

Wave propagation in abstract dynamical system with boundary control

M.I.Belishev*

Abstract

Let L_0 be a positive definite operator in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with the defect indexes $n_{\pm} \geq 1$ and let $\{\text{Ker } L_0^*; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2\}$ be its canonical (by M.I.Vishik) boundary triple. The paper deals with an evolutionary dynamical system of the form

$$\begin{aligned} u_{tt} + L_0^* u &= 0 && \text{in } \mathcal{H}, \quad t > 0; \\ u|_{t=0} = u_t|_{t=0} &= 0 && \text{in } \mathcal{H}; \\ \Gamma_1 u &= f(t), && t \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where f is a boundary control (a $\text{Ker } L_0^*$ -valued function of time), $u = u^f(t)$ is a trajectory. Some of the general properties of such systems are considered. An abstract analog of the finiteness principle of wave propagation speed is revealed.

Key words: symmetric semi-bounded operator, Vishik boundary triple, dynamic system with boundary control, finiteness of wave propagation speed.
MSC: 35Lxx, 35L05, 35Q93, 47B25.

Dedicated to the 85-th jubilee of A.S.Blagoveshchenskii

*St.Petersburg Department of Steklov Mathematical Institute, St.Petersburg, Russian Federation,
 e-mail: belishev@pdmi.ras.ru,
 ORCID: 0000-0002-4759-7428;

0 About the paper

- A dynamical system with boundary control (DSBC) that we deal with, is determined by a symmetric semi-bounded operator with nonzero defect indexes. We are interested in most general properties of such systems. Motivation comes from a program of constructing a functional model of such operators (the so-called *wave model*: see [3], [6]-[9]). The given paper develops the results [2, 5] on the general properties of DSBC. Perhaps, most curious of new facts is that the finiteness principle of wave propagation speed (for short, FS principle), which is well known and holds in numerous applications, does have a relevant analog for abstract DSBC.
- The paper is dedicated to the jubilee of my teacher Aleksandr Sergeevich Blagoveshchenskii, one of the pioneers and creators of the dynamical inverse problems theory. At one time, he explained me the deepness and opportunities of the D'Alembert formula. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the given work is done in the manner and technique of Alexander Sergeevich.

1 Operator L_0

Boundary triple

- As was noted above, DSBC is associated with a semi-bounded operator. The class of these operators that we deal with, is the following. We assume that L_0 is a closed densely defined symmetric positive definite operator in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with nonzero defect indexes; so that

$$\overline{\text{Dom } L_0} = \mathcal{H}; \quad L_0 \subset L_0^*; \quad L_0 \geq \gamma \mathbb{I}, \quad \gamma > 0; \quad 1 \leq n_+^{L_0} = n_-^{L_0} \leq \infty$$

holds, where \mathbb{I} is the identity operator. Note that by virtue of $n_{\pm}^{L_0} \neq 0$ such an operator is necessarily unbounded.

- We denote $\mathcal{K} := \text{Ker } L_0^*$ and use the (orthogonal) projection P in \mathcal{H} on \mathcal{K} . Note that $\dim \mathcal{K} = n_{\pm}^{L_0}$ holds.

Let L be the extension of L_0 by Friedrichs: $L_0 \subset L = L^* \subset L_0^*$, $L \geq \gamma \mathbb{I}$, $\text{Ran } L = \mathcal{H}$. Its inverse L^{-1} is a self-adjoint bounded operator in \mathcal{H} .

The well-known decomposition by Vishik [20] is

$$\text{Dom } L_0^* = \text{Dom } L_0 \dot{+} L^{-1} \mathcal{K} \dot{+} \mathcal{K} = \text{Dom } L \dot{+} \mathcal{K}; \quad (1)$$

the latter equality is established in the framework of M.Krein's theory [15]. Thus, each $y \in \text{Dom } L_0^*$ is uniquely represented in the form

$$y = y_0 + L^{-1}g + h = y' + h \quad (2)$$

with some $g, h \in \mathcal{K}$ and $y' := y_0 + L^{-1}g \in \text{Dom } L$. The components are determined by y as follows:

$$y' = L^{-1}L_0^*y, \quad y_0 = L^{-1}L_0^*(y - y'), \quad h = y - y' - y_0. \quad (3)$$

The operators

$$\Gamma_1 := L^{-1}L_0^* - \mathbb{I}, \quad \Gamma_2 := PL_0^*; \quad \text{Dom } \Gamma_{1,2} = \text{Dom } L_0^*$$

are called *boundary operators*. By definitions and (2),

$$\Gamma_1 y = -h, \quad \Gamma_2 y = g. \quad (4)$$

Also, these definitions imply

$$\text{Ran } \Gamma_1 = \text{Ran } \Gamma_2 = \mathcal{K}. \quad (5)$$

Note that, in general, boundary operators may be unclosable; moreover, such a situation is typical in applications. However, if one endows $\text{Dom } L_0^*$ with the graph-norm $\|y\|_{\text{graph}}^2 = \|y\|^2 + \|L_0^*y\|^2$ then $\Gamma_{1,2}$ become continuous [15].

- The relation

$$(L_0^*u, v) - (u, L_0^*v) = (\Gamma_1 u, \Gamma_2 v) - (\Gamma_2 u, \Gamma_1 v), \quad u, v \in \text{Dom } L_0^* \quad (6)$$

is valid (see, e.g., [5]). By operator theory terminology [15], relations (5) and (6) mean that the collection $\{\mathcal{K}; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2\}$ constitutes the *boundary triple* of the operator L_0 . The general boundary triple theory provides

$$L_0 = L_0^* \upharpoonright [\text{Ker } \Gamma_1 \cap \text{Ker } \Gamma_2], \quad L = L_0^* \upharpoonright \text{Ker } \Gamma_1 \quad (7)$$

(see [15], Chapter 7).

- A possible way to realize decomposition (2) is to solve two "boundary value problems".

Lemma 1. *Let $y = y_0 + L^{-1}g + h$ be the Vishik decomposition of $y \in \text{Dom } L_0^*$. Then the elements h and g are uniquely determined by the relations*

$$L_0^*h = 0; \quad \Gamma_1h = \Gamma_1y. \quad (8)$$

and

$$L_0^{*2}w = 0; \quad \Gamma_1w = 0; \quad \Gamma_2w = \Gamma_2(y - h), \quad (9)$$

respectively, where $w := L^{-1}g$.

Proof. Element h obeying the second relation in (8), does exist due to (5). It is unique. Indeed, if h' satisfies (8) then $\tilde{y} := h - h'$ obeys $\Gamma_1\tilde{y} = 0$, i.e., $\tilde{y} \in \text{Dom } L$. The latter implies $\tilde{y} = 0$ by virtue of $\text{Dom } L \cap \text{Ker } L_0^* = \{0\}$ (see (1)).

Since $L_0^*L_0^*L^{-1}g = L_0^*g = 0$, $L^{-1}g \in \text{Dom } L$ is valid (so that $\Gamma_1L^{-1}g \stackrel{\text{see (7)}}{=} 0$ and $\Gamma_2L^{-1}g = \Gamma_2(y - y_0 - h) \stackrel{(7)}{=} \Gamma_2(y - h)$ hold), we see that $w = L^{-1}g$ solves problem (9). If w' also solves it, for $\tilde{w} := w - w'$ one has $\Gamma_1\tilde{w} = \Gamma_2\tilde{w} = 0$ that leads to $\tilde{w} \in \text{Dom } L_0$ by virtue of (7). Therefore, $L_0^*\tilde{w} = L_0\tilde{w} \in \text{Ran } L_0$ and, hence, $L_0^*\tilde{w} \perp \text{Ker } L_0^*$. The latter makes $L_0^*L_0^*\tilde{w} = 0$ possible only if $L_0^*\tilde{w} = 0$. Since $L_0^*\tilde{w} = L_0\tilde{w} = 0$, we arrive at $\tilde{w} = 0$ by injectivity of L_0 . \square

Thus, to determine h and g in (2), one can find h from (8), solve (9) and then get $g = Lw$.

