

An inverse problem for a heat equation with piecewise-constant thermal conductivity

N. S. Hoang^{†*} A. G. Ramm^{††}

[†]Mathematics Department, Kansas State University,
Manhattan, KS 66506-2602, USA

Abstract

The governing equation is $u_t = (a(x)u_x)_x$, $0 \leq x \leq 1$, $t > 0$, $u(x, 0) = 0$, $u(0, t) = 0$, $a(1)u'(1, t) = f(t)$. The extra data are $u(1, t) = g(t)$. It is assumed that $a(x)$ is a piecewise-constant function, and $f \neq 0$. It is proved that the function $a(x)$ is uniquely defined by the above data. No restrictions on the number of discontinuity points of $a(x)$ and on their locations are made. The number of discontinuity points is finite, but this number can be arbitrarily large.

If $a(x) \in C^2[0, 1]$, then a uniqueness theorem has been established earlier for multidimensional problem, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $n > 1$ (see MR1211417 (94e:35004)) for the stationary problem with infinitely many boundary data. The novel point in this work is the treatment of the discontinuous piecewise-constant function $a(x)$ and the proof of Property C for a pair of the operators $\{\ell_1, \ell_2\}$, where $\ell_j := -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + k^2 q_j^2(x)$, $j = 1, 2$, and $q_j^2(x) > 0$ are piecewise-constant functions, and for the pair $\{L_1, L_2\}$, where $L_j u := -[a_j(x)u'(x)]' + \lambda u$, $j = 1, 2$, and $a_j(x) > 0$ are piecewise-constant functions. Property C stands for completeness of the set of products of solutions of homogeneous differential equations (see MR1759536 (2001f:34048))

Keywords: inverse problems, heat equation, Property C, piecewise-constant thermal conductivity.

MSC: 35R30, 74J25, 34E05.

1 Introduction

Let

$$\dot{u} = (a(x)u')', \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1, \quad t > 0, \quad u' := \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}, \quad \dot{u} := \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, \quad (1)$$

$$u(x, 0) = 0, \quad u(0, t) = 0, \quad a(1)u'(1, t) = f(t) \neq 0, \quad (2)$$

$$u(1, t) = g(t). \quad (3)$$

Problem (1)–(2) describes the heat transfer in a rod, $a(x)$ is the heat conductivity, $a(1)u'(1, t)$ is the heat flux, $g(t)$ is the measurement, the extra data.

*Email: nguyenhs@math.ksu.edu

[†]Corresponding author; Email: ramm@math.ksu.edu

The inverse problem (IP) is:

IP: Given $f(t)$ and $g(t)$ for all $t > 0$, find $a(x)$.

Assumption A: $a(x)$ is a piecewise-constant function, $a(x) = a_j$, $x_j \leq x \leq x_{j+1}$, $x_1 = 0$, $x_{n+1} = 1$, $0 < c_0 \leq a_j \leq c_1$, $1 \leq j \leq n$.

This assumption holds throughout the paper and is not repeated. The set of piecewise-constant functions with finitely many discontinuity points is denoted by Π .

If $a(x) \in C^2$, then the uniqueness of the solution to some multidimensional inverse problems has been proved in [3] (see also [2]). Problem (1)–(3) with $a(x) \in C^2([0, 1])$ has been studied in [5], [6]. The treatment of discontinuous piecewise-constant $a(x)$ is of interest in applications.

In [1] equation (1) with the conditions $u(0, t) = u(1, t) = 0$, $u(x, 0) = g(x)$, was studied, and the measured (extra) data were the values $u(\xi_m, t)$, $\forall t > 0$, $1 \leq m \leq M$, $0 \leq \xi_m \leq 1$, where $M = 3n$, and n is the number of the discontinuity points of $a(x)$. It was assumed in [1] that $\min_j |x_j - x_{j+1}|$ is not too small. Under these assumptions the uniqueness theorem for the IP was proved in [1], and an algorithm for finding $a(x)$ was proposed. The stability of this algorithm with respect to perturbations of the data was not studied in [1].

