

Spectral analysis of a coupled bending-torsion beam energy harvester: asymptotic results

Chris Vales*

Abstract. This work is concerned with the spectral analysis of a piezoelectric energy harvesting model based on a coupled bending-torsion beam. After building the problem's operator setting and showing that the governing operator is nonselfadjoint with a purely discrete spectrum, we derive an asymptotic approximation of its spectrum. In doing so, we also prove that the addition of energy harvesting can be viewed as a weak perturbation of the underlying beam dynamics, in the sense that no piezoelectric parameters appear in the spectral approximation's first two orders of magnitude. We conclude by outlining future work based on numerical simulations.

Keywords. Coupled bending-torsion beam, nonselfadjoint operator, discrete spectrum, asymptotic approximation, weak perturbation.

1 Introduction

A piezoelectric energy harvester is a device that utilizes the properties of piezoelectric materials to convert mechanical strain energy into electric energy. The harvesting of mechanical vibration energy is currently considered for the making of self powered microelectronic devices and remote sensors [24, 20, 11], with applications in areas such as health monitoring [18] and distributed sensor networks [23].

In this work we consider a piezoelectric harvester extracting energy from the vibration of a coupled bending-torsion beam. Such coupled vibration naturally occurs when the beam's cross section has at most one plane of symmetry, such as in the vibration of aircraft wings, turbomachinery blading, and bridges [5, 12]. It can also occur by our breaking a beam's cross sectional symmetry on purpose, which has been shown to increase the amount of harvested power compared to purely bending vibration [1, 2].

We consider a uniform cantilever beam with its left end fixed and its right end free. The beam's cross section is assumed to have only one plane of symmetry, which causes the coupling of the bending and torsion motions. A piezoelectric material layer is attached onto the top face of the beam throughout its length. Perfectly conducting electrodes at the top and bottom faces of the layer connect it to a resistance load, thereby closing an electric circuit. The layer is attached so that it harvests energy from the normal beam strain due to bending, not the shear strain due to torsion.

The modeled quantities are the beam's vertical centerline displacement $w(t, x)$, the twist angle of its cross sections $\theta(t, x)$, and the generated electric voltage $v(t)$, where $t \geq 0$ denotes time and $x \in [0, L]$ space. Using dot and prime to denote differentiation with respect to time and space respectively, the complete electromechanical model reads

$$\begin{aligned} m\ddot{w} + S\ddot{\theta} + Ew'''' &= 0, \\ J\ddot{\theta} + S\ddot{w} - G\theta'' &= 0, \\ C_p\dot{v} + \frac{1}{R}v + C_D\dot{w}'(t, L) &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

*Mathematics & Statistics, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, USA; Mathematics, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH, USA (chris.vales@dartmouth.edu).

with boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned}
w(t, 0) = w'(t, 0) &= 0, \\
\theta(t, 0) &= 0, \\
w'''(t, L) &= 0, \\
Ew''(t, L) + k_1 \dot{w}'(t, L) + C_I v &= 0, \\
G\theta'(t, L) + k_2 \dot{\theta}(t, L) &= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

and initial conditions

$$\begin{aligned}
w(0, x) = w_0(x), \quad \dot{w}(0, x) = w_1(x), \\
\theta(0, x) = \theta_0(x), \quad \dot{\theta}(0, x) = \theta_1(x), \\
v(0) = v_0.
\end{aligned}$$

The first two equations of (1) model the bending and torsion vibration motions respectively, whereas the third equation models the electric circuit. In the mechanical equations, m denotes mass per unit length, J polar mass moment per unit volume, S the coupling constant with units of mass, E and G the bending and torsion rigidity respectively. In the electric equation, C_p is the piezoelectric layer's internal capacitance, R the load resistance, and $C_D < 0$ the direct (or forward) piezoelectric coupling coefficient [13].

In the boundary conditions (2), constant $C_I > 0$ is the inverse (or backward) piezoelectric coupling coefficient. The terms involving positive constants k_1 and k_2 model vibration control mechanisms through strain-actuated damping and are independent of the piezoelectric layer [4, 5].

In this work we derive an asymptotic approximation of the spectrum of the operator governing the model's dynamics. Moreover, we show that the addition of piezoelectric energy harvesting can be considered a weak perturbation of the underlying beam dynamics, in the sense that no piezoelectric parameters appear in the first two orders of magnitude of the spectral approximation. Our motivation for pursuing this line of research is to facilitate the study of the geometric properties of the governing operator's set of eigenvectors—particularly completeness, minimality, and the Riesz basis property.

Asymptotic spectral investigations have been made in the past for various beams and associated piezoelectric energy harvesters. These include works on the Euler-Bernoulli beam [8, 9] and associated energy harvester [29, 30]; the Rayleigh beam [22, 28]; the Timoshenko beam [10, 14, 15, 16, 25, 26] and associated energy harvester [31]; the coupled bending-torsion beam [12, 7, 4, 5, 32]. Among other results, the Riesz basis property has been proven for models based on the Euler-Bernoulli beam [30], the Rayleigh beam [22, 28] and the Timoshenko beam [25, 26].

The present work is based on the analysis of the coupled bending-torsion beam initiated in [5, 32] and is an effort to improve some aspects of it and refine its results. More specifically, we extend the considered model by adding energy harvesting and study its effect on the underlying beam dynamics. We provide a detailed construction of the problem's operator setting, identifying sufficient parameter conditions for its well-posedness. Additionally, we refine the asymptotic analysis by including higher order terms and by studying the limitations of the employed methodology. In particular, we show that the derived asymptotic approximation is valid for an infinite subset of the governing operator's spectrum, but not necessarily for the whole spectrum as claimed in [5, 32]. Finally, we propose numerical simulations that will be used to supplement the derived asymptotic results.

In Section 2 we build the operator setting of the problem and describe the governing operator's spectrum. The main results are presented in Section 3 and proven in Section 4, followed by a discussion in Section 5. Appendix A contains proofs omitted in the main text. More detailed proofs for all results in this work can be found in [33].

2 Operator setting

We define vector

$$f := (f_0(t, x), f_1(t, x), f_2(t, x), f_3(t, x), f_4(t)) := (w, \dot{w}, \theta, \dot{\theta}, v),$$

with smooth and complex valued component functions. Assuming that $S < m$ and $S < J$, the model equations (1) are written as

$$\dot{f} = iAf, \quad (3)$$

with governing operator

$$A := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ i\frac{EJ}{D}\frac{d^4}{dx^4} & 0 & i\frac{GS}{D}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -i & 0 \\ -i\frac{ES}{D}\frac{d^4}{dx^4} & 0 & -i\frac{Gm}{D}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -i\frac{C_D}{C_p}\delta'_L & 0 & 0 & i\frac{1}{C_p R} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

where $D := mJ - S^2 > 0$, $\delta'_L g := -g'(t, L)$, and time t is from now on treated as a parameter. To define the appropriate domain for operator A , we consider space

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}} := \{f_i \in C^\infty([0, L]), f_4 \in \mathbb{C}, i = 0, \dots, 3 : f_0(0) = 0, f'_0(0) = 0, f_2(0) = 0\}.$$

and the following inner product, based on the system's mechanical and electric energy,

$$\langle f, g \rangle := \frac{1}{2} \int_0^L [Ef''_0 \bar{g}''_0 + mf_1 \bar{g}_1 + Gf'_2 \bar{g}'_2 + Jf_3 \bar{g}_3 + S(f_1 \bar{g}_3 + f_3 \bar{g}_1)] dx + \frac{1}{2} C_p f_4 \bar{g}_4, \quad (5)$$

with $f, g \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ and bars denoting complex conjugation.

Lemma 2.1. The functional $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of (5) forms an inner product in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$.

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Lemma 2.2. Let $\mathcal{H}_1 := H^2((0, L)) \times L^2([0, L]) \times H^1((0, L)) \times L^2([0, L]) \times \mathbb{C}$ with its usual product norm

$$\|f\|_1^2 := \int_0^L \left(\sum_{j=0}^2 |f_0^{(j)}|^2 + |f_1|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^1 |f_2^{(k)}|^2 + |f_3|^2 \right) dx + |f_4|^2. \quad (6)$$

If $S < m$ and $S < J$, then norm (6) and the norm induced by (5) are equivalent in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$.

Proof. See Appendix A. □

The well-posedness of the operator setting rests on the condition $S < \min(m, J)$, where S is the coupling constant of the bending and torsion motions. Therefore, the present work and derived results are valid for *weakly* coupled bending-torsion beams.

