

# A Coefficient Inverse Problem for the Mean Field Games System

Michael V. Klibanov \*

## Abstract

A Coefficient Inverse Problem (CIP) of the determination of a coefficient of the Mean Field Games System (MFGS) of the second order is considered. The input data are generated by a single measurement event. Lateral Cauchy data, i.e. Dirichlet and Neumann boundary data are given for solutions of both equations forming the MFGS. In addition, solutions of both these equations are given at a fixed moment of time. Hölder stability estimates are obtained for both complete and incomplete lateral Cauchy data. These estimates imply uniqueness of our CIP. Furthermore, our Hölder stability estimates can be arranged to become almost Lipschitz stability estimates. The apparatus of Carleman estimates is the main mathematical tool of this paper.

**Key Words:** the mean field games system, Carleman estimates, Hölder stability estimates, uniqueness

**2020 MSC codes:** 35R30, 91A16

## 1 Introduction

The mean field games (MFG) theory is a relatively new field, which studies the collective behavior of large populations of rational decision-makers. This theory was first introduced in 2006-2007 in seminal publications of Lasry and Lions [24] as well as of Huang, Caines and Malhamé [7]. Social sciences enjoy a rapidly increasing role in the modern society. Therefore, mathematical modeling of social phenomena can potentially provide a quite important societal impact. In this regard, the MFG theory is the single mathematical model of social processes, which is based on an universal system of coupled Partial Differential Equations (PDEs) [4]. This is the so-called Mean Field Games system (MFGS). The number of applications of the MFGS to the societal problems is flourishing and includes such areas as, e.g. finance, fight with corruption, cybersecurity, election dynamics, quantum information theory, robotic control, etc., see, e.g. [1, 4, 5, 22, 23, 24, 31] and references cited therein.

Thus, due to a broad range of applications of the MFGS, it is important to address various mathematical questions for this system. One of these questions is addressed in the current paper. The author addresses in this paper the question of Hölder stability

---

\*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC, 28223, USA, mklibanv@charlotte.edu

estimates and uniqueness theorems for a Coefficient Inverse Problem (CIP) for the MFGS of the second order. Stability estimates with respect to possible errors/noise in the input data are proven here. They can also be considered as accuracy estimates. Such estimates are important since the input data are always noisy. In addition, our stability estimates imply uniqueness of our CIP.

Furthermore, our Hölder stability estimates can be arranged to become almost Lipschitz stability estimates, see Remark 2.2 in subsection 2.3 as well as item 3 in Remarks 3.3 in subsection 3.3.

The MFGS of the second order is a system of two coupled nonlinear parabolic PDEs with two different directions of time [1, 24]. Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be the domain of interest where agents are located (not necessary in the physical sense). Let  $x \in \Omega$  be the location of an agent and  $t \in (0, T)$  be time. The first equation, which is the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation, describes the behavior of the price/value function  $u(x, t)$ . The second equation, which is Fokker-Plank equation, describes the density  $m(x, t)$  of agents in space and time.

The so-called global and local interaction terms depending on  $m(x, t)$  are parts of the HJB equation. The local interaction term usually has the form  $f(x, t) m(x, t)$ , and it is much easier to handle than the global interaction term. Unlike this, the global interaction term is a highly unusual one in the theory of CIPs. This is the integral operator

$$\int_{\Omega} Y(x, y) m(y, t) dy \quad (1.1)$$

with the kernel  $Y(x, y) \in L_{\infty}(\Omega \times \Omega)$  [5, formulas (3.1)]. The presence of this term causes a significant challenge here. We refer to subsection 2.3 and the first item of Remark 3.2 (subsection 3.1) for further comments about (1.1).

Since two parabolic equations forming the MFGS have two opposite directions of time, then the classical theory of parabolic PDEs is inapplicable to the MFGS. Indeed, until very recently uniqueness theorems for the MFGS were unknown unless restrictive conditions are not imposed [2]. Recently the author with coauthors has addressed the uniqueness question in four works [15]-[18], all of which are for the case of a single measurement data. This was done via introducing either one extra terminal/initial condition in the MFGS [15, 16, 18] or via considering lateral Cauchy data and ignoring terminal and initial conditions [17]. Both Lipschitz and Hölder stability estimates for solutions of corresponding problems for the MFGS were obtained in these references. Such estimates for the MFGS were unknown prior [15]-[18].

For the first time, the apparatus of Carleman estimates was introduced in the MFG theory in [15]. This apparatus is also used in [16]-[18] as well as in this paper. While works [15]-[18] consider the case when coefficients of the MFGS are known, in [19] both Hölder and Lipschitz stability estimates are derived for some CIPs for the MFGS with the final overdetermination. The latter means that the initial and terminal conditions are given for both functions  $u(x, t)$  and  $m(x, t)$ , and also either partial or complete lateral Cauchy data are given for these two functions. In the case of one parabolic equation, a CIP, similar with the one of [19], was considered by the author in [14]. CIPs of [19] are significantly different from the one considered in this paper.

Both the method of [19] and the technique of the current paper use a significantly modified framework of the so-called Bukhgeim-Klibanov method, which was first published in [3]. In this reference, the tool of Carleman estimates was introduced in the field

of Inverse Problems for the first time, see, e.g. [8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 32, 33] and references cited therein for some follow up publications. The author with coauthors has also extended the idea of [3] from the theory to the so-called convexification globally convergent numerical method, see, e.g. [12, 13] including the most recent works for problems of the MFGS [20, 21].

There is also a significant additional difficulty here, which we overcome. This difficulty is due to the fact that the unknown coefficient of the MFGS is involved in this system together with its first  $x$ -derivatives. Nevertheless we work with the data resulting from a single measurement event. We also refer to [10] for a CIP for a hyperbolic equation and to [32] for CIP for a parabolic equation. In both these cases unknown coefficients are involved together with their first derivatives. However, it is yet unclear whether techniques of [10, 32] can be adapted for our case.

The author is aware about only three previous analytical works of other authors on CIPs for the MFGS [9, 26, 27]. Publications [26, 27] are the first theoretical results for CIPs for the MFGs. In [26, 27] uniqueness of the reconstruction of the interaction term  $F(x, m(x, t))$  in the HJB equation is proven in the case when multiple initial conditions  $m(x, 0)$  are known. Using the Carleman estimate of [8, 33] and the framework of [3], Lipschitz stability estimate is proven in [9] for an inverse source problem for the MFGS. It is well known that the question about stability and uniqueness of a CIP can usually be reduced to the same questions for an inverse source problem. However, although the problem considered in [9] is similar with the one of this paper, our case of the CIP for the MFGS, in which the unknown coefficient is involved together with its first derivatives in the underlying PDEs as well as integral term (1.1) is present, does not fit the framework of [9], also, see subsection 2.3. We refer to [5, 6, 20, 21] for numerical studies of CIPs for the MFGS.

**Remark 1.1.** *We are not concerned below with extra smoothness conditions since traditionally they are not of a significant concern in the field of CIPs, see, e.g. [29], [30, Theorem 4.1].*

All functions of this paper are real valued ones. We use below Cauchy-Schwarz and Young's inequalities multiple times without further mentioning. We formulate our CIP in section 2. In section 3, we formulate our theorems. We prove these theorems in sections 4 and 5.

## 2 Coefficient Inverse Problem

### 2.1 Problem statement

Let  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  denotes points in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and let  $\bar{x} = (x_2, \dots, x_n)$ . To make the presentation simpler, we assume that our domain of interest  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a rectangular prism. Let  $a, b, B_i > 0, i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $T > 0$  be some numbers and  $a < b$ . We set:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &= \{x : a < x_1 < b, -B_i < x_i < B_i, i = 2, \dots, n\}, \\ \Omega_1 &= \{\bar{x} : -B_i < x_i < B_i, i = 2, \dots, n\}, \\ \Gamma_1^+ &= \{x \in \partial\Omega : x_1 = b\}, \Gamma_1^- = \{x \in \partial\Omega : x_1 = a\}, \Gamma_{1,T}^\pm = \Gamma_1^\pm \times (0, T), \\ \Gamma_i^\pm &= \{x \in \partial\Omega : x_i = \pm B_i\}, \Gamma_{i,T}^\pm = \Gamma_i^\pm \times (0, T), i = 2, \dots, n, \\ Q_T &= \Omega \times (0, T), S_T = \partial\Omega \times (0, T). \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Keeping in mind notations (2.1), denote

