

Als Typoskript gedruckt

Technische Universität Dresden

Herausgeber: Der Rektor

**On a class of block operator matrices in
system theory.**

Sascha Trostorff
Institut für Analysis
MATH-AN-01-2015

arXiv:1502.05496v1 [math.FA] 19 Feb 2015

On a class of block operator matrices in system theory.

Sascha Trostorff

Institut für Analysis, Fachrichtung Mathematik

Technische Universität Dresden

Germany

sascha.trostorff@tu-dresden.de

April 29, 2018

Abstract. We consider a class of block operator matrices arising in the study of scattering passive systems, especially in the context of boundary control problems. We prove that these block operator matrices are indeed a subclass of block operator matrices considered in [Trostorff: A characterization of boundary conditions yielding maximal monotone operators. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 267(8): 2787–2822, 2014], which can be characterized in terms of an associated boundary relation.

Keywords and phrases: Maximal monotone operators, boundary data spaces, selfadjoint relations

Mathematics subject classification 2010: 47N20, 47B44, 93A30

Contents

1	Introduction	5
2	Preliminaries	5
2.1	Maximal monotone relations	5
2.2	Boundary data spaces and a class of maximal monotone block operator matrices	7
2.3	A class of block operator matrices in system theory	9
3	Main result	9

1 Introduction

Following [5], a natural class of C_0 -semigroup generators $-A$ arising in the context of scattering passive systems in system theory, can be described as a block operator matrix of the following form: Let E_0, E, H, U be Hilbert spaces with $E_0 \subseteq E$ dense and continuous and let $L \in L(E_0, H)$, $K \in L(E_0, U)$. Moreover, denote by $L^\diamond \in L(H, E'_0)$ and $K^\diamond \in L(U, E'_0)$ the dual operators of L and K , respectively, where we identify H and U with their dual spaces. Then A is a restriction of $\begin{pmatrix} K^\diamond K & -L^\diamond \\ L & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ with domain

$$\mathcal{D}(A) := \{(u, w) \in E_0 \times H \mid K^\diamond K u - L^\diamond w \in E\}, \quad (1)$$

where we consider $E \cong E'$ as a subspace of E'_0 . It is proved in [5, Theorem 1.4] that for such operator matrices A , the operator $-A$ generates a contractive C_0 -semigroup on $E \oplus H$ and a so-called scattering passive system, containing $-A$ as the generator of the corresponding system node, is considered (see [4] for the notion of system nodes and scattering passive systems). This class of semigroup generators were particularly used to study boundary control systems, see e.g. [8, 9, 7]. In these cases, L is a suitable realization of a differential operator and K is a trace operator associated with L . More precisely, $G_0 \subseteq L \subseteq G$, where G_0 and G are both densely defined closed linear operators, such that $K|_{\mathcal{D}(G_0)} = 0$ (as a typical example take G_0 and G as the realizations of the gradient on $L_2(\Omega)$ for some open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathcal{D}(G_0) = H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{D}(G) = H^1(\Omega)$). It turns out that in this situation, the operator A is a restriction of the operator matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & D \\ G & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, where $D := -(G_0)^*$ (see Lemma 3.1 below). Such restrictions were considered by the author in [6], where it was shown that such (also nonlinear) restrictions are maximal monotone (a hence, $-A$ generates a possibly nonlinear contraction semigroup), if and only if an associated boundary relation on the so-called boundary data space of G is maximal monotone.

In this note, we characterize the class of boundary relations, such that the corresponding operator A satisfies (1) for some Hilbert spaces E_0, U and operators $L \in L(E_0, H)$, $K \in L(E_0, U)$. We hope that this result yields a better understanding of the semigroup generators used in boundary control systems and provides a possible way to generalize known system-theoretical results to a class of nonlinear problems.

The article is structured as follows. In Section 2 we recall the basic notion of maximal monotone relations, we state the characterization result of [6] and introduce the class of block operator matrices considered in [5]. Section 3 is devoted to the main result (Theorem 3.2) and its proof.

Throughout, every Hilbert space is assumed to be complex, its inner product $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ is linear in the second and conjugate linear in the first argument and the induced norm is denoted by $|\cdot|$.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Maximal monotone relations

In this section we introduce the basic notions for maximal monotone relations. Throughout let H be a Hilbert space.

Definition. Let $C \subseteq H \oplus H$. We call C *linear*, if C is a linear subspace of $H \oplus H$. Moreover, we define for $M, N \subseteq H$ the *pre-set of M under C* by

$$[M]C := \{x \in H \mid \exists y \in M : (x, y) \in C\}$$

and the *post-set of N under C* by

$$C[N] := \{y \in H \mid \exists x \in N : (x, y) \in C\}.$$

The *inverse relation C^{-1}* of C is defined by

$$C^{-1} := \{(v, u) \in H \oplus H \mid (u, v) \in C\}.$$

A relation C is called *monotone*, if for each $(x, y), (u, v) \in C$:

$$\Re\langle x - u \mid y - v \rangle \geq 0.$$

A monotone relation C is called *maximal monotone*, if for each monotone relation $B \subseteq H \oplus H$ with $C \subseteq B$ we have $C = B$. Moreover, we define the *adjoint relation $C^* \subseteq H \oplus H$* of C by

$$C^* := \{(v, -u) \in H \oplus H \mid (u, v) \in C\}^\perp,$$

where the orthogonal complement is taken in $H \oplus H$. A relation C is called *selfadjoint*, if $C = C^*$.

