

# TIME REVERSAL FOR RADIATIVE TRANSPORT WITH APPLICATIONS TO INVERSE AND CONTROL PROBLEMS

SEBASTIAN ACOSTA

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper we develop a time reversal method for the radiative transport equation to solve two problems: an inverse problem for the recovery of an initial condition from boundary measurements, and the exact boundary controllability of the transport field with finite steering time. Absorbing and scattering effects, modeled by coefficients with low regularity, are incorporated in the formulation of these problems. This time reversal approach leads to a convergent iterative procedure to reconstruct the initial condition provided that the scattering coefficient is sufficiently small in the  $L^\infty$  norm. Then, using duality arguments, we show that the solvability of the inverse problem leads to exact controllability of the transport field with minimum-norm control obtained constructively. The solution approach to both of these problems may have medical applications in areas such as optical imaging and optimization of radiation delivery for cancer therapy.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The radiative transport equation, also known as the linear Boltzmann equation, governs the propagation of particles as they interact with the underlying medium. Hence, this equation has applications in various scientific disciplines, including gas dynamics, optics, astrophysics, nanotechnology, and biology. The mathematical modeling for some of these applications is developed in the following books [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] among others. This publication is primarily motivated by the connection between transport phenomena, and medical applications such as optical imaging and the optimization of radiation therapy. More precisely, we construct a time reversal method to solve two problems governed by the radiative transport equation. These problems are the recovery of an initial condition from boundary measurements, and the exact boundary controllability of the transport field. We shall refer to the former as the *inverse source problem*, and to the latter as the *control problem*.

**1.1. The inverse source problem.** The understanding of transport problems leads to imaging methods for biological media with particular applications in medicine [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. Another area of interest is the development of wave-based imaging techniques suited for turbid or heavily cluttered media modeled with stochastic differential equations. The connection to the radiative transport equation is provided by the fact that the Wigner transform of stochastic wave fields satisfies the transport equation in specific asymptotic regimes. For details and recent developments in this theory, we refer to [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22].

The general radiative transport problem is governed by the following system,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + (\theta \cdot \nabla) u + \mu_a u + \mu_s (I - \mathcal{K}) u &= f && \text{in } (0, \infty) \times (\Omega \times \mathbb{S}), \\ u &= u_0 && \text{on } \{t = 0\} \times (\Omega \times \mathbb{S}), \end{aligned}$$

augmented by a prescribed in-flow profile which we assume to be vanishing. The properties of the medium are modeled by the absorption coefficient  $\mu_a$ , the scattering coefficient  $\mu_s$  and the

scattering operator  $\mathcal{K}$ . The precise definitions and assumptions concerning these coefficients are made in Section 2. The transport equation has solutions  $u = u(t, x, \theta)$  representing the density of radiation at time  $t \in [0, \infty)$ , position  $x \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , moving in the direction  $\theta \in \mathbb{S}$  at speed  $c > 0$ . Here  $\mathbb{S}$  denotes the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The driving sources in this problem are the actual forcing term in the right-hand side of the equation denoted by  $f$  and the initial condition  $u_0$ .

For inverse source problems in transport theory, the goal is to reconstruct some of the driving sources in the formulation of the transport problem from the knowledge of out-flowing boundary data. This theory can be divided into two main areas, namely, transient and stationary problems. To the best of our knowledge, there is no rigorous work concerning the reconstruction of the initial condition  $u_0$  from boundary measurements for general heterogeneous, absorbing, scattering media. In this paper, we partially fill that void by developing an iterative method, suited for weakly scattering media, to recover the unknown initial condition.

Most works in the literature are concerned with the stationary case and the recovery of isotropic sources  $f = f(x)$ . Among those that address uniqueness and stability of reconstructions in scattering media, we highlight [23, 24, 25]. We consider our work the counterpart of [23] for the time-dependent case. In fact, based on a Neumann series argument, analogue to that of [23], we have derived an iterative method for the recovery of the unknown initial condition. The method is convergent provided that the scattering coefficient is sufficiently small. This claim is made precise in Section 2 and then we prove it in Section 5.

For the stationary case, the use of the Neumann series is limited to certain smallness condition for the anisotropic portion of the scattering kernel as shown by Bal and Tamasan [23]. Stefanov and Uhlmann [24] by-pass this condition by reducing the inverse source problem to Fredholm form, showing that generic media an unknown isotropic source can be uniquely recovered in a stable manner from boundary measurements. Their proof assumes full boundary data and it is valid for all absorption and scattering coefficients in an open and dense subset of certain normed spaces. The case of partial data has been recently addressed by Hubenthal [25] whose approach is an extension of [24]. He is able to show that a source is recoverable if it is supported on certain regions that are *visible* from the accessible portion of the boundary.

We also wish to mention some early works for special geometries or symmetries by Larsen [26] and Siewert [27]. Larsen obtained a uniqueness result for sources embedded within a plane-parallel half-space. Siewert considered the transport problem in plane-parallel slab geometry and he obtained an algorithm to reconstruct the unknown source using spherical-harmonics expansions. A more recent practical work was carried out by Kim and Moscoso [9] for the problem in half-space with constant coefficients. Using appropriate Green's functions, they developed explicit formulae for the recovery of a point source or a piecewise constant source supported in a box. Most other studies for the stationary inverse source problem are concerned with non-scattering media and make use of the (attenuated) Radon transform and mathematical tools from integral geometry and microlocal analysis. An excellent literature review is found in [10, Section 7].

**1.2. The control problem.** Control theory for PDEs is a very broad subject which has been investigated by a large number of researchers. We only direct the reader to following publications [28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33] some which contain extended lists of references and overviews of important developments. From these references, it is clear that control theory

has been comprehensively developed for many PDEs of mathematical physics (wave, heat, Maxwell, elasticity, Schrodinger). However, this is not the case for the Boltzmann equation, not even in the linearized case. In fact, the exact controllability for transient radiative transport in heterogeneous media was first established in 2007 by Klibanov and Yamamoto [34]. We develop here an alternative proof for the exact controllability of the transport equation. As in the case of the inverse problem, we are particularly motivated by applications in medicine. For instance, radiation delivery for cancer therapy must be controlled in order to effectively destroy cancerous cell while minimizing damage to surrounding healthy tissues [35].

The exact controllability for radiative transport is to find inflow boundary conditions over a window of *steering* time to drive the transport field to a desired final state. The control data is usually not unique, but the first step is to establish its existence. The approach developed in [34] employs Carleman estimates which yield continuous observability even for time-dependent absorption and scattering coefficients, and also for optimal steering time. As a consequence, their results are much stronger than ours. However, we base our work on the analysis of the inverse problem, which is solved using time reversal. Therefore, our work reveals an alternative approach with added value worth reporting in this paper. The precise statement with regard to exact controllability is given in Section 2 and we provide a proof in Section 6.

## 2. NOTATION AND STATEMENT OF MAIN RESULTS

In this section we state the direct problem for transient radiative transport and its associated time-reversed problem. We also review some preliminary facts in order to state our main results in the proper mathematical framework. The formulation pursued here allows for heterogeneous media modeled by coefficients with low regularity.

We assume that  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a bounded convex domain with smooth boundary  $\partial\Omega$ . The unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $\mathbb{S}$ . The respective outflow and inflow portions of the boundary are

$$(\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{S})_{\pm} = \{(x, \theta) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{S} : \pm \nu(x) \cdot \theta > 0\}$$

where  $\nu$  denotes the outward unit normal vector on  $\partial\Omega$ . It will be assumed that the particles travel at a fixed speed  $c > 0$ . In the rest of the paper, we will often make reference to the following scales:

- $l = \text{diam}(\Omega)$ , the diameter of the bounded region  $\Omega$ ,
- $c > 0$ , the speed of propagation, and
- $T = \text{diam}(\Omega)/c$ .

Now we define the appropriate Hilbert spaces over which the radiative transport problem is well-posed. First, we denote by  $\mathbb{V}^0$  and  $\mathbb{V}^1$  the completion of  $C^1(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{S})$  with respect to the norms associated with the following inner products,

$$(1) \quad \langle u, w \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^0} = \langle u, w \rangle_{L^2(\Omega \times \mathbb{S})}$$

$$(2) \quad \langle u, w \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^1} = l^2 \langle \theta \cdot \nabla u, \theta \cdot \nabla w \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^0} + \langle u, w \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^0} + l \langle |\nu \cdot \theta| u, w \rangle_{L^2(\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{S})}$$

where  $\nabla$  denotes the weak gradient with respect to the spatial variable  $x \in \Omega$ . Now, denote by  $\mathbb{T}$  the trace space defined as the completion of  $C(\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{S})$  with respect to the norm associated with the following inner product,

$$(3) \quad \langle u, w \rangle_{\mathbb{T}} = l \langle |\nu \cdot \theta| u, w \rangle_{L^2(\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{S})}.$$

We also have the spaces  $\mathbb{T}_\pm$  denoting the restriction of functions in  $\mathbb{T}$  to the in- and out-flow portions of the boundary  $\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{S}$ , respectively. Functions in  $\mathbb{V}^1$  have well-defined traces on the space  $\mathbb{T}$  as asserted by the following lemma whose proof is found in [3, 4, 36, 37, 38, 39].

