

## Graphical Abstract

### **Prescribed-Time Boundary Control of Flexible String Systems**

He Yang, Chuan Zhang, Yingxin Guo, Xianfu Zhang



arXiv:2412.19073v1 [math.OC] 26 Dec 2024

## Highlights

### **Prescribed-Time Boundary Control of Flexible String Systems**

He Yang, Chuan Zhang, Yingxin Guo, Xianfu Zhang

- Some earlier works have been focused on backstepping design for PT stable of parabolic PDE systems, and no work has been done on PT stable of hyperbolic PDE systems via backstepping method. This paper is an attempt to fill this gap, and provide evidence supporting PT stable of flexible string systems.
- Different from the distributed control strategy, the boundary control proposed in this paper is physically more realistic when applied to flexible string systems due to the actuation and sensor are all nonintrusive, and it does not require to construct additional state observers.
- The PT stability of target system is strictly derived according to the Lyapunov method. By analyzing the well-posedness of kernel equation and inverse kernel equation, we establish the equivalence of PT stability between the original system and the target system. Additionally, the boundary controller is explicitly related to the kernel function, and an algorithm is given to obtain the numerical expression of kernel function.

# Prescribed-Time Boundary Control of Flexible String Systems<sup>\*</sup>

He Yang<sup>a</sup>, Chuan Zhang<sup>a,\*</sup>, Yingxin Guo<sup>a</sup> and Xianfu Zhang<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*School of Mathematical Science, Qufu Normal University, Qufu, 273165, Shandong, China*

<sup>b</sup>*School of Control Science and Engineering, Shandong University, Jinan, 250061, Shandong, China*

## ARTICLE INFO

### Keywords:

Prescribed-time stabilization  
Boundary control  
Backstepping method  
Flexible string system

## ABSTRACT

This paper presents a boundary control scheme for prescribed-time (PT) stable of flexible string systems via backstepping method, and the dynamics of such systems modeled by Hamilton's principle is described as hyperbolic partial differential equation (PDE). Initially, to construct a boundary controller with PT stabilization capacity, a PT stable hyperbolic PDE system with time-varying coefficient is chosen as the target system, and a corresponding Volterra integral transform with time-varying kernel function is considered. Meanwhile, the kernel equation and controller is determined by taking derivative. Then, to identify the boundary controller, the well-posedness of kernel equation is derived by means of successive approximation and mathematical induction, and the upper bound of kernel function is estimated. Furthermore, the inverse transform is proved with the help of a similar process for kernel function. Subsequently, the PT stability of closed-loop system is proved by PT stability of target system and reversible integral transform. Finally, the simulation results demonstrate the effectiveness of our scheme.

## 1. Introduction

In the practical environment, basically all mechanical structures can be regarded as flexible structures, the control problems of flexible systems generally have a wide range of application background, which can be found in industrial production, marine engineering, aerospace and civil engineering and so on. Have an important impact on the production and life of human beings, are the hotspot of domestic and foreign scholars, and have achieved a lot of research results [1, 2, 3]. Usually, people adopt three modeling methods, namely, Hamilton's principle [4], Newton-Euler equations [5] and Lagrange equations [6] to analyze the dynamics of flexible systems. In contrast to rigid-body structures, the system models of flexible structures are very complex and have infinite dimensions, which can be described by distributed parameter systems built by PDE.

There are two main ideas for control studies of distributed parameter systems. One is to discretize the infinite-dimensional system model into a finite-dimensional system model and to design the control based on the discretized system model. However, during the discrete processing of infinite-dimensional systems, the neglected critical modal information may have an important impact on the system performance, and the proposed control scheme based on the discrete model may not be able to control the infinite-dimensional system effectively or achieve the expected control effect [7]. In order to overcome the defects of the above control methods, another kind of idea is to design the control methods directly based on the infinite-dimensional system

model, and common control methods include distributed control [8, 9], boundary control [10], and point control [11]. Different from distributed control, boundary control is used to control the whole infinite-dimensional system by putting effects on the endpoint positions of the flexible systems, which requires fewer sensors and actuators, is simple to operate, easy to realize, low-cost, and is more practical in controlling flexible structures, getting much attention and research. A boundary control was used in [12] to restrain the flexural and torsional deflection vibrations of flexible wing joint and to achieve the desired angular position of the wing, the stability of the wing system was demonstrated by Lyapunov direct method. A novel boundary anti-disturbance control was established in [13] to suppress vibration of spatially nonlinear flexible string systems affected by unknown disturbances. The event-triggered stabilization of one-dimensional reaction-diffusion PDE systems with input delays was considered in [14], under the proposed event-triggered boundary control, the well-posedness and exponential stability of the closed-loop system were guaranteed. Although all of the above control methods are applicable to the study of boundary control problems for distributed parameter systems, however, compared to other methods, backstepping is a special control method that works well for nonlinear systems [15, 16, 17].

The basic idea of backstepping method is to transform the unstable original system model into a stable system model similar to the original model by constructing a Volterra integral transform. Then the specific form of the boundary controller is further determined by solving the kernel function in the integral transform, so the main work focuses on the proof of solvability and well-posedness of the kernel equation. The exponential stabilization of parabolic distributed parameter systems with mixed boundary conditions and external perturbations was discussed in [18]. A disturbance observer based boundary control with backstepping and estimation/elimination strategy was designed in [19] to

<sup>\*</sup>This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (62003189); the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (Grant No.2020M672024); the Natural Science Foundation of Shandong Province (Grant Nos.ZR2024QF012 and ZR2021MA043); the Research Fund for the Taishan Scholar Project of Shandong Province of China under Grant ts20190905.

\*Corresponding author

✉ zhangchuan@qfnu.edu.cn (C. Zhang)

exponentially stabilize the closed-loop system. In [20], it was studied the problem of boundary control of fractional ordinary differential equations coupled with time-fractional reaction-advection-diffusion equations with delays. All of the above studies use boundary control to achieve asymptotic or exponential stabilization of flexible systems. However, the PT stabilization of flexible systems based on boundary control is yet to be investigated.

For some time-constrained applications, such as tactical missile guidance [21], multi-intelligence body formation control [22] and pacecraft rendezvous guidance [23] and so on, it is necessary to meet the required performance metrics or control objectives within a finite or fixed time or even a prescribed time. Although the finite-time (FT) control exhibits a quicker convergence speed compared to the asymptotic convergence control, but the convergence time of the system stabilization is related to the initial conditions [24], which makes it inconvenient for practical applications. The initial conditions do not influence the convergence duration of fixed-time (FxT) control, but the upper limit of convergence time is associated with the system parameters, and it is extremely difficult to achieve the convergence of systems state within an arbitrary time range [25]. The PT control inherits the advantages of the above control [26, 27, 28], which can make the systems state converge to an equilibrium point in a specified time, as well as the initial conditions and control parameters do not exert any influence on the convergence time, which can be prescribed by the designer according to the actual situation. Therefore, it is required to develop flexible systems to realize the study of the PT stabilization problem.

In summary, the boundary control problem for flexible systems has been widely developed, but using boundary control for PT stabilization of flexible system based on backstepping has not been addressed. Therefore, this article utilizes the backstepping technique to investigate the PT stabilization of flexible string systems based on boundary actuation. The primary contributions and innovations are as:

- Some earlier works have been focused on backstepping design for PT stable of parabolic PDE systems in [27, 29], and no work has been done on PT stable of hyperbolic PDE systems via backstepping method. This paper is an attempt to fill this gap, and provide evidence supporting PT stable of flexible string systems.
- Different from the distributed control strategy utilized in [8, 9], the boundary control proposed in this paper is physically more realistic when applied to flexible string systems due to the actuation and sensor are all nonintrusive, and it does not require to construct additional state observers.
- The PT stability of target system is strictly derived according to the Lyapunov method. By analyzing the well-posedness of kernel equation and inverse kernel equation, we establish the equivalence of PT stability between the original system and the target system. Additionally, the boundary controller is explicitly related to

the kernel function, and an algorithm is given to obtain the numerical expression of kernel function.

**Notation.** In this paper,  $\mathbb{R}$  denotes the set of real numbers,  $\mathbb{R}^+$  expresses the non-negative real numbers.  $\mathbb{N}$  is the set of non-negative integers,  $\mathbb{C}^\infty$  denotes infinitely continuously differentiable.  $\frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l}$  represents the  $l$ -order time partial derivative,  $\frac{d^l}{dt^l}$  denotes  $l$ -order time derivative.  $L^2[0, 1]$  denotes the set of functions on the interval  $[0, 1]$  satisfying  $\int_0^1 p^2(x, t) dx < \infty$ .  $\|p(x, t)\|_{L^2}$  denotes the norm of  $p(x, t) \in L^2[0, 1]$  and  $\|p(x, t)\|_{L^2} = \left(\int_0^1 p^2(x, t) dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . To simplify the description,  $p_x(x, t)$ ,  $p_{xx}(x, t)$ ,  $p_t(x, t)$  and  $p_{tt}(x, t)$  are  $\frac{\partial p(x, t)}{\partial x}$ ,  $\frac{\partial^2 p(x, t)}{\partial x^2}$ ,  $\frac{\partial p(x, t)}{\partial t}$  and  $\frac{\partial^2 p(x, t)}{\partial t^2}$ , respectively.  $\dot{V}(t)$  denotes  $\frac{dV(t)}{dt}$ .

## 2. Mathematical Modeling and Preliminary

This paper takes the flexible string on the two-dimensional plane as the research object, and Fig.1 displays a simplified model of this system.