$$\begin{aligned}
H^{2,1}(Q_T) &= \left\{ u : \|u\|_{H^{2r,r}(Q_T)}^2 = \sum_{|\alpha|+2m \leq 2} \|D_x^\alpha \partial_t^m u\|_{L_2(Q_T)}^2 < \infty \right\}, \\
H^{2,1}(\Gamma_{iT}^\pm) &= \left\{ \begin{aligned} &u : \|u\|_{H^{2,1}(\Gamma_{iT}^\pm)}^2 = \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \|u_{x_j}\|_{L_2(\Gamma_{iT}^\pm)}^2 + \\ &+ \sum_{j,s=1, (j,s) \neq (i,i)}^n \|u_{x_j x_s}\|_{L_2(\Gamma_{iT}^\pm)}^2 + \sum_{j=0}^1 \|\partial_t^j u\|_{L_2(\Gamma_{iT}^\pm)}^2 < \infty, \end{aligned} \right\}, \\
H^{2,1}(S_T) &= \left\{ u : \|u\|_{H^{2,1}(S_T)}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \|u\|_{H^{2,k}(\Gamma_{iT}^\pm)}^2 < \infty \right\}, \\
H^{1,0}(\Gamma_{iT}^\pm) &= \left\{ u : \|u\|_{H^{1,0}(\Gamma_{iT}^\pm)}^2 = \sum_{\substack{j=1, j \neq i \\ i=1, \dots, n}}^n \|u_{x_j}\|_{L_2(\Gamma_{iT}^\pm)}^2 + \|u\|_{L_2(\Gamma_{iT}^\pm)}^2 < \infty \right\}, \\
H^{1,0}(S_T) &= \left\{ u : \|u\|_{H^{1,0}(S_T)}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \|u\|_{H^{1,0}(\partial_i^\pm \Omega_T)}^2 < \infty \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We consider the MFGS of the second order in the following form [5, formulas (3.1)],

$$\begin{aligned}
&u_t(x, t) + \Delta u(x, t) - k(x)(\nabla u(x, t))^2/2 + \\
&+ \int_{\Omega} Y(x, y) m(y, t) dy + f(x, t) m(x, t) = 0, \quad (x, t) \in Q_T, \\
&m_t(x, t) - \Delta m(x, t) - \operatorname{div}(k(x)m(x, t)\nabla u(x, t)) = 0, \quad (x, t) \in Q_T,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where  $\nabla u = (u_{x_1}, \dots, u_{x_n})$ , the coefficient  $k(x) \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$  and  $f(x, t) m(x, t)$  is the local interaction term. Thus, we use in the second line of (2.2) both global and local interaction terms. We assume below that the function  $f(x, t)$  is twice differentiable with respect to  $t$  and functions  $f, f_t, f_{tt} \in L_\infty(Q_T)$ . The first equation (2.2) is the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation and the second one is the Fokker-Plank equation. The function  $Y(x, y) \in L_\infty(\Omega \times \Omega)$  is specified in subsections 2.4 and 2.5.

We now formulate two CIPs, which we study in this paper.

**Coefficient Inverse Problem (CIP).** *Assume that functions  $u, m \in C^4(\overline{Q_T})$  satisfy equations (2.2). Let  $t_0 \in (0, T)$  be a number. Let*

$$\begin{aligned}
&u(x, t_0) = u_0(x), \quad m(x, t_0) = m_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \\
&u|_{S_T} = g_0(x, t), \quad \partial_n u|_{S_T} = g_1(x, t), \\
&m|_{S_T} = p_0(x, t), \quad \partial_n m|_{S_T} = p_1(x, t),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where  $n(x)$  is the unit outward looking normal vector at the point  $x \in \partial\Omega$ . Determine the coefficient  $k(x) \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ , assuming that the right hand sides of equalities (2.3) are known.

**Remarks 2.1:**

1. The right hand sides of second and third lines of equalities (2.3) are called ‘‘lateral Cauchy data’’.

2. *Even though the lateral Cauchy data in (2.3) are given on the entire lateral boundary  $S_T$  and represent, therefore, complete lateral Cauchy data, we also consider below the case of incomplete data, see item 1 of Remarks 3.3, in subsection 3.3.*

## 2.2 Some comments

This is a CIP with the single measurement data. In a real game scenario, the input data (2.3) can be obtained by conducting polls of game players. In the case of the boundary data, polls are usually conducted not just at the boundary but rather in a small neighborhood of the boundary. Consider, for example the 1d case when  $\Omega = (a, b)$ . Then polling for both value function  $u(x, t)$  and the density function  $m(x, t)$  is conducted for  $x \in (a, a + \gamma) \cup (b - \gamma, b)$ , where  $\gamma > 0$  is a small number. Hence, it is possible to approximately figure out both Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions at  $x = a, b$  for both functions  $u(x, t)$  and  $m(x, t)$ . To figure out functions  $u(x, t_0), m(x, t_0)$ , one needs to arrange polling of game players at a fixed moment of time  $\{t = t_0\}$ . Similar considerations are valid for the  $n$ -D case, which we consider here. Our input data (2.3) require less information than the data of [6, Model 1, Model 2], in which case the data are given for all  $(x, t) \in Q_T$ .

In the case of one parabolic equation, uniqueness theorems for CIPs for the situation when the data are known at a moment of time  $t_0 \in (0, T)$ , in addition to the incomplete lateral Cauchy data, were proven by the method of [3] in a number of publications of the author, see, e.g. [11], [13, section 3.4.2]. In [8, 33] Lipschitz stability estimates were proven for this problem.

## 2.3 Comments about the global interaction term (1.1)

It was pointed out in section 1 that this term is the one, which causes a significant challenge of this paper. Indeed, it is the presence of this term in MFGS (2.2), which does not allow almost “automatic” applications of the previously developed theory of CIPs for a single parabolic equation to CIPs for the MFGS.

In [8] Lipschitz stability estimate was proven for a CIP for a single parabolic equation, and that CIP is quite similar with ours, also, see [33]. In addition, the Lipschitz stability estimate for an analog of our CIP (2.2)-(2.3) for the MFGS is proven in the recent work [9] using a close analog of the idea of [8]. Thus, it seems to be, at least at the first glance, that the Lipschitz estimate can indeed be proven for our CIP (2.2)-(2.3) via basically the same method as the one in [8, 9, 33]. However, the above mentioned significant challenge of the MFGS, which is

$$Y(x, y) \neq 0, \tag{2.4}$$

is not addressed in [9]. This indicates that, at least at the time being, the Carleman Weight Function, which is used in [8, 9, 33] to obtain the above mentioned Lipschitz stability estimates, is not capable to handle the case (2.4) for our CIP (2.2)-(2.3). Furthermore, the author is unaware about any ideas of obtaining Lipschitz stability estimates for problem (2.2)-(2.3) under condition (2.4).

**Remark 2.2.** *In fact, our Hölder stability estimates can be arranged to become almost Lipschitz stability estimates, see item 3 in Remarks 3.3 in subsection 3.3.*

The author cannot handle the case (2.4) for a general function  $Y(x, y)$ . Nevertheless, the author can handle two important less general forms of the function  $Y(x, y)$ , see

subsections 2.4 and 2.5. The price we pay for being able to handle our two cases with condition (2.4) is that we obtain Hölder stability estimates for our CIP rather than the anticipated and more challenging Lipschitz stability. Still, the author firmly believes that Hölder stability estimates of this paper are better than the current absence of any stability estimates with condition (2.4), especially due to the numerical consideration in the next two paragraphs. To work out these, we use a special Carleman Weight Function, see subsection 3.1.

Finally, another important consideration in favor of the Hölder stability estimates of this paper is the numerical one. Indeed, we have already obtained numerical results via the convexification method for our CIP (2.2)-(2.3) [21]. These results have about the same good quality as the ones in our previous works for a similar CIP for a single parabolic equation [12], [13, chapter 9]. Note that in our recent numerical work [20] a version of the convexification method was applied to a different problem for the MFGS and good quality results were obtained. The distinctive feature of the convexification is its rigorously guaranteed global convergence, which is a rare case in the field of CIPs.

In any version of the convexification method one basically adapts the proof of the corresponding uniqueness/stability theorem to specific needs of the convexification. This is exactly what is done in [21]. The presence of the Carleman Weight Function in the numerical scheme is a crucial element of the convexification. However, the Carleman Weight Function of [8, 9, 33] depends on two large parameters, which means that it changes too rapidly. The latter is inconvenient for the numerical implementation. On the other hand, in [21] the Carleman Weight Function of subsection 3.1 is used, that function depends on a single large parameter, and our experience of [12], [13, chapter 9] demonstrates that this function is truly convenient to work with in numerical studies.

## 2.4 The first form of the kernel $Y(x, y)$ of the integral operator in (2.2)

It was pointed out in [28, page 2653] that a popular choice of the kernel  $Y(x, y)$  of the integral operator in the first equation (2.2) is the product of  $n$  Gaussians,

$$\prod_{i=1}^n \exp\left(-\frac{(x_i - y_i)^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right) \quad (2.5)$$

with some numbers  $\sigma_i > 0$ . Since Gaussians approximate the  $\delta$ -function in the distribution sense, then this justifies our choice of the function  $Y(x, y)$  in (1.1) in the form, which is somewhat more general than (2.5), i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} Y(x, y) &= \delta(x_1 - y_1) \bar{Y}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}), \\ \bar{Y} &\in L_\infty(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_1), \quad \|\bar{Y}\|_{L_\infty(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_1)} \leq N_1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

In (2.6)  $\delta(x_1 - y_1)$  is the  $\delta$ -function and  $N_1 > 0$  is a number. By (2.6) the integral in the first equation (2.2) becomes

$$\int_{\Omega} Y(x, y) m(y, t) dy = \int_{\Omega_1} \bar{Y}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) m(x_1, \bar{y}, t) d\bar{y}, \quad x = (x_1, \bar{x}) \in \Omega, t \in (0, T). \quad (2.7)$$

Thus, the integral operator in the right hand side of (2.7) represents local interaction with respect to  $x_1$  and global interaction with respect to  $x_2, \dots, x_n$ .