Example

- As an illustration, we consider the Laplace operator. Let (Ω, g) be a compact smooth¹ Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 2$ ² with the smooth connected boundary Γ , let Δ be the Laplace-Beltrami differential operator in Ω .

Let $H^p(\Omega)$, $p = 1, 2$, $H_0^1(\Omega) = \{y \in H^1(\Omega) \mid y|_\Gamma = 0\}$ and $H_0^2(\Omega) = \{y \in H^2(\Omega) \mid y|_\Gamma = \partial_\nu y|_\Gamma = 0\}$ be the Sobolev spaces (ν is the outward normal on Γ). We put $\mathcal{H} := L_2(\Omega)$ and denote by $\text{Harm}(\Omega) := \{h \in \mathcal{H} \mid \Delta h = 0 \text{ in } \Omega \setminus \Gamma\}$ the subspace of harmonic functions. The following is the well-known facts.

The operator (*minimal Laplacian*) $L_0 := \overline{-\Delta|C_0^\infty(\Omega)} = -\Delta|H_0^2(\Omega)$ is positive definite. Its adjoint (*maximal Laplacian*) is $L_0^* = -\Delta|H^2(\Omega) +$

¹In the subsequent, *smooth* always means C^∞ -smooth.

²the case $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is quite suitable for our goals.

Harm(Ω)], and $\mathcal{K} = \text{Ker } L_0^* = \text{Harm}(\Omega)$ holds. The Friedrichs extension of L_0 is $L = -\Delta \upharpoonright [H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)]$.

- By (2) and (4), to describe how the boundary operators $\Gamma_{1,2}$ act, one needs to show how to find the harmonic functions h and g for a given $y \in \text{Dom } L_0^*$. Since y_0 and $L^{-1}g$ belong to $H_0^1(\Omega)$, we have $y = h$ on Γ . Thus, the function h can be specified as the (unique) solution of the Dirichlet problem

$$\Delta h = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \Gamma; \quad h = y \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \quad (10)$$

To find the harmonic g , we recall that the summand y_0 in (2) belongs to $\text{Dom } L_0 = H_0^2(\Omega)$ and, hence, obeys $\partial_\nu y_0|_\Gamma = 0$. This implies

$$\partial_\nu L^{-1}g \stackrel{(2)}{=} \partial_\nu(y - y_0 - h) = \partial_\nu(y - h).$$

In the mean time, we have $L^{-1}g \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $L_0^*L_0^*L^{-1}g = L_0^*g = 0$. As a result, $L^{-1}g$ obeys

$$\Delta^2(L^{-1}g) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \Gamma; \quad L^{-1}g = 0, \quad \partial_\nu(L^{-1}g) = \partial_\nu(y - h) \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (11)$$

(h is already known). Solving this well-posed Cauchy problem for the biharmonic equation, we get $L^{-1}g$ and then find $g = \Delta L^{-1}g$.

As is easy to recognize, (10) and (11) are some concrete versions of (8) and (9) respectively. We get rights to claim that $L_0^*h = 0$ and $L_0^{*2}w = 0$ are the abstract Laplace and biharmonic equations respectively.

2 Dynamics determined by operator L_0

System α

- The boundary triple, in turn, determines a *dynamical system with boundary control* (DSBC) of the form

$$\ddot{u} + L_0^*u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}, \quad t > 0; \quad (12)$$

$$u|_{t=0} = \dot{u}|_{t=0} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}; \quad (13)$$

$$\Gamma_1 u = f \quad \text{in } \mathcal{K}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (14)$$

where $(\dot{}) := \frac{d}{dt}$; $f = f(t)$ is a \mathcal{K} -valued function of time (*boundary control*). By $u = u^f(t)$ we denote the solution (*wave*). For short, we call (12)–(14) just system α ; function $u^f(\cdot)$ is its *trajectory*.

Introduce the class of smooth controls

$$\mathcal{M} := \{f \in C^\infty([0, \infty); \mathcal{K}) \mid \text{supp } f \subset (0, \infty)\},$$

vanishing near $t = 0$. As is shown in [5], for each $f \in \mathcal{M}$ there exists a unique classical solution $u = u^f(t) \in C^\infty([0, \infty); \mathcal{H})$ (a *smooth wave*) obeying $u^f(t) \in \text{Dom } L_0^*$, $t \geq 0$ and represented in the form

$$u^f(t) = -f(t) + L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^t \sin[(t-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \ddot{f}(s) ds, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (15)$$

Integrating by parts, we get the equivalent representation

$$u^f(t) = -f(t) + L^{-1} \int_0^t \left\{ 1 - \cos[(t-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \right\} \ddot{f}(s) ds = -f(t) + u_L^f(t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (16)$$

where the summand $u_L^f(t) \in \text{Dom } L$ corresponds to the element $y' \in \text{Dom } L$ in decomposition (2).

The right hand side in (15) is meaningful for any $f \in H_{\text{loc}}^2([0, \infty); \mathcal{K})$ vanishing near $t = 0$. For such controls, it defines a (generalized) solution u^f to (12)–(14). The following is some of its properties.

- In what follows, we assume that all time functions are extended to $t < 0$ by zero.

Let a map \mathcal{T}_τ delay functions by the rule $(\mathcal{T}_\tau w)(t) := w(t - \tau)$. Since the operator L_0^* which governs the evolution of system α , does not depend on time, the steady state relation

$$u^{\mathcal{T}_\tau f}(t) = (\mathcal{T}_\tau u^f)(t) = u^f(t - \tau), \quad t \geq 0, \quad \tau > 0 \quad (17)$$

and its consequence

$$u^{\dot{f}}(t) = \dot{u}^f(t), \quad u^{\ddot{f}}(t) = \ddot{u}^f(t) \stackrel{(12)}{=} -L_0^* u^f(t), \quad t \geq 0 \quad (18)$$

hold.

- The following is the control theory attributes of system α .

The space of controls (inputs) $\mathcal{F} := L_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{K})$ is an *external space*. It contains a family of delayed controls $\mathcal{F}_\tau := \mathcal{T}_\tau \mathcal{F}$, $\tau > 0$ and the smooth class \mathcal{M} , which satisfies

$$\frac{d^p}{dt^p} \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}, \quad p = 1, 2, \dots \quad (19)$$

and is locally dense in $\mathcal{F}: \overline{\{f|_{[0,T]} \mid f \in \mathcal{M}\}} = L_2([0, T]; \mathcal{H}), \quad T > 0.$

The space \mathcal{H} is an *internal space*, the waves (states) $u^f(t)$ are its elements. It contains an increasing family of *reachable sets* $\mathcal{U}^\tau := \{u^f(\tau) \mid f \in \mathcal{M}\}, \tau \geq 0$ and the total reachable set $\mathcal{U} := \text{span} \{\mathcal{U}^\tau \mid \tau \geq 0\}$. By (19) and (18) an invariance of reachable sets

$$L_0^* \mathcal{U}^\tau = \mathcal{U}^\tau, \quad \tau \geq 0; \quad L_0^* \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U} \quad (20)$$

holds.