In this article, we consider the flexible string system to




Figure 1: The flexible string system

be a hyperbolic PDE system. The left boundary of the string is assumed to be fixed.  $p(1, t)$ ,  $p_t(1, t)$  and  $p_{tt}(1, t)$  are the displacement, velocity and acceleration of the tip payload respectively.  $u(t)$  is the boundary control input; Let  $\rho_0$  be the uniform mass per unit length of the string;  $M$  denotes the mass of the payload at the right boundary of the string;  $T_f$  is a constant tension;  $x \in [0, 1]$  is the spatial independent variable, and  $t \in [0, T)$  is the time independent variable.

We can derive the equations of motion describing the flexible string from Hamilton's principle as follows

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \delta [E_k(t) - E_p(t) + W(t)] dt = 0,$$

where  $t_1, t_2$  are two time variables;  $\delta$  denotes the variational operator;  $E_k(t)$  and  $E_p(t)$  represent kinetic and potential energy, respectively.  $W(t)$  represents the virtual power done by the non-conservative forces acting on the system.

The governing equations for the flexible string systems

are obtained:

$$\rho_0 \cdot p_{tt}(x, t) = T_f \cdot p_{xx}(x, t), \quad (1a)$$

$$p(0, t) = 0, \quad (1b)$$

$$T_f \cdot p_x(1, t) + M \cdot p_{tt}(1, t) = u(t), \quad (1c)$$

$$p(x, 0) = p_0(x), \quad (1d)$$

where (1b) and (1c) are the boundary conditions, (1d) is the initial condition.

**Definition 1.** (Prescribed-Time Stability): If for any initial condition  $p_0(x) \in L^2[0, 1]$  and any prescribed time  $T > 0$ , the  $L^2$ -norm of the system state  $p(x, t)$  satisfies  $\|p(x, t)\|_{L^2[0,1]} \rightarrow 0$  when  $t$  tends to  $T$ , then the system (1) is PT stable. If there is a boundary controller  $u(t)$  which ensures that the corresponding closed-loop system is PT stabilization, then the system is said to be PT stable.

**Definition 2.** The first class of  $\lambda$ -order modified Bessel function  $I_\lambda(\cdot)$  is defined as

$$I_\lambda(f) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n! \Gamma(n + \lambda + 1)} \left(\frac{f}{2}\right)^{\lambda+2n},$$

the first class of  $\lambda$ -order modified Bessel function can also be notated as

$$I_\lambda(f) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n! (n + \lambda)!} \left(\frac{f}{2}\right)^{\lambda+2n}.$$

**Assumption 1.** [30] For all  $t \in [0, T]$ , if the kinetic energy of the system (1) is bounded, then  $p_t(x, t)$  and  $p_{xt}(x, t)$  are bounded for  $\forall (x, t) \in [0, 1] \times [0, T]$ .

**Assumption 2.** [30] For all  $t \in [0, T]$ , if the potential of the system (1) is bounded,  $p_x(x, t)$  and  $p_{xx}(x, t)$  are bounded for  $\forall (x, t) \in [0, 1] \times [0, T]$ .

**Lemma 1.** [31] For non-negative integers  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $j \leq l$ , the following equation is satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^l \binom{l}{j} (l-j+1)! (j+n)! \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^l \binom{l}{j} (l-j+n)! (j+1)! \\ &= \frac{(l+n+2)!}{(n+1)(n+2)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Lemma 2.** [31] For any real numbers  $\xi > 0$  and  $\eta > 0$ , the following equation holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\eta \int_0^\tau (s\tau)^{n-1} (s+\tau) ds d\tau &= \frac{\eta^{2n+1}}{n(n+1)}, \quad \eta > 0 \\ \int_\eta^\xi \int_0^\eta (s\tau)^{n-1} (s-\tau) ds d\tau &= \frac{(\xi\eta)^n (\xi-\eta)}{n(n+1)}, \quad 0 \leq \eta \leq \xi \end{aligned}$$

where  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n \geq 1$ .

**Lemma 3.** [32, 33] Let  $\psi_1(x, t)$ ,  $\psi_2(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}$ , then the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_1 \psi_2 &\leq |\psi_1 \psi_2| \leq \psi_1^2 + \psi_2^2, \\ |\psi_1 \psi_2| &= \left| \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}} \psi_1 \right) (\sqrt{\delta} \psi_2) \right| \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \psi_1^2 + \delta \psi_2^2, \quad \delta > 0. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 4.** [34] If  $\tilde{h}(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}$  is a function on  $(x, t) \in [0, L] \times [0, T]$  and satisfy the boundary condition on  $\tilde{h}(0, t) = 0$ ,  $\forall t \in [0, T]$ , with the below inequality holds:

$$\tilde{h}^2(x, t) \leq L \int_0^L [\tilde{h}'(x, t)]^2 dx.$$

**Lemma 5.** The upper and lower bounds of the Lyapunov candidate function given by (34) as

$$0 \leq \sigma_2 V_1 \leq V(t) \leq \sigma_3 V_1(t),$$

where  $\sigma_2$  and  $\sigma_3$  are constants defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_2 &= 1 - \frac{2\alpha\rho_0}{\min(\beta\rho_0, \beta T_f)} > 0, \\ \sigma_3 &= 1 + \frac{2\alpha\rho_0}{\min(\beta\rho_0, \beta T_f)} > 1. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof.** By Lemma 3, we know (36) can be transformed into

$$|V_2(t)| \leq \alpha\rho_0 \int_0^1 \left\{ [v_t(x, t)]^2 + [v_x(x, t)]^2 \right\} dx \leq \sigma_1 V_1(t),$$

where  $\sigma_1 = \frac{2\alpha\rho_0}{\min(\beta\rho_0, \beta T_f)}$ , and we can further get

$$-\sigma_1 V_1(t) \leq V_2(t) \leq \sigma_1 V_1(t),$$

given that  $\alpha$  is a small positive weighting constant satisfying  $0 < \alpha < \frac{\min(\beta\rho_0, \beta T_f)}{2\rho_0}$ , we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_2 &= 1 - \sigma_1 = 1 - \frac{2\alpha\rho_0}{\min(\beta\rho_0, \beta T_f)} > 0, \\ \sigma_3 &= 1 + \sigma_1 = 1 + \frac{2\alpha\rho_0}{\min(\beta\rho_0, \beta T_f)} > 1, \end{aligned}$$

therefore, we further get

$$0 \leq (1 - \sigma_1) V_1 \leq V_1(t) + V_2(t) = V(t) \leq (1 + \sigma_1) V_1(t),$$

which means

$$0 \leq \sigma_2 V_1 \leq V(t) \leq \sigma_3 V_1(t).$$

□

**Lemma 6.** [35] If  $\varphi(s, t) \in \mathbb{R}$  is continuously differentiable relative to  $x \in [0, L]$ , and  $\varphi_s(s, t) \in L^2[0, L]$ , furthermore, the boundary condition  $\varphi(0, t) = 0$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ , then we get

$$\int_0^L \varphi^2(s, t) ds \leq L^2 \int_0^L \varphi_s^2(s, t) ds, \quad \forall s \in [0, L].$$

### 3. PT boundary controller design

#### 3.1. Selection and PT stability of target system

Unlike the traditional Volterra integral transform, to achieve PT stabilization capacity, a Volterra integral transform with time-varying kernel function is considered:

$$v(x, t) = p(x, t) - \int_0^x k(x, y, t) p(y, t) dy. \quad (2)$$

With this transform (2), we convert the original system (1) into a target system with time-varying coefficient  $\mu(t)$ :

$$\rho_0 \cdot v_{tt}(x, t) = T_f \cdot v_{xx}(x, t) - \mu(t) v(x, t), \quad (3a)$$

$$v(0, t) = 0, \quad (3b)$$

$$T_f \cdot v_x(1, t) = -M \cdot v_{tt}(1, t), \quad (3c)$$

$$v(x, 0) = v_0(x), \quad (3d)$$

where  $\mu(t) \in C^\infty[0, T]$ . To stabilize the target system within the prescribed time,  $\mu(t)$  is designed as:

$$\mu(t) = \frac{\mu_0^2 T^2}{(T-t)^2}, \quad \mu_0 > 0, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (4)$$

From the above equation,  $\mu(t)$  is monotonically increasing,  $\mu(0) = \mu_0^2$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \mu(t) = +\infty$ . Furthermore, taking the  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ -order derivative of the time-varying function  $\mu(t)$  with respect to time  $t$  yields

$$\frac{d^l}{dt^l} \mu(t) = \mu^{\frac{l}{2}+1}(t) (l+1)! \frac{1}{(\mu_0 T)^l}.$$

**Remark 1.** In this paper,  $\mu_0$  only needs to satisfy  $\mu_0 > 0$ , and it is not necessary to solve for the exact range of  $\mu_0$ . This is more general than [27].

**Theorem 1.** For any prescribed time  $T > 0$  and initial condition  $v_0(x) \in L^2[0, 1]$ , if there are constants  $\mu_0 > 0$ ,  $\rho_0 > 0$ ,  $T_f > 0$  and  $M > 0$ , the target system (3) is PT stabilization at the prescribed time  $T$ .

**Proof.** To prove that the closed-loop system (1) is PT stabilization under the PT boundary controller, it is initially necessary to prove the PT stabilization of the target system.

Consider the Lyapunov candidate function

$$V(t) = V_1(t) + V_2(t), \quad (5)$$

in which

$$V_1(t) = \frac{\beta}{2} \rho_0 \int_0^1 v_x^2(x, t) dx + \frac{\beta}{2} T_f \int_0^1 v_t^2(x, t) dx, \quad (6)$$

$$V_2(t) = \alpha \rho_0 \int_0^1 x v_x(x, t) v_t(x, t) dx, \quad (7)$$

where  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are two positive weighting constants.