Remark 2.1.

(a) A pair $(x, y) \in H \oplus H$ belongs to C^* if and only if for each $(u, v) \in C$ we have

$$\langle v \mid x \rangle_H = \langle u \mid y \rangle_H.$$

Thus, the definition of C^* coincides with the usual definition of the adjoint operator for a densely defined linear operator $C : \mathcal{D}(C) \subseteq H \rightarrow H$.

(b) Note that a selfadjoint relation is linear and closed, since it is an orthogonal complement.

We recall the famous characterization result for maximal monotone relations due to G. Minty.

Theorem 2.2 ([2]). *Let $C \subseteq H \oplus H$ be monotone. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) C is maximal monotone,
- (ii) $\exists \lambda > 0 : (1 + \lambda C)[H] = H$, where $(1 + \lambda C) := \{(u, u + \lambda v) \mid (u, v) \in C\}$,
- (iii) $\forall \lambda > 0 : (1 + \lambda C)[H] = H$.

Remark 2.3.

(a) We note that for a monotone relation $C \subseteq H \oplus H$ the relations $(1 + \lambda C)^{-1}$ for $\lambda > 0$ are Lipschitz-continuous mappings with best Lipschitz-constant less than or equal to 1. By the latter Theorem, maximal monotone relations are precisely those monotone relations, where $(1 + \lambda C)^{-1}$ for $\lambda > 0$ is defined on the whole Hilbert space H .

- (b) If $C \subseteq H \oplus H$ is closed and linear, then C is maximal monotone if and only if C and C^* are monotone. Indeed, if C is maximal monotone, then $(1 + \lambda C)^{-1} \in L(H)$ for each $\lambda > 0$ with $\sup_{\lambda > 0} \|(1 + \lambda C)^{-1}\| \leq 1$. Hence, $(1 + \lambda C^*)^{-1} = \left((1 + \lambda C)^{-1} \right)^* \in L(H)$ for each $\lambda > 0$ with $\sup_{\lambda > 0} \|(1 + \lambda C^*)^{-1}\| \leq 1$. The latter gives for each $(x, y) \in C^*$ and $\lambda > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} |x + \lambda y|_H^2 &= |x|_H^2 + 2\Re \lambda \langle x|y \rangle_H + \lambda^2 |y|_H^2 \\ &= |(1 + \lambda C^*)^{-1}(x + \lambda y)|_H^2 + 2\Re \lambda \langle x|y \rangle_H + \lambda^2 |y|_H^2 \\ &\leq |x + \lambda y|_H^2 + 2\Re \lambda \langle x|y \rangle_H + \lambda^2 |y|_H^2 \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$-\frac{\lambda}{2}|y|^2 \leq \Re \langle x|y \rangle_H.$$

Letting λ tend to 0, we obtain the monotonicity of C^* . If on the other hand C and C^* are monotone, we have that $[\{0\}](1 + \lambda C^*) = \{0\}$ for each $\lambda > 0$ and thus, $\overline{[H]}(1 + \lambda C)^{-1} = (1 + \lambda C)[H] = ([\{0\}](1 + \lambda C^*))^\perp = H$. Since, moreover $(1 + \lambda C)^{-1}$ is closed and Lipschitz-continuous due to the monotonicity of C , we obtain that $[H](1 + \lambda C)^{-1}$ is closed, from which we derive the maximal monotonicity by Theorem 2.2.

2.2 Boundary data spaces and a class of maximal monotone block operator matrices

In this section we will recall the main result of [6]. For doing so, we need the following definitions. Throughout, let E, H be Hilbert spaces and $G_0 : \mathcal{D}(G_0) \subseteq E \rightarrow H$ and $D_0 : \mathcal{D}(D_0) \subseteq H \rightarrow E$ be two densely defined closed linear operators satisfying

$$G_0 \subseteq -(D_0)^*.$$

We set $G := (-D_0)^* \supseteq G_0$ and $D := -(G_0)^* \supseteq D_0$, which are both densely defined closed linear operators.