**Lemma 2.1.** *The trace mapping  $u \mapsto u|_{\partial\Omega}$  defined for  $C^1(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{S})$  can be extended to a bounded operator  $\gamma : \mathbb{V}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ . Moreover,  $\gamma : \mathbb{V}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  is surjective. Analogous claims hold for the partial trace maps  $\gamma_\pm : \mathbb{V}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_\pm$ .*

In addition, we have the following definition for traceless closed subspaces of  $\mathbb{V}^1$ .

$$(4) \quad \mathbb{V}_\pm^1 = \text{null}(\gamma_\pm) = \{v \in \mathbb{V}^1 : \gamma_\pm v = 0\}.$$

For simplicity, we only pose and analyze the transport problem with vanishing incoming flow. In other words, we shall work in the space  $\mathbb{V}_-^1$ . When a prescribed incoming flow needs to be included, it is easy to lift it as right-hand side source using the surjectivity of the trace operator  $\gamma_-$ . The transient radiative transport problem for general heterogeneous, scattering media is the following.

**Definition 2.2** (Direct Problem). *Given initial condition  $u_0 \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  and forcing term  $f \in C^1([0, \infty); \mathbb{V}^0) \cup C([0, \infty); \mathbb{V}^1)$ , find a solution  $u \in C^1([0, \infty); \mathbb{V}^0) \cap C([0, \infty); \mathbb{V}_-^1)$  to the following initial boundary value problem*

$$(5) \quad \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + (\theta \cdot \nabla)u + \mu_a u + \mu_s(I - \mathcal{K})u = \frac{1}{l}f \quad \text{in } (0, \infty) \times (\Omega \times \mathbb{S}),$$

$$(6) \quad u = u_0 \quad \text{on } \{t = 0\} \times (\Omega \times \mathbb{S}).$$

We have included the factor  $1/l$  on the right-hand side of (5) so that both  $u$  and  $f$  have the same physical units. Here again  $\nabla$  denotes the gradient with respect to the spatial variable  $x \in \Omega$ . Here  $\mu_a$  and  $\mu_s$  are the absorption and scattering coefficients, respectively. The scattering operator  $\mathcal{K} : \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  is given by

$$(7) \quad (\mathcal{K}u)(x, \theta) = \int_{\mathbb{S}} \kappa(x, \theta, \theta')u(x, \theta') dS(\theta'),$$

where  $\kappa$  is known as the scattering kernel. Throughout the paper we will make the following assumptions concerning the regularity of the absorption and scattering coefficients, and the scattering kernel.

**Assumption 2.3.** *The scattering coefficient  $0 \leq \mu_s \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ . So there exists a positive constant  $\bar{\mu}_s$  such that  $0 \leq \mu_s(x) \leq \bar{\mu}_s$  for a.a.  $x \in \Omega$ . Similarly, the absorption coefficient  $0 \leq \mu_a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ , with a constant  $\bar{\mu}_a$  such that  $0 \leq \mu_a(x) \leq \bar{\mu}_a$  for a.a.  $x \in \Omega$ .*

We consider a bounded and conservative scattering operator obtained by making the following assumption concerning the scattering kernel.

**Assumption 2.4.** *The scattering kernel  $0 \leq \kappa \in L^2(\Omega \times \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S})$ . It is also assumed that the scattering operator is conservative in the following sense,*

$$(8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}} \kappa(x, \theta, \theta') dS(\theta') = 1, \quad \text{for a.a. } (x, \theta) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{S}.$$

In addition, we assume a reciprocity condition on the scattering kernel given by

$$(9) \quad \kappa(x, \theta, \theta') = \kappa(x, -\theta', -\theta), \quad \text{for a.a. } (x, \theta, \theta') \in \Omega \times \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}.$$

This means that the scattering events are reversible in a local sense at each point  $x \in \Omega$ .

Now we turn our attention to a problem referred to as *reversed transport*. This problem will be used later in the analysis of the inverse problem. It is formally obtained by reversing both time  $t$  and direction  $\theta$  in the original transport equation (5), and by employing the reciprocity relation (9) to obtain the adjoint scattering operator  $\mathcal{K}^*$ . This is expressed mathematically in (41). The reversed transport problem is defined as follows.

**Definition 2.5** (Time Reversed Problem). *Given initial condition  $\psi_0 \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  and forcing term  $\rho \in C^1([0, \infty); \mathbb{V}^0) \cup C([0, \infty); \mathbb{V}^1)$ , find a solution  $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty); \mathbb{V}^0) \cap C([0, \infty); \mathbb{V}_-^1)$  to the following initial boundary value problem*

$$(10) \quad \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + (\theta \cdot \nabla) \psi - \mu_a \psi - \mu_s (I - \mathcal{K}^*) \psi = \frac{1}{l} \rho \quad \text{in } (0, \infty) \times (\Omega \times \mathbb{S}),$$

$$(11) \quad \psi = \psi_0 \quad \text{on } \{t = 0\} \times (\Omega \times \mathbb{S}),$$

where the adjoint scattering operator  $\mathcal{K}^* : \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  is given by

$$(12) \quad (\mathcal{K}^* \psi)(x, \theta) = \int_{\mathbb{S}} \kappa(x, \theta', \theta) \psi(x, \theta') dS(\theta').$$

Before presenting the main results of this paper, we wish to stress the importance of the reciprocity relation (9). This relation is derived from physical principles of scattering theory usually leading to rotationally invariant kernels of the form  $\kappa = \kappa(x, \theta \cdot \theta')$  which satisfy reciprocity. This relation plays a subtle but important role in this paper. It implies that the time reversed equation (10) (but not boundary conditions) coincides with the so-called *adjoint equation*. As a consequence, we obtain a simple but powerful relationship, expressed mathematically in (56), which leads to the equivalence between the solvability of the inverse and the control problems. See the proof of theorem 2.9 found in Section 6.

**2.1. Main result for the inverse problem.** Now we state the inverse problem for transient transport along with its unique solvability and stability under the assumption that the scattering coefficient is relatively small. Our proof, presented in Section 5, is based on a time reversal method inspired by the work of Stefanov and Uhlmann [40]. Our main goal is to provide a constructive proof that the initial state of the transport field can be uniquely reconstructed from time-resolved boundary measurements. For this inverse source problem, we assumed that the properties of the medium are known.

Let  $u \in C^1([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^0) \cap C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}_-^1)$  solve the direct transport problem 2.2 for unknown initial condition  $u_0 \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$ . The outflowing boundary measurements are modeled by the operator  $\Lambda : \mathbb{V}_-^1 \rightarrow C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)$  defined as

$$(13) \quad (\Lambda u_0)(t) = \gamma_+ u(t), \quad t \in [0, \tau],$$

where  $\gamma_+ : \mathbb{V}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_+$  is the out-flowing trace operator defined in lemma 2.1. With this notation we define the inverse problem as follows.

**Definition 2.6** (Inverse Problem). *Let  $u$  be the solution to the direct problem 2.2 for some unknown initial condition  $u_0$  and forcing term  $f = 0$ . The inverse source problem is, given the out-flowing measurement  $\Lambda u_0$ , find the initial state  $u_0$ .*

Our main result concerning this inverse problem is the following.

**Theorem 2.7.** *Assume that  $l\bar{\mu}_s e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)} < e^{-1}$ . Then there exists a time  $\tau < \infty$  such that the out-flowing boundary measurement  $\Lambda u_0 \in C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)$  determines the initial condition*

$u_0 \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  uniquely. Moreover, the following stability estimate holds,

$$\|u_0\|_{\mathbb{V}_-^1} \leq C \|\Lambda u_0\|_{C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)}$$

for some positive constant  $C = C(\bar{\mu}_a, \bar{\mu}_s, l)$ .

