

THE MODULATING FUNCTION METHOD FOR STATE ESTIMATION AND FEEDBACK OF INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL SYSTEMS

FOLKE FRIEDRICH, JOHANN REGER, AND TIMO REIS

ABSTRACT. We investigate state feedback and observation for infinite-dimensional linear systems, including a variety of partial differential equations with boundary control and observation. We extend the modulating function approach to infinite-dimensional systems. This approach, simply put, involves reconstructing part of the state by convolving with null controls of the adjoint system. We show how this method aids in state reconstruction, and we also examine distributional solutions of the adjoint system, showing their ability to handle unbounded feedback operators. This enables us to use feedback from spatial point evaluations in partial differential equations.

Keywords. modulating function, infinite-dimensional systems, partial differential equations, boundary control, state feedback, state reconstruction

Mathematics subject classifications (2020). 93C25, 93B53, 93B07, 93B28

1. INTRODUCTION

The modulating function approach relies on reconstructing parts of the state through the convolution of input and output using specific precomputed functions. More precisely, for a linear system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t), \\ y(t) &= Cx(t) + Du(t), \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

$A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$, this approach means that, for given $T > 0$, $\varphi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we can construct functions $\mu : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $\eta : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, such that all trajectories of (1.1) fulfill

$$\forall t \geq T : \quad \varphi_0^\top x(t) = \int_0^T u(t-\tau)^\top \mu(\tau) - y(t-\tau)^\top \eta(\tau) d\tau. \quad (1.2)$$

In this scenario, the term $\varphi_0^\top x(t)$ (interpreted as the component of $x(t)$ in the direction of φ_0) can be determined by capturing the input and output over the moving horizon $[t-T, t]$ and conducting (numerical) integration. Through a straightforward integration by parts, it becomes evident that the values of μ and η solving the ‘null control problem of the adjoint system’, expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\varphi}(t) &= A^\top \varphi(t) + C^\top \eta(t), & \varphi(0) &= \varphi_0, & \varphi(T) &= 0, \\ \dot{\mu}(t) &= B^\top \varphi(t) + D^\top \eta(t), \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

indeed fulfill the objective stated in (1.2). Here, we note that, by classical systems theory, the control problem (1.3) has a solution, if (1.1) is an observable system. Clearly, the solution to (1.3) can be precomputed, making the entire process of moderate numerical complexity. The above adumbrated approach can be used for the following two objectives:

- (a) **State estimation:** By selecting a linearly independent family $(\varphi_{01}, \dots, \varphi_{0n})$ and determining corresponding null controls η_1, \dots, η_n along with outputs μ_1, \dots, μ_n for the adjoint system, we can compute the scalars $\varphi_{0i}^\top x(t)$, where $i = 1, \dots, n$. These values then allow us to determine $x(t)$. If only $N \leq n$ null controls are provided, we can determine the orthogonal projection (i.e.,

the best approximation) of $x(t)$ onto the N -dimensional plane $\text{span}(\varphi_{01}, \dots, \varphi_{0N})$. Additionally, the reconstruction of $x(t)$ becomes straightforward if the initial values of the adjoint null control problem are orthonormal.

- (b) **State feedback:** Here we aim for realizing the state feedback $u(t) = Fx(t)$, $F \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, by only accessing the input and output. To achieve this, we solve m null control problems for the adjoint system, where the initial values $\varphi_{01}, \dots, \varphi_{0m} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the transposes of the row vectors of F . Then, by (1.2), the moving horizon integration of the input and output of (1.1) gives

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi_{01}^\top x(t) \\ \vdots \\ \varphi_{0m}^\top x(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_{01}^\top \\ \vdots \\ \varphi_{0m}^\top \end{bmatrix} x(t) = Fx(t).$$

While the modulating function based approach is rather elementary for finite-dimensional systems, dealing with infinite-dimensional cases poses challenges, especially when boundary control or boundary observation are involved. To encompass a broad spectrum of infinite-dimensional linear systems, we employ the system node framework developed by STAFFANS in [23] and various journal publications. Such systems are described by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}(t) \\ y(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A\&B \\ C\&D \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x(t) \\ u(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.4)$$

where $A\&B : X \times U \supset \text{dom}(A\&B) \rightarrow X$, $C\&D : X \times U \supset \text{dom}(C\&D) \rightarrow Y$ are linear operators, where detailed specifications regarding their properties will be outlined in the upcoming section. The seemingly confusing $\&$ -signs refer to the circumstance that the domain of these operators is not necessarily a Cartesian product of subspaces of X and U . Although the extensive theory on system nodes presented in the book [23] is outlined with almost no examples of partial differential equations, such systems can generally be incorporated into this framework with ease, even in the spatially higher dimensional case. Examples include, among others, systems governed by the wave equation, advection-diffusion equation, Maxwell's equations, Oseen equations, Euler-Bernoulli and Timoshenko beam equations [6, 17–19].

Another significant advantage of this theory is that this class is closed under taking the adjoint, allowing for the formulation of an infinite-dimensional counterpart to the null control problem (1.3).

The objective of this article is indeed the development of a theory for the modulating function approach for infinite-dimensional linear systems governed by system nodes, with a focus on state estimation and the realization of state feedback, achieved solely by accessing the input and output. The state estimation problem will be addressed by showing that, for $\varphi_0 \in X$, and functions $\mu \in L^2([0, T]; U)$, $\eta \in L^2([0, T]; Y)$ involved in the null control problem for the adjoint system,

$$\forall t \geq T : \quad \langle x(t), \varphi_0 \rangle_X = \int_0^T \langle u(t - \tau), \mu(\tau) \rangle_U - \langle y(t - \tau), \eta(\tau) \rangle_Y d\tau. \quad (1.5)$$

Indeed, employing an argument similar to the one above, the simultaneous application of this approach with initial values $\varphi_{01}, \dots, \varphi_{0k}$ for the adjoint null control problem allows for the determination of the orthogonal projection of $x(t)$ onto $\text{span}(\varphi_{01}, \dots, \varphi_{0k})$. The situation becomes more intricate when adapting this approach for state feedback, when incorporating *unbounded feedback*, which, in an abstract way, means that $u = Fx$, where F is mapping from a certain space \mathcal{V} , which is in between X and the domain of A , to the input space U (assumed to be finite-dimensional in this setup, for obvious reasons). For $U = \mathbb{R}^m$, we can represent F as a m -tuple of elements of \mathcal{V}' , where the latter refers to the dual of \mathcal{V} with respect to the pivot space X . Indeed, \mathcal{V}' can be considered as an extension of the state space of the adjoint system, and one has to look for inputs η_i controlling the adjoint system with $\varphi(0) = F_i$ to drive it to zero in a certain sense. However, this may not necessarily be possible in the classical function sense, requiring an extension of the solution theory for system nodes to the distributional sense. We will show that (1.5) now takes on a different, more generalized

interpretation. Specifically, instead of a moving horizon L^2 -inner product, we will observe that the application of F_i to $x(t)$ is represented by convolving the distributions η_i and μ_i with the functions $u|_{[t-T,t]}$ and $y|_{[t-T,t]}$. We emphasize the significance of unbounded state feedback, as it enables the capability to provide feedback through point evaluations for systems governed by partial differential equations.

We do not assume that the system (and so also its adjoint) is well-posed, which refers to the additional property that the terminal state and input depend continuously on the initial state and output. While this property simplifies the theory significantly, it imposes restrictions on the class of systems. In addition, there are many practically relevant systems for which well-posedness criteria are not yet known. Allowing for non-wellposedness significantly enhances the accessibility of boundary-controlled partial differential equations within our approach. A drawback is that incorporating non-well-posed systems and addressing unbounded feedback operators necessitates a significantly expanded theoretical framework. Nevertheless, the authors are confident that the effort is worthwhile.

This work is organized as follows: In the upcoming Section 2, we will present the notation, function spaces, and operator-theoretic framework used throughout this article. Subsequently, in Section 3, we introduce the basics of system nodes, and present a novel theory for distributional solutions of such systems. Section 4 focuses on the adjoint system and its systems theoretic properties. Here we also present our main result on the distributional approach to the previously motivated partial state reconstruction problem. In the remaining sections, we reap the fruits of our theoretical sowing: In Section 5 we show that our modulating function approach to system nodes can be used for the estimation of the state. Thereafter, in Section 6 we show that our approach can be used for implementing a state feedback. Finally, we present two examples in Section 7. First we use our presented theory to construct an exponentially stabilizing feedback for a vibrating string with force control at the left end, and measurement of the displacement at some interior point. Further, we consider state estimation of a reaction-diffusion equation on a two-dimensional spatial domain, where the control consists of the Dirichlet boundary values at some part of the boundary, and the output is formed by the Neumann boundary values, again at some part of the boundary.

Before examining the mathematical details, we offer an overview of existing results on the modulating function approach. This method originates in SHINBROT'S work [22]. The basic idea is to use the titular *modulating functions* to reformulate linear- and certain nonlinear ordinary differential equations as algebraic equations which allowed the use of simple regression methods to estimate unknown system parameters. In the following decades, the modulating function method was adopted for the parameters estimation of increasingly large classes of systems. Most notably for this work is the early application to systems governed by partial differential equations by PERDREAUVILLE and GOODSON in [16] and later FAIRMAN and SHEN in [5]. Afterwards, new developments largely concerned the application to finite-dimensional systems, mostly centered around the choice of the modulating function itself. The first use of the modulating function method for the purpose of state estimation for finite-dimensional systems was done in [15] and [11] through the use of modulating functions with non-zero boundary conditions. In any case, since the original work by SHINBROT, the only requirement where homogenous boundary conditions and certain differentiability conditions, resulting in the shape of the modulating function being a degree of freedom. In [7], FISCHER and DEUTSCHER developed a modulating function based fault detection paradigm for systems governed by partial differential equations, which instead used the reformulation from a differential- to an algebraic equation to obtain a *kernel equation*, the solution of which determines the modulating function. This approach was then utilized in [8] to create a state estimator for parabolic partial differential equations, which obtains an estimate in the form of the coefficients of a truncated series decomposition of the desired distributed state. This approach was extended to coupled parabolic systems in [20] and parabolic system with certain nonlinear reaction terms in [9]. A systematic and unified approach

to infinite-dimensional systems, particularly addressing boundary control and aiming to incorporate unbounded feedback, has not yet been established.

