

Controllability for a one-dimensional wave equation in a non-cylindrical domain

Isaías Pereira de Jesus^{a,*}

^a *Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal do Piauí, 64049-550, Teresina, PI, Brazil*

Abstract

This paper deals with the controllability for a one-dimensional wave equation with mixed boundary conditions in a non-cylindrical domain. This equation models small vibrations of a string where an endpoint is fixed and the other is moving. As usual, we consider one main control (the leader) and an additional secondary control (the follower). We use Stackelberg-Nash strategies.

Keywords: Wave equation; Hierarchic control; Stackelberg-Nash strategy; Controllability.

2000 MSC: 35Q10, 35B37, 35B40

1. Introduction and main result

There are plenty of situations where several controls are required in order to drive a system to one or more objectives. Usually, if we assign different roles to the controls, we speak of *hierarchic control*. The concept of hierarchic control in the context of hyperbolic PDEs was introduced in [1] when the author analyzed the approximate controllability for a system associated with a wave equation. There, he considered one main control (the leader) and an additional secondary control (the follower).

In [2, 3], the hierarchic control of a parabolic PDE and the Stokes systems have been analyzed and used to solve an approximate controllability problem. In [4, 5], a strategy has been used to deduce the exact controllability (to trajectories) for a parabolic PDE. Recently, in [6], the authors studied a hierarchic control problem for a hyperbolic PDE.

*Corresponding author. Phone: +55 (86) 3215-5835

Email address: isaias@ufpi.edu.br (Isaías Pereira de Jesus)

In this article, motivated by the arguments contained in the work of J.-L. Lions [1], we investigate a similar question of hierarchic control for the wave equation, employing the Stackelberg strategy in the case of time dependent domains.

In spite of the vast literature on the controllability problems of the wave equation in cylindrical domains, there are only a few works dealing with non-cylindrical case. We refer to [7, 8, 9, 10] for some known results in this direction.

Some other basic references on controllability can be found in [11] and [12].

The novelty of this paper relies on the consideration of moving boundaries. The approach proposed consists in a suitable change transforming a system written over a moving domain into an equivalent system written over a fixed domain.

1.1. Statement of the problem

As in [13], given $T > 0$, we consider the non-cylindrical domain defined by

$$\widehat{Q} = \{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2; 0 < x < \alpha_k(t); t \in (0, T)\},$$

where

$$\alpha_k(t) = 1 + kt, \quad 0 < k < 1.$$

Its lateral boundary is defined by $\widehat{\Sigma} = \widehat{\Sigma}_0 \cup \widehat{\Sigma}_0^*$, with

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_0^* = \{(\alpha_k(t), t); t \in (0, T)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\Sigma}_0 = \widehat{\Sigma} \setminus \widehat{\Sigma}_0^* = \{(0, t); t \in (0, T)\}.$$

We also represent by Ω_t and Ω_0 the intervals $(0, \alpha_k(t))$ and $(0, 1)$, respectively.

Consider the following wave equation in the non-cylindrical domain \widehat{Q} :

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u'' - u_{xx} = 0 \quad \text{in } \widehat{Q}, \\ u(x, t) = \begin{cases} \tilde{w}(t) & \text{on } \widehat{\Sigma}_0^*, \\ 0 & \text{on } \widehat{\Sigma}_0, \end{cases} \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad u'(x, 0) = u_1(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega_0, \end{array} \right. \quad (1.1)$$

where u is the state variable, \tilde{w} is the control variable and $(u_0(x), u_1(x)) \in L^2(0, 1) \times H^{-1}(0, 1)$. By $u' = u'(x, t)$ we represent the derivative $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ and by $u_{xx} = u_{xx}(x, t)$ the second order partial derivative $\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}$. Equation (1.1)

models the motion of a string where an endpoint is fixed and the other one is moving. The constant k is called the speed of the moving endpoint.

The main goal of this article is to analyze the hierarchic control of (1.1) and, in particular, to prove that the Stackelberg-Nash strategy allows to solve the approximate controllability problem.

The control system of this paper is similar to that of [14]. But motivated by [13], the control is put on a different boundary. To overcome the difficulties, we transform the system (1.1) into an equivalent wave equation with variable coefficients in the cylindrical domain and establish the approximate controllability of this equation by Holmgren's Uniqueness Theorem.

Following the work of J.-L. Lions [1], we divide $\widehat{\Sigma}_0^*$ into two parts

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_0^* = \widehat{\Sigma}_1 \cup \widehat{\Sigma}_2, \quad (1.2)$$

and consider

$$\tilde{w} = \{\tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2\}, \quad \tilde{w}_i = \text{control function in } L^2(\widehat{\Sigma}_i), \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (1.3)$$

Thus, we observe that the system (1.1) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u'' - u_{xx} = 0 \quad \text{in } \widehat{Q}, \\ u(x, t) = \begin{cases} \tilde{w}_1(t) & \text{on } \widehat{\Sigma}_1, \\ \tilde{w}_2(t) & \text{on } \widehat{\Sigma}_2, \\ 0 & \text{on } \widehat{\Sigma} \setminus \widehat{\Sigma}_0^*, \end{cases} \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad u'(x, 0) = u_1(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega_0. \end{array} \right. \quad (1.4)$$

In the decomposition (1.2), (1.3) we establish a hierarchy. We think of \tilde{w}_1 as being the “main” control, the leader, and we think of \tilde{w}_2 as the follower, in Stackelberg terminology.

