

THE CARLEMAN CONTRACTION MAPPING METHOD FOR A COEFFICIENT INVERSE PROBLEM OF THE EPIDEMIOLOGY*

MICHAEL V. KLIBANOV[†] AND TRUNG TRUONG[‡]

Abstract. It is proposed to monitor spatial and temporal spreads of epidemics via solution of a Coefficient Inverse Problem for a system of three coupled nonlinear parabolic equations. To solve this problem numerically, a version of the so-called Carleman contraction mapping method is developed for this problem. On each iteration, a linear problem with the incomplete lateral Cauchy data is solved by the weighted Quasi-Reversibility Method, where the weight is the Carleman Weight Function. This is the function, which is involved as the weight in the Carleman estimate for the corresponding parabolic operator. Convergence analysis ensures the global convergence of this procedure. Numerical results demonstrate an accurate performance of this technique for noisy data.

Key words. monitoring epidemics, coefficient inverse problem, Carleman estimate, convexification, numerical studies.

MSC codes. 35R30

1. Introduction. In 1927 Kermack and McKendrick have proposed a renowned mathematical model of the spread of epidemics. Their model relies on a system of three coupled nonlinear Ordinary Differential Equations. This system governs time dependent propagations of the total number of: susceptible (S), infected (I) and recovered (R) populations, i.e. it works with the so-called “SIR model”. In 2021, Lee, Liu, Tembine, Li and Osher [20] have modified the SIR model of [8] via introducing a system of three nonlinear coupled parabolic Partial Differential Equations (PDEs). We also call this model “SIR system”. An attractive point of the model of [20] is that it governs both spatial and time dependencies of S,I,R populations. Hence, if the solution of this system is found, then the spatial and temporal distributions of SIR populations are monitored inside of an affected city.

However, a significant obstacle on this way is that coefficients of that system are actually unknown. The current paper is devoted to an alleviation of this obstacle. We solve the corresponding Coefficient Inverse Problem (CIP) of the recovery of those coefficients. This solution can be considered as the calibration step, although we simultaneously find both: unknown coefficients and the solution of the SIR system.

Denote $\mathbf{x} = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Let $t > 0$ be time. The unknown coefficients of the SIR system of PDEs of [20] are: the infection rate $\beta(\mathbf{x}, t)$, the recovery rate $\gamma(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and three 2D vector functions representing velocities of propagations of S,I,R populations. These functions are: $q_S(\mathbf{x}, t)$, $q_I(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $q_R(\mathbf{x}, t)$. In principle, all these functions need to be computed as solutions of some CIPs. However, this task is too difficult to handle at this point of time. Hence, we focus below on computing only infection and recovery rates. If having just generic dependencies of $\beta(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $\gamma(\mathbf{x}, t)$ on three variables (x, y, t) , then we would need to have input data to be dependent on three variables: otherwise our input data, which are the boundary functions depending on two variables, would be under-determined. The latter would most likely imply non-uniqueness of our CIP. We point out that we work with the case of the data resulting

*Submitted to the editors DATE.

Funding:

[†]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC (mklibanv@charlotte.edu).

[‡]Department of Mathematics and Physics, Marshall University, Huntington, WV (truongt@marshall.edu).

from a single measurement event, which is quite natural here.

Therefore, we assume below that $\beta = \beta(\mathbf{x})$ and $\gamma = \gamma(\mathbf{x})$. In the reality of an epidemic, this assumption might work well only on a small time interval. Then, however, one can consider the case when $\beta(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $\gamma(\mathbf{x}, t)$ are piecewise constant functions with respect to t on a sequence of time intervals:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} &0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n = T, \\ &\beta(\mathbf{x}, t) = \beta_i(\mathbf{x}), \quad \gamma(\mathbf{x}, t) = \gamma_i(\mathbf{x}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \end{aligned}$$

Our method uses the knowledge of incomplete lateral Cauchy data for the SIR system. “Incomplete” in this case means that the Neumann boundary condition is given on the entire lateral boundary of our domain of interest, and the Dirichlet boundary condition is given only on a part of that boundary. However, our numerical method does not need a knowledge of the initial conditions of that system. Instead, it needs the knowledge of the solution of the SIR system at a certain interior point of the time interval we work with. An applied justification of the latter is given below in this section. Therefore, if the solution of that system is known at a sequence of interior points $\{t = t_{0,i}\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$, $t_{0,i} \in (t_i, t_{i+1})$, then the method of the current paper can be adjusted to this case. However, the case (1.1) is outside of the scope of our publication. In addition, we assume below that the velocities depend only on \mathbf{x} . This assumption can also be adjusted to the (\mathbf{x}, t) –dependence, similarly with the above. Summarizing, we assume that

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} &\beta = \beta(\mathbf{x}), \gamma = \gamma(\mathbf{x}), \\ &q_S = q_S(\mathbf{x}), q_I = q_I(\mathbf{x}), q_R = q_R(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Any CIP for a PDE is both ill-posed and nonlinear. The ill-posedness and the nonlinearity of CIPs cause the non-convexity of conventional least squares cost functionals for CIPs, see, e.g. [1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7]. The non-convexity, in turn causes the presence of local minima and ravines in those functionals. Hence, convergence of any optimization technique for such a functional can be rigorously guaranteed only if its starting point is located in a sufficiently small neighborhood of the true solution, which means local convergence. In general, it is unclear, however, how to figure out such a neighborhood a priori.

We call a numerical method for a CIP “globally convergent” if its convergence to the true solution of that CIP is rigorously guaranteed without an assumption of an advanced knowledge of a sufficiently small neighborhood of that solution.

To address the problem of the construction of globally convergent numerical methods for CIPs, the convexification concept was first proposed in [11]. The convexification is a numerical concept for CIPs, which is based on Carleman estimates. Naturally, each new CIP requires its own version of the convexification method, see, e.g. publications [3, 9, 10, 12, 13] about various versions of the convexification method. These versions include both the global convergence analysis and numerical studies. The global convergence property is defined above. In particular, in [10] the CIP of this paper is solved numerically by the convexification method.

Although we study here the same CIP as the one in [10], there is a significant difference between the approach of this paper and the one of [10]. This is because we use here the so-called “Carleman contraction mapping method” (CCMM). The CCMM was originated in [19] and [21], also, see, e.g. [18, 22] for some follow up publications. This method is applicable to some inverse source problems for quasilinear PDEs, see, e.g. [22, 19, 21]. It is also applicable to some CIPs, see, e.g. [18]. In the CCMM, a

certain nonlinear boundary value problem associated with the original problem (see, section 3 for our specific case) is solved numerically via an iterative procedure. On each iterative step a weighted quadratic functional is minimized. It seems to be, on the first glance, that such an approach should diverge. However, the key element of the CCMM is the presence of the so-called Carleman Weight Function (CWF) in that functional. The CWF is the function, which is involved in the Carleman estimate for the corresponding PDE operator. The presence of the CWF guarantees convergence of the process. That functional is minimized via a version of the so-called Quasi-Reversibility Method (QRM). The QRM was first proposed by Lattes and Lions [16]. The version of the QRM, which requires the minimization of a quadratic functional, was first proposed in [14, section 2.5], also see [9, chapter 4].

The convergence rate of the CCMM is the same as the one of the classical contraction mapping, see Theorem 7.1 in section 7 for the main convergence result of this paper. The latter explains the name of this method. The idea of the proof of Theorem 7.1 has some similarities with the ideas of proofs in [19, 21]. Nevertheless, significant differences with [19, 21] remain in this paper. They are caused by significant differences between the underlying PDE operators. Therefore, it is necessary to provide a complete proof of that theorem here. The CCMM converges globally in terms of the above definition. Just as in the case of the convexification method, each new application of the CCMM requires its own global convergence analysis. The latter is the focal point of the analytical effort of this paper.

- Remark 1.1.*
1. To simplify the presentation of solving our already difficult CIP, we assume that all functions representing the solution of our forward problem are sufficiently smooth.
 2. In addition to item 1, it is well known that the regularity assumptions are not of a significant concern in the theory of CIPs, see, e.g. [23, 24], [25, Theorem 4.1].

All functions considered below are real valued ones. In section 2 we pose both forward and inverse problems. In section 3 we describe our nonlinear transformation procedure. In section 4 we formulate two estimates: a Carleman estimate and an estimate of the Volterra integral, in which our CWF is involved. In section 5 we formulate our version of the second generation of the convexification method. In sections 6 and 7 we carry out the convergence analysis. In particular, Theorems 7.1-7.4 of section 7 are the main analytical results of this paper. In section 8 we present results of our numerical experiments.

2. Statements of Forward and Inverse Problems. In this section we pose both the forward problem and the inverse problem. Let $m > 1$ be an integer and B be a Banach space with its norm $\|\cdot\|_B$. Denote

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} B_m &= B \times B \times \dots \times B, \text{ } m \text{ times,} \\ \|u\|_{B_m} &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k\|_B^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad \forall u = (u_1, \dots, u_m)^T \in B_m. \end{aligned}$$

There is a general Carleman estimate for parabolic equations, in which the CWF depends on two large parameters [9, section 2.3], [17, §1 of Chapter 4]. This estimate is applicable to those CIPs for parabolic PDEs, which have lateral Cauchy data at any small smooth part of the spatial boundary. However, since the CWF in this case depends on two large parameters, then it changes too rapidly. This, in turn makes it inconvenient to work with such a CWF in numerical studies. Thus, we use a simpler

CWF of [9, formula (9.20)], which depends on only one large parameter. However, to use it, we need to assume that we solve our CIP in a rectangular domain.