## 2.5 The second form of the kernel $Y(x, y)$ of the integral operator in (2.2)

For  $z \in \mathbb{R}$  let  $H(z)$  be the Heaviside function,

$$H(z) = \begin{cases} 1, & z > 0, \\ 0, & z < 0. \end{cases}$$

Consider the function  $Y(x, y)$  in the form

$$\begin{aligned} Y(x, y) &= H(y_1 - x_1) \bar{Y}(x, y), \quad (x, y) \in \Omega \times \Omega, \\ \bar{Y} &\in L_\infty(\Omega \times \Omega), \quad \|\bar{Y}\|_{L_\infty(\Omega \times \Omega)} \leq N_1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

Then by (2.1) and (2.8) the integral in the first equation (2.2) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} Y(x, y) m(y, t) dy = \\ &= \int_{\Omega_1} \left( \int_{x_1}^b \bar{Y}(x_1, \bar{x}, y_1, \bar{y}) m(y_1, \bar{y}, t) dy_1 \right) d\bar{y}, \quad x = (x_1, \bar{x}) \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Therefore, the integral operator in (2.9) represents the global interaction with respect to all  $n$  spatial variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ .

## 3 Formulations of Theorems

**Remark 3.1.** Let  $t_0 \in (0, T)$  be the number in (2.3). Without any loss of generality we set everywhere below  $t_0 = T/2$ .

### 3.1 Two Carleman estimates

Let  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\lambda \geq 1$  be two parameters, which we will choose later, and  $\lambda$  will be sufficiently large. The Carleman Weight Function in our case is  $\varphi_\lambda(x_1, t)$ ,

$$\varphi_\lambda(x_1, t) = \exp \left[ 2\lambda (x_1^2 - \alpha (t - T/2)^2) \right]. \quad (3.1)$$

Let the number  $\varepsilon \in (0, T/2)$ . Denote

$$Q_{\varepsilon, T} = \Omega \times (\varepsilon, T - \varepsilon). \quad (3.2)$$

It follows from (2.1), (3.1) and (3.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\bar{Q}_T} \varphi_\lambda(x_1, t) &= \varphi_\lambda(b, T/2) = e^{2\lambda b^2}, \\ \min_{\bar{Q}_{T, \varepsilon}} \varphi_\lambda(x_1, t) &= \exp \left[ 2\lambda (a^2 - \alpha (T/2 - \varepsilon)^2) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

**Remarks 3.2:**

1. *The Carleman Weight Function (3.1) for parabolic operators  $\partial_t \pm \Delta$  depends only on one spatial variable  $x_1$  and has only one large parameter  $\lambda$  rather than two large parameters of [8, 9, 11, 32, 33], [13, section 2.3], [25, Chapter 4, §1] and other references. This Carleman Weight Function was previously used in the works of the author with coauthors [12, 17, 21], [13, formula (9.20)]. In particular, publications [12], [13, chapter 9] are about numerical studies of a similar CIP for one parabolic equation via the convexification method, and the most recent work [21] is about numerical studies of our CIP (2.2)-(2.3) using the convexification method. As stated in subsection 2.3, function (3.1) is more convenient for the numerical implementation in the convexification method than those depending on two large parameters. The author is unaware about other publications, in which Carleman Weight Function (3.1) is used.*
2. *The reason why we choose (3.1) is that it allows us to work with the integral term in (2.2) for cases (2.7), (2.9).*
3. *The reason of our assumption that the domain  $\Omega$  in (2.1) is a rectangular prism is that Theorem 3.1 is proven in [17] only for this case. It is not yet clear whether this theorem is valid for a more general domain  $\Omega$ . Still, it is clear from (2.7) and (2.9) that  $\Omega$  should be a cylindrical domain.*
4. *In addition to item 3, based on his experience, the author believes that a non very general shape of the underlying domain is rarely a primary concern when working with CIPs, since CIPs are very difficult ones in their own rights anyway, see, e.g. [11, sections 2.3, 2.4], [12], [13, sections 3.2, chapters 7-10], [25, §1 in Chapter 4].*

**Theorem 3.1** [17]. *Let conditions (2.1) and (3.1) hold. Then there exists a sufficiently large number  $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\alpha, \Omega, T) \geq 1$  and a number  $C_0 = C_0(\alpha, \Omega, T) > 0$ , both numbers depending only on listed parameters, such that the following two Carleman estimates hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{Q_T} (u_t \pm \Delta u)^2 \varphi_\lambda dxdt &\geq (C_0/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} \left( u_t^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n u_{x_i x_j}^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
&+ C_0 \int_{Q_T} (\lambda (\nabla u)^2 + \lambda^3 u^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt - \\
&- C_0 \left( \|\partial_n u\|_{H^{1,0}(S_T)}^2 + \|u\|_{H^{2,1}(S_T)}^2 \right) e^{3\lambda b^2} - \\
&- C_0 \left( \|u(x, T)\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|u(x, 0)\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)), \\
&\forall \lambda \geq \lambda_0, \forall u \in H^3(Q_T).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Suppose now that

$$u|_{S_T \setminus (\Gamma_{1T}^+)} = 0. \tag{3.5}$$

Then the third line of (3.4) becomes

$$-C \left( \|\partial_n u\|_{H^{1,0}(\Gamma_{1T}^+)}^2 + \|u\|_{H^{2,1}(\Gamma_{1T}^+)}^2 \right) e^{3\lambda b^2}. \tag{3.6}$$

The implication of (3.6) from (3.5) can be obtained by a slight modification of the proof of [17].

### 3.2 Estimates of some integrals

In this subsection we estimate from the above weighted  $L_2(Q_T)$  norms of terms of terms in the right hand sides of (2.7) and (2.8) as well as one more integral. The weight is the Carleman Weight Function (3.1). In this subsection  $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(N_1, Q_T) > 0$  denotes different numbers depending only on listed parameters.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\bar{Y}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  be the function in (2.6), (2.7). Then the following estimate is valid*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{Q_T} \left( \int_{\Omega_1} \bar{Y}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) h(x_1, \bar{y}, t) d\bar{y} \right)^2 \varphi_\lambda(x, t) dx dt \leq \\ & \leq \tilde{C} \int_{Q_T} h^2 \varphi_\lambda dx dt, \quad \forall h \in L_2(Q_T), \quad \forall \lambda > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

The proof of this Lemma is obvious since the function  $\varphi_\lambda(x_1, t)$  is independent on  $\bar{x}$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $Y(x, y)$  be the function in (2.8). Then the following estimate is valid*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{Q_T} \left( \int_{\Omega} Y(x, y) h(y, t) dy \right)^2 \varphi_\lambda(x, t) dx dt \leq \\ & \leq \tilde{C} \int_{Q_T} h^2 \varphi_\lambda dx dt, \quad \forall h \in L_2(Q_T), \quad \forall \lambda > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

**Proof.** By (2.9), Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Fubini theorem

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{Q_T} \left( \int_{\Omega} Y(x, y) h(y, t) dy \right)^2 \varphi_\lambda(x, t) dx dt \leq \\ & \leq \tilde{C} \int_{Q_T} \left[ \int_{\Omega_1} \left( \int_{x_1}^b h^2(y_1, \bar{y}, t) dy_1 \right) d\bar{y} \right] \varphi_\lambda(x_1, t) dx dt = \\ & = \tilde{C} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega_1} \left\{ \int_a^b \left[ \int_{\Omega_1} \left( \int_{x_1}^b h^2(y_1, \bar{y}, t) dy_1 \right) d\bar{y} \right] \varphi_\lambda(x_1, t) dx_1 \right\} d\bar{x} dt \leq \\ & \leq \tilde{C} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega_1} \left[ \int_a^b \left( \int_{x_1}^b h^2(y_1, \bar{y}, t) dy_1 \right) \varphi_\lambda(x_1, t) dx_1 \right] d\bar{y} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

We obviously have

$$\int_a^b \left( \int_{x_1}^b f(x_1, y_1) dy_1 \right) dx_1 = \int_a^b \left( \int_a^{y_1} f(x_1, y_1) dx_1 \right) dy_1, \quad \forall f \in L_1((a, b) \times (a, b)).$$

Hence, using the fact that the  $\varphi_\lambda(x_1, t)$  is increasing with respect to  $x_1 \in (a, b)$ , we obtain

in the last integral of (3.9)

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_a^b \left( \int_{x_1}^b h^2(y_1, \bar{y}, t) dy_1 \right) \varphi_\lambda(x_1, t) dx_1 = \int_a^b \left( \int_a^{y_1} \varphi_\lambda(x_1, t) dx_1 \right) h^2(y_1, \bar{y}, t) dy_1 \leq \\ & \leq \int_a^b \left( \int_a^{y_1} \varphi_\lambda(y_1, t) dx_1 \right) h^2(y_1, \bar{y}, t) dy_1 \leq (b-a) \int_a^b h^2(y_1, \bar{y}, t) \varphi_\lambda(y_1, t) dy_1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_{\Omega_1} \left[ \int_a^b \left( \int_{x_1}^b h^2(y_1, \bar{y}, t) dy_1 \right) \varphi_\lambda(x_1, t) dx_1 \right] d\bar{y} dt \leq \\ & \leq (b-a) \int_0^T \left( \int_{\Omega} h^2(x, t) \right) \varphi_\lambda(x, t) dx dt = (b-a) \int_{Q_T} h^2 \varphi_\lambda dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing this with (3.9), we obtain the target estimate (3.8).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3** ([11], [13, Lemma 3.1.1]). *The following inequality holds*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{Q_T} \left( \int_{T/2}^t h(x, \tau) d\tau \right)^2 \varphi_\lambda dx dt \leq \\ & \leq C_1 (1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} (h^2 \varphi_\lambda)(x, t) dx dt, \quad \forall \lambda > 0, \quad \forall h \in L_2(Q_T), \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where the number  $C_1 = C_1(\alpha) > 0$  depends only on the parameter  $\alpha$  in (3.1).