In system α , the input-state map is

$$W^\tau : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}, \quad \text{Dom } W^\tau = \mathcal{M}, \quad W^\tau f := u^f(\tau), \quad \tau \geq 0.$$

Lemma 2. *For any $\tau > 0$, the map W^τ is closable.*

Proof. 1. Take an arbitrary $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$. Applying $L^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ in (15), we have

$$(L^{-\frac{1}{2}} u^f(\tau), \phi) = -(L^{-\frac{1}{2}} f(\tau), \phi) + (L^{-1} \int_0^\tau \sin[(\tau-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \ddot{f}(s) ds, \phi) =: -I + II. \quad (21)$$

Since $L = L^*$, the second summand is of the form

$$II = \int_0^\tau ds (\ddot{f}(s), \psi(s))$$

with $\psi(s) := L^{-1} \sin[(\tau-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \phi$ obeying $\ddot{\psi}(s) = -\sin[(\tau-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \phi \in \mathcal{H}$. Then one can easily justify integration by parts:

$$\begin{aligned} II &= \left[(\dot{f}(s), L^{-1} \sin[(\tau-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \phi) + (f(s), L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cos[(\tau-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \phi) \right] \Big|_{s=0}^{s=\tau} + \\ &+ \int_0^\tau (f(s), \sin[(\tau-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \phi) ds = (f(\tau), L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \phi) + \\ &+ \int_0^\tau (f(s), \sin[(\tau-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \phi) ds = (L^{-\frac{1}{2}} f(\tau), \phi) + \int_0^\tau (\sin[(\tau-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] f(s), \phi) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting II in the form of the latter sum to (21) and taking into account the arbitrariness of ϕ , one represents

$$L^{-\frac{1}{2}} u^f(\tau) = \int_0^\tau \sin[(\tau-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] f(s) ds. \quad (22)$$

2. In view of (15), the value of the wave $u^f(\tau)$ is determined by the values $f|_{0 \leq t \leq \tau}$ of control (does not depend on $f|_{t > \tau}$). Let $f|_{[0, \tau]} \rightarrow 0$ in $L_2([0, \tau]; \mathcal{H})$ and $u^f(\tau) \rightarrow y$ in \mathcal{H} . The limit passage in (22) leads to $L^{-\frac{1}{2}}y = 0$. The latter implies $y = 0$.

Thus, $f \rightarrow 0$ and $W^\tau f \rightarrow y$ yields $y = 0$, i.e., W^τ is closable. \square

Denote $\mathcal{F}^\tau := L_2([0, \tau]; \mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{M}^\tau := \{f|_{[0, \tau]} \mid f \in \mathcal{M}\}$. By (15), the value $u^f(\tau)$ of the wave is determined by the values $f|_{0 \leq t \leq \tau}$ of control (does not depend on $f|_{t > \tau}$). Therefore, the map

$$W^\tau : \mathcal{F}^\tau \rightarrow \mathcal{H}, \quad \text{Dom } W^\tau = \mathcal{M}, \quad W^\tau f := u^f(\tau)$$

is well defined and closable for all $\tau > 0$.

Example

• In the example chosen above as illustration, we have $\mathcal{H} = \text{Harm}(\Omega)$, whereas the bijection $\text{Harm}(\Omega) \ni y \leftrightarrow y|_\Gamma$ does occur. Therefore, by (4), system α can be written in the equivalent (traditional) form of an initial-boundary value problem

$$u_{tt} - \Delta u = 0 \quad \text{in } (\Omega \setminus \Gamma) \times \mathbb{R}_+; \quad (23)$$

$$u|_{t=0} = u_t|_{t=0} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega; \quad (24)$$

$$u = f \quad \text{on } \Gamma \times \overline{\mathbb{R}_+}, \quad (25)$$

which describes propagation of wave $u = u^f(x, t)$ in Ω , the wave being initiated by the boundary source (control) $f = f(\gamma, t)$. Let us recall some of its known properties.

For smooth controls of the class $\mathcal{M} := \{f \in C^\infty(\Gamma \times \overline{\mathbb{R}_+}) \mid \text{supp } f \subset \Gamma \times \mathbb{R}_+\}$ vanishing near $t = 0$, system (23)–(25) has a unique classical solution $u^f \in C^\infty(\Omega \times \overline{\mathbb{R}_+})$.

For all $\tau > 0$, the map $W^\tau : f|_{[0, \tau]} \mapsto u^f(\cdot, \tau)$ is continuous from $\mathcal{F}^\tau := L_2(\Gamma \times [0, \tau])$ to \mathcal{H} [17].

Let $\Omega^r := \{x \in \Omega \mid \text{dist}(x, \Gamma) < r\}$ be a metric neighborhood of the boundary of radius $r > 0$; denote $T_* := \inf\{r > 0 \mid \Omega^r = \Omega\}$. The relation

$$\text{supp } u^f(\cdot, t) \subset \overline{\Omega^t}, \quad t > 0 \quad (26)$$

holds and shows that waves move from the boundary into the manifold with velocity ≤ 1 . At the moment $t = T_*$ the waves fill up the whole Ω . In what follows we refer to these facts as a *finiteness of wave propagation speed* principle (FS principle). It corresponds to a hyperbolicity of the initial boundary value problem (23)–(25).

- Introduce the reachable sets $\mathcal{U}^t := \{u^f(\cdot, t) \mid f \in \mathcal{M}\}$ and note the evident relation $\mathcal{U}^s \subset \mathcal{U}^t$ for $s < t$. As a consequence of (26), we have the embedding $\mathcal{U}^\tau \subset \mathcal{H}^\tau := \{y \in \mathcal{H} \mid \text{supp } y \subset \overline{\Omega^\tau}\}$. A remarkable fact, which is interpreted as a local approximate boundary controllability of system α , is that this embedding is dense: the equality

$$\overline{\mathcal{U}^\tau} = \mathcal{H}^\tau, \quad \tau > 0 \tag{27}$$

holds [4], [19]. Since Ω is compact, for $\tau \geq T_*$ relation (27) implies $\overline{\mathcal{U}^\tau} = \mathcal{H}$, so that system (23)–(25) is controllable for any moment $T > T_*$.

Note in addition that, in the given Example, the family of the projectors P^τ in \mathcal{H} onto $\overline{\mathcal{U}^\tau}$ is continuous with respect to τ . However, in the system governed by the Maxwell equations, the relevant family may have infinite-dimensional breaks: see [14]. Thus, the continuity of $\overline{\mathcal{U}^\tau}$ is definitely not a general fact.

Controllability of system α

- For the abstract system α of the form (12)–(14) and its reachable sets $\mathcal{U}^\tau = \{u^f(\tau) \mid f \in \mathcal{M}\}$, to discuss property (27) is meaningless because there is no analog of the subspaces \mathcal{H}^τ . Nevertheless, the question can be posed for the total reachable set \mathcal{U} as follows. We say that system α is controllable if the equality

$$\overline{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{H} \tag{28}$$

holds. If (28) is not valid, we say $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{H} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}}$ to be a defect (unreachable) subspace. The question is on the conditions which provide (28). The answer is the following.

Let A be an operator in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$ be a subspace. We say that \mathcal{G} is an *invariant subspace* of A if $\overline{\text{Dom } A \cap \mathcal{G}} = \mathcal{G}$ and $A(\text{Dom } A \cap \mathcal{G}) \subset \mathcal{G}$ hold ³, whereas operator $A_{\mathcal{G}} : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$, $\text{Dom } A_{\mathcal{G}} = \text{Dom } A \cap \mathcal{G}$, $A_{\mathcal{G}}y := Ay$ is called a part of A in \mathcal{G} .

³see some comments to this definition in [9]

A symmetric densely defined operator A is said to be *completely non-self-adjoint* if it has no (substantially) self-adjoint parts, i.e., there are no parts $A_{\mathcal{G}}$, which satisfy $A_{\mathcal{G}}^* = \overline{A_{\mathcal{G}}}$.

System α is determined by operator L_0 . As is shown in [5], it is controllable, i.e., (28) holds, if and only if L_0 is completely non-self-adjoint.