This theorem is a consequence of theorem 5.1 which is stated and proved in Section 5. See also the remarks following the proof of theorem 5.1 concerning the validity of theorem 2.7 in a weaker setting, that is, for initial data  $u_0 \in \mathbb{V}^0$ . Notice that theorem 5.1 provides a convergent iterative method for the reconstruction of the unknown initial condition  $u_0$ . It is also worth mentioning that the stability estimate of theorem 2.7 is optimal for the chosen norms because we can easily show that  $\|u_0\|_{\mathbb{V}_-^1}$  dominates  $\|\Lambda u_0\|_{C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)}$  up to a constant. In other words, in this stability relation we cannot relax the norm of the measured data  $\Lambda u_0$  without relaxing the norm of the initial condition  $u_0$  as well.

**2.2. Main result for the control problem.** Here we proceed to define the control problem and state our main result concerning exact controllability of the transport field from control boundary data. Our proof, based on duality arguments, is presented in Section 6.

For the controllability issue, we work within the framework of a Hilbert space for the control functions on the boundary (generalized traces) and the corresponding mild solutions of the radiative transport problem. For the existence of mild solutions in semigroup theory, see the standard references [41, 42]. The treatment of generalized traces for mild solutions can be found in [34, Section 2] or [4, Section 14.4] which is based on Cessenat [37, 36]. See also Bardos [43, pp. 205-208].

We consider the following transport problem with prescribed inflow data. Given  $h \in L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_-)$ , find a mild solution  $v \in C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^0)$  of the following problem

$$(14) \quad \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + (\theta \cdot \nabla)v + \mu_a v + \mu_s (I - \mathcal{K})v = 0 \quad \text{in } (0, \tau] \times (\Omega \times \mathbb{S}),$$

$$(15) \quad v = 0 \quad \text{on } \{t = 0\} \times (\Omega \times \mathbb{S}),$$

$$(16) \quad v = h \quad \text{on } [0, \tau] \times (\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{S})_-.$$

The inflowing boundary control is modeled by the bounded operator  $\Upsilon : L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_-) \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  defined as

$$(17) \quad \Upsilon h = v(\tau),$$

where  $v$  is the mild solution of the problem (14)-(16). With this notation, we define the control problem in precise terms as follows.

**Definition 2.8** (Exact Controllability). *Given a target state  $v_\star \in \mathbb{V}^0$ , find a finite steering time  $\tau > 0$  and an inflow control condition  $h \in L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_-)$  such that  $\Upsilon h = v_\star$ .*

Our main result concerning this control problem is the following.

**Theorem 2.9.** *Assume that  $l\bar{\mu}_s e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)} < e^{-1}$ . Then there exists a steering time  $\tau < \infty$  such that for a given target state  $v_\star \in \mathbb{V}^0$ , there exists inflow control  $h \in L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_-)$  so that the mild solution  $v \in C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^0)$  of the problem (14)-(16) satisfies  $v(\tau) = v_\star$ .*

*The control boundary condition has the form  $h = h_{\min} + g$  where  $g \in \text{null}(\Upsilon)$  and  $h_{\min} \in \text{null}(\Upsilon)^\perp$  is uniquely determined by  $v_\star$  as the minimum-norm control satisfying,*

$$\|h_{\min}\|_{L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_-)} \leq C \|v_\star\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}$$

for some positive constant  $C = C(\bar{\mu}_a, \bar{\mu}_s, l)$ .

### 3. ANALYSIS OF THE DIRECT PROBLEM

In this section we briefly review the well-posedness of the direct problem 2.2 and the reversed problem 2.5 in appropriate functional spaces. Most of the results in this section are well-known or easily derived from the literature for radiative transport equations. However, we explicitly state the key ideas in order to use them later in the analysis of the inverse and control problems. Our approach is mainly based on semigroup theory and its application to evolution PDEs [4, 41, 42]. Besides reviewing some standard results, the purpose of this section is to specify conditions on the absorbing and scattering coefficients that make the semigroups associated with the two evolution problems decay exponentially fast. See proposition 3.5 at the end of this section. It will become clear in the analysis of the inverse problem (see Section 5) that the exponential decay of these semigroups is essential for our proof of the main results of this paper.

In order to accomplish our goal for this section, we will treat the transport problems as bounded perturbations of the ballistic portion of the transport equation. Hence, we start by analyzing the ballistic (non-scattering) transport problems.

**Definition 3.1** (Ballistic Problems). *For the direct problem, given initial condition  $u_0 \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$ , find a solution  $u \in C^1([0, \infty); \mathbb{V}^0) \cap C([0, \infty); \mathbb{V}_-^1)$  to the following initial boundary value problem*

$$(18) \quad \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + (\theta \cdot \nabla)u + (\mu_a + \mu_s)u = 0 \quad \text{in } (0, \infty) \times (\Omega \times \mathbb{S}),$$

$$(19) \quad u = u_0 \quad \text{on } \{t = 0\} \times (\Omega \times \mathbb{S}).$$

*Similarly, for the time-reversed ballistic problem, given initial condition  $\psi_0 \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$ , find a solution  $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty); \mathbb{V}^0) \cap C([0, \infty); \mathbb{V}_-^1)$  to the following initial boundary value problem*

$$(20) \quad \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + (\theta \cdot \nabla)\psi - (\mu_a + \mu_s)\psi = 0 \quad \text{in } (0, \infty) \times (\Omega \times \mathbb{S}),$$

$$(21) \quad \psi = \psi_0 \quad \text{on } \{t = 0\} \times (\Omega \times \mathbb{S}).$$

The ballistic problems are well-posed. In fact, solutions can be written explicitly using the method of characteristics. Since we plan to use the theory of semigroups, then we pose these ballistic problems as abstract Cauchy problems in  $\mathbb{V}_-^1$  with the following operators  $A_0, B_0 : \mathbb{V}_-^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  given by

$$(22) \quad A_0 v = -c [(\theta \cdot \nabla)v + (\mu_a + \mu_s)v],$$

$$(23) \quad B_0 v = -c [(\theta \cdot \nabla)v - (\mu_a + \mu_s)v],$$

as their respective generators. We have the following properties concerning the strongly continuous semigroups generated by  $A_0$  and  $B_0$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\{S_0(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  and  $\{R_0(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  be the  $C_0$ -semigroups generated by  $A_0$  and  $B_0$ , respectively. Then the following properties are satisfied.*

- (i) *Let  $v \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  be fixed, then the maps  $t \mapsto S_0(t)v$  and  $t \mapsto R_0(t)v$  are continuous from  $\mathbb{R}_+$  to  $\mathbb{V}_-^1$  and continuously differentiable from  $\mathbb{R}_+$  to  $\mathbb{V}^0$ .*
- (ii) *For each  $t \geq 0$ , both  $S_0(t)$  and  $R_0(t)$  extend as bounded operators from  $\mathbb{V}^0$  to  $\mathbb{V}^0$ .*
- (iii) *For all  $t \geq 0$ , we have  $\|S_0(t)\| \leq 1$  and  $\|R_0(t)\| \leq e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)}$ .*
- (iv) *For all  $t > T$  we have  $S_0(t) = R_0(t) = 0$ .*
- (v) *For all  $t \geq 0$  and all  $\omega \leq 0$ , we have  $\|S_0(t)\| \leq e^{\omega(t-T)}$  and  $\|R_0(t)\| \leq e^{\omega(t-T)} e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)}$ .*

*Proof.* The proof of properties (i)-(iii) follow from the standard theory of semigroups [41, 42] and the fact that the solutions of the Cauchy problems can be explicitly expressed using the method of characteristics. Similarly, property (iv) holds because we impose vanishing inflow condition on the boundary of  $\Omega$  by working in the space  $\mathbb{V}_-^1$ . Thus, for time  $t > T$  the support of solution  $u = u(t)$  or  $\psi = \psi(t)$  has already left the domain  $\Omega$ . Finally, the combination of (iii)-(iv) yields the estimates in (v) as desired.  $\square$

Now we turn to the full problem in heterogeneous, absorbing, scattering media. We view both, the direct problem 2.2 and the reversed problem 2.5 as perturbations of the ballistic problems 3.1. So we pose the former two problems as abstract Cauchy problems in  $\mathbb{V}_-^1$ .