Using the norm equivalence result, we define the problem's state space as the closure of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ in the topology generated by the norm induced by (5), which yields the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H} = \left\{ f_0 \in H^2((0, L)), f_1, f_3 \in L^2([0, L]), f_2 \in H^1((0, L)), f_4 \in \mathbb{C} : \right. \\ \left. f_0(0) = 0, f'_0(0) = 0, f_2(0) = 0 \right\}. \quad (7)$$

The domain of operator A is then defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom } A := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{H} : f_0 \in H^4((0, L)), f_1, f_2 \in H^2((0, L)), f_3 \in H^1((0, L)), f_4 \in \mathbb{C}, \right. \\ f_1(0) = 0, f_1'(0) = 0, f_3(0) = 0, f_0'''(L) = 0, \\ \left. Ef_0''(L) + k_1 f_1'(L) + C_I f_4 = 0, Gf_2'(L) + k_2 f_3(L) = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Lemma 2.3. The domain of operator A is dense in \mathcal{H} .

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Next, we show that A is nonselfadjoint and has a compact inverse, properties we will use to describe its spectrum.

Proposition 2.4. Operator A is unbounded, closed and nonselfadjoint.

Proof. To verify the relation

$$\langle Af, g \rangle = \langle f, A^*g \rangle \quad \forall f \in \text{dom } A, g \in \text{dom } A^*,$$

let operator A^* have the following matrix

$$A^* = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ i \frac{EJ}{D} \frac{d^4}{dx^4} & 0 & i \frac{GS}{D} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -i & 0 \\ -i \frac{ES}{D} \frac{d^4}{dx^4} & 0 & -i \frac{Gm}{D} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i \frac{C_I}{C_p} \delta'_L & 0 & 0 & -i \frac{1}{C_p R} \end{bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

and domain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom } A^* := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{H} : f_0 \in H^4((0, L)), f_1, f_2 \in H^2((0, L)), f_3 \in H^1((0, L)), f_4 \in \mathbb{C}, \right. \\ f_1(0) = 0, f_1'(0) = 0, f_3(0) = 0, f_0'''(L) = 0, \\ \left. Ef_0''(L) - k_1 f_1'(L) - C_D f_4 = 0, Gf_2'(L) - k_2 f_3(L) = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Performing the required integrations by parts and enforcing the boundary conditions for $f \in \text{dom } A$ and $g \in \text{dom } A^*$ yields

$$\langle Af, g \rangle - \langle f, A^*g \rangle = 0,$$

which means that $A^* \neq A$.

Given the minor differences between $\text{dom } A$ and $\text{dom } A^*$, it follows that $\text{dom } A^*$ is also dense in \mathcal{H} , so A^{**} is well defined. Repeating the above calculation shows that $A^{**} = A$. As the adjoint of densely defined A^* , A^{**} is closed [6]. □

The above proof demonstrates that A is nonselfadjoint because of the contributions from the electric circuit equation and the right-end boundary conditions involving the piezoelectric and control parameters. If only the mechanical system with $k_1 = k_2 = 0$ is considered, then the corresponding operator is selfadjoint.

Proposition 2.5. Operator A is invertible and its inverse is compact.

Proof. Let $g \in \mathcal{H}$; we show that there exists unique $f \in \text{dom } A$ such that $Af = g$. Expanded into its components, $Af = g$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= ig_0, \\ Ef_0'''' &= -i(mg_1 + Sg_3) \\ f_3 &= ig_2, \\ Gf_2'' &= i(Sg_1 + Jg_3) \\ f_4 &= -iC_p R[g_4 + \frac{C_D}{C_p}g_0'(L)]. \end{aligned}$$

The second and fourth equations yield respectively

$$\begin{aligned} f_0(x) &= -i\frac{1}{E} \int_0^x \int_0^{x_4} \int_{x_3}^L \int_{x_2}^L [mg_1(x_1) + Sg_3(x_1)] dx_1 dx_2 dx_3 dx_4 \\ &\quad + i\frac{C_I C_D R - k_1}{2E} g_0'(L)x^2 + i\frac{C_I C_p R}{2E} g_4 x^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$f_2(x) = -i\frac{1}{G} \int_0^x \int_{x_2}^L [Sg_1(x_1) + Jg_3(x_1)] dx_1 dx_2 - i\frac{k_2}{G} g_2(L)x$$

after the appropriate boundary conditions of $\text{dom } A$ are enforced. The above equations uniquely define f in terms of g . Further inspection shows that component functions f_i belong to the appropriate function spaces and satisfy all boundary conditions of $\text{dom } A$; namely, $f \in \text{dom } A$.

To prove compactness, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_1 &:= H^2((0, L)) \times L^2([0, L]) \times H^1((0, L)) \times L^2([0, L]) \times \mathbb{C}, \\ \mathcal{H}_2 &:= H^4((0, L)) \times H^2((0, L)) \times H^2((0, L)) \times H^1((0, L)) \times \mathbb{C} \end{aligned}$$

with their usual product norms, so that $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_1$ and $\text{dom } A \subset \mathcal{H}_2$. The above calculations imply that map $A^{-1} : \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$ is bounded. Since the embedding $\mathcal{H}_2 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_1$ is compact [3], operator $A^{-1} : \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1$ is compact too. From the equivalence of the norm induced topologies of \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}_1 , it follows that $A^{-1} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is compact. \square

Corollary 2.6. Operator A has a purely discrete spectrum, which has ∞ as its limit point and is symmetric about the imaginary axis.

Proof. Being compact, operator A^{-1} has a purely discrete spectrum with 0 as its limit point, leading to the first result. Namely, A 's spectrum consists entirely of isolated eigenvalues with finite algebraic multiplicities. Next, direct calculation shows that pair (λ, f) is a solution of the spectral problem $Af = \lambda f$ if and only if $(-\bar{\lambda}, \bar{f})$ is one, which yields the second result. \square

Lemma 2.7. If $C_I = -C_D$, then all eigenvalues of A have positive imaginary part.

Proof. See Appendix A. \square

3 Main results

We now present the main results of this work. Their proof is given in the next section, followed by a discussion. All results are subject to the standing assumptions $S < m$, $S < J$ and $C_I = -C_D$. In addition, $\sigma(A)$ is used to denote the spectrum of operator A , while the symbols of complex multivalued functions are used to denote their principal branch.

Theorem 3.1 (Weak perturbation). The model's piezoelectric parameters do not appear in the first two orders of magnitude of the asymptotic approximation of $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. The third order terms are the first to be modified by the addition of piezoelectric energy harvesting.

Theorem 3.2 (Eigenvalue asymptotics). The leading order term of the asymptotic approximation of $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ consists of the two disjoint subsets

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n} = \frac{\pi\sqrt{G}}{L\sqrt{J}}n - i\frac{\sqrt{G}}{2L\sqrt{J}}\ln\frac{k_2 - \sqrt{GJ}}{k_2 + \sqrt{GJ}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (11)$$

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{2,n} = (n - 1/4)^2 \frac{\pi^2\sqrt{EJ}}{L^2\sqrt{mJ - S^2}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (12)$$

referred to as the unperturbed branches 1 and 2 respectively, subject to condition

$$k_2 > \sqrt{GJ}.$$

Furthermore, there exists an infinite subset $\sigma^*(A) \subset \sigma(A)$ such that the second order asymptotic approximation of $\sigma^*(A)$ consists of two disjoint subsets referred to as the perturbed branches 1 and 2.

The asymptotic approximation of perturbed branch 1 reads

$$\lambda_{1,n} = \tilde{\lambda}_{1,n} [1 + w_{1,n} + \mathcal{O}(n^{-2})], \quad n \in \mathbb{N}^*, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (13)$$

with infinite subset $\mathbb{N}^* \subset \mathbb{N}$,

$$w_{1,n} = -i\frac{\sqrt{G}}{2L\sqrt{J}}\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}^{-1}\ln K_{1,n} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-3/2}), \quad (14)$$

and $K_{1,n}$ given by (47). For each $\lambda_{1,n}$ the branch also contains $-\bar{\lambda}_{1,n}$.

The asymptotic approximation of perturbed branch 2 reads

$$\lambda_{2,n} = \tilde{\lambda}_{2,n} [1 + w_{2,n} + \mathcal{O}(n^{-3})], \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (15)$$

with $w_{2,n} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-2})$ given by (51) in implicit form. For each $\lambda_{2,n}$ the branch also contains $-\bar{\lambda}_{2,n}$.