Deriving (6) and (7) along the trajectory of the target system (3) with respect to time  $t$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_1(t) &= \beta T_f \int_0^1 v_x(x, t) v_{xt}(x, t) dx \\ &\quad + \beta \rho_0 \int_0^1 v_t(x, t) v_{tt}(x, t) dx \\ &= \beta T_f v_x(1, t) v_t(1, t) - \beta T_f \int_0^1 v_t(x, t) v_{xx}(x, t) dx \\ &\quad + \beta T_f \int_0^1 v_t(x, t) v_{xx}(x, t) dx \\ &\quad - \beta \mu(t) \int_0^1 v_t(x, t) v(x, t) dx \\ &= \beta T_f v_x(1, t) v_t(1, t) - \beta \mu(t) \int_0^1 v_t(x, t) v(x, t) dx, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_2(t) &= \alpha \rho_0 \int_0^1 (x v_{xt}(x, t) v_t(x, t) \\ &\quad + x v_x(x, t) v_{tt}(x, t)) dx \\ &= \alpha \rho_0 \int_0^1 (x v_{xt}(x, t) v_t(x, t) + x v_x(x, t) \\ &\quad \cdot \left( \frac{T_f}{\rho_0} v_{xx}(x, t) - \frac{1}{\rho_0} \mu(t) v(x, t) \right)) dx \\ &= \alpha \rho_0 \int_0^1 x v_x(x, t) v_{xx}(x, t) dx \\ &\quad - \alpha \int_0^1 x v_x(x, t) \mu(t) v(x, t) dx \\ &\quad + \alpha T_f \int_0^1 x v_x(x, t) v_{xx}(x, t) dx, \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 3 and the method of integration by parts yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_1(t) &\leq \beta T_f v_x(1, t) v_t(1, t) \\ &\quad - \left( \frac{\beta \mu(t)}{\delta_1} \int_0^1 (v_t(x, t))^2 dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \beta \mu(t) \delta_1 \int_0^1 (v(x, t))^2 dx \right) \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_2(t) &\leq \frac{\alpha T_f}{2} (v_x(1, t))^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha T_f}{2} \int_0^1 (v_x(x, t))^2 dx \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha \mu(t)}{\delta_2} \int_0^1 (v(x, t))^2 dx \\ &\quad - \alpha \mu(t) \cdot \delta_2 \int_0^1 (v_x(x, t))^2 dx \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha \rho_0}{2} (v_t(1, t))^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha \rho_0}{2} \int_0^1 (v_t(x, t))^2 dx \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

Applying the partial derivative of (5) relative to time  $t$ , and substituting (8) and (9) yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{V}(t) &= \dot{V}_1(t) + \dot{V}_2(t) \\
 &\leq \beta T_f v_x(1, t) v_t(1, t) \\
 &\quad - \left( \frac{\beta \mu(t)}{\delta_1} \int_0^1 (v_t(x, t))^2 dx \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \beta \mu(t) \delta_1 \int_0^1 (v(x, t))^2 dx \right) \\
 &\quad + \frac{\alpha T_f}{2} [v_x(1, t)]^2 - \frac{\alpha T_f}{2} \int_0^1 [v_x(x, t)]^2 dx \\
 &\quad - \left( \frac{\alpha \mu(t)}{\delta_2} \int_0^1 (v(x, t))^2 dx \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \alpha \mu(t) \delta_2 \int_0^1 (v_x(x, t))^2 dx \right) \\
 &\quad + \frac{\alpha \rho_0}{2} [v_t(1, t)]^2 - \frac{\alpha \rho_0}{2} \int_0^1 [v_t(x, t)]^2 dx \\
 &\leq - \left( \frac{\alpha \rho_0}{2} + \frac{\beta \mu(t)}{\delta_1} \right) \int_0^1 [v_t(x, t)]^2 dx \\
 &\quad - \left( \beta \mu(t) \delta_1 + \frac{\alpha \mu(t)}{\delta_2} \right) \int_0^1 [v(x, t)]^2 dx \\
 &\quad - \left( \frac{\alpha T_f}{2} + \alpha \mu(t) \delta_2 \right) \int_0^1 [v_x(x, t)]^2 dx \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (\alpha T_f \cdot v_x^2(1, t) + \alpha \rho_0 \cdot v_t^2(1, t) \\
 &\quad + 2\beta T_f v_x(1, t) v_t(1, t)) \\
 &\leq - \left( \frac{\alpha \rho_0}{2} + \frac{\beta \mu(t)}{\delta_1} \right) \int_0^1 [v_t(x, t)]^2 dx \\
 &\quad - \left( \frac{\alpha T_f}{2} + \alpha \mu(t) \delta_2 \right) \int_0^1 [v_x(x, t)]^2 dx \\
 &\quad + \frac{\delta_3}{2} [v_x(1, t) + v_t(1, t)]^2 \\
 &\leq -\lambda_1 \mu(t) V_1(t) + \varepsilon,
 \end{aligned}$$

from Lemma 5, we can further deduce:

$$\dot{V}(t) \leq -\frac{2\lambda_1}{\sigma_3} \mu(t) V(t) + \varepsilon, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1 = \min \left( \frac{1}{\delta_1 \rho_0}, \frac{\alpha \delta_2}{\beta T_f} \right) > 0, \\ \delta_3 = \max (\alpha T_f, \alpha \rho_0, \beta T_f) > 0, \\ \varepsilon = \frac{\delta_3}{2} [v_x(1, t) + v_t(1, t)]^2. \end{cases}$$

Integrating both sides of (10) with respect to time  $t$  from 0 to  $t$ , one can compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
 V(t) &\leq e^{-\frac{2\lambda_1}{\sigma_3} \int_0^t \mu(s) ds} V(0) \\
 &\quad + \varepsilon \cdot e^{-\frac{2\lambda_1}{\sigma_3} \int_0^t \mu(s) ds} \cdot \int_0^t e^{\frac{2\lambda_1}{\sigma_3} \int_0^s \mu(s) ds} ds, \quad (11)
 \end{aligned}$$

let  $\zeta(t) = e^{-\frac{2\lambda_1}{\sigma_3} \int_0^t \mu(s) ds}$  and use  $\mu(t) = \frac{\mu_0^2 T^2}{(T-t)^2}$ ,  $\mu_0 > 0$ , we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \zeta(t) &= e^{\frac{2\lambda_1}{\sigma_3} \mu_0^2 T} e^{-\frac{2\lambda_1}{\sigma_3} \mu_0 T \sqrt{\mu(t)}} \\
 &= e^{\frac{2\lambda_1}{\sigma_3} \mu_0^2 T} e^{-\frac{2\lambda_1}{\sigma_3} \mu_0^2 T \left( \frac{T}{T-t} \right)},
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $t \in [0, T)$ , this function is monotonically decreasing and satisfies  $\zeta(0) = 1$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \zeta(t) = 0$ , which implies that  $V(t)$  is bounded. Using Lemma 5, Lemma 6 and (6), for  $t \in [0, T)$ , there is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{T_f}{2} \|v(x, t)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \frac{T_f}{2} \int_0^1 v^2(x, t) dx \\
 &\leq \frac{T_f}{2} \int_0^1 [v_x(x, t)]^2 dx \quad (12) \\
 &\leq V_1(t) \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_2} V(t) \in \mathcal{L}_\infty,
 \end{aligned}$$

from this we can deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|v(x, t)\|_{L^2} &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sigma_2 T_f} V(t)} \\
 &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sigma_2 T_f} \left\{ \zeta(t) \left[ V(0) + \varepsilon \cdot \int_0^t e^{\frac{2\lambda_1}{\sigma_3} \int_0^s \mu(s) ds} ds \right] \right\}}, \quad (13)
 \end{aligned}$$

from the Definition 1, the target system (3) satisfies the PT stability in the time  $T > 0$ .

**Remark 2.** The PT stability analysis given in this paper can be also used in stability analysis of controller design based on Lyapunov method.

### 3.2. Determination and well-posedness of kernel equations

To determine the PT boundary controller, it is necessary to obtain the kernel functions in (2). According to the idea of the backstepping method [36], firstly, taking partial derivation for time  $t$  gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
 v_t(x, t) &= p_t(x, t) - \int_0^x k_t(x, y, t) p(y, t) dy \\
 &\quad - \int_0^x k(x, y, t) p_t(y, t) dy. \quad (14) \\
 v_{tt}(x, t) &= p_{tt}(x, t) - \int_0^x k_{tt}(x, y, t) p(y, t) dy \\
 &\quad - 2 \int_0^x k_t(x, y, t) p_t(y, t) dy \\
 &\quad - \int_0^x k(x, y, t) p_{tt}(y, t) dy.
 \end{aligned}$$



Substituting (1a) into the above equation and using partial integration yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
 v_{tt}(x, t) &= \frac{T_f}{\rho_0} p_{xx}(x, t) - \int_0^x k_{tt}(x, y, t) p(y, t) dy \\
 &\quad - 2 \int_0^x k_t(x, y, t) p_t(y, t) dy \\
 &\quad - \frac{T_f}{\rho_0} \int_0^x k(x, y, t) dp_x(y, t) \\
 &= \frac{T_f}{\rho_0} p_{xx}(x, t) - \int_0^x k_{tt}(x, y, t) p(y, t) dy \\
 &\quad - 2 \int_0^x k_t(x, y, t) p_t(y, t) dy \\
 &\quad - \frac{T_f}{\rho_0} k(x, x, t) p_x(x, t) + \frac{T_f}{\rho_0} k(x, 0, t) p_x(0, t) \\
 &\quad + \frac{T_f}{\rho_0} p(x, t) k_y(x, x, t) - \frac{T_f}{\rho_0} p(0, t) k_y(x, 0, t) \\
 &\quad - \frac{T_f}{\rho_0} \int_0^x p(y, t) k_{yy}(x, y, t) dy,
 \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Secondly, using Leibniz's differential rule [37], taking partial derivative for the space  $x$  gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
 v_x(x, t) &= p_x(x, t) - k(x, x, t) p(x, t) \\
 &\quad - \int_0^x k_x(x, y, t) p(y, t) dy, \\
 v_{xx}(x, t) &= p_{xx}(x, t) - \frac{d}{dx} k(x, x, t) p(x, t) \\
 &\quad - k(x, x, t) p_x(x, t) \\
 &\quad - k_x(x, y, t) p(x, t) \\
 &\quad - \int_0^x k_{xx}(x, y, t) p(y, t) dy.
 \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 k_x(x, x, t) &= k_x(x, y, t) |_{y=x} \\
 \frac{d}{dx} k(x, x, t) &= k_x(x, y, t) + k_y(x, y, t).
 \end{aligned}$$