Let the number α be such that

$$(2.2) \quad \alpha \in \left(0, 1/\sqrt{2}\right).$$

Let $a, b, A > 0$ be some numbers. Denote

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \Omega &= \{\mathbf{x} = (x, y) : a < x < b, |y| < A\}, \\ \Gamma &= \partial\Omega \cap \{x = b\}, \\ Q_T &= \Omega \times (0, T), \quad S_T = \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \quad \Gamma_T = \Gamma \times (0, T), \\ Q_{\alpha T} &= \Omega \times (T/2(1 - \alpha), T/2(1 + \alpha)). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, let $G \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded domain with a sufficiently smooth boundary and such that

$$(2.4) \quad \Omega \subset G, \quad \partial\Omega \cap \partial G = \emptyset.$$

Denote

$$(2.5) \quad G_T = G \times (0, T), \quad S_{G_T} = \partial G \times (0, T).$$

We now use notations of [20]. Assume that (1.2) holds. Also, let

$$(2.6) \quad \beta, \gamma \in C(\overline{G}); \quad q_S, q_I, q_R \in C^1(\overline{G}).$$

Let $\rho_S(\mathbf{x}, t)$, $\rho_I(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $\rho_R(\mathbf{x}, t)$ be S, I and R populations respectively. The initial boundary value problem for the SIR system of [20, formulas (2.1)] is:

$$(2.7) \quad \partial_t \rho_S - \frac{\eta_S^2}{2} \Delta \rho_S + \operatorname{div} \rho_S q_S + \beta(\mathbf{x}) \rho_S \rho_I = 0, \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in G_T,$$

$$(2.8) \quad \partial_t \rho_I - \frac{\eta_I^2}{2} \Delta \rho_I + \operatorname{div}(\rho_I q_I) - \beta(\mathbf{x}) \rho_S \rho_I = 0, \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in G_T,$$

$$(2.9) \quad \partial_t \rho_R - \frac{\eta_R^2}{2} \Delta \rho_R + \operatorname{div}(\rho_R q_R) - \gamma(\mathbf{x}) \rho_I = 0, \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in G_T,$$

$$(2.10) \quad \partial_n \rho_S|_{S_{G_T}} = g_1(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad \partial_n \rho_I|_{S_{G_T}} = g_2(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad \partial_n \rho_R|_{S_{G_T}} = g_3(\mathbf{x}, t),$$

$$(2.11) \quad \rho_S(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \rho_S^0(\mathbf{x}), \quad \rho_I(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \rho_I^0(\mathbf{x}), \quad \rho_R(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \rho_R^0(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in G.$$

Here and below ∂_n is the normal derivative. This is our forward problem. Functions g_1, g_2, g_3 are fluxes of S, I, R populations through the boundary ∂G [20]. Here, $\eta_S^2, \eta_R^2, \eta_I^2 > 0$ are constant viscosity terms. To simplify the presentation, we assume below that

$$(2.12) \quad \frac{\eta_S^2}{2} \equiv \frac{\eta_I^2}{2} \equiv \frac{\eta_R^2}{2} \equiv d > 0,$$

where d is a number. A more general case when identities (2.12) are not in place, can be considered along the same lines, although this topic is outside of the scope of the current publication.

If system (2.7)-(2.9) would be replaced with a single linear parabolic equation, then Theorem 5.3 of §5 of Chapter 4 of the book [15] would guarantee the existence and uniqueness of a sufficiently smooth solution of the corresponding initial boundary value problem with the Neumann boundary condition, provided that coefficients, initial and boundary data satisfy certain non-restrictive conditions. However, since we now have a system of coupled parabolic equations and these equations are nonlinear ones, then basically nothing can be derived from the book [15] about existence of a sufficiently smooth solution of the initial boundary value problem (2.7)-(2.11). An improvement of the results of this book, which is unlikely possible, is outside of the scope of this paper.

On the other hand, we truly want to solve the applied CIP posed below since this solution might bring at least something of a value to the important societal problem of monitoring of epidemics. Therefore, we just assume the existence and uniqueness of the solution

$$(2.13) \quad (\rho_S, \rho_I, \rho_R)(\mathbf{x}, t) \in C_3^{8,4}(\overline{G_T})$$

of the forward problem (2.7)-(2.11), see (2.1) for the subscript “3” in $C_3^{8,4}(\overline{G_T})$. As to the $C_3^{8,4}(\overline{G_T})$ -smoothness, we need it for our derivations and refer to Remarks 1.1 in section 1.

We now pose our CIP. It makes a little sense to measure the S,I,R functions at $\{t = 0\}$. Indeed, the epidemic process is not yet mature at small times. Hence, it is unlikely that the authorities know about the existence of an epidemic at $t \approx 0$. Hence, unlike the forward problem, we do not assume in our inverse problem the knowledge of initial conditions (2.11) at $\{t = 0\}$. Instead, to work with our CIP, we assume the knowledge of the functions ρ_S, ρ_I, ρ_R at a fixed moment of time $t_0 \in (0, T)$. For convenience of notations, we set $t_0 = T/2$. Thus, we assume below that the spatial distributions of S,I,R populations inside of the affected city are conducted at the moment of time $t = T/2$. As to the boundary data for our CIP, we need these data at S_T and Γ_T , see (2.3). This is because we actually solve the CIP only inside the domain Ω , see the paragraph below (2.1). Thus, it makes sense to assume that the boundary data for our CIP are generated by the solution of of the forward problem (2.7)-(2.11).

Coefficient Inverse Problem (CIP). *Assume that conditions (1.2), (2.3)-(2.6) hold, coefficients $\beta(\mathbf{x})$ and $\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ are known for $\mathbf{x} \in G \setminus \Omega$ and are unknown inside of the domain Ω . In addition, assume that vector functions q_S, q_I, q_R are known. Let the vector function $(\rho_S, \rho_I, \rho_R)(\mathbf{x}, t) \in C_3^{8,4}(\overline{G_T})$ (see (2.13)) be the solution of the forward problem (2.7)-(2.11). Let*

$$(2.14) \quad \rho_S\left(\mathbf{x}, \frac{T}{2}\right) = p_1(\mathbf{x}), \quad \rho_I\left(\mathbf{x}, \frac{T}{2}\right) = p_2(\mathbf{x}), \quad \rho_R\left(\mathbf{x}, \frac{T}{2}\right) = p_3(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega,$$

$$(2.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_n \rho_S(\mathbf{x}, t) |_{S_T} = r_1(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad \partial_n \rho_I(\mathbf{x}, t) |_{S_T} = r_2(\mathbf{x}, t), \\ \partial_n \rho_R(\mathbf{x}, t) |_{S_T} = r_3(\mathbf{x}, t), \end{aligned}$$

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho_S |_{\Gamma_T} = f_1(y, t), \quad \rho_I |_{\Gamma_T} = f_2(y, t), \\ \rho_S |_{\Gamma_T} = f_3(y, t), \quad (y, t) \in \Gamma_T. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that functions in the right hand sides of (2.14)-(2.16) are known. In addition, assume that there exists a number $c > 0$ such that

$$(2.17) \quad |p_1(\mathbf{x})|, |p_2(\mathbf{x})| \geq c, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

At the same time, a knowledge of initial conditions (2.16) is not assumed. Determine the infection rate $\beta(\mathbf{x})$ and the recovery rate $\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$.

In the case of a single linear parabolic equation, one can sometimes impose sufficient conditions to guarantee an analog of (2.17). This is usually done using the maximum principle for parabolic equations [15, §2 of Chapter 1]. However, since we have the system (2.7)-(2.9) of nonlinear equations, then it is unlikely that a proper sufficient condition guaranteeing (2.17) can be imposed. Thus, we simply assume the validity of (2.17). We note that condition (2.17) has a clear physical meaning: it tells one that the S and I populations exceed a certain number at the time when measurements inside of the affected city are conducted.

3. Transformation. The first step of both first and second generations of the convexification method is a transformation procedure. In our specific case, this procedure transforms the original CIP into such a system of six coupled nonlinear integral differential equations with Volterra integral operators in them, which does not contain unknown coefficients.

Set $t = T/2$ in (2.7) and (2.9). Using (2.14) and (2.17), we obtain

$$(3.1) \quad \beta(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{(p_1 p_2)(\mathbf{x})} \partial_t \rho_S \left(\mathbf{x}, \frac{T}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{(p_1 p_2)(\mathbf{x})} [c \Delta p_1(\mathbf{x}) - \operatorname{div}(p_1 q_S)(\mathbf{x})],$$

$$(3.2) \quad \gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{p_2(\mathbf{x})} \partial_t \rho_R \left(\mathbf{x}, \frac{T}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{p_2(\mathbf{x})} [c \Delta p_3(\mathbf{x}) - \operatorname{div}(p_3 q_R)(\mathbf{x})].$$

Denote

$$(3.3) \quad v_1(\mathbf{x}, t) = \partial_t \rho_S(\mathbf{x}, t), v_2(\mathbf{x}, t) = \partial_t \rho_I(\mathbf{x}, t), v_3(\mathbf{x}, t) = \partial_t \rho_R(\mathbf{x}, t), \\ V(\mathbf{x}, t) = (v_1, v_2, v_3)^T(\mathbf{x}, t).$$

By (2.14) and (3.3)

$$(3.4) \quad \rho_S(\mathbf{x}, t) = \int_{T/2}^t v_1(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau + p_1(\mathbf{x}), \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in Q_T, \\ \rho_I(\mathbf{x}, t) = \int_{T/2}^t v_2(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau + p_2(\mathbf{x}), \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in Q_T, \\ \rho_R(\mathbf{x}, t) = \int_{T/2}^t v_3(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau + p_3(\mathbf{x}), \quad (\mathbf{x}, t) \in Q_T.$$

Since by (3.3)

$$\partial_t \rho_S(\mathbf{x}, T/2) = v_1(\mathbf{x}, T/2) = v_1(\mathbf{x}, t) - \int_{T/2}^t \partial_t v_1(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau, \\ \partial_t \rho_R(\mathbf{x}, T/2) = v_3(\mathbf{x}, T/2) = v_3(\mathbf{x}, t) - \int_{T/2}^t \partial_t v_3(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau,$$

then (3.1)-(3.4) imply:

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta(\mathbf{x}) &= \left(v_1(\mathbf{x}, t) - \int_{T/2}^t \partial_t v_1(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau \right) s_1(\mathbf{x}) + s_2(\mathbf{x}), \\ \gamma(\mathbf{x}) &= \left(v_3(\mathbf{x}, t) - \int_{T/2}^t \partial_t v_3(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau \right) s_3(\mathbf{x}) + s_4(\mathbf{x}), \\ s_1(\mathbf{x}) &= -[(p_1 p_2)(\mathbf{x})]^{-1}, \\ s_2(\mathbf{x}) &= -s_1(\mathbf{x}) [c\Delta p_1(\mathbf{x}) - \operatorname{div}(p_1 q_S)(\mathbf{x})], \\ s_3(\mathbf{x}) &= 1/p_2(\mathbf{x}), \\ s_4(\mathbf{x}) &= s_3(\mathbf{x}) [c\Delta p_3(\mathbf{x}) - \operatorname{div}(p_3 q_R)(\mathbf{x})]. \end{aligned}$$

Differentiate (2.7)-(2.9), (2.15) and (2.16) with respect to t and use (2.12) and (3.3)-(3.5). We obtain the system of three coupled nonlinear integral differential equations with incomplete lateral Cauchy data and Volterra integrals with respect to t :

$$(3.6) \quad \partial_t V - d\Delta V + (\operatorname{div}(v_1 q_S), \operatorname{div}(v_2 q_I), \operatorname{div}(v_3 q_I))^T + P(V) = 0 \text{ in } Q_T,$$

$$(3.7) \quad \partial_n V|_{S_T} = (\partial_t r_1, \partial_t r_2, \partial_t r_3)^T(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad V|_{\Gamma_T} = (\partial_t f_1, \partial_t f_2, \partial_t f_3)^T(y, t).$$

In (3.6), we have singled out the linear part of the matrix differential operator. The 3D vector function P is nonlinear with respect to V ,

$$(3.8) \quad P(V) = P \left(V, \nabla V, \int_{T/2}^t V(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau, \int_{T/2}^t \partial_t V(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau, S(\mathbf{x}) \right),$$

$$(3.9) \quad S = (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4)^T(\mathbf{x}) \in C_4^6(\bar{\Omega}),$$

where functions $s_i(\mathbf{x})$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$ are defined in (3.5). The 3D vector function P is

$$(3.10) \quad P = P(x_1, \dots, x_{19}) \in C_3^2(\mathbb{R}^{19}).$$

Thus, we have obtained the system of three coupled nonlinear integral differential equations (3.6) with the lateral incomplete Cauchy data (3.7) and condition (3.8). We observe that the unknown coefficients $\beta(\mathbf{x})$ and $\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ are not involved in system (3.6), which is exactly the goal of our transformation procedure.

However, the presence in (3.8) of integral terms containing the t -derivative $\partial_t V(\mathbf{x}, \tau)$ makes the convergence analysis inconvenient. Therefore, we differentiate (3.6), (3.7) with respect to t and denote

$$(3.11) \quad W(\mathbf{x}, t) = (V, V_t)^T(\mathbf{x}, t) = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_{1t}, v_{2t}, v_{3t})^T(\mathbf{x}, t).$$

The system (3.6) becomes

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} &\partial_t W - d\Delta W + \\ &+ (\operatorname{div}(v_1 q_S), \operatorname{div}(v_2 q_I), \operatorname{div}(v_3 q_I), \operatorname{div}(v_{1t} q_S), \operatorname{div}(v_{2t} q_I), \operatorname{div}(v_{3t} q_I))^T + \\ &+ Y(W, S) = 0 \text{ in } Q_T, \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.13) \quad Y(W, S) = Y \left(W, \int_{T/2}^t W(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau, \nabla W, \int_{T/2}^t \nabla W(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau, S(\mathbf{x}) \right).$$

The boundary conditions for W are generated by (3.7) and (3.11):

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} W|_{\Gamma_T} &= G_0(y, t) = (\partial_t f_1, \partial_t f_2, \partial_t f_3, \partial_t^2 f_1, \partial_t^2 f_2, \partial_t^2 f_3)^T(y, t), \\ \partial_n W|_{S_T} &= G_1(\mathbf{x}, t) = (\partial_t r_1, \partial_t r_2, \partial_t r_3, \partial_t^2 r_1, \partial_t^2 r_2, \partial_t^2 r_3)^T(\mathbf{x}, t). \end{aligned}$$

By (3.9) and (3.10)

$$(3.15) \quad Y = Y(x_1, \dots, x_{40}) \in C_6^2(\mathbb{R}^{40}).$$

The transformation procedure ends up with problem (3.11)-(3.15). We focus below on the numerical solution of this problem. Suppose for a moment that problem (3.11)-(3.15) is solved. Then the target coefficients $\beta(\mathbf{x})$ and $\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ should be reconstructed via backwards calculations using formulas (3.11), (3.3) and (3.5) sequentially.

4. Two Estimates. As stated in section 2, we use the CWF of [9, formula (9.20)], which depends only on a single large parameter. Our CWF is

$$(4.1) \quad \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) = \exp \left[2\lambda \left(x^2 - (t - T/2)^2 \right) \right],$$

where $\lambda \geq 1$ is a large parameter. By (2.3) and (4.1)

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) &\leq \exp \left[2\lambda \left(b^2 - (t - T/2)^2 \right) \right] \text{ in } Q_T, \\ \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) &\geq \exp \left[-\lambda \alpha^2 T^2 / 2 \right] \text{ in } Q_{\alpha T}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $H_0^{2,1}(Q_T)$ the subspace of the space $H^{2,1}(Q_T)$ defined as:

$$(4.3) \quad H_0^{2,1}(Q_T) = \{u \in H^{2,1}(Q_T) : \partial_n u|_{S_T} = 0, u|_{\Gamma_T} = 0\}.$$

THEOREM 4.1 (Carleman estimate for the operator $\partial_t - d\Delta$ - Theorem 9.4.1 in [9]). *Let $d > 0$ be the number in (2.12). There exists a sufficiently large number $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(Q_T, d) \geq 1$ and a number $C = C(Q_T, d) > 0$, both depending only on listed parameters, such that the following Carleman estimate holds:*

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{Q_T} (u_t - d\Delta u)^2 \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt &\geq C \int_{Q_T} \left(\lambda (\nabla u)^2 + \lambda^3 u^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt - \\ -C \left(\|u(\mathbf{x}, T)\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|u(\mathbf{x}, 0)\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) &\lambda^2 \exp(-2\lambda(T^2/4 - b^2)), \\ \forall u \in H_0^{2,1}(Q_T), \forall \lambda &\geq \lambda_0. \end{aligned}$$

This Carleman estimate is proven in [9, Theorem 9.4.1] for the case when boundary conditions (4.3) are replaced with $u|_{S_T} = 0, u_x|_{\Gamma_T} = 0$. However, it easily follows from that proof that the same result is valid for boundary conditions (4.3), see formulas (9.100) and (9.103) of [9]. We also need an estimate of the Volterra integral, in which the CWF (4.1) is involved. Theorem 4.2 is proven in [9, Lemma 3.1.1].

THEOREM 4.2 (An estimate for the Volterra integral operator). *The following Carleman estimate is valid:*

$$(4.5) \quad \int_{Q_T} \left(\int_{T/2}^t f(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau \right)^2 \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) d\mathbf{x}dt \leq \frac{C}{\lambda} \int_{Q_T} f^2(\mathbf{x}, t) \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) d\mathbf{x}dt, \\ \forall \lambda > 0, \forall f \in L_2(Q_T),$$

where the number $C = C(T, \alpha) > 0$ depends only on listed parameters.

5. Numerical Method for Problem (3.11)-(3.14).

5.1. Sets. The smoothness requirement for W , which our method needs, is $W \in C_6^2(\overline{Q_T})$. On the other hand, by (2.13), (3.3) and (3.11) $W \in C_6^{4,2}(\overline{Q_T}) \subset C_6^2(\overline{Q_T})$. By the embedding theorem

$$(5.1) \quad H_6^4(Q_T) \subset C_6^2(\overline{Q_T}), \quad \|u\|_{C_6^2(\overline{Q_T})} \leq C \|u\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}, \quad \forall u \in H_6^4(Q_T),$$

and $H_6^4(Q_T)$ is dense in $C_6^2(\overline{Q_T})$ and compactly embedded in $C_6^2(\overline{Q_T})$ in terms of the norm of the space $C_6^2(\overline{Q_T})$. The number $C = C(Q_T)$ in (5.1) depends only on the domain Q_T . We define the subspace $H_{6,0}^4(Q_T)$ of the space $H_6^4(Q_T)$ as:

$$(5.2) \quad H_{6,0}^4(Q_T) = \{W \in H_6^4(Q_T) : \partial_n W|_{S_T} = 0, W|_{\Gamma_T} = 0\}.$$

Let $M > 0$ be an arbitrary number. Introduce two sets $B(M)$ and $B_0(M)$,

$$(5.3) \quad B(M) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} W \in H_6^4(Q_T) : \|W\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)} < M, \\ W|_{\Gamma_T} = G_0(y, t), \partial_n W|_{S_T} = G_1(\mathbf{x}, t), \end{array} \right\},$$

$$(5.4) \quad B_0(M) = \{W \in H_{6,0}^4(Q_T) : \|W\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)} < M\},$$

where vector functions G_0, G_1 were defined in (3.14). By (5.1), (5.3) and (5.4)

$$(5.5) \quad \|W\|_{C_6^2(\overline{Q_T})} \leq CM, \quad \forall W \in B(M) \cup B_0(M).$$

We assume that in (3.9)

$$(5.6) \quad \|S\|_{C_4(\overline{\Omega})} < M.$$

It follows from (3.15), (5.5) and (5.6) that the following holds true for the vector function Y in (3.13):

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & |Y(W_1, S_1) - Y(W_2, S_2)| \leq \\ & \leq C_1 (|W_1 - W_2|(\mathbf{x}, t) + |\nabla W_1 - \nabla W_2|(\mathbf{x}, t)) + \\ & + C_1 \left(\left| \int_{T/2}^t |W_1 - W_2|(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau \right| + \left| \int_{T/2}^t |\nabla W_1 - \nabla W_2|(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau \right| \right) + \\ & \quad + C_1 |S_1(\mathbf{x}) - S_2(\mathbf{x})|, \\ & \forall W_1, W_2 \in (B(M) \cup B_0(M)), \forall (\mathbf{x}, t) \in Q_T, \end{aligned}$$

where vector functions S_1, S_2 satisfy (5.6). Here and everywhere below, $C_1 = C_1(M, T, \Omega) > 0$ denotes different numbers depending only on M, T, Ω .