4 Proof of main results

In this section we prove Theorems 3.1 and 3.2. We denote by $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ an eigenvalue and by $f \in \text{dom } A$ an eigenvector of operator A . Written out to its components, the spectral equation

$$Af = \lambda f \quad (16)$$

reads

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= i\lambda f_0 \\ i\frac{EJ}{D}f_0'''' + i\frac{GS}{D}f_2'' &= \lambda f_1 \\ f_3 &= i\lambda f_2 \\ -i\frac{ES}{D}f_0'''' - i\frac{Gm}{D}f_2'' &= \lambda f_3 \\ f_4 &= -\frac{C_D/C_p}{\lambda - i\frac{1}{C_p R}}\lambda f_0'(L), \end{aligned}$$

assuming that $\lambda \neq i(C_p R)^{-1}$. Combining the first and second equations with the third and fourth yields

$$EGf_0^{(6)} + EJ\lambda^2 f_0^{(4)} - Gm\lambda^2 f_0'' - D\lambda^4 f_0 = 0,$$

which is the spectral equation written in terms of component function f_0 only. We now rewrite the boundary conditions encoded in $\text{dom } A$ in a form that involves only f_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned} f_0(0) = f_0'(0) = f_0^{(4)}(0) = 0, \\ f_0'''(L) = 0, \\ Ef_0''(L) + ik_1\lambda f_0'(L) - \frac{C_I C_D}{C_p} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - i\frac{1}{C_p R}} f_0'(L) = 0 \\ EGf_0^{(5)}(L) + ik_2 E\lambda f_0^{(4)}(L) - Gm\lambda^2 f_0'(L) - ik_2 m\lambda^3 f_0(L) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Based on the above results, we define operator pencil $A_0(\cdot)$ by

$$A_0(\lambda)f_0 := EGf_0^{(6)} + EJ\lambda^2 f_0^{(4)} - Gm\lambda^2 f_0'' - D\lambda^4 f_0 \quad (17)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom } A_0(\lambda) := \left\{ f_0 \in H^6((0, L)) : f_0(0) = 0, f_0'(0) = 0, f_0^{(4)}(0) = 0, f_0'''(L) = 0, \right. \\ \left. Ef_0''(L) + \left(ik_1 - \frac{C_I C_D}{C_p} \frac{1}{\lambda - i\frac{1}{C_p R}} \right) \lambda f_0'(L) = 0, \right. \\ \left. EGf_0^{(5)}(L) + ik_2 E\lambda f_0^{(4)}(L) - Gm\lambda^2 f_0'(L) - ik_2 m\lambda^3 f_0(L) = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The spectral problem for A can now be rewritten as the equivalent problem

$$A_0(\lambda)f_0 = 0, \quad (19)$$

where a nontrivial pair (λ, f_0) is a solution to (19) if and only if (λ, f) is a solution to (16).

4.1 Characteristic roots

We look for solutions to problem (19) of the form $f_0(x) \propto e^{\zeta x}$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$. Substituting that into the above equation and making the changes of variable $y := \zeta^2$ and $z := y + \alpha/3\lambda^2$ with

$$\alpha := \frac{J}{G}, \quad \beta := \frac{m}{E}, \quad \gamma := \frac{D}{EG}, \quad (20)$$

yields the depressed cubic equation

$$z^3 + pz + q = 0,$$

where

$$p := -\left(\frac{\alpha^2}{3}\lambda^4 + \beta\lambda^2\right), \quad q := \frac{2}{27}\alpha^3\lambda^6 + \left(\frac{\alpha\beta}{3} - \gamma\right)\lambda^4.$$

Using Cardano's formulas the equation's three roots can be found as

$$z_j = \hat{z}_j - \tilde{z}_j, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, \quad (21)$$

with

$$\hat{z}_1 = \sqrt[3]{-\frac{q}{2} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{q}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{p}{3}\right)^3}}, \quad \tilde{z}_1 = \sqrt[3]{\frac{q}{2} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{q}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{p}{3}\right)^3}} \quad (22)$$

and

$$\hat{z}_j = \exp\left[i\frac{2\pi}{3}(j-1)\right]\hat{z}_1, \quad \tilde{z}_j = \exp\left[-i\frac{2\pi}{3}(j-1)\right]\tilde{z}_1, \quad j = 2, 3. \quad (23)$$

Employing (22) and expanding the involved roots as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ using the generalized binomial expansion theorem leads to

$$z_1 = -\frac{2J}{3G}\lambda^2 - \frac{GS^2}{EJ^2} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-2}).$$

Reversing the changes of variable yields

$$\zeta_{1,2} = \pm \sqrt{z_1 - \frac{\alpha}{3}\lambda^2} = \pm i \left(\sqrt{\frac{J}{G}}\lambda + \frac{G^{3/2}S^2}{2EJ^{5/2}}\lambda^{-1} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3}).$$

Unless stated otherwise, all asymptotic results are understood in the limit $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, using (23) we calculate

$$\zeta_{3,4} = \pm \sqrt{z_2 - \frac{\alpha}{3}\lambda^2} = \pm i \left[\left(\frac{D}{EJ} \right)^{1/4} \lambda^{1/2} - \frac{GS^2}{4E^{3/4}J^{7/4}D^{1/4}} \lambda^{-1/2} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3/2}),$$

and

$$\zeta_{5,6} = \pm \sqrt{z_3 - \frac{\alpha}{3}\lambda^2} = \pm \left[\left(\frac{D}{EJ} \right)^{1/4} \lambda^{1/2} + \frac{GS^2}{4E^{3/4}J^{7/4}D^{1/4}} \lambda^{-1/2} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3/2}).$$

Finally, using constants

$$a_1 := \left(\frac{J}{G} \right)^{1/2}, \quad a_2 := \frac{G^{3/2}S^2}{2EJ^{5/2}}, \quad (24)$$

$$a_3 := \left(\frac{D}{EJ} \right)^{1/4}, \quad a_4 := \frac{GS^2}{4E^{3/4}J^{7/4}D^{1/4}}, \quad (25)$$

the characteristic roots ζ_j of (19) are written as

$$\zeta_{1,2} = \pm ia_1 \lambda \left[1 + \frac{a_2}{a_1} \lambda^{-2} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-4}) \right], \quad (26)$$

$$\zeta_{3,4} = \pm ia_3 \lambda^{1/2} \left[1 - \frac{a_4}{a_3} \lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-2}) \right], \quad (27)$$

$$\zeta_{5,6} = \pm a_3 \lambda^{1/2} \left[1 + \frac{a_4}{a_3} \lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-2}) \right]. \quad (28)$$

4.2 Reduced spectral equation

We express the solution to (19) as a linear combination of the terms $e^{\zeta_j x}$

$$f_0(x) = \sum_{j=1,3,5} b_j e^{\zeta_j x} + \sum_{k=1,3,5} c_k e^{\zeta_{k+1} x} = \sum_{j=1,3,5} b_j e^{\zeta_j x} + \sum_{k=1,3,5} c_k e^{-\zeta_k x},$$

with \mathbb{C}^3 constants $b := (b_1, b_3, b_5)^T$, $c := (c_1, c_3, c_5)^T$. Next, we enforce the six boundary conditions encoded in (18) using the *reflection matrices method* [9, 10, 32].

The three left-end boundary conditions produce a system of three equations for the six unknown constants, which can be written as

$$b = R_1 c, \quad (29)$$

with 3×3 matrix R_1 termed the *left reflection matrix*. Similarly, the three right-end boundary conditions lead to system

$$b = R_2 c, \quad (30)$$

where the 3×3 matrix R_2 is called the *right reflection matrix*. Assuming R_1 is invertible, we combine the two equations to write

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & R_2 \\ R_1^{-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \end{pmatrix} \\ \left(I - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & R_2 \\ R_1^{-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \end{pmatrix} &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which admits a nontrivial solution if and only if

$$\begin{aligned}\det\left(I - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & R_2 \\ R_1^{-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) &= 0 \\ \det(I - R_1^{-1}R_2) &= 0 \\ \det(R_1 - R_2) &= 0.\end{aligned}\tag{31}$$

Through these manipulations, enforcing the boundary conditions has been reduced to solving the reduced spectral equation (31), which involves the determinant of a 3×3 matrix. To derive (31) we calculate the asymptotic approximation of the two reflection matrices.

4.3 Left reflection matrix

The three left-end boundary conditions yield the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \zeta_1 & \zeta_3 & \zeta_5 \\ \zeta_1^4 & \zeta_3^4 & \zeta_5^4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_3 \\ b_5 \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 & -1 \\ \zeta_1 & \zeta_3 & \zeta_5 \\ -\zeta_1^4 & -\zeta_3^4 & -\zeta_5^4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_3 \\ c_5 \end{pmatrix} \\ A_1 b &= B_1 c \\ b &= A_1^{-1} B_1 c \\ b &= R_1 c.\end{aligned}$$

Using matrix

$$B_2 := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \zeta_1 & \zeta_3 & \zeta_5 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

we write

$$R_1 = A_1^{-1} B_1 = A_1^{-1} (-A_1 + 2B_2) = -I + 2A_1^{-1} B_2.\tag{32}$$

Since the second row of B_2 is its only nonzero row, we only need calculate the second column of A_1^{-1} to determine R_1 .