The direct problem 2.2 corresponds to

$$(24) \quad \dot{u}(t) = Au(t) + \frac{1}{T} f(t) \quad \text{for } t > 0,$$

$$(25) \quad u(0) = u_0,$$

where  $T = l/c$  and the operator  $A : \mathbb{V}_-^1 \subset \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  is given by

$$(26) \quad Av = -c[(\theta \cdot \nabla)v + \mu_a v + \mu_s(I - \mathcal{K})v].$$

Similarly, the reversed problem 2.5 corresponds to

$$(27) \quad \dot{\psi}(t) = B\psi(t) + \frac{1}{T} \rho(t) \quad \text{for } t > 0,$$

$$(28) \quad \psi(0) = \psi_0,$$

where the operator  $B : \mathbb{V}_-^1 \subset \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  is given by

$$(29) \quad Bv = -c[(\theta \cdot \nabla)v - \mu_a v - \mu_s(I - \mathcal{K}^*)v].$$

In order to apply the theory of bounded perturbation of semigroups [41, Ch. 3], we find it convenient to state and prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}^* : \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  be defined by (7) and (12), respectively. Then we have  $\|\mathcal{K}\| = \|\mathcal{K}^*\| = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $u \in \mathbb{V}^0$  and consider,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{K}u\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2 &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{S}} \kappa(x, \theta, \theta') u(x, \theta') d\theta' \right)^2 d\theta dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \kappa(x, \theta, \theta') d\theta' \int_{\mathbb{S}} \kappa(x, \theta, \theta') u(x, \theta')^2 d\theta' d\theta dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \kappa(x, \theta, \theta') u(x, \theta')^2 d\theta' d\theta dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \kappa(x, \theta, \theta') d\theta u(x, \theta')^2 d\theta' dx = \|u\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Fubini's theorem and assumption 2.4 on the scattering kernel  $\kappa$ . Now, notice that equality is attained for the function  $u(x, \theta) \equiv 1$ . Therefore, it follows that  $\|\mathcal{K}\| = \|\mathcal{K}^*\| = 1$ .  $\square$

Now we may state and prove the well-posedness of the direct problem 2.2 and reversed problem 2.5 in terms of the associated Cauchy problems (25)-(26) and (28)-(29), respectively.

**Theorem 3.4.** *The direct problem 2.2 has a unique solution given by the formula*

$$u(t) = S(t)u_0 + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^t S(t-s)f(s)ds,$$



where  $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  is the  $C_0$ -semigroup generated by  $A$  satisfying properties (i)-(ii) of lemma 3.2 and such that  $S(t) : \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  is bounded with  $\|S(t)\| \leq M_\omega e^{(\omega + M_\omega c \bar{\mu}_s)t}$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and all  $\omega \leq 0$  where  $M_\omega = e^{-\omega T}$ .

Similarly, the reversed problem 2.5 has a unique solution given by the formula

$$\psi(t) = R(t)\psi_0 + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^t R(t-s)\rho(s)ds,$$

where  $\{R(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  is the  $C_0$ -semigroup generated by  $B$  satisfying properties (i)-(ii) of lemma 3.2 and such that  $R(t) : \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  is bounded with  $\|R(t)\| \leq N_\omega e^{(\omega + N_\omega c \bar{\mu}_s)t}$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and all  $\omega \leq 0$  where  $N_\omega = e^{-\omega T} e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)}$ .

*Proof.* The proof for both problems 2.2 and 2.5 is exactly the same, so we only address the well-posedness of the direct problem 2.2. We use [41, Ch. 3 : Thm. 1.3] and property (v) in lemma 3.2 to obtain the existence of  $S(t)$  as a  $C_0$ -semigroup satisfying properties (i)-(ii) of lemma 3.2 and the estimate on its norm  $\|S(t)\|$ . Now since we assume that  $f \in C([0, \infty); \mathbb{V}^1) \cup C^1([0, \infty); \mathbb{V}^0)$ , the regularity of the term

$$\int_0^t S(t-s)f(s)ds,$$

follows from [41, Ch. 7: Section 7]. □

The estimate  $\|R(t)\| \leq N_\omega e^{(\omega + N_\omega c \bar{\mu}_s)t}$  found in theorem 3.4 motivates us to find conditions on  $\bar{\mu}_a$ ,  $\bar{\mu}_s$  and a good choice of  $\omega < 0$  such that the reversed semigroup  $R(t)$  becomes a contraction for sufficiently large time  $t > 0$ . It will be evident that such a property determines the solvability of the inverse problem. See below in Section 5. So consider the function  $E : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by the exponential rate found in the estimate  $\|R(t)\| \leq N_\omega e^{(\omega + N_\omega c \bar{\mu}_s)t}$ , or in other words,

$$E(\omega) = \omega + e^{-\omega T} e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s) c \bar{\mu}_s}.$$

We would like to find an optimal choice  $\omega^* < 0$  that minimizes  $E$  over  $\mathbb{R}$ . Subsequently, we would like to find a condition on  $\bar{\mu}_a$  and  $\bar{\mu}_s$  leading to  $E(\omega^*) < 0$ . Clearly,  $\omega^*$  is the unique solution to  $E'(\omega) = 0$  which is easily obtained to be

$$\omega^* = \frac{\ln(T e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s) c \bar{\mu}_s})}{T}.$$

Recalling that  $l = Tc$ , it follows that

$$E(\omega^*) = \frac{\ln(T e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s) c \bar{\mu}_s})}{T} + \frac{1}{T} = \frac{\ln(e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s) \bar{\mu}_s} l e)}{T}$$

Hence, in order for  $E(\omega^*) < 0$ , we require that  $l \bar{\mu}_s e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)} < e^{-1}$ . Now, from the estimates in theorem 3.4, we clearly arrive at the following result.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $l = \text{diam}(\Omega)$ . If*

$$l \bar{\mu}_s e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)} < e^{-1}$$

*then both  $\|S(t)\|$  and  $\|R(t)\|$  decay exponentially fast according to*

$$\|S(t)\| \leq \|R(t)\| \leq e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)} (e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)} l \bar{\mu}_s)^{t/T-1}, \quad t \geq T.$$

## 4. ANALYSIS OF THE STATIONARY PROBLEM

In this section we state the stationary or steady-state problem for the transport equation in general heterogeneous, absorbing, scattering media. This is done for the stationary problems corresponding to both, the *direct problem* 2.2 and also the *reversed problem* 2.5. We shall prove the well-posedness of both problems under the same assumptions of proposition 3.5.

In the analysis of the inverse problem, it will become clear that the well-posedness of the reversed stationary problem plays two important roles. The first of these roles has to do with the definition of a time reversal operator that solves the inverse problem up to a contraction map. More precisely, this operator is written in terms of a time-reversed evolution problem which in turn needs an initial state to be well-defined. The needed initial state is then provided by the solution of a reversed stationary problem in order to obtain a crucial stability property. The second role is that a carefully chosen solution for a reversed stationary problem will allow us to stay within the framework of the space  $\mathbb{V}^1$ . As a consequence, the stability of the source reconstruction method is given in terms of the  $\mathbb{V}^1$ -norm which is stronger than that of the space  $\mathbb{V}^0$ .

The reversed problem is particularly challenging since the coefficients in the PDE appear with the reversed signs. This means that the term containing  $\mu_a$  acts as emission instead of absorption. As a result, the weak formulation of this problem does not lead to a coercive (uniformly convex) form. Instead, it leads to an indefinite (saddle-point) problem. We shall overcome this difficulty by employing the celebrated theorem of Babuška [44]. This is a generalization of the Lax-Milgram lemma especially designed for such saddle-point problems. Our approach follows the ideas developed in [38, 39], but we introduce certain simplifications and modifications.

Now we proceed to state the direct stationary problem with vanishing incoming flow. In other words, we shall work in the space  $\mathbb{V}_-^1$ . As in the case of transient transport, when a prescribed incoming flow needs to be included, it can be lifted using the surjectivity of the trace operator  $\gamma_-$ .

**Definition 4.1** (Direct Stationary Problem). *Given  $f \in \mathbb{V}^0$  find a solution  $u \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  to the following boundary value problem*

$$(30) \quad (\theta \cdot \nabla)u + \mu_a u + \mu_s(I - \mathcal{K})u = \frac{1}{l}f \quad \text{in } \Omega \times \mathbb{S}.$$

And the reversed stationary problem is defined as follows.