2. NOTATION, FUNCTION SPACES, OPERATOR THEORETIC PRELIMINARIES

\mathbb{N} and \mathbb{N}_0 represent the sets of natural numbers excluding and including zero, respectively. Let X and Y be Hilbert spaces, consistently assumed to be real throughout this work. We note, without going into detail, that, by a complexification, all results in this paper can also be formulated for the complex case. The norm in X will be represented as $\|\cdot\|_X$ or simply $\|\cdot\|$, provided the context is clear. The identity mapping in X is denoted as I_X (or just I , if context makes it clear).

The symbol X' stands for the topological dual of X , and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{X', X}$ stands for the corresponding duality product. Reflexivity of Hilbert spaces justifies that we can set $\langle x, x' \rangle_{X, X'} = \langle x', x \rangle_{X', X}$ for all $x \in X, x' \in X'$.

The space of bounded linear operators from X to Y is denoted by $L(X, Y)$. As customary, we abbreviate $L(X) := L(X, X)$. The domain $\text{dom } A$ of a potentially unbounded linear operator $A : X \supset \text{dom } A \rightarrow Y$ is usually endowed with the graph norm, represented as

$$\|x\|_{\text{dom } A} := (\|x\|_X^2 + \|Ax\|_Y^2)^{1/2}.$$

The dual of a densely defined linear operator $A : X \supset \text{dom } A \rightarrow Y$ is $A' : Y' \supset \text{dom } A' \rightarrow X'$ with

$$\text{dom } A' = \{y' \in Y' \mid \exists z' \in X' \text{ s.t. } \forall x \in \text{dom } A : \langle Ax, y' \rangle_{Y, Y'} = \langle z', x \rangle_{X', X}\}.$$

The vector $z' \in X'$ in the above set is uniquely determined by $y' \in \text{dom } A'$, and we define $A'y' = z'$. If, X and Y are identified with their duals, the dual $A' : X \supset \text{dom } A' \rightarrow Y$ of A is also called the *adjoint of A* , and denoted by $A^* : Y \supset \text{dom } A^* \rightarrow X$.

We adopt the notation presented in the book by ADAMS [1] for Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces. When referring to function spaces with values in a Hilbert space X , we indicate the additional notation “; X ” following the specification of the domain. For instance, the Lebesgue space of p -integrable X -valued functions over the domain Ω is denoted as $L^p(\Omega; X)$.

For $T > 0, k \in \mathbb{N}$, the spaces

$$H_{0l}^k([0, T]; X) := \left\{ v \in H^k([0, T]; X) \mid v(0) = \dots = \frac{d^{k-1}}{dt^{k-1}}v(0) = 0 \right\}, \quad (2.1)$$

$$H_{0r}^k([0, T]; X) := \left\{ v \in H^k([0, T]; X) \mid v(T) = \dots = \frac{d^{k-1}}{dt^{k-1}}v(T) = 0 \right\} \quad (2.2)$$

play a crucial role throughout this work. Note that $H_{0l}^k([0, T]; X)$ is a closed subspace of the Sobolev space $H^k([0, T]; X)$, thus it is Hilbert space endowed with the usual norm in $H^k([0, T]; X)$.

Their dual spaces with respect to the pivot space $L^2([0, T]; X)$ are denoted by

$$H_{0l}^{-k}([0, T]; X) := H_{0r}^k([0, T]; X)', \quad H_{0r}^{-k}([0, T]; X) := H_{0l}^k([0, T]; X)' \quad (2.3)$$

and we set $H_{0l}^0([0, T]; X) := L^2([0, T]; X) =: H_{0r}^0([0, T]; X)$. An exceptional role is played by the δ -distribution $\delta \in X \rightarrow H_{0l}^{-1}([0, T])$, which is defined by

$$\langle \delta, w \rangle_{H_{0l}^{-1}([0, T]), H_{0r}^1([0, T])} = w(0) \quad \forall w \in H_{0r}^1([0, T]).$$

For $k \geq 0$, the *left derivative* $\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)_l : H^{-k}([0, T]; X) \rightarrow H_{0l}^{-k-1}([0, T]; X)$ is defined by the dual of the right derivative, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)_l v, w \right\rangle_{H_{0l}^{-k-1}([0, T]; X), H_{0r}^{k+1}([0, T]; X)} &:= \left\langle v, \frac{d}{dt} w \right\rangle_{H_{0l}^{-k}([0, T]; X), H_{0r}^k([0, T]; X)} \\ &\forall v \in H_{0l}^{-k-1}([0, T]; X), w \in H_{0r}^{k+1}([0, T]; X). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

By further defining the left derivative of $v \in H_{0l}^k([0, T]; X)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ by its conventional weak derivative, we see that, for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(\frac{d}{dt})_l$ is a bounded and bijective operator from $H_{0l}^k([0, T]; X)$ to $H_{0l}^{k-1}([0, T]; X)$. The *right derivative* $(\frac{d}{dt})_r : H_{0r}^k([0, T]; X) \rightarrow H_{0r}^{k-1}([0, T]; X)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, is introduced in an analogous manner.

The τ -right shift operator, $S_{r,\tau} \in L(L^2([0, T]; X), L^2([0, T]; X))$ maps $v \in L^2([0, T]; X)$ to $S_{r,\tau}v$ with $(S_{r,\tau}v)|_{[0, \tau]} = 0$ and $(S_{r,\tau}v)(t) = v(t - \tau)$ for almost all $\tau \in [0, T]$. Its restriction fulfills $S_{r,\tau} \in L(H_{0l}^k([0, T]; X), H_{0l}^k([0, T]; X))$. In a completely analogous way, we can define the τ -left shift operator $S_{l,\tau} \in L(H_{0r}^k([0, T]; X), H_{0r}^k([0, T]; X))$. The τ -right shift operator S on $H_{0l}^{-k}([0, T]; X)$, $k \geq 0$, is defined as the dual of the τ -left shift on $H_{0r}^k([0, T]; X)$. It can be seen that, by the above definition, the τ -right shift operator on L^2 extends to τ -right shift operator on H_{0l}^{-k} .

For $w \in H_{0l}^k([0, T]; X)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $A \in L(X, Y)$, we clearly have that the pointwise multiplication $Aw := (t \mapsto Aw(t))$ fulfills $Aw \in H_{0l}^k([0, T]; Y)$, and, likewise, $Aw \in H_{0r}^k([0, T]; Y)$ for $w \in H_{0r}^k([0, T]; X)$. Then the pointwise multiplication of A with $w \in H_{0l}^{-k}([0, T]; X)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Aw, w \rangle_{H_{0l}^{-k}([0, T]; Y), H_{0r}^k([0, T]; Y)} &:= \langle v, A^*w \rangle_{H_{0l}^{-k}([0, T]; X), H_{0r}^k([0, T]; X)} \\ &\quad \forall v \in H_{0l}^{-k}([0, T]; X), w \in H_{0r}^k([0, T]; Y), \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

and an analogous definition for the pointwise multiplication of A with $w \in H_{0r}^{-k}([0, T]; X)$. We clearly have that, in the above sense, pointwise multiplication commutes with taking the left and right derivative, i.e.,

$$\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)_l A = A \left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)_l, \quad \left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)_r A = A \left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)_r.$$

Next we introduce some function spaces on the infinite time horizon. First, we note that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the elements of $H_{0l}^k([0, T]; X)$, $H_{0r}^k([0, T]; X)$ can be regarded as distributions in the sense of SCHWARTZ. Then the support of v in some of these spaces, denoted as $\text{supp } v \subset [0, T]$, is defined by the support v regarded as a distribution. For support of distributions we refer to [21, Def. 6.22].

For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the space $H_{0,\text{loc}}^k([0, T]; X)$ consists of all $v \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$ with the property that, for all $T > 0$, the restriction of v to $[0, T]$ is in $H_{0l}^k([0, T]; X)$. Convergence in is declared by the locally convex topology [21, Chap. 1] defined by the seminorms defined by the $H_{0l}^k([0, T]; X)$ -norm of the restrictions to $[0, T]$.

To define what we mean by $H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-k}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$ with $k > 0$, we first mention that, for $0 < T_1 < T_2$, $H_{0r}^k([0, T_1]; X)$ can be regarded as a subspace of $H_{0r}^k([0, T_2]; X)$ by extending with zero on $[T_1, T_2]$. In this context, we can apply elements of $H_{0r}^k([0, T_1]; X)$ to those in $H_{0l}^{-k}([0, T_1]; X)$. This immediately gives rise to the definition of the restriction of $v \in H_{0l}^{-k}([0, T_2]; X)$ to $H_{0l}^{-k}([0, T_1]; X)$. Now, by an element $v \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-k}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$, we mean a family $(v_T)_{T>0}$ with $v_T \in H_{0l}^{-k}([0, T]; X)$ for all $T > 0$, and moreover, for all $0 < T_1 < T_2$, the restriction of v_{T_2} to $[0, T_1]$ is given by v_{T_1} . Once more, we can equip $H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-k}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$ with a locally convex topology, and the support of $v = (v_T)_{T>0}$ is defined as the union of the supports of v_T for all $T > 0$. In this way, we can identify $H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-k}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$ with $L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$.