Example 2.4. As a guiding example we consider the following operators. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ open and define G_0 as the closure of the operator

$$\begin{aligned} C_c^\infty(\Omega) \subseteq L_2(\Omega) &\rightarrow L_2(\Omega)^n \\ \phi &\mapsto (\partial_i \phi)_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ denotes the set of infinitely differentiable functions compactly supported in Ω . Moreover, let D_0 be the closure of

$$\begin{aligned} C_c^\infty(\Omega) \subseteq L_2(\Omega)^n &\rightarrow L_2(\Omega) \\ (\phi_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} &\mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_i \phi_i. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by integration by parts, we obtain $G_0 \subseteq -(D_0)^*$. Moreover, we have that $G : \mathcal{D}(G) \subseteq L_2(\Omega) \rightarrow L_2(\Omega)^n$, $u \mapsto \text{grad } u$ with $\mathcal{D}(G) = H^1(\Omega)$ as well as $D : \mathcal{D}(D) \subseteq L_2(\Omega)^n \rightarrow L_2(\Omega)$, $v \mapsto \text{div } v$ with $\mathcal{D}(D) = \{v \in L_2(\Omega)^n \mid \text{div } v \in L_2(\Omega)\}$, where $\text{grad } u$ and $\text{div } v$ are meant in the sense of distributions. We remark that in case of a smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ of

Ω , elements $u \in \mathcal{D}(G_0) = H_0^1(\Omega)$ are satisfying $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and elements $v \in \mathcal{D}(D_0)$ are satisfying $v \cdot n = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, where n denotes the unit outward normal vector field. Thus, G_0 and D_0 are the gradient and divergence with vanishing boundary conditions, while G and D are the gradient and divergence without any boundary condition. In the same way one might treat the case of $G_0 = \text{curl}_0$, the rotation of vectorfields with vanishing tangential component and $G = \text{curl}$. Note that then $D_0 = -\text{curl}_0$ and $D = -\text{curl}$.

As the previous example illustrates, we want to interpret G_0 and D_0 as abstract differential operators with vanishing boundary conditions, while G and D are the respective differential operators without any boundary condition. This motivates the following definition.

Definition. We define the spaces¹

$$\mathcal{BD}(G) := (\mathcal{D}(G_0))^{\perp_{\mathcal{D}_G}}, \quad \mathcal{BD}(D) := (\mathcal{D}(D_0))^{\perp_{\mathcal{D}_D}},$$

where the orthogonal complements are taken in \mathcal{D}_G and \mathcal{D}_D , respectively. We call $\mathcal{BD}(G)$ and $\mathcal{BD}(D)$ *abstract boundary data spaces associated with G and D* , respectively. Consequently, we can decompose $\mathcal{D}_G = \mathcal{D}_{G_0} \oplus \mathcal{BD}(G)$ and $\mathcal{D}_D = \mathcal{D}_{D_0} \oplus \mathcal{BD}(D)$. We denote by $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} : \mathcal{D}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{BD}(G)$ and by $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)} : \mathcal{D}_D \rightarrow \mathcal{BD}(D)$ the corresponding orthogonal projections. In consequence, $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* : \mathcal{BD}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_G$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* : \mathcal{BD}(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_D$ are the canonical embeddings and we set $P_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} := \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} : \mathcal{D}_G \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_G$ as well as $P_{\mathcal{BD}(D)} := \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)} : \mathcal{D}_D \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_D$. An easy computation gives

$$\mathcal{BD}(G) = [\{0\}](1 - DG), \quad \mathcal{BD}(D) = [\{0\}](1 - GD)$$

and thus, $G[\mathcal{BD}(G)] \subseteq \mathcal{BD}(D)$ as well as $D[\mathcal{BD}(D)] \subseteq \mathcal{BD}(G)$. We set

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{G} : \mathcal{BD}(G) &\rightarrow \mathcal{BD}(D), x \mapsto Gx \\ \dot{D} : \mathcal{BD}(D) &\rightarrow \mathcal{BD}(G), x \mapsto Dx \end{aligned}$$

and observe that both are unitary operators satisfying $(\dot{G})^* = \dot{D}$ (see [3, Section 5.2] for details).

Having these notions at hand, we are ready to state the main result of [6].

Theorem 2.5 ([6, Theorem 3.1]). *Let G_0, D_0, G and D be as above and let*

$$A \subseteq \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D \\ G & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{D}(A) \subseteq H_0 \oplus H_1 \rightarrow H_0 \oplus H_1$$

be a (possibly nonlinear) restriction of $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & D \\ G & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{D}(G) \times \mathcal{D}(D) \subseteq H_0 \oplus H_1 \rightarrow H_0 \oplus H_1, (u, w) \mapsto (Dw, Gu)$. Then A is maximal monotone, if and only if there exists a maximal monotone relation $h \subseteq \mathcal{BD}(G) \oplus \mathcal{BD}(D)$ such that

$$\mathcal{D}(A) = \left\{ (u, w) \in \mathcal{D}(G) \times \mathcal{D}(D) \mid \left(\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} u, \dot{D} \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)} w \right) \in h \right\}.$$

We call h the boundary relation associated with A .

¹For a closed linear operator C we denote by \mathcal{D}_C its domain, equipped with the graph-norm of C .