Let us define the following secondary cost functional

$$\tilde{J}_2(\tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2) = \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\widehat{Q}} (u(\tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2) - \tilde{u}_2)^2 dxdt + \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{2} \int_{\widehat{\Sigma}_2} \tilde{w}_2^2 d\widehat{\Sigma}, \quad (1.5)$$

and the main cost functional

$$\tilde{J}(\tilde{w}_1) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\widehat{\Sigma}_1} \tilde{w}_1^2 d\widehat{\Sigma}, \quad (1.6)$$

where $\tilde{\sigma} > 0$ is a constant and \tilde{u}_2 is a given function in $L^2(\widehat{Q})$.

Remark 1.1. *From the regularity and uniqueness of the solution of (1.4) (see Remark (1.3)) the cost functionals \tilde{J}_2 and \tilde{J} are well defined.*

Now, let us describe the Stackelberg-Nash strategy. Thus, for each choice of the leader \tilde{w}_1 , we try to find a Nash equilibrium for the cost functional \tilde{J}_2 , that is, we look for a control $\tilde{w}_2 = \mathfrak{F}(\tilde{w}_1)$, depending on \tilde{w}_1 , satisfying:

$$\tilde{J}_2(\tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2) = \inf_{\hat{w}_2 \in L^2(\hat{\Sigma}_2)} \tilde{J}_2(\tilde{w}_1, \hat{w}_2). \quad (1.7)$$

After this, we consider the state $u(\tilde{w}_1, \mathfrak{F}(\tilde{w}_1))$ given by the solution of

$$\begin{cases} u'' - u_{xx} = 0 & \text{in } \hat{Q}, \\ u(x, t) = \begin{cases} \tilde{w}_1 & \text{on } \hat{\Sigma}_1, \\ \mathfrak{F}(\tilde{w}_1) & \text{on } \hat{\Sigma}_2, \\ 0 & \text{on } \hat{\Sigma} \setminus \hat{\Sigma}_0^*, \end{cases} \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad u'(x, 0) = u_1(x) & \text{in } \Omega_0. \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

We will look for any optimal control \tilde{w}_1 such that

$$\tilde{J}(\tilde{w}_1, \mathfrak{F}(\tilde{w}_1)) = \inf_{\bar{w}_1 \in L^2(\hat{\Sigma}_1)} \tilde{J}(\bar{w}_1, \mathfrak{F}(\tilde{w}_1)), \quad (1.9)$$

subject to the following restriction of the approximate controllability type

$$(u(x, T; \tilde{w}_1, \mathfrak{F}(\tilde{w}_1)), u'(x, T; \tilde{w}_1, \mathfrak{F}(\tilde{w}_1))) \in B_{L^2(\Omega_T)}(u^0, \rho_0) \times B_{H^{-1}(\Omega_T)}(u^1, \rho_1), \quad (1.10)$$

where $B_X(C, r)$ denotes the ball in X with center C and radius r .

To explain this optimal problem, we are going to consider the following sub-problems:

- **Problem 1** Fixed any leader control \tilde{w}_1 , find the follower control $\tilde{w}_2 = \mathfrak{F}(\tilde{w}_1)$ (depending on \tilde{w}_1) and the associated state u , solution of (1.4) satisfying the condition (1.7) (Nash equilibrium) related to \tilde{J}_2 , defined in (1.5).

- **Problem 2** Assuming that the existence of the Nash equilibrium \tilde{w}_2 was proved, then when \tilde{w}_1 varies in $L^2(\hat{\Sigma}_1)$, prove that the solutions $(u(x, t; \tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2), u'(x, t; \tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2))$ of the state equation (1.4), evaluated at $t = T$, that is, $(u(x, T; \tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2), u'(x, T; \tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2))$, generate a dense subset of $L^2(\Omega_T) \times H^{-1}(\Omega_T)$.

Remark 1.2. By the linearity of system (1.8), without loss of generality we may assume that $u_0 = 0 = u_1$.

1.2. *Reduction to controllability problem in a cylindrical domain*

When $0 < k < 1$, in order to prove the main result of this paper (Theorem 1.1), we first transform (1.1) into a wave equation with variable coefficients in a cylindrical domain.

For this, we divide Σ_0^* into two parts

$$\Sigma_0^* = \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2, \quad (1.11)$$

and consider

$$w = \{w_1, w_2\}, \quad w_i = \text{control function in } L^2(\Sigma_i), \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (1.12)$$

We can also write

$$w = w_1 + w_2, \quad \text{with } \Sigma_0^* = \Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2. \quad (1.13)$$

