Analysis and control of a non-linear parabolic unstable system

J. Frederic Bonnans

CENTRE DE ROCQUENCOURT

Institut National
de Recherche
en Informatique
et en Automatique

Domaine de Voluceau
Rocquencourt
B.P.105
78153 Le Chesnay Cedex
France
Tél.:(3) 954 90 20

Rapports de Recherche

N° 220

ANALYSIS AND CONTROL OF A NON-LINEAR PARABOLIC UNSTABLE SYSTEM

Joseph Frédéric BONNANS

Juillet 1983

ANALYSIS AND CONTROL OF A NON-LINEAR PARABOLIC UNSTABLE SYSTEM

Joseph Frédéric BONNANS

INRIA

Domaine de Voluceau
BP 105 - Rocquencourt
78153 LE CHESNAY CEDEX (France)

RESUME.

On étudie dans ce rapport un système évolutif non linéaire de type diffusion-réaction. Ce système peut, pour des valeurs finies des paramètres de contrôle, exploser en un temps fini. Il est donc difficile d'utiliser les méthodes classiques, basées sur des estimations a priori sur la solution de l'équation du système. L'étude se limite aux solutions fortes, auxquelles on applique le théorême des fonctions implicites. Dans le cas où on impose à la solution d'être dans un espace de type L^p, le problème se traite d'une manière similaire en choisissant des nouveaux espaces qui sont optimaux en un certain sens.

Les résultats précédents permettent d'exprimer les conditions d'optimalité de problèmes de contrôle associés au système. Si le critère inclut un coût de l'état dans un espace de type L^p, ceci entraîne l'utilisation de produits de dualité abstraits. Ceux-ci peuvent être considérés comme des extensions par continuité d'intégrales. □

ABSTRACT.

This paper is concerned with a non-linear evolutive system of diffusion-reaction type. This system may, for finite values of the control, blow up in a finite time ; consequently, classical methods based on a priori estimates on the solution seem not well suited. We restrict the study to the strong solutions, and show that the implicit function theorem can be applied. If, in addition, the solution has to belong to some L^p-space, the problem can be treated in a similar manner by choosing some new spaces which are maximal in some sense.

Preceding results allow to express the optimality conditions of control problems associated to the system. If the criterion includes a state cost in a L^p norm, this implies the use of abstract duality products ; these may be viewed as extension by continuity of integrals.

I - SETTING OF THE PROBLEM

Let Ω be a bounded open set of $\mathbb{R}^3$, with C^∞ boundary Γ. Let T be a strictly positive real number and denote

$$Q = \Omega \times]0,T[,$$
$$\Sigma = \Gamma \times]0,T[.$$

Consider the system

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial y}{\partial t} - \Delta y - y^3 = f \text{ in } Q, \\ \dfrac{\partial y}{\partial n} = u \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ y(x,0) = h(x), \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

As we are interested in strong solutions of (1.1) we impose that y belongs to $H^{2,1}(Q)$ (for the definition of such spaces see [9]). We shall see that this implies that (f,u,h) belongs to $U = L^2(Q) \times H^{1/2,\,1/4}(\Sigma) \times H^1(\Omega)$. Then the existence of solutions for time t near 0 can easily be deduced from results of H. Ishii [4]. On the other hand, it is known that the non linear term may cause a blowing up of the solution of (1.1) in a finite time [2]. We show here the following results :

- If (1.1) has a solution for $(f_o,u_o,h_o) \in U$, this solution is unique and, in a neighbourhood of (f_o,u_o,h_o) in U, (1.1) has a unique solution which depends on (f,u,h) in a regular way.

- If we impose the regularity condition $y \in L^\alpha(Q)$, with $\alpha \in [2,+\infty]$, the preceding result still holds if, when $\alpha > 10$, we choose some new function spaces for y and (f,u,h), depending on α.

- With these results it is possible to express the gradient of some criterions and to deduce the optimality conditions of control problems associated to equation (1.1).

II - ANALYSIS OF THE STATE EQUATION

We analyse equation (1.1), with the a priori restriction that $y \in H^{2,1}(Q)$. The trace theorems [9] and (1.1) imply that $u \in H^{1/2,\, 1/4}(\Sigma)$ and $h \in H^1(\Omega)$. In addition (J.L. Lions [8]), if the space dimension n is so that $n \leq 3$, for any $\lambda > 1$ the following holds :

$$(2.1) \qquad \begin{cases} W^{2,1;\lambda}(Q) \overset{n\leq 3}{\subset} L^{\mu}(Q) \\ \text{with :} \\ \frac{1}{\mu} \geq \frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{2}{5} \text{ if } \frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{2}{5} > 0, \\ \mu = +\infty \text{ if not.} \end{cases}$$

For $\lambda = 2$, noticing that $W^{2,1;2}(Q) = H^{2,1}(Q)$, we get :

$$(2.2) \qquad H^{2,1}(Q) \overset{n\leq 3}{\subset} L^{10}(Q).$$

Consequently, if $y \in H^{2,1}(Q)$, $\frac{dy}{dt} - \Delta y - y^3$ is in $L^2(Q)$, and so by (1.1), f is in $L^2(Q)$. To sum up, (f,u,h) is in $U = L^2(Q) \times H^{1/2,\, 1/4}(\Sigma) \times H^1(\Omega)$. Endowed with the norm

$$||(f,u,h)||_U = (||f||^2_{L^2(Q)} + ||u||^2_{H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma)} + ||h||^2_{H^1(\Omega)})^{1/2},$$

