

New results on controllability and stability for degenerate Euler-Bernoulli type equations

ALESSANDRO CAMASTA*

Department of Mathematics

University of Bari Aldo Moro

Via E. Orabona 4

70125 Bari - Italy

e-mail: alessandro.camasta@uniba.it

GENNI FRAGNELLI†

Department of Ecology and Biology

Tuscia University

Largo dell'Università, 01100 Viterbo - Italy

e-mail: genni.fragnelli@unitus.it

Abstract

In this paper we study the controllability and the stability for a degenerate beam equation in divergence form via the energy method. The equation is clamped at the left end and controlled by applying a shearing force or a damping at the right end.

Keywords: degenerate beam equation, fourth order operator, boundary observability, null controllability, stabilization, exponential decay.

2000AMS Subject Classification: 35L10, 35L80, 93B05, 93B07, 93D23, 93D15

1 Introduction

Starting from a paper of G. Leugering [14], we consider the following viscoelastic beam of length 1:

$$y_{tt}(t, x) - (a(x)y_{xx}(t, x))_{xx} = 0, \quad (t, x) \in (0, +\infty) \times (0, 1) \quad (1.1)$$

which is clamped at the left end, $x = 0$, and controlled by applying a shearing force or a damping at the right end, $x = 1$. In particular, at $x = 1$, we consider the following conditions

$$y(t, 1) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad y_x(t, 1) = f(t), \quad (1.2)$$

*The author is a member of the *Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA)* of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM), a member of UMI “*Modellistica Socio-Epidemiologica (MSE)*” and he is partially supported by the GNAMPA project 2023 *Modelli differenziali per l'evoluzione del clima e i suoi impatti*. He is also a member of the project *Mathematical models for interacting dynamics on networks (MAT-DYN-NET) CA18232*.

†The author is a member of the *Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA)* of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM), a member of UMI “*Modellistica Socio-Epidemiologica (MSE)*” and is supported by FFABR *Fondo per il finanziamento delle attività base di ricerca* 2017 and by the GNAMPA project 2023 *Modelli differenziali per l'evoluzione del clima e i suoi impatti*.

where $f \in L^2_{loc}[0, +\infty)$, or

$$\begin{cases} \beta y(t, 1) - (ay_{xx})_x(t, 1) + y_t(t, 1) = 0, \\ \gamma y_x(t, 1) + (ay_{xx})(t, 1) + y_{tx}(t, 1) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$, $T > 0$, where β and γ are non negative constants. The novelty of this paper is that the function $a : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ degenerates at the extreme point $x = 0$; in particular, we consider two cases: the weakly degenerate case and the strongly degenerate one. The degeneracy of our problem is quantified by a suitable real parameter that belongs to the interval $(0, 2)$ for technical reasons. More precisely, we have the following definitions:

Definition 1.1. A function a is *weakly degenerate at 0*, (WD) for short, if $a \in \mathcal{C}[0, 1] \cap \mathcal{C}^1(0, 1]$, $a(0) = 0$, $a > 0$ on $(0, 1]$ and if

$$K := \sup_{x \in (0, 1]} \frac{x|a'(x)|}{a(x)}, \quad (1.4)$$

then $K \in (0, 1)$.

Definition 1.2. A function a is *strongly degenerate at 0*, (SD) for short, if $a \in \mathcal{C}^1[0, 1]$, $a(0) = 0$, $a > 0$ on $(0, 1]$ and in (1.4) we have $K \in [1, 2)$.

Due to the degeneracy at $x = 0$, the natural boundary conditions at $x = 0$ are

$$y(t, 0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} y_x(t, 0) = 0, & \text{if } a \text{ is (WD)}, \\ (ay_{xx})(t, 0) = 0, & \text{if } a \text{ is (SD)}, \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$, $T > 0$. Hence, in the present paper we study two problems: the first one is the controllability, i.e. we want to find conditions such that there exists a control $f \in L^2(0, T)$, where T is sufficiently large, so that the solution of (1.1), (1.2), (1.5) with initial conditions

$$y(0, x) = y_0(x) \quad \text{and} \quad y_t(0, x) = y_1(x), \quad (1.6)$$

$x \in (0, 1)$, satisfies

$$y(T, x) = y_t(T, x) = 0 \quad \forall x \in (0, 1).$$

The second problem is the stability, i.e. we want to find conditions such that the solution of (1.1), (1.3), (1.5) and (1.6) satisfies

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} E_y(t) = 0,$$

where E_y is the energy associated to the problem.

Problems similar to (1.1) are considered in several papers and are studied from a lot of point of views, see, for example, [20]. However, in a lot of cases the equation is in non divergence form (see, for example, [2], [4], [10], [11], [12], [13], [19]). In particular, in [10] and [12] the following Euler-Bernoulli beam equation is considered

$$my_{tt}(t, x) + EIy_{xxxx}(t, x) = 0, \quad x \in (0, 1), \quad t > 0,$$

with clamped conditions (1.2) at the left end $x = 0$ and with dissipative conditions at the right end

$$\begin{cases} -EIy_{xxx}(t, 1) + \mu_1 y_t(t, 1) = 0, & \mu_1 \geq 0, \\ EIy_{xx}(t, 1) + \mu_2 y_{tx}(t, 1) = 0, & \mu_2 \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

Here m is the mass density per unit length and EI is the flexural rigidity coefficient. Moreover, the following variables have engineering meanings: y is the vertical displacement, y_t is

the velocity, y_x is the rotation, y_{tx} is the angular velocity, $-EIy_{xx}$ is the bending moment and $-EIy_{xxx}$ is the shear. In particular, the boundary conditions (1.7) mean that the shear is proportional to the velocity and the bending moment is negatively proportional to the angular moment.

However, in all the previous papers the equation is *non degenerate*. The first results on controllability and stabilization for a *degenerate* beam equation but in *non divergence form* can be found in [8] and [9], respectively. To our knowledge, this is the first paper where the equation *degenerates* in a point of the space domain and it is in *divergence form*. Clearly, controllability and stability results for a problem in divergence form can also be obtained from the ones of the problem in non divergence form, simply rewriting

$$(a(x)y_{xx}(t, x))_{xx} = a''(x)y_{xx}(t, x) + 2a'(x)y_{xxx}(t, x) + a(x)y_{xxxx}(t, x). \quad (1.8)$$

Thus, if we study well posedness and stability for (1.1) rewritten using (1.8), we have to require additional regularity on the function a and on the solution y . Moreover, the reference space for (1.1) is the natural $L^2(0, 1)$; on the contrary, the reference space for the equation in non divergence form (1.8) is a suitably weighted L^2 -space. Thus, one can understand the importance of this paper: we prove controllability and stability results under basic assumptions on the degenerate function a in the natural L^2 -space.

From the methodological point of view the strategy employed to analyze (1.1) is based on an energy approach and direct methods such as multipliers. For the first problem we consider the energy of the associated homogeneous adjoint problem, for the second one we consider the energy of (1.1). We underline again that in both cases we assume that the constant K appearing in Definitions 1.1 and 1.2 is strictly less than 2 for technical reasons. The case $K \geq 2$ is an open problem.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce notations, hypotheses and preliminary results used throughout the paper. In Section 3 we consider (1.1), (1.2), (1.5) and (1.6) and we prove that the energy associated to the solution of the adjoint problem is constant through time; then we establish some estimates from above and below for the energy and, thanks to these estimate and to the boundary observability, we prove that the original problem has a unique solution by transposition, which is null controllable. In Section 4 we consider (1.1), (1.3), (1.5) and (1.6) and we study the boundary stabilization problem proving its well posedness together with its exponential stability. However, the case $\gamma = 0$ and/or $\beta = 0$ in the strongly degenerate case is still an open problem. Section 5 is devoted to the proof of the generation theorems that are crucial to derive the well posedness of the considered problems.

2 Preliminary results

In this section we will introduce some preliminary results that will be crucial for the following. As a first step, we consider the next spaces introduced in [7].

If the function a is (WD), we consider:

$$V_a^2(0, 1) := \{u \in H^1(0, 1) : u' \text{ is absolutely continuous in } [0, 1], \\ \sqrt{a}u'' \in L^2(0, 1)\};$$

on the other hand, if a is (SD), then

$$V_a^2(0, 1) := \{u \in H^1(0, 1) : u' \text{ is locally absolutely continuous in } (0, 1], \\ \sqrt{a}u'' \in L^2(0, 1)\}.$$

In both cases we consider on $V_a^2(0, 1)$ the norm

$$\|u\|_{2,a}^2 := \|u\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 + \|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 + \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \quad \forall u \in V_a^2(0, 1), \quad (2.1)$$

which is equivalent to the following one

$$\|u\|_2^2 := \|u\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 + \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \quad \forall u \in V_a^2(0,1) \quad (2.2)$$

(see [7, Propositions 2.1 and 2.2]). Using the previous spaces, it is possible to prove the following Gauss-Green formula: setting

$$\mathcal{Q}(0,1) := \{u \in V_a^2(0,1) : au'' \in H^2(0,1)\},$$

one has

$$\int_0^1 (au'')''v \, dx = [(au'')'v]_{x=0}^{x=1} - [au''v']_{x=0}^{x=1} + \int_0^1 au''v'' \, dx \quad (2.3)$$

for all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{Q}(0,1) \times V_a^2(0,1)$ (see [6, Lemmas 2.1 and 2.3]).

In $\mathcal{Q}(0,1)$ the next lemmas hold.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume a (WD) and $y \in \mathcal{Q}(0,1)$. The following assertions are true:*

1. *If $y'(0) = 0$ or $(ay'')(0) = 0$, then $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} y'(\delta)(ay'')'(\delta) = 0$.*
2. *If $y'(0) = 0$ or $(ay'')(0) = 0$, then $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} y'(\delta)(ay'')(0) = 0$.*
3. $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} a(\delta)(y')^2(\delta) = 0$.
4. $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \delta a(\delta)(y'')^2(\delta) = 0$.

Proof. Since a is (WD) and $y \in \mathcal{Q}(0,1)$, one has $ay'' \in \mathcal{C}^1[0,1]$ and y' absolutely continuous in $[0,1]$. Thus, one has immediately

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} y'(\delta)(ay'')'(\delta) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} y'(\delta)(ay'')(0) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} a(\delta)(y')^2(\delta) = 0.$$

Thus it remains to prove the last point. To this aim observe that (1.4) implies that the function

$$x \mapsto \frac{x^\gamma}{a(x)} \quad (2.4)$$

is non decreasing in $(0,1]$ for all $\gamma \geq K$, in particular

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{x^\gamma}{a(x)} = 0 \quad (2.5)$$

for all $\gamma > K$. Thus, using the fact that $ay'' \in \mathcal{C}^1[0,1]$ and (2.5), one has

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \delta a(\delta)(y'')^2(\delta) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\delta}{a(\delta)}(ay'')^2(\delta) = 0. \quad (2.6)$$

□

Lemma 2.2. *Assume a (SD) and $y \in \mathcal{Q}(0,1)$. The following assertions are true:*

1. $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \delta y'(\delta) = 0$.
2. *If $(ay'')(0) = 0$, then $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} y'(\delta)(ay'')(0) = 0$.*
3. *If $(ay'')(0) = 0$, then $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} a(\delta)(y')^2(\delta) = 0$.*
4. *If $(ay'')(0) = 0$, then $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \delta a(\delta)(y'')^2(\delta) = 0$.*

Proof. 1. As a first step we will prove that $\exists \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \delta y'(\delta) \in \mathbb{R}$. To this aim, we rewrite $\delta y'(\delta)$ as

$$\delta y'(\delta) = y'(1) - \int_{\delta}^1 (xy')'(x) dx = y'(1) - \int_{\delta}^1 y'(x) dx - \int_{\delta}^1 xy''(x) dx.$$

Since $y' \in L^2(0, 1)$ and $|xy''| = \frac{x}{\sqrt{a}} |\sqrt{a}y''| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{a(1)}} |\sqrt{a}y''| \in L^2(0, 1)$, by the absolute continuity of the integral, one has that $\exists \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \delta y'(\delta) = L \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume $L \neq 0$, then there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|y'(\delta)| \geq \frac{C}{\delta}$$

for all δ in a neighbourhood of 0. Since $\frac{1}{\delta} \notin L^1(0, 1)$, one can conclude that $y' \notin L^1(0, 1)$, but this is not possible since $y' \in L^2(0, 1)$. Hence $L = 0$.

2. Clearly,

$$y'(\delta)(ay'')(\delta) = y'(1)(ay'')(1) - \int_{\delta}^1 (y'ay'')' dx = y'(1)(ay'')(1) - \int_{\delta}^1 a(y'')^2 dx - \int_{\delta}^1 y'(ay'')' dx.$$

By the absolute continuity of the integral, using the fact that $a(y'')^2$ and $y'(ay'')'$ belong to $L^1(0, 1)$, one has that there exists $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} y'(\delta)(ay'')(\delta) = L \in \mathbb{R}$. As before, if $L \neq 0$, then there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|y'(\delta)(ay'')(\delta)| \geq C \tag{2.7}$$

for all δ in a neighbourhood of 0. Moreover,

$$|(ay'')(\delta)| \leq \int_0^{\delta} |(ay'')'(x)| dx \leq \sqrt{\delta} \|(ay'')'\|_{L^2(0,1)}. \tag{2.8}$$

Hence, by (2.7) and (2.8), we have

$$C \leq |y'(\delta)ay''(\delta)| \leq |y'(\delta)|\sqrt{\delta}\|(ay'')'\|_{L^2(0,1)}.$$

This implies

$$|y'(\delta)| \geq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\delta}\|(ay'')'\|_{L^2(0,1)}} \tag{2.9}$$

for all δ in a neighbourhood of 0, in contrast to the fact that $y' \in L^2(0, 1)$. Hence $L = 0$.

3. To obtain the thesis we rewrite $a(\delta)(y')^2(\delta)$ in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} a(\delta)(y')^2(\delta) &= a(1)(y')^2(1) - \int_{\delta}^1 (a(y')^2)'(s) ds = a(1)(y')^2(1) - \int_{\delta}^1 (a'(y')^2)(s) ds \\ &\quad - 2 \int_{\delta}^1 (ay'y'')(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since $a'(y')^2$ and $ay'y''$ belong to $L^1(0, 1)$, we have that $\exists \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} a(\delta)(y')^2(\delta) = L \in \mathbb{R}$. If $L \neq 0$, then there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|(y')^2(\delta)| \geq \frac{C}{a(\delta)}$$

for all δ in a neighbourhood of 0. Since $\frac{1}{a} \notin L^1(0, 1)$ (see [1]), one can conclude that $y' \notin L^2(0, 1)$. Hence $L = 0$.