### 3.3 Hölder stability estimates and uniqueness

Let  $N_2, N_3, N_4 > 0$  be three numbers. Recall that the number  $N_1 > 0$  was introduced in (2.6). Denote

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(N_2) &= \left\{ v \in C^4(\bar{Q}_T) : \|v\|_{C^4(\bar{Q}_T)} \leq N_2 \right\}, \\ S_2(N_3) &= \left\{ k \in C^1(\bar{\Omega}) : \|k\|_{C^1(\bar{\Omega})} \leq N_3 \right\}, \\ N &= \max(N_1, N_2, N_3). \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Suppose that we have two triples

$$(u_i, m_i, k_i) \in S_1^2(N_2) \times S_2(N_3), \quad i = 1, 2 \tag{3.12}$$

satisfying the following analogs of conditions (2.3), see Remark 3.1:

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(x, T/2) &= u_{0,i}(x), \quad m_i(x, T/2) = m_{0,i}(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ u_i|_{S_T} &= g_{0,i}(x, t), \quad \partial_n u_i|_{S_T} = g_{1,i}(x, t), \quad i = 1, 2, \\ m_i|_{S_T} &= p_0(x, t), \quad \partial_n m_i|_{S_T} = p_{1,i}(x, t), \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u} &= u_1 - u_2, \quad \tilde{m} = m_1 - m_2, \quad \tilde{k} = k_1 - k_2, \\ \tilde{u}_0 &= u_{0,1} - u_{0,2}, \quad \tilde{m}_0 = m_{0,1} - m_{0,2}, \\ \tilde{g}_0 &= g_{0,1} - g_{0,2}, \quad \tilde{g}_1 = g_{1,1} - g_{1,2}, \quad \tilde{p}_0 = p_{0,1} - p_{0,2}, \quad \tilde{p}_1 = p_{1,1} - p_{1,2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Using (3.11)-(3.14) and triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{u}, \tilde{m}, \tilde{k}) &\in S_1^2(2N_2) \times S_2(2N_3), \\ \tilde{u}(x, T/2) &= \tilde{u}_0(x), \quad \tilde{m}(x, T/2) = \tilde{m}_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \\ \tilde{u}|_{S_T} &= \tilde{g}_0(x, t), \quad \partial_n \tilde{u}|_{S_T \setminus \Gamma_{1T}^-} = \tilde{g}_1(x, t), \\ \tilde{m}|_{S_T} &= \tilde{p}_0(x, t), \quad \partial_n \tilde{m}|_{S_T^-} = \tilde{p}_1(x, t). \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let either conditions (2.6), (2.7) or conditions (2.8), (2.9) be in place. Suppose that there exist two triples  $(u_i, m_i, k_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  satisfying equations (2.2) and conditions (3.11)-(3.15). Assume that*

$$\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u_{0,1}(x)|^2 \geq c, \quad x \in \bar{\Omega}, \quad (3.16)$$

where  $c > 0$  is a number. Also, let the function  $f(x, t)$  in the first equation (2.2) be such that there exist its  $t$ -derivatives  $f, f_t, f_{tt} \in L_\infty(Q_T)$  and  $\|\partial_t^k f\|_{L_\infty(Q_T)} \leq N$ ,  $k = 0, 1, 2$ . Let  $\delta > 0$  be a sufficiently small number. Assume that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{u}_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \|\tilde{m}_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)} &\leq \delta, \\ \|\partial_t^s \tilde{g}_0\|_{H^{2,1}(S_T^-)}, \|\partial_t^s \tilde{p}_0\|_{H^{2,1}(S_T)} &\leq \delta, \quad s = 0, 1, 2, \\ \|\partial_t^s \tilde{g}_1\|_{H^{1,0}(S_T)}, \|\partial_t^s \tilde{p}_1\|_{H^{1,0}(S_T)} &\leq \delta, \quad s = 0, 1, 2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Let  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  be an arbitrary number. Then for every  $\varepsilon$  satisfying

$$\frac{T}{2} (1 - \sqrt{\rho}) < \varepsilon < \frac{T}{2}. \quad (3.18)$$

there exists a sufficiently small number

$$\delta_0 = \delta_0(N, \varepsilon, \Omega, T, c, \rho) \in (0, 1), \quad (3.19)$$

and a number  $C = C(N, \varepsilon, \Omega, T, c) > 0$ , both numbers depending only on listed parameters, such that

$$\|\partial_t^s \tilde{u}\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})}, \|\partial_t^s \tilde{m}\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})}, \|\tilde{k}\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \leq C\delta^{1-\rho}, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, \delta_0), \quad s = 0, 1, 2. \quad (3.20)$$

Also, CIP (2.2)-(2.3) has at most one solution  $(u, m, k) \in S_1^2(N_2) \times S_2(N_3)$ .

**Theorem 3.3.** *Assume that all conditions of Theorem 3.2 hold, except that the normal derivatives  $\partial_n u_i$  and  $\partial_n m_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  are unknown at  $S_T \setminus \Gamma_{1T}^+$ . On the other hand, assume that (3.17) is replaced with*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{u}_0\|_{H^2(\Omega)}, \|\tilde{m}_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)} &\leq \delta, \\ \tilde{g}_0(x, t) = \tilde{p}_0(x, t) &= 0, \quad (x, t) \in S_T \setminus \Gamma_{1T}^+, \\ \|\partial_t^s \tilde{g}_1\|_{H^{1,0}(\Gamma_{1,T}^+)}, \|\partial_t^s \tilde{p}_1\|_{H^{1,0}(\Gamma_{1,T}^+)} &\leq \delta, \quad s = 0, 1, 2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Then estimate (3.20) still holds as well as uniqueness.

**Remarks 3.3:**

1. Therefore, it follows from (3.13), (3.14), (3.21) and Theorem 3.3 that if Dirichlet boundary conditions for two pairs  $(u_1, m_1)$  and  $(u_2, m_2)$  coincide at  $S_T \setminus \Gamma_T^+$ , then stability and uniqueness for our CIP still hold, even if the Neumann boundary conditions at  $S_T \setminus \Gamma_T^+$  are unknown for these two pairs. In other words, Theorem 3.3 works for the case of incomplete lateral Cauchy data for our CIP.
2. Everywhere below  $C = C(N, \varepsilon, \Omega, T, c) > 0$  denotes different numbers depending only on listed parameters. Also, in the course of the proof of Theorem 3.2 we will choose the parameter  $\alpha > 0$  in the Carleman Weight Function (3.1), so that it will depend only on  $\Omega, T$  and  $\varepsilon$ , i.e.  $\alpha = \alpha(\Omega, T, \varepsilon) > 0$ . Hence, we do not indicate the dependence of some parameters on  $\alpha$  in the proof of Theorem 3.2.
3. Note that if  $\rho \approx 0$ , then (3.20) is almost Lipschitz stability estimate, in which case one must have  $C\delta$  instead of  $C\delta^{1-\rho}$  in (3.20).
4. A condition like (3.16) is always imposed in publications about the Bukhgeim-Klibanov method, including the above cited ones [3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 32, 33].

