

Control of Parabolic Equations with Inverse Square Infinite Potential Wells

Arick Shao

Queen Mary University of London

Joint work with Alberto Enciso (ICMAT), Bruno Vergara (Brown).

Section 1

Introduction

The Main Setting

Main setting. Heat equation with **critically singular potential**:

$$-\partial_t v + \left(\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}\right) v = Y \cdot \nabla v + W v \quad \text{on } (0, T) \times \Omega,$$

$$v|_{t=0} = v_0 \quad \text{on } \Omega,$$

$$"v|_{(0, T) \times \Gamma} = f \quad \text{on } (0, T) \times \Gamma.$$

- $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$: open, bounded.
- $\Gamma := \partial\Omega \in C^2$.
- $d := d(\cdot, \Gamma)$: distance to boundary.
- $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$: strength of singular potential.
- $Y \in C^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$, $W \in d^{-1} L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$: lower-order coefficients.

Control of Heat Equations

Q. Can solutions be controlled via Dirichlet data?

Control of Heat Equations

Q. Can solutions be controlled via [Dirichlet data](#)?

Null controllability:

- Given any initial data v_0 , is there a control f such that $v|_{t=T} = 0$?

Control of Heat Equations

Q. Can solutions be controlled via **Dirichlet data**?

Null controllability:

- Given any initial data v_0 , is there a control f such that $v|_{t=T} = 0$?

Approximate controllability:

- Given any initial data v_0 , final data v_T , and $\varepsilon > 0$, is there a control f with

$$\|v|_{t=T} - v_T\| < \varepsilon?$$

Critically Singular Potentials

$\sigma = 0$: classical heat equation.

- **Spectral/Fourier methods**: precise results, but for specific Y, W .
- **Carleman estimates**: robust results, for general Y, W .

Critically Singular Potentials

$\sigma = 0$: classical heat equation.

- **Spectral/Fourier methods**: precise results, but for specific Y, W .
- **Carleman estimates**: robust results, for general Y, W .

$\sigma \neq 0$: adds “infinite potential well”.

- **Remark**. Natural to consider Y, W .
 - d not regular away from Γ .

Critically Singular Potentials

$\sigma = 0$: classical heat equation.

- **Spectral/Fourier methods**: precise results, but for specific Y, W .
- **Carleman estimates**: robust results, for general Y, W .

$\sigma \neq 0$: adds “infinite potential well”.

- **Remark**. Natural to consider Y, W .
 - d not regular away from Γ .

Some motivations for $\sigma \neq 0$:

- Wave equations: AdS/CFT, holography.
- Heat equations: “playground” for understanding σ/d^2 .

Boundary Asymptotics

Difficulty. Potential is **critically singular**:

- Same scaling as $\Delta \Rightarrow$ **cannot treat perturbatively**.

Boundary Asymptotics

Difficulty. Potential is **critically singular**:

- Same scaling as $\Delta \Rightarrow$ **cannot treat perturbatively**.

1. **Modified asymptotics** of solutions at Γ :

$$v \sim_{\Gamma} d^{\kappa} v_D + d^{1-\kappa} v_N, \quad \kappa := \frac{1-\sqrt{1-4\sigma}}{2}, \quad \sigma \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

- Dirichlet trace: $\mathcal{D}_{\sigma} v := d^{-\kappa} v|_{\Gamma}$.
- Neumann trace: $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma} v := d^{2\kappa} \nabla d \cdot \nabla (d^{-\kappa} v)|_{\Gamma}$.

Boundary Asymptotics

Difficulty. Potential is **critically singular**:

- Same scaling as $\Delta \Rightarrow$ **cannot treat perturbatively**.

1. **Modified asymptotics** of solutions at Γ :

$$v \sim_{\Gamma} d^{\kappa} v_D + d^{1-\kappa} v_N, \quad \kappa := \frac{1-\sqrt{1-4\sigma}}{2}, \quad \sigma \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

- **Dirichlet trace:** $\mathcal{D}_{\sigma} v := d^{-\kappa} v|_{\Gamma}$.
- **Neumann trace:** $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma} v := d^{2\kappa} \nabla d \cdot \nabla (d^{-\kappa} v)|_{\Gamma}$.

Remark. Threshold values of σ :

- $\sigma = \frac{1}{4}$ ($\kappa = \frac{1}{2}$): threshold for well-posedness and controllability.
- $\sigma \leq -\frac{3}{4}$ ($\kappa \leq -\frac{1}{2}$): Dirichlet branch $\notin L^2$.

Boundary Asymptotics

Difficulty. Potential is **critically singular**:

- Same scaling as $\Delta \Rightarrow$ **cannot treat perturbatively**.

