

Sharp control time for viscoelastic bodies*

L. Pandolfi[†]

August 30, 2018

Abstract: It is now well understood that equations of viscoelasticity can be seen as perturbation of wave type equations. This observation can be exploited in several different ways and it turns out that it is a useful tool when studying controllability. Here we compare a viscoelastic system which fills a surface of a solid region (the string case has already been studied) with its memoryless counterpart (which is a generalized telegraph equation) in order to prove exact controllability of the viscoelastic body at precisely the same times at which the telegraph equation is controllable.

The comparison is done using a moment method approach to controllability and we prove, using the perturbations theorems of Paley-Wiener and Bari, that a new sequence derived from the viscoelastic system is a Riesz sequence, a fact that implies controllability of the viscoelastic system.

The results so obtained generalize existing controllability results and furthermore show that the “sharp” control time for the telegraph equation and the viscoelastic system coincide.

Keywords: Controllability and observability, integral equations, linear systems, partial differential equations, heat equations with memory, viscoelasticity.

1 Introduction

We consider a control problem for the following equation:

*This paper fits into the research programme of the GNAMPA-INDAM and has been written in the framework of the “Groupement de Recherche en Contrôle des EDP entre la France et l’Italie (CONEDP-CNRS)”.

[†]Dipartimento di Scienze Matematiche “Giuseppe Luigi Lagrange”, Politecnico di Torino, Corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Torino, Italy (luciano.pandolfi@polito.it)

$$w_{tt} = 2cw_t + \nabla \cdot (a(x)\nabla w) + q(x)w + \int_0^t M(t-s) (\nabla \cdot (a(x)\nabla w(s)) + q(x)w(s)) ds + F(x, t). \quad (1.1)$$

Here $t > 0$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes a function $w(x, t)$, $x \in \Omega$ where Ω is the region occupied by the body. We assume that it is a bounded region with a smooth (C^2) boundary and $\dim \Omega = d \leq 3$. In this case, the physical meaning of the problem can be explained as follows: when $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with $d = 1$ or $d = 2$, then w represents the vertical displacement of the point in position x at time t of a viscoelastic string or membrane in the linear approximation. If $d = 3$ then the relations of Eq. (1.1) with viscoelasticity are less stringent, since in this case the displacement is a three dimensional vector whose components in general are not independent so that Eq. (1.1) represents one of the components of the deformation only in quite special cases.

Eq. (1.1) has to be supplemented with the initial condition

$$w(\cdot, 0) = w_0, \quad w_t(\cdot, 0) = w_1.$$

The control f acts in the Dirichlet boundary condition:

$$w(x, t) = f(x, t) \quad x \in \Gamma \subseteq \partial\Omega, \quad w(x, t) = 0 \quad x \in \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma.$$

We stress the fact that the control f is *real valued* and we assume that it belongs to $L^2_{\text{loc}}(0, +\infty; L^2(\Omega))$.

Note that the arguments of $w = w(x, t)$ are not explicitly indicated unless needed for clarity. According to the convenience, we shall write $w(x, t)$ or $w(t)$ or simply w . Furthermore, w does depend on f but also this dependence is not indicated.

It is well known that (when the boundary control f is square integrable) a natural space for the evolution of the system is

$$L^2(\Omega) \times H^{-1}(\Omega)$$

as in the corresponding memoryless case (i.e. $M(t) \equiv 0$). We choose the initial data in this space.

The affine term $F(x, t)$ depends on the history of the body for $t < 0$.

We will study controllability of system (1.1), i.e. we study whether, starting from every initial condition, is it possible to force $(w(\cdot, t), w_t(\cdot, t))$ to hit any prescribed target $(\xi, \eta) \in L^2(\Omega) \times H^{-1}(\Omega)$ at some time $T > 0$. It is easily seen that this property does not depend on the initial condition or on the affine term. So, when studying controllability, we can assume

$$w(x, 0) = 0, \quad w_t(x, 0) = 0, \quad F(x, t) = 0 \quad (1.2)$$

and the problem we are studying is as follows: to investigate whether there exists a “control time” T such that for every $\xi \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $\eta \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$ there exists $f \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))$ such that

$$w(\cdot, T) = \xi \in L^2(\Omega), \quad w_t(\cdot, T) = \eta \in H^{-1}(\Omega).$$

This problem has already been studied with the methods in this paper when $d = 1$.

Note that if controllability holds at time T , it holds also at larger times. So, we would like to study also the infimum of the control times (the “sharp control time”). This is done in Section 5 where it is proved that it coincides with the sharp control time of the (generalized) *telegraph equation*. This is the special case obtained when $M(t) \equiv 0$:

$$\begin{cases} w_{tt} = 2cw_t + \nabla \cdot (a(x)\nabla w) + q(x)w, \\ w(x, t) = f(x, t) \quad x \in \Gamma, \quad w(x, t) = 0 \quad x \in \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

Under the assumptions above on the region Ω and standard assumptions on Γ which we don’t need to recall here, controllability holds for the telegraph equation with L^2 -boundary control, as proved in [32] (the definition of controllability is the same as above. See also [31] for controllability under distributed controls).

A Γ -dependent value for the control time T of Eq. (1.3) is identified in [32]. So, we shall study controllability of the viscoelastic body when the subset $\Gamma \in \partial\Omega$ is so chosen that the telegraph equation is controllable at a certain time T , using *real* controls $f \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))$. The reason of the stress posed on the (obvious) property that the control is real will be seen below.

The result we are going to prove is the following theorem:

Theorem 1 *We assume:*

- $d \leq 3$ and $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded region with C^2 boundary.

- $M(t) \in H_{\text{loc}}^2(0, +\infty)$
- $q(x) \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ and $a(x) \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$, with $a(x) > a_0 > 0$ for every $x \in \bar{\Omega}$.

If the telegraph equation (1.3) is controllable in time T , then Eq. (1.1) is controllable at the same time T . Furthermore, Eq. (1.1) and (1.3) have the same sharp control time.

Among the different ways in which controllability can be proved, possibly the oldest one is the reduction of a control problem to a moment problem. Theorem 1 has been proved using this idea when $d = 1$ (see references below) and we are going to prove that moment methods can be used in general.

Note that once the controllability property in Theorem 1 has been proved, the technique in [28] can be applied to our system, for the identification of external distributed sources.

Notations. We shall use the following notations. The term “locally bounded” denotes a sequence of (usually continuous) functions which is bounded on every compact interval (of $[0, +\infty)$). We shall use $\{M_n\}$ and $\{M_n(t)\}$ to denote respectively a *bounded* sequence of positive numbers and a *locally bounded* sequence of positive functions (not the same at every occurrence).

Let $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$ be two sequences (in any normed space). the notation $\{a_n\} \asymp \{b_n\}$ indicates the existence of $m_0 > 0$ and m_1 such that for every n we have

$$m_0|a_n| \leq |b_n| \leq m_1|a_n|.$$

The numbers $m_0 > 0$ and m_1 depend on the sequences.

We shall use \star to denote convolution,

$$(f \star g) = \int_0^t f(t-s)g(s) \, ds.$$

We mentioned already that we don’t indicate the space or time variables in w (or related functions, as ξ , η and f) unless needed for clarity. Furthermore, for every $t > 0$ we introduce the notations

$$Q_t = \Omega \times (0, t), \quad G_t = \Gamma \times (0, t), \quad \Sigma_t = (\partial\Omega) \times (0, t).$$

Finally, $\partial/\partial\nu$ denotes normal derivative and

$$\gamma_a \phi = a(x) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \nu} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \text{ (in particular on } \Gamma).$$

1.1 References and known results

It seems that the first nontrivial results on controllability of viscoelastic systems are due to Lasiecka and Leugering (see for example [16, 18, 19]) then followed by several contribution. Among them, we consider in particular the results in [9, 22, 25]. The paper [22] proves Theorem 1 (even for a nonconvolution kernel) in the case $q(x) = 0$ and $a(x) = 1$. More important, it explicitly assumes that the control acts on the whole boundary of Ω , $\Gamma = \partial\Omega$ (used in the proof of Lemma 4.1).

Under these conditions the paper [22], relying on multiplier techniques, proves controllability when $T \geq T_0$, where T_0 is explicitly identified.

A similar controllability result is proved in [9] where the proof is based on Carleman estimates. In this paper the control is distributed in a subregion close to $\partial\Omega$. An idea in [5] can then be used to derive boundary controllability in a smaller region, using controls which acts on the whole boundary. Note that in this paper the memory kernel can be space dependent. We believe that the techniques we are going to use cannot be extended to space-dependent kernels.

The paper [25] uses a different idea. The equation with memory is considered as a perturbation of a wave equation and its solutions are then represented using cosine operator theory (this idea is implicit in previous papers, for example by Leugering). It is proved in [25] that controllability holds for the equation with memory provided that the control acts in a part of the boundary chosen so to have controllability of the corresponding wave equation. However, the argument is based on category arguments and the control time is not identified.

We mention that the paper [9, 25] are concerned with the heat equation with memory, i.e. with an equation of first order in time, so that they study only the controllability of the component $w(t)$, not of the velocity, but at least the arguments in [25] are easily extended to the pair (deformation/velocity).

In conclusion, Theorem 1 extends and completes the results in [9, 22, 25] and furthermore it uses completely different techniques, which have their independent interest: the proof uses moment methods and extends to higher space dimension the techniques and results developed in [1, 3, 4, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29].

1.2 Preliminary information

We report the following result (see for example [15]):

Theorem 2 *for every $f \in L^2(G_T) = L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))$ and every initial condition $w(\cdot, 0) = \xi \in L^2(\Omega)$, $w_t(\cdot, 0) = \eta \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$, Eq. (1.1) admits a unique solution $w(\cdot, t) \in C(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ with $w_t(\cdot; t) \in C(0, T; H^{-1}(\Omega))$. The transformation*

$$(\xi, \eta, f) \mapsto (w, w_t)$$

is linear and continuous in the indicated spaces.