5.2. The sequence of quadratic functionals. We construct in this subsection 5.2 a sequence of weighted quadratic Tikhonov-like functionals with the CWF (4.1) in them to be minimized on the set $\overline{B(M)}$.

Remark 5.1. The paper [18] works with a version of the CCMM for a CIP for a 1d hyperbolic PDE. Similarly with the current paper, the minimizations of weighted quadratic functionals, although with a different CWF in them, are performed in [18] on a bounded set. However, that set is significantly different from our set $\overline{B(M)}$ due to a significant difference between our CIP and the CIP of [18]. The latter difference, in turn causes a significant difference in the convergence analysis of these two papers.

5.2.1. The functional number 0. Consider only the linear part of operators in (3.12). First, we introduce the linear operator L ,

$$(5.8) \quad L(W) = \partial_t W - d\Delta W + (\operatorname{div}(v_1 q_S), \operatorname{div}(v_2 q_I), \operatorname{div}(v_3 q_I), \operatorname{div}(v_{1t} q_S), \operatorname{div}(v_{2t} q_I), \operatorname{div}(v_{3t} q_I))^T.$$

Next, we construct the functional number zero as:

$$(5.9) \quad J_{0,\lambda,\xi}(W) = e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} [L(W)]^2 \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt + \xi \|W\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}^2.$$

Here $\xi \in (0, 1)$ is the regularization parameter and $\xi \|W_0\|_{H_3^4(Q_T)}^2$ is the Tikhonov regularization term. We recall that in the regularization theory, this term is always considered in the norm of such a Banach space, which is dense in the original space in terms of the norm of the original space, compactly embedded in the original one and its norm is stronger than the norm of the original space [26]. The original space in our case is $C_6^2(\overline{Q_T})$, also, see (5.1). The multiplier $e^{-2\lambda b^2}$ in (5.9) balances integral term with the regularization term since (4.2) implies that $\max_{\overline{Q_T}} \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) = e^{-2\lambda b^2}$.

Minimization Problem Number Zero. Minimize the functional $J_{0,\lambda,\xi}(W_0)$ on the set $\overline{B(M)}$.

5.2.2. The functional number $n \geq 1$. Suppose that for an appropriate given values of λ and ξ we have constructed already vector functions

$$(5.10) \quad W_{0,\min,\lambda,\xi}, W_{1,\min,\lambda,\xi}, \dots, W_{n-1,\min,\lambda,\xi} \in \overline{B(M)},$$

where $W_{k,\min,\lambda,\xi}$ is the minimizer of a certain functional $J_{k,\lambda,\xi}(W)$ on the set $\overline{B(M)}$: we will prove below that such a minimizer exists and is unique. Let Y be the 6D vector function in (3.12), (3.13), (3.15) and L be the linear operator in (5.8). Consider the following functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}$:

$$(5.11) \quad J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W) = e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} [L(W) + Y(W_{n-1,\min,\lambda}, S)]^2 \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt + \xi \|W\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}^2.$$

Minimization Problem Number n . Minimize the functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W)$ on the set $\overline{B(M)}$.

6. Some Properties of the Functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W)$. Since the functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W)$ is quadratic, it is automatically strongly convex on the entire space $H_6^4(Q_T)$ due to the presence of the regularization term. However, in our convergence analysis, we need to see how the presence of the terms with ∇W and W affects the strong convexity estimate on the set $\overline{B(M)}$ and how this is linked with the regularization parameter ξ . This can be done using the Carleman estimate of Theorem 4.1. Besides, we establish in this section the existence and uniqueness of the minimizer on the set $\overline{B(M)}$ of the functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W)$. In addition, we establish here the global convergence to that minimizer of two versions of the gradient method of the minimization of $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W)$.

We note that the Riesz theorem is inapplicable here since we search for the minimizer on the bounded set $\overline{B(M)} \subset H_6^4(Q_T)$ rather than on the whole space $H_6^4(Q_T)$.

6.1. Strong convexity of the functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W)$ on the set $\overline{B(M)}$.

THEOREM 6.1. *Let the vector function $W_{n-1,\min,\lambda} \in \overline{B(M)}$ and let (5.6) holds. The following three assertions are true:*

1. *For each value of $\lambda > 0$ and for each $W \in \overline{B(M)}$ the functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W)$ has the Fréchet derivative $J'_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W) \in H_{6,0}^4(Q_T)$. The Fréchet derivative has the form*

$$(6.1) \quad J'_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W)(h) = 2e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} [L(W) + Y(W_{n-1,\min,\lambda}, S)] L(h) \varphi_\lambda dxdt + 2\xi(h, W), \quad \forall h \in H_{6,0}^4(Q_T).$$

where (\cdot, \cdot) is the scalar product in $H_6^4(Q_T)$. Furthermore, $J'_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W)$ is Lipschitz continuous on $\overline{B(M)}$. This means that there exists a number $D = D(\lambda, \xi, M) > 0$ depending only on listed parameters such that

$$(6.2) \quad \left\| J'_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_1) - J'_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_2) \right\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)} \leq D \|W_1 - W_2\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}, \quad \forall W_1, W_2 \in \overline{B(M)}.$$

2. *Let $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(Q_T, d) \geq 1$ be the number of Theorem 4.1. There exists a sufficiently large number $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(Q_T, d, M) \geq \lambda_0$ such that if $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$ and the regularization parameter ξ is such that*

$$(6.3) \quad \frac{\xi}{2} \in \left[\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{T^2}{4}\right), \frac{1}{2} \right),$$

then the functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W)$ satisfies the following estimate:

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_2) - J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_1) - J'_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_1)(W_2 - W_1) \geq \\ & \geq C_1 \lambda \int_{Q_T} \left[(\nabla(W_2 - W_1))^2 + (W_2 - W_1)^2 \right] \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) dxdt + \\ & \quad + (\xi/2) \|W_2 - W_1\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}^2, \\ & \quad \forall W_1, W_2 \in \overline{B(M)}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. this functional is strongly convex on the set $\overline{B(M)}$.

3. *For each $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$ there exists unique minimizer $W_{n,\min,\lambda} \in \overline{B(M)}$ of the functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W)$ on the set $\overline{B(M)}$ and the following inequality holds:*

$$(6.5) \quad J'_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi})(W - W_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi}) \geq 0, \quad \forall W \in \overline{B(M)}.$$

Remark 6.2. Thus, the right hand side of the strong convexity estimate (6.3) includes not only the quadratic term $(\xi/2) \|W_2 - W_1\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}^2$, which is to be expected since the functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}$ is quadratic, but other terms as well. The latter is important in our convergence analysis below.

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Let $W_1, W_2 \in \overline{B(M)}$ be two arbitrary points. Denote $h = W_2 - W_1$. Then $W_2 = W_1 + h$. By (5.2)-(5.4) and triangle inequality

$$(6.6) \quad h \in B_0(2M).$$

By (5.11)

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.7) \quad J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_1 + h) &= e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} [L(W_1) + L(h) + Y(W_{n-1,\min,\lambda}, S)]^2 \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt + \\
&\quad + \xi \|W_1 + h\|_{H_{\delta}^4(Q_T)}^2 = \\
&= e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} (L(W_1) + Y(W_{n-1,\min,\lambda}, S))^2 \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt + \xi \|W_1\|_{H_{\delta}^4(Q_T)}^2 \\
&\quad + 2e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} (L(W_1) + Y(W_{n-1,\min,\lambda}, S)) L(h) \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt + 2(W_1, h) + \\
&\quad + e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} (L(h))^2 \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt + \xi \|h\|_{H_{\delta}^4(Q_T)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By (5.2), (5.4) and (6.6) $h \in H_{6,0}^4(Q_T)$. Consider the functional $Z_{n,\lambda,\xi}(h)$ defined as:

$$(6.8) \quad Z_{n,\lambda,\xi}(h) = 2e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} (L(W_1) + Y(W_{n-1,\min,\lambda}, S)) L(h) \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt + 2(W_1, h).$$

Clearly, this is a linear bounded functional $Z_{n,\lambda,\xi} : H_{6,0}^4(Q_T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Hence, by Riesz theorem there exists unique point $\widehat{Z}_{n,\lambda,\xi} \in H_{6,0}^4(Q_T)$ such that

$$(6.9) \quad Z_{n,\lambda,\xi}(h) = \left(\widehat{Z}_{n,\lambda,\xi}, h \right), \quad \forall h \in H_{6,0}^4(Q_T).$$

On the other hand, (6.7)-(6.9) imply that

$$\lim_{\|h\|_{H_{\delta}^4(Q_T)} \rightarrow 0} \frac{J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_1 + h) - J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_1) - \left(\widehat{Z}_{n,\lambda,\xi}, h \right)}{\|h\|_{H_{\delta}^4(Q_T)}} = 0.$$

Hence, $\widehat{Z}_{n,\lambda,\xi}$ is the Fréchet derivative of the functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_1)$ at the point W_1 ,

$$(6.10) \quad \widehat{Z}_{n,\lambda,\xi} = J'_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_1) \in H_{6,0}^4(Q_T).$$

We omit the proof of the Lipschitz continuity property (6.2) since this proof is quite similar with the proof of Theorem 5.3.1 of [9], so as of Theorem 3.1 of [3].