The left derivative $(\frac{d}{dt})_l$ can now be straightforwardly defined on $H_{0,\text{loc}}^k(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. It can be observed that this operator continuously and bijectively maps $H_{0,\text{loc}}^k(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$ to $H_{0,\text{loc}}^{k-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$, and possesses a continuous inverse. Similarly, we can define the τ -right shift on $H_{0,\text{loc}}^k(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, which is a continuous by boundedness of the right shift on finite time intervals.

Finally, in this introductory overview of the general concepts, we introduce convolution. For $v, w \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$, we define the convolution of v and w by $v * w \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ with

$$(v * w)(t) = \int_0^t \langle v(t), w(t - \tau) \rangle_X d\tau.$$

Note that we even have that $v * w$ is continuous. Convolution is bilinear, commutative, continuous as a mapping from $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) \times L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ to $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$, and the restriction of $v * w$ to $[0, T]$ only depends on the restrictions of v and w to $[0, T]$.

For $v \in H^1_{0,\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$, $w \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$, it holds that $v * w \in H^1_{0,\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ with

$$\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)_l(v * w) = \left(\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)_l v\right) * w.$$

As the left derivative is a linear homeomorphism from $H^k_{0,\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$ to $H^{k-1}_{0,\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, convolution generalizes uniquely to a continuous bilinear mapping

$$* : H^{k_1}_{0,\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X) \times H^{k_2}_{0,\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X) \rightarrow H^{k_1+k_2}_{0,\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$$

via

$$\forall k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}, v, w \in L^2_{\text{loc}}([0, T]; X) : \quad \left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)_l^{k_1+k_2}(v * w) = \left(\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)_l^{k_1} v\right) * \left(\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)_l^{k_2} w\right). \quad (2.6)$$

The convolution $\varphi * v \in H^{k_1}_{0,\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$ of a scalar function $\varphi \in H^{k_1}_{0,\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ and a X -valued function $v \in H^{k_2}_{0,\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$ can be defined in a straightforward way.

3. SYSTEM NODES AND TRAJECTORIES

For Hilbert spaces X , U , and Y and linear operators $A\&B : \text{dom}(A\&B) \subset X \times U \rightarrow X$, $C\&D : \text{dom}(C\&D) \subset X \times U \rightarrow Y$, we introduce the necessary fundamentals for systems of the form (1.4). In the infinite-dimensional case, the operators $A\&B$ and $C\&D$ do not segregate into distinct components corresponding to the state and input, in contrast to the finite-dimensional scenario. This deviation is primarily motivated by the application of boundary control in partial differential equations. The autonomous dynamics (i.e., those with trivial input $u \equiv 0$) are determined by the so-called *main operator* $A : \text{dom}(A) \subset X \rightarrow X$ with $\text{dom}(A) := \{x \in X \mid \begin{pmatrix} x \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \text{dom}(A\&B)\}$ and $Ax := A\&B \begin{pmatrix} x \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ for all $x \in \text{dom}(A)$.

Definition 3.1 (System node). A *system node* on the triple (X, U, Y) of Hilbert spaces is a linear operator $S = \begin{bmatrix} A\&B \\ C\&D \end{bmatrix}$ with $A\&B : \text{dom}(A\&B) \subset X \times U \rightarrow X$, $C\&D : \text{dom}(C\&D) \subset X \times U \rightarrow Y$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (a) $A\&B$ is closed.
- (b) $C\&D \in L(\text{dom}(A\&B), Y)$.
- (c) For all $u \in U$, there exists some $x \in X$ with $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} \in \text{dom}(S)$.
- (d) The main operator A generates a strongly continuous semigroup $\mathfrak{A}(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow X$ on X .

The above properties imply that S is closed with $\text{dom}(S) = \text{dom}(A\&B)$.

Next, we define the term *trajectory* of (1.4). We note that the topology on $C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$ is defined using the locally convex topology through seminorms determined by the maximum over intervals of the form $[0, T]$, where $T > 0$.

Definition 3.2 (Classical/generalized trajectories). Let $S = \begin{bmatrix} A\&B \\ C\&D \end{bmatrix}$ be a system node on (X, U, Y) . A *classical trajectory* of (1.4) is a triple

$$(x, u, y) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X) \times C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U) \times C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; Y)$$

which for all $t > 0$ satisfies (1.4).

A *generalized trajectory* of (1.4) is a limit of classical trajectories of (1.4) in the topology of $C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; Y)$.

Any $A\&B$ with properties (a), (c) and (d) in Definition 3.1 can be regarded as a system node on $(X, U, \{0\})$. Consequently, we may also speak of classical and generalized trajectories (x, u) for

$$\dot{x} = A\&B \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.1)$$

We rephrase a solvability result from [23]. Here, besides smoothness of the input, it is required that the pair consisting of the initial state and initial input value is in $\text{dom}(A\&B)$. For boundary control systems, this means that the boundary value at $t = 0$ is consistent with the corresponding boundary value of the prescribed initial state.

Proposition 3.3 (Existence of classical trajectories [23, Thm. 4.3.9]). *Let S be a system node on (X, U, Y) , let $x_0 \in X$ and $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U)$ with $\begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ u(0) \end{pmatrix} \in \text{dom } S$. Then there exists a unique classical trajectory (x, u, y) of (1.4) with $x(0) = x_0$.*

We will now present more specific results regarding the existence and regularity of the trajectories. Initially, it is essential to highlight that the operator $A\&B$ can be distinctly separated into components corresponding to the state and the input, aligning with the conventional framework used in numerous studies on infinite-dimensional systems, such as, for instance [25]. However, to establish such a separation, it becomes necessary to define a specific space wherein X is continuously and densely embedded.

Remark 3.4 (System nodes). Let $S = \begin{bmatrix} A\&B \\ C\&D \end{bmatrix}$ be a system node on (X, U, Y) .

- (a) For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define $X_k := \text{dom}(A^k)$, and X_{-k} is the completion of X with respect to the norm $\|x\|_{X_{-k}} := \|(\lambda I - A)^{-k}x\|$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ in the resolvent set of A . For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the operator A restricts (resp. extends) to closed and densely defined operator $A_k : X_k \supset \text{dom } A_k = X_{k+1} \rightarrow X_k$. The semigroup $\mathfrak{A}(\cdot)$ generated by A restricts (resp. extends) to a semigroup $\mathfrak{A}_k(\cdot)$ on X_k . The generator of this semigroup is A_k [25, Prop. 2.10.3 & 2.10.4].
- (b) There exists an operator $B \in L(U, X_{-1})$ such that $[A_{-1} \ B] \in L(X \times U, X_{-1})$ is an extension of $A\&B$. The domain of $A\&B$ satisfies

$$\text{dom}(A\&B) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} \in X \times U \mid A_{-1}x + Bu \in X \right\},$$

see [23, Def. 4.7.2 & Lem. 4.7.3].

- (c) For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote $X_{d,k}$ as the space constructed as in (a), but now from A^* . Then [25, Prop. 2.10.2] yields $X_{d,k} = X'_{-k}$, where the latter refers to the dual of X_{-k} with respect to the pivot space X .

We provide some further statements on classical generalized trajectories.

Remark 3.5 (Classical/generalised trajectories). Let $S = \begin{bmatrix} A\&B \\ C\&D \end{bmatrix}$ be a system node on (Y, X, U) .

- (a) Assume that (x, u) is a classical trajectory of $\dot{x} = A\&B \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix}$. Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \text{dom } S).$$

- (b) (x, u) is a generalized trajectory of $\dot{x} = A\&B \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix}$ if, and only if, $x \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$, and

$$\forall t > 0 : \quad x(t) = \mathfrak{A}(t)x(0) + \int_0^t \mathfrak{A}_{-1}(t - \tau)Bu(\tau)d\tau, \quad (3.2)$$

where the latter has to be interpreted as an integral in the space X_{-1} . Consequently, $x \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X_{-1})$. The output evaluation $y(t) = C\&D \begin{pmatrix} x(t) \\ u(t) \end{pmatrix}$ is - at a glance - not necessarily

well-defined for all $t > 0$. However, it is shown in [23, Lem. 4.7.9] that the second integral of $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix}$ is continuous as a mapping from $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ to $\text{dom}(A\&B) = \text{dom } S$, i.e.,

$$\int_0^\cdot (\cdot - \tau) \begin{pmatrix} x(\tau) \\ u(\tau) \end{pmatrix} d\tau \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \text{dom}(A\&B)) \subset L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \text{dom}(A\&B)).$$

As the above expression is nothing but the application of the inverse of $\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)_l^2$ to $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix}$, we can interpret that

$$\begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-2}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \text{dom}(A\&B)).$$

Now using that $C\&D \in L(\text{dom}(A\&B), Y)$, we can use the definition (2.5) of the pointwise multiplication to see that

$$y := C\&D \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-2}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; Y). \quad (3.3)$$

This can be used to show that (x, u, y) is a generalized trajectory of (1.4) if, and only if, (x, u) is a generalized trajectory of $\dot{x} = A\&B \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix}$, and y as in (3.3) fulfills $y \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; Y)$.