- There exist dynamical systems (12)–(14), in which (27) takes the form $\overline{\mathcal{W}^\tau} = \mathcal{H}$ for any $\tau > 0$. As example, one can mention the system on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ governed by the Euler-Bernoulli equation $u_{tt} + \Delta^2 u = 0$ and relevant boundary controls [18]. The following agreement excludes such cases from consideration as trivial ones.

Convention 1. For system α , we assume that there are $\tau > 0$ such that $\overline{\mathcal{W}^{\tau+\epsilon}} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{W}^\tau} \neq \{0\}$ holds for any $\epsilon > 0$.

In other words, it is assumed that the family of the reachable subspaces $\overline{\mathcal{W}^\tau}$ does have the positive growth points.

In the concrete systems realizing the trivial case, the FS principle is not in force: (26) is broken and the waves propagate with infinite velocity. If the condition in Convention 1 is violated, our further results remain true but become trivial. For the rest of the paper, Convention 1 is accepted.

System β

- Consider a dynamical system β of the form

$$\ddot{v} + Lv = \psi \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}, \quad t > 0; \quad (29)$$

$$v|_{t=0} = \dot{v}|_{t=0} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}, \quad (30)$$

controlled by a *source* ψ , which is an \mathcal{H} -valued function of time. By $v = v^\psi(t)$ we denote the solution. For smooth sources of the class

$$\mathcal{N} := \{ \psi \in C^\infty([0, \infty); \mathcal{H}) \mid \text{supp } \psi \subset (0, \infty) \}$$

vanishing near $t = 0$, the solution is unique, classical, smooth, is represented in the form

$$v^\psi(t) = L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^t \sin[(t-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \psi(s) ds, \quad t \geq 0 \quad (31)$$

and belongs to $\text{Dom } L$ for any t . By (7), the latter implies

$$\Gamma_1 v^\psi(t) = 0, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (32)$$

The right hand side of (31) makes sense for $\psi \in L_2^{\text{loc}}([0, \infty); \mathcal{H})$ and is referred to as a generalized solution. If $\psi \in H_{\text{loc}}^1([0, \infty); \mathcal{H})$ then integration by parts in (31) provides

$$v^\psi(t) = L^{-1} \int_0^t \left\{ \mathbb{I} - \cos[(t-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \right\} \psi(s) ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

In this case, $v^\psi(t) \in \text{Dom } L$ holds and relation (32) remains valid.

- As a partial case, we deal with the instantaneous sources $\psi = \delta(t)y$, where $y \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\delta(\cdot)$ is the Dirac delta-function, and the corresponding solutions $v = v^{\delta y}(t) =: v^y(t)$ of the system

$$\ddot{v} + Lv = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}, \quad t > 0; \quad (33)$$

$$v|_{t=0} = 0, \quad \dot{v}|_{t=0} = y \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}. \quad (34)$$

The solution is represented in the form

$$v^y(t) = L^{-\frac{1}{2}} [\sin(tL^{\frac{1}{2}})] y, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (35)$$

A generalized solution v^y is well defined for any $y \in \mathcal{H}$. If $y \in \text{Dom } L^{\frac{1}{2}}$ then $v^y(t) \in \text{Dom } L$ and property (32) holds for v^y :

$$\Gamma_1 v^y(t) = 0, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (36)$$

- Let us consider the relations between systems α and β .

Lemma 3. *For any $T > 0$, the relation*

$$(u^f(T), y) = - \int_0^T (f(t), \Gamma_2 v^y(T-t)) dt, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}, \quad y \in \text{Dom } L \quad (37)$$

is valid.

Proof. By the choice of controls and proper smoothness of the corresponding

trajectories u^f and v^y , one can easily justify the following calculations:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\stackrel{(12)}{=} \int_0^T (\ddot{u}^f(t) + L_0^* u^f(t), v^y(T-t)) dt = \int_0^T (\ddot{u}^f(t), v^y(T-t)) dt + \\
&+ \int_0^T (L_0^* u^f(t), v^y(T-t)) dt = [(\dot{u}^f(t), v^y(T-t)) + (u^f(t), \dot{v}^y(T-t))] \Big|_{t=0}^{t=T} + \\
&+ \int_0^T (u^f(t), \ddot{v}^y(T-t)) dt + \int_0^T (L_0^* u^f(t), v^y(T-t)) dt = \\
&\stackrel{(13), (??)}{=} (u^f(T), y) + \int_0^T (u^f(t), \ddot{v}^y(T-t)) dt + \int_0^T (L_0^* u^f(t), v^y(T-t)) dt = \\
&\stackrel{(6)}{=} (u^f(T), y) + \int_0^T (u^f(t), \ddot{v}^y(T-t) + L_0^* v^y(T-t)) dt + \\
&+ \int_0^T [(\Gamma_1 u^f(t), \Gamma_2 v^y(T-t)) - (\Gamma_2 u^f(t), \Gamma_1 v^y(T-t))] dt = \\
&\stackrel{(14), (33), (36)}{=} (u^f(T), y) + \int_0^T (f(t), \Gamma_2 v^y(T-t)) dt
\end{aligned}$$

(we also use $L_0^* v^y = L v^y$ by $L \subset L_0^*$). Comparing the beginning with the end, we arrive at (37). \square

One more relation between trajectories of systems α and β is the following. Quite analogous calculations starting from the equality $0 = \int_0^T (\ddot{u}^f(t) + L_0^* u^f(t), v^\psi(T-t)) dt$ lead to the relation

$$\int_0^T (u^f(t), \psi(T-t)) dt = - \int_0^T (f(t), \Gamma_2 v^\psi(T-t)) dt, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}, \psi \in \mathcal{N}. \tag{38}$$

• Let us derive a consequence of (38). We say that a source ψ acts from a subspace $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$ if $\psi(t) \in \mathcal{G}$ holds for all t .

Fix a positive $\sigma < T$; let ψ act from $\overline{\mathcal{U}} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^\sigma}$ ⁴. Also, let $f \in \mathcal{F}_{T-\sigma} \cap \mathcal{M}$ be a delayed control. For such a choice, by (17) we have $u^f(t) \in \mathcal{U}^\sigma$ for all $0 \leq t \leq T$ that obeys $(u^f(t), \psi(T-t)) = 0$, $0 \leq t \leq T$. Hence, the left integral in (38) vanishes and we obtain

$$\int_{T-\sigma}^T (f(t), \Gamma_2 v^\psi(T-t)) dt = \int_0^\sigma (f(T-t), \Gamma_2 v^\psi(t)) dt = 0.$$

⁴Recall Convention 1!

As a result, by arbitrariness of f we conclude that for any smooth ψ acting from $\overline{\mathcal{U}} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^\sigma}$ the relation

$$\Gamma_2 v^\psi(t) = 0, \quad 0 \leq t \leq \sigma, \quad (39)$$

holds. It will be used later.

Quite analogously, by the use of (37) for system (33)–(34), the relation $y \in [\overline{\mathcal{U}} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^\sigma}] \cap \text{Dom } L$ implies

$$\Gamma_2 v^y(t) = 0, \quad 0 \leq t \leq \sigma \quad (40)$$

is derived.

3 Abstract FS principle

As was already mentioned, to discuss property (26) for abstract systems α and β is meaningless: there are no manifolds, domains, boundaries in them. However, a remarkable fact is that a relevant analog of FS principle for them does exist.

- At first, let us turn to the Example and clarify, which fact related to FS principle, we are going to reveal in the abstract case.

