-t)}} dx dt + \int_0^T \int_a^b \tfrac{M^3}{(t(T-t))^3} |g(t,x)|^2 e^{-\frac{M\beta(x)}{t(T-t)}} dx dt \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where $M := \mathcal{C}_2 \max\{T + T^2; nT^2\}$.

Remark 2. In the case of $\gamma \in [1/2, 1]$, our weight β will be the classical one (see (46), (47), (48) and (49)). On the other hand, for $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ we will follow the strategy of [1, 10, 37], adapting the weight β to the nonsmooth coefficient $|x|^{2\gamma}$ (see (46), (47), (48), (77) and (78)).

Proof of Proposition 5: Without loss of generality, we may assume that $b < 1$. Let a', b' be such that $a < a' < b' < b$. All the computations of the proof will be made assuming, first, $g \in H^1(0,T; L^2(-1,1)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^2 \cap H_0^1(-1,1))$. Then, the conclusion of Proposition 5 will follow by a density argument.

First case: $\boxed{\gamma \in [1/2, 1]}$ Consider the weight function

$$\alpha(t,x) := \frac{M\beta(x)}{t(T-t)}, \quad (t,x) \in (0,T) \times \mathbb{R}, \tag{45}$$

where $\beta \in C^2([-1,1])$ satisfies

$$\beta \geqslant 1 \text{ on } (-1,1), \tag{46}$$

$$|\beta'| > 0 \text{ on } [-1, a'] \cup [b', 1], \tag{47}$$

$$\beta'(1) > 0, \quad \beta'(-1) < 0, \tag{48}$$

$$\beta'' < 0 \text{ on } [-1, a'] \cup [b', 1] \tag{49}$$

and $M = M(T, n, \beta) > 0$ will be chosen later on. We also introduce the function

$$z(t,x) := g(t,x)e^{-\alpha(t,x)}\,, \tag{50}$$

that satisfies

$$e^{-\alpha}\mathcal{P}_n g = P_1 z + P_2 z + P_3 z\,, \tag{51}$$

where

$$\begin{gathered} P_1 z := -\tfrac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x^2} + (\alpha_t - \alpha_x^2)z + (n\pi)^2|x|^{2\gamma}z\,, \quad P_2 z := \tfrac{\partial z}{\partial t} - 2\alpha_x \tfrac{\partial z}{\partial x}\,, \\ P_3 z := -\alpha_{xx} z\,. \end{gathered} \tag{52}$$

We develop the classical proof (see [25]), taking the $L^2(Q)$-norm in the identity (51), then developing the double product, which leads to

$$\int_Q \left(P_1 z P_2 z - \frac{1}{2}|P_3 z|^2 \right) dxdt \leqslant \int_Q |e^{-\alpha}\mathcal{P}_n g|^2 dxdt\,, \tag{53}$$

where $Q := (0,T) \times (-1,1)$ and we compute precisely each term, paying attention to the behaviour of the different constants with respect to n and T.

Terms concerning $-\partial_x^2 z$: Integrating by parts, we get

$$-\int_Q \frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x^2}\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} dxdt = \int_Q \frac{\partial z}{\partial x}\frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial t \partial x} dxdt = \int_0^T \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{-1}^1 \left|\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}\right|^2 dxdt = 0\,, \tag{54}$$

because $\partial_t z(t, \pm 1) = 0$ and $z(0) \equiv z(T) \equiv 0$, which is a consequence of assumptions (50), (45) and (46). Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Q \frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x^2} 2\alpha_x \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} dxdt = &-\int_Q \left|\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}\right|^2 \alpha_{xx} dxdt \\ &+ \int_0^T \left(\alpha_x(t,1)\left|\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}(t,1)\right|^2 - \alpha_x(t,-1)\left|\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}(t,-1)\right|^2 \right) dt\,. \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

Terms concerning $(\alpha_t - \alpha_x^2)z$: Again integrating by parts, we have

$$\int_Q (\alpha_t - \alpha_x^2) z \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} dxdt = -\frac{1}{2}\int_Q (\alpha_t - \alpha_x^2)_t |z|^2 dxdt\,. \tag{56}$$

Indeed, the boundary terms at $t = 0$ and $t = T$ vanish because, thanks to (50), (45), (46),

$$|(\alpha_t - \alpha_x^2)|z|^2| \leqslant \frac{1}{[t(T-t)]^2} e^{\frac{-M}{t(T-t)}} |M(T-2t)\beta + (M\beta')^2| \cdot |g|^2$$

tends to zero when $t \to 0$ and $t \to T$, for every $x \in [-1, 1]$. Moreover,

$$-2\int_Q (\alpha_t - \alpha_x^2) z \alpha_x \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} dxdt = \int_Q [(\alpha_t - \alpha_x^2)\alpha_x]_x |z|^2 dxdt\,, \tag{57}$$

thanks to an integration by parts in the space variable.

Terms concerning $(n\pi)^2|x|^{2\gamma}z$: First, since $z(0) \equiv z(T) \equiv 0$,

$$\int_Q (n\pi)^2 |x|^{2\gamma} z \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} dxdt = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T \frac{d}{dt}\int_{-1}^1 (n\pi)^2 |x|^{2\gamma}|z|^2 dxdt = 0\,. \tag{58}$$

Furthermore, thanks to an integration by parts in the space variable,

$$-2\int_Q (n\pi)^2|x|^{2\gamma} z\alpha_x \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} dxdt = \int_Q [n^2\pi^2|x|^{2\gamma}\alpha_x]_x z^2 dxdt\,. \tag{59}$$

Combining (53), (54), (55), (56), (57), (58) and (59), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_Q |z|^2\Big\{-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha_t-\alpha_x^2)_t + [(\alpha_t-\alpha_x^2)\alpha_x]_x + n^2\pi^2[|x|^{2\gamma}\alpha_x]_x - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{xx}^2\Big\}dxdt \\ + \int_0^T \left(\alpha_x(t,1)\Big|\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}(t,1)\Big|^2 - \alpha_x(t,-1)\Big|\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}(t,-1)\Big|^2\right)dt \\ - \int_Q \Big|\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}\Big|^2 \alpha_{xx} dxdt \leqslant \int_Q |e^{-\alpha}\mathcal{P}_n g|^2 dxdt\,. \end{aligned}\tag{60}$$