4. If $K = 1$, then, using the fact that $\frac{\delta}{a(\delta)} \leq \frac{1}{a(1)}$ and proceeding as in (2.6), one has immediately the thesis since $ay'' \in \mathcal{C}^1[0, 1]$ and $(ay'')(0) = 0$. On the other hand, if $K \in (1, 2)$, then, using the Taylor formula, we have

$$a(\delta)y''(\delta) = (ay'')'(\xi_\delta)\delta + o(\delta),$$

for $\xi_\delta \in (0, \delta)$; hence

$$\begin{aligned} \delta a(\delta)(y'')^2(\delta) &= \delta y''(\delta)((ay'')'(\xi_\delta)\delta + o(\delta)) \\ &= (ay'')'(\xi_\delta)\delta^2 y''(\delta) + o(\delta^2)y''(\delta). \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Now, $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \delta^2 y''(\delta) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\delta^2}{a(\delta)}(ay'')(\delta) = 0$ and, analogously, $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} o(\delta^2)y''(\delta) = 0$; moreover, using the fact that $ay'' \in \mathcal{C}^1[0, 1]$, one has $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \delta^2 y''(\delta)(ay'')'(\xi_\delta) = 0$. Thus, passing to the limit in (2.10), we have the thesis.

(Observe that the previous proof holds also if $K = 1$).

□

Finally, we recall the following Hardy-Poincaré inequality which will be essential in the next sections:

Proposition 2.1 (Proposition 2.1, [1]). *Assume that $a : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is in $\mathcal{C}[0, 1]$, $a(0) = 0$, $a > 0$ on $(0, 1]$. If there exists $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that the function*

$$x \mapsto \frac{a(x)}{x^\theta} \text{ is non increasing in } (0, 1],$$

then for any function w , locally absolutely continuous on $(0, 1]$, continuous at 0 and satisfying

$$w(0) = 0, \text{ and } \int_0^1 a(x)|w'(x)|^2 dx < +\infty,$$

the following inequality holds

$$\int_0^1 \frac{a(x)}{x^2} w^2(x) dx \leq C_{HP} \int_0^1 a(x)|w'(x)|^2 dx,$$

where $C_{HP} := \frac{4}{(1-\theta)^2}$.

3 The boundary controllability problem

The first problem considered in this paper is a boundary controllability problem. In particular, we will consider the following system

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt}(t, x) + (au_{xx})_{xx}(t, x) = 0, & (t, x) \in Q_T, \\ u(t, 0) = 0, & t \in (0, T), \\ \begin{cases} u_x(t, 0) = 0, & \text{if } a \text{ is (WD)}, \\ (au_{xx})(t, 0) = 0, & \text{if } a \text{ is (SD)}, \end{cases} & t \in (0, T), \\ u(t, 1) = 0, \quad u_x(t, 1) = f(t), & t \in (0, T), \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), \quad u_t(0, x) = u_1(x), & x \in (0, 1), \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where $T > 0$, $Q_T := (0, T) \times (0, 1)$, f is a control function that acts on the non degeneracy boundary point and it is used to drive the solution to equilibrium at a given time $T > 0$. In this framework we look for conditions under which, given initial data (u_0, u_1) in a suitable space, there exists a control f such that

$$u(T, x) = u_t(T, x) = 0, \quad \forall x \in (0, 1).$$

3.1 Well posedness for the problem with homogeneous boundary conditions

In this subsection we study the well posedness of the following degenerate hyperbolic problem with Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} y_{tt}(t, x) + (ay_{xx})_{xx}(t, x) = 0, & (t, x) \in (0, +\infty) \times (0, 1), \\ y(t, 0) = y(t, 1) = 0, & t \in (0, +\infty), \\ y_x(t, 1) = 0, & t \in (0, +\infty), \\ \begin{cases} y_x(t, 0) = 0, & \text{if } a \text{ is (WD)}, \\ (ay_{xx})(t, 0) = 0, & \text{if } a \text{ is (SD)}, \end{cases} & t \in (0, +\infty), \\ y(0, x) = y_T^0(x), & x \in (0, 1), \\ y_t(0, x) = y_T^1(x), & x \in (0, 1) \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

and we give some preliminary results needed for the following.

We underline that the choice of denoting initial data with T -dependence is connected to the approach for null controllability used in Subsection 3.3.

In order to study the well posedness of (3.2), thanks to the spaces introduced in Section 2, we consider the following Hilbert spaces, which are different according to the kind of degeneracy of a .

In particular, if the function a is (WD), then we consider:

$$\begin{aligned} H_a^2(0, 1) &:= \{u \in V_a^2(0, 1) : u(0) = u(1) = 0\} \\ &= \{u \in H_0^1(0, 1) : u' \text{ is absolutely continuous in } [0, 1], \\ &\quad \sqrt{a}u'' \in L^2(0, 1)\}; \end{aligned}$$

on the other hand, if a is (SD), then

$$\begin{aligned} H_a^2(0, 1) &:= \{u \in V_a^2(0, 1) : u(0) = u(1) = 0\} \\ &= \{u \in H_0^1(0, 1) : u' \text{ is locally absolutely continuous in } (0, 1], \\ &\quad \sqrt{a}u'' \in L^2(0, 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

In both cases we consider on $H_a^2(0, 1)$ the norms $\|\cdot\|_{2,a}$ or $\|\cdot\|_2$ defined in (2.1) and in (2.2), respectively. In every case, setting

$$\mathcal{Z}(0, 1) := \{u \in H_a^2(0, 1) : au'' \in H^2(0, 1)\},$$

the Gauss-Green formula (2.3) becomes

$$\int_0^1 (au'')'' v \, dx = -[au''v']_{x=0}^{x=1} + \int_0^1 au''v'' \, dx \quad (3.3)$$

for all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{Z}(0, 1) \times H_a^2(0, 1)$. Now, define

$$\begin{aligned} H_{a,0}^2(0, 1) &:= \{u \in H_a^2(0, 1) : u'(0) = u'(1) = 0\} \\ &= \{u \in H_0^1(0, 1) : u' \text{ is absolutely continuous in } [0, 1], \\ &\quad u'(0) = u'(1) = 0, \sqrt{a}u'' \in L^2(0, 1)\} \end{aligned}$$

if a is (WD), and

$$\begin{aligned} H_{a,0}^2(0, 1) &:= \{u \in H_a^2(0, 1) : u'(1) = 0\} \\ &= \{u \in H_0^1(0, 1) : u' \text{ is locally absolutely continuous in } (0, 1], \\ &\quad u'(1) = 0, \sqrt{a}u'' \in L^2(0, 1)\} \end{aligned}$$

if a is (SD). On $H_{a,0}^2(0,1)$ we consider the same norms of $H_a^2(0,1)$ and the following one

$$\|u\|_{2,\sim} := \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)} \quad \forall u \in H_{a,0}^2(0,1).$$

Proposition 3.1. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). Then the norms $\|\cdot\|_{2,a}$, $\|\cdot\|_2$ and $\|\cdot\|_{2,\sim}$ are equivalent in $H_{a,0}^2(0,1)$. In particular,*

$$\|u\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq \|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2, \quad (3.4)$$

for all $u \in H_{a,0}^2(0,1)$.

Proof. Clearly $\|u\|_{2,\sim} \leq \|u\|_2 \leq \|u\|_{2,a}$ for all $u \in H_a^2(0,1)$ and, in particular, for all $u \in H_{a,0}^2(0,1)$. Thus, it is sufficient to prove that there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\|u\|_2 \leq C\|u\|_{2,\sim} \quad \text{or} \quad \|u\|_{2,a} \leq C\|u\|_{2,\sim},$$

for all $u \in H_{a,0}^2(0,1)$. Thus, fix $u \in H_{a,0}^2(0,1)$; since $u(0) = 0$, we have

$$|u(x)| = \left| \int_0^x u'(s) ds \right| \leq \int_0^x |u'(s)| ds \leq \sqrt{x} \|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)} \leq \|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}, \quad (3.5)$$

for all $x \in (0,1]$, and

$$\|u\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq \|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2. \quad (3.6)$$

Thus, it remains to estimate $\|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2$. To this aim, using the fact that $u'(1) = 0$, we rewrite

$$|u'(x)| = \left| \int_x^1 \frac{\sqrt{a(t)}u''(t)}{\sqrt{a(t)}} dt \right| \leq \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)} \left(\int_x^1 \frac{1}{a(t)} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

for every $x \in (0,1]$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 &\leq \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \int_0^1 \int_x^1 \frac{1}{a(t)} dt dx \\ &= \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \int_0^1 \frac{1}{a(t)} \int_0^t dx dt = \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \int_0^1 \frac{t}{a(t)} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

By (2.4), one has

$$\int_0^1 \frac{t}{a(t)} dt = \int_0^1 \frac{t^K}{a(t)} t^{1-K} dt \leq \frac{1}{a(1)} \int_0^1 t^{1-K} dt = \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)}. \quad (3.8)$$

Consequently

$$\|u\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq \|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2$$

and the thesis follows. \square

To complete the description of the functional setting needed to treat problem (3.2), another important Hilbert space related to its well posedness is given by the following one:

$$\mathcal{H}_0 := H_{a,0}^2(0,1) \times L^2(0,1),$$

endowed with inner product and norm given by

$$\langle (u, v), (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0} := \int_0^1 au''\tilde{u}'' dx + \int_0^1 v\tilde{v} dx$$

and

$$\|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{H}_0}^2 := \int_0^1 a(u'')^2 dx + \int_0^1 v^2 dx$$

for every $(u, v), (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \in \mathcal{H}_0$. Now, consider the operators $A : D(A) \subset L^2(0, 1) \rightarrow L^2(0, 1)$ and $\mathcal{A} : D(\mathcal{A}) \subset \mathcal{H}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0$ given by

$$Au := (au'')'',$$

for all $u \in D(A)$, where

$$D(A) := \{u \in \mathcal{Z}(0, 1) : u'(0) = u'(1) = 0, \text{ if } a \text{ is (WD), or} \\ (au'')(0) = u'(1) = 0, \text{ if } a \text{ is (SD)}\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{A} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Id \\ -A & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D(\mathcal{A}) := D(A) \times H_{a,0}^2(0, 1).$$

Observe that for all $(u, v) \in D(\mathcal{A})$

$$\int_0^1 (au'')'' v dx = \int_0^1 au'' v'' dx. \quad (3.9)$$

Indeed, thanks to (3.3), it is sufficient to prove that there exists $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} (au'' v')(\delta) = 0$. This is clearly satisfied if a is (WD), since in this case v is absolutely continuous in $[0, 1]$ and $v'(0) = 0$. Now, assume that a is (SD). Since $(au'' v')(1) = 0$, one can write

$$(au'' v')(\delta) = - \int_{\delta}^1 (au'' v')'(x) dx = - \int_{\delta}^1 (au'')'(x) v'(x) dx - \int_{\delta}^1 (au'' v'')(x) dx,$$

where $\delta \in (0, 1)$ is fixed. Clearly, $au'' \in H^2(0, 1)$, $\sqrt{a}u'', \sqrt{a}v'', v' \in L^2(0, 1)$, thus $(au'')'v'$ and $au''v'' \in L^1(0, 1)$ and, by the absolute continuity of the integral, $\exists \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (au'' v')(\delta) = L \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $(u, v) \in D(\mathcal{A})$, we know that $(au'')(0) = 0$, hence (2.8) holds and

$$|(au'')(x)| \leq \|(au'')'\|_{L^2(0,1)} \sqrt{x}.$$

This implies that, if $L \neq 0$, proceeding as in (2.7) and (2.9), one has $v' \notin L^2(0, 1)$; hence $L = 0$.

Thanks to (3.9) and using the semigroup technique, we can prove the following generation theorem whose proof is written in the Appendix.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). Then the operator $(\mathcal{A}, D(\mathcal{A}))$ is non positive with dense domain and generates a contraction semigroup $(T(t))_{t \geq 0}$.*

Thanks to the operator $(\mathcal{A}, D(\mathcal{A}))$ and setting

$$\mathcal{U}(t) := \begin{pmatrix} y(t) \\ y_t(t) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{U}_0 := \begin{pmatrix} y_T^0 \\ y_T^0 \end{pmatrix},$$

(3.2) can be formulated as the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathcal{U}}(t) = \mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}(t), & t \geq 0, \\ \mathcal{U}(0) = \mathcal{U}_0. \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

Thus, by Theorem 3.1, if $\mathcal{U}_0 \in \mathcal{H}_0$, the mild solution of (3.10) is given by $\mathcal{U}(t) = T(t)\mathcal{U}_0$; if $\mathcal{U}_0 \in D(\mathcal{A})$, then the solution \mathcal{U} is more regular and the equation in (3.2) holds for all $t \geq 0$. In particular, as in [3, Proposition 3.15], one has the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). If $(y_T^0, y_T^1) \in \mathcal{H}_0$, then there exists a unique mild solution*

$$y \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, +\infty); L^2(0, 1)) \cap \mathcal{C}([0, +\infty); H_{a,0}^2(0, 1))$$

of (3.2) which depends continuously on the initial data $(y_T^0, y_T^1) \in \mathcal{H}_0$. Moreover, if $(y_T^0, y_T^1) \in D(A)$, then the solution y is classical, in the sense that

$$y \in \mathcal{C}^2([0, +\infty); L^2(0, 1)) \cap \mathcal{C}^1([0, +\infty); H_{a,0}^2(0, 1)) \cap \mathcal{C}([0, +\infty); D(A))$$

and the equation of (3.2) holds for all $t \geq 0$.

Remark 1. Due to the reversibility (in time) of the differential equation, solutions exist with the same regularity also for $t < 0$.

3.2 Energy estimates

In this subsection we prove some estimates from below and from above of the energy associated to the solution of (3.2) in order to obtain an observability inequality. First of all we give the definition of the energy.

Definition 3.1. Let y be a mild solution of (3.2) and consider its energy given by the continuous function defined as

$$E_y(t) := \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \left(y_t^2(t, x) + a(x) y_{xx}^2(t, x) \right) dx \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

The definition above is natural and guarantees that the classical conservation of the energy still holds true also in this degenerate situation.

Theorem 3.3. *Assume a (WD) or (SD) and let y be a mild solution of (3.2). Then*

$$E_y(t) = E_y(0) \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Proof. First of all assume that y is a classical solution. Then multiplying the equation

$$y_{tt} + (ay_{xx})_{xx} = 0$$

by y_t , integrating over $(0, 1)$ and using the formula of integration by parts (3.9), one has

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \left(y_t^2 \right)_t dx + \int_0^1 (ay_{xx})_{xx} y_t dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_0^1 \left(y_t^2 + ay_{xx}^2 \right) dx \right) = \frac{d}{dt} E_y(t). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently the energy associated to y is constant. If y is a mild solution, we can proceed as in [8]. \square

Now we prove an inequality for the energy which we will use in the next subsection to establish the controllability result. First of all, we start proving the following preliminary result.