The corresponding systems β is

$$\begin{aligned} v_{tt} - \Delta v &= \psi && \text{in } (\Omega \setminus \Gamma) \times \mathbb{R}_+; \\ v|_{t=0} = v_t|_{t=0} &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega; \\ v &= 0 && \text{on } \Gamma \times \overline{\mathbb{R}_+}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $0 < \sigma < \tau < T_*$. Assume that the source ψ acts from the subspace $\mathcal{H}^\tau \ominus \mathcal{H}^\sigma$, i.e., $\text{supp } \psi(\cdot, t) = \Omega^\tau \setminus \Omega^\sigma$, $t > 0$ holds. Thus, the source is located in a ‘layer’ $\Omega^\tau \setminus \Omega^\sigma$, which is separated from the boundary Γ by distance σ , whereas $\Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega^\tau}$ is a nonempty open set. In such a case, the wave v^ψ propagates in both directions from the layer with velocity 1. By the latter, at the moment $t > 0$ it is located in the bigger layer $\Omega^{\tau+t} \setminus \Omega^{\sigma-t}$. In terms of subspaces, this can be written as $v^\psi(t) \in \mathcal{H}^{\tau+t} \ominus \mathcal{H}^{\sigma-t}$. It is the property that has an abstract analog for system β .




Figure 1: Domains

- The relevant analog is the following. For convenience in formulation, we put $\mathcal{U}^t|_{t<0} := \{0\}$ and $\Psi := L_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$.

Theorem 1. *Let $0 < \sigma < \tau$ and let a source $\psi \in \Psi$ act from the subspace $\overline{\mathcal{U}^\tau} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^\sigma}$. Then the relation $v^\psi(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau+t}} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\sigma-t}}$ is valid for all $t > 0$.*

Proof. The proof consists of a few steps.

Step 1. Here we derive an auxiliary relation. By

$$C_{s,t} := \{(\xi, \eta) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mid 0 \leq \eta \leq t, s - t + \eta \leq \xi \leq s + t - \eta\}$$

we denote a characteristic cone of the string equation $u_{tt} - u_{ss} = 0$.

Lemma 4. *Let $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{N}$ be a control and a source in systems α and β . The relation*

$$(v^\psi(s), u^f(t)) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{C_{s,t}} [(\Gamma_2 v^\psi(\xi), f(\eta)) + (\psi(\xi), u^f(\eta))] d\xi d\eta, \quad 0 \leq t \leq s \quad (41)$$




Figure 2: Cones

is valid.

Proof. For the Blagoveshchenskii function $b(s, t) := (v^\psi(s), u^f(t))$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
b_{tt}(s, t) - b_{ss}(s, t) &= (v^\psi(s), \ddot{u}^f(t)) - (\ddot{v}^\psi(s), u^f(t)) \stackrel{(12), (??)}{=} \\
&= -(v^\psi(s), L_0^* u^f(t)) + (Lv^\psi(s) - \psi(s), u^f(t)) \stackrel{\text{by } L \subset L_0^*}{=} \\
&= -(v^\psi(s), L_0^* u^f(t)) + (L_0^* v^\psi(s), u^f(t)) - (\psi(s), u^f(t)) \stackrel{(6)}{=} \\
&= (\Gamma_1 v^\psi(s), \Gamma_2 u^f(t)) - (\Gamma_2 v^\psi(s), \Gamma_1 u^f(t)) - (\psi(s), u^f(t)) \stackrel{(14), (32)}{=} \\
&= -(\Gamma_2 v^\psi(s), f(t)) - (\psi(s), u^f(t)) =: F(s, t) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+.
\end{aligned}$$

In the mean time, (30) provides the zero Cauchy data: $b|_{t=0} = b_t|_{t=0} = 0$ on the bottom $[s-t, s+t] \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}_+}$ of the cone $C_{s,t}$. Integrating by D'Alembert formula, we get

$$b(s, t) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{C_{s,t}} F(\xi, \eta) d\xi d\eta$$

which is (41). □

Now, fix (s, t) provided $C_{s,t} \subset C_{\frac{\sigma}{2}, \frac{\sigma}{2}}$. By this choice, in the cone $C_{s,t}$ we have

$$\Gamma_2 v^\psi(\xi) \Big|_{\xi \leq \sigma} \stackrel{(39)}{=} 0 \quad (42)$$

and $(\psi(\xi), u^f(\eta)) = 0$, the latter being valid in view of $u^f(\eta) \in \mathcal{U}^\eta \subset \mathcal{U}^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \subset \mathcal{U}^\sigma$, whereas $\psi(\xi)$ is orthogonal to \mathcal{U}^σ . Thus, both summands under integral in (41) vanish in the cone and we get $(v^\psi(s), u^f(t)) = 0$. Since $f \in \mathcal{M}$ is arbitrary, the last equality means that $v^\psi(s) \perp \mathcal{U}^t$ holds. Keeping s fixed and varying $t \in [0, \sigma - s]$ (until $(s, t) \in C_{\frac{\sigma}{2}, \frac{\sigma}{2}}$ holds), we get $v^\psi(s) \perp \mathcal{U}^{\sigma-s}$. Varying s in the admissible segment $[0, \frac{\sigma}{2}]$, we arrive at

$$v^\psi(s) \in \overline{\mathcal{U}} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\sigma-s}}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq \frac{\sigma}{2}. \quad (43)$$

Step 2. In the above considerations, to extend the segment to $[0, \sigma]$ is not possible since for $s < t$ the bottom $[s - t, s + t]$ of the cone $C_{t,s}$ does not fit in $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+}$. Therefore, we change the cone for

$$C'_{s,t} := \{(\xi, \eta) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mid 0 \leq \xi \leq s, \xi - s + t \leq \eta \leq -\xi + s + t\}.$$

Fix (s, t) provided $C'_{s,t} \subset C'_{\frac{\sigma}{2}, \frac{\sigma}{2}}$. Repeating the same calculations as on Step 1, we arrive at the Cauchy problem for the string equation

$$\begin{aligned} b_{tt} - b_{ss} &= F(s, t), & 0 < s < t; \\ b \Big|_{s=0} &= b_s \Big|_{s=0} \stackrel{(30)}{=} 0, & t \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

for the same b and F as before. Integrating by D'Alembert, we get

$$(v^\psi(s), u^f(t)) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{C'_{s,t}} [(\Gamma_2 v^\psi(\xi), f(\eta)) + (\psi(\xi), u^f(\eta))] d\xi d\eta, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t.$$

By (42) and orthogonality $(\psi(\xi), u^f(\eta)) = 0$ for all $\xi < \sigma$, the summands in the integral vanish and we obtain $(u^f(t), v^\psi(s)) = 0$ for $(s, t) \in C'_{\frac{\sigma}{2}, \frac{\sigma}{2}}$. Keeping $\frac{\sigma}{2} < t < \sigma$ fixed and extending s from 0 to $\sigma - t$, we conclude that $(v^\psi(\sigma - t), u^f(t)) = 0$ holds for $0 \leq t \leq \sigma$. Since $f \in \mathcal{M}$ is arbitrary, the latter obeys $v^\psi(t) \perp \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\sigma-t}}$, i.e.,

$$v^\psi(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{U}} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\sigma-t}}, \quad \frac{\sigma}{2} \leq t \leq \sigma. \quad (44)$$

Putting (43) and (44) together, we obtain

$$v^\psi(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{U}} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\sigma-t}}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq \sigma \quad (45)$$

and establish the first part of the Theorem for smooth ψ . Approximating $\psi \in \Psi$ with smooth sources and using the continuity of the map $\psi|_{[0,t]} \rightarrow v^\psi(t)$, we complete the proof of the first part.

It remains to prove the relation $v^\psi(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau+t}}$.

Step 3. Let $I^t : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, $I^t y := v^y(t)$ be a map that resolves problem (33)–(34). By (35) we have $I^t = L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sin[tL^{\frac{1}{2}}]$, so that I^t is a bounded self-adjoint operator in \mathcal{H} . Let us establish the following.

Lemma 5. *The relation*

$$I^t \overline{\mathcal{U}^\tau} \subset \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau+t}}, \quad \tau > 0, t > 0 \quad (46)$$

holds.