In view of (48), we have $\alpha_x(t,1)\geqslant 0$ and $\alpha_x(t,-1)\leqslant 0$, thus (60) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\int_Q |z|^2\Big\{-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha_t-\alpha_x^2)_t + [(\alpha_t-\alpha_x^2)\alpha_x]_x - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{xx}^2 + n^2\pi^2[|x|^{2\gamma}\alpha_x]_x\Big\}dxdt \\ - \int_Q \Big|\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}\Big|^2 \alpha_{xx} dxdt \leqslant \int_Q |e^{-\alpha}\mathcal{P}_n g|^2 dxdt\,. \end{aligned}\tag{61}$$

Now, in the left hand side of (61) we separate the terms on $(0,T)\times(a',b')$ and those on $(0,T)\times[(-1,a')\cup(b',1)]$. One has

$$\begin{aligned} -\alpha_{xx}(t,x) \geqslant \frac{C_1 M}{t(T-t)} \qquad \forall x\in[-1,a']\cup[b',1]\,,\ t\in(0,T)\,, \\ |\alpha_{xx}(t,x)| \leqslant \frac{C_2 M}{t(T-t)} \qquad \forall x\in[a',b']\,,\ t\in(0,T)\,, \end{aligned}\tag{62}$$

where $C_1 = C_1(\beta) := \min\{-\beta''(x); x\in[-1,a']\cup[b',1]\}$ is positive thanks to the assumption (49) and $C_2 = C_2(\beta) := \sup\{|\beta''(x)|; x\in[a',b']\}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2}(\alpha_t-\alpha_x^2)_t + [(\alpha_t-\alpha_x^2)\alpha_x]_x - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{xx}^2 = \frac{1}{(t(T-t))^3}\Big\{M\beta(3Tt-T^2-3t^2) \\ +M^2\Big[(2t-T)(\beta''\beta+2\beta'^2) - \frac{t(T-t)\beta''^2}{2}\Big] - 3M^3\beta''\beta'^2\Big\}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, owing to (47) and (49), there exist $m_1 = m_1(\beta) > 0$ $C_3 = C_3(\beta) > 0$ and $C_4 = C_4(\beta) > 0$ such that, for every $M \geqslant M_1$ and $t\in(0,T)$,

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2}(\alpha_t-\alpha_x^2)_t + [(\alpha_t-\alpha_x^2)\alpha_x]_x - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{xx}^2 \geqslant \frac{C_3 M^3}{[t(T-t)]^3} \quad \forall x\in[-1,a']\cup[b',1]\,, \\ \Big|-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha_t-\alpha_x^2)_t + [(\alpha_t-\alpha_x^2)\alpha_x]_x - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{xx}^2\Big| \leqslant \frac{C_4 M^3}{[t(T-t)]^3} \quad \forall x\in[a',b'] \end{aligned}\tag{63}$$

where

$$M_1 = M_1(T,\beta) := m_1(\beta)(T+T^2). \tag{64}$$

Using (61), (62) and (63), we deduce, for every $M \geqslant M_1$,

$$\int_0^T \int_{(-1,a')\cup(b',1)} \frac{C_1 M}{t(T-t)}\Big|\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}\Big|^2 dxdt$$
$$+\int_0^T \int_{(-1,a')\cup(b',1)} \left[\frac{C_3 M^3}{(t(T-t))^3}|z|^2 + (n\pi)^2[|x|^{2\gamma}\alpha_x]_x|z|^2\right] dxdt$$
$$\leqslant \int_0^T \int_{a'}^{b'} \left[\frac{C_2 M}{t(T-t)}\Big|\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}\Big|^2 + \frac{C_4 M^3}{(t(T-t))^3}|z|^2 - (n\pi)^2[|x|^{2\gamma}\alpha_x]_x|z|^2\right] dxdt$$
$$+\int_Q |e^{-\alpha}\mathcal{P}_n g|^2 dxdt\,. \quad (65)$$

Moreover, for every $x \in (-1,1)$, we have

$$|(n\pi)^2[|x|^{2\gamma}\alpha_x]_x| = \frac{M(n\pi)^2}{t(T-t)}\Big|2\gamma\mathrm{sign}(x)|x|^{2\gamma-1}\beta'(x)+|x|^{2\gamma}\beta''(x)\Big| \leqslant \frac{C_5 n^2 M}{t(T-t)}$$

where $C_5 = C_5(\beta) := \pi^2 \max\{2\gamma|x|^{2\gamma-1}|\beta'(x)| + |x|^{2\gamma}|\beta''(x)|; x \in [-1,1]\}$ is finite because $2\gamma - 1 \geqslant 0$. Let $M_2 = M_2(T,n,\beta)$ be defined by

$$M_2 = M_2(T,n,\beta) := \sqrt{\frac{2C_5}{C_3}}n\left(\frac{T}{2}\right)^2\,. \quad (66)$$

From now on, we take

$$M = M(T,n,\beta) := \mathcal{C}_2 \max\{T+T^2; nT^2\} \quad (67)$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}_2 = \mathcal{C}_2(\beta) := \max\left\{m_1; \sqrt{\frac{C_5}{8C_3}}\right\}$$

so that $M \geqslant M_1$ and M_2 (see (64) and (66)). From $M \geqslant M_2$, we deduce that

$$|(n\pi)^2[|x|^{2\gamma}\alpha_x]_x| \leqslant \frac{C_3 M^3}{2[t(T-t)]^3} \quad \forall (t,x) \in Q\,.$$

We have

$$\int_0^T \int_{(-1,a')\cup(b',1)} \left(\frac{C_1 M}{t(T-t)}\Big|\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}\Big|^2 + \frac{C_3 M^3}{2(t(T-t))^3}|z|^2\right) dxdt$$
$$\leqslant \int_0^T \int_{a'}^{b'} \left(\frac{C_2 M}{t(T-t)}\Big|\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}\Big|^2 + \frac{C_6 M^3}{(t(T-t))^3}|z|^2\right) dxdt$$
$$+\int_Q |e^{-\alpha}\mathcal{P}_n g|^2 dxdt\,, \quad (68)$$

where $C_6 = C_6(\beta) := C_4 + C_3/2$. Since for every $\epsilon > 0$

$$\frac{C_1 M}{t(T-t)}\Big|\frac{\partial g}{\partial x} - \alpha_x g\Big|^2 + \frac{C_3 M^3}{2(t(T-t))^3}|g|^2$$
$$\geqslant \left(1 - \frac{1}{1+\epsilon}\right)\frac{C_1 M}{t(T-t)}\Big|\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}\Big|^2 + \frac{M^3}{(t(T-t))^3}\left(\frac{C_3}{2} - \epsilon C_1(\beta')^2\right)|g|^2\,. \quad (69)$$