Let A be the operator in $L^2(\Omega)$,

$$\text{dom } A = H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega), \quad Aw = \nabla \cdot (a(x)\nabla w) + q(x)w. \quad (1.4)$$

This operator is selfadjoint with compact resolvent. So, it has a normalized sequence $\{\phi_n(x)\}$ of eigenvectors, which is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\Omega)$. We define:

$$-\lambda_n^2 \text{ is the eigenvalue of } \phi_n.$$

Note the sign and the exponent, but this does not imply that $-\lambda_n^2$ is real negative. This property does depend on the sign of $q(x)$. But, $-\lambda_n^2$ is real negative for large n . Moreover, the eigenvalues might not be distinct. The multiplicity of each eigenvalue is finite. A known fact is that

$$-\lambda_n^2 \asymp n^{2/d} \quad \text{where } d = \dim \Omega.$$

I.e., there exists $m_0 > 0$ and $m_1 > 0$ and N such that

$$n > N \implies m_0 n^{2/d} < \lambda_n^2 < m_1 n^{2/d},$$

see [24, p. 192]. So,

Lemma 3 *If $d \leq 3$ then we have $\sum 1/\lambda_n^4 < +\infty$.*

This Lemma will be explicitly used in our proof.

2 Riesz sequences and moment methods

Linear control systems can be reduced to the solution of suitable *moment problems*: given a sequence $\{e_n\}$ in a Hilbert space H (inner product is $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and the norm is $|\cdot|$) and a sequence $\{c_n\} \in l^2$, it is required to solve

$$\langle f, e_n \rangle = c_n \quad (2.1)$$

for every index n .

In general, $\{\langle f, e_n \rangle\} \notin l^2$ and so we have an operator \mathbb{J} on H , whose domain is

$$\text{dom } \mathbb{J} = \{f \in H : \{\langle f, e_n \rangle\} \in l^2\}, \quad \text{so that } \mathbb{J} : H \mapsto l^2.$$

In our case however, it will be $\text{dom } \mathbb{J} = H$ and $\mathbb{J} \in \mathcal{L}(H, l^2)$. The adjoint $\mathbb{J}^* : l^2 \mapsto H$ is given by

$$\mathbb{J}^* (\{v_n\}) = \sum e_n v_n \quad (2.2)$$

The moment problem is to understand whether \mathbb{J} is surjective.

It turns out that, when $\mathbb{J} \in \mathcal{L}(H, l^2)$, \mathbb{J} is surjective if and only if $\{e_n\}$ is a *Riesz sequence*, see [2, Theorem I.2.1], which is defined as follows: we first define a Riesz basis. A *Riesz basis* of H is a complete sequence which is the image of an orthonormal basis under a linear, bounded and boundedly invertible transformation in H .

A sequence which is a Riesz basis in its closed span is a *Riesz sequence*.

The following holds (see [33, Th. 9]):

Lemma 4 *The sequence $\{e_n\}$ is a Riesz sequence if and only if there exist numbers $m_0 > 0$ and $m_1 > 0$ such that*

$$m_0 \sum |a_n|^2 \leq \left| \sum a_n e_n \right|_H^2 \leq m_1 \sum |a_n|^2 \quad (2.3)$$

for every finite sequence $\{a_n\}$. If furthermore the sequence $\{e_n\}$ is complete, then it is a *Riesz basis*.

Every Riesz sequence admits biorthogonal sequences $\{\psi_n\}$ i.e. sequences such that

$$\langle \psi_k, e_n \rangle = \delta_{n,k} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = k \\ 0 & \text{if } n \neq k. \end{cases}$$

One (and only one) of these biorthogonal sequence belongs to the closed space spanned by $\{e_n\}$. This biorthogonal sequence is a Riesz sequence too, and the solution of the moment problem (2.1) is

$$f = \sum c_n \psi_n.$$

Let $\{e_n\}$ and $\{z_n\}$ be two sequences in H . We say that they are *quadratically close* if

$$\sum |e_n - z_n|^2 < +\infty$$

and we use the following test (see [33]):

Theorem 5 *Let $\{e_n\}$ be a Riesz sequence in H and let $\{z_n\}$ be quadratically close to $\{e_n\}$. Then we have*

- **Paley-Wiener Theorem:** *there exists N such that $\{z_n\}_{n>N}$ is a Riesz sequence in H ;*
- **Bari Theorem:** *the sequence $\{z_n\}$ is a Riesz sequence if, furthermore, it is ω -independent, i.e. if (here $\{\alpha_n\}$ is a sequence of numbers)*

$$\sum \alpha_n z_n = 0 \implies \{\alpha_n\} = 0.$$

A usefull observation is as follows: if $\{z_n\}$ is quadratically close to a Riesz sequence then $\sum \alpha_n z_n$ converges in H if and only if $\{\alpha_n\} \in l^2$.

The concrete case we are interested in, is the case $H = L^2(0, T; K)$ where K is a second Hilbert space (it will be $K = L^2(\Gamma)$). In this context, we need two special results.

Theorem 6 *Let $\mathbb{Z}' = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and let $\{\beta_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'}$, $\{k_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'}$ be such that*

$$\beta_{-n} = -\beta_n, \quad k_n = k_{-n} \in K, \quad |\operatorname{Im} \beta_n| < L. \quad (2.4)$$

for e suitable number L . If the sequence $\{e^{i\beta_n t} k_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'}$ is a Riesz sequence in $L^2(-T, T, K)$, then the sequences

$$\{k_n \cos \beta_n t\}_{n>0}, \quad \{k_n \sin \beta_n t\}_{n>0} \quad (2.5)$$

are Riesz sequences in $L^2(0, T; K)$.

Proof. The assumption is that (2.3) holds for the sequence $\{e^{i\beta_n t} k_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'}$ in $L^2(-T, T; K)$. We prove that a similar property holds for the sequences (2.5) in $L^2(0, T; K)$. We consider the cosine sequence. The sine sequence is treated analogously.

Let $\{a_n\}$ be any finite sequence of complex numbers. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{n>0} a_n k_n \cos \beta_n t \right\|_{L^2(0, T; K)}^2 = \frac{1}{4} \left\| \sum_{n>0} a_n k_n e^{i\beta_n t} + \sum_{n>0} a_n k_n e^{-i\beta_n t} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; K)}^2 \\ & = \frac{1}{8} \left\| \sum_{n>0} a_n k_n e^{i\beta_n t} + \sum_{n>0} a_n k_n e^{-i\beta_n t} \right\|_{L^2(-T, T; K)}^2 \\ & = \frac{1}{8} \left\| \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} a_n k_n e^{i\beta_n t} \right\|_{L^2(-T, T; K)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the last equality we used we used $-\beta_n = \beta_n$, $k_{-n} = k_n$ and $a_n = a_{-n}$ (in the case of the sine sequence we have $-a_n = a_{-n}$).

Inequalities (2.3) hold by assumption for the last series, hence also for the first one. ■

This proof has been adapted from [12], where it is proved that the opposite implication is false.

Nothing that the transformation

$$\sum \alpha_n e^{i\beta_n t} k_n \mapsto \sum \alpha_n e^{-i\beta_n T} e^{i\beta_n \tau} k_n : \quad L^2(-T, T; K) \mapsto L^2(0, 2T; K)$$

is bounded and boundedly invertible (use $|\operatorname{Im} \beta_n|$ bounded), we have also:

Corollary 7 *Let conditions (2.4) hold. If the sequence $\{e^{i\beta_n t} k_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'}$ is a Riesz sequence in $L^2(0, 2T, K)$, then the sequences in (2.5) are Riesz sequences in $L^2(0, T; K)$.*

Now we consider a Riesz basis $\{e_n\}$ in $L^2(0, T; K)$ and a time $T_0 < T$. Then $\{e_n\}$ is complete in $L^2(0, T_0; K)$ but it is not a Riesz sequence since every element of $L^2(0, T_0; K)$ has infinitely many representation as a series $\sum a_n e_n$ (one such representation for every extension which belongs to $L^2(0, T; K)$).

Let \mathbb{J}_0 be the operator from $L^2(0, T_0; K)$ to l^2 given by

$$\mathbb{J}_0 f = \left\{ \langle f, e_n \rangle_{L^2(0, T_0; K)} \right\}.$$

We prove:

Lemma 8 *The codimension of the range of the operator \mathbb{J}_0 is infinite.*

Proof. We know that

$$(\text{im } \mathbb{J}_0)^\perp = \ker \mathbb{J}_0^* = \left\{ \{c_n\} \in l^2 : \sum c_n e_n = 0 \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T_0; K) \right\}$$

Every sequence $\{c_n\}$ such that $\sum c_n e_n = 0$ in $L^2(0, T_0; K)$ while $\sum c_n e_n \neq 0$ in $L^2(T_0, T; K)$ belongs to $\ker \mathbb{J}_0^*$, and conversely (a part the null element).

If $\ker \mathbb{J}_0^*$ were finite dimensional then its image under the map

$$\{c_n\} \mapsto \sum c_n e_n : \quad l^2 \mapsto L^2(0, T; K)$$

would be finite dimensional, which is not true. This ends the proof. ■

3 Preliminaries on the telegraph equation

We called (generalized) telegraph equation the equation (1.3), obtained from Eq. (1.1) when $M(t) = 0$. Of course, Theorem 2 holds in particular for the telegraph equation and the definition of controllability can be applied to the telegraph equation too.

Controllability, using *real valued controls*, of the telegraph equation at a certain time T (and so also at larger times) has been proved in [32] under standard assumption on Γ . Here we don't make any use of the explicit assumptions on Γ , we just use controllability of the telegraph equation, but it is known that controllability of a wave type equation imposes conditions on the "size" of the active part Γ of $\partial\Omega$, see [6, 17].

A trivial observation is as follows: we can change at will the value of c without affecting controllability. In fact, $u(x, t) = e^{bt}w(x, t)$ solves a telegraph equation like the one of w , but with

$$c, q(x) \text{ replaced with } c + b \text{ and } q(x) - b^2 - cb$$

while $a(x)$ remains unchanged. The eigenvalues depends on this transformation, but the asymptotic estimate and Lemma 3 are not affected.

So, we might choose $b = -c$ and cancel the velocity term but we shall see that a different choice is more useful when studying controllability of the viscoelastic system.