Proof. Take an $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\theta > 0$. By virtue (45), for a source $\psi \in \Psi$ acting from $\overline{\mathcal{U}} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau+\theta}}$ one has

$$(v^\psi(\tau + \theta - t), u^f(t)) = 0, \quad 0 \leq t \leq \theta + \tau.$$

Putting $t = \tau$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (v^\psi(\theta), u^f(\tau)) \stackrel{(31)}{=} \left(\int_0^\theta L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sin[(\theta - s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \psi(s) ds, u^f(\theta) \right) = \\ &= \int_0^\theta (\psi(s), L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sin[(\theta - s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] u^f(\tau)) ds. \end{aligned}$$

By arbitrariness of ψ , the latter leads to

$$L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sin[(\theta - s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] u^f(\tau) \perp \overline{\mathcal{U}} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau+\theta}}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq \theta,$$

that is equivalent to $L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sin[(\theta - s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] u^f(\tau) \in \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau+\theta}}$. Putting $s = 0$ and $\theta = t$, we get $I^t u^f(\tau) \in \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau+t}}$. Since the waves $u^f(\tau)$ are dense in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^\tau}$, we arrive at (46). \square

Let a source ψ satisfy $\psi(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{U}^\tau}$ for all $t \geq 0$. Representing

$$v^\psi(t) \stackrel{(31)}{=} \int_0^t [I^{t-s} \psi(s)] ds, \quad t > 0,$$

and taking into account $I^{t-s}\psi(s) \stackrel{(46)}{\in} \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau+t}}$ for all $s \leq t$, we conclude that $v^\psi(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau+t}}$ is valid and, thus, prove Theorem 1. \square

The crucial observation that interior products of waves satisfy the string equation $\square b = F$ is due to A.S.Blagoveshchenskii. It was it that made possible to develop a version of the BC-method for solving dynamical (time-domain) inverse problems [1]. Simple but productive trick, which consists in changing the roles of the spatial variable s and time t (with the replacement of the cone $C_{s,t}$ by the cone $C'_{s,t}$) was also invented by Aleksandr Sergeevich [10, 12, 13].

4 Wave parts of systems and operators

Systems $\beta_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\beta_{\mathcal{U}}$

- Recall that system β is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{v} + Lv &= \psi && \text{in } \mathcal{H}, \quad t > 0; \\ v|_{t=0} = \dot{v}|_{t=0} &= 0 && \text{in } \mathcal{H}, \end{aligned}$$

and its trajectory is

$$v^\psi(t) = L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^t \sin[(t-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \psi(s) ds, \quad t > 0.$$

As a partial case, we deal with the sources $\psi = \delta(t)y$ and the corresponding trajectory $v = v^{\delta y} =: v^y$ of the system

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{v} + Lv &= 0 && \text{in } \mathcal{H}, \quad t > 0; \\ v|_{t=0} = 0, \quad \dot{v}|_{t=0} &= y && \text{in } \mathcal{H}, \end{aligned}$$

which is represented by

$$v^y(t) = L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sin[(t-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] y, \quad t > 0.$$

- Recall the decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \overline{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \mathcal{D}$, where $\mathcal{U} := \text{span} \{ \mathcal{U}^t \mid t > 0 \}$.

Lemma 6. *If $\psi(t) \in \mathcal{D}$ ($\psi(t) \in \mathcal{U}$) holds for $t > 0$ then $v^\psi(t) \in \mathcal{D}$ ($v^\psi(t) \in \mathcal{U}$) is valid for all $t > 0$. If $y \in \mathcal{D}$ ($y \in \mathcal{U}$) holds then $v^y(t) \in \mathcal{D}$ ($v^y(t) \in \mathcal{U}$) is valid for all $t > 0$.*

Proof. **1.** Let $\psi(t) \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{N}$, $t > 0$. Since $\psi(t) \perp \mathcal{U}$ for $t > 0$, relation (38) easily imply $\Gamma_2 v^\psi|_{t>0} = 0$. Hence, by (41) we have $(u^f(t), v^\psi(s)) = 0$ for all s, t . Therefore, $v^\psi(s) \perp \mathcal{U}$ holds for all $s > 0$. By approximating, if necessary, the source $\psi \in \mathcal{D}$ with the sources of the class \mathcal{N} , one cancels the restriction $\psi(t) \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{N}$.

As one can easily verify, the same is true for the sources $\psi = \delta(t)y$ with $y \in \mathcal{D}$: we have $v^y(t) \in \mathcal{D}$ for all $t > 0$.

2. Let $\psi(t) \in \mathcal{U}$, $t > 0$. Fix an arbitrary $y \in \mathcal{D}$. By (31) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (v^\psi(t), y) &= \int_0^t \left(L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sin[(t-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] \psi(s), y \right) ds = \\ &= \int_0^t \left(\psi(s), L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sin[(t-s)L^{\frac{1}{2}}] y \right) ds = \int_0^t (\psi(s), v^y(t-s)) ds = \\ &= 0, \quad t > 0, \end{aligned}$$

the latter equality being valid due to relation $v^y(t) \in \mathcal{D}$ proved above. Thus, we arrive at $v^\psi(t) \perp y$, i.e., $v^\psi(t) \in \mathcal{U}$, $t > 0$. \square

- As a result, we conclude that system β evolves either in the subspace \mathcal{D} or in the subspace \mathcal{U} , depending on the source ψ acting from \mathcal{D} or \mathcal{U} respectively. It means that β splits in two independent (noninteracting) systems $\beta_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\beta_{\mathcal{U}}$, the second system sharing the common evolution space with DSBC α . If α is controllable, i.e., $\overline{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{H}$ holds, then $\mathcal{D} = \{0\}$ and system $\beta_{\mathcal{D}}$ is absent⁵. Recall that the latter occurs if and only if operator L_0 , which determines all systems under consideration, is completely non-selfadjoint [5]. One can claim that system $\beta_{\mathcal{D}}$ is a part of system β uncontrollable (unobservable) from boundary. This picture is in full agreement with the general systems theory: see [16], Chapter 10.

Space and wave parts of L_0^*

- Fix $T > 0$ and assume that operator L_0^* has a part in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$. Recall that this means $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T} \cap \text{Dom } L_0^* = \overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$ and $L_0^*[\overline{\mathcal{U}^T} \cap \text{Dom } L_0^*] \subset \overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$. Simplifying the notation, we denote the part $L_0^*_{\overline{\mathcal{U}^T}}$ by L_0^{*T} . This part is a closable operator in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$ and we preserve the same notation L_0^{*T} for its closure. We say L_0^{*T} to be a *space part* of L_0^* in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$.

⁵It is the case in the Example.

In the mean time, the lineal set \mathcal{U}^T of smooth waves is dense in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$ and invariant: $L_0^* \mathcal{U}^T = \mathcal{U}^T$ holds (see (20)). Therefore the operator

$$L_{0u}^{*T} : \overline{\mathcal{U}^T} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{U}^T}, \text{ Dom } L_{0u}^{*T} = \mathcal{U}^T, \quad L_{0u}^{*T} y := L_0^* y$$

is well defined, densely defined and closable in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$. We preserve the same notation L_{0u}^{*T} for its closure and call it *a wave part* of L_0^* in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$.

As is evident, $L_{0u}^{*T} \subset L_0^{*T}$ holds but something more can be said about relations between these parts. In the following Lemma, by *isomorphism* we mean an injective, surjective, bounded, and boundedly invertible operator. Recall that $\mathcal{K} := \text{Ker } L_0^*$. Denote $\mathcal{F}^T := L_2([0, T]; \mathcal{K})$ and $\mathcal{M}^T := \{f|_{[0, T]} \mid f \in \mathcal{M}\}$.