In our paper the extra data (3) consists of measurement, taken at one point, rather than at $3n$ points, and we impose no restrictions on $\min_j |x_j - x_{j+1}|$. Under these assumptions, which are much weaker than in [1], we prove the uniqueness of the solution to IP.

One of our main results is

Theorem 1 *The IP has at most one solution.*

Remark 1 *The IP is ill-posed: small variations of the data $\{f(t), g(t)\}$ in the $C(0, \infty)$ -norm may lead to large variations of the coefficient $a(x)$, or may lead to a problem which has no solutions. We assumed that the data are known for all $t > 0$. If one assumes that $f(t) = 0$ for $t > T$, where $T > 0$ is an arbitrary fixed number, then the solution $u(x, t)$ is an analytic function of t in the region $t > T$. Therefore the data $\{f(t), g(t)\}$, known in the interval $[0, T + \epsilon)$, where $\epsilon > 0$ is an arbitrary small fixed number, determine uniquely the data for all $t > 0$. Thus, if $f(t) = 0$ for $t > T$, then the uniqueness theorem for the solution to IP remains valid if the data are known for $t \in [0, T + \epsilon)$.*

Let us formulate IP in an equivalent form.

Take the Laplace transform of the equation (1)–(3), denote

$$v(x, \lambda) := Lu := \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} u(x, t) dt,$$

and get:

$$\lambda v - (a(x)v')' = 0, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1, \quad v(0, \lambda) = 0, \quad (4)$$

$$a(1)v'(1, \lambda) = F(\lambda), \quad v(1, \lambda) = G(\lambda), \quad (5)$$

where $F := Lf$ and $G := Lg$.

The IP can be reformulated as follows:

IP: Given $F(\lambda)$ and $G(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda > 0$, find $a(x)$.

Let us transform equation (4)-(5) to yet another equivalent form.

Let $a(x)v' := \psi$. Then (4)-(5) can be replaced by the following problem

$$-\psi'' + \lambda a^{-1}(x)\psi = 0, \quad \psi(1, \lambda) = F(\lambda), \quad \psi'(0, \lambda) = 0, \quad (6)$$

$$\psi'(1, \lambda) = \lambda G(\lambda). \quad (7)$$

The IP can be reformulated as follows:

IP Given $G(\lambda)$ and $F(\lambda)$, find $a^{-1}(x) := q^2(x)$.

Let

$$\ell\psi := -\psi'' + k^2 q^2(x)\psi = 0, \quad \lambda := k^2, \quad q^2(x) := a^{-1}(x), \quad c_1^{-1} \leq q^2(x) \leq c_0^{-1}. \quad (8)$$

Consider the following problems:

$$\ell_j \psi_j = 0, \quad \ell_j := -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + k^2 q_j^2(x), \quad \psi_j'(0, k) = 0, \quad \psi_j(0, k) = 1, \quad j = 1, 2. \quad (9)$$

Our second main result is

Theorem 2 *The sets $\{\psi_1(x, k)\psi_2(x, k)\}_{\forall k \geq 0}$ and $\{v_1'(x, \lambda)v_2'(x, \lambda)\}_{\forall \lambda \geq 0}$, $k := \lambda^{1/2}$, are dense in the set Π of piecewise-constant functions on $[0, 1]$.*

Remark 2 *Theorem 2 says that if $h(x) \in \Pi$ and*

$$\int_0^1 h(x)\psi_1(x, k)\psi_2(x, k)dx = 0, \quad \forall k > 0, \quad (10)$$

then $h = 0$. Similar conclusion holds if $\psi_j(x, k)$ is replaced by $v_j'(x, \lambda)$ in (10). Such a property of the pair of the operators $\{\ell_1, \ell_2\}$ is called Property C ([2], [4]).

Clearly if the set $\{\psi_1(x, k)\psi_2(x, k)\}_{\forall k \geq 0}$ is dense in the set Π , then the set of products $\{v_1'(x, \lambda)v_2'(x, \lambda)\}_{\forall \lambda \geq 0}$ is dense in the set Π .

