

The minimal control time for the exact controllability by internal controls of 1D linear hyperbolic systems

Guillaume Olive

(joint work with Long Hu)

Workshop on PDEs and Control 2025

*(A conference to celebrate the 60th birthday of
Francisco Guillén-González & Manuel González-Burgos)*

Seville, September 3-5, 2025



Outline of the talk

I. Framework

II. Boundary controllability : brief review

III. Proof of the main result

System description

Equations

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y(t, x) + u(t, x), \quad (t, x) \in R_T,$$

■ $R_T = (0, T) \times (0, 1)$ and $y : R_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state.

■ $\Lambda \in C^{0,1}([0, 1])^{n \times n}$ is diagonal, with

$$\lambda_1 < \cdots < \lambda_m < 0 < \lambda_{m+1} < \cdots < \lambda_{m+p}.$$

■ $M \in L^\infty(0, 1)^{n \times n}$ is the **internal coupling matrix**.

■ $u : R_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the **control**. Constraint : $\text{supp } u \subset (0, T) \times \omega$ with $\omega \subset (0, 1)$ open, fixed.

System description

Equations

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y(t, x) + u(t, x), \quad (t, x) \in R_T,$$

■ $R_T = (0, T) \times (0, 1)$ and $y : R_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state.

■ $\Lambda \in C^{0,1}([0, 1])^{n \times n}$ is diagonal, with

$$\lambda_1 < \dots < \lambda_m < 0 < \lambda_{m+1} < \dots < \lambda_{m+p}.$$

■ $M \in L^\infty(0, 1)^{n \times n}$ is the **internal coupling matrix**.

■ $u : R_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the **control**. Constraint : $\text{supp } u \subset (0, T) \times \omega$ with $\omega \subset (0, 1)$ open, fixed.

Initial condition

$$y(0, x) = y^0(x).$$

System description

Equations

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y(t, x) + u(t, x), \quad (t, x) \in R_T,$$

■ $R_T = (0, T) \times (0, 1)$ and $y : R_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state.

■ $\Lambda \in C^{0,1}([0, 1])^{n \times n}$ is diagonal, with

$$\lambda_1 < \dots < \lambda_m < 0 < \lambda_{m+1} < \dots < \lambda_{m+p}.$$

■ $M \in L^\infty(0, 1)^{n \times n}$ is the **internal coupling matrix**.

■ $u : R_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the **control**. Constraint : $\text{supp } u \subset (0, T) \times \omega$ with $\omega \subset (0, 1)$ open, fixed.

Initial condition

$$y(0, x) = y^0(x).$$

Denoting by $y = \begin{pmatrix} y_- \\ y_+ \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{m+p}$,

Boundary conditions

$$y_-(t, 1) = Q_1 y_+(t, 1), \quad y_+(t, 0) = Q_0 y_-(t, 0).$$

■ $Q_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ and $Q_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ are the **boundary coupling matrices**.

Minimal control time

Well-posedness : $\forall y^0 \in L^2, \forall u \in L^2, \quad \exists ! y \in C^0([0, T]; L^2(0, 1)^n)$.

Minimal control time

Well-posedness : $\forall y^0 \in L^2, \forall u \in L^2, \exists! y \in C^0([0, T]; L^2(0, 1)^n)$.

Exact Controllability (EC) in time T :

$$\forall y^0, y^1 \in L^2, \quad \exists u \in L^2, \quad y(T, \cdot) = y^1.$$

Minimal control time

Well-posedness : $\forall y^0 \in L^2, \forall u \in L^2, \exists ! y \in C^0([0, T]; L^2(0, 1)^n)$.

Exact Controllability (EC) in time T :

$$\forall y^0, y^1 \in L^2, \quad \exists u \in L^2, \quad y(T, \cdot) = y^1.$$

Remark : **(EC)** in time $T_1 \implies$ **(EC)** in time $T_2 \geq T_1$.

Definition

Minimal time for **(EC)** :

$$T_{\inf} = \inf \{ T > 0, \text{ System is (EC) in time } T \}, \quad (\in [0, +\infty]).$$

Minimal control time

Well-posedness : $\forall y^0 \in L^2, \forall u \in L^2, \exists ! y \in C^0([0, T]; L^2(0, 1)^n)$.