Theorem 3.4. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). If y is a classical solution of (3.2), then $y_{xx}(\cdot, 1) \in L^2(0, T)$ for any $T > 0$ and*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} a(1) \int_0^T y_{xx}^2(t, 1) dt &= \int_0^1 \left[y_t x^2 y_x \right]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx + \int_{Q_T} x y_t^2 dx dt \\ &\quad + \int_{Q_T} \left(3xa - \frac{x^2}{2} a' \right) y_{xx}^2 dx dt - \int_{Q_T} a' y_x^2 dx dt. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Proof. Multiplying the equation in (3.2) by $x^2 y_x$ and integrating over $Q_T = (0, T) \times (0, 1)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \int_{Q_T} y_{tt} x^2 y_x dx dt + \int_{Q_T} x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_{xx} dx dt \\
&= \int_0^1 [y_t x^2 y_x]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_T} x^2 (y_t^2)_x dx dt + \int_{Q_T} x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_{xx} dx dt \\
&= \int_0^1 [y_t x^2 y_x]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T [x^2 y_t^2]_{x=0}^{x=1} dt + \int_{Q_T} x y_t^2 dx dt + \int_{Q_T} x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_{xx} dx dt \\
&= \int_0^1 [y_t x^2 y_x]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx + \int_{Q_T} x y_t^2 dx dt + \int_{Q_T} x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_{xx} dx dt
\end{aligned}$$

since, thanks to the boundary conditions of y , we have $y_t(t, 0) = 0 = y_t(t, 1)$. Now, consider the term $\int_{Q_T} x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_{xx} dx dt$, which is clearly well defined, and let $\delta > 0$. Then

$$\int_{Q_T} x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_{xx} dx dt = \int_0^T \int_0^\delta x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_{xx} dx dt + \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_{xx} dx dt. \quad (3.12)$$

By the Hölder's inequality, $x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_{xx} \in L^1(0, 1)$, hence

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^T \int_0^\delta x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_{xx} dx dt = 0,$$

by the absolute continuity of the integral. In the next steps, we will estimate the second term of (3.12). Setting $I := [\delta, 1]$, since $y \in D(A)$, we have $a y_{xx} \in H^2(I)$ and, in particular, $y_{xx} \in H^2(I)$ since $a(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in I$. Hence, we can integrate by parts

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_\delta^1 x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_{xx} dx dt = \int_0^T [x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_x]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 (x^2 y_x)_x (a y_{xx})_x dx dt \\
&= \int_0^T [x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_x]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - 2 \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 x y_x (a y_{xx})_x dx dt - \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 x^2 y_{xx} (a y_{xx})_x dx dt \\
&= \int_0^T [x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_x]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - 2 \int_0^T [x y_x a y_{xx}]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt + 2 \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 (x y_x)_x a y_{xx} dx dt \\
&\quad - \int_0^T [x^2 a y_{xx}^2]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt + \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 a y_{xx} (x^2 y_{xx})_x dx dt \\
&= \int_0^T [x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_x]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - 2 \int_0^T [x y_x a y_{xx}]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - \int_0^T [x^2 a y_{xx}^2]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt \\
&\quad + 2 \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 a y_x y_{xx} dx dt + 2 \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 x a y_{xx}^2 dx dt + 2 \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 x a y_{xx}^2 dx dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 x^2 a y_{xx} y_{xxx} dx dt \\
&= \int_0^T [x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_x]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - 2 \int_0^T [x y_x a y_{xx}]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - \int_0^T [x^2 a y_{xx}^2]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt \\
&\quad + 4 \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 x a y_{xx}^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 a (y_x^2)_x dx dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 x^2 a (y_{xx}^2)_x dx dt
\end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_0^T [x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_x]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - 2 \int_0^T [x y_x a y_{xx}]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - \int_0^T [x^2 a y_{xx}^2]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt \\
&+ 4 \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 x a y_{xx}^2 dx dt + \int_0^T [a y_x^2]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 a' y_x^2 dx dt \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T [x^2 a y_{xx}^2]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 (2x a + x^2 a') y_{xx}^2 dx dt \\
&= \int_0^T [x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_x]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - 2 \int_0^T [x y_x a y_{xx}]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T [x^2 a y_{xx}^2]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt \\
&+ \int_0^T [a y_x^2]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 a' y_x^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 \left(3x a - \frac{x^2}{2} a'\right) y_{xx}^2 dx dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that in the strongly degenerate case $\int_0^T \int_0^1 a' y_x^2 dx dt \in \mathbb{R}$, being $y_x \in L^2(0, 1)$ and $a \in C^1[0, 1]$. In particular, by (3.4), we have

$$\int_{Q_T} |a' y_x^2| dx dt \leq \max_{x \in [0, 1]} |a'(x)| \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \int_{Q_T} a y_{xx}^2 dx dt. \quad (3.14)$$

In the weakly degenerate case, it results

$$\int_{Q_T} |a' y_x^2| dx dt \leq \int_{Q_T} \frac{1}{x^2} x^2 |a' y_x^2| dx dt \leq K \int_{Q_T} \frac{a}{x^2} y_x^2 dx dt.$$

Thus, we can apply Proposition 2.1 (where $\theta = K \in (0, 1)$) to y_x , obtaining

$$\int_{Q_T} |a' y_x^2| dx dt \leq K \int_{Q_T} \frac{a}{x^2} y_x^2 dx dt \leq \frac{4K}{(1-K)^2} \int_{Q_T} a y_{xx}^2 dx dt. \quad (3.15)$$

In every case $\int_0^T \int_0^1 a' y_x^2 dx dt \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\int_{Q_T} |a' y_x^2| dx dt \leq \max \left\{ \frac{\max_{x \in [0, 1]} |a'(x)|}{a(1)(2-K)}, \frac{4K}{(1-K)^2} \right\} \int_{Q_T} a y_{xx}^2 dx dt.$$

Now, consider the term $\int_0^T \int_\delta^1 \left(3x a - \frac{x^2}{2} a'\right) y_{xx}^2 dx dt$. Clearly, $x a y_{xx}^2 \in L^1(0, 1)$; moreover

$$\left| \frac{x^2}{2} a' y_{xx}^2 \right| \leq \frac{K}{2} a x y_{xx}^2 \in L^1(0, 1).$$

Thus, by the absolute continuity of the integral,

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 \left(3x a - \frac{x^2}{2} a'\right) y_{xx}^2 dx dt = \int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(3x a - \frac{x^2}{2} a'\right) y_{xx}^2 dx dt.$$

It remains to estimate the boundary terms in (3.13). To this aim observe that, thanks to the boundary conditions of y ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&[x^2 y_x (a y_{xx})_x]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} - 2[x y_x a y_{xx}]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} - \frac{1}{2}[x^2 a y_{xx}^2]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} + [a y_x^2]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} \\
&= -\delta^2 y_x(t, \delta) (a y_{xx})_x(t, \delta) + 2\delta y_x(t, \delta) (a y_{xx})(t, \delta) - \frac{1}{2} (a y_{xx}^2)(t, 1) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \delta^2 (a y_{xx}^2)(t, \delta) - a(\delta) y_x^2(t, \delta).
\end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Thanks to Lemma 2.1, if a is (WD), or Lemma 2.2, if a is (SD), one has that the boundary terms in (3.16) reduce to $-\frac{1}{2}(ay_{xx}^2)(t, 1)$. Hence, by (3.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^T \int_{\delta}^1 x^2 y_x (ay_{xx})_{xx} dx dt &= -\frac{1}{2}a(1) \int_0^T y_{xx}^2(t, 1) dt - \int_0^T \int_0^1 a' y_x^2 dx dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(3xa - \frac{x^2}{2}a'\right) y_{xx}^2 dx dt \end{aligned}$$

and (3.11) follows. \square

Thanks to the previous equality and Proposition 2.1 one can prove an estimate from below on the energy using the term $\int_0^T y_{xx}^2(t, 1) dt$.

Theorem 3.5. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). If y is a mild solution of (3.2), then*

$$a(1) \int_0^T y_{xx}^2(t, 1) dt \leq 4 \left(T \max \left\{ 1, \frac{6+K}{2} + \frac{4K}{(1-K)^2} \right\} + \max \left\{ \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)}, 1 \right\} \right) E_y(0),$$

if a is (WD), and

$$a(1) \int_0^T y_{xx}^2(t, 1) dt \leq 4 \left(T \max \left\{ 1, \frac{6+K}{2} + \frac{\max_{x \in [0,1]} |a'(x)|}{a(1)(2-K)} \right\} + \max \left\{ \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)}, 1 \right\} \right) E_y(0),$$

if a is (SD).

Proof. As a first step we estimate the distributed terms in (3.11). Using the fact that $x|a'| \leq Ka$, by (2.4), we find

$$\left| \int_{Q_T} \left(3xa - \frac{x^2}{2}a'\right) y_{xx}^2 dx dt \right| \leq \frac{6+K}{2} \int_{Q_T} xay_{xx}^2 dx dt \leq \frac{6+K}{2} \int_{Q_T} ay_{xx}^2 dx dt. \quad (3.17)$$

Clearly,

$$\int_{Q_T} xy_t^2 dx dt \leq \int_{Q_T} y_t^2 dx dt. \quad (3.18)$$

Now, we will estimate the boundary terms in (3.11). By (3.4), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^1 x^2 y_x(\tau, x) y_t(\tau, x) dx \right| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 x^4 y_x^2(\tau, x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 y_t^2(\tau, x) dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \int_0^1 a(x) y_{xx}^2(\tau, x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 y_t^2(\tau, x) dx \end{aligned}$$

for all $\tau \in [0, T]$. By Theorem 3.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^1 \left[x^2 y_x(\tau, x) y_t(\tau, x) \right]_{\tau=0}^{\tau=T} dx \right| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \int_0^1 a(x) y_{xx}^2(T, x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 y_t^2(T, x) dx \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \int_0^1 a(x) y_{xx}^2(0, x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 y_t^2(0, x) dx \\ &\leq 2 \max \left\{ \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)}, 1 \right\} E_y(0). \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

By (3.11), (3.14), (3.15), (3.17), (3.18) and (3.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}a(1) \int_0^T y_{xx}^2(t, 1)dt &\leq \int_{Q_T} y_t^2 dx dt + \left(\frac{6+K}{2} + \frac{4K}{(1-K)^2} \right) \int_{Q_T} ay_{xx}^2 dx dt \\ &\quad + 2 \max \left\{ \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)}, 1 \right\} E_y(0), \end{aligned}$$

in the weakly degenerate case, and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}a(1) \int_0^T y_{xx}^2(t, 1)dt &\leq \int_{Q_T} y_t^2 dx dt + \left(\frac{6+K}{2} + \frac{\max_{x \in [0,1]} |a'(x)|}{a(1)(2-K)} \right) \int_{Q_T} ay_{xx}^2 dx dt \\ &\quad + 2 \max \left\{ \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)}, 1 \right\} E_y(0), \end{aligned}$$

in the strongly one. Thus, the thesis follows if y is a classical solution; on the other hand, if y is a mild solution, we can proceed as in [8]. \square

In order to obtain an estimate from above on the energy, the next preliminary result is useful.

Theorem 3.6. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). If y is a classical solution of (3.2), then $y_{xx}(\cdot, 1) \in L^2(0, T)$ for any $T > 0$ and*

$$\frac{1}{2}a(1) \int_0^T y_{xx}^2(t, 1)dt = \int_0^1 [xy_t y_x]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_T} y_t^2 dx dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_T} (3a - xa')y_{xx}^2 dx dt. \quad (3.20)$$

Proof. Multiplying the equation in (3.2) by xy_x , integrating over Q_T and using the boundary conditions of y , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_0^1 [xy_x y_t]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_T} x(y_t^2)_x dx dt + \int_{Q_T} xy_x (ay_{xx})_{xx} dx dt \\ &= \int_0^1 [xy_x y_t]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_T} y_t^2 dx dt + \int_{Q_T} xy_x (ay_{xx})_{xx} dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Now, let $\delta > 0$ and rewrite the well defined integral $\int_{Q_T} xy_x (ay_{xx})_{xx} dx dt$ as

$$\int_{Q_T} xy_x (ay_{xx})_{xx} dx dt = \int_0^T \int_0^\delta xy_x (ay_{xx})_{xx} dx dt + \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 xy_x (ay_{xx})_{xx} dx dt.$$

Due to the absolute continuity of the integral we get

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^T \int_0^\delta xy_x (ay_{xx})_{xx} dx dt = 0.$$

Moreover, it is possible to integrate by parts the second term:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \int_\delta^1 xy_x(ay_{xx})_{xx} dx dt &= \int_0^T \left[xy_x(ay_{xx})_x \right]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 (xy_x)_x(ay_{xx})_x dx dt \\
&= - \int_0^T \delta y_x(t, \delta)(ay_{xx})_x(t, \delta) dt - \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 y_x(ay_{xx})_x dx dt \\
&\quad - \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 xy_{xx}(ay_{xx})_x dx dt \\
&= - \int_0^T \delta y_x(t, \delta)(ay_{xx})_x(t, \delta) dt - \int_0^T [ay_x y_{xx}]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 ay_{xx}^2 dx dt - \int_0^T [axy_{xx}^2]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt + \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 (xy_{xx})_x ay_{xx} dx dt \\
&= - \int_0^T \delta y_x(t, \delta)(ay_{xx})_x(t, \delta) dt + \int_0^T a(\delta) y_x(t, \delta) y_{xx}(t, \delta) dt \\
&\quad - \int_0^T [axy_{xx}^2]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt + \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 ay_{xx}^2 dx dt + \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 ay_{xx}^2 dx dt \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 xa(y_{xx}^2)_x dx dt \\
&= - \int_0^T \delta y_x(t, \delta)(ay_{xx})_x(t, \delta) dt + \int_0^T a(\delta) y_x(t, \delta) y_{xx}(t, \delta) dt \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T [axy_{xx}^2]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 (3a - xa') y_{xx}^2 dx dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

As in the proof of Theorem 3.4, one has

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^T \int_\delta^1 (3a - xa') y_{xx}^2 dx dt = \int_{Q_T} (3a - xa') y_{xx}^2 dx dt$$

and, thanks to Lemma 2.1 or 2.2, the boundary terms in (3.22) reduce to $-\frac{1}{2}(ay_{xx}^2)(t, 1)$.