U is an Hilbert space. Define

$$\mathcal{O} = \{(f,u,h) \in U \text{ such that (1.1) has (at least) a solution in } H^{2,1}(Q)\}.$$

Then :

Theorem 2.1. $\mathcal{O}$ is an open, convex, non empty subset of U. The application from $\mathcal{O}$ onto $H^{2,1}(Q)$, associating to (f,u,h) the solution of (1.1) is univalued and C^1. □

We first state and proof a lemma, then prove the theorem.

Lemma 2.1. For any $q \in L^\infty(0,T,L^3(\Omega))$ and $(f,u,h) \in U$, the equation

$$(2.3)\qquad \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \Delta z + qz = f \text{ in } Q, \\ \dfrac{\partial z}{\partial n} = u \text{ on } \Sigma\ , \\ z(x,0) = h(x), \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

has a unique solution in $H^{2,1}(Q)$. □

Proof of lemma 2.1.

For the sake of simplicity we denote $|.|$, $(.,.)$ the norm and scalar product of $L^2(\Omega)$, and C_i some positive constants. We multiply the first equation (2.3) by z and integrate on Ω at a given $t \in [0,T]$. After an integration by parts, we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}|z(.,t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{3}\int_\Omega \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x_i}(x,t)\right)^2 dx = -\int_\Omega q(x,t)(z(x,t))^2 dx$$
$$+ \int_\Gamma u(\gamma,t)z(\gamma,t)d\gamma + \int_\Omega f(x,t)z(x,t)dx\ .$$

We notice that $1 = 1/3 + 1/6 + 1/2$; then, using Hölder's inequality :

$$\left|\int_\Omega q(x,t)(z(x,t))^2dx\right| \le ||q(.,t)||_{L^3(\Omega)} ||z(.,t)||_{L^6(\Omega)} ||z(.,t)||_{L^2(\Omega)}\ ,$$
$$\le ||q||_{L^\infty(0,T,L^3(\Omega))} ||z(.,t)||_{L^6(\Omega)} ||z(.,t)||_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

The Sobolev's inclusion theorems [1] imply that $H^1(\Omega) \overset{n\le 3}{\subset} L^6(\Omega)$, so that for some $C_1 > 0$ depending on $||q||_{L^\infty(0,T,L^3(\Omega))}$:

$$\left|\int_\Omega q(x,t)(z(x,t))^2dx\right| \le \frac{1}{4}||z(.,t)||^2_{H^1(\Omega)} + \frac{C_1}{2}|z(.,t)|^2.$$

We deduce that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}|z(.,t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{3}\int_\Omega \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x_i}(x,t)\right)^2 dx \le \frac{1}{4}||z(.,t)||^2_{H^1(\Omega)} +$$

$$+ \frac{C_1}{2}|z(.,t)|^2 + C_2||u(.,t)||_{L^2(\Gamma)}||z(.,t)||_{H^1(\Omega)}$$

$$+ |z(.,t)|\ |f(.,t)|,$$

$$\le \frac{1}{2}||z(.,t)||^2_{H^1(\Omega)} +$$

$$+ C_3|z(.,t)|^2 + C_4||u(.,t)||^2_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \frac{1}{2}|f(.,t)|^2,$$

so that, with

$$||w||^2_{H^1(\Omega)} = \sum_{i=1}^{3}\int_\Omega\left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial x_i}(x,t)\right)^2 dx + |w|^2,$$

we get, multiplying by 2 the preceding inequality

$$\frac{d}{dt}|z(.,t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{3}\int_\Omega\left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x_i}(x,t)\right)^2 dx \le C_5|z(.,t)|^2 + C_4||u(.,t)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} +$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2}|f(.,t)|^2.$$

From Gronwall's inequality we deduce the unicity of the solution of (2.3) and get a priori estimate of z in $L^\infty(0,T,L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0,T,H^1(\Omega))$. To deduce an estimate of qz in $L^2(Q)$, we notice that

$$||qz||^2_{L^2(Q)} = \int_0^T ||q(.,t)z(.,t)||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\,dt$$

Using Hölder's inequality with $\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{6}$, we get

$$||qz||^2_{L^2(Q)} \le \int_0^T ||q(.,t)||^2_{L^3(\Omega)}\,||z(.,t)||^2_{L^6(\Omega)}\,dt$$

$$\le ||q||^2_{L^\infty(0,T,L^3(\Omega))}\,||z||^2_{L^2(0,T,L^6(\Omega))}$$

$$\le \quad C_6.$$

Then we write (2.3) as

$$(2.4)\qquad \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \Delta z = f - qz \text{ in } Q, \\ \dfrac{\partial z}{\partial n} = u \text{ on } \Sigma , \\ z(x,0) = h(x), \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

As we got an estimate of qz in $L^2(Q)$, the right-hand side of (2.4) is estimated in U. Then, considering z as solution of (2.4) with a given right-hand side, we deduce from [9] an a priori estimate of z in $H^{2,1}(Q)$.