1. **Modified asymptotics** of solutions at Γ :

$$v \sim_{\Gamma} d^{\kappa} v_D + d^{1-\kappa} v_N, \quad \kappa := \frac{1-\sqrt{1-4\sigma}}{2}, \quad \sigma \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

- **Dirichlet trace:** $\mathcal{D}_{\sigma} v := d^{-\kappa} v|_{\Gamma}$.
- **Neumann trace:** $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma} v := d^{2\kappa} \nabla d \cdot \nabla (d^{-\kappa} v)|_{\Gamma}$.

Remark. Threshold values of σ :

- $\sigma = \frac{1}{4}$ ($\kappa = \frac{1}{2}$): threshold for well-posedness and controllability.
- $\sigma \leq -\frac{3}{4}$ ($\kappa \leq -\frac{1}{2}$): Dirichlet branch $\notin L^2$.

2. **Shift of regularity** for solutions at Γ .

- L^2 -norm of $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma} v \Leftrightarrow H^{1+\delta(\sigma)}$ -norm of solution.

The Case $n = 1$

Existing results only for $n = 1$:

$$-\partial_t v + \partial_x^2 v + \frac{\sigma}{x^2} v = 0, \quad \text{on } (0, T) \times (0, 1).$$

- Boundary null control at $x = 1$: Martinez-Vancostenoble
- Boundary null control at $x = 0$: Biccari, Cannarsa-Martinez-Vancostenoble, Gueye

The Case $n = 1$

Existing results only for $n = 1$:

$$-\partial_t v + \partial_x^2 v + \frac{\sigma}{x^2} v = 0, \quad \text{on } (0, T) \times (0, 1).$$

- Boundary null control at $x = 1$: **Martinez-Vancostenoble**
- Boundary null control at $x = 0$: **Biccari, Cannarsa-Martinez-Vancostenoble, Gueye**

(**Biccari, 2019**) Boundary null controllability for $(-\frac{3}{4} <) \sigma < \frac{1}{4}$

- Proved via **moment method** (**Fattorini-Russell, 1970s**).
- **Cost of controllability** $\rightarrow +\infty$ as $\sigma \nearrow \frac{1}{4}$.

The Case $n = 1$

Existing results only for $n = 1$:

$$-\partial_t v + \partial_x^2 v + \frac{\sigma}{x^2} v = 0, \quad \text{on } (0, T) \times (0, 1).$$

- Boundary null control at $x = 1$: **Martinez-Vancostenoble**
- Boundary null control at $x = 0$: **Bicari, Cannarsa-Martinez-Vancostenoble, Gueye**

(**Bicari, 2019**) Boundary null controllability for $(-\frac{3}{4} <) \sigma < \frac{1}{4}$

- Proved via **moment method** (**Fattorini-Russell, 1970s**).
- **Cost of controllability** $\rightarrow +\infty$ as $\sigma \nearrow \frac{1}{4}$.

(**Bicari, 2019**) Several key open questions remain:

- Null controllability via **global Carleman estimates**?
- **Potential critically singular at $x = 0$ and $x = 1$?**
- **Higher dimensions**, $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $n > 1$?

The Case $n > 1$

Results only for interior null control.

The Case $n > 1$

Results only for interior null control.

Null controllability for

$$-\partial_t v + \Delta v + \frac{\sigma}{|x-x_0|^2} v = \dots$$

- Cannarsa-Martinez-Vancostenoble, Cazacu, Ervedoza, Vancostenoble-Zuazua.
- Via **global Carleman estimates**.

The Case $n > 1$

Results only for interior null control.

Null controllability for

$$-\partial_t v + \Delta v + \frac{\sigma}{|x-x_0|^2} v = \dots$$

- Cannarsa-Martinez-Vancostenoble, Cazacu, Ervedoza, Vancostenoble-Zuazua.
- Via **global Carleman estimates**.

(Biccari-Zuazua, 2016) Interior null controllability for

$$-\partial_t v + \left(\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}\right) v = \dots$$

- Via **global Carleman estimate**.
- Does not work for boundary control.

Theorem 1: Null Control

Theorem (Enciso-S-Vergara, 2023)

Assume:

- $Y \in C^1(\Omega)$, $d \cdot W \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.
- Γ is C^2 and convex.
- $-\frac{3}{4} < \sigma < 0$.

Then, $\forall T > 0$ and $\forall v_0 \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$, $\exists f \in L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)$ s.t. solution v of

$$-\partial_t v + (\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}) v = Y \cdot \nabla v + W v \quad \text{on } (0, T) \times \Omega,$$

$$v|_{t=0} = v_0 \quad \text{on } \Omega,$$

$$\mathcal{D}_\sigma v = f \quad \text{on } (0, T) \times \Gamma,$$

satisfies $v|_{t=T} = 0$.