Hence by the previous limit, (3.21) and (3.22) we obtain the thesis. \square

Thanks to the equality stated in the previous theorem, one can prove an estimate from above on the energy. This estimate will be crucial to obtain the observability of (3.2).

Theorem 3.7. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). If y is a mild solution of (3.2), then*

$$a(1) \int_0^T y_{xx}^2(t, 1) dt \geq \left(T \min \{6 - 3K, K + 2\} - (K + 4) \max \left\{ \frac{1}{a(1)(2 - K)}, 1 \right\} \right) E_y(0)$$

for any $T > 0$.

Proof. As a first step, assume that y is a classical solution of (3.2). Then, multiplying the equation in (3.2) by $\frac{-Ky}{2}$, integrating by parts over Q_T and applying (3.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= -\frac{K}{2} \int_{Q_T} y_{tt} y dx dt - \frac{K}{2} \int_{Q_T} y(ay_{xx})_{xx} dx dt \\
&= -\frac{K}{2} \int_0^1 [yy_t]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx + \frac{K}{2} \int_{Q_T} y_t^2 dx dt - \frac{K}{2} \int_{Q_T} ay_{xx}^2 dx dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing the previous equality to (3.20) multiplied by 2 and using (1.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
a(1) \int_0^T y_{xx}^2(t, 1) dt &= 2 \int_0^1 [xy_t y_x]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx - \frac{K}{2} \int_0^1 [yy_t]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx + \left(\frac{K}{2} + 1\right) \int_{Q_T} y_t^2 dx dt \\
&\quad + \int_{Q_T} \left(3 - \frac{xa'}{a} - \frac{K}{2}\right) ay_{xx}^2 dx dt \\
&\geq 2 \int_0^1 [xy_t y_x]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx - \frac{K}{2} \int_0^1 [yy_t]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx + \left(\frac{K}{2} + 1\right) \int_{Q_T} y_t^2 dx dt \\
&\quad + \int_{Q_T} \left(3 - \frac{3K}{2}\right) ay_{xx}^2 dx dt \\
&\geq 2 \int_0^1 [xy_t y_x]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx - \frac{K}{2} \int_0^1 [yy_t]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx \\
&\quad + \min\{6 - 3K, K + 2\} \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_T} (y_t^2 + ay_{xx}^2) dx dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we analyze the boundary terms that appear in the previous relation. As in (3.19), one has

$$2 \left| \int_0^1 [xy_x(\tau, x)y_t(\tau, x)]_{\tau=0}^{\tau=T} dx \right| \leq 4 \max\left\{ \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)}, 1 \right\} E_y(0).$$

Furthermore, by Proposition 3.1, Theorem 3.3 and (3.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_0^1 y(\tau, x)y_t(\tau, x) dx \right| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 y_t^2(\tau, x) dx + \frac{1}{2a(1)(2-K)} \int_0^1 a(x)y_{xx}^2(\tau, x) dx \\
&\leq \max\left\{ 1, \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \right\} E_y(\tau) = \max\left\{ 1, \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \right\} E_y(0)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\tau \in [0, T]$; hence

$$\frac{K}{2} \left| \int_0^1 [yy_t]_{\tau=0}^{\tau=T} dx \right| \leq K \max\left\{ 1, \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \right\} E_y(0)$$

and the thesis follows if y is a classical solution. If y is a mild solution we proceed as in [8]. \square

3.3 Boundary observability and null controllability

As in [8] we give the following definition.

Definition 3.2. Problem (3.2) is said to be observable in time $T > 0$ via the second derivative at $x = 1$ if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $(y_T^0, y_T^1) \in \mathcal{H}_0$ the classical solution y of (3.2) satisfies

$$CE_y(0) \leq \int_0^T y_{xx}^2(t, 1) dt. \quad (3.23)$$

Moreover, any constant satisfying (3.23) is called observability constant for (3.2) in time T .

Setting

$$C_T := \sup\{C > 0 : C \text{ satisfies (3.23)}\},$$

we have that problem (3.2) is observable if and only if

$$C_T = \inf_{(y_T^0, y_T^1) \neq (0,0)} \frac{\int_0^T y_{xx}^2(t, 1) dt}{E_y(0)} > 0.$$

The inverse of C_T , i.e. $c_T := \frac{1}{C_T}$, is called the *cost of observability* (or the *cost of control*) in time T .

Thanks to Theorem 3.7 one can estimate the constant C_T , obtaining the observability of (3.2).

Corollary 3.1. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). If*

$$T > \frac{K+4}{\min\{6-3K, K+2\}} \max\left\{1, \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)}\right\},$$

then (3.2) is observable in time T . Moreover

$$C_T \geq T \min\{6-3K, K+2\} - (K+4) \max\left\{1, \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)}\right\}.$$

Now, we give the definition of solution by transposition for the problem (3.1).

Definition 3.3. Let $f \in L_{loc}^2[0, +\infty)$ and $(u_0, u_1) \in L^2(0, 1) \times (H_{a,0}^2(0, 1))^*$. We say that u is a solution by transposition of (3.1) if

$$u \in C^1\left([0, +\infty); (H_{a,0}^2(0, 1))^*\right) \cap \mathcal{C}([0, +\infty); L^2(0, 1))$$

and for all $T > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u_t(T), v_T^0 \rangle_{(H_{a,0}^2(0,1))^*, H_{a,0}^2(0,1)} - \int_0^1 u(T, x) v_T^1 dx &= \langle u_1, v(0) \rangle_{(H_{a,0}^2(0,1))^*, H_{a,0}^2(0,1)} \\ &\quad - \int_0^1 u_0(x) v_t(0, x) dx - \int_0^T a(1) v_{xx}(t, 1) f(t) dt \end{aligned}$$

for all $(v_T^0, v_T^1) \in \mathcal{H}_0$, where v solves the backward problem

$$\begin{cases} v_{tt}(t, x) + (av_{xx})_{xx}(t, x) = 0, & (t, x) \in (0, +\infty) \times (0, 1), \\ v(t, 0) = 0, \quad v(t, 1) = 0, & t > 0, \\ \begin{cases} v_x(t, 0) = 0, & \text{if } a \text{ is (WD)}, \\ (av_{xx})(t, 0) = 0, & \text{if } a \text{ is (SD)}, \end{cases} & t > 0, \\ v_x(t, 1) = 0, & t > 0, \\ v(T, x) = v_T^0(x), \quad v_t(T, x) = v_T^1(x), & x \in (0, 1). \end{cases} \quad (3.24)$$

In order to study the null controllability for (3.1), we consider the bilinear form $\Lambda : \mathcal{H}_0 \times \mathcal{H}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$\Lambda(V_T, W_T) := \int_0^T a(1) v_{xx}(t, 1) w_{xx}(t, 1) dt,$$

where v and w are the solutions of (3.24) associated to the data $V_T := (v_T^0, v_T^1)$ and $W_T := (w_T^0, w_T^1)$, respectively. As in [8], assuming a (WD) or (SD), one has that Λ is continuous and coercive and, using these properties, one can show the null controllability for (3.1). Indeed, setting T_0 the lower bound found in Corollary 3.1, i.e.

$$T_0 := \frac{K+4}{\min\{6-3K, K+2\}} \max\left\{1, \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)}\right\},$$

one has the next result.

Theorem 3.8. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). Then, for all $T > T_0$ and for every $(u_0, u_1) \in L^2(0, 1) \times (H_{a,0}^2(0, 1))^*$, there exists a control $f \in L^2(0, T)$ such that the solution of (3.1) satisfies*

$$u(T, x) = u_t(T, x) = 0 \quad \forall x \in (0, 1).$$

We omit the proof since it can be easily obtained by the one of [8, Theorem 4.1] with suitable changes.

4 The linear stabilization

In this section we consider the second problem of the paper, i.e. the linear stabilization of the following degenerate beam equation

$$\begin{cases} y_{tt}(t, x) + (ay_{xx})_{xx}(t, x) = 0, & (t, x) \in Q_T, \\ y(t, 0) = 0, & t \in (0, T), \\ \begin{cases} y_x(t, 0) = 0, & \text{if } a \text{ is (WD)}, \\ (ay_{xx})(t, 0) = 0, & \text{if } a \text{ is (SD)}, \end{cases} & t \in (0, T), \\ \beta y(t, 1) - (ay_{xx})_x(t, 1) + y_t(t, 1) = 0, & t \in (0, T), \\ \gamma y_x(t, 1) + (ay_{xx})(t, 1) + y_{tx}(t, 1) = 0, & t \in (0, T), \\ y(0, x) = y_0(x), \quad y_t(0, x) = y_1(x), & x \in (0, 1), \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where, as usual, $Q_T := (0, T) \times (0, 1)$, $T > 0$ and $\beta, \gamma \geq 0$.

4.1 The well posedness

In order to study the well posedness of (4.1), we introduce the following Hilbert spaces: if the function a is (WD), we consider

$$\begin{aligned} K_a^2(0, 1) &:= \{u \in V_a^2(0, 1) : u(0) = 0\} \\ &= \{u \in H^1(0, 1) : u' \text{ is absolutely continuous in } [0, 1], u(0) = 0, \\ &\quad \sqrt{a}u'' \in L^2(0, 1)\}; \end{aligned}$$

on the other hand, if (SD), then

$$\begin{aligned} K_a^2(0, 1) &:= \{u \in V_a^2(0, 1) : u(0) = 0\} \\ &= \{u \in H^1(0, 1) : u' \text{ is locally absolutely continuous in } (0, 1], u(0) = 0, \\ &\quad \sqrt{a}u'' \in L^2(0, 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

On $K_a^2(0, 1)$ we consider the norms $\|\cdot\|_{2,a}$ or $\|\cdot\|_2$ defined in (2.1) and in (2.2), respectively, and the following one

$$\|u\|_{2,\circ}^2 := |u'(1)|^2 + \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2$$

for all $u \in K_a^2(0, 1)$.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). Then the three norms are equivalent in $K_a^2(0, 1)$. In particular, for all $u \in K_a^2(0, 1)$*

$$\|u\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq \|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq 2 \left(|u'(1)|^2 + \frac{\|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2}{a(1)(2-K)} \right) \leq 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \right\} \|u\|_{2,\circ}^2, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\|u\|_2^2 \leq \max \left\{ 2, 1 + \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)} \right\} \|u\|_{2,\circ}^2$$

and

$$\|u\|_{2,a}^2 \leq \max \left\{ 4, \frac{4}{a(1)(2-K)} + 1 \right\} \|u\|_{2,\circ}^2$$

Proof. Fix $u \in K_a^2(0, 1)$ and take $x \in (0, 1]$. Since $u(0) = 0$, we have that (3.5) and (3.6) still hold. Moreover,

$$|u'(1) - u'(x)| = \left| \int_x^1 \frac{\sqrt{a(t)}u''(t)}{\sqrt{a(t)}} dt \right| \leq \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)} \left(\int_x^1 \frac{1}{a(t)} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

for all $x \in (0, 1)$. Consequently, proceeding as in (3.7) and (3.8),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 |u'(x) - u'(1)|^2 dx &\leq \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \int_0^1 dx \int_x^1 \frac{1}{a(t)} dt \\ &\leq \frac{\|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2}{a(1)(2-K)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Now, we estimate $|u'(1)|^2$. By (4.3)

$$\begin{aligned} |u'(1)|^2 &= \left| \int_0^1 (u'(1))^2 dx \right| \leq 2 \int_0^1 (u'(1) - u'(x))^2 dx + 2 \int_0^1 |u'(x)|^2 dx \\ &\leq 2 \left(\frac{\|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2}{a(1)(2-K)} + \|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Hence, for all $u \in K_a^2(0, 1)$, it results

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{2,\circ}^2 &= |u'(1)|^2 + \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq \left(\frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)} + 1 \right) \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 + 2\|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)} + 1, 2 \right\} \|u\|_{2,a}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by (3.6) and (4.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 &\leq \|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 = \int_0^1 |u'(x)|^2 dx \leq \int_0^1 (|u'(x) - u'(1)| + |u'(1)|)^2 dx \\ &\leq 2|u'(1)|^2 + 2 \int_0^1 |u'(x) - u'(1)|^2 dx \\ &\leq 2|u'(1)|^2 + 2 \frac{\|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2}{a(1)(2-K)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (4.2) holds and for all $u \in K_a^2(0, 1)$, it results

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_2^2 &= \|u\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 + \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq 2|u'(1)|^2 + \left(\frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)} + 1 \right) \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \\ &\leq \max \left\{ 2, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)} + 1 \right\} \|u\|_{2,\circ}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{2,a}^2 &= \|u\|_2^2 + \|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq 4|u'(1)|^2 + \left(\frac{4}{a(1)(2-K)} + 1 \right) \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \\ &\leq \max \left\{ 4, \frac{4}{a(1)(2-K)} + 1 \right\} \|u\|_{2,\circ}^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

To complete the description of the functional setting needed to treat problem (4.1), we consider the space

$$\mathcal{W}(0, 1) := \{u \in K_a^2(0, 1) : au'' \in H^2(0, 1)\},$$

where (2.3) becomes

$$\int_0^1 (au'')'' v \, dx = [(au'')'v](1) - [au''v']_{x=0}^{x=1} + \int_0^1 au''v'' \, dx \quad (4.5)$$

for all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{W}(0, 1) \times K_a^2(0, 1)$. Now, define

$$K_{a,0}^2(0, 1) := \{u \in K_a^2(0, 1) : u'(0) = 0, \text{ when } a \text{ is (WD)}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{W}_0(0, 1) := \{u \in \mathcal{W}(0, 1) : u'(0) = 0 \text{ if } a \text{ is (WD), or} \\ (au'')(0) = 0, \text{ if } a \text{ is (SD)}\}.$$

Observe that, if a is (SD), then $K_{a,0}^2(0, 1) \equiv K_a^2(0, 1)$. Clearly, for all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{W}_0(0, 1) \times K_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$ (4.5) becomes

$$\int_0^1 (au'')'' v \, dx = [(au'')'v](1) - [au''v'](1) + \int_0^1 au''v'' \, dx. \quad (4.6)$$

Indeed, it is sufficient to prove that, if a is (SD), then there exists $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} (au''v')(\delta) = 0$. To this aim, one can write

$$\begin{aligned} (au''v')(\delta) &= (au''v')(1) - \int_\delta^1 (au''v')'(x) \, dx \\ &= (au''v')(1) - \int_\delta^1 (au'')'(x)v'(x) \, dx - \int_\delta^1 (au''v'')(x) \, dx, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta \in (0, 1)$ is fixed, and, proceeding as in Subsection 3.1, one has the thesis.