Exact Controllability (EC) in time T :

$$\forall y^0, y^1 \in L^2, \quad \exists u \in L^2, \quad y(T, \cdot) = y^1.$$

Remark : **(EC)** in time $T_1 \implies$ **(EC)** in time $T_2 \geq T_1$.

Definition

Minimal time for **(EC)** :

$$T_{\inf} = \inf \{ T > 0, \text{ System is (EC) in time } T \}, \quad (\in [0, +\infty]).$$

- $T > T_{\inf} \implies$ System is **(EC)** in time T .
- $T < T_{\inf} \implies$ System is not **(EC)** in time T .

Minimal control time

Well-posedness : $\forall y^0 \in L^2, \forall u \in L^2, \exists ! y \in C^0([0, T]; L^2(0, 1)^n)$.

Exact Controllability (EC) in time T :

$$\forall y^0, y^1 \in L^2, \quad \exists u \in L^2, \quad y(T, \cdot) = y^1.$$

Remark : **(EC)** in time $T_1 \implies$ **(EC)** in time $T_2 \geq T_1$.

Definition

Minimal time for **(EC)** :

$$T_{\inf} = \inf \{ T > 0, \text{ System is (EC) in time } T \}, \quad (\in [0, +\infty]).$$

- $T > T_{\inf} \implies$ System is **(EC)** in time T .
- $T < T_{\inf} \implies$ System is not **(EC)** in time T .

Goal

$$T_{\inf} = ??? \quad (M, Q_1, Q_0 \text{ are fixed}).$$

Literature

Very few results, and only when $\omega = (a, b)$ is an **interval** :

Theorem ([Zhuang, Li & Rao (2016), DCDS] – also for quasilinear systems, [Li, Lu & Qu (2024), COCV])

Assume Q_1, Q_0 are invertible. Then, (EC) in any time $T > (T_m + T_{m+1}) \times \max\{a, 1 - b\}$.^a

a. See after for the definition of T_k .

Literature

Very few results, and only when $\omega = (a, b)$ is an **interval** :

Theorem ([**Zhuang, Li & Rao** (2016), DCDS] – also for quasilinear systems, [**Li, Lu & Qu** (2024), COCV])

Assume Q_1, Q_0 are invertible. Then, **(EC)** in any time $T > (T_m + T_{m+1}) \times \max\{a, 1 - b\}$.^a

a. See after for the definition of T_k .

Related result :

Theorem ([**Alabau-Boussouira, Coron & Olive** (2017), SICON])

Consider 2×2 **underactuated** quasilinear system with **periodic boundary conditions** :

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial y}{\partial t} + \Lambda(y) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = M(y) + \begin{pmatrix} u(t, x) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ y(t, 0) = y(t, 1), \\ y(0, x) = y^0(x). \end{cases}$$

If $(\partial M_2 / \partial y_1)(0, 0) \neq 0$, then **(EC)** in any time $T > \max\{T_1, T_2\} \times (1 - |b - a|)$ (locally near $y = 0$, for regular enough y^0 , etc.).

Main Result

Theorem ([Hu & Olive (2024), cocv])

■ $T_{\inf} < +\infty \implies Q_1, Q_0$ are invertible (in part., $m = p$).

■ If Q_1, Q_0 are invertible,

$$T_{\inf} = \max_{I \in \mathcal{C}} T_{\inf}^{bc}(I),$$

where :

▶ $\mathcal{C} = \{\text{connected components of } \overline{\omega}^c\}$.

▶ $T_{\inf}^{bc}(I) = \text{minimal control time, on the interval } I, \text{ by boundary controls (explicit ! See after)}$.

($T_{\inf} = 0$ if $\overline{\omega} = [0, 1]$).

Main Result

Theorem ([Hu & Olive (2024), cocv])

■ $T_{\inf} < +\infty \implies Q_1, Q_0$ are invertible (in part., $m = p$).

■ If Q_1, Q_0 are invertible,

$$T_{\inf} = \max_{I \in \mathcal{C}} T_{\inf}^{bc}(I),$$

where :

▶ $\mathcal{C} = \{\text{connected components of } \overline{\omega}^c\}$.

▶ $T_{\inf}^{bc}(I) = \text{minimal control time, on the interval } I, \text{ by boundary controls (explicit ! See after).}$

($T_{\inf} = 0$ if $\overline{\omega} = [0, 1]$).