Theorem 1: Null Control

Theorem (Enciso-S-Vergara, 2023)

Assume:

- $Y \in C^1(\Omega)$, $d \cdot W \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.
- Γ is C^2 and convex.
- $-\frac{3}{4} < \sigma < 0$.

Then, $\forall T > 0$ and $\forall v_0 \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$, $\exists f \in L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)$ s.t. solution v of

$$-\partial_t v + (\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}) v = Y \cdot \nabla v + W v \quad \text{on } (0, T) \times \Omega,$$

$$v|_{t=0} = v_0 \quad \text{on } \Omega,$$

$$\mathcal{D}_\sigma v = f \quad \text{on } (0, T) \times \Gamma,$$

satisfies $v|_{t=T} = 0$.

First boundary control result for $n > 1$.

- First boundary control result for $Y, W \neq 0$ for any n .

Theorem 2: Approximate Control

Theorem (S-Vergara, 2024)

Assume:

- $Y \in C^1(\Omega)$, $d \cdot W \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.
- Γ is C^2 , $\omega \subseteq \Gamma$ open.
- $-\frac{3}{4} < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}$.

Then, $\forall T > 0$ and $\forall v_0, v_T \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$, $\exists f \in L^2((0, T) \times \omega)$ s.t. solution v of

$$-\partial_t v + (\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}) v = Y \cdot \nabla v + W v \quad \text{on } (0, T) \times \Omega,$$

$$v|_{t=0} = v_0 \quad \text{on } \Omega,$$

$$\mathcal{D}_\sigma v = f \quad \text{on } (0, T) \times \Gamma,$$

satisfies $\|v|_{t=T} - v_T\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} < \varepsilon$.

Theorem 2: Approximate Control

Theorem (S-Vergara, 2024)

Assume:

- $Y \in C^1(\Omega)$, $d \cdot W \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.
- Γ is C^2 , $\omega \subseteq \Gamma$ open.
- $-\frac{3}{4} < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}$.

Then, $\forall T > 0$ and $\forall v_0, v_T \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$, $\exists f \in L^2((0, T) \times \omega)$ s.t. solution v of

$$\begin{aligned} -\partial_t v + (\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}) v &= Y \cdot \nabla v + W v && \text{on } (0, T) \times \Omega, \\ v|_{t=0} &= v_0 && \text{on } \Omega, \\ \mathcal{D}_\sigma v &= f && \text{on } (0, T) \times \Gamma, \end{aligned}$$

satisfies $\|v|_{t=T} - v_T\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} < \varepsilon$.

Approximate control is weaker, but result is definitive:

- Can localise control f to arbitrarily small $\omega \subseteq \Gamma$.
- Handles full range of σ .

Section 2

Proof of Null Control

Duality

Proof via duality (**Russell**) and HUM (**Lions**) machinery:

- Controllability \Leftrightarrow quantitative uniqueness for dual problem.
- Need **dual, well-posed theories** for both settings.

Duality

Proof via duality (**Russell**) and HUM (**Lions**) machinery:

- Controllability \Leftrightarrow quantitative uniqueness for dual problem.
- Need **dual, well-posed theories** for both settings.

Controllability:

$$\begin{aligned} -\partial_t v + \left(\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}\right) v &= Y \cdot \nabla v + W v, \\ v|_{t=0} &= v_0 \in H^{-1}(\Omega), \\ \mathcal{D}_\sigma v &= f \in L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma). \end{aligned}$$

- Holds for $-\frac{3}{4} < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}$.
- “New” for **all** Y, W .

Observability:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u + \left(\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}\right) u &= X \cdot \nabla u + V u, \\ u|_{t=T} &= u_T \in H_0^1(\Omega), \\ \mathcal{D}_\sigma u &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

- Holds for $-\frac{3}{4} < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}$.
- “New” for $X, V \neq 0$.

Duality

Proof via duality (**Russell**) and HUM (**Lions**) machinery:

- Controllability \Leftrightarrow quantitative uniqueness for dual problem.
- Need **dual, well-posed theories** for both settings.

Controllability:

$$\begin{aligned} -\partial_t v + \left(\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}\right) v &= Y \cdot \nabla v + W v, \\ v|_{t=0} &= v_0 \in H^{-1}(\Omega), \\ \mathcal{D}_\sigma v &= f \in L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma). \end{aligned}$$

- Holds for $-\frac{3}{4} < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}$.
- “New” for **all** Y, W .