Let  $x = 1$  and combine (1c) and (3c) to get:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &T_f \cdot v_x(1, t) + M \cdot v_{tt}(1, t) \\
 &= T_f \cdot p_x(1, t) - T_f \cdot k(1, 1, t) p(1, t) \\
 &\quad - T_f \int_0^1 k_x(1, y, t) p(y, t) dy \\
 &\quad + M \cdot p_{tt}(1, t) - \frac{MT_f}{\rho_0} k(1, 1, t) p_x(1, t) \\
 &\quad + \frac{MT_f}{\rho_0} k_y(1, 1, t) p(1, t) \\
 &\quad - \frac{MT_f}{\rho_0} \int_0^1 k_{yy}(1, y, t) p(y, t) dy = 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

to ensure that the original system (1) is transformed into the target system (3) by the integral transform (2), we have to choose the following controller:

$$\begin{aligned}
 u(t) &= T_f \cdot k(1, 1, t) p(1, t) \\
 &\quad + T_f \int_0^1 k_x(1, y, t) p(y, t) dy \\
 &\quad + \frac{MT_f}{\rho_0} k(1, 1, t) p_x(1, t) \\
 &\quad - \frac{MT_f}{\rho_0} k_y(1, 1, t) p(1, t) \\
 &\quad + \frac{MT_f}{\rho_0} \int_0^1 k_{yy}(1, y, t) p(y, t) dy.
 \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Finally, substituting (2), (15) and (16) into the target system (3) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\rho_0 \cdot v_{tt}(x, t) - T_f \cdot v_{xx}(x, t) + \mu(t) v(x, t) \\
 &= T_f \cdot p_{xx}(x, t) - \rho_0 \int_0^x k_{tt}(x, y, t) p(y, t) dy \\
 &\quad - 2\rho_0 \int_0^x k_t(x, y, t) p_t(y, t) dy - T_f \cdot k(x, x, t) p_x(x, t) \\
 &\quad + T_f \cdot k(x, 0, t) p_x(0, t) + T_f \cdot p(x, t) k_y(x, x, t) \\
 &\quad - T_f \cdot p(0, t) k_y(x, 0, t) - T_f \cdot \int_0^x p(y, t) k_{yy}(x, y, t) dy \\
 &\quad - T_f \cdot p_{xx}(x, t) + T_f \cdot \frac{d}{dx} k(x, x, t) p(x, t) \\
 &\quad + T_f \cdot k(x, x, t) p_x(x, t) + T_f \cdot k_x(x, x, t) p(x, t) \\
 &\quad + T_f \int_0^x k_{xx}(x, y, t) p(y, t) dy \\
 &\quad + \mu(t) \left( p(x, t) - \int_0^x k(x, y, t) p(y, t) dy \right) \\
 &= \left( T_f \cdot k_y(x, x, t) + T_f \cdot \frac{d}{dx} k(x, x, t) + T_f \cdot k_x(x, x, t) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \mu(t) \cdot p(x, t) + \int_0^x (-\rho_0 \cdot k_{tt}(x, y, t) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - T_f \cdot k_{yy}(x, y, t) + T_f \cdot k_{xx}(x, y, t) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - \mu(t) k(x, y, t) \right) p(y, t) dy \\
 &\quad - 2\rho_0 \int_0^x k_t(x, y, t) p_t(y, t) dy \\
 &\quad + T_f \cdot k(x, 0, t) p_x(0, t) - T_f \cdot p(0, t) k_y(x, 0, t) = 0.
 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Substituting the boundary condition (1b) into (18) yields the kernel equations with time-varying coefficient:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \rho_0 k_{tt}(x, y, t) &= -T_f k_{yy}(x, y, t) + T_f k_{xx}(x, y, t) \\
 &\quad - \mu(t) k(x, y, t),
 \end{aligned} \tag{19a}$$

$$\frac{d}{dx} k(x, x, t) = -\frac{1}{2T_f} \mu(t), \tag{19b}$$

$$k(x, 0, t) = 0, \tag{19c}$$



where the domain of definition of kernel functions  $k(x, y, t)$  is

$$\mathbb{D} = \{(x, y, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, T] : 0 \leq y \leq x \leq 1\},$$

the initial condition for the kernel equations (19) is

$$\int_0^x k(x, y, 0) p_0(y) dy = p_0(x) - v_0(x).$$

**Remark 3.** This paper solves the problem of well-posedness of the kernel equations in the case of no analytic solution, and the proposed method is also applicable to the proof of well-posedness of kernel equations in [38], which is more generalized.

**Remark 4.** Since the kernel equations contain a function  $\mu(t) \in C^\infty[0, T]$  with property  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \mu(t) = +\infty$ , it is important not only to prove the well-posedness of kernel equations (19), but also to obtain an explicit expression for the upper bound estimate of the time-varying kernel functions with respect to the time correlation.

**Remark 5.** Note that in contrast to the general kernel equations [39, 40], the kernel equations in this paper are hyperbolic distributed parameter systems with time-varying coefficient, and it is difficult to obtain their analytic solution. The uniqueness and existence of kernel function solution is proved in the Appendix. In Algorithm 1, the numerical solution of the kernel functions is given based on the finite difference method, and the controller is obtained using the numerical solution.

**Theorem 2.** *Considering (1) and the target system (3), the function  $\mu(t) \in C^\infty[0, T]$  is designed as (4), then there is a unique solution to the kernel equations (19) on the domain of definition  $\mathbb{D}$ , and the upper bound of the kernel functions  $k(x, y, t)$  is estimated as*

$$|k(x, y, t)| \leq y \mu_0 T \cdot \left( \frac{\mu(t)(6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)}{e \cdot (x^2 - y^2)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot I_1 \left( \frac{\sqrt{e \cdot \mu(t)(6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)(x^2 - y^2) / T_f}}{\mu_0 T} \right), \quad (20)$$

where  $\mu_0 > 0$ ,  $T$  is prescribed time.  $I_1(f)$  denotes the first class of first-order modified Bessel function.

The proof of Theorem 2 is given in the Appendix. Observe that the time-varying gain kernel grows unboundedly near the end time  $T$ , but the boundary controller is bounded on  $t \in [0, T]$ , as will be shown later in the PT stabilization of the closed-loop system.

To demonstrate that the closed-loop system (1) and the target system (3) can be converted to each other by

**Algorithm 1:** The steps of the numerical solution algorithm for the kernel function

- 
- Step 1:** Give the initialization parameters  $T, \mu_0, \rho_0, T_f, M$  based on Theorem 4;
- Step 2:** Discretize  $x, y$  and  $t$ , determine the space step  $hx, hy$  and the time step  $ht$ , and generate the sequence of discrete points  $i, j, n$ , and compute the number of discrete points  $xnumber, ynumber, tnumber$ ;
- Step 3:** Initialize the matrix used to store  $k(x, y, t)$  and its derivatives;
- Step 4:** Discrete  $k_{xx}, k_{yy}, k_{tt}$ , construct difference equations, use for loops to compute  $p(x, 0), \mu(t), k(1, 1, t)$  and  $k(x, y, 0)$ ; use nested loops to compute the values of  $p(x, y), k(x, y, t)$  at each discrete point;
- Step 5:** The value obtained in step 4 is used in a nested loop for  $u(t)$ . The outer loop traverses the time step for accumulating the integral approximation, and the inner loop traverses the space step for approximating the integral calculation;
- 

the integral transform (2), it is necessary to prove that the integral transform (2) is invertible.

The inverse transformation of the integral transform (2) is given by

$$p(x, t) = v(x, t) + \int_0^x r(x, y, t) v(y, t) dy, \quad (21)$$

where the domain of definition of  $r(x, y, t)$  is  $\mathbb{D}$ . The integral transform (2) and the inverse transform (21) satisfy the below relation

$$r(x, y, t) = k(x, y, t) + \int_y^x k(x, \gamma, t) r(\gamma, y, t) d\gamma, \quad (22)$$

the inverse transformation (21) converts the target system (3) into the original system (1) with the boundary controller (17). Substituting the integral transform (21) into the original system (1), and then utilizing the target system (3), the method of integration by parts and Leibniz's differential rule, the kernel equations can be obtained:

$$\rho_0 \cdot r_{tt}(x, y, t) = -T_f \cdot r_{yy}(x, y, t) + T_f \cdot r_{xx}(x, y, t) + \mu(t) r(x, y, t), \quad (23a)$$

$$\frac{d}{dx} r(x, x, t) = -\frac{1}{2T_f} \mu(t), \quad x \in [0, 1], \quad (23b)$$

$$r(x, 0, t) = 0, \quad x \in [0, 1], \quad (23c)$$

where  $(x, y, t) \in \mathbb{D}$ .