## 4 Proof of Theorem 3.2

In this proof the integral term in the first equation (2.2) is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Omega} Y(x, y) m(y, t) dy = \\
 & = \begin{cases} \int_{\Omega_1} \bar{Y}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) m(x_1, \bar{y}, t) d\bar{y}, & \text{in the case (2.7),} \\ \int_{\Omega_1} \left( \int_{x_1}^b \bar{Y}(x_1, \bar{x}, y_1, \bar{y}) m(y_1, \bar{y}, t) dy_1 \right) d\bar{y} & \text{in the case (2.9).} \end{cases} \quad (4.1)
 \end{aligned}$$

Subtract equations (2.2) for the triple  $(u_2, m_2, k_2)$  from the same equations for the triple  $(u_1, m_1, k_1)$ . Use the formula

$$y_1 z_1 - y_2 z_2 = \tilde{y} z_1 + y_2 \tilde{z}, \quad \forall y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R},$$

where  $\tilde{y} = y_1 - y_2$  and  $\tilde{z} = z_1 - z_2$ . Using notations (3.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \tilde{u}_t + \Delta \tilde{u} + \int_{\Omega} Y(x, y) \tilde{m}(y, t) dy + f(x, t) \tilde{m}(x, t) - \\
 & - k_2(x) \nabla \tilde{u} (\nabla u_1 + \nabla u_2) / 2 = \tilde{k}(x) (\nabla u_1)^2 / 2, \quad (x, t) \in Q_T, \quad (4.2)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \tilde{m}_t - \Delta \tilde{m} - \operatorname{div}(k_2(x) \tilde{m} \nabla u_1) - \operatorname{div}(k_2(x) m_2 \nabla \tilde{u}) = \\
 & = \operatorname{div}(\tilde{k}(x) m_1 \nabla u_1), \quad (x, t) \in Q_T. \quad (4.3)
 \end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$v(x, t) = \tilde{u}_t(x, t), \quad q(x, t) = \tilde{m}_t(x, t). \quad (4.4)$$

Then by (3.15) and (4.4)

$$\tilde{u}(x, t) = \int_{T/2}^t v(x, \tau) d\tau + \tilde{u}_0(x), \quad \tilde{m}(x, t) = \int_{T/2}^t q(x, \tau) d\tau + \tilde{m}_0(x). \quad (4.5)$$

Also, setting in (4.2)  $t = T/2$  and using (3.13), (3.15) and (4.4), we obtain

$$\tilde{k}(x) = 2(\nabla u_{0,1}(x))^{-2} v(x, T/2) + F(x), \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & F(x) = \\ & = 2(\nabla u_{0,1}(x))^{-2} \left( \Delta \tilde{u}_0 + \int Y(x, y) \tilde{m}_0(y) dy + f(x, 0) \tilde{m}_0(x) \right) - \\ & \quad - (\nabla u_{0,1}(x))^{-2} k_2(x) \nabla \tilde{u}_0 \nabla (u_{0,1} + u_{0,2})(x). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Next,

$$v(x, T/2) = v(x, t) - \int_{T/2}^t v_t(x, \tau) d\tau. \quad (4.8)$$

Substituting this in (4.6), we obtain

$$\tilde{k}(x) = 2(\nabla u_{0,1}(x))^{-2} \left( v(x, t) - \int_{T/2}^t v_t(x, \tau) d\tau \right) + F(x). \quad (4.9)$$

Differentiating equations (4.2) and (4.3) with respect to  $t$ , and using (4.4)-(4.9), we obtain two integral differential equations. The first equation is:

$$\begin{aligned} & v_t + \Delta v + \int_{\Omega} Y(x, y) q(y, t) dy + fq + f_t \int_{T/2}^t q(x, \tau) d\tau - \\ & - k_2 \nabla v (\nabla u_1 + \nabla u_2) / 2 - k_2 \left( \int_{T/2}^t \nabla v(x, \tau) d\tau \right) (\nabla u_{1t} + \nabla u_{2t}) / 2 \\ & - (\nabla u_{0,1}(x))^{-2} (\nabla u_1)^2 \left( v(x, t) - \int_{T/2}^t v_t(x, \tau) d\tau \right) = \\ & = F(x) (\nabla u_1)^2 / 2 - f_t \tilde{m}_0 + k_2 \nabla \tilde{u}_0 (\nabla u_{1t} + \nabla u_{2t}) / 2, \quad (x, t) \in Q_T. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

And the second equation is

$$\begin{aligned}
& q_t - \Delta q - \operatorname{div}(k_2 q \nabla u_1) - \operatorname{div} \left( k_2 \nabla u_{1t} \int_{T/2}^t q(x, \tau) d\tau \right) - \\
& - \operatorname{div}(k_2 m_2 \nabla v) - \operatorname{div} \left( k_2 m_{2t} \int_{T/2}^t \nabla v(x, \tau) d\tau \right) - \\
& - \operatorname{div} \left( \left( 2(\nabla u_{0,1})^{-2} \left( v(x, t) - \int_{T/2}^t v_t(x, \tau) d\tau \right) \right) m_1 \nabla u_1 \right) = \\
& = \operatorname{div}(F m_1 \nabla u_1) + \operatorname{div}(k_2 \nabla u_{1t} \tilde{m}_0) + \operatorname{div}(k_2 m_{2t} \nabla \tilde{u}_0), \quad (x, t) \in Q_T.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Since the term

$$\int_{T/2}^t v_t(x, \tau) d\tau \tag{4.12}$$

is present in both equations (4.10) and (4.11), then we differentiate equations (4.10) and (4.11) with respect to  $t$  once again. Denote

$$w(x, t) = v_t(x, t), \quad r(x, t) = q_t(x, t). \tag{4.13}$$

Then term (4.12) is replaced in the resulting equations either with  $v(x, t)$  or with

$$\int_{T/2}^t w(x, \tau) d\tau. \tag{4.14}$$

Using (4.10), (4.13) and (4.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& w_t + \Delta w + \int_{\Omega} Y(x, y) r(y, t) dy + 2f_t q + fr + f_{tt} \int_{T/2}^t q(x, \tau) d\tau - \\
& - k_2 \nabla w (\nabla u_1 + \nabla u_2) / 2 - k_2 \nabla v (\nabla u_{1t} + \nabla u_{2t}) - \\
& - k_2 \left( \int_{T/2}^t \nabla v(x, \tau) d\tau \right) (\nabla u_{1tt} + \nabla u_{2tt}) / 2 - \\
& - 2(\nabla u_{0,1}(x))^{-2} \nabla u_{1t} \nabla u_1 \left( v(x, t) - \int_{T/2}^t w(x, \tau) d\tau \right) = \\
& = F(x) (\nabla u_{1t} \nabla u_1) - f_{tt} \tilde{m}_0 + k_2 \nabla \tilde{u}_0 (\nabla u_{1tt} + \nabla u_{2tt}) / 2, \quad (x, t) \in Q_T.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Also, (4.11) and (4.13) lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
& r_t - \Delta r - 2 \operatorname{div} (k_2 r \nabla u_1) - \operatorname{div} (k_2 q \nabla u_{1t}) - \\
& - \operatorname{div} (k_2 m_2 \nabla w) - 2 \operatorname{div} (k_2 m_{2t} \nabla v) - \operatorname{div} \left( k_2 m_{2tt} \int_{T/2}^t \nabla v (x, \tau) d\tau \right) - \\
& - \operatorname{div} \left( \left( -2 (\nabla u_{0,1} (x))^{-2} \left( v (x, t) - \int_{T/2}^t w (x, \tau) d\tau \right) \right) (m_1 \nabla u_1)_t \right) = \\
& = \operatorname{div} (F (x) (m_1 \nabla u_1)_t) + \operatorname{div} (k_2 \nabla u_{1tt} \tilde{m}_0) + \\
& + \operatorname{div} (k_2 m_{2tt} \nabla \tilde{u}_0), \quad (x, t) \in Q_T.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

It is well known that Carleman estimates can work not only with Partial Differential Equations but with differential inequalities as well. Hence, it is convenient to rewrite equations (4.10), (4.11), (4.15) and (4.16) in the more compact forms of differential inequalities. Thus, using (2.6), (3.11)-(3.17), (4.7) and (4.10), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
|v_t + \Delta v| & \leq C \left( |\nabla v| + |v| + \left| \int_{T/2}^t |\nabla v| (x, \tau) d\tau \right| + \left| \int_{T/2}^t |w| (x, \tau) d\tau \right| \right) + \\
& + C \left( \left| \int_{T/2}^t |q| (x, \tau) d\tau \right| + G (q) (x, t) + |q| \right) + C \bar{\delta} (x, t), \quad (x, t) \in Q_T.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

In (4.17)

$$\begin{aligned}
& G (q) (x, t) = \\
& = \begin{cases} \int_{\Omega_1} |q| (x_1, \bar{y}, t) d\bar{y} \text{ in the case} \\ \text{of the second line of (4.1),} \\ \int_{\Omega_1} \left( \int_{x_1}^b |q| (y_1, \bar{y}, t) dy_1 \right) d\bar{y} \text{ in the case of} \\ \text{the third line of (4.1).} \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

Using (3.7), (3.8) and (4.18), we obtain

$$\int_{Q_T} [G (h) (x, t)]^2 \varphi_\lambda (x, t) dx dt \leq \tilde{C} \int_{Q_T} h^2 \varphi_\lambda dx dt, \quad \forall h \in L_2 (Q_T), \quad \forall \lambda > 0. \tag{4.19}$$