Observability:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u + \left(\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}\right) u &= X \cdot \nabla u + V u, \\ u|_{t=T} &= u_T \in H_0^1(\Omega), \\ \mathcal{D}_\sigma u &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

- Holds for $-\frac{3}{4} < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}$.
- “New” for $X, V \neq 0$.

HUM \Rightarrow controllability follows from **observability-side estimates**:

Observability

Crucial estimates. For any solution u of

$$\partial_t u + \left(\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}\right) u = X \cdot \nabla u + V u,$$

$$u|_{t=T} = u_T \in H_0^1(\Omega),$$

$$\mathcal{D}_\sigma u = 0,$$

then:

- Neumann trace: $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$ is well-defined in $L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)$.

Observability

Crucial estimates. For any solution u of

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t u + \left(\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}\right) u &= X \cdot \nabla u + V u, \\ u|_{t=T} &= u_T \in H_0^1(\Omega), \\ \mathcal{D}_\sigma u &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

then:

- **Neumann trace:** $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$ is well-defined in $L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)$.
- **Hidden regularity** (via trace, energy/smoothing estimates):

$$\|\mathcal{N}_\sigma u\|_{L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)} \lesssim \|u_T\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \quad -\frac{3}{4} < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}.$$

Observability

Crucial estimates. For any solution u of

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t u + \left(\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}\right) u &= X \cdot \nabla u + V u, \\ u|_{t=T} &= u_T \in H_0^1(\Omega), \\ \mathcal{D}_\sigma u &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

then:

- **Neumann trace:** $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$ is well-defined in $L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)$.

- **Hidden regularity** (via trace, energy/smoothing estimates):

$$\|\mathcal{N}_\sigma u\|_{L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)} \lesssim \|u_T\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \quad -\frac{3}{4} < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}.$$

- **Observability inequality** (via **Carleman** and energy estimates):

$$\|u|_{t=0}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\mathcal{N}_\sigma u\|_{L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)}, \quad -\frac{3}{4} < \sigma < 0.$$

Observability

Crucial estimates. For any solution u of

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t u + \left(\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}\right) u &= X \cdot \nabla u + V u, \\ u|_{t=T} &= u_T \in H_0^1(\Omega), \\ \mathcal{D}_\sigma u &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

then:

- **Neumann trace:** $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$ is well-defined in $L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)$.

- **Hidden regularity** (via trace, energy/smoothing estimates):

$$\|\mathcal{N}_\sigma u\|_{L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)} \lesssim \|u_T\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \quad -\frac{3}{4} < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}.$$

- **Observability inequality** (via **Carleman** and energy estimates):

$$\|u|_{t=0}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\mathcal{N}_\sigma u\|_{L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)}, \quad -\frac{3}{4} < \sigma < 0.$$

Main objective. Prove the lemma!

- Focus on **global Carleman estimate** (key step and contribution).

The HUM Machinery

Rough sketch. Define functional:

$$I_\sigma : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad I_\sigma(u_T) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{(0,T) \times \Gamma} |\mathcal{N}_\sigma u|^2 - \int_\Omega u(0) v_0.$$

- Lemma, upper bound $\Rightarrow I_\sigma$ is **continuous**.
- Lemma, **observability** $\Rightarrow I_\sigma$ is **coercive** (in certain norm).

The HUM Machinery

Rough sketch. Define functional:

$$I_\sigma : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad I_\sigma(u_T) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{(0,T) \times \Gamma} |\mathcal{N}_\sigma u|^2 - \int_\Omega u(0)v_0.$$

- Lemma, upper bound $\Rightarrow I_\sigma$ is **continuous**.
- Lemma, **observability** $\Rightarrow I_\sigma$ is **coercive** (in certain norm).

Thus, I_σ has minimiser \tilde{u}_T :

- Null control given by $\mathcal{N}_\sigma \tilde{u}$.

Carleman Overview

Goal. Weighted spacetime estimate (roughly):

$$\begin{aligned}
 & C' \lambda \int_{(0,T) \times \Gamma} (\mathcal{N}_\sigma u)^2 + \int_{(0,T) \times \Omega} e^{-2\lambda F} \left(\partial_t u + \Delta u + \frac{\sigma}{d^2} u \right)^2 \\
 & \geq C \lambda \int_{(0,T) \times \Omega} e^{-2\lambda F} \left(|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{1}{d^2} u^2 \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

- $F = F(t, x)$: specially chosen weight.
- $\lambda \gg 1$: large free parameter.
 - Allows to absorb $X \cdot \nabla u + V u$ terms.