The last space needed to study the well posedness of (4.1) is the following one:

$$\mathcal{K}_0 := K_{a,0}^2(0, 1) \times L^2(0, 1),$$

endowed with inner product and norm given by

$$\langle (u, v), (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \rangle_{\mathcal{K}_0} := \langle (u, v), (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0} + \beta u(1)\tilde{u}(1) + \gamma u'(1)\tilde{u}'(1)$$

and

$$\|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{K}_0}^2 := \|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{H}_0}^2 + \beta u^2(1) + \gamma (u')^2(1)$$

for every $(u, v), (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \in \mathcal{K}_0$.

Now, consider the operator $(B, D(B))$ defined as $By := (ay_{xx})_{xx}$ for all $y \in D(B) := \mathcal{W}_0(0, 1)$ and define $\mathcal{B} : D(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathcal{K}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_0$ as

$$\mathcal{B} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Id \\ -B & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathcal{B}) := \{ &(u, v) \in D(B) \times K_{a,0}^2(0, 1) : \beta u(1) - (au'')'(1) + v(1) = 0, \\ &\gamma u'(1) + (au'')(1) + v'(1) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.1. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). Then the operator $(\mathcal{B}, D(\mathcal{B}))$ is non positive with dense domain and generates a contraction semigroup $(R(t))_{t \geq 0}$.*

We postpone the proof of the previous result to the Appendix. Moreover, as in the Subsection 3.1, one has the following existence theorem.

Theorem 4.2. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). If $(y_T^0, y_T^1) \in \mathcal{K}_0$, then there exists a unique mild solution*

$$y \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, +\infty); L^2(0, 1)) \cap \mathcal{C}([0, +\infty); K_{a,0}^2(0, 1))$$

of (4.1) which depends continuously on the initial data $(y_T^0, y_T^1) \in \mathcal{K}_0$. Moreover, if $(y_T^0, y_T^1) \in D(\mathcal{B})$, then the solution y is classical, in the sense that

$$y \in \mathcal{C}^2([0, +\infty); L^2(0, 1)) \cap \mathcal{C}^1([0, +\infty); K_{a,0}^2(0, 1)) \cap \mathcal{C}([0, +\infty); D(B))$$

and the equation of (4.1) holds for all $t \geq 0$.

Remark 1 still holds in this case.

In the last result of this section we study the degenerate elliptic equation associated to (4.1), whose analysis is crucial to obtain the stabilization of problem (4.1). In particular, we prove that the corresponding elliptic problem admits a unique solution satisfying suitable estimates.

Proposition 4.2. *Assume a (WD) or (SD) and consider $\beta \geq 0$ and $\gamma > 0$. Define*

$$\|z\|^2 := \int_0^1 a(z'')^2 dx + \beta z^2(1) + \gamma (z'(1))^2$$

for all $z \in K_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$. Then the norms $\|\cdot\|$, $\|\cdot\|_{2,a}$, $\|\cdot\|_2$ and $\|\cdot\|_{2,o}$ are equivalent in $K_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$. Moreover, for every $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$, the variational problem

$$\int_0^1 az''\varphi'' dx + \beta z(1)\varphi(1) + \gamma z'(1)\varphi'(1) = \lambda\varphi(1) + \mu\varphi'(1) \quad \forall \varphi \in K_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$$

admits a unique solution $z \in K_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$ which satisfies the estimates

$$\|z\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq C_1 C_2 C_{a,K,\lambda,\mu}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|z\|^2 \leq C_{a,K,\lambda,\mu}^2, \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$C_1 := 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \right\}, \quad C_2 := \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\gamma} \right\} \quad (4.8)$$

and

$$C_{a,K,\lambda,\mu} := \sqrt{C_2} \left(|\lambda| \sqrt{C_1} + |\mu| \right).$$

In addition $z \in D(B)$ and solves

$$\begin{cases} Bz = 0, \\ \beta z(1) - (az'')'(1) = \lambda, \\ \gamma z'(1) + (az'')(1) = \mu. \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

Proof. Clearly, for all $z \in K_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$, $\|z\|_{2,o}^2 \leq \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\gamma} \right\} \|z\|^2$. Moreover, by (3.5),

$$\|z\|^2 \leq \max\{1, \gamma\} \|z\|_{2,o}^2 + \beta \|z\|_{2,a}^2,$$

for all $z \in K_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$. The first part of the thesis follows by Proposition 4.1, which holds in $K_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$ and, in particular, in $K_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$.

Now, consider the bilinear and symmetric form $\Lambda : K_{a,0}^2(0,1) \times K_{a,0}^2(0,1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\Lambda(z, \varphi) := \int_0^1 az''\varphi'' dx + \beta z(1)\varphi(1) + \gamma z'(1)\varphi'(1).$$

Clearly, Λ is coercive and continuous. Now, consider the linear functional

$$\Gamma(\varphi) := \lambda\varphi(1) + \mu\varphi'(1),$$

with $\varphi \in K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$ and $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$. The functional Γ is continuous and linear; thus, by the Lax-Milgram Theorem, there exists a unique solution $z \in K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$ of

$$\Lambda(z, \varphi) = \Gamma(\varphi) \tag{4.10}$$

for all $\varphi \in K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$; in particular,

$$\int_0^1 a(z'')^2 dx + \beta z^2(1) + \gamma(z'(1))^2 = \lambda z(1) + \mu z'(1). \tag{4.11}$$

Now, we will prove (4.7). To this aim observe that

$$|z(x)|^2 \leq \|z'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \right\} \|z\|_{2,\circ}^2 \tag{4.12}$$

for all $x \in (0,1]$, and, by the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{2,\circ}$,

$$|z'(1)|^2 \leq \|z\|_{2,\circ}^2 \tag{4.13}$$

for all $z \in K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$. By (4.11), (4.12) and (4.13) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|z\|^2 &= \lambda z(1) + \mu z'(1) \leq |\lambda| \sqrt{2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \right\}} \|z\|_{2,\circ} + |\mu| \|z\|_{2,\circ} \\ &\leq C_{a,K,\lambda,\mu} \|z\|, \end{aligned}$$

thus

$$\|z\| \leq C_{a,K,\lambda,\mu}.$$

Moreover, by (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|z\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 &\leq 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \right\} \|z\|_{2,\circ}^2 \leq 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \right\} \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\gamma} \right\} \|z\|^2 \\ &\leq 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \right\} \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\gamma} \right\} C_{a,K,\lambda,\mu}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we will prove that z belongs to $D(B)$ and solves (4.9). To this aim, consider again (4.10); clearly, it holds for every $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(0,1)$, so that $\int_0^1 az''\varphi'' dx = 0$ for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(0,1)$. Thus az'' is constant a.e. in $(0,1)$ (see, e.g., [17, Lemma 1.2.1]) and so $(az'')'' = 0$ a.e. in $(0,1)$, in particular $Az = (az'')'' \in L^2(0,1)$ (this implies $az'' \in H^2(0,1)$, by [5, Lemma 2.1]) and $z'(0) = 0$ in the weakly degenerate case, since $z \in K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$.

Now, coming back to (4.10) and using (4.5) or (4.6), for all $\varphi \in K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 az''\varphi'' dx + \beta z(1)\varphi(1) + \gamma z'(1)\varphi'(1) &= \lambda\varphi(1) + \mu\varphi'(1) \\ \iff -(az'')'(1)\varphi(1) + (az''\varphi')(1) + \beta z(1)\varphi(1) + \gamma(z'\varphi')(1) &= \lambda\varphi(1) + \mu\varphi'(1) \end{aligned}$$

in the weakly degenerate case and

$$\int_0^1 az''\varphi'' dx + \beta z(1)\varphi(1) + \gamma z'(1)\varphi'(1) = \lambda\varphi(1) + \mu\varphi'(1)$$

$$\iff -(az'')'(1)\varphi(1) + (az''\varphi')(1) - (az''\varphi')(0) + \beta z(1)\varphi(1) + \gamma(z'\varphi')(1) = \lambda\varphi(1) + \mu\varphi'(1),$$

in the strongly one. Thus, $-(az'')'(1) + \beta z(1) = \lambda$ and $\gamma z'(1) + (az'')(1) = \mu$, and, in the strongly degenerate case $(az'')(0) = 0$; that is $z \in D(B)$ and solves (4.9). \square

4.2 Stabilization in the case $\beta, \gamma > 0$

In this subsection we will study the stability of (4.1) in the case $\beta, \gamma > 0$. To this aim we give the following definition.

Definition 4.1. Let y be a mild solution of (4.1) and define its energy as

$$E_y(t) := \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \left(y_t^2(t, x) + a(x)y_{xx}^2(t, x) \right) dx + \frac{\beta}{2} y^2(t, 1) + \frac{\gamma}{2} y_x^2(t, 1) \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Thus, if y is a mild solution, then

$$y^2(t, 1) \leq \frac{2}{\beta} E_y(t), \quad (4.14)$$

$$y_x^2(t, 1) \leq \frac{2}{\gamma} E_y(t). \quad (4.15)$$

In particular, it is possible to prove that the energy is a non increasing function.

Theorem 4.3. Assume a (WD) or (SD) and let y be a classical solution of (3.1). Then the energy is non increasing. In particular,

$$\frac{dE_y(t)}{dt} = -y_t^2(t, 1) - y_{tx}^2(t, 1), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Proof. Multiplying the equation $y_{tt} + Ay = 0$ by y_t and integrating over $(0, 1)$, we have

$$0 = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \left(y_t^2 \right)_t dx + \int_0^1 (ay_{xx})_{xx} y_t dx.$$

Using the boundary conditions and (4.6), one has

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \left(y_t^2 \right)_t dx + (ay_{xx})_x(t, 1)y_t(t, 1) - y_{tx}(t, 1)a(1)y_{xx}(t, 1) + \int_0^1 ay_{xx}y_{txx} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_0^1 \left(y_t^2 + ay_{xx}^2 \right) dx + \beta y^2(t, 1) + \gamma y_x^2(t, 1) \right) + y_t^2(t, 1) + y_{tx}^2(t, 1) \\ &= \frac{d}{dt} E_y(t) + y_t^2(t, 1) + y_{tx}^2(t, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\frac{d}{dt} E_y(t) = -y_t^2(t, 1) - y_{tx}^2(t, 1) \leq 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0$$

and, consequently, the energy E_y associated to y is non increasing. \square

Proposition 4.3. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). If y is a classical solution of (4.1), then*

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= 2 \int_0^1 \left[xy_t y_x \right]_{t=s}^{t=T} dx - \int_s^T y_t^2(t, 1) dt + \int_{Q_s} y_t^2 dx dt \\
&+ \int_{Q_s} (3a - xa') y_{xx}^2 dx dt + 2\beta \int_s^T y_x(t, 1) y(t, 1) dt + 2 \int_s^T y_x(t, 1) y_t(t, 1) dt \\
&+ 2\gamma \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1) dt + 2 \int_s^T y_x(t, 1) y_{tx}(t, 1) dt - \int_s^T a(1) y_{xx}^2(t, 1) dt
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

for every $0 < s < T$. Here $Q_s := (s, T) \times (0, 1)$.

Proof. Fix $s \in (0, T)$. Multiplying the equation in (4.1) by xy_x and integrating over Q_s , we have

$$0 = \int_{Q_s} y_{tt} xy_x dx dt + \int_{Q_s} (ay_{xx})_{xx} xy_x dx dt. \tag{4.17}$$

Clearly the previous integrals are well defined and integrating by parts the first integral in (4.17), we obtain

$$\int_{Q_s} y_{tt} xy_x dx dt = \int_0^1 \left[y_t xy_x \right]_{t=s}^{t=T} dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_s^T y_t^2(t, 1) dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_s} y_t^2 dx dt, \tag{4.18}$$

since $y_t(t, 0) = 0$. Now, fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$; then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_s^T \int_\delta^1 (ay_{xx})_{xx} xy_x dx dt &= \int_s^T [xy_x (ay_{xx})_x]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt - \int_s^T [(xy_x)_x ay_{xx}]_{x=\delta}^{x=1} dt \\
&+ \int_s^T \int_\delta^1 a(xy_x)_{xx} y_{xx} dx dt \\
&= \int_s^T (y_x (ay_{xx})_x)(t, 1) dt - \int_s^T (xy_x (ay_{xx})_x)(t, \delta) dt \\
&- \int_s^T (y_x ay_{xx})(t, 1) dt - \int_s^T a(1) y_{xx}^2(t, 1) dt \\
&+ \int_s^T (y_x ay_{xx})(t, \delta) dt + \int_s^T (xay_{xx}^2)(t, \delta) dt \\
&+ \int_s^T \int_\delta^1 a(xy_x)_{xx} y_{xx} dx dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

Now, consider the term $\int_\delta^1 a(xy_x)_{xx} y_{xx} dx$. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\delta^1 a(xy_x)_{xx} y_{xx} dx &= 2 \int_\delta^1 ay_{xx}^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_\delta^1 ax(y_{xx}^2)_x dx \\
&= 2 \int_\delta^1 ay_{xx}^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} (ay_{xx}^2)(t, 1) - \frac{1}{2} (xay_{xx}^2)(t, \delta) - \frac{1}{2} \int_\delta^1 ay_{xx}^2 dx \\
&- \frac{1}{2} \int_\delta^1 xa' y_{xx}^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, it follows

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (xay_{xx}^2)(t, \delta) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (xy_x (ay_{xx})_x)(t, \delta) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (y_x ay_{xx})(t, \delta) = 0;$$

moreover, $xa'y_{xx}^2 \in L^1(0,1)$. Hence, by the absolute continuity of the integral, one has

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\delta}^1 a(xy_x)_{xx} y_{xx} dx = \frac{3}{2} \int_0^1 ay_{xx}^2 dx + \frac{1}{2} a(1) y_{xx}^2(t,1) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 xa'y_{xx}^2 dx.$$

Thus, by (4.19), one has the following equality

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q_s} (ay_{xx})_{xx} xy_x dx dt &= \int_s^T (y_x(ay_{xx})_x)(t,1) dt - \int_s^T (y_x ay_{xx})(t,1) dt \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{2} \int_{Q_s} ay_{xx}^2 dx dt - \frac{1}{2} \int_s^T a(1) y_{xx}^2(t,1) dt - \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_s} xa'y_{xx}^2 dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

Furthermore, by (4.17), (4.18) and (4.20), one has

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_0^1 [y_t xy_x]_{t=s}^{t=T} dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_s^T y_t^2(t,1) dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_s} y_t^2 dx dt \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{2} \int_{Q_s} ay_{xx}^2 dx dt + \beta \int_s^T y_x(t,1) y(t,1) dt + \int_s^T y_x(t,1) y_t(t,1) dt \\ &\quad + \gamma \int_s^T y_x^2(t,1) dt + \int_s^T y_x(t,1) y_{tx}(t,1) dt - \frac{1}{2} \int_s^T a(1) y_{xx}^2(t,1) dt - \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q_s} xa'y_{xx}^2 dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying the previous equality by 2 we have the thesis. \square

As a consequence of the previous equality, we have the next relation.