Controllability in time T is equivalent to surjectivity of the map $f \mapsto (w, w_t)$ (acting from $L^2(G_T)$ to $L^2(\Omega) \times H^{-1}(\Omega)$). Using standard arguments, it is easy to see that this is equivalent to the following property:

Lemma 9 *The telegraph equation is controllable in time T iff there exist $m = m_T > 0$, $M = M_T > 0$ such that the following inequality holds:*

$$m \left(\|\phi_0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\phi_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \leq \int_{G_T} \|\gamma_a \phi\|^2 dG_T \leq M \left(\|\phi_0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\phi_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right). \quad (3.1)$$

Here ϕ denotes the solution of the adjoint system

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{tt} &= 2c\phi_t + \nabla \cdot (a(x)\nabla\phi) + q(x)\phi, \\ \phi(\cdot, 0) &= \phi_0(x) \in H_0^1(\Omega), \quad \phi_t(\cdot, 0) = \phi_1(x) \in L^2(\Omega), \quad \phi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

The inequality from above holds for every T , even when the system is non controllable. Controllability instead is crucial for the inequality from below.

Lemma 9 is the starting point of the HUM method (see [20]). The proof in [15] essentially extends similar inequalities to the case that the kernel is not zero.

Now we list three consequences which we shall use below:

Lemma 10 *Let Γ be so chosen that controllability holds for the telegraph equation at some time T . Let $A\phi = 0$. If $\gamma_a\phi = 0$ then we have $\phi = 0$.*

Proof. In fact, $\phi(x, t) = e^{2ct}\phi(x)$ solves (3.2) with $\phi(x, 0) = \phi(x)$ and $\phi_t(x, 0) = 2c\phi(x)$. The choice of Γ implies that the left inequality in (3.1) holds for T sufficiently large, and the integral is zero. Hence $\phi = 0$. ■

We can extend Lemma 10 to nonzero eigenvalues:

Lemma 11 *Let Γ be so chosen that controllability holds for the telegraph equation at some time T . Let $A\phi = \lambda_n\phi$. If $\gamma_a\phi = 0$ then $\phi = 0$.*

Proof. For the proof, we apply the left inequality in (3.1) (which holds for T sufficiently large). Let

$$\beta_n = \sqrt{\lambda_n^2 - c^2}. \quad (3.3)$$

We distinguish the case $\beta_n \neq 0$ and the case $\beta_n = 0$. In the first case, the inequality is applied to the solution $\phi(x, t) = e^{ct}\phi(x) \sin \beta_n t$. Otherwisewe use the solution $\phi(x, t) = e^{ct}\phi(x) \cos \beta_n t$. ■

We recall that a sequence $\{\psi_n\}$ in a Hilbert space is *almost normalized* (or *almost normal*) when there exist $m > 0$ and M such that

$$m \leq \|\psi_n\| \leq M.$$

Lemma 12 *If Γ is so chosen that controllability holds for the telegraph equation at time T , then the sequence $\{(\gamma_a \phi_n)/\lambda_n\}$ is almost normalized in $L^2(\Gamma)$ (here ϕ_n are the normalized eigenfunctions of A whose eigenvalue is not zero).*

Proof. We solve Eq. (3.2) with initial conditions

$$\phi(x, 0) = 0, \quad \phi_t(x, 0) = \phi_n(x).$$

The solution is (β_n is defined in (3.3))

$$\phi(x, t) = \frac{1}{\beta_n} e^{ct} \phi_n(x) \sin \beta_n t$$

(we might have $\beta_n = 0$ for a *finite* set of indices. We disregard these elements without affecting the result). Using $\|\phi_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1$, inequality (3.1) gives

$$m \leq \int_{G_T} \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{\beta_n} e^{ct} \sin \beta_n t \right)^2 \left| \frac{\gamma_a \phi_n}{\lambda_n} \right|^2 dG_T < M.$$

The result follows since, when $c \neq 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\lambda_n}{\beta_n} = 1, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_0^T e^{2ct} \sin^2 \beta_n t dt = \frac{1}{4c} (e^{2cT} - 1).$$

Instead, if $c = 0$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_0^T \sin^2 \beta_n t dt = \frac{1}{2} T. \quad \blacksquare$$

See [14] for the idea of this proof.

3.1 Moment method for the telegraph equation

The following computations make sense for smooth controls and are then extended to square integrable controls by continuity. Let

$$w_n(t) = \int_{\Omega} w(x, t) \phi_n(x) dx$$

($\{\phi_n\}$ is the orthonormal basis of $L^2(\Omega)$, of eigenvectors of the operator A in (1.4)). Then, $w_n(t)$ solves

$$w_n'' = 2cw_n' - \lambda_n^2 w_n - \int_{\Gamma} (\gamma_a \phi_n) f(x, t) d\Gamma.$$

So, with

$$\beta_n = \sqrt{\lambda_n^2 - c^2},$$

we have

$$w_n(t) = - \int_{G_t} e^{cs} \left[\frac{\gamma_a \phi_n}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n s \right] f(x, t - s) dG_t \quad (3.4)$$

if $\beta_n \neq 0$. We might have $\beta_n = 0$ for a finite number of indices and in this case (3.4) has to be replaced with

$$w_n(t) = - \int_{G_t} s e^{cs} [\gamma_a \phi_n] f(x, t - s) dG_t. \quad (3.5)$$

So, we have

$$- w(x, t) = \sum \phi_n(x) \int_{G_t} e^{cs} \left[\frac{\gamma_a \phi_n}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n s \right] f(x, t - s) dG_t, \quad (3.6)$$

$$- w_t(x, t) = \sum \beta_n \phi_n(x) \int_{G_t} e^{cs} \frac{\gamma_a \phi_n}{\beta_n} \left[\frac{c}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n s + \cos \beta_n s \right] f(x, t - s) dG_t. \quad (3.7)$$

If $\beta_n = 0$ then the corresponding term in (3.6) is replaced with (3.5) while in (3.7) it is replaced with

$$\int_{G_t} (1 + cs) e^{cs} (\gamma_a \phi_n) f(x, t - s) dG_t. \quad (3.8)$$

For any $k > 0$ such that $kI - A$ is positive, the sequence $\{\phi_n(\sqrt{k + \lambda_n^2})^{-1}\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $(\text{dom}(kI - A))^{1/2}$ and so $\{\phi_n \sqrt{k + \lambda_n^2}\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $(\text{dom}(kI - A))^{1/2}$ '. This space is unitary equivalent to $H^{-1}(\Omega)$ since (from [10, Theorem 1-D])

$$(\text{dom}(kI - A))^{1/2} = H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Hence, every $\chi \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$ is represented as

$$\chi = \sum \chi_n \left(\sqrt{k + \lambda_n^2} \right) \phi_n$$

for an arbitrary $\{\chi_n\} \in l^2$. Then we have also

$$\chi = \sum_{\beta_n=0} \left(\chi_n \sqrt{k + c} \right) \phi_n + \sum_{\beta_n \neq 0} \left(\chi_n \frac{\sqrt{k + \lambda_n^2}}{\beta_n} \right) (\beta_n \phi_n).$$

It follows that the sequence $\{\beta_n \phi_n\}$ is a Riesz basis of $H^{-1}(\Omega)$ (in this sequence the term $\beta_n \phi_n$ has to be replaced with ϕ_n if $\beta_n = 0$).

Equalities (3.6)–(3.7) show that controllability at time T of the telegraph equation is equivalent to solvability of the following moment problem

$$\int_{G_T} e^{cs} \left[\frac{\gamma_a \phi_n}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n s \right] f(x, T - s) \, dG_T = \xi_n \quad (3.9)$$

$$\int_{G_T} e^{cs} \frac{\gamma_a \phi_n}{\beta_n} \left[\frac{c}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n s + \cos \beta_n s \right] f(x, T - s) \, dG_T = \eta_n \quad (3.10)$$

where $\{\xi_n\}$ and $\{\eta_n\}$ belong to l^2 .

We noted that when $\beta_n = 0$ the corresponding terms in (3.9) and (3.10) have to be replaced respectively with (3.5) or (3.8). In order to have a unified formulation, we introduce

$$\mathcal{J} = \{n : \beta_n = 0\}$$

(a finite set of indices) and $c_n = \eta_n + i\xi_n$. Then, $\{c_n\}$ is an arbitrary (complex valued) l^2 sequence. The moment problem (3.9)–(3.10) reduces to the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{G_T} \left(\frac{\gamma_a \phi_n}{\beta_n} \right) \left[e^{i\beta_n s} + \frac{c}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n s \right] (e^{cs} f(x, T - s)) \, dG_T &= c_n, \quad n \notin \mathcal{J} \\ \int_{G_T} (1 + cs + is) (\gamma_a \phi_n) (e^{cs} f(x, T - s)) \, dG_T &= c_n, \quad n \in \mathcal{J} \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

where f is *real valued*. Now we introduce, for $n < 0$,

$$\beta_n = -(\beta_{-n}), \quad \phi_n = \phi_{-n}, \quad \lambda_n = \lambda_{-n}.$$

Then we consider the moment problem (3.11) with

$$n \in \mathbb{Z}' = \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}, \quad \{c_n\} \in l_2(\mathbb{Z}')$$

with *complex valued* controls. The next formula proves that the moment problem in \mathbb{Z}' and *complex* control f is solvable if and only if the moment problem (3.11) is solvable in $l^2(\mathbb{N})$, with *real valued control*. In fact, let

$f(s) = h(s) + ik(s)$ and put (for $n \notin \mathcal{J}$. Obvious modification for $n \in \mathcal{J}$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{G_T} \frac{\gamma_a \phi_n}{\beta_n} \left\{ \left(\cos \beta_n s + \frac{c}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n s \right) h(s) \right. \\ & \left. - (\sin \beta_n s) k(s) + i \left[\left(\cos \beta_n s + \frac{c}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n s \right) k(s) + h(s) \sin \beta_n s \right] \right\} dG_T \\ & = \omega_n + i\nu_n = A_n + B_n + iC_n + iD_n \end{aligned}$$