■ Strategy of proof : inspired by [Ammar-Khodja, Benabdallah, González-Burgos & de Teresa (2011), mcrf] on the implication

“boundary controllability \implies internal controllability”

for the **heat equation** (see also [Alabau-Boussouira, Coron & Olive (2017), sicon]).

Main Result

Theorem ([Hu & Olive (2024), cocv])

■ $T_{\inf} < +\infty \implies Q_1, Q_0$ are invertible (in part., $m = p$).

■ If Q_1, Q_0 are invertible,

$$T_{\inf} = \max_{I \in \mathcal{C}} T_{\inf}^{bc}(I),$$

where :

▶ $\mathcal{C} = \{\text{connected components of } \overline{\omega}^c\}$.

▶ $T_{\inf}^{bc}(I) = \text{minimal control time, on the interval } I, \text{ by boundary controls (explicit ! See after).}$

($T_{\inf} = 0$ if $\overline{\omega} = [0, 1]$).

■ Strategy of proof : inspired by [Ammar-Khodja, Benabdallah, González-Burgos & de Teresa (2011), MCRF] on the implication

“boundary controllability \implies internal controllability”

for the **heat equation** (see also [Alabau-Boussouira, Coron & Olive (2017), SICON]).

■ Related results for 1D **parabolic systems** : [Boyer & Olive (2014), MCRF] and [Boyer & Morancey (2025), AMBP].

Examples

We assume that Q_1, Q_0 are invertible.

$$\omega = (a, b) \implies T_{\inf} = \max \left\{ T_{\inf}^{bc}(0, a), T_{\inf}^{bc}(b, 1) \right\}.$$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial y}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y(t, x), \\ y_-(t, a) = v_-(t) \quad y_+(t, 0) = Q_0 y_-(t, 0), \\ y(0, x) = y^0(x). \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial y}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y(t, x), \\ y_-(t, 1) = Q_1 y_+(t, 1) \quad y_+(t, b) = v_+(t), \\ y(0, x) = y^0(x). \end{cases}$$

Examples

We assume that Q_1, Q_0 are invertible.

$$\omega = (a, b) \implies T_{\inf} = \max \left\{ T_{\inf}^{bc}(0, a), T_{\inf}^{bc}(b, 1) \right\}.$$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial y}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y(t, x), \\ y_-(t, a) = v_-(t) \quad y_+(t, 0) = Q_0 y_-(t, 0), \\ y(0, x) = y^0(x). \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial y}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y(t, x), \\ y_-(t, 1) = Q_1 y_+(t, 1) \quad y_+(t, b) = v_+(t), \\ y(0, x) = y^0(x). \end{cases}$$

$$\omega = (0, c) \cup (d, 1) \implies T_{\inf} = T_{\inf}^{bc}(c, d).$$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial y}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y(t, x), \\ y_-(t, d) = v_-(t) \quad y_+(t, c) = v_+(t), \\ y(0, x) = y^0(x). \end{cases}$$

We need to know T_{\inf}^{bc} for **one-sided** and **two-sided** controllability.

Outline of the talk

I. Framework

II. Boundary controllability : brief review

III. Proof of the main result

Control of a single equation

The transport equation :

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial y}{\partial t} + \lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = 0, \\ y(t, 1) = v(t) \text{ if } \lambda < 0, \quad (y(t, 0) = v(t) \text{ if } \lambda > 0), \\ y(0, x) = y^0(x). \end{cases} \quad (\text{TE})$$

We have

$$T_{\text{inf}}^{bc} = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{|\lambda(\xi)|} d\xi.$$

Control of a single equation

The transport equation :

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial y}{\partial t} + \lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = 0, \\ y(t, 1) = v(t) \text{ if } \lambda < 0, \quad (y(t, 0) = v(t) \text{ if } \lambda > 0), \\ y(0, x) = y^0(x). \end{cases} \quad (\text{TE})$$

We have

$$T_{\text{inf}}^{bc} = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{|\lambda(\xi)|} d\xi.$$

Coming back to systems,

Definition

$T_k = T_{\text{inf}}^{bc}$ of (TE) with speed λ_k .