2.3 A class of block operator matrices in system theory

In [5] the following class of block operator matrices is considered: Let E, E_0, H, U be Hilbert spaces such that $E_0 \subseteq E$ with dense and continuous embedding. Moreover, let $L \in L(E_0, H)$ and $K \in L(E_0, U)$ such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} L \\ K \end{pmatrix} : E_0 \subseteq E \rightarrow H \oplus U$$

is closed. This assumption particularly yields that the norm on E_0 is equivalent to the graph norm of $\begin{pmatrix} L \\ K \end{pmatrix}$. We define $L^\diamond \in L(H, E'_0)$ and $K^\diamond \in L(U, E'_0)$ by $(L^\diamond x)(w) := \langle x | Lw \rangle_H$ and $(K^\diamond u)(w) := \langle u | Kw \rangle_U$ for $x \in H, w \in E_0, u \in U$ and consider the following operator

$$A \subseteq \begin{pmatrix} K^\diamond K & -L^\diamond \\ L & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{D}(A) \subseteq E \oplus H \rightarrow E \oplus H \quad (2)$$

with $\mathcal{D}(A) := \{(u, w) \in E_0 \times H \mid K^\diamond K u - L^\diamond w \in E\}$, where we consider $E \cong E' \subseteq E'_0$ as a subspace of E'_0 . We recall the following result from [5], which we present in a slight different formulation².

Theorem 2.6 ([5, Theorem 1.4]). *The operator A defined above is maximal monotone.*

Remark 2.7. We remark that in [5, Theorem 1.4] the operator $-A$ is considered and it is proved that $-A$ is the generator of a contraction semigroup.

We note that operators of the form (2) were applied to discuss boundary control problems. For instance in [9, 7] the setting was used to study the wave equation with boundary control on a smooth domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. In this case the operator L was a suitable realization of the gradient on $L_2(\Omega)$ and K was the Dirichlet trace operator. More recently, Maxwell's equations on a smooth domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ with boundary control were studied within this setting (see [8]). In this case L was a suitable realization of curl, while K was the trace operator mapping elements in $\mathcal{D}(L)$ to their tangential component on the boundary.

In both cases, there exist two closed operators $G_0 : \mathcal{D}(G_0) \subseteq E \rightarrow H$, $D_0 : \mathcal{D}(D_0) \subseteq H \rightarrow E$ with $G_0 \subseteq -(D_0)^* =: G$ such that $G_0 \subseteq L \subseteq G$ and $K|_{\mathcal{D}(G_0)} = 0$ (cp. Example 2.4). It is the purpose of this paper to show how the operators A in (2) and in Theorem 2.5 are related in this case.

3 Main result

Let E, H be Hilbert spaces and $G_0 : \mathcal{D}(G_0) \subseteq E \rightarrow H$ and $D_0 : \mathcal{D}(D_0) \subseteq H \rightarrow E$ be densely defined closed linear operators with $G_0 \subseteq -(D_0)^* =: G$ and $D_0 \subseteq -(G_0)^* =: D$.

Hypothesis. We say that two Hilbert spaces E_0, U and two operators $L \in L(E_0, H)$ and $K \in L(E_0, U)$ satisfy the hypothesis, if

- (a) $E_0 \subseteq E$ dense and continuous.

²We note that in [5] an additional operator $G \in L(E_0, E'_0)$ is incorporated in A , which we will omit for simplicity.

(b) $\begin{pmatrix} L \\ K \end{pmatrix} : E_0 \subseteq E \rightarrow H \oplus U$ is closed.

(c) $G_0 \subseteq L \subseteq G$ and $K|_{\mathcal{D}(G_0)} = 0$.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that E_0, U and L, K satisfy the hypothesis. Let $(u, w) \in E_0 \times H$ such that $K^\diamond K u - L^\diamond w \in E$. Then $w \in \mathcal{D}(D)$ and $Dw = K^\diamond K u - L^\diamond w$.*

Proof. For $v \in \mathcal{D}(G_0)$ we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w | G_c v \rangle_H &= \langle w | L v \rangle_H \\ &= (L^\diamond w)(v) \\ &= (-K^\diamond K u + L^\diamond w)(v) + (K^\diamond K u)(v) \\ &= \langle -K^\diamond K u + L^\diamond w | v \rangle_E + \langle K u | K v \rangle_U \\ &= \langle -K^\diamond K u + L^\diamond w | v \rangle_E, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $G_0 \subseteq L$ and $K v = 0$. The latter gives $w \in \mathcal{D}(G_0^*) = \mathcal{D}(D)$ and $Dw = -G_0^* w = K^\diamond K u - L^\diamond w$. \square

The latter lemma shows that if the hypothesis holds and A is given as in (2), then A is a restriction of $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & D \\ G & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, which, by Theorem 2.6, is maximal monotone. However, such restrictions are completely characterized by their associated boundary relation (see Theorem 2.5). The question, which now arises is: can we characterize those boundary relations, allowing to represent A as in (2)? The answer gives the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $A \subseteq \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D \\ G & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(i) *There exist Hilbert spaces E_0, U and operators $L \in L(E_0, H)$, $K \in L(E_0, U)$ satisfying the hypothesis, such that*

$$\mathcal{D}(A) = \{(u, w) \in E_0 \times H \mid K^\diamond K u - L^\diamond w \in E\}.$$

(ii) *There exists $h \subseteq \mathcal{BD}(G) \oplus \mathcal{BD}(G)$ maximal monotone and selfadjoint, such that*

$$\mathcal{D}(A) = \{(u, w) \in \mathcal{D}(G) \times \mathcal{D}(D) \mid (\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} u, \overset{\bullet}{D} \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)} v) \in h\}.$$

We begin to prove the implication (i) \Rightarrow (ii).