To do that we employ the method of cofactors, which requires that we first calculate the determinant of A_1 . Expanding about the matrix's third row and employing (26)–(28) we find

$$\frac{1}{\det A_1} = \frac{1}{a_1^4 a_3 (1-i)} \lambda^{-9/2} [1 - ia_4 \lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-2})].$$

Denoting by $A_1^{-1}(j, k)$ the (j, k) entry of A_1^{-1} and by C_{jk} its (j, k) cofactor, we write

$$\begin{aligned}A_1^{-1}(1, 2) &= \frac{C_{21}}{\det A_1} = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-7/2}), \\ A_1^{-1}(2, 2) &= \frac{C_{22}}{\det A_1} = -\frac{1}{a_3(1-i)} \lambda^{-1/2} [1 - ia_4 \lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-2})], \\ A_1^{-1}(3, 2) &= \frac{C_{23}}{\det A_1} = \frac{1}{a_3(1-i)} \lambda^{-1/2} [1 - ia_4 \lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-2})]\end{aligned}$$

and, after using (32),

$$\begin{aligned}
R_1(1, 1) &= -1 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-5/2}), \\
R_1(1, 2) &= \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3}), \\
R_1(1, 3) &= \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3}), \\
R_1(2, 1) &= \frac{2a_1}{a_3(1+i)}\lambda^{1/2} [1 - ia_4\lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-2})], \\
R_1(2, 2) &= -i - \frac{2a_4}{1+i} \frac{1+ia_3}{a_3} \lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-2}), \\
R_1(2, 3) &= -\frac{2}{1-i} \left[1 + a_4 \frac{1-ia_3}{a_3} \lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-2}) \right], \\
R_1(3, 1) &= -\frac{2a_1}{a_3(1+i)}\lambda^{1/2} [1 - ia_4\lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-2})], \\
R_1(3, 2) &= -\frac{2}{1+i} \left[1 - a_4 \frac{1+ia_3}{a_3} \lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-2}) \right], \\
R_1(3, 3) &= i + \frac{2a_4}{1-i} \frac{1-ia_3}{a_3} \lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Direct calculation shows that

$$\det R_1 = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-5/2}) \neq 0,$$

which means that R_1 is indeed invertible.

4.4 Right reflection matrix

We define

$$\begin{aligned}
e_j &:= e^{\zeta_j L}, \quad j = 1, 3, 5, \\
\hat{c} &:= ik_1 - \frac{C_I C_D}{C_p} \left(\lambda - i \frac{1}{C_p R} \right)^{-1}
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

and the 3×3 matrices

$$\begin{aligned}
A_3 &:= \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_j^3 & & \\ E\zeta_j^2 + \hat{c}\lambda\zeta_j & & \\ EG\zeta_j^5 + iEk_2\lambda\zeta_j^4 - Gm\lambda^2\zeta_j - imk_2\lambda^3 & & \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with } j = 1, 3, 5, \\
B_3 &:= \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_j^3 & & \\ \hat{c}\lambda\zeta_j - E\zeta_j^2 & & \\ EG\zeta_j^5 - iEk_2\lambda\zeta_j^4 - Gm\lambda^2\zeta_j + imk_2\lambda^3 & & \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with } j = 1, 3, 5
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\bar{E} := \text{diag}(e_1, e_3, e_5),$$

where values $j = 1, 3, 5$ correspond to columns one, two and three respectively.

Now, the three right-end boundary conditions generate the system

$$\begin{aligned}
A_3 \bar{E} b &= B_3 \bar{E}^{-1} c \\
b &= \bar{E}^{-1} A_3^{-1} B_3 \bar{E}^{-1} c \\
b &= R_2 c.
\end{aligned}$$

Using 3×3 matrix

$$B_4 := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & \\ E\zeta_j^2 & & \\ iEk_2\lambda\zeta_j^4 - imk_2\lambda^3 & & \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with } j = 1, 3, 5,$$

where again values $j = 1, 3, 5$ correspond to columns one, two and three, we simplify the calculation of R_2 to

$$R_2 = \bar{E}^{-1} A_3^{-1} B_3 \bar{E}^{-1} = \bar{E}^{-1} A_3^{-1} (A_3 - 2B_4) \bar{E}^{-1} = \bar{E}^{-1} (I - 2A_3^{-1} B_4) \bar{E}^{-1}. \quad (34)$$

Since the first row of B_4 is zero, only columns two and three of A_3^{-1} are needed for determining R_2 .

As before, to determine the desired entries of A_3^{-1} we begin with calculating A_3 's determinant,

$$\frac{1}{\det A_3} = \frac{1}{i2Ek_1a_1^4a_3^4(Ga_1 + k_2)} \lambda^{-8} \left[1 - d_1\lambda^{-1/2} + d_2\lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3/2}) \right],$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} d_1 &:= \frac{(1-i)Ea_3}{2k_1} + \frac{(i-1)k_2(Ea_3^4 - m)}{2Ea_1a_3^3(Ga_1 + k_2)}, \\ \hat{d}_2 &:= i\frac{C_I C_D}{k_1 C_p} + i\frac{k_2(Ea_3^4 - m)}{k_1a_1a_3^2(Ga_1 + k_2)}, \\ d_2 &:= d_1^2 - \hat{d}_2. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we calculate the required entries of matrices A_3^{-1} and B_4 and combine them to derive the entries of $I - 2A_3^{-1}B_4$ which appears in (34). Denoting its entries simply by (j, k) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1, 1) &= 1 - r_{11} \left[1 + \hat{r}_{11}\lambda^{-1/2} + \tilde{r}_{11}\lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3/2}) \right], \\ (1, 2) &= r_{12}\lambda^{-2} \left[1 - \hat{r}_{12}\lambda^{-1/2} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) \right], \\ (1, 3) &= r_{12}\lambda^{-2} \left[1 + \hat{r}_{13}\lambda^{-1/2} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) \right], \\ (2, 1) &= r_{21}\lambda^{3/2} \left[1 - \hat{r}_{12}\lambda^{-1/2} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) \right], \\ (2, 2) &= 1 - r_{22}\lambda^{-1/2} \left[1 + (\hat{r}_{22} - d_1)\lambda^{-1/2} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) \right], \\ (2, 3) &= r_{23}\lambda^{-1/2} \left[1 - d_1\lambda^{-1/2} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) \right], \\ (3, 1) &= -ir_{21}\lambda^{3/2} \left[1 + \hat{r}_{13}\lambda^{-1/2} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) \right], \\ (3, 2) &= -ir_{23}\lambda^{-1/2} \left[1 - d_1\lambda^{-1/2} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) \right], \\ (3, 3) &= 1 + ir_{22}\lambda^{-1/2} \left[1 + (i\hat{r}_{22} - d_1)\lambda^{-1/2} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) \right], \end{aligned}$$

with constants

$$\begin{aligned} r_{11} &:= \frac{2k_2}{Ga_1 + k_2}, & \hat{r}_{11} &:= \frac{(1-i)Ea_3}{2k_1} - d_1, \\ \tilde{r}_{11} &:= i\frac{C_I C_D}{k_1 C_p} - \frac{(1-i)Ea_3 d_1}{2k_1} + d_2, & r_{12} &:= -\frac{2k_2(Ea_3^4 - m)}{Ea_1^4(Ga_1 + k_2)}, \\ \hat{r}_{12} &:= i\frac{Ea_3}{k_1} + d_1, & \hat{r}_{13} &:= \frac{Ea_3}{k_1} - d_1 \\ r_{21} &:= \frac{k_2 a_1^3}{a_3^3(Ga_1 + k_2)} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
r_{22} &:= \frac{E^2 a_1 a_3^4 (Ga_1 + k_2) - k_1 k_2 (Ea_3^4 - m)}{Ek_1 a_1 a_3^3 (Ga_1 + k_2)}, \\
\hat{r}_{22} &:= i \frac{2Ek_2 a_3 (Ea_3^4 - m)}{E^2 a_1 a_3^4 (Ga_1 + k_2) - k_1 k_2 (Ea_3^4 - m)}, \\
r_{23} &:= \frac{E^2 a_1 a_3^4 (Ga_1 + k_2) + k_1 k_2 (Ea_3^4 - m)}{Ek_1 a_1 a_3^3 (Ga_1 + k_2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying $I - 2A_3^{-1}B_4$ from left and right by diagonal matrix \bar{E}^{-1} yields

$$R_2 = \begin{bmatrix} e_1^{-2}(1,1) & e_1^{-1}e_3^{-1}(1,2) & e_1^{-1}e_5^{-1}(1,3) \\ e_1^{-1}e_3^{-1}(2,1) & e_3^{-2}(2,2) & e_3^{-1}e_5^{-1}(2,3) \\ e_1^{-1}e_5^{-1}(3,1) & e_3^{-1}e_5^{-1}(3,2) & e_5^{-2}(3,3) \end{bmatrix},$$

where (j, k) denotes the entries of $I - 2A_3^{-1}B_4$ calculated above.