The kernel equations (23) are similar to (19), then by Theorem 2, there is also a unique solution to the kernel equations (23), and the inverse kernel functions  $r(x, y, t)$  have the same properties as the kernel functions  $k(x, y, t)$ . It is evident that we can obtain the below Theorem:

**Theorem 3.** *Considering the original system (1) and the target system (3),  $\mu(t) \in C^\infty[0, T]$  is taken as (4), then there is a unique solution of the kernel equations (23) on  $\mathbb{D}$ , which is second-order continuously differentiable with respect to*

the space  $x, y$  and infinitely continuously differentiable with respect to the time  $t$ . Moreover, the upper bound of the kernel functions  $r(x, y, t)$  is estimated as

$$|r(x, y, t)| \leq y\mu_0 T \cdot \left( \frac{\mu(t)(6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)}{e(x^2 - y^2)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot I_1 \left( \frac{\sqrt{e \cdot \mu(t)(6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)(x^2 - y^2)/T_f}}{\mu_0 T} \right), \quad (24)$$

where  $0 \leq y \leq x \leq 1, t \in [0, T)$ , and  $T$  is prescribed time.

**Remark 6.** The proof procedure for the inverse kernel function is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.

### 3.3. PT stability of closed-loop system

The target system (3) is adapted on a compact subset  $[0, T^*]$ ,  $0 < T^* < T$ . Therefore, from the well-posedness of the target system and the kernel equations as well as the bounded and inverse integral transform (2) on  $[0, T^*]$ , it follows that the closed-loop system (1) based on the PT boundary controller (9) is well-posedness for  $t \in [0, T)$ .

**Theorem 4.** Consider flexible string system (1),  $\mu(t)$  is shown in (4). For any prescribed time  $T > 0$ , if there are constants  $\mu_0 > 0, \rho_0 > 0, T_f > 0$  and  $M > 0$ , as well as any initial condition  $p_0(x) \in L^2[0, 1]$ , the closed-loop system (1) based on the PT boundary controller (17) is PT stabilization, where the controller gains satisfy the kernel equation (19).

Since the kernel functions  $k(x, y, t)$  and  $r(x, y, t)$  are continuous on  $\mathbb{D}$ , we can obtain

$$\|k(x, y, t)\|_{\infty} = \sup_{0 \leq y \leq x \leq 1} |k(x, y, t)| \leq \mathfrak{M}_k(t), \quad t \in [0, T).$$

$$\|r(x, y, t)\|_{\infty} = \sup_{0 \leq y \leq x \leq 1} |r(x, y, t)| \leq \mathfrak{M}_r(t), \quad t \in [0, T).$$

In order to determine the explicit expressions for  $\mathfrak{M}_k(t)$  and  $\mathfrak{M}_r(t)$ , using the power series property

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Phi_n^m \leq \left( \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Phi_n \right)^m, \quad m \geq 1, \quad \Phi_n \geq 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and the first class of first-order modified Bessel function

$$I_1 \left( \frac{\sqrt{\mu(t) \cdot e \cdot (6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)(x^2 - y^2)/T_f}}{\mu_0 T} \right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\left( \frac{\sqrt{\mu(t) \cdot e \cdot (6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)(x^2 - y^2)/T_f}}{2\mu_0 T} \right)^{2n+1}}{n!(n+1)!},$$

which results in

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\mu_0 T} \left( \frac{e \cdot \mu(t)(6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)(x^2 - y^2)}{T_f} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \cdot I_1 \left( \frac{\sqrt{\mu(t) \cdot e \cdot (6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)(x^2 - y^2)/T_f}}{\mu_0 T} \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n!)^2} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\mu(t)(6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)(x^2 - y^2)/T_f}}{2\mu_0 T} \right)^n \\ & = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \left( \frac{\sqrt{e\mu(t)(6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)(x^2 - y^2)/T_f}}{2\mu_0 T} \right)^n / n! \right)^2 \\ & = e^{\frac{\sqrt{e\mu(t)(6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)(x^2 - y^2)/T_f}}{\mu_0 T}}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Then, by (25) it is possible to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |y\mu_0 T \cdot \frac{I_1 \left( \frac{\sqrt{\mu(t) \cdot e \cdot (6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)(x^2 - y^2)/T_f}}{\mu_0 T} \right)}{\sqrt{\mu(t) \cdot e \cdot (6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)(x^2 - y^2)/T_f / \mu_0 T}}| \\ & \leq C_k \cdot e^{\frac{\sqrt{e\mu(t)(6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)/T_f}}{\mu_0 T}}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where  $C_k > 0$  is a constant. From the estimate (20) of the upper bound on the kernel function  $k(x, y, t)$ , an explicit expression for  $\mathfrak{M}_k(t)$  can be obtained as

$$|k(x, y, t)| \leq \mathfrak{M}_k(t) = C_k \cdot e^{\frac{\sqrt{e\mu(t)(6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)/T_f}}{\mu_0 T}}, \quad (27)$$

similarly, the estimate (24) of the upper bound on the inverse kernel function  $r(x, y, t)$  leads to the explicit expression for  $\mathfrak{M}_r(t)$

$$|r(x, y, t)| \leq \mathfrak{M}_r(t) = C_k \cdot e^{\frac{\sqrt{e\mu(t)(6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)/T_f}}{\mu_0 T}}. \quad (28)$$

Using the inverse integral transforms (2) and (21), and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, combined with estimates of the upper bounds on the kernel functions  $k(x, y, t)$  and  $r(x, y, t)$ , it can be obtained that

$$\|p(x, t)\|_{L^2} \leq (1 + \mathfrak{M}_r(t)) \cdot \|v(x, t)\|_{L^2}, \quad (29)$$

$$\|v(x, t)\|_{L^2} \leq (1 + \mathfrak{M}_k(t)) \cdot \|p(x, t)\|_{L^2}, \quad (30)$$

substituting (13) into (29) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \|p(x, t)\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq (1 + \mathfrak{M}_r(t)) \cdot \|v(x, t)\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq (1 + \mathfrak{M}_r(t)) \\ & \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sigma_2 T_f} \left[ \zeta(t) \left( V(0) + \varepsilon \int_0^t e^{\frac{2\lambda_1}{\sigma_3} \int_0^s \mu(s) ds} ds \right) \right]}, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

using (28) and (31), for  $t \in [0, T]$ , it follows that

$$\|p(x, t)\|_{L^2} \leq \left( 1 + C_k \cdot e^{\frac{\sqrt{e^{-\mu(t)}(6+\mu_0^2 T^2)}/T_f}{\mu_0 T}} \right) \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sigma_2 T_f} \left[ \zeta(t) \left( V(0) + \varepsilon \int_0^t e^{\frac{2\lambda_1}{\sigma_3} \int_0^s \mu(s) ds} ds \right) \right]},$$

then substituting the function  $\mu(t) = \frac{\mu_0^2 T^2}{(T-t)^2}$  into the above equation we have

$$\|p(x, t)\|_{L^2} \leq \left( 1 + C_k \cdot e^{\frac{\sqrt{e^{(6+\mu_0^2 T^2)}/T_f}}{T-t}} \right) \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sigma_2 T_f} \left[ \zeta(t) \left( V(0) + \varepsilon \int_0^t e^{\frac{2\lambda_1}{\sigma_3} \int_0^s \mu(s) ds} ds \right) \right]}. \quad (32)$$

When  $t \rightarrow T$ , from  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \sigma(t) = 0$ , we know that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \|p(x, t)\|_{L^2} = 0$ . According to the Definition 1, the closed-loop system (1) is PT stabilization in the prescribed time  $T > 0$ .

**Remark 7.** From (42), we get that  $V_1(t)$  is bounded on  $t \in [0, T]$ , and thus  $v_t(x, t)$  and  $v_x(x, t)$  are bounded on  $\forall(x, t) \in [0, 1] \times [0, T]$ , and further  $p_x(x, t)$ ,  $p_t(x, t)$  are bounded on  $\forall(x, t) \in [0, 1] \times [0, T]$ , then we get that  $E_k(t)$  and  $E_p(t)$  are bounded. Using Assumptions 1 and 2, we can obtain that  $p_{xx}(x, t)$  and  $p_{xt}(x, t)$  are also bounded. Finally, we use (1a) to see that  $p_{tt}(x, t)$  is also bounded. Since  $p(x, t)$ ,  $p_x(x, t)$ , and  $k(x, y, t)$  are all bounded, we can conclude that the boundary controller is also bounded.

□

#### 4. Numerical simulations

To demonstrate the effectiveness of the boundary controller designed in this paper, in the following we perform numerical simulations to verify the PT stability of the closed-loop system (1) based on the boundary controller.

In the simulation, using the finite difference method to discretize (1). The parameters of the string systems and the initial condition are chosen as follows:

$$p_0 = 1 \text{ kg/m}, M = 1 \text{ kg}, T_f = 10 \text{ N}, \mu_0 = 4.6, T = 2; \\ p_0(x) = -\frac{1}{2}x(x-1).$$

Fig.2 represents the graph of the prescribed time function  $\mu(t)$ , which shows that  $\mu(t)$  is monotonically increasing in  $t \in [0, T]$ . Fig.3 and Fig.4 exhibit the space-time evolution of the states for the open-loop system (1) and the closed-loop system based on boundary control (9), respectively. As can be seen in Fig. 3, the system is unstable and fluctuating.

From Fig.4, it can be seen that the closed-loop system under the action of the boundary controller achieves stabilization after the prescribed time  $T$ .

The time evolution of the boundary controller is




Figure 2: The trajectory of the prescribed time function




Figure 3: The evolution of the open-loop system state




Figure 4: The evolution of the closed-loop system state based on boundary control

shown in Fig.5, which shows that the boundary controller is bounded and converges to zero within the prescribed time  $T = 2$ .

To better illustrate the evolution of the system state, Fig.6 and Fig.7 give the trajectory of the state  $L^2$ -norms with respect to time for the open-loop system and the closed-loop system based on the boundary control (9). Fig.7 shows that the  $L^2$ -norm of the closed-loop system state converges to zero in the prescribed time .