We now prove the strong convexity estimate (6.4). By (6.7)-(6.10)

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.11) \quad J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_1 + h) - J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_1) - J'_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_1)(h) &= \\
&= e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} (L(h))^2 \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt + \xi \|h\|_{H_{\delta}^4(Q_T)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Carleman estimate (4.4), estimate from the below the first term in the second line of (6.11). By (2.6) and (5.8)

$$(6.12) \quad (L(h))^2 \geq (h_t - d\Delta h)^2 - C_1 \left(|\nabla h|^2 + |h|^2 \right).$$

Since $h \in H_{6,0}^4(Q_T)$, then by (4.3) and (5.2) we can apply Carleman estimate (4.4) to the vector function h . Hence, setting $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, multiplying (6.12) by $\varphi_\lambda e^{-2\lambda b^2}$ and

integrating over Q_T , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.13) \quad & e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} (L(h))^2 \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt \geq e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} (h_t - d\Delta h)^2 \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt - \\
& - e^{-2\lambda b^2} C_1 \int_{Q_T} (|\nabla h|^2 + |h|^2) \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt \geq \\
& \geq C e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} (\lambda |\nabla h|^2 + \lambda^3 |h|^2) \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt - \\
& - e^{-2\lambda b^2} C_1 \int_{Q_T} (|\nabla h|^2 + |h|^2) \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt - \\
& - C \left(\|h(\mathbf{x}, T)\|_{H_6^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|h(\mathbf{x}, 0)\|_{H_6^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \lambda^2 \exp(-\lambda T^2/2)
\end{aligned}$$

Choose $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(Q_T, d, M) \geq \lambda_0$ so large that $C\lambda_1 > 2C_1$. Then the second term in the third line of (6.13) is absorbed by the first term in that line. Hence, (6.13) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.14) \quad & e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} (L(h))^2 \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt \geq C_1 \lambda \int_{Q_T} (|\nabla h|^2 + |h|^2) \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt - \\
& - C \left(\|h(\mathbf{x}, T)\|_{H_6^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|h(\mathbf{x}, 0)\|_{H_6^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \lambda^2 \exp(-\lambda T^2/2), \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, by (5.4), (6.6) and trace theorem

$$\|h(\mathbf{x}, T)\|_{H_6^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|h(\mathbf{x}, 0)\|_{H_6^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq C_1 \|h\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}^2.$$

Hence, by (5.5)

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.15) \quad & \xi \|h\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}^2 - C \left(\|h(\mathbf{x}, T)\|_{H_6^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|h(\mathbf{x}, 0)\|_{H_6^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \lambda^2 \exp(-\lambda T^2/2) \geq \\
& \geq (\xi - C_1 \lambda^2 \exp(-\lambda T^2/2)) \|h\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}^2 \geq (\xi/2) \|h\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, using (6.11), (6.14) and (6.15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.16) \quad & J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_1 + h) - J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_1) - J'_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_1)(h) \geq \\
& \geq C_1 \lambda \int_{Q_T} (|\nabla h|^2 + |h|^2) \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt + (\xi/2) \|h\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}^2, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_1,
\end{aligned}$$

which proves (6.4). As soon as (6.4) is established, existence and uniqueness of the minimizer $W_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi}$ of the functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}$ on the set $\overline{B(M)}$ as well as inequality (6.5) follow from a simple combination of Lemma 2.1 with Theorem 2.1 of [3] as well as from a combination of Lemma 5.2.1 with Theorem 5.2.1 of [9]. \square

6.2. Global convergence of the gradient projection method. Suppose that there exists a vector function

$$(6.17) \quad F \in B(M).$$

For each vector function $W \in B(M)$ consider the difference

$$(6.18) \quad \widetilde{W} = W - F.$$

By (5.3), (5.4), (6.18) and triangle inequality

$$(6.19) \quad \widetilde{W} \in B_0(2M), \quad \forall W \in B(M).$$

The convenience of the transformation (6.18) is that since $B_0(2M)$ is the ball of the radius $2M$ with the center at $\{0\}$ in the space $H_{6,0}^4(Q_T)$, then it is easy to construct projection operator of $H_{6,0}^4(Q_T)$ on $\overline{B_0(2M)}$ as:

$$(6.20) \quad P_{B_0(2M)}(Y) = \begin{cases} Y & \text{if } Y \in \overline{B_0(2M)}, \\ 2M \cdot Y / \|Y\|_{H_{6,0}^4(Q_T)} & \text{if } Y \notin \overline{B_0(2M)}. \end{cases}$$

By (6.17) and triangle inequality

$$(6.21) \quad \widetilde{W} + F \in B(3M), \quad \forall \widetilde{W} \in \overline{B_0(2M)}$$

Consider the functional $I_{n,\lambda,\xi} : \overline{B_0(2M)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as:

$$(6.22) \quad \begin{aligned} I_{n,\lambda,\xi}(\widetilde{W}) &= J_{n,\lambda,\xi}(\widetilde{W} + F) = \\ &= e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left[L(\widetilde{W} + F) + Y(\widetilde{W}_{n-1,\min,\lambda} + F, S) \right]^2 \varphi_\lambda dxdt + \\ &\quad + \xi \left\| \widetilde{W} + F \right\|_{H_{6,0}^4(Q_T)}^2, \quad \forall \widetilde{W} \in \overline{B_0(2M)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{W}_{n-1,\min,\lambda} \in \overline{B_0(2M)}$ is the unique minimizer of the functional $J_{n-1,\lambda,\xi}(\widetilde{W} + F)$ on the set $\overline{B_0(2M)}$. An obvious analog of Theorem 6.1 is valid for the functional $I_{n,\lambda,\xi}(\widetilde{W})$, where by (6.21)

$$(6.23) \quad \lambda \geq \lambda_2 = \lambda_1(Q_T, d, 3M) \geq \lambda_1(Q_T, d, M).$$

Theorem 6.1 and (6.23) justify the existence and uniqueness of the minimizer $\widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda} \in \overline{B_0(2M)}$ of the functional $I_{n,\lambda,\xi}$ on the set $\overline{B_0(2M)}$ for any n and for λ satisfying (6.23), which, in turn justifies the presence of the term $\widetilde{W}_{n-1,\min,\lambda}$ in (6.22). We now construct a sequence converging to $\widetilde{W}_{\min,n,\lambda,\xi}$. We start from an arbitrary point $\widetilde{W}_0 \in B_0(2M)$. The sequence of the gradient projection method is:

$$(6.24) \quad \widetilde{W}_n = P_{B_0(2M)} \left(\widetilde{W}_{n-1} - \gamma I'_{n,\lambda,\xi}(\widetilde{W}_{n-1}) \right), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots,$$

where the step size $\gamma > 0$ is a certain number and $I'_{n,\lambda,\xi}(\widetilde{W}_{n-1})$ is the Fréchet derivative of the functional $I_{n,\lambda,\xi}(\widetilde{W})$ at the point \widetilde{W}_{n-1} . Note that since by Theorem 6.1 $I'_{n,\lambda,\xi} \in H_{6,0}^4(Q_T)$ and since (6.20) holds, then in (6.24) $\widetilde{W}_n \in H_{6,0}^4(Q_T)$ for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Theorem 6.3 follows immediately from a combination of Theorem 6.1 with Theorem 2.1 of [3].

THEOREM 6.3. *Let parameters λ and ξ satisfy (6.23) and (6.3) respectively. Then there exists a sufficiently small number $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that for any $\gamma \in (0, \gamma_0)$ the sequence (6.24) converges to the minimizer $\widetilde{W}_{\min,n,\lambda,\xi}$. Furthermore, there exists a number $\theta = \theta(\gamma) \in (0, 1)$ such that the following convergence estimate holds:*

$$\left\| \widetilde{W}_n - \widetilde{W}_{\min,n,\lambda,\xi} \right\|_{H_{6,0}^4(Q_T)} \leq \theta^n \left\| \widetilde{W}_0 - \widetilde{W}_{\min,n,\lambda,\xi} \right\|_{H_{6,0}^4(Q_T)}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Thus, the gradient projection method (6.24) of the minimization of the functional $I_{n,\lambda,\xi}$ on the set $\overline{B_0(2M)}$ converges globally, since it starts from an arbitrary point $\widetilde{W}_0 \in B_0(2M)$ and smallness condition is not imposed on M .

6.3. Global convergence of the gradient descent method. The gradient projection method is not easy to implement due to the necessity to obtain zero boundary conditions via (6.17), (6.18). In addition, it is inconvenient to use the projection operator (6.20) in computations. Hence, we now formulate a simpler gradient descent method of the minimization of functional (5.11) on the set $\overline{B(M)}$. To do this, we need to assume that the minimizer that functional belongs to the set $B(M/3)$.

Let $W_0 \in B(M/3)$ be an arbitrary point and let $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ be a number. The sequence of the gradient descent method is:

$$(6.25) \quad W_n = W_{n-1} - \gamma J'_{n,\lambda,\xi}(W_{n-1}), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Theorem 6.4 follows immediately from a combination of Theorem 6.1 with Theorem 6 of [12].

THEOREM 6.4. *Let $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$, where λ_1 is the number of Theorem 6.1 and let (6.3) holds. Let $W_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} \in \overline{B(M)}$ be the minimizer of the functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}$ on the set $\overline{B(M)}$, which was found in Theorem 6.1. Assume that $W_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} \in B(M/3)$. Then there exists a sufficiently small number $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that for any $\gamma \in (0, \gamma_0)$ all terms of sequence (6.25) belong to the set $B(M)$. Furthermore, the sequence (6.25) converges to $W_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi}$ and there exists a number $\theta = \theta(\gamma) \in (0, 1)$ such that the following convergence estimate is valid:*

$$\|W_n - W_{\min,n,\lambda,\xi}\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)} \leq \theta^n \|W_0 - W_{\min,n,\lambda,\xi}\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

This is again the global convergence property since $W_0 \in B(M/3)$ is an arbitrary point and since smallness conditions are not imposed on the number M .

7. Convergence of Minimizers to the True Solution. One of the main concepts of the regularization theory is the assumption that there exists an “ideal” solution of an ill-posed problem with the “ideal”, noiseless input data [26]. We call this “exact solution”. The input data in our case are lateral data G_0, G_1 in (3.14) as well as the vector function S in (3.9).

The above Theorems 6.1-6.3 characterize some properties of the functionals $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}$. However, they do not address the question about the relevance of minimizers of these functionals to the true solution of problem (3.11)-(3.15) as well as to the true solution of our CIP. These key questions are addressed in Theorems 7.1-7.4 of this section.