Using (4.11), we also obtain similarly with the above

$$\begin{aligned}
|q_t - \Delta q| &\leq C \left( |\nabla q| + |q| + \left| \int_{T/2}^t (|\nabla q| + |q|)(x, \tau) d\tau \right| \right) + \\
&+ C \left( |\Delta v| + |\nabla v| + \left| \int_{T/2}^t (|\Delta v| + |\nabla v|)(x, \tau) d\tau \right| \right) + \\
&+ C \left| \int_{T/2}^t (|\nabla w| + |w|)(x, \tau) d\tau \right| + C\bar{\delta}(x, t), \quad (x, t) \in Q_T.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Similarly, (4.13) and (4.15) lead to:

$$\begin{aligned}
|w_t + \Delta w| &\leq C \left( |\nabla w| + |w| + \left| \int_{T/2}^t |w|(x, \tau) d\tau \right| \right) + \\
&+ C \left( |\nabla v| + |v| + \left| \int_{T/2}^t |\nabla v|(x, \tau) d\tau \right| \right) + C|r| + \\
&+ C \left( |q| + \left| \int_{T/2}^t |q|(x, \tau) d\tau \right| + G(r)(x, t) \right) + C\bar{\delta}(x, t), \quad (x, t) \in Q_T.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

Finally, using (3.11)-(3.17), (4.7) and (4.16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|r_t - \Delta r| &\leq C (|\nabla r| + |r| + |\nabla q| + |q| + |\Delta v| + |\nabla v| + |v|) + \\
&+ C (|\Delta w| + |\nabla w| + |w|) + \\
&+ C \left| \int_{T/2}^t (|\Delta v| + |\nabla v| + |v|)(x, \tau) d\tau \right| + \\
&+ C \left| \int_{T/2}^t (|\nabla w| + |w|)(x, \tau) d\tau \right| + C\bar{\delta}(x, t), \quad (x, t) \in Q_T.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

In (4.17)-(4.22)  $\bar{\delta}(x, t) \in L_2(Q_T)$  denotes different non-negative functions such that

$$\|\bar{\delta}(x, t)\|_{L_2(Q_T)} \leq \delta. \tag{4.23}$$

Using (3.15), (4.4) and (4.13) we obtain the following lateral Cauchy data for the system of inequalities (4.17)-(4.22):

$$\begin{aligned}
v|_{S_T} &= \tilde{g}_{0t}(x, t), \quad \partial_n v|_{S_T} = \tilde{g}_{1t}(x, t), \\
q|_{S_T} &= \tilde{p}_{0t}(x, t), \quad \partial_n q|_{S_T} = \tilde{p}_{1t}(x, t), \\
w|_{S_T} &= \tilde{g}_{0tt}(x, t), \quad \partial_n w|_{S_T} = \tilde{g}_{1tt}(x, t), \\
r|_{S_T} &= \tilde{p}_{0tt}(x, t), \quad \partial_n r|_{S_T} = \tilde{p}_{1tt}(x, t).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

Square both sides of each of inequalities (4.17)-(4.22). Then multiply each of the resulting inequalities by the Carleman Weight Functions  $\varphi_\lambda(x_1, t)$  defined in (3.1) and apply the Carleman estimates (3.4) using the first line of (3.3), where  $\lambda_0 \geq 1$  was chosen in Theorem 3.1. Also, use second and third lines of (3.17) as well as (4.23) and (4.24). In addition, use (3.10), (4.18) and (4.19). We obtain four inequalities.

#### 4.1 Estimating functions $v$ and $q$

The first inequality is:

$$\begin{aligned}
(1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} \left( v_t^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n v_{x_i x_j}^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \int_{Q_T} (\lambda (\nabla v)^2 + \lambda^3 v^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt \\
\leq C \int_{Q_T} [|\nabla v|^2 + |v|^2] \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
+C \int_{Q_T} w^2 \varphi_\lambda dxdt + C \int_{Q_T} q^2 \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
+C \left( \|v(x, T)\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|v(x, 0)\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) + \\
+C e^{3\lambda b^2} \delta^2, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

Choose a sufficiently large number

$$\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(N, \varepsilon, \Omega, T, c) \geq \lambda_0 \geq 1 \tag{4.26}$$

such that  $\lambda_1 > 2C$ . Then (4.25) and trace theorem lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
(1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} \left( v_t^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n v_{x_i x_j}^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \int_{Q_T} (\lambda (\nabla v)^2 + \lambda^3 v^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt \leq \\
\leq C \int_{Q_T} (w^2 + q^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
+C \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + C \delta^2 e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

Applying similar arguments to (4.20), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} \left( q_t^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n q_{x_i x_j}^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \int_{Q_T} (\lambda (\nabla q)^2 + \lambda^3 q^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt \leq \\
+C \int_{Q_T} ((\Delta v)^2 + (\nabla v)^2 + (\nabla w)^2 + w^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
+C \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + C \delta^2 e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

It follows from (4.28) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{Q_T} q^2 \varphi_\lambda dxdt \leq (C/\lambda^3) \int_{Q_T} ((\Delta v)^2 + (\nabla v)^2 + (\nabla w)^2 + w^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
+C \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + C \delta^2 e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

Substituting (4.29) in (4.27) and using  $(1/\lambda) \gg (1/\lambda^3)$  for all  $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} \left( v_t^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n v_{x_i x_j}^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \int_{Q_T} (\lambda (\nabla v)^2 + \lambda^3 v^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt &\leq \\
&\leq C \int_{Q_T} [(1/\lambda^3) (\nabla w)^2 + w^2] \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
&+ C \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \left( \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 \right) + \\
&+ C\delta^2 e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

In particular, (4.30) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{Q_T} (\Delta v)^2 \varphi_\lambda dxdt &\leq C \int_{Q_T} [(1/\lambda^2) (\nabla w)^2 + \lambda w^2] \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
&+ C\lambda \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \left( \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 \right) + \\
&+ C\delta^2 \lambda e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

Substituting (4.31) in (4.28), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} \left( q_t^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n q_{x_i x_j}^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \int_{Q_T} (\lambda (\nabla q)^2 + \lambda^3 q^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt &\leq \\
&+ C \int_{Q_T} ((\nabla v)^2 + (\nabla w)^2 + \lambda w^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
&+ C \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + C\delta^2 e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

Summing up (4.30) and (4.32), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} \left[ (v_t^2 + q_t^2) + \sum_{i,j=1}^n (v_{x_i x_j}^2 + q_{x_i x_j}^2) \right] \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
+ \int_{Q_T} [\lambda ((\nabla v)^2 + (\nabla q)^2) + \lambda^3 (v^2 + q^2)] \varphi_\lambda dxdt &\leq \\
&\leq C \int_{Q_T} ((\nabla w)^2 + \lambda w^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
&+ C\lambda \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \left( \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 \right) + \\
&+ C\delta^2 \lambda e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

## 4.2 Estimating functions $w$ and $r$

We now estimate functions  $w$  and  $r$ . Using (4.21), we obtain similarly with (4.27)

$$\begin{aligned}
(1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} \left( w_t^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n w_{x_i x_j}^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \int_{Q_T} (\lambda (\nabla w)^2 + \lambda^3 w^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt &\leq \\
&\leq C \int_{Q_T} ((\nabla v)^2 + v^2 + q^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + C \int_{Q_T} r^2 \varphi_\lambda dxdt \\
&+ C \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \|w\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + C\delta^2 e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

Next, using (4.22), we obtain similarly with (4.28)

$$\begin{aligned}
(1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} \left( r_t^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n r_{x_i x_j}^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \int_{Q_T} (\lambda (\nabla r)^2 + \lambda^3 r^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt \leq \\
+ C \int_{Q_T} ((\Delta v)^2 + (\nabla v)^2 + v^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
+ C \int_{Q_T} ((\Delta w)^2 + (\nabla w)^2 + w^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
+ C \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \|r\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + C\delta^2 e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

By (4.31) and (4.33)

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{Q_T} ((\Delta v)^2 + (\nabla v)^2 + v^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt \leq C \int_{Q_T} [(1/\lambda^2) (\nabla w)^2 + \lambda w^2] \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
+ C\lambda \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \left( \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 \right) + \\
+ C\delta^2 \lambda e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

Substituting (4.36) in (4.35), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} \left( r_t^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n r_{x_i x_j}^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \int_{Q_T} (\lambda (\nabla r)^2 + \lambda^3 r^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt \leq \\
\leq C \int_{Q_T} ((\Delta w)^2 + (\nabla w)^2 + \lambda w^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
+ C\lambda \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \left( \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|r\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 \right) \\
+ C\delta^2 \lambda e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.37}$$

Next, substituting (4.36) in (4.34), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} \left( w_t^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n w_{x_i x_j}^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \int_{Q_T} (\lambda (\nabla w)^2 + \lambda^3 w^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt \leq \\
\leq C \int_{Q_T} (q^2 + r^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
+ C\lambda \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \times \\
\times \left( \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|w\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|r\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 \right) + \\
+ C\delta^2 \lambda e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

In particular, (4.37) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{Q_T} r^2 \varphi_\lambda dxdt \leq (C/\lambda^3) \int_{Q_T} ((\Delta w)^2 + (\nabla w)^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
+ (C/\lambda^2) \int_{Q_T} w^2 \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
+ C \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \left( \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|r\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 \right) + \\
+ C\delta^2 e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