We sum the terms with $n > 0$ with the corresponding terms with $-n$ of the *conjugate equality*. Using the parity of the functions we find the moment problem (3.11) for $n > 0$, $f = h/2$ and the right hand side

$$(\omega_n + \omega_{-n}) + i(\nu_n - \nu_{-n}),$$

which can be arbitrarily assigned. Conversely, let us assume that the moment problem (3.11) is solvable for $n > 0$, and real valued control and consider the previous equalities for $n \in \mathbb{Z}'$. The sequences $\{A_n\}$, $\{B_n\}$, $\{C_n\}$, $\{D_n\}$ can be arbitrarily assigned in $l^2(\mathbb{Z}')$ when the moment problem (3.11) is solvable, with the conditions

$$A_n = A_{-n}, \quad B_n = -B_{-n}, \quad C_n = C_{-n}, \quad D_n = -D_{-n}.$$

Now we fix $\{\eta_n + i\xi_n\}$ in $l^2(\mathbb{Z}')$ and we see that the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} A_n + B_n + iC_n + iD_n &= \eta_n + i\xi_n, \\ A_n - B_n + iC_n - iD_n &= \eta_{-n} + i\xi_{-n}, \end{aligned} \quad n > 0$$

can be realized. Hence, our assumption that the telegraph equation is solvable in time T with real valued controls can be rephrased as follows:

Theorem 13 *The telegraph equation is controllable in time T if and only if the moment problem (3.11) is solvable for every complex sequence $\{c_n\} \in l^2(\mathbb{Z}')$, with complex valued control functions $f \in L^2(G_T)$.*

It has an interest to note that when $\{\xi_n\}$ and $\{\eta_n\}$ are arbitrary in l^2 , the same holds for the sequence $\{\eta_n + i\xi_n - (\gamma/\beta_n)\xi_n\}$, for every number γ . So, we have also:

Theorem 14 *The telegraph equation is controllable in time T if and only if the moment problem (3.11) with c replaced with any number γ (in particular with $\gamma = 0$) is solvable for every complex sequence $\{c_n\} \in l^2(\mathbb{Z}')$.*

Using [2, p. 34] we then get:

Theorem 15 *Let us consider the sequence whose elements are*

$$\left(e^{i\beta_n t} + \frac{c\gamma}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n t \right) \frac{\gamma_a \phi_n}{\beta_n} \quad n \notin \mathcal{J}, \quad (1 + (i + \gamma)s)\gamma_a \phi_n \quad n \in \mathcal{J}$$

where γ is any fixed complex number. If the telegraph equation is controllable in time T , then this sequence is a Riesz sequence in $L^2(G_T) = L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))$ and conversely.

4 Moment problem and controllability of viscoelastic systems

The computations are simplified if we perform first a transformation introduced in [26]. This transformation is more transparent if we integrate both the sides of (1.1). We recall that we can assume zero initial conditions (and affine term) without restriction so that we get

$$w_t(t) = 2cw(t) + \int_0^t \tilde{N}(t-s) (\nabla \cdot (a(x)\nabla w(s)) + q(x)w(s)) \, ds$$

with conditions

$$w(0) = 0, \quad w|_{\Gamma}(t) = f(t), \quad w|_{\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma}(t) = 0$$

and

$$\tilde{N}(t) = 1 + \int_0^t M(s) \, ds.$$

We introduce

$$\theta(x, t) = e^{2\gamma t} w(x, t), \quad \gamma = -M(0)/2 = -\tilde{N}'(0)/2.$$

We see that θ solves the following equation, where

$$\alpha = c + \gamma :$$

$$\theta_t = 2\alpha\theta(t) + \int_0^t N(t-s) (\nabla \cdot (a(x)\nabla\theta(s)) + q(x)\theta(s)) \, ds \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\theta(0) = 0 \quad \theta|_{\Gamma}(t) = e^{2\gamma t} f(t), \quad \theta|_{\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma}(t) = 0$$

(the functions $e^{2\gamma t} f(t)$ will be renamed $f(t)$) and

$$N(t) = e^{2\gamma t} \tilde{N}(t) \quad \text{so that } N(0) = 1 \text{ and } N'(0) = 0 .$$

The condition $N'(0) = 0$ simplifies the following computations.

Noting that

$$w_t = e^{-2\gamma t} (\theta_t - 2\gamma\theta) ,$$

controllability of the pair (w, w_t) is equivalent to controllability of the pair (θ, θ_t) . So, from now on we study the controllability of the pairs $(\theta(t), \theta_t(t))$ where θ solves Eq. (4.1).

Remark 16 Computing the derivative of both the sides of Eq. (4.1) we get

$$\theta_{tt} = 2\alpha\theta_t + \nabla \cdot (a(x)\nabla\theta) + q(x)\theta + \int_0^t N(t-s) (\nabla \cdot (a(x)\nabla\theta(s)) + q(x)\theta(s)) \, ds .$$

The telegraph equation which corresponds to this system is

$$\theta_{tt} = 2\alpha\theta_t + \nabla \cdot (a(x)\nabla\theta) + q(x)\theta \tag{4.2}$$

We shall prove controllability of the viscoelastic system comparing it with the telegraph equation (4.2). ■

We project $\theta(t)$ along the eigenvector ϕ_n . Let

$$\theta_n(t) = \int_{\Omega} \theta(x, t) \phi_n(x) \, dx$$

so that

$$\theta'_n = 2\alpha\theta_n - \lambda_n^2 \int_0^t N(t-s)\theta_n(s) \, ds - \int_0^t N(t-s) \left[\int_{\Gamma} (\gamma_a \phi_n) f(x, s) \, d\Gamma \right] \, ds .$$

For every n we introduce the functions $z_n(t)$ which solve

$$z'_n = 2\alpha z_n - \lambda_n^2 \int_0^t N(t-s)z_n(s) \, ds, \quad z_n(0) = 1. \tag{4.3}$$

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_n(t) &= - \int_0^t z_n(\tau) \int_0^{t-\tau} N(t-\tau-s) \int_{\Gamma} (\gamma_a \phi_n) f(x, s) \, d\Gamma \, ds \, d\tau \\ &= - \int_{G_t} \left\{ \int_0^s N(s-\tau) z_n(\tau) \, d\tau \right\} (\gamma_a \phi_n) f(x, t-s) \, dG_t\end{aligned}\tag{4.4}$$

$$\theta'_n(t) = - \int_{G_t} \left[z_n(s) + \int_0^s N'(s-\tau) z_n(\tau) \, d\tau \right] (\gamma_a \phi_n) f(x, t-s) \, dG_t.\tag{4.5}$$

Note that these computations are justified thanks to Theorem 2 (see also [25, Appendix]), which justify also the following equalities, respectively in $L^2(\Omega)$ and $H^{-1}(\Omega)$:

$$\theta(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \theta_n(t) \phi_n(x), \quad \theta_t(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \theta'_n(t) \phi_n(x).$$

Let $\{\xi_n\} \in l^2$ and $\{\eta_n\} \in l^2$ be the sequence of the coefficients of the expansions of the targets ξ and η in series of, respectively, $\{\phi_n\}$ and $\{\beta_n \phi_n\}$ ($\beta_n \phi_n$ replaced with ϕ_n if $\beta_n = 0$). We see that controllability at time T is equivalent to the solvability of the following moment problem:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{G_T} Z_n(t) \frac{\gamma_a \phi_n}{\beta_n} f(x, T-s) \, dG_T &= c_n = -(\eta_n + i\xi_n), \quad n \notin \mathcal{J} \\ \int_{G_T} Z_n(t) (\gamma_a \phi_n) f(x, T-s) \, dG_T &= c_n = -(\eta_n + i\xi_n), \quad n \in \mathcal{J}\end{aligned}\tag{4.6}$$

where, for $n > 0$,

$$Z_n(t) = \begin{cases} z_n(t) + \int_0^t N'(t-s) z_n(s) \, ds + i\beta_n \int_0^t N(t-s) z_n(s) \, ds, & n \notin \mathcal{J}, \\ z_n(t) + \int_0^t N'(t-s) z_n(s) \, ds + i \int_0^t N(t-s) z_n(s) \, ds, & n \in \mathcal{J} \end{cases}\tag{4.7}$$

(we recall that if $n \in \mathcal{J}$ then the element $\beta_n \phi_n$ of the basis of $H^{-1}(\Omega)$ has to be replaced with ϕ_n).

It is convenient to reformulate the moment problem with $n \in \mathbb{Z}'$. This is done using the following definitions:

$$z_n(t) = z_{-n}(t), \quad \phi_n(x) = \phi_{-n}(x), \quad \beta_{-n} = -\beta_n, \quad \lambda_{-n} = \lambda_n, \quad n \notin \mathcal{J}.$$

These inequalities imply

$$Z_{-n}(t) = \overline{Z}_n(t), \quad n \notin \mathcal{J}.$$

We impose an analogous condition also if $n \in \mathcal{J}$:

$$Z_{-n}(t) = \overline{Z}_n(t) \quad \text{if } n \in \mathcal{J}.$$

So, we can consider the moment problem (4.6) with $n \in \mathbb{Z}' = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, extending the definition of \mathcal{J} as the set of positive or negative indices for which $\beta_n = 0$.

In order to prove Theorem 1, we must prove:

Theorem 17 *Let the telegraph equation (4.2) be controllable at time T . Let, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}'$,*

$$\Psi_n = \frac{\gamma_a \phi_n}{\beta_n} \quad n \notin \mathcal{J}, \quad \gamma_a \Phi_n \quad n \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (4.8)$$

Then, the sequence $\{Z_n(t)\Psi_n\}$ is a Riesz sequence in $L^2(G_T) = L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))$.

The remaining part of this section is devoted to the proof of theorem 17.