$$\lambda_1 < \dots < \lambda_m < 0 < \lambda_{m+1} < \dots < \lambda_{m+p},$$

$$\text{implies } T_1 \leq \dots \leq T_m, \quad T_{m+1} \geq \dots \geq T_{m+p}.$$

Two-sided boundary controllability

We consider

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial y}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y(t, x), \\ y_-(t, 1) = v_-(t) \quad y_+(t, 0) = v_+(t), \\ y(0, x) = y^0(x). \end{cases}$$

Theorem

$$T_{\inf}^{bc} = \max \{ T_m, \quad T_{m+1} \}.$$

Upper bound \leq : [Li & Rao (2003), `sicon`] (“Constructive method”).

Lower bound \geq : [Hu & Olive (2021), `cocv`] (Backstepping method).

One-sided boundary controllability

We consider

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial y}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y(t, x), \\ y_-(t, 1) = v(t) \quad y_+(t, 0) = Qy_-(t, 0), \\ y(0, x) = y^0(x). \end{cases}$$

Theorem ([Hu & Olive (2021), JMPA])

■ $T_{\inf} < +\infty \implies \text{rank } Q = p.$

■ If $\text{rank } Q = p,$

$$T_{\inf}^{bc} = \max_{1 \leq k \leq p} \{T_{m+k} + T_{c_k}, \quad T_m\},$$

where c_k are indices from the LCU-decomposition of Q .

Proof by compactness-uniqueness (T_{\inf}^{bc} is the same as for $M = 0$).

What are the c_k ?

Definition ([**Hu & Olive** (2022), JDE])

Q is in **canonical form** if there is **at most one nonzero entry** on each row and column, and $\sum_{k=1}^{\rho} c_k = 1$.

We denote by (r_k, c_k) , $(1 \leq k \leq \rho)$ the corresponding indices, with $r_1 < \dots < r_\rho$.

Examples :

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \boxed{1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boxed{1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \boxed{1} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \boxed{1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boxed{1} & 0 \\ \boxed{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

What are the c_k ?

Definition ([Hu & Olive (2022), JDE])

Q is in **canonical form** if there is **at most one nonzero entry** on each row and column, and $\sum = 1$.

We denote by (r_k, c_k) , $(1 \leq k \leq \rho)$ the corresponding indices, with $r_1 < \dots < r_\rho$.

Examples :

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \boxed{1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boxed{1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \boxed{1} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \boxed{1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boxed{1} & 0 \\ \boxed{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The Gaussian elimination gives :

Proposition

There exist $L \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ (lower triang., $\text{diag } L = 1$) and $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ (upper triang., invert.) :

$$LQU := Q^c \text{ is in canonical form.}$$

Moreover, Q^c is unique. We set $(r_k, c_k)(Q) = (r_k, c_k)(Q^c)$.

See also [Dopico, Johnson & Molera (2006), LAA].

Remark : $\text{rank } Q = p$ implies $r_k = k$.

Outline of the talk

I. Framework

II. Boundary controllability : brief review

III. Proof of the main result

Why should Q_1, Q_0 be invertible ?

The transport equation :

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial y}{\partial t} + \lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = u(t, x), \\ y(t, 1) = 0 \text{ if } \lambda < 0, \quad (y(t, 0) = 0 \text{ if } \lambda > 0), \\ y(0, x) = y^0(x), \end{cases} \quad (\text{TE})$$

is **never (EC)**.

Remark : (TE) is approximately/null controllable in any time !

Proof for $\omega = (0, 1)$

In that case, the system is **(EC)** in any time $T > 0$.

Proof for $\omega = (0, 1)$

In that case, the system is **(EC)** in any time $T > 0$.

The proof is easy and well-known : we define

$$\bar{y} = \eta(t)y^f + (1 - \eta(t))y^b, \quad (1)$$

where :

Proof for $\omega = (0, 1)$

In that case, the system is **(EC)** in any time $T > 0$.

The proof is easy and well-known : we define

$$\bar{y} = \eta(t)y^f + (1 - \eta(t))y^b, \quad (1)$$

where :

■ $\eta \in C^1$ is a time cut-off function such that

$$\eta(0) = 1, \quad \eta(T) = 0,$$

Proof for $\omega = (0, 1)$

In that case, the system is **(EC)** in any time $T > 0$.