- (c) Let us now consider generalized trajectories with $u = 0$. To this end, we define the operator $C \in L(\text{dom}(A), Y)$ by $Cx = C\&D \begin{pmatrix} x \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. If $\dot{x} = Ax$ with $x(0) = x_0 \in X_1$, then, by Remark 3.4 (a), we have that $x = \mathfrak{A}(\cdot)x_0 \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \text{dom } A)$, and thus $y := Cx \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, Y) \subset L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, Y)$. To define the output for more general x_0 , we first use that, by [4, Chap. II, Lem. 1.3],

$$\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, x_0 \in X_{-1} : \mathfrak{A}(\cdot)(\lambda I - A)x_0 = (\lambda I - \frac{d}{dt})\mathfrak{A}(\cdot)x_0,$$

where $\frac{d}{dt}$ now refers to the standard distributional derivative. Then we obtain that,

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, x_0 \in X_k : \mathfrak{A}(\cdot)x_0 \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{k-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X).$$

Now using the definition (2.5) of the pointwise multiplication, we see that

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, x_0 \in X_k : y := C\mathfrak{A}(\cdot)x_0 \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{k-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; Y).$$

Then the *state-to-output map*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{C}_k : X_k &\rightarrow H_{0,\text{loc}}^{k-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; Y), \\ x_0 &\mapsto C\mathfrak{A}(\cdot)x_0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

is continuous and well-defined.

The above findings on the state trajectory leads us to introduce the continuous operator

$$\mathfrak{S} : L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U) \rightarrow L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X_{-1}), \quad (3.5)$$

$$u \mapsto \int_0^\cdot \mathfrak{A}_{-1}(\cdot - \tau)Bu(\tau)d\tau,$$

which maps an input to the corresponding state trajectory with trivial initial value. Clearly, \mathfrak{S}_T actually maps to the smaller space $C([0, T]; X_{-1})$. We choose its target space to be $L^2([0, T]; X_{-1})$, as we will be incorporate it into the framework of Sobolev spaces. Namely, Remark 3.5 (b) yields that

$$u \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{S}u \\ u \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.6)$$

maps continuously from $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U)$ to $H_{0l}^{-2}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \text{dom}(A\&B))$. Note that, well-posedness is equivalent to \mathfrak{C} mapping from X to $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; Y)$, \mathfrak{S} mapping from $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U)$ to $C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$, and

$$u \mapsto C\&D \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{S}u \\ u \end{pmatrix}$$

being a mapping from $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U)$ to $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; Y)$.

The findings in Remark 3.5 yield that $(x, u, y) \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X) \times L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U) \times L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; Y)$ is a generalized trajectory of (1.4) if, and only if, for some $x_0 \in X$, it holds that $x = \mathfrak{A}(\cdot)x_0 + \mathfrak{S}u$

and $y = \mathfrak{C}_T x_0 + C \& D (\mathfrak{S}_u^u)$. This will be the basis for the concept of distributional trajectories for system nodes. To this end, we first note that, as a consequence of shift-invariance, we can conclude that

$$\forall u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{>0}; U) : \quad \mathfrak{S} \left(\frac{d}{dt} \right)_l u = \left(\frac{d}{dt} \right)_l \mathfrak{S} u.$$

A density argument now yields that, for all $u \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U)$, we have $\mathfrak{S} u \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X_{-1})$ with $\mathfrak{S} \left(\frac{d}{dt} \right)_l u = \left(\frac{d}{dt} \right)_l \mathfrak{S} u$. Consequently, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, \mathfrak{S} restricts (resp. extends, whenever $k < 0$) uniquely to the *distributional input-to-state map*

$$\mathfrak{S}_k : \quad H_{0,\text{loc}}^k(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U) \rightarrow H_{0,\text{loc}}^k(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X_{-1}) \quad (3.7)$$

with, moreover

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \mathfrak{S}_k \\ I \end{array} \right] : H_{0,\text{loc}}^k(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U) \rightarrow H_{0,\text{loc}}^{k-2}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \text{dom}(A \& B)) \text{ is continuous.} \quad (3.8)$$

Next we show that \mathfrak{S}_k commutes with the convolution operator.

Lemma 3.6. *Let S be a system node on (X, U, Y) , and let $u \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^k(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U)$, $\alpha \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^l(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$. Then the distributional input-to-state map fulfills*

$$\mathfrak{S}_{k+l}(\alpha * u) = \alpha * \mathfrak{S}_k u.$$

Proof. The case $k, l \geq 0$ follows from (3.2). The statement with possible negative exponents k, l can then be concluded by taking limits. \square

4. DUALITY AND THE MODULATING FUNCTION

Here, we establish the foundational principles for the modulating function for system nodes.

Firstly, we elucidate the concept of distributional null-controllability of certain (extrapolated) states. Following that, we will introduce the adjoint system node, along with showing a relationship of its trajectories to the ones the primal system node.

Next we consider the *adjoint system node* $S^* = \left[\begin{array}{c} A \& B \\ C \& D \end{array} \right]^*$, which is indeed shown to be a system node in [23, Lem. 6.2.14], if S itself is a system node. We typically denote

$$S^* = \left[\begin{array}{c} A^d \& B^d \\ C^d \& D^d \end{array} \right], \quad (4.1)$$

and we consider the *adjoint system*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\varphi}(t) \\ \mu(t) \end{pmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{c} A^d \& B^d \\ C^d \& D^d \end{array} \right] \begin{pmatrix} \varphi(t) \\ \eta(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.2)$$

It is moreover shown in [23, Lem. 6.2.14] that the main operator of S^* is the adjoint of the main operator of S , that is, $A^* = A^d$.

Next, we present our main result concerning the modulating function approach. We generalize the existing findings in two ways: first, by considering infinite-dimensional systems (represented by system nodes), and second, by formulating our results within the distributional setting. Our approach is admittedly very abstract, and it requires a keen eye to see that it extends the existing theory of modulating functions. In the following, we will make an effort to assist the reader in this regard.

For a system (1.4) and some $K \& L \in L(\text{dom}(A \& B); \mathbb{R}) = \text{dom}(A \& B)'$, we aim to reconstruct an additional output

$$z(t) = K \& L \begin{pmatrix} x(t) \\ u(t) \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.3)$$

by using the past of the input u and the output y . It follows immediately from the definition of system nodes that the extension

$$S_{\text{ext}} = \left[\begin{array}{c} A \& B \\ C \& D \\ K \& L \end{array} \right] \quad (4.4)$$

is again a system node, now on $(X, U, Y \times \mathbb{R})$. Now denoting the adjoint of S_{ext} by

$$S_{\text{ext}}^* = \begin{bmatrix} A^d \& [B^d \ G] \\ C^d \& [D^d \ H] \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.5)$$

we consider a distributional input η , such that, for the δ -distribution $\delta \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\varphi} \\ \mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A^d \& [B^d \ G] \\ C^d \& [D^d \ H] \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \eta \\ \delta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.6)$$

with φ, η, μ vanishing on $[T, \infty)$ for some $T > 0$. By the latter, we mean that, for the distributional input-to-state map $\mathfrak{S}_{k,\text{ext}}^d$ associated to S_{ext}^* , we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ C^d \& [D^d \ H] \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{S}_{k,\text{ext}}^d \\ I \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \eta \\ \delta \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.7)$$

By saying that φ, η, μ vanish on $[T, \infty)$, we mean that

$$\text{supp } \varphi \subset [0, T], \quad \text{supp } \eta \subset [0, T], \quad \text{supp } \mu \subset [0, T]. \quad (4.8)$$

We refer to η with (4.7), (4.8) as a *generalized null control in time T* for the following reasons: In the simpler case, where φ, η and μ are function rather than genuine distributions, then the latter means that φ is controlled to zero in time T . If, on top of that, the additional scalar output is simply formed by taking the inner product with some element of the state space, i.e., there exists some $\varphi_0 \in X$ with $K \& L \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} = \langle x, \varphi_0 \rangle_X$ for all $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} \in \text{dom}(A \& B)$, then S_{ext}^* fulfills $\text{dom}(S_{\text{ext}}^*) = \text{dom } S^* \times \mathbb{R}$, and

$$S_{\text{ext}}^* \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \eta \\ \lambda \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A^d \& B^d \\ C^d \& D^d \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \lambda \varphi_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \forall \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} \in \text{dom}(S), \lambda \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Indeed, (4.6) now means that the initial value $\varphi_0 \in X$ is controlled to zero in time T .

To incorporate the distributional approach, we will employ the convolution $u * \mu - y * \eta$ instead of the expression on the right hand side of (1.5). By saying that $u * \mu - y * \eta$ coincides with $K \& L \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix}$ for $t \geq 0$, we mean that

$$\text{supp } (u * \mu - y * \eta - z) \subset [0, T]. \quad (4.9)$$

Now we are able to present our main result concerning the distributional approach to modulating functions for infinite-dimensional systems. Our approach based on distributions leads to a significantly broader framework, offering numerous additional possibilities, particularly for state feedback, as shown in Section 6.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $S = \begin{bmatrix} A \& B \\ C \& D \end{bmatrix}$ be a system node on (X, U, Y) , let*

$$K \& L \in L(\text{dom}(A \& B); \mathbb{R}) = \text{dom}(A \& B)',$$

and let (x, u, y) be a generalized trajectory of (1.4). Let S_{ext} be defined as in (4.4), and let $\mathfrak{S}_{k,\text{ext}}^d$ be the distributional input-to-state map associated to the system with node S_{ext}^ .*

For $T > 0$, assume that

$$\eta \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-k}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; Y), \quad \varphi \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-k}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X), \quad \mu \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-k-2}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

such that (4.7) and (4.8) holds. Then, for

$$z = K \& L \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-k-2}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}),$$

the identity (4.9) holds.