Lemma 3.3. *Assume (i) in Theorem 3.2 and set*

$$h := \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathcal{BD}(G) \oplus \mathcal{BD}(G) \mid \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x \in E_0, K^\diamond K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x - L^\diamond \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} y \in E \right\}.$$

Then $(u, w) \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ if and only if $(u, w) \in \mathcal{D}(G) \times \mathcal{D}(D)$ with $(\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} u, \overset{\bullet}{D} \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)} w) \in h$.

Proof. Let $(u, w) \in \mathcal{D}(A)$. Then we know by Lemma 3.1, that $(u, w) \in \mathcal{D}(G) \times \mathcal{D}(D)$. We decompose $u = u_0 + P_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u$, where $u_0 \in \mathcal{D}(G_0) \subseteq E_0$. Since $u, u_0 \in E_0$ we get that $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} u = P_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} u \in E_0$. In the same way we decompose $w = w_0 + P_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}w$, where $w_0 \in \mathcal{D}(D_0)$. Since

$$(L^\diamond w_0)(z) = \langle w_0 | Lz \rangle_H = \langle w_0 | Gz \rangle_H = \langle -D_c w_0 | z \rangle_E$$

for each $z \in E_0$, we obtain $L^\diamond w = -D_0 w_0 \in E$ and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} K^\diamond K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} u - L^\diamond \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} \overset{\bullet}{D} \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)} w &= K^\diamond K P_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} u - L^\diamond P_{\mathcal{BD}(D)} w \\ &= K^\diamond K (u - u_0) - L^\diamond (w - w_0) \\ &= K^\diamond K u - L^\diamond w - D_c w_0 \in E, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where we have used $\overset{\bullet}{G} \overset{\bullet}{D} = 1$, $K u_0 = 0$ and $(u, w) \in \mathcal{D}(A)$. Thus, we have $(\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} u, \overset{\bullet}{D} \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)} w) \in h$.

Assume now, that $(u, w) \in \mathcal{D}(G) \times \mathcal{D}(D)$ with $(\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} u, \overset{\bullet}{D} \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)} w) \in h$. Since $u_0 := u - P_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} u \in \mathcal{D}(G_0) \subseteq E_0$ and by assumption $P_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} u = \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} u \in E_0$, we infer that $u \in E_0$. Moreover, decomposing $w = w_0 + P_{\mathcal{BD}(D)} w$ with $w_0 \in \mathcal{D}(D_0)$ and using $D_0 w_0 = -L^\diamond w_0$ we derive that

$$K^\diamond K u - L^\diamond w = K^\diamond K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} u - L^\diamond \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} \overset{\bullet}{D} \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)} w + D_c w_0 \in E$$

by (3) and $(\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} u, \overset{\bullet}{D} \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)} w) \in h$. Hence, $(u, w) \in \mathcal{D}(A)$. \square

Although we already know that h in the previous Lemma is maximal monotone by Theorem 2.6 and Theorem 2.5, we will present a proof for this fact, which does not require these Theorems.

Proposition 3.4. *Assume (i) in Theorem 3.2 holds and let $h \subseteq \mathcal{BD}(G) \oplus \mathcal{BD}(G)$ be as in Lemma 3.3. Then h is linear and maximal monotone.*

Proof. The linearity of h is clear due to the linearity of all operators involved. Let now $(x, y) \in h$. Then we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Re \langle x | y \rangle_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} &= \Re \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x | \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* y \rangle_E + \Re \langle G \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x | G \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* y \rangle_E \\ &= \Re \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x | \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* y \rangle_E + \Re \langle L \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x | G \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* y \rangle_E \\ &= \Re \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x | \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* y \rangle_E + \Re \left(L^\diamond G \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* y \right) (\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x) \\ &= \Re \left(L^\diamond \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} y + \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* y \right) (\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x) \\ &= \Re \left(L^\diamond \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} y + \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* y - K^\diamond K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x \right) (\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x) + \\ &\quad + \langle K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x | K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x \rangle_U. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x \in E_0$ and $K^\diamond K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x - L^\diamond \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} y \in E$, we get from Lemma 3.1 $K^\diamond K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x - L^\diamond \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} y = D \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} y = \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* y$, since $\overset{\bullet}{D} \overset{\bullet}{G} = 1$. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Re \langle x|y \rangle_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} &= \Re \left(L^\diamond \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} y + \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* y - K^\diamond K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x \right) (\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x) + \\ &\quad + \langle K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x | K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x \rangle_U. \\ &= \langle K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x | K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x \rangle_U \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the monotonicity of h . To show that h is maximal monotone, it suffices to prove $(1+h)[\mathcal{BD}(G)] = \mathcal{BD}(G)$ by Theorem 2.2. Let $f \in \mathcal{BD}(G)$ and consider the linear functional

$$E_0 \ni x \mapsto \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f | x \rangle_E + \langle G \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f | Lx \rangle_H.$$