Proposition 4.4. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). If y is a classical solution of (4.1), then for all $0 < s < T$ we have*

$$\int_{Q_s} y_t^2 \left(\frac{K}{2} + 1 \right) dx dt + \int_{Q_s} y_{xx}^2 \left(3a - xa' - \frac{K}{2} a \right) dx dt = (B.T.), \quad (4.21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (B.T.) &= \frac{K}{2} \int_0^1 [yy_t]_{t=s}^{t=T} dx - 2 \int_0^1 [xy_t y_x]_{t=s}^{t=T} dx + \frac{K\beta}{2} \int_s^T y^2(t,1) dt \\ &\quad + \frac{K}{2} \int_s^T y(t,1) y_t(t,1) dt + \gamma \left(\frac{K}{2} - 2 \right) \int_s^T y_x^2(t,1) dt \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{K}{2} - 2 \right) \int_s^T y_x(t,1) y_{tx}(t,1) dt + \int_s^T y_t^2(t,1) dt - 2\beta \int_s^T y_x(t,1) y(t,1) dt \\ &\quad - 2 \int_s^T y_x(t,1) y_t(t,1) dt + \int_s^T a(1) y_{xx}^2(t,1) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let y be a classical solution of (4.1) and fix $s \in (0, T)$. Multiplying the equation in (4.1) by y , integrating over Q_s and using (4.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{Q_s} y_{tt} y dx dt + \int_{Q_s} y (ay_{xx})_{xx} dx dt \\ &= \int_0^1 [yy_t]_{t=s}^{t=T} dx - \int_{Q_s} y_t^2 dx dt + \int_s^T (y(ay_{xx})_x)(t,1) dt \\ &\quad - \int_s^T (y_x ay_{xx})(t,1) dt + \int_{Q_s} ay_{xx}^2 dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

Obviously, all the previous integrals make sense and multiplying (4.22) by $\frac{K}{2}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{K}{2} \int_{Q_s} \left(-y_t^2 + ay_{xx}^2 \right) dx dt + \frac{K}{2} \int_0^1 \left[y_t y \right]_{t=s}^{t=T} dx \\ &+ \frac{K}{2} \int_s^T y(t, 1) (ay_{xx})_x(t, 1) dt - \frac{K}{2} \int_s^T a(1) y_x(t, 1) y_{xx}(t, 1) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

By summing (4.16) and (4.23), we get the thesis. \square

By (4.21), we can get the next estimate.

Proposition 4.5. *Assume a (WD) or (SD) and let y be a classical solution of (4.1). Then there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 < s < T$*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \int_{Q_s} \left(y_t^2 + ay_{xx}^2 \right) dx dt &\leq \left(\vartheta + \varrho + \varsigma + \left(2 - \frac{K}{2} \right) \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) E_y(s) \\ &+ \left(\frac{K}{4} + \frac{K\beta}{2} + \beta \right) \int_s^T y^2(t, 1) dt + \left(\beta + 1 + \frac{2\gamma^2}{a(1)} \right) \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\vartheta := K \max \left\{ 1, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)}, \frac{2}{\gamma} \right\}, \quad \varrho := 4 \max \left\{ \frac{2}{\gamma}, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)}, 1 \right\}$$

and

$$\varsigma := \max \left\{ \frac{K}{4} + 2, \frac{2}{a(1)} \right\}. \quad (4.24)$$

Proof. Since by assumption $K < 2$, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $2 - K \geq \varepsilon_0$. Thus,

$$3a - xa' - \frac{K}{2}a = \frac{3(2-K)a + 2(Ka - xa')}{2} \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}a \quad \text{and} \quad 1 + \frac{K}{2} \geq \frac{2-K}{2} \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}.$$

As a consequence, the boundary terms in (4.21) can be estimated by below in the following way

$$(B.T.) = \int_{Q_s} y_t^2 \left(1 + \frac{K}{2} \right) dx dt + \int_{Q_s} y_{xx}^2 \left(3a - \frac{K}{2}a - xa' \right) dx dt \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \int_{Q_s} \left(y_t^2 + ay_{xx}^2 \right) dx dt. \quad (4.25)$$

Now, we estimate the boundary terms from above. By Proposition 4.1, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^1 y(\tau, x) y_t(\tau, x) dx \right| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 y_t^2(\tau, x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 y^2(\tau, x) dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 y_t^2(\tau, x) dx + y_x^2(\tau, 1) + \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \int_0^1 a(x) y_{xx}^2(\tau, x) dx \\ &\leq \max \left\{ 1, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)}, \frac{2}{\gamma} \right\} E_y(\tau) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\tau \in [s, T]$. Hence, by Theorem 4.3,

$$\int_0^1 \left[y(\tau, x) y_t(\tau, x) \right]_{\tau=s}^{\tau=T} dx \leq 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)}, \frac{2}{\gamma} \right\} E_y(s). \quad (4.26)$$

Using again Proposition 4.1, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
2 \int_0^1 xy_x(\tau, x)y_t(\tau, x)dx &\leq \int_0^1 y_x^2(\tau, x)dx + \int_0^1 y_t^2(\tau, x)dx \\
&\leq 2|y_x(\tau, 1)|^2 + \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)} \int_0^1 a(x)y_{xx}^2(\tau, x)dx + \int_0^1 y_t^2(\tau, x)dx \\
&\leq 2 \max \left\{ \frac{2}{\gamma}, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)}, 1 \right\} E_y(\tau),
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\tau \in [s, T]$, and, by Theorem 4.3,

$$2 \int_0^1 [xy_x(\tau, x)y_t(\tau, x)]_{\tau=s}^{\tau=T} dx \leq 4 \max \left\{ \frac{2}{\gamma}, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)}, 1 \right\} E_y(s). \quad (4.27)$$

Now, since $K < 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\gamma \left(\frac{K}{2} - 2 \right) \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1)dt + \left(\frac{K}{2} - 2 \right) \int_s^T y_x(t, 1)y_{tx}(t, 1)dt \\
&\leq \left(\frac{K}{2} - 2 \right) \frac{1}{2} (y_x^2(T, 1) - y_x^2(s, 1)) \leq \left(2 - \frac{K}{2} \right) \frac{1}{2} y_x^2(s, 1) \\
&\leq \left(2 - \frac{K}{2} \right) \frac{1}{\gamma} E_y(s).
\end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

Obviously

$$\frac{K}{2} \int_s^T y(t, 1)y_t(t, 1)dt \leq \frac{K}{4} \int_s^T y^2(t, 1)dt + \frac{K}{4} \int_s^T y_t^2(t, 1)dt, \quad (4.29)$$

$$2\beta \int_s^T y_x(t, 1)y(t, 1)dt \leq \beta \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1)dt + \beta \int_s^T y^2(t, 1)dt \quad (4.30)$$

and

$$\int_s^T 2y_x(t, 1)y_t(t, 1)dt \leq \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1)dt + \int_s^T y_t^2(t, 1)dt. \quad (4.31)$$

Furthermore, recalling that $\gamma y_x(t, 1) + a(1)y_{xx}(t, 1) + y_{tx}(t, 1) = 0$,

$$\frac{1}{a(1)} \int_s^T a^2(1)y_{xx}^2(t, 1)dt \leq \frac{2}{a(1)} \gamma^2 \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1)dt + \frac{2}{a(1)} \int_s^T y_{tx}^2(t, 1)dt. \quad (4.32)$$

Hence, by (4.25), (4.26)-(4.32)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \int_{Q_s} \left(y_t^2 + a y_{xx}^2 \right) dx dt \leq K \max \left\{ 1, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)}, \frac{2}{\gamma} \right\} E_y(s) \\
& + 4 \max \left\{ \frac{2}{\gamma}, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)}, 1 \right\} E_y(s) + \left(2 - \frac{K}{2} \right) \frac{1}{\gamma} E_y(s) \\
& + \left(\frac{K}{4} + \frac{K\beta}{2} + \beta \right) \int_s^T y^2(t, 1) dt + \left(\beta + 1 + \frac{2}{a(1)} \gamma^2 \right) \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1) dt \\
& + \left(\frac{K}{4} + 2 \right) \int_s^T y_t^2(t, 1) dt + \frac{2}{a(1)} \int_s^T y_{tx}^2(t, 1) dt \\
& \leq K \max \left\{ 1, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)}, \frac{2}{\gamma} \right\} E_y(s) \\
& + 4 \max \left\{ \frac{2}{\gamma}, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)}, 1 \right\} E_y(s) + \left(2 - \frac{K}{2} \right) \frac{1}{\gamma} E_y(s) \\
& + \left(\frac{K}{4} + \frac{K\beta}{2} + \beta \right) \int_s^T y^2(t, 1) dt + \left(\beta + 1 + \frac{2}{a(1)} \gamma^2 \right) \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1) dt \\
& + \max \left\{ \frac{K}{4} + 2, \frac{2}{a(1)} \right\} \int_s^T -\frac{d}{dt} E_y(t) dt \\
& \leq K \max \left\{ 1, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)}, \frac{2}{\gamma} \right\} E_y(s) \\
& + 4 \max \left\{ \frac{2}{\gamma}, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)}, 1 \right\} E_y(s) + \left(2 - \frac{K}{2} \right) \frac{1}{\gamma} E_y(s) \\
& + \left(\frac{K}{4} + \frac{K\beta}{2} + \beta \right) \int_s^T y^2(t, 1) dt + \left(\beta + 1 + \frac{2}{a(1)} \gamma^2 \right) \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1) dt \\
& + \max \left\{ \frac{K}{4} + 2, \frac{2}{a(1)} \right\} E_y(s).
\end{aligned}$$

□

In the next proposition we will find an estimate from above for

$$\int_s^T y^2(t, 1) dt + \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1) dt.$$

To this aim, since $\beta, \gamma > 0$, we can consider the constant

$$C_\delta := 1 - 2C_2 \max\{1, C_1\} \delta \left(\frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \right),$$

where C_1 and C_2 are the constants defined in Proposition 4.2.

Proposition 4.6. *Assume a (WD) or (SD). If y is a classical solution of (4.1), then for every $0 < s < T$ and for every $\delta \in (0, \nu)$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_s^T y^2(t, 1) dt + \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1) dt & \leq \frac{2\delta}{C_\delta} \int_s^T E_y(t) dt \\
& + \frac{1}{C_\delta} \left(2 + 4 \frac{C_1^2 C_2^2}{\beta} + 4 \frac{C_1 C_2^2}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\delta} + 2 \frac{C_1 C_2^2 \max\{1, C_1\}}{\delta} \right) E_y(s),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\nu := \frac{\beta\gamma}{2C_2 \max\{1, C_1\}(\beta + \gamma)}.$$

Proof. Set $\lambda = y(t, 1)$, $\mu = y_x(t, 1)$, where $t \in [s, T]$, and let $z = z(t, \cdot) \in K_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$ be the unique solution of

$$\int_0^1 az_{xx}\varphi'' dx + \beta z(t, 1)\varphi(1) + \gamma z_x(t, 1)\varphi'(1) = \lambda\varphi(1) + \mu\varphi'(1), \quad \forall \varphi \in K_{a,0}^2(0, 1).$$

By Proposition 4.2, $z(t, \cdot) \in D(B)$ for all t and solves

$$\begin{cases} Bz = 0, \\ \beta z(t, 1) - (az_{xx})_x(t, 1) = \lambda, \\ \gamma z_x(t, 1) + (az_{xx})(t, 1) = \mu. \end{cases} \quad (4.33)$$

Now, multiplying the equation in (4.1) by z and integrating over Q_s , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 [y_t z]_{t=s}^{t=T} dx - \int_{Q_s} y_t z_t dx dt &= - \int_s^T z(t, 1)(ay_{xx})_x(t, 1) dt + \int_s^T z_x(t, 1)(ay_{xx})(t, 1) dt \\ &\quad - \int_{Q_s} az_{xx} y_{xx} dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

On the other hand, multiplying the equation in (4.33) by y and integrating over Q_s , we have $\int_{Q_s} (az_{xx})_{xx} y dx dt = 0$. Thus, by (4.5), we get

$$\int_{Q_s} az_{xx} y_{xx} dx dt = - \int_s^T (az_{xx})_x(t, 1) y(t, 1) dt + \int_s^T y_x(t, 1) (az_{xx})(t, 1) dt. \quad (4.35)$$

Substituting (4.35) in (4.34), using the fact that $(az_{xx})_x(t, 1) = \beta z(t, 1) - \lambda$, $(az_{xx})(t, 1) = -\gamma z_x(t, 1) + \mu$, $\lambda = y(t, 1)$ and $\mu = y_x(t, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 [y_t z]_{t=s}^{t=T} dx - \int_{Q_s} y_t z_t dx dt &= - \int_s^T z(t, 1)(ay_{xx})_x(t, 1) dt + \int_s^T z_x(t, 1)(ay_{xx})(t, 1) dt \\ &\quad + \int_s^T (az_{xx})_x(t, 1) y(t, 1) dt - \int_s^T y_x(t, 1) (az_{xx})(t, 1) dt \\ &= - \int_s^T z(t, 1)(ay_{xx})_x(t, 1) dt + \int_s^T z_x(t, 1)(ay_{xx})(t, 1) dt + \int_s^T y(t, 1) [\beta z(t, 1) - \lambda] dt \\ &\quad - \int_s^T y_x(t, 1) [-\gamma z_x(t, 1) + \mu] dt \\ &= \int_s^T z(t, 1) [\beta y(t, 1) - (ay_{xx})_x(t, 1)] dt \\ &\quad + \int_s^T z_x(t, 1) [(ay_{xx})(t, 1) + \gamma y_x(t, 1)] dt - \int_s^T y^2(t, 1) dt - \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_s^T y^2(t, 1) dt + \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1) dt &= - \int_s^T (y_t z)(t, 1) dt - \int_s^T (z_x y_{tx})(t, 1) dt \\ &\quad - \int_0^1 [y_t z]_{t=s}^{t=T} dx + \int_{Q_s} y_t z_t dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