4.5 Solving the spectral equation

We are now in a position to derive and solve a modified version of the reduced spectral equation (31). We start by considering the behavior of functions $e_j(\lambda)$, $j = 1, 3, 5$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, defined in (33). Let

$$\lambda =: x + iy, \quad \lambda^{1/2} =: u + iv, \tag{35}$$

with $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y, u, v \geq 0$. Since the set of eigenvalues is symmetric about the imaginary axis, we need only consider the case where λ is in the complex plane's first quadrant; namely, $x, y \geq 0$. Consequently, $\lambda^{1/2}$ is also in the first quadrant, and particularly in the triangular domain below straight line $u = v$, with $u \rightarrow \infty$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$.

Using (26)-(28), we expand functions e_j to leading order

$$\begin{aligned}
e_1(\lambda) &= e^{ia_1 L \lambda} [1 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1})] = e^{-a_1 Ly} e^{ia_1 Lx} [1 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1})], \\
e_3(\lambda) &= e^{ia_3 L \lambda^{1/2}} [1 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1/2})] = e^{-a_3 Lv} e^{ia_3 Lu} [1 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1/2})], \\
e_5(\lambda) &= e^{a_3 L \lambda^{1/2}} [1 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1/2})] = e^{a_3 Lu} e^{ia_3 Lv} [1 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1/2})],
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that e_1 , e_3 and e_5^{-1} are bounded functions with $e_5^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ exponentially as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, whereas e_1^{-1} , e_3^{-1} and e_5 are unbounded. Assuming it is nonsingular, we use diagonal matrix

$$\tilde{E} := \text{diag}(e_1, e_3, 1)$$

to write

$$\begin{aligned}
\det(R_1 - R_2) &= 0 \\
\det[\tilde{E}(R_1 - R_2)\tilde{E}] &= 0 \\
\det R_3 &= 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

so that unbounded terms e_1^{-1} and e_3^{-1} are removed from the spectral equation.

To derive the reduced spectral equation (36), we calculate the entries of matrix R_3 while

removing all exponentially decaying terms,

$$\begin{aligned}
R_3(1, 1) &= -e_1^2 - 1 + r_{11} \left(1 + \hat{r}_{11}\lambda^{-1/2} + \tilde{r}_{11}\lambda^{-1} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3/2}), \\
R_3(1, 2) &= -r_{12}\lambda^{-2} \left(1 - \hat{r}_{12}\lambda^{-1/2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3}), \\
R_3(1, 3) &= \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3}), \\
R_3(2, 1) &= -r_{21}\lambda^{3/2} \left(1 - \hat{r}_{12}\lambda^{-1/2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{1/2}), \\
R_3(2, 2) &= -ie_3^2 - 1 - \frac{2a_4(1+ia_3)}{(1+i)a_3}e_3^2\lambda^{-1} + r_{22}\lambda^{-1/2} \left[1 + (\hat{r}_{22} - d_1)\lambda^{-1/2} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3/2}), \\
R_3(2, 3) &= -\frac{2}{1-i}e_3 \left[1 + \frac{(1-ia_3)a_4}{a_3}\lambda^{-1} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3/2}), \\
R_3(3, 1) &= \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{1/2}), \\
R_3(3, 2) &= -\frac{2}{1+i}e_3 \left[1 - \frac{(1+ia_3)a_4}{a_3}\lambda^{-1} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3/2}), \\
R_3(3, 3) &= i + \frac{2a_4(1-ia_3)}{(1-i)a_3}\lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, expanding $\det R_3$ about the matrix's first row and using functions

$$H_1(\lambda) := -e_1^2 + r_{11} - 1, \quad H_2(\lambda) := -e_3^2 - i,$$

we write equation (36) in the form

$$D_1 - D_2 = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3/2}), \tag{37}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
D_1 &:= H_1 H_2 + [ir_{22}H_1 + r_{11}\hat{r}_{11}H_2] \lambda^{-1/2} + \left[\tilde{D}_1 H_1 + ir_{11}\hat{r}_{11}r_{22} + r_{11}\tilde{r}_{11}H_2 \right] \lambda^{-1}, \\
\tilde{D}_1 &:= ir_{22}(\hat{r}_{22} - d_1) + i4a_4e_3^2 - \frac{2a_4}{1-i} \frac{1-ia_3}{a_3} (ie_3^2 + 1) - i \frac{2a_4}{1+i} \frac{1+ia_3}{a_3} e_3^2, \\
D_2 &:= ir_{12}r_{21}\lambda^{-1/2} \left(1 - 2\hat{r}_{12}\lambda^{-1/2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Close inspection of (37) reveals that the terms of the two leading orders of magnitude (1, $\lambda^{-1/2}$) contain no piezoelectric parameters, only mechanical and control parameters. The third order terms (λ^{-1}) are the first to depend on piezoelectric parameters. This proves Theorem 3.1.

Next, keeping terms of only the first two orders of magnitude in (37), we derive the second order spectral equation

$$g_1(\lambda)g_2(\lambda) + [ig_1(\lambda)h_1(\lambda) + r_{11}\hat{r}_{11}g_2(\lambda) - ir_{12}r_{21}] \lambda^{-1/2} = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}), \tag{38}$$

with functions

$$g_1(\lambda) := -e^{i2c_1\lambda} + r_{11} - 1, \tag{39}$$

$$g_2(\lambda) := -e^{i2c_3\lambda^{1/2}} - i, \tag{40}$$

$$h_1(\lambda) := r_{22} + 2c_4e^{i2c_3\lambda^{1/2}} \tag{41}$$

and

$$c_j := a_j L, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, 4. \tag{42}$$

To first order, equation (38) reads

$$g_1(\lambda)g_2(\lambda) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1/2}). \tag{43}$$

Omitting the remainder term leads to solutions

$$g_1(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}) = 0 \Rightarrow \tilde{\lambda}_{1,n} = \frac{n\pi}{c_1} - i\frac{1}{2c_1}\ln(r_{11} - 1), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (44)$$

subject to $r_{11} - 1 > 0$, and

$$g_2(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,n}) = 0 \Rightarrow \tilde{\lambda}_{2,n} = (n - 1/4)^2 \frac{\pi^2}{c_3^2}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (45)$$

which we refer to respectively as the unperturbed branches 1 and 2. Therefore, the leading order term of the asymptotic approximation of the eigenvalues consists of the two disjoint subsets (44) and (45). Moving on, we use the leading order solutions (44) and (45) to derive asymptotic approximations of the set of eigenvalues.

4.6 Perturbed branch 1

First, we quantify the contribution of the remainder term omitted from (43), leading to a first order approximation of a subset of spectrum $\sigma(A)$.

We fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and define disk $B_\epsilon(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n})$ of radius $\epsilon > 0$ centered at $\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}$. For $\lambda \in B_\epsilon(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n})$ we cannot conclude that the values $|g_2(\lambda)|$ are bounded away from zero. This is due to the fact that function g_2 depends on $\lambda^{1/2}$, and points $\{\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}^{1/2}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are approaching the real axis as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where all points $\{\tilde{\lambda}_{2,m}^{1/2}\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ —the zeros of g_2 —are located. This can be seen by evaluating $g_2(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in B_\epsilon(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n})$, leading to

$$|g_2(\lambda)|^2 = 2 \left[\sin \left(2c_3 \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{c_1}} n^{1/2} \right) + 1 \right] + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2}),$$

which shows that $|g_2(\lambda)|$ is oscillating with n within $[0, 2 + \xi]$, where $\xi \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

To resolve that, we fix a small positive constant δ and consider the subset $\{\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$, $\mathbb{N}^* \subset \mathbb{N}$, for which $\inf_\lambda |g_2(\lambda)| > \delta$ when $\lambda \in B_\epsilon(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n})$, leading to a countably infinite subset of the unperturbed branch 1 points. For this subset, we may rewrite (43) as

$$g_1(\lambda) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1/2}).$$

Now, we employ Rouché's theorem to show that analytic functions g_1 and $g_1 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1/2})$ have the same number of zeros in $B_\epsilon(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n})$ for an appropriately selected ϵ .