This functional is continuous and thus there is $w \in E_0$ with³

$$\forall x \in E_0 : \langle w | x \rangle_E + \langle Lw | Lx \rangle_H + \langle Kw | Kx \rangle_U = \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f | x \rangle_E + \langle G \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f | Lx \rangle_H. \quad (4)$$

In particular, for $x \in \mathcal{D}(G_0) \subseteq E_0$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Gw | G_c x \rangle_H &= \langle Lw | Lx \rangle_H \\ &= \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f | x \rangle_E + \langle G \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f | Lx \rangle_H - \langle w | x \rangle_E \\ &= \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f | x \rangle_E + \langle G \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f | G_c x \rangle_H - \langle w | x \rangle_E \\ &= \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f | x \rangle_E - \langle DG \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f | x \rangle_E - \langle w | x \rangle_E \\ &= -\langle w | x \rangle_E, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $Kx = 0$ and $DG \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f = \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f$. The latter gives $w \in \mathcal{D}(D)$ and $DGw = w$ or, in other words, $P_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} w = w$. Set $u := \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} w$ and $v = f - u$. It is left to show that $(u, v) \in h$. First, note that $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* u = P_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} w = w \in E_0$. Moreover, we compute for $x \in E_0$ using (4)

$$\begin{aligned} \left(K^\diamond K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* u - L^\diamond \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} v \right) (x) &= \langle K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* u | Kx \rangle_U - \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} v | Lx \rangle_H \\ &= \langle Kw | Kx \rangle_U - \langle G \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f | Lx \rangle_H + \langle G \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* u | Lx \rangle_H \\ &= \langle Kw | Kx \rangle_U - \langle G \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f | Lx \rangle_H + \langle Lw | Lx \rangle_H \\ &= \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f | x \rangle_E - \langle w | x \rangle_E, \end{aligned}$$

which gives $K^\diamond K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* u - L^\diamond \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} v = \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* f - w \in E$. This completes the proof. \square

The only thing, which is left to show is that h is selfadjoint.

Proposition 3.5. *Assume (i) in Theorem 3.2 holds and let $h \subseteq \mathcal{BD}(G) \oplus \mathcal{BD}(G)$ be as in Lemma 3.3. Then h is selfadjoint.*

³Recall that the norm on E_0 is equivalent to the graph norm of $\begin{pmatrix} L \\ K \end{pmatrix}$.

Proof. We note that h^* is monotone, since h is maximal monotone by Proposition 3.4 and Remark 2.3. Thus, due to the maximality of h , it suffices to prove $h \subseteq h^*$. For doing so, let $(u, v), (x, y) \in h$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle y|u \rangle_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} &= \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* y | \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* u \rangle_E + \langle G \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* y | G \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* u \rangle_H \\ &= \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* y | \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* u \rangle_E + \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} y | L \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* u \rangle_H \\ &= \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* y | \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* u \rangle_E + \left(L^\diamond \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} y - K^\diamond K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x \right) (\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* u) + \\ &\quad + \langle K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x | K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* u \rangle_U. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x \in E_0$ and $L^\diamond \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} y - K^\diamond K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x \in E$ we have $L^\diamond \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} y - K^\diamond K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x = -D \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* \overset{\bullet}{G} y = -\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}^* y$ according to Lemma 3.1. Thus,

$$\langle y|u \rangle_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} = \langle K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x | K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* u \rangle_U.$$

Repeating this argumentation and interchanging y and x as well as u and v , we get that

$$\langle v|x \rangle_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} = \langle K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* u | K \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^* x \rangle_U$$

and hence, $\langle y|u \rangle_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} = \langle x|v \rangle_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}$, which implies $h \subseteq h^*$. \square

This completes the proof of (i) \Rightarrow (ii) in Theorem 3.2. To show the converse implication, we need the following well-known result for selfadjoint relations, which for sake of completeness, will be proved.