**Definition 4.2** (Reversed Stationary Problem). *Given  $\rho \in \mathbb{V}^0$  find a solution  $\psi \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  to the following boundary value problem*

$$(31) \quad (\theta \cdot \nabla)\psi - \mu_a \psi - \mu_s(I - \mathcal{K}^*)\psi = \frac{1}{l}\rho \quad \text{in } \Omega \times \mathbb{S}.$$

One of the most important tools in our analysis is the following integration-by-parts formula or Green's identity. For functions  $u, v \in \mathbb{V}^1$  we have

$$(32) \quad \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{S}} (\theta \cdot \nabla u)v = \int_{\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{S}} (\theta \cdot \nu)uv - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{S}} (\theta \cdot \nabla v)u,$$

and in particular if we let  $v = u \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  and multiply by  $l$ , we obtain from Young's inequality that

$$(33) \quad \frac{l^2}{2}\|(\theta \cdot \nabla)u\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2 \geq \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{S}} l(\theta \cdot \nabla u)u = \frac{l}{2} \int_{\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{S}} (\theta \cdot \nu)u^2 = \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{\mathbb{T}}^2.$$

We will also need a stability estimate for the ballistic portion of the stationary problems. This may be obtained from a Poincaré-type inequality to estimate the  $\mathbb{V}^0$ -norm of a function in terms of its directional derivative provided that inflow values vanish. Since the ballistic solution can be written explicitly using an integrating factor, the proof of a Poincaré inequality from [39] can be easily modified to obtain the following stability estimates.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $l = \text{diam}(\Omega)$ . For all  $v \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} &\leq \sqrt{2}l \|(\theta \cdot \nabla)v + (\mu_a + \mu_s)v\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \\ \|(\theta \cdot \nabla)v\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} &\leq \left(1 + \sqrt{2}l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)\right) \|(\theta \cdot \nabla)v + (\mu_a + \mu_s)v\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} &\leq \sqrt{2}l e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)} \|(\theta \cdot \nabla)v - (\mu_a + \mu_s)v\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \\ \|(\theta \cdot \nabla)v\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} &\leq \left(1 + \sqrt{2}l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s) e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)}\right) \|(\theta \cdot \nabla)v - (\mu_a + \mu_s)v\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to prove the well-posedness of the stationary problems 4.1 and 4.2, we first set up associated variational problems similar to those of [38]. However, as opposed to [38], we directly seek for a solution in the trial space  $\mathbb{V}_-^1$  which already has enough regularity for the solution to satisfy the transport PDE in a strong sense. Without further ado, we define the bilinear forms governing the stationary problems 4.1-4.2.

Let  $a, b : \mathbb{V}_-^1 \times \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a bilinear forms given by

$$(34) \quad a(u, v) = l \langle (\theta \cdot \nabla)u + \mu_a u + \mu_s(I - \mathcal{K})u, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^0},$$

$$(35) \quad b(\psi, \phi) = l \langle (\theta \cdot \nabla)\psi - \mu_a \psi - \mu_s(I - \mathcal{K}^*)\psi, \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^0}.$$

Hence, the stationary problems 4.1-4.2 are equivalent to find  $u, \psi \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  such that

$$(36) \quad a(u, v) = \langle f, v \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^0} \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathbb{V}^0,$$

$$(37) \quad b(\psi, \phi) = \langle \rho, \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^0} \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \mathbb{V}^0.$$

As stated above, the reversed problem 4.2, governed by the bilinear form  $b(\cdot, \cdot)$  poses the greater challenge due to its lack of positive definiteness. Hence, we first proceed to analyze this case, and the steps can be easily modified to deal with the more favorable structure of the other bilinear form  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ . We start with the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.4.** *If  $l\bar{\mu}_s e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)} < e^{-1}$ , then for each  $\psi \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  there exists  $\phi \in \mathbb{V}^0$  such that  $b(\psi, \phi) \geq \beta \|\psi\|_{\mathbb{V}^1} \|\phi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}$ , where the constant  $\beta > 0$  is independent of  $\psi$  and  $\phi$ . In fact,*

$$\beta = \frac{1 - \sqrt{2}/e}{2\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\max\{\beta_1, \beta_2\}},$$

where  $\beta_1 = (1 + \sqrt{2}l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s) e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)})$  and  $\beta_2 = \sqrt{2} e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)}$ .

Moreover, for each non-zero  $\phi \in \mathbb{V}^0$  there exists  $\psi \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  such that  $b(\psi, \phi) > 0$ .

*Proof.* For given  $\psi \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$ , let  $\phi = l((\theta \cdot \nabla)\psi - (\mu_a + \mu_s)\psi) \in \mathbb{V}^0$ . Then we have,

$$\begin{aligned} b(\psi, \phi) &= \|\phi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2 + l \langle \mu_s \mathcal{K}^* \psi, \phi \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^0} \\ &\geq \|\phi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2 - l\bar{\mu}_s \|\psi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \|\phi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \\ &\geq (1 - \sqrt{2}l\bar{\mu}_s e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)}) \|\phi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2 \geq (1 - \sqrt{2}/e) \|\phi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we have used an estimate from lemma 4.3. Now it only remains to show that  $\|\phi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}$  dominates  $\|\psi\|_{\mathbb{V}^1}$ . From the definitions of  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  and lemma 4.3, we obtain that

$$\|\phi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \geq \frac{l}{\beta_1} \|(\theta \cdot \nabla)\psi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\phi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \geq \frac{1}{\beta_2} \|\psi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}.$$

Finally, using Green's identity (33) we arrive at the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\max\{\beta_1, \beta_2\}} \left( l^2 \|(\theta \cdot \nabla)\psi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2 + \|\psi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\max\{\beta_1, \beta_2\}} \left( l^2 \|(\theta \cdot \nabla)\psi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2 + \|\psi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2 + \|\psi\|_{\mathbb{T}}^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The desired result follows by recalling the definition of the norm in  $\mathbb{V}^1$  given in (2).

For the second part, given non-zero  $\phi \in \mathbb{V}^0$ , we choose  $\psi \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  such that  $(\theta \cdot \nabla)\psi - (\mu_a + \mu_s)\psi = \phi/l$  in  $(\Omega \times \mathbb{S})$ . This can indeed be accomplished since the ballistic stationary problem with vanishing inflow data is uniquely solvable in  $\mathbb{V}_-^1$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} b(\psi, \phi) &\geq \|\phi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2 - l\bar{\mu}_s \|\psi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \|\phi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \\ &\geq \|\phi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2 \left( 1 - \sqrt{2} l\bar{\mu}_s e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)} \right) \\ &\geq \|\phi\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}^2 \left( 1 - \sqrt{2}/e \right) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used an estimate from lemma 4.3. This concludes the proof.  $\square$

The above lemma holds under the condition that  $l\bar{\mu}_s e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)} < e^{-1}$ . This choice was purposely made to coincide with the hypothesis of proposition 3.5. It will become clear in Section 5 that the conclusion of proposition 3.5 is crucial for the well-posedness of the inverse problem.

Lemma 4.4 and Babuška's theorem [44] lead to the well-posedness of the reversed stationary problem 4.2 as stated in the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.5.** *If  $l\bar{\mu}_s e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)} < e^{-1}$ , then for each  $\rho \in \mathbb{V}^0$ , the reversed stationary problem 4.2 has a unique solution  $\psi \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  such that (31) is satisfied a.e. in  $(\Omega \times \mathbb{S})$ . Moreover, the solution satisfies the following stability estimate,*

$$\|\psi\|_{\mathbb{V}^1} \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \|\rho\|_{\mathbb{V}^0},$$

where  $\beta > 0$  is defined in lemma 4.4. Same conclusion holds for the direct stationary problem 4.1.

This theorem implies that the so-called *subcriticality* condition,  $\mu_a(x) \geq 0$ , assumed in the literature is not necessary for the stationary radiative transport problem to be well-posed. Notice that the proof of lemma 4.4 is indifferent to the sign of the coefficients  $\mu_a$  and  $\mu_s$ , provided that  $l\bar{\mu}_s e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)}$  is sufficiently small. This last remark implies the well-posedness of the direct stationary problem 4.1 for  $l\bar{\mu}_s e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)} < e^{-1}$ . However, other proofs can be found in the literature since the direct stationary problem 4.1 satisfies the *subcriticality* condition.

We also wish to state here the following corollary that we will employ in the analysis of the inverse problem in Section 5.

**Corollary 4.6.** *Let  $\{S(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  and  $\{R(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  be the  $C_0$ -semigroups associated with the direct and reversed problems 2.2 and 2.5, respectively. If  $l\bar{\mu}_s e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)} < e^{-1}$ , then these semigroups*

are bounded linear operators from  $\mathbb{V}_-^1$  to  $\mathbb{V}_-^1$  satisfying the following estimates

$$\|S(t)\|_{\mathbb{V}^1} \leq \frac{1+l(\bar{\mu}_a+2\bar{\mu}_s)}{\beta} \|S(t)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \quad \text{and} \quad \|R(t)\|_{\mathbb{V}^1} \leq \frac{1+l(\bar{\mu}_a+2\bar{\mu}_s)}{\beta} \|R(t)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}$$

where  $\beta > 0$  is defined in lemma 4.4.