Hence, choosing

$$\epsilon = \epsilon(\beta) := \frac{C_3}{4C_1\|\beta'\|_\infty^2},$$

from (68), (69) and (50) we deduce that

$$\int_0^T \int_{(-1,a')\cup(b',1)} \left(\frac{C_7 M}{t(T-t)} \left|\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}\right|^2 + \frac{C_3 M^3 |g|^2}{4(t(T-t))^3} \right) e^{-2\alpha} dxdt$$
$$\leqslant \int_0^T \int_{a'}^{b'} \left(\frac{C_9 M^3 |g|^2}{(t(T-t))^3} + \frac{C_8 M}{t(T-t)} \left|\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}\right|^2 \right) e^{-2\alpha} dxdt$$
$$+ \int_Q |e^{-\alpha}\mathcal{P}_n g|^2 dxdt\,, \quad (70)$$

where $C_7 = C_7(\beta) := [1 - 1/(1+\epsilon)]C_1$, $C_8 = C_8(\beta) := 2C_2$ and $C_9 = C_9(\beta) := C_6 + 2C_2 \sup\{\beta'(x)^2 : x \in [a', b']\}$. So, adding the same quantity to both sides,

$$\int_Q \left(\frac{C_7 M}{t(T-t)} \left|\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}\right|^2 + \frac{C_3 M^3 |g|^2}{4(t(T-t))^3} \right) e^{-2\alpha} dxdt \leqslant \int_Q |e^{-\alpha}\mathcal{P}_n g|^2 dxdt$$
$$+ \int_0^T \int_{a'}^{b'} \left(\frac{C_{11} M^3 |g|^2}{(t(T-t))^3} + \frac{C_{10} M}{t(T-t)} \left|\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}\right|^2 \right) e^{-2\alpha} dxdt\,, \quad (71)$$

where $C_{10} = C_{10}(\beta) := C_8 + C_7$ and $C_{11} = C_{11}(\beta) := C_9 + C_3/4$. Let us prove that the third term of the right hand side may be dominated by terms similar to the other two. We consider $\rho \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R};\mathbb{R}_+)$ such that $0 \le \rho \le 1$ and

$$\rho \equiv 1 \text{ on } (a', b')\,, \quad (72)$$

$$\rho \equiv 0 \text{ on } (-1, a) \cup (b, 1)\,. \quad (73)$$

We have

$$\int_Q (\mathcal{P}_n g) \frac{g\rho e^{-2\alpha}}{t(T-t)} dxdt = \int_0^T \int_{-1}^1 \left[\frac{\partial g}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x^2} + (n\pi)^2 |x|^{2\gamma} g \right] \frac{g\rho e^{-2\alpha}}{t(T-t)} dxdt.$$

Integrating by parts with respect to time and space, we obtain

$$\int_Q \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial (g^2)}{\partial t} \frac{\rho e^{-2\alpha}}{t(T-t)} dxdt = \int_Q \frac{1}{2}|g|^2 \rho \left(\frac{2\alpha_t}{t(T-t)} + \frac{T-2t}{(t(T-t))^2} \right) e^{-2\alpha} dxdt$$

and

$$-\int_Q \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x^2} \frac{g\rho e^{-2\alpha}}{t(T-t)} dxdt = \int_Q \frac{\rho e^{-2\alpha}}{t(T-t)} \left|\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}\right|^2 dxdt$$
$$- \int_Q \frac{|g|^2 e^{-2\alpha}}{2t(T-t)} \left(\rho'' - 4\rho'\alpha_x + \rho(4\alpha_x^2 - 2\alpha_{xx}) \right) dxdt\,. \quad (74)$$

Thus,

$$\int_Q \mathcal{P}_n g \frac{g\rho e^{-2\alpha}}{t(T-t)} dxdt \geqslant \int_Q \frac{\rho e^{-2\alpha}}{t(T-t)} \left|\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}\right|^2 dxdt$$
$$- \int_Q \frac{|g|^2 e^{-2\alpha}}{2t(T-t)} \left(\rho'' - 4\rho'\alpha_x + \rho\left(4\alpha_x^2 - 2\alpha_{xx} - 2\alpha_t - \frac{T-2t}{t(T-t)} \right) \right) dxdt\,. \quad (75)$$

Therefore,

$$\int_0^T \int_{a'}^{b'} \frac{C_{10}M}{t(T-t)} \Big|\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}\Big|^2 e^{-2\alpha} dxdt$$
$$\leqslant \int_Q \frac{C_{10}M\rho}{t(T-t)} \Big|\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}\Big|^2 e^{-2\alpha} dxdt \leqslant \int_Q \mathcal{P}_n g \frac{C_{10}M g\rho e^{-2\alpha}}{t(T-t)} dxdt$$
$$+ \int_Q \frac{C_{10}M|g|^2 e^{-2\alpha}}{2t(T-t)} \left(\rho'' - 4\rho'\alpha_x + \rho\left(4\alpha_x^2 - 2\alpha_{xx} - 2\alpha_t - \frac{T-2t}{t(T-t)}\right)\right) dxdt$$
$$\leqslant \int_Q |\mathcal{P}_n g|^2 e^{-2\alpha} dxdt + \int_0^T \int_a^b \frac{C_{12}M^3|g|^2 e^{-2\alpha}}{(t(T-t))^3} dxdt$$

for some constant $C_{12} = C_{12}(\beta, \rho) > 0$. Combining (71) with the previous inequality, we get

$$\int_Q \left(\frac{C_7 M}{t(T-t)} \Big|\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}\Big|^2 + \frac{C_3 M^3 |g|^2}{4(t(T-t))^3}\right) e^{-2\alpha} dxdt$$
$$\leqslant \int_Q 2|e^{-\alpha}\mathcal{P}_n g|^2 dxdt + \int_0^T \int_a^b \frac{C_{13}M^3|g|^2}{(t(T-t))^3} e^{-2\alpha} dxdt\,, \quad (76)$$

where $C_{13} = C_{13}(\beta, \rho) := C_{11} + C_{12}$. Then, the global Carleman estimates (44) holds with

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \mathcal{C}_1(\beta) := \frac{\min\{C_7; C_3/4\}}{\max\{2; C_{13}\}}.$$

<u>Second case:</u> $\boxed{\gamma \in (0, 1/2)}$ The previous strategy does not apply to $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ because the term $(n\pi)^2[|x|^{2\gamma}\alpha_x]_x$ (that diverges at $x = 0$) in (65) can no longer be bounded by $\frac{C_3 M^3}{(t(T-t))^3}$ (which is bounded at $x = 0$). Note that both terms are of the same order as M^3, because of the dependence of M with respect to n in (67). In order to deal with this difficulty, we adapt the choice of the weight β and the dependence of M with respect to n.