Carleman Overview

Goal. Weighted spacetime estimate (roughly):

$$C'\lambda \int_{(0,T)\times\Gamma} (\mathcal{N}_\sigma u)^2 + \int_{(0,T)\times\Omega} e^{-2\lambda F} \left(\partial_t u + \Delta u + \frac{\sigma}{d^2} u \right)^2 \\ \geq C\lambda \int_{(0,T)\times\Omega} e^{-2\lambda F} \left(|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{1}{d^2} u^2 \right).$$

- $F = F(t, x)$: specially chosen weight.
- $\lambda \gg 1$: large free parameter.
 - Allows to absorb $X \cdot \nabla u + V u$ terms.

Very rough derivation. Integrate by parts:

$$\int_{(0,T)\times\Omega} e^{-\lambda F} (\partial_t + \Delta)(e^{\lambda F} w) S w, \quad w := e^{-\lambda F} u.$$

- $S w := \partial_t w + \lambda \nabla F \cdot \nabla w + \dots$: multiplier.
- Good choice of F , large $\lambda \Rightarrow$ positive bulk term.

A Boundary-Adapted Weight

(Biccari-Zuazua, 2016) Carleman weight roughly of form (near Γ)

$$F_I(t, x) \approx \frac{1}{t(T-t)} [C - d^2(x) - d^s(x)e^{s d(x)}], \quad s \gg 1.$$

- Does not capture $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$ at boundary.
- Carleman estimate bounds L^2 -norm of u , but not full H^1 -norm.

A Boundary-Adapted Weight

(Biccari-Zuazua, 2016) Carleman weight roughly of form (near Γ)

$$F_I(t, x) := \frac{1}{t(T-t)} \left[C - d^2(x) - d^s(x) e^{s d(x)} \right], \quad s \gg 1.$$

- Does not capture $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$ at boundary.
- Carleman estimate bounds L^2 -norm of u , but not full H^1 -norm.

Idea. Need special power of d in F to capture $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$:

$$F_0(t, x) := \frac{1}{t(T-t)} \left[\frac{1}{1+2\kappa} d^{1+2\kappa}(x) + \beta \right], \quad \kappa := \frac{1-\sqrt{1-4\sigma}}{2}, \quad \beta > 0.$$

- Integrations by parts $\Rightarrow L^2$ -norm of $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$ at boundary.

A Boundary-Adapted Weight

(Bicari-Zuazua, 2016) Carleman weight roughly of form (near Γ)

$$F_I(t, x) \approx \frac{1}{t(T-t)} [C - d^2(x) - d^s(x)e^{s d(x)}], \quad s \gg 1.$$

- Does not capture $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$ at boundary.
- Carleman estimate bounds L^2 -norm of u , but not full H^1 -norm.

Idea. Need special power of d in F to capture $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$:

$$F_0(t, x) := \frac{1}{t(T-t)} \left[\frac{1}{1+2\kappa} d^{1+2\kappa}(x) + \beta \right], \quad \kappa := \frac{1-\sqrt{1-4\sigma}}{2}, \quad \beta > 0.$$

- Integrations by parts $\Rightarrow L^2$ -norm of $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$ at boundary.

Lemma. Boundary only sees $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$ —assuming $u_T \in H_0^1(\Omega)$:

$$d^{-1+\kappa} u|_\Gamma = \frac{1}{1-2\kappa} \mathcal{N}_\sigma u, \quad \int_{(0,T) \times \Gamma} e^{-2\lambda F} \partial_t (\mathcal{D}_\sigma u) \mathcal{N}_\sigma u = 0.$$

The Global Weight

Problem. d fails to be differentiable away from Γ .

- F_0 not viable away from Γ .

The Global Weight

Problem. d fails to be differentiable away from Γ .

- F_0 not viable away from Γ .

Proposition. There exists “boundary-defining function” $0 < y \in C^2(\Omega)$ such that:

- Near-boundary ($d < \delta_0$): $y = d$, and $-\nabla^2 y \geq 0$.
- Intermediate ($\delta_0 \leq d \leq 2\delta_0$): $|\nabla y| \geq c$, and $-\nabla^2 y \geq -\epsilon'$.
- Far region ($d > 2\delta_0$): $-\nabla^2 y \geq \epsilon$, and y has unique critical point x_* .

The Global Weight

Problem. d fails to be differentiable away from Γ .

- F_0 not viable away from Γ .