7.1. Introducing noise in the input data. Let W^* be that exact solution of problem (3.12)-(3.14) with the exact data G_0^*, G_1^* and the exact vector function S^* ,

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{aligned} L(W^*) + Y(W^*, S^*) &= 0 \text{ in } Q_T, \\ W^*|_{\Gamma_T} &= G_0^*(y, t), \quad \partial_n W^*|_{S_T} = G_1^*(\mathbf{x}, t). \end{aligned}$$

It is natural to assume that

$$(7.2) \quad W^* \in B^*(M),$$

where, similarly with (5.3),

$$(7.3) \quad B^*(M) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} W \in H_6^4(Q_T) : \|W\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)} < M, \\ W|_{\Gamma_T} = G_0^*(y, t), \partial_n W|_{S_T} = G_1^*(\mathbf{x}, t), \end{array} \right\}$$

Due to the requirement $u \in H_0^{2,1}(Q_T)$ in Carleman estimate (4.4), we need to work with the zero boundary conditions in our convergence analysis. Hence, let

$F \in B(M)$ be the vector function in (6.17). Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be the noise level in the input data. Suppose that there exists a vector function $F^* \in B^*(M)$ such that

$$(7.4) \quad \|F - F^*\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)} < \delta.$$

In addition, let

$$(7.5) \quad \|S - S^*\|_{C_4(\bar{\Omega})} < \delta.$$

Keep notations of subsection 6.2 and similarly with (6.18) let

$$(7.6) \quad \widetilde{W}^* = W^* - F^*.$$

Then, by (7.3) and triangle inequality

$$(7.7) \quad \widetilde{W}^* \in B_0(2M).$$

7.2. Convergence of minimizers. Denote

$$(7.8) \quad \begin{aligned} h_n &= \widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} - \widetilde{W}^*, \\ s_n &= W_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} - W^*. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $W_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi}$ is the minimizer of the functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}$ on the set $\overline{B(M)}$, and $\widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi}$ is the minimizer of the functional $I_{n,\lambda,\xi}$ in (6.22) on the set $\overline{B_0(2M)}$. We cannot guarantee that $\widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} + F = W_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi}$. Hence, we provide two types of convergence estimates: for noisy and noiseless data. The difference here is that we have the same lateral Cauchy data for $W_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi}$ and W^* in the case of noiseless data, and these data are not necessary zero. On the other hand, in the noisy case, we have zero lateral Cauchy data for both $\widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi}$ and \widetilde{W}^* .

The vector function $W^*(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is actually generated by the exact coefficients $\beta^*(\mathbf{x})$ and $\gamma^*(\mathbf{x})$ of the SIR system (2.7)-(2.9). We approximate them via the pair of functions $\beta_{n,\lambda,\delta}(\mathbf{x}), \gamma_{n,\lambda,\delta}(\mathbf{x})$ in the case of noisy data and by the pair of functions $\beta_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{x}), \gamma_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{x})$ in the case of noiseless data. Following the end of section 3, we obtain these pairs of functions from the vector functions $\widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} + F$ in the case of noisy data and from the vector functions $W_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi}$ for the noiseless cases respectively via applying formulas (3.11), (3.3) and (3.5) sequentially.

THEOREM 7.1 (convergence for noisy data). *Let conditions (7.1)-(7.8) hold. Let $\lambda \geq \lambda_2$, where $\lambda_2 \geq 1$ is defined in (6.23). Assume that condition (6.3) holds. Then the following convergence estimates are valid:*

$$(7.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} (|\nabla h_n|^2 + |h_n|^2) \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt \leq \\ & \leq (C_1/\lambda)^n e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} (|\nabla h_0|^2 + |h_0|^2) \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt + \\ & \quad + (C_1/\lambda) (\xi + \delta^2), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left| \nabla \left(\widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} + F \right) - \nabla W^* \right|^2 \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt + \\
& + e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left| \left(\widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} + F \right) - W^* \right|^2 \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt \leq \\
(7.10) \quad & \leq (C_1/\lambda)^n e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left| \nabla \left(\widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda,\xi} + F \right) - \nabla W^* \right|^2 \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt + \\
& + (C_1/\lambda)^n e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left| \left(\widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda,\xi} + F \right) - W^* \right|^2 \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt + \\
& + (C_1/\lambda) \xi + C_1 \delta^2.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left[(\beta_{n,\lambda,\delta}(\mathbf{x}) - \beta^*(\mathbf{x}))^2 + (\gamma_{n,\lambda,\delta}(\mathbf{x}) - \gamma^*(\mathbf{x}))^2 \right] \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt \leq \\
(7.11) \quad & \leq (C_1/\lambda)^n e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left| \nabla \left(\widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda,\xi} + F \right) - \nabla W^* \right|^2 \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt + \\
& + (C_1/\lambda)^n e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left| \left(\widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda,\xi} + F \right) - W^* \right|^2 \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt + \\
& + (C_1/\lambda) \xi + C_1 \delta^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. First, we consider the case $n = 1$. Using the analog of (6.4) for $I_{n,\lambda,\xi}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.12) \quad & I_{1,\lambda,\xi} \left(\widetilde{W}^* \right) - I_{1,\lambda,\xi} \left(\widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} \right) - \\
& - I'_{1,\lambda,\xi} \left(\widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} \right) \left(\widetilde{W}^* - \widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} \right) \geq \\
& \geq C_1 \lambda \int_{Q_T} \left[(\nabla h_1)^2 + h_1^2 \right] \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $-I_{1,\lambda,\xi} \left(\widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} \right) \leq 0$ and also since by (6.5)

$$-I'_{1,\lambda,\xi} \left(\widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} \right) \left(\widetilde{W}^* - \widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} \right) \leq 0,$$

then (7.12) implies

$$(7.13) \quad e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left[(\nabla h_1)^2 + h_1^2 \right] \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt \leq \frac{C_1}{\lambda} I_{1,\lambda,\xi} \left(\widetilde{W}^* \right).$$

We now estimate $I_{1,\lambda,\xi} \left(\widetilde{W}^* \right)$ from the above. By (6.22) and (7.6)

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.14) \quad & I_{1,\lambda,\xi} \left(\widetilde{W}^* \right) = J_{1,\lambda,\xi} \left(\widetilde{W}^* + F \right) = \\
& = e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left[L \left(\widetilde{W}^* + F \right) + Y \left(\widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda} + F, S \right) \right]^2 \varphi_\lambda \, d\mathbf{x}dt + \\
& + \xi \left\| \widetilde{W}^* + F \right\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Next consider the expression in the second line of (7.14). We have:

$$\begin{aligned} L(\widetilde{W}^* + F) + Y(\widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda} + F, S) &= L(W^*) + \\ &+ L(F - F^*) + Y(\widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda} + F, S) = \\ &= [L(W^*) + Y(W^*, S^*)] + L(F - F^*) \\ &+ \left[Y(\widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda} + F, S) - Y(\widetilde{W}^* + F^*, S^*) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By (7.1) $L(W^*) + Y(W^*, S^*) = 0$. Hence,

$$(7.15) \quad \begin{aligned} L(\widetilde{W}^* + F) + Y(W_{0,\min,\lambda}, S) &= L(F - F^*) + \\ &+ \left[Y(\widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda} + F, S) - Y(\widetilde{W}^* + F^*, S^*) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, by (7.4)

$$(7.16) \quad |L(F - F^*)| \leq C_1 \delta,$$

and by (5.7), (7.4) and (7.5)

$$(7.17) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left| Y(\widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda} + F, S) - Y(\widetilde{W}^* + F^*, S^*) \right| \leq \\ &\leq C_1 \left(\left| \widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda} - \widetilde{W}^* \right|(\mathbf{x}, t) + \left| \nabla \widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda} - \nabla \widetilde{W}^* \right|(\mathbf{x}, t) \right) + \\ &+ C_1 \left| \int_{T/2}^t \left| \widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda} - \widetilde{W}^* \right|(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau \right| + \\ &+ C_1 \left| \int_{T/2}^t \left| \nabla \widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda} - \nabla \widetilde{W}^* \right|(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau \right| + C_1 \delta. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 4.2, Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (4.2), (7.8) and (7.15)-(7.17)

$$(7.18) \quad \begin{aligned} &e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left[L(\widetilde{W}^* + F) + Y(\widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda} + F, S) \right]^2 \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt \leq \\ &\leq C_1 e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left[\left| \nabla \widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda} - \nabla \widetilde{W}^* \right|^2 + \left| \widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda} - \widetilde{W}^* \right|^2 \right] \varphi_\lambda d\mathbf{x}dt + \\ &+ C_1 \delta^2 = C_1 e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left(|\nabla h_0|^2 + |h_0|^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) d\mathbf{x}dt + C_1 \delta^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally

$$(7.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \xi \left\| \widetilde{W}^* + F \right\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}^2 &= \xi \|W^* + (F - F^*)\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}^2 \leq \\ &\leq 2\xi \|W^*\|_{H_6^4(Q_T)}^2 + 2\delta^2 \leq 2\xi M^2 + 2\delta^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (7.14)-(7.19) imply

$$I_{1,\lambda,\xi}(\widetilde{W}^*) \leq e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left(|\nabla h_0|^2 + |h_0|^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) d\mathbf{x}dt + C_1 (\xi + \delta^2).$$

Combining this with (7.13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left(|\nabla h_1|^2 + |h_1|^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) d\mathbf{x}dt \leq \\ &\leq (C_1/\lambda) e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left(|\nabla h_0|^2 + |h_0|^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) d\mathbf{x}dt + (C_1/\lambda) (\xi + \delta^2), \end{aligned}$$

which is estimate (7.9) at $n = 1$. Continuing these estimates via the mathematical induction, we obtain

$$(7.20) \quad \begin{aligned} & e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left(|\nabla h_n|^2 + |h_n|^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt \leq \\ & \leq (C_1/\lambda)^n e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left(|\nabla h_0|^2 + |h_0|^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt + \\ & \quad + \left(\sum_{k=1}^n (C_1/\lambda)^k \right) (\xi + \delta^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{C_1}{\lambda} \right)^k = \frac{C_1}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - (C_1/\lambda)} < 2 \frac{C_1}{\lambda},$$

then (7.20) implies the first target estimate (7.9).