We make the proof constructive by considering

$$q_N(x,t) = \inf (N, \sup (-N, q(x,t))).$$

Obviously $q_N \to q$ in $L^\infty(0,T,L^3(\Omega))$ as $N \to +\infty$. As $q_N \in L^\infty(Q)$ it is known that equation (2.3), with q_N instead of q, has a solution z. But we estimated z_N in $H^{2,1}(Q)$ independantly of N. So z_N has at least one weak limit point z in $H^{2,1}(Q)$. Passing to the limit in the equation we deduce that z is solution of (2.3). □

Proof of Theorem 2.1.

The set $\mathcal{O}$ is the range of $H^{2,1}(Q)$ through the application

$$H^{2,1}(Q) \to U,$$
$$y \to \left(\frac{\partial y}{\partial t} - \Delta y - y^3 , \frac{\partial y}{\partial n}, y(.,0)\right) .$$

Because of (2.2) and the trace theorems [9], this application is continuous. Hence $\mathcal{O}$ is connex and non empty. Let us prove the unicity of the solution of (1.1). Let y,z, be two solutions. Their difference $w = y-z$ is solution of

$$(2.5)\qquad \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial w}{\partial t} - \Delta w - (y^2 + yz + z^2)w = 0 \text{ in } Q , \\ \dfrac{\partial w}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma , \\ w(x,0) = 0 , \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

As $H^{2,1}(Q) \overset{n\leq 3}{\subset} L^\infty(0,T,L^6(\Omega))$ (see [9]) the function $q = y^2 + yz + z^2$ is in $L^\infty(0,T,L^3(\Omega))$. Then lemma 2.1 implies that the unique solution of (2.5) is $w=0$. This means that the solution of (2.1) is unique.

To prove that $\mathcal{O}$ is opened and that y depends in a smooth way on (f,u,h) we apply the implicit function theorem to

$$F : H^{2,1}(Q) \times U \to U,$$
$$(y,f,u,h) \to \left(\frac{\partial y}{\partial t} - \Delta y - y^3 - f, \frac{\partial y}{\partial n} - u, y(.,0) - h\right).$$

It is clear that F is C^1. The operator $\frac{\partial F}{\partial y}$ is defined by

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial y}(y) : H^{2,1}(Q) \to U,$$
$$z \to \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \Delta z - 3y^2 z, \frac{\partial z}{\partial n}, z(.,0)\right).$$

As before we see that $y^2 \in L^\infty(0,T,L^3(\Omega))$ so that Lemma 2.1. implies that $\frac{\partial F}{\partial y}(y)$ is an isomorphism from $H^{2,1}(Q)$ onto U. This allows to use the implicit function theorem which gives the result. □

We now take into account a constraint on the state of the type $y \in L^\alpha(Q)$, $\alpha \in [2, +\infty]$. Because of (2.2) the constraint is automatically satisfied if $\alpha \leq 10$. To deal with the case $\alpha > 10$, we use some new spaces. For y, a natural space is $Y_\alpha = H^{2,1}(Q) \cap L^\alpha(Q)$. When endowed with the norm

$$||y||_{Y_\alpha} = ||y||_{H^{2,1}(Q)} + ||y||_{L^\alpha(Q)},$$

it is easily checked that Y_α is a Banach space : a Cauchy sequence $\{y_n\}$ in Y_α converges toward some y in $H^{2,1}(Q)$ and some z in $L^\alpha(Q)$. But the convergence in $L^\beta(Q)$ implies the convergence a.e. on Q, hence $y = z$ and $y_n \to y$ in Y_α.

In order to define a new space for (f,u,h), let us call $z = z(f,u,h)$ the solution of the linear equation

$$(2.6)\qquad \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \Delta z = f \text{ in } Q, \\ \dfrac{\partial z}{\partial n} = u \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ z(x,0) = h(x) \text{ p.p. } x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

If $(f,u,h) \in U$ then (2.6) has a unique solution z in $H^{2,1}(Q)$. Define

$$U_\alpha = \{(f,u,h) \in U \text{ such that } z(f,u,h) \in L^\alpha(Q)\} \,.$$

As (2.6) is linear, U_α is a vector space ; we endow it with the norm

$$||(f,u,h)||_{U_\alpha} = ||(f,u,h)||_U + ||z(f,u,h)||_{L^\alpha(Q)} \,.$$

Then, as for Y_α , it can be checked that U_α is a Banach space. An interesting particular case is when $f \in L^\lambda(Q)$, $2 \leq \lambda < +\infty$, $u \equiv 0$ and $h \equiv 0$. Then, from results of [10], $z(f, 0,0)$ is in $W^{2,1,\lambda}(Q)$. With (2.1) we see that z is in Y_α if $\frac{1}{\alpha} \geq \frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{2}{5}$, so that

$$(2.7)\qquad f \in L^{5\alpha/5+2\alpha}(Q) \Longrightarrow (f,0,0) \in U_\alpha \,, \forall \alpha \in \,]10, +\infty].$$