Let $\beta \in C^1([-1, 1]) \cap C^2([-1, 0) \cup (0, 1])$ be such that

$$\beta'' < 0 \text{ on } [-1, 0) \cup (0, a'] \cup [b', 1] \quad (77)$$

and β has the following form on a neighborhood $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ of 0

$$\beta(x) = \mathcal{C}_0 - \int_0^x \sqrt{\mathrm{sign}(s)|s|^{2\gamma} + \mathcal{C}_1} ds \qquad \forall x \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)\,, \quad (78)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_0$, $\mathcal{C}_1$ are large enough to ensure that $\beta(x) \geqslant 1$, and $\mathrm{sign}(s)|s|^{2\gamma} + \mathcal{C}_1 \geq 0$ on $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$. Notice that

$$\beta'(x) = -\sqrt{\mathrm{sign}(x)|x|^{2\gamma} + \mathcal{C}_1} \qquad \forall x \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)\,, \quad (79)$$

thus β'' diverges at $x = 0$. Performing the same computations as in the previous case, we get to inequality (61). Notice that one obtains (59) even if $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$: the boundary terms vanish and $x \mapsto |x|^{2\gamma-1}$ is integrable at $x = 0$. Then, owing to (47) and (77), there exist $m_1 = m_1(\beta) > 0$, $C_3 = 1/2$ and $C_4 = C_4(\beta) > 0$ such that, for every $M \geqslant M_1$ and $t \in (0,T)$,

$$-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha_t - \alpha_x^2)_t + [(\alpha_t - \alpha_x^2)\alpha_x]_x - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{xx}^2 \geqslant \frac{C_3 M^3}{[t(T-t)]^3}|\beta''(x)|\,\beta'(x)^2 \qquad \forall x \in [-1,0) \cup (0,a'] \cup [b',1]\,,$$

and

$$\Big| -\frac{1}{2}(\alpha_t - \alpha_x^2)_t + [(\alpha_t - \alpha_x^2)\alpha_x]_x - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{xx}^2 \Big| \leqslant \frac{C_4 M^3}{[t(T-t)]^3} \qquad \forall x \in [a', b']\,,$$

where $M_1 = M_1(T,\beta)$ is defined by (64). In view of (61) and (77), for every $M \geqslant M_1$,

$$\int_0^T \int_{(-1,a')\cup(b',1)} \left[\frac{C_3 M^3}{(t(T-t))^3}|\beta''(x)|\,\beta'(x)^2\,|z|^2 + (n\pi)^2(|x|^{2\gamma}\alpha_x)_x|z|^2\right] dxdt \leqslant \int_0^T\int_{a'}^{b'} \left[\frac{C_2 M}{t(T-t)}\Big|\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}\Big|^2 + \frac{C_4 M^3}{(t(T-t))^3}|z|^2\right] dxdt - (n\pi)^2 \int_0^T\int_{a'}^{b'} (|x|^{2\gamma}\alpha_x)_x|z|^2\,dxdt\,. \quad (80)$$

Moreover,

$$|(n\pi)^2(|x|^{2\gamma}\alpha_x)_x| = (n\pi)^2\frac{M}{t(T-t)}\Big|2\gamma\mathrm{sign}(x)|x|^{2\gamma-1}\beta'(x) + |x|^{2\gamma}\beta''(x)\Big| \leqslant \frac{C_5 n^2 M}{t(T-t)}\Big(|x|^{2\gamma-1}|\beta'(x)| + |x|^{2\gamma}|\beta''(x)|\Big) \quad \forall x \in (-1,0)\cup(0,1)\,,$$

where $C_5 = \pi^2(2\gamma+1)$.

From now on, we take

$$M = M(T,n,\beta) := \mathcal{C}_2 \max\{T + T^2; nT^2\}\,, \qquad (81)$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}_2 = \mathcal{C}_2(\beta) := \max\left\{m_1, \frac{1}{\lambda}\right\}$$

and $\lambda = \lambda(\beta)$ is a (small enough) constant, that will be chosen later on. From $M \geqslant nT^2/\lambda$, we deduce that, for every $x \in (-1,0)\cup(0,1)$,

$$|(n\pi)^2(|x|^{2\gamma}\alpha_x)_x| \leqslant \frac{C_6\lambda^2 M^3}{(t(T-t))^3}\Big(|x|^{2\gamma-1}|\beta'(x)| + |x|^{2\gamma}|\beta''(x)|\Big)\,,$$

where $C_6 = C_6(\gamma) > 0$. Let us verify that, for $\lambda = \lambda(\beta) > 0$ small enough and for every $x \in (-1,0)\cup(0,a')\cup(b',1)$, we have

$$\frac{C_6\lambda^2 M^3}{(t(T-t))^3}|x|^{2\gamma-1}|\beta'(x)| \leqslant \frac{C_3 M^3}{4(t(T-t))^3}|\beta''(x)|\,\beta'(x)^2\,,$$
$$\frac{C_6\lambda^2 M^3}{(t(T-t))^3}|x|^{2\gamma}|\beta''(x)| \leqslant \frac{C_3 M^3}{4(t(T-t))^3}|\beta''(x)|\,\beta'(x)^2\,,$$

or, equivalently, for every $x \in (-1,0) \cup (0,a') \cup (b',1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_6 \lambda^2 |x|^{2\gamma-1} &\leqslant \frac{C_3}{4} |\beta''(x)| \cdot |\beta'(x)| \,, \\ C_6 \lambda^2 |x|^{2\gamma} &\leqslant \frac{C_3}{4} \beta'(x)^2 \,. \end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