Proof. As the general result follows by taking suitable limits, it is no loss of generality to assume that (x, u, y) be a classical trajectory of (1.4).

Consider a ‘mollifier sequence’ (α_n) in $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{>0})$. That is, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

- (i) $\int_0^\infty \alpha_n(t) dt = 1$,
- (ii) $\text{supp } \alpha_n \subset (0, 1/n]$, and

(iii) $\alpha_n(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

Such a sequence exists by [2, p. 110]. We consider

$$\varphi_n := \alpha_n * \varphi, \quad \eta_n := \alpha_n * \eta, \quad \mu_n := \alpha_n * \mu,$$

which are, by the convolution rule (2.6), infinitely often differentiable. By using $\delta * \alpha_n = \alpha_n$ and Lemma 3.6, we have, by denoting S_{ext}^* as in (4.5), that

$$\forall t \geq 0 : \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\varphi}_n(t) \\ \mu_n(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A^d \& [B^d G] \\ C^d \& [D^d H] \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n \\ \delta_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad \varphi_n(0) = 0.$$

By combining (4.8) with $\text{supp } \alpha_n \subset (0, 1/n]$, we have that

$$\text{supp } \varphi \subset [0, T + 1/n], \quad \text{supp } \eta \subset [0, T + 1/n], \quad \text{supp } \mu \subset [0, T + 1/n]. \quad (4.10)$$

Now, for $t \geq 0$, $\tau \leq t$, we use the product rule to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \langle x(t - \tau), \varphi_n(\tau) \rangle_X \\ &= \langle \dot{x}(t - \tau), \dot{\varphi}_n(\tau) \rangle_X - \langle \dot{x}(t - \tau), \varphi_n(\tau) \rangle_X \\ &= \left\langle x(t - \tau), A_d \& [B^d G] \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n(\tau) \\ \eta_n(\tau) \\ \alpha_n(\tau) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_X - \left\langle [A \& B] \begin{pmatrix} x(t - \tau) \\ u(t - \tau) \end{pmatrix}, \varphi_n(\tau) \right\rangle_X \\ &= \underbrace{\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} x(t - \tau) \\ u(t - \tau) \end{pmatrix}, S_{\text{ext}}^* \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n(\tau) \\ \eta_n(\tau) \\ \alpha_n(\tau) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_{X \times U} - \left\langle S_{\text{ext}} \begin{pmatrix} x(t - \tau) \\ u(t - \tau) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n(\tau) \\ \eta_n(\tau) \\ \alpha_n(\tau) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_{X \times Y \times \mathbb{R}}}_{=0} \\ & \quad - \langle u(t - \tau), \mu_n(\tau) \rangle_U + \langle y(t - \tau), \eta_n(\tau) \rangle_Y + \alpha_n(\tau) z(t - \tau) \end{aligned}$$

Taking the integral with respect to τ from 0 to t , we obtain, by using that $\varphi_n(0) = 0$,

$$\forall t \geq 0 : \langle x(0), \varphi_n(t) \rangle_X = -(u * \mu_n)(t) + (y * \eta_n)(t) + (\alpha_n * z)(t).$$

Since, by (4.10), $\varphi_n(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq T + 1/n$, we have

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : \text{supp} \left((u * \mu_n - y * \eta_n) - \alpha_n * z \right) \subset [0, T + 1/n]. \quad (4.11)$$

Since, by [2, Thm. 4.15], we have, for all $w \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$, that $(\alpha_n * w)$ converges in $L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$ to w , the definition of the distributional convolution gives rise to the fact that the latter also holds in $H_{0,\text{loc}}^k(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; X)$. Consequently, by taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.11), we obtain that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : \text{supp} \left((u * \mu - y * \eta) - z \right) \subset [0, T + 1/n],$$

and thus (4.9) holds, which is the desired statement. \square

5. STATE ESTIMATION

Here we assume that S is a system node on (X, U, Y) , where the Hilbert space X is separable (which, for practical purposes, imposes no restriction whatsoever). Further, for a dense subspace Z of X , and $T_0 > 0$, we assume that the adjoint system (4.2) has the property that any $\varphi_0 \in D$ is distributionally null controllable in time $T > 0$ in the following sense: Let $\mathfrak{C}_0^d : X \rightarrow H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U)$ be the state-to-output map (see (3.4)), and let \mathfrak{S}_k^d be the distributional input-to-state map, both of the adjoint system (4.2). Then, by a null control $\eta \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-k}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; Y)$ for $\varphi_0 \in X$ in time T , we mean one with

$$\text{supp} \left(\mathfrak{A}^*(\cdot)\varphi_0 + \mathfrak{S}_k^d \eta \right) \subset [0, T].$$

If $\mathfrak{S}_k^d u$ is represented by a continuous function (e.g. the state in a generalized trajectory of (4.2)), then it indeed means that the initial value φ_0 is controlled to zero in the sense of generalized solutions. The above concept therefore means that the state is controlled to zero in the distributional sense.

Further note that, by the findings in the antecedent section, we have, for any $\varphi_0 \in X$, and $K \& L \in \text{dom}(A \& B)'$ with $K \& L \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} = \langle x, \varphi_0 \rangle_X$ for all $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} \in \text{dom}(A \& B)$, the above null control problem is equivalent to the generalized null control problem (4.7), (4.8).

As mentioned above, we assume that, for a dense subspace $D \subset X$, any $\varphi_0 \in D$ is distributionally controllable to zero. By using Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization together with separability of X , we find a sequence $(\varphi_{0j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in D , which is an orthonormal basis of X . For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\eta_j \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-k}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; Y)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be a null control for φ_{0j} in time T , and let $\mu_j \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-k-2}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U)$ be the corresponding output. Let (x, u, y) be a generalized trajectory of (1.4). Then, by Theorem 4.1, $z_j = -y * \eta_j + u * \mu_j$ coincides with $\langle \varphi_{0j}, x(\cdot) \rangle_X \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ on $[T, \infty)$. Consequently, the restriction of z_j to $[T, \infty)$ is a continuous function. If the null controls along with their respective outputs are moreover in L^2 , we have that, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, (1.5) holds with $\varphi_{0j} = \varphi_0$, $\eta = \eta_j$ and $\mu = \mu_j$. A consequence of is that the Fourier coefficient $\langle x(t), \varphi_{0j} \rangle_X$ of the state $x(t)$ can be determined from the input and output of the system (1.4) via precomputed null controls of the adjoint system. Hence, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the expression

$$w_n := \sum_{j=0}^n (-y * \eta_j + u * \mu_j) \varphi_{0j}$$

is represented on $[T, \infty)$ by a continuous function taking values in X , where it pointwisely consists of the best approximation of $x(t)$ in $\text{span}(\varphi_{01}, \dots, \varphi_{0N})$ with respect to the norm in X . Again, if the null controls for the adjoint systems and their respective outputs are in L^2 , then w_n as above is given by the continuous function

$$w_N(t) = \sum_{n=0}^N \left(\int_0^{T_0} \langle u(t-\tau), \mu_n(\tau) \rangle_U - \langle y(t-\tau), \eta_n(\tau) \rangle_Y d\tau \right) \varphi_{0n}. \quad (5.1)$$

We give some further remarks on the state reconstruction problem.

Remark 5.1.

- (a) The null controls η_n are of course not uniquely determined by φ_{0n} . In case where null control exist in the function sense, a possible choice are optimal controls, such as the solutions of the optimal control problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{T_0} \|\eta_n(t)\|_Y^2 + \|\mu_n(t)\|_U^2 dt \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\varphi}_n(t) \\ \mu_n(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} [A \& B]^d \\ [C \& D]^d \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n(t) \\ \eta_n(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \varphi_n(0) = \varphi_{0n}, \quad \varphi_n(T_0) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

According to the results in [18, Sec. 5], the optimal control is the solution of the boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\varphi}_n(t) \\ \mu_n(t) \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} [A \& B]^d \\ [C \& D]^d \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n(t) \\ \eta_n(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \varphi_n(0) = \varphi_{0n}, \quad \varphi_n(T) = 0, \\ \begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}_n(t) \\ \eta_n(t) \end{pmatrix} &= - \begin{bmatrix} A \& B \\ C \& D \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_n(t) \\ \mu_n(t) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

- (b) It follows from the above findings that the existence of a dense subspace $D \subset X$, which consists of null controllable states in time T by the adjoint system (4.2), that the system (1.4) is *reconstructable in time T* . That is, for $t \geq T$, the collection of the input and output on $[0, t]$ uniquely determines the final state $x(t)$. This property is also called *final state observability* [12].

The above property of the adjoint system could appropriately be called *approximate null-controllability in time T* , as any state can be approximated by one which is null controllable in time T . This property generalizes *exact null-controllability in time T* , which refers to null controllability

in time T for any state. The latter property of the adjoint system is shown in [23, Sec. 9.4] to be equivalent to *exact reconstructability of (1.4) in time T* , in the case where the latter system is well-posed. Here, by *exact reconstructability in time T* , we mean that there exists some $M > 0$, such that the classical (and thus also the generalized) trajectories of (1.4) with $u \equiv 0$ fulfill

$$\|x(T)\|_X \geq M \|y\|_{L^2([0,T];Y)}.$$

The equivalence between approximate reconstructability of (1.4) and approximate null-controllability of the adjoint system (4.2), along with the handling of non-well-posed systems in this context, appears not to have been addressed thus far.