Relation (2.7) allows us to prove the following lemma :

<u>Lemma 2.2.</u> Let (f,u,h) be in $\mathcal{O}$, i.e. (1.1) has a solution y in $H^{2,1}(Q)$. Then for any $\alpha \in \,]10, +\infty]$:

$$y \in L^\alpha(Q) \Longleftrightarrow z(f,u,h) \in L^\alpha(Q). \qquad \square$$

<u>Proof</u>

The function $w = y-z$ is solution of

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial w}{\partial t} - \Delta w = y^3 \text{ in } Q \,, \\ \dfrac{\partial w}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma \,, \\ w(x,0) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

By (2.2) y^3 is in $L^{10/3}(Q)$. Because of (2.7) this implies that w is in $L^\infty(Q)$. This proves the lemma. $\square$

Remark 2.1. Lemma 2.2. shows that U_α is a "good structure" for (f,u,h). The idea consisting in considering only the linear part of the system equation to define a convenient space is from J.L. Lions [7] where it is applied to some other systems. Note that once we impose that $y \in H^{2,1}(Q)$ and $(f,u,h) \in U$, the space U_α is the largest space for (f,u,h), and hence is optimal in this way. □

Define

$$\mathcal{O}_\alpha = \{(f,u,h) \in U_\alpha \;;\; (1.1) \text{ has a solution in } Y_\alpha\} .$$

Here is the analogue of Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 2.2. $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$ is a open, connex, non empty subset of U_α. The application from $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$ onto Y_α, associating to (f,u,h) the solution of (1.1), is univalued and C^1. □

Proof

The set $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$ is connex and non empty because it is the range in U_α of the continuous application

$$Y_\alpha \to U ,$$

$$y \to \left(\frac{\partial y}{\partial t} - \Delta y - y^3, \frac{\partial y}{\partial n}, y(.,0)\right).$$

Let us check that the range of this application is in U_α. As y is in Y_α, the definition of U_α implies that $\left(\frac{\partial y}{\partial t} - \Delta y, \frac{\partial y}{\partial n}, y(.,0)\right)$ is in U_α. On the other hand $Y_\alpha \subset H^{2,1}(Q)$, so by (2.2) $y^3 \in L^{10/3}(Q)$ and so, by (2.7), $(-y^3,0,0)$ is in U_α. So the sum of these two terms is also in U_α. The continuity of the application can be checked by similar arguments.

The unicity of y is a consequence of Theorem 2.1. We prove that $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$ is open and that $(f,u,h) \to y$ is C^1 with the implicit function theorem applied to

$$F : Y_\alpha \times U_\alpha \to U_\alpha ,$$
$$(y,f,u,h) \to \left(\frac{\partial y}{\partial t} - \Delta y - y^3 - f, \frac{\partial y}{\partial n} - u, y(.,0) - h\right).$$

It is easily checked that F is C^1. Lemma 2.1 says that the linear equation $\frac{\partial F}{\partial y}(y)z = (f,u,h)$ has a unique solution z in $H^{2,1}(Q)$. But we can write z as z_1+z_2, solution of

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial z_1}{\partial t} - \Delta z_1 = f \text{ in } Q , \\ \dfrac{\partial z_1}{\partial n} = u \text{ on } \Sigma , \\ z_1(x,0) = h(x) \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega , \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial z_2}{\partial t} - \Delta z_2 = 3y^2 z \text{ in } Q , \\ \dfrac{\partial z_2}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma , \\ z_2(x,0) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega . \end{cases}$$

As (f,u,h) and, by (2.7), $(3y^2z,0,0)$ are in U_α, z_1 and z_2 are in Y_α and so is z. The result follows. □

III - APPLICATION TO OPTIMAL CONTROL PROBLEMS

We now consider (f,u,h) as control parameters and apply the preceding results to the study of some open-loop optimal control problems. Let α be in $[2,+\infty[$ and

$$J(f,u,h) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_Q |y(f,u,h) - y_d|^\alpha dxdt \text{ if } (f,u,h) \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha , \\ +\infty \text{ if not ;} \end{cases}$$

in this expression y(f,u,h) is the solution of (1.1), y_d is an element of $L^\alpha(Q)$ and $\mathcal{O}_\alpha = \mathcal{O}$ if $\alpha \in [2,10]$. We now compute the gradient of J, and first study the case $\alpha \le 10$.