Substituting (4.39) in (4.38), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} \left( w_t^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n w_{x_i x_j}^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \int_{Q_T} (\lambda (\nabla w)^2 + \lambda^3 w^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt &\leq \\
&\leq C \int_{Q_T} q^2 \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
&\quad + C\lambda \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \times \\
&\quad \times \left( \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|w\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|r\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 \right) + \\
&\quad + C\delta^2 \lambda e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.40}$$

In particular, (4.40) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{Q_T} (\Delta w)^2 \varphi_\lambda dxdt &\leq C\lambda \int_{Q_T} q^2 \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
&\quad + C\lambda^2 \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \times \\
&\quad \times \left( \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|w\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|r\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 \right) + \\
&\quad + C\delta^2 \lambda^2 e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.41}$$

Substituting (4.41) in (4.37), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} \left( r_t^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n r_{x_i x_j}^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \int_{Q_T} (\lambda (\nabla r)^2 + \lambda^3 r^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt &\leq \\
&\leq C \int_{Q_T} ((\nabla w)^2 + \lambda w^2 + \lambda q^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
&\quad + C\lambda^2 \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \times \\
&\quad \times \left( \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|w\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|r\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 \right) + \\
&\quad + C\delta^2 \lambda^2 e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.42}$$

Summing up (4.40) and (4.42), we obtain the following analog of (4.33):

$$\begin{aligned}
(1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} \left[ (w_t^2 + r_t^2) + \sum_{i,j=1}^n (w_{x_i x_j}^2 + r_{x_i x_j}^2) \right] \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
+ \int_{Q_T} [\lambda ((\nabla w)^2 + (\nabla r)^2) + \lambda^3 (w^2 + r^2)] \varphi_\lambda dxdt &\leq C\lambda \int_{Q_T} q^2 \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
&\quad + C\lambda^2 \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \times \\
&\quad \times \left( \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|w\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|r\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 \right) + \\
&\quad + C\delta^2 \lambda^2 e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.43}$$

### 4.3 Estimate all four functions $v, q, w, r$ simultaneously

Summing up (4.33) and (4.43), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(1/\lambda) \int_{Q_T} & \left[ (v_t^2 + q_t^2 + w_t^2 + r_t^2) + \sum_{i,j=1}^n (v_{x_i x_j}^2 + q_{x_i x_j}^2 + w_{x_i x_j}^2 + r_{x_i x_j}^2) \right] \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
& + \lambda \int_{Q_T} [((\nabla v)^2 + (\nabla q)^2 + (\nabla w)^2 + (\nabla r)^2)] \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\
& + \lambda^3 \int_{Q_T} (v^2 + q^2 + w^2 + r^2) \varphi_\lambda dxdt \leq \\
& \leq C \lambda^2 \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \times \\
& \times \left( \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|w\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|r\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 \right) + \\
& + C \delta^2 \lambda^2 e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.44}$$

### 4.4 The target Hölder stability estimate

By (3.2) and (3.3)

$$\int_{Q_T} h^2 \varphi_\lambda dxdt \geq \exp[2\lambda(a^2 - \alpha(T/2 - \varepsilon)^2)] \int_{Q_{\varepsilon, T}} h^2 dxdt, \quad \forall h \in L_2(Q_T). \tag{4.45}$$

Introduce the vector function  $V(x, t)$  as well as its two norms,

$$\begin{aligned}
V(x, t) &= (v, q, w, r)^T(x, t), \\
\|V\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon, T})}^2 &= \|v\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon, T})}^2 + \|q\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon, T})}^2 + \|w\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon, T})}^2 + \|r\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon, T})}^2, \\
\|V\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 &= \|v\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|q\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|w\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \|r\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.46}$$

Obviously

$$\|V\|_{H^2(Q_T)} \leq C. \tag{4.47}$$

Using (4.44)-(4.46), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \exp[2\lambda(a^2 - \alpha(T/2 - \varepsilon)^2)] \|V\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon, T})}^2 \leq \\
& \leq C \lambda^2 \exp(-2\lambda(\alpha T^2/4 - b^2)) \|V\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + C \delta^2 \lambda^2 e^{3\lambda b^2}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.48}$$

Dividing both sides of (4.48) by  $\exp[2\lambda(a^2 - \alpha(T/2 - \varepsilon)^2)]$  and noticing that  $\lambda^2 e^{-2\lambda a^2} < 1$  for  $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|V\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon, T})}^2 & \leq C \exp[-2\lambda(\alpha \varepsilon(T - \varepsilon) - b^2)] \|V\|_{H^2(Q_T)}^2 + \\
& + C \delta^2 \exp[2\lambda(3b^2/2 + \alpha(T/2 - \varepsilon)^2)], \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.49}$$

Let the number  $\beta > 0$ . Choose the parameter  $\alpha$  as

$$\alpha = \frac{(1 + \beta)b^2}{\varepsilon(T - \varepsilon)}. \tag{4.50}$$

Then in the first line of (4.49)

$$\exp [-2\lambda (\alpha \varepsilon (T - \varepsilon) - b^2)] = \exp (-2\lambda \beta b^2). \quad (4.51)$$

Next, using (4.50), we obtain in the second line of (4.49)

$$\exp [2\lambda (3b^2/2 + \alpha (T/2 - \varepsilon)^2)] = \exp (2\lambda d), \quad (4.52)$$

$$d = \left[ \frac{3}{2} + \frac{(1 + \beta) (T/2 - \varepsilon)^2}{\varepsilon (T - \varepsilon)} \right] b^2. \quad (4.53)$$

Recall that the number  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ . Choose  $\lambda = \lambda(\delta)$  such that

$$\delta^2 e^{2\lambda(\delta)d} = \delta^{2-2\rho}. \quad (4.54)$$

Hence, in (4.52)

$$2\lambda(\delta) = \ln \left( \delta^{-2\rho/d} \right). \quad (4.55)$$

Since we must have

$$\lambda(\delta) \geq \lambda_1 = \lambda_1(N, \varepsilon, \Omega, T, c) \geq 1, \quad (4.56)$$

see (4.26), then we must have

$$\delta \in (0, \delta_0), \quad \delta_0 = \delta_0(N, \varepsilon, \Omega, T, c, \rho) = \exp \left( -\frac{\lambda_1 d}{\rho} \right) \in (0, 1). \quad (4.57)$$

Substituting  $2\lambda(\delta)$  from (4.55) in the right hand side of (4.51), we obtain

$$\exp (-2\lambda(\delta) \beta b^2) = \delta^{(2\rho\beta b^2)/d}. \quad (4.58)$$

Next, using (4.53), we obtain

$$\frac{2\rho\beta b^2}{d} = \frac{2\rho\beta}{3/2 + (1 + \beta) (T/2 - \varepsilon)^2 / (\varepsilon (T - \varepsilon))}. \quad (4.59)$$

By (4.52) and (4.54) the term in the second line of (4.49) can be estimated from the above by  $C\delta^{2-2\rho}$  when  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . Hence, we want the multiplier  $C \exp [-2\lambda(\alpha \varepsilon (T - \varepsilon) - b^2)]$  in the first line of (4.49) not to exceed  $C\delta^{2-2\rho}$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . Hence, it follows from (4.51), (4.54), (4.58) and (4.59) that we should have

$$\frac{\rho\beta b^2}{d} = \frac{\rho\beta}{3/2 + (1 + \beta) (T/2 - \varepsilon)^2 / (\varepsilon (T - \varepsilon))} \geq 1 - \rho. \quad (4.60)$$

This is equivalent with

$$\beta \left[ \rho - (1 - \rho) \frac{(T/2 - \varepsilon)^2}{\varepsilon (T - \varepsilon)} \right] \geq (1 - \rho) \left[ \frac{3}{2} + \frac{(T/2 - \varepsilon)^2}{\varepsilon (T - \varepsilon)} \right]. \quad (4.61)$$

To find numbers  $\beta > 0$  satisfying (4.61), it is necessary and sufficient to have

$$\rho - (1 - \rho) \frac{(T/2 - \varepsilon)^2}{\varepsilon (T - \varepsilon)} > 0. \quad (4.62)$$

It obviously follows from (3.18) that inequality (4.62) holds. Thus, if we choose any  $\beta$  satisfying (4.61), then (4.57)-(4.60) imply

$$\exp(-2\lambda(\delta)\beta b^2) = \delta^{(2\rho\beta b^2)/d} \leq \delta^{2-2\rho}, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, \delta_0).$$

Combining this with (4.49)-(4.58) and recalling (4.47), we obtain

$$\|V\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})} \leq C\delta^{1-\rho}, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, \delta_0).$$

Hence, by (4.46)

$$\|v\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})} + \|q\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})} + \|w\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})} + \|r\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})} \leq C\delta^{1-\rho}, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, \delta_0). \quad (4.63)$$

Next, it follows from the first line of (3.21), (4.4), (4.5), (4.13) and (4.63) that we also have:

$$\|\partial_t^s \tilde{u}\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})}, \|\partial_t^s \tilde{m}\|_{H^{2,1}(Q_{\varepsilon,T})} \leq C\delta^{1-\rho}, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, \delta_0), \quad s = 0, 1, 2. \quad (4.64)$$

Finally, using the first line of (3.17), (4.6)-(4.8), Lemma 3.3 and (4.63), we obtain

$$\|\tilde{k}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\delta^{1-\rho}, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, \delta_0). \quad (4.65)$$

The target estimate (3.20) of this theorem follows immediately from estimates (4.64) and (4.65).