To evaluate the functions on $\partial B_\epsilon(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n})$, let $\lambda = \tilde{\lambda}_{1,n} + \epsilon e^{i\theta}$, $\theta \in [-\pi, \pi]$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(\lambda) &= -e^{i2c_1\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}} e^{i2c_1\epsilon e^{i\theta}} + r_{11} - 1 \\ &= (r_{11} - 1)(1 - e^{i2c_1\epsilon e^{i\theta}}) \\ &= i2c_1 e^{i\theta} (r_{11} - 1) \epsilon [1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)] \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

or

$$|g_1(\lambda)| > M_1 \epsilon \quad \text{on } \partial B_\epsilon(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n})$$

with constant $M_1 > 0$ and sufficiently small ϵ . Moreover, for sufficiently large n there exists constant $M_2 > 0$ such that

$$|\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1/2})| = |\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})| \leq M_2 n^{-1/2} \quad \text{on } \partial B_\epsilon(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}).$$

Therefore, for $\epsilon_n = 2M_2 M_1^{-1} n^{-1/2}$

$$|g_1(\lambda)| > 2M_2 n^{-1/2} > |\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1/2})| \quad \text{on } \partial B_\epsilon(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}).$$

Applying Rouché's theorem yields that functions g_1 and $g_1 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1/2})$ have the same number of zeros in $B_{\epsilon_n}(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n})$, with $\epsilon_n = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Namely, the first order asymptotic approximation of the considered subset of eigenvalues reads

$$\lambda_{1,n} = \tilde{\lambda}_{1,n} [1 + \mathcal{O}(n^{-3/2})], \quad n \in \mathbb{N}^*, \quad (46)$$

with $\mathbb{N}^* \subset \mathbb{N}$ the infinite subset constructed above.

Next, we calculate a formula for the term of order $n^{-3/2}$ and establish the new remainder term. To do so, we look for solutions of the second order spectral equation (38) of the form

$$\lambda = \tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}(1 + w_1).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(\lambda) &= (r_{11} - 1)(1 - e^{i2c_1\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}w_1}), \\ g_2(\lambda) &= g_2(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}) + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}), \\ h_1(\lambda) &= h_1(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}) + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting into (38) and keeping terms of the first two orders of magnitude ($1, n^{-1/2}$) yields

$$e^{i2c_1\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}w_1} = \frac{1 + \left[ih_1(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n})g_2^{-1}(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}) + \frac{r_{11}\hat{r}_{11}}{r_{11}-1} - i\frac{r_{12}r_{21}}{(r_{11}-1)g_2(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n})} \right] \tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}^{-1/2}}{1 + ih_1(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n})g_2^{-1}(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n})\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}^{-1/2}} =: K_{1,n}, \quad (47)$$

or equivalently

$$w_{1,n} = -i\frac{1}{2c_1}\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}^{-1} \ln K_{1,n} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-3/2}). \quad (48)$$

To calculate the new remainder term, we consider $\lambda \in B_\epsilon(\hat{\lambda}_{1,n})$ with radius $\epsilon > 0$ and center $\hat{\lambda}_{1,n} = \tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}(1 + w_{1,n})$. Using function

$$G_1(\lambda) := g_1(\lambda)g_2(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}) + \left[ig_1(\lambda)h(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}) + r_{11}\hat{r}_{11}g_2(\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}) - ir_{12}r_{21} \right] \tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}^{-1/2}$$

we rewrite the second order spectral equation (38) as

$$G_1(\lambda) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}),$$

with $G_1(\hat{\lambda}_{1,n}) = 0$ as established above. Applying Rouché's theorem in a way analogous to that shown earlier, we derive the second order asymptotic approximation

$$\lambda_{1,n} = \tilde{\lambda}_{1,n} [1 + w_{1,n} + \mathcal{O}(n^{-2})], \quad n \in \mathbb{N}^*, \quad (49)$$

with $w_{1,n}$ of order $n^{-3/2}$ given by (48).

4.7 Perturbed branch 2

The proof of the perturbed branch 2 approximation follows the same steps as that of perturbed branch 1, so we present only the key points. First, we pick $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and form disk $B_\epsilon(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,n})$ of radius $\epsilon > 0$ centered at $\tilde{\lambda}_{2,n}$. To make sure that $\inf_{\lambda} |g_1(\lambda)| > 0$ when $\lambda \in B_\epsilon(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,n})$ it is sufficient to assume that

$$\epsilon < \left| \frac{1}{2c_1} \ln(r_{11} - 1) \right|,$$

with the right hand side being the distance along the imaginary axis between any two points in sets $\{\tilde{\lambda}_{1,n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\tilde{\lambda}_{2,m}\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$. Application of Rouché's theorem then yields the first order approximation

$$\hat{\lambda}_{2,n} = \tilde{\lambda}_{2,n} + \mathcal{O}(1) = \tilde{\lambda}_{2,n} [1 + \mathcal{O}(n^{-2})], \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (50)$$

Next, we look for solutions of (38) of the form

$$\lambda = \tilde{\lambda}_{2,n}(1 + w_2).$$

Substitution into (38) leads to the following transcendental equation for w_2 ,

$$\left[(ir_{22} + 2c_4)\tilde{\lambda}_{2,n}^{-1/2} - c_3\tilde{\lambda}_{2,n}^{1/2}w_2 \right] \left(-e^{i2c_1\tilde{\lambda}_{2,n}}e^{i2c_1\tilde{\lambda}_{2,n}w_2} + r_{11} - 1 \right) - ir_{12}r_{21}\tilde{\lambda}_{2,n}^{-1/2} = 0. \quad (51)$$

We consider (51) to be the solution for $w_{2,n}$ in implicit form.

Finally, we form $B_\epsilon(\tilde{\lambda}_{2,n})$ of radius $\epsilon > 0$ centered at $\tilde{\lambda}_{2,n} = \tilde{\lambda}_{2,n}(1 + w_{2,n})$. Reapplying Rouché's theorem yields the second order asymptotic approximation

$$\lambda_{2,n} = \tilde{\lambda}_{2,n} [1 + w_{2,n} + \mathcal{O}(n^{-3})], \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (52)$$

with $w_{2,n}$ of order n^{-2} given by (51).

5 Discussion

In the present work we demonstrate that the addition of piezoelectric energy harvesting can be viewed as a weak perturbation of the underlying beam model, by showing that no piezoelectric parameters appear in the first two orders of magnitude of the asymptotic approximation of spectrum $\sigma(A)$.

In addition, we show that the leading order term of the asymptotic approximation of $\sigma(A)$ consists of a two-branch structure, which is the same structure with that identified in [5] where only the mechanical part of the present model was considered. Furthermore, we prove that the two-branch structure is retained in the second order approximation of an infinite subset $\sigma^*(A) \subset \sigma(A)$, but not necessarily in that of the whole spectrum.

However, the present proof offers no information on the behavior of complement $\sigma(A) \setminus \sigma^*(A)$, which may consist of eigenvalues breaking the unperturbed structure. Additionally, the remainder term derived in Section 4.7 for the first order approximation of the perturbed branch 2 eigenvalues is of order 1; namely, the remainder is not necessarily decreasing with the eigenvalue number n as $n \rightarrow \infty$. These results show that additional work is required to fully understand the role of the unperturbed structure in the higher order asymptotic approximations of $\sigma(A)$.

To address these shortcomings, we plan to solve the second order asymptotic equation (38) and the original spectral problem (16) numerically. Doing so will allow us to verify the asymptotic analysis and generate results for subset $\sigma(A) \setminus \sigma^*(A)$ not covered by the derived asymptotic approximation. Our goal is to combine the asymptotic and numerical results to derive a first order asymptotic approximation of the whole spectrum $\sigma(A)$.

Having an asymptotic approximation of the whole spectrum will enable us to use existing operator technology to study the Riesz basis property for the governing operator's set of eigenvectors [5, 27], which remains an open problem for the coupled bending-torsion beam.

A Omitted proofs

Proof of Lemma 2.1. It follows immediately that the functional is linear in the first argument, conjugate symmetric, and that $f = 0$ yields $\langle f, f \rangle = 0$. Next, given that

$$|S(f_1\bar{f}_3 + f_3\bar{f}_1)| \leq 2S|f_1||f_3|,$$

it is also true that

$$\begin{aligned}
C &\geq m|f_1|^2 + J|f_3|^2 - 2S|f_1||f_3| \\
&= \left(\sqrt{m}|f_1| - \sqrt{J}|f_3|\right)^2 + 2\sqrt{mJ}|f_1||f_3| - 2S|f_1||f_3| \\
&= \left(\sqrt{m}|f_1| - \sqrt{J}|f_3|\right)^2 + 2\frac{D}{\sqrt{mJ} + S}|f_1||f_3| \\
&\geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

since $D > 0$, which means that $\langle f, f \rangle \geq 0$ for any $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$. Finally, if $\langle f, f \rangle = 0$ then nonnegativity implies that

$$f_0(x) = c_1x + c_2, \quad f_2(x) = c_3, \quad f_4 = 0,$$

for constants c_1, c_2 and c_3 , as well as

$$\left(\sqrt{m}|f_1| - \sqrt{J}|f_3|\right)^2 + 2\frac{D}{\sqrt{mJ} + S}|f_1||f_3| = 0,$$

which yields that $f_1, f_3 = 0$. Enforcing the boundary conditions encoded in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ requires that $f_0, f_2 = 0$; namely, $f = 0$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.2. Let $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$. Using inequality

$$|f_1\bar{f}_3 + f_3\bar{f}_1| \leq 2|f_1||f_3| \leq |f_1|^2 + |f_3|^2,$$

we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^L \left[E|f_0''|^2 + m|f_1|^2 + G|f_2'|^2 + J|f_3|^2 + S(|f_1|^2 + |f_3|^2) \right] dx + \frac{1}{2}C_p|f_4|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^L \left[E \sum_{j=0}^2 |f_0^{(j)}|^2 + (m+S)|f_1|^2 + G \sum_{k=0}^1 |f_2^{(k)}|^2 + (J+S)|f_3|^2 \right] dx + \frac{1}{2}C_p|f_4|^2 \\
&\leq C\|f\|_1^2,
\end{aligned}$$

with finite positive constant $C := \frac{1}{2} \max(E, m+S, G, J+S, C_p)$.