Proposition 3.1. If $\alpha \in [2,10]$ the application $(f,u,h) \to J(f,u,h)$ is of class C^1 from $\mathcal{O}$ onto $\mathbb{R}$. There exists an adjoint state $p \in W^{2,1;\alpha/\alpha-1}(Q)$, solution of

$$(3.1)\quad \begin{cases} -\dfrac{\partial p}{\partial t} - \Delta p - 3y^2 p = |y-y_d|^{\alpha-2}\,(y-y_d) \text{ in } Q, \\ \dfrac{\partial p}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ p(x,T) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

such that

$$(3.2)\quad \begin{cases} \langle J'(f,u,h),\,(e,v,g)\rangle_{U'U} = \int_Q p(x,t)\,e(x,t)\,dxdt + (p_{|\Sigma},v)_\Sigma \\ \qquad\qquad - \int_\Omega p(x,0)\,g(x)\,dx, \end{cases}$$

where $p_{|\Sigma}$ is the trace of p on Σ and $(p_{|\Sigma},.)_\Sigma$ is the extension by continuity in $H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma)'$ of the linear application $v \to \int_\Sigma p_{|\Sigma} v\, d\Sigma$, defined on a dense subset of $H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma)$. □

Proof

J is C^1 as being the composition of two applications of class C^1 :

$$(f,u,h) \to y \to \frac{1}{\alpha}\int_Q |y-y_d|^\alpha\, dxdt,$$

and

$$\langle J'(f,u,h),\,(e,v,g)\rangle_{U'U} = \int_Q |y-y_d|^{\alpha-2}\,(y-y_d)z\, dxdt,$$

where $z \in H^{2,1}(Q)$ is solution of the linearized state equation:

$$(3.3)\quad \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \Delta z - 3y^2 z = e \text{ in } Q, \\ \dfrac{\partial z}{\partial n} = v \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ z(x,0) = g(x), \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

The space $L^2(Q)$ being identified to its dual, U' is identical to $L^2(Q) \times H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma)' \times H^1(\Omega)'$, hence $J'(f,u,h) \equiv (p,q,r)$, elements of the preceding spaces. With (3.3) we get

$$\text{(3.4)} \quad \begin{cases} \int_Q p(\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \Delta z - 3y^2 z)dxdt + (q, \frac{\partial z}{\partial n})_\Sigma + \langle r, z(.,0)\rangle_{H^1(\Omega)' H^1(\Omega)} = \\ \qquad = \int_Q |y-y_d|^{\alpha-2}\,(y-y_d)z\,dxdt, \ \forall z \in H^{2,1}(Q). \end{cases}$$

In (3.4), $(.,.)_\Sigma$ means the duality product between $H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma)$ and its dual. We now interpret (3.4). Put

$$\bar{f} = |y-y_d|^{\alpha-2}\,(y-y_d) + 3y^2 p.$$

We easily check that $\bar{f}$ is, at least, in $L^{10/9}(Q)$ (p being in $L^2(Q)$) and

$$\text{(3.5)} \qquad \int_Q p(\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \Delta z)dxdt = \int_Q \bar{f}\, z\, dxdt,$$

for any z in

$$Z = \{z \in H^{2,1}(Q) \ ; \ \frac{\partial z}{\partial n} \equiv 0 \text{ on } \Sigma \text{ and } z(.,0) \equiv 0\} .$$

Consider $\bar{f}$ as given. Then (3.5) defines p in a unique way. This is because for any $e \in L^2(Q)$, there exists $z = z(e) \in H^{2,1}(Q)$ solution of

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \Delta z = e \text{ in } Q , \\ \frac{\partial z}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ z(.,0) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. } \ x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

As $z \in H^{2,1}(Q) \subset L^{10}(Q)$, the application $L : e \to \int_Q \bar{f} z(e)dxdt$ is linear continuous from $L^2(Q)$ onto $\mathbb{R}$. Then (3.5) is equivalent to :

$$\int_Q p(x,t)\, e(x,t)\, dxdt = L(e), \qquad \forall e \in L^2(Q).$$

$L^2(Q)$ being idenfied to its dual, this equation admits a unique solution in $L^2(Q)$. Consider now $\bar{p}$ solution of

$$(3.6)\quad \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial \bar{p}}{\partial t} - \Delta \bar{p} = \bar{f} \text{ in } Q, \\ \dfrac{\partial \bar{p}}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ \bar{p}(x,T) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

As $\bar{f} \in L^{10/9}(Q)$, equation (3.6) has a unique solution $\bar{p}$ in $W^{2,1;10/9}(Q)$ (see [10]) hence, by (2.1), $\bar{p}$ is also in $L^2(Q)$. Multiplying the first equation (3.6) by $z \in Y$ and integrating by parts, we check that $\bar{p}$ is solution of (3.5) and so $p = \bar{p}$. From (3.6) and the definition of $\bar{f}$ we deduce that p is solution of (3.1).

Let us show that p is in $W^{2,1;\alpha/\alpha-1}(Q)$. As y is in $L^{10}(Q)$ and p is in $L^2(Q)$, y^2p is in $L^{10/7}(Q)$. On the other hand $|y-y_d|^{\alpha-2}\,(y-y_d)$ is in $L^{\alpha/\alpha-1}(Q)$, hence f is in $L^{\beta}(Q)$ with $\beta = \inf\,(\alpha/\alpha-1,\ 10/7)$. As p is solution of (3.6), p is in $W^{2,1;\beta}(Q)$. We get the result if $\alpha/\alpha-1 \leq 10/7$. As $\alpha \in [2,10]$, $\alpha/\alpha-1$ is in $[10/9,2]$ so the case $\alpha/\alpha-1 \in]10/7,2]$ remains open. In that case the preceding analysis shows that p is in $W^{2.1;10/7}(Q)$, hence by (2.1) in $L^{10/3}(Q)$. Then y^2p is in $L^2(Q)$, and so $\bar{f}$ is in $L^{\alpha/\alpha-1}(Q)$. As p is solution of (3.6) it is in $W^{2,1;\alpha/\alpha-1}(Q)$.