Note that when (x, t) varies in \widehat{Q} the point (y, t) , with $y = \frac{x}{\alpha_k(t)}$, varies in $Q = \Omega \times (0, T)$, where $\Omega = (0, 1)$. Then, the application

$$\zeta : \widehat{Q} \rightarrow Q, \quad \zeta(x, t) = (y, t)$$

is of class C^2 and the inverse ζ^{-1} is also of class C^2 . Observe that in (1.13) $\Sigma_i = \zeta(\widehat{\Sigma}_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$). Therefore the change of variables $u(x, t) = v(y, t)$, transforms the initial-boundary value problem (1.4) into the equivalent system

$$\left| \begin{array}{l} v'' + Lv = 0 \quad \text{in } Q, \\ v(y, t) = \begin{cases} w_1 & \text{on } \Sigma_1, \\ w_2 & \text{on } \Sigma_2, \\ 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_0^*, \end{cases} \\ v(y, 0) = v_0(y), \quad v'(y, 0) = v_1(y), \quad y \in \Omega, \end{array} \right. \quad (1.14)$$

where

$$\begin{cases}
Lv = - \left[\frac{\beta_k(y, t)}{\alpha_k(t)} v_y \right]_y + \frac{\gamma_k(y)}{\alpha_k(t)} v'_y, \\
\beta_k(y, t) = \frac{1 - k^2 y^2}{\alpha_k(t)}, \\
\gamma_k(y) = -2ky, \\
v_0(y) = u_0(x), \\
v_1(y) = u_1(x) + ky u_x(0), \\
\Sigma = \Sigma_0 \cup \Sigma_0^*, \\
\Sigma_0 = \{(0, t) : 0 < t < T\}, \\
\Sigma_0^* = \{(1, t) : 0 < t < T\}, \\
\Sigma_0^* = \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2.
\end{cases}$$

We consider the coefficients of the operator L satisfying the following conditions:

(H1) $\beta_k(y, t) \in C^1(\overline{Q})$;

(H2) $\gamma_k(y) \in W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)$.

Remark 1.3. *By a similar method used in [15], we get that for any given $(v_0, v_1) \in L^2(\Omega) \times H^{-1}(\Omega)$ and $w_i \in L^2(\widehat{\Sigma}_i)$, (1.14) admits a unique solution in the sense of transposition, with $v \in C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0, T]; H^{-1}(\Omega))$.*

Using the diffeomorphism $\zeta^{-1}(y, t) = (x, t)$, from Q onto \widehat{Q} , we obtain a unique global weak solution u to the problem (1.4) with the regularity $u \in C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega_t)) \cap C^1([0, T]; H^{-1}(\Omega_t))$.

• **Cost functionals in the cylinder Q .** From the diffeomorphism ζ , which transforms \widehat{Q} into Q , we transform the cost functionals $\widetilde{J}_2, \widetilde{J}$ into the cost functionals J_2, J defined by

$$J_2(w_1, w_2) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t) [v(w_1, w_2) - v_2(y, t)]^2 dy dt + \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2^2 d\Sigma \tag{1.15}$$

and

$$J(w_1) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_1} w_1^2 d\Sigma, \tag{1.16}$$

where $\sigma > 0$ is a constant and $v_2(y, t)$ is a given function in $L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))$.

Associated with the functionals J_2 and J defined above, we will consider the following sub-problems:

• **Problem 3** Fixed any leader control w_1 , find the follower control w_2 (depending on w_1) and the associated state v solution of (1.14) satisfying (Nash equilibrium)

$$J_2(w_1, w_2) = \inf_{\hat{w}_2 \in L^2(\Sigma_2)} J_2(w_1, \hat{w}_2), \quad (1.17)$$

related to J_2 defined in (1.15).

• **Problem 4** Assuming that the existence of the Nash equilibrium w_2 was proved, then when w_1 varies in $L^2(\Sigma_1)$, prove that the solutions $(v(y, t; w_1, w_2), v'(y, t; w_1, w_2))$ of the state equation (1.14), evaluated at $t = T$, that is, $(v(y, T; w_1, w_2), v'(y, T; w_1, w_2))$, generate a dense subset of $L^2(\Omega) \times H^{-1}(\Omega)$.

The main result of this paper is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that (3.3) and (3.4) hold. Let us consider $w_1 \in L^2(\Sigma_1)$ and w_2 a Nash equilibrium in the sense (1.17). Then $(v(T), v'(T)) = (v(\cdot, T, w_1, w_2), v'(\cdot, T, w_1, w_2))$, where v solves the system (1.14), generates a dense subset of $L^2(\Omega) \times H^{-1}(\Omega)$.*

The contents of this paper are organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to establish the existence and uniqueness of Nash equilibrium. In Section 3, we investigate the approximate controllability proving the density Theorem 1.1. In Section 4, we present the optimality system for the leader control. Finally, we present some additional comments and questions in Section 5.

2. Nash equilibrium

In this section, fixed any leader control $w_1 \in L^2(\Sigma_1)$ we determine the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the problem

$$\inf_{w_2 \in L^2(\Sigma_2)} J_2(w_1, w_2), \quad (2.1)$$

and a characterization of this solution in terms of an adjoint system.

In fact, this is a classical type problem in the control of distributed systems (cf. J.-L. Lions [16]). It admits a unique solution

$$w_2 = \mathfrak{F}(w_1). \quad (2.2)$$

Indeed, for solution of the problem (2.1), we will minimize the functional J_2 . For this, we consider $\mathcal{U}_{ad} = \{(v, w_2) \in L^2(Q) \times L^2(\Sigma_2) : v \text{ solution of (1.14)}\}$ and $J_2 : \mathcal{U}_{ad} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by (1.15). We write $v = v(w_1, w_2)$ and prove the following items:

- (a) \mathcal{U}_{ad} is non-empty, closed convex subset of $L^2(Q) \times L^2(\Sigma_2)$.
- (b) J_2 is weakly coercive.