6. STATE FEEDBACK

We will now discuss the benefit of Theorem 4.1 for state feedback. To this end, we introduce a subspace of X which is, loosely speaking, consisting of all states which are part of a trajectory with smooth input. More precisely, we consider the space

$$\mathcal{V} = \{x \in X \mid \exists u \in U \text{ s.t. } \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} \in \text{dom}(A \& B)\}. \quad (6.1a)$$

which is a Hilbert space equipped with the norm

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{V}} = \inf \left\{ \left\| \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\text{dom}(A \& B)} \mid u \in U \text{ s.t. } \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} \in \text{dom}(A \& B) \right\}, \quad (6.1b)$$

see [23, Lem. 4.3.12]. It can be immediately seen that the embeddings $X \subset \mathcal{V} \subset \text{dom}(A)$ are continuous.

The state feedbacks that will be considered are not limited to bounded ones, but we also allow for those which are only defined on \mathcal{V} . Here we recall from Remark 3.4 (b) that the operator $A \& B$ in a system node extends to $[A_{-1} \ B] \in L(X \times U, X_{-1})$, where $A_{-1} : X_{-1} \supset \text{dom } A_{-1} = X \rightarrow X_{-1}$ is the extension of A to X .

Next we present what we mean by state feedback $u = Fx$ for the control system (3.1).

Definition 6.1. Let X, U be Hilbert spaces, and let $A \& B : \text{dom}(A \& B) \subset \mathcal{X} \times U \rightarrow X$ be an operator with the properties (a), (c) and (d) in Definition 3.1. Let \mathcal{V} be defined as in (6.1), and let $[A_{-1} \ B] \in L(X \times U, X_{-1})$ be the extension of $A \& B$ to $X \times U$ as introduced in Remark 3.4. Then we say that $F \in L(U, \mathcal{V})$ is an *admissible feedback for $\dot{x}(t) = A \& B \begin{pmatrix} x(t) \\ u(t) \end{pmatrix}$* , if the operator $A_F : \text{dom}(A_F) \subset X \rightarrow X$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup on X , where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}(A_F) &= \{x \in \mathcal{V} \mid A_{-1}x + BFx \in X\}, \\ A_F x &= A_{-1}x + BFx. \end{aligned}$$

For more detailed information on state feedback for system nodes, please refer to [23, Sec.7.3]. To apply Theorem 4.1 regarding partial state reconstruction, we will assume a finite-dimensional input space. This, again, presents no practical limitation, as systems motivated by real-world applications typically have only a finite number of actuators. The assumption that $\dim U < \infty$ allows us to identify U with \mathbb{R}^m , where an admissible feedback F becomes a bounded operator from \mathcal{V} to \mathbb{R}^m . Therefore, we can represent F as an m -tuple $(F_1, \dots, F_m) \in (\mathcal{V}')^m$ via

$$F_i = e_i^\top F, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

where $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the i th canonical unit vector. Consequently, the action of F on $x \in \mathcal{V}$ is given by

$$Fx = \sum_{i=1}^m \langle x, F_i \rangle_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}'} e_i. \quad (6.2)$$

Let $T > 0$, and consider $(K\&L)_i \in \text{dom}(A\&B)'$ with

$$(K\&L)_i \left(\begin{smallmatrix} x \\ u \end{smallmatrix} \right) = \langle x, F_i \rangle_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}'} \quad \forall \left(\begin{smallmatrix} x \\ u \end{smallmatrix} \right) \in \text{dom}(A\&B).$$

Now, for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $K\&L = (K\&L)_i$, we consider the generalized null controls $\eta_i \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-k}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; Y)$ in time T , and let $\mu_i \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-k-2}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; U)$ be the corresponding output. Let (x, u, y) be a generalized trajectory of (1.4). Then, by Theorem 4.1, we have that $-y * \eta_i + u * \mu_i$ and $z_i = (K\&L)_i \left(\begin{smallmatrix} x \\ u \end{smallmatrix} \right) = \langle x(\cdot), F_i \rangle_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}'} \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-2}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ coincide on $[T, \infty)$, in the sense of

$$\text{supp}(u * \mu_i - y * \eta_i - z_i) \subset [0, T], \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

By using (6.2), the feedback is now realized by

$$u = \sum_{i=1}^m (-y * \eta_i + u * \mu_i) e_i \quad \text{on } [T, \infty).$$

7. EXAMPLES

7.1. Stabilization of a vibrating string. Consider a spatially homogeneous, undamped vibrating string of length $\ell > 0$, clamped at the right end and force-controlled at the left end. For simplicity, we assume the propagation speed is one. We measure the velocity of the string at some interior point $\xi_0 \in (0, \ell)$. Denoting the displacement at position $\xi \in [0, \ell]$ and time $t \geq 0$ by $w(t, \xi)$, and by abbreviating $v' := \frac{\partial w}{\partial \xi}$, the system is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{w}(t, \xi) &= w''(t, \xi), & (t, \xi) &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \ell], \\ u(t) &= -w'(t, 0), \quad 0 = w(t, \ell) & t &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \\ y(t) &= \dot{w}(t, \xi_0), & t &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

and depicted in Fig. 1. This system is typically supplemented with initial values for the input and output, which are not specified further here.




FIGURE 1. Vibrating string with force input at $\xi = 0$ and velocity output at $\xi_0 \in (0, \ell)$.

Our goal is to stabilize the system exponentially. This can be achieved by applying velocity feedback at the left end, i.e., using the control law $u(t) = -k\dot{w}(t, 0)$ for some arbitrary $k > 0$. In fact, according to [10, Thm. 9.1.3], this feedback law ensures exponential stabilization of the system. However, since our measurement is assumed to be consisting of the velocity at the interior point ξ_0 , we do not have direct access to $\dot{w}(t, 0)$. Therefore, we apply the theory developed in this article to retrieve the velocity at the left end after all.

First we give a representation of (7.1) as a system node. To this end, as it is usual for systems governed by the wave equation, we consider the state variable

$$x(t) = \begin{pmatrix} q(t) \\ p(t) \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} w'(t, \cdot) \\ \dot{w}(t, \cdot) \end{pmatrix} \in L^2([0, \ell]; \mathbb{R}^2).$$

Hereby, $q(t), p(t) \in L^2([0, \ell])$ respectively denote the spatial distribution of the strain and the momentum (equalling to the displacement velocity due to our dimensionless setting) of the string at time t . Now using that the clamping condition $w(t, \ell) = 0$ implies that the displacement velocity at the right end is zero, we obtain a system (1.4) with $\begin{bmatrix} A\&B \\ C\&D \end{bmatrix}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}(S) = \text{dom}(A\&B) &= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \\ u \end{pmatrix} \in H^1([0, \ell]; \mathbb{R}^2) \times \mathbb{R} \mid p(\ell) = 0 \wedge -q(0) = u \right\} \\ A\&B \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \\ u \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} p' \\ q' \end{pmatrix}, \quad C\&D \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \\ u \end{pmatrix} = p(\xi_0). \end{aligned} \quad (7.2a)$$

That this is a system node on $(L^2([0, \ell]; \mathbb{R}^2), \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ can be proven by using the techniques presented in [17, Sec. 4.2]. The class described therein differs from the one above only in the output, which in that case consists of a boundary value. However, our interior value output does not affect the property of the above operators forming a system node.

Since we are aiming to reconstruct the velocity at the left end, we introduce the additional output (4.3) with $K\&L \in \text{dom}(A\&B)'$ defined by

$$K\&L \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \\ u \end{pmatrix} = p(0). \quad (7.2b)$$

To determine the adjoint of the system node $S_{\text{ext}} = \begin{bmatrix} A\&B \\ C\&D \\ K\&L \end{bmatrix}$, let $\varphi_q, \varphi_p \in L^2([0, \ell])$, $\eta, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_q \\ \varphi_p \\ \eta \\ \alpha \end{pmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} A\&B \\ C\&D \\ K\&L \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} q \\ p \\ u \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle &= \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_q \\ \varphi_p \\ \eta \\ \alpha \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} p' \\ q' \\ p(\xi_0) \\ p(0) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_{L^2([0, \ell]; \mathbb{R}^2) \times \mathbb{R}^2} \\ &= \int_0^\ell \varphi_q(\xi) p'(\xi) + \varphi_p(\xi) q'(\xi) d\xi + \eta p(\xi_0) + \alpha p(0). \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

Now assuming that $\begin{pmatrix} \varphi_q \\ \varphi_p \\ \eta \\ \alpha \end{pmatrix} \in \text{dom}(S_{\text{ext}})$, the choices $p, q \in C_0^\infty([0, \ell])$ with $\xi_0 \notin \text{supp}(p)$ lead - together with the definition of the weak derivative - to the fact that

$$\varphi_p \in H^1([0, \ell]), \quad \varphi_q|_{[0, \xi_0]} \in H^1([0, \xi_0]), \quad \varphi_q|_{[\xi_0, \ell]} \in H^1([\xi_0, \ell]). \quad (7.4)$$

Now we denote the left and right limits of a function f at ξ_0 respectively by $f(\xi_0^-)$ and $f(\xi_0^+)$, and $\varphi'_q \in L^2([0, \ell])$ stands for the function which represents the weak derivative of $\varphi_q|_{[0, \xi_0]}$ on $[0, \xi_0]$ and, at the same time, the weak derivative of $\varphi_q|_{[\xi_0, \ell]}$ on $[\xi_0, \ell]$. Then, by invoking that $p(\ell) = 0$ and $q(0) = -u$, we obtain that the expression in (7.3) equals to