We now clarify the relations between p,q,r, to obtain (3.2). Put $\beta = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}$. As $p \in W^{2,1;\beta}(Q)$, we know [3] that

$$p(.,0) \in B^{2-2/\beta,\beta}(\Omega),$$

$$p_{|\Sigma} \in B^{2-1/\beta,1-1/\beta;\beta}(Q),$$

where $B^{\cdot,\cdot}(\Omega)$ is a Besov space (see [1]) and

$$B^{2s,s;\beta}(Q) = B^{s,\beta}(0,T;L^{\beta}(\Omega)) \cap L^{\beta}(0,T;B^{2s,\beta}(\Omega)).$$

As $\alpha \in [2;10]$, β is in $[10/9,2]$. As $\frac{1}{5} = 2 - 2 \times \frac{9}{10}$, p(.,0) is at least in $B^{1/5,10/9}(\Omega)$. The first indice of this Besov space being not integer, it is equal to $W^{1/5,10/9}(\Omega)$ ([1]). We know [1] that

$$W^{1/5,10/9}(\Omega) \overset{n\leq 3}{\subset} L^{\lambda}(\Omega),\ \frac{1}{\lambda} = \frac{9}{10} - \frac{1/5}{3},$$

i.e. $\lambda = 6/5$. So $p(.,0)$ is in $L^{6/5}(\Omega)$. As $g \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $n = 3$, g is in $L^6(\Omega)$ too and so $\int_\Omega p(x,0)g(x)dx$ is meaningful. About $p_{|\Sigma}$ we known that is is in $L^\beta(\Sigma)$ and so in $L^{10/9}(\Sigma)$. Now suppose that $v \in H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma) \cap L^{10}(\Sigma)$. From (3.1) and (3.4), integrating by parts,we obtain :

$$-\int_\Omega p(x,0)g(x)dx + \int_\Sigma p_{|\Sigma}\ v\ d\Sigma = \langle r,g\rangle_{H^1(\Omega)'H^1(\Omega)} + (q,v)_\Sigma$$

As this is true for any $g \in H^1(\Omega)$, it follows that

$$-\int_\Omega p(x,0)g(x)dx = \langle r,g\rangle_{H^1(\Omega)'H^1(\Omega)},$$

and so

$$\int_\Sigma p_{|\Sigma}\ v\ d\Sigma = (q,v)_\Sigma\ ,\quad \forall v \in H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma) \cap L^{10}(\Sigma).$$

This is true in particular if $v \in \mathscr{D}(\bar{\Sigma})$ which is a dense subset of $H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma)$. So the continuous application

$$H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma) \to \mathbb{R}\ ,$$
$$v \to (q,v)_\Sigma,$$

is the extension by continuity to $H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma)$ of the application $v \to \int_\Sigma pvd\Sigma$. This proves the proposition. □

<u>Remark 3.1.</u> If $\alpha = 2$, p belongs to $H^{2,1}(Q)$ and $p_{|\Sigma} \in H^{3/2,3/4}(\Sigma)$ so that $(p_{|\Sigma}\ ,v)_\Sigma$ is actually, for any $v \in H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma)$, equal to $\int_\Sigma pvd\Sigma$. This remains probably true for some values of α superior to 2 ; to prove it we would need an extension of (2.1) to spaces $W^{2s,s;\lambda}(Q)$ with $0 < s < 1$. □

We now extend the results to the case $\alpha > 10$. As U_α is no more, as U, a product space, we may no more split the gradient into three terms.

Proposition 3.2. If $\alpha \in]10,+\infty[$, the application $(f,u,h) \to J(f,u,h)$ is of class C^1 from $\mathcal{O}_\alpha$ onto $\mathbb{R}$. There exists an adjoint state $p \in W^{2,1;\alpha/\alpha-1}(Q)$ solution of

$$(3.7)\quad \begin{cases} -\dfrac{\partial p}{\partial t} - \Delta p - 3y^2 p = |y-y_d|^{\alpha-2}\,(y-y_d) \text{ in } Q, \\ \dfrac{\partial p}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ p(x,T) = 0 \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

and $\langle J'(f,u,h), (e,v,g)\rangle_{U'_\alpha U_\alpha}$ is the extension by continuity to U_α of

$$\int_Q p(x,t)e(x,t)\,dxdt + \int_\Sigma p(\gamma,t)v(\gamma,t)\,d\gamma dt - \int_\Omega p(x,0)g(x)\,dx$$

which is defined on a dense subset of U_α. $\square$

Proof

J is still C^1 as the composition of two C^1 applications. To get an explicit expression of the gradient, let us show that (3.7) has a solution for any $\alpha \in]10,+\infty[$. Let $q \in W^{2,1;\alpha/\alpha-1}(Q)$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\dfrac{\partial q}{\partial t} - \Delta q = |y-y_d|^{\alpha-2}\,(y-y_d) \text{ in } Q, \\ \dfrac{\partial q}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma\,, \\ q(x,T) = 0 \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega\,. \end{cases}$$