Figure 5: The evolution of the boundary controller




Figure 6: The trajectory of the  $L^2$ -norm of the open-loop system state




Figure 7: The trajectory of the  $L^2$ -norm of the closed-loop system state based on boundary control

## 5. Conclusion

This paper investigates a boundary control problem for the PT stabilization of flexible string systems by backstepping, where the dynamics of the system is represented by a hyperbolic PDE. To develop a boundary controller with PT stabilization, a hyperbolic PDE system with time-varying coefficient is chosen as the target system firstly, and the PT stability of the target system is proved by using the Lyapunov method, and the Volterra integral transform with time-varying kernel functions are considered accordingly. Secondly, the expressions of the kernel equations and controller are obtained by derivation, the well-posedness of the kernel equations is derived by successive approximation and mathematical induction, and the upper bound of the kernel

functions is estimated. Furthermore, the existence of the solution of the inverse transformation is proved with the help of a similar process for the kernel functions. Finally, the PT stability of the closed-loop system is proved using the PT stability of the target system and the inverse integral transform. In the future, we will further consider the PT stabilization of perturbed flexible string systems.

## Declarations

**Conflict of interest** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

## Appendix A

### Proof of Theorem 2

**Proof.** Make variable substitution:

$$\xi = x + y, \quad \eta = x - y,$$

let

$$F(\xi, \eta, t) = k(x, y, t) = k\left(\frac{\xi + \eta}{2}, \frac{\xi - \eta}{2}, t\right),$$

then the kernel equations (19) are transformed into:

$$F_{\xi\eta}(\xi, \eta, t) = \frac{\rho_0}{4T_f} F_{tt}(\xi, \eta, t) + \frac{1}{4T_f} \mu(t) F(\xi, \eta, t), \quad (33a)$$

$$F_{\xi}(\xi, 0, t) = -\frac{1}{4T_f} \mu(t), \quad (33b)$$

$$F(\xi, \xi, t) = 0, \quad (33c)$$

where the domain of definition of  $F(\xi, \eta, t)$  is

$$\mathbb{D}_1 = \{(\xi, \eta, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, T) : \eta \in [0, 1], \xi \in [\eta, 2 - \eta]\}.$$

To solve the above equations by successive approximation, it is necessary to transform (33) into an integral equation. Integrating (33a) with respect to  $\eta$  from 0 to  $\eta$  and using (33b) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\eta F_{\xi\eta}(\xi, \eta, t) d\eta \\ &= F_{\xi}(\xi, \eta, t) - F_{\xi}(\xi, 0, t) \\ &= \frac{\rho_0}{4T_f} \int_0^\eta F_{tt}(\xi, s, t) ds \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{4T_f} \int_0^\eta \mu(t) F(\xi, s, t) ds, \end{aligned}$$

therefore, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\xi}(\xi, \eta, t) &= -\frac{1}{4T_f} \mu(t) + \frac{\rho_0}{4T_f} \int_0^\eta F_{tt}(\xi, s, t) ds \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{4T_f} \int_0^\eta \mu(t) F(\xi, s, t) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Then, integrating (34) with respect to  $\xi$  from  $\eta$  to  $\xi$  and using (33c) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\eta}^{\xi} F_{\xi}(\xi, \eta, t) d\xi \\ &= F(\xi, \eta, t) - F(\eta, \eta, t) \\ &= -\frac{1}{4T_f} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \mu(t) d\tau \\ & \quad + \frac{\rho_0}{4T_f} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} F_{tt}(\xi, s, t) ds \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{4T_f} \int_0^{\eta} \mu(t) F(\tau, s, t) ds d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

thereby, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(\xi, \eta, t) &= -\frac{1}{4T_f} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \mu(t) d\tau \\ & \quad + \frac{\rho_0}{4T_f} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} F_{tt}(\xi, s, t) ds \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{4T_f} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \mu(t) F(\tau, s, t) ds d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The solution of (33) is equivalent to that of the integral equation (35). Next, using successive approximation and mathematical induction to obtain the solution of the integral equation (35).

First, take an initial condition  $F^0(\xi, \eta, t) = 0$ . Then, iteratively calculate equation (35), the iterative equation is given as

$$\begin{aligned} F^n(\xi, \eta, t) &= -\frac{1}{4T_f} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \mu(t) \cdot (\xi - \eta) \\ & \quad + \frac{\rho_0}{4T_f} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} F_{tt}^{n-1}(\tau, s, t) ds d\tau \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{4T_f} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \mu(t) F^{n-1}(\tau, s, t) ds d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

The continuous sequence of functions

$$F^0(\xi, \eta, t), F^1(\xi, \eta, t), F^2(\xi, \eta, t), \dots, F^n(\xi, \eta, t),$$

denoted  $\{F^n(\xi, \eta, t)\}$ , where  $n \geq 2$ . If the sequence of functions converges, let the limit be

$$F(\xi, \eta, t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F^n(\xi, \eta, t), \quad n \geq 2, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The difference between the two consecutive terms above is:

$$\Delta F^n(\xi, \eta, t) = F^n(\xi, \eta, t) - F^{n-1}(\xi, \eta, t).$$

To prove the uniform convergence of the function sequence  $\{F^n(\xi, \eta, t)\}$ , we introduce the infinite series:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Delta F^n(\xi, \eta, t), \quad (36)$$

where it can be seen that

$$\Delta F^1(\xi, \eta, t) = -\frac{1}{4T_f} \mu(t) \cdot (\xi - \eta), \quad (37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta F^n(\xi, \eta, t) &= \frac{\rho_0}{4T_f} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \Delta F_{tt}^{n-1} ds d\tau \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{4T_f} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \mu(t) \\ & \quad \cdot \Delta F^{n-1}(\tau, s, t) ds d\tau, \quad n \geq 2. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

It is sufficient to show that the series (36) converges to obtain that the sequence  $\{F^n(\xi, \eta, t)\}$  is convergent. The following proves that the infinite series (36) converges absolutely uniformly.

When  $n = 1$ , according to (37), for  $\forall (\xi, \eta, t) \in \mathbb{D}_1$ , the  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ -order partial derivative of  $\Delta F^1(\xi, \eta, t)$  with respect to time  $t$  is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} \Delta F^1(\xi, \eta, t) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4T_f} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \left| \frac{d^l}{dt^l} \mu(t) \right| d\tau \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4T_f} \cdot \frac{d^l}{dt^l} \mu(t) (\xi - \eta) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4T_f} \mu^{\frac{l}{2}+1}(t) (l+1)! \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^l (\xi - \eta). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

When  $n = 2$ ,  $n = 3$  and  $n = 4$ , take the  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ -order partial derivatives for the time  $t$  for both sides of (38), and use (39), Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, for  $(\xi, \eta, t) \in \mathbb{D}_1$ , the estimates of the  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ -order partial derivatives of  $\Delta F^2(\xi, \eta, t)$ ,  $\Delta F^3(\xi, \eta, t)$  and  $\Delta F^4(\xi, \eta, t)$  for the time  $t$  can be obtained respectively.

When  $n = 2$ , we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} \Delta F^2(\xi, \eta, t) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{4T_f} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \left( \rho_0 \cdot \left| \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} \Delta F_{tt}^1(\xi, \eta, t) \right| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{d^l}{dt^l} \mu(t) \cdot \left| \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} \Delta F^1(\tau, s, t) \right| \right) ds d\tau \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4T_f} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \left( \rho_0 \cdot \left| \frac{\partial^{l+2}}{\partial t^{l+2}} \Delta F^1(\tau, s, t) \right| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sum_{j=0}^l \binom{l}{j} \frac{d^j}{dt^j} \mu(t) \cdot \left| \frac{\partial^{l-j}}{\partial t^{l-j}} \Delta F^1(\tau, s, t) \right| \right) ds d\tau \\ & \leq \left( \frac{1}{4T_f} \right)^2 \left( \rho_0 \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^{l+2} \mu^{\frac{l+2}{2}+1}(t) (l+3)! \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^l \mu^{\frac{l}{2}+2}(t) \frac{(l+3)!}{2 \times 3} \right) \frac{\xi \eta (\xi - \eta)}{2} \\ & \leq \left( \frac{1}{4T_f} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^{l+2} \mu^{\frac{l+2}{2}+1}(t) \frac{(l+3)!}{2 \times 3} \\ & \quad \cdot (2 \times 3 + \mu_0^2 T^2) \frac{\xi \eta (\xi - \eta)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

When  $n = 3$ , it is easy to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} \Delta F^3(\xi, \eta, t) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4T_f} \int_{\eta}^{\xi} \int_0^{\eta} \left( \left| \frac{\partial^{l+2}}{\partial t^{l+2}} \Delta F^2(\tau, s, t) \right| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sum_{j=0}^l \binom{l}{j} \frac{d^l}{dt^l} \mu(t) \cdot \left| \frac{\partial^{l-j}}{\partial t^{l-j}} \Delta F^2(\tau, s, t) \right| \right) ds d\tau \\ & \leq \left( \frac{1}{4T_f} \right)^3 \left( \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^{l+4} \mu^{\frac{l+4}{2}+1}(t) \frac{(l+5)!}{4 \times 5} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \cdot (2 \times 3 + \mu_0^2 T^2) \left( \frac{4 \times 5}{2 \times 3} + \mu_0^2 T^2 \right) \right) \frac{(\xi \eta)^2 (\xi - \eta)}{2! 3!}. \end{aligned}$$

When  $n = 4$ , we have access to the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} \Delta F^4(\xi, \eta, t) \right| \\ & \leq \left( \frac{1}{4T_f} \right)^4 \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^{l+6} \mu^{\frac{l+6}{2}+1}(t) \frac{(l+7)!}{6 \times 7} (2 \times 3 + \mu_0^2 T^2) \\ & \quad \cdot \left( \frac{4 \times 5}{2 \times 3} + \mu_0^2 T^2 \right) \left( \frac{6 \times 7}{4 \times 5} + \mu_0^2 T^2 \right) \frac{(\xi \eta)^3 (\xi - \eta)}{3! 4!}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mu(t) = \frac{\mu_0^2 T^2}{(T-t)^2}$ . For  $(\xi, \eta, t) \in \mathbb{D}_1$ , the recursive form of the  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ -order partial derivative of  $\Delta F(\xi, \eta, t)$  with respect to time  $t$  can be obtained by iterative computational induction as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} \Delta F^n(\xi, \eta, t) \right| \\ & \leq \left( \frac{1}{4T_f} \right)^n \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^{l+2n-2} \mu^{\frac{l+2n-2}{2}+1}(t) \\ & \quad \cdot \frac{(l+2n-1)!}{(2n-2)(2n-1)} \cdot \prod_{m=1}^n \left[ \frac{2m(2m+1)}{m(m+1)} \right] \\ & \quad + \mu_0^2 T^2 + \delta_{m,1}(3) \left] \frac{(\xi \eta)^{n-1} (\xi - \eta)}{(n-1)! n!}, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where  $n \geq 2$ ,  $\delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & i = j \\ 0, & i \neq j \end{cases}$ .