4.1 The functions $Z_n(t)$

Let

$$K_n(t) = N'(t) + i\beta_n N(t) \quad \text{if } n \notin \mathcal{J}, \quad K_n(t) = N'(t) + iN(t) \quad \text{if } n \in \mathcal{J}.$$

The right hand side of the equality (4.7) is a variation of constants formula, so that (compare (4.3)) $Z_n(t)$ solves

$$Z'_n = 2\alpha Z_n - \lambda_n^2 \int_0^t N(t-s)Z_n(s) ds + K_n(t), \quad Z_n(0) = 1. \quad (4.9)$$

Hence also

$$\begin{cases} Z''_n = 2\alpha Z'_n - \lambda_n^2 Z_n - \lambda_n^2 \int_0^t N'(t-s)Z_n(s) ds + K'_n(t), \\ Z_n(0) = 1, \\ Z'_n(0) = 2\alpha + i\beta_n \quad (n \notin \mathcal{J}), \quad Z'_n(0) = 2\alpha + i \quad (n \in \mathcal{J}). \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

Then we have the following representation formulas, where now

$$\beta_n = \sqrt{\lambda_n^2 - \alpha^2}$$

if $n \notin \mathcal{J}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} Z_n(t) &= e^{\alpha t} e^{i\beta_n t} + e^{\alpha t} \frac{\alpha}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n t \\ &+ \frac{1}{\beta_n} \int_0^t e^{\alpha(t-s)} \sin \beta_n(t-s) \left[K'_n(s) - \lambda_n^2 \int_0^s N'(s-r) Z_n(r) dr \right] ds, \end{aligned}$$

if $n \in \mathcal{J}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} Z_n(t) &= e^{\alpha t} (1 + (\alpha + i)t) \\ &+ \int_0^t e^{\alpha(t-s)} (t-s) \left[(N''(s) + iN'(s)) - \alpha^2 \int_0^r N'(r-s) Z_n(s) ds \right] dr. \end{aligned}$$

We introduce

$$S_n(t) = e^{-\alpha t} Z_n(t)$$

and we see that, for $n \notin \mathcal{J}$,

$$S_n(t) = G_n(t) - \frac{\lambda_n^2}{\beta_n} \int_0^t \sin \beta_n(t-s) \int_0^s (e^{-\alpha(s-r)} N'(s-r)) S_n(r) dr ds$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G_n(t) &= e^{i\beta_n t} + \frac{\alpha}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n t + \frac{1}{\beta_n} \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s} [N''(s) + i\beta_n N'(s)] \sin \beta_n(t-s) ds \\ &e^{i\beta_n t} + \frac{\alpha - N'(0)}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n t + \int_0^t N'(t-s) e^{-\alpha(t-s)} \left[e^{i\beta_n(t-s)} + \frac{\alpha}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n(t-s) \right] ds \\ &= e^{i\beta_n t} + \frac{\alpha}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n t + \int_0^t N'(t-s) e^{-\alpha(t-s)} \left(e^{i\beta_n s} + \frac{\alpha}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n s \right) ds \quad (4.11) \end{aligned}$$

(in the last step we used $N'(0) = 0$).

Instead, for $n \in \mathcal{J}$ we have

$$G_n(t) = 1 + (\alpha + i)t + \int_0^t e^{-\alpha(t-s)} N'(t-s) [1 + (\alpha + i)s] ds.$$

Using the fact that the linear transformation

$$y \mapsto y(t) + \int_0^t e^{-\alpha(t-s)} N(t-s) y(s) ds$$

is bounded with bounded inverse, we get, using Theorem 15:

Theorem 18 *Let the telegraph equation (4.2) be controllable at time T . The, the sequence $\{G_n(t)\Psi_n\}$ is Riesz in $L^2(G_T)$.*

We shall need asymptotic estimates of $S_n(t)$ which holds for large n . So, when deriving these estimates, we can work with $n \notin \mathcal{J}$.

We introduce the notations

$$N_1(t) = e^{-\alpha t} N'(t) \quad \text{so that } N_1(0) = 0, \quad \mu_n = \frac{\lambda_n^2}{\beta_n^2}.$$

Then, an integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned} S_n(t) &= G_n(t) - \mu_n \int_0^t N_1(t-r) S_n(r) \, dr \\ &+ \mu_n \int_0^t \left(\int_0^{t-r} N_1'(t-r-s) \cos \beta_n s \, ds \right) S_n(r) \, dr. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Gronwall inequality shows:

Lemma 19 *For every $T > 0$ there exists $M = M_T$ such that for every $t \in [0, T]$ and every n we have:*

$$|S_n(t)| \leq M$$

We integrate by parts again the last integral in (4.12) and we get

$$\begin{aligned} S_n(t) &= G_n(t) - \mu_n \int_0^t N_1(t-r) S_n(r) \, dr \\ &+ \frac{\mu_n}{\beta_n} \int_0^t \left(N_1'(0) \sin \beta_n(t-r) + \int_0^{t-r} N_1''(t-r-s) \sin \beta_n s \, ds \right) S_n(r) \, dr. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

We note that

$$1 - \mu_n = -\frac{\alpha_n}{\beta_n^2}$$

and we rewrite the previous equality as

$$\begin{aligned} (S_n - E_n) + N_1 \star (S_n - E_n) &= \frac{N_1'(0)}{\beta_n} \int_0^t \sin \beta_n(t-r) S_n(r) \, dr \\ &+ \frac{1}{\beta_n} \int_0^t N_1''(s) \int_0^{t-s} \sin \beta_n(t-s-r) S_n(r) \, dr \, ds + \frac{1}{\beta_n^2} M_n(t). \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Here

$$M_n(t) = -\alpha^2 \int_0^t N_1(t-r) S_n(r) dr + \frac{\alpha}{\beta_n} \int_0^t \left[N_1'(0) \sin \beta_n(t-r) + \int_0^{t-r} N_1''(t-r-s) \sin \beta_n s ds \right] dr.$$

Using the definition of $E_n(t)$ we see that

Theorem 20 *There exists a sequence $\{M_n(t)\}$ of continuous functions defined for $t \geq 0$, bounded on bounded intervals and such that*

$$S_n(t) = e^{i\beta_n t} + \frac{M_n(t)}{\beta_n}. \quad (4.15)$$

Now we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t S_n(r) \sin \beta_n(t-r) dr &= \int_0^t \left(e^{i\beta_n r} + \frac{M_n(r)}{\beta_n} \right) \sin \beta_n(t-r) dr \\ &= -\frac{i}{2} t e^{i\beta_n t} + \frac{i}{2\beta_n} \sin \beta_n t + \frac{1}{\beta_n} \int_0^t M_n(r) \sin \beta_n(t-r) dr. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

We observe

$$\frac{i}{\beta_n} t e^{i\beta_n t} = - \int_0^t s e^{i\beta_n s} ds + \frac{1}{\beta_n^2} (e^{i\beta_n t} - 1) = - \int_0^t s E_n(s) ds + \frac{1}{\beta_n^2} M_n(t).$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\beta_n} \int_0^t S_n(r) \sin \beta_n(t-r) dr &= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{it}{\beta_n} e^{i\beta_n t} + \frac{1}{\beta_n^2} M_n(t) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t s E_n(s) ds + \frac{1}{\beta_n^2} M_n(t). \end{aligned}$$

We replace this expression in (4.14) and we rewrite the equality as

$$\begin{aligned} (S_n - E_n) + N_1 \star (S_n - E_n) &= \frac{N_1'(0)}{2} \int_0^t s E_n(s) ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t N_1''(s) \int_0^{t-s} r E_n(r) dr ds + \frac{1}{\beta_n^2} M_n(t) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t N_1'(t-r) r E_n(r) dr + \frac{1}{\beta_n^2} M_n(t) \end{aligned}$$

(as usual, the functions $M_n(t)$ are not the same at every step).

Let $L(t)$ be the resolvent kernel of $N_1(t)$ so that $L(0) = 0$ and $L(t)$ is twice differentiable. We have

$$\begin{aligned} S_n(t) &= E_n(t) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t N_1'(t-s) s E_n(s) \, ds \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t (s E_n(s)) \left[\int_0^{t-s} L(t-s-r) N_1'(r) \, dr \right] \, ds + \frac{1}{\beta_n^2} M_n(t). \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_n S_n(t) &= \Psi_n E_n(t) + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t s \left[N_1'(t-s) - \int_0^{t-s} L(t-s-r) N_1'(r) \, dr \right] \Psi_n E_n(s) \, ds + \frac{1}{\beta_n^2} M_n(t) \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

(note that we can replace $\Psi_n M_n(t)$ with $M_n(t)$ since $\{\Psi_n\}$ is bounded in $L^2(\Gamma)$). The sequence whose elements are

$$\Psi_n E_n(t) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t s \left[N_1'(t-s) - \int_0^{t-s} L(t-s-r) N_1'(r) \, dr \right] \Psi_n E_n(s) \, ds$$

is the image of a Riesz sequence of $L^2(G_T)$ under a linear bounded and boundedly invertible transformation. Hence, it is a Riesz sequence too so that, using Theorem 5 and Lemma 3, we get:

Theorem 21 *Let the telegraph equation (4.2) be controllable at time T . The following hold:*

- *There exists N such that $\{S_n(t)\Psi_n\}_{|n|>N}$ is a Riesz sequence in $L^2(G_T)$;*
- *the sequence $\{S_n(t)\Psi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'}$ is a Riesz sequence in $L^2(G_T)$ if and only if we can prove that it is ω -independent.*

Our final goal is the proof that $\{S_n(t)\Psi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'}$ is ω -independent in $L^2(G_T)$, which will finish the proof of Theorem 1.

4.2 ω -independence

In this section we prove that the sequence $\{S_n(t)\Psi_n\}$ (hence also $\{Z_n(t)\Psi_n\}$) is ω -independent in $L^2(G_T)$ when the telegraph equation is controllable at time T . We consider the equality

$$\sum_{n \neq 0} \alpha_n S_n(t) \Psi_n = 0 \quad \text{in } L^2(G_T) \quad (4.18)$$

and we show that $\{\alpha_n\} = 0$. Theorem 21 implies that $\{\alpha_n\} \in l^2$ and we proceed in several steps, whose key points are:

- the sequence $\{\alpha_n\}$ is “regular”. In particular, $\alpha_n = \gamma_n / \beta_n^3$ with $\{\gamma_n\} \in l^2$.
- The series (4.18) is termwise differentiable.