In fact, using the triangle inequality, we have

$$\|v - v_2\|_{L^2(Q)} \geq \left| \|v\|_{L^2(Q)} - \|v_2\|_{L^2(Q)} \right|$$

and as v_2 is fixed, it follows that

$$\lim_{\substack{\|v\|_{L^2(Q)} \rightarrow \infty \\ \|w_2\|_{L^2(\Sigma_2)} \rightarrow \infty}} J_2(v, w_2) = \frac{1}{2} \|(\alpha_k(t))^{\frac{1}{2}}(v - v_2)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|w_2\|_{L^2(\Sigma_2)}^2 \rightarrow \infty.$$

- (c) J_2 is weakly sequentially lower semicontinuous.

Indeed, as \mathcal{U}_{ad} is a closed subset of Hilbert space $L^2(Q) \times L^2(\Sigma_2)$ then $(v, w_2) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$. We consider two sequences $(v^n) \subset L^2(Q)$ and $(w_2^n) \subset L^2(\Sigma_2)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} v^n &\rightharpoonup v && \text{in } L^2(Q) \\ w_2^n &\rightharpoonup w_2 && \text{in } L^2(\Sigma_2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \|(\alpha_k(t))^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^n - v_2)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|(\alpha_k(t))^{\frac{1}{2}}(v - v_2)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2$$

and

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|w_2^n\|_{L^2(\Sigma_2)}^2 \geq \|w_2\|_{L^2(\Sigma_2)}^2.$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_2(v^n, w_2^n) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|(\alpha_k(t))^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^n - v_2)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|w_2^n\|_{L^2(\Sigma_2)}^2 \right\} \\ &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|(\alpha_k(t))^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^n - v_2)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{\sigma}{2} \|w_2^n\|_{L^2(\Sigma_2)}^2 \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|(\alpha_k(t))^{\frac{1}{2}}(v - v_2)\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 + \frac{\sigma}{2} \|w_2\|_{L^2(\Sigma_2)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_2(v^n, w_2^n) \geq J_2(v, w_2).$$

(d) J_2 is strictly convex.

In fact, we consider $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $(v, w_2), (\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}_2) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$ with $(v, w_2) \neq (\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}_2)$. Writing $v_2 = \lambda v + (1 - \lambda)\tilde{v}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & J_2[\lambda(v, w_2) + (1 - \lambda)(\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}_2)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t) [\lambda v + (1 - \lambda)\tilde{v} - v_2]^2 dy dt \\ &+ \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} [\lambda w_2 + (1 - \lambda)\tilde{w}_2]^2 d\Sigma \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t) [\lambda v + (1 - \lambda)\tilde{v} - \lambda v_2 - (1 - \lambda)v_2]^2 dy dt \quad (2.3) \\ &+ \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} [\lambda w_2 + (1 - \lambda)\tilde{w}_2]^2 d\Sigma \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t) [\lambda(v - v_2) + (1 - \lambda)(\tilde{v} - v_2)]^2 dy dt \\ &+ \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} [\lambda w_2 + (1 - \lambda)\tilde{w}_2]^2 d\Sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Expanding the expression after the last equal sign in (2.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t) (v - v_2)^2 dy dt \\ &+ \lambda(1 - \lambda) \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t) \underbrace{(v - v_2)(\tilde{v} - v_2)}_{(*)} dy dt \quad (2.4) \\ &+ \frac{(1 - \lambda)^2}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t) (\tilde{v} - v_2)^2 dy dt + \frac{\sigma \lambda^2}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2^2 d\Sigma \\ &+ \sigma \lambda(1 - \lambda) \int_{\Sigma_2} \underbrace{w_2 \tilde{w}_2}_{(**)} d\Sigma + \frac{\sigma(1 - \lambda)^2}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} \tilde{w}_2^2 d\Sigma. \end{aligned}$$

After applying Young's inequality to (*) and noting that $\lambda(1 - \lambda) > 0$,

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lambda(1-\lambda) \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v-v_2)(\tilde{v}-v_2) dy dt \\
& < \frac{\lambda(1-\lambda)}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v-v_2)^2 dy dt \\
& + \frac{\lambda(1-\lambda)}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(\tilde{v}-v_2)^2 dy dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Similarly, we estimate (**) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sigma \lambda(1-\lambda) \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2 \tilde{w}_2 d\Sigma < \frac{\sigma \lambda(1-\lambda)}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2^2 d\Sigma \\
& + \frac{\sigma \lambda(1-\lambda)}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} \tilde{w}_2^2 d\Sigma.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Substituting (2.5) and (2.6) into the right-hand side of (2.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& J_2[\lambda(v, w_2) + (1-\lambda)(\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}_2)] \\
& < \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v-v_2)^2 dy dt \\
& + \frac{\lambda(1-\lambda)}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v-v_2)^2 dy dt \\
& + \frac{\lambda(1-\lambda)}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(\tilde{v}-v_2)^2 dy dt \\
& + \frac{(1-\lambda)^2}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(\tilde{v}-v_2)^2 dy dt + \frac{\sigma \lambda^2}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2^2 d\Sigma \\
& + \frac{\sigma \lambda(1-\lambda)}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2^2 d\Sigma + \frac{\sigma \lambda(1-\lambda)}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} \tilde{w}_2^2 d\Sigma \\
& + \frac{\sigma(1-\lambda)^2}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} \tilde{w}_2^2 d\Sigma = \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v-v_2)^2 dy dt + \frac{\sigma \lambda}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2^2 d\Sigma \\
& + \frac{(1-\lambda)}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(\tilde{v}-v_2)^2 dy dt + \frac{\sigma(1-\lambda)}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} \tilde{w}_2^2 d\Sigma \\
& = \lambda \left[\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v-v_2)^2 dy dt + \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2^2 d\Sigma \right] \\
& + (1-\lambda) \left[\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(\tilde{v}-v_2)^2 dy dt + \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} \tilde{w}_2^2 d\Sigma \right] \\
& = \lambda J_2(v, w_2) + (1-\lambda) J_2(\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}_2),
\end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$J_2[\lambda(v, w_2) + (1 - \lambda)(\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}_2)] < \lambda J_2(v, w_2) + (1 - \lambda)J_2(\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}_2).$$