Theorem 3.6 ([1, Theorem 5.3]). *Let Y be a Hilbert space and $C \subseteq Y \oplus Y$ a selfadjoint relation. Let $U := \overline{[Y]C}$. Then there exists a selfadjoint operator $S : [Y]C \subseteq U \rightarrow U$ such that*

$$C = S \oplus (\{0\} \times U^\perp).$$

Proof. Due to the selfadjointness of C , we have that

$$U = \overline{[Y]C} = \overline{[Y]C^*} = (C[\{0\}])^\perp. \quad (5)$$

We define the relation $S := \{(u, v) \in U \oplus U \mid (u, v) \in C\}$ and prove that S is a mapping. First we note that S is linear as C and U are linear. Thus, it suffices to show that $(0, v) \in S$ for some $v \in U$ implies $v = 0$. Indeed, if $(0, v) \in S$, we have $(0, v) \in C$ and hence, $v \in C[\{0\}] = U^\perp$. Thus, $v \in U \cap U^\perp = \{0\}$ and hence, S is a mapping. Next, we show that $C = S \oplus (\{0\} \times U^\perp)$. First note that $S \subseteq C$ as well as $\{0\} \times U^\perp \subseteq C$ by definition and hence, $S \oplus (\{0\} \times U^\perp) \subseteq C$ due to the linearity of C . Let now $(u, v) \in C$ and decompose $v = v_0 + v_1$ for $v_0 \in U, v_1 \in U^\perp = C[\{0\}]$. Hence, $(0, v_1) \in C$ and $(u, v_0) = (u, v) - (0, v_1) \in C$. Moreover, $u \in U$ by (5) and thus, we derive $(u, v_0) \in S$ and consequently, $(u, v) = (u, v_0) + (0, v_1) \in S \oplus (\{0\} \times U^\perp)$. Finally, we show that S is selfadjoint. Using that $C = S \oplus (\{0\} \times U^\perp)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} (x, y) \in S^* &\Leftrightarrow x, y \in U \wedge \forall (u, v_0) \in S : \langle v_0|x \rangle_U = \langle u|y \rangle_U \\ &\Leftrightarrow x, y \in U \wedge \forall (u, v_0) \in S, v_1 \in U^\perp : \langle v_0 + v_1|x \rangle_Y = \langle v_0|x \rangle_Y = \langle u|y \rangle_Y \\ &\Leftrightarrow x, y \in U \wedge \forall (u, v) \in C : \langle v|x \rangle_Y = \langle u|y \rangle_Y \\ &\Leftrightarrow x, y \in U \wedge (x, y) \in C^* = C \\ &\Leftrightarrow (x, y) \in S, \end{aligned}$$

which gives $S = S^*$, i.e. S is selfadjoint. \square

Remark 3.7. It is obvious that in case of a monotone selfadjoint relation C in the latter theorem, the operator S is monotone, too.

Lemma 3.8. *Assume (ii) in Theorem 3.2 and let $h = S \oplus (\{0\} \times U^\perp)$ with $U := \overline{[\mathcal{BD}(G)]h}$ and $S : [\mathcal{BD}(G)]h \subseteq U \rightarrow U$ selfadjoint. We define the vectorspace*

$$E_0 := \left\{ u \in \mathcal{D}(G) \mid \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u \in \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{S}) \right\} \subseteq E$$

and the operators $L : E_0 \rightarrow H, w \mapsto Gw$ and $K : E_0 \rightarrow U, u \mapsto \sqrt{S}\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u$. Then the operator $\begin{pmatrix} L \\ K \end{pmatrix} : E_0 \subseteq E \rightarrow H \oplus U$ is closed and E_0, U, L and K satisfy the hypothesis, if we equip E_0 with the graph norm of $\begin{pmatrix} L \\ K \end{pmatrix}$.

Proof. Let $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in E_0 such that $w_n \rightarrow w$ in E , $Gw_n = Lw_n \rightarrow v$ in H and $\sqrt{S}\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}w_n = Kw_n \rightarrow z$ in U for some $w \in E, v \in H, z \in U$. Due to the closedness of G we infer that $w \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ and $v = Gw$. Thus, $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to w in \mathcal{D}_G and hence, $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}w_n \rightarrow \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}w$. By the closedness of \sqrt{S} , we get $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}w \in \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{S})$ and $z = \sqrt{S}\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}w$. Thus, $w \in E_0$ and $\begin{pmatrix} L \\ K \end{pmatrix} w = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ z \end{pmatrix}$ and hence, $\begin{pmatrix} L \\ K \end{pmatrix}$ is closed. Thus, E_0 equipped with the graph norm of $\begin{pmatrix} L \\ K \end{pmatrix}$ is a Hilbert space. Moreover, E_0, U, L and K satisfy the hypothesis, since clearly $\mathcal{D}(G_0) \subseteq E_0 \subseteq \mathcal{D}(G)$, which gives $E_0 \subseteq E$ dense and $G_0 \subseteq L \subseteq G$. Moreover, by definition we have $K|_{\mathcal{D}(G_0)} = 0$. \square

The only thing, which is left to show, is that $\mathcal{D}(A)$ is given as in Theorem 3.2 (i).