The second inequality is easy to satisfy for $\lambda = \lambda(\beta)$ small enough, because $|\beta'| > 0$ on $[-1,a'] \cup [b',1]$. Thanks to (79), for every $x \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$,

$$\beta'(x)^2 = \operatorname{sign}(x)|x|^{2\gamma} + \mathcal{C}_1 \,,$$

so

$$\beta''(x)\beta'(x) = \gamma |x|^{2\gamma-1} \,.$$

Therefore, for every $x \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \setminus \{0\}$, the first inequality in (82) is equivalent to

$$C_6 \lambda^2 \leqslant \frac{C_3}{4} \gamma \,,$$

which is trivially satisfied when $\lambda = \lambda(\beta)$ is small enough. Moreover, the first inequality of (82) holds for every $x \in [-1,-\epsilon] \cup [\epsilon, a'] \cup [b',1]$ when $\lambda = \lambda(\beta)$ is small enough, since $|\beta''\beta'| > 0$ on this compact set. Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int\limits_{(-1,a')\cup(b',1)} & \frac{C_3 M^3}{2(t(T-t))^3} |\beta''(x)| \, \beta'(x)^2 \, |z|^2 dx dt \\ & \leqslant \int_0^T \int_{a'}^{b'} \left[\frac{C_2 M}{t(T-t)} \left| \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right|^2 + \frac{C_5 M^3}{(t(T-t))^3} |z|^2 \right] dx dt \,, \end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

where $C_5 = C_5(\beta) > 0$. Since the function $|\beta''|(\beta')^2$ is bounded from below by some positive constant on $[-1,a'] \cup [b',1]$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int\limits_{(-1,a')\cup(b',1)} & \frac{C_6 M^3}{2(t(T-t))^3} |z|^2 dx dt \\ & \leqslant \int_0^T \int_{a'}^{b'} \left[\frac{C_2 M}{t(T-t)} \left| \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \right|^2 + \frac{C_5 M^3}{(t(T-t))^3} |z|^2 \right] dx dt \,, \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

where $C_6 = C_6(\beta) > 0$. The rest of the proof goes as for $\gamma \in [1/2, 1]$. □

4.2 Uniform observability

The Carleman estimate of Proposition 5 allows to prove the following uniform observability result.

Proposition 6. *Let $\gamma \in (0,1)$ and let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $0 < a < b < 1$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for every $T > 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, and $g_{0,n} \in L^2(-1,1)$ the solution of (17) satisfies*

$$\int_{-1}^1 g_n(T,x)^2 dx \leqslant T^2 e^{C\left(1 + T^{-\frac{1+\gamma}{1-\gamma}}\right)} \int_0^T \int_a^b g_n(t,x)^2 dx dt.$$

Let us recall that explicit bounds on the observability constant of the heat equation with a potential are already known.

Theorem 6. *Let $-1 < a < b < 1$. There exists $c > 0$ such that, for every $T > 0$, α, $\beta \in L^\infty((0,T) \times (-1,1))$, $g_0 \in L^2(-1,1)$, the solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t g - \partial_x^2 g + \beta \partial_x g + \alpha g = 0 & (t,x) \in [0,T] \times (-1,1)\,, \\ g(t,\pm 1) = 0 & t \in [0,T]\,, \\ g(0,x) = g_0(x) & x \in (-1,1)\,, \end{cases}$$

satisfies

$$\int_{-1}^{1} |g(T,x)|^2 dx \leqslant e^{cH(T,\|\alpha\|_\infty,\|\beta\|_\infty)} \int_0^T \int_a^b |g(t,x)|^2 dxdt\,,$$

where $H(T,A,B) := 1 + \frac{1}{T} + TA + A^{2/3} + (1+T)B^2$.

For the proof of the above result we refer to [22, Theorem 1.3] in the case of $\beta \equiv 0$, and to [15, Theorem 2.3] for $\beta \not\equiv 0$. The optimality of the power $2/3$ of A in $H(T,A,B)$ has been proved in [17].

Proposition 6 may be seen as an improvement of the above estimate (relatively to the asymptotic behavior as $n \to +\infty$), in the special case of (17).

Proof of Proposition 6: We derive an explicit observability constant from the Carleman estimate of Proposition 5. For $t \in (T/3, 2T/3)$, we have

$$\frac{4}{T^2} \leqslant \frac{1}{t(T-t)} \leqslant \frac{9}{2T^2}$$

and

$$\int_{-1}^{1} g(T,x)^2 dx \leqslant \int_{-1}^{1} g(t,x)^2 dx e^{-\lambda_n \frac{T}{3}}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathcal{C}_1 \frac{64M^3}{T^6} e^{-\frac{9M\beta^*}{2T^2}} \frac{T}{3} e^{\lambda_n \frac{T}{3}} \int_{-1}^{1} g(T,x)^2 dx \leqslant \mathcal{C}_3 \int_0^T \int_a^b g(t,x)^2 dxdt$$

where $\beta^* := \max\{\beta(x) : x \in [-1,1]\}$, $\beta_* := \min\{\beta(x) : x \in [-1,1]\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_3 := \max\{x^3 e^{-\beta_* x}\}$. Using the inequality $M \geqslant \mathcal{C}_2[T+T^2]$ and Proposition 4, we get

$$\int_{-1}^{1} g(T,x)^2 dx \leqslant \mathcal{C}_4 T^2 e^{c_1 \frac{M}{T^2} - c_2 n^{\frac{2}{1+\gamma}} T} \int_0^T \int_a^b g(t,x)^2 dxdt \tag{85}$$

for some constants $c_1, c_2, \mathcal{C}_4 > 0$ (independent of n, T and g).

First case: $n < 1 + \frac{1}{T}$**.** Then, $M = \mathcal{C}_2(T + T^2)$ thus

$$\int_{-1}^{1} g(T,x)^2 dx \leqslant \mathcal{C}_4 T^2 e^{c_1 \mathcal{C}_2 (1+\frac{1}{T})} \int_0^T \int_a^b g(t,x)^2 dxdt.$$

Second case: $n \geqslant 1 + \frac{1}{T}$**.** Then, $M = \mathcal{C}_2 n T^2$. The maximum value of the function $x \mapsto c_1 \mathcal{C}_2 x - c_2 x^{\frac{2}{1+\gamma}} T$ on $(0,+\infty)$ is of the form $c_3 T^{-\frac{1+\gamma}{1-\gamma}}$ for some constant $c_3 > 0$ (independent of T). Thus,

$$\int_{-1}^{1} g(T,x)^2 dx \leqslant \mathcal{C}_4 T^2 e^{c_3 T^{-\frac{1+\gamma}{1-\gamma}}} \int_0^T \int_a^b g(t,x)^2 dxdt.$$

This gives the conclusion. $\square$

In the case of $\gamma = 1$, we also have the following result.