Now, we have to estimate the four terms in the previous equality. As a first step observe that by (4.7) and the definition of $C_{a,K,\lambda,\mu}$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 z^2(t, x) dx &\leq C_1 C_2 C_{a,K,\lambda,\mu}^2 \\ &\leq 2C_1^2 C_2^2 y^2(t, 1) + 2C_1 C_2^2 y_x^2(t, 1), \end{aligned} \quad (4.37)$$

since $\lambda = y(t, 1)$ and $\mu = y_x(t, 1)$. Thus, for all $t \in [s, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 |y_t z|(t, x) dx &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 y_t^2(t, x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 z^2(t, x) dx \\ &\leq E_y(t) + C_1^2 C_2^2 y^2(t, 1) + C_1 C_2^2 y_x^2(t, 1) \\ &\leq E_y(t) + 2 \frac{C_1^2 C_2^2}{\beta} E_y(t) + 2 \frac{C_1 C_2^2}{\gamma} E_y(t) \\ &\leq \left(1 + 2 \frac{C_1^2 C_2^2}{\beta} + 2 \frac{C_1 C_2^2}{\gamma} \right) E_y(t). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 4.3,

$$\int_0^1 [y_t z]_{t=s}^{t=T} dx \leq 2 \left(1 + 2 \frac{C_1^2 C_2^2}{\beta} + 2 \frac{C_1 C_2^2}{\gamma} \right) E_y(s). \quad (4.38)$$

Moreover, for any $\delta > 0$ we have

$$\int_s^T |(y_t z)(t, 1)| dt \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \int_s^T y_t^2(t, 1) dt + \delta \int_s^T z^2(t, 1) dt. \quad (4.39)$$

By definition of $\|\cdot\|$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} z^2(t, 1) &\leq \frac{1}{\beta} \|\cdot\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\beta} C_{a,K,\lambda,\mu}^2 \leq 2 \frac{C_1 C_2}{\beta} y^2(t, 1) + 2 \frac{C_2}{\beta} y_x^2(t, 1) \\ &\leq 2 \frac{C_2 \max\{1, C_1\}}{\beta} (y^2(t, 1) + y_x^2(t, 1)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

Thus, by (4.39), we have

$$\int_s^T |(y_t z)(t, 1)| dt \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \int_s^T y_t^2(t, 1) dt + 2 \frac{C_2 \max\{1, C_1\}}{\beta} \delta \int_s^T (y^2 + y_x^2)(t, 1) dt. \quad (4.41)$$

In a similar way, it is possible to find the next estimate

$$\int_s^T |(z_x y_{tx})(t, 1)| dt \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \int_s^T y_{tx}^2(t, 1) dt + 2 \frac{C_2 \max\{1, C_1\}}{\gamma} \delta \int_s^T (y^2 + y_x^2)(t, 1) dt, \quad (4.42)$$

being

$$z_x^2(t, 1) \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\cdot\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} C_{a,K,\lambda,\mu}^2. \quad (4.43)$$

Therefore, summing (4.41) and (4.42) and applying Theorem 4.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_s^T |(y_t z)(t, 1)| dt + \int_s^T |(z_x y_{tx})(t, 1)| dt \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\delta} \int_s^T -\frac{d}{dt} E_y(t) dt + 2 \max\{1, C_1\} C_2 \delta \left(\frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) \int_s^T (y^2 + y_x^2)(t, 1) dt \\ &\leq \frac{E_y(s)}{\delta} + 2 \max\{1, C_1\} C_2 \delta \left(\frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) \int_s^T (y^2 + y_x^2)(t, 1) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.44)$$

Finally, we estimate the last integral in (4.36), i.e. $\int_{Q_s} |y_t z_t| dx dt$. To this aim, consider again problem (4.9) and differentiate with respect to t . Thus

$$\begin{cases} (a(z_t)_{xx})_{xx} = 0, \\ \beta z_t(t, 1) - (a(z_t)_{xx})_x(t, 1) = y_t(t, 1), \\ \gamma(z_t)_x(t, 1) + (a(z_t)_{xx})(t, 1) = (y_x)_t(t, 1). \end{cases}$$

Clearly, z_t satisfies (4.7) and, proceeding as in (4.37), we have

$$\|z_t\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq 2C_1^2 C_2^2 y_t^2(t, 1) + 2C_1 C_2^2 y_{tx}^2(t, 1) \leq 2C_1 C_2^2 \max\{1, C_1\} (y_t^2(t, 1) + y_{tx}^2(t, 1)).$$

Thus, for $\delta > 0$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Q_s} |y_t z_t| dx dt &\leq \delta \int_{Q_s} y_t^2 dx dt + \frac{1}{\delta} \int_{Q_s} z_t^2 dx dt \\ &\leq 2\delta \int_s^T E_y(t) dt + \frac{2C_1 C_2^2 \max\{1, C_1\}}{\delta} \int_s^T (y_t^2(t, 1) + y_{tx}^2(t, 1)) dt \\ &= 2\delta \int_s^T E_y(t) dt + \frac{2C_1 C_2^2 \max\{1, C_1\}}{\delta} \int_s^T -\frac{d}{dt} E_y(t) dt \\ &\leq 2\delta \int_s^T E_y(t) dt + \frac{2C_1 C_2^2 \max\{1, C_1\}}{\delta} E_y(s). \end{aligned} \tag{4.45}$$

Coming back to (4.36) and using (4.38), (4.44) and (4.45), we obtain the thesis for every $\delta \in (0, \nu)$. \square

As a consequence of Propositions 4.5 and 4.6, we can formulate the main result of this section, whose proof is based on [18, Theorem 8.1].

Theorem 4.4. *Assume a (WD) or (SD) and let y be a mild solution of (3.1). Then, for all $t > 0$ and for all $\delta \in \left(0, \min\left\{\nu, \frac{\varepsilon_0}{C_3}\right\}\right)$, one has*

$$E_y(t) \leq E_y(0) e^{1 - \frac{t}{M}},$$

where $M := \frac{C_4}{\varepsilon_0 - \delta C_3}$,

$$C_3 := \left(\frac{K}{4} + \frac{K\beta}{2} + \beta + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\beta}{2}\right) \frac{2}{C_\delta} + \left(\beta + 1 + \frac{2\gamma^2}{a(1)} + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\gamma}{2}\right) \frac{2}{C_\delta},$$

$$C_4 := \vartheta + \varrho + \varsigma + \left(2 - \frac{K}{2}\right) \frac{1}{\gamma} + C_5$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} C_5 &:= \frac{1}{C_\delta} \left(2 + 4 \frac{C_1^2 C_2^2}{\beta} + 4 \frac{C_1 C_2^2}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{2C_1 C_2^2 \max\{1, C_1\}}{\delta}\right) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\frac{K}{4} + \frac{K\beta}{2} + 2\beta + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\beta}{2} + 1 + \frac{2\gamma^2}{a(1)} + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\gamma}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. As a first step, consider y a classical solution of (3.1) and take $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta < \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_0}{C_3}, \nu \right\}$. By definition of E_y and Propositions 4.5, 4.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon_0 \int_s^T E_y(t) dt &= \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \int_{Q_s} \left(y_t^2(t, x) + a(x) y_{xx}^2(t, x) \right) dx dt \\
&+ \varepsilon_0 \frac{\beta}{2} \int_s^T y^2(t, 1) dt + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1) dt \\
&\leq \left(\vartheta + \varrho + \varsigma + \left(2 - \frac{K}{2} \right) \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) E_y(s) + \left(\frac{K}{4} + \frac{K\beta}{2} + \beta + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\beta}{2} \right) \int_s^T y^2(t, 1) dt \\
&+ \left(\beta + 1 + \frac{2\gamma^2}{a(1)} + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\gamma}{2} \right) \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1) dt \\
&\leq \left(\vartheta + \varrho + \varsigma + \left(2 - \frac{K}{2} \right) \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) E_y(s) + \left(\frac{K}{4} + \frac{K\beta}{2} + \beta + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\beta}{2} \right) \frac{2}{C_\delta} \delta \int_s^T E_y(t) dt \\
&+ \left(\frac{K}{4} + \frac{K\beta}{2} + \beta + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\beta}{2} \right) \frac{1}{C_\delta} \left(2 + 4 \frac{C_1^2 C_2^2}{\beta} + 4 \frac{C_1 C_2^2}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{2C_1 C_2^2 \max\{1, C_1\}}{\delta} \right) E_y(s) \\
&+ \left(\beta + 1 + \frac{2\gamma^2}{a(1)} + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\gamma}{2} \right) \frac{2}{C_\delta} \delta \int_s^T E_y(t) dt \\
&+ \left(\beta + 1 + \frac{2\gamma^2}{a(1)} + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\gamma}{2} \right) \frac{1}{C_\delta} \left(2 + 4 \frac{C_1^2 C_2^2}{\beta} + 4 \frac{C_1 C_2^2}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{2C_1 C_2^2 \max\{1, C_1\}}{\delta} \right) E_y(s).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies $\left[\varepsilon_0 - \delta C_3 \right] \int_s^T E_y(t) dt \leq C_4 E_y(s)$. Hence, we can apply [18, Theorem 8.1] with $M := \frac{C_4}{\varepsilon_0 - \delta C_3}$ and (4.52) holds. If y is the mild solution of the problem, we can proceed as in [16], obtaining the thesis. \square

4.3 Stabilization if $\beta, \gamma \geq 0$ in the weakly degenerate case

Through this subsection we will assume that a is (WD). In this situation, we know that if $y \in K_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$ then $y'(0) = 0$; thus, using this property we can prove the previous results if $\beta = 0$ and/or $\gamma = 0$. Moreover, the same results are improved when β and γ are strictly positive. Indeed

$$|y'(x)| = \left| \int_0^x y''(t) dt \right| \leq \int_0^1 \frac{\sqrt{a(t)} |y''(t)|}{\sqrt{a(t)}} dt \leq \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\sqrt{a} y''\|_{L^2(0,1)} \quad (4.46)$$

for all $x \in (0, 1]$. In particular,

$$|y'(1)|^2 \leq \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)} \|\sqrt{a} y''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2.$$

Hence, for all $y \in K_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|y\|_{2,\circ}^2 &= |y'(1)|^2 + \|\sqrt{a} y''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq \left(1 + \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)} \right) \|\sqrt{a} y''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \\
&\leq \left(1 + \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)} \right) \|y\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that the previous inequality holds also if β and γ are non negative.

Hence, if a is (WD), Proposition 4.2 still holds with the following estimates

$$\|y\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{a(1)(2-K)} \right\} A_\gamma C_{a,K,\lambda,\mu}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|y\| \|^2 \leq C_{a,K,\lambda,\mu}^2, \quad (4.47)$$

where

$$A_\gamma := \begin{cases} \min \left\{ \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\gamma} \right\}, \left(1 + \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)} \right) \right\}, & \gamma \neq 0, \\ 1 + \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)}, & \gamma = 0, \end{cases}$$

and $C_{a,K,\lambda,\mu} := \sqrt{A_\gamma} (|\lambda|\sqrt{C_1} + |\mu|)$. Observe that if $\gamma \geq 1$, then $A_\gamma = 1$.

Moreover, observe that if y is a mild solution of (4.1), then, by (3.5), (4.46), the fact that $y_x(t, 0) = 0$ and the definition of $\| \cdot \|$, we also have that

$$y^2(t, 1) \leq \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)} \|\sqrt{a}y''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq 2 \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)} E_y(t),$$

$$y_x^2(t, 1) \leq \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)} \|\sqrt{a}y''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq 2 \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)} E_y(t),$$

$$y^2(t, 1) \leq \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)} \|\sqrt{a}y''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)} \|y\| \|^2$$

and

$$y_x^2(t, 1) \leq \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)} \|\sqrt{a}y''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \leq \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)} \|y\| \|^2$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Clearly, these estimates hold also if β and γ are strictly positive provided a (WD). Thus

$$y^2(t, 1) \leq C_\beta E_y(t), \quad (4.48)$$

$$y_x^2(t, 1) \leq C_\gamma E_y(t), \quad (4.49)$$

$$y^2(t, 1) \leq \frac{1}{2} C_\beta \|y\| \|^2 \quad (4.50)$$

and

$$y_x^2(t, 1) \leq \frac{1}{2} C_\gamma \|y\| \|^2, \quad (4.51)$$

where

$$C_\beta := \begin{cases} 2 \min \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)}, \frac{1}{\beta} \right\}, & \beta \neq 0, \\ 2 \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)}, & \beta = 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad C_\gamma := \begin{cases} 2 \min \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)}, \frac{1}{\gamma} \right\}, & \gamma \neq 0, \\ 2 \left\| \frac{1}{a} \right\|_{L^1(0,1)}, & \gamma = 0. \end{cases}$$

Clearly (4.47), (4.48), (4.49), (4.50) and (4.51) improve (4.7) and (4.14), (4.15), (4.40), (4.43), respectively, in the case $\beta, \gamma > 0$.

Evidently, under the assumptions of this subsection Theorem 4.3 and Propositions 4.3, 4.4 still hold. On the other hand, Propositions 4.5 and 4.6 rewrite as

Proposition 4.7. *If y is a classical solution of (4.1), then there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 < s < T$*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \int_{Q_s} \left(y_t^2 + a y_{xx}^2 \right) dx dt &\leq \left(\vartheta + \varrho + \varsigma + \left(2 - \frac{K}{2} \right) \frac{C_\gamma}{2} \right) E_y(s) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{K}{4} + \frac{K\beta}{2} + \beta \right) \int_s^T y^2(t, 1) dt + \left(\beta + 1 + \frac{2\gamma^2}{a(1)} \right) \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\vartheta := K \max \left\{ 1, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)}, C_\gamma \right\}, \quad \varrho := 4 \max \left\{ C_\gamma, \frac{2}{a(1)(2-K)}, 1 \right\}$$

and ς is the one defined in (4.24).