In Section 2 proofs are given.

2 Proofs

2.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. We prove this Theorem for the problem (4)-(5). Suppose there are v_j and $a_j \in \Pi$, $j = 1, 2$, which solve problem (4)-(5), and let $w := v_1 - v_2$. Then

$$\lambda w - (a_1 w')' = (p v_2')', \quad p := a_1(x) - a_2(x), \quad (11)$$

$$w(0, \lambda) = 0, \quad w(1, \lambda) = 0, \quad a_1 v_1'(1, \lambda) = a_2 v_2'(1, \lambda). \quad (12)$$

Multiply (11) by v_1 , a solution to equation (4) with $a = a_1$, and integrate over $[0, 1]$, and then by parts, to get

$$\int_0^1 p(x)v_2'v_1'dx = pv_2'v_1\Big|_0^1 + a_1w'v_1\Big|_0^1 - a_1wv_1'\Big|_0^1 = 0, \quad \forall \lambda > 0, \quad \lambda = k^2, \quad k > 0, \quad (13)$$

where we have used the conditions $w(0, \lambda) = w(1, \lambda) = 0$ and $a_1(1)v_1'(1, \lambda) = a_2(1)v_2'(1, \lambda)$. Note that $v_2(x, \lambda)$ can be considered as an arbitrary solution to equation (4), up to a constant factor. The set $\{v_1'(x, \lambda)v_2'(x, \lambda)\}$ is dense in Π by Theorem 2. Since $a_1(x) - a_2(x) := p(x) \in \Pi$, it follows from (13) that $p(x) = 0$. So $a_1 = a_2$. Theorem 1 is proved. \square

2.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Let us prove completeness of the set of products $\{\psi_1(x, k)\psi_2(x, k)\}_{\forall k \geq 0}$. Assume that $h \in \Pi$ and (10) holds. The function $\psi_j(x, k)$, $j = 1, 2$, are entire functions of k . This follows from the integral equation for ψ_j , which is an immediate consequence of equations (8)–(9):

$$\psi_j(x, k) = 1 + k^2 \int_0^x (x-s)q_j^2(s)\psi_j(s, k)ds, \quad x \geq 0, \quad j = 1, 2. \quad (14)$$

Equation (14) implies that for any fixed k one has $\psi_j(x) := \psi_j(x, k) \geq 1$, $\forall x \in [0, 1]$, $j = 1, 2$, that $\psi_j'(x, k) \geq 0$, $\psi_j''(x, k) \geq 0$, and $\frac{\partial^m \psi_j(x, k)}{\partial k^m} \geq 0$ for all $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Consequently, $\psi_j(x)$, $j = 1, 2$, are convex functions of x on the semiaxis $x > 0$. Since $\psi_j(x, k)$, $j = 1, 2$, are positive, it follows from (14) that $\psi_j(x, k)$, $j = 1, 2$, are increasing functions with respect to both x and k . So we have

$$\psi_j(x, k) > 0, \quad \psi_j'(x, k) > 0, \quad \psi_j''(x, k) > 0, \quad \forall k > 0, \quad j = 1, 2. \quad (15)$$

Assume $0 < x_{11} < x_{12} < \dots < x_{1N_1} < 1$ and $0 < x_{21} < x_{22} < \dots < x_{2N_2} < 1$ are discontinuity points of $a_1(x)$ and $a_2(x)$, respectively.