Proposition 7. *Assume $\gamma = 1$. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $0 < a < b < 1$. Then there exists $T_1 > 0$ such that, for every $T > T_1$, system (17) is observable in (a, b) in time T uniformly with respect to $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$.*

Proof: One can follow the lines of the previous proof until (85). Then, for $n \geqslant 1 + \frac{1}{T}$, we have $M = \mathcal{C}_2 n T^2$. Thus,

$$\int_{-1}^{1} g(T, x)^2 dx \leqslant \mathcal{C}_4 T^2 e^{[c_1 \mathcal{C}_2 - c_2 T]n} \int_0^T \int_a^b g(t, x)^2 dx dt.$$

This proves Proposition 7 with $T_1 := c_1 \mathcal{C}_2 / c_2$. $\square$

4.3 Construction of the control function for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$

The goal of this section is the proof of null controllability in any time $T > 0$ for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Our construction of the control steering the initial state to zero is the one of [5], which is in turn inspired by [32] (see also [33]).

For $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we define $\varphi_n(y) := \sqrt{2} \sin(n\pi y)$ and $H_n := L^2(-1, 1) \otimes \varphi_n$, which is a closed subspace of $L^2(\Omega)$. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $E_j := \oplus_{n \leqslant 2^j} H_n$ and denote by Π_{E_j} the orthogonal projection onto E_j.

Proposition 8. *Let $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and let $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $0 < a < b < 1$ and $0 < c < d < 1$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $T > 0$, every $j \in \mathbb{N}^*$, and every $g_0 \in E_j$ the solution of (4) satisfies*

$$\int_\Omega g(T, x, y)^2 dx dy \leqslant T^2 e^{C\left(2^j + T^{-\frac{1+\gamma}{1-\gamma}}\right)} \int_0^T \int_\omega g(t, x, y)^2 dx dy dt$$

where $\omega := (a, b) \times (c, d)$.

For the proof of Proposition 8 we shall need the following inequality obtained in [32] (see also [33]).

Proposition 9. *Let $c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $c < d$. There exists $C > 0$ such that, for every $L \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $(b_k)_{1 \leqslant k \leqslant L} \in \mathbb{R}^L$,*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{L} |b_k|^2 \leqslant e^{CL} \int_c^d \left| \sum_{k=1}^{L} b_k \varphi_k(y) \right|^2 dy.$$

Proof of Proposition 8: Let $(g_{0,n})_{1 \leqslant n \leqslant 2^j} \in L^2(-1, 1)^{2^j}$ be such that

$$g_0(x, y) = \sum_{n=1}^{2^j} g_{0,n}(x) \varphi_n(y).$$

Then the solution of (4) is given by

$$g(t, x, y) = \sum_{n=1}^{2^j} g_n(t, x) \varphi_n(y)$$

where, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, g_n is the solution of (17). Applying Propositions 6 and 9, and recalling that $(\varphi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}^*}$ is an orthonormal sequence of $L^2(0,1)$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega g(T,x,y)^2 dxdy &= \sum_{n=1}^{2^j} \int_{-1}^1 g_n(T,x)^2 dx \\
&\leqslant T^2 e^{C\left(1+T^{-\frac{1+\gamma}{1-\gamma}}\right)} \sum_{n=1}^{2^j} \int_0^T \int_a^b g_n(t,x)^2 dxdt \\
&\leqslant T^2 e^{C\left(2^j+T^{-\frac{1+\gamma}{1-\gamma}}\right)} \int_0^T \int_a^b \int_c^d \left| \sum_{n=1}^{2^j} g_n(t,x)\varphi_k(y) \right|^2 dydxdt \\
&= T^2 e^{C\left(2^j+T^{-\frac{1+\gamma}{1-\gamma}}\right)} \int_0^T \int_\omega g(t,x,y)^2 dxdydt\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant C may change from line to line. □

Let $T > 0$ and $f_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$. We now proceed to construct a control $u \in L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ such that the solution of (2) satisfies $f(T,\cdot) \equiv 0$. Fix $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ with

$$0 < \rho < \frac{1-\gamma}{1+\gamma} \tag{86}$$

and let $K = K(\rho) > 0$ be such that $K\sum_{j=1}^\infty 2^{-j\rho} = T$. Let $(a_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be defined by

$$\begin{cases} a_0 = 0 \\ a_{j+1} = a_j + 2T_j\,, \quad j \geqslant 0\,, \end{cases}$$

where $T_j := K2^{-j\rho}$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. We now define the control u in the following way. On $[a_j, a_j+T_j]$, we apply a control u such that $\Pi_{E_j} f(a_j+T_j,\cdot) = 0$ and

$$\|u\|_{L^2(a_j,a_j+T_j;L^2(\Omega))} \leqslant \mathcal{C}_j \|f(a_j,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

where, in view of Proposition 8,

$$\mathcal{C}_j := e^{C\left(2^j+T_j^{-\frac{1+\gamma}{1-\gamma}}\right)}\,.$$

Observe that, in light of (14),

$$\|f(a_j+T_j,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leqslant (1+\sqrt{T_j}\mathcal{C}_j)\|f(a_j,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Then, on the interval $[a_j+T_j, a_{j+1}]$ we apply no control in order to take advantage of the natural exponential decay of the solution, thus obtaining

$$\|f(a_{j+1},\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leqslant e^{-\lambda_{2^j}T_j}\|f(a_j+T_j,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\,,$$

where λ_n is defined in (23). Combining the above inequalities, we conclude that

$$\|f(a_{j+1},\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leqslant \exp\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{2^j}\big[\ln(1+\sqrt{T_k}\mathcal{C}_k) - C(2^k)^{\frac{2}{1+\gamma}}T_k\big]\Big)\|f_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\,.$$

The choice of ρ ensures that the sum in the exponential diverges to $-\infty$ as $j \to +\infty$, forcing $f(T,\cdot) \equiv 0$. The fact that $u \in L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ can be checked by similar arguments. □

4.4 End of the proof of Theorems 1 and 2

Let ω be an open subset of $(0,1) \times (0,1)$. There exists $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ with $0 < a < b < 1$, $0 < c < d < 1$ such that $(a,b) \times (c,d) \subset \omega$.

The first (resp. third) statement of Theorem 2 has been proved in Section 4.3 (resp. Section 3); let us prove the second one.