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_0^{\xi_0} \varphi'_q(\xi) p(\xi) d\xi + \varphi_q p \Big|_0^{\xi_0^-} - \int_{\xi_0}^\ell \varphi_p(\xi) q'(\xi) d\xi + \varphi_q p \Big|_{\xi_0^+}^\ell - \int_0^\ell \varphi'_p(\xi) q(\xi) d\xi + \varphi_p q \Big|_0^\ell \\ & + \eta p(\xi_0) + \alpha p(0) \\ &= - \int_0^\ell \varphi'_q(\xi) p(\xi) + \varphi'_p(\xi) q(\xi) d\xi \\ & + (\varphi_q(\xi_0^-) - \varphi_q(\xi_0^+) + \eta) p(\xi_0) + (\alpha - \varphi_q(0)) p(0) + \varphi_p(\ell) q(\ell) + \varphi_p(0) u. \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}(S_{\text{ext}}^*) &= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_q \\ \varphi_p \\ \eta \\ \alpha \end{pmatrix} \in L^2([0, \ell]; \mathbb{R}^2) \times \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \begin{array}{l} (7.4) \text{ holds with } \varphi_p(\ell) = 0, \alpha = \varphi_q(0) \\ \text{and } \eta = \varphi_q(\xi_0^+) - \varphi_q(\xi_0^-) \end{array} \right\}, \\ S_{\text{ext}}^* \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_q \\ \varphi_p \\ \eta \\ \alpha \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} -\varphi'_p \\ -\varphi'_q \\ \varphi_p(0) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

This means that the system governed by the node S_{ext} is actually also a wave equation, again with clamping condition on the right hand side and force control on the left hand side. In addition, we now have an interface condition at ξ_0 . Defining $\varphi_w : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow H^1([0, \ell])$ by

$$\varphi_w(t, \xi) = - \int_{\xi}^{\ell} \varphi_p(t, \zeta) d\zeta, \quad (7.5)$$

we see that the adjoint system is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\varphi}_w(t, \xi) &= \varphi_w''(t, \xi), & (t, \xi) &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \ell], \\ \alpha(t) &= -\varphi_w'(t, 0), \quad \eta(t) = -\varphi_w'(t, \xi_0^+) + \varphi_w'(t, \xi_0^-), \quad 0 = \varphi_w(t, \ell), & t &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \\ \mu(t) &= \dot{\varphi}_w(t, 0), & t &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.6)$$

The input η can therefore be regarded as a point force acting at ξ_0 .

Let us determine a generalized null control. To this end, we start by choosing a function $\alpha \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ such that $\text{supp } \alpha \subset (0, \xi_0)$. Based on this, we aim to find a control $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that the problem (7.6) is satisfied under the zero initial conditions $\varphi_w(0, \xi) = \dot{\varphi}_w(0, \xi) = 0$, for $\xi \in [0, \ell]$. The general strategy for designing such a control is as follows: while $\alpha = -\varphi'(\cdot, 0)$ generates a wave propagating from left to right, we construct η , the interface value at ξ_0 , so that this wave is fully absorbed at ξ_0 . First of all, it can be seen that the solution fulfills, independent on the control η ,

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \xi \in [0, \ell] \text{ with } t \leq \xi_0 : \quad \varphi_w(t, \xi) = \begin{cases} \int_0^{t-\xi} \alpha(\tau) d\tau & : t \geq \xi \\ 0 & : t < \xi. \end{cases}$$

Now designing the control (with aforementioned interpretation)

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : \quad \eta(t) = \varphi_w'(\xi_0^-) = \begin{cases} 0 & : t \leq \xi_0, \\ -\alpha(t - \xi_0) & : t > \xi_0. \end{cases}, \quad (7.7)$$

we obtain that the solution fulfills

$$\forall \varphi_q(t, \xi) = \begin{cases} \int_0^{t-\xi} \alpha(\tau) d\tau & : t \leq \min\{\xi, \xi_0\}, \\ 0 & : t > \min\{\xi, \xi_0\}. \end{cases}$$

This yields that $\varphi_w(t, \xi) = 0$ for all $\xi \in [0, \ell]$ and $t \geq \xi_0$. Moreover, the output satisfies

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : \quad \mu(t) = \dot{\varphi}_w(t, 0) = \alpha(t). \quad (7.8)$$

Next we take a sequence (α_n) of smooth functions that converges in $H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ to the δ -distribution. By using (7.7), the corresponding input sequence $(\eta_n) = (-\alpha_n(\cdot - \xi_0))$ converges to the negative of the shifted δ -distribution $\delta_{\xi_0} \in H_{0,\text{loc}}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ that is defined by

$$\langle \delta_{\xi_0}, w \rangle_{H_{0l}^{-1}([0, T]), H_{0r}^1([0, T])} = w(\xi_0) \quad \forall w \in H_{0r}^1([0, T]), \quad T > \xi_0.$$

Since the corresponding output sequence satisfies $(\mu_n) = (\alpha_n)$ by (7.8), it converges to δ . Combining these results, we conclude that $\eta = -\delta_{\xi_0}$ and $\mu = \delta_{\xi_0}$ meet the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 with $T = \xi_0$. Consequently, for all generalized trajectories of the system (7.1) (defined as those of the system with nodes as in (7.2)), the distribution $u * \mu - y * \eta$ coincides with $\dot{w}(\cdot, 0)$ on (ξ_0, ∞) .

By noting that the δ -distribution is neutral with respect to convolution, and that convolution with δ_{ξ_0} corresponds to a delay of length ξ_0 , we deduce that

$$z(t) = u(t) + y(t - \xi_0)$$

coincides with the velocity at the left-hand side of the string for any $t \geq \xi_0$. Hence, for any $k > 0$, the feedback law

$$u(t) = -kz(t) = -k(u(t) + y(t - \xi_0)), \quad t \geq \xi_0,$$

or, equivalently,

$$u(t) = -\frac{-k}{k+1} \cdot y(t - \xi_0),$$

represents an admissible state feedback that stabilizes the system exponentially.

7.2. State reconstruction for a reaction-diffusion equation with Dirichlet boundary control.

Consider a reaction-diffusion equation defined on a rectangular domain $\Omega = (0, L_1) \times (0, L_2) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. The control is applied through the Dirichlet boundary values on the right-hand side of the boundary, i.e., $\Gamma = \{L_1\} \times [0, L_2] \subset \partial\Omega$. On the remaining part of $\partial\Omega$, the Dirichlet boundary values on the remaining boundaries are set to zero. The output is given by the Neumann boundary values on Γ . We further assume that the diffusion and reaction are isotropic and independent on space. That is, for $k > 0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, we consider the system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t, \xi) &= k\Delta x(\xi, t) + cx(\xi, t), & (t, \xi) &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega, \\ u(\xi, t) &= x(\xi, t), & (t, \xi) &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \Gamma, \\ 0 &= x(\xi, t), & (t, \xi) &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times (\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma), \\ y(\xi, t) &= n^\top(\xi)\nabla x(\xi, t), & (t, \xi) &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \Gamma, \end{aligned} \quad (7.9)$$

where $n \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ represents the function defining the outward normal vectors on $\partial\Omega$.

To formulate a proper formulation with a suitable system node, we first have to declare the right spaces: For the state space we use the natural choice $L^2(\Omega)$. Since the overall Dirichlet trace has to be in the fractional Sobolev space $H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ (see [17, Sec. 4.1], the input u has to evolve in the space $H_0^{1/2}(\Gamma)$, which stand for the space of all elements of $H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ whose extension to zero on $\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma$ is still in $H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$, see also [19]. The output space is given by $H^{-1/2}(\Gamma) := H_0^{1/2}(\Gamma)'$. Now let $\gamma : H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ be the *trace operator*, and consider the space

$$H_\Gamma^1(\Omega) = \left\{ x \in H^1(\Omega) \mid (\gamma x)|_{\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma} = 0 \right\}.$$

This definition leads us to the consideration of $\gamma_\Gamma : H_\Gamma^1(\Omega) \rightarrow H_0^{1/2}(\Gamma)$, which maps a function to the restriction of its trace to Γ . Further, for $H_{\text{div}}(\Omega)$ consisting of all $x \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ whose weak divergence is in $L^2(\Omega)$, $\gamma_{\Gamma, n} : H_{\text{div}}(\Omega) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$ is the *normal trace operator restricted to Γ* , see also [19]. For fundamentals on the normal trace operator, we refer to [24].