Using $h_n = \widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} - \widetilde{W}^* = \left[\left(\widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} + F \right) - W^* \right] - (F - F^*)$ and (7.4), we obtain

$$(7.21) \quad \begin{aligned} |\nabla h_n|^2 + |h_n|^2 & \geq \left| \nabla \left(\widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} + F \right) - \nabla W^* \right|^2 + \\ & \quad + \left| \left(\widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} + F \right) - W^* \right|^2 - \delta^2. \end{aligned}$$

The second target estimate (7.10) easily follows from (7.9) and (7.21). Estimate (7.10) being combined with (3.11), (3.3) and (3.5) leads to (7.11). \square

THEOREM 7.2 (convergence for noiseless data). *Let $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$, where $\lambda_1 \geq 1$ was found in Theorem 6.1. Let the noise level $\delta = 0$ and conditions (6.3), (7.1)-(7.3) as well as the notation in the second line of (7.8) hold. Then the following convergence estimates are valid:*

$$(7.22) \quad \begin{aligned} & e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left(|\nabla s_n|^2 + |s_n|^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt \leq \\ & \leq (C_1/\lambda)^n e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left(|\nabla s_0|^2 + |s_0|^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt + (C_1/\lambda) \xi, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.23) \quad \begin{aligned} & e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left[\left(\beta_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) - \beta^*(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 + \left(\gamma_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) - \gamma^*(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 \right] \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt \leq \\ & \leq (C_1/\lambda)^n e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left(|\nabla s_0|^2 + |s_0|^2 \right) \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x}dt + (C_1/\lambda) \xi, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned}$$

We omit the proof of this theorem since it is completely similar with the proof of Theorem 7.1. It follows from (6.3) and (7.10) that the sequence $\left\{ \widetilde{W}_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} + F \right\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ converges to the exact solution W^* in the case of noisy data, as long as the level of noise in the data $\delta \rightarrow 0$. And (7.22) implies that the sequence $\left\{ W_{n,\min,\lambda,\xi} \right\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ also converges to the exact solution W^* in the case of noiseless data. Estimates

(7.11) and (7.23) imply that the same statements are true for the target reconstructed coefficients. In all cases convergence is in terms of integrals with the CWF $\varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t)$ in them. Finally, Theorems 6.2, 6.3, 7.1 and 7.2 imply that we have constructed in section 5 a globally convergent numerical method for our CIP.

We now provide more explicit convergence estimates for the unknown coefficients. Recall that the domain $Q_{\alpha T}$ is the one defined in (2.3) for the number α in (2.2). We also recall that by the regularization theory, the regularization parameter should depend on the noise level [26].

THEOREM 7.3. *Let conditions of Theorem 7.1 hold, so as (2.2). Let*

$$(7.24) \quad T^2 > \frac{8b^2}{1 - 2\alpha^2}.$$

Define two numbers m, s as

$$(7.25) \quad m = \alpha^2 \frac{T^2}{2} + 2b^2, \quad s = \frac{T^2}{4} \left[(1 - 2\alpha^2) - \frac{8b^2}{T^2} \right].$$

Suppose that the number $\delta_0 \in (0, 1)$ is so small that

$$(7.26) \quad \ln(\delta_0^{-1/m}) \geq \lambda_2.$$

For every $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$, let $\lambda = \lambda(\delta) = \ln(\delta^{-1/m})$. Following (6.3), choose the regularization parameter ξ as

$$(7.27) \quad \xi(\delta) = 2 \exp\left(-\lambda(\delta) \frac{T^2}{4}\right).$$

Then the following convergence estimate holds:

$$(7.28) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\beta_{n,\lambda(\delta),\delta} - \beta^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\gamma_{n,\lambda(\delta),\delta} - \gamma^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \\ & \leq \alpha^{-1} (C_1/\lambda(\delta))^n \exp([\lambda(\delta) (\alpha^2 T^2/2 + 2b^2)]) \times \\ & \times \left[\left\| \nabla \left(\widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda,\xi} + F \right) - \nabla W^* \right\|_{L^2_3(Q_T)}^2 + \left\| \left(\widetilde{W}_{0,\min,\lambda,\xi} + F \right) - W^* \right\|_{L^2(Q_T)}^2 \right] \\ & \quad + C_1 \alpha^{-1} \delta^\rho, \end{aligned}$$

for any $\alpha \in (0, 1/\sqrt{2})$, where $\rho = \max(1, s/m)$.

Proof. Since $Q_{\alpha T} \subset Q_T$, then, using (4.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_T} \left[(\beta_{n,\lambda,\delta}(\mathbf{x}) - \beta^*(\mathbf{x}))^2 + (\gamma_{n,\lambda,\delta}(\mathbf{x}) - \gamma^*(\mathbf{x}))^2 \right] \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} dt \geq \\ & \geq e^{-2\lambda b^2} \int_{Q_{\alpha T}} \left[(\beta_{n,\lambda,\delta}(\mathbf{x}) - \beta^*(\mathbf{x}))^2 + (\gamma_{n,\lambda,\delta}(\mathbf{x}) - \gamma^*(\mathbf{x}))^2 \right] \varphi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, t) \, d\mathbf{x} dt \geq \\ & \geq \alpha C_1 e^{-2\lambda b^2} \exp(-\lambda \alpha^2 T^2/2) \left(\|\beta_{n,\lambda(\delta),\delta} - \beta^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\gamma_{n,\lambda(\delta),\delta} - \gamma^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (7.11), (7.24)-(7.27), we obtain

$$(7.29) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\beta_{n,\lambda(\delta),\delta} - \beta^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\gamma_{n,\lambda(\delta),\delta} - \gamma^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \alpha^{-1} C_1 e^{-\lambda s} + \\ & \quad + \alpha^{-1} C_1 e^{2\lambda b^2} \exp(-\lambda \alpha^2 T^2/2) \delta^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the above choice $\lambda = \lambda(\delta)$ terms in the right hand side of (7.29) are:

$$e^{2\lambda b^2} \exp(-\lambda\alpha^2 T^2/2) \delta^2 = \delta, \quad e^{-\lambda s} = \delta^{s/m}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

We now formulate an analogous theorem for the case when conditions of Theorem 7.2 are valid.

THEOREM 7.4. *Let conditions of Theorem 7.2 hold. Assume that inequality (7.24) is valid and let s be the number defined in (7.25). Let the regularization parameter $\xi = 2 \exp(-\lambda T^2/4)$. Then the following convergence estimate holds for any $\alpha \in (0, 1/\sqrt{2})$ and for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\beta_{n,\lambda} - \beta^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\gamma_{n,\lambda} - \gamma^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \\ & \leq \alpha^{-1} (C_1/\lambda)^n \exp([\lambda(\alpha^2 T^2/2 + 2b^2)]) \times \\ & \times \left[\|\nabla W_{0,\min,\lambda,\xi} - \nabla W^*\|_{L^2_2(Q_T)}^2 + \|W_{0,\min,\lambda,\xi} - W^*\|_{L^2(Q_T)}^2 \right] + C_1 e^{-\lambda s}. \end{aligned}$$

We omit the proof of this theorem since it is similar with the proof of Theorem 7.3.

8. Numerical Studies. In this section, we discuss some tests, which demonstrate the numerical performance of the method. We note first that even though our Theorems 7.1-7.4 require sufficiently large values of $\lambda > 1$, we establish numerically in subsection 8.1 that $\lambda = 5$ can be chosen as an optimal value of this parameter. This coincides with the observation of many past publications on the convexification method: we refer to e.g. [3, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18], in which optimal values of λ were $\lambda \in [1, 5]$. This is similar with many cases of the asymptotic theories. Indeed, such a theory sometimes states that if a certain parameter X is sufficiently large, then a certain formula Y has a good accuracy. However, in a computational practice only results of numerical experiments can establish what exactly ‘‘sufficiently large X ’’ means in computations.

To demonstrate the fact that our method can image rather complicated shapes of inclusions, we choose letters-like shapes of inclusions. More precisely, our shapes mimic letters A, M, Ω and B . Indeed, these shapes are non-convex and have voids. We are not concerned with the accurate imaging of the fine structures of edges. Instead, we want to compute rather accurately just shapes of inclusions and values of the unknown coefficients $\beta(\mathbf{x})$ and $\gamma(\mathbf{x})$.

8.1. Numerical setup. In our numerical simulations, the domain $\Omega = \{\mathbf{x} = (x, y) : 1 < x < 2, |y| < 0.5\}$ and $T = 1$ is the end time. The larger domain G , where the forward problem (2.7)- (2.11) is computed to generate data for the inverse problem, is $G = \{\mathbf{x} = (x, y) : (x - 1.5)^2 + y^2 < 1\}$. The viscosity term is $d = 0.1$, the velocities are $q_s = q_I = q_R = (0.2, 0.2)^T$. The Neumann boundary conditions (2.10) and the initial conditions (2.11) are chosen as:

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(\mathbf{x}, t) &= g_2(\mathbf{x}, t) = g_3(\mathbf{x}, t) = 0, \\ \rho_S^0(\mathbf{x}) &= 0.6, \quad \rho_I^0(\mathbf{x}) = 0.8, \quad \rho_R^0(\mathbf{x}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

To solve the forward problem, we use the PDE Toolbox in MATLAB to implement a Finite Element Method with the maximal mesh edge length 0.05. We compute the data $r_j, f_j, j = 1, 2, 3$ in (2.15), (2.16) for eleven (11) equally spaced temporal points on $[0, T]$.

In all our numerical experiments $\beta(\mathbf{x}) = \gamma(\mathbf{x}) = 0.1$ in the data simulation process in the part of the domain G , which is outside of our letters-like shapes. However, when computing the inverse problems, we assume that functions $\beta(\mathbf{x})$ are $\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ unknown in the entire domain Ω , see (2.4).