Let us consider $\gamma = 1$ and $\omega = (a,b) \times (0,1)$. From Proposition 7, we deduce that (3) is observable in ω in any time $T > T_1$. From Theorem 5, we deduce that for any time $T < \frac{a^2}{2}$, (3) is not observable in ω in time T. Thus, the quantity

$$T^* := \inf\{T > 0\,;\ \text{system (3) is observable in } \omega \text{ in time } T\ \}$$

is well defined and belongs to $[\frac{a^2}{2}, +\infty)$. Clearly, observability in some time $T_\sharp$ implies observability in any time $T > T_\sharp$, so

- for every $T > T^*$, (4) is observable in ω in time T,
- for every $T < T^*$, (4) is not observable in ω in time T.

5 Conclusion and open problems

In this article we have studied the null controllability of the Grushin type equation (1), in the rectangle $\Omega = (-1,1) \times (0,1)$, with a distributed control localized on an open subset ω of $(0,1) \times (0,1)$. We have proved that null controllability:

- holds in any positive time, when degeneracy is not too strong, i.e. $\gamma \in (0,1)$,
- holds only in large time, when $\gamma = 1$ and ω is a strip parallel to the y-axis,
- does not hold when degeneracy is too strong, i.e. $\gamma > 1$.

Null controllability when $\gamma = 1$, T is large enough, and the control region ω is more general is an open problem. When $\gamma = 1$, it would be interesting to characterize the minimal time T^* required for null controllability and possibly connect it with the associated diffusion process. We conjecture that $T^* = \frac{a^2}{2}$.

The technique of this paper should possibly extend to higher dimensional cylindrical domains of the form $(-1,1) \times (0,1)^m$. However, the generalization of this result to other muldimensional configurations (including $x \in (-1,1)^n$, $y \in (0,1)^m$ with $m, n \geqslant 1$) or boundary controls, is widely open.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the referees for their constructive comments that helped improve the exposition. They also warmly thank Gilles Lebeau, Luc Hillairet, and Vilmos Komornik for their stimulating remarks.

A The case when $\{x=0\} \subset \omega$

In this appendix we briefly explain why null controllability holds when degeneracy occurs inside the control region. Consider the control system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f - \partial_x^2 f - |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y^2 f = u(t,x,y)1_\omega(x,y) & (t,x,y) \in (0,T)\times\Omega \\ f(t,x,y) = 0 & (t,x,y) \in (0,T)\times\partial\Omega \\ f(0,x,y) = f_0(x,y) & (x,y)\in\Omega \end{cases} \tag{87}$$

with $\omega = (-a,a)\times(0,1)\,,\ 0<a\le 1$. Fix $b\in(0,a)$ and choose cut-off functions $\xi_i \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})\,,\ i=0,1,2$, such that $0\le\xi_i\le 1$ and

$$\begin{cases} \xi_0+\xi_1+\xi_2 \equiv 1 \\ \xi_0(x) = 1 \quad \text{if } |x|\le b\,, \quad \xi_0(x) = 0 \quad \text{if } |x|\ge a \\ \xi_1(x) = 0 \quad \text{if } x\le b\,, \quad \xi_0(x) = 1 \quad \text{if } x\ge a \\ \xi_2(x) = 1 \quad \text{if } x\le -a\,, \quad \xi_2(x) = 0 \quad \text{if } x\ge -b \end{cases} \tag{88}$$

Let $\omega_1 = (b,a)\times(0,1)$ and let $\Omega_1 = (b,1)\times(0,1)$. There exists a control $u_1\in L^2((0,T)\times\Omega_1)$ such that the solution f_1 of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f - \partial_x^2 f - |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y^2 f = u_1(t,x,y)1_{\omega_1}(x,y) & (t,x,y) \in (0,T)\times\Omega_1 \\ f(t,x,y) = 0 & (t,x,y) \in (0,T)\times\partial\Omega_1 \\ f(0,x,y) = f_0(x,y) & (x,y)\in\Omega_1 \end{cases}$$

satisfies $f_1(T,\cdot)\equiv 0$ on Ω_1. Similarly, let $\omega_2 = (-a,-b)\times(0,1)$ and let $u_2\in L^2((0,T)\times\Omega_2)$, where $\Omega_2 = (-1,-b)\times(0,1)$, be such that the solution f_2 of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f - \partial_x^2 f - |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y^2 f = u_2(t,x,y)1_{\omega_2}(x,y) & (t,x,y) \in (0,T)\times\Omega_2 \\ f(t,x,y) = 0 & (t,x,y) \in (0,T)\times\partial\Omega_2 \\ f(0,x,y) = f_0(x,y) & (x,y)\in\Omega_2 \end{cases}$$

satisfies $f_2(T,\cdot)\equiv 0$ on Ω_2. Finally, let $\Omega_0 = (-a,a)\times(0,1)$ and let f_0 be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f - \partial_x^2 f - |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y^2 f = 0 & (t,x,y) \in (0,T)\times\Omega_0 \\ f(t,x,y) = 0 & (t,x,y) \in (0,T)\times\partial\Omega_0 \\ f(0,x,y) = \xi_0(x)f_0(x,y) & (x,y)\in\Omega_0\,. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$f(t,x,y) := \xi_1(x)f_1(t,x,y) + \xi_2(x)f_2(t,x,y) + \frac{T-t}{T}f_0(t,x,y)$$

satisfies (87) for a suitable control u, as well as $f(T,\cdot)\equiv 0$ on Ω.

References

[1] F. Alabau-Boussouira, P. Cannarsa, and G. Fragnelli. Carleman estimates for degenerate parabolic operators with applications to null controllability. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 6(2):161–204, 2006.

[2] J.M. Ball. Strongly continuous semigroups, weak solutions, and the variation of constants formula. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 63:370–373, July 1977.

[3] K. Beauchard and E. Zuazua. Some controllability results for the 2D Kolmogorov equation. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 26:1793–1815, 2009.

[4] A. Benabdallah, Y. Dermenjian, and J. Le Rousseau. Carleman estimates for the one-dimensional heat equation with a discontinuous coefficient and applications to controllability and an inverse problem. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 336(2):865–887, 2007.

[5] A. Benabdallah, Y. Dermenjian, and J. Le Rousseau. On the controllability of linear parabolic equations with an arbitrary control location for stratified media. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 344(6):357–362, 2007.

[6] A. Bensoussan, G.d. Prato, M.C. Delfour, and S.K. Mitter. *Representation and Control of Infinite Dimensional Systems*. Springer Verlag, 1992.

[7] U. Boscain and C. Laurent. The Laplace-Beltrami operator in almost-Riemannian Geometry. *(preprint)*, 2011.

[8] P. Cannarsa and L. de Teresa. Controllability of 1-d coupled degenerate parabolic equations. *Electron. J. Differ. Equ.*, Paper No. 73:21 p., 2009.