Now, we will calculate the Gateaux derivative of the functional (1.15). For $\theta_1 \in L^2(\Omega \times (0, T))$, $\theta_2 \in L^2(\Sigma_2)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_2'(v, w_2) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left\{ J_2(v + \varepsilon\theta_1, w_2 + \varepsilon\theta_2) - J_2(v, w_2) \right\} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v + \varepsilon\theta_1 - v_2)^2 dy dt + \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} (w_2 + \varepsilon\theta_2)^2 d\Sigma \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v - v_2)^2 dy dt - \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2^2 d\Sigma \right\} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t) \left[(v - v_2)^2 + 2\varepsilon\theta_1(v - v_2) + \varepsilon^2\theta_1^2 \right] dy dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} (w_2 + \varepsilon\theta_2)^2 d\Sigma - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v - v_2)^2 dy dt - \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2^2 d\Sigma \right\} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v - v_2)^2 dy dt + \varepsilon \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v - v_2)\theta_1 dy dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)\theta_1^2 dy dt + \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2^2 d\Sigma + \varepsilon\sigma \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2\theta_2 d\Sigma + \frac{\sigma}{2} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\Sigma_2} \theta_2^2 d\Sigma \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v - v_2)^2 dy dt - \frac{\sigma}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2^2 d\Sigma \right\} \\ &= \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v - v_2)\theta_1 dy dt + \sigma \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2\theta_2 d\Sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the Euler - Lagrange equation for problem (2.1) is given by

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v - v_2)\hat{v} dy dt + \sigma \int_{\Sigma_2} w_2\hat{w}_2 d\Sigma = 0, \quad \forall \hat{w}_2 \in L^2(\Sigma_2), \quad (2.7)$$

where \hat{v} is solution of the following system

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \hat{v}'' + L\hat{v} = 0 \quad \text{in } Q, \\ \hat{v} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_1, \\ \hat{w}_2 & \text{on } \Sigma_2, \\ 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \setminus (\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2), \end{cases} \\ \hat{v}(y, 0) = 0, \quad \hat{v}'(y, 0) = 0, \quad y \in \Omega. \end{array} \right. \quad (2.8)$$

In order to express (2.7) in a convenient form, we introduce the adjoint state defined by

$$\begin{cases} p'' + L^* p = \alpha_k(t)(v - v_2) & \text{in } Q, \\ p(T) = p'(T) = 0, & y \in \Omega, \\ p = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

where L^* is the formal adjoint of the operator L .

Multiplying (2.9) by \widehat{v} and integrating by parts, we find

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t)(v - v_2)\widehat{v} \, dy \, dt + \int_{\Sigma_2} \frac{1}{\alpha_k^2(t)} p_y \widehat{w}_2 \, d\Sigma = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

so that (2.7) becomes

$$p_y = \sigma \alpha_k^2(t) w_2 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_2. \quad (2.11)$$

We summarize these results in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *For each $w_1 \in L^2(\Sigma_1)$ there exists a unique Nash equilibrium w_2 in the sense of (1.17). Moreover, the follower w_2 is given by*

$$w_2 = \mathfrak{F}(w_1) = \frac{1}{\sigma \alpha_k^2(t)} p_y \quad \text{on } \Sigma_2, \quad (2.12)$$

where $\{v, p\}$ is the unique solution of (the optimality system)

$$\begin{cases} v'' + Lv = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ p'' + L^* p = \alpha_k(t)(v - v_2) & \text{in } Q, \\ v = \begin{cases} w_1 & \text{on } \Sigma_1, \\ \frac{1}{\sigma \alpha_k^2(t)} p_y & \text{on } \Sigma_2, \\ 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_0^*, \end{cases} \\ p = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ v(0) = v'(0) = 0, \\ p(T) = p'(T) = 0, & y \in \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

Of course, $\{v, p\}$ depends on w_1 :

$$\{v, p\} = \{v(w_1), p(w_1)\}. \quad (2.14)$$

3. Approximate controllability

Since we have proved the existence, uniqueness and characterization of the follower w_2 , the leader w_1 now wants that solutions v and v' , evaluated at time $t = T$, to be as close as possible to (v^0, v^1) . This will be possible if the system (2.13) is approximately controllable. We are looking for

$$\inf \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_1} w_1^2 d\Sigma, \quad (3.1)$$

where w_1 is subject to

$$(v(T; w_1), v'(T; w_1)) \in B_{L^2(\Omega)}(v^0, \rho_0) \times B_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}(v^1, \rho_1), \quad (3.2)$$

assuming that w_1 exists, ρ_0 and ρ_1 being positive numbers arbitrarily small and $\{v^0, v^1\} \in L^2(\Omega) \times H^{-1}(\Omega)$.