*Proof.* Let  $u_0 \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  be arbitrary and consider,

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(t)u_0\|_{\mathbb{V}^1} &\leq \frac{l}{c\beta} \|\dot{u}(t)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} = \frac{l}{c\beta} \|Au(t)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \\ &= \frac{l}{c\beta} \|AS(t)u_0\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} = \frac{l}{c\beta} \|S(t)Au_0\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \\ &\leq \frac{l}{c\beta} \|S(t)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \|Au_0\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \leq \frac{l}{c\beta} \|S(t)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \|A\| \|u_0\|_{\mathbb{V}^1}. \end{aligned}$$

We have also used the fact that a semigroup commutes with its generator when acting on the domain of the generator. In other words,  $S(t)Av = AS(t)v$  for all  $v \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$ . The boundedness of  $S(t) : \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  was obtained in theorem 3.4, and it is clear that  $A : \mathbb{V}_-^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  is bounded with  $\|A\| \leq c(l^{-1} + \bar{\mu}_a + 2\bar{\mu}_s)$ . The proof for  $R(t)$  is similar.  $\square$

## 5. THE INVERSE PROBLEM

With the tools developed in the previous two sections, we are ready to solve the inverse problem 2.6. We base our analysis on the time reversal method, which is usually employed for the wave equation. In particular, our approach mimics that of [40] for the thermoacoustic tomography problem. The time reversal method is particularly well-suited for the wave equation because that equation is invariant under time inversion. Unfortunately, the radiative transport equation does not enjoy such a property; and this represents our main challenge. However, the theory expanded in Sections 3-4 provides the necessary tools to deal with this difficulty.

Let  $u \in C^1([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^0) \cap C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}_-^1)$  solve the Cauchy problem,

$$(38) \quad \dot{u}(t) = Au(t) \quad \text{for } 0 < t \leq \tau,$$

$$(39) \quad u(0) = u_0,$$

where the operator  $A : \mathbb{V}_-^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  is defined in (26) and the initial condition  $u_0 \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$ . The boundary measurements are modeled by the operator  $\Lambda : \mathbb{V}_-^1 \rightarrow C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)$  defined by (13) for some chosen time  $\tau > 0$ . Recall also Definition 2.6 of the inverse problem.

We wish to determine the existence of a finite measurement time  $\tau$  which ensures the recovery of  $u_0$  from  $\Lambda u_0$ . Clearly we need  $\tau \geq T = \text{diam}(\Omega)/c$  because  $T$  is the time required for the special case when the medium is non-scattering.

In order to employ a time reversal argument, we define the following *reflection operator*  $U : C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^1) \rightarrow C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^1)$  given by

$$(40) \quad (Uv)(x, \theta, t) = v(x, -\theta, \tau - t).$$

This operator is certainly bounded, and in fact it is norm-preserving. Moreover, it is also well-defined and norm-preserving as  $U : C^1([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^0) \rightarrow C^1([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^0)$  and  $U : C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_\pm) \rightarrow C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_\mp)$ , and in all cases  $U^2 = I$ . We will also use the fact that

$$(41) \quad UK = \mathcal{K}^*U$$

which follows from the reciprocity condition (9) satisfied by the scattering kernel  $\kappa$ .

It is not hard to see that  $\tilde{u} := (Uu) \in C^1([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^0) \cap C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^1)$  solves the following reversed initial boundary value problem,

$$(42) \quad \dot{\tilde{u}}(t) = B\tilde{u}(t) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \tau,$$

$$(43) \quad \tilde{u}(0) = (Uu)(0),$$

$$(44) \quad \gamma_- \tilde{u}(t) = (U\Lambda u_0)(t) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \tau.$$

where the generator  $B : \mathbb{V}_-^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  is defined in (29).

If we had access to  $(Uu)(0)$ , then we could solve (42)-(44) and it would follow that  $u_0 = (U\tilde{u})(0)$ . Unfortunately, this is not realistic and we only have access to the boundary measurements  $\Lambda u_0$ . For the time reversal method,  $(Uu)(0)$  is simply replaced by a known function  $\psi$  of our choice.

Inspired by the work of Stefanov and Uhlmann [40] we employ the reversed stationary problem 4.2 as a lift to obtain an initial condition  $\psi$  that conforms to the boundary data  $(U\Lambda u_0)(t)$  at  $t = 0$ . Such a function would satisfy a boundary value problem of the form,

$$(45) \quad (\theta \cdot \nabla)\psi - \mu_a \psi - \mu_s(I - \mathcal{K}^*)\psi = 0 \quad \text{in } (\Omega \times \mathbb{S}),$$

$$(46) \quad \gamma_- \psi = h_0 \quad \text{on } (\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{S})_-.$$

for  $h_0 \in \mathbb{T}_-$ . As seen below, in practice we choose  $h_0 = (U\Lambda u_0)(0)$ .

With this choice of  $\psi$ , we proceed to define the time reversal operator which acts as an approximate left-inverse for  $\Lambda$ . Given  $h \in C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)$ , find  $v \in C^1([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^0) \cap C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^1)$  satisfying

$$(47) \quad \dot{v}(t) = Bv(t) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \tau,$$

$$(48) \quad v(0) = \psi,$$

$$(49) \quad \gamma_- v(t) = (Uh)(t) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \tau.$$

where  $\psi$  satisfies (45)-(46) with  $h_0 = (Uh)(0)$ .

The time reversal operator  $G : C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+) \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^1$  is given by

$$(50) \quad Gh = (Uv)(0).$$

We should prove the well-posedness of the boundary value problem (45)-(46) and the initial boundary value problem (47)-(49). These problems are not the same as the respective reversed problems 4.2 and 2.5 because now we are prescribing a non-zero inflow data in (46) and (49). However, since the trace operator  $\gamma_-$  is surjective, we can always lift the boundary data and pose new problems in the  $\mathbb{V}_-^1$ . Then, theorems 4.5 and 3.4 yield the well-posedness of these two problems, respectively. As a consequence, then  $G$  is a bounded operator.

We are interested in making  $I - G\Lambda$  a contraction mapping in the space  $\mathbb{V}_-^1$  for some properly chosen measurement time  $\tau < \infty$ . This is the basic idea employed in [40]. We proceed to state our result in the form of a theorem.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Assume that  $l\bar{\mu}_s e^{l(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_s)} < e^{-1}$ . Let  $Q : \mathbb{V}_-^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}_-^1$  be given by  $Q = I - G\Lambda$ . There exists a final time  $\tau < \infty$  such that  $Q : \mathbb{V}_-^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}_-^1$  is a contraction and  $(I - Q) : \mathbb{V}_-^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}_-^1$  is boundedly invertible. Moreover, the solution to the inverse problem 2.6 is given by*

$$u_0 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} Q^n Gh, \quad h = \Lambda u_0,$$

with convergence in the  $\mathbb{V}^1$ -norm.

*Proof.* Following the approach in [40, Thm. 1], let  $w \in C^1([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^0) \cap C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}_-^1)$  solve the following Cauchy problem,

$$(51) \quad \dot{w}(t) = Bw(t) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \tau,$$

$$(52) \quad w(0) = (Uu)(0) - \psi \in \mathbb{V}_-^1.$$

Notice that this is in the precise form of the reversed Cauchy problem 2.5 and the initial condition in (52) truly belongs to  $\mathbb{V}_-^1$  by design. Hence, theorem 3.4 implies that  $w(t) = R(t)((Uu)(0) - \psi)$ . Since (51) is satisfied in a strong sense at  $t = \tau$ , then it follows from theorem 4.5 that

$$(53) \quad \|w(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^1} \leq \frac{l}{c\beta} \|\dot{w}(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}.$$

Notice also that  $(v+w)$  and  $(Uu)$  solve the same initial boundary value problem (42)-(44). By uniqueness then  $w = Uu - v$  for all  $t \in [0, \tau]$ , in particular if we apply  $U$  and evaluate at  $t = 0$  we obtain  $(Uw)(0) = u_0 - G\Lambda u_0$ . We have used the definition of  $G$  given in (50). Then we obtain that  $Qu_0 = (Uw)(0)$ . Therefore, the following estimates hold

$$\begin{aligned} \|Qu_0\|_{\mathbb{V}^1} &= \|(Uw)(0)\|_{\mathbb{V}^1} = \|w(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^1} \leq \frac{l}{c\beta} \|\dot{w}(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} = \frac{l}{c\beta} \|Bw(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \\ &= \frac{l}{c\beta} \|BR(\tau)((Uu)(0) - \psi)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} = \frac{l}{c\beta} \|R(\tau)B((Uu)(0) - \psi)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \\ &= \frac{l}{c\beta} \|R(\tau)B(Uu)(0)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \leq \frac{l}{c\beta} \|R(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \|B\| \|(Uu)(0)\|_{\mathbb{V}^1} \\ &= \frac{l}{c\beta} \|R(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \|B\| \|u(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^1} = \frac{l}{c\beta} \|R(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \|B\| \|S(\tau)u_0\|_{\mathbb{V}^1} \\ &\leq \frac{l}{c\beta} \|R(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \|B\| \frac{l}{c\beta} \|S(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \|A\| \|u_0\|_{\mathbb{V}^1}. \end{aligned}$$