Having introduced the above spaces and trace operators, we can formulate the system node associated to (7.9), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom } S = \text{dom } A\&B = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} \in H_\Gamma^1(\Omega) \times H_0^{1/2}(\Gamma) \mid \nabla x \in H_{\text{div}}(\Omega) \wedge u = \gamma_\Gamma \right\}, \\ A\&B \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} &= k\Delta x + cx, \quad C\&D \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} = \gamma_{\Gamma, n}x. \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

It can be shown by using straightforward calculations that S is a self-dual system node, i.e., $S = S'$. Consequently, for the Riesz isomorphism $\mathcal{R} : H_0^{1/2}(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$, the adjoint of S fulfills

$$S^* = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{R}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} S \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{R} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7.11)$$

We aim to keep our primary objective in focus throughout all cumbersome discussions about system nodes: leveraging the modulating function approach for state reconstruction. In doing so, we employ the methodology outlined in Section 5: We determine null controls for the adjoint system. The latter is, due to (7.11), only differing from the original system (7.9) by the Riesz isomorphism pointwisely

applied to the input and output. That is, the adjoint system is determined by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\varphi}(t, \xi) &= k\Delta\varphi(\xi, t) + c\varphi(\xi, t), & (t, \xi) &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega, \\ \tilde{\eta}(\xi, t) &= \varphi(\xi, t), & (t, \xi) &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \Gamma, \\ 0 &= \varphi(\xi, t), & (t, \xi) &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times (\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma), \\ \tilde{\mu}(\xi, t) &= n^\top(\xi)\nabla\varphi(\xi, t), & (t, \xi) &\in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \Gamma \end{aligned} \quad (7.12)$$

and

$$\eta(\cdot, t) = \mathcal{R}^{-1}\tilde{\eta}(\cdot, t), \quad \mu(\cdot, t) = \mathcal{R}\tilde{\mu}(\cdot, t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \quad (7.13)$$

It follows from the results in [13, 14] that for any $T > 0$, $\varphi_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, there exist some smooth $\tilde{\eta} : [0, T] \rightarrow H_0^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ such that the system (7.12) with $\varphi(t, \cdot) = \varphi_0$ fulfills $\varphi(T, \cdot) = 0$. If the initial value of the adjoint system satisfies $\varphi_0 \in H_\Gamma^1(\Omega)$, then [3, Part II-1, Thm. 3.1, p.143] can be applied to show that we can choose a null control $\tilde{\eta} \in L^2([0, T]; H_0^{1/2}(\Gamma))$, such that the corresponding output satisfies $\tilde{\mu} \in L^2([0, T]; H^{-1/2}(\Gamma))$. This clearly gives $\eta \in L^2([0, T]; H^{-1/2}(\Gamma))$, $\mu \in L^2([0, T]; H_0^{1/2}(\Gamma))$. A consequence is that, in this case, we do not need to work with distributional solutions but can instead handle functions. The considerations in Section 5 yield that, for such a null control η as above, we have that any generalized (and thus also classical) trajectory of (7.9), (7.13) fulfills

$$\forall t \geq T : \quad \langle x(t), \varphi_0 \rangle_{L^2} = \int_0^T \langle u(t-\tau), \mu(\tau) \rangle_{H^{1/2}} - \langle y(t-\tau), \eta(\tau) \rangle_{H^{-1/2}} d\tau. \quad (7.14)$$

Next we show that we can get rid of the bothersome Riesz isomorphism. The definition of the Riesz isomorphism gives

$$\forall v \in H^{-1/2}(\Gamma), w \in H_0^{1/2}(\Gamma) : \quad \langle v, \mathcal{R}w \rangle_{H^{-1/2}} = \langle v, w \rangle_{H^{-1/2}, H^{1/2}} = \langle \mathcal{R}^{-1}v, w \rangle_{H^{1/2}}.$$

Hence, (7.14) is equivalent to

$$\forall t \geq T : \quad \langle x(t), \varphi_0 \rangle_{L^2} = \int_0^T \langle u(t-\tau), \tilde{\mu}(\tau) \rangle_{H^{1/2}, H^{-1/2}} - \langle y(t-\tau), \tilde{\eta}(\tau) \rangle_{H^{-1/2}, H^{1/2}} d\tau.$$

That is, the inner products in the above identity are duality products between Dirichlet traces and Neumann traces of the system (7.9) and its adjoint.

Next we present our computations for partially reconstructing the state. Here we determine null controls for the adjoint system (7.12), and the projection to the span of this orthonormal system is determined via (5.1), with the slight modification that the inner products inside the integral have to be replaced by duality products.

With approximation order N with $(\varphi_{0j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ as defined in Section 5, obtained through Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization of a basis of polynomials up to order 10, resulting in $N = 66$. The result for a simulation is shown in Fig. 2.

CONCLUSION

In this article, we have examined the modulation-based approach for partial state reconstruction from (past) inputs and outputs. This approach is based on generalized null controls of the adjoint system, which are, loosely speaking, convolved with the input and output. The novelty of this article is multifaceted: first, a unifying approach for this method was presented for infinite-dimensional linear systems. Hereby we use the approach via so-called ‘system nodes’ which requires relatively few assumptions, and it is closed with respect to taking the adjoint. In particular, we do not assume well-posedness. Second, a novel distributional approach to the modulating function (it actually should be referred to as ‘modulating distribution’) was introduced, enabling the reconstruction of ‘artificial outputs’ determined by unbounded operators.




FIGURE 2. Top row: The spatial region Ω with in- and outputs; The L^2 norm of the estimation error $e(t, \xi) = x(t, \xi) - \hat{x}(t, \xi)$ with state estimate $\hat{x}(t, \xi)$. Bottom row: The simulated state; The estimation error $e(t, \xi_1, L_2/2)$ for $t \in [0, 5]$ s.

Our theoretical results were applied in two scenarios: first, we employed the distributional approach to reconstruct a boundary value of an vibrating string from input and output data, which was subsequently used for exponential stabilization. Second, we considered a diffusion-reaction equation with Dirichlet control and Neumann observation. Here, the presented approach was utilized for state reconstruction. We have performed numerical determinations to illustrate the latter.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. A. Adams and J. J. Fournier. *Sobolev spaces*. Elsevier, 2003.
- [2] H. Alt. *Linear Functional Analysis, An Application-Oriented Introduction*. Universitext. Springer London, 2016.
- [3] A. Bensoussan, M. C. Delfour, and S. K. Mitter. *Representation and control of infinite dimensional systems*, volume 1. Springer, 2007.
- [4] K.-J. Engel and R. Nagel. *One-parameter semigroups for linear evolution equations*, volume 194 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2000.
- [5] F. W. Fairman and D. W. C. Shen. Parameter identification for a class of distributed systems. *International Journal of Control*, 11(6):929–940, 1970.

- [6] B. Farkas, B. Jacob, T. Reis, and M. Schmitz. Operator splitting based dynamic iteration for linear infinite-dimensional port-Hamiltonian systems, 2024. arXiv:2302.01195.
- [7] F. Fischer and J. Deutscher. Algebraic fault detection and isolation for parabolic distributed-parameter systems using modulation functions. In *2nd IFAC Workshop on Control of Systems Governed by Partial Differential Equations*, pages 164 – 169, 06 2016.
- [8] L. Ghaffour, M. Noack, J. Reger, and T.-M. Laleg-Kirati. Non-asymptotic state estimation of linear reaction diffusion equation using modulating functions. In *21st IFAC World Congress*, pages 4262–4267, 2020.
- [9] L. Ghaffour, M. Noack, J. Reger, and T.-M. Laleg-Kirati. Modulating functions approach for non-asymptotic state estimation of nonlinear PDEs. In *22nd IFAC World Congress*, pages 9875–9880, 2023.
- [10] B. Jacob and H. Zwart. *Linear Port-Hamiltonian Systems on Infinite-dimensional Spaces*. Number 223 in Operator Theory: Advances and Applications. Springer, Germany, 2012.
- [11] J. Jouffroy and J. Reger. Finite-time simultaneous parameter and state estimation using modulating functions. In *IEEE Conference on Control Applications*, pages 394–399, 2015.
- [12] K. Kruse and C. Seifert. Final state observability estimates and cost-uniform approximate null-controllability for bi-continuous semigroups. *Semigroup Forum*, 106:421–443, 2023.
- [13] G. Lebeau and L. Robbiano. Contrôle exact de l'équation de la chaleur. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 20(1-2):335–356, 1995.
- [14] Y.-J. Lin Guo and W. Littman. Null boundary controllability for semilinear heat equations. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 32(3):281–316, 1995.
- [15] D. Y. Liu, T.-M. Laleg-Kirati, W. Perruquetti, and O. Gibaru. Non-asymptotic state estimation for a class of linear time-varying systems with unknown inputs. In *19th IFAC World Congress*, pages 3732–3738, 2014.
- [16] F. J. Perdreauville and R. E. Goodson. Identification of systems described by partial differential equations. *Journal of Basic Engineering*, 88(2):463–468, June 1966.
- [17] F. Philipp, T. Reis, and M. Schaller. Infinite-dimensional port-Hamiltonian systems – a system node approach, 2023. arXiv:2302.05168.
- [18] T. Reis and M. Schaller. Linear-quadratic optimal control for infinite-dimensional systems, 2024. arXiv:2401.11302.
- [19] T. Reis and M. Schaller. Port-Hamiltonian formulation of Oseen flows. In F. L. Schwenninger and M. Waurick, editors, *Systems Theory and PDEs*, pages 123–148. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 2024.
- [20] D. Rojas, M. Noack, J. Reger, and G. Pérez-Zuñiga. State estimation for coupled reaction-diffusion PDE systems using modulating functions. *Sensors*, 22:5008, 07 2022.
- [21] W. Rudin. *Functional Analysis*. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1973.
- [22] M. Shinbrot. On the analysis of linear and nonlinear dynamical systems from transient-response data. *National Advisory Committee For Aeronautics*, 1954. Technical Note 3288.
- [23] O. J. Staffans. *Well-posed linear systems*, volume 103 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2005.
- [24] L. Tartar. *An Introduction to Sobolev Spaces and Interpolation Spaces*. Title Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007.
- [25] M. Tucsnak and G. Weiss. *Observation and Control for Operator Semigroups*. Birkhäuser Advanced Texts Basler Lehrbücher. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2009.

F. Friedrich: CONTROL ENGINEERING GROUP, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT ILMENAU, ILMENAU, GERMANY

Email address: folke.friedrich@tu-ilmenau.de

J. Reger: CONTROL ENGINEERING GROUP, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT ILMENAU, ILMENAU, GERMANY

Email address: johann.reger@tu-ilmenau.de

T. Reis: SYSTEMS THEORY AND PARTIAL DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS GROUP, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT ILMENAU, ILMENAU, GERMANY

Email address: timo.reis@tu-ilmenau.de