If p exists, $w = p-q$ is solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\dfrac{\partial w}{\partial t} - \Delta w - 3y^2 w = 3y^2 q \text{ in } Q, \\ \dfrac{\partial w}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma\,, \\ w(x,T) = 0 \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Because of (2.1), y^2 belongs to $L^5(Q)$ and q is at least in $L^{5/3}(Q)$, so that $3y^2q$ is in $L^{5/4}(Q)$. Define

$$\hat{y}_d = y - |3y^2q|^{1/4}\, s(q),$$

where s(.) is the sign function $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$s(a) = \begin{cases} -1 \text{ if } a < 0, \\ \ \ 0 \text{ if } a = 0, \\ +1 \text{ if } a > 0. \end{cases}$$

It is easily checked that $\hat{y}_d$ is in $L^5(Q)$ and that

$$3y^2q = |y-\hat{y}_d|^3(y-\hat{y}_d) \text{ a.e. in } Q.$$

Consequently, the equation on w appears as the costate equation associated to the criterion $\frac{1}{5}\int_Q |y-\hat{y}_d|^5 dxdt$.

By proposition 3.1., it admits a solution in $W^{2,1;5/4}(Q)$. This proves the existence of $p = q+w$, solution of (3.7) in $W^{2,1;\alpha/\alpha-1}(Q)$. Expressing J as a product of derivatives and using (3.7) we get

$$\langle J'(f,u,h), (e,v,g)\rangle_{U'_\alpha U_\alpha} = \int_Q \left(-\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} - \Delta p - 3y^2p\right) z \, dxdt,$$

z being the solution in Y_α of the linearized state equation (3.3). We can choose arbitrarily z in Y_α, (e,v,g) being then functions of z through (3.3). We suppose that $z \in \mathcal{D}(\bar{Q})$. From the trace theorems used in the proof of proposition 3.1., we deduce that p has a trace on Σ (resp. $\Omega \times \{0\}$) which is at least in $L^1(\Sigma)$ (resp. $L^1(\Omega)$). Integrating by parts, this allows to write

$$\langle J'(f,u,h), (e,v,g)\rangle_{U'_\alpha U_\alpha} = \int_Q pe\,dxdt + \int_\Sigma p_{|\Sigma}\, v\,dxdt - \int_\Omega p(x,0)g(x)dx,$$

and this is true for any $(e,v,g) \in U_\alpha$ becoming to the range of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{Q})$ by the application

$$z \to \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \Delta z - 3y^2z, \frac{\partial z}{\partial n}, z(.,0)\right).$$

As this application is surjective from Y_α on U_α and $\mathcal{D}(\bar{Q})$ is dense in Y_α, we deduce that the range of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{Q})$ is dense in U_α. This proves the proposition. □

Remark 3.2. If one of the elements (e,v,g) is regular enough to give a meaning to the corresponding integral in (3.8), then the gradient of J in the direction 'e,v,g) splits in the sum of an integral and an abstract bilinear form. In the general case we cannot split the gradient because (e,v,g) are related by the condition $z(e,v,g) \in L^{\alpha}(Q)$. □

We now apply the preceding results to the study of an open-loop control problem. We consider $\alpha > 0$, three positive constants N_1,N_2,N_3 and K a closed convex set in U. Define

$$I(f,u,h) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha}\int_Q |y-y_d|^{\alpha}dxdt + \frac{N_1}{2}||f||^2_{L^2(Q)} + \frac{N_2}{2}||u||^2_{H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma)} + \\ \qquad + \frac{N_3}{2}||h||^2_{H^1(\Omega)} \quad \text{if } (f,u,h) \in \mathcal{O}_{\alpha}, \\ +\infty \quad \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

The control problem is

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Minimize } I(f,u,h), \\ (f,u,h) \in K. \end{cases}$$

Our result is :

Theorem 3.1. We suppose $\alpha > 10$ and

(i) $\mathcal{O}_{\alpha} \cap K \neq \emptyset$,
(ii) $N_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, or K is bounded in U.

Then (3.9) has at least one solution. Any solution of (3.9) checks the necessary optimality conditions

$$(3.10)\quad \begin{cases} \left.\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial y}{\partial t} - \Delta y - y^3 = f \\ &-\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} - \Delta p - 3y^2 p = |y-y_d|^{\alpha-2}\,(y-y_d) \end{aligned}\right\} \text{ in } Q, \\ \frac{\partial y}{\partial n} = u \;;\; \frac{\partial p}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ y(x,0) = h(x) \;;\; p(x,T) = 0 \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

and

$$(3.11)\quad \begin{cases} \langle J'(f,u,h),\,(e-f,v-u,g-h)\rangle_{U'_\alpha U_\alpha} + N_1 \int_Q f(e-h)\,dxdt\ + \\ \qquad + N_2(u,v-u)_{H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma)} + N_3(h,\ g-h)_{H^1(\Omega)} \geq 0\,, \\ \forall (e,v,g) \in K\,, \end{cases}$$

$J'(f,u,h)$ being related to p through proposition 3.2. □

Remark 3.3. Here is a formulation equivalent to (3.11) using no abstract linear form :

$\forall (e,v,g) \in K$, for any sequence $(e_n,v_n,g_n) \to (e,v,g)$ in U_α in such a way that (e_n-e,v_n-v,g_n-g) is "smooth", we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Big[\int_Q (p+N_1 f)(e_n-e)\,dxdt + \int_\Sigma (p_{|\Sigma}+N_2 u)(v_n-u)\,d\Sigma$$

$$- \int_\Omega (p(x,0)+N_3 h(x))(g_n(x)-h(x))\,dx \Big] \geq 0\,. \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1.