As in [13], we assume that

$$T > \frac{e^{\frac{2k(1+k)}{1-k}} - 1}{k} \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$0 < k < 1. \quad (3.4)$$

Now as in the case (1.13) and using Holmgren's Uniqueness Theorem (cf. [17]; and see also [13] for additional discussions), we conclude this section with the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1

We decompose the solution (v, p) of (2.13) setting

$$\begin{cases} v = v_0 + g, \\ p = p_0 + q, \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

where v_0, p_0 is given by

$$\begin{cases} v_0'' + L v_0 = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ v_0 = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_1, \\ \frac{1}{\sigma \alpha_k^2(t)} (p_0)_y & \text{on } \Sigma_2, \\ 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_0^*, \end{cases} \\ v_0(0) = v_0'(0) = 0, & y \in \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} p_0'' + L^* p_0 = \alpha_k(t) (v_0 - v_2) \text{ in } Q, \\ p_0 = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ p_0(T) = p_0'(T) = 0, \quad y \in \Omega, \end{array} \right. \quad (3.7)$$

and $\{g, q\}$ is given by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} g'' + L g = 0 \text{ in } Q, \\ g = \begin{cases} w_1 \text{ on } \Sigma_1, \\ \frac{1}{\sigma \alpha_k^2(t)} q_y \text{ on } \Sigma_2, \\ 0 \text{ on } \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_0^*, \end{cases} \\ g(0) = g'(0) = 0, \quad y \in \Omega, \end{array} \right. \quad (3.8)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} q'' + L^* q = \alpha_k(t) g \text{ in } Q, \\ q = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ q(T) = q'(T) = 0, \quad y \in \Omega. \end{array} \right. \quad (3.9)$$

We next set

$$\begin{aligned} A : L^2(\Sigma_1) &\longrightarrow H^{-1}(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \\ w_1 &\longmapsto A w_1 = \{g'(T; w_1) + \delta g(T; w_1), -g(T; w_1)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

which defines

$$A \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(\Sigma_1); H^{-1}(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)),$$

where δ is a positive constant.

Using (3.5) and (3.10), we can rewrite (3.2) as

$$A w_1 \in \{-v_0(T) + \delta g(T) + B_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}(v^1, \rho_1), -v_0(T) + B_{L^2(\Omega)}(v^0, \rho_0)\}. \quad (3.11)$$

We will show that $A w_1$ generates a dense subspace of $H^{-1}(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$. For this, let $\{f^0, f^1\} \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ and consider the following systems (“adjoint states”):

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \varphi'' + L^* \varphi = \alpha_k(t) \psi \text{ in } Q, \\ \varphi = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ \varphi(T) = f^0, \quad \varphi'(T) = f^1, \quad y \in \Omega, \end{array} \right. \quad (3.12)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \psi'' + L\psi = 0 \text{ in } Q, \\ \psi = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_1, \\ \frac{1}{\sigma\alpha_k^2(t)}\varphi_y & \text{on } \Sigma_2, \\ 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_0^*, \end{cases} \\ \psi(0) = \psi'(0) = 0, \quad y \in \Omega. \end{array} \right. \quad (3.13)$$

Multiplying (3.13)₁ by q , (3.12)₁ by g , where q, g solve (3.9) and (3.8), respectively, and integrating in Q we obtain

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \alpha_k(t) g \psi \, dy \, dt = -\frac{1}{\sigma} \int_{\Sigma_2} \frac{1}{\alpha_k^4(t)} q_y \varphi_y \, d\Sigma, \quad (3.14)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle g'(T), f^0 \rangle_{H^{-1}(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega)} + \delta \langle g(T), f^0 \rangle_{L^2(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega)} - (g(T), f^1) \\ &= - \int_{\Sigma_1} \frac{1}{\alpha_k^2(t)} \varphi_y w_1 \, d\Sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Considering the left-hand side of the above equation as the inner product of $\{g'(T) + \delta g(T), -g(T)\}$ with $\{f^0, f^1\}$ in $H^{-1}(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ and $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$\langle \langle Aw_1, f \rangle \rangle = - \int_{\Sigma_1} \frac{1}{\alpha_k^2(t)} \varphi_y w_1 \, d\Sigma,$$

where $\langle \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \rangle$ represent the duality pairing between $H^{-1}(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ and $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$. Therefore, if

$$\langle \langle Aw_1, f \rangle \rangle = 0$$

for all $w_1 \in L^2(\Sigma_1)$, then

$$\varphi_y = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma_1. \quad (3.16)$$

Hence, in case (1.13),

$$\psi = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma, \quad \text{so that } \psi \equiv 0. \quad (3.17)$$

Therefore

$$\varphi'' + L^* \varphi = 0, \quad \varphi = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \quad (3.18)$$

and satisfies (3.16). Therefore, according to Holmgren's Uniqueness Theorem (cf. [17]; and see also [13] for additional discussions) and if (3.3) holds, then $\varphi \equiv 0$, so that $f^0 = 0, f^1 = 0$. This ends the proof. \blacksquare

4. The optimality system

Thanks to the results obtained in Section 2 , we can take, for each w_1 , the Nash equilibrium w_2 associated to solution v of (1.14). We will show the existence of a leader control w_1 solution of the following problem:

$$\inf J(w_1), \quad (4.1)$$

where $J(w_1)$ is given in (1.16). For this, we will use a duality argument due to Fenchel and Rockafellar [18] (cf. also [19, 20]).