To prove the converse inequality, we begin by calculating finite positive constants c_0 and c_2 such that

$$\|f_0''\|_{L^2}^2 \geq c_0\|f_0\|_{H^2}^2, \quad \|f_2'\|_{L^2}^2 \geq c_2\|f_2\|_{H^1}^2.$$

Since $f_0 \in C^\infty([0, L])$ with $f_0(0) = f_0'(0) = 0$, we may express f_0 in the form

$$f_0(x) = \int_0^x \int_0^y f_0''(z) dz dy, \quad \text{with } f_0'' \in C([0, L]).$$

Then, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we find that

$$\int_0^L |f_0'(x)|^2 dx \leq L^2 \int_0^L |f_0''(x)|^2 dx$$

and

$$\int_0^L |f_0(x)|^2 dx \leq L^4 \int_0^L |f_0''(x)|^2 dx,$$

which yield

$$\|f_0''\|_{L^2}^2 \geq c_0\|f_0\|_{H^2}^2, \quad \text{with } c_0 := (L^4 + L^2 + 1)^{-1}.$$

Similarly, for f_2 we find that

$$\|f_2'\|_{L^2}^2 \geq c_2 \|f_2\|_{H^1}^2, \quad \text{with } c_2 := (L^2 + 1)^{-1}.$$

We are now in a position to write

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|^2 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^L \left[E|f_0''|^2 + m|f_1|^2 + G|f_2'|^2 + J|f_3|^2 - S(|f_1|^2 + |f_3|^2) \right] dx + \frac{1}{2} C_p |f_4|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^L \left[E c_0 \sum_{j=0}^2 |f_0^{(j)}|^2 + (m - S)|f_1|^2 + G c_2 \sum_{k=0}^1 |f_2^{(k)}|^2 + (J - S)|f_3|^2 \right] dx + \frac{1}{2} C_p |f_4|^2 \\ &\geq c \|f\|_1^2, \end{aligned}$$

with $c := \frac{1}{2} \min(E c_0, m - S, G c_2, J - S, C_p)$ finite and positive if $S < m$ and $S < J$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.3. For given $g \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we construct function $f_\epsilon \in \text{dom } A$ such that $\|f_\epsilon - g\|_1 < C\epsilon$ for a finite positive constant C . Invoking Lemma 2.2 then yields the desired result.

We begin by setting $f_4 := g_4 \in \mathbb{C}$. Next, the denseness of $C_c^\infty((0, L))$ in $L^2([0, L])$ provides the existence of $f_1 \in C_c^\infty((0, L))$ such that $\|f_1 - g_1\|_{L^2}^2 < \epsilon$ [19, 17]. It follows that $f_1 \in H^2((0, L))$ and $f_1(0) = f_1'(0) = f_1'(L) = 0$. The same argument yields $f_3 \in C_c^\infty((0, L)) \subset H^1((0, L))$ with $f_3(0) = f_3(L) = 0$ such that $\|f_3 - g_3\|_{L^2}^2 < \epsilon$.

Since $g_2 \in H^1((0, L))$ with $g_2(0) = 0$, there is $g_2' \in L^2([0, L])$ such that

$$g_2(x) = \int_0^x g_2'(y) dy, \quad x \in [0, L].$$

Now, there exists $f_2' \in C_c^\infty((0, L))$ such that $\|f_2' - g_2'\|_{L^2}^2 < \epsilon$. Using that, we form $f_2 \in C^\infty([0, L])$ as

$$f_2(x) := \int_0^x f_2'(y) dy, \quad x \in [0, L],$$

which implies that $f_2 \in H^2((0, L))$ with $f_2(0) = f_2'(L) = 0$. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we write

$$\|f_2 - g_2\|_{L^2}^2 \leq L^2 \int_0^L |f_2'(y) - g_2'(y)|^2 dy = L^2 \|f_2' - g_2'\|_{L^2}^2$$

and

$$\|f_2 - g_2\|_{H^1}^2 = \|f_2 - g_2\|_{L^2}^2 + \|f_2' - g_2'\|_{L^2}^2 < C_2 \epsilon,$$

with $C_2 := 1 + L^2$.

Since $g_0 \in H^2((0, L))$ with $g_0(0) = g_0'(0) = 0$, there is $g_0'' \in L^2([0, L])$ for which

$$g_0(x) = \int_0^x \int_0^y g_0''(z) dz dy, \quad x \in [0, L].$$

We truncate and extend g_0'' to form $\tilde{f}_0'' \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\tilde{f}_0''(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & x < 0, \\ g_0''(x) & x \in (0, L - \epsilon), \\ \alpha & x \in (L - \epsilon, L + \epsilon), \\ 0 & x > L + \epsilon, \end{cases}$$

with constant $\alpha := -C_I E^{-1} g_4 \in \mathbb{C}$. Using positive constant $\delta < \epsilon$ and mollifier $\phi_\delta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, we form $f_0'' \in C^\infty([0, L])$ as

$$f_0''(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi_\delta(x - y) \tilde{f}_0''(y) dy, \quad x \in [0, L],$$

which ensures that f_0'' satisfies the desired conditions $f_0''(L) = \alpha$ and $f_0'''(L) = 0$. Next, we define $f_0 \in C^\infty([0, L])$ by

$$f_0(x) := \int_0^x \int_0^y f_0''(z) dz dy, \quad x \in [0, L],$$

so that $f_0 \in H^4((0, L))$ with $f_0(0) = f_0'(0) = 0$, $f_0''(L) = \alpha$ and $f_0'''(L) = 0$. Denoting by $\tilde{f}_0''|_{[0, L]}$ the restriction of \tilde{f}_0'' to $[0, L]$, we write

$$\|f_0'' - g_0''\|_{L^2}^2 < \|f_0'' - \tilde{f}_0''|_{[0, L]}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\tilde{f}_0''|_{[0, L]} - g_0''\|_{L^2}^2.$$

For any $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, its mollification $\phi_\delta * u$ converges to u in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ as $\delta \downarrow 0$ [19, 17]. It follows that the restriction of $f_0'' \equiv \phi_\delta * \tilde{f}_0''$ to $[0, L]$ converges in $L^2([0, L])$ to the corresponding restriction of \tilde{f}_0'' as $\delta \downarrow 0$; namely, that

$$\|f_0'' - \tilde{f}_0''|_{[0, L]}\|_{L^2}^2 < \tilde{c}_0 \delta < \tilde{c}_0 \epsilon,$$

for a finite positive constant \tilde{c}_0 . Additionally,

$$\|\tilde{f}_0''|_{[0, L]} - g_0''\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{L-\epsilon}^L |\alpha - g_0''(x)|^2 dx < (\alpha + \|g_0''\|_{L^\infty})\epsilon.$$

Therefore,

$$\|f_0'' - g_0''\|_{L^2}^2 < c_0 \epsilon,$$

with $c_0 := \tilde{c}_0 + \alpha + \|g_0''\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$. Finally, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as earlier,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_0' - g_0'\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq L^2 \|f_0'' - g_0''\|_{L^2}^2, \\ \|f_0 - g_0\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq L^4 \|f_0'' - g_0''\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

namely,

$$\|f_0 - g_0\|_{H^2}^2 < C_0 \epsilon,$$

with constant $C_0 := (1 + L^2 + L^4)c_0$.