The infimum of I on $\mathcal{O}_\alpha \cap K$ is bounded because of (i). Let (f_n,u_n,h_n) be a minimizing sequence of I on $\mathcal{O}_\alpha \cap K$ and y_n the associated state. Because of (ii) and the definition of I, we get

$$\begin{cases} f_n \text{ is bounded in } L^2(Q), \\ u_n \text{ is bounded in } H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma), \\ h_n \text{ is bounded in } H^1(\Omega), \\ y_n \text{ is bounded in } L^\alpha(Q). \end{cases}$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{\partial y_n}{\partial t} - \Delta y_n = f_n + (y_n)^3$$

is bounded in $L^2(Q)$. We deduce of that an estimate of $\{y_n\}$ in $H^{2,1}(Q)$ hence in Y_α. So there exists (f,u,h,y) in $Z = L^2(Q) \times H^{1/2,1/4}(\Sigma) \times H^1(\Omega) \times Y_\alpha$ such that :

$$(f_n,u_n,h_n,y_n) \rightharpoonup (f,u,h,y) \text{ in } Z.$$

As the inclusion of $H^{2,1}(Q)$ into $L^2(Q)$ is compact $y_n \to y$ in $L^2(Q)$, hence a.e. in Q. From a lemma of J.L. Lions ([6], p. 12) we deduce that $(y_n)^3 \rightharpoonup y_n$ in $L^3(Q)$. This allows to pass to the limit in the state equation. On the other hand we can consider I as a convex function of (f,u,h,y) in $U \times Y_\alpha$, hence weakly l.s.c., so that

$$I(f,u,h) \le \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf I(f_n,u_n,h_n).$$

This implies that (f,u,h) is a solution of (3.9).

The necessary optimality conditions (3.10), (3.11) are an easy consequence of proposition 3.2. □

Remark 3.4. A problem similar to (3.9) has been studied by J.L. Lions [8] who obtained the expression of the necessary optimality conditions in the case

$\alpha \leq 10$; the method employed was of penalization type and avoided the analysis of the state equation. □

Remark 3.5. One can find in [2] the application of the same type of methods to other exemples of parabolic systems, and in particular to a (1.1) type system with a non-linearity in $y^{5/3}$ only, associated with boundary Neumann conditions in $L^2(\Sigma)$ and an initial condition in $L^2(\Omega)$. Also considered are a problem of control by coefficients and a problem of control of a second order hyperbolic system. □

CONCLUSION

The analysis of an unstable parabolic equation of diffusion-reaction type, apt to explode in a finite time, lead to the following conclusions : if the system equation admits a solution y on [0,T] for a given value of the parameters, in some neighbourhood of these parameters, the system equation has a unique solution depending in a smooth way on the parameters. If y is imposed to be in some L^p space , the results are still true if, for $p > 10$, we choose new spaces for y and the parameters, depending on p. These spaces are related to the linear part of the equation. The preceding results allow to study some control problems associated to the system. □

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] ADAMS R.A. (1975). Sobolev spaces. Academic Press, New York.

[2] BONNANS J.F. (1982). Thèse de Docteur-Ingénieur, Université Technologique de Compiègne.

[3] GRISVARD P. (1966). Commutativité de deux foncteurs d'interpolation et applications. J. Math. Pures et Appl. 45, pp. 143-290.

[4] ISHII H. (1977). Asymptotic stability and blowing up of solutions of some nonlinear equations. J. Diff. Equ. 26, pp. 291-319.

[5] LIONS J.L. (1968). Contrôle optimal des systèmes gouvernés par des équations aux dérivées partielles. Dunod, Gauthier-Villars, Paris.

[6] LIONS J.L. (1969). Quelques méthodes de résolution des problèmes aux limites non linéaires. Dunod,Gauthier-Villars, Paris.

[7] LIONS J.L. (1980). Function spaces and optimal control of distributed systems. Cours à l'UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro.

[8] LIONS J.L. (à paraître). Contrôle optimal de systèmes distribués instables. Dunod.

[9] LIONS J.L. - MAGENES E. (1968). Problèmes aux limites non homogènes et applications, Volumes 1 et 2, Dunod, Paris.

[10] SOLONNIKOV (1964). Inégalités a priori pour les équations du second ordre de type parabolique. Trudy Math. Inst. Steklov LX , pp. 133-212.

Imprimé en France

par

l'Institut National de Recherche en Informatique et en Automatique