We have used the norm-preserving properties of the reflection  $U$ . The estimate (53) was used in the second inequality and the constant  $\beta$  is defined in lemma 4.4. Recall that  $B\psi = 0$  from (45). We have also used the fact that a semigroup commutes with its generator when acting on the domain of the generator. In other words,  $R(t)Bv = BR(t)v$  for all  $v \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$ . The boundedness of  $S(t)$  and  $R(t)$  was obtained in theorem 3.4 as maps on  $\mathbb{V}^0$ , and in Corollary 4.6 as maps on  $\mathbb{V}_-^1$ . Finally, it is clear that  $A : \mathbb{V}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  and  $B : \mathbb{V}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  are bounded with  $\|A\| = \|B\| \leq c(l^{-1} + \bar{\mu}_a + 2\bar{\mu}_s)$ . Hence we obtain the following estimate,

$$\|Qu_0\|_{\mathbb{V}^1} \leq \left( \frac{1 + l(\bar{\mu}_a + 2\bar{\mu}_s)}{\beta} \right)^2 \|R(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \|S(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \|u_0\|_{\mathbb{V}^1}$$

Now the stability estimate from proposition 3.5 implies that both  $\|S(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}$  and  $\|R(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}$  decay exponentially fast as  $\tau$  increases. Therefore, there exists a finite time  $\tau$  such that  $Q : \mathbb{V}_-^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}_-^1$  is a contraction mapping and the desired results follow from the Neumann series theorem.  $\square$

We point that theorem 5.1 directly implies the validity of the first main result expressed as theorem 2.7. Notice that the choice of  $\psi$  in (48) as the solution of the reverse stationary problem (45)-(46) was crucial in order to stay within the formulation of the space  $\mathbb{V}^1$  and to obtain the estimate on the norm of  $Q$ . These two facts follow from the following two properties:

- $\psi$  conforms to the boundary data  $(U\Lambda u_0)(t)$  at  $t = 0$ , and
- $\psi$  belongs to the null space of the generator  $B$ .

From the well-posedness of the reversed stationary problem 4.2, we see that the above two properties determine  $\psi$  uniquely within the space  $\mathbb{V}^1$ .

Now to conclude this section, we wish to mention that the time reversal operator  $G$  from (50) can be modified to obtain a bounded operator  $G : L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+) \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$ . This is accomplished using the concepts of mild solutions and generalized traces as in [34, Section 2], [4, Section 14.4] or Cessenat [37, 36]. In fact, the measurement operator  $\Lambda$  from (13) can be boundedly extended to  $\Lambda : \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)$  as shown in the proof of theorem 2.9 in Section 6. However, it would no longer make sense to speak of measured boundary data  $(U\Lambda u_0)(t)$  at time  $t = 0$ . Hence, the function  $\psi$  and the operator  $G$  have to be modified as follows. We let  $v \in C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^0)$  be the mild solution of (47)-(49) with  $\psi \equiv 0$  and  $h \in L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)$ . Then, we can obtain (following steps analogous to those in the proof of theorem 5.1) an estimate on the norm of  $Q : \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$ ,

$$\|Qu_0\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \leq \|R(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \|S(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \|u_0\|_{\mathbb{V}^0}, \quad \text{for all } u_0 \in \mathbb{V}^0.$$

In view of proposition 3.5, we see that there exists  $\tau < \infty$  such that  $Q : \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  is a contraction mapping and the conclusion of theorem 5.1 is valid with convergence in the  $\mathbb{V}^0$ -norm for initial condition  $u_0 \in \mathbb{V}^0$ . Finally, we also have that the conclusion of theorem 2.7 is also valid in a generalized sense, meaning that

$$(54) \quad \|u_0\|_{\mathbb{V}^0} \leq C \|\Lambda u_0\|_{L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)} \quad \text{for all } u_0 \in \mathbb{V}^0,$$

for some positive constant  $C = C(\bar{\mu}_a, \bar{\mu}_s, l)$ .

## 6. THE CONTROL PROBLEM

In this section, we develop the proof of our main result concerning the exact controllability problem the radiative transport. It is well-known in control theory that exact controllability in a Hilbert space setting is equivalent to the continuous observability property for the so-called adjoint problem. In turn, observability is obtained from the solvability of the inverse problem which we have already established in Section 5. The relation between these concepts is made precise using duality arguments which we proceed to describe.

We will need the following *angular-reflection* operator  $V : \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  defined by

$$(55) \quad (Vw)(x, \theta) = w(x, -\theta),$$

which is clearly unitary.

*Proof of theorem 2.9.* We wish to construct the adjoint of the measurement operator  $\Lambda$  defined in (13) viewed for now as a densely defined operator  $\Lambda : \mathbb{V}_-^1 \subset \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)$ . First, let  $u_0 \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$  be arbitrary and  $u \in C^1([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^0) \cap C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}_-^1)$  be the unique solution of the problem (38)-(39) with  $u_0$  as initial condition. Hence we have that  $\gamma_+ u = \Lambda u_0$ .

Now let  $h \in L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)$  be arbitrary, and  $\{h_k\}_{k \geq 1} \subset C^1([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)$  be a sequence converging to  $h$  in the  $L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)$ -norm. For each  $h_k$  let  $v_k \in C^1([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^0) \cap C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{V}^1)$  be the strong solution of the problem (14)-(16). Hence,  $v_k(\tau) = \Upsilon h_k$  where  $\Upsilon : L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+) \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^0$  is bounded as defined in (17).

Recall the reflector operator from (40) and notice that  $\phi = Uu$  solves

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\phi}(t) &= B\phi(t) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \tau, \\ \phi(\tau) &= (Uu)(\tau), \\ \gamma_+ \phi(t) &= 0 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \tau. \end{aligned}$$



Now integrate  $0 = (\dot{v}_k - Av_k)\phi$  over the domain  $[0, \tau] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{S}$  and use integration-by-parts to obtain  $\langle v_k(\tau), \phi(\tau) \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^0} - \langle v_k(0), \phi(0) \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^0} = \langle v_k, \phi \rangle_{L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_-)} - \langle v_k, \phi \rangle_{L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)}$ . Recall that  $v_k(\tau) = \Upsilon h_k$ ,  $v_k(0) = 0$ ,  $\gamma_- v_k = h_k$ ,  $\gamma_+ \phi = 0$ , and  $\gamma_- \phi = \gamma_- Uu = U\gamma_+ u = U\Lambda u_0$ . Also notice that  $\phi(\tau) = Vu_0$ . It follows that  $\langle \Upsilon h_k, Vu_0 \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^0} = \langle h_k, U\Lambda u_0 \rangle_{L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_-)}$ . Recall that  $\Upsilon$  is bounded, so after taking the limit  $k \rightarrow \infty$  we obtain

$$\langle \Upsilon h, Vu_0 \rangle_{\mathbb{V}^0} = \langle h, U\Lambda u_0 \rangle_{L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_-)}, \quad \text{for all } h \in L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+) \text{ and } u_0 \in \mathbb{V}_-^1$$

where  $U$  and  $V$  are the reflector operators defined in (40) and (55), respectively. Because  $V = V^* = V^{-1}$  and  $U = U^* = U^{-1}$ , we find that

$$(56) \quad \Lambda^* = V\Upsilon U$$

Since  $V$ ,  $\Upsilon$  and  $U$  are bounded operators then so is  $\Lambda^*$  and consequently  $\Lambda$  can be boundedly extended to  $\Lambda : \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)$ . We have already used this extension in Section 5 to obtain (54). This means that  $\Lambda : \mathbb{V}^0 \rightarrow L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_+)$  is injective and it has a closed range. Because  $\Upsilon^* = U\Lambda V$ , with  $U$  and  $V$  being boundedly invertible, it follows from the closed range theorem that both  $range(\Upsilon^*) \subset L^2([0, \tau]; \mathbb{T}_-)$  and  $range(\Upsilon) \subset \mathbb{V}^0$  are closed.