For $f_\epsilon := (f_0, f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4)$, the above demonstrates that $f_\epsilon \in \text{dom } A \subset \mathcal{H}$ and

$$\|f_\epsilon - g\|_1^2 < C\epsilon,$$

with positive constant $C := C_0 + C_2 + 2 < \infty$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.7. We denote by $\{\mu_j\}$ and $\{\lambda_j\}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, the sets of eigenvalues of operators iA and A respectively. Since $\lambda_j = -i\mu_j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, proving that $\text{Re } \mu_j < 0$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ implies the desired result. To prove that, we consider the dynamical system formed by (3) for $f \in \text{dom } A \subset \mathcal{H}$ and show that the norm induced by (5) defines a Liapunov function. The result then follows from the Liapunov stability method [21].

We use the problem's PDE formulation (1)–(2) and denote by $\mathcal{E}(t)$ the total energy as a function of time t , which is equivalent to the norm induced by (5). We then have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(t) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^L \left[Ew''\bar{w}'' + m\dot{w}\bar{w} + G\theta'\bar{\theta}' + J\dot{\theta}\bar{\theta} + S(\dot{w}\bar{\theta} + \dot{\theta}\bar{w}) \right] dx + \frac{1}{2} C_p v\bar{v} \\ \dot{\mathcal{E}}(t) &= \int_0^L \text{Re} \left[Ew''\bar{w}'' + m\dot{w}\bar{w} + G\theta'\bar{\theta}' + J\dot{\theta}\bar{\theta} + S(\dot{w}\bar{\theta} + \dot{\theta}\bar{w}) \right] dx + C_p \text{Re}(v\bar{v}). \end{aligned}$$

From equations (1) we derive respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}(m\dot{w}\bar{w} + S\dot{w}\bar{\theta}) &= -\text{Re}(Ew''''\bar{w}), \\ \text{Re}(J\dot{\theta}\bar{\theta} + S\dot{\theta}\bar{w}) &= \text{Re}(G\theta''\bar{\theta}), \\ C_p \text{Re}(v\bar{v}) &= -\frac{1}{R}|v|^2 - C_D \text{Re}[\bar{w}'(t, L)v]. \end{aligned}$$

Using those and boundary conditions (2) we find

$$\dot{\mathcal{E}}(t) = -k_1|\dot{w}'(t, L)|^2 - k_2|\dot{\theta}(t, L)|^2 - \frac{1}{R}|v|^2 - (C_I + C_D) \operatorname{Re}[\bar{w}'(t, L)v].$$

If $C_I = -C_D$ then $\mathcal{E}(t)$ is monotone decreasing, which yields the desired result. \square

Acknowledgements

I thank Marianna A. Shubov for her advice and support related to this work. This work was funded in part by a Dissertation Year Fellowship awarded by the Graduate School of the University of New Hampshire.

References

- [1] A. Abdelkefi, F. Najjar, A. H. Nayfeh, and S. B. Ayed. An energy harvester using piezoelectric cantilever beams undergoing coupled bending-torsion vibrations. *Smart Mater. Struct.*, 20(11):115007, 2011.
- [2] A. Abdelkefi, A. H. Nayfeh, M. R. Hajj, and F. Najjar. Energy harvesting from a multifrequency response of a tuned bending-torsion system. *Smart Mater. Struct.*, 21(7):075029, 2012.
- [3] R. A. Adams and J. J. F. Fournier. *Sobolev spaces*. Academic Press, Boston, 2nd edition, 2003.
- [4] A. V. Balakrishnan. Control of structures with self-straining actuators: coupled Euler/Timoshenko model. In S. Sivasundaram, editor, *Nonlinear problems in aviation and aerospace*, pages 179–194. Gordon & Breach, Reading, 2000.
- [5] A. V. Balakrishnan, M. A. Shubov, and C. A. Peterson. Spectral analysis of coupled Euler-Bernoulli and Timoshenko beam model. *Z. Angew. Math. Mech.*, 84(5):291–313, 2004.
- [6] M. S. Birman and M. Z. Solomiak. *Spectral theory of self-adjoint operators in Hilbert space*. D. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1987.
- [7] R. E. D. Bishop, S. M. Cannon, and S. Miao. On coupled bending and torsional vibration of uniform beams. *J. Sound Vib.*, 131(3):457–464, 1989.
- [8] G. Chen, S. G. Krantz, D. W. Ma, C. E. Wayne, and H. H. West. The Euler-Bernoulli beam equation with boundary energy dissipation. In S. J. Lee, editor, *Operator methods for optimal control problems*. Marcel Dekker, New York, 1987.
- [9] G. Chen and J. Zhou. The wave propagation method for the analysis of boundary stabilization in vibrating structures. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 50(5):1254–1283, 1990.
- [10] M. P. Coleman and H. Wang. Analysis of vibration spectrum of a Timoshenko beam with boundary damping by the wave method. *Wave Motion*, 17(3):223–239, 1993.
- [11] K. A. Cook-Chennault, N. Thambi, and A. M. Sastry. Powering MEMS portable devices—a review of non-regenerative and regenerative power supply systems with special emphasis on piezoelectric energy harvesting systems. *Smart Mater. Struct.*, 17(4):043001, 2008.
- [12] E. Dokumaci. An exact solution for coupled bending and torsion vibrations of uniform beams having single cross-sectional symmetry. *J. Sound Vib.*, 119(3):443–449, 1987.
- [13] A. Erturk and D. J. Inman. A distributed parameter electromechanical model for cantilevered piezoelectric energy harvesters. *J. Vib. Acoust.*, 130(4):041002, 2008.
- [14] B. Geist and J. R. McLaughlin. Double eigenvalues for the uniform Timoshenko beam. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 10(3):129–134, 1997.
- [15] B. Geist and J. R. McLaughlin. Eigenvalue formulas for the uniform Timoshenko beam: the free-free problem. *Electron. Res. Ann. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 4(3):12–17, 1998.

- [16] B. Geist and J. R. McLaughlin. Asymptotic formulas for the eigenvalues of the Timoshenko beam. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 253(2):341–380, 2001.
- [17] J. K. Hunter and B. Nachtergaele. *Applied analysis*. World Scientific, New Jersey, 2001.
- [18] D. J. Inman and B. L. Grisso. Towards autonomous sensing. In *Proc. SPIE 6174 Smart Structures and Materials*, San Diego, 2006.
- [19] E. H. Lieb and M. Loss. *Analysis*. AMS, Providence, 2nd edition, 2001.
- [20] H. Liu, J. Zhong, C. Lee, S.-W. Lee, and L. Lin. A comprehensive review on piezoelectric energy harvesting technology: materials, mechanisms, and applications. *Appl. Phys. Rev.*, 5(4):041306, 2018.
- [21] L. Perko. *Differential equations and dynamical systems*. Springer, New York, 2001.
- [22] B. Rao. Optimal energy decay rate in a damped Rayleigh beam. *DCDS*, 4(4):721–734, 1998.
- [23] S. Roundy and P. K. Wright. A piezoelectric vibration based generator for wireless electronics. *Smart Mater. Struct.*, 13(5):1131–1142, 2004.
- [24] M. Safaei, H. A. Sodano, and S. R. Anton. A review of energy harvesting using piezoelectric materials: state-of-the-art a decade later (2008–2018). *Smart Mater. Struct.*, 28(11):113001, 2019.
- [25] M. A. Shubov. Spectral operators generated by Timoshenko beam model. *Syst. Control Lett.*, 38(4–5):249–258, 1999.
- [26] M. A. Shubov. Asymptotic and spectral analysis of the spatially nonhomogeneous Timoshenko beam model. *Math. Nachr.*, 241(1):125–162, 2002.
- [27] M. A. Shubov. On the completeness of root vectors generated by systems of coupled hyperbolic equations. *Math. Nachr.*, 287(13):1497–1523, 2014.
- [28] M. A. Shubov. Spectral asymptotics, instability and Riesz basis property of root vectors for Rayleigh beam model with non-dissipative boundary conditions. *ASY*, 87(3-4):147–190, 2014.
- [29] M. A. Shubov. Asymptotic representation for the eigenvalues of a non-selfadjoint operator governing the dynamics of an energy harvesting model. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 73:545–569, 2016.
- [30] M. A. Shubov. Spectral analysis of a non-selfadjoint operator generated by an energy harvesting model and application to an exact controllability problem. *ASY*, 102(3-4):119–156, 2017.
- [31] M. A. Shubov. Asymptotic and spectral analysis of a model of the piezoelectric energy harvester with the Timoshenko beam as a substructure. *Appl. Sci.*, 8(9):1434, 2018.
- [32] M. A. Shubov and C. A. Peterson. Asymptotic analysis of nonselfadjoint operators generated by coupled Euler-Bernoulli and Timoshenko beam model. *Math. Nachr.*, 267(1):88–109, 2004.
- [33] C. Vales. *Asymptotic spectral analysis of a coupled bending-torsion beam energy harvester*. PhD dissertation, University of New Hampshire, 2024.