The following result holds:

Theorem 4.1. *Assume the hypotheses (H1) – (H2), (1.13), (3.3) and (3.4) are satisfied. Then for $\{f^0, f^1\}$ in $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ we uniquely define $\{\varphi, \psi, v, p\}$ by*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \varphi'' + L^* \varphi = \alpha_k(t) \psi \text{ in } Q, \\ \psi'' + L \psi = 0 \text{ in } Q, \\ v'' + L v = 0 \text{ in } Q, \\ p'' + L^* p = \alpha_k(t)(v - v_2) \text{ in } Q, \\ \varphi = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ \psi = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_1, \\ \frac{1}{\sigma \alpha_k^2(t)} \varphi_y & \text{on } \Sigma_2, \\ 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_0^*, \end{cases} \\ v = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{\alpha_k^2(t)} \varphi_y & \text{on } \Sigma_1, \\ \frac{1}{\sigma \alpha_k^2(t)} p_y & \text{on } \Sigma_2, \\ 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_0^*, \end{cases} \\ p = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \\ \varphi(\cdot, T) = f^0, \varphi'(\cdot, T) = f^1 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ v(0) = v'(0) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ p(T) = p'(T) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \end{array} \right. \quad (4.2)$$

We uniquely define $\{f^0, f^1\}$ as the solution of the variational inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle v'(T, f) - v^1, \widehat{f}^0 - f^0 \rangle_{H^{-1}(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega)} - (v(T, f) - v^0, \widehat{f}^1 - f^1) \\ & + \rho_1 (\|\widehat{f}^0\| - \|f^0\|) + \rho_0 (|\widehat{f}^1| - |f^1|) \geq 0, \forall \widehat{f} \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega). \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Then the optimal leader is given by

$$w_1 = -\frac{1}{\alpha_k^2(t)} \varphi_y \quad \text{on } \Sigma_1,$$

where φ corresponds to the solution of (4.2).

Proof. Let A be the continuous linear operator defined by (3.10) and introduce the following two convex proper functions:

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 : L^2(\Sigma_1) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}, \\ F_1(w_1) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_1} w_1^2 d\Sigma \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$F_2 : H^{-1}(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\},$$

given by

$$F_2(Aw_1) = F_2(\{g'(T, w_1) + \delta g(T, w_1), -g(T, w_1)\}) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \begin{cases} g'(T) + \delta g(T) \in v^1 - v_0'(T) + \delta g(T) + \rho_1 B_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}, \\ -g(T) \in -v^0 + v_0(T, w_1) - \rho_0 B_{L^2(\Omega)}, \end{cases} \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

With these notations, problems (3.1)–(3.2) become equivalent to

$$\inf_{w_1 \in L^2(\Sigma_1)} [F_1(w_1) + F_2(Aw_1)] \quad (4.6)$$

provided we prove that the range of A is dense in $H^{-1}(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$, under conditions (3.3) and (3.4).

By the Duality Theorem of Fenchel and Rockafellar [18](see also [19], [20]), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{w_1 \in L^2(\Sigma_1)} [F_1(w_1) + F_2(Aw_1)] \\ &= - \inf_{(\hat{f}^0, \hat{f}^1) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)} [F_1^*(A^* \{\hat{f}^0, \hat{f}^1\}) + F_2^* \{-\hat{f}^0, -\hat{f}^1\}], \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

where F_i^* is the conjugate function of F_i ($i = 1, 2$) and A^* the adjoint of A .

We have

$$\begin{aligned} A^* : H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) &\longrightarrow L^2(\Sigma_1) \\ (f^0, f^1) &\longmapsto A^* f = -\frac{1}{\alpha_k^2(t)} \varphi_y, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

where φ is given in (3.12). We see easily that

$$F_1^*(w_1) = F_1(w_1) \quad (4.9)$$

and

$$F_2^*({\widehat{f}}^0, {\widehat{f}}^1) = \langle v^1 - v'_0(T) + \delta g(T), {\widehat{f}}^0 \rangle_{H^{-1}(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega)} + (v_0(T) - v^0, {\widehat{f}}^1) + \rho_1 \|{\widehat{f}}^0\| + \rho_0 |{\widehat{f}}^1|. \quad (4.10)$$