Lemma 3.9. *Assume that (ii) in Theorem 3.2 holds and let E_0, U and K, L be as in Lemma 3.8. Then*

$$\mathcal{D}(A) = \{(u, w) \in E_0 \times H \mid K^\diamond K u - L^\diamond w \in E\}.$$

Proof. Let $(u, w) \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, i.e. $(u, w) \in \mathcal{D}(G) \times \mathcal{D}(D)$ with $(\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u, \overset{\bullet}{D} \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}w) \in h$. Then, by definition of U and S , we have that $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u \in \mathcal{D}(S) \subseteq E_0$ and $\overset{\bullet}{D} \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}w - S\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u \in U^\perp$. Let $x \in E_0$ and set $w_0 := w - P_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}w \in \mathcal{D}(D_0)$ as well as $x_0 := x - P_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}x \in \mathcal{D}(G_0)$.

Then we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
(K^\diamond Ku - L^\diamond w)(x) &= \langle Ku|Kx\rangle_U - \langle w|Lx\rangle_H \\
&= \langle \sqrt{S}\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u|\sqrt{S}\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}x\rangle_U - \langle w|Gx\rangle_H \\
&= \langle S\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u - \overset{\bullet}{D}\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}w|\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}x\rangle_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} + \\
&\quad + \langle \overset{\bullet}{D}\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}w|\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}x\rangle_{\mathcal{BD}(G)} - \langle w|Gx\rangle_H \\
&= \langle P_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}w|GP_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}x\rangle_H + \langle DP_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}w|P_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}x\rangle_E - \langle w|Gx\rangle_H \\
&= \langle P_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}w|GP_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}x\rangle_H + \langle DP_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}w|P_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}x\rangle_E - \\
&\quad - \langle w|GP_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}x\rangle_H - \langle w|G_0x_0\rangle_H \\
&= \langle -w_0|GP_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}x\rangle_H + \langle DP_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}w|P_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}x\rangle_E + \langle Dw|x_0\rangle_E \\
&= \langle D_0w_0|P_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}x\rangle_E + \langle DP_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}w|P_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}x\rangle_E + \langle Dw|x_0\rangle_E \\
&= \langle Dw|x\rangle_E,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}x \in \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{S}) \subseteq U$ in the fourth equality. Thus, $K^\diamond Ku - L^\diamond w = Dw \in E$. Moreover, $u \in E_0$ since $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u \in \mathcal{D}(S) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{S})$. This proves one inclusion. Let now $(u, w) \in E_0 \times H$ with $K^\diamond Ku - L^\diamond w \in E$. Then by Lemma 3.1 $w \in \mathcal{D}(D)$ with $K^\diamond Ku - L^\diamond w = Dw$. We need to prove that $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u \in \mathcal{D}(S)$. We already have $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u \in \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{S})$, by definition of E_0 . Let now $v \in \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{S})$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \sqrt{S}\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u|\sqrt{S}v\rangle_U &= \langle Ku|K\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^*v\rangle_U \\
&= (K^\diamond Ku - L^\diamond w)(\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^*v) + \langle w|L\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^*v\rangle_H \\
&= \langle Dw|\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^*v\rangle_E + \langle w|G\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^*v\rangle_H \\
&= \langle w|G\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}^*v\rangle_{\mathcal{D}_D} \\
&= \langle \pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}w|\overset{\bullet}{G}v\rangle_{\mathcal{BD}(D)} \\
&= \langle \overset{\bullet}{D}\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}w|v\rangle_U,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives $\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u \in \mathcal{D}(S)$ with $S\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u = \overset{\bullet}{D}\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}w$. Hence, $(\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(G)}u, \overset{\bullet}{D}\pi_{\mathcal{BD}(D)}w) \in S \subseteq h$, and thus, $(u, w) \in \mathcal{D}(A)$. \square

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank George Weiss, who asked the question on the relation between the operators considered in [5] and [6] during a workshop in Leiden.

References

- [1] R. Arens. Operational calculus of linear relations. *Pac. J. Math.*, 11:9–23, 1961.
- [2] G. Minty. Monotone (nonlinear) operators in a hilbert space. *Duke Math. J.*, 29, 1962.

- [3] R. Picard, S. Trostorff, and M. Waurick. On a comprehensive Class of Linear Control Problems. *IMA J. Math. Control Inf.*, 2014. doi:10.1093/imamci/dnu035.
- [4] O. J. Staffans. *Well-posed linear systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [5] O. J. Staffans and G. Weiss. A physically motivated class of scattering passive linear systems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 50(5):3083–3112, 2012.
- [6] S. Trostorff. A characterization of boundary conditions yielding maximal monotone operators. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 267(8):2787–2822, 2014.
- [7] M. Tucsnak and G. Weiss. How to get a conservative well-posed linear system out of thin air. II: Controllability and stability. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 42(3):907–935, 2003.
- [8] G. Weiss and O. J. Staffans. Maxwell’s equations as a scattering passive linear system. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 51(5):3722–3756, 2013.
- [9] G. Weiss and M. Tucsnak. How to get a conservative well-posed linear system out of thin air. Part I. Well-posedness and energy balance. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 9:247–273, 2003.