Proposition. There exists “boundary-defining function” $0 < y \in C^2(\Omega)$ such that:

- Near-boundary ($d < \delta_0$): $y = d$, and $-\nabla^2 y \geq 0$.
- Intermediate ($\delta_0 \leq d \leq 2\delta_0$): $|\nabla y| \geq c$, and $-\nabla^2 y \geq -\epsilon'$.
- Far region ($d > 2\delta_0$): $-\nabla^2 y \geq \epsilon$, and y has unique critical point x_* .

Idea. Replace d by y in Carleman weight

$$F(t, x) := \frac{1}{t(T-t)} \left[\frac{1}{1+2\kappa} y(x)^{1+2\kappa} + \beta \right].$$

- Also work with smoother operator $\partial_t + \Delta + \sigma y^{-2}$.
- $y = d_\Gamma$ near $\Gamma \Rightarrow$ estimate still captures $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$ on $(0, T) \times \Gamma$.
- Γ convex $\Rightarrow y$ “almost-convex” \Rightarrow controls \dot{H}^1 -norm on all of $(0, T) \times \Omega$.
- L^2 -terms contain many singular weights, but most leading terms positive.

Double Carleman

Problem. Estimate does not control L^2 -norm of u near critical point x_* !

$$\begin{aligned}
 & C' \lambda \int_{(0, T) \times \Gamma} (\mathcal{N}_\sigma u)^2 + \int_{(0, T) \times \Omega} e^{-2\lambda F} \left(\partial_t u + \Delta u + \frac{\sigma}{y^2} u \right)^2 \\
 & \geq C \lambda \int_{(0, T) \times \Omega} e^{-2\lambda F} \dots |\nabla u|^2 - C_* \lambda^2 \int_{(0, T) \times B_\delta(x_*)} e^{-2\lambda F} \dots u^2 \\
 & \quad + C \lambda^3 \int_{(0, T) \times [\Omega \setminus B_\delta(x_*)]} e^{-2\lambda F} \dots u^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

- L^2 -part positive only away from x_* (contains $|\nabla y|^2$ -weight).

Double Carleman

Problem. Estimate does not control L^2 -norm of u near critical point x_* !

$$\begin{aligned}
 & C' \lambda \int_{(0,T) \times \Gamma} (\mathcal{N}_\sigma u)^2 + \int_{(0,T) \times \Omega} e^{-2\lambda F} \left(\partial_t u + \Delta u + \frac{\sigma}{y^2} u \right)^2 \\
 & \geq C \lambda \int_{(0,T) \times \Omega} e^{-2\lambda F} \dots |\nabla u|^2 - C_* \lambda^2 \int_{(0,T) \times B_\delta(x_*)} e^{-2\lambda F} \dots u^2 \\
 & \quad + C \lambda^3 \int_{(0,T) \times [\Omega \setminus B_\delta(x_*)]} e^{-2\lambda F} \dots u^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

- L^2 -part positive only away from x_* (contains $|\nabla y|^2$ -weight).

Idea. Construct two boundary-defining functions y_1 and y_2 , with $x_{*,1} \neq x_{*,2}$.

- Sum Carleman estimates obtained from y_1 and y_2 .

Double Carleman

Problem. Estimate does not control L^2 -norm of u near critical point x_* !

$$\begin{aligned}
 & C' \lambda \int_{(0,T) \times \Gamma} (\mathcal{N}_\sigma u)^2 + \int_{(0,T) \times \Omega} e^{-2\lambda F} \left(\partial_t u + \Delta u + \frac{\sigma}{y^2} u \right)^2 \\
 & \geq C \lambda \int_{(0,T) \times \Omega} e^{-2\lambda F} \dots |\nabla u|^2 - C_* \lambda^2 \int_{(0,T) \times B_\delta(x_*)} e^{-2\lambda F} \dots u^2 \\
 & \quad + C \lambda^3 \int_{(0,T) \times [\Omega \setminus B_\delta(x_*)]} e^{-2\lambda F} \dots u^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

- L^2 -part positive only away from x_* (contains $|\nabla y|^2$ -weight).

Idea. Construct two boundary-defining functions y_1 and y_2 , with $x_{*,1} \neq x_{*,2}$.

- Sum Carleman estimates obtained from y_1 and y_2 .

Balance β_1 and β_2 , take λ large enough:

- Near $x_{*,1}$: positive L^2 -part from y_2 -bound absorbs negative L^2 -part from y_1 -bound.
- Near $x_{*,2}$: positive L^2 -part from y_1 -bound absorbs negative L^2 -part from y_2 -bound.