Lemma 7. *Assume that W^T is an isomorphism from \mathcal{F}^T to $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$ and $\mathcal{K} \cap \overline{\mathcal{U}^T} = \{0\}$ holds. Then the space and wave parts coincide: $L_0^{*T} = L_{0u}^{*T}$ holds.*

Proof. Choose a pair $(y, L_0^{*T} y) = (y, L_0^* y) \in \text{graph } L_0^{*T}$. In view of (19) and (20), one can find a sequence of controls $g_n \in \mathcal{M}^T$ provided $u^{g_n}(T) \rightarrow L_0^* y$ in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$. By isomorphism of W^T , this sequence has to converge: $g_n \rightarrow g$ in \mathcal{F}^T . Representing uniquely $g_n = -\ddot{f}_n$, $g = -\ddot{f}$ with $f_n \in \mathcal{M}^T$, we have the convergence $f_n \rightarrow f$ in \mathcal{F}^T , which implies $u^{f_n}(T) \rightarrow u^f(T)$ in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$. Along with the latter convergence, one has $L_0^* u^{f_n}(T) \stackrel{(18)}{=} -\ddot{u}^{f_n}(T) = u^{-\ddot{f}_n}(T) = u^{g_n}(T) \rightarrow L_0^* y$. As a result, we conclude that $(u^f(T), L_0^* y) \in \text{graph } L_{0u}^{*T}$ holds.

In the mean time, $L_{0u}^{*T} \subset L_0^{*T}$ obeys $\text{graph } L_{0u}^{*T} \subset \text{graph } L_0^{*T}$. Hence, both pairs $(y, L_0^* y)$ and $(u^f(T), L_0^* y)$ belong to $\text{graph } L_0^{*T}$. The latter follows to $(y - u^f(T), 0) \in \text{graph } L_0^{*T}$, i.e., $y - u^f(T) \in \mathcal{K}$. In view of $\mathcal{K} \cap \overline{\mathcal{U}^T} = \{0\}$ we arrive at $y = u^f(T)$ and conclude that the graphs of the space and wave parts of L_0^* in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$ coincide, i.e., $L_0^{*T} = L_{0u}^{*T}$ does hold. \square

- The assumption on W^T to be an isomorphism is rather restrictive: for instance, it is invalid in the Example. However, analyzing the proof of Lemma 7, it is easy to remark that such an assumption can be relaxed as follows. It suffices to require the convergence of $L_0^* u^{f_n}(T)$ to imply the convergence of $u^{f_n}(T)$ in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$, whereas the convergence of f_n in \mathcal{F}^T is not necessary. As can be shown, the latter holds in the Example for times $T < T_*$.

In this regard, it is worth noting that the convergence of $L_0^* u^{f_n}(T)$ implies the convergence of the summands $u_L^{f_n}(T) \in \text{Dom } L$ in representation (16).

This reflects a general fact: in (3), if $L_0^* y_n$ converges then $y'_n = L^{-1} L_0^* y_n$ also converges.

The counterexamples of $L_0^{*T} \neq L_{0_u}^{*T}$ are not known and a hope for the equality with no assumptions is still alive.

Completeness of waves

- In system β one can introduce a 'source–state' map $\mathcal{I}^t \psi := v^\psi(t)$, $t > 0$ for $\psi \in L_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ ⁶. Fix a subspace $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{H}$ and denote by $\Psi_{\mathcal{A}} := L_2^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{A})$ the space of sources acting from \mathcal{A} . In this notation, the statement of Theorem 1 takes the form

$$\mathcal{I}^t \Psi_{\overline{\mathcal{U}^\tau} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^\sigma}} \subset \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau+t}} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\sigma-t}}, \quad 0 < \sigma < \tau, t > 0.$$

In the mean time, in the Example, as well as in many other applications, a stronger relation occurs: not embedding but equality holds. It is interpreted as a completeness of waves in domains, which they fill up. In the abstract case, by analogy with applications, one may speak about completeness of waves in the filled subspaces. Below we show a result of this kind under some additional assumption.

- Let P^ϵ be the projection in $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$ onto $\overline{\mathcal{U}^\epsilon}$; denote $P_\perp^\epsilon := \mathbb{I} - P^\epsilon$. Assume that there is a continuous (in norm) family of the bounded operators N^ϵ , $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_*$ such that

$$N^0 = \mathbb{I}; \quad N^\epsilon y \in \text{Dom } L, \quad P_\perp^\epsilon N^\epsilon y = P_\perp^\epsilon y, \quad y \in \text{Dom } L_0^* \quad (47)$$

holds. Note that, by (47), one has $y - N^\epsilon y \in \overline{\mathcal{U}^\epsilon}$.

In the Example, in capacity of N^ϵ one can take the multiplication by a smooth function χ^ϵ provided $0 \leq \chi^\epsilon(\cdot) \leq 1$, $\chi^\epsilon|_{\Omega \setminus \Omega^\epsilon} = 1$, $\chi^\epsilon|_\Gamma = 0$. Parameter ϵ_* is chosen to provide the interior boundary of the subdomain Ω^{ϵ_*} to be smooth. By analogy to χ^ϵ we call N^ϵ a *neutralizer*.

Lemma 8. *Let operator L_0 be such that the neutralizers N^ϵ , $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_*$ do exist and let operator L_0^* have a space part $L_0^{*\epsilon}$ in each subspace $\overline{\mathcal{U}^\epsilon}$. Then the relation*

$$\overline{\mathcal{I}^t \Psi_{\overline{\mathcal{U}^\tau}} = \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau+t}}, \quad \tau > 0, t > 0} \quad (48)$$

is valid.

⁶It is used in [3, 8] and called an *isotony*

Proof. (sketch) Fix $0 < \tau < T$ and take $f \in \mathcal{M}^T$. The corresponding waves $u^f(T)$ constitute a dense set in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$ by definition of the latter. As is evident, the projections $P_{\perp}^{\epsilon} u^f(T)$ are dense in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\epsilon}}$. Loosely speaking, the idea of the proof is to represent $u^f(T)$ as a wave produced by a relevant source F , which acts from the subspace $\overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau}}$.

The wave u^f that satisfies (12)–(14), is also determined by the system

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{u} + L_0^* u &= \delta \dot{u}^f(\tau) + \dot{\delta} u^f(\tau), & \tau < t < T; \\ u|_{t=\tau} &= \dot{u}|_{t=\tau} = 0; \\ \Gamma_1 u &= f, & \tau \leq t \leq T, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta = \delta(t)$ is the Dirac function.

Taking $\epsilon < \tau$ and representing $u^f = N^{\epsilon} u^f + [u^f - N^{\epsilon} u^f]$, we get the system β (with a shifted time) of the form

$$N^{\epsilon} \ddot{u}^f + L N^{\epsilon} u^f = F^{\epsilon}, \quad \tau < t < T; \quad (49)$$

$$N^{\epsilon} u^f|_{t=\tau} = N^{\epsilon} \dot{u}^f|_{t=\tau} = 0 \quad (50)$$

(we use $L_0^* N^{\epsilon} u^f = L N^{\epsilon} u^f$) with a source

$$F^{\epsilon}(t) := - \left[\frac{d^2}{dt^2} + L_0^* \right] (u^f(t) - N^{\epsilon} u^f(t)) + \delta \dot{u}^f(\tau) + \dot{\delta} u^f(\tau),$$

where $u^f(t) - N^{\epsilon} u^f(t) \in \text{Dom } L_0^* \cap \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\epsilon}}$ holds. By the latter, we have $L_0^*[u^f(t) - N^{\epsilon} u^f(t)] = L_0^{*\epsilon}[u^f(t) - N^{\epsilon} u^f(t)] \in \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\epsilon}} \subset \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau}}$, where $L_0^{*\epsilon}$ is the space part of L_0^* in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^{\epsilon}}$. In the mean time, $u^f(\tau)$ and $\dot{u}^f(\tau)$ belong to $\overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau}}$. So, the source F^{ϵ} does act from the subspace $\overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau}}$, its time of acting being equal to $T - \tau$.