To obtain the uniqueness result claimed by this theorem, it is sufficient to set in (3.17) and (3.20)  $\delta = 0$ . Then we obtain  $\tilde{u}(x, t) = \tilde{m}(x, t) = 0$  in  $Q_{\varepsilon,T}$  and

$$\tilde{k}(x) \equiv 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \quad (4.66)$$

Next, applying Theorems 4.1 and 5.1 of [18] to the system (4.2), (4.3) with condition (4.66) and zero Neumann boundary condition at  $S_T$  (see (3.15), (3.17)) in domains  $\Omega \times (0, \varepsilon)$  and  $\Omega \times (T - \varepsilon, T)$  respectively, we obtain  $\tilde{u}(x, t) \equiv \tilde{m}(x, t) \equiv 0$  in  $Q_T$ .  $\square$

## 5 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Estimate (4.25) was obtained under the assumption that inequalities in the second line of (3.17). The same is true for the above estimates, similar with (4.25), for functions  $q, w, r$ . Now, however, it follows from (3.21) that we can use the implication of (3.6) from (3.5) and those estimates will be still valid. Then we can precisely repeat the proof of Theorem 3.2 and obtain Hölder obtain estimates (3.20).

As to uniqueness, if  $\delta = 0$ , then the above paragraph implies of course that  $\tilde{u}(x, t) = \tilde{m}(x, t) = 0$  in  $Q_{\varepsilon,T}$ , and (4.66) is also in place. As to Theorems 4.1 and 5.1 of [18] being applied to the system (4.2), (4.3) with condition (4.66), a little problem is that these theorems are valid only if Neumann boundary conditions equal zero at the entire lateral boundary  $S_T$  whereas in our case they are equal to zero only at  $\Gamma_{1,T}^+$ , see (3.21). On the other hand, Dirichlet boundary conditions equal zero on the rest of the boundary  $S_T \setminus \Gamma_{1,T}^+$ . Still, proofs of Carleman estimates of [18], which are actually taken from [15, 16], can be straightforwardly rewritten for the case when zero Neumann boundary conditions are given at  $\Gamma_{1,T}^+$  and zero Dirichlet boundary conditions are given at  $S_T \setminus \Gamma_{1,T}^+$ . Therefore, just as in the end of the proof of Theorem 3.2, results of [18] again imply now that  $\tilde{u}(x, t) \equiv \tilde{m}(x, t) \equiv 0$  in  $Q_T$ .  $\square$

## 6 Declarations

**Funding and/or Conflicts of interests/Competing interests.** The author has no funding. The author does not have competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

## References

- [1] Achdou, Y., Cardaliaguet, P., Delarue, F., Porretta, A. and Santambrogio, F.: *Mean Field Games*. Cetraro, Italy 2019, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, C.I.M.E. Foundation Subseries, Volume 2281, Springer (2019).
- [2] Bardi, M. and Fischer, M.: On non-uniqueness and uniqueness of solutions in finite-horizon mean field games, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, vol. 25, 44 (2019).
- [3] Bukhgeim, A.L. and Klibanov, M.V.: Uniqueness in the large of a class of multidimensional inverse problems, *Soviet Mathematics Doklady*, 17, 244–247 (1981).
- [4] Burger, M., Caffarelli, L. and Markowich, P.A.: Partial differential equation models in the socio-economic sciences, *Philosophical Transactions of Royal Society*, A372, 20130406 (2014).
- [5] Chow, Y.T., Fung, S.W., Liu, S., Nurbekyan, L. and Osher, S.: A numerical algorithm for inverse problem from partial boundary measurement arising from mean field game problem, *Inverse Problems*, 39, 014001 (2023).
- [6] Ding, L., Li, L., Osher, S. and Yin, W.: A mean field game inverse problem, *J. Scientific Computing*, 92:7 (2022).
- [7] Huang, M., Caines, P.E, and Malhamé, R.P.: Large-population cost-coupled LQG problems with nonuniform agents: individual-mass behavior and decentralized Nash equilibria, *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 52, 1560–1571 (2007).
- [8] Imanuvilov, O.Y. and Yamamoto, M.: Lipschitz stability in inverse parabolic problems by the Carleman estimate, *Inverse Problems*, 14, 1229-1245 (1998).
- [9] O. Imanuvilov, H. Liu and M. Yamamoto, Lipschitz stability for determination of states and inverse source problem for the mean field game equations, *arXiv: 2304.06673*, 2023.
- [10] Klibanov, M.V., Yamamoto M.: Lipschitz stability of an inverse problem for an acoustic equation, *Applicable Analysis*, 85, 515-538-2006.
- [11] Klibanov, M.V.: Carleman estimates for global uniqueness, stability and numerical methods for coefficient inverse problems, *J. of Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems*, 21, 477-510 (2013).
- [12] Klibanov, M.V., Li, J. and Zhang, W.: Convexification for an inverse parabolic problem, *Inverse Problems*, 36, 085008 (2020).

- [13] Klibanov M.V. and Li, J.: Inverse Problems and Carleman Estimates: Global Uniqueness, Global Convergence and Experimental Data, De Gruyter, Berlin (2021).
- [14] Klibanov, M.V.: Stability estimates for some parabolic inverse problems with the final overdetermination via a new Carleman estimate, *arXiv: 2301.09735* (2023).
- [15] Klibanov M.V. and Averboukh, Y.: Lipschitz stability estimate and uniqueness in the retrospective analysis for the mean field games system via two Carleman estimates, *arXiv: 2302.10709* (2023).
- [16] Klibanov, M.V.: The mean field games system: Carleman estimates, Lipschitz stability and uniqueness, *Journal of Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems*, published online, <https://doi.org/10.1515/jiip-2023-0023> (2023).
- [17] Klibanov, M.V., Li, J. and Liu, H.: On the mean field games system with lateral Cauchy data via Carleman estimates, *arXiv: 2303.0758* (2023).
- [18] Klibanov, M.V., Li, J. and Liu, H.: Hölder stability and uniqueness for the mean field games system via Carleman estimates, *arXiv: 2304.00646*, 2023.
- [19] Klibanov, M.V., Li, J. and Liu, H.: Coefficient inverse problems for a generalized mean field games system with the final overdetermination, *arXiv: 2305.01065* (2023).
- [20] Klibanov, M.V., Li, J. and Yang, Z.: Convexification numerical method for the retrospective problem of mean field games, *arXiv: 2306.144404*, 2023.
- [21] Klibanov, M.V., Li, J. and Yang, Z.: A globally convergent numerical method for a coefficient inverse problem of mean field games, in preparation.
- [22] Kolokoltsov, V.N. and Malafeyev, O.A.: Mean field game model of corruption, *Dynamics Games and Applications* 7, 34–47 (2017).
- [23] Kolokoltsov, V.N. and Malafeyev, O.A.: Many Agent Games in Socio-economic Systems: Corruption, Inspection, Coalition Building, Network Growth, Security, Springer Nature Switzerland AG (2019).
- [24] Lasry, J.-M. and Lions, P.-L.: Mean field games, *Japanese Journal of Mathematics*, 2, 229-260 (2007).
- [25] Lavrentiev M.M, V.G. Romanov, V.G. and Shishatskii, S.P.: Ill-Posed Problem of Mathematical Physics and Analysis, AMS, Providence, RI (1986).
- [26] Liu, H., Mou, C. and Zhang, S.: Inverse problems for mean field games, *arXiv: 2205.11350* (2022).
- [27] Liu, H. and Zhang, S.: On an inverse boundary problem for mean field games, *arXiv: 2212.09110* (2022).
- [28] Liu, S., Jacobs, M., Li, W., Nurbekyan, L. and Osher, S.: Computational methods for first order nonlocal mean field games with applications, *SIAM J. Numerical Analysis*, 59, 2639-2668 (2021).

- [29] Novikov, R.G.:  $\partial$ -bar approach to approximate inverse scattering at fixed energy in three dimensions, *International Math. Research Reports*, 6, 287-349 (2005).
- [30] Romanov, V.G.: *Inverse Problems of Mathematical Physics*, VNU Press, Utrecht (1987).
- [31] Trusov, N.V.: Numerical study of the stock market crises based on mean field games approach, *Journal of Inverse and Ill-posed Problems*, 29, 849–865 (2021).
- [32] Yuan, G., Yamamoto, M.: Lipschitz stability in the determination of the principal part of a parabolic equation, *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 15, 525-554 (2009).
- [33] Yamamoto, M.: Carleman estimates for parabolic equations. Topical Review, *Inverse Problems*, 25, 123013 (2009).