The Double Carleman Estimate

Theorem. Let F_j be the Carleman weight from y_j . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} C'\lambda \int_{(0,T)\times\Gamma} (\mathcal{N}_\sigma u)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_{(0,T)\times\Omega} e^{-2\lambda F_j} \left(\partial_t u + \Delta u + \frac{\sigma}{y_j^2} u \right)^2 \\ \geq C\lambda \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_{(0,T)\times\Omega} e^{-2\lambda F_j} \left(|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{\lambda^2}{y_j^2} u^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

- Combine with energy estimates \Rightarrow observability \Rightarrow null controllability.

The Double Carleman Estimate

Theorem. Let F_j be the Carleman weight from y_j . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} C'\lambda \int_{(0,T)\times\Gamma} (\mathcal{N}_\sigma u)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_{(0,T)\times\Omega} e^{-2\lambda F_j} \left(\partial_t u + \Delta u + \frac{\sigma}{y_j^2} u \right)^2 \\ \geq C\lambda \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_{(0,T)\times\Omega} e^{-2\lambda F_j} \left(|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{\lambda^2}{y_j^2} u^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

- Combine with energy estimates \Rightarrow observability \Rightarrow null controllability.

Questions. Weaker results than for classical parabolic equations:

- Can convexity assumption for Γ be removed?
- Must control be on all of Γ ?
- What about $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}$?

The Double Carleman Estimate

Theorem. Let F_j be the Carleman weight from y_j . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} C'\lambda \int_{(0,T)\times\Gamma} (\mathcal{N}_\sigma u)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_{(0,T)\times\Omega} e^{-2\lambda F_j} \left(\partial_t u + \Delta u + \frac{\sigma}{y_j^2} u \right)^2 \\ \geq C\lambda \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_{(0,T)\times\Omega} e^{-2\lambda F_j} \left(|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{\lambda^2}{y_j^2} u^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

- Combine with energy estimates \Rightarrow observability \Rightarrow null controllability.

Questions. Weaker results than for classical parabolic equations:

- Can convexity assumption for Γ be removed?
- Must control be on all of Γ ?
- What about $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{4}$?

Recently. Can address all three points for approximate control.

Section 3

Proof of Approximate Control

The HUM Revisited

Proof via same duality/HUM setup as before:

- **Main difference.** Need **unique continuation** property from ω , rather than observability.

The HUM Revisited

Proof via same duality/HUM setup as before:

- **Main difference.** Need **unique continuation** property from ω , rather than observability.

Crucial properties. For any solution u of

$$\partial_t u + \left(\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}\right) u = X \cdot \nabla u + V u,$$

$$u|_{t=T} = u_T \in H_0^1(\Omega),$$

$$\mathcal{D}_\sigma u = 0,$$

then $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$ is well-defined in $L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)$, and

- $\|\mathcal{N}_\sigma u\|_{L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)} \lesssim \|u_T\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$.
- If $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u|_{(0, T) \times \omega} = 0$, then $u \equiv 0$.

The HUM Revisited

Proof via same duality/HUM setup as before:

- **Main difference.** Need **unique continuation** property from ω , rather than observability.

Crucial properties. For any solution u of

$$\partial_t u + \left(\Delta + \frac{\sigma}{d^2}\right) u = X \cdot \nabla u + V u,$$

$$u|_{t=T} = u_T \in H_0^1(\Omega),$$

$$\mathcal{D}_\sigma u = 0,$$

then $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u$ is well-defined in $L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)$, and

- $\|\mathcal{N}_\sigma u\|_{L^2((0, T) \times \Gamma)} \lesssim \|u_T\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$.
- If $\mathcal{N}_\sigma u|_{(0, T) \times \omega} = 0$, then $u \equiv 0$.

Main objective. Prove the lemma!

- **Hidden regularity:** same proof as before.
- **Unique continuation property:** new **local Carleman estimate** (near $(0, T) \times \omega$).

The HUM Machinery

Rough sketch. Can assume $v_0 \equiv 0$. Define functional:

$$I_{\sigma, \varepsilon} : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad I_{\sigma}(u_T) := \varepsilon \|u_T\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{(0, T) \times \Gamma} |\mathcal{N}_{\sigma} u|^2 + \int_{\Omega} u_T v_T.$$

- Lemma, upper bound $\Rightarrow I_{\sigma, \varepsilon}$ is **continuous**.
- Lemma, **unique continuation** $\Rightarrow I_{\sigma, \varepsilon}$ is **coercive**.

The HUM Machinery

Rough sketch. Can assume $v_0 \equiv 0$. Define functional:

$$I_{\sigma, \varepsilon} : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad I_{\sigma}(u_T) := \varepsilon \|u_T\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{(0, T) \times \Gamma} |\mathcal{N}_{\sigma} u|^2 + \int_{\Omega} u_T v_T.$$

- Lemma, upper bound $\Rightarrow I_{\sigma, \varepsilon}$ is **continuous**.
- Lemma, **unique continuation** $\Rightarrow I_{\sigma, \varepsilon}$ is **coercive**.