The proof is easy and well-known : we define

$$\bar{y} = \eta(t)y^f + (1 - \eta(t))y^b, \quad (1)$$

where :

- $\eta \in C^1$ is a time cut-off function such that

$$\eta(0) = 1, \quad \eta(T) = 0,$$

- y^f/y^b is the solution to the forward/backward problem (without control)

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial y^f}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y^f}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y^f(t, x), \\ y_-^f(t, 1) = Q_1 y_+^f(t, 1), \quad y_+^f(t, 0) = Q_0 y_-^f(t, 0), \\ y^f(0, x) = y^0(x), \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial y^b}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y^b}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y^b(t, x), \\ y_-^b(t, 0) = Q_0^{-1} y_+^b(t, 0), \quad y_+^b(t, 1) = Q_1^{-1} y_-^b(t, 1), \\ y^b(T, x) = y^1(x). \end{cases}$$

Proof for $\omega = (0, 1)$

In that case, the system is **(EC)** in any time $T > 0$.

The proof is easy and well-known : we define

$$\bar{y} = \eta(t)y^f + (1 - \eta(t))y^b, \quad (1)$$

where :

■ $\eta \in C^1$ is a time cut-off function such that

$$\eta(0) = 1, \quad \eta(T) = 0,$$

■ y^f/y^b is the solution to the forward/backward problem (without control)

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial y^f}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y^f}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y^f(t, x), \\ y_-^f(t, 1) = Q_1 y_+^f(t, 1), \quad y_+^f(t, 0) = Q_0 y_-^f(t, 0), \\ y^f(0, x) = y^0(x), \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial y^b}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y^b}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y^b(t, x), \\ y_-^b(t, 0) = Q_0^{-1} y_+^b(t, 0), \quad y_+^b(t, 1) = Q_1^{-1} y_-^b(t, 1), \\ y^b(T, x) = y^1(x). \end{cases}$$

Then, we simply take as control

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u} &= \frac{\partial \bar{y}}{\partial t} + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial \bar{y}}{\partial x} - M(x)\bar{y} \\ &= \eta'(t)(y^f - y^b). \end{aligned}$$

Proof for $\bar{\omega} \neq [0, 1]$

Let $T > T_{\inf}^{bc}(I)$ for all $I \in \mathcal{C}$. Let us prove that the system is **(EC)**.

Proof for $\bar{\omega} \neq [0, 1]$

Let $T > T_{\inf}^{bc}(I)$ for all $I \in \mathcal{C}$. Let us prove that the system is **(EC)**.

Lemma

*There exists $\omega_0 \subset\subset \omega$, very close to ω (thus, **not small**), such that :*

- $\bar{\omega}_0^c = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \dots \cup I_N$ (disjoint open intervals).
- $T > T_{\inf}^{bc}(I_k)$ for all k .

Proof for $\bar{\omega} \neq [0, 1]$

Let $T > T_{\inf}^{bc}(I)$ for all $I \in \mathcal{C}$. Let us prove that the system is **(EC)**.

Lemma

*There exists $\omega_0 \subset\subset \omega$, very close to ω (thus, **not small**), such that :*

- $\bar{\omega}_0^c = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \dots \cup I_N$ (disjoint open intervals).
- $T > T_{\inf}^{bc}(I_k)$ for all k .

Then, as in [Ammar-Khodja, Benabdallah, González-Burgos & de Teresa (2011), MCRF],

$$y = \xi(x)y^* + (1 - \xi(x))\bar{y},$$

where :

Proof for $\bar{\omega} \neq [0, 1]$

Let $T > T_{\inf}^{bc}(I)$ for all $I \in \mathcal{C}$. Let us prove that the system is (EC).

Lemma

There exists $\omega_0 \subset\subset \omega$, very close to ω (thus, **not small**), such that :

- $\bar{\omega}_0^c = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \dots \cup I_N$ (disjoint open intervals).
- $T > T_{\inf}^{bc}(I_k)$ for all k .