We use these properties in order to prove that the sequence $\{S_n(t)\Psi_n\}$ satisfies an equality similar to (4.18), but with one term removed.

- Hence, we can iterate the procedure, and after a finite number of steps we get

$$\sum_{|n| > N} \tilde{\alpha}_n S_n(t) \Psi_n = 0.$$

The coefficient $\tilde{\alpha}_n$ is zero if and only if the original coefficient α_n is zero.

We proved that $\{S_n(t)\Psi_n\}_{|n| > N}$ is a Riesz sequence and so for every n with $|n| > N$ we have $\tilde{\alpha}_n = 0$, hence $\alpha_n = 0$.

- So, the series in (4.18) is in fact a finite sum, and this implies $\alpha_n = 0$ since we shall prove that the sequence $\{S_n(t)\Psi_n\}$ is linearly independent.

Now we proceed to realize this program.

We state a lemma which will be repeatedly used.

Lemma 22 *Let*

$$\Phi(x, t) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} \alpha_n e^{i\beta_n t} \Psi_n \in H^1(0, T; L^2(\Gamma)).$$

Then, there exists $\{\delta_n\} \in l^2$ such that

$$\alpha_n = \frac{\delta_n}{\beta_n}.$$

For completeness, we give a proof in Appendix 6.1.

We single out from the series (4.18) those terms which correspond to indices in \mathcal{J} (if any). Let

$$F(t) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{J}} \alpha_n S_n(t) \Psi_n \quad \text{if } \mathcal{J} \neq \emptyset, \quad F(t) = 0 \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

This sum is finite and for the indices in this sum we have

$$S_n(t) = 1 + (\alpha + i)t + \int_0^t (t-r) \left\{ e^{-\alpha r} (N''(r) + iN'(r)) \right. \quad (4.19)$$

$$\left. - \alpha^2 \int_0^r N_1(r-s) S_n(s) ds \right\} dr. \quad (4.20)$$

So, $S_n(t)$ does not depend on n when $n \in \mathcal{J}$ and it is of class H^3 . Hence, using $N \in H^3$, $F(t)$ is a fixed H^3 function (possibly zero).

When, in the next equalities, the index of the series is not explicitly indicated, we intend that it belongs to the set $\mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathcal{J}$.

Using (4.11) and (4.13) we rewrite (4.18) as

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum \alpha_n e^{i\beta_n t} \Psi_n = F(t) + \alpha \sum \frac{\alpha_n}{\beta_n} \Psi_n \sin \beta_n t \\ & + \int_0^t N_1(t-s) \sum \alpha_n \left(e^{i\beta_n s} + \frac{\alpha}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n s \right) \Psi_n ds \\ & - \int_0^t N_1(t-r) \sum \alpha_n \mu_n S_n(r) \Psi_n dr \\ & + N_1'(0) \sum \int_0^t \frac{\alpha_n \mu_n}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n(t-r) S_n(r) \Psi_n dr \\ & + \int_0^t N_1''(s) \sum \frac{\alpha_n \mu_n}{\beta_n} \int_0^{t-s} \sin \beta_n(t-s-r) S_n(r) \Psi_n dr ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

We prove that every term on the right hand side is of class $H^1(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))$.

Thanks to the fact that $\{\Psi_n \sin \beta_n s\}$ and $\{\psi_n \cos \beta_n s\}$ are Riesz sequences in $L^2(G_T)$ (see Corollary 7) each series on the right hand side, a part possibly the two last rows, is differentiable.

The series (4.22) below is the series at the second last row. If it is differentiable, then also the series at the last row is differentiable. So, we prove differentiability of

$$\sum \frac{\alpha_n \mu_n}{\beta_n} \int_0^t \sin \beta_n(t-r) S_n(r) \Psi_n \, dr. \quad (4.22)$$

Convergence of this series is clear, using (4.15) and $d \leq 3$.

Now we prove that the following series, obtained by formal termwise differentiation, converges in $L^2(G_T)$:

$$\sum \alpha_n \mu_n \int_0^t \cos \beta_n(t-r) S_n(r) \Psi_n \, dr. \quad (4.23)$$

We replace $S_n(r)$ with its expression (??) and we get the following series:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum \alpha_n \mu_n \int_0^t \cos \beta_n(t-s) E_n(s) \Psi_n \, ds \\ & -iN'(0) \sum \frac{\alpha_n}{\beta_n} \int_0^t s \cos \beta_n(t-s) e^{i\beta_n s} \Psi_n \, ds \\ & + \sum \frac{\alpha_n}{\beta_n^2} \int_0^t M_n(s) \cos \beta_n(t-s) \, ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

The last series converges since $d \leq 3$ and the first and second series converge, thanks to Corollary 7, because the convolution integrals are combinations of $\cos \beta_n t$, $\sin \beta_n t$ and $e^{i\beta_n t}$.

So, we have

$$\sum \alpha_n e^{i\beta_n t} \Psi_n \in W^{1,2}(0, T; L^2(\Gamma)), \quad \alpha_n = \frac{\delta_n}{\beta_n}, \quad \{\delta_n\} \in l^2.$$

We replace this expression of $\{\alpha_n\}$ in (4.21) and we equate the derivatives of both the sides. We get

$$\begin{aligned}
& -i \sum \delta_n e^{i\beta_n t} \Psi_n = F'(t) + \alpha \sum \frac{\delta_n}{\beta_n} \Psi_n \cos \beta_n t \\
& + \int_0^t N_1'(t-s) \sum \frac{\delta_n}{\beta_n} \left(e^{i\beta_n s} + \frac{\alpha}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n s \right) \Psi_n \, ds \\
& - \int_0^t N_1'(t-r) \sum \frac{\delta_n \mu_n}{\beta_n} S_n(r) \Psi_n \, dr \\
& + N_1'(0) \int_0^t \sum \frac{\delta_n \mu_n}{\beta_n} \cos \beta_n(t-r) S_n(r) \Psi_n \, dr \\
& + \int_0^t N_1''(s) \int_0^{t-s} \sum \frac{\delta_n \mu_n}{\beta_n} \cos \beta_n(t-s-r) S_n(r) \Psi_n \, dr \, ds. \quad (4.25)
\end{aligned}$$

Arguments similar to the previous ones show that every series on the right hand side can be differentiated once more. The term in the second last line is the one that deserves a bit of attention. Its derivative is the sum of the two series

$$\begin{aligned}
& N_1'(0) \sum \frac{\delta_n \mu_n}{\beta_n} S_n(t) \Psi_n, \\
& - N_1'(0) \sum \delta_n \mu_n \int_0^t \sin \beta_n(t-r) S_n(r) \Psi_n \, dr.
\end{aligned}$$

The first series converges thanks to the first statement in Theorem 21.

We insert (??) in the second series and we get

$$\sum \delta_n \mu_n \Psi_n \int_0^t \sin \beta_n(t-r) \left\{ E_n(r) - ir N'(0) \frac{1}{\beta_n} e^{i\beta_n r} + \frac{1}{\beta_n^2} M_n(r) \right\} \, dr.$$

Convergence of this series is seen as in the first step of differentiation.

Hence we get

$$\delta_n = \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n}{\beta_n}, \quad \alpha_n = \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n}{\beta_n^2}, \quad \{\tilde{\gamma}_n\} \in l^2.$$

Now we iterate this process: we replace δ_n with $\tilde{\gamma}_n/\beta_n$ and we equate the derivatives. We get

$$\tilde{\gamma}_n = \frac{\gamma_n}{\beta_n}, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \alpha_m = \frac{\gamma_n}{\beta_n^3}, \quad \{\gamma_n\} \in l^2. \quad (4.26)$$

Details of the computations are in Appendix 6.1.

So, we have:

Theorem 23 *If the telegraph equation is controllable in time T then there exists a sequence $\{\gamma_n\} \in l^2$ such that*

$$\alpha_n = \gamma_n \quad \text{if } n \in \mathcal{J}, \quad \alpha_n = \frac{\gamma_n}{\beta_n^3}, \quad \text{if } n \notin \mathcal{J}$$

where α_n are the coefficients in the series (4.18).

We recall the definition of $S_n(t)$ in terms of $Z_n(t)$ and we rewrite (4.18) as

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} \alpha_n \Psi_n Z_n(t) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} \frac{\gamma_n}{\beta_n^3} \Psi_n Z_n(t) = 0 \quad (4.27)$$

The series (4.27) converges uniformly so that, computing with $t = 0$, we get:

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} \alpha_n \Psi_n = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} \frac{\gamma_n}{\beta_n^3} \Psi_n = 0. \quad (4.28)$$

Here γ_n/β_n^2 has to be replaced with γ_n in $n \in \mathcal{J}$. We implicitly intend this substitutions also in the next series.

Using $\beta_n^2 \asymp \lambda_n^2$, the first statement in Theorem 21 and the form of $K_n(t)$ and $d \leq 3$, we get

Corollary 24 *The series (4.27) is termwise differentiable.*

Hence we have:

$$\sum \alpha_n \Psi_n \left\{ -\lambda_n^2 \int_0^t N(t-s) Z_n(s) ds + K_n(t) \right\} = 0$$

We can distribute the series on the sum and we get

$$\int_0^t N(t-s) \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} \frac{\gamma_n \lambda_n^2}{\beta_n^3} Z_n(s) \Psi_n ds = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} \frac{\gamma_n}{\beta_n^3} K_n(t) \Psi_n. \quad (4.29)$$

Using (4.28) and $K_n(t) = N'(t) + i\beta_n N(t)$ we get

$$\sum \frac{\gamma_n}{\beta_n^3} K_n(t) \Psi_n = iN(t) \sum \frac{\gamma_n}{\beta_n^2} \Psi_n$$

and so

$$\int_0^t N(t-s) \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} \frac{\gamma_n \lambda_n^2}{\beta_n^3} Z_n(s) \Psi_n ds = iN(t) \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} \frac{\gamma_n}{\beta_n^2} \Psi_n.$$

Computing with $t = 0$ and using $N(0) = 1 \neq 0$ we see that $\{\alpha_n\}$ has a further property:

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} \frac{\gamma_n}{\beta_n^2} \Psi_n = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} \beta_n \alpha_n \Psi_n = 0 \quad (4.30)$$

and so the right hand side of (4.29) vanishes.