The exact controllability problem 2.8 reduces to showing the surjectivity of the control operator  $\Upsilon$ . Since  $range(\Upsilon)$  is closed in  $\mathbb{V}^0$ , then basic duality theory tells us that  $range(\Upsilon) = null(\Upsilon^*)^\perp = null(U\Lambda V)^\perp$ . Now, we know that  $U$  and  $V$  are isometries and  $\Lambda$  is injective. Hence  $range(\Upsilon) = \mathbb{V}^0$ , which establishes the exact boundary controllability of the transport field. Moreover, from pseudo-inverse theory for Hilbert spaces [45], we obtain the minimum-norm control given by  $h_{\min} = \Upsilon^*(\Upsilon\Upsilon^*)^{-1}v_*$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to sincerely thank his collaborators, Liliana Borcea and Ricardo Alonso, for fruitful discussions and for carefully reading the manuscript of this paper. The author also wishes to thank Guillaume Bal for his helpful suggestions given during the *Coupled Physics Inverse Problems* workshop at the CMM, Universidad de Chile, January 2013.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Kenneth M. Case and P. F. Zweifel. *Linear transport theory*. Addison-Wesley series in nuclear engineering. Reading, Mass., Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1967.
- [2] Robert Dautray and J.-L. Lions. *Mathematical analysis and numerical methods for science and technology*, volume 6. Berlin ; New York : Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [3] V. I. Agoshkov. *Boundary value problems for transport equations*. Modeling and simulation in science, engineering & technology. Boston : Birkhäuser Boston, 1998.
- [4] M. Mokhtar-Kharroubi. *Mathematical topics in neutron transport theory : new aspects.*, volume 46 of *Series on advances in mathematics for applied sciences*. Singapore : World Scientific, 1997.
- [5] Carlo Cercignani and Ester Gabetta, editors. *Transport phenomena and kinetic theory : applications to gases, semiconductors, photons, and biological systems*. Modeling and simulation in science, engineering & technology. Boston : Birkhäuser, 2007.
- [6] Lihong V. Wang and Hsin-I. Wu. *Biomedical optics : principles and imaging*. Hoboken, N.J. : Wiley-Interscience, 2007.
- [7] S. R. Arridge. Optical tomography in medical imaging. *Inverse Problems*, 15:R41–R93, 1999.
- [8] A. P. Gibson, J. C. Hebden, and S. R. Arridge. Recent advances in diffuse optical imaging. *Phys. Med. Biol.*, 50(4):R1–R43, February 2005.
- [9] Arnold D Kim and Miguel Moscoso. Radiative transport theory for optical molecular imaging. *Inverse Problems*, 22(1):23–42, 2006.

- [10] G. Bal. Inverse transport theory and applications. *Inverse Problems*, 25:053001, 2009.
- [11] Kui Ren. Recent developments in numerical techniques for transport-based medical imaging methods. *Commun. Comput. Phys.*, 8(1):1–50, 2010.
- [12] Leonid Ryzhik, George Papanicolaou, and Joseph B. Keller. Transport equations for elastic and other waves in random media. *Wave Motion*, 24:327–370, 1996.
- [13] Liliana Borcea, Leila Issa, and Chrysoula Tsogka. Source localization in random acoustic waveguides. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 8(5):1981–2022, 2010.
- [14] J. P. Fouque, J. Garnier, G. Papanicolaou, and K. Solna. *Wave propagation and time reversal in randomly layered media*, volume 56 of *Stochastic modelling and applied probability*. New York : Springer, 2007.
- [15] Guillaume Bal, George Papanicolaou, and Leonid Ryzhik. Radiative transport limit for the random Schrödinger equation. *Nonlinearity*, 15:513–529, 2002.
- [16] Josselin Garnier and George Papanicolaou. Pulse propagation and time reversal in random waveguides. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 67(6):1718–1739, 2007.
- [17] Josselin Garnier and Knut Solna. Effective transport equations and enhanced backscattering in random waveguides. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 68(6):1574–1599, 2008.
- [18] Guillaume Bal, Tomasz Komorowski, and Lenya Ryzhik. Kinetic limits for waves in random medium. *Kinetic and Related Models*, 3(4):529–644, 2010.
- [19] Guillaume Bal and Kui Ren. Transport-based imaging in random media. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 68(6):1738–1762, 2008.
- [20] Guillaume Bal and Olivier Pinaud. Kinetic models for imaging in random media. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 6(3):792–819, 2007.
- [21] Guillaume Bal and Olivier Pinaud. Imaging using transport models for wave-wave correlations. *Mathematical Models & Methods in Applied Sciences*, 21(5):1071–1093, 2011.
- [22] Jani Lukkarinen and Herbert Spohn. Kinetic limit of wave propagation in a random medium. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 183:93–162, 2007.
- [23] G. Bal and A. Tamasan. Inverse source problems in transport equations. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 39(1):57–76, 2007.
- [24] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. An inverse source problem in optical molecular imaging. *Analysis & PDE*, 1(1):115–126, 2008.
- [25] Mark Hubenthal. An inverse source problem in radiative transfer with partial data. *Inverse Problems*, 27(12):125009, 2011.
- [26] Edward W. Larsen. The inverse source problem in radiative transfer. *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transfer*, 15(1):1–5, 1975.
- [27] C. E. Siewert. An inverse source problem in radiative transfer. *Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy & Radiative Transfer*, 50(6):603–609, 1993.
- [28] I. Lasiecka and R. Triggiani. *Control theory for partial differential equations : continuous and approximation theories*. Encyclopedia of mathematics and its applications: 74-75. Cambridge ; New York : Cambridge University Press., 2000.
- [29] Enrique Zuazua. Controllability and observability of partial differential equations: Some results and open problems. In C.M. Dafermos and E. Feireisl, editors, *Handbook of Differential Equations: Evolutionary Equations*, volume 3, pages 527 – 621. North-Holland, 2007.
- [30] J. L. Lions. Exact controllability, stabilization and perturbations for distributed systems. *SIAM Review*, 30(1):1–68, 1988.
- [31] A. V. Fursikov. *Optimal control of distributed systems : theory and applications*, volume 187 of *Translations of mathematical monographs*. Providence, R.I. : American Mathematical Society, 2000.
- [32] Claude Bardos, Gilles Lebeau, and Jeffrey Rauch. Sharp sufficient conditions for the observation, control, and stabilization of waves from the boundary. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 30(5):1024–1065, September 1992.
- [33] M. M. Eller and J. E. Masters. Exact boundary controllability of electromagnetic fields in a general region. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 45:99–123, January 2002.
- [34] Michael V. Klibanov and Masahiro Yamamoto. Exact controllability for the time dependent transport equation. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 46(6):2071–2195, 2007.

- [35] David M. Shepard, Michael C. Ferris, Gustavo H. Olivera, and T. Rockwell Mackie. Optimizing the delivery of radiation therapy to cancer patients. *SIAM Review*, 41(4):721–744, 1999.
- [36] M. Cessenat. Théorèmes de trace pour des espaces de fonctions de la neutronique. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Série I*, 300:89–92, 1985.
- [37] M. Cessenat. Théorèmes de trace  $L^p$  pour des espaces de fonctions de la neutronique. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Série I*, 299:831–834, 1984.
- [38] H. Egger and M. Schlottbom. A mixed variational framework for the radiative transfer equation. *Mathematical Models & Methods in Applied Sciences*, 22(3):1150014, 2012.
- [39] Thomas A. Manteuffel, Klaus J. Ressel, and Gerhard Starke. A boundary functional for the least-squares finite-element solution of neutron transport problems. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 37(2):556–586, 2000.
- [40] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. Thermoacoustic tomography with variable sound speed. *Inverse Problems*, 25:075011, 2009.
- [41] Klaus-Jochen Engel and Rainer Nagel. *One-parameter semigroups for linear evolution equations*, volume 194 of *Graduate texts in mathematics*. New York : Springer, 2000.
- [42] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*, volume 44 of *Applied mathematical sciences*. New York : Springer-Verlag, 1983.
- [43] Claude Bardos. Problèmes aux limites pour les équations aux dérivées partielles du premier ordre à coefficients réels; théorèmes d’approximation; applications à l’équations de transport. *Ann. Sci. École. Norm. Sup.*, 3(2):185–233, 1970.
- [44] I. Babuška. Error-bounds for finite element method. *Numer. Math.*, 16(4):322–333, 1971.
- [45] F. Deutsch. *Best approximations in inner product spaces*. CMS books in mathematics: 7. New York : Springer, 2001.

COMPUTATIONAL AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, RICE UNIVERSITY, HOUSTON, TX 77005  
*E-mail address:* `sebastian.acosta@rice.edu`