The following mathematical induction shows that (40) holds for all positive integers  $n \geq 2$ .

For  $n = 2$ , it can be proved that (40) holds by (39). Assuming that the recursive form (40) holds for positive integers  $n$ , the following proof that (40) is suitable for positive integers  $n+1$ . Taking  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ -order partial derivatives on both sides of (38) with respect to  $t$ , and combining (40), Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} \Delta F^{n+1}(\xi, \eta, t) \right| \\ & \leq \left( \frac{1}{4T_f} \right)^{n+1} \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^{l+2n} \mu^{\frac{l+2n}{2}+1}(t) \frac{(l+2n+1)!}{2n(2n+1)} \\ & \quad \cdot \prod_{m=1}^{n+1} \left[ \frac{2m(2m+1)}{m(m+1)} + \mu_0^2 T^2 + \delta_{m,1}(3) \right] \frac{(\xi \eta)^n (\xi - \eta)}{n!(n+1)!}. \end{aligned}$$

By mathematical induction, the recursive form (39) applies for all  $n \geq 2$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . When  $l = 0$ , the right side

of inequality (39) is a general term for the following positive term convergent series:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{4T_f} \right)^{n+1} \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^{2n} \mu^{n+1}(t) \cdot 2(n-1)! \\ & \quad \cdot \prod_{m=1}^{n+1} \left[ \frac{2m(2m+1)}{m(m+1)} + \mu_0^2 T^2 + \delta_{m,1}(3) \right] \frac{(\xi \eta)^n (\xi - \eta)}{n!(n+1)!}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Furthermore, using the ratio convergence method for positive term series to find the radius of convergence of the power series (41), we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2n! \prod_{m=1}^{n+2} \left[ \frac{2m(2m+1)}{m(m+1)} + \mu_0^2 T^2 + \delta_{m,1}(3) \right] \frac{1}{(n+2)!(n+1)!}}{2(n-1)! \prod_{m=1}^{n+1} \left[ \frac{2m(2m+1)}{m(m+1)} + \mu_0^2 T^2 + \delta_{m,1}(3) \right] \frac{1}{(n+1)!n!}} = 0.$$

From the above analysis, it is clear that the series (41) is absolutely convergent on the domain of definition  $[\eta, \eta - 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, T^*]$ , where  $[0, T^*]$ ,  $0 < T^* < T$  denotes any compact subset of  $[0, T]$ . So it follows that the series (36) converges absolutely uniform convergence on the domain of definition  $[\eta, \eta - 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, T^*]$ . It is shown that the infinite sequence  $\{F^n(\xi, \eta, t)\}$  is uniformly convergent on the domain of definition  $[\eta, \eta - 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, T^*]$ . Therefore, there is a unique solution  $F(\xi, \eta, t)$  of the integral equation (35) on  $[\eta, \eta - 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, T^*]$ .

From the above analysis, it is clear that the equation (33) has a unique solution on the domain of definition  $\mathbb{D}_1$ , and  $F(\xi, \eta, t)$  is second-order continuously differentiable on  $\mathbb{D}_1$  with respect to the spaces  $\xi$  and  $\eta$ , as well as infinitely continuously differentiable with respect to the time  $t$ . This indicates that there is a unique solution  $k(x, y, t)$  of the kernel equations (19) on  $\mathbb{D}$ , and  $k(x, y, t)$  is second-order continuously differentiable on  $\mathbb{D}$  with respect to the spaces  $x, y$ , as well as infinitely continuously differentiable with respect to the time  $t$ .

Next, an estimate of the upper bound on the kernel functions is obtained using the series (41) and the first class of first-order modified Bessel function.

Since the upper bound estimate of the obtained function  $F(\xi, \eta, t)$  is relative to the time-dependent sequence, the explicit expression for the upper bound estimate of  $F(\xi, \eta, t)$  is further given. According to

$$\left| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta F(\xi, \eta, t) \right| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\Delta F^n(\xi, \eta, t)|,$$

combining with the series (36) and (41), the following series is obtained:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta F^n(\xi, \eta, t) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{4T_f} \right)^{n+1} \mu^{n+1}(t) \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^{2n} 2(n-1)! \\ & \quad \cdot \prod_{m=1}^{n+1} \left[ \frac{2m(2m+1)}{m(m+1)} + \mu_0^2 T^2 + \delta_{m,1}(3) \right] \frac{(\xi \eta)^n (\xi - \eta)}{n!(n+1)!}. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$



To obtain an explicit expression for the upper bound of the function  $F(\xi, \eta, t)$  with respect to the time-growth estimate, using the inequality deflation to further simplify (42).

When  $m = 1$ , it is obvious that

$$\prod_{m=1}^{n+1} \left[ \frac{2m(2m+1)}{m(m+1)} + \mu_0^2 T^2 + \delta_{m,1} \right] = 6 + \mu_0^2 T^2,$$

when  $m \geq 2$ , it can be deduced that

$$\frac{2m(2m+1)}{m(m+1)} = \frac{4m^2 + 2m}{m^2 + m} = 4 - \frac{2m}{m^2 + m} = 4 - \frac{2}{m+1} \leq 4,$$

so we can get

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{m=1}^{n+1} \left[ \frac{2m(2m+1)}{m(m+1)} + \mu_0^2 T^2 + \delta_{m,1} \right] \\ & \leq \prod_{m=1}^{n+1} (6 + \mu_0^2 T^2) \\ & \leq (6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)^{n+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Therefore, for  $\forall n \geq 2, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there is

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta F^n(\xi, \eta, t) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{4T_f} \right)^{n+1} \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^{2n} \mu^{n+1}(t) \cdot 2(n-1)! \\ & \quad \cdot (6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)^{n+1} \frac{(\xi\eta)^n (\xi - \eta)}{n!(n+1)!} \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{4T_f} \right)^{n+1} \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^{2n} \mu^{n+1}(t) \cdot 2e^n \\ & \quad \cdot (6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)^{n+1} \frac{(\xi\eta)^n \cdot (\xi - \eta)}{n!(n+1)!}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

For  $\xi \in [\eta, 2 - \eta]$ ,  $\eta \in [0, 1]$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ , since  $F(\xi, \eta, t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F^n(\xi, \eta, t)$ ,  $n \geq 2, n \in \mathbb{N}$  and series (36), we have

$$|F(\xi, \eta, t)| = \left| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta F^n(\xi, \eta, t) \right|,$$

and combining with (44) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & |F(\xi, \eta, t)| \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{4T_f} \right)^{n+1} \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^{2n} \mu^{n+1}(t) \cdot 2e^n \\ & \quad \cdot (6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)^{n+1} \frac{(\xi\eta)^n (\xi - \eta)}{n!(n+1)!}. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

To further obtain the explicit expression for  $F(\xi, \eta, t)$  with respect to time-varying growth, the first class of  $\lambda$ -order modified Bessel function is introduced:

$$I_\lambda(f) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n! \Gamma(n + \lambda + 1)} \left( \frac{f}{2} \right)^{\lambda + 2n}. \quad (46)$$

For the given

$$\begin{aligned} & |F(\xi, \eta, t)| \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{4T_f} \right)^{n+1} \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^{2n} \mu^{n+1}(t) \\ & \quad \cdot 2e^n (6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)^{n+1} \frac{(\xi\eta)^n (\xi - \eta)}{n!(n+1)!}, \end{aligned}$$

we make a simplified deformation:

$$a = \frac{1}{4T_f} \mu(t), b = \frac{e}{\mu_0^2 T^2}, c = 6 + \mu_0^2 T^2,$$

then the above equation is transformed into

$$|F(\xi, \eta, t)| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a^{n+1} \cdot b^n \cdot c^{n+1}}{n!(n+1)!} (\xi\eta)^n \cdot (\xi - \eta). \quad (47)$$

Let  $z = 2\sqrt{abc\xi\eta}$ , then one gets

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{a^{n+1} \cdot b^n \cdot c^{n+1}}{n!(n+1)!} \\ & = (a \cdot c)^{\frac{1}{2}} (b \cdot \xi\eta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{n!(n+1)!} \cdot \left( \frac{z}{2} \right)^{2n+1}, \end{aligned}$$

so (47) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & |F(\xi, \eta, t)| \\ & \leq (a \cdot c)^{\frac{1}{2}} (b \cdot \xi\eta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!(n+1)!} \left( \frac{z}{2} \right)^{2n+1} (\xi - \eta), \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

as for (46), if we make  $\lambda = 1$ , then we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(z) & = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n! \Gamma(n + 1 + 1)} \cdot \left( \frac{z}{2} \right)^{2n+1} \\ & = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!(n+1)!} \left( \frac{z}{2} \right)^{2n+1}, \end{aligned}$$

then substituting  $a, b, c$  and  $z$  into (48), (48) can be further simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} & |F(\xi, \eta, t)| \\ & \leq (ac)^{\frac{1}{2}} (b\xi\eta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} I_1(z) (\xi - \eta) \\ & \leq \frac{\mu_0 T}{2} \left( \frac{\mu(t) (6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)}{e\xi\eta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad \cdot I_1 \left( \frac{\sqrt{\mu(t) e (6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)} \xi\eta / T_f}{\mu_0 T} \right) (\xi - \eta), \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where  $(\xi, \eta, t) \in \mathbb{D}_1$ .