Then, as in [Ammar-Khodja, Benabdallah, González-Burgos & de Teresa (2011), MCRF],

$$y = \xi(x)y^* + (1 - \xi(x))\bar{y},$$

where :

- $\xi \in C^1$ is a space cut-off function such that

$$\xi(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \notin \bar{\omega}_1, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \bar{\omega}_0, \end{cases} \quad \omega_0 \subset\subset \omega_1 \subset\subset \omega.$$

Proof for $\bar{\omega} \neq [0, 1]$

Let $T > T_{\inf}^{bc}(I)$ for all $I \in \mathcal{C}$. Let us prove that the system is **(EC)**.

Lemma

There exists $\omega_0 \subset\subset \omega$, very close to ω (thus, **not small**), such that :

- $\bar{\omega}_0^c = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \dots \cup I_N$ (disjoint open intervals).
- $T > T_{\inf}^{bc}(I_k)$ for all k .

Then, as in [Ammar-Khodja, Benabdallah, González-Burgos & de Teresa (2011), MCRF],

$$y = \xi(x)y^* + (1 - \xi(x))\bar{y},$$

where :

- $\xi \in C^1$ is a space cut-off function such that

$$\xi(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \notin \bar{\omega}_1, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \bar{\omega}_0, \end{cases} \quad \omega_0 \subset\subset \omega_1 \subset\subset \omega.$$

- In each $[0, T] \times I_k$: y^* is the controlled solution from the boundary.

Proof for $\bar{\omega} \neq [0, 1]$

Let $T > T_{\inf}^{bc}(I)$ for all $I \in \mathcal{C}$. Let us prove that the system is **(EC)**.

Lemma

There exists $\omega_0 \subset\subset \omega$, very close to ω (thus, **not small**), such that :

- $\bar{\omega}_0^c = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \dots \cup I_N$ (disjoint open intervals).
- $T > T_{\inf}^{bc}(I_k)$ for all k .

Then, as in [Ammar-Khodja, Benabdallah, González-Burgos & de Teresa (2011), MCRF],

$$y = \xi(x)y^* + (1 - \xi(x))\bar{y},$$

where :

- $\xi \in C^1$ is a space cut-off function such that

$$\xi(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \notin \bar{\omega}_1, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \bar{\omega}_0, \end{cases} \quad \omega_0 \subset\subset \omega_1 \subset\subset \omega.$$

- In each $[0, T] \times I_k$: y^* is the controlled solution from the boundary.

The conclusion is as before :

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \frac{\partial y}{\partial t} + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} - M(x)y \\ &= \xi'(x)\Lambda(x)(y^* - \bar{y}) + (1 - \xi(x))\bar{u}, \quad (\text{supp } u \subset (0, T) \times \bar{\omega}_1). \end{aligned}$$

Open problems

- Underactuated systems : ¹

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y(t, x) + Ju(t, x), \quad \text{rank } J < n?$$

- Nonlocal boundary conditions : ¹

$$\begin{pmatrix} y_-(t, 1) \\ y_+(t, 0) \end{pmatrix} = Q \begin{pmatrix} y_-(t, 0) \\ y_+(t, 1) \end{pmatrix}?$$

- $\text{supp } u_k \subset (0, T) \times \omega_k$ with ω_k **disjoint**?
- Null controllability?
- Moving control domain $\omega = \omega(t)$?
- Quasi-linear systems ? ^{1 2}

1. Some results in [Alabau-Boussouira, Coron & Olive (2017), `sicon`].

2. Some results in [Zhuang, Li & Rao (2016), `ccds`].

Open problems

- Underactuated systems :¹

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial t}(t, x) + \Lambda(x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}(t, x) = M(x)y(t, x) + Ju(t, x), \quad \text{rank } J < n?$$

- Nonlocal boundary conditions :¹

$$\begin{pmatrix} y_-(t, 1) \\ y_+(t, 0) \end{pmatrix} = Q \begin{pmatrix} y_-(t, 0) \\ y_+(t, 1) \end{pmatrix}?$$

- $\text{supp } u_k \subset (0, T) \times \omega_k$ with ω_k **disjoint**?
- Null controllability?
- Moving control domain $\omega = \omega(t)$?
- Quasi-linear systems?^{1 2}

Thank you for your attention !

More details available at :

<https://doi.org/10.1051/cocv/2024069>

1. Some results in [Alabau-Boussouira, Coron & Olive (2017), `sicon`].

2. Some results in [Zhuang, Li & Rao (2016), `dcds`].