Using again $N(0) \neq 0$ in (4.29), we get

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} \alpha_n \lambda_n^2 Z_n(t) \Psi_n = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} \frac{\gamma_n \lambda_n^2}{\beta_n^3} Z_n(t) \Psi_n = 0. \quad (4.31)$$

We recall equality (4.27): $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}'} \alpha_n Z_n(t) \Psi_n = 0$. We introduce the finite (possibly empty) set of indices

$$\mathcal{O} = \{n : \lambda_n = 0\}.$$

Note that if $n \in \mathcal{O}$ then $Z_n(t) = \hat{Z}(t)$, the same for every n . We rewrite (4.31) and (4.27) as (the sum on the right side is zero if $\mathcal{O} = \emptyset$):

$$\sum_{n \notin \mathcal{O}} \alpha_n Z_n(t) \Psi_n = - \sum_{n \in \mathcal{O}} \alpha_n Z_n(t) \Psi_n, \quad \sum_{n \notin \mathcal{O}} \alpha_n \lambda_n^2 Z_n(t) \Psi_n = 0. \quad (4.32)$$

Let $k_1 \notin \mathcal{O}$ be an index (of minimal absolute value) for which $\alpha_{k_1} \neq 0$. Combining the equalities in (4.32) we get

$$\sum_{n \notin \mathcal{O}} \left(\alpha_n - \frac{\alpha_n \lambda_n^2}{\lambda_{k_1}^2} \right) Z_n(t) \Psi_n = - \sum_{n \in \mathcal{O}} \alpha_n Z_n(t) \Psi_n.$$

Note that the right hand side is the same as in the first equality of (4.32).

Let

$$\alpha_n^{(1)} = \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_n^2}{\lambda_{k_1}^2} \right) \alpha_n$$

and note that

$$\{\alpha_n^{(1)}\} \in l^2; \quad \begin{cases} \alpha_{k_1}^{(1)} = 0 \text{ if } \lambda_k = \lambda_{k_1} \\ \text{if } \lambda_k \neq \lambda_{k_1} \text{ then } \alpha_k^{(1)} = 0 \end{cases} \iff \alpha_k = 0.$$

So,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{O}} \alpha_n Z_n(t) \Psi_n \in X_1 = \text{clspan} \{Z_n(t) \Psi_n, \quad n \notin \mathcal{O}, \lambda_n \neq \lambda_{k_1}\} \\ \sum_{\substack{n \notin \mathcal{O} \\ \lambda_n \neq \lambda_{k_1}}} \alpha_n^{(1)} Z_n(t) \Psi_n = - \sum_{n \in \mathcal{O}} \alpha_n Z_n(t) \Psi_n. \end{array} \right. \quad (4.33)$$

Thanks to $\{\alpha_n^{(1)}\} \in l^2$, we can start a bootstrap argument and repeat this procedure: we find that $\{\lambda_n^3 \alpha_n^{(1)}\} \in l^2$. We fix a second element k_2 (of minimal absolute value) such that $\alpha_{k_2}^{(1)} \neq 0$ and, acting as above, we get

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{O}} \alpha_n Z_n(t) \Psi_n \in X_2 = \text{clspan} \{Z_n(t) \Psi_n, \quad n \notin \mathcal{O}, \lambda_n \notin \{\lambda_{k_1}, \lambda_{k_2}\}\} \\ \sum_{\substack{n \notin \mathcal{O} \\ \lambda_n \notin \{\lambda_{k_1}, \lambda_{k_2}\}}} \alpha_n^{(2)} Z_n(t) \Psi_n = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{O}} \alpha_n Z_n(t) \Psi_n. \end{array} \right. \quad (4.34)$$

The new sequence $\{\alpha_n^{(2)}\} \in l^2$ has the property that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \alpha_k^{(2)} = 0 \text{ if } \lambda_k \in \{\lambda_{k_1}, \lambda_{k_2}\} \\ \text{if } \lambda_n \notin \{\lambda_{k_1}, \lambda_{k_2}\} \text{ then } \alpha_n^{(2)} = 0 \iff \alpha_n = 0. \end{array} \right.$$

Repeating this argument, we find

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{O}} \alpha_n Z_n(t) \Psi_n \in X_R = \text{clspan} \{Z_n(t) \Psi_n, \quad n \notin \mathcal{O}, \lambda_n \notin \{\lambda_{k_1}, \lambda_{k_2}, \dots, \lambda_{k_R}\}\}$$

for every R , i.e.

Lemma 25 *We have:*

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{O}} \alpha_n Z_n(t) \Psi_n \in \bigcap_R X_R = \{0\}$$

and, after at most $2N$ iteration of the process, we find

$$\sum_{|n| > N} \alpha_n^{(N)} Z_n(t) \Psi_n = 0.$$

If N is large enough, as specified in the first statement of Theorem 21, we see that

$$\alpha_n^{(N)} = 0 \quad \text{for all } n > N$$

and the original equality (4.27) involves a finite sum. We rewrite it as

$$\sum_{\substack{|n| \leq K \\ n \notin \mathcal{O}}} \alpha_n Z_n(t) \Psi_n = 0. \quad (4.35)$$

This equality implies $\alpha_n = 0$ for every $n \notin \mathcal{O}$ since

Lemma 26 *The sequence $\{Z_n(t)\Psi_n(x)\}_{n \notin \mathcal{O}}$ is linearly independent.*

Proof. Lemmas 10 and 11 show that $\Psi_n(x) \neq 0$ so that we can confine ourselves to prove that $\{Z_n(t)\}$ is linearly independent. The proof is similar to the proof of the corresponding result in [3, 30] and is omitted. ■

In conclusion, Equality (4.27) is in fact

$$0 = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{O}} \alpha_n Z_n(t) \Psi_n = \tilde{Z}(t) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{O}} \alpha_n \Psi_n, \quad \tilde{Z}(t) \neq 0.$$

So,

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{O}} \alpha_n \Psi_n = 0.$$

Finally we prove:

Lemma 27 *If $n \in \mathcal{O}$ then $\alpha_n = 0$.*

Proof. We introduce

$$\Phi(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{O}} \alpha_n \Phi_n(x)$$

which is an eigenfunction of the operator A whose eigenvalue is 0

$$A\Phi(x) = 0.$$

Note that if $\lambda_n = 0$ then $\beta_n = i\alpha$ does not depend on n and so

$$\Psi_n = \begin{cases} \frac{\gamma_a \Phi_n}{\beta_n} = \frac{\gamma_a \Phi_n}{i\alpha} & \text{if } \alpha \neq 0 \\ \gamma_a \Phi_n & \text{if } \alpha = 0. \end{cases}$$

So, in both the cases, we get

$$A\Phi = 0, \quad \gamma_a\Phi = 0.$$

Using Lemma 11, we see that

$$0 = \Phi(x) = \sum \alpha_n \Phi_n(x) = 0.$$

The condition $\alpha_n = 0$ follows, since $\{\Phi_n\}$ is an orthonormal sequence. ■

5 Sharp control time

It is clear that we can't control *every* system of the form (1.1) at a “small” time T_0 , at which the corresponding telegraph equation is not controllable, since $M(t) = 0$ is a possible choice of the kernel. In this section we are going to improve this obvious observation, in that non controllability of the viscoelastic system implies non controllability of the corresponding telegraph equation, regardless of the relaxation kernel $M(t)$.

Theorem 28 *Let the telegraph equation (4.2) be non controllable at time T_0 . Then, Eq. (1.1) is not controllable at time T_0 , for every choice of the $H_{\text{loc}}^2(0, +\infty)$ kernel $M(t)$.*

Proof. We proceed by contradiction: let Eq. (1.1) be controllable at time T . Then, the moment problem (4.6) is solvable in l^2 and then the sequence $\{Z_n(t)\Psi_n\}$ is a Riesz sequence in $L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))$. Using the first statement of Theorem 21 the converse way around, we get that there exists a number N such that the sequence whose elements are described in Theorem 15, and index n such that $|n| > N$, is Riesz in $L^2(0, T_0; L^2(\Gamma))$.

This implies that the moment problem (3.9)-(3.10) for the telegraph equation is solvable for $\{\xi_n, \eta_n\} \in L$, where L has finite codimension, see [11, p. 323] I.e., the reachable set at time T_0 for the telegraph equation would have finite codimension. We use Lemma 8 in order to prove that this is not the case.

Let $T > T_0$ be any time at which the telegraph equation (4.2) is controllable.

Let us denote e_n the elements of the sequence described in Theorem 15. Adding elements of $(\text{cl span } \{e_n\})^\perp$, we complete the sequence $\{e_n\}$ to a Riesz

basis of $L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))$. We denote k_n the added elements, so that the Riesz basis of $L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))$ is $\{e_n\} \cup \{k_n\}$.

We consider the operator $\mathbb{J}_0: L^2(0, T_0; L^2(\Gamma)) \mapsto l^2$ given by

$$\mathbb{J}_0 f = \left\{ \langle f, e_n \rangle_{L^2(0, T_0; L^2(\Gamma))} \right\} \cup \left\{ \langle f, k_n \rangle_{L^2(0, T_0; L^2(\Gamma))} \right\}.$$

Lemma 8 shows that the codimension of its image is not finite and so we have also

$$\dim L^\perp = \dim \left\{ \langle f, e_n \rangle_{L^2(0, T_0; L^2(\Gamma))} \right\}^\perp = +\infty.$$

So, the index N cannot exist and the viscoelastic system cannot be controllable at a time T_0 where the telegraph equation is not controllable. ■

The previous negative result has a clear relation with the following fact, that the speed of propagation of waves in a viscoelastic material is equal to the speed of propagation in the corresponding memoryless elastic material, see [7, 8].

6 Appendix: proofs

in this appendix we prove Lemma and the last step of differentiation.