By the latter, shifting time $t \rightarrow t - \tau$ in (49)–(50) and applying Theorem 1, we see that the source F^{ϵ} produces the wave $v^{F^{\epsilon}}(T - \tau) = N^{\epsilon} u^f(T)$. When f varies in \mathcal{M}^T , the projections $P_{\perp}^{\epsilon} N^{\epsilon} u^f(T) = P_{\perp}^{\epsilon} u^f(T)$ of such waves constitute a complete system in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^{\epsilon}}$. Tending $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, by (47) we conclude that there is a sequence $\{F^{\epsilon}\}$ of the sources, which act from $\overline{\mathcal{U}^{\tau}}$ and provide $v^{F^{\epsilon}}(T - \tau) \rightarrow u^f(T)$. Therefore, these sources produce a system of waves complete in $\overline{\mathcal{U}^T}$.

Since τ and T are arbitrary, it is easy to see that what has been proved is equivalent to the equality (48). To justify the formal operations with δ and $\dot{\delta}$, one needs to approximate them by a proper smooth regularizations: see, e.g, [5]. \square

The idea to use a neutralizer comes from the Example, where its existence is guaranteed and do not require additional assumptions.

One more abstract property

Here is one more fact that takes place in the Example, which can be generalized. At first glance, it looks very specific but, as will be shown, does have an abstract analog.

Recall that the Friedrichs extension $L = -\Delta$ of the minimal Laplacian is defined on $\text{Dom } L = H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$. Let $y \in \text{Dom } L$ and $\text{supp } y \subset \Omega \setminus \Omega^\tau$ for a positive $\tau < T_*$, so that $\text{supp } y$ is separated from the boundary Γ by the distance τ . In such a case, we have $y|_\Gamma = \partial_\nu y|_\Gamma = 0$ and hence $y \in H_0^2(\Omega)$ i.e., $y \in \text{Dom } L_0$ holds.

Lemma 9. *Let $\tau > 0$ satisfy $\overline{\mathcal{U}} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^\tau} \neq \{0\}$ and $y \in [\overline{\mathcal{U}} \ominus \overline{\mathcal{U}^\tau}] \cap \text{Dom } L$ hold. Then the relation $y \in \text{Dom } L_0$ is valid.*

Proof. Recall that $y \stackrel{(7)}{\in} \text{Ker } \Gamma_1$. Let $T > \tau$. By $y \in \text{Dom } L$ and (40), we have $\Gamma_2 v^y|_{0 < t \leq \tau} = 0$. Since $y \in \text{Dom } L$, one has

$$\dot{v}^y(t) \stackrel{(35)}{=} \cos[tL^{\frac{1}{2}}] y = L^{-1} \cos[tL^{\frac{1}{2}}] Ly, \quad t \geq 0.$$

This implies $\dot{v}^y \in C([0, T]; \text{Dom } L)$, where $\text{Dom } L$ is endowed with the L -graph norm [11]. By corresponding continuity of $\Gamma_{1,2}$, we get $\Gamma_2 \dot{v}^y|_{t=+0} = \Gamma_2 y = 0$. So, $y \in \text{Ker } \Gamma_1 \cap \text{Ker } \Gamma_2$, i.e., $y \stackrel{(7)}{\in} \text{Dom } L_0$ does hold. \square

A bit of philosophy

A character and goal of this paper may be commented on as follows. In our opinion, working in specific branches of mathematical physics (like inverse problems), it is however reasonable to pay attention to abstractions. Let us refer to the authority of classicists. According to Van der Waerden, a maxima, which Emmy Noether adhered to in her work, claims that *any interconnection between numbers, functions and operations becomes transparent, available for further generalization and productive only after that, as it is separated from any specific objects and is reduced to general terms.*

Systems α and β are the general terms. We try to follow the maxima.

References

- [1] M.I.Belishev. An approach to multidimensional inverse problems for the wave equation. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 297 (1987), 524–527. (Russian). English transl. in *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, 36, 481–484.
- [2] M.I.Belishev. Dynamical systems with boundary control: models and characterization of inverse data. *Inverse Problems*, 17: 659–682, 2001.
- [3] M.I.Belishev. A unitary invariant of a semi-bounded operator in reconstruction of manifolds. *Journal of Operator Theory*, Volume 69 (2013), Issue 2, 299-326.
- [4] M.I.Belishev. Boundary Control Method. *Encyclopedia of Applied and Computational Mathematics*, Volume no: 1, Pages: 142–146. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-70529-1. ISBN 978-3-540-70528-4
- [5] M.I.Belishev, M.N.Demchenko. Dynamical system with boundary control associated with a symmetric semibounded operator. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, October 2013, Volume 194, Issue 1, pp 8-20. DOI: 10.1007/s10958-013-1501-8.
- [6] M.I.Belishev, S.A.Simonov. Wave model of the Sturm-Liouville operator on the half-line. *St. Petersburg Math. J.*, 29 (2018), no. 2, 227–248.
- [7] M.I.Belishev, S.A.Simonov. A Wave Model of Metric Spaces. *Functional Analysis and Its Applications*, April 2019, Volume 53, Issue 2, pp 79–85. doi.org/10.1134/S0016266319020011.
- [8] M. I. Belishev, S.A.Simonov. A Wave Model of Metric Space with Measure. *Mat. Sbornik*, 2019, to appear.
- [9] M.I.Belishev, S.A.Simonov On evolutionary first-order dynamical system with boundary control. *Zapiski Nauchnykh Seminarov POMI*, 2019, 483, 41-54. (in Russian)
- [10] M.I.Belishev, A.S.Blagoveschenskii. Dynamical Inverse Problems of Wave Theory. SPb State University, St-Petersburg, 1999 (in Russian).
- [11] M.Sh.Birman, M.Z.Solomak. Spectral Theory of Self-Adjoint Operators in Hilbert Space. *Reidel Publishing Comp.*, 1987.

- [12] A.S.Blagovestchenskii. On a local approach to the solving the dynamical inverse problem for inhomogeneous string. *Trudy MIAN V.A. Steklova* 115 (1971), 28-38 (in Russian).
- [13] A.S.Blagovestchenskii. Inverse Problems of Wave Processes. *VSP, Netherlands*, 2001.
- [14] M.N. Demchenko. On a partially isometric transform of divergence-free vector fields. *J. Math. Sci.*, 166 (1) (2010) 11–22.
- [15] V.F.Derkach, M.M.Malamud. Theory of symmetric operator extensions and boundary value problems. (in Russian) *Kiïv*, 2017. ISBN 966-02-2571, ISBN 978-966-02-8267-4 (v.104)
- [16] R.Kalman, P.Falb, M.Arbib. Topics in Mathematical System Theory. *New-York: McGraw-Hill*, 1969.
- [17] I.Lasiecka, R.Triggiani. Recent advances in regularity of second-order hyperbolic mixed problems, and applications. In Christopher K. R. T. (ed.) et al. Jones, editor, *Dynamics reported. Expositions in dynamical systems*, volume 3, pages 104–162. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1994.
- [18] I.Lasiecka and R.Triggiani. Exact Controllability of the Euler-Bernoulli Equation with Boundary Controls for Displacement and Moment. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, v. 146, no 1, 1990.
- [19] D.Tataru. Unique continuation for solutions to PDE's: between Hörmander's and Holmgren's theorem. *Comm. PDE*, 20 (1995), 855–884.
- [20] M.I.Vishik. On general boundary value problems for elliptic differential equations. *Proceedings of Moscow Math. Society*, 1 (1952), 187–246 (in Russian). English translation: Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 224 (1963), 107–172.