Proposition 4.8. *If y is a classical solution of (4.1), then for every $0 < s < T$ and for every $\delta \in (0, \nu)$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_s^T y^2(t, 1) dt + \int_s^T y_x^2(t, 1) dt &\leq \frac{2\delta}{C_\delta} \int_s^T E_y(t) dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{C_\delta} \left(2 + 2C_1^2 A_\gamma^2 C_\beta + 2C_1 A_\gamma^2 C_\gamma + \frac{1}{\delta} + 2 \frac{C_1 A_\gamma^2 \max\{1, C_1\}}{\delta} \right) E_y(s), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\nu := \frac{1}{\max\{1, C_1\}(C_\beta + C_\gamma)A_\gamma},$$

C_1 is as in (4.8) and

$$C_\delta := 1 - \delta \max\{1, C_1\}(C_\beta + C_\gamma)A_\gamma.$$

We omit the proofs since they are similar to the previous ones and, thanks to the previous results, Theorem 4.4 still holds with different constants. In particular:

Theorem 4.5. *Assume a (WD) and let y be a mild solution of (3.1). Then, for all $t > 0$ and for all $\delta \in \left(0, \min \left\{ \nu, \frac{\varepsilon_0}{C_3} \right\} \right)$, one has*

$$E_y(t) \leq E_y(0) e^{1 - \frac{t}{M}}, \quad (4.52)$$

where $M := \frac{C_4}{\varepsilon_0 - \delta C_3}$,

$$C_3 := \left(\frac{K}{4} + \frac{K\beta}{2} + \beta + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\beta}{2} \right) \frac{2}{C_\delta} + \left(\beta + 1 + \frac{2}{a(1)} \gamma^2 + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\gamma}{2} \right) \frac{2}{C_\delta},$$

$$C_4 := \vartheta + \varrho + \varsigma + \left(2 - \frac{K}{2} \right) \frac{C_\gamma}{2} + C_5$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} C_5 &:= \frac{1}{C_\delta} \left(2 + 2C_1^2 A_\gamma^2 C_\beta + 2C_1 A_\gamma^2 C_\gamma + \frac{1}{\delta} + 2 \frac{C_1 A_\gamma^2 \max\{1, C_1\}}{\delta} \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\frac{K}{4} + \frac{K\beta}{2} + 2\beta + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\beta}{2} + 1 + \frac{2\gamma^2}{a(1)} + \varepsilon_0 \frac{\gamma}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here $\vartheta, \varrho, \varsigma$ and ν, C_δ, C_1 are considered in Propositions 4.7 and 4.8, respectively.

5 Appendix

Proof of Theorem 3.1. According to [15, Corollary 3.20], it is sufficient to prove that $\mathcal{A} : D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0$ is dissipative and that $\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{A}$ is surjective, where

$$\mathcal{I} := \begin{pmatrix} Id & 0 \\ 0 & Id \end{pmatrix}.$$

\mathcal{A} is dissipative: take $(u, v) \in D(\mathcal{A})$. Clearly, we can apply (3.9) obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{A}(u, v), (u, v) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0} &= \langle (v, -Au), (u, v) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0} \\ &= \int_0^1 au''v'' dx - \int_0^1 vAu dx = 0; \end{aligned}$$

thus \mathcal{A} is dissipative (see [15, Chapter 2.3]).

$\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{A}$ is surjective: take $(f, g) \in \mathcal{H}_0$. We have to prove that there exists $(u, v) \in D(\mathcal{A})$ such that

$$(\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{A}) \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f \\ g \end{pmatrix} \iff \begin{cases} v = u - f, \\ Au + u = f + g. \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

To this purpose, introduce the bilinear form $L : H_{a,0}^2(0, 1) \times H_{a,0}^2(0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$L(u, z) := \int_0^1 uz dx + \int_0^1 au''z'' dx$$

for all $u, z \in H_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$. Thanks to the equivalence of the norms, the operator L is coercive and continuous: in fact, for all $u, z \in H_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$, we have

$$|L(u, z)| \leq \|u\|_{L^2(0,1)} \|z\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)} \|\sqrt{a}z''\|_{L^2(0,1)} \leq 2\|u\|_2^2 \|z\|_2^2.$$

Now, define $F : H_{a,0}^2(0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$F(z) = \int_0^1 (f + g)z dx,$$

for all $z \in H_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$. Obviously, $F \in (H_{a,0}^2(0, 1))^*$, being $(H_{a,0}^2(0, 1))^*$ the dual space of $H_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$ with respect to the pivot space $L^2(0, 1)$. Hence, by the Lax-Milgram Theorem, there exists a unique solution $u \in H_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$ of

$$L(u, z) = F(z) \text{ for all } z \in H_{a,0}^2(0, 1),$$

i.e.

$$\int_0^1 uz dx + \int_0^1 au''z'' dx = \int_0^1 (f + g)z dx \quad (5.2)$$

for all $z \in H_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$.

Now, take $v := u - f$; then $v \in H_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$. We will prove that $(u, v) \in D(\mathcal{A})$ and solves (5.1). To begin with, (5.2) holds for every $z \in C_c^\infty(0, 1)$. Thus we have

$$\int_0^1 au''z'' dx = \int_0^1 (f + g - u)z dx$$

for every $z \in C_c^\infty(0, 1)$. Hence $(au'')'' = (f + g - u)$ a.e. in $(0, 1)$, i.e. $Au = f + g - u$ a.e. in $(0, 1)$, and $Au \in L^2(0, 1)$. Thus $au'' \in H^2(0, 1)$ (by [5, Lemma 2.1]), $u \in \mathcal{Z}(0, 1)$ and $u'(0) = u'(1) = 0$, if a is (WD), or $u'(1) = 0$ if a is (SD) (recall that $u \in H_{a,0}^2(0, 1)$). In the

last case, coming back to (5.2) and applying the formula of integration by parts (3.3), we obtain

$$\int_0^1 (au'')''z \, dx - (au''z')(0) = \int_0^1 au''v'' \, dx = \int_0^1 (f+g-u)z \, dx$$

for all $z \in H_{a,0}^2(0,1)$. Since $(au'')'' = (f+g-u)$ a.e. in $(0,1)$, one has $(au''z')(0) = 0$ for all $z \in H_{a,0}^2(0,1)$; hence $(au'')(0) = 0$. This implies that $(u,v) \in D(\mathcal{A})$, $u + Au = f + g$, and, recalling that $v = u - f$, we have that (u,v) solves (5.1). \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Since the proof is similar to the previous one, we sketch it.

\mathcal{B} is dissipative: take $(u,v) \in D(\mathcal{B})$. Then $(u,v) \in D(B) \times K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$ and so (4.6) holds. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{B}(u,v), (u,v) \rangle_{\mathcal{K}_0} &= \langle (v, -Bu), (u,v) \rangle_{\mathcal{K}_0} \\ &= \int_0^1 au''v'' \, dx - \int_0^1 vAudx + \beta u(1)v(1) + \gamma u'(1)v'(1) \\ &= -[(au'')'v](1) + [au''v'](1) + \beta u(1)v(1) + \gamma u'(1)v'(1) \\ &= v(1)[\beta u(1) - (au'')'(1)] + v'(1)[\gamma u'(1) + (au'')(1)] = -v^2(1) - (v'(1))^2 \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

thus \mathcal{B} is dissipative.

$\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{B}$ is surjective: take $(f,g) \in \mathcal{K}_0 = K_{a,0}^2(0,1) \times L^2(0,1)$. We have to prove that there exists $(u,v) \in D(\mathcal{B})$ such that

$$(\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{B}) \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f \\ g \end{pmatrix} \iff \begin{cases} v = u - f, \\ Au + u = f + g. \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

Thus, define $G : K_{a,0}^2(0,1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$G(z) = \int_0^1 (f+g)z \, dx + z(1)f(1) + z'(1)f'(1),$$

for all $z \in K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$. Obviously, $G \in (K_{a,0}^2(0,1))^*$, being $(K_{a,0}^2(0,1))^*$ the dual space of $K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$ with respect to the pivot space $L^2(0,1)$. Now, introduce the bilinear form $\mathcal{P} : K_{a,0}^2(0,1) \times K_{a,0}^2(0,1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\mathcal{P}(u,z) := \int_0^1 au''z'' \, dx + \int_0^1 uz \, dx + (\beta+1)u(1)z(1) + (\gamma+1)u'(1)z'(1)$$

for all $u, z \in K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$. Clearly, since β and γ are non negative constants, thanks to the equivalence of the norms given in Proposition 4.1, $\mathcal{P}(u,z)$ is coercive. Furthermore, $\mathcal{P}(u,z)$ is continuous: indeed, by (3.5) and (4.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{P}(u,z)| &\leq \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}\|\sqrt{a}z''\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \|u\|_{L^2(0,1)}\|z\|_{L^2(0,1)} \\ &\quad + (\beta+1)|u(1)||z(1)| + (\gamma+1)|u'(1)||z'(1)| \\ &\leq \|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}\|\sqrt{a}z''\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \|u\|_{L^2(0,1)}\|z\|_{L^2(0,1)} + (\beta+1)\|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}\|z'\|_{L^2(0,1)} \\ &\quad + 4(\gamma+1) \left(\frac{\|\sqrt{a}u''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2}{a(1)(2-K)} + \|u'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \right) \left(\frac{\|\sqrt{a}z''\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2}{a(1)(2-K)} + \|z'\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C\|u\|_{2,a}\|z\|_{2,a} \end{aligned}$$

for all $u, z \in K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$ and for a positive constant C .

As a consequence, by the Lax-Milgram Theorem, there exists a unique solution $u \in K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$ of

$$\mathcal{P}(u, z) = G(z),$$

for all $z \in K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 au''z'' dx + \int_0^1 uz dx + (\beta + 1)u(1)z(1) + (\gamma + 1)u'(1)z'(1) = \\ \int_0^1 (f + g)z dx + z(1)f(1) + z'(1)f'(1) \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

for all $z \in K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$.

Now, take $v := u - f$; then $v \in K_{a,0}^2(0,1)$. We will prove that $(u, v) \in D(\mathcal{B})$ and solves (5.3). As in the proof of Theorem 3.1, one can prove that $u \in \mathcal{W}(0,1)$.

Coming back to (5.4) and applying the formula of integration by parts (4.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 (au'')''z dx - (au'')'(1)z(1) + [au''z']_{x=0}^{x=1} + (\beta + 1)u(1)z(1) + (\gamma + 1)u'(1)z'(1) = \\ \int_0^1 (f + g - u)z dx + z(1)f(1) + z'(1)f'(1). \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Since $(au'')'' = (f + g - u)$ a.e. in $(0,1)$, (5.5) implies that

$$-(au'')'(1)z(1) + (\beta + 1)u(1)z(1) = f(1)z(1) \quad \forall z \in K_a^2(0,1), \quad (5.6)$$

$$(au'')(1)z'(1) + (\gamma + 1)u'(1)z'(1) = f'(1)z'(1) \quad \forall z \in K_a^2(0,1) \quad (5.7)$$

and

$$(au''z')(0) = 0 \quad \forall z \in K_a^2(0,1). \quad (5.8)$$

From (5.6) and (5.7) it follows

$$-(au'')'(1) + (\beta + 1)u(1) = f(1) \iff -(au'')'(1) + \beta u(1) = f(1) - u(1) = -v(1)$$

and

$$(au'')(1) + (\gamma + 1)u'(1) = f'(1) \iff (au'')(1) + \gamma u'(1) = f'(1) - u'(1) = -v'(1)$$

respectively, i.e. $-(au'')'(1) + \beta u(1) + v(1) = 0$ and $(au'')(1) + \gamma u'(1) + v'(1) = 0$. On the other hand, if a is (WD), then $u'(0) = 0$ and (5.8) is clearly satisfied; if a is (SD), then (5.8) implies $(au'')(0) = 0$. Hence (u, v) belongs to $D(\mathcal{B})$ and solves (5.3). \square

References

- [1] F. Alabau-Boussouira, P. Cannarsa, G. Fragnelli, *Carleman estimates for degenerate parabolic operators with applications to null controllability*, J. Evol. Equ. **6** (2006), 161-204.
- [2] C. Behn, J. Steigenberger, C. Will, *Effects of Boundary Damping on Natural Frequencies in Bending Vibrations of Intelligent Vibrissa Tactile Systems*, International Journal on Advances in Intelligent Systems **8** (2015), 245-254.
- [3] A. Bensoussan, G. Da Prato, M.C. Delfour, S.K. Mitter, "Representation and Control of Infinite Dimensional Systems", Second edition. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2007.

- [4] A. Biselli, M.P. Coleman, *The Exact Frequency Equations for the Euler-Bernoulli Beam Subject to Boundary Damping*, Int. J. Acoust. Vib. **25** (2020), 183-189.
- [5] A. Camasta, G. Fragnelli, *A degenerate operator in non divergence form*, Recent Advances in Mathematical Analysis, Trends in Mathematics, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-20021-2>.
- [6] A. Camasta, G. Fragnelli, *Degenerate fourth order parabolic equations with Neumann boundary conditions*, submitted for publication, arXiv:2203.02739.
- [7] A. Camasta, G. Fragnelli, *Fourth-order differential operators with interior degeneracy and generalized Wentzell boundary conditions*, Electron. J. Differ. Equ. **2022** (2022), 1-22.
- [8] A. Camasta, G. Fragnelli, *Boundary controllability for a degenerate beam equation*, submitted for publication, arXiv:2302.06453.
- [9] A. Camasta, G. Fragnelli, *A stability result for a degenerate beam equation*, submitted for publication, arXiv:2304.07088.
- [10] G. Chen, S.G. Krantz, D.W. Ma, C.E. Wayne, H.H. West, *The Euler-Bernoulli beam equation with boundary energy dissipation*, Operator methods for optimal control problems (New Orleans, La., 1986), 67–96, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., 108, Dekker, New York, 1987.
- [11] G. Chen, M.C. Delfour, A.M. Krall, G. Payre, *Modeling, stabilization and control of serially connected beams*, SIAM J. Control Optim. **25** (1987), 526–546.
- [12] G. Chen, J. Zhou, *The wave propagation method for the analysis of boundary stabilization in vibrating structures*, SIAM J. Appl. Math. **50** (1990), 1254–1283.
- [13] M.P. Coleman, L.A. McSweeney, *The Exact Frequency Equations for the Rayleigh and Shear Beams with Boundary Damping*, Int. J. Acoust. Vib. **25** (2020), 3-8.
- [14] G. Leugering, *On boundary feedback stabilisability of a viscoelastic beam*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh (1990), 57–69.
- [15] K.J. Engel, R. Nagel, “One-parameter semigroups for linear evolution equations”, GTM 194, Springer New York, 2000.
- [16] G. Fragnelli, D. Mugnai, *Linear stabilization for a degenerate wave equation in non divergence form with drift*, submitted for publication, arXiv:2212.05264.
- [17] J. Jost, X. Li-Jost, “Calculus of variations”, Cambridge University (1998).
- [18] V. Komornik, “Exact Controllability and Stabilization: The Multiplier Method”, RAM Res. Appl. Math. 36, Masson, Paris, John Wiley, Chichester, UK, 1994.
- [19] S.H. Sandilo, W.T.V. Horssen, *On Boundary Damping for an Axially Moving Tensioned Beam*, J. Vib. Acoust. **134** (2012), 8 pp.
- [20] M.A. Shibov, *Spectral analysis of Euler–Bernoulli beam model with distributed damping and fully non-conservative boundary feedback matrix*, Asymptot. Anal. **129** (2022), 75–112.