Thus, I_{σ} has minimiser \tilde{u}_T :

- Approximate control given by $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma} \tilde{u}|_{(0, T) \times \omega}$.
- Extra term in $I_{\sigma, \varepsilon} \Rightarrow$ need less for coercivity, minimizer only approximate control.

Localising the Carleman estimate

Question. How to localise estimate to near ω ?

Localising the Carleman estimate

Question. How to localise estimate to near ω ?

Idea. Consider local Carleman weight near ω :

$$F(t, x) := \frac{1}{t(T-t)} \left[\frac{1}{1+2\kappa} d(x)^{1+2\kappa} + |w(x)|^2 \right].$$

- $w := (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1})$ local coordinates on Γ near $x_0 \in \omega$, with $w(x_0) = 0$.
- w constant along integral curves of ∇y .
- By construction, $\nabla y \cdot \nabla w = 0$ (needed to avoid terms that are too singular).

Localising the Carleman estimate

Question. How to localise estimate to near ω ?

Idea. Consider local Carleman weight near ω :

$$F(t, x) := \frac{1}{t(T-t)} \left[\frac{1}{1+2\kappa} d(x)^{1+2\kappa} + |w(x)|^2 \right].$$

- $w := (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1})$ local coordinates on Γ near $x_0 \in \omega$, with $w(x_0) = 0$.
- w constant along integral curves of ∇y .
- By construction, $\nabla y \cdot \nabla w = 0$ (needed to avoid terms that are too singular).

Observation. $F \geq 0$, and $F = 0$ only at $(0, T) \times \{x_0\}$.

- Leads to **unique continuation from near $(0, T) \times \{x_0\}$** (rather than from $(0, T) \times \Gamma$).

Avoiding Convexity

Can remove convexity assumption on Γ :

- **Observation.** d^{-1} very large near $\Gamma \Rightarrow$ positive bulk terms.
- Stronger than negative terms from concavity of d .
- $w \ll d^{-1}$ cannot interfere with positivity.

Avoiding Convexity

Can remove convexity assumption on Γ :

- **Observation.** d^{-1} very large near $\Gamma \Rightarrow$ positive bulk terms.
- Stronger than negative terms from concavity of d .
- $w \ll d^{-1}$ cannot interfere with positivity.

Remark. In some ways, localisation makes estimate easier:

- Do not need to replace d by y .
- Only need one Carleman estimate.

Extending to $\sigma > 0$

Question. How to extend result to $\sigma > 0$?

- Carleman estimate fails for $\sigma > 0$!

Extending to $\sigma > 0$

Question. How to extend result to $\sigma > 0$?

- Carleman estimate fails for $\sigma > 0$!

Idea. Since $\mathcal{D}_\sigma u = \mathcal{N}_\sigma u = 0$ on $(0, T) \times \omega$:

- u vanishes to additional powers of d .
- Extra vanishing \Rightarrow can apply Carleman estimate with $\sigma < 0$.

Extending to $\sigma > 0$

Question. How to extend result to $\sigma > 0$?

- Carleman estimate fails for $\sigma > 0$!

Idea. Since $\mathcal{D}_\sigma u = \mathcal{N}_\sigma u = 0$ on $(0, T) \times \omega$:

- u vanishes to additional powers of d .
- Extra vanishing \Rightarrow can apply Carleman estimate with $\sigma < 0$.

Theorem. The following estimate holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & C' \lambda \int_{(0, T) \times [\Gamma \cap B_\varepsilon(x_0)]} \left[\frac{1}{d^{q_1}} (\mathcal{N}_\sigma u)^2 + \frac{1}{d^{q_0}} (\mathcal{D}_\sigma u)^2 \right] + \int_{(0, T) \times B_\varepsilon(x_0)} e^{-2\lambda F} \left(\partial_t u + \Delta u + \frac{\sigma}{d^2} u \right)^2 \\
 & \geq C \lambda \sum_{j=1}^2 \int_{(0, T) \times B_\varepsilon(x_0)} e^{-2\lambda F} \left(|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{\lambda^2}{d^2} u^2 \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

- Leads to unique continuation property.

Thank You

Thank you for your attention!

A. Enciso, A. Shao, B. Vergara, *Controllability of parabolic equations with inverse square infinite potential wells via global Carleman estimates*, arXiv: 2112.04457

A. Shao, B. Vergara, *Approximate boundary controllability for parabolic equations with inverse square infinite potential wells*, arXiv: 2311.01628