So, from (4.8)–(4.10), the expression in (4.7) becomes

$$\inf_{w_1 \in L^2(\Sigma_1)} [F_1(w_1) + F_2(Aw_1)] = - \inf_{({\widehat{f}}^0, {\widehat{f}}^1) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)} \Theta({\widehat{f}}^0, {\widehat{f}}^1), \quad (4.11)$$

where the functional $\Theta : H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\Theta({\widehat{f}}^0, {\widehat{f}}^1) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_1} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_k^2(t)} \right)^2 \widehat{\varphi}_y^2 d\Sigma + (v^0 - v_0(T), {\widehat{f}}^1) - \langle v^1 - v'_0(T) + \delta g(T), {\widehat{f}}^0 \rangle_{H^{-1}(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega)} + \rho_1 \|{\widehat{f}}^0\| + \rho_0 |{\widehat{f}}^1|.$$

This is the dual problem of (3.1), (3.2). Hence, we can use the primal or the dual problem to derive the optimality system for the leader control. ■

5. Some additional comments and questions

As a future work we are looking for improvements and generalizations of these results to other models. To close this section, we make some comments and briefly discuss some possible extensions of our results and also indicate open issues on the subject.

- In the case of $k = 1$, some results have been obtained in [13]. However, we do not extend the approach developed in this paper to the case $k = 1$.

- In the case $k > 1$, the moving boundary is a spacelike surface, on which an initial condition rather than a boundary condition needs to be imposed. It would be quite interesting to study the controllability for (1.1) in this case. For interested readers on this subject, we cite for instance [13], [21], and [22].

- In [6], those authors considered the controllability for semilinear wave equations using a fixed-point formulation. Moreover, they proposed as a future work possible extensions to boundary controls and/or superlinear nonlinearities.

Acknowledgements. The author wants to express his gratitude to the anonymous reviewers for their questions and commentaries; they were very helpful in improving this article.

References.

References

- [1] J.-L. Lions, *Hierarchical control*, Mathematical Science, Proc. Indian Academic Science, **104**, (1994) 295-304.
- [2] J. Díaz, J.-L. Lions, *On the approximate controllability of Stackelberg-Nash strategies. in: J.I. Díaz (Ed.), Ocean Circulation and Pollution Control Mathematical and Numerical Investigations*, 17-27, Springer, Berlin, (2005).
- [3] G. González, F. Lopes, M. Rojas-Medar, *On the approximate controllability of Stackelberg-Nash strategies for Stokes equations* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **141** (5), (2013) 1759-1773.
- [4] F. Araruna, E. Fernández-Cara, S. Guerrero, M. Santos, *New results on the Stackelberg - Nash exact control of linear parabolic equations*, Systems & Control Letters, **104**, (2017) 78-85.
- [5] F. Araruna, E. Fernández-Cara, M. Santos, *Stackelberg-Nash exact controllability for linear and semilinear parabolic equations*, ESAIM : Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations, **21**, (3), (2015) 835-856.
- [6] F. Araruna., E. Fernández-Cara, L. Silva, *Hierarchical control for the wave equation*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, **178**, (1), (2018) 264-288.
- [7] A. Sengouga, *Observability of the 1-D wave equation with mixed boundary conditions in a non-cylindrical domain*, Mediterr. J. Math. (2018) 15: 62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00009-018-1107-y>.
- [8] L. Cui, Y. Jiang, Y. Wang, *Exact controllability for a one-dimensional wave equation with the fixed endpoint control*. Boundary Value Problems, (2015). doi: 10.1186/s13661-015-0476-4.
- [9] L. Cui, L. Song, *Exact controllability for a wave equation with fixed boundary control*. Boundary Value Problems, (2014). doi: 10.1186/1687-2770-2014-47.

- [10] M. Milla Miranda, *Exact controllability for the wave equation in domains with variable boundary*, Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. Madr. **9** (1996) 435-457.
- [11] J.-M. Coron, *Control and Nonlinearity*, American Math. Soc., Providence, (2007).
- [12] M. Tucsnak, G. Weiss, *Observation and control for operator semigroups*, Birkhauser Advanced Texts, Birkhauser Verlag, Basel, (2009).
- [13] L. Cui, X. Liu, H. Gao, *Exact controllability for a one-dimensional wave equation in non-cylindrical domains*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **402**, (2013) 612-625.
- [14] I. Jesus, *Approximate controllability for a one-dimensional wave equation with the fixed endpoint control*, Journal of Differential Equations, **263** (2017) 5175-5188.
- [15] M. Milla Miranda, *HUM and the wave equation with variable coefficients*, Asymptotic Analysis **11**, (1995) 317-341.
- [16] J.-L. Lions, *Contrôle optimal des systèmes gouvernés par des équations aux dérivées partielles*, Dunod, Paris, 1968.
- [17] L. Hörmander, *Linear partial differential operators* Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Bd. 116. Academic Press. Inc., Publishers, New York, (1963).
- [18] R. Rockafellar *Convex Analysis*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., (1969).
- [19] H. Brezis, *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*, Springer-Verlag, (2010).
- [20] I. Ekeland, R. Temam, *Analyse convexe et problèmes variationnels*, Dunod, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1974).
- [21] L. Cui , H. Gao, *Exact controllability for a wave equation with mixed boundary conditions in a non-cylindrical domain*, Eletronic Journal of Differential Equations, **101**, (2014) 1-12.
- [22] H. Sun, H. Li, L. Lu, *Exact controllability for a string equation in domains with moving boundary in one dimension*, Eletronic Journal of Differential Equations, **2015**, (2015) 1-7.