6.1 Appendix 1: the proof of Lemma 22

We first note that Theorem 21 implies $\{\alpha_n\} \in l^2$ and that in order to prove the formula for $\{\alpha_n\}$ it is sufficient that we prove that it holds for $|n|$ sufficiently large. So, we consider the new function

$$C(x, t) = \sum_{|n| \geq N} \alpha_n e^{i\beta_n t} \Psi_n \in W^{1,2}(0, T; L^2(\Gamma)) \quad (6.1)$$

where N is the number specified in Theorem 21. It is known that $C'(x, t) = C_t(x, t)$ is the $L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))$ limit of the incremental quotient respect to the variable t :

$$C_t(x, t) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{C(x, t+h) - C(x, t)}{h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sum_{|n| > N} \alpha_n \frac{e^{i\beta_n h} - 1}{h} e^{i\beta_n t} \Psi_n.$$

Thanks to the choice of N , there exists $m_0 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} m_0 \sum_{|n|>N} \left| \alpha_n \beta_n \frac{e^{i\beta_n h} - 1}{\beta_n h} \right|^2 &\leq \left\| \frac{C(x, t+h) - C(x, t)}{h} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \\ &\leq 2 \|C'\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds for h “small”, $|h| < h_0$. We consider $0 < h < h_0$.

Let s be real. There exists $s_0 > 0$ such that:

$$\left| \frac{e^{is} - 1}{s} \right|^2 = \left(\frac{\cos s - 1}{s} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\sin s}{s} \right)^2 > \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for } 0 < s < s_0.$$

Then we have, for every $h \in (0, h_0)$,

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{|n|>N \\ \beta_n < s_0/h}} |\alpha_n \beta_n|^2 \leq \sum_{|n|>N} \left| \alpha_n \beta_n \frac{e^{i\beta_n h} - 1}{\beta_n h} \right|^2 \leq \frac{2}{m_0} \|C'\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))}^2.$$

The limit for $h \rightarrow 0^+$ gives the result.

6.2 Appendix 2: end of the proof of formula (4.26)

We insert $\delta_n = \tilde{\gamma}_n/\beta_n$ in (4.25) and we equate the derivatives of both the sides. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum \tilde{\gamma}_n e^{i\beta_n t} \Psi_n &= F''(t) \Psi_n - \alpha \sum \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n}{\beta_n} \Psi_n \sin \beta_n t \\ &+ N_1'(0) \sum \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n}{\beta_n^2} \Psi_n \left(e^{i\beta_n t} + \frac{\alpha}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n t \right) \\ &+ \int_0^t N_1''(t-s) \sum \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n}{\beta_n^2} \Psi_n \left(e^{i\beta_n s} + \frac{\alpha}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n s \right) ds \\ &- N_1'(0) \sum \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n \mu_n}{\beta_n^2} \Psi_n S_n(t) - \int_0^t N_1''(t-r) \sum \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n \mu_n}{\beta_n^2} \Psi_n S_n(r) dr \\ &+ N_1'(0) \sum \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n \mu_n}{\beta_n^2} \Psi_n S_n(t) - N_1'(0) \int_0^t \sum \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n \mu_n}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n(t-r) \Psi_n S_n(r) dr \\ &+ \int_0^t N_1''(t-s) \sum \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n \mu_n}{\beta_n^2} \Psi_n S_n(s) ds \\ &- \int_0^t N_1''(s) \int_0^{t-s} \sum \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n \mu_n}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n(t-s-r) \Psi_n S_n(r) dr ds. \end{aligned}$$

The integrals which do not contain $S_n(t)$ can be differentiated (use the substitution $t - s = r$ to remove the variable t from $N_1''(t)$).

We cancel similar terms with opposite sign and we consider the remaining terms which contains $S_n(t)$, i.e.

$$N_1'(0) \int_0^t \sum \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n \mu_n}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n(t - r) \Psi_n S_n(r) \, dr$$

$$\int_0^t N_1''(s) \int_0^{t-s} \sum \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n \mu_n}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n(t - s - r) \Psi_n S_n(r) \, dr \, ds.$$

We compute the derivative of the first series termwise and we see that the series so obtained is L^2 -convergent:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t \sum \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n \mu_n}{\beta_n} \sin \beta_n(t - r) S_n(r) \, dr = \int_0^t \sum \tilde{\gamma}_n \mu_n \cos \beta_n(t - r) S_n(r) \, dr.$$

Convergence of a series of this kind has already been proved, see the proof of the convergence of the series (4.23).

The convergence of this series implies also that the last integral can be differentiated.

References

- [1] S. Avdonin and B.P. Belinskiy, On controllability of an homogeneous string with memory. *J. Mathematical Analysis Appl.* **398** (2013) 254–269.
- [2] S.A. Avdonin and S.A. Ivanov, *Families of Exponentials. The Method of Moments in Controllability Problems for Distributed Parameter Systems*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 1995.
- [3] S. Avdonin and L. Pandolfi, Simultaneous temperature and flux controllability for heat equations with memory. *Quarterly Appl. Math.* **71** (2013) 339–368. Electronic version DOI 10.1090/S0033-569X-2012-01287-7
- [4] S. Avdonin and L. Pandolfi, Temperature and heat flux dependence/independence for heat equations with memory. in *Time Delay Systems - Methods, Applications and New Trend*, Edited by R. Sipahi,

- T. Vyhlidal, P. Pepe, and S.-I. Niculescu. Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci. 423, Springer-Verlag, (2012) 87–101.
- [5] V. Barbu and M. Iannelli, Controllability of the heat equation with memory. *Diff. Integral Eq.* **13** (2000) 1393–1412.
- [6] C. Bardos, G. Lebeau and J. Rauch, Sharp sufficient conditions for the observation, control, and stabilization of waves from the boundary. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **30** (1992) 10241065.
- [7] G.M.C. Fisher and M.E. Gurtin, M.E., Wave propagation in the linear theory of viscoelasticity. *Quarterly Appl. Math.* **23** (1965) 257–263.
- [8] I. Herrera and Gurtin, M.E., A correspondence principle for viscoelastic wave propagation. *Quarterly Appl. Math.* **22** (1965) 360–364.
- [9] X. Fu, J. Yong and X. Zhang, Controllability and observability of the heat equation with hyperbolic memory kernel. *J. Diff. Equations*, **247** (2009) 2395–2439.
- [10] D. Fujiwara, Concrete characterization of the domains of fractional powers of some elliptic differential operators of the second order. *Proc. Japan Acad.*, **43** (1967) 82–86.
- [11] I.C. Gohberg and M.G. Krejn, *Opérateurs Linéaires non Auto-adjoints dans un Espace Hilbertien*. Dunod, Paris (1971).
- [12] G.M. Gubreeve and M.G. Volkova, One remark about the unconditional exponential bases and cosine bases, connected with them. *Methods of Funct. Anal. and Topology*, **14** (2008) 330–333.
- [13] M.E.Gurtin and A.G. Pipkin, A general theory of heat conduction with finite wave speed. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **31** (1968) 113–126.
- [14] A. Hassel, T. Tao, Erratum for “Upper and lower bounds for normal derivatives of Dirichlet eigenfunctions”. *Math. Res. Lett.* **17** (2010) 793–794.
- [15] J.U. Kim, Control of a second-order integro-differential equation. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **31** (1993) 101–110.

- [16] I. Lasiecka, Controllability of a viscoelastic Kirchhoff plate, in *Control and estimation of distributed parameter systems*. Internat. Ser. Numer. Math., 91 Birkhäuser, Basel (1988) 237–247.
- [17] I. Lasiecka and R. Triggiani, Exact boundary controllability on $L_2(\Omega) \times H^{-1}(\Omega)$ of the wave equation with Dirichlet boundary control acting on a portion of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ and related problems. *Appl Mat Optim* **18** (1988) 241–277.
- [18] G. Leugering, Exact controllability in viscoelasticity of fading memory type. *Applicable Anal.* **18** (1984) 221–243.
- [19] G. Leugering, On boundary controllability of viscoelastic systems. In *Control of partial differential equations* (Santiago de Compostela, 1987) Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci., 114, Springer, Berlin (1989) 190–220.
- [20] J.-L. Lions, *Contrlabilit exacte, perturbations et stabilisation de systmes distribus. Tome 1*. Masson, Paris, (1988).
- [21] P. Loreti, L. Pandolfi and D. Sforza, Boundary controllability and observability of a viscoelastic string. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **50** (2012) 820–844.
- [22] J.U. Kim, Control of a second-order integro-differential equation. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **31** (1993) 101–110.
- [23] V. Komornik, *Exact controllability and stabilization. The multiplier method*. Masson, Paris; John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, (1994).
- [24] V. P. Mikhailov, *Partial Differential Equations*. Mir, Moscou 1978.
- [25] L. Pandolfi, The controllability of the Gurtin-Pipkin equation: a cosine operator approach. *Appl. Math. Optim.* **52** (2005) 143–165. (see a correction in *Appl. Math. Optim.* **64** (2011) 467–468).
- [26] L. Pandolfi, Riesz systems and the controllability of heat equations with memory. *Int. Eq. Operator Theory*, **64** (2009) 429–453.
- [27] L. Pandolfi, Riesz systems and moment method in the study of heat equations with memory in one space dimension. *Discrete Continuous Dynam. Systems - B*, **14** (2010) 1487–1510.

- [28] L. Pandolfi, Riesz systems and an identification problem for heat equations with memory. *Discrete Continuous Dynam. Systems-S* **4** (2011) 745–759.
- [29] L. Pandolfi, Boundary controllability and source reconstruction in a viscoelastic string under external traction. submitted for publication, arXiv:1206.3034
- [30] L. Pandolfi, Traction, deformation and velocity of deformation in a viscoelastic string. *Evol. Equations and Control Theory* (to appear) arXiv:1210.6147
- [31] M.A. Shubov, C.F. Martin, J.P. Dauer and B.P. Belinskyi, Exact controllability of the damped wave equation. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **35** (1997) 1773–1789.
- [32] Soriano, J. A. Exact controllability of the generalized telegraph equation. *Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. Madrid* 8 (1995) 459-493.
- [33] Young, R. M. *An introduction to nonharmonic Fourier series*. Academic Press, San Diego, CA (2001).