[9] P. Cannarsa, G. Fragnelli, and D. Rocchetti. Null controllability of degenerate parabolic operators with drift. *Netw. Heterog. Media*, 2(4):695–715 (electronic), 2007.

[10] P. Cannarsa, G. Fragnelli, and D. Rocchetti. Controllability results for a class of one-dimensional degenerate parabolic problems in nondivergence form. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 8:583–616, 2008.

[11] P. Cannarsa, P. Martinez, and J. Vancostenoble. Persistent regional null controllability for a class of degenerate parabolic equations. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 3(4):607–635, 2004.

[12] P. Cannarsa, P. Martinez, and J. Vancostenoble. Null controllability of degenerate heat equations. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 10(2):153–190, 2005.

[13] P. Cannarsa, P. Martinez, and J. Vancostenoble. Carleman estimates for a class of degenerate parabolic operators. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 47(1):1–19, 2008.

[14] P. Cannarsa, P. Martinez, and J. Vancostenoble. Carleman estimates and null controllability for boundary-degenerate parabolic operators. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 347(3-4):147–152, 2009.

[15] A. Doubova, E. Fernández-Cara, and E. Zuazua. On the controllability of parabolic systems with a nonlinear term involving the state and the gradient. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 42 (3):798–819, 2002.

[16] A. Doubova, A. Osses, and J.-P. Puel. Exact controllability to trajectories for semilinear heat equations with discontinuous diffusion coefficients. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 8:621–661, 2002.

[17] T. Duyckaerts, X. Zhang, and E. Zuazua. On the optimality of the observability inequalities for parabolic and hyperbolic systems with potentials. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré : Analyse Nonlinéaire*, 25:1–41, 2008.

[18] Sylvain Ervedoza. Control and stabilization properties for a singular heat equation with an inverse-square potential. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 33(10-12):1996–2019, 2008.

[19] C. Fabre, J.P. Puel, and E. Zuazua. Approximate controllability of the semilinear heat equation. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, 125A:31–61, 1995.

[20] H.O. Fattorini and D. Russel. Exact controllability theorems for linear parabolic equations in one space dimension. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 43:272–292, 1971.

[21] E. Fernández-Cara and E. Zuazua. Null and approximate controllability for weakly blowing up semilinear heat equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 17:583–616, 2000.

[22] E. Fernández-Cara and E. Zuazua. The cost of approximate controllability for heat equations: The linear case. *Advances in Differential Equations*, 5(4-6):465–514, 2000.

[23] E. Fernández-Cara and E. Zuazua. On the null controllability of the one-dimensional heat equation with BV coefficients. *Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 12:167–190, 2002.

[24] C. Flores and L. de Teresa. Carleman estimates for degenerate parabolic equations with first order terms and applications. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 348(7-8):391–396, 2010.

[25] A.V. Fursikov and O.Y. Imanuvilov. Controllability of evolution equations. *Lecture Notes Series, Seoul National University Research Institute of Mathematics Global Analysis Research Center, Seoul*, 34, 1996.

[26] N. Garofalo. Unique continuation for a class of elliptic operators which degenerate on a manifold of arbitrary codimension. *J. Differential Equations*, 104(1):117–146, 1993.

[27] M. González-Burgos and L. de Teresa. Some results on controllability for linear and nonlinear heat equations in unbounded domains. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 12 (11):1201–1240, 2007.

[28] L. Hörmander. Hypoelliptic second order differential equations. *Acta Math.*, 119:147–171, 1967.

[29] O.Y. Imanuvilov. Boundary controllability of parabolic equations. *Uspekhi. Mat. Nauk*, 48(3(291)):211–212, 1993.

[30] O.Y. Imanuvilov. Controllability of parabolic equations. *Mat. Sb.*, 186(6):109–132, 1995.

[31] O.Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto. Carleman estimate for a parabolic equation in sobolev spaces of negative order and its applications. *Control of Nonlinear Distributed Parameter Systems, G. Chen et al. eds., Marcel-Dekker*, pages 113–137, 2000.

[32] G. Lebeau and L. Robbiano. Contrôle exact de l'équation de la chaleur. *Comm. P.D.E.*, 20:335–356, 1995.

[33] G. Lebeau and J. Le Rousseau. On carleman estimates for elliptic and parabolic operators. applications to unique continuation and control of parabolic equations.

[34] J.-L. Lions. *Équations différentielles opérationnelles et problèmes aux limites*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Bd. 111. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1961.

[35] J.-L. Lions. *Contrôle optimal de systèmes gouvernés par des équations aux dérivées partielles.* Avant propos de P. Lelong. Dunod, Paris, 1968.

[36] A. Lopez and E. Zuazua. Uniform null controllability for the one dimensional heat equation with rapidly oscillating periodic density. *Annales IHP. Analyse non linéaire*, 19 (5):543–580, 2002.

[37] P. Martinez and J. Vancostenoble. Carleman estimates for one-dimensional degenerate heat equations. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 6(2):325–362, 2006.

[38] P. Martinez, J. Vancostonoble, and J.-P. Raymond. Regional null controllability of a linearized Crocco type equation. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 42, no. 2:709–728, 2003.

[39] L. Miller. On the null-controllability of the heat equation in unbounded domains. *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques*, 129, 2:175–185, 2005.

[40] L. Miller. On exponential observability estimates for the heat semigroup with explicit rates. *Rendiconti Lincei: Matematica e Applicazioni*, 17, 4:351–366, 2006.

[41] M. Reed and B. Simon. *Methods of modern mathematical physics. I. Functional analysis. Second edition.* Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], 1980.

[42] J. Le Rousseau. Carleman estimates and controllability results for the one-dimensional heat equation with bv coefficients. *J. Differential Equations*, 233(2):417–447, 2007.

[43] J. Vancostenoble and E. Zuazua. Null controllability for the heat equation with singular inverse-square potentials. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 254(7):1864–1902, 2008.

[44] Zabczyk. *Mathematical control theory: an introduction.* Birkhäuser, 2000.

[45] E. Zuazua. Approximate controllability of the semilinear heat equation: boundary control. *International Conference in honour of Prof. R. Glowinski, Computational Sciences for the 21st Century, M.O. Bristeau et al. eds., John Wiley and Sons*, pages 738–747, 1997.

[46] E. Zuazua. Finite dimensional null-controllability of the semilinear heat equation. *J.Math. Pures et Appl.*, 76:237–264, 1997.