To solve the inverse problem, we write the differential operators of the objective functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}$ in (5.11) in the form of finite differences and minimize the so discretized functional with respect to the values of the vector function W at grid points. More precisely, we discretize Ω into a 33×33 meshgrid of equal edge length and $[0, T]$ into 11 equally spaced points. The data generated by the forward solver are interpolated correspondingly to fit this mesh. We then add noise to the data using different noise levels. For $j = 1, 2, 3$, let \mathbf{P}_j , \mathbf{R}_j , \mathbf{F}_j be the discretized matrices of $p_j(\mathbf{x})$, $r_j(\mathbf{x}, t)$, $f_j(y, t)$, respectively. These functions are defined in (2.14)-(2.16). We use the following noise model: given a matrix \mathbf{A} , the noisy version of \mathbf{A} is

$$\mathbf{A}^{\text{noise}} = \mathbf{A} + \delta \|\mathbf{A}\|_{\infty} \text{Rand}(\mathbf{A}),$$

where $\text{Rand}(\mathbf{A})$ is a matrix of the same size as \mathbf{A} whose entries are uniformly generated random numbers on $(-1, 1)$, $\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\infty} := \max_{ij} |\mathbf{A}_{ij}|$ is the infinity norm of \mathbf{A} , and $\delta \in [0, 1)$ is the noise level. Since we need to differentiate the data $r_j(\mathbf{x}, t)$, $f_j(y, t)$ twice with respect to t , we first use cubic smoothing splines to approximate the noisy data, then differentiate these splines with respect to t . We proceed similarly to compute the required derivatives of $p_j(\mathbf{x})$. The regularization parameter $\xi = 10^{-2}$ is chosen by trial and error. For simplicity, we implement the $H_6^2(Q_T)$ -norm for the regularization term instead of the $H_6^4(Q_T)$ -norm as in the theory. We observe numerically that the $H_6^2(Q_T)$ norm yields sufficiently good results.

To minimize the discretized functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}$, we use the `lsqlin` function of MATLAB. This is a function in the Optimization Toolbox designed to solve linear problems using the least squares methods. We stop the iterative process when the difference between the solutions of the current step and the previous step is less than 10^{-5} . This stopping criterion is reached within 5 iterations in all our numerical experiments.

We select the parameter of the Carleman Weight Function $\lambda = 5$. See Figure 1 for an experiment for different values of λ . In this experiment, we run our method to reconstruct γ , and $\lambda = 5$ gives the best result in terms of both shape and value of γ . It is worth noting that the method fails when $\lambda = 0$, i.e. in the case when the CWF is absent in the objective functional $J_{n,\lambda,\xi}$. This further justifies the above theory since analogs of all our theorems are invalid at $\lambda = 0$. We point out that, once chosen, the value $\lambda = 5$ is used in all other tests.

8.2. Testing for different noise levels. In this test, we consider γ and β be as follows,

$$\gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 0.4 & x \text{ inside of 'A'} \\ 0.1 & x \text{ outside of 'A'} \end{cases}, \quad \beta(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 0.6 & x \text{ inside of 'M'} \\ 0.1 & x \text{ outside of 'M'} \end{cases}.$$

Figures 2 and 3 show the reconstructions of γ and β for at different noise levels: $\delta = 0$, $\delta = 2\%$, and $\delta = 5\%$. We obtain good reconstructions of both the shape and the values of the unknown coefficients for the letters at lower noise levels. When noise is 5%, the reconstruction of the letter 'M' is distorted, but we can still see the general shape and reasonable value.

8.3. Testing of different unknown coefficients. In this test, our method reconstructs different functions $\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ and $\beta(\mathbf{x})$. The noise level for this test is $\delta = 2\%$.




Fig. 1: Experiment with different values of λ . We choose $\lambda = 5$ as an optimal value of λ . This value is used in all other tests.




Fig. 2: Reconstruction of γ (letter “A”) at different noise levels.

We consider two cases:

$$\gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 0.4 & x \text{ inside } \Omega' \\ 0.1 & x \text{ outside } \Omega' \end{cases}, \quad \beta(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 0.6 & x \text{ inside } B' \\ 0.1 & x \text{ outside } B' \end{cases}$$




Fig. 3: Reconstruction of β (letter “M”) at different noise levels.

and

$$\gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 0.8 & x \text{ inside } \Omega \\ 0.1 & x \text{ outside } \Omega \end{cases}, \quad \beta(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \text{ inside } B \\ 0.1 & x \text{ outside } B \end{cases},$$

see Figures 4 and 5, respectively. Even with different shapes and values of γ and β , our method still performs quite well.

Acknowledgments. The work of M. V. Klibanov was partially supported by National Science Foundation grant DMS 2436227.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. ASADZADEH AND L. BEILINA, *Stability and convergence analysis of a domain decomposition fe/fd method for maxwell’s equations in the time domain*, Algorithms, 15 (2022), p. 337, <https://doi.org/10.1137/140951758>.
- [2] M. ASADZADEH AND L. BEILINA, *A stabilized p1 domain decomposition finite element method for time harmonic maxwell’s equations*, Math. Comput. Simul, 204 (2023), pp. 556–574.
- [3] A. B. BAKUSHINSKII, M. V. KLIBANOV, AND N. A. KOSHEV, *Carleman weight functions for a globally convergent numerical method for ill-posed cauchy problems for some quasilinear pdes*, Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications, 34 (2017), pp. 201–224.
- [4] L. BEILINA, M. G. ARAM, AND E. M. KARCHEVSKII, *An adaptive finite element method for solving 3d electromagnetic volume integral equation with applications in microwave thermometry*, Journal of Computational Physics, 459 (2022), p. 111122.
- [5] G. CHAVENT, *Nonlinear Least Squares for Inverse Problems: Theoretical Foundations and Step-by-Step Guide for Applications*, Springer Science & Business Media, New York, 2009.
- [6] A. V. GONCHARSKY AND S. Y. ROMANOV, *Iterative methods for solving coefficient inverse problems of wave tomography in models with attenuation*, Inverse Probl., 33 (2017), p. 025003.
- [7] A. V. GONCHARSKY AND S. Y. ROMANOV, *A method of solving the coefficient inverse problems of wave tomography*, Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications, 77 (2019), pp. 967–980.
- [8] W. O. KERMACK AND A. G. MCKENDRICK, *A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A, 115 (1927), pp. 700–721.
- [9] M. KLIBANOV AND J. LI, *Inverse Problems and Carleman Estimates: Global Uniqueness, Global Convergence and Experimental Data*, De Gruyter, 2021.




Fig. 4: Reconstruction of γ (letter “ Ω ”) and β (letter “B”) with values 0.4 and 0.6 respectively inside these shapes and 0.1 outside at 2% of the noise.

- [10] M. KLIBANOV, J. LI, AND Z. YANG, *Spatiotemporal monitoring of epidemics via solution of a coefficient inverse problem*, arXiv: 2401.02070, (2024).
- [11] M. V. KLIBANOV AND O. V. IOUSSOUPOVA, *Uniform strict convexity of a cost functional for three-dimensional inverse scattering problem*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 26 (1995), pp. 147–179.
- [12] M. V. KLIBANOV, V. A. KHOA, A. V. SMIRNOV, L. H. NGUYEN, G. W. BIDNEY, L. NGUYEN, A. SULLIVAN, AND V. N. ASTRATOV, *Convexification inversion method for nonlinear SAR imaging with experimentally collected data*, J. Appl. Ind. Math., 15 (2021), pp. 413–436.
- [13] M. V. KLIBANOV, J. LI, L. H. NGUYEN, AND Z. YANG, *Convexification numerical method for a coefficient inverse problem for the radiative transport equation*, SIAM J. Imag. Sci., 16 (2023), pp. 35–63.
- [14] M. V. KLIBANOV AND A. A. TIMONOV, *Carleman Estimates and Coefficient Inverse Problems and Numerical Applications*, VSP, Utrecht, 2004.
- [15] O. A. LADYZHENSKAYA, V. A. SOLONNIKOV, AND N. N. URALCEVA, *Linear and Quasilinear Equations of Parabolic Type*, AMS, Providence, R.I., 1968.
- [16] R. LATTES AND J.-L. LIONS, *The Method of Quasi-Reversibility: Applications to Partial Differential Equations*, Elsevier, New York, 1969.
- [17] M. M. LAVRENTIEV, V. G. ROMANOV, AND S. P. SHISHATSKII, *Ill-Posed Problems of Mathematical Physics and Analysis*, AMS, Providence, R. I., 1986.
- [18] T. T. LE, M. V. KLIBANOV, L. H. NGUYEN, A. SULLIVAN, AND L. NGUYEN, *Carleman contraction mapping for a 1d inverse scattering problem with experimental time-dependent data*, Inverse Problems, 38 (2022), p. 045002.
- [19] T. T. LE AND L. H. NGUYEN, *A convergent numerical method to recover the initial condition of nonlinear parabolic equations from lateral cauchy data*, Journal of Ill-posed and Inverse Problems, 30 (2022), pp. 256–286.
- [20] W. LEE, S. LIU, H. TEMBINE, W. LI, AND S. OSHER, *Controlling propagation of epidemics via mean-field control*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 81 (2021), pp. 190–207.
- [21] L. H. NGUYEN, *The carleman contraction mapping method for quasilinear elliptic equations with over-determined boundary data*, Acta Math. Vietnam., 48 (2023), pp. 401–422.
- [22] L. H. NGUYEN AND M. V. KLIBANOV, *Carleman estimates and the contraction principle for an inverse source problem for nonlinear hyperbolic equations*, Inverse Problems, 38 (2022), p. 035009.
- [23] R. G. NOVIKOV, *The inverse scattering problem on a fixed energy level for the two-dimensional*




Fig. 5: Reconstruction of γ (letter “ Ω ”) and β (letter “B”) with values 0.8 and 1 respectively inside these shapes and 0.1 outside at 2% of the noise.

- schrödinger operator*, J. Funct. Anal., 103 (1992), pp. 409–463.
- [24] R. G. NOVIKOV, *The $\bar{\partial}$ -approach to approximate inverse scattering at fixed energy in three dimensions*, International Math. Research Reports, 6 (2005), pp. 287–349.
- [25] V. G. ROMANOV, *Inverse Problems of Mathematical Physics*, VNU Press, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 1986.
- [26] A. N. TIKHONOV, A. V. GONCHARSKY, V. V. STEPANOV, AND A. G. YAGOLA, *Numerical methods for the solution of ill-posed problems*, Kluwer, London, 1995.