To derive from (10) that $h = 0$ it is sufficient to prove that $h(x) = 0, \forall x \in [x_0, 1]$, where $x_0 := \max(x_{1N_1}, x_{2N_2})$, because then one can prove similarly, in finitely many steps, that $h = 0$ on the whole interval $[0, 1]$ using the assumption $h \in \Pi$. We have

$$\psi_j''(x, k) = k^2 q_{jN_j}^2(x)\psi_j(x, k), \quad \forall k > 0, \quad \forall x \in [x_0, 1], \quad (16)$$

where q_{jN_j} is the value of q_j on the interval $[x_0, 1]$. From (16) one gets

$$\psi_j(x, k) = a_j(k)e^{kq_{jN_j}(x-x_0)} + b_j(k)e^{-kq_{jN_j}(x-x_0)}, \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad j = 1, 2. \quad (17)$$

It follows from (15) and (17) that

$$\psi_j(x_0, k) = a_j(k) + b_j(k) > 0, \quad \psi_j'(x_0, k) = kq_{jN_j}[a_j(k) - b_j(k)] \geq 0, \quad (18)$$

and

$$2a_j(k) = \psi_j(x_0, k) + \frac{\psi_j'(x_0, k)}{kq_jN_j} > \psi_j(x_0, k). \quad (19)$$

This implies

$$a_j(k) \geq |b_j(k)| \geq 0, \quad \forall k > 0, \quad j = 1, 2. \quad (20)$$

Since $h \in \Pi$, one may assume without loss of generality that

$$h(x) = C \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [x_0, 1]. \quad (21)$$

It follows from (10) that

$$-\int_0^{x_0} \psi_1(x, k)\psi_2(x, k)h(x)dx = \int_{x_0}^1 \psi_1(x, k)\psi_2(x, k)h(x)dx, \quad \forall k > 0. \quad (22)$$

From (15), (17) and (20), one gets

$$1 \leq \psi_j(x, k) \leq \psi_j(x_0, k) < 2a_j(k), \quad 0 \leq x \leq x_0, \quad \forall k > 0, \quad j = 1, 2. \quad (23)$$

Therefore,

$$\left| \int_0^{x_0} \psi_1(x, k)\psi_2(x, k)h(x)dx \right| \leq 4a_1(k)a_2(k) \int_0^{x_0} |h(x)|dx. \quad (24)$$

From (20), (17) and (15) one obtains

$$\psi_j(x, k) \geq a_j(k)[e^{kq_jN_j(x-x_0)} - e^{-kq_jN_j(x-x_0)}], \quad x \in [x_0, 1], \quad j = 1, 2. \quad (25)$$

Take an arbitrary $y \in (x_0, 1)$ and fix it. One has $\psi_j(x, k) \geq \psi_j(y, k)$, $\forall x \in [y, 1]$. Therefore,

$$\int_{x_0}^1 \psi_1(x, k)\psi_2(x, k)h(x)dx \geq C(1-y)\psi_1(y, k)\psi_2(y, k), \quad \forall k > 0. \quad (26)$$

This, (23), (22), and (24) imply the following inequalities:

$$\infty > 4 \int_0^{x_0} |h(x)|dx \geq C(1-y) \frac{\psi_1(y, k)\psi_2(y, k)}{a_1(k)a_2(k)}, \quad \forall k > 0. \quad (27)$$

It follows from (25) that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi_j(y, k)}{a_j(k)} = \infty. \quad (28)$$

Let $k \rightarrow \infty$ in (27) and use (28) to conclude that $C = 0$ and, therefore, $h(x) = 0$ for $x \in [x_0, 1]$. Similarly one proves that $h(x) = 0$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$.

Theorem 2 is proved. \square

References

- [1] Gutman, S. and Ha, J., Identifiability of piecewise constant conductivity in a heat conduction process, *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.*, 46, N2, (2007), 694-713.
- [2] Ramm, A. G., Springer, New York, 2005
- [3] Ramm, A. G., Multidimensional inverse scattering problems, Longman/Wiley, New York, 1992, pp.1-385.
- [4] Ramm, A. G., Property C for ODE and applications to inverse problems, in the book *Operator Theory and Its Applications*, Amer. Math. Soc., Fields Institute Communications vol. 25, (2000), pp.15-75, Providence, RI.
- [5] Ramm, A. G., An inverse problem for the heat equation, *Jour. of Math. Anal. Appl.*, 264, N2, (2001), 691-697.
- [6] Ramm, A. G., An inverse problem for the heat equation II, *Applic. Analysis*, 81, N4, (2002), 929-937.