Finally, by substituting the transformations  $\xi = x + y$  and  $\eta = x - y$  into (45) and (49), an estimate of the upper



bound of the time-varying kernel function  $k(x, y, t)$  can be obtained:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |k(x, y, t)| \\
& \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{4T_f} \right)^{n+1} \mu^{n+1}(t) \left( \frac{1}{\mu_0 T} \right)^{2n} \\
& \quad \cdot 2(n-1)! (6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)^{n+1} \frac{(\xi\eta)^n \cdot (\xi - \eta)}{n!(n+1)!} \\
& \leq y\mu_0 T \left( \frac{\mu(t)(6 + \mu^2 T^2)}{e(x^2 - y^2)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad \cdot I_1 \left( \frac{\sqrt{e \cdot \mu(t)(6 + \mu_0^2 T^2)}(x^2 - y^2)/T_f}{\mu_0 T} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $(x, y, t) \in \mathbb{D}$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] Zhijie Liu, Jinkun Liu, and Wei He. Modeling and vibration control of a flexible aerial refueling hose with variable lengths and input constraint. *Automatica*, 77:302–310, 2017.
- [2] Shu-Xin Wang, Yan-Hui Wang, and Bai-Yan He. Dynamic modeling of flexible multibody systems with parameter uncertainty. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 36(3):605–611, 2008.
- [3] Wei He, Xinyue Tang, Tingting Wang, and Zhijie Liu. Trajectory tracking control for a three-dimensional flexible wing. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 30(5):2243–2250, 2022.
- [4] Xiaoping Zhang, Wenwei Xu, Satish S Nair, and VijaySekhar Chellaboina. Pde modeling and control of a flexible two-link manipulator. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 13(2):301–312, 2005.
- [5] Bruno Scaglioni, Luca Bascetta, Marco Baur, and Gianni Ferretti. Closed-form control oriented model of highly flexible manipulators. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 52:174–185, 2017.
- [6] Bongsoo Kang and James K Mills. Dynamic modeling of structurally-flexible planar parallel manipulator. *Robotica*, 20(3):329–339, 2002.
- [7] Gregory Hagen and Igor Mezic. Spillover stabilization in finite-dimensional control and observer design for dissipative evolution equations. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 42(2):746–768, 2003.
- [8] Shuangye Mo, Wu-Hua Chen, Hao Sun, and Qian Wan. Distributed hybrid control for heterogeneous multi-agent systems subject to deception attacks and its application to secondary control for dc micro-grid. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 125:48–65, 2024.
- [9] Qikun Shen, Yang Yi, and Tianping Zhang. Fuzzy adaptive distributed synchronization control of uncertain multi-agents systems with unknown input power and sector nonlinearities. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 174:113897, 2023.
- [10] Boumediène Chentouf and Sabour Mansouri. Exponential decay rate for the energy of a flexible structure with dynamic delayed boundary conditions and a local interior damping. *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 103:106185, 2020.
- [11] Xiaona Song, Yulong Song, Vladimir Stojanovic, and Shuai Song. Improved dynamic event-triggered security control for t-s fuzzy lpv-pde systems via pointwise measurements and point control. *International Journal of Fuzzy Systems*, 25(8):3177–3192, 2023.
- [12] Wei He, Tingting Wang, Xiuyu He, Lung-Jieh Yang, and Okyay Kaynak. Dynamical modeling and boundary vibration control of a rigid-flexible wing system. *IEEE/ASME transactions on mechatronics*, 25(6):2711–2721, 2020.
- [13] Zhijia Zhao, Choon Ki Ahn, and Han-Xiong Li. Boundary antidisturbance control of a spatially nonlinear flexible string system. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 67(6):4846–4856, 2019.
- [14] Florent Koudohode, Nicolás Espitia, and Miroslav Krstic. Event-triggered boundary control of an unstable reaction diffusion pde with input delay. *Systems & Control Letters*, 186:105775, 2024.
- [15] Wenshun Lv, Runan Guo, and Fang Wang. Observer-based adaptive neural network control design for nonlinear systems under cyber-attacks through sensor networks. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 185:115170, 2024.
- [16] Ji Wang and Yangjun Pi. Output feedback vibration control of a string driven by a nonlinear actuator. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 72:403–419, 2019.
- [17] Ling Zhao, Zhuojun Li, Hongbo Li, and Bo Liu. Backstepping integral sliding mode control for pneumatic manipulators via adaptive extended state observers. *ISA transactions*, 144:374–384, 2024.
- [18] Chunxia Bao, Baotong Cui, Xuyang Lou, Wei Wu, and Jiajia Jia. Sliding mode boundary control for exponential stabilization of linear parabolic distributed parameter systems subject to external disturbance. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 33(15):9364–9390, 2023.
- [19] Ze-Hao Wu, Hua-Cheng Zhou, Feiqi Deng, and Bao-Zhu Guo. Disturbance observer-based boundary control for an antistable stochastic heat equation with unknown disturbance. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(6):3604–3611, 2022.
- [20] Mimi Hou, Xuan-Xuan Xi, and Xian-Feng Zhou. State feedback controller design of fractional ordinary differential equations coupled with a fractional reaction–advection–diffusion equation with delay. *Transactions of the Institute of Measurement and Control*, 46(4):649–665, 2024.
- [21] Sambhav Kumar Jain, Tapan K Jain, Srikant Srivastava, and Saumya Shanker. Comparison of filtering techniques for transfer alignment of air-launched tactical guided weapons. *Defence Science Journal*, 74(4), 2024.
- [22] Thomas Meurer and Miroslav Krstic. Finite-time multi-agent deployment: A nonlinear pde motion planning approach. *Automatica*, 47(11):2534–2542, 2011.
- [23] Jorge Cortés. Finite-time convergent gradient flows with applications to network consensus. *Automatica*, 42(11):1993–2000, 2006.
- [24] Najmeh Ghaderi and Hamed Mojallali. Output feedback finite-time boundary control for an unstable heat pde with spatially varying coefficients. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 34(17):11351–11376, 2024.
- [25] Meiling Tao, Qiang Chen, Xiongxiang He, and Shuzong Xie. Fixed-time filtered adaptive parameter estimation and attitude control for quadrotor uavs. *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, 58(5):4135–4146, 2022.
- [26] Peng-Ju Ning, Chang-Chun Hua, Kuo Li, and Hao Li. A novel theorem for prescribed-time control of nonlinear uncertain time-delay systems. *Automatica*, 152:111009, 2023.
- [27] Chengzhou Wei and Junmin Li. Prescribed-time stabilization of semi-linear parabolic equations subject to distributed disturbance. *ISA transactions*, 128:355–366, 2022.
- [28] Hefu Ye and Yongduan Song. Prescribed-time tracking control of mimo nonlinear systems with nonvanishing uncertainties. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(6):3664–3671, 2022.
- [29] Chengzhou Wei and Zhile Xia. Prescribed-time and output feedback stabilization of heat equation with an intermediate-point heat source and boundary control. *Systems & Control Letters*, 192:105891, 2024.
- [30] Yang Yu and Shuzhi Sam Ge. Adaptive boundary feedback control of a rigid–flexible system under unknown time-varying disturbance. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 361(18):107256, 2024.
- [31] Thomas Meurer and Andreas Kugi. Tracking control for boundary controlled parabolic pdes with varying parameters: Combining backstepping and differential flatness. *Automatica*, 45(5):1182–1194, 2009.
- [32] Shuzhi Sam Ge, Wei He, Bernard Voon Ee How, and Yoo Sang Choo. Boundary control of a coupled nonlinear flexible marine riser. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 18(5):1080–1091, 2009.

- [33] Zhijia Zhao, Xiuyu He, Zhigang Ren, and Guilin Wen. Output feedback stabilization for an axially moving system. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, 49(12):2374–2383, 2018.
- [34] Zhijia Zhao, Xiuyu He, Zhigang Ren, and Guilin Wen. Boundary adaptive robust control of a flexible riser system with input nonlinearities. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, 49(10):1971–1980, 2018.
- [35] Zhijia Zhao, Xiuyu He, and Choon Ki Ahn. Boundary disturbance observer-based control of a vibrating single-link flexible manipulator. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, 51(4):2382–2390, 2019.
- [36] Yuan Lei, Xinglan Liu, and Chengkang Xie. Stabilization of an ode-pde cascaded system by boundary control. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 357(14):9248–9267, 2020.
- [37] Weijiu Liu. Boundary feedback stabilization of an unstable heat equation. *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, 42(3):1033–1043, 2003.
- [38] Nicolás Espitia, Andrey Polyakov, Denis Efimov, and Wilfrid Perruquetti. Boundary time-varying feedbacks for fixed-time stabilization of constant-parameter reaction–diffusion systems. *Automatica*, 103:398–407, 2019.
- [39] Miroslav Krstic, Antranik A Siranosian, Andras Balogh, and Bao-Zhu Guo. Control of strings and flexible beams by backstepping boundary control. In *2007 American Control Conference*, pages 882–887. IEEE, 2007.
- [40] Lingling Su, Wei Guo, Jun-Min Wang, and Miroslav Krstic. Boundary stabilization of wave equation with velocity recirculation